



**UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE CÓRDOBA
FACULTAD DE LENGUAS
MAESTRÍA EN INGLÉS CON ORIENTACIÓN EN
LINGÜÍSTICA APLICADA**

**MOHANDAS GANDHI'S SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS: THE POWER TO REACH
UNITY IN DIVERSITY**

TRABAJO DE TESIS PRESENTADO POR SUSANA BEATRIZ ROSSA

DIRECTORA: Mgtr. SANDRA FADDA

CÓRDOBA MAYO 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction.

Unity in Diversity	Page	7
Identity, Social Representations and Discourse	Page	11
Colonialism versus Non-violent Resistance	Page	12
Methodology	Page	14
The Corpus	Page	15
A Transdisciplinary Approach	Page	18
The Study	Page	20

CHAPTER TWO: Survey of Literature. The Historical Perspective

India's Unity in Diversity	Page	23
The Transformation of an ordinary man	Page	25
The Spiritual Father of Indian Secularism	Page	26
A Folk Hero	Page	27
A Non-violent Activist	Page	28
A Charismatic Servant Leader	Page	29
A Moral Theorist	Page	30

CHAPTER THREE: Survey of Literature. The Analytical Perspective

Discourse and Representations	Page	32
The Representations of Social Actors	Page	34
Political Discourse, Power and Ideology	Page	35
Ideologies, Values and Norms	Page	36
Colonial Discourse	Page	37
The Perceptual Biases of Colonial Discourse	Page	40
The Discourse of Non-violence	Page	42

CHAPTER FOUR: Satyagrahis

A Living Faith in God	Page	47
Non-violence	Page	48
Voluntary Suffering	Page	50
Satyagraha is a Non-violent Strategy	Page	52
Satyagraha: Struggle, Battle or War?	Page	55
The Soldiers of Satyagraha. Anchoring in metaphor	Page	57
Pronouns, Representations and the Construction of Satyagraha	Page	59
Gandhi, the Satyagrahi and the Leader	Page	60
Conclusion	Page	61

CHAPTER FIVE: Indian Villages

The Village: The Real India	Page	64
The Representation of Indian Rural Life	Page	66
The Indian Farmer, the Saviour or Redeemer	Page	67
An Unromantic Vision of Village Life	Page	69
Villages vs Cities: Construction of the victim	Page	71
Conclusion	Page	72

CHAPTER SIX: The Colonizers

Colonial Administration	Page	75
Colonial Law	Page	77
Exploitation of the Masses	Page	80
British Colonialism or British People: Deed or Doer?	Page	81

	The Colonizers: Opponents, Enemies or Villains	Page	83
	Indian People and British People: Love or Hatred?	Page	85
CHAPTER SEVEN	Conclusions		
	Discourse, Ideology and Power	Page	87
	Gandhi's Political Discourse	Page	88
	Non-violence and Satyagraha	Page	90
	Gandhi's Spiritual Discourse	Page	91
	Gandhi's Non-violent Resistance	Page	91
	The Discourse of Resistance	Page	95
	Gandhi's Discoursal Construction of the Quest for India's Independence: A Battle between Evil and Good not between Individuals	Page	100
	The Importance of Critical Discourse Analysis	Page	102
BIBLIOGRAPHY		Page	105
GLOSSARY		Page	112
APPENDIX		Page	113

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Mgtr. Sandra Fadda for her guidance. I am totally indebted to my family for their patience and encouragement throughout this long process.

ABSTRACT

Research on intergroup conflict and on identity within the social and behavioural sciences has provided broadly applicable explanations of phenomena such as bias, prejudice and discrimination. In the colonial system, identities and power relations are constructed as a function of the dichotomy dominance/privilege - subjugation/suffering. The rationale for colonization purporting to the westernization of those perceived as backward peoples involves clear demarcation of the borderlines between the colonizer and the colonized and encompasses appropriation and negation of what is local or indigenous, naturalized by the use of a development metaphor. Resistance is the action of contesting colonial state and power in an effort to dismantle colonialism and to reclaim what has been lost to it. Violent oppositional models assume the “enmity” between the native and the imperialist and reproduce the binarism of difference of colonial knowledge. Mohandas Gandhi, the Indian leader, proposes a moral framework for being truly civilized, an alternative to the historical representations and to the values and ideologies that inform and legitimize exploitation in India. He does not define oppression in terms of the presence of an oppressive other but conceptualizes it as a system of economic, political and cultural structures. His notion of resistance requires the transformation of these structures and is based on the creation of a new order of intergroup relations characterized by interdependence and love and not by antagonism, hatred and vindictiveness.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Mohandas Gandhi was a feeble man who wore glasses and a traditional Hindu loincloth called a dhoti. Armed only with a bamboo staff, his courage and his soul-force, he challenged modern Western power as violent imposition on others. Choosing to exercise power through self-suffering and non-violence, he fought for a cause he considered just. Gandhi was the first Indian to make his political mark outside the country, before doing so in India, and the greatest Indian mass-mobilizer who brought millions of men, and especially women, into public life. Service, for him, was about duty, not about power. His ideas of interfaith harmony, his insistence on non-violence and his advocacy of a simple life and self-sustainability are enduring and universal. He touched no heights of eloquence and beauty because he was concerned with meaning, not with style. Gandhi's speeches and writings were not art for him but a practical medium of expression. He had something to say- whether it was about high politics, religion, economy, morality, sanitation or hygiene- and he said it, in the simplest way, without obfuscation or jargon and without any delay. Structured from the periphery of a colonial empire, Gandhi's discourse became an effective method of self-knowledge and of political action and a powerful weapon to persuade and convert opponents.

Unity in Diversity

Gandhi is a natural inspiration and inevitable symbol for all efforts in favour of peace, non-violence and equality across the world. Through his words "Our ability to reach unity in diversity will be the test and beauty of our civilization", Gandhi alludes to the concept of "unity without uniformity and diversity without fragmentation"¹. The oxymoron "unity in diversity" refers to reaffirmation of the fundamental truths that underlie all faiths, philosophies and traditions and cognizance of difference as a harmonizing factor in human interaction, which

¹ Lalonde, R. (1994) *Edited extract from M.A thesis, Unity in Diversity: Acceptance and Integration in an Era of Intolerance and Fragmentation*. Ottawa, Ontario: Department of Geography, Carleton University.

offers a solution to those who are resistant to any kind of cultural hegemony and those who fear intolerance. Etymologically, “civilization” relates to the Latin term *civitas* or city. Its most basic definition is “a society made up of cities” but it can also be used as a label for complex human societies characterized by urban development, social stratification, a form of government, division of labour, surplus of food, literacy and symbolic systems of communication. In a wide sense, the word “civilization” often means nearly the same as culture and is associated with the stage of social and cultural development that is considered most advanced. Early in the evolution of the concept, it was used to differentiate between culturally superior and morally good communities and backward and morally wrong ones.

The effective blend of the antonyms *unitas* and *varietas* provides a cosmivision that enables us to foster the diversity inherent in the human species as it exists today without perpetuating its alienation from nature and from each other and a strategy to resolve the problems of living harmoniously with other creatures. When the boundaries between the self and all of creation are obliterated and a deep sense of connectedness pervades conscience, awareness of the oneness of humankind becomes awareness of the oneness of nature as a whole. The holistic view of the universe described in the concept “unity in diversity”, which appears in the natural and social sciences and humanities literature that draws from ecology as well as in the teachings of the Bahá’í Faith² and in Gandhi’s writings, is based on the knowledge that biological diversity is necessary to sustain the healthy existence of ecosystems. It has developed as an attempt to recapture human beings’ bonds with their natural roots and has found its most profound application in the interaction of all the life forms that make up the macrocosm. This feeling of interconnectedness reveals the need to broaden the concept of territory beyond political, social and cultural boundaries, to curb divisive theories and ideologies and to focus on mutual dependence in order to prevent much of the inequality and violence caused by self-centeredness, materialism, ethnocentrism, exploitation, neglect and bigotry.

Most behavioural scientists accept the premise that human beings are adapted for group living since they are not suited for survival as lone individuals or even as small family units.

² As stated in the Official Website of the Worldwide Bahá’í Community, the Bahá’í Faith established by [Bahá’u’lláh](#) in 1863 initially grew in Persia and parts of the Middle East. At the heart of its teachings is the goal of a unified world order which ensures the prosperity of all nations, territorial clines, creeds and classes. It emphasizes the essential worth of the unity of God, the unity of religion and the unity of humanity, openly rejecting notions of racism and nationalism.

Numerous studies have demonstrated a pervasive tendency to divide the social world into bounded collections of people identified in terms of religious affiliation, nationality, language, race, class or ideology and to validate categories indicative of group membership which sustain a boundary rhetoric. Group phenomena are associated with what Brewer (2001, p. 117) defines as social and collective identities. Social identity is that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from the social relationships and the social groups he/she participates in. It pertains to identification with others who share general status markers or established roles. Collective identity, on the other hand, is the shared sense of belonging to a group. It pertains to identification with a social movement and is manifested in action aimed at forging an image of what the group stands for and how it is represented and viewed by others (Hogg et al., 2004, p.253). Unification and fragmentation are strategies of institution and maintenance of power relations either through the construction of unity among all the members of a group, despite their distinctiveness, or through the separation of the inner networking of a societal system that connects people usually based on mutually shared attributes. There has been an increasing focus on intragroup structural differentiation which determines what is normative or prototypical of membership. Diversity is delineated among the categories and blurred within them for the sake of organizing the mental and social worlds at evaluative, perceptive and behavioural levels.

Codes to classify individuals and circumstances can be found in common sense as well as in domain-specific ontologies about the everyday world. Common sense as a resource of knowledge is embedded in tradition and culture and manifests itself in and through social representations enriching the understanding of social facts. Ontology is about the object of inquiry and seeks explanation and classing of entities. Various discourses have constructed identity in terms of binary categorization and segmented society into in-groups and out-groups, distinguished along divisionary lines that unite, divide and define them. Boundaries are cognitive constructions that make human beings aware of their underlying union as members of a particular people and that can represent them as us in juxtaposition with or in opposition to others.

For Brewer (1999), behavioural patterns that arise at the perception of the self as well as of the other due to group membership may be harmonious or hostile, hegemonic or resistant. Interaction may be characterized by solidarity and collaboration or by hostility, incompatibility of goals or beliefs, coercion or appropriation. Group-based identities have been attributed an

active participation in the causes and consequences of intergroup cooperation and conflict. In the Confucian view, harmony involves acceptance of self and of diversity. Social differences can be blended into a single social and cultural product so that they can be the reason for unity rather than discord. As Li (2008) has noted in his exploration of the Confucian idea of harmony with distinctiveness, “harmony does not require the world to eliminate or even reduce differences because harmony is achieved through differences” (p.432). Nevertheless, group affiliation, power structures, leaders, myths and modernization can foster biased social perception. Hegemony is established through confrontation of ideologies and dialectic persuasion and is supported by similarity and consensus. The dominant collective influences the others, imposing its worldview. Resistance is the strategy of opposing such vision of reality and the action of attempting to modify the status-quo.

Unfair evaluative, cognitive, emotional or behavioural response to other groups can encompass stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination. Stereotyping (Hogg et al., 2004) refers to the beliefs and expectations individuals have concerning what members of other groups are like (p. 254). The distinguishing traits can be either positive or negative, accurate or inaccurate and agreed or rejected by members of the stereotyped group. These schemas or cognitive frameworks for organizing, interpreting and recalling information can influence individuals’ standpoints and actions. They can change when intergroup relations are altered and those who are stereotype-discrepant are sub-typed as a special case that proves the rule. Prejudice involves negative emotional responses and discrimination is differential treatment of others. Both are based on group membership (Baron and Branscombe, 2012, p.179). Prejudice has traditionally been considered the feeling component of attitudes towards social groups that can be linked to categorical thinking. Holding prejudiced views of an out-group allows group members to bolster their own group’s image, particularly when it has been threatened, thus affecting its comparative value; in-groups may view themselves as morally superior and feel the need to draw inter-group boundaries more firmly. Under extreme conditions they may come to see the opposing group as not even human. Contact reduces both negative affect towards outgroups and the salience of distinctions between in-groups and out-groups through processes tending to increased inclusiveness, such as re-evaluation of one’s worldview and redefinition of the boundaries between “us” and “not-us”.

Identity, Social Representations and Discourse

Collective identities are theorized as conceptual structures comprising beliefs and knowledge, norms and values, attitudes and expectations as well as emotions, and as being reinforced and negotiated in discourse (Koller, 2012, p.19). As socio-cognitive representations which are held by people who identify themselves as members of a group, collective identities are constructed, negotiated and changed through discursive interaction within and between groups. In discourse as a social practice, socio-cognitive representations that a text producer holds about a social group, be it their own or another, translate into the textual construction of a collective identity for it (p.20). Drawing on the concept from social psychology (Moscovici, 1984), social representations are about processes of collective meaning-making resulting in common cognitions which produce bonds uniting societies, organizations and groups (Hoijer, 2011, p.3). Representations can also be defined as systems of classification and denotation, of allotting categories and names (Moscovici, 1984, p.30).

Dominant representations foster the construction of homogeneous prototypes as central group members and of less prototypical ones as marginal or deviant ones (Hogg and Reid, 2006, p.19). The perspectival condition of peripherality predicated on the stigmatized dissimilarities between the peripheral or marginal society and that to which it is supposedly peripheral can create otherness, presented as a negation of identity and thus a motive for potential discrimination (Staszak, 2008, p.2). Adopting prejudice as a social discourse implies assuming its ideological and changeable character, separating it from the realms of the *self* and positing it in the context of conflictive relationships. According to van Dijk (2005), dominant ideologies accepted as part of common-sense knowledge by minority groups are clear examples of dominance and of attempts to legitimate power abuse (p.17). Ideologies influence the production and understanding of discourse. Dominant discourses create the conditions to constitute verisimilitude within a discursive net (Raiter, 2001, p.20). It is difficult to challenge them because they are part of the identity of most members of a society and influence their attitudes and behaviour. New discourses may adhere to dominant ones, criticize them on the basis of the same ideas or change the socio-semiotic of the net. Out-groups cease to be others when they succeed in conferring upon themselves a positive autonomous identity and in calling for discursive legitimacy and a policy to establish norms. The incorporation of the possibility of difference becomes an alternative that subverts the established order of things.

Colonialism versus Non-violent Resistance

According to *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, imperial colonialism is a practice of domination which involves political and economic control over a dependent territory to exploit natural resources. In the nineteenth century, one way of relieving the tension between this policy and liberal thought was the argument known as the civilizing mission, which suggested that a temporary period of political dependence or tutelage was necessary in order for uncivilized societies to advance to the point where they were capable of sustaining liberal institutions and self- government. Colonial discourse reflects conflict between the colonizer and the colonized characterized by dichotomies representative of subjugation and presents a stereotyped and homogenous other as a repository of Western knowledge. Western categories of identity and otherness, transmitted through the universalist claims of religion and science are forcibly imposed through colonization (Staszak, 2008, p.3). The Orient is described in negative ways and is categorized as having achieved a limited degree of progress on the evolutionary scale. As victims of prejudice and discrimination, colonized people conceive social identity as a project of resistance to oppression.

Resistance as a means of conflict resolution has become an amorphous concept which encompasses different types of overt or covert behaviour, ranging from subtle subversion to social movements and revolution. Jefferess (2003) redefines it as “endeavours to transform the discursive and material structures of colonial power rather than simply subversion of or opposition to certain aspects of these structures” (p.7). For him, Gandhian *Ahimsa*³ presents an alternative paradigm from the political and economic points of view, based on the cultural and social transformations essential for reconciliation and on the construction of social identity in a new order in which the relationship between the self and the other is an interdependent and not an antagonistic one. Galtung (1990) states that “all forms of life, particularly human life should enjoy closeness and not be kept apart by steep self-other gradients that drive wedges in social space” (p.302). For him the Gandhian axiom *unity of life* means “enhancing all life not just human life, and all human life, not just the categories chosen by some religion or ideology” (p.302), thus contributing to the idea of “unity in diversity.” Understanding that differences enrich human interaction shows an advanced stage of development opposite to barbarism and

³ *Ahimsa* is generally translated as non-violence but it means literally lacking any desire to kill.

chaos. Ziveri (2016) states that the objectives of Gandhian non-violence are to teach by example the values of *dharma* or collective well-being, *prembal* or love force, *satybal* or truth force, *dayabal* or the force of compassion, *tapbal* or the force of suffering and *nitibal* or the force of justice, and to convert the opponent through persuasion (p.80) The techniques adopted are renunciation, fasting, non-cooperation, civil disobedience, strikes and boycotts and a constructive program based on *Sarvodaya* (the welfare of all) and *Swadeshi* (self-sufficiency) as an alternative interpretation of social relations and economic practices (p.83)

As an option to colonial Manichaeism, the values of modernity and the hegemonic frame of violence, Gandhi's non-violent discourse takes up the bourgeois, anarchist, romantic, religious and feminist experiences of pacifism and becomes a method of self-knowledge, social relations and political action. In this universe of values, *satyagraha* (holding firmly to Truth) and *ahimsa* (no harm to anyone) are the guiding principles of a transformation project leading to a new harmony and Gandhi's weapons to fight two battles: the political struggle for India's independence and the cultural confrontation between ancient and modern civilizations. The present socio-historical and linguistic study attempts to continue with critical linguists' proposal of a multidisciplinary study which focuses on the ideological use of language in the construction of identity and of intergroup relations. More precisely, its aim is to explore social representations in Gandhian discourse, the semantic fields in which they are anchored and the linguistic resources that express them and their potential to reproduce or subvert social inequalities in an attempt to identify the way in which these representations reveal the contesting ideologies of non-violence and of colonization in the interaction between the colonized and the colonizer.

In order to achieve such aim, the study will centre on the following hypothesis: Gandhi's discourse is a non-violent ideological discourse of resistance which creates social representations that reflect changes in intergroup relations based on the rediscovery of the significance of difference and of the oneness of humankind. Gandhi's discursive strategies reproduce an alternative order in which out-group hate becomes love of individual and indignation for the threatening systems created by them, thus contributing to a positive evaluation of non-violence as an alternative way of conflict resolution.

Methodology

Gandhi is a consummate communication strategist and practitioner whose discourse turns India's freedom struggle from one waged by a small elite, urban group into an unarmed mass uprising. Through his embodiment of an ascetic, he creates a coherent non-violent narrative which is an intriguing model of self-representation and self-aware performance providing continuous annotation of his deeds until the day of his death. This narrative goes beyond traditional public speeches, prayers or writings towards the use of symbolic actions that blurs the border between action and discourse (Ziveri, 2016). The Mahatma's communication strategy has multiple objectives, such as to disseminate a non-violent critique of the hegemonic Western discourse of social, economic and cultural domination, to promote social mobilization and to construct an alternative non-violent cosmopolitanism.

Following Koller's (2005) proposal, this study integrates Critical Discourse Analysis and a socio-cognitive approach to collective identity. This choice is motivated by an understanding of collective identity as a mental model that comprises cognitive and affective components and is further to change through negotiation in discourse, as Koller (2005) points out. It is complemented by studies within Social Psychology- Identity Theory (Brewer, 1999, 2001; Hogg, Abrams, Otter and Hinkle, 2004; Hogg and Reid, 2006; Hogg, Abrams and Brewer, 2017; Hogg and Gaffney, 2018) and Social Representation Theory (Moscovici, 1984; Hoijer, 2011)

According to Fairclough (2001), Critical Discourse Analysis is analysis of the dialectical relationships between discourse (including language), other forms of semiosis and other elements of social practices. Its particular concern is with the way discourse figures within processes of change. Discourse internalizes and is internalized by other elements without the different elements being reducible to each other. Discourses include representations of how things are or have been as well as imaginaries- representations of how things might or could or should be (p.231). Discourses may under certain conditions be operationalized or put into practice, a dialectical process with three aspects: they may be enacted as new ways of (inter)acting, they may be inculcated as new ways of being (identities), or they may be physically materialized. Enactment and instantiation may themselves take semiotic forms as new discourses (Fairclough, 2012a, p.12)

Social actor representations as a discursive analytical category are seen as the ways social actors are presented in the field of discourse. In his socio-semantic inventory of how social actors can be represented, van Leeuwen (1996, 2008) points out that social actors, mainly human actors, can be included or excluded and be assigned a role. The textual variables to be considered are: codification of exclusion and inclusion, activation, passivation, personalization and impersonalization, among others. The analysis focuses on both human and non-human social actors, groups or individuals and also employs the cognitive semantic theory of metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980,2003; Lakoff, 1991, 1992) which posits that metaphor is a cognitive phenomenon which conceptualizes one thing in terms of another.

The Corpus

The corpus of this study consists of eleven speeches delivered by Gandhi during the campaigns of non-cooperation, civil and total disobedience and during the partition of India. The speeches selected are the following: (1) Reception in Madras, April 21st, 1915; (2) Speech at Benaras Hindu University, February 4th, 1916; (3) Statement at the Great Trial, March 18th, 1922; (4) Dandi March Speeches, March -April, 1930; (5) Appeal to America, September 13th, 1931; (6) Speech at Kingsley Hall, London, October, 1931, (7) Speech at the Round Table Conference, November 30th, 1931; (8) Quit India Speeches, August 8th, 1942; (9) Speech at the Inter-Asian Relations Conference, April 2nd, 1947 , (10) Speech at the Prayer Meeting, January 4th, 1948 and (11) Speech on the Eve of the Great Fast, January 12th, 1948. All the corpus is included in an appendix.

Gandhi did not begin his frays in the nationalist movement by calling the masses to rise against British rule in one go. The first time he officially used Satyagraha was in South Africa in 1907 when he organized opposition to the Asiatic Registration Law. For the Mahatma the struggle for political independence had to be run in tandem with and subordinated to a larger struggle for Indian regeneration. The Constructive Programme started after his return from South Africa in 1914. Some of its most relevant issues were communal unity, rebirth of village industry and khadi, removal of untouchability, upliftment of women and economic equality.

The Non-cooperation campaign was launched in 1920 and lasted for about two years. It was followed by the Civil Disobedience campaign from 1930 until 1931. Total Disobedience started in 1940. Selection of the corpus is based on these different stages of the evolution of the Indian Movement for Independence from colonial rule which can be represented as follows:

❖ Satyagraha in South Africa

Speech at reception in Madras April 21st, 1915

❖ National Regeneration and Constructive Programme

Speech at Benaras Hindu University, February 4th, 1916

❖ Non-cooperation Movement: boycotts, protests

Statement at the Great Trial, March 18th, 1922

❖ Civil Disobedience Movement

Dandi March Speeches, March- April, 1930

Appeal to America, September 13th, 1931

Speech at Kingsley Hall, London, October, 1931

Speech at the Round Table Conference, November 30th, 1931

❖ Total Disobedience Movement

Quit India Speeches, August 8th, 1942

Speech at the Inter-Asian Relations Conference, April 2nd, 1947

❖ Fast

Speech at the Prayer Meeting, January 4th, 1948

Speech on the Eve of the Great Fast, January 12th, 1948

The speeches chosen for the analysis are characterized by criticism of the hegemonic Western discourse of social, economic and cultural domination, social mobilization and the construction of an alternative non-violent cosmopolitanism. In two of them, the reply to a welcome address by the South African League at a meeting at the Victoria Public Hall in Madras and the

speech at the opening ceremony at Benaras Hindu University, Gandhi talks about the struggle of languages and how the colonized have been forced to disregard their own culture in favour of the colonizer's. In the Statement in the Great Trial of 1922, the Mahatma shows his ability as an orator, openly condemning the oppressor's violent means and exposing the irreparable harm done to his country. He makes the point that non-violence is the way to go and reiterates his theme of non-violent non-compliance when he is accused of inciting disaffection towards His Majesty's Government established by law in India and submits to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon him for what in law is deliberate crime and what appears to him to be the highest duty of a citizen, non-cooperation with evil. The day before the march to Dandi, Gandhi gives a speech to a large audience at the end of an evening prayer. In it, he lays out a plan for his people to follow and tells them how to non-violently disobey the English, so that India may one day become independent. The march has a profound effect on the non-violent revolution for liberation and the messages delivered during it possess universal appeal. The Appeal to America and the Quit India Speeches are mainly devoted to the essence of his concept of non-violence and its two fundamental principles, namely, suffering without retaliation and self-discipline on the part of the true non-violent practitioners.

Gandhi uses the battle metaphor to represent his peaceful quest for freedom and democracy and counterposes it to violent revolutionaries' and anarchists' fratricidal combats. In his speeches at political panels with English and Indian leaders, the Speech at the Round Table Conference (November 30th 1931), the Quit India Speeches (August 8th 1942) and the Speech before the Inter Asian Relations Conference (April 2nd 1947), the Mahatma encourages Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs to reunite and contrasts his non-violent civil disobedience with the violence of those who fight for independence and believe in the doctrine of the sword. He acknowledges the difference between urban and rural life and stresses city dwellers' lack of respect for others. He blames the English for having intensified Indian conflicts but openly states that he does not hate the English for their occupation of India and even claims to be their friend. Unlike many revolutionary leaders, he does not taste something bitter when he thinks of the dominant power. In the Speech at the Prayer Meeting (January 4th, 1948) as well as in the last recorded speech before his assassination, the Speech on the Eve of the Last Fast (January 12th, 1948), Gandhi refers to the Inner Voice or the Voice within that guides him and defines his fast as a process of self-purification in the search for Truth and a protest against some wrong

done by society, his last non-violent action that will end only “if there is a reunion of hearts of all communities brought about without any outside pressure but from an awakened sense of duty” (*Speech on the Eve of the Great Fast*, January 12th 1948, par.3). This hearty friendship between Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims that Gandhi longs for “will help India regain her prestige and her fast-fading sovereignty over the heart of Asia and there through the world” (*Speech on the Eve of the Great Fast*, January 12th, 1948, par. 3).

A Transdisciplinary Approach

The texts chosen contain relevant representations of the practice of non-violent resistance to evil, untruth and violence, which can be analysed critically in terms of the relationship between semiosis and other “moments” of the social practice (social identity, social relations, cultural values and consciousness), in ways that facilitate integration of textual analysis into multidisciplinary research on social change, as Fairclough’s (2012b) transdisciplinary dialectical approach to Critical Discourse Analysis and Koller’s (2005) combination of critical discourse studies and socio-cognitive approaches propose. For scholars in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis like Fairclough (1989, 1995, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2012a, 2012b), van Leeuwen (1996, 2008) and van Dijk (1998, 2000, 2001, 2005), language does not simply convey information that it overtly indicates, language can be used to shape the addressees’ feelings, emotions, thoughts, modes of behaviour and ideologies.

Fairclough (1989) defines a critical language study as an orientation towards language which highlights how language conventions and language practices are invested with power relations and ideological processes which people are often unaware of (p.5). His theory of discourse is based on three parameters, the micro-level of language texts (syntactic analysis, use of metaphor and rhetorical devices), the meso-level of discourse practice (processes of text production, distribution and consumption) and the macro-level of discursive events as instances of socio-cultural practices (intertextual and interdiscursive elements). His approach to discourse analysis comprises text description, interpretation processes and their relations with the text and explanation of the way interaction processes relate to social action, assessing the contribution

of discourse in the construction or reconstruction of the three dimensions of the social: knowledge, social identities and social relations (Fairclough, 1995, p.3-20).

According to van Dijk (2000), language and discourse are two crucial social practices influenced by ideologies, which in turn also influence the way ideologies are acquired, learnt or changed (p.9). He defines ideologies as the basic framework of social cognition which is shared by members of social groups. Ideologies are constituted by sociocultural values and organized by an ideological schema that represents the self-definition of the group. They form the basis of the social representations of the group and monitor the overall coherence of group members' beliefs, social practices, text and talk (p.10). The other framework is van Leeuwen's (1996, 2008) socio-semantic inventory which provides a set of sociologically and critically relevant categories for investigating the representations of social actors in texts (p. 32).

Fairclough (2003) acknowledges the importance of metaphors in all sorts of language and in all sorts of discourse, not only as superficial stylistic adornments but also as resources that help construct reality since they structure thought, action and individuals' systems of knowledge and of beliefs (p.131). Koller (2005) admits that the cognitive underpinnings of discourse are rarely addressed in Critical Discourse Analysis and that accounts of metaphor mostly refer to metaphoric expressions as a lexical, or even rhetorical device, rather than to conceptual metaphor as a cognitive phenomenon. However, she highlights that Fairclough's (1989, cited in Koller, 2005) observations that metaphor can be attached to ideology (p. 201) and the idea that group membership and its entailing notion of in-groups and out-groups (van Dijk's 1995, cited in Koller, 2005) can be conceptualized metaphorically (p.204) would be amenable to a combined theory of metaphor in discourse. Thus, Koller's (2005) proposal of integrating Cognitive Metaphor research (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, 2003; Lakoff 1991,1992) to Critical Discourse Analysis on the grounds of the representational power of metaphor, becomes a useful tool to examine the persuasive power of Gandhi's evocative and highly metaphorical language.

Transdisciplinary work with other fields of study which address societal transformations contributes to give accounts of the ways in which and the extent to which social changes are changes in discourse (Fairclough, 2012b, p.452) The approaches mentioned above are complemented by studies within Social Psychology- Social Identity Theory (Brewer, 1999, 2001; Hogg, Abrams, Otter and Hinkle, 2004; Hogg and Reid, 2006; Hogg, Abrams and Brewer, 2017; Hogg and Gaffney, 2018) and Social Representation Theory (Moscovici, 1984; Hoijer, 2011)- which are relevant to matters of identity construction in the hegemonic framework of violence.

The Study

This socio-historical linguistic study attempts to explore the role of Mohandas Gandhi's rhetoric in the reproduction of social representations and ideologies in the process through which he led India to independence and resisted the advance of European civilization. The ultimate end is to determine whether his narrative is tainted with prejudice or is a useful tool to reduce intergroup bias. A critical analysis of Gandhi's discourse reveals his perception of the relations of power between in-groups and out-groups as well as the influence of Gandhian thought in the construction of India's identity and in the transformation of power relations between the colonizer and the colonized.

The general objectives are to analyse the way in which ideology permeates Gandhi's construction of the social identities of the in-group and the out-group, to compare his nonviolent rhetoric and colonial discourse so as to establish similarities and differences between them and to identify the reasons for the validity of the discourse of non-violence and to account for the way discourse analysis can turn into a useful tool to constitute identity and to reveal social changes. The information provided by the study of the micro and macro discursive content of Gandhi's speeches and of the semiotic and lexicalization processes involved in his representations is of major significance to the understanding of the influence of ideology and ideological symbols in the creation of the collective identities of the colonized and the colonizer.

The transdisciplinary research methodology is associated with a version of Critical Discourse Analysis proposed by Fairclough (2012a), which the author considers "a variant of

Bhaskar's explanatory critique" (p.6). Critical Discourse Analysis is integrated within frameworks of transdisciplinary research combining elements from different disciplines to address research issues. The methodology or transdisciplinary process of theoretically constructing the object of research, can be formulated in four stages:

Stage One: focus upon a social wrong in its semiotic aspects

Stage Two: identify obstacles to addressing the social wrong.

Stage Three: consider whether the social order needs the social wrong.

Stage Four: identify possible ways past the obstacles.

As stated by Fairclough (2012a), Critical Discourse Analysis is a form of critical social science geared to a better understanding of the nature and sources of social wrongs or "aspects of social systems, form or orders which are detrimental to human well-being" (p.6). These social wrongs can be ameliorated through major changes in these systems, forms or orders. One point of entry into the analysis of the social order can be semiotic and entails selecting relevant discourses and categories of analysis and examining the dialectical relations between semiosis and other social elements. The ways of addressing social wrongs can be connected with questions of ideology. Discourse is ideological in so far as it contributes to sustaining particular relations of power and domination. Obstacles to addressing social wrongs are tested, challenged and resisted and discourses are contested and replaced by others as part of the struggle in support of alternatives.

As regard the selection of a research topic that relates to a social wrong and that can be approached in a transdisciplinary way with particular emphasis on semiosis and other moments, the social wrong under consideration is the tyranny of violence, prejudice and discrimination embodied in the hegemonic rhetoric of colonialism and the research topic is Gandhi's discourse of non-violent resistance to it produced during the Indian quest for independence from colonial rule. The construction of the objects of research is a transdisciplinary process which involves decisions about relevant bodies of social science and theory to engage with and focuses on Gandhi's discourse of peaceful resistance to the discourse of colonial domination and particularly on the Indian leader's discursive construction of the colonizers and the colonized and the ideologies and biases permeating it.

This is a qualitative study conducted to provide a complete detailed description of linguistic features identified in the data and not to assign frequencies to them and consists of analysis of linguistic forms and ideological analysis of the construction of the collective identities of the colonized and the colonizer. The data collected are Gandhi's representational choices and the coding process is a-priori coding or data approached with a pre-set list of coding categories derived from existing theory or literature. The categories for analysis of Gandhi's representations are codification of exclusion and inclusion, activation, passivation, personalization through nomination and categorizations and impersonalization through abstraction and objectivation (van Leeuwen, 1996, 2008). The categories selected for ideological analysis are polarization or categorization us-them, positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, national self-glorification, victimization, lexicalization, hyperbole and metaphor (van Dijk, 2000).

The present paper is organized as follows: Chapter One is the Introduction, Chapter Two provides the theoretical background from the historical perspective, Chapter Three is about the analytical perspective, Chapters Four, Five and Six present the research findings and Chapter Seven summarizes the main insights gained from the research and suggests further developments.

CHAPTER TWO

Survey of Literature: The Historical Perspective

Few things in the debate about unity and diversity in India carry as much weight as the interpretation and representation of the past. The modern secular state and the concept of national unity as transcending the boundaries of minorities, ethnic groups and religious communities are in line with Indian tradition. Nevertheless, the instances of conflict between collectives that testify to the existence of different nations that ought to be acknowledged through territorial demarcation and the pressure of advocates of various forms of communalism

are also confirmed by history. Gandhi, the saintly man and the charismatic leader, played a vital role in the struggle about the past and its representations as part of the process of self-understanding and construction of India's national identity. This chapter provides some useful information about Mohandas Gandhi, the ordinary man who becomes a spiritual genius and the leader of millions of Indians in the context of a multicultural India.

India's Unity in Diversity

India is a plural society, a synthesis of the religions, cultures and languages of people who belong to different castes and communities. National unity and integrity have survived despite multiple foreign invasions and sharp economic and social inequalities which have obstructed the emergence of egalitarian social relations. To say that India is a nation of great diversity means that India is a vast country with different physical features like deserts, evergreen forests, mountains, perennial and non-perennial river systems, long coasts and fertile plains as well as a land of multiple religions, languages, territorial clines, castes, cultures and settlement patterns. According to a report published in 2020 by the Indian Union of Public Service Commission, the Indian population consists of Hindus (82,41%), Muslims (11,6%), Christians (2,32%), Sikhs (1,99%), Buddhists (0,77%) and Jains (0,41%). The Hindus and the Muslims are divided into sects. India has the world's second highest number of languages. They belong to several families, the major ones being the Indo-Aryan languages spoken by 75% of Indians and the Dravidian languages spoken by 20% of Indians. Representatives of all the three major races⁴ of the world, namely Caucasoid, Mongoloid and Negroid, are found in the country. The following groups also conform its diversity: the Proto-Australoid, the Mediterranean, the Western, the Nordic and the Brachycephals. India is a country of castes. The term caste is used to refer to both, Varna as well as Jati. Whereas Varna is the four-fold division of society according to functional differentiation, Jati refers to a limited regional endogamous group of families. The four varnas include: Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras. There are more than three thousand Jatis and there is no one all India system of ranking them in order and status. As regards culture, there is variation in art, architecture, dance forms, theatre forms and music. Indian diversity is also characterized by tribal, rural and urban settlements and

⁴ Although the term "races" is used in the report cited, it has been replaced by less ambiguous and/or loaded terms such as "territorial clines" in order to avoid reference to the concept race as foundational to racism.

marriage and kinship patterns along religious and regional lines. In spite of the fact that the national governance framework is a uniform one and the entire country is governed by one single constitution and by a uniform pattern of law, penal code and administrative works, divisive politics, regionalism, development imbalance, economic disparities, ethnic differentiation and nativism are factors that threaten India's unity. Freedom of religion and religious practice is guaranteed by the constitution. Moreover, there is no state religion and all creeds are given equal preference. Shrines and holy rivers are spread throughout the length and breadth of the country. Closely related to them is the old culture of pilgrimage, which has always moved people to various parts of the country and fostered in them a sense of geo-cultural unity. Diversity has played an important role in sustaining and developing Indian society. Diversity per se is not a problem, the handling of diversity is the cause of most inter-religious and interstate conflicts together with some external factors such as foreign organizations or extremist groups who incite violence and sow feelings of separatism.

Secularism is the principle of seeking to conduct human affairs based on secular, naturalistic considerations and is most commonly defined as the separation of religion from civic affairs and the state. Communalism is a political philosophy and economic system that integrates communal ownership and confederations of highly localized independent communities. Gottlob (2007) argues that, due to the fact that the interpretation and representation of the past carries much weight in the debate about national unity and cultural diversity in India, secular minded individuals who subscribe to the formula "unity in diversity" rely to a great extent on the historical experience of people of different cultures and ethnic origins coexisting in the subcontinent and possessing a common idea of India. For this reason, the concept of national unity as transcending the boundaries of religious communities and the tradition of toleration pleading for a multicultural India are in line with Indian tradition. Communalists, on the other hand, point to the long experience of conflict between the communities that proves the existence of different nations in India and concludes the need of territorial demarcation. The ideologues of Hindu nationalism who point to the long experience of suffering from the hands of Muslim invaders and rulers, make the relation between religious communities appear as one of enmity. They use the past mainly in support of strategies that are not supposed to be open to alternatives. Gottlob (2007) thinks that the insertion of the unifying model of the nation state and the diversity of cultural and social forms of life into an overarching

perspective of temporal change may result in what he defines as a modern form of unity or unity in diversity.

The Transformation of an Ordinary Man

As Majmudar (2005) points out, the metamorphosis of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, an ordinary man, into Mahatma Gandhi, an extraordinary spiritual genius, was not meteoric. It was a continuous process of faith development characterized by conflict, crises and turning points (p.17). In his book *Gandhi. A Very Short Introduction*, Parekh (2001) states some important facts about Gandhi's life and work. Gandhi was born in the coastal town of Porbandar in the Indian State of Gujarat in 1869. The Gandhis were merchants by caste and had risen to important political positions. Karamchand Uttamchand Gandhi was the chief administrator and member of the Court of Porbandar. Gandhi grew up in an eclectic religious environment. His parents were followers of the Hindu cult of Vishnu. His mother belonged to the Pranami sect, which combined Hindu and Muslim religious beliefs. Mrs. Gandhi's fasts, vows and ideas of religious harmony left an abiding impression on her son. He was also exposed to Christian missionaries and to Jains who practiced non-violence and strict self-discipline. Although he was in contact with many religious beliefs, he had no deep knowledge of any of them, including his own.

Forced to get married when he was only thirteen years old, Gandhi turned into an enemy of child marriage. He left for England to train as a lawyer in 1888. While in England, he became interested in British and European law and politics, interacted with theosophists and studied Christianity and his own religious tradition, finding the New Testament and the Gita deeply moving. On being called to the bar, Gandhi returned to India in 1891. His legal career failed to fulfil his expectations and, when a Muslim firm in South Africa sought his services as a lawyer, he accepted the offer and sailed for South Africa in 1893. He stayed there for two decades, returning to India in 1914. The African experience was a turning point in his life. He defended the voting rights of Indians in South Africa, led campaigns against restrictions on immigration and discriminatory licensing laws and fought prejudiced minds. Gandhi's work did not provide a solution for the Indian problem in South Africa but the country drew him into the vortex of discrimination and provided him with the ideal setting where his talents could unfold themselves. Dalton (2012) argues that what South Africa did for Gandhi was much more

important than what Gandhi did for South Africa. It provided the laboratory for Gandhi's experiment and proved an excellent testing ground since many of the problems he later found in India occurred there in miniature (p. 15). Religious and moral attitudes had begun to form in London, where his young mind tried to unify the teaching of the Gita, The Light of Asia and the Sermon on the Mount. But they took definite shape in South Africa, which gave the start to his life's mission of self-realization and to his struggle for India's independence, as well.

The first years after his arrival in his native land were spent on the periphery of Indian politics until the violent outbreaks of the Amritsar massacre and the enactment of martial law. Gandhi returned to his country with a reputation as a leading Indian nationalist, theorist and community organizer and by the autumn of 1920 he had become a dominant figure on the political stage. Dalton (2012) points out that it was at this time that passive resistance and its non-Indian and nonreligious associations were outgrown by satyagraha (p. 15). The next twenty years were not easy and his determination to free India from colonial domination was tested with increasing rigor. Gandhi took leadership of the Indian National Congress, now turned into a political organization with a mass base, and began escalating demands until the Indian National Congress declared the independence of the country. The British did not recognize the declaration and Gandhi and the Indian National Congress withdrew their support of the Raj when the Viceroy declared war on Germany without consultation in September 1939. Tensions escalated until Gandhi demanded independence in 1942 and the British responded by imprisoning him and other Congress leaders. Meanwhile, the Muslim League cooperated with Britain and moved, against Gandhi's strong opposition, to demands for a totally separate Muslim state of Pakistan. In August 1947 the British partitioned the land with Pakistan and India each achieving independence on terms that Gandhi disapproved. On January 30th, 1948, Gandhi was on his way to address a prayer meeting when a Hindu nationalist, Nathuram Godse, shot him dead, thus putting an end to the life of a leader whose influence had never before been attained by any other political figure in India.

Gandhi, the Spiritual Father of Indian secularism

Gandhi is hailed by many as the spiritual father of Indian secularism, who embodies a religious approach to politics. As the substance of Indian civilization, religion can further

communal harmony and national unity and its universal values can be opposed to the narrowness of communalism. Sen and Wagner (2009) point out that in traditional India, where creeds give meaning to all of life and are a central issue in identity formation, Gandhi “epitomizes the logic that religion and secularism may not be an antithesis of one another”. His philosophy regarding religion still remains largely relevant in contemporary India and can be utilized in other countries” where schisms based on religious differences have become the bane of modern societies” (p.6). The authors think that it is difficult to find a man who is so deeply religious and secular as Gandhi is. They consider the Mahatma as the knower of social representations, whose understanding of culture, mythology and religion and use of symbols which are part of a cultural narrative significantly mobilizes public opinion. Mythology becomes a means to promote secularism and the struggle for India’s freedom and the strong evocative power of traditional Indian symbols helps convey a constructive, secular, socio-political message. In Asian societies and particularly in the Indian context, people bring their cultural baggage -myths, beliefs, values and common sense- into the political arena. Gandhi creates linkages between concepts and representations in order to generate new perspectives, such as the involvement of women and the adoption of non- violence in the freedom struggle in an attempt to overcome inter-ethnic and religious divide (p.7).

Gandhi, a Folk Hero

In *India’s Struggle*, Gipson (2019) defines Gandhi as a folk hero or a real, fictional or mythological hero whose name, personality and deeds are embedded in people’s popular consciousness, and explains the Indian National Congress’s appeal to peasants by portraying Gandhi as a sort of messiah, a successful strategy which results in gaining support from illiterate peasants steeped in traditional Hindu culture and in the incorporation of radical forces within the peasantry into the non-violent resistance movement. Gandhi is presented as the reincarnation of earlier Indian nationalist leaders or even as a demigod in popular plays, songs and poems and in Congress- sponsored religious celebrations (p. 58). The author cites Dalton (2012), who thinks that people flock to Gandhi because his criticism of Western civilization driven by brute force and immorality and his ideas of an Indian civilization, of changing hatred for love and achieving unity, equality and brotherhood, capture the imagination of the people of his heritage.

Gandhi, a Non-violent Activist

Mohandas Gandhi is the key figure in the history of non-violence. His ethical commitments to avoid the use of violence in conflict resolution, which he calls his experiments with truth, have been replicated by supporters of social justice around the world. He encourages his followers to respect opponents as human beings but to challenge them through the use of forceful methods of popular resistance. As a powerful leader, he is able to maximize impact reuniting a large number of Indians who are deeply divided by caste, class, sex and religion. Gandhi's most important effort is the salt march to the ocean with the intent of making salt from seawater, a form of civil disobedience which challenges British salt tax and monopoly of salt production and provides a means of building support along the way. The salt march helps forge a national consciousness and cut across traditional divisions.

Non-violence is not Gandhi's invention but a philosophy and an ideal way of life which he adopts and extends to social and political planes. *Ahimsa* implies avoidance of physical and passive violence. This living force that promotes love and respect of others is the basis of the search for Truth. True non-violence contains a universal applicability as a power to emancipate physically and spiritually that can lead to democracy and requires inner peace and a sense of stability and rootedness, a home, a boundary. However, such rootedness should not become a prison or a barrier that excludes others. Fearing the others' closeness and perceiving them as a threat to one's security help transform them into outsiders or objects of mild or strong indifference, even when they are not treated in a hostile manner. All such exclusions are a form of psychological violence. Non-violence requires a secure and inclusive identity. Accordingly, Gandhi challenges religious, gender-based, national, racial, and other divisions.

For Weber's (2001), *Satyagraha* is Gandhi's technique of non-violent activism. It comes into being before that name is invented. The English phrase passive resistance used to describe it, is supposed to be a weapon of the weak, characterized by hatred which may result in violence. The word '*Sadagraha*' (Sat or truth, *Agraha* or firmness), later changed to '*Satyagraha*', has since become current in Gujarati as a designation for the movement. For Gandhi it is not only a method of conducting conflict but a way of life, of living in Truth. The three basic precepts essential to *Satyagraha* are Truth, non-violence and self-suffering. Truth implies openness, honesty and fairness, working steadily towards the discovery of the absolute Truth and

converting the opponent into a friend in the process. Non-violence is refusal to inflict injury upon others. To make the concept meaningful in the social and political spheres, Gandhi transforms *Ahimsa* into an active social technique to use as a positive force in the search for political and social truths. Self-suffering or willingness to self-sacrifice is a truism, a noble and morally enriching test of love which realizes the dignity of the individual. Fasting, civil disobedience, non-cooperation, non-violent strike and constructive action are the tools of *Satyagraha* in action. *Satyagrahis* should have a living faith in God, must believe in truth and non-violence and in the inherent goodness of human nature. They must live a chaste life and be ready and willing to give up their lives and possessions. They must obey the rules of discipline and must accept to suffer in order to correct a situation. Any violence inflicted by the opponent should be accepted without retaliation (p.64).

Gandhi's conflict norms derive from an integrative resolution attitude and go into the realms of human transcendence: in a conflict situation, adherence to non-violence in thought, word and deed should be the only plan and reaching the truth (and ultimately the Truth) should be the goal. The opponent should not be forced to expose to loss. Threat, coercion or punishment should be replaced by self-suffering. The opponent's conscience should be touched so that they can be converted to seeing the truth. The truth should emerge in the form of a mutually satisfactory and agreed upon solution. The Mahatma conceives the non-violent struggle against oppression as a moral principle and not as a useful strategy for attaining a pragmatic end.

Gandhi, a charismatic servant leader

The Bhagavad Gita⁵ states that a leader is a superior person who acts without self-gain and who has great personal concern for followers. While enlisting the qualities of a superior person, the Gita says that "he is one who hates no creature, who is friendly and compassionate to all, who is free from attachment and egoism, balanced in pleasure and pain, and forgiving." Weber (2004) considers Gandhi a charismatic leader whose disobedience campaigns help establish an independent charismatic authority which can be used to enhance his power within

⁵ Majmudar (2005), defines the Bhagavad Gita, one of the most revered Hindu manuscripts whose call for selfless action inspired many leaders of the Indian Independence Movement, as Gandhi's "spiritual dictionary" (p.85).

more confined nationalist networks. Charisma is thus a grievous matter for Weber; it is the source of norms, standards and meaning bestowed upon society by dominant personalities (p.12). Barnabas and Clifford (2012) state that the Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale (SLBS) consists of six dimensions, namely Voluntary Subordination, Authentic Self, Covenantal Relationship, Responsible Morality, Transcendental Spirituality, and Transforming Influence and that Gandhi's ideals and characteristics depict clearly that he practices servant leadership. As a symbol of service to humankind for whom serving people is a pleasure and a privilege, he has the quality of an authentic self with all its subsidiary qualities: humility, integrity, accountability, security, vulnerability, collaboration, equality, availability, acceptance, moral responsibility, transcendental spirituality and transforming influence (p. 146). Dalton (2012) attributes part of this charisma to his skill as a communicator and to his ability to use symbols and images in a language for and of the Indian people and compares him with a poet who treats his past with affection, drawing from the Indian classics words such as *ahimsa, moksha, Ram Raj, karma yoga, tapasya* and charging them with fresh meaning until they become symbols of both past and future (p.32).

Gandhi, a Moral Theorist

Parekh (2001) states his reasons for considering Gandhi a moral theorist. For the Mahatma, morality means serving and becoming one with all living beings. It involves refraining from causing them any harm and helping them realize full moral and spiritual potential. Spirituality, on the other hand, consists in becoming one with the cosmic spirit and cultivating the love of all living beings, which necessarily entails morality. The political theorist establishes a close connection between Gandhi's theory of man and his views on God and religion. For Gandhi, human beings are four-dimensional in nature, possessing a body, a mind, a soul and a non-material personality. The natural uniqueness of individual nature is ontologically as important and central to identity as the universal human nature shared by all human beings (p.49).

According to Parekh (2001), in Gandhian philosophy, the individual Self is a self-realized and autonomous being who wants to govern themselves and resists any source of domination. Self-realization or the ultimate end, can be defined as the realization of the deeper and broader self or identification with Others belonging to both the human and the non-human

world. It is a quest for Truth which can be attained listening to the Voice within and can be realized via two approaches: social service or spiritual practice. The social is an essential dimension of self-realization which results in a moral and spiritual political order of constructive Self-Other relations. Social service encompasses communal unity, removal of untouchability, village sanitation, village industries apart from mere field work or extension activities. A self-realized individual who has reached God or Truth through love becomes a spiritual self. This state can only be attained through service of humanity, morality and self-restraint. Gandhi's spiritual self believes in eternal oneness, the essential unity of man and all that lives. All beings are part of the same soul, God, the only spiritual force to which everybody and everything is bound. To be open to God is to be open to all creeds (p. 60)

For Gandhi, human beings have souls and are spiritual in nature, thus sharing a capacity to perceive and pursue good and act on it. His view stresses both human identity and difference and leaves space for autonomy and diversity. These features of Gandhi's human theory have important implications since they help bypass the traditional western debate on whether men are good or evil and avoid the homogenizing and monistic impulse to consider human beings as having a specific nature or essence which dictates how they ought to live, while opposing the idea that rights and duties are mutually exclusive (p.62). Gandhi, the man and the Mahatma, is both a philosopher-activist and a charismatic leader. Parekh (2001) finds in the combination of his moralistic language, his clarity of vision, his use of culturally suffused symbols and his enormous self-confidence, the reasons why he impresses and intrigues his countrymen (p. 15). For Dalton (2012), the Indian leader's uniqueness rests both, on the originality of his thinking about power and on his ability to put theory into practice, which turn him into a rare revolutionist, representing disciplined and responsible political action (p. x). What Gandhi left us is his non-violent message celebrating unity in diversity, a powerful discursive legacy through which one can discover and interpret the multidimensional personality of a great man and an extraordinary spiritual genius.

CHAPTER THREE

Survey of Literature: The Analytical Perspective

Identity is a central organizing feature of the social world and is increasingly treated as something that is actively accomplished in discourse. Theorizations about discourse and identity have always had a significant place in Linguistics. Due to the cross-disciplinary status of this field of study, discursive approaches to identity differ in the role assigned to language in the construction and communication of identities and in the types of identities they explore. When looking at in-group and out-group construction, the representation of social actors is of paramount importance. The aim of this chapter is to provide a multidisciplinary analytical framework for the study of Gandhi's discursive construction of the collective identities of the colonized and the colonizer in the struggle for India's independence from colonial rule.

Discourse and Representations

Koller (2012) admits that identities are constructed, negotiated, reinforced and possibly subverted in and through discourse. Linguistic stimuli activate belief systems which are objectified in representations and anchored in existing meaning systems. Bearing in mind that the collective self-construal containing aspects of the self-concept which differentiate in-group from out-group members is reflected in collective identities and manifested in action aimed at promoting the group's identity, Koller (2009, 2012) suggests drawing on social actor representation, central notion of Critical Discourse Analysis, to analyse collective identity. The concept is indebted to van Leeuwen's (1996, 2008) taxonomy of social actor representation and, as an analytical category, it is related to how social actors are presented in discourse. Another parameter, namely metaphoric expression, can be integrated to it since Koller (2005) relies on the representational power of metaphor to relate the cognitive structure underlying a discourse and the ideology permeating it (p.206). The integration of cognitive metaphor research (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, 2003; Lakoff 1991, 1992) to Critical Discourse Analysis, or what Koller later refers to as Critical Discourse Studies, reveals a more comprehensive notion which takes an eclectic approach to methods of analysis and also has theoretical and applied dimensions. The parameters social actor representations and metaphor serve to represent social actors in

particular ways. Social cognition refers to the mental models structuring ideologies, which are acquired and reproduced through social, including discursive, practices and interact with the personal cognition of group members. Cognitively structured ideologies provide group cohesion by defining membership in a group as well as its norms and values. These different representations are generally structured metaphorically. Koller (2005) argues that metaphoric expressions prove useful to study cognitive and ideological determinants of discourse (p.206).

Fairclough (2003) conceives of discourse as an abstract uncountable noun that denotes any transindividual semiotic form of social practice regulated by social convention that is socially constituted and socially constitutive or as a concrete count noun which characterizes a semiotically realized way of representing aspects of the world from a specific perspective:

I see discourse as ways of representing aspects of the world- the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the mental world of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth and the social world. (p.124)

Discourses not only represent the world as it is, they are also projective, imaginaries, representing possible worlds which are different from the actual world and tied in to projects to change the world in particular directions (p.124)

According to him, different discourses are different perspectives on the world and they are associated with the different relations people have to the world, which in turn depend on their position in the world, their social and personal identities and the social relationships in which they stand to other people. These different versions of reality are constructed through choices- what is included or excluded, what is made explicit or left implicit, what is fore-grounded and what is back-grounded and what process types and categories are drawn upon to represent events. Partly these choices are a matter of vocabulary which provides sets of pre-constructed categories (p.129). Fairclough (2003) also mentions the selection of metaphors, which map embodied notions of spatial relationships experienced physically into other domains, and cites Lakoff and Johnson (1980) “whose influential work on metaphors which are embedded within cultures is also relevant here” (p. 131). There are always alternative ways of wording any social practice and alternative wordings corresponding to different categorizations. Such alternative wordings and categorizations often realize different discourses.

The Representations of Social Actors

Van Leeuwen's (1996, 2008) framework for the analysis of social actor representations articulates the role of social actors in the text by drawing socio-semantic categories rather than grammatical ones. Social actors can be excluded or realized for ideological reasons through the following discursive mechanisms: genericization and specification, assimilation, association and dissociation, indetermination and differentiation. Other ways of representing them in discourse is through nomination and categorization, functionalization and identification as well as through personalization and overdetermination. Exclusion is an important aspect that Critical Discourse Analysis research should attend to and backgrounding is considered a less radical type of exclusion. Van Leeuwen (1996, 2008) directs attention to the difference between actors represented as part of a class of people (genericised) or as identifiable individuals (specified) and actors referred to as individuals (individuated) or as groups (assimilated). Social actors can be represented as groups through association and dissociation. Association is reference to groups formed by social actors, which are never labelled in the text although the actors or groups who make up the association may be referred to. Dissociation refers to unformed association. Indetermination occurs when actors are unspecified or anonymous. Differentiation creates difference between an actor or group and similar ones. Social actors may be represented in terms of their unique identity or in terms of the identities or functions they share with others (nominated) or they may be characterized in terms of what they do (functionalized) or in terms of what they are (identified). There are three categories of identification. Actors may be referred to in terms of major classification systems defined by a society (classification), in terms of kinship or work relations (relational identification) or through personal attributes which often have cultural connotations (personal identification). Representational choices may characterize social actors as human beings (personalization) or as non-human subjects (impersonalization) represented in terms of qualities assigned to them (abstraction) or by means of reference to a place or thing closely associated with them (objectification). Impersonalized actors can be non-human entities that are still represented as engaged in particular actions. Finally, van Leeuwen (1996, 2008) identifies a process in which social actors are represented as participants in more than one social practice at the same time, namely overdetermination. The categories listed above are of sociological and critical relevance for the study of collective identity to the extent that they can be seen as feeding into it to provide cumulative evidence of the text producer's beliefs

and/or knowledge about social actor groups, the attitudes towards them and the emotions that accrue to them.

Political Discourse, Power and Ideology

Van Dijk (1998) states that, in the accomplishment of their discourses, language users adapt the properties of their “text and talk” to the social function of the communicative event (p.216). Thus, political discourse can be defined as the “text and talk” of professional politicians and political institutions. Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) regard politics as a social field constituted by a network of practices (associated with political parties or the public spheres among others) which include various genres (political speeches, interviews, political debates among others), political discourses and styles (of political leaders, for example). Discourses can generally be identified with different positions and perspectives of different groups of social actors, for example different political parties. Fairclough (2000) highlights the importance of language in politics and government, particularly due to social changes which have transformed politicians into media personalities. For him, political differences have always been constituted as differences in language; political struggles have been, partly, struggles over the dominant language (p.3). The analysis of political language should focus on language as part of the political action, how the politician achieves consent depending on the way he represents the social world and how he or she projects a particular identity tied to particular values (p. 14).

A critical analysis of discourse encompasses a study of the relations between discourse, power, dominance and social inequality. The notion of power is further elaborated by Fairclough (1989), who explores the various dimensions of the relations of power and language: the idea that discourse is a place where relations of power are exercised and enacted and the idea that certain discourses are shaped and constituted by relations of power. Thus, the exercise of power is achieved through ideology and, more particularly, through the ideological workings of language (p.43). For van Dijk (2000) power is defined in terms of the control one group has over another group and ideology functions as the mental dimension of this form of control, which legitimizes dominance (p.35). It makes sense to speak of ideologies in a combined sense of being at the same time cognitive and social. At one level of theoretical description they are part of the minds of individual people, but at another level, they are a joint representation,

distributed over the minds of the members of a group, something they have in common (van Dijk, 2000, p.30).

Fairclough (1989) considers that language is invested by ideology in various ways and at various levels. As texts bear the imprint of ideological processes and structures, meanings and metaphors are among the features and levels of discourse that may be ideologically invested (p.117). Representations which affect, sustain or undermine power relations are said to be ideological. Fairclough (1989) integrates the concept of hegemony to the analysis of power, ideology and discourse: “hegemony cuts across and integrates politics, economy and ideology and ascribes a place to each of them within an overall focus upon politics and power” (p 122). Hegemony provides a framework to analyse ideology and discourse since it is a focus of constant struggle around points of great instability between classes or blocs to construct, sustain or fracture alliances and relations of domination/subordination which take political, economic and ideological forms. Hegemonic struggle takes place in a broad front which includes institutions of civil society with possible unevenness between different levels and domains and can be conceptualized and analysed in terms of language. From the perspective of hegemony, it is a process of constituting and reconstituting social relations. Fairclough (1989) highlights that discursal change and its relations to social struggle and change and to ideological change is where the language/ideology problem should be confronted (p. 127).

Ideology, Values and Norms

Discourse may affect the formation or change of mental models and hence, realize persuasive goals, thus contributing to what van Dijk (2000) defines as positive self- presentation of the in-group (p.81) and negative presentation of out-group members (p.78). Emphasizing the negative characteristics of out-group members may be accomplished by the semantic manifestation of local and global meanings as well as through formal structures of syntax, style and rhetoric and may contribute to the discursive reproduction of out-group derogation that is characteristic of ideological text and talk. The Dutch linguist argues that ideologies form the

basic social representations of the beliefs shared by a group and function as the framework that defines the overall coherence of these beliefs. For this reason, they must be located together with what is defined as social memory, that is, social knowledge and attitudes.

The categorization of people in in-groups and out-groups, and even the division between good and bad out-groups, “is not value-free, but imbued with ideologically based application of norms and values” (p.78). Such norms and values which are connected to ideologies, organize our actions and evaluations. Whereas ideologies are typical for groups and may determine group conflict and struggle, values have a more specific cultural function and, in principle, are valid for most competent members of the same culture. The beliefs which are not usually disputed within the same culture are called the common background. It is the specific, group-related and interest-defined interpretation of values that forms the building blocks of ideological beliefs.

Unlike common-ground knowledge, ideologies are not sociocultural and cannot be presupposed to be accepted by everyone. Social ideologies typically organize people and society in polarized terms, the in-group or us and the out-group or them, and are connected to group identity and positioning. According to van Dijk (2000), polarization may also apply to the good and bad subcategories of out-groups as is the case for friends and allies, on the one hand, and enemies, on the other. Ideological discourse roughly defined by its three main components, meaning, form and action and interaction, is mainly characterized by the strategies of categorial division of people in in-group and out-group and of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, typical of group interaction in political confrontation (p. 80).

Colonial Discourse

Colonial discourse is distinguished by the interplay of power and dominance and the creation of out-groups and in-groups. Defined as the boundary legacy of colonialism, its discursive constructions reflect the spatial, political/administrative and cognitive boundaries into which colonial states fit indigenous people over time and the way power is manifested.

Staszak (2009) believes that “carving humanity into races and the world into continents” is a template that Europe has used to create spatial forms of otherness (p.4). For him, the anthropological fiction of races and the geographical fiction of continents allow certain categories like civilized/savage, white men/ men of colour to be reified and naturalized by giving them a supposed legitimacy to justify colonial policy and domination of one race and continent over others. The opposition of colonist/native or white/of colour is a kind of “binary form of otherness” (p.4). In his reflections on the relationship between otherness and the West, Staszak (2009) states that difference belongs to the realm of fact and that the process by which a dominant group creates a dominated out-group by stigmatizing a difference belongs to the realm of discourse (p.2).

Mills (1997) defines colonial discourse as “the literary and non-literary writings which were produced within the period and context of British imperialism and the effect of colonialism and colonial texts on current societies” (p.105). Colonial discourse encompasses a body of texts, a set of practices and rules that produced them and the organization of the thinking underlying them. Mills points out that although early work on colonial discourse stressed the way colonizers represented indigenous people as “deficient in relation to British norms,” more recent ones characterized those texts as “less homogenous and more traversed by conflicting discourses” (p.107).

For Pennycook (2002), colonialism is not merely “a site of colonial imposition” but “a site of production”, evolving from the idea of colonialism as a context in which colonial nations’ cultures are thrust upon colonized populations to that of colonialism as a practice which produces ways of thinking, saying and doing which permeate back into the cultures and discourses of the colonial nations (p.8). Nevertheless, the author admits that colonialist cultural constructs have deep roots in Western ways of thinking and produce images of the other who have biologically distinguishing features, in juxtaposition to supposed norms of the self. The dichotomy between the West and primitive societies suggests, on the one hand, a world of modernity and civilization, of change, adaptability and progress who has the right to speak about the rest of the world with authority and paternalistic ease and, on the other, a world out there, of static, unchanging, traditional societies. For every construction of the colonizers, their languages, cultures and political structures as advanced, superior, modern, civilized, mature,

there is a parallel construction of the native other as backward, indolent, dirty, primitive, deprived.

Both Pennycook (2002) and Mills (1997) cite Edward Said's (1978) discussions of Orientalism and Homi Bhabha's (1994) work on mimicry and ambivalence as useful theorizing that has given rise to a wealth of studies of how colonial discourse constructs the other. There has developed a split in those studies between theorists who have drawn on discourse theory and those who have turned to psychoanalysis as a framework. Pennycook (2002) admits that Orientalism constructs the Orient around a distinction between East and West or between we and they, determining largely what could be said about this entity and acting as the basis for European justification of its imperialism (p.8). He highlights ambivalence in the discussion of Orientalism as a system of representation or as a misrepresentation of reality. Another point Pennycook (2002) makes is that he is not interested in how European culture was imposed on local people but in how colonialism produced European culture as a colonial legacy (p.16). To analyse discourse as both representation and misrepresentation leaves ambiguous the key epistemological question as to whether one is dealing with a view of language and the world in which there is a reality that can be represented in language or whether one is working with a view that sees realities as produced through language. Such options have crucial implications for the way a politics of opposition is constructed.

Mills (1997) points out that in Said's (1978 cited in Mills, 1999) views of colonial texts, the Orient is produced as "a repository of Western knowledge, rather than as a society and culture functioning on its own terms" (p.107). According to her, other theorists such as Hulme (1986 cited in Mills, 1999), and Pratt (1992 cited in Mills) adhere to Said's (1978 cited in Mills, 1997) idea that this representation of the non-European world should be attributed to a largescale system of beliefs structured by discursive frameworks that are given credibility and force by the power relations found in imperialism. The seemingly objective statements about the inhabitants of colonized countries are made within a context of evaluation and denigration (p.109). They stereotype rather than individuate them, dehumanize them by generalizations and deny them a history or a possibility of change. Nevertheless, Mills (1997) says that Hulme (1986 cited in Mills, 1997) and Pratt (1992 cited in Mills, 1997) question Said's (1978 cited in Mills, 1997) notion of homogeneity and assume that there have been various discourses

circulating within the colonial period and that the dominant meaning is not the only meaning that is available within the text (p.110). She cites Hulme (1986 cited in Mill, 1997) who considers that, rather than representing other cultures as deficient in relation to a Western norm, stereotypes such as “the noble savage” or “the exotic paradise” are examples of positive categorization, of differentiation which might question the self-evident superiority of Western civilization (p.117). For Mills (1997), Pratt (1992 cited in Mills, 1997) allows for the possibility of texts as having more than one meaning and argues that the seeming laziness attributed to indigenous people in the “native indigence” representation of colonial texts could be read as a form of refusal to partake in colonial rule rather than as an attempt to homogenize the group. Pratt’s (1992 cited in Mills, 1997) “contact zones” define “social spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other in asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination,” thus giving evidence of “an invasion of the lived experience of colonialism by the presence of the colonized other” (p.121).

Mills (1997) agrees with the idea of the influence of power in colonial contexts, which reduce the colonized to “objects of knowledge” and thinks that the textual decisions about racial groupings which represent a reality as not being of the same order as a Western European reality, determine who is regarded as “open” to colonial expansion and “in need of the civilizing influence of European powers”. She highlights that the inhabitants of the colonized countries are described in terms of their absence and not of their presence and erased from consideration (p.116). Thinking along the same line, Fabian (2014) argues that colonies are set in an earlier age than the colonizer’s (denial of coevalness) and are not granted the status which is claimed for the narrator as a representative of the colonizing power. They are relegated to a distant period of British historical development or Western progress through the use of past tense and made into an object of knowledge by means of the ethnographic present, a signal identifying a discourse as an observer’s language which freezes society at the time of observation (p.34).

The Perceptual Biases of Colonial Discourse

In the language of social psychology, the perceptual biases characteristic of colonial discourse can be described as a tendency to view members of out-groups as more homogeneous than members of the in-group, defined as homogeneity effect, or as the tendency to derogate

out-groups and favour in-groups or ethnocentrism (Dovidio, Gaertner, Ufkes, Saguy and Pearson, 2016, p.7). Intergroup relations are not only a matter of ethnocentrism or in-group favouritism but can also involve behaviour that materially disadvantages and stigmatizes outgroups and involve intergroup aggression. Relationships between groups characterized by antagonism, conflict and mutual contempt may result in prejudice, discrimination, stigmatization and dehumanization (Hogg and Gaffney, 2018, p.15-20). Out-group members are at risk of being seen as interchangeable or expendable and are even more likely to be stereotyped, regardless of whether the out-group is another race, religion, nationality or other naturally occurring group. Stereotypes are considered the cognitive component of attitudes towards a social group. The reasons for these attitudes are that people generally have more contact with in-group members while perceiving the out-group as more homogeneous or undifferentiated (Baron and Branscombe, 2012, p. 183). On the other hand, human social groups are organized into discrete in-group and out-group categories, value their in-groups positively and maintain positive cooperative relationships with them. In-group positivity is enhanced by social comparison with out-groups in which in-group attributes are evaluated as better than those of the out-groups. Positive self-evaluation of the own group need not always be the cause of negative attitudes towards out-groups (Brewer, 1999).

Whereas separatism and segregationism explicitly underestimate social interaction and encourage exclusion, colour-blindness, aversive racism and assimilation are examples of “bias without awareness” as Dovidio, Gaertner, Ufkes, Saguy and Pearson (2016, p. 12-15) define ideology biased inclusion which reduces recognition of unfair treatment and inhibits action that ameliorates injustice. Colour-blindness focuses on equal treatment and commonalities between different groups but is consistent with an acculturation tradition which emphasizes assimilation, thus reinforcing hierarchical relationships and perpetuating discrimination. Aversive racism does not reflect blatant forms expressed openly and directly and supports principles of racial equality and sympathy with victims of past injustice. Nevertheless, aversive racists have negative feelings towards these individuals such as avoidant reactions of discomfort, anxiety or fear. Assimilation requires that the members of minority groups conform to dominant values and ideals and abandon their own. As regard religion, intolerance of other faiths may result in intergroup conflict and violence. Communalism is a theory or system of government according to which each commune is virtually an independent state and the nation is merely a federation

of such states. It manifests as strong allegiance to one's own group rather than to society as a whole, suppression of distinctions within the community and emphasis on essential unity among its members. As a political philosophy, communalism has its roots in the religious and cultural diversity of a country. According to Punathil (2019), mobilization on the basis of religious identity is central to the escalation of conflict between religious minorities in India. With the arrival of Islam in the Middle Ages, antagonism between Hindu and Muslim groups started and later increased as a result of colonial imperialism and its policy of "divide and rule" (p.1). Orientalists pictured Hindu-Muslim antagonism as an age-old problem of uncivilized Indians but other authors preferred to speak of collective collusion between two identities of faith. Since communal representations have always dominated Indian politics, secularism or separation of religion from civic affairs and the state, has never got the chance to emerge out of creative dialogue between these two different communities. The National Secular Society states that the principles of secularism are: separation of religious institutions from state institutions and a public sphere where religion may participate but not dominate, freedom to practice one's faith or belief without harming others and equality so that religious beliefs or lack of them do not bring about advantages or disadvantages to anyone (p. 3)

The Discourse of Non-Violence

Non-violence has become one of the techniques for conflict resolution in recent years. According to Weber (1991), the main reasons for the employment of non-violent political action are that it is available to all, it is the least likely to alienate opponents and third parties, it breaks the cycle of violence and counter-violence, it leaves open the possibility of conversion and is the surest way of achieving public sympathy. This method is more likely to produce a constructive rather than a destructive outcome since its main aim is to arrive at the truth of a given situation rather than mere victory for one side. What is more, it is the only one that is consistent with the teachings of the major religions. In addition, non-violence can also be the basis for a way of life since it adheres to the beliefs of underlying unity of humankind and of self-realization or identification with both the human and the non-human world. There are various approaches to non-violence which can be classified as tactical, strategic, pragmatic and ideological. Tactical exponents use short to medium term campaigns in order to achieve a goal

within an existing social framework and their aim is reform. Strategic exponents are guided by a structural analysis of social relationships and are mainly concerned about the transformation of society. Their campaigns are conducted within the context of long-term revolutionary strategy. Pragmatic exponents view conflict as a relationship between antagonists with incompatible interests and their goal is to defeat the opponent. For them, non-violence is the most effective way. Ideological exponents believe in the unity of means and ends and view the opponent as a partner in the struggle to satisfy the needs of all. They may consider non-violence as a way of life and choose it for ethical reasons (p.40).

Non-violent action is a technique by which people who reject submission and passivity can wage conflict in a peaceful way. It consists of acts of protest and persuasion, withdrawal of cooperation with people, activities, institutions or regimes, acts of civil disobedience or deliberate violation of laws or regulations that are believed to be illegitimate for some reason, or non-violent intervention, designed to undermine the sources of power of the opponent in order to bring about change. Peaceful intervention may involve the disruption of established behaviour patterns, policies, relationships or institutions (fasting, blockades, imprisonment seeking, facility overloading) or creation of new ones such as alternative non-hierarchical political, social or economic institutions, ethical investment groups, communication or transport chains, parallel media, energy exchange cooperatives or alternative schools. According to Galtung (1990), non-violent resisters reject all physical violence on principle, either direct, structural, cultural or ecological. Violence is a problem at the level of individual action, of group processes and of political structure. At the personal level, structural violence is inherent in exclusive language and behaviour and reflects institutionalized values and organizational patterns. At the process level, it is inherent in traditional hierarchical or male dominated group dynamics (p.291).

Capitalism, patriarchy or the state may reinforce violence. Non-violent theorists propose alternative value sets which manifest in non-exclusive language and conduct, the adoption of empowering group processes characterized by no hierarchies, decision by consensus and systematic efforts to deal with power imbalances. Weber (1991) thinks that these theorists usually share the anarchist aversion to state power in any form and are more interested in a comprehensive strategy of resistance and disruption, coupled with the creation of a vast network

of cooperative organizations to supplant capitalist control of production processes and undermine patriarchy and state power (p.25).

From the perspective of discourse, Ziveri (2016) identifies three periods in the evolution of the discourse of non-violence: the classical period, the modern period and the postmodern period. During the first half of the Twentieth Century, the development of communication and transport technologies, the improvement of education and the urbanization and work reorganization phenomena are overshadowed by the barbarity of the World Wars and the explicit violence of totalitarian ideologies and of mass societies guided by the requirements of bellicose myths. It is in this context in which Mohandas Gandhi's rhetoric emerges as a reinterpretation of Thoreau's rebel experiences and Tolstoy's pacifist ideas and has a crucial role in spreading his criticism of the hegemonic discourse of domination, in promoting mobilization and in construing a non-violent cosmovision. Anchored in a religious and spiritual matrix frame, the Indian leader's principled non-violent discourse becomes a classical referent in Europe and in the United States, inspiring social movements such as Lanza del Vasto's Community of the Ark and leaders such as Martin Luther King, Nelson Mandela and Lech Walesa. Gandhi sees the key effects of non-violent action on opponents as conversion and his communication tactics aim at reaching the rural masses, facilitating dialogue with his followers, mobilizing third parties and persuading those who do not adhere to his ideas. His simple, straightforward and assertive language is never used to insult, ridicule or to polemicize with the adversary but to offer an alternative vision of the world based on values which may contribute to transform the opponents' visions of themselves, of power relations and of social change. Yamabhai (1973) states that Gandhi conceives non-violence as the only means leading to Truth, Truth being equated with God. It is as necessary to sustain the soul as food is necessary to sustain the body. Non-violence is a power that can be wielded by all those who have a living faith in the God of love and have love for all mankind; an extremely active force exclusively for the brave who have committed themselves to the right cause, to Truth or God, which is untenable unless it is undertaken as a response to a violent situation (p.1)

Whereas the classical and modern non-violent discourses criticize and oppose the violent power of colonialism, racism, totalitarianism, and environmental crime, postmodern discourse is characterized by what Foucault (1984 cited in Ziveri,2016) calls a proliferation,

juxtaposition and disjunction of discourses defined by Ziveri (2016) as non-violent communicative action, a form of productive counter-power or intervention of discourse with the strategic objective of modifying public opinion's vision of reality and of creating narrative alternatives about social inequality, group identity and social action. In communicative terms, a requirement for the effectiveness of non-violent action is that channels are open and that relevant meanings are produced. Non-violence as communication is a convenient way of bringing out other effects of non-violent action. Turning from merely descriptive and informative, the discourse of non-violence becomes performative and embodies new social relations realized through speech acts (p.393)

The present analytical framework has been prepared on the grounds that a socio historical linguistic study of the ways social actors are represented in Gandhi's non-violent discursive construction of collective identity involves critical analysis from different perspectives including discourse, ideology, social representation and social psychology but mainly focusing on the idea that identity is described in terms of membership in groups and that this sense of belonging is expressed and constituted in and through discourse.

CHAPTER FOUR

Satyagrahis

This chapter is about the representation of *Satyagrahis* in Gandhian discourse, more precisely in the speeches that form the corpus of research. A *Satyagrahi* is a person dedicated to truth, one who offers *Satyagraha* (holding onto truth) or participates in *satyagraha* campaigns. After the suppression of the military and political rebellions of 1857, Indian political life had become confined to small groups of educated middle class men petitioning and pleading for administrative and constitutional reforms. In the 1920s and 1930s, the non-cooperation and civil disobedience movements inspired and led by Gandhi, radically transformed social life in India and helped redefine the meaning of power. What the Gandhian era achieved was a major breakthrough to other social groups, particularly peasants and businessmen. These people became Gandhi's disciplined volunteers who managed to achieve correct insight into the real

nature of evil in a situation by seeking truth in a spirit of peace and love. The Mahatma and his followers formed a close-knit team devoted to the service of society, a group of “heroes made out of the clay” as Gandhi’s political mentor, Gopal Khrisna Gokhale, called them when he referred to Gandhi and said: “He is without doubt the stuff of which heroes and martyrs are made. Nay, more, he has in him the marvellous spiritual power to turn ordinary men around him into heroes and martyrs.” (Traboulay, 1997, p. 67)

In order to understand the way Gandhi represents *Satyagrahis* in his speeches, it is necessary to understand what *Satyagraha* means to him, in terms of the way he represents it discursively. The word *Satyagraha* is a compound of the Sanskrit nouns *Satya*, “Truth” and *Agraha*, “grasp”. As Gandhi states in *Harijan*⁶ (March 26th, 1938), *Satyagraha* is both a doctrine and a useful strategy for attaining a pragmatic end. It is “soul-force pure and simple”, the force which is born of Truth and love or non-violence and a non-violent struggle for the attainment of self- rule through voluntary suffering.

***Satyagraha* is a doctrine and Satyagrahis are the followers**

The structure of *Satyagraha* is built upon three pillars: a living faith in God or Truth, non-violence and voluntary suffering (Majmudar, 2005, p.138). Gandhi’s representations of *Satyagrahis* as the followers of the doctrine can be traced exploring his selection of word meaning related to the mother concepts of his thinking through lexicalization, since ideological content is most directly expressed in discourse meaning, as van Dijk (2000) states (p.42). Gandhi’s linguistic choices to characterize his disciples act as a framework for listeners or readers to view the world from the Gandhian perspective. Van Leeuwen’ socio-semantic inventory contributes to assign categories to them and thus to define their collective identity as members of certain groups (1996, 2008).

⁶ *Harijan* was a weekly newspaper in English, which focused on India’s and the world’s social and economic problems.

A Living Faith in God or Truth

In *Essence of Hinduism*, Gandhi (1987) states that *Satyagraha* cannot be undertaken without a living or unflinching faith in God (p.92) and adds that a *Satyagrahi* who has any stay or help that is not God, can be a passive resister or a non-cooperator but not a true *Satyagrahi* (p.93). To have faith in God or Truth is exclusively about theistic religious faith and can be analysed by identifying faith with a certain kind of belief with theological content which is held with firmness and conviction: God exists, is benevolent towards us and has a plan for salvation, or by identifying faith with a practical commitment. This is a fiducial model of faith as trust, understood as an action rather than as an affective state of confidence: trust God or trust in God. In the speech which Gandhi calls his spiritual message, the *Speech at Kingsley Hall* (October, 1931), he tries to find an answer to the questions Who is God? and What is God? Answers which are inspiring for any *Satyagrahi*. For Gandhi, God is “the law which governs all life” (par.3), “that informing power of the spirit” that holds all together, that creates, dissolves and recreates (par.4), “life, truth, light, love, the supreme Good” (par.4). Gandhi believes in “the existence of God” (par.1), feels “the real presence of God within” (par.5) and sees the power of the spirit “as purely benevolent” (par.4). As regards what God is, Gandhi speaks of “an undefinable mysterious power that pervades everything” (par.1), “an orderliness in the universe” (par.3), “a divine authority” (par.4). In the last paragraph of the speech he states:

He who would in his own person test the fact of God’s presence can do so by a living faith and since faith itself cannot be proved by extraneous evidence, the safest course is to believe in the moral government of the world and therefore in the supremacy of the moral law, the law of truth and love. (par 5)

From these expressions it can be inferred that the third person singular pronoun “he” refers to all his disciples and to Gandhi himself, since a *Satyagrahi*’s living faith in God involves a model of faith which is characterized by theological content, firmness and conviction. *Satyagrahis* must follow the Law of God leading to the discovery of Him within them. In the speech, the Mahatma repeatedly names God. The concept of God in Hinduism varies in its diverse traditions. In his study of the essence of Hinduism, Gandhi affirms that “a man may not believe in God and still call himself a Hindu” (1987, p. 3). Majmudar (2005) posits that until 1931 Gandhi used the terms “God” and “Truth” interchangeably to indicate one and the same

Ultimate Reality; but later, however, he found the formulation “Truth is God” preferable to “God is Truth” in order to appeal to all religions, even to atheists (p.139). Thus, independently of their religious affiliations or beliefs, true *Satyagrahis* follow Truth and live according to the law of love which governs all creation. On the level of language, *Satyagrahis* are categorized (van Leeuwen 1996, p.52; 2008, p. 40) according to functionalization (van Leeuwen, 1996, p.54 2008, p.42). In other words, they are characterized in terms of what they do: they are Truth seekers.

Non-violence

In *Harijan* (March 14th, 1936), the Mahatma admits that “non-violence is soul force or the power of the Godhead within us” (p.39). In the last paragraph of the *Speech at the Reception in Madras* (April 21st 1915), referring to Indian immigrants in Transvaal who formed part of Gandhi’s first satyagraha campaign, the Mahatma says:

They realized the common danger and they realized also that their destiny was an Indian’s and it was they, and they alone, who matched the soul-forces against the physical forces. (par. 4)

Varma (2001) states that Gandhi conceives soul-force as a positive and active force that “arises from the higher realms of the spirit” and is “the highest and most powerful force available to man”. The euphemism “soul force” as the opposite of “physical force” alludes to *Satyagrahis*’ resistance to evil, “the common danger”, with inner strength and non-violent means.

In Gandhian thought, non-violence is both a creed and a policy, as Gandhi states in the *Statement in the Great Trial* (March 18th 1922) when he says: “Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is also the last article of my creed. (par.2). It is an ordered moral government of the whole universe and the only means to fight evil. Somewhere in the same speech he declares:

I am endeavouring to show to my countrymen that violent non-cooperation only multiplies evil and that as evil can only be sustained by violence, withdrawal of support to evil requires complete abstention from violence. (par.12)

The Interplay of the words “evil” and “violence” and the phrase “abstention from violence” reveals Gandhi’s strategy to fight evil incarnated in violence and characterizes *Satyagrahis* as non-violent non-cooperators with evil.

The rationale of non-violence is manifested in *Appeal to America* (September 13th 1930). Gandhi pleads with a wider international audience to get support for the Indian independence movement:

The reason for the struggle having drawn the attention of the world, I know, does not lie in the fact that we Indians are fighting for our liberty, but in the fact that the means adopted by us for attaining that liberty are unique and, as far as history shows us, have not been adopted by any other people of whom we have any record. (par.2)

The inclusive phrase “we, Indians” used to refer to all those who adhere to the non-violent way, reveals that Gandhi makes no categorial distinction as to race, ethnicity, religion or language. *Satyagrahis* are presented as a homogenous consensual group through a process of collectivization (van Leeuwen, 1996, p.48; 2008, p. 37) and, as a practitioner of *Satyagraha*, Gandhi forms parts of it, as well. The argument in favour of their non-violent means is sustained thorough a comparison (van Dijk, 2000, p.65), in which the Mahatma juxtaposes *Satyagrahis*’ means and those used by an unspecified other realized in the phrase “any other people”. Reference to historical statistical figures (van Dijk, 2000, p.69) presents some evidence or proof for the opinion expressed and adds credibility to the statement. Effective use of hyperbole, “the means adopted are unique”, helps to highlight the distinctive nature of the strategy. Within the global structure of positive self-presentation, Gandhi achieves self-glorification through polarization between an in-group formed by non-violent *Satyagrahis* and an out-group whose members have other means (van Dijk, 2000, p.78). The idea of violence is restated:

The means adopted are not violence, not bloodshed, not diplomacy...they are purely and simply truth and non-violence. No wonder that the attention of the world is directed towards this attempt to lead a successful bloodless revolution. Hitherto, nations have fought in the manner of the brute. They have wreaked vengeance upon those whom they have considered their enemies. (par.3)

By means of the nouns “bloodshed”, “vengeance” and “enemies” the phrase “in the manner of the brute”, Gandhi represents non-violence through his understanding of violence. Instead of portraying it in terms of what non-violence is, he does so in terms of what it is not, in a way that contributes to a negative presentation of the out-group and strengthens polarization between the pacifist character of the *Satyagrahis* and the violent rest of the world represented as “nations who have fought in the manner of the brute”. Political acts of non-violent resistance can have revolutionary ends. Through the phrase “successful bloodless revolution”, Gandhi evokes a forcible overthrow of the existing social order and reiterates the non-belligerent nature of the uprising. The adjective “bloodless” has a positive connotation and contrasts with the noun “bloodshed” which refers to the bloody revolution led by the violent fraction of the independence movement. Non-violence is counterposed with the “imprecations upon the so-called enemy contained in national anthems”, the solemn promise of “destruction” and the act of seeking Divine assistance “for the destruction of the enemy” (par.4), which help represent attempts to attain freedom “through bloody means” in a world that “is “sick of blood-spilling” (par.5). Rather than as revolutionaries, *Satyagrahis* are represented as peaceful reformers who conceive their resistance as change and focus on the transformation of the structure of power assumed within colonial discourse by fostering an order in which the relationship between the self and the other is of mutual interdependence rather than of antagonism as Jefferess (2003) suggests.

Voluntary Suffering

Gandhi inculcates the idea of self-suffering, maintaining that non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. It does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means putting one’s whole soul against the will of the tyrant. The Mahatma uses the noun “pledge” to refer to *Satyagrahis*’ allegiance to the civil disobedience movement. Everywhere, *Satyagrahis* “pledged” themselves to fight for *purna Swaraj* or complete self-rule to the ultimate consequences.

... a few men took the pledge to carry on the movement even at the risk of their lives till swaraj was won. (April 5th 1930, par.3)

Take a pledge with God and your conscience as witness, that you will no longer rest till freedom is achieved. (August 8th 1942, par.31)

A “pledge” is a solemn promise or a type of security interest given on a loan by which legal rights are granted by a debtor to a creditor over the debtor’s property. The term “pledge” evokes *Satyagrahis*’ strong devotion to non-violence. For the Mahatma the success of non-violence rests on the absence of violence, on suffering without retaliation and forgiveness as he states in *Appeal to America* (September 13th 1930):

It must be a sight worth contemplating and treasuring that millions of people have given themselves to suffering without retaliation in order that they might vindicate the dignity and honour of the nation. I have called that suffering a process of self- purification.

(par 6)

Self-suffering is a concomitant of self-sacrifice and may even be associated with death for the ideal of recovering the sovereignty of the nation. In *Benaras Hindu University Speech* (February 4th 1916), Gandhi manifests his own strong commitment to the cause through statements in first person.

I would not hesitate to declare that they (the English) would have to go and I hope I would be prepared to die in defence of that belief. That would, in my opinion, be an honourable death. (par.12)

According to Dijvi (2012) the Mahatma separates dying from killing and prizes dying for a cause as a nobler deed. In the *Benaras Hindu University Speech* (February 4th 1916), he blames violent revolutionaries for degrading the truly sovereign act of dying by killing to achieve it:

I honour the anarchist for his love of the country. I honour him for his bravery in willing to die for his country; but I ask him is killing honourable? Is the dagger of an assassin a fit precursor of an honourable death? (par.12)

The negative presentation of the belligerent, who he names “anarchists”, is achieved through rhetorical questions related to killing and weapons which categorize anarchists as parts of a

violent-segment. The Mahatma celebrates *Satyagrahis'* non-violent self-suffering. Majmudar (2005) establishes a close connection between self-suffering and both, truth and non-violence, and highlights the healing, transforming and redemptive power of the former. Together, the power of truth based on non-violent courage and self-suffering constitute the vows taken by all *Satyagrahis*, the epitomes of self-endurance as Majmudar defines them (p.141).

Satyagraha is a Non-violent Strategy

As a strategy, *satyagraha* is a form of civil resistance and comprises non-cooperation, civil disobedience and fasting. Gandhi uses the capitalized noun *Satyagraha* and the noun *satyagrahis* to nominalize the movement and its members in order to identify both: "In Satyagraha there is no place for fraud or falsehood or any kind of untruth" (*Quit India Speech*, August 8th 1942, par.27) or "A *Satyagrahi* whether free or incarcerated will always be victorious" (*Speech on the Eve of the Historic Dandi*, March 11th, 1930) and resorts to the noun phrase "civil disobedience movement" to refer to the nation-wide campaign that started after the declaration of sovereignty and self-rule by the Indian National Congress on January 26th, 1930.

The terms "civil disobedience" and "civil resistance" are commonly used as near synonyms of the noun *satyagraha*, however, there is no conceptual convergence among them. Non-violent resistance is the practice of achieving goals such as social change through symbolic protests, civil disobedience, economic or political non-cooperation, *satyagraha*, fasting or other non-violent methods. Civil disobedience, on the other hand, is the active professed refusal of a citizen to obey certain laws or pay certain taxes. The act violates the law and the actor willingly accepts punitive measures against him. Gandhi avoids the phrase "passive resistance" because it does not exclude the use of physical force or violence.

In the *Speech at Dandi* (April 5th 1930), the ideas of civil disobedience as a movement and as a strategy of non-compliance with certain norms are introduced:

If the civil disobedience movement becomes widespread in the country and the Government tolerates it, the salt law may be taken as abolished (par.3)

If you, brothers and sisters come forward as true volunteers and commit civil disobedience of the salt law, (...) we shall have in us the power to attain in a single day what we hold to be our birthright. (par.13)

The volunteer men and women, are individuated in terms of gender, which constructs a particular image of the movement as inclusive and unbiased, a distinctive feature which reveals Gandhi's attitude towards women in public life. The kinship names "brothers" and "sisters" create a sense of cohesion between Gandhi, his disciples and the volunteers. (van Leeuwen, 1996, p.46; 2008, p.35). *Satyagraha* has the characteristics of an ideological group (van Dijk, 2000, p.32). It has an internal structure composed of a leader, his disciples and some volunteers, a common goal and a shared ideology. The term "birthright", or right of possession or moral right a person has from birth, used in the expression "to attain (...) what we hold to be our birthright" refers to their common goal or self-rule. Popularized in India by self-rule advocates the words "Swaraj is my birthright and I shall have it" acquired the status of a political slogan. It was coined by Tilak, a well-known Indian journalist who, like Gandhi, conveyed his message through the mass media, as stated by Chaturvedy (2021). Through the use of the trigger word "birthright", Gandhi appeals to his followers' national sentiment since the attainment of *swaraj* is *Satyagrahis*' main end in life.

In the *Speech on the Eve of Dandi March* (March 11th 1930), the walk through rural India, from Ahmedabad to Dandi on the Arabian sea, is portrayed as a continuous flow of "civil resisters":

From what I have been and heard during the last fortnight, I am inclined to believe that the stream of civil resisters will flow unbroken. (par.2)

According to Ackerman and Rodal (2008), "conflicts waged by civilian populations that centre in self-determination and freedom from oppression have been pertinent lessons of successful collective application of non-violent sanctions" (p.111-126). Civilians use them to challenge and delegitimize rulers, mobilize people, constraint authoritarian powers or undermine their sources of support. The effective combination of the words "stream" and "flow" describing a steady and continuous movement, contribute to characterize *satyagraha* as mass mobilization.

This is a relevant fact since the Salt March marks the transition of Indian nationalism from a middle-class basis to the masses. The phrase “civil resisters” is used to refer to Gandhi’s enthusiastic followers and to categorize them in terms of what they do through the process of functionalization: they resist abusive authority and injustice. Ackerman and Rodal (2008) define civil resistance as “civilian based non-violent action” (p.111) and highlight the need for a serious examination of the norms that rule international and intranational relations so that the decision to use non-violence is not based only on a philosophy but on commonsensical, moral and legal considerations (p.123). Ordinary citizens join civic campaigns to seek decisive change in favour of rights, justice or democracy.

The idea of non-violent resistance is re-stated in in the *Quit India Speeches* (August 8th 1942) through the expression “I will have to resist the might of the Empire with the might of the dumb millions with no limit but of non-violence as policy confined to this struggle” (par.46). The abstract noun “might” may be used to indicate either “the power, authority or resources wielded by an individual or group” or to refer to “bodily strength”. In his statement, Gandhi counterposes the Empire’s power with the inner strength which *Satyagrahis* are known for. Polarized cognition and categorization of the in-group (resisters) and the out-group (members of the Empire) in terms of the dichotomy “power- inner strength” is ideologically loaded and is comprehensible in a social context of subjugation. The “might” of the Empire is the power imposed through coercion; Gandhi’s and his disciples’ “might” is their strength to resist suffering (van Dijk, 2000, p.80)

Fasting or abstention from all or some kind of food or drink can take different forms as political action. The fast as a protest acquires a different role in the *Speech on the Eve of the Last Fast* (January 12th 1948) as the last resource in *Satyagrahis’* armoury.

A fast which a votary of non-violence sometimes feels impelled to undertake by way of protest against some wrong done by society, and this he does when as a votary of Ahimsa has no other remedy left. (par. 1)

I never like to feel resourceless, a satyagrahi never should. Fasting is the last resort in the place of the sword. (par. 2)

Gandhi explains the relevance of fasting and the reasons for having adopted it as a *Satyagrahi*. It is the last non-violent alternative left for votaries of non-violence to confront the violence of those who are in favour of the partition of the country on religious grounds. In an attempt to legitimate the fast, he argues that the friendship between Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims which *Satyagrahis* support is “non-existent” and that this fragmentation of the country is “a state that no Indian patriot worthy of the name can contemplate with equanimity” (par. 2). *Satyagrahis* are positively represented as patriots, a category which not only has the semantic feature of human but also works to constitute a positive image for *Satyagrahis*. A patriot is a person who supports his or her country and is ready to defend it against any enemy or detractor. The noun patriot is associated with positive feelings and differs from the term nationalist which may have a negative connotation, especially when it is related to extreme exclusionary movements.

Satyagraha: Struggle, Battle or War?

Gandhi’s lexical choices to refer to *Satyagraha* campaigns include military vocabulary related to warfare. The war frame serves a cognitive function by allowing people to leverage what they know about war as a mental model for thinking about a complex issue (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). The well-defined schematic knowledge for a prototypical war, involving two opposing forces as parts in a confrontation to achieve different goals, calls to mind the adversarial relationship between civil resisters and the evils of colonialism. Such a frame adds to Gandhi’s polarization between a non-violent in-group and a violent out-group (van Dijk, 2005, p. 42).

The *Speech at Dandi* (April 5th 1930) and the *Quit India Speeches* (August 8th 1942) were memorable allocutions directed to an immediate audience, the marchers and the members of the All India Congress Committee, respectively. In the *Speech at Dandi* (April 5th 1930), the effort to achieve self-rule is framed as a mass “struggle” that demands great sacrifice: “This is a struggle not of one man but of millions of us” and “Hence in the struggle for Swaraj millions should offer themselves for sacrifice and win such Swaraj as will benefit the vast masses of the country” (par. 19). In the *Quit India Speeches* (August 8th 1942), Gandhi resorts to a hyperbole and to the noun “struggle” and the phrase “more genuinely democratic” in “I believe that, in the history of the world, there has not been a more genuinely democratic struggle for freedom as

ours (...)" (par.5). The word "fight" is used to refer to a vigorous struggle or campaign and is pre-modified by the adjective non-violent which differentiates it from an armed conflict in: "Ours is not a drive for power, but purely a non-violent fight for India's independence" (par.4).

Gandhi's *Appeal to America* (September 13th 1930) is directed to a remote audience. Gandhi begins his speech evoking the world consequences of the Indian struggle: "The Indian struggle in its consequences affects not only India but the whole world..." (par.1). The expression "affects the whole world" is used for extra effect: to receive nation-wide as well as world-wide support. According to Yamabhai (1933), the speaker selects universal appeals to convince his audience of the importance of the undertaking and to gain universal acceptance.

I have, therefore, no hesitation in inviting the great nations of the earth to give their hearty cooperation to India in her mighty struggle. (par.6)

In his representation of India's forceful effort for the attainment of self-rule he uses the noun "struggle" and the adjective "mighty" meaning "impressively powerful" which make the positive self-presentation more grandiloquent. The selection of the classifying adjective "Indian" and the toponym "India" and the invitation to cooperate with the country create a sense of unity and cohesive, almost familial, relation between Gandhi and "the great nations of the earth".

In the *Quit India Speeches* (August 8th 1942), the noun "war" in the phrase "fratricidal war" is used to refer to Pakistan's demand for the annexation of Kashmir, a Muslim majority province, to Pakistan. Since the liberal secular ideology of India regards the retention of Kashmir essential to preserve the multi-ethnic and multireligious character of the nation, the trigger phrase evokes an armed conflict in which people kill members of their own social group.

The Congress cannot be party to such a fratricidal war. Those Hindus who, like Dr. Moonje and Shri Savarkar, believe in the doctrine of the sword, may seek to keep the Mussalmans under Hindus. (par.20)

Hindus and Muslims who proposed the separation of India and Pakistan on religious grounds are individuated through proper nouns and characterized as violent individuals who "believe in

the doctrine of the sword”. Peaceful members of the Independence movement are collectivized as “The Congress”. The Congress is the Indian National Congress. After 1920, and under the leadership of Mohandas Gandhi, the Congress acquired a compelling ideology of *swaraj* or self-rule and became the head of the Indian Independence Movement (Marshall, 2001, p.179). The negative presentation of partitionists enhances the positive presentation of the Mahatma and his followers.

Although the use of the military framework may be controversial because of its association with barbarity, the selection of nouns such as “struggle” and “fight”, which refer to strong efforts to attain self-rule devoid of any kind of violence can be related to the military ideals of hardiness, civic responsibility and self-endurance. Sustaining political unity and civic duty in absence of war is what James called “a moral equivalent of war”⁷ as stated by McClay (2010), who argues “in his influential essay James dubbed the moral equivalent of war, that is, a shared objective that can elicit the same willingness to sacrifice and the same disciplined purposeful ethos as military conflict does, yet, directed towards entirely peaceful purposes.”

The Soldiers of Satyagraha: Anchoring in metaphor

Metaphor is principally a way of conceiving of one thing in terms of another (Lakoff and Johnson, 2003, p.37). As postulated by Hoijer (2011), anchoring social phenomena in metaphors may make the former comprehensible by imagining them as something else and may serve ideological and legitimating functions (p.11). In the *Speech at Dandi* (April 5th 1930), the Mahatma posits: “... it (the government) did not have the courage to arrest this army of peace” (par.1). “Peace army” is a phrase coined by the Mahatma to conceptualize a non-violent volunteer force. Although the word “army” can have a negative meaning due to its connection to militarism, for Gandhi it has strong metaphorical and spiritual connotations. For him, an army of peace is a form of unarmed peace-keeping group trained not in the art of shooting but in the art of self-surrender and sacrifice (Singh, 2003). In the *Dandi speeches* (March-April,

⁷ The words moral equivalent of war derive from a speech given at Stanford University by pacifist American psychologist and philosopher William James (Mc Clay, 2010)

1930) and in the *Quit India Speeches* (August 8th 1942), practitioners of *Satyagraha* are represented as “soldiers of *Satyagraha*” and “soldiers of freedom”.

The soldiers of Satyagraha will never do what ordinary soldiers do. (March 17th, 1930, par.14)

A non-violent soldier of freedom will covet nothing for himself. (August 8th, 1942, par.4)

Misra (2014) explores Gandhi’s preoccupation with military affairs and chooses the less bellicose term “martiality” to refer to the values of courage, heroism and self-sacrifice and the military style organization particularly associated with soldiers. Martiality is the use of military or quasi military mobilization of a disciplined mass force in pursuit of political goals. Gandhi’s main objective was to shape the disarmed *Satyagrahis* into a non-violent army which might have a chance of success against the militarily superior West. In the *Speech at Dabhan* (March 15th 1930), he speaks about the enlistment of volunteers, the action of wearing khadi as uniforms and of giving up drinking alcohol.

If you feel strong enough, give up Government jobs, enlist yourselves as soldiers in this salt satyagraha, burn your foreign cloth and wear khadi. Give up liquor. (par.7)

When Gandhi states that the soldiers of *Satyagraha* will not reproduce ordinary soldiers’ behaviour, he alludes to the prototypical soldier of a war frame. Nevertheless, the image of the soldier which Gandhi recalls is used as a metaphor of endurance, selfless commitment, courage, loyalty, integrity and discipline. The Mahatma also praises military organization. Soldiers have symbolic relevance in the construction of *Satyagrahis*’ collective identity in terms of sacrifice, sense of duty and cohesion as members of a team. According to Majmudar (2005), “A *Satyagrahi* relies upon his or her faith in truth, moral courage and inward strength of the soul. He or she is a crusader of truth and a soldier of non-violence” (p.141). Revisiting James’s idea of “the moral equivalent of war”, the soldier of *Satyagraha* embodies what James calls “the old elements of army-discipline” and the “new energies and hardihoods” that perpetuate the strength and bravery to which the military mind so faithfully clings. In Misra’s (2014) words,

“Gandhi emerges less as a universalizing pacifist or a consistent opponent of violence than as a figure who was trying to construct a non-violent but still martial form of nationalism”.

Pronouns, Representation and the Construction of *Satyagrahis*

Pronouns are important discursive tools in actor representation. Fairclough (2003) renders them worth attending to in texts and highlights the identificational meanings of the first person pronoun “we” and the non-anaphoric pronoun “they” in the “us and them” division in text representation and construction of groups and communities (p.149). For van Leeuwen (1996) the pronoun “them” may symbolically remove actors from the readers’ or listeners’ world of immediate experience and treat them as distant others. In all the speeches analysed, *Satyagrahis* and India seem to merge, including people from villages, towns and cities, rich and poor, men and women, children and the elderly, Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, Christians, Sikhs and untouchable alike. They share the addressor’s collective identity, value system and beliefs. Gandhi’s representation of the practitioners of *Satyagraha* as “we” is an explicit naming of the “we-self” and “a covert assumption about shared communality” (Pennycook, 1994, p.176).

We Indians are fighting for our liberty. (September 13th 1930, par.2)

We must purge ourselves of hatred. (August 8th, 1942, par.6)

If we really become worthy of the great message, the conquest of the West will be completed. (April 2nd, 1947, par. 13)

The mantra is: Do or die. We shall either free India or die in the attempt. We shall not live to see the perpetuation of our slavery. (August 8th. 1942, par. 31)

Ours *is* not a drive for power, but purely a non-violent fight for India’s independence. (August 8th. 1942, par. 4)

Our quarrel is not with the British people; we fight their imperialism. (August 8th, 1942, par.6)

The third person singular pronoun “he” or the possessive determiner “his” used to refer to *Satyagrahis* serve as a way of hiding the locus of authority which supports the speaker’s views and of “cajoling the listener or reader into accepting the statements as common knowledge whose general authority renders their truth hard to question.” (Pennycook, 1994, p.177).

A Satyagrahi, whether free or incarcerated, is ever victorious. He is vanquished only when he forsakes truth and non-violence and turns a deaf ear to the inner voice. (...) If, therefore, there is such a thing as defeat for even a Satyagrahi, he alone is the cause of it. (March 11th 1930, par.6)

Fasting is his (a *Satyagrahi*’s) last resort in the place of the sword- his or other’s (January 12th 1948, par.2)

Gandhi resorts to first person singular pronouns “I/me” in the expressions “It was they, the simple-minded folk (...) who inspired me” (April 21st. 1915, par.2), “I speak feelingly, as a Hindu” (February 4th1916, par.7) or “I may not harbour hatred against anybody” (August 8th. 1942 par. 6) to manifest his adherence to the ethics of the movement.

Gandhi, the Satyagrahi and the leader

In the process of constituting his collective identity as a *Satyagrahi*, Gandhi also delineates his identity as leader of *Satyagraha*. His is one of the best examples of servant leadership, term introduced by Greenleaf in an essay that he first published in 1970 and which was later revisited by many scholars. Barnabas and Clifford (2012) adhere to the idea that Gandhi personifies the model of servant leadership in an Indian culture but admit that he practices the aspects of leadership which an ordinary man can follow (p. 145). They cite Greenleaf’s words: “The servant-leader is servant first... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then, conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead.” (p.123). In the *Quit India Speeches* (August 8th 1942), Gandhi resorts to a first-person narrative and says:

I have taken such an inordinately long time over pouring out what was agitating my soul, to those whom I had just now the privilege of serving (...) when I appear before you not as your commander but as a humble servant. And he who serves best is the chief among equals. (par. 44)

In political speeches narrative functions as a device that supports the addressor's persuasive intention by presenting an ideologically biased selection of past events. It constructs Gandhi's experience of becoming the leader of the Indian Independence Movement. The addressee experiences events as the addressor sees and describes them. The charismatic servant leader assumes his role and serves both the nation and its people. The writings which brought the image of the servant leader into the world admitted that, as their leader, Gandhi gave the masses of common people a great dream of their own good society and thus empowered them.

Conclusion

“During much of Gandhi's life, although not necessarily reflected in the literature, his closest relationships were with those who surrendered themselves fully to his wider quest, including his social work and spiritual experiments, not merely to his political campaigns” (Weber, 2004, p. 125). In 1906, Gandhi formed the Natal Indian Congress in South Africa and organized his first campaign of civil resistance or satyagraha against the Transvaal government, who sought to further restrict the rights of Indian immigrants. In his *Speech at the Reception in Madras* (April 21st 1915), he describes the first *satyagrahis* in South Africa:

You have said that I inspired these great men and women, but I cannot accept that proposition. It was they, the simple-minded folk, who worked away in faith, never expecting the slightest reward who inspired me by their great sacrifice, by their great faith, by their great trust in the great God, to do the work I was able to do. (par. 2)

They (the simple-minded folk) realized the might of religious force (...) and let them who have finished their work, and who have died for you and me, let them inspire you and us. (par.3)

It was not only the Hindus who struggled, but there were Mohamedans, Parsis and Christians and almost every part of India was represented in the struggle. They realized

the common danger, and they realized also that their destiny was an Indian's and it was they, and they alone, who matched the soul-forces against the physical forces. (par.4)

In these statements, one can identify the three elements that Ackerman and Rodal (2008, pp.111-126) consider essential to successful civil resistance, inclusiveness, non-violent discipline and representative leadership.

The fusion of India, peaceful civil resisters and Gandhi himself, involved in a common search for Truth, indexes the larger self, thus contributing to the overall ideological strategy of positive self-presentation (van Dijk, 2000, p.81). As an in-group, they strive for “positive distinctiveness” (Turner, 1975 cited in Brewer, 2001 p. 437) with respect to the colonizer and their Indian associates, as Gandhi calls violent revolutionaries, and seek to achieve positive comparison on a dimension that is highly valued in India as well as world-wide: the ideology of non-violence.

Utilizing van Leeuwen's (1996, 2008) socio-semantic framework for analysing the representation of social actors, this section of the study reports on the discursive devices used by Gandhi to construct *Satyagrahis*' collective identity in the speeches selected for analysis. Following the dictates of *Satyagraha*, *Satyagrahis* are functionalized (p.54; p.42) as truth seekers, non-violent non-cooperators with evil and peaceful reformers who conceive resistance as change. Through a process of collectivization (p.48; p.37), the ordinary men and women who join the satyagraha campaigns are represented as brothers and sisters who form a disciplined community and are turned into a “peace army” trained in the art of self-surrender and sacrifice as Weber (1996) defines it (p.52).

By means of metaphoric expressions, *Satyagrahis*' strong sense of fellowship helps transform the disciplined un-armed team of simple-minded folk comprising representatives of all religions, ethnic groups, gender and social classes into the “soldiers of *Satyagraha*”, the “real heroes” (Weber, 1996, p.55) of a conflict framed as a struggle against oppression. *Satyagrahis* match the prototypical (Hogg et.al., 2017, p.572) heroes in that they are courageous, loyal, selfless, determined and have a passion for justice but, unlike them, they are

“soul-force warriors” (Nazareth, 2018) who use their self- suffering, and not their physical force, to achieve victory. Their collective identity as members of a group (Koller, 2012) is manifested in social action aimed at promoting the group’s identity (Brewer, 2001 cited in Hogg et al., 2017, p.571). They are civil resisters who are aware of the common danger of English imperialism. They resist the colonizer’s discrimination and abuse and commit themselves to the attainment of self-rule.

Ackerman and Rodal (2008, p.119) argue that civil resistance is about developing power and that this power, generated by the action of ordinary people rather than elites or governments, “proceeds by delegitimizing, incapacitating and disintegrating an oppressive system rather than decapitating the ruler”. Non-violent action aims to crumble the regime’s basis of oppression. In *Young India*, Gandhi (1920, August 25th) proclaims: “Non-violence is a positive state of love, of doing good even to the evil-doer” (p.2). Awareness of the idea that hurting others is hurting oneself, can transform inter-group relations. Civil resisters’ sacrifice does not mean subjection to the oppressor, it implies using their soul-force against their power. What is remarkable is that, contrary to ethnocentric views of social relations, *Satyagrahis*’ in-group pride is not reciprocally related to hostility towards the out-groups. Group identification and loyalty and intragroup cohesion and solidarity- we peaceful Indians against the shared “threats” (Brewer, 2002, p.435-436) of colonization and partition- are important characteristics that define Gandhi’s and his disciples’ nationalism. India is placed before any internal divisions and self-interest is sacrificed for “the collective welfare of the nation” (Brewer and Schneider cited in Brewer, 1991, p. 479).

CHAPTER FIVE

Indian Villages

In a letter to Nehru written on August 23, 1944, Gandhi stated: “For me, India begins and ends in its villages.” Although he had not been born in one, the Mahatma acknowledged the importance of the village as a way of life and as a concept and a focal point of reference for

individual prestige and identification. He spoke and wrote a good deal about it. This chapter focuses on the ways the Indian village is discursively constructed in the speeches analysed and on the different purposes these representations serve.

Jodhka (2002) characterizes the Indian village as “an important category in the nationalist imaginations” that describes the core of the traditional social order of India and as “a primary unit representing the social formation of the entire civilization.” He analyses the ideological orientation towards village of the three most important leaders of the Indian freedom movement, Nehru, Ambedkar and Gandhi, and concludes that, in opposition to Nehru’s view of the village as a “site of backwardness” and Ambedkar’s as “a site of oppression,” for Gandhi, it is a “site of authenticity.” (p.3344-3345). Jodhka states the different purposes the idea of the Indian village serves in Gandhi’s discourse. Firstly, he invokes it as a political symbol to establish equivalence between the Indian civilization and the Western civilization, based on the argument that the Indians had a system of representation built into the caste panchayats and were as advanced a community as the whites were. Secondly, Gandhi counterposes the village to the city and presents village life as a critique of and an alternative to the modern western culture and civilization. Thirdly, although he continues to see village as an alternative way of living, he identifies many faults with the existing lifestyle of the Indian rural people and emphasizes on the ways and means to reform them.

Gandhi’s more substantive speeches and writings on the village began when he got involved in the nationalist freedom struggle. In order to de-legitimize British rule over India, he needed an ideology which required the construction of a difference that would establish the sovereign identity of India and would restore its cultural confidence. The idea of village came in very handy in this endeavour, as Jodhka (2002) notes (p.3346).

The Village, “the real India”

To assess the influence of modern urban civilization, Gandhi contrasts the Indian village and the cities that were set up by the British. While village life symbolizes the essence of India, modern cities stand for western domination and colonization (Jodhka, 2002, p.3346).

You, friends, have not seen the real India and you are not meeting in conference in the midst of real India. Delhi, Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, Lahore- all these are big cities and are, therefore, influenced by the West. (April 2nd 1947, par. 4)

The Mahatma represents the village as “the real India”. The adjective “real” denotes the quality of existing in fact and not being imaginary. What the speaker highlights is the quality of being genuine, of not having been corrupted by the West as big cities have. The strategy of positive self-presentation and negative-other presentation (van Dijk, 2000) proves to be effective as a nationalist appeal since the village is an undisputed symbol of native life (p.78). According to van Dijk (2000), whether or not in combination with the derogation of outgroups, group-talk is often characterized by another overall strategy, namely that of positive self-presentation, in which the speaker emphasizes the positive characteristics of the own group, such as the own party or the own country. It is essentially ideological because it is based on the positive self-schema that defines the ideology of a group. The blend of in-group favouritism and negative other-presentation, or emphasis placed on the negative attributes of the out-group, is imbued with ideologically based applications of norms and values and leads to a polarized cognition (p.81). For van Dijk (2000), in polarization text and talk about others is strongly monitored by underlying social representations (attitudes, ideologies) of groups, rather than by models of unique individual people (p.80). Such categorial division is the one which Jodhka (2002) identifies in Gandhi’ s discourse between villages as the essence of India and modern cities as symbols of western domination and colonial rule (p.3346). Categorization is one of the elementary mental aspects of actor or group description, as we know from studies of social psychology. The Indian village is a site of authenticity but modern cities are totally western.

The growth of big cities is not a sign of progress but of degeneration, “the real plague spots” of India as Gandhi called them (Parel, 1997, p.xiii). He finds that there is clear connection between the experience of village India and freedom as he states in *Hind Swaraj*, in villages, “the common people lived independently and followed their agricultural profession. They enjoyed true Home Rule” (Gandhi, 1938. p.55). Empirically such villages existed in the past and can be found in the interiors of India. Although a difficult task for an India which has been made rich though immorality, Jodhka (2002) thinks that “the real swaraj or self- rule as Gandhi imagined, could be achieved only by restoring the civilizational strength of India through revival of its village communities” (p.3346).

Gandhi personifies India in the *Speech in the Great Trial* (March 18th 1922): “Before the British advent, India spun and wove in her millions of cottages” (par. 9). According to Lakoff and Johnson (2003), personification is an ontological metaphor which helps us comprehend phenomena in human terms by conceptualizing an object metaphorically as a human being (p.33). India is activated in terms of the human activities spinning and weaving. The prepositional phrase “in her millions of cottages” invokes small countryside houses, the dwelling places of subordinate tenants, farm laborers, village servants and artificers as stated in Baden-Powell’s (1899) description of the village dwelling-site (p.7). India substitutes the Indians, more specifically Indian villagers through spatialization. Spatialization is a form of objectivation in which social actors are represented by means of reference to a place with which they are, in the given context, closely associated (van Leeuwen, 1996, p.59; 2008, 46).

The choice of the toponym India, the attribution of human traits to the Motherland and reference to countryside houses and to handwork characteristic of traditional cottage industry help to feed a nationalist sentiment and contribute to the construction of the rural identity of the Indian village. Spinning was fundamental to cotton manufacturing before the industrial revolution and is part of Indian national heritage. As the freedom struggle revolved around the use of cotton cloth produced in India and the dumping of foreign made clothes, Gandhi’s hand spinning can be considered an essential element of his philosophy and politics.

The Mahatma represents the Indian village as the nation that needs to recover its lost self in order to attain freedom from foreign domination. According to Ashcroft (2009), the nation has been a strong centre of resistance to imperial control in colonial societies. In a broader and ideal sense, the village is “India in microcosm” (Srinivas,1955 as cited in Jodhka, 2002, p.3343) and a hallmark of Indian nationhood (Jodhka, 2002, p.3352).

The Representations of Indian Rural Life

Gandhi’s discontent with Western modernity leads to his recognition of the important role played by the Indian peasantry in village life. As regard the social organization of the village, the British land revenue system gave rise to an agrarian class structure consisting of three classes: the landowners (*zamindars*), the tenants and the agricultural laborers. The

landowners were tax gatherers and non-cultivating owners of land. The agricultural laborers were placed in a position of bondsmen and hereditarily attached laborers. Caste was a form of social stratification. The Mahatma does not make any reference to the castes that composed the social structure of the village but works with individuals' occupations prescribed by the hereditary caste hierarchy: upper castes were the landowners, middle-ranked castes were the farmers and artisans and the lowest ranked castes, the laborers who performed menial tasks.

The categories of van Leeuwen's (1996, 2008) socio semantic inventory become critically relevant to account for the ways village inhabitants are represented in Gandhi's portrayal of village life. In spite of the fact that the peasants are considered an essential component of village society, the word "peasantry" never appears in the speeches analysed. In *Benaras Hindu University Speech* (February 4th 1916), Gandhi uses the phrase "rich landlords" to refer to those who own lands and categorizes agricultural laborers and small land-owners in terms of the functions they share (van Leeuwen, 1996, p.54; 2008, p.42) as "agriculturalists" and "farmers" to allude to people who grow crops or to small-holders who work on the land and keep livestock (par.10). In *Appeal to America* (September 13th 1930), he draws special attention to "spinners" and their well-known skill as crafters: "the millions of spinners who had become famous through the canning of their deft fingers for drawing the finest thread" (par.12). Assimilation (van Leeuwen, 1996, p.48; 2008, p.37) realized by the plural nouns "landlords", "farmers", "agriculturalists" and "spinners" helps identify groups of people in terms of the activities they perform and the roles they play and provides a picture of the village labour force.

Rural way of life is the dominant pattern in India and its social structure deals with the major elements of diversity of Indian society. Institutions like family, kinship, caste, class and village have millennia-old historical roots and encompass the entire field of life. As the ideologue of the village, Gandhi was mainly concerned with the village, a form of community for societies which practiced subsistence agriculture and whose members were particularly affected by Western urbanization and mechanization.

The Indian Farmer, the saviour or redeemer

In his representations of Indian villages, Gandhi focuses mainly on rural workers. The rediscovery of the peasants inspires his appeal to the toiling masses and results in changes in

the movement for India's independence. As Jodhka (2002) points out, from an elite-bourgeois activity directed at mobilizing an emerging middle class, the nationalist movement was transformed into a popular movement. Thus, the rural masses started experiencing a sense of involvement in the destiny of the nation (p.3346).

Gandhi's statement: "Our salvation can only come from the farmer. Neither the lawyers, nor the doctors, nor the rich landlords are going to secure it" (*Benaras Hindu University Speech*, (February 4th 1916, par.10) is a manifestation of the need to promote a non-violent alternative to exploitation based on centralization. A centralized economy is one in which production, consumption and distribution as well as allocation of resources are determined by the government. Village economy is self-sufficient, self-reliant and decentralized. The village industries such as spinning, weaving, carpentry and pottery flourish according to the needs of the people, can thrive without the patronage of the government and the tax-payer's money and can help avoid the main drawbacks of centralization such as increasing poverty, unemployment and concentration of money power in the hands of few. Since Gandhi's ideas on economics are man-centered rather than material wealth-centered, farmers of agriculturalists only aid nature and never interfere with it. The trigger phrase "our salvation" consists of the inclusive determiner "our" encompassing all Indians and the speaker himself, and the abstract noun "salvation", whose meaning can be related to prevention from harm, ruin or loss and can also be extended to redemption or the action of saving from sin, error or evil. In the New Testament, redemption is used to refer to both deliverance from sin and to freedom from captivity. Farmers are represented as playing, at the same time, more than one role: the role of land-laborers and the divine role of saviours or redeemers, one which they would not normally be eligible for because of their condition of being common-folk. In van Leeuwen's (1996; 2008) taxonomy this process is labelled overdetermination (p.61; p.47). In Christian theology, Jesus is referred to as the Saviour or the Redeemer. Right from the start of his Gospel, Luke presents Jesus as the one Saviour for all people, the sole agent of final salvation. The Saviour or Redeemer stands for the hard-working Indian farmers. This allusion to Christianity reveals Gandhi's attitude towards other creeds. He embraced the ethical teachings of Jesus and was particularly touched by the figure of the suffering Christ.

In his article *Economic Salvation and Mahatma Gandhi*, Yadav (2013) deals with the idea of salvation, which, according to him, will come when the *Swadeshi* or self-sufficiency

spirit pervades the country and cotton is refined, spun and woven in the place where it is produced. With economic salvation will come self-confidence and self-confidence will lead to *Swaraj* in India. The *charkha* or Indian spinning-wheel, the symbol of the *Swadeshi* movement, will become the symbol of the binding between the masses and the classes and the external symbol of internal reform. Its re-adoption will ensure millions of Indian peasants' freedom from growing pauperism. The Indian farmers are elevated to the position of saviours or redeemers in whose hands rests the economic salvation of India.

An Unromantic Vision of Village Life

Though he repeatedly talks about reviving the village, the Mahatma does not romanticize traditional village life but exposes many flaws that are not a consequence of Western urban influence: religious division, the practice of untouchability and a general lack of cleanliness, as stated in *Appeal to America* (September 13th 1930) and in *Benaras Hindu University Speech* (February 4th 1916):

We represent in India all the principal religions of the earth and it is a matter of deep humiliation to confess that we are a house divided against itself; that we Hindus and Mussalmans are flying at one another (...) It is a matter of still deeper humiliation to me that we Hindus regard several millions of our own kith and kin as too degraded even for our touch. I refer to the so-called "untouchables." (September 13th., 1930, par.6)

We do not know the elementary laws of cleanliness. We spit anywhere on the carriage floor... (February 4th, par.8)

In both speeches, the first-person plural pronoun "we" deictically refers to the current speaker's in-groups, Hinduism ("we Hindus") and Indian society, and is the subject of active verbal forms which foreground agency (we represent, we regard, we spit). The abstract noun "weaknesses" used three times in paragraph six and in the place of nouns with stronger negative connotation, such as "fault" or "guilt", de-emphasizes the speaker's negative self-presentation.

Such “weaknesses”, as stated in *Appeal to America* (September 13th 1930), are lack of unity between Hindus and Muslims and untouchability (par. 6) and the drink and drug curse (par. 8). Pollution is another weakness Gandhi mentions in the speeches at Benaras Hindu University and at the Inter-Asian Relations Conference:

The city mostly is a stinking den. We are a people unused to city life. But if we want city life, we cannot reproduce the easy-going hamlet life. It is not comforting to think that people walk about the streets of Indian Bombay under the perpetual fear of dwellers in the storeyed buildings spitting upon them. (February 4th 1916, par.8)

If some of you see the Indian villages, you will not be fascinated by the sight. You will have to scratch below the dung heap. I do not pretend to say that they were places of paradise. Today they are really dung heaps. (April 2nd 1947, par.,8)

The boundaries between India and the villages seem to blur in the expression “these are no small weaknesses in a nation struggling to be free” (par.7) since both, India and the villages, are the nation and share the same “weaknesses”.

“Nation” and “village” are associated with the idea of “house” (van Leeuwen 1996, p.50; 2008, p.38). According to Hart (2007), the metaphorical construction “house” in “we are a house divided against itself” features a container schema. Part of the knowledge stored in the conceptual frame for “house” is that it is a dwelling space although it can also be related to a sense of belongingness and an idea of rootedness and security and then be referred to as “home”. The content are the inhabitants of India. The quote “a house divided against itself” can be found in the Bible, in Mathew, 12:25: “And Jesus knew their thoughts and said unto them: Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation and every city and every house divided against itself shall not stand”. A “divided house” can be interpreted as a fragmented society whose members fight or discriminate against other members of the same society, an effective Biblical allusion and a moving metaphor in the context of the struggle for freedom.

Villages versus Cities: The Construction of the Victim

The British exploited India through its cities and Indian cities exploited the villages and turned villagers into semi-starved lifeless individuals who had been deprived of their wealth and of their rights. Cities were not only symbols of alien rule and exploitation, but also a morally corrupting influence on villages and on villagers, who were left rotting in hopeless ignorance and misery:

Little do town dwellers know that the semi-starved masses of India are slowly sinking to lifelessness (...) Little do town dwellers know (...) that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. (March 18th 1922, par. 9)

(...) the government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. (March 18th 1922, par.9)

By counterposing the authentic Indian village with the modern cities that were set up by the British in India, Gandhi uses village life as a critique of colonial rule and of the civilization of the West. He manages to construe the village masses as the victims of the foreign exploiter:

May I not then, on behalf of these semi-starved millions, appeal to the conscience of the world to come to the rescue of these people who are dying for regaining their liberty. (September 13th 1930, par.13)

The archetypal image of the moral and deserving victim built opposite to an immoral opponent is very significant in the context of colonial domination. Applying van Dijk (2000) analytical parameter “local meanings”, which are the result of the selections made by speakers or writers in their mental models of events or according to their more general socially shared beliefs (p.44), one can identify ideologically biased discourses and the ways they polarize the representations of the self and of the other. Nominal reference is a major constructive device since it can foreground significant aspects about the victim. Gandhi’s lexical choices to represent the victim include linguistic units that allude to a multitudinous group of ordinary

individuals crowded together and not fragmented in terms of ethnicity, class, religious affiliation, language or occupation. The collective noun “masses”, the noun “millions” and the noun phrase “the masses” repeatedly appear in the texts. In the *Quit India Speeches* (August 8th 1942), the noun “millions” is pre-modified by the adjectives “voiceless” and “dumb”, which indicate impossibility to speak or to express opinions and delineate the representation of a sufferer⁸ that has been silenced or is incapable of speaking.

The voiceless millions of the land saw in me their friend and representative... (par.27)

I will have to resist the might of the Empire with the might of the dumb millions with no limit but of nonviolence as policy confined to this struggle. (par. 46)

Post-modification by the prepositional phrase “of India” and “of the land” make the victim part of a political unit, the Motherland, a relevant facet in the creation of its group identity.

Voice is a metaphor for power. Abstractions and complex situations are routinely understood via metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson, 2003, p.4). Having voice implicates receiving a fair hearing from others and becomes a source of empowerment closely linked to notions of self-determination and autonomy. In a context of subjugation and discrimination, denial of voice undermines individuals’ capacity for political influence. The construction of an innocent voiceless victim evokes empathy and concern. The Mahatma appeals to the conscience of the world and becomes the voice of the “dumb masses” submitted to the bleeding process of urbanization and the evil of industrialization. Being adequately represented in decision making is sufficient to restore the victim’ s sense of voice.

Conclusion

Gandhi celebrates the village. In Gandhian thought, Indian villages are self-reliant and self-sufficient sites of authenticity and village life is the essence of India. His proposal of a

⁸ According to Singh (1996), a sufferer is a person who is subjected to something bad or unpleasant. Gandhian philosophy of resistance is characterized by an intertwining of non-violence and exemplary suffering. Men can shape history if they are prepared to undergo self-suffering. Progress is to be measured according to the amount of suffering undergone by the sufferer.

revival of village communities can be regarded as an attempt to restore India's civilizational strength, essential for the achievement of political freedom. His main concern is the resurgence of defunct handicrafts to save the peasants from the ills of industrialization and the inevitability of moving to the cities. The Mahatma's holistic, spiritual, ecological, and communitarian pattern of society as a "futuristic" view of the traditional village society (Jodhka, 2002, p.3347) is what van Dijk (2000) defines as "history as lesson strategy". National self-glorification as a way for positive self- presentation or praise of one's own country and glorification of its history and traditions (p.32) is a manifestation of the Indian leader's strong non-violent nationalism.

The Mahatma discursively creates villages as "real India", with their strengths and their weaknesses, and manages to represent them as victims of the industrialized urban civilization imposed by the foreign exploiter, the voiceless millions of the land. Through ideologically permeated lexis, significant categorization in terms of parameters connected to the traditional rural way of living and metaphors related to concepts that are dear to Indian people, such as nationhood, redemption, home, self-determination and autonomy, Gandhi constructs the civilization of the humble peasants, of the spinning-wheel and of the *Swadeshi* mantra, which he invokes as the key to the economic salvation of India. Allusions to Christian theology and to the Bible exhibit his basic approach of equal respect for all religions.

The statement "I have travelled from one end of India to the other and I have seen the miserable specimens of humanity with the lustreless eyes. They are India" (*Speech before the Inter-Asian Relations Conference* (April 2nd 1947, par. 8) reveals the importance of village as a concrete denominator of Indian nationhood so necessary to establish India's sovereign identity and Gandhi's concern for the toiling masses who have become his non-violent disciples in the struggle for independence.

CHAPTER SIX

The Colonizers

As stated in the Introduction, imperial colonialism involves political and economic control over dependent territories to exploit natural resources, justified on the need of a period of political tutelage of uncivilized societies until they reach a level of development that enables them to become autonomous. Gandhi was fiercely critical of British colonialism for replacing the native and people-centred system of government in India with an autonomous state standing over and beyond the purview of society. He initiated the non-cooperation and the civil disobedience movements as strong manifestations of resistance to colonial violence and to the legalistic orientation of control of the interaction of various peoples and organizations in an attempt to increase fear of the state power in the minds of conflictive societal forces. Non-violence proposes an alternative paradigm based on the cultural and social transformations essential for reconciliation. The central concern in this chapter is the colonizers. The exploration of the representations of the colonizers in Gandhi's discourse offers relevant information to determine whether the construction of their collective identities reproduces the stereotypical and homogeneous vision of the other, typical of colonial discourse.

In order to analyse what Moscovici (1984) defines as the purpose of all representations or the categories and points of reference which "make something unfamiliar, or unfamiliarity itself, familiar" (p.24), we can make use of the two mechanisms he proposes, namely naming and categorizing. One which enables us to connect new phenomena to existing socially derived and socially shared structures of knowledge and another that allows us to shape abstract and complex ideas into concrete objects, images or metaphors (p.29). Whereas naming and categorizing are loaded with preference, affection or dislike and are closely related to stereotyping and to prejudice and discrimination, the attribution of images and metaphors to a phenomenon may also serve ideological and legitimating functions. According to Baron and Branscombe (2012), the terms stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination are often used interchangeably. However, social psychologists have traditionally drawn a distinction between them by building on the more general attitude concept (p.183). Fastening new phenomena to well-known emotions, an attachment mechanism which is not specifically pointed out in the

theory of social representations, can also be relevant to the study of social phenomena connected to feelings of anger, fear or threat, as suggested by Hoijer (2011, p.8-11).

According to Moscovici (1984), representations do not simply grade or label persons and objects considered as discrete units, their main objective is to form opinion (p.37). Lexical choices coding for opinions that are represented in social cognition can be the result of a critically relevant evaluative categorization in terms of the identities which social actors share with others, as van Leeuwen (1996) posits (p.32), and also an ideological decision that reveals the speaker's position, thus becoming "the most obvious component in ideological discourse analysis" (van Dijk, 1998, p. 205).

Colonial Administration

Assigning a name to an entity gives it socially accessible meaning and "locates it in the identity matrix of our culture" (Moscovici, 1984, p.39). This value laden activity reflects social attitudes and is closely related to political and ideological realities. In 1922 Gandhi was arrested for writing articles advocating resistance to colonial rule. In his Statement in the trial, he explains the reasons for his disaffection and non-cooperation with the Government. He chooses the words "British authority" to name the moral or legal right to control British colonies. Gandhi refers to his experience as an Indian in South Africa:

My first contact with British authority in that country was not of a happy character. I discovered that as a man and an Indian, I had no rights. More correctly I discovered that I had no rights as a man because I was an Indian. (March 18th 1922, par.4)

This "British authority" was exerted through various systems of governance in the colonies-trading companies, indirect rule, settler rule or condominium government. Settler colonies were the system of colonial administration established in southern and eastern Africa. Immigrants settled and established direct rule over the colonies. In 1814 the Cape officially became a British colony in what is now South Africa. Gandhi began his public life there in 1893 and was subjected to racism and to laws that restricted the rights of Indian laborers. Both racism and restriction of rights constituted the core of colonial authority. Gandhi refused to comply with racial segregation rules on a South African train and was forcibly ejected. Recalled as his

moment of truth, the incident marked the beginning of his fight against injustice and his defence of his rights as an Indian and as a man. The strategies of passive resistance he developed to protest against these policies were known as his first acts of civil disobedience.

The region under British control in India included areas directly administered by the United Kingdom and areas ruled by indigenous rulers under British paramountcy, called the princely states. “British Rule” is used to refer to British Raj or the period of direct rule of the British Crown on the Indian subcontinent from 1858 until the independence of both, India and Pakistan, in 1947, as Gandhi posits in the *Statement in the Great Trial* (March 18th, 1922)

India is less manly under British rule than she ever was before. (par.10)

Gandhi refers to colonial administration by means of the umbrella term “system” which covers the hyponyms “government” and “administration” associated with groups of entities as complex wholes and not with specific identifiable individual members. Through deverbal nouns which denote activity, such as “government” and “administration”, the actors are named in terms of their occupations and roles (van Leeuwen 1996, p.54; 2008, p.42). Post-modification by participial and relative clauses and predicates of propositions attributing negative characteristics to them, enable the speaker to state his critique of a regime imported from the colonial country, which seeks to forcibly supplant the native system of government centred on the individual.

I had either to submit to a system which I considered had done an irreparable harm to my country... (March 18th 1922, par.2)

... the Government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. (March 18th 1922, par.9)

In my opinion, the administration of the law is thus prostituted, consciously or unconsciously for the benefit of the exploiter. (March 18th 1922, par.9)

Gandhi’s selection of word meaning in his representations of colonial administration shows that it is not merely the result of an evaluative categorization and identification but also

an ideological decision, given the Mahatma's change from loyalty to the crown to rebellion against it as a result of what Parel (1997) calls his "South African experiences" (p. xxi). His leadership role in the Natal Indian Congress and the Transvaal British Indian Association, his campaigns against discriminatory legislation against indentured Indian laborers, traders and settlers, the discovery of the techniques of satyagraha, his career as a lawyer and a journalist, his ventures into the field of education and his incarcerations during his stay in South Africa are significant issues in the acquisition of Gandhi's vision of Indian nationalism, which, according to Parel (1997) differentiate him from other Indian nationalists (p. xxi). The historian highlights that Gandhi's admiration for the British constitution helps to put his attitude towards colonialism in its right perspective since policies in conformity with it are thought to be good and those contrary to it, evil.

Colonial Law

In the *Speech on the Eve of the Dandi March* (March 11th 1930) and in the *Speech at Dandi* (April 5th 1930), Gandhi encourages Indian people to join the fight for people's civil rights. The march is an act of civil disobedience, a non-violent protest against the British monopoly on salt and a technique for fighting social and political injustice. He again uses the word "government" to refer to the British administration and highlights its potential actions of allowing people to march, arresting them, tolerating disobedience or abolishing taxation to describe the authoritarian character of the colonial system.

Even if the government allows me to march tomorrow morning, this will be my last speech on the sacred banks of the Sabarmati. (March 11th 1930, par. 1)

Our ranks will swell and our hearts strengthen as the number of our arrests by the Government increases. (March 11th 1930, par. 4)

I had thought that the Government might perhaps let my party come as far as Dandi. (April 5th 1930, par. 1)

If the Government tolerates the impending civil disobedience you may take it for certain that the Government, too, has decided to abolish this tax sooner or later. (April 5th 1930, par. 4)

As the march is a non-violent protest against the salt law, Gandhi mainly focuses on the distinction between colonial law and British law⁹. Active voice and past form of the verb “teach” and the demonstrative determiner “that” help differentiate British law from the reforms introduced in the Indian Penal Code, rooted in a narrowly rationalist conception of Indian society.

Time was when I was infatuated with British rule, as British law taught that the person of every individual is sacred. According to that law, the police cannot kill or manhandle a man even though he might be guilty of murder (...) But here the very opposite is true. How otherwise can the police have the authority to decide whether I hold a handful of salt or pebbles? (April 5th 1930, par.14)

According to Hoijer (2011), anchoring social phenomena in metaphors may serve ideological functions. These metaphors not only underline the seriousness of the issue but also relate to feelings (p.11-12). In the *Statement in the Great Trial* (March 18th ,1922), Gandhi indicts the British Empire for its violent methods to curtail Indian people’s fundamental freedoms. The atrocities heaped upon the people of Punjab: the attack on innocent Indians who

⁹ British colonial expansion brought the administration of English common and statutory law to the newly acquired territories in America, Asia, Africa and the Pacific. Common law denominated a body of mostly unlegislated law founded on custom and precedent. It formed the basis of jurisdiction in all three types of direct colonial holdings: trading posts, settlement colonies and British colonies of domination in Asia and in Africa. Nevertheless, British administrators in all three types of colonies soon realized the need to adapt their imported law according to local circumstances and they amended English common and statutory law with colonial statutes in response to specific colonial situations. The Colonial Laws Validity Act (1865) recognized the validity of colonial legislation and declared contradictory laws invalid only to the extent of their conflict with British law. Legal pluralism was advocated by the legal reforms of India’s first governor general in 1772, placing Muslims under Muslim civil law, Hindus under Hindu civil law and all indigenous inhabitants under Muslim penal law. The Regulating Act of 1773 extended British jurisdiction over all British subjects, all company servants and all other indigenous inhabitants who chose to submit to it. A unified Indian Penal Code was introduced in 1860 and during the rest of the nineteenth century most fields of commercial, criminal and procedural law had been fully codified, incorporating only little indigenous legal practice. Legal pluralism continued only in the field of Hindu and Muslim personal laws.

were shot in cold blood in Jallianwala Bagh, the Rowlatt Act, public flogging and the crawling order¹⁰ are “unhealed wounds”.

The first shock came in the shape of the Rowlatt Act- a law designed to rob the people of all real freedom. Then followed the Punjab horrors beginning with the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh and culminating in crawling orders, public flogging and other indescribable humiliations. (par.7)

I fought for cooperation and working of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, hoping that the Prime Minister would redeem his promise to the Indian Mussalmans, that the Punjab wound would be healed, and that the reforms, inadequate and unsatisfactory though they were, marked a new era of hope in the life of India. But all that hope was shattered. (par.7-8)

The “wound” metaphor represents the deleterious effects of subjugation as an injury to a living tissue and refers to the lingering impact of humiliating norms which perpetuate submission. The wound is even more serious and painful when flaws are covered up instead of actually being fixed, as Gandhi’s use of the “whitewash” metaphor suggests:

The Punjab crime was whitewashed and most culprits went not only unpunished but remained in service, and some continued to draw pensions from the Indian revenue and in some cases were even rewarded. (par.8)

By describing the imposition of the British law and the government punishments as “indescribable humiliations”, Gandhi is summarizing the harshness and savage character of colonial rule over India. Elsewhere in the same speech, he includes the administration of the law in the category of “terrorist” and refers to its acts as an “organized display of force”. The affective resonance of trigger words such as “horrors”, “massacre”, “crime” and “terrorism”

¹⁰ The Rowlatt Act was legislation passed by the Imperial Legislative Council, the legislature of British India, which allowed certain political cases to be tried without juries and permitted internment of suspects without trial. Flogging was a kind of corporeal punishment which consisted of beating the human body with a whip or rods. The crawling act was promulgated by Brigadier General Dryer obliging Indian people to crawl on their bellies when they traversed the lane where a Church of England missionary had been assaulted.

help the speaker build an emotional atmosphere against the colonial system and attach his representations of colonial law to some well-known emotions such as anger, dislike and fear.

They do not know a subtle but effective system of terrorism and an organized display of force on the one hand, and the deprivation of all powers of retaliation or self-defence on the other, has emasculated the people and induced them in the habit of simulation.
(March 18th, 1922).

Calling the legislation “a subtle but effective system of terrorism”, he links it to a threatening unlawful use of violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, intended to coerce governments or society in the pursuit of political, religious or ideological goals. Connecting the denial of all powers of retaliation or self-defence to the process of emasculation, Gandhi attempts to make something unfamiliar more familiar, to express it in Moscovici’s (1984) words (p.29). Used metaphorically, emasculation is associated with the deprivation of strength, vigour or spirit for the sake of making someone or something weaker, a topic which was highly significant for the Indian native inhabitants, who were suffering from exploitation of their people and their natural resources and from imposition of the colonizers’ language and culture.

Exploitation of the masses

In the *Benaras Hindu University Speech* (February 4th, 1916), Gandhi describes the humble living conditions of “the millions of the poor” and compares them with the lives of the “richly bedecked noblemen”, “the rich landlords” and “city-dwellers”, who he identifies as the colonizers’ accomplices. In the *Statement in the Great Trial* (March 18th, 1922), he speaks of “semi-starved masses” sinking to lifelessness and of “heartless and inhuman processes” that have ruined cottage industry. He assigns the colonizers and their Indian associates the name “exploiter”. This is not a neutral classification but a question of excluding them from the ingroup of fellow countrymen and emphasizing their agency or active responsibility for the exploitation of the masses for their own benefit, an action that is considered acceptable in the rational scenario of Modernity.

Little do they (town dwellers) know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter. (March 18th 1922, par.9)

The law itself in this country has been used to serve the foreign exploiter. (March 18th 1922, par.9)

Parekh (2001) attributes Gandhi's critique of foreign exploitation to his idea of the indivisibility of humanity (p. 49). For Gandhi, systems of oppression and exploitation have no winners but only losers, because human beings cannot degrade or brutalize others without also degrading and brutalizing themselves, or inflict psychic and moral damage on others without inflicting it on themselves as well, since humanity is indivisible.

Little do they realize that the Government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures, can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye. I have no doubt whatsoever that both, England and the town dweller of India, will have to answer, if there is a God above, for this crime against humanity, which is perhaps unequalled in history. (March 18th 1922, par.9)

Alluding to "a crime against humanity unequalled in history", Gandhi anchors exploitation of the masses in feelings of threat and anger, emotions that work as catalysts that reinforce anti-imperialist attitudes and raise European colonialism to the condition of a natural expression of an inherent impulse of aggressiveness characteristic of colonial imperative rule.

British Colonialism or British people: Deed or Doer?

Gandhi's *Statement in the Great Trial* (March 18th 1922) is said to have put the entire colonial system on trial. He accuses the government of having caused great damage to Indian society and economy: "But I hold it to be a virtue to be disaffected towards a government which in its totality had done more harm to India than any previous system" (par.10). What he contests is the link of the state to justice: "In my opinion, the administration of the law is thus prostituted, consciously or unconsciously, for the benefit of the exploiter" (par.9). Although this is a severe

indictment against British colonialism, Gandhi has no animosity towards the King or any administrator:

I have no personal ill-will against any single administrator, much less can I have any disaffection towards the King's person. (March 18th, 1922, par.10)

There are other references, in other speeches, to Gandhi's feelings towards the English. In the *Speech at the Round Table Conference* (November 30th 1931), one can find an example of his effort to bridge the gap between the Indians and the British. Gandhi expresses affection for individuals of English descent through the selection of the noun "Englishmen" and the noun phrases "English men" and "English women" used to thank the people who have entertained him as guest in the East End of London.

I have come in touch with so many Englishmen. (November 30th 1931, par.6)

It has enhanced, it has deepened my irrepressible faith in human nature that although English men and English women have been fed upon lies that I see so often disfiguring your Press... I found no irritation and no resentment even in the operatives. (November 30th 1931, par.7)

When in the same speech he says: "I am carrying with me thousands upon thousands of English friendships" (par.8), the idea of retaining something abstract refers to the preservation of the relationship of mutual cooperation between Indian people and English people. This peaceful inter-human friendship highlights the universal right to reciprocity in a world of plural values and the dialogical content of Gandhi's non-violence.

As a non-violent activist and the ideologue of *Ahimsa*¹¹, Gandhi distinguishes between evil and good as well as between evil and the evil-doer. For him, evil resides in the deed, not in

¹¹ Although it has already been mentioned and defined in this study, it is worth stating some additional information about the key concept *Ahimsa*. Ponnuru states that *Ahimsa* is derived from the Sanskrit verb root *san* which means "to kill". The form *hims* means "desirous to kill", the prefix *a-* is a negation. So, *Ahimsa* means literally "lacking any desire to kill". Literally translated, *Ahimsa* means "to be without harm" or "to be utterly harmless", not only to oneself and others but to all living beings. But its implications are far wider. It is more than not doing violence, it is more than an attitude, it is a whole way of life and is the opposite of *himsa* or violence which is to hurt the vitalities (*pranas*), through vibration due to the passions which agitate mind, body or speech.

the doer. In his view, the only way to fight evil is through non-violence. Punishment and retaliation cannot reform the evil-doer. Even the worst man has a particle of good in him and we must appeal to that innate goodness so that evil is transformed into good. In the *Statement in the Great Trial* (March 18th 1922) he describes what Parekh (2001) calls his alternative to the traditional theory of revolution based on violence: “A non-violent revolution is not a program of seizure of power. It is a program of transformation of relationships ending in a peaceful transfer of power” (p.67).

In my opinion, non-cooperation with evil is as much a duty as is cooperation with good. But in the past non-cooperation has been deliberately expressed in violence to the evildoer. I am endeavouring to show to my countrymen that violent non-cooperation only multiplies evil and that as evil can only be sustained by violence, withdrawal of support of evil requires complete abstention from violence. (par. 11)

For Gandhi, the new method of fighting against injustice should activate the soul, mobilize the individual’s latent moral energies, appeal to both the head and the heart and create a climate conducive to peaceful resolution of conflict led in a spirit of mutual good will. In the Annual Lecture delivered at SOAS University in London in 1995, Parekh speaks of Gandhi’s theory of *Satyagraha* as “a novel way of defining the very idea of revolution” which presupposes a deeper sense of shared humanity to give meaning and energy to its sense of justice. Colonialism damages both the Indians and the British and needs to be ended in the interest of both. A *Satyagrahi* assumes the burden of the common evil and seeks to liberate both himself and his opponent from its tyrannical automatism. He overcomes his opponent by refusing to see him as one and by appealing instead to his sense of decency and their common humanity.

The Colonizers: opponents, enemies or villains?

Represented as a threat to society due to their unlawful use of intimidation and their crimes against humanity and a frightening danger because of their exploitation of the others, the colonizers are agents of intergroup conflict. They function as adversaries and foil to the colonized. As adversaries, they constitute an obstacle the colonized must struggle to overcome; as foil, they embody characteristics that are dramatically opposed to those of the colonized. They have high levels of command and power and crave for more; they are often driven by their

desire for material wealth and their goal is often total domination of the others. For all these reasons the colonizers fit the authority figure of the archetypal fairy-tale villain. In Lakoff's (1991) fairy tale scenario, the villain commits a crime against an innocent victim. The offense is due to imbalance of power and creates a moral imbalance. The villain is inherently evil and thus, reasoning with him is out of the question. The hero engages him in battle, defeats him and rescues the victim. The moral balance is restored and victory is achieved. The asymmetry created between the villain and the hero rests on the former's irrationality and inability to negotiate, which turn him into an enemy. The enemy-as-demon metaphor exhibits a demon typically associated with evil (p.4).

For Gandhi, colonialism is evil. The wrong of colonialism consists in the creation and upholding of a political association that denies its members equal and reciprocal cooperation and undermines their capacity to exercise their self-determining agency in a particular way. The unilateral imposition of systems imported from Britain to replace the native individual-centred government and indigenous customary law is the enemy-as-demon which the colonized have to fight against. In Gandhian representations, the colonizers are the antagonists, the agents that cause conflict for the colonized but, unlike the villains, they may or may not be bad. Because of this, Gandhi's antagonists do not reproduce the asymmetry villain-hero of Lakoff's fairy tale and can be classified as evil or good, depending on whether their means are violent or non-violent. *Satyagraha* means fighting oppression through self-suffering and non-violence in order to "liquidate antagonisms but not antagonists themselves" as Gandhi states in *Harijan* (April 29th 1939).

As Parekh (2001) posits, the moral and political significance of Gandhi's *Satyagraha* is beyond any doubt. A highly original and creative contribution to theories of social change and political action, it stresses the limits of rational discussion and the dangers of violence and offers new forms of political praxis that break through the narrow straitjacket of the reason-violence dichotomy. *Satyagraha* takes full account of the rational and moral nature of human beings and highlights the value of moral persuasion and of the appeal to the shared humanities of the parties involved (p.73).

Indian People and British People: Love or Hatred?

The *Quit India Speech*, delivered at the Bombay session of the All India Congress Committee on August 8th 1942, is directed to oppressed social groups, mainly Hindus and Muslims, and constitutes a demand for an end to British rule in India. In the sixth paragraph of Gandhi's address, he deals with the dichotomy "love and hatred" to describe Indian people's attitudes towards the British.

I have noticed that there is hatred towards the British among the people. The people say they are disgusted with their behaviour. The people make no distinction between British imperialism and the British people...Our quarrel is not with the British people we fight their imperialism. The proposal for the withdrawal of British power did not come out of anger. (par. 6)

Speaking for myself, I can say that I have never felt any hatred. As a matter of fact, I feel myself to be a greater friend of the British now than ever before. (par.6)

The demonym "the British" and the noun phrase "British people" used to categorize natives of the United Kingdom in terms of their place of origin contrast the phrases "British imperialism" and "British power" associated with colonial domination, in an attempt to distinguish "doers" from "deeds", as stated in the analysis of the *Statement in the Great Trial* (March 18th 1922).

The idea that evil is not incarnated in the "doer" but in the "deed" is revisited in the second part of the *Quit India Speeches* (August 8th 1942), when the Mahatma speaks negatively about the British empire:

We have thus to deal with an empire whose ways are crooked. (par. 26)

I now want to turn to good account in fighting this empire which is upheld on untruth and violence. (par. 27)

As "a detractor of all forms of universalistic attitude which are in search of uniformity and homogenization" (Jahanbegloo, 2018), Gandhi strongly opposes all forms of subjugation

and authoritarianism (p.7). His alternative model of cosmopolitan interaction based on an inclusivist and empathic vision of humanity, devoid of any sense of intergroup bias or polarization between in-group and out-group members, proves that in-group love and out-group hatred are not always reciprocally related. Brewer (1999) exposes findings from cross cultural research as an alternative to the prevailing approach to ethnocentrism, which presumes that attachment to one's in-groups requires hostility towards the members of other groups. She reveals that ingroup identification is independent of negative attitudes toward out-groups (p.429).

Conclusion

As van Dijk (2000) suggests, group members tend to speak or write negatively about out-groups and to define them as opponents, competitors or even enemies, only because they are different (p.78). Discourse analysis goes beyond a superficial content study of positive or negative terms describing attributed out-group characteristics and includes exploration of semantic and formal strategies used for the description of the out-group which are not ideologically neutral. In the texts analysed, the distinct lines of division defined in terms of nationality seem to blur, allowing room to reformulate the English-category. The Mahatma fragments the English category into subcategories- the colonizers, the administrators and English men and English women from the South East of London. He replaces human individuality with broad impersonal group generalization in an attempt to distance the collective integrated by the Indian masses, *Satyagrahis* and he himself from the colonial institutions segment and establishes proximity links with single English men and English women who adopt the "friend-equal" persona in emulation of their Indian counterparts. On the other hand, Gandhi prunes from the larger Indian people category a series of subcategories- rich landlords, noblemen, town dwellers of India, Indian associates in the administration of the country- and draws similarity connections between some of them and the colonizer. This construct is built on a framework structured along the themes of shared responsibility in the destruction of native economy, hostility towards the out-group and interest in the suppression of the antagonist. These negative topics describe the construct in association with violent ends and violent means.

Gandhi believes that those civilizations and cultures that are blinded by prejudice and hatred of the "other" would fail to see the harmonizing threads that bind humanity. His view of

the otherness of the other reinforces the spiritual values of the East and contributes to peace, democracy and a sense of human solidarity. He subjects colonialism to severe indictment and charges it and the native people with a view to further its sinful interests, with moral corruption and spiritual degeneration. Nevertheless, his critique of colonial rule is essentially cultural and is not based on the derogation of the antagonist. His representation of the other as an opponent to convert, not as an enemy or a villain to suppress, is based on the idea of the spiritual impact of voluntary suffering or “suffering love”. According to Parekh (2001), the *Satyagrahi*’s love of his opponent and moral nobility disarms the latter, diffuses his feelings of anger and hatred and mobilizes his higher nature. This uncomplaining love denies the opponent the pleasure of victory and creates in him a mood conducive to calm introspection. The two together trigger the complex process of critical self-examination on which a *Satyagrahi* relies for his ultimate success (p.70).

CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusions

This chapter is about the conclusions and the main contributions of the socio historical and linguistic study of Gandhi’s representations of the social actors of the struggle for Indian independence and of the way the relations of discourse, power and ideologies influence his construction of the collective identities of the colonized and of the colonizers.

Discourse, Ideologies and Power

From Fairclough’s (2003) perspective, discourses not only represent the material world and the world of thoughts, feelings and beliefs as they are but they are also projections, imaginaries, representing possible worlds which are different from the actual one, and tied in to projects to change it in particular directions (p.124). Considering power as a central concern in Critical Discourse Analysis, Fairclough’s definition of ideologies as representations of aspects of the world which can be shown to contribute to establishing maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation (p10), reveals the close connection

between ideologies and power. The conceptualization of power as depending on achieving consent or acquiescence is closely related to politics conceived as a struggle for hegemony, a contention over the claims of particular visions and representations of the world to having a universal status (p.45). Discourse can be defined as a place where relations of power are exercised or as an entity shaped and constituted by relations of power. Power, in discourse or behind discourse, is not a permanent and undisputed attribute of any one person or social grouping. Those who hold power at a particular moment have to constantly reassert it, those who do not hold power are always liable to make a bid for it (Fairclough, 1989, p. 43).

The exercise of power triggers the resistance of power. India has a rich history of resistance to the might of imperialism, starting from popular protest and culminating in the giant campaigns led by Mohandas Gandhi. As a material form of ideology, discourse played an important role in Gandhi's resistance to domination as one of his major battlegrounds for contested notions of justice, nationhood and political maturity both in the quest for India's independence and in the cultural confrontation between ancient and modern civilizations. As Jeffress (2003) posits, Gandhi's non-violent resistance aims to transform the material and discursive structures of colonial power rather than simply oppose to certain aspects of these structures.

Gandhi' s political discourse

Taking into account the idea that political discourse is the text and talk of the political world, it is worth highlighting its role as "a major battleground of politics where individuals constantly contest the meanings of terms, symbols and concepts as they compete for power or strive for justice" (Haynes, 1991, p.22). As Haynes (1991) posits, an important method of testing cultural hegemony in a colonial context is to judge the extent to which the colonized operate within the confines of colonial discourse and the extent to which such discourse constrains the actors who use it from constructing formulations that challenge colonial rule and the underlying moral principles on which it is based. Assuming the critical role of political rhetoric in shaping political culture, the author thinks that the analysis of political discourse "can illuminate the causal relationships between colonial domination and the production and reproduction of cultural forms by the colonized" (p.23).

The influence of Gandhian political discourse can be attributed to the capacity to frame arguments in a manner that is convincing and emotionally evocative to both local and international audiences. Its main concern is to raise awareness and consciousness of the identity of the Indian nation. Lelyveld (2001) defines Gandhi's message as a message of democratic empowerment which signals the breakdown of established lines of dominance and the beginning of a new self-conscious social collectivity. Language is not only a useful tool for the communicator, the consecration of Hindi as the national language of India is one of Gandhi's most enduring crusades in his resistance to British rule and in his rejection of the English language as the language of the state, the schools and even private communication among Indians. Lelyveld considers the Mahatma a major formulator of India's national linguistic order due to his active role in mobilizing a population to construct a new idiom for the nation-state (p. 64). Although Gandhi's ideology is philosophically complex, it is stated in simple terms, which is bound to have a greater appeal to rural Indians than the discourse of the nationalist urban intellectuals. The masses respond to Gandhi's political discourse because it seems to mirror their own and it gives voice to the unrepresented and vulnerable individuals who are excluded from the civic arena by virtue of their inability to express themselves.

The Indian politician's speeches are based on the idea of non-violence and on the principle "non-cooperation with evil is as much a duty as is cooperation with good". Except for the *Benaras Hindu University Speech* (February 4th 1916), in which Gandhi manifests his rejection of the use of the English language as a tool for subjection and bigotry and the *Speech at Kingsley Hall* (October, 1931), in which he tries to analyse the significance of a deep faith in God, all the speeches selected for analysis in this work are related to Gandhi's ideas of non-violent resistance to the tyranny of violence, prejudice and discrimination. The question of untouchability, one of his central concerns, is explicitly mentioned in the *Appeal to America* (September 13th 1930) and in the *Speech Before the Inter-Asian Relations Conference* (April 2nd 1947). Through his allocutions, Gandhi, the emblematic figure, the rebel, the mass leader, becomes the voice of "the ancient land of India", redelivering the message of truth that the wise men from the East left to the Indian people "to show the way out to a hungry world" (*Appeal to America*, September 13th, 1930).

Non-violence and Satyagraha

In his *Statement in the Great Trial* (March 18th 1922), Gandhi defines non-violence as the first article of his faith and the last article of his creed and categorizes his voluntary submission to penalty for refusal to cooperate with evil (the Government established by law in India) as an act of non-violence, thus defining his philosophy of abstention from violence and his practice of not causing harm to others. When he outlines his plan of action in the *Dandi Speeches* (March- April 1930) and in the *Quit India Speeches* (August 8th 1942), he refers to the solemn promise not to commit violent acts towards others as a weapon of the brave. According to Merton (2007), Gandhian non-violence is not a sentimental evasion or denial of the reality of evil but “acceptance of the necessity to use the force and the presence of evil as a fulcrum for good and for liberation” (p.18). Non-violence implies a kind of bravery far different from violence. In the use of physical force, one assumes the irreversibility of evil and cannot eliminate it. Non-violence takes account of the non-final state of the relationships among men and seeks to change relationships that are evil into others that are good, or at least not so bad (p.18). Gandhi does not divide mankind into good and evil. He is convinced that all human beings, even the enemy, have a kernel of decency: for him there are only evil acts, no wholly evil men: “Our quarrel is not with the British people, we fight their Imperialism” (August 8th 1942, par.6)

It was through his acquaintance with Thoreau and Tolstoy and his reading of the New Testament that Gandhi rediscovered his own tradition and his Hindu *dharma* or duty and, in the process, he discovered himself. This rediscovery was what Majmudar (2005) describes as “the metamorphosis of an ordinary man, Mohandas Gandhi, into Mahatma Gandhi, an extraordinary spiritual genius” (p.17). The spiritual genius’s insistence on non-violent means in the struggle for Indian freedom resulted from his contact with a universally valid spiritual tradition which he saw to be common to all religions and to both, East and West. The Mahatma acknowledged that non-violence could help to realize truth and found a new technique of resistance to colonial domination which integrated the processes of attaining spiritual knowledge and acquiring political efficacy. *Satyagraha* is not only a philosophy but also a method of confronting evil and injustices designed not to coerce the opponent but to set into motion forces which could lead to his conversion. Gandhi uses his own understanding of the idea of “holding fast onto truth” to awaken the sleeping and enslaved Indian people to an awareness of their own identity

and their historic vocation. This peaceful “awakening of the poorest of the poor” should enable Indians to complete the conquest of the conqueror, “not through vengeance” because they have been exploited, but with real understanding (*Speech before the Inter-Asian Relations Conference, April 2nd 1947, par.12*).

Gandhi’s Spiritual Discourse

Gandhi’s spiritual discourse is both based on the Hindu’s worldview and on western humanism, based on human rights, state secularism, equality and civic nationalism. The Christianity and the spiritual and religious humanism of the West open his eyes to forces of wisdom and of love and forgiveness which are close to his own heart because they are expressed in the symbols and philosophic language of his own people. In traditional India, religion gives meaning to all of life and is a central issue in identity formation. Religion provides the ethical framework for all of Gandhi’s political and social actions. He always tries to balance political realities on the ground of moral ideological pursuits. His opposition is towards excessive centrality of wealth and passion and the loss of morality and spirituality and encompasses the struggle against capitalism and the need to engage in intercultural discourse with the oppressor, not simply opposing them agonistically. Internally, there is always an underlying spiritual urge, whether it is in the use of moral force for pressing political demands, or in the multifaceted constructive programs like upliftment of the oppressed classes, Hindu-Muslim unity or emphasis on self-sufficiency,

Gandhi’s Non-violent Resistance

Ideologies of resistance typically feature the self-defined fundamental properties of the group (van Dijk, 1998, p.11). Gandhi discursively constructs *satyagraha* as a struggle against the evils of imperialism and categorizes it in terms of its strategies as a non-violent, mass movement whose objective is to attain self-rule. He constructs *Satyagrahis* as his walking mates and as the soldiers of *Satyagraha*. In the process, he represents himself as a non-violent reformer and a self-made leader.

The phrase “civil resisters” (*Speech on the Eve of the Dandi March*, March 11th 1930, par.2) invokes civil resistance, a near synonym for non-violent resistance and civil disobedience, but a more appropriate term when it is used to refer to its civic quality and to the decision not to use violent methods based on prudential, ethical or legal considerations. Non-cooperation, civil disobedience and fasting are forms of *satyagraha*. Civil disobedience and direct action have been used interchangeably both in activist as well as in academic circles but, according to Conway (2003), the meaning of these terms may be associated with assumptions of illegality and even violence (p.508).

Bearing in mind the social character and the ideological load Moscovici (1984) attributes to the process of anchoring through categorization and naming (p.30), one can trace the evolution of Gandhi’s nationalist ideas and the development of the civil resistance movement in the way he names himself and how he categorizes his campaigns. His love for India made him work for the good of the country, which lay in remaining part of the British Empire. When his allegiance with the empire foundered, the Mahatma put his energy in the service of rebellion and became a reformer. In his *Statement in the Great Trial* (March 18th 1922), on being accused of inciting disaffection towards His Majesty’s government, Gandhi tells the Court members that, from “a staunch loyalist and co-operator” he has become “an uncompromising disaffectionist and non-cooperator”(par.3) after experiencing “his first contact with British authority” in South Africa and discovering that “I had no rights as a man because I was an Indian” (par.4). The negative experience of opposing colonial bigotry in South Africa led to his change from loyal service to and cooperation with the crown, “I gave the government my voluntary and hearty cooperation” (*Statement in the Great Trial*, March 18th 1922, par. 5), “I have rendered on more than one occasion such services as I could to the Empire” (*Quit India Speeches*, August 8th 1942, par 46), to political non-violent activism, “We have resolved to utilize all our resources in the pursuit of an exclusively non-violent struggle” (*Speech on the Eve of the Dandi March*, March 11th 1930, par.3). His nationalist political philosophy acquires more sophistication and political acumen. In the *Dandi March Speeches* (March - April, 1930), he uses the nouns “*satyagraha*” to name the method of confronting injustice and “*satyagrahis*” to name practitioners of *satyagraha* and the phrase “civil disobedience” to refer to the emerging non-violent resistance movement. A right cause, pure weapons and the presence of God with His blessings define the self-schema that reveals the ideology of the group. Turned into a self-made leader, Gandhi guides an “army of peace” whose members become “soldiers of

Satyagraha” or “soldiers of freedom”. However, *Satyagrahis* do not reproduce the violent behaviour ordinary soldiers are associated with since “they will never do what the ordinary soldiers do” (*Speech at Dabhan*, March 15th 1930, par. 7).

Although Gandhi sought out Islamic causes in order to cement a symbolic alliance between the Hindus and the Muslims in India against the colonial administration, Muslim activists started developing a distinct political discourse. The Gandhian counter-hegemonic rhetoric which dominated during the non-violent resistance campaign turned into a weaker challenge and had to confront the violence of the All India Muslim League embodied in their “fratricidal war” and their demand for the “vivisection” of India (*Quit India Speeches*, August 8th 1942, par.20). The two-nation theory was an ideology of religious nationalism which influenced the Indian subcontinent after its independence from the British Empire. It required the partition of the country and the creation of a Muslim nation-state in the North West and East of India, which Gandhi strongly opposed. As van Dijk (2000) suggests, speakers express underlying concepts and beliefs in specific lexicalization depending on their positions, roles, goals, points of view or opinions (p.77). Gandhi’s choice of the adjective “fratricidal” and the noun “vivisection” help describe the effect of partition in emotional terms since both lexical items are associated with the idea of killing or damaging others. For the Indian leader, Hindus and Muslims are sons of the soil of India who must fight as brothers to keep India united and free: “India is without doubt the homeland of all the Mussalmans inhabiting this country. Every Mussalman should therefore cooperate in the fight for India’s freedom” (*Quit India Speeches*, August 8th 1942, par.25). The partition contradicted his vision of unity among Indians of all religions.

After the failure of the British attempt to secure full Indian cooperation and support in World War II, Gandhi launched his Total disobedience or Quit India movement demanding an end of British rule in India. The Mahatma made a call to “do or die” (*Quit India Speeches*, August 8th 1942). In the concluding part of the *Quit India Speeches*, he defines himself not as a commander in the military tradition but as a humble servant:

I have no weapon but love to wield my authority over any one. I do sport a stick which you can break into bits without the slightest exertion. It is simply my staff with the help

of which I walk. Such a cripple is not elated, when he has been called upon to bear the greatest burden. (par.44)

His words embody the attributes of a servant leader: humility, moral authority and spirit of self-sacrifice. A servant leader shares power and focuses on the growth of others, he serves first and then aspires to lead.

The Quit India campaign was effectively crushed since it did not enjoy the support of influential Indian nationalist leaders and of the Muslim League. The British refused to grant immediate independence saying that it could happen only after the war had ended. Independence was achieved for two nations, not for one, when India lost territory to new born Pakistan. It was one of Gandhi's greatest disappointments in life: Indian freedom was realized without Indian unity. His dream did not come true: "...though we are now two countries-which is a thing I never wanted-we should at least try to arrive at an agreement so that we could live as peaceful neighbours". (*Speech at the Evening Prayer*, January 4th 1948, par. 2). The partition triggered riots, mass casualties and a colossal wave of migration. In an effort to promote peace among his people Gandhi announced his decision to go on a fast. Now a faster, in his *Speech on the Eve of the last Fast* (January 12th 1948), he turns fasting into a potent weapon in the *satyagraha* armoury "to protest against some wrong done by society" (par.1) and "the last resort in the place of the sword" a *Satyagrahi* has (par.2). The Mahatma reflects "No man, if he is pure, has anything more precious to give than his life. I hope and pray that I have that purity in me to justify the step" (par.2), alluding to voluntary self-suffering, one of the three pillars which *satyagraha* is built upon. Soon languages of power appropriated from the colonial rulers consolidated as common-sense while Gandhian cultural meanings were regarded as romantic. Nevertheless, Gandhi remained as an emblematic figure, a peaceful rebel, a reformer and a mass-leader.

Assigning names and the socio-psychological process of placing somebody or something into a group or category are not value-free activities. Rather, they reflect social attitudes and are closely related to political and ideological realities, as stated by Moscovici (1984). Both strategies help trace in Gandhi's discursive constructions the evolution of non-violent resistance in India and the Mahatma's development from a loyalist cooperator to the leader of a mass opposition movement. Emotional anchoring embedded in Gandhi's language

has revealed the feelings fastened to the representations of his campaigns in the struggle for Indian independence.

The Discourse of Resistance

Pennycook (2002) presents two views about the relation between language and reality: one, which sustains the existence of a reality that can be represented in language and the other, which sees realities as produced through language (p.165). These two visions have crucial implications for the construction of the politics of opposition to colonialism. Such non-compliant discourses may aim to uncover the truth, the reality behind the words, or to construct counter-representations. Tiffin (1987) analyses the counter-discursive strategy which she labels “canonical counter-discourse” by which the resister unveils the basic assumptions of British canonical text and subverts it for resistance purposes (p.97). The discursive function of European texts captured the non-European subjects within European frameworks which read their alterity as terror or lack. Tiffin argues that very often those texts which facilitated such material and psychic capture were those which the imposed European education systems foisted on the colonized as the “great literature” which dealt with universals; ones whose culturally specific imperial terms were to be accepted as axiomatic at the colonial margins. Concomitantly, representations of Europe and Europeans within those texts were situated as normative. In view of this, it can be said that some of Gandhi’s speeches are attempts to disclose the assumptions of British canonical text in order to undermine its power and construct counter-representations. Addressing university students in the *Benaras Hindu University Speech* (February 4th 1916), Gandhi attributes the Indian people’s supposed lack of initiative, which the colonizers blame them for, to the fact that the only education they receive is “English education” and wonders “how can we have any (initiative) if we are to devote the precious years of our life to the mastery of a foreign tongue?” (par.5). In the *Speech before the Inter Asian Relations Conference* (April 2nd 1947), Gandhi uses the trigger words “the cultural conquest India has undergone” to refer to the fact that Indian people study their history through English books and not through originals (par.9). He recalls the glory of Asia’s past associated with “wise men” from the East like Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus and Moses, whose “great message”, he thinks, should be transmitted to young generations in Indian schools and universities in the students’ native languages. When he says: “What I want you to understand is the message of Asia. It is not to be learnt through the western spectacles or by imitating the atom bomb” (par.12), the

phrase “western spectacles” refers to the way Indian people were forced “to see” history and reality in colonial times. It is a critique of western cultural domination, which had led to the fall of the traditional Indian system of education and the transformation of educated men into “foreigners in their own land” (February 4th 1916, par. 5).

Gandhi’s rejection of the biased perception of history can be interpreted as his reaction to what Tiffin (1987) denominates “the vilification of the alterity of the colonial world” instantiated in canonical texts (p.97) or to what Sharpe (1989), calls “ruptures in the representation of British colonialism as a civilizing mission” (p.99). The colonizer’s “discourse of civility” hid the violence inherent in the political rationale for colonization attempting to facilitate the modernization and westernization of the indigenous population of uncivilized areas of the world. The image of the cotton weaver and the untouchable as the Western educated native’s subaltern shadows created by colonial discourse, revealed the excesses of the colonizers’ power and their binary representation of Indian society in terms of access to English education. The Mahatma disapproves of any kind of stigmatization of alterity due to two important features of his theory of man: all human beings have an identical soul and hence, a common destination but are naturally unique and have different goals and ways of realizing them (Parekh, 1989 p.49). Gandhi opposes social segregation and its capacity to fortify indolence or passivity to violence, power and brute force. The words “They are India” in “I have seen the miserable specimens of humanity with the lustreless eyes. They are India” (*Speech before the Inter-Asian Relations Conference, April 2nd 1947*) reveal his concern for inclusiveness.

There is a foundational difference between what Gianolla (2020) calls Gandhi’s “civilizational” political discourse and the hegemony of the western discourse of civility (p.8). Benefitting from the immense cultural diversity of India, Gandhi is committed to challenge the violence of the monocultural political perspective on three fronts: he struggles against the colonial empire, opposes the religious-based communal division between Hindus and Muslims and condemns untouchability and his rhetoric reflects it. The Mahatma was one of the only caste Hindus who attacked untouchability in a radical way. In *Appeal to America* (September 13th 1930), he identifies himself with the untouchables or the “several millions of our own kith and kin” regarded as “too degraded even for our touch” and equates his love for them with his love for Rama, the mythological Hindu God. For Gandhi, it is in the humble bhāngis “in whom

you find the concentrated essence of wisdom” (*Speech before the Inter-Asian Relations Conference*, April 2nd 1947). He does not construct the actors of the struggle for self-rule as dichotomies representative of cultural, ethnic or religious differences or as essentialized others in juxtaposition to supposed norms of the self as he manifests in the *Speech in the Reception in Madras* (April 21st 1915), when he states that “almost every part of India was represented in the struggle” (par. 4). His main aim is to disaggregate people according to their behaviour and attitude toward non-violence. The categorial division results in the creation of a group integrated by supporters of non-violence and another group constituted by supporters of violence. This process of in-group and out-group formation is what van Dijk’s (2003, p. 80) defines as a polarized cognition theoretically enhanced, since the properties assigned to each group are semantically each other’s opposite. The Mahatma does not vilify either the foreign exploiters and their Indian accomplices, the revolutionary terrorists or the violent partitionists but blames evil institutions and evil systems created by them, which he makes responsible for “a crime against humanity” and “an irreparable harm done to my country” (*Statement in the Great Trial*, March 18 1922, par. 9,10,11). Burrowes (1996) states that Gandhi sees conflict as built into social structures not into people and makes a clear distinction between the actor and the deed (p.107). Gandhi’s speeches construct “the Government established by law in British India”, “the administration of the law” (*Statement in the Great Trial*, March 18th 1922, par. 9 and 10) and “the East India Company” (*Appeal to America*, September 13th 1930, par 13) as structures imposed parasitically by modern civilization upon an essentially good civilization. Placed in a different conceptual space to that of the British people’s true spirit and values, colonial structures are represented in ways whose meanings include the feature human and by reference to the instruments with which they carry out the activities they are represented as being engaged in. They are categorized as evil and are blamed for the historical “excessiveness” of the unfair treatment of Indians (*Statement in the Great Trial*, March 18th 1922, par. 5).

Gandhi’s representations of the human social actors of the struggle for independence disrupt the binary logic that underpins colonial discourse in that they do not reproduce the construct of the civilized, rational and good, and the primitive, irrational and evil, on the opposite sides of a fixed border. He unmasks the colonialists’ fear of the indigenous other, veiled in the ambivalence of regarding the colonized as both inferior yet exotically other, through his own representations which are untainted by double standards. He does not

stereotype but genericizes town dwellers in terms of their reprehensible behaviour and categorizes the peasantry according to their occupations as prescribed by the hereditary caste system but not in terms of castes. The Mahatma chooses the metaphor of the Saviour or Redeemer, which was conventionally constructed through two interwinding characteristics, Eurocentric universalism and Christianity missionary zeal, and which was premised on the transformation of non-Western cultures by Western cultures into a Eurocentric prototype. The saviour metaphor was deeply embedded in the universalist pretension of Europe as the centre of the universe and in the faith in the superiority of the beliefs of the proselytizer over those of the potential convert. In the *Benaras Hindu University Speech* (February 4th 1916), Gandhi refashions the metaphor and discursively constructs the farmer as the saviour of Indian economy. Salvation does not come from the educated middle class or the rich landlords but from the hard-working land-laborers who can save the Indian village from the evils of materialism, self-indulgence, dependence upon machines and poverty brought about by the colonial system. (*Statement in the Great Trial*, March 18th 1922; *Appeal to America*, September 13th 1930).

In Christian theology, redemption means deliverance from sin or freedom from captivity. The liberation of India from colonial rule is to the Mahatma a religious duty because, for him, it is a step to the liberation of all mankind from the tyranny of violence (Merton, 2007, p.12). He questions the merits of evolutionary change and rejects the fundamental myths of colonialism. Gandhi constructs his own counter-myth built around the intrinsic superiority of the Indian civilization and finds this superiority in values that Orientalists used in their own characterizations of the Indian subcontinent. Nevertheless, Gandhi firmly opposes to the colonial-nationalist assumption that spirituality, anti-materialism, non-violence and the belief in social duties are signs of India's weakness and backwardness. He celebrates "the spiritual life for which this country is noted and for which this country has no rival (*Benaras Hindu University Speech*, February, 4th 1916, par.2) and tells rich noblemen that "there is no salvation for India unless you strip yourselves of this jewellery and hold it in trust for your countrymen in India" (*Benaras Hindu University Speech*, February 4th 1916, par. 9), thus manifesting his opposition to materialism.

Gandhi defines the moral principles of *Satyagraha* with a vocabulary grounded in the idiom of Hinduism: *ahimsa* (no harm to anyone), *dharma* (duty), *tapas* (self-suffering), and *tyag* (renunciation). Since the search for truth and the struggle to improve the welfare of all are one and the same thing, he makes no distinction between religion and politics. Linking the discourses of religion and of politics, he forges a new political logic which interrogates the patterns that establish the modern civilization as more advanced than the ancient civilization and reprobates the standards which colonial advocates and Indian nationalists employ in asserting or accepting the superiority of British civilization: modern medicine, law, Western technology, industrial growth, English education and representative government. Mondal (2004) cites Parekh's (1989) idea that one of Gandhi's key ideological innovations was the reframing of the spatial dichotomy between East and West to one between ancient and modern civilizations (p.431), manifested, for example, in the words:

India is by itself almost a continent. It contains one fifth of the human race. It represents one of the most ancient civilizations. It has traditions handed down from tens of thousands of years, some of which, to the astonishment of the world, remain intact. (*Appeal to America*, September 13th 1930, par. 1)

If India is to perpetuate the glory of her ancient past, it can do so only when it attains freedom. (*Appeal to America*, September 13th 1930, par 2)

It will be the privilege of the ancient land of India to show that way out to the starving world. (*Appeal to America*, September 13th 1930, Par. 5)

Praise for one's own country, its principles, history and traditions is a form of nationalist ideology, according to van Dijk (2005, p.78). Gianolla (2020) defines it as Gandhi's attempt to diminish the philosophical, epistemological and scientific preponderance of the civilization of the West in order to undermine its supposed superiority and pave the way for an intercultural dialogue among civilizations based on individual and collective empowerment (p.8).

In view of the loss of credibility and legitimacy of the traditional Indian notion of the political community based on hereditary monarchy, Gandhi transforms the concept of the nation, defining the Indian nation less in terms of an overarching political integration than in

terms of the accommodative character of Indian civilization. The Indian nation should be rooted in Indian traditions and cultures and should be self-sufficient. The people calling themselves a nation should have the sense of being a community despite individual differences, capacity to absorb people of different faiths and a shared lingua franca. For the first time the individual is acknowledged as its basic unit. This idea of a new nation and nationalism is one imbued of humanity and cooperative character and stripped of any kind of jingoism as expressed in: “When it becomes that you will find that Hindus, Mussalmans, Sikhs, Europeans, Anglo Indians Christians, Untouchable, will all live together as one man” (*Speech at the Round Table Conference*, November 30th 1931).

Gandhi’ s Discoursal Construction of the Quest for Indian Independence: a Battle between Evil and Good, not between Individuals

Gandhi’s non-violence is an attempt to create a new order invested in the transformation of cultures of power, in which conflict is reflected as a battle between evil and good, not between individuals. In his discursive construction of the quest for Indian independence, *Satyagrahis*, the “soldiers” of non-violence and the embodiment of self-endurance, loyalty and discipline, are represented as the heroes who have to struggle against the power of the colonial system and its institutions in order to rescue the victim, the Indian village as the essence of India and the epitome of Indian nationhood. The heroes have to resist, undergo hardships and rescue the victim, so that harmony may be restored. There is no enemy, only an opponent to persuade and convert. Resistance is resistance to the tyranny of violence and non-cooperation with evil. Victory is the consequence of love and not of hatred. Gandhi’s discourse seems to replicate the structure of Lakoff’s (1991) fairy tale of the just war in that it metaphorically creates heroes and victims. The struggle for freedom from colonial domination fits Lakoff’s rescue scenario. Nevertheless, it does not reproduce the asymmetry built into it since there is no enemy-as-demon to defeat. *Satyagraha* is represented as a sort of non-violent warfare whose aim is to expose the opponent’s flaws without hurting them since true democracy can never come through the removal of the opposition as a result of suppression or extermination of the antagonist. The only way of purging the world of evil is by overcoming evil by good, anger by love, untruth by truth, *himsa* by *ahimsa* as Gandhi believes. Violence corrupts and degrades

individuals. Non-violence is a law of life meant for all living beings and can be used as the most effective principle of social action in order to achieve harmony with distinctiveness.

Gandhian discourse is not prejudiced and does not reproduce the exclusivism, absolutism and intolerance of colonial discourse. The representations of the social actors of the struggle for Indian independence reflect Gandhi's decision to end discrimination of all kinds and to foster distinction devoid of domination and hierarchy, which leads to equality based on difference rather than on similarity. It is the voice of a servant leader by example and not by force and double standards, "for the last fifty years I have known no other way, I have been a humble servant of humanity..." (*Speech at the Prayer Meeting*, August 8th 1942). It is a voice which resists the power of foreign domination and legitimizes India's collective identity- a kaleidoscope of peoples, religions, languages and customs. It is the voice that echoes the voices of millions of souls living under a variety of crusts, as Gandhi defines the Indian people. Gandhi redelivers "the message of the wise men from the East" (*Speech before the Inter-Asian Relations Conference*, April 2nd 1947, par. 13). His political rhetoric seems to rest on antiquity, tradition and spirituality and creates a sense of dissimilarity with colonial discourse based on the Mahatma's rejection to the idea of modernity associated with it. The idealization of India's ancient past coupled with a symbolic relocation of all of modernity's desired principles (bread labor in opposition to dehumanizing technology, rurality in opposition to industrial growth, Indian education in opposition to British education, village as the central institution with government by consensus in opposition to representative values) give Gandhian discourse a subversive charge which attempts to undermine the logic of the British Empire's civilizing mission premised on notions of Indian degeneracy, superstition and stale custom as stated by Mondal (2004, p.435).

The Mahatma's nationalist imagination resorts to discourse to construe nationhood through the village, the "real India" (*Speech before the Inter-Asian Relations Conference*, April 2nd 1947, par 4 and 12). The notion of the new free nation emerges to provide an identity to all those who consider India their Motherland or their homeland, independently of any ethnic, religious or cultural bond. Gandhi's ideology is stated in simple terms and its idealization of the Indian village identifies a recognizable social universe as the goal of nationalism. This is bound to have a greater appeal to rural Indians than urban intellectual thought. The national elite rejects

Gandhism because its anti-modernism does not fit their conceptualization of nationhood, which, for them, is a modern concept that can be articulated only by the vocabulary of modern political thought. Gandhi's representations of the social actors of the struggle for independence are not permeated with the perceptual biases manifested in the representations of the colonized in colonial discourse. Gandhi does not stereotype out-group members and his discursive representations of prototypical figures such as the self-sufficient village, the hard-working farmer and the courageous peaceful soldier serve the purpose of revealing traditional values which he attempts to instill through his rhetoric in order to reduce intergroup conflict.

Gianolla (2020) conceptualizes Gandhi's struggle as a non-antagonistic effort to build an intercultural dialogue in order to dispute the historical impact of colonialism and an intracultural dialogue between Hindus and with Muslims to dispute internal forms of oppression. The spiritual and political leader's proposal of a simple life characterized by the welfare of all, tolerance and sustainable use of local resources, of pacific redefinition of intergroup boundaries and of dialogue with the opponent, shared by Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism and Christianity, is valid not only for all those who suffer from imposition of extrinsic ways of thinking and models of life but for the whole world.

The Importance of Critical Discourse Analysis

This study of Gandhi's political rhetoric brings the critical tradition of social analysis into the study of discourse as the battlefield of the leaders' campaigns to change the status-quo. It gives the researcher the possibility of going beyond the analysis of the individual text and of analyzing and interpreting the identities and positioning of social actors. Methodologically, the approach integrates, as Koller (2005) proposes, cognitive metaphor research to the critical analysis of discourse and entails working in a transdisciplinary way through dialogue with Identity Theory and Social Representation Theory. This integrative approach helps to reveal the relations between discourse, power and ideologies and their influence in the construction of collective identities. The result is a description and an evaluation of the way resistance to

colonial power emerges and becomes virulent among Indian people in colonial times through analysis of the representations of the social actors of the Indian struggle for independence from colonial domination in samples of Gandhi's non-violent nationalistic discourse.

The critical study of the Mahatma's linguistic choices through which he construes his version of reality helps to understand his resistance rhetoric nurtured on the values and traditions of a glorious Indian past and consistent with the teachings of the world major religions; one which preaches self-reliance, morality, inclusiveness and humanitarian service and does not alienate opponents, always leaving open a possibility for conversion and redemption. It is a discursive production permeated with the ideology of non-violence which resists the hegemony of colonial discourse and helps to unmask the violence of the regime embodied in the biased perception of colonial texts. Gandhi's discourse presents an alternative paradigm from the political and economic points of view, based on the cultural and social transformations essential for reconciliation and on the construction of social identity in a new order in which the relationship between the in-groups and out-groups is one of mutual interdependence rather than of antagonism.

Ahimsa reveals Gandhism as praxis and provides an option to colonial discourse since it reformulates the nature of conflict and redefines the boundaries between the contending self and other, capitalizing on the founding belief of unity in diversity. In the Foreword of *Gandhi's India -Unity in Diversity*, a selection of Mohandas Gandhi's words explaining the implications of national integration, Husain writes: "Gandhiji lived for peace, harmony and reconciliation and he laid down his precious life for the vindication of these ideals". Expressing his admiration for the Mahatma, his American disciple Martin Luther King (1963 cited in Nazareth, 2018) said:

I came to see for the first time that the Christian doctrine of love, operating through the Gandhian method of non-violence is one of the most potent weapons available to an oppressed people in their struggle for freedom: Christ furnished the spirit and motivation, Gandhi furnished the method.

For Gandhi, the ability to achieve unity in diversity is the beauty and test of the Indian people as a society which has reached an advanced stage of social and cultural development.

The way Gandhi discursively represents the social actors of the struggle for India's independence reveals that the idea of interfaith and interethnic harmony coupled with non-violence is attainable and universal and that growing contact between opposing groups may help reduce the salience of differences leading to conflict. However, some critics regard the blend of harmony and non-violence as utopian. They claim that although it cannot be said that Gandhi was self-consciously writing in the utopian tradition since there are no antecedents of utopianism in Gandhi's writings, it was in utopia that he sought to articulate a new nation on the basis of reconciliation of differences. Because of time and space restrictions, it is not possible for the researcher to include the topic in this study but it would be an interesting scope of future research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackermann, P. and Rodal, B. (2008). The Strategic Dimensions of Civil Resistance. *Survival*. Vol. 50 (3) 111-126. doi:10.1080.100396330802173131.
- Aschcroft, B., Griffiths, G. y Tiflin, H. (2002). *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. Great Britain: Routledge.
- Ashmore, R., Jussim, L. y Wilder, D. (2001). *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict and Conflict Reduction*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Attenborough, R. (2000). *The Words of Gandhi*. New York: New Market Press.
- Baden Powel, B.H. (1899). What is a Village. The Origin and Growth of Village Communities In India. London. Longmans.
- Retrieved from c: /Users/usuario/Downloads/R.B654.pdf
- Barnabas, A. and Clifford, P. (2012). Mahatma Gandhi, the Indian Model of Servant Leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*. Vol.7 (2), 133-150.
- Baron, R. y Branscombe, N. (2012) *Social Psychology*. 13th Edition. U.S: Pearson.
- Brewer, M. (1999). The Psychology of Prejudice: In-group Love or Outgroup Hate? *Journal of social Issues*, Vol 55 (3), 429-444.
- Brewer, M. (2001). The Many Faces of Social Identity: Implications for political Psychology. *Political Psychology*. Vol. 22 (1), 115-125.
- Burrowes, R. (1996). *The Strategy of Self-Defense*. Sunny Press.
- Chaturvedy, A. (2021). How Tilak Transformed the Freedom Movement. Retrieved February 2022 from [https:// timesofindia.indiatimes.com/readersblog](https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/readersblog)
- Conway, J. (2003). Civil Resistance and the Diversity of Tactics. *Osgood Hall Law Journal*. 23, 505-517.
- Dalton, D. (2012). *Mahatma Gandhi Non-Violent Power in Action*. New York. Columbia University Press.
- Dijvi, F. (2012). *The Impossible Indian: Gandhi and the Temptation of Violence*. London. Hurst.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Ufkes, E. G., Saguy, T. y Pearson, A. R. (2016). Included but Invisible? Subtle Bias, Common Identity, and the Darker Side of “We”. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 10 (1), 6–46. doi:10.1111/sipr.12017.

- Fabian, J. (2014). *Time and the Other. How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York. Columbia University Press
- Fairclough, I. y Fairclough, N. (2012). *Analysis and Evaluation of Argumentation in C.D.A: deliberation and the dialectics of enlightenment*. Retrieved October 2020 from <https://www.academia.edu/3775784>
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman. (3rd edition 2014). -----
- (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London and New York. Longman.
- (2000). *New Labour, New Language*. U.S and Canada. Routledge.
- (2001). The Dialectics of Discourse. *Textus*. 14 (2), 231-292
- (2003). *Analysing Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge.
- (2012a). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Academia.edu. Retrieved October 2020 from <https://www.academia.edu/3791325>
- (2012b). International Advances in Engineering and Technology. (IAET). *International Scientific Researcher*. Vol. 7 July 2012. Retrieved October 2020 from [academia.edu/31906816/Critical_discourse_analysis](https://www.academia.edu/31906816/Critical_discourse_analysis)
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol 27 (3), 291-305. Retrieved from [ipev.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Galtung-Johan/CulturalViolence.pdf](https://www.ipev.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Galtung-Johan/CulturalViolence.pdf)
- Gandhi, M. (1931). Appeal to America. In *English for Today*. U.S.A.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Harijan, March 14th 1936.
- Harijan, April 29th 1939.
- *Hind Swaraj*. Navajivan Publishing House.
- *Young India*, 1929.
- Famous speeches and views on non-violence. Retrieved August 2020 from gandhiasharamsabarmati.org and gandhiasharamsevagram.org
- Quotations, views on non-violence and famous speeches. Retrieved August 2020 from <http://www.mkgandhi.org/nonviolence/index.htm>
- (1968). *Gandhi's India- Unity in Diversity*. New Delhi: National Book Trust.
- Speech at the Reception in Madras (April 21st 195)
- Speech at Benaras Hindu University (February 4th 1916)
- Statement in the Great Trial (March 18th 1922)

- Speech on the Eve of Historic Dandi March (March 11th 1930)
- Speech at Dabhan (March 15th 1930)
- Speech at Dandi (April 5th 1930)
- Speech at Kingsley Hall (October 1931)
- Speech at the Round Table conference (November 30th 1931)
- Speech Quit India (August 8th 1942)
- Speech at the Inter-Asian Relations Conference (April 2nd 1947)
- Speech at the Prayer Meeting (January 4th 1948)
- Speech on the Eve of the Last fast (January 12th 1948)

Gianolla, C. (2020). Undermining Populism Through Gandhi's Intercultural Democratic Discourse. *Journal of Cultural Discourses*.15 (1), 26-41.

doi:10.1080/174471432020.1734011

Gipson, T. (2019). *India's Struggle*.US. lulu.com,

Retrieved from [amazon.com/Indias-Struggle-Therlee-Gipson/dp/0359597327](https://www.amazon.com/Indias-Struggle-Therlee-Gipson/dp/0359597327)

Gottlob, M. (2007). India's Unity in Diversity as a Question of Historical Perspective. *Special Articles. Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol. 42 (09) Retrieved October 2020 from epw.in/journal/2007/09/india_unity_in_diversity_as_a_question_of_political-diversity

Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The Servant as Leader*. Robert Greenleaf Publishing Centre.

Hart, C. (2008). Critical Discourse Analysis and Metaphor: Towards a Theoretical

Framework.*Critical Discourse Studies*.5. 91-106. doi:10.1080/17405900801990058

Haynes, D. (1991) *Rhetoric and ritual in Colonial India*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Hogg, M and Reid, S. (2006). Social Identity, Self-Categorization and the Communication of Group norms. *Communication Theory. International Communication Association*, 16.

7-30. doi:10.1111/j-1468-2885-2006-00003-x

Hogg, M, Abrams, D., Otten, S. and Hinkle, S. (2004). The Social Identity Perspective. Inter-Group Relations, Self-Conception and Small Groups. *Small Group Research*, Vol.35(3). June 2004, 246-276.doi:10.1177/1046496404263424.

Hogg, M., Abrams, D., Brewer, M. (2017). Social Identity: The role of the Self in Group Processes and Inter-group Relations. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*.

Vol.20 (5), 570-581. doi:10.1177/1368430217690909.

- Hogg, M. and Gaffney, A. (2018). Group Processes and Intergroup Relations. In Strevens' *Handbook of Experimental Psychology and Cognitive Neuroscience*. (pp.1-34)
doi: 10.1002/9781119170174.epcn414
- Höijer, B. (2011). Social Representation Theory. A New Theory for Media Research. *Nordicom Review*.32(2) doi:10.1515/nor-2017-10109.
- Jahanbegloo, R. (2018). *The global Gandhi*. India. Routledge.
- Jefferess, D. (2003). *Changing the story: Postcolonial studies and resistance*. Mac Master University, Canada. Retrieved September 2020 from <http://proquest.umi.com>.
- Jodhka, S. (2002). Nation and Village. *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 10th 2002.
- Kher, V. (Ed). (1987). *The Essence of Hinduism*. Ahmedabad. Navajivan Publishing House.
- Kohn, M. and Kavita, R., Colonialism. *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2022 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), forthcoming URL=
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2022/entries/colonialism>>
- Koller, V. (2005). Critical Discourse and Social Cognition: Evidence from Business and Media Discourse. *Discourse Society*.2005.16,199-224.
doi:10.1177/0957926505049621
- (2009). Analysing Collective Identity in Discourse: Social actors and Context. *Journals Open Edition*. Semen. Retrieved September 2021 from <https://doi.org/10.4000/semn.8877>.
- (2012) How to Analyse Collective Identity in Discourse-Textual and Contextual Parameters. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*. Vol.5 (2), 19-38 Retrieved September 2021 from <http://cadaad.net/journal>.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). Metaphor and War: The Metaphor system Used to Justify War in the Gulf (Parts One and Two). *Peace Research*. 23, 25-32.
- (1992). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In Ortony, A. (Ed) *Metaphor and Thought* (2nd. Edition) Cambridge University Press. (pp. 1-50)
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. London. University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. USA. The University of Chicago Press.
- Lalonde, R. (1994). *Unity in Diversity: Acceptance and Integration in an Era of Intolerance and Fragmentation* (Extract from Master Thesis). Carlton University.

- Law, Colonial Systems of British Empire. Encyclopaedia of Western Colonialism since 1450. Retrieved February 2022 from Encyclopedia.com
- Lelyveld, D. (2001) Words as Deeds: Gandhi on Language. *Annual of Urdu Studies*. Vol. 16.
- Li, Ch. (2008). The Philosophy of Harmony in Classical Confucianism. *Philosophy compass* 3.(3), 423-435. doi:10.1111/j.1747.9991.2008.00141.x
- Mac Clay, W. (2010). The Moral Equivalent of War. *National Affairs*. Retrieved February 2022 From national affairs.com/publications/detail/the-moral-equivalent-of-war.
- Majmudar, U. (2005). *Gandhi's Pilgrimage of Faith: From Darkness to Light*. Suny Press.
- Marshall, (2001). The Cambridge Illustrated History of the British Empire. Cambridge University Press.
- Merton, T. (2007). (Ed.) *Gandhi on Non-Violence. Selected Texts from Mohandas K. Gandhi's Non-violence in Peace and War*. New York: New Directions Books.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Misra, M. (2014) Sergeant Major Gandhi: Indian Nationalism and Non-violent Martiality. *The Journal of Asian Studies*. Vol.73 (3) 689-709. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/s0021911814000485.
- Mondal, A. (2004). *Nationalism and Post-Colonial Identity*. Routledge.
- Moscovici, S. (1984). *Social Representations*. London. Cambridge University Press.
- National Integration Sub Committee of the National Committee for Gandhi Centenary.
- Nazareth, P. (n.d.). Gandhi, Christ and Christianity. Retrieved February 2022 from www.mkgandhi.org
- Panther Brick, S. (2012) *Gandhi and Nationalism. The Path to Indian Independence*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Parekh, B. (1989). *Colonialism, Tradition and Reform: An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- (2001). *Gandhi: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from Academia.edu/16383738/_Bikhu_C_Parekh_Gandhi_A_Very_Short_Introduction_Book_zz_org
- Parel, A. (1997). *Hind Swaraj and Other Writings*. University of Calgary. Canada. Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). The Politics of Pronouns. *ELT Journal*. V48 (2) (pp.173-178).

- Pennycook, A. (2001). *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Ponnu, (n.d.) Ahimsa. Its Theory and Practice in Gandhism. Retrieved February 2022 from www.mkgandhi.org
- Punathil, S. (2019). *Interrogating Communalism*. India. Routledge.
- Raiter, A. (2001). *Lenguaje y Sentido Común: Las Bases para la Formación del Discurso Dominante*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos.
- Sanchez, C. (08de febrero de 2019). *Normas APA*. 7ma. Edición. Normas APA (7ma. Edición). <https://normas.apa.org>
- Sen, R. and Wagner, W. (2009). Gandhi, Secularism and Social Capital in Modern India. *Psychological Studies*. (June 2009) 54 National Academy of Psychology India.
- Sharpe, J. (1989). Figures of Colonial Resistance. In Aschcroft, B., Griffiths, G. y Tiflin, H. (Eds.) *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. Great Britain. Routledge.
- Singh, S. (n.d.) Satyagraha: Gandhian Way of Life. Retrieved November 2021 from [mkgandhi.org/articles/satyagraha way of life.htm](http://mkgandhi.org/articles/satyagraha-way-of-life.htm)
- Staszak, J.F. (2019). Other/ Alterity. *Kabul Magazine*. Biblioteca Digital. Retrieved March 2021 from <https://www.kabulmagazine.com/jean-francois-staszak-alterita-otherness/>
- Tiffin, H. (1987), Postcolonial Literatures and Counter-discourse. In Aschcroft, B., Griffiths, G. y Tiflin, H. (Eds.) *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. Great Britain. Routledge.
- Traboulay, D. (1997) Mahatma Gandhi's Satyagraha and non-violent resistance. City University of New York. Retrieved November 2021 from academicworks.cuny.edu/si-pub/81/
- Van Dijk, T. (1998) *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Great Britain. Sage Publications.
- (2000). *Ideología y Discurso*. España: Ariel Lingüística
- (2001) *Multidisciplinary C.D.A.: A Plea for Diversity* in Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London. Sage Publications.
- (2005). Política, Ideología y Discurso. *Quorum Académica*. 2 (2), 15-47. . Retrieved October 2020 from www.discursos.org/oldarticles/Política%20ideologia.pdf
- Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In Caldas-Coulthard & Coulthard (Eds.) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- (2008). *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Varma, R. (2001). *The Spiritual Basis of Satyagraha*. Ahmedabad Navajiban Publishing House.
- Weber, T. (1991). *Conflict Resolution and Gandhian Ethics*. Recuperado en diciembre 2020 de <http://www.mkgandhi.org>
- (1996). *Gandhi's Peace Army: The Shanti Sena and Unarmed Peace-Making*. Siracuse University Press.
- .----- (2001). *Interpersonal Conflict*. Retrieved October 2020 from mkgandhi.org/articles/Thomas%Weber.htm
- (2004). *Gandhi as Disciple and Mentor*. United Kingdom. Cambridge University Press.
- Yadav, Y (2013). *Economic Salvation and Mahatma Gandhi*. The Gandhi King Community retrieved from gandhiking.ning.com/profiles/blogs/keconomic-salvatio-and-mahatma-gandhi-1
- Yamabhai, S. (1933) *The Rhetoric of non-violence. A Critical Analysis of selected Speeches by Mohandas Gandhi*. (doctoral thesis). The Ohio State University.
- Ziveri, D. (2016). *El Saber No violento y la Acción Comunicativa en la Dinámica de la Post Modernidad*. (doctoral thesis). Universidad Complutense de Madrid. España. Retrieved January 2021 de <https://eprints.ucm.es/37562/1/T37181.pdf>

GLOSSARY

Ahimsa	Non-violence.
Bhagvadgita	(popularly known as Gita) a part of the great Hindu epic Mahabharata.
Brahamn	The Ultimate Reality.
Brahamana religion	The first or the highest of the four castes sanctioned by the Hindu
Dharma	Religion: duty. A comprehensive Sanskrit term embracing the concepts of Law, justice, duty and virtue.
Harijan	5Literally a man of God; an untouchable
Khadi	Hand-spun, hand woven cloth
Kshatriya	The second of the four castes
Mahatma	Great Soul
Mantra	A verse in a religious text, incantation
Moksha	Self -realization
Pariah	An outcaste
Poorna Swaraj	Complete or full independence
Satya	Truth
Satyagraha	Literally insistence on truth
Shudra or Shoodra	The last of the four castes
Swaraj	Self-rule
Tapasya	Penance
Varna	Caste based on occupation

APPENDIX

1-RECEPTION IN MADRAS -April 21st 1915.

In reply to the Welcome address read by Mr. G. A. Natesan on behalf of the Indian South African League, at a meeting at the Victoria Public Hall, Madras, on the 21st April 1915, Mr. Gandhi said:

1-Mr. Chairman and Friends, - On behalf of my wife and myself I am deeply grateful for the great honour this you here in Madras, and may I say, this Presidency, have done to us and the affection that has been lavished upon us in this great and enlightened - not benighted-Presidency.

2-If there is anything that we have deserved, as has been stated in this beautiful address, I can only say I lay it at the feet of my Master under whose inspiration I have been working all this time under exile in South Africa. (Hear, hear). In so far as the sentiments expressed in this address are merely prophetic. Sir, I accept them as a blessing and as a prayer from you and from this great meeting that both my wife and I myself may possess the power, the inclination, and the life to dedicate whatever we may develop in this sacred land of ours to the service of the Motherland. (Cheers). It is no wonder that we have come to Madras. As my Friend, Mr. Natesan, will perhaps tell you, we have been overdue and we have neglected Madras. But we have done nothing of the kind. We know that we had a corner in your hearts and we knew that you will not misjudge us if we did not hasten to Madras before going to the other presidencies and to other towns. But, Sir, if one-tenth of the language that has been used in this address is deserved by us, what language do you propose to use for those who have lost their lives, and therefore finished their work on behalf of your suffering countrymen in South Africa? What language do you propose to use for Magappan and Narayansawmy, lads of seventeen or eighteen years, who braved in simple faith all the trials, all the sufferings, and all the indignities for the sake of the honour of the Motherland (Cheers). What language do you propose to use with reference to Valliamma, that sweet girl of seventeen years who was discharged from Maritzburg prison, skin and bone suffering from fever to which she succumbed after about a month's time (Cries of shame).It was the Madrasis who of all the Indians were singled out by the great

Divinity that rules over us for this great work. Do you know that in the great city of Johannesburg, the Madarasis look on a Madrasis as dishonoured if he has not passed through the jails once or twice during this terrible crisis that your countrymen in South Africa went through during these eight long years? You have said that I inspired these great men and women, but I cannot accept that proposition. It was they, the simple-minded folk, who worked away in faith, never expecting the slightest reward, who inspired me, who kept me to the proper level, and who inspired me by their great sacrifice, by their great faith, by their great trust in the great God, to do the work that I was able to do. (Cheers).

3-It is my misfortune that my wife and I have been obliged to work in the lime-light, and you have magnified out of all proportion (cries of 'No? No?') this little work we have been able to do. Believe me, my dear friends, that if you consider, whether in India or in South Africa, it is possible for us, poor mortals-the same individuals, the same stuff of which you are made if you consider that it is possible for us to do anything whatsoever without your assistance and without you're doing the same thing that we would be prepared to do, you are lost, and we are also lost, and our services will be in vain, I do not for one moment believe that the inspiration was given by us. The inspiration was given by them to us, and we were able to be interpreters between the powers who called themselves the Governors and those men for whom redress was so necessary. We were simply links between those two parties and nothing more. It was my duty, having received the education that was given to me by my parents to interpret what was going on in our midst to those simple folk, and they rose to the occasion. They realised the might of religious force, and it was they who inspired us, and let them who have finished their work, and who have died for you and me, let them inspire you and us. We are still living and who knows whether the devil will not possess us tomorrow and we shall not forsake the post of duty before any new danger that may face us. But these three have gone for ever.

4-An old man of 75 from the United Provinces, Harbart Singh, has also joined the majority and died in jail in South Africa; and he deserved the crown that you would seek to impose upon us. These young men deserve all the adjectives that you have so affectionately, but blindly lavished upon us. It was not only the Hindus who struggled, but there were Mohamedans, Parsis and Christians, and almost every part of India was represented in the struggle. They realised the common danger, and they realised also what their destiny was

an Indians, and it was they, and they alone, who matched the soul-forces against the physical forces. (Loud applause.)

2-BENARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY SPEECH- February 4th 1916.

[Pandit Malaviya had invited Gandhiji to speak on the occasion of the opening of the Benaras Hindu University. Lord Hardinge, the Viceroy, had come specially to lay the foundation-stone of the University. To protect his life extra precautions were taken by the police. They were omnipresent and all houses along the route were guarded. Banaras was, so to say, in a state of siege].

Eminent persons from all over India had come. Many of them delivered addresses. On February 4, 1916 it was Gandhiji' s turn to address the audience, mostly consisting of impressionable youths. A galaxy of princes, bedecked and bejewelled, had occupied the dias. The Maharaja of Darbhanga was in the chair.

Gandhiji who was clad in a short, coarse dhoti, Kathiawadi cloak and turban rose to speak. The police precautions and the luxury around him hurt him deeply. Turning to the audience, Gandhiji said that he wanted to think audibly-speak without reserve:

1-I wish to tender my humble apology for the long delay that took place before I was able to reach this place. And you will readily accept the apology when I tell you that I am not responsible for the delay nor is any human agency responsible for it. The fact is that I am like an animal on show, and my keepers in their over kindness always manage to neglect a necessary chapter in this life, and, that is, pure accident. In this case, they did not provide for the series of accidents that happened to us-to me, keepers, and my carriers. Hence this delay.

2-Friends, under the influence of the matchless eloquence of Mrs. Besant who has just sat down, pray, do not believe that our University has become a finished product, and that all the young men who are to come to the University, that has yet to rise and come into existence, have also come and returned from it finished citizens of a great empire. Do not go away with any such impression, and if you, the student world to which my remarks are supposed to be addressed this evening, consider for one moment that the spiritual life, for

which this country is noted and for which this country has no rival, can be transmitted through the lip, pray, believe me, you are wrong. You will never be able merely through the lip, to give the message that India, I hope, will one day deliver to the world. I myself have been fed up with speeches and lectures. I except the lectures that have been delivered here during the last two days from this category, because they are necessary. But I do venture to suggest to you that we have now reached almost the end of our resources in speech-making; it is not enough that our ears are feasted, that our eyes are feasted, but it is necessary that our hearts have got to be touched and that our hands and feet have got to be moved.

3-We have been told during the last two days how necessary it is, if we are to retain our hold upon the simplicity of Indian character, that our hands and feet should move in unison with our hearts. But this is only by way of preface. I wanted to say it is a matter of deep humiliation and shame for us that I am compelled this evening under the shadow of this great college, in this sacred city, to address my countrymen in a language that is foreign to me. I know that if I was appointed an examiner, to examine all those who have been attending during these two days this series of lectures, most of those who might be examined upon these lectures would fail. And why? Because they have not been touched.

4-I was present at the sessions of the great Congress in the month of December. There was a much vaster audience, and will you believe me when I tell you that the only speeches that touched the huge audience in Bombay were the speeches that were delivered in Hindustani? In Bombay, mind you, not in Benaras where everybody speaks Hindi. But between the vernaculars of the Bombay Presidency on the one hand and Hindi on the other, no such great dividing line exists as there does between English and the sister language of India; and the Congress audience was better able to follow the speakers in Hindi. I am hoping that this University will see to it that the youths who come to it will receive their instruction through the medium of their vernaculars. Our languages are the reflection of ourselves, and if you tell me that our languages are too poor to express the best thought, then say that the sooner we are wiped out of existence the better for us. Is there a man who dreams that English can ever become the national language of India? Why this handicap on the nation? Just consider for one moment what an equal race our lads have to run with every English lad.

5-I had the privilege of a close conversation with some Poona professors. They assured me that every Indian youth, because he reached his knowledge through the English language, lost at least six precious years of life. Multiply that by the numbers of students turned out by our schools and colleges, and find out for yourselves how many thousand years have been lost to the nation. The charge against us is that we have no initiative. How can we have any, if we are to devote the precious years of our life to the mastery of a foreign tongue? We fail in this attempt also. Was it possible for any speaker yesterday and today to impress his audience as was possible for Mr. Higginbotham? It was not the fault of the previous speakers that they could not engage the audience. They had more than substance enough for us in their addresses. But their addresses could not go home to us. I have heard it said that after all it is English educated India which is leading and which is leading and which is doing all the things for the nation. It would be monstrous if it were otherwise. The only education we receive is English education. Surely, we must show something for it. But suppose that we had been receiving during the past fifty years education through our vernaculars, what should we have today? We should have today a free India, we should have our educated men, not as if they were foreigners in their own land but speaking to the heart of the nation; they would be working amongst the poorest of the poor, and whatever they would have gained during these fifty years would be a heritage for the nation. Today even our wives are not the sharers in our best thought. Look at Professor Bose and Professor Ray and their brilliant researches. Is it not a shame that their researches are not the common property of the masses? Let us now turn to another subject.

6-The Congress has passed a resolution about self-government, and I have no doubt that the All-India Congress Committee and the Muslim League will do their duty and come forward with some tangible suggestions. But I, for one, must frankly confess that I am not so much interested in what they will be able to produce as I am interested in anything that the student world is going to produce or the masses are going to produce. No paper contribution will ever give us self-government. No amount of speeches will ever make us fit for self-government. It is only our conduct that will fit for us it. And how are we trying to govern ourselves?

7-I want to think audibly this evening. I do not want to make a speech and if you find me this evening speaking without reserve, pray, consider that you are only sharing the thoughts of a man who allows himself to think audibly, and if you think that I seem to transgress

the limits that courtesy imposes upon me, pardon me for the liberty I may be taking. I visited the Vishwanath temple last evening, and as I was walking through those lanes, these were the thoughts that touched me. If a stranger dropped from above on to this great temple, and he had to consider what we as Hindus were, would he not be justified in condemning us? Is not this great temple a reflection of our own character? I speak feelingly, as a Hindu. Is it right that the lanes of our sacred temple should be as dirty as they are? The houses round about are built anyhow. The lanes are tortuous and narrow. If even our temples are not models of roominess and cleanliness, what can our self-government be? Shall our temples be abodes of holiness, cleanliness and peace as soon as the English have retired from India, either of their own pleasure or by compulsion, bag and baggage?

8-I entirely agree with the President of the Congress that before we think of self-government, we shall have to do the necessary plodding. In every city there are two divisions, the cantonment and the city proper. The city mostly is a stinking den. But we are a people unused to city life. But if we want city life, we cannot reproduce the easy-going hamlet life. It is not comforting to think that people walk about the streets of Indian Bombay under the perpetual fear of dwellers in the storeyed building spitting upon them. I do a great deal of railway traveling. I observe the difficulty of third-class passengers. But the railway administration is by no means to blame for all their hard lot. We do not know the elementary laws of cleanliness. We spit anywhere on the carriage floor, irrespective of the thoughts that it is often used as sleeping space. We do not trouble ourselves as to how we use it; the result is indescribable filth in the compartment. The so-called better class passengers overawe their less fortunate brethren. Among them I have seen the student world also; sometimes they behave no better. They can speak English and they have worn Norfolk jackets and, therefore, claim the right to force their way in and command seating accommodation.

9-I have turned the searchlight all over, and as you have given me the privilege of speaking to you, I am laying my heart bare. Surely, we must set these things right in our progress towards self-government. I now introduce you to another scene. His Highness the Maharaja who presided yesterday over our deliberations spoke about the poverty of India. Other speakers laid great stress upon it. But what did we witness in the great pandal in which the foundation ceremony was performed by the Viceroy? Certainly, a most gorgeous

show, an exhibition of jewellery, which made a splendid feast for the eyes of the greatest jeweller who chose to come from Paris. I compare with the richly bedecked noble men the millions of the poor. And I feel like saying to these noble men, "There is no salvation for India unless you strip yourselves of this jewellery and hold it in trust for your countrymen in India." I am sure it is not the desire of the King-Emperor or Lord Hardinge that in order to show the truest loyalty to our King-Emperor, it is necessary for us to ransack our jewellery boxes and to appear bedecked from top to toe. I would undertake, at the peril of my life, to bring to you a message from King George himself that he expects nothing of the kind.

10-Sir, whenever I hear of a great palace rising in any great city of India, be it in British India or be it in India which is ruled by our great chiefs, I become jealous at once, and say, "Oh, it is the money that has come from the agriculturists." Over seventy-five per cent of the population are agriculturists and Mr. Higginbotham told us last night in his own felicitous language, that they are the men who grow two blades of grass in the place of one. But there cannot be much spirit of self-government about us, if we take away or allow others to take away from them almost the whole of the results of their labour. Our salvation can only come through the farmer. Neither the lawyers, nor the doctors, nor the rich landlords are going to secure it.

11-Now, last but not the least, it is my bounden duty to refer to what agitated our minds during these two or three days. All of us have had many anxious moments while the Viceroy was going through the streets of Banaras. There were detectives stationed in many places. We were horrified. We asked ourselves, "Why this distrust?" Is it not better that even Lord Harding should die than live a living death? But a representative of a mighty sovereign may not. He might find it necessary to impose these detectives on us? We may foam, we may fret, we may resent, but let us not forget that India of today in her impatience has produced an army of anarchists. I myself am an anarchist, but of another type. But there is a class of anarchists amongst us, and if I was able to reach this class, I would say to them that their anarchism has no room in India, if India is to conquer. It is a sign of fear. If we trust and fear God, we shall have to fear no one, not the Maharajas, not the Viceroys, not the detectives, not even King George.

12-I honour the anarchist for his love of the country. I honour him for his bravery in being

willing to die for his country; but I ask him-is killing honourable? Is the dagger of an assassin a fit precursor of an honourable death? I deny it. There is no warrant for such methods in any scriptures. If I found it necessary for the salvation of India that the English should retire, that they should be driven out, I would not hesitate to declare that they would have to go, and I hope I would be prepared to die in defence of that belief. That would, in my opinion, be an honourable death. The bomb-thrower creates secret plots, is afraid to come out into the open, and when caught pays the penalty of misdirected zeal.

13-I have been told, "Had we not done this, had some people not thrown bombs, we should never have gained what we have got with reference to the partition movement." (Mrs. Besant : 'Please stop it.')

This was what I said in Bengal when Mr. Lyon presided at the meeting. I think what I am saying is necessary. If I am told to stop I shall obey. (Turning to the Chairman) I await your orders. If you consider that by my speaking as I am, I am not serving the country and the empire I shall certainly stop. (Cries of 'Go on.')

(The Chairman: 'Please, explain your object.')

I am simply. . . (another interruption). My friends, please do not resent this interruption. If Mrs. Besant this evening suggests that I should stop, she does so because she loves India so well, and she considers that I am erring in thinking audibly before you young men. But even so, I simply say this, that I want to purge India of this atmosphere of suspicion on either side, if we are to reach our goal; we should have an empire which is to be based upon mutual love and mutual trust. Is it not better that we talk under the shadow of this college than that we should be talking irresponsibly in our homes? I consider that it is much better that we talk these things openly. I have done so with excellent results before now. I know that there is nothing that the students do not know. I am, therefore, turning the searchlight towards ourselves. I hold the name of my country so dear to me that I exchange these thoughts with you, and submit to you that there is no room for anarchism in India. Let us frankly and openly say whatever we want to say our rulers, and face the consequences if what we have to say does not please them.

But let us not abuse.

14-I was talking the other day to a member of the much-abused Civil Service. I have not very much in common with the members of that Service, but I could not help admiring the manner in which he was speaking to me. He said: "Mr. Gandhi, do you for one moment suppose that all we, Civil Servants, are a bad lot, that we want to oppress the people whom we have come to govern?" "No," I said. "Then if you get an opportunity put in a word for

the much-abused Civil Service.” And I am here to put in that word. Yes, many members of the Indian Civil Service are most decidedly overbearing; they are tyrannical, at times thoughtless. Many other adjectives may be used. I grant all these things and I grant also that after having lived in India for a certain number of years some of them become somewhat degraded. But what does that signify? They were gentlemen before they came here, and if they have lost some of the moral fibre, it is a reflection upon ourselves.

15-Just think out for yourselves, if a man who was good yesterday has become bad after having come in contact with me, is he responsible that he has deteriorated or am I? The atmosphere of sycophancy and falsity that surrounds them on their coming to India demoralizes them, as it would many of us. It is well to take the blame sometimes. If we are to receive self-government, we shall have to take it. We shall never be granted self-government. Look at the history of the British Empire and the British nation; freedom loving as it is, it will not be a party to give freedom to a people who will not take it themselves. Learn your lesson if you wish to from the Boer War. Those who were enemies of that empire only a few years ago have now become friends.

.
(At this point there was an interruption and a movement on the platform to leave. The speech, therefore, ended here abruptly)

3-STATEMENT IN THE GREAT TRIAL – March 18th 1922.

[The historical trial of Mahatma Gandhi and Shri. Shankarlal Ghelabhai Banker, editor, and printer and publisher respectively of Young India, on charges under Section 124 A of the Indian Penal Code, was held on Saturday, 18th March 1922, before Mr. C. N. Broomfield, I. C. S., District and Sessions Judge, Ahmedabad.]

Sir J. T. Strangman, Advocate-General, with Rao Bahadur Girdharlal Uttamram, Public Prosecutor of Ahmedabad, appeared for the Crown. Mr. A. C. Wild, Remembrancer of Legal Affairs, was also present. Mahatma Gandhi and Shri Shankarlal Banker were undefended.

Among the members of the public who were present on the occasion were : Kasturba Gandhi, Sarojini Naidu, Pandit M. M. Malaviya, Shri N. C. Kelkar, Smt. J. B. Petit, and Smt. Anasuyaben Sarabhai.

The Judge, who took his seat at 12 noon, said that there was slight mistake in the charges were then read out by the Registrar. These charges were of “bringing or attempting to excite disaffection towards His Majesty’s Government established by law in British India, and thereby committing offences punishable under Section 124 A of the Indian Penal Code,” the offences being in three articles published in Young India of September 29 and December 15 of 1921, and February 23 of 1922. The offending articles were then read out : first of them was, “Tampering with Loyalty”; and second, “The Puzzle and its Solution”, and the last was “Shaking the Manes”.

The Judge said that the law required that the charges should not be read out but explained. In this case it would not be necessary for him to say much by way of explanation. The charge in each case was that of bringing or attempting to excite into hatred or contempt or exciting or attempting to excite disaffection towards His Majesty’s Government, established by law in British India. Both the accused were charged with the three offences under Section 124 A, contained in the articles read out, written by Mahatma Gandhi and printed by Shri Banker. The charges having been read out, the Judge called upon the accused to plead to the charges. He asked Gandhiji whether he pleaded guilty or claimed to be tried. Gandhiji said: “I plead guilty to all the charges. I observe that the King’s name has been omitted from the charge, and it has been properly omitted.”]

The Judge asked Shri Banker the same question and he too readily pleaded guilty. The Judge wished to give his verdict immediately after Gandhiji had pleaded guilty, but Sir Strangman insisted that the procedure should be carried out in full. The Advocate-General requested the Judge to take into account “the occurrences in Bombay, Malabar and Chauri Chaura, leading to rioting and murder”. He admitted, indeed, that “in these articles you find that non-violence is insisted upon as an item of the campaign and of the creed,” but he added “of what value is it to insist on non-violence, if incessantly you preach disaffection towards the Government and hold it up as a treacherous Government, and if you openly and deliberately seek to instigate others to overthrow it?” These were the circumstances which he asked the Judge to take into account in passing sentence on the accused.

As regards Shri Banker, the second accused, the offence was lesser. He did the publication but did not write. Sir Strangman’s instructions were that Shri Banker was a man of means and he requested the court to impose a substantial fine in addition to such term of imprisonment as might be inflicted upon.

Court: Mr. Gandhi, do you wish to make any statement on the question of sentence?

Gandhiji: I would like to make a statement.

Court: Could you give me in writing to put it on record?

Gandhiji: I shall give it as soon as I finish it.

[Gandhiji then made the following oral statement followed by a written statement that he read.]

1-Before I read this statement, I would like to state that I entirely endorse the learned Advocate-General’s remarks in connection with my humble self. I think that he has made, because it is very true and I have no desire whatsoever to conceal from this court the fact that to preach disaffection towards the existing system of Government has become almost a passion with me, and the Advocate-General is entirely in the right when he says that my

preaching of disaffection did not commence with my connection with Young India but that it commenced much earlier, and in the statement that I am about to read, it will be my painful duty to admit before this court that it commenced much earlier than the period stated by the Advocate-General. It is a painful duty with me but I have to discharge that duty knowing the responsibility that rests upon my shoulders, and I wish to endorse all the blame that the learned Advocate-General has thrown on my shoulders in connection with the Bombay occurrences, Madras occurrences and the Chauri Chaura occurrences. Thinking over these things deeply and sleeping over them night after night, it is impossible for me to dissociate myself from the diabolical crimes of Chauri Chaura or the mad outrages of Bombay. He is quite right when he says, that as a man of responsibility, a man having received a fair share of education, having had a fair share of experience of this world, I should have known the consequences of every one of my acts. I know them. I knew that I was playing with fire. I ran the risk and if I was set free I would still do the same. I have felt it this morning that I would have failed in my duty, if I did not say what I said here just now.

2-I wanted to avoid violence. Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is also the last article of my creed. But I had to make my choice. I had either to submit to a system which I considered had done an irreparable harm to my country, or incur the risk of the mad fury of my people bursting forth when they understood the truth from my lips. I know that my people have sometimes gone mad. I am deeply sorry for it and I am, therefore, here to submit not to a light penalty but to the highest penalty. I do not ask for mercy. I do not plead any extenuating act. I am here, therefore, to invite and cheerfully submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime, and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, the Judge, is, as I am going to say in my statement, either to resign your post, or inflict on me the severest penalty if you believe that the system and law you are assisting to administer are good for the people. I do not except that kind of conversion. But by the time I have finished with my statement you will have a glimpse of what is raging within my breast to run this maddest risk which a sane man can run.

3-[He then read out the written statement :] I owe it perhaps to the Indian public and to the public in England, to placate which this prosecution is mainly taken up, that I should

explain why from a staunch loyalist and co-operator, I have become an uncompromising disaffectionist and non-co-operator. To the court too I should say why I plead guilty to the charge of promoting disaffection towards the Government established by law in India.

4-My public life began in 1893 in South Africa in troubled weather. My first contact with British authority in that country was not of a happy character. I discovered that as a man and an Indian, I had no rights. More correctly I discovered that I had no rights as a man because I was an Indian.

5-But I was not baffled. I thought that this treatment of Indians was an excrescence upon a system that was intrinsically and mainly good. I gave the Government my voluntary and hearty co-operation, criticizing it freely where I felt it was faulty but never wishing its destruction.

6-Consequently when the existence of the Empire was threatened in 1899 by the Boer challenge, I offered my services to it, raised a volunteer ambulance corps and served at several actions that took place for the relief of Ladysmith. Similarly, in 1906, at the time of the Zulu 'revolt', I raised a stretcher bearer party and served till the end of the 'rebellion'. On both the occasions I received medals and was even mentioned in dispatches. For my work in South Africa I was given by Lord Hardinge a Kaisar-i-Hind gold medal. When the war broke out in 1914 between England and Germany, I raised a volunteer ambulance car in London, consisting of the then resident Indians in London, chiefly students. Its work was acknowledged by the authorities to be valuable. Lastly, in India when a special appeal was made at the war Conference in Delhi in 1918 by Lord Chelmsford for recruits, I struggled at the cost of my health to raise a corps in Kheda, and the response was being made when the hostilities ceased and orders were received that no more recruits were wanted. In all these efforts at service, I was actuated by the belief that it was possible by such services to gain a status of full equality in the Empire for my countrymen.

7-The first shock came in the shape of the Rowlatt Act-a law designed to rob the people of all real freedom. I felt called upon to lead an intensive agitation against it. Then followed the Punjab horrors beginning with the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh and culminating in

crawling orders, public flogging and other indescribable humiliations. I discovered too that the plight of the Prime Minister to the Mussalmans of India regarding the integrity of Turkey and the holy places of Islam was not likely to be fulfilled. But in spite of the forebodings and the grave warnings of friends, at the Amritsar Congress in 1919, I fought for co-operation and working of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, hoping that the Prime Minister would redeem his promise to the Indian Mussalmans, that the Punjab would be healed, and that the reforms, inadequate and unsatisfactory though they were, marked a new era of hope in the life of India.

8-But all that hope was shattered. The Khilafat promise was not to be redeemed. The Punjab crime was whitewashed and most culprits went not only unpunished but remained in service, and some continued to draw pensions from the Indian revenue and in some cases were even rewarded. I saw too that not only did the reforms not mark a change of heart, but they were only a method of further draining India of her wealth and of prolonging her servitude.

9-I came reluctantly to the conclusion that the British connection had made India more helpless than she ever was before, politically and economically. A disarmed India has no power of resistance against any aggressor if she wanted to engage, in an armed conflict with him. So much is this the case that some of our best men consider that India must take generations, before she can achieve Dominion Status. She has become so poor that she has little power of resisting famines. Before the British advent India spun and wove in her millions of cottages, just the supplement she needed for adding to her meagre agricultural resources. This cottage industry, so vital for India's existence, has been ruined by incredibly heartless and inhuman processes as described by English witness. Little do town dwellers how the semi-starved masses of India are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for their work they do for the foreign exploiter, that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. Little do realize that the Government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures, can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye. I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town dweller of India will have to answer, if there is a God above, for this crime against humanity, which is perhaps unequalled in

history. The law itself in this country has been used to serve the foreign exploiter. My unbiased examination of the Punjab Marital Law cases has led me to believe that at least ninety-five per cent of convictions were wholly bad. My experience of political cases in India leads me to the conclusion, in nine out of every ten, the condemned men were totally innocent. Their crime consisted in the love of their country. In ninety-nine cases out of hundred, justice has been denied to Indians as against Europeans in the courts of India. This is not an exaggerated picture. It is the experience of almost every Indian who has had anything to do with such cases. In my opinion, the administration of the law is thus prostituted, consciously or unconsciously, for the benefit of the exploiter.

10-The greater misfortune is that the Englishmen and their Indian associates in the administration of the country do not know that they are engaged in the crime I have attempted to describe. I am satisfied that many Englishmen and Indian officials honestly believe that they are administering one of the best systems devised in the world, and that India is making steady, though, slow progress. They do not know, a subtle but effective system of terrorism and an organized display of force on the one hand, and the deprivation of all powers of retaliation or self-defence on the other, has emasculated the people and induced in them the habit of simulation. This awful habit has added to the ignorance and the self-deception of the administrators. Section 124 A, under which I am happily charged, is perhaps the prince among the political sections of the Indian Penal Code designed to suppress the liberty of the citizen.

11-Affection cannot be manufactured or regulated by law. If one has no affection for a person or system, one should be free to give the fullest expression to his disaffection, so long as he does not contemplate, promote, or incite to violence. But the section under which mere promotion of disaffection is a crime. I have studied some of the cases tried under it; I know that some of the most loved of India's patriots have been convicted under it. I consider it a privilege, therefore, to be charged under that section. I have endeavoured to give in their briefest outline the reasons for my disaffection. I have no personal ill-will against any single administrator, much less can I have any disaffection towards the King's person. But I hold it to be a virtue to be disaffected towards a Government which in its totality has done more harm to India than any previous system. India is less manly under the British rule than she ever was before. Holding such a belief, I consider it to be a sin to

have affection for the system. And it has been a precious privilege for me to be able to write what I have in the various articles tendered in evidence against me. In fact, I believe that I have rendered a service to India and England by showing in non-co-operation the way out of the unnatural state in which both are living.

12-In my opinion, non-co-operation with evil is as much a duty as is co-operation with good. But in the past, non-co-operation has been deliberately expressed in violence to the evil-doer. I am endeavouring to show to my countrymen that violent non-co-operation only multiplies evil, and that as evil can only be sustained by violence, withdrawal of support of evil requires complete abstention from violence. Non-violence implies voluntary submission to the penalty for non-co-operation with evil. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit cheerfully to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is deliberate crime, and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, the Judge and the assessors, is either to resign your posts and thus dissociate yourselves from evil, if you feel that the law you are called upon to administer is an evil, and that in reality I am innocent, or to inflict on me the severest penalty, if you believe that the system and the law you are assisting to administer are good for the people of this country, and that my activity is, therefore, injurious to the common weal

4-DANDI MARCH SPEECHES March- April 1930

4.1. On the Eve of Dandi March- March 11th 1930

[On the 11th of March 1930, the crowd swelled to 10,000 at the evening prayer held on the Sabarmati sands at Ahmedabad. At the end, Gandhiji delivered a memorable speech on the eve of his historic march:]

1-In all probability this will be my last speech to you. Even if the Government allow me to march tomorrow morning, this will be my last speech on the sacred banks of the Sabarmati. Possibly these may be the last words of my life here.

2-I have already told you yesterday what I had to say. Today I shall confine myself to what you should do after my companions and I are arrested. The programme of the march to Jalalpur must be fulfilled as originally settled. The enlistment of the volunteers for this purpose should be confined to Gujarat only. From what I have seen and heard during the last fortnight, I am inclined to believe that the stream of civil resisters will flow unbroken.

3-But let there be not a semblance of breach of peace even after all of us have been arrested. We have resolved to utilize all our resources in the pursuit of an exclusively nonviolent struggle. Let no one commit a wrong in anger. This is my hope and prayer. I wish these words of mine reached every nook and corner of the land. My task shall be done if I perish and so do my comrades. It will then be for the Working Committee of the Congress to show you the way and it will be up to you to follow its lead. So long as I have reached Jalalpur, let nothing be done in contravention to the authority vested in me by the Congress. But once I am arrested, the whole responsibility shifts to the Congress. No one who believes in non-violence, as a creed, need, therefore, sit still. My compact with the Congress ends as soon as I am arrested. In that case volunteers. Wherever possible, civil disobedience of salt should be started. These laws can be violated in three ways. It is an offence to manufacture salt wherever there are facilities for doing so. The possession and sale of contraband salt, which includes natural salt or salt earth, is also an offence. The purchasers of such salt will be equally guilty. To carry away the natural salt deposits on the seashore is likewise violation of law. So is the hawking of such salt. In short, you may choose any one or all of these devices to break the salt monopoly.

4-We are, however, not to be content with this alone. There is no ban by the Congress and wherever the local workers have self-confidence other suitable measures may be adopted. I stress only one condition, namely, let our pledge of truth and nonviolence as the only means for the attainment of Swaraj be faithfully kept. For the rest, everyone has a free hand. But, that does not give a license to all and sundry to carry on their own responsibility. Wherever there are local leaders, their orders should be obeyed by the people. Where there are no leaders and only a handful of men have faith in the programme, they may do what they can, if they have enough self-confidence. They have a right, nay it is their duty, to do so. The history of the is full of instances of men who rose to leadership, by sheer force of self-confidence, bravery and tenacity. We too, if we sincerely aspire to Swaraj and are impatient to attain it, should have similar self-confidence. Our ranks will swell and our hearts strengthen, as the number of our arrests by the Government increases.

5-Much can be done in many other ways besides these. The Liquor and foreign cloth shops can be picketed. We can refuse to pay taxes if we have the requisite strength. The lawyers can give up practice. The public can boycott the law courts by refraining from litigation. Government servants can resign their posts. In the midst of the despair reigning all round people quake with fear of losing employment. Such men are unfit for Swaraj. But why this despair? The number of Government servants in the country does not exceed a few hundred thousand. What about the rest? Where are they to go? Even free India will not be able to accommodate a greater number of public servants. A Collector then will not need the number of servants, he has got today. He will be his own servant. Our starving millions can by no means afford this enormous expenditure. If, therefore, we are sensible enough, let us bid good-bye to Government employment, no matter if it is the post of a judge or a peon. Let all who are co-operating with the Government in one way or another, be it by paying taxes, keeping titles, or sending children to official schools, etc. withdraw their co-operation in all or as many ways as possible. Then there are women who can stand shoulder to shoulder with men in this struggle.

6-You may take it as my will. It was the message that I desired to impart to you before starting on the march or for the jail. I wish that there should be no suspension or abandonment of the war that commences tomorrow morning or earlier, if I am arrested

before that time. I shall eagerly await the news that ten batches are ready as soon as my batch is arrested. I believe there are men in India to complete the work our begun by me. I have faith in the righteousness of our cause and the purity of our weapons. And where the means are clean, there God is undoubtedly present with His blessings. And where these three combine, there defeat is an impossibility. A Satyagrahi, whether free or incarcerated, is ever victorious. He is vanquished only, when he forsakes truth and nonviolence and turns a deaf ear to the inner voice. If, therefore, there is such a thing as defeat for even a Satyagrahi, he alone is the cause of it. God bless you all and keep off all obstacles from the path in the struggle that begins tomorrow.

4.2. Speech at Dabhan, March 15th 1930

1-I have come to know that a Headman, a Matadar and a watchman of Kanakapura have submitted their resignations. I hope that you have handed in those resignations willingly and that none of you would not, seeking pardon, withdraw them. When we have once taken a vow, we shall not withdraw them even if we die.

2-Your Headman has submitted his resignation but his old uncle has registered himself as a volunteer. It is not that only young people can join this struggle. This is a religious as also a nonviolent struggle and even children can take part in it. The names of some women have also been received by me. I have received names even of children below the age of fifteen and I do not hesitate to mention them.

3-I have received names of many more old men also and they say that it is better to die in jail than outside it, but only out of thoughtfulness I do not take them along with me. On reaching Dandi, we shall call them first and send them first to jail. I hope that the Headmen and Matadars from the neighbouring villages also will send in their resignations.

4-Although we claim to practise cow-protection, we should now call it buffalo-protection or service to buffaloes. In this town of Dabhan, there are three hundred buffaloes as against three cows. This suggests that we are ignorant of animal's husbandry. In this district, it is

difficult to obtain cow's milk or ghee for sick persons or for those who have taken the vow to serve only the cow. Goseva does not mean saving the cows from Muslims or Englishmen—this amounts to cow-slaughter. That is a misinterpretation of the term goseva.

5-The number of cows sent to Australia to be slaughtered is a hundred times the number that are slaughtered in India by the Muslims. If you desire to see to it that cows are not exported abroad; you should all train yourselves in animal husbandry and act in accordance with _____ that _____ science.

6-I do not recall the taste of buffalo milk. Hence, I cannot distinguish it from cow's milk. However, doctors have testified that buffalo's milk and ghee are not as nourishing as those of the cow and Europeans do not even touch the milk of the buffalo.

7-Ours is a holy war. It is a nonviolent struggle. Even women and children can take part in it. The soldiers of satyagraha will never do what the ordinary soldiers do. Your village consumes 800 maunds of salt a year, and thus pays money to the Government without reason. The Government appropriates to itself all the taxes you pay without making any return to you. We wish to throw off that burden and hence we demand complete freedom. If you feel strong enough, give up Government jobs, enlist yourselves as soldiers in this salt satyagraha, burn your foreign cloth and wear khadi. Give up liquor. There are many things within your power through which you can secure the keys which will open the gates of freedom.

4.3. Speech at Dandi April 5th, 1930

1-When I left Sabarmati with my companions for this seaside hamlet of Dandi, I was not certain in my mind that we would be allowed to reach this place. Even while I was at Sabarmati there was a rumour that I might be arrested. I had thought that the Government might perhaps let my party come as far as Dandi, but not me certainly. If someone says that this betrays imperfect faith on my part, I shall not deny the charge. That I have reached here is in no small measure due to the- power of peace and non-violence: the power is universally felt. The Government may, if it wishes, congratulate itself on acting as it has

done, for it could have arrested every one of us. In saying that it did not have the courage to arrest this army of peace, we praise it. It felt ashamed to arrest such an army. He is a civilized man who feels ashamed to arrest such an army. He is a civilized man who feels ashamed to do anything which his neighbours would disapprove. The Government deserve to be congratulated on not arresting us, even if it desisted only from fear of world opinion.

2- Tomorrow we shall break the salt tax law. Whether the Government will tolerate that is a different question. It may not tolerate it, but it deserves congratulations on the patience and forbearance it has displayed in regard to this party.

3-If the civil disobedience movement becomes widespread in the country and the Government tolerates it, the salt law may be taken as abolished. I have no doubt in my mind that the salt tax stood abolished the very moment that the decision to break the salt laws was reached and a few men took the pledge to carry on the movement even at the risk of their lives till swaraj was won.

4-If the Government tolerates the impending civil disobedience you may take it for certain that the Government, too, has resolved to abolish this tax sooner or later. If they arrest me or my companions tomorrow, I shall not be surprised, I shall certainly not be pained. I would be absurd to be pained if we get something that we have invited on ourselves.

5-What if I and all the eminent leaders in Gujarat and in the rest of the country are arrested? This movement is based on the faith that when a whole nation is roused and on the march no leader is necessary. Of the hundreds of thousands that blessed us during our march and listened to my speeches there will be many who are sure to take up this battle That alone will be mass civil disobedience.

6- We are now resolved to make salt freely in every home, as our ancestors used to, and sell it from place to place, and we will continue doing so wherever possible till the Government yields, so much so that the salt in Government stocks will become superfluous. If the awakening of the people in the country is true and real, the salt law is as good as abolished.

7-But the goal we wish to reach is yet very far. For the present Dandi is our destination but our real destination is no other than the temple of the goddess of swaraj. Our minds will not be at peace till we have her darshan, nor will we allow the Government £3 any peace.

8-Those Headmen who have resigned their posts should prove themselves true to their word and should regard it as a sin to serve this Government till freedom is won.

9-For the last four or five days, I have been speaking about other constructive activities also, and they should be taken up immediately in this Jalalpur taluka. Surat district is notorious for the drink habit, and the Jalalpur taluka is particularly so. Now that the wind of self-purification is here, it should not be a difficult task to eradicate the drink evil altogether. There is a sin in every leaf of the palm tree. Its only value lies in the ruin it brings us. This plant is like poison to us. All palm trees should therefore be cut down.

10-There should not be a single person in Jalalpur taluka wearing foreign cloth. Everyone who comes to Dandi should come with the intention to participate in, and offer his mite to, this swaraj yajna.

11-I would not: like anyone coming to Dandi wearing foreign cloth. If it is our wish to turn Dandi into a place of pilgrimage or a bulwark of swaraj, everyone coming here should be dressed exclusively in . khadi. I know that the stock of khadi in the khadi stores are about to be exhausted and if, therefore, you fail to get a full-length sari or dhoti and come wearing only a khadi langoti, you will be welcome here as a civilized person. If, ignoring my suggestion, any of you come to Dandi wearing foreign cloth, I shall have to place at the points of approach to Dandi, volunteers who will kneel before you and request you to wear khadi. If you feel offended by their doing so and slap them in the face, those satyagrahis will let themselves be slapped.

12-Dandi was chosen not by a man but God. How otherwise could we have chosen for the battle-field of satyagraha such an out-of-the-way place--a place where no food grains are to be had, where there is scarcity of water, where thousands can assemble only with difficulty, walking ten miles from the railway station, and where if you a/e travelling on foot, you have to negotiate creeks full of slush and mud? The truth is that in this struggle we have to put up with suffering. You have made the road from Navsari to Dandi famous throughout the world by arranging for free drinking-water at frequent intervals along it. If this struggle did not have your approval, your blessings, why would you be doing this?

13-Dandi should be a sacred ground for us, where we should utter no untruth, commit no sin. Everyone coming here should come with this devout feeling in his hearth If you brothers and sisters come forward as true volunteers and commit civil disobedience of the salt law, no matter what force the Government threatens to use against you, and if you do whatever else you may be required to do, we shall have in us the power to attain in a single day what we hold to be our birthright.

14-Time was when I was infatuated with British rule, as British law taught that the person of every individual is sacred. According to that law, the police cannot kill or manhandle a man even though he might be guilty of murder. It is the duty of the police to produce the man alive before the court. Nor has the police any authority outside the jail to seize from a person even goods alleged to have been stolen. But here the very opposite is true. How otherwise can the police have the authority to decide whether X hold a handful of salt or pebbles?

15-Every man's house is his castle. Our body also is a fort of a kind. And once salt has entered that fort, it should not allow to be forced out of it even if horses are made to trample on your heads. From today we should begin cultivating the strength of will to see that a fist holding salt does not open even if the wrist should be cut off.

16-Unauthorized entry into a house is a barbarous act. It is for a judge to decide whether I hold in my hand salt or dust. The English law holds the human person to be sacred. If every official assumes the authority of a judge and enters our homes, he would « be acting as a robber.

17-But the officers in India, when they feel impelled, throw the English laws to the winds or ignore them completely at their sweet will .and, resorting to the Act of 1818, render them all ineffective.

18-They have started arresting one leader after another. But according to the principle of this struggle, that the leader is one who endures the utmost suffering, one of those left outside should assume leadership and take the movement forward.

19This is a struggle not of one man but of millions of us. If three or four men can fight and win swaraj, they will rule the country afterwards. Hence in the struggle for swaraj millions should offer themselves for sacrifice and win such swaraj as will benefit the vast masses of the country.

20-The Government is taking away from us all the eminent leaders one after another. If we get ready to follow in their footsteps and do the duty shown by them, we can smile at what the Government is doing, but if we fail to do our duty we should feel ashamed. The leaders are behind the bars, and now we in our turn should take their place.

21-It is true that many of the leaders in and outside Gujarat have been jailed, that many volunteers have been wounded because they would not part with the salt in their hands, and that, at places, some were beaten so hard that they became unconscious.

22-But I remain unmoved. My heart now is as hard as stone. I am in this struggle for swaraj ready to sacrifice thousands and hundreds of thousands of men if necessary. Since we have embarked upon a movement which will send thousands to jail, how can we weep over their imprisonment? In this game of dice we are playing, the throw has been as we wanted. Should we then weep or smile? This is God's grace; let us remain unmoved and watch His miracles.

23- If in spite of our breaking several salt laws the Government takes no notice of the camp here till the 13th, we shall disband it after that date and go somewhere else. But this plan depends entirely on the Government. For the present, we can but take what the Government gives.

24-If you have not yet gone out to remove salt, let the whole village get together and go. Hold the salt in your fist and think that you are carrying in your hand salt worth Rs. 6 crores. Every year, the Government has been taking away from us Rs. 6 crores through its monopoly of salt. You can today take the pledge not to eat salt supplied by the Government. You have a mine of salt right at your doorsteps.

5-APPEAL TO AMERICA – September 13th 1930

1-In my opinion, the Indian Conference bears in its consequences not only upon India but upon the whole world. India is by itself almost a continent. It contains one-fifth of the human race. It represents one of the most ancient civilisations. It has traditions handed down from tens of thousands of years, some of which, to the astonishment of the world, remain intact. No doubt the ravages of time have affected the purity of that civilisation, as they have that of many other cultures and many institutions.

2-If India is to perpetuate the glory of her ancient past, it can do so only when it attains freedom. The reason for the struggle having drawn the attention of the world, I know, does not lie in the fact that we Indians are fighting for our liberty, but in the fact that the means adopted by us for attaining that liberty are unique and, as far as history shows us, have not been adopted by any other people of whom we have any record.

3-The means adopted are not violence, not bloodshed, not diplomacy as one understands it nowadays, but they are purely and simply truth and nonviolence. No wonder that the attention of the world is directed towards this attempt to lead a successful, bloodless revolution. Hitherto, nations have fought in the manner of the brute. They have wreaked vengeance upon those whom they have considered to be their enemies.

4-We find in searching national anthems adopted by great nations that they contain imprecations upon the so-called enemy. They have vowed destruction and have not hesitated to take the name of God and seek Divine assistance for the destruction of the enemy. We in India have reversed the process. We feel that the law that governs brute creation is not the law that should guide the human race. That law is inconsistent with human dignity.

5-I personally would wait, if need be, for ages rather than seek to attain the freedom of my country through bloody means. I feel in the innermost recesses of my heart, after a political experience extending over an unbroken period of close upon thirty-five years, that the

world is sick unto death of blood-spilling. The world is seeking a way out, and I flatter myself with the belief that perhaps it will be the privilege of the ancient land of India to show that way out to the starving world.

6-I have, therefore, no hesitation whatsoever in inviting all the great nations of the earth to give their hearty cooperation to India in her mighty struggle. It must be a sight worth contemplating and treasuring that millions of people have given themselves to suffering without retaliation in order that they might vindicate the dignity and honour of the nation. I have called that suffering a process of self-purification. It is my certain conviction that no man loses his freedom except through his own weakness. I am painfully conscious of our own weaknesses. We represent in India all the principal religions of the earth, and it is a matter of deep humiliation to confess that we are a house divided against itself; that we Hindus and Mussalmans are fighting at one another. It is a matter of still deeper humiliation to me that we Hindus regard several millions of our own kith and kin as too degraded even for our touch. I refer to the so-called "untouchables."

7-These are no small weaknesses in a nation struggling to be free. You will find that, in this struggle through self-purification, we have assigned a foremost part of our creed to the removal of this curse of untouchability and the attainment of unity amongst all the different classes and communities of India representing the different creeds.

8-It is along the same lines that we seek to rid our land of the curse of drink. Happily, for us, intoxicating drinks and drugs are confined to comparatively a very small number of people, largely factory hands and the like. Fortunately for us, the drink and drug curse is accepted as a curse. It is not considered to be the fashion for men or women to drink or to take intoxicating drugs. All the same, it is an uphill fight that we are fighting in trying to remove this evil from our midst.

9-It is a matter of regret, deep regret, for me to have to say that the existing government has made of this evil a source of very large revenue, amounting to nearly twenty-five crores of rupees. But I am thankful to be able to say that the women of India have risen to the occasion in combating it by peaceful means, that is, by a fervent appeal to those who are

given to the drink habit to give it up, and by an equally fervent appeal to the liquor-dealers. A great impression has been created upon those who are addicted to these two evil habits.

10-I wish that it were possible for me to say that in this, at least, we were receiving hearty cooperation of the rulers. If we could only have received the cooperation without any legislation, I dare say that we would have achieved this reform and banished intoxicating drink and drugs from our afflicted land.

11-There is a force which has a constructive effect and which has been put forth by the nation during this struggle. That is the great care for the semi-starved millions scattered throughout the 700,000 villages dotted over the surface 1,900 miles long and 1,500 miles broad. It is a painful phenomenon that these simple villagers, through no fault of their own, have nearly six months of the year idle upon their hands.

12-The time was not very long ago when every village was self-sufficient in regard to the two primary human wants: food and clothing. Unfortunately for us, the East India Company, by means I would prefer not to describe, destroyed that supplementary village industry, and the millions of spinners who had become famous through the cunning of their deft fingers for drawing the finest thread, such as has never yet been drawn by any modern machinery. These village spinners found themselves one fine morning with their noble occupation gone. From that day forward India has become progressively poor.

13-No matter what may be said to the contrary, it is a historical fact that, before the advent of the East India Company, these villagers were not idle, and he who wants may see today that these villagers are idle. It, therefore, required no great effort or learning to know that these villagers must starve if they cannot work for six months in the year. May I not, then, on behalf of these semi-starved millions, appeal to the conscience of the world to come to the rescue of people dying for regaining its liberty? [Soon after his arrival in London to attend the Second Round Table Conference (on constitutional progress of India) in September 1931, Gandhiji made a broadcast to America on the Columbia Broadcasting Service, from Kingsley Hall, a settlement house in a poor neighbourhood where Gandhiji was staying. It was broadcast live.]

6-SPEECH AT KINGSLEY HALL, LONDON- October,1931

In October 1931, Mahatma Gandhi visited London where he addressed a large gathering. The Mahatma's address took place at the Kingsley Hall.

He called this address as his spiritual message. Here's the famous speech by the Mahatma.

1-There is an indefinable mysterious power that pervades everything, I feel it though I do not see it. It is this unseen power which makes itself felt and yet defies all proof, because it is so unlike all that I perceive through my senses. It transcends the senses. But it is possible to reason out the existence of God to a limited extent. Even in ordinary affairs we know that people do not know who rules or why and how He rules and yet they know that there is a power that certainly rules.

2-In my tour last year in Mysore I met many poor villagers and I found upon inquiry that they did not know who ruled Mysore. They simply said some God ruled it. If the knowledge of these poor people was so limited about their ruler I who am infinitely lesser in respect to God than they to their ruler need not be surprised if I do not realize the presence of God - the King of Kings.

3-Nevertheless, I do feel, as the poor villagers felt about Mysore, that there is orderliness in the universe, there is an unalterable law governing everything and every being that exists or lives. It is not a blind law, for no blind law can govern the conduct of living being and thanks to the marvellous researches of Sir J. C. Bose it can now be proved that even matter is life. That law then which governs all life is God. Law and the law-giver are one. I may not deny the law or the law-giver because I know so little about it or Him.

4-Just as my denial or ignorance of the existence of an earthly power will avail me nothing even so my denial of God and His law will not liberate me from its operation, whereas humble and mute acceptance of divine authority makes life's journey easier even as the acceptance of earthly rule makes life under it easier. I do dimly perceive that whilst everything around me is ever changing, ever dying there is underlying all that change a living power that is changeless, that holds all together, that creates, dissolves and recreates.

That informing power of spirit is God, and since nothing else that I see merely through the senses can or will persist, He alone is. And is this power benevolent or malevolent? I see it as purely benevolent, for I can see that in the midst of death life persists, in the midst of untruth truth persists, in the midst of darkness light persists. Hence, I gather that God is life, truth, light. He is love. He is the supreme Good. But He is no God who merely satisfies the intellect, if He ever does. God to be God must rule the heart and transform it. He must express himself in every smallest act of His votary. This can only be done through a definite realization, more real than the five senses can ever produce.

5-Sense perceptions can be and often are false and deceptive, however real they may appear to us. Where there is realization outside the senses it is infallible. It is proved not by extraneous evidence but in the transformed conduct and character of those who have felt the real presence of God within. Such testimony is to be found in the experiences of an unbroken line of prophets and sages in all countries and climes. To reject this evidence is to deny oneself. This realization is preceded by an immovable faith. He who would in his own person test the fact of God's presence can do so by a living faith and since faith itself cannot be proved by extraneous evidence the safest course is to believe in the moral government of the world and therefore in the supremacy of the moral law, the law of truth and love. Exercise of faith will be the safest where there is a clear determination summarily to reject all that is contrary to truth and love. I confess that I have no argument to convince through reason. Faith transcends reason. All that I can advise is not to attempt the impossible."

7- SPEECH AT THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE- November 30th 1931

1-It will be after all and at best a paper solution. But immediately you withdraw that wedge, the domestic ties, the domestic affection, the knowledge of common birth – do you suppose that all these will count for nothing?

2-Were Hindus and Mussalmans and Sikhs always at war with one another when there was no British rule, when there was no English face seen there? We have chapter and verse given to us by Hindu historians and by Mussalman historians to say that we were living in comparative peace even then. And Hindus and Mussalmans in the villages are not even today quarrelling. In those days they were not known to quarrel at all. The late Maulana Muhammad Ali often used to tell me, and he was himself a bit of an historian. He said : ‘If God’ – ‘Allah’ as he called out – gives me life, I propose to write the history of Mussalman rule in India; and then I will show , through that documents that British people have preserved, that was not so vile as he has been painted by the British historian; that the Mogul rule was not so bad as it has been shown to us in British history; and so on. And so have Hindu historians written. This quarrel is not old; this quarrel is coeval with this acute shame. I dare to say, it is coeval with the British Advent, and immediately this relationship, the unfortunate, artificial, unnatural relationship between Great Britain and India is transformed into a natural relationship, when it becomes, if it does become, a voluntary partnership to be given up, to be dissolved at the will of either party, when it becomes that you will find that Hindus, Mussalmans, Sikhs, Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Christians, Untouchable, will all live together as one man.

3-I do not intend to say much tonight about the Princes, but I should be wronging them and should be wronging the Congress if I did not register my claim, not with the Round Table Conference but with the Princes. It is open to the Princes to give their terms on which they will join the Federation. I have appealed to them to make the path easy for those who inhabit the other part of India, and therefore, I can only make these suggestions for their favourable consideration, for their earnest consideration. I think that if they accepted, no matter what they are, but some fundamental rights as the common property of all India, and if they accepted that position and allowed those rights to be tested by the Court, which will be again of their own creation, and if they introduced elements – only elements – of representation on behalf of their subject, I think that they would have gone a long way to conciliate their subjects. They would have gone a long way to show to the world and to show to the whole of India that they are also fired with a democratic spirit, that they do not

want to remain undiluted autocrats, but that they want to become constitutional monarch even as King George of Great Britain is.

4-An Autonomous Frontier Province: Let India get what she is entitled to and what she can really take, but whatever she gets, and whenever she gets it, let the Frontier Province get complete autonomy today. That Frontier will then be a standing demonstration to the whole of India, and therefore, the whole vote of the Congress will be given in favour of the Frontier Province getting provincial Autonomy tomorrow. Prime Minister, If you can possibly get your Cabinet to endorse the proposition that from tomorrow the Frontier Province becomes a full-fledged autonomous province, I shall then have a proper footing amongst the Frontier tribes and convince them to my assistance when those over the border cast an evil eye on India.

5-Thanks: Last of all, my last is pleasant task for me. This is perhaps the last time that I shall be sitting with you at negotiations. It is not that I want that. I want to sit at the same table with you in your closets and to negotiate and to plead with you and to go down on bended knees before I take the final lead and final plunge.

6-But whether I have the good fortune to continue to tender my co-operation or not does not depend upon me. It largely depends upon you. It depends upon so many circumstances over which neither you nor we may have any control whatsoever. Then, let me perform this pleasant task of giving my thanks to all from Their Majesties down to the poorest men in the East End where I have taken up my habitation.

7-In that settlement, which represent the poor people of the East End of London, I have become one of them. They have accepted me as a member, and as a favoured member of their family. It will be one of the richest treasures that I shall carry with me. Here, too, I have found nothing but courtesy and nothing but a genuine affection from all with whom I have come in touch. I have come in touch with so many Englishmen. It has been a priceless privilege to me, they have listened to what must have often appeared to them to be unpleasant, although it was true. Although I have often been obliged to say these things to them, they have never shown the slightest impatience or irritation. It is impossible for me to forget these things. No matter what befalls me, no matter what the fortunes may be of this Round Table Conference, one thing I shall certainly carry with me, that is, that from high to low I have found nothing but the utmost courtesy and that utmost affection. I consider that it was well worth my paying this visit to England in order to find this human affection.

8-It has enhanced it has deepened my irrepressible faith in human nature that although English men and English women have been fed upon lies that I see so often disfiguring your Press, that although in Lancashire, the Lancashire people had perhaps some reason for becoming irritated against me, I found no irritation and no resentment even in the operatives. The operatives, men and women, hugged me. They treated me as one of their own. I shall never forget that.

9-I am carrying with me thousands upon thousands of English friendships. I do not know them but I read that affection in their eyes as early in the morning I walk through your streets. All this hospitality, all this kindness will never be effaced from my memory, no matter what befalls my unhappy land. I thank you for your forbearance. (Concluded)

8-THE QUIT INDIA SPEECHES- August 8th 1942

Gandhiji addressed the A.I.C.C. at Bombay on 8-8-42 outlining his plan of action, in Hindustani, as follows;}

1-Before you discuss the resolution, let me place before you one or two things, I want you to understand two things very clearly and to consider them from the same point of view from which I am placing them before you. I ask you to consider it from my point of view, because if you approve of it, you will be enjoined to carry out all I say. It will be a great responsibility. There are people who ask me whether I am the same man that I was in 1920, or whether there has been any change in me. You are right in asking that question.

2-Let me, however, hasten to assure that I am the same Gandhi as I was in 1920. I have not changed in any fundamental respect. I attach the same importance to nonviolence that I did then. If at all, my emphasis on it has grown stronger. There is no real contradiction between the present resolution and my previous writings and utterances.

3-Occasions like the present do not occur in everybody's and but rarely in anybody's life. I want you to know and feel that there is nothing but purest Ahimsa in all that I am saying and doing today. The draft resolution of the Working Committee is based on Ahimsa, the contemplated struggle similarly has its roots in Ahimsa. If, therefore, there is any among you who has lost faith in Ahimsa or is wearied of it, let him not vote for this resolution. Let me explain my position clearly. God has vouchsafed to me a priceless gift in the weapon of Ahimsa. I and my Ahimsa are on our trail today. If in the present crisis, when the earth is being scorched by the flames of Hims² and crying for deliverance, I failed to make use of the God given talent, God will not forgive me and I shall be judged unwrongly of the great gift. I must act now. I may not hesitate and merely look on, when Russia and China are threatened.

4-Ours is not a drive for power, but purely a nonviolent fight for India's independence. In a violent struggle, a successful general has been often known to effect a military coup and to set up a dictatorship. But under the Congress scheme of things, essentially nonviolent as it is, there can be no room for dictatorship. A non-violent soldier of freedom will covet nothing for himself, he fights only for the freedom of his country. The Congress is unconcerned as to who will rule, when freedom is attained. The power, when it comes, will belong to the people of India, and it will be for them to decide to whom it placed in the entrusted. May be that the reins will be placed in the hands of the Parsis, for instance-

as I would love to see happen-or they may be handed to some others whose names are not heard in the Congress today. It will not be for you then to object saying, "This community is microscopic. That party did not play its due part in the freedom's struggle; why should it have all the power?" Ever since its inception the Congress has kept itself meticulously free of the communal taint. It has thought always in terms of the whole nation and has acted accordingly... I know how imperfect our Ahimsa is and how far away we are still from the ideal, but in Ahimsa there is no final failure or defeat. I have faith, therefore, that if, in spite of our shortcomings, the big thing does happen, it will be because God wanted to help us by crowning with success our silent, unremitting Sadhana¹ for the last twenty-two years.

5-I believe that in the history of the world, there has not been a more genuinely democratic struggle for freedom than ours. I read Carlyle's French Revolution while I was in prison, and Pandit Jawaharlal has told me something about the Russian revolution. But it is my conviction that inasmuch as these struggles were fought with the weapon of violence, they failed to realize the democratic ideal. In the democracy which I have envisaged, a democracy established by nonviolence, there will be equal freedom for all. Everybody will be his own master. It is to join a struggle for such democracy that I invite you today. Once you realize this you will forget the differences between the Hindus and Muslims, and think of yourselves as Indians only, engaged in the common struggle for independence.

6-Then, there is the question of your attitude towards the British. I have noticed that there is hatred towards the British among the people. The people say they are disgusted with their behaviour. The people make no distinction between British imperialism and the British people. To them, the two are one This hatred would even make them welcome the Japanese. It is most dangerous. It means that they will exchange one slavery for another. We must get rid of this feeling. Our quarrel is not with the British people, we fight their imperialism. The proposal for the withdrawal of British power did not come out of anger. It came to enable India to play its due part at the present critical juncture It is not a happy position for a big country like India to be merely helping with money and material obtained willy-nilly from her while the United Nations are conducting the war. We cannot evoke the true spirit of sacrifice and valour, so long as we are not free. I know the British Government will not be able to withhold freedom from us, when we have made enough self-sacrifice. We must, therefore, purge ourselves of hatred. Speaking for myself, I can say that I have never felt any hatred. As a matter of fact, I feel myself to be a greater friend

of the British now than ever before. One reason is that they are today in distress. My very friendship, therefore, demands that I should try to save them from their mistakes. As I view the situation, they are on the brink of an abyss. It, therefore, becomes my duty to warn them of their danger even though it may, for the time being, anger them to the point of cutting off the friendly hand that is stretched out to help them. People may laugh, nevertheless that is my claim. At a time when I may have to launch the biggest struggle of my life, I may not harbour hatred against anybody.

II

[Gandhiji's address before the A.I.C.C. at Bombay on 8-8-'42 delivered in Hindustani:] 7-

I congratulate you on the resolution that you have just passed. I also congratulate the three comrades on the courage they have shown in pressing their amendments to a division, even though they knew that there was an overwhelming majority in favour of the resolution, and I congratulate the thirteen friends who voted against the resolution. In doing so, they had nothing to be ashamed of. For the last twenty years we have tried to learn not to lose courage even when we are in a hopeless minority and are laughed at. We have learned to hold on to our beliefs in the confidence that we are in the right. It behoves us to cultivate this courage of conviction, for it ennobles man and raises his moral stature.

8-I was, therefore, glad to see that these friends had imbibed the principle which I have tried to follow for the last fifty years and more.

9-Having congratulated them on their courage, let me say that what they asked this Committee to accept through their amendments was not the correct representation of the situation. These friends ought to have pondered over the appeal made to them by the Maulana to withdraw their amendments; they should have carefully followed the explanations given by Jawaharlal. Had they done so, it would have been clear to them that the right which they now want the Congress to concede has already been conceded by the Congress.

10-Time was when every Mussalman claimed the whole of India as his motherland. During the years that the Ali brothers were with me, the assumption underlying all their talks and discussions was that India belonged as much to the Mussalmans as to the Hindus. I can testify to the fact that this was their innermost conviction and not a mask; I lived with them for years. I spent days and nights in their company. And I make bold to say that their utterances were the honest expression of their beliefs. I know there are some who say that

I take things too readily at their face value, that I am gullible. I do not think I am such a simpleton, nor am I so gullible as these friends take me to be. But their criticism does not hurt me. I should prefer to be considered gullible rather deceitful.

11-What these Communist friends proposed through their amendments is nothing new. It has been repeated from thousands of platforms. Thousands of Mussalmans have told me, that if Hindu-Muslim question was to be solved satisfactorily, it must be done in my lifetime. I should feel flattered at this; but how can I agree to proposal which does not appeal to my reason? Hindu-Muslim unity is not a new thing. Millions of Hindus and Mussalmans have sought after it. I consciously strove for its achievement from my boyhood. While at school, I made it a point to cultivate the friendship of Muslims and Parsi co-students. I believed even at that tender age that the Hindus in India, if they wished to live in peace and amity with the other communities, should assiduously cultivate the virtue of neighbourliness. It did not matter, I felt, if I made no special effort to cultivate the friendship with Hindus, but I must make friends with at least a few Mussalmans. It was as counsel for a Mussalmans merchant that I went to South Africa. I made friends with other Mussalmans there, even with the opponents of my client, and gained a reputation for integrity and good faith. I had among my friends and co-workers Muslims as well as Parsis. I captured their hearts and when I left finally for India, I left them sad and shedding tears of grief at the separation.

12-In India too I continued my efforts and left no stone unturned to achieve that unity. It was my life-long aspiration for it that made me offer my fullest co-operation to the Mussalmans in the Khilafat movement. Muslims throughout the country accepted me as their true friend.

13-How then is it that I have now come to be regarded as so evil and detestable? Had I any axe to grind in supporting the Khilafat movement? True, I did in my heart of hearts cherish a hope that it might enable me to save the cow. I am a worshipper of the cow. I believe the cow and myself to be the creation of the same God, and I am prepared to sacrifice my life in order to save the cow. But, whatever my philosophy of life and my ultimate hopes, I joined the movement in no spirit of bargain. I co-operated in the struggle for the Khilafat solely on order to discharge my obligation to my neighbour who, I saw, was in distress. The Ali brothers, had they been alive today, would have testified to the truth of this assertion. And so would many others bear me out in that it was not a bargain on my part for saving the cow. The cow like the Khilafat. Stood on her own merits. As an honest man,

a true neighbour and a faithful friend, it was incumbent on me to stand by the Mussalmans in the hour of their trial.

14-In those days, I shocked the Hindus by dinning time they have now got used to it. Maulana Bari told me, however, that through he would not allow me dine with him, lest some day he should be accused of a sinister motive. And so, whenever I had occasion to stay with him, he called a Brahmana cook and made social arrangements for separate cooking. Firangi Mahal, his residence, was an old-styled structure with limited accommodation; yet he cheerfully bore all hardships and carried out his resolve from which I could not dislodge him. It was the spirit of courtesy, dignity and nobility that inspired us in those days. They respected one another's religious feelings, and considered it a privilege to do so. Not a trace of suspicion lurked in anybody's heart. Where has all that dignity, that nobility of spirit, disappeared now? I should ask all Mussalmans, including Quaid-I-Azam Jinnah, to recall those glorious days and to find out what has brought us to the present impasse. Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah himself was at one time a Congressman. If today the Congress has incurred his wrath, it is because the canker of suspicion has entered his heart. May God bless him with long life, but when I am gone, he will realize and admit that I had no designs on Mussalmans and that I had never betrayed their interests. Where is the escape for me, if I injure their cause or betray their interests? My life is entirely at their disposal. They are free to put an end to it, whenever they wish to do so. Assaults have been made on my life in the past, but God has spared me till now, and the assailants have repented for their action. But if someone were to shoot me in the belief that he was getting rid of a rascal, he would kill not the real Gandhi, but the one that appeared to him a rascal.

15-To those who have been indulging in a campaign of an abuse and vilification I would say, "Islam enjoins you not to revile even an enemy. The Prophet treated even enemies with kindness and tried to win them over by his fairness and generosity. Are you followers of that Islam or of any other? If you are followers of the true Islam, does it behave you to distrust the words of one who makes a public declaration of his faith? You may take it from me that one day you will regret the fact that you distrusted and killed one who was a true and devoted friend of yours." It cuts me to the quick to see that the more I appeal and the more the Maulana importunes, the more intense does the campaign of vilification grow. To me, these abuses are like bullets. They can kill me, even as a bullet can put an end to my life. You may kill me. That will not hurt me. But what of those who indulge in abusing?

They bring discredit to Islam. For the fair name of Islam, I appeal to you to resist this unceasing campaign of abuse and vilification.

16-Maulana Saheb is being made a target for the filthiest abuse. Why? Because he refuses to exert on me the pressure of his friendship. He realizes that it is a misuse of friendship to seek up to compel a friend to accept as truth what he knows is an untruth.

17-To the Quaid-Azam I would say: Whatever is true and valid in the claim for Pakistan is already in your hands. What is wrong and untenable is in nobody's gift, so that it can be made over to you. Even if someone were to succeed in imposing an untruth on others, he would not be able to enjoy for long the fruits of such a coercion. God dislikes pride and keeps away from it. God would not tolerate a forcible imposition of an untruth.

18-The Quaid-Azam says that he is compelled to say bitter things but that he cannot help giving expression to his thoughts and his feelings. Similarly, I would say: "I consider myself a friend of Mussalmans. Why should I then not give expression to the things nearest to my heart, even at the cost of displeasing them? How can I conceal my innermost thoughts from them? I should congratulate the Quaid-i-Azam on his frankness in giving expression to his thoughts and feelings, even if they sound bitter to his hearers. But even so why should the Mussalmans sitting here be reviled, if they do not see eye to eye with him? If millions of Mussalmans are with you can you not afford to ignore the handful of Mussalmans who may appear to you to be misguided? Why should one with the following of several millions be afraid of a majority community, or of the minority being swamped by the majority? How did the Prophet work among the Arabs and the Mussalmans? How did he propagate Islam? Did he say he would propagate Islam only when he commanded a majority? I appeal to you for the sake of Islam to ponder over what I say. There is neither fair play nor justice in saying that the Congress must accept a thing, even if it does not believe in it and even if it goes counter to principles it holds dear.

19-Rajaji said: "I do not believe in Pakistan. But Mussalmans ask for it, Mr. Jinnah asks for it, and it has become an obsession with them. Why not then say, "yes" to them just now? The same Mr. Jinnah will later on realize the disadvantages of Pakistan and will forgo the demand." I said: "It is not fair to accept as true a thing which I hold to be untrue, and ask others to do say in the belief that the demand will not be pressed when the time comes for settling in finally. If I hold the demand to be just, I should concede it this very day. I should not agree to it merely in order to placate Jinnah Saheb. Many friends have come and asked me to agree to it for the time being to placate Mr. Jinnah, disarm his

suspicious and to see how he reacts to it. But I cannot be party to a course of action with a false promise. At any rate, it is not my method.”

20-The Congress as no sanction but the moral one for enforcing its decisions. It believes that true democracy can only be the outcome of non-violence. The structure of a world federation can be raised only on a foundation of non-violence, and violence will have to be totally abjured from world affairs. If this is true, the solution of Hindu-Muslim question, too, cannot be achieved by a resort to violence. If the Hindus tyrannize over the Mussalmans, with what face will they talk of a world federation? It is for the same reason that I do not believe in the possibility of establishing world peace through violence as the English and American statesmen propose to do. The Congress has agreed to submitting all the differences to an impartial international tribunal and to abide by its decisions. If even this fairest of proposals is unacceptable, the only course that remains open is that of the sword, of violence. How can I persuade myself to agree to an impossibility? To demand the vivisection of a living organism is to ask for its very life. It is a call to war. The Congress cannot be party to such a fratricidal war. Those Hindus who, like Dr. Moonje and Shri Savarkar, believe in the doctrine of the sword may seek to keep the Mussalmans under Hindus domination. I do not represent that section. I represent the Congress. You want to kill the Congress which is the goose that lays golden eggs. If you distrust the Congress, you may rest assured that there is to be perpetual war between the Hindus and the Mussalmans, and the country will be doomed to continue warfare and bloodshed. If such warfare is to be our lot, I shall not live to witness it.

21-It is for that reason that I say to Jinnah Saheb, “You may take it from me that whatever in your demand for Pakistan accords with considerations of justice and equity is lying in your pocket; whatever in the demand is contrary to justice and equity you can take only by the sword and in no other manner.” There is much in my heart that I would like to pour out before this assembly. One thing which was uppermost in my heart I have already dealt with. You may take it from me that it is with me a matter of life and death. If we Hindus and Mussalmans mean to achieve a heart unity, without the slightest mental reservation on the part of either, we must first unite in the effort to be free from the shackles of this empire. If Pakistan after all is to be a portion of India, what objection can there be for Mussalmans against joining this struggle for India’s freedom? The Hindus and Mussalmans must, therefore, unite in the first instance on the issue of fighting for freedom. Jinnah Saheb

thinks the war will last long. I do not agree with him. If the war goes on for six months more, how shall we be able to save China?

22-I, therefore, want freedom immediately, this very night, before dawn, if it can be had. Freedom cannot now wait for the realization of communal unity. If that unity is not achieved, sacrifices necessary for it will have to be much greater than would have otherwise sufficed. But the Congress must win freedom or be wiped out in the effort. And forget not that the freedom which the Congress is struggling to achieve will not be for the Congressmen alone but for all the forty cores of the Indian people. Congressmen must for ever remain humble servants of the people.

23-The Quaid-i-Azam has said that the Muslim League is prepared to take over the rule from the Britishers if they are prepared to hand it over to the Muslim League, for the British took over the empire from the hands of the Muslims. This, however, will be Muslim Raj. The offer made by Maulana Saheb and by me does not imply establishment of Muslim Raj or Muslim domination. The Congress does not believe in the domination of any group or any community. It believes in democracy which includes in its orbit Muslims, Hindus, Christians, Parsis, Jews-every one of the communities inhabiting this vast country. If Muslim Raj is inevitable, then let it be; but how can we give it the stamp of our assent? How can we agree to the domination of one community over the others?

24-Millions of Mussalmans in this country come from Hindu stock. How can their homeland be any other than India? My eldest son embraced Islam some years back. What would his homeland be-Porbandar or the Punjab? I ask the Mussalmans: "If India is not your homeland, what other country do you belong to? In what separate homeland would you put my son who embraced Islam?" His mother wrote him a letter after his conversion, asking him if he had on embracing Islam given up drinking which Islam forbids to its follower. To those who gloated over the conversion, she wrote to say: "I do not mind his becoming a Mussalmans, so much as his drinking. Will you, as pious Mussalmans, tolerate his drinking even after his conversion? He has reduced himself to the state of a rake by drinking. If you are going to make a man of him again, his conversion will have been turned to good account. You will, therefore, please see that he as a Mussalman abjures wine and woman. If that change does not come about, his conversion goes in vain and our non-co-operation with him will have to continue."

25-India is without doubt the homeland of all the Mussalmans inhabiting this country. Every Mussalman should therefore co-operate in the fight for India's freedom. The

Congress does not belong to any one class or community; it belongs to the whole nation. It is open to Mussalmans to take possession of the Congress. They can, if they like, swamp the Congress by their numbers, and can steer it along the course which appeals to them. The Congress is fighting not on behalf of the Hindu but on behalf of the whole nation, including the minorities. It would hurt me to hear of a single instance of a Mussalman being killed by a Congressman. In the coming revolution, Congressmen will sacrifice their lives in order to protect the Mussalman against a Hindu's attack and vice versa. It is a part of their creed, and is one of the essentials of non-violence. You will be excepted on occasions like these not to lose your heads. Every Congressman, whether a Hindu or a Mussalman, owes this duty to the organization to which will render a service to Islam. Mutual trust is essential for success in the final nation-wide struggle that is to come.

26-I have said that much greater sacrifice will have to be made this time in the wake of our struggle because of the opposition from the Muslim League and from Englishmen. You have seen the secret circular issued by Sir Frederick Puckle. It is a suicidal course that he has taken. It contains an open incitement to organizations which crop up like mushrooms to combine to fight the Congress. We have thus to deal with an empire whose ways are crooked. Ours is a straight path which we can tread even with our eyes closed. That is the beauty of Satyagraha.

27-In Satyagraha, there is no place for fraud or falsehood, or any kind of untruth. Fraud and untruth today are stalking the world. I cannot be a helpless witness to such a situation. I have travelled all over India as perhaps nobody in the present age has. The voiceless millions of the land saw in me their friend and representative, and I identified myself with them to an extent it was possible for a human being to do. I saw trust in their eyes, which I now want to turn to good account in fighting this empire upheld on untruth and violence. However gigantic the preparations that the empire has made, we must get out of its clutches. How can I remain silent at this supreme hour and hide my light under the bushel? Shall I ask the Japanese to tarry awhile? If today I sit quiet and inactive, God will take me to task for not using up the treasure He had given me, in the midst of the conflagration that is enveloping the whole world. Had the condition been different, I should have asked you to wait yet awhile. But the situation now has become intolerable, and the Congress has no other course left for it.

28-Nevertheless, the actual struggle does not commence this moment. You have only placed all your powers in my hands. I will now wait upon the Viceroy and plead with him

for the acceptance of the Congress demand. That process is likely to take two or three weeks. What would you do in the meanwhile? What is the programme, for the interval, in which all can participate? As you know, the spinning wheel is the first thing that occurs to me. I made the same answer to the Maulana. He would have none of it, though he understood its import later. The fourteen-fold constructive programme is, of course, there for you to carry out. What more should you do? I will tell you. Every one of you should, from this moment onwards, consider yourself a free man or woman, and acts as if you are free and are no longer under the heel of this imperialism.

29-It is not a make-believe that I am suggesting to you. It is the very essence of freedom. The bond of the slave is snapped the moment he considers himself to be a free being. He will plainly tell the master: "I was your bond slave till this moment, but I am a slave no longer. You may kill me if you like, but if you keep me alive, I wish to tell you that if you release me from the bondage, of your own accord, I will ask for nothing more from you. You used to feed and clothe me, though I could have provided food and clothing for myself by my labour. I hitherto depended on you instead of on God, for food and raiment. But God has now inspired me with an urge for freedom and I am today a free man, and will no longer depend on you."

30-You may take it from me that I am not going to strike a bargain with the Viceroy for ministries and the like. I am not going to be satisfied with anything short of complete freedom. May be, he will propose the abolition of salt tax, the drink evil, etc. But I will say, "Nothing less than freedom."

31-Here is a mantra, a short one, that I give you. You may imprint it on your hearts and let every breath of yours give expression to it. The mantra is: 'Do or Die'. We shall either free India or die in the attempt; we shall not live to see the perpetuation of our slavery. Every true Congressman or woman will join the struggle with an inflexible determination not to remain alive to see the country in bondage and slavery. Let that be your pledge. Keep jails out of your consideration. If the Government keep me free, I will not put on the Government the strain of maintaining a large number of prisoners at a time, when it is in trouble. Let every man and woman live every moment of his or her life hereafter in the consciousness that he or she eats or lives for achieving freedom and will die, if need be, to attain that goal. Take a pledge, with God and your own conscience as witness, that you will no longer rest till freedom is achieved and will be prepared to lay down your lives in

the attempt to achieve it. He who loses his life will gain it; he who will seek to save it shall lose it. Freedom is not for the coward or the faint-hearted.

32-A word to the journalists. I congratulate you on the support you have hitherto given to the national demand. I know the restrictions and handicaps under which you have to labour. But I would now ask you to snap the chains that bind you. It should be the proud privilege of the newspapers to lead and set an example in laying down one's life for freedom.

33-You have the pen which the Government can't suppress. I know you have large properties in the form of printing presses, etc., and you would be afraid lest the Government should attach them. I do not ask you to invite an attachment of the printing-press voluntarily. For myself, I would not suppress my pen, even if the press was to be attached. As you know my press was attached in the past and returned later on. But I do not ask from you that final sacrifice. I suggest a middle way. You should now wind up your standing committee, and you may declare that you will give up the pen only when India has won her freedom. You may tell Sir Frederick Puckle that he can't expect from you a command performance, that his press notes are full of untruth, and that you will refuse to publish them. You will openly declare that you are wholeheartedly with the Congress. If you do this, you will have changed the atmosphere before the fight actually begins.

34-From the Princes I ask with all respect due to them a very small thing. I am a well-wisher of the Princes. I was born in a State. My grandfather refused to salute with his right hand any Prince other than his own. But he did not say to the Prince, as I felt, he ought to have said, that even his own master could not compel him, his minister, to act against his conscience. I have eaten the Prince's salt and I would not be false to it. As a faithful servant, it is my duty to warn the Princes that if they will act while I am still alive, the Princes may come to occupy an honourable place in free India. In Jawaharlal's scheme of free India, no privileges or the privileged classes have a place. Jawaharlal considers all property to be State-owned. He wants planned economy. He wants to reconstruct India according to plan. He likes to fly; I do not. I have kept a place for the Princes and the Zamindars in India that I envisage. I would ask the Princes in all humility to enjoy through renunciation. The Princes may renounce ownership over their properties and become their trustees in the true sense of the term. I visualize God in the assemblage of people. The Princes may say to their people: "You are the owners and masters of the State and we are your servants." I

would ask the Princes to become servants of the people and render to them an account of their own services.

35-The empire too bestows power on the Princes, but they should prefer to derive power from their own people; and if they want to indulge in some innocent pleasures, they may seek to do so as servants of the people. I do not want the Princes to live as paupers. But I would ask them: "Do you want to remain slaves for all time? Why should you, instead of paying homage to a foreign power, not accept the sovereignty of your own people?" You may write to the Political Department: "The people are now awake. How are we to withstand an avalanche before which even the Large empire are crumbling? We, therefore, shall belong to the people from today onwards. We shall sink or swim with them." Believe me, there is nothing unconstitutional in the course I am suggesting. There are, so far as I know, no treaties enabling the empire to coerce the Princes. The people of the States will also declare that though they are the Princes' subjects, they are part of the Indian nation and that they will accept the leadership of the Princes, if the latter cast their lot with the people, the latter will meet death bravely and unflinchingly, but will not go back on their word.

36-Nothing, however, should be done secretly. This is an open rebellion. In this struggle secrecy is a sin. A free man would not engage in a secret movement. It is likely that when you gain freedom you will have a C.I.D. of your own, in spite of my advice to the contrary. But in the present struggle, we have to work openly and to receive bullets on our chest, without taking to heels.

37-I have a word to say to Government servants also. They may not, if they like, resign their posts yet. The late Justice Ranade did not resign his post, but he openly declared that he belonged to the Congress. He said to the Government that though he was a judge, he was a Congressman and would openly attend the sessions of the Congress, but that at the same time he would not let his political views warp his impartiality on the bench. He held Social Reform Conference in the very Pandal1 of the Congress. I would ask all the Government servants to follow in the footsteps of Ranade and to declare their allegiance to the Congress as an answer to the secret circular issued by Sir Frederick Puckle.

38-This is all that I ask of you just now. I will now write to the Viceroy. You will be able to read the correspondence not just now but when I publish it with the Viceroy's consent. But you are free to aver that you support the demand to be put forth in my letter. A judge came to me and said: "We get secret circulars from high quarters. What are we to do?" I

replied, "If I were in your place, I would ignore the circulars. You may openly say to the Government: 'I have received your secret circular. I am, however, with the Congress. Though I serve the Government for my livelihood, I am not going to obey these secret circulars or to employ underhand methods,'"

39-Soldiers too are covered by the present programme. I do not ask them just now to resign their posts and to leave the army. The soldiers come to me, Jawaharlal and the Maulana and say: "We are wholly with you. We are tired of the Governmental tyranny." To these soldiers I would say: You may say to the Government, "Our hearts are with the Congress. We are not going to leave our posts. We will serve you so long as we receive your salaries. We will obey your just orders, but will refuse to fire on our own people."

40-To those who lack the courage to do this much I have nothing to say. They will go their own way. But if you can do this much, you may take it from me that the whole atmosphere will be electrified. Let the Government then shower bombs, if they like. But no power on earth will then be able to keep you in bondage any longer.

41-If the students want to join the struggle only to go back to their studies after a while, I would not invite them to it. For the present, however, till the time that I frame a programme for the struggle, I would ask the students to say to their professors: "We belong to the Congress. Do you belong to the Congress, or to the Government? If you belong to the Congress, you need not vacate your posts. You will remain at your posts but teach us and lead us unto freedom." In all fights for freedom, the world over, the students have made very large contributions.

42-If in the interval that is left to us before the actual fight begins, you do even the little I have suggested to you, you will have changed the atmosphere and will have prepared the ground for the next step.

43-There is much I should get like to say. But my heart is heavy. I have already taken up much of your time. I have yet to say a few words in English also. I thank you for the patience and attention with which you have listened to me even at this late hour. It is just what true soldiers would do. For the last twenty-two years, I have controlled my speech and pen and have stored up my energy. He is a true Brahmacharri who does not fritter away his energy. He will, therefore, always control his speech. That has been my conscious effort all these years. But today the occasion has come when I had to unburden my heart before you. I have done so, even though it meant putting a strain on your patience; and I

do not regret having done it. I have given you my message and through you I have delivered it to the whole of India.

III

[The following is the concluding portion of Gandhiji's speech before the A.I.C.C. at Bombay on 8-8-'42 which was delivered in English:]

44-I have taken such an inordinately long time over pouring out, what was agitating my soul, to those whom I had just now the privilege of serving. I have been called their leader or, in the military language, their commander. But I do not look at my position in that light. I have no weapon but love to wield my authority over any one. I do sport a stick which you can break into bits without the slightest exertion. It is simply my staff with the help of which I walk. Such a cripple is not elated, when he has been called upon to bear the greatest burden. You can share that burden only when I appear before you not as your commander but as a humble servant. And he who serves best is the chief among equals. Therefore, I was bound to share with you such thoughts as were welling up in my breast and tell you, in as summary a manner as I can, what I expect you to do as the first step.

45-Let me tell you at the outset that the real struggle does not commence today. I have yet to go through much ceremonial as I always do. The burden, I confess, would be almost unbearable. I have to continue to reason in those circles with whom I have lost my credit and who have no trust left in me. I know that in the course of the last few weeks I have forfeited my credit with a large number of friends, so much so, that they have begun to doubt not only my wisdom but even my honesty. Now I hold my wisdom is not such a treasure which I cannot afford to lose; but my honesty is a precious treasure to me and I can ill-afford to lose it. I seem however to have lost it for the time being.

46-Friend of the Empire

Such occasions arise in the life of the man who is a pure seeker after truth and who would seek to serve the humanity and his country to the best of his lights without fear or hypocrisy. For the last fifty years I have known no other way. I have been a humble servant of humanity and have rendered on more than one occasion such services as I could to the Empire, and here let me say without fear of challenge that throughout my career never have I asked for any personal favour. I have enjoyed the privilege of friendship as I enjoy it today with Lord Linlithgow. It is a friendship which has outgrown official relationship.

Whether Lord Linlithgow will bear me out, I do not know, but there is a personal bond between him and myself. He once introduced me to his daughter. His son-in law, the A.D.C. was drawn towards me. he fell in love with Mahadev more than with me and Lady Anna and he came to me. She is an obedient and favourite daughter. I take interest in their welfare. I take the liberty to give out these personal and sacred tit-bits only to give you an earnest of the personal bond will never interfere with the stubborn struggle on which, if it falls to my lot, I may have to launch against Lord Linlithgow, as the representative of the Empire. I will have to resist the might of that Empire with the might of the dumb millions with no limit but of nonviolence as policy confined to this struggle. It is a terrible job to have to offer resistance to a Viceroy with whom I enjoy such relations. He has more than once trusted my word, often about my people. I would love to repeat that experiment, as it stands to his credit. I mention this with great pride and pleasure. I mention it as an earnest of my desire to be true to the Empire when that Empire forfeited my trust and the Englishman who was its Viceroy came to know it.

47-Charlie Andrews

Then there is the sacred memory of Charlie Andrews which wells up within me. At this moment the spirit of Andrews hovers about me. For me he sums up the brightest traditions of English culture. I enjoyed closer relations with him than with most Indians. I enjoyed his confidence. There were no secrets between us. We exchanged our hearts every day. Whatever was in his heart, he would blurt out without the slightest hesitation or reservation. It is true he was a friend of Gurudev I but he looked upon Gurudev with awe. He had that peculiar humility. But with me he became the closest friend. Years ago, he came to me with a note of introduction from Gokhale. Pearson and he were the first-rank specimens of Englishmen. I know that his spirit is listening to me.

Then I have got a warm letter of congratulations from the Metropolitan of Calcutta. I hold him to be a man of God. Today he is opposed to me.

48-Voice of Conscience

With all this background, I want to declare to the world, although I may have forfeited the regard of many friends in the West and I must bow my head low; but even for their

friendship or love I must not suppress the voice of conscience – promoting of my inner basic nature today. There is something within me impelling me to cry out my agony. I have known humanity. I have studied something of psychology. Such a man knows exactly what it is. I do not mind how you describe it. That voice within tells me, “You have to stand against the whole world although you may have to stand alone. You have to stare in the face the whole world although the world may look at you with bloodshot eyes. Do not fear. Trust the little voice residing within your heart.” It says: “Forsake friends, wife and all; but testify to that for which you have lived and for which you have to die. I want to live my full span of life. And for me I put my span of life at 120 years. By that time India will be free, the world will be free.

49-Real Freedom

Let me tell you that I do not regard England or for that matter America as free countries. They are free after their own fashion, free to hold in bondage coloured races of the earth. Are England and America fighting for the liberty of these races today? If not, do not ask me to wait until after the war. You shall not limit my concept of freedom. The English and American teachers, their history, their magnificent poetry have not said that you shall not broaden the interpretation of freedom. And according to my interpretation of that freedom I am constrained to say they are strangers to that freedom which their teachers and poets have described. If they will know the real freedom they should come to India. They have to come not with pride or arrogances but in the spite of real earnest seekers of truth. It is a fundamental truth which India has been experimenting with for 22 years.

50-Congress and Non-violence

Unconsciously from its very foundations long ago the Congress has been building on non-violence known as constitutional methods. Dadabhai and Pherozeshah who had held the Congress India in the palm of their hands became rebels. They were lovers of the Congress. They were its masters. But above all they were real servants. They never countenanced murder, secrecy and the like. I confess there are many black sheep amongst us Congressmen. But I trust the whole of India today to launch upon a non-violent struggle. I trust because of my nature to rely upon the innate goodness of human nature which perceives the truth and prevails during the crisis as if by instinct. But even if I am deceived in this I shall not swerve. I shall not flinch. From its very inception the Congress based its

policy on peaceful methods, included Swaraj and the subsequent generations added non-violence. When Dadabhai entered the British Parliament, Salisbury dubbed him as a black man; but the English people defeated Salisbury and Dadabhai went to the Parliament by their vote. India was delirious with joy. These things however India has outgrown.

51-I will go Ahead

It is, however, with all these things as the background that I want Englishmen, Europeans and all the United Nations to examine in their hearts what crime had India committed in demanding Independence. I ask, is it right for you to distrust such an organization with all its background, tradition and record of over half a century and misrepresent its endeavours before all the world by every means at your command? Is it right that by hook or by crook, aided by the foreign press, aided by the President of the U.S.A., or even by the Generalissimo of China who has yet to win his laurels, you should present India's struggle in shocking caricature? I have met the Generalissimo. I have known him through Madame Shek who was my interpreter; and though he seemed inscrutable to me, not so Madame Shek; and he allowed me to read his mind through her. There is a chorus of disapproval and righteous protest all over the world against us. They say we are erring the move is inopportune. I had great regard for British diplomacy which has enabled them to hold the Empire so long. Now it stinks in my nostrils, and others have studied that diplomacy and are putting it into practice. They may succeed in getting, through these methods, world opinion on their side for a time; but India will speak against that world opinion. She will raise her voice against all the organized propaganda. I will speak against it. Even if all the United Nations opposed me, even if the whole of India forsakes me, I will say, "You are wrong. India will wrench with non-violence her liberty from unwilling hands." I will go ahead not for India's sake alone, but for the sake of the world. Even if my eyes close before there is freedom, non-violence will not end. They will be dealing a mortal blow to China and to Russia if they oppose the freedom of non-violent India which is pleading with bended knees for the fulfilment of debt along overdue. Does a creditor ever go to debtor like that? And even when, India is met with such angry opposition, she says, "We won't hit below the belt, we have learnt sufficient gentlemanliness. We are pledged to non-violence." I have been the author of non-embarrassment policy of the Congress and yet today you find me talking this strong language. I say it is consistent with our honour. If a

man holds me by the neck and wants to draw me, may I not struggle to free myself directly?
There is no inconsistency in our position today.

52-Appeal to United nations

There are representatives of the foreign press assembled here today. Through them I wish to say to the world that the United Powers who somehow or other say that they have need for India, have the opportunity now to declare India free and prove their bona fides. If they miss it, they will be missing the opportunity of their lifetime, and history will record that they did not discharge their obligations to India in time, and lost the battle. I want the blessings of the whole world so that I may succeed with them. I do not want the United Powers to go beyond their obvious limitations. I do not want them to accept non-violence and disarm today. There is a fundamental difference between fascism and this imperialism which I am fighting. Do the British get from India which they hold in bondage? Think what difference it would make if India was to participate as a free ally. That freedom, if it is to come, must come today. It will have no taste left in it today you who have the power to help cannot exercise it. If you can exercise it, under the glow of freedom what seems impossible, today, will become possible tomorrow. If India feels that freedom, she will command that freedom for China. The road for running to Russia's help will be open. The Englishmen did not die in Malaya or on Burma soil. What shall enable us to retrieve the situation? Where shall I go, and where shall I take the forty crores of India? How is this vast mass of humanity to be aglow in the cause of world deliverance, unless and until it has touched and felt freedom. Today they have no touch of life left. It has been crushed out of them. Its lustre is to be put into their eyes, freedom has to come not tomorrow, but today.

53-Do or Die

I have pledged the Congress and the Congress will do or die.

9- SPEECH BEFORE THE INTER ASIAN RELATIONS CONFERENCE- April 2nd 1947

[The closing session of the Inter-Asian Relations Conference held on April 2, 1947 was a great finale to the intense activity which marked the proceedings during the past ten days. Over 20,000 visitors and delegates and observers gave a great ovation to Gandhiji when Mrs. Naidu introduced him as a 'one of the greatest Asians of the age'. Gandhiji who followed Dr. Sjahriar, the Premier of Indonesia, made the following speech:]

1-I do not think that I should apologize to you for having to speak in a foreign tongue. I wonder if this loud speaker carries my voice to the farthest end of this vast audience. If some of those who are far away are unable to listen to what I may say, it will be the fault of the loud speaker.

2-I was going to tell you that I do not wish to apologize. I dare not. You cannot understand the provincial language, which is my mother tongue. I do not want to insult you by speaking in my own language (Gujarati). Our national speech is Hindustani. I know that it will be a long time before it can be made into an international speech. For international commerce, undoubtedly, English occupies the first place. I used to hear that French was the language of diplomacy. I was told, when I was young, that if I wanted to go from one end of Europe to the other, I must try to pick up French. I tried to learn French, in order that I may be able to make myself understood. There is a rivalry between the French and the English. Having been taught English, I have naturally to resort to it.

3-I was wondering, as to what I was to speak to you. I wanted to collect my thoughts, but, let me confess to you that I had no time. Yet I had promised yesterday that I would try to say a few words. While I was coming with Badshah Khan, I asked for a little piece of paper and pencil. I got a pen, instead of a pencil. I tried to scribble a few words. You will be sorry to hear that piece of paper is not by my side, though I remember what I wanted to say.

4-You, friends, have not seen the real India and you are not meeting in conference in the midst of real India. Delhi, Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, Lahore-all these are big cities and are, therefore, influenced by the West.

5-I then thought of a story. It was in French and was translated for me by an Anglo-French philosopher. He was an unselfish man. He befriended me without having known me, because he always sided with the minorities. I was not then in my own country. I was not only in a hopeless minority, but in a despised minority, if the Europeans in South Africa

will forgive me for saying so. I was a coolie lawyer. At the time, we had no coolie doctors, and we had no coolie lawyers. I was the first in the field. You know, perhaps, what is meant by the word 'coolie'.

6-This friend—his mother was a French woman and his father was an Englishman—said: “I want to translate for you a French story. There were three scientists who went out from France in search of truth. They went to different parts of Asia. One of them found his way to India. He began to search. He went to the so-called cities of those times—naturally this was before British occupation, before even the Mogul period. He saw the so-called high caste people, men and women, till he felt at a loss. Finally, he went to one humble cottage and there he found the truth that he was in search of.”

7-If you really want to see India villages at its best, you have to find it in the humble bhangi homes of such villages. There are seven lakhs of such villages, and thirty-eighty crores of people inhabit them.

8-If some of you see the Indian villages, you will not be fascinated by the sight. You will have to scratch below the dung heap. I do not pretend to say that they were places of paradise. Today, they are really dung heaps. They were not like that before. What I say is not from history, but from what I have seen myself. I have travelled from one end of India to the other, and I have seen the miserable specimens of humanity with the lustreless eyes. They are India. In these humble cottages, in the midst of these dung heaps, are to be found humble bhangis, in whom you find the concentrated essence of wisdom.

9-Again, I have learnt from books—books written by English historians. We read books written in English historians, but we do not write in our own mother tongue, or in the national language Hindustani. We study our history through English books, rather than through originals. That is the cultural conquest which India has undergone.

10-The first of these wise men was Zoroaster. He belonged to the East. He was followed by Buddha who belonged to the East—India. Who followed Buddha? Jesus, who came from the East. Before Jesus was Moses who belonged to Palestine, though he was born in Egypt. And after Jesus came Mohamed. I omit my reference to Krishna and Rama and other lights. I do not call them lesser lights but they are less known a single person in the world to match these men of Asia. And then what happened? Christianity became disfigured, when it went to the West. I am sorry to have to say that—I would not talk any further.

11-I have told you the story, in order to make you understand that what you see in the big cities is not the real India. Certainly, the carnage that is going on before our very eyes is a

shameful thing. As I said yesterday, do not carry the memory of that carnage beyond the confines of India.

12-What I want you to understand is the message of Asia. It is not to be learnt through the western spectacles or by imitating the atom bomb. If you want to give a message of truth. I do not want merely to appeal to your head. I want to capture your heart.

13-In this age of democracy, in this age of awakening of the poorest of the poor, you can redeliver this message with the greatest emphasis. You will complete the conquest of the West, not through vengeance, because you have been exploited, but with real understanding. I am sanguine, if all of you put your hearts together—not merely heads—to understand the secret of the message these wise men of the East have left to us, and us if we really become worthy of that great message, the conquest of the West will be completed. This conquest will be loved by the West itself.

14-The West is today pinning for wisdom. It is despairing of a multiplication of the atom bombs, because the atom bombs mean utter destruction, not merely of the West, but of the whole world, as if the prophecy of the Bible is going to be fulfilled and there is to be a perfect deluge. It is up to you to tell the world of its wickedness and sin—that is the heritage your teachers and my teachers have taught Asia.

10-SPEECH AT THE PRAYER MEETING - January 4th,1948

1-Today there is talk of war everywhere. Everyone fears a war breaking out between the two countries. If that happens it will be a calamity both for India and for Pakistan. India has written to the U.N. because whenever there is a fear of conflict anywhere the U.N. is asked to promote a settlement and to stop fighting from breaking out. India therefore wrote to the U. N. O. however trivial the issue may appear to be; it could lead to a war between the two countries. It is a long memorandum and it has been cabled. Pakistan's leaders Zafullah Khan and Liaquat Ali Khan have since issued long statements. I would take leave to say that their argument does not appeal to me. You may ask if I approve of the Union Government approaching the UNO I may say that I both approve and do not approve of what they did. I approve of it, because after all what else are they to do? They are convinced that what they are doing is right. If there are raids from outside the frontier of Kashmir, the obvious conclusion is that it must be with the connivance of Pakistan. Pakistan can deny it. But the denial does not settle the matter. Kashmir has acceded the accession upon certain conditions. If Pakistan harasses Kashmir and if Sheikh Abdullah who is the leader of Kashmir asks the Indian Union for help, the latter is bound to send help. Such help therefore was sent to Kashmir.

2-At the same time Pakistan is being requested to get out of Kashmir and to arrive at a settlement with India over the question through bilateral negotiations. If no settlement can be reached in this way then a war is inevitable. It is to avoid the possibility of war that the Union Government has taken the step it did. Whether they are right in doing so or not God alone knows. Whatever might have been the attitude of Pakistan, if I had my way, I would have invited Pakistan's representatives to India and we could have met, discussed the matter and worked out some settlement. They keep saying that they want an amicable settlement but they do nothing to create the conditions for such a settlement. I shall therefore humbly say to the responsible leaders of Pakistan that though we are now two countries – which is a thing I never wanted – we should at least try to arrive at an agreement so that we could live as peaceful neighbours. Let us grant for the sake of argument that all Indians are bad, but Pakistan at least is a new-born nation which has more ever come into being in the name of religion and it should at least keep itself clean. But they themselves make no such claim. It is not their argument that Muslims have committed no atrocities in Pakistan.

3-I shall therefore suggest that it is now their duty, as far as possible, to arrive at an amicable understanding with India and live in harmony with her. Mistakes were made on both sides. Of this I have no doubt. But this does not mean that we should persist in those mistakes, for then in the end we shall only destroy ourselves in a war and the whole of the sub-continent will pass into the hands of some third power. That will be the worst imaginable fate for us. I shudder to think of it. Therefore, the two Dominions should come together with God as witness and find a settlement. The matter is now before the UNO. It cannot be withdrawn from there. But if India and Pakistan come to a settlement the big powers in the UNO will have to endorse that settlement. They will not object to the settlement. They themselves can only say that they will do their best to see that the two countries arrive at an understanding through mutual discussions. Let us pray to God is to grant that we may either learn to live in amity with each other or if we must fight to let us fight to the very end. That may be folly but sooner or later it will purify us. Now a few words about Delhi.

4-I came to know of the incidents which took place last evening through Brijkishan. I had gone to the Camp for the evening prayer. I came away after the prayer but he had stayed over to talk to the people in the Camp. There are some Muslim houses at a little distance from the Camp. About four or five hundred inmates of the Camp mostly women and children but also some men – issued out of the Camp to take possession of the houses. I am told they did not indulge in any kind of violence. Some of the houses were vacant. Some were occupied by the owners. They tried to take possession even of the latter. The police were near at hand. They immediately went to the spot and brought the situation under control at about 9 O' clock according to the information I have. The police have stayed on there. I understand they had to use tear gas. Tear gas does not kill but it can be pretty painful. I am told that something has happened today again.

5-All I can say is that is a matter of great shame for us. Have not the refugees learnt even from their immense suffering that they have to exercise some restraint? It is highly improper to go and occupy other people's houses. It is for the Government to find them shelter or whatever else their need. Today the Government is our own. But if we defy our own Government and defy the police and forcibly occupy houses the Government is not likely to continue for long. It is still worse that such things should happen in the capital city of India where there are so many ambassadors from all over the world. Do we want to show them the spectacle of people occupying what-ever they can? It is all the more

regrettable that women and children were used as a shield. It is inhuman. It is like Muslim rulers keeping a herd of cows in theanguard of their armies to make sure that the Hindus would not fight. It is uncivilized, barbaric behaviour. It is still more barbaric to put women and children in front to provide against the police making a lathi charge. It is abuse of womanhood. I must humbly ask all the refugees - women and children – not to behave in this way. Let them settle down. If they don't, then apart from a war between Indian and Pakistan, we may kill ourselves in mutual strife. We may lose Delhi and make ourselves the laughing-stock of the world. If we want to keep India a free country, we must stop the things that are at present going on.

11-SPEECH ON THE EVE OF THE LAST FAST- January 12th 1948

My Fast as a Protest

1-One fasts for health's sake under laws governing health, fasts as a penance for a wrong done and felt as such. In these fasts, the fasting one need not believe in Ahimsa. here is, however, a fast which a votary of non-violence sometimes feels impelled to undertake by way of protest against some wrong done by society, and this he does when as a votary of Ahimsa has no other remedy left. Such an occasion has come my way.

2-When on September 9th, I returned to Delhi from Calcutta, it was to proceed to the West Punjab. But that was not to be. Gay Delhi looked a city of the dead. As I alighted from the train, I observed gloom on every face I saw. Even the Sardar, whom humour and the joy that humour gives never desert, was no exception this time. The cause of it I did not know. He was on the platform to receive me. He lost no time in giving me the sad news of the disturbances that had taken place in the Metropolis of the Union. At once I saw that I had to be in Delhi and 'do or die'. There is an apparent calm brought about by prompt military and police action. But there is storm within the breast. It may burst forth any day. This I count as no fulfilment of the vow to 'do' which alone can keep me from death, the incomparable friend. I yearn for heart friendship between the Hindus, the Sikhs and the Muslims. It subsisted between them the other day. Today it is non-existent. It is a state that no Indian patriot worthy of the name can contemplate with equanimity. Though the Voice within has been beckoning for a long time, I have been shutting my ears to it, lest it may be the voice of Satan otherwise called my weakness. I never like to feel resourceless, a Satyagrahi never should. Fasting is his last resort in the place of the sword—his or other's. I have no answer to return to the Muslim friends who see me from day to day as to what they should do. My impotence has been gnawing at me of late. It will go immediately the fast is undertaken. I have been brooding over it for the last three days. The final conclusion has flashed upon me and it makes me happy. No man, if he is pure has anything more precious to give than his life. I hope and pray that I have that purity in me to justify the step.

Worthy of Blessing

3-I ask you all to bless the effort and to pray for me and with me. The fast begins from the first meal tomorrow. The period is indefinite and I may drink water with or without salts and sour limes. It will end when and if I am satisfied that there is a reunion of hearts of all the communities brought about without any outside pressure, but from an awakened sense of duty. The reward will be the regaining of India's dwindling prestige and her fast fading sovereignty over the heart of Asia and there through the world. I flatter myself with belief that the loss of the hope of the aching, storm-tossed and hungry world. Let no friend, or foe if there be one, be angry with me. There are friends who do not believe in the method of the fast for the reclamation of the human mind. They will bear with me and extend to me the same liberty of action that they claim for themselves. With God as my supreme, and sole counsellor, I felt that I must take the decision without any other adviser. If I made a mistake and discover it, I shall have no hesitation in proclaiming it from the housetop and retracing my faulty step. There is clear indication, as I claim there is, of the Inner Voice, it will not be gainsaid. I plead for all absence of argument and inevitable endorsement of the step. If the whole of India responds or at least Delhi does, the fast might be soon ended.

No Softness

4-But whether it ends soon or late or never, let there be no softness in dealing with what may be termed as a crisis. Critics have regarded some of my previous fasts as coercive and held that on merits the verdict would have gone against my stand but for the pressure exercised by the fasts. What value can an adverse verdict have when the purpose is demonstrably sound? A pure fast, like duty, is its own reward. I do not embark upon it for the sake of the result it may bring. I do so because I must. Hence, I urge everybody dispassionately to examine the purpose and let me die, if I must, in peace which I hope is ensured. Death for me would be a glorious deliverance rather than that I should be a helpless witness of the destruction of India, Hinduism, Sikhism and Islam. That destruction is certain if Pakistan ensures no equality of status and security of life and property for all professing the various faiths of the world, and if India copies her. Only then Islam dies in the two India's, not in the world. But Hinduism and Sikhism have no world outside India. Those who differ from me will be honoured by me for their resistance however implacable. Let my fast quicken conscience, not deaden it. Just contemplate the rot that has set in beloved India and you will rejoice to think that there is a humble son of hers who is strong

enough and possibly pure enough to take the happy step. If he is neither, he is a burden on earth. The sooner he disappears and clears the Indian atmosphere of the burden the better for him and all concerned.

I would beg of all friends not to rush to Birla House nor try to dissuade me or be anxious for me. I am in God's hands. Rather, they should turn the searchlights inwards, for this is essentially a testing time for all of us. Those who remain at their post of duty and perform it diligently and well, now more so than hitherto, will help me and the cause in every way. The fast is a process of self-purification.

