

weakened the pacifist movement. To people of different political outlooks, military preparedness, "deterrence", and even war, seemed preferable to risking genocide, totalitarian oppression, and dehumanizing exploitation.

At the same time, the success of Gandhi's movement in India, and the U.S. civil rights movement led by Martin Luther King, suggested that nonviolence actually could achieve justice and remove the main causes of war.

In regard to the strategy of developing mass demonstrations, an advantage of Gandhian nonviolence over pacifism was that through the formula of "tactical nonviolence", it made coalition demonstrations that included pacifists and non-pacifists, easier.

The substitution of nonviolence for pacifism has had at least one serious drawback. It's discouraged the impulse of pacifists to strengthen the critique of military force, and hence weakened their ability to influence the mass of the American public. When ending war is seen to be exclusively the task of removing social and economic causes of war, such as racism and corporate capitalism, and mobilizing groups into nonviolent resistance against the "Establishment", arguments against the principle of military force assume a low priority. What has happened, therefore, is that the movements for peace and social justice have remained rather well organized, static movements. The middle-class American public has been most influenced by the social Darwinist arguments of the "Right", and the military argument derived from the experience at Munich that "aggressors mustn't be appeased". Consequently, the political climate of the country has drifted to the right. Ronald Reagan isn't as much a cause of problems as a symptom of a society that has largely rejected the analysis of the "Left", and adopted a social Darwinist, militaristic outlook on the world.

What is needed to stop the drift to the right and to war is a re-establishment of pacifism as the central perspective in the peace movement. Kumarappa is correct that pacifism has a strong negative theme. It's against war. But every great and effective humanitarian movement has been negative in

that sense. It has been against an inhuman institution. The abolition movement was categorically against slavery. The women suffrage movement was against the domination of political life by men. These movements have been the most dynamic and effective when they have categorically rejected the institutions that are seen to be dehumanizing, not when they have sought only to ameliorate conditions within these institutions, or reform them.

Kumarappa sets up a dichotomy between pacifism and Gandhian nonviolence. As a reading of For Pacifists will show (many libraries have copies, and copies can be obtained for \$2.50 from Arthur Harvey, Poor Farm Road, Weare, N.H. 03281), Gandhi saw no such contradiction. He advocated only that pacifists add to their condemnation of military force the lessons learned from nonviolent resistance. He recommended that the European nations disarm, and practice nonviolence against the Nazis. He saw the need for democratic world government, a global political structure within which disputes could be resolved justly without resort to military violence. He saw democratic society evolving toward a nonviolent, anarchist society. He advocated that pacifists make sure that their personal lifestyles are nonviolent. All of these positions are shared by the United States Pacifist Party.

In addition, as well as being a "spiritual" leader, Gandhi was an educator and "propagandist". Possibly because he was a lawyer by profession, and regarded himself as a scientist (he titled his autobiography The Story of My Experiments with Truth), he understood the importance of developing an airtight case for any humanitarian movement, and of convincing as many people as possible of the rightness of that movement. In South Africa, a great deal of his energy went into publishing the newspaper Indian Opinion, in which he developed and honed his theories of nonviolence in a constant dialogue with the Indian people. Before moving permanently back to India, he wrote and had widely distributed the pamphlet Hind Swaraj, that analyzed the evils of British imperialism, and explained the elements of a strategy of nonviolence to win Indian independence. Once permanently back in India, he founded the newspapers