DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 852 CS 508 879

AUTHOR Bode, Robert A.
TITLE Mahatma Gandhi's Theory of Nonviolent Communication.
PUB DATE Feb 95
NOTE 56p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western States Communication Association (Portland, OR, February 10-14, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; *Nonverbal Communication; *Speech Acts; Theories; *Verbal Communication; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS Communication Context; *Gandhi (Mahatma); *Nonviolence; Peace Education

ABSTRACT

In this paper, an attempt is made to reveal from Gandhi's thoughts, life, and work a nonviolent communication theory. The revelation of such a theory of nonviolent communication has the potential to add substantially to the understanding of what may bring about greater communal harmony in a variety of communication contexts, and the ability to educate persons about what constitutes peaceful and nonviolent communication and relationships. While no communication theorists, ancient or contemporary, specifically state that nonviolent speech and acts are central to their theories of communication, Mahatma Gandhi's thoughts, life, work, and his views on nonviolent communication make a contribution to communication theory. Gandhi did not specifically state he had a nonviolent communication theory; indeed, he denied being a theorist. He was an activist. The nonviolent communication theory consists of four theoretical units: (1) nonviolent speech and action; (2) maintenance of relationships and enrichment of personhood; (3) openness; and (4) flexibility. To carry these units further: Gandhi predicted that from violent communications harm would result, and that nonviolent communication contributes to the maintenance of peaceful relationships and to the enrichment of personhood. The theory of nonviolent communication recommends means (flexibility and openness) of achieving the end. The widespread utility of the theory of nonviolent communication seems to be useful for peace educators to consider as they continue to stress the importance of nonviolence in communication situations. (Contains 160 notes.) (RS)

MAHATMA GANDHI'S THEORY OF NONVIOLENT COMMUNICATION

Presented at the
Western States Communication Association Confefence
February, 1995

Robert A. Bode, PH.D.
Department of Communication, Mailstop 9102
Western Washington University
Bellingham, Washington 98225-9102
Department Phone (206) 650-3415
Office Phone (206) 650-3870

MAHATMA GANDHI'S THEORY OF NONVIOLENT COMMUNICATION

ABSTRACT

In this paper, an attempt is made to reveal from Gandhi's thoughts, life, and work a nonviolent communication theory. The revelation of such a theory has the potential to add substantially to our understanding of what may bring about greater communal harmony in a variety of contexts, and to our ability to educate persons about what constitutes peaceful and nonviolent communication and relationships. Admittedly, to my knowledge, Gandhi has not specifically stated he had a nonviolent communication theory. Indeed, my recollections of the thoughts, life, and work of Gandhi are that he denied being a theorist. He was an actionist. In spite of such qualifications, my readings of Gandhian artifacts lead me to propose such a theory in the hopes that we may learn, that we may educate, that we consider urging others to model many of Gandhi's actions, and that we may continue to engage in lively discussions about the value of emulating such a notable practitioner of nonviolence in general and a notable practioner of nonviolent communication in particular.

AN OVERVIEW

Some of the generally accepted goals of a theory are to explain, describe, predict, and control. In a communication context, such goals may be accomplished by explaining and describing communication in terms of both speech and acts, by predicting the outcomes of speech and actions, and by controlling speech and actions in order to bring about the peaceful resolution of differences.

Many of Gandhi's thoughts, his life, and his works may be viewed as explanatory or descriptive, predictive, and related to controlling one's communication. Gandhi has explained and described what he meant by both violent and nonviolent communication--he predicted outcomes of violent and nonviolent communication and he recommended that adherents to nonviolence control their communication. Thusly framed, Gandhi offers us a theory of nonviolent communication which I believe consists of four theoretical units.

The first and foremost of the theoretical units is *nonviolent speech and action.* The second unit is the *maintenance of relationships and enrichment of personhood* (considered to be the end of Gandhi's theory of nonviolent communication). The third and fourth units are *openness* and *flexibility* (the means through which the end is accomplished). Each of these theoretical units warrant further explanation. Gandhi's theory of nonviolent communication is widely applicable. Briefly stated, Gandhi's theory of nonviolent communication may be thought of as useful in intrapersonal and

interpersonal communication contexts, in small and large group communication contexts, and in mass or international communication contexts.

NONVIOLENT SPEECH AND ACTION

Gandhi repeatedly warned against the use of violent speech and acts, and he has prescribed and described what he meant by such speech and acts. He also urged adherents to practice nonviolent speech and acts as they carried out their roles in *Satyagraha* campaigns.

Satyagrahis were advised by Gandhi to avoid harboring ill-will or bitterness toward evil-doers and they were expected to refrain from the use of inappropriate offensive language.[1] Rules for *Satyagrahis* (written by Gandhi) urged that "no intentional injury in thought, work or deed" were allowed, that "swearing and cursing" were to be excluded, and that if some people did insult officials, *Satyagrahis* were to protect the officials even at the risk of their own lives.[2] *Satyagrahi* qualifications and duties were to avoid embarrassing evil-doers,[3] to have no trace of bitterness toward opponents,[4] and to be charitable toward adversaries.[5]

Gandhi believed that violence was found in forms of speech. He therefore repeatedly admonished that *Satyagrahis* should have neither a trace of bitterness in them nor violence in their language.[6] He urged *Satyagrahis* to ask for forgiveness "for every unkind word thoughtlessly uttered or unkind deed done to any one."[7] In addition, Gandhi suggested that *Satyagrahis* who were engaged in non-cooperation should not lie.[8]

There were many channels through which Gandhi communicated his ideas regarding violent and nonviolent speech and action. In a letter to a friend, for example, Gandhi elegantly stated his convictions about violent and nonviolent speech: "Violence

means injuring a creature through bodily action or speech or in thought . . . Non-violence means not injuring any creature in this manner."[9] In another instance, during an exchange of editorials with a critic of *Satyagraha* (who had suggested *Satyagraha* campaigns included violence), Gandhi wrote:

> *I should also remind correspondents that the word* Satyagraha *is often most loosely used and is made to cover veiled violence. But as the author of the word I may be allowed to say that it excludes every form of violence, direct or indirect, veiled or unveiled, and whether in thought, word or deed.*[10]

So insistent was Gandhi about nonviolent speech and acts that he believed their opposites could defeat a worthy cause. He wrote that a successful *Satyagraha* campaign should exclude violence in "any shape or form, whether in thought, speech, or deed."[11]

Gandhi frequently advised diverse audiences consisting of a variety of people involved in a *Satyagraha* campaign, but he targeted more specific audiences as well. During a speech in which Gandhi addressed Congressional members, he stated that "Our speech has often belied our profession."[12] In this setting, the reference was to reforming administrative processes, and Gandhi was concerned that speech had been directed toward others that attempted to "destroy," a form of speech he considered inappropriate

for members of Congress.[13] On another occasion, Gandhi stated: "Our violence in word and deed is but a feeble echo of the surging violence of thought in us."[14]

Gandhi admitted that nonviolence was frequently more difficult to live up to than it was to talk about.[15] When asked why he and others had failed to convince an opponent, Gandhi asserted that the failure had occurred because some had not been nonviolent, had sworn, and had been indifferent toward their opponents with language choices.[16] Gandhi claimed that "I may have controlled my tongue but I had not put a similar control on the speech of others."[17] Gandhi also attempted to monitor his own speech and chastised himself for being unable at times to live up to his own expectations. During an encounter with Gandhi, an official in Congress asserted that Gandhi was wrong about the implications and applications of nonviolence.[18] Gandhi admitted that he had exposed the official "to ridicule and unkind attacks" and, as a result, he had been weak and unjust.[19] Although Gandhi claimed his weakness was an accident, such an admission can be viewed as a failure to monitor his speech and actions. Gandhi implied there were difficulties that had to be overcome as people tried to create new patterns of speech that were nonviolent. He made this point when he stated that "inertia . . . ties the mind down to old ruts."[20] While Gandhi may have admitted there were difficulties to be overcome in the search for new speech patterns, he nevertheless tried to help adherents of nonviolence by his instruction.

Gandhi gave specific examples of violent speech and acts. "We must rid ourselves of petty jealousies and bickering."[21] Gandhi believed that there was no better

way to lose a cause than to abuse an opponent.[22] He made harsh indictments of violent communication practices in which he believed Indian Congressional officials had participated, and he included himself in the indictments.

Gandhi was concerned with the violent speech and actions of officials. He was also concerned with the effects of such speech and actions, charging that

> *. . . We have been betrayed into violence in our dealings with one another. We have quarreled with one another in our committees; . . . we have refused to carry out instructions of the Working Committee. We have formed rival groups wanting to seize power.*[23]

Such examples of violent speech and acts were considered by Gandhi to be responsible for preventing Congress from becoming highly credible. Gandhi believed that the use of violent speech and actions "reduced our professions of non-violence to a mockery."[24] Gandhi urged Congress that the goal of independence could only be reached by "evidence of our non-violent speech and action," and he further believed that "strictest adherence" to nonviolent speech and action was crucial.[25] There were times when Congress agreed that nonviolence was the best policy, and they would temporarily adopt nonviolence as their means.

The policy of nonviolence that Congress adopted, asserted Gandhi, "should put an easy restraint upon the speech, writings and actions of Congressmen in their dealings with

the [Muslim] League and its members."[26] Such restraints, believed Gandhi, could lead to communal unity that was both real and lasting.[27] Gandhi was hopeful that Congressional officials could serve as models of nonviolent speakers and activists, but he also used others as models of nonviolence.

An instance in which Gandhi instructed readers about the value of nonviolent speech and action through *Harijan* was when he related a story about Sardar Prithvisingh.[28] Prithvisingh was a revolutionary who for years believed that only violent means could bring about India's freedom from the British. According to Gandhi, Prithvisingh's violent and daring behaviors were unsurpassed. "He was *himsa* [violence] in action personified."[29] Prithvisingh went to Gandhi, submitted himself to a potential life behind bars because of the many acts of violence he had committed, and chose to behave nonviolently in his speech and action. He became a model prisoner and an outspoken proponent for nonviolence, was ultimately released from prison, and devoted himself to a life of nonviolence. A page from Prithvisingh's diary, reprinted in *Harijan*, stated that he had finally realized his violent behaviors "would not enrich my nation nor make any contribution to the uplift of humanity."[30] The pedagogical value of such revelations was important to Gandhi, and he used such episodes to teach the lessons of nonviolent speech and action.

Gandhi consistently stressed the idea that there were forms of violent speech and action, such as swearing at and insulting opponents. In addition, Gandhi urged *Satyagrahis* to avoid embarrassing others and to ask for forgiveness of unkind words they

had thoughtlessly uttered. Lies, attempts to destroy opponents, ridicule, unkind attacks, petty jealousies, bickering, and quarreling also were considered violent forms of speech to Gandhi. He encouraged adherents (such as individual *Satyagrahis*, the groups that followed them, Congressional officials and readers of *Harijan*) to avoid practicing such forms of speech and action. He also used models as pedagogues in order to convey his ideas regarding nonviolent speech and action. Gandhi also believed that nonviolent speech and action had cross-situational applicability: he clearly viewed nonviolent speech and acts as appropriate for a wide variety of situations and was so convinced about the possible applications of nonviolent speech and acts that he repeatedly argued that his methods were capable of being universally applied:

> *In referring to the universality of* Satyagraha *I have time and again observed . . . that it is capable of application in the social no less than in the political field. It may equally be employed against Government, society, or one's own family, father, mother, husband or wife as the case may be.*[31]

Peace scholar Anima Bose defended Gandhi's position by asserting that Gandhi challenged himself to bring about a state of improved welfare for all people.[32] She has stated that the welfare of all became a primary objective of Gandhi's and suggested that in

order to achieve peace and harmony, Gandhi's nonviolent techniques--as manifested in *Satyagraha*--were necessarily universally oriented.[33]

Other scholars who have analyzed nonviolence have made similar claims for Gandhi's techniques.[34] Jarantanuja Bandyopadhyaya has claimed that individual, group, and mass nonviolent campaigns were possible in Gandhi's view.[35] Nonviolent campaigns could also be used as tools for resistance to tyrannical governments, and nonviolence may be considered useful as a national defense policy.[36] Traditionally, nonviolence has been most closely associated with mass movement campaigns for social change. However, creative thinkers may find Gandhi's techniques applicable in interpersonal and small group settings as well. Gandhi and others have clearly suggested that nonviolence may be used for resolving differences, for confronting oppressors, for rooting out evil, and may be employed at "any level of social interaction."[37]

Nonviolent speech and acts, according to Gandhi, appear to be applicable to many communication situations and can be viewed as appropriate across situations. As we know from his background, Gandhi engaged in significant rhetorical confrontations ranging from interpersonal to international. As might be expected, his search for an effective means of resolving differences demanded that such means would be applicable to a range of communication contexts.

Gandhi was emphatic about the widespread utility of nonviolence. When one reader asserted, "You may inspire a few persons to study *ahimsa* but society as a whole is not likely to take it,"[38] Gandhi responded, "The correspondent doubts in substance the

universal application of *ahimsa*, and asserts that society has made little progress towards it."[39] In order to support his views about the applicability of nonviolence, Gandhi turned to the All India Congress Committee (A.I.C.C.) and to Indian scholars. The A.I.C.C., stated Gandhi (in his reply to the reader), has affirmed that

> . . . *Non-violence continues to be the weapon against all internal disturbances.* . . . *That means that* ahimsa *for all occasions and all purposes has been recognized by a society, however small it may be, and that* ahimsa *as a remedy to be used by society has made fair strides.*[40]

Gandhi added that Indian scholar Maulana, "a great thinker of keen intellect and vast reading," had experiences that it was "*ahimsa* alone" that could free India.[41] Gandhi invoked the name of another prominent Indian scholar when he stated: "Jawaharlal is not a man to stand in awe of anyone. His study of history and contemporary events is second to none. It is after mature thought that he has accepted *ahimsa* as a means for the attainment of *Swaraj* [freedom]."[42] Gandhi admitted that in the event nonviolence failed to achieve freedom, Jawaharlal would urge violence as a means of achieving freedom,[43] but Gandhi apparently did not feel that Jawaharlal's view diminished the value of the applicability of nonviolence as a desirable means toward the desirable end--freedom. In yet another example, Gandhi's belief that his methods could be applied to a variety of situations is clear when he stated:

I have been practicing with scientific precision non-violence and its possibilities for an unbroken period of over fifty years. I have applied it in every walk of life, domestic, institutional, economic, and political. I know of no single case in which it has failed. Where it has seemed sometimes to have failed, I have ascribed it to my imperfections.[44]

Critics of Gandhi's views were frequently willing to recognize the utility of *Satyagraha* for internal affairs, but not for external affairs. For example, some believed that *Satyagraha* would not work in the event India were invaded by a foreign power, and Gandhi addressed this concern by arguing that many members of Congress believed nonviolence could be "applied to all fields, including internal disorder and external aggression."[45] To further illustrate his conviction that nonviolence was applicable to foreign aggressors, Gandhi stated that if India could recognize the "matchless beauty of non-violence. . . . she will become unconquerable in the face of any invaders."[46] He reasoned that a small state that learned the art of nonviolence was immune, but that a small state "no matter how powerfully armed," in the midst of a combination of larger well-armed States, was not.[47]

In order to support this position, Gandhi did not have to look far: World War II was raging at the time, and Germany's militaristic force could be viewed as a small state that was powerfully armed. "Hitlerism," as Gandhi referred to this force, "means naked

ruthless force reduced to an exact science," which "worked with scientific precision."[48] As Gandhi witnessed the violence of the war, he wrote that what "is going on before our very eyes is a demonstration of the futility of violence as also of Hitlerism."[49] Gandhi suggested that Germany could not hold subjugated nations perpetually, and he stated "that all the blood that has been spilled by Hitler has added not a millionth part of an inch to the world's moral stature."[50] These lessons were directed toward Indians as well as the world powers. In the event India was to first "demonstrate the efficacy of non-violence . . . in our own country . . . we can expect to influence the tremendously armed powers of the west."[51]

In order to successfully argue that nonviolence could be applied to many situations, Gandhi had to answer the question of how such notions of nonviolent speech and action were to be translated into practice. A rhetorical exchange between Gandhi and a member of Congress illustrated the difficulty Gandhi faced when he was asked how persons should go about nonviolently resolving communal riots.

In this exchange, Gandhi simply asserted that Congress had yet to discover "a sure method of dealing successfully . . . with communal riots."[52] Gandhi further stated: "I have no ready-made concrete plan. . . . Only I have no choice as to the means. It must always be purely non-violent."[53] Gandhi's vagueness as to how to act nonviolently was perhaps nowhere more clearly stated than in his assertion that the

. . . opportunity comes to everyone almost daily. There are communal classes, there are dacoities [dacoits are person who robbed and murdered while roving in gangs], *there are wordy duels. In all these things those who are truly non-violent can and will demonstrate it.*[54]

Gandhi believed that millions could be trained in the art of nonviolence[55] and that the effects of such training could have extraordinary consequences. With one eye toward independence and the other toward the violence of World War II, Gandhi stated that he could not support Britain in the war effort even if Britain would as a result guarantee India's independence.[56] He further stated that he was certain in his "belief that only non-violence can save India and the world from self-extinction."[57]

On another occasion, Gandhi articulated his beliefs about the possible consequences of nonviolence, but this time he was concerned with how only a few people could bring about exceptional results if their nonviolence was genuine:

A small body of determined spirits fixed by an unquenchable faith in their mission can alter the course of history. It has happened before and it may happen again if the non-violence . . . is unalloyed gold, not mere glittering tinsel.[58]

According to Gandhi, millions could use nonviolence or a few could use nonviolence--in either situation, he believed the results that could be brought about could be consequential.

Gandhi believed individual, social, political, national, and international issues were resolvable through nonviolent means. Individual problems within families, problems among communal groups, and problems among nations were addressed through Gandhi's ideas regarding *Satyagraha*, through *CWMG*, and through *Harijan*. That Gandhi intended nonviolence to be used in numerous situations is clear in each of these sources.

Gandhi's vision of nonviolence appears to have been that there were many forms of violent speech and action, and he specifically stated several examples of each. By identifying examples of violent speech and action and then urging adherents to avoid such practices, Gandhi made the point that nonviolence included speech and acts. Nonviolent speech and action are thus a consistent and recurring theme and may be viewed as an important aspect of Gandhi's nonviolent communication theory.

Gandhi also believed that nonviolent speech and action were applicable across many communication situations. Nonviolent speech and action were not considered by Gandhi to be situation bound. Nonviolent action was capable of being applied in both interpersonal and international contexts. Nonviolent action and its cross-situational application is a key theoretical unit in Gandhi's rhetorical theory. From this core emerges

other theoretical units: one dealt with the goal of Gandhi's nonviolent communication theory, which was to maintain human relationships.

MAINTENANCE OF HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

For Gandhi, the goal of communication was to build and maintain human relationships and thus enhance personhood. Gandhi's insistence upon nonviolence recognized the importance of others, valued humanity, and appreciated the importance of human relationships and personhood.

To Gandh close personal relationships were very important in working through conflicts. Gandhi stated that Ruskin's book, *Unto This Last*, engrossed him and confirmed his view of a simple and ideal life that was, in part, dependent upor the "'invisible gold' of companionship."[59] One of Gandhi's greatest political antagonists claimed that even though Gandhi would go all out for causes, he never forgot the human background of the situation.[60] The "bonds of relationship" were important to Gandhi, whether with "friends, co-workers and even opponents."[61]

Satyagrahis, wrote Gandhi, never should intend to embarrass a wrong-doer, overlook "the inherent goodness of human nature," or appeal to the fears of others.[62] *Satyagrahis* also should strive to discover "the best" in others.[63] At the same time, *Satyagrahis* should try to convert the hearts of others.[64] Gandhi frequently stated his concern for relationships and people.

Gandhi's concern was for the whole of personhood, not just the part of humanity with whom one was friendly. Humanity, according to Gandhi, was not divisible into water-tight compartments, and his messages were consistently concerned with the well-being of people from India and from nations throughout the world.[65] In a letter to Jinnah, Gandhi tried to convey the importance of the overall relationship between the Hindus and Muslims they respectively represented. Gandhi wrote: "I proceed on the assumption that India is not to be regarded as two or more nations but as one family consisting of many members."[66] His concern for relationships and personhood was directed "towards the whole of the human family and not merely for the human family which inhabitants this little spot of earth called India."[67] According to Gandhi, the world was full of good human beings,[68] and nonviolence or *ahimsa* was to be expressed in "selfless service of the masses."[69] The art of nonviolence may be, according to Gandhi, capable of regeneration and radical reform of the whole of personhood.

Gandhi's nonviolent communication theory included the valuing of personhood throughout the world, but he also stressed the importance of individual relationships and friendships. During widespread communal violence throughout India in 1939-1940, Gandhi urged readers of *Harijan* to establish warm relationships. He felt that if people could develop such relationships, violence could be prevented. The real test of a practitioner of *ahimsa*, Gandhi stated, would come at a "time of political disturbances or communal disorders, or under the menace of thieves and *dacoits*."[70] Gandhi urged *Satyagrahis* to "cultivate friendly relations" within the communities of thieves and

dacoits.[71] He operationalized his views regarding relationships and friendships when he wrote: "If I am a Hindu, I must fraternize with the Mussalmans and the rest. In my dealings with them I may not make any distinction beem my co-religionists and those who might belong to a different faith."[72]

Although Gandhi frequently disagreed with others, he appears, nevertheless, to have valued the relationships he had with his opponents. Malaviyaji was a friend of Gandhi's, but they frequently disagreed about strategies for accomplishing political goals. In one instance, Malaviyaji urged Gandhi to "avoid at all costs" a fast that he planned to undertake.[73] Gandhi wrote of Malaviyaji that "he is always deeply concerned about my health, my politics, and my morals. We have differences of opinion, but our love cheerfully stands the strain. [74] This communication exchange has suggested that Gandhi clearly recognized and valued how a relationship played a key role in the resolution of differences.

Lord Linlithgow, a prominent politician with whom Gandhi frequently interacted, also had very different opinions and political agendas from Gandhi. Each might be viewed as the other's adversary, and yet Gandhi repeatedly stressed how he believed their relationship was important. Gandhi wrote elegantly about how their confrontations drew them together, how their relationship would endure under the strain between them, and how their differences could not sever their relationship. Gandhi stated, after one serious disagreement, that in "spite of the failure [to agree on a policy dealing with India's war involvement and freedom] we have come nearer to each other. There is a clarification of

the situation."[75] During another clash between Linlithgow and Gandhi, in which the war effort and India's role in the war were issues, Gandhi wrote: ". . . and though our ways seem to diverge for the moment, our close personal friendship will, as you have kindly said at the time of saying farewell, bear the strain of divergence."[76]

Yet another example illustrating Gandhi's ongoing concern for maintaining relationships with individuals with whom he dramatically disagreed was manifested in *Harijan*, as he wrote about one of his visits with Linlithgow. The tension between Gandhi and Linlithgow must have been exceptional, because Gandhi wrote that the discussions led to a breakdown in their talks.[77] In spite of the breakdown, Gandhi stated that the Viceroy "and I have become friends never to be parted, be the differences between us as great as they can be."[78]

On the question of partition, Jinnah was Gandhi's primary rival. Although Gandhi and Jinnah radically disagreed, again Gandhi consistently suggested that their relationship was very important. Gandhi repeatedly stated or implied the importance of their specific relationship (and of relationships in general) in *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks*.

At a prayer meeting that followed one of the sessions in which Gandhi and Jinnah talked, Gandhi stated his hopes that throughout the talks, his speech would be guided so "that not a word might escape my lips so as to hurt . . . Jinnah . . . or damage the cause."[79] The talks did not always go well, and yet the strengths of the relationship between Gandhi and Jinnah appeared, from time to time, to sustain them. In a letter that Gandhi wrote to Jinnah during the talks, he stated:

Last evening's talks have left a bad taste in my mouth. Our talks and our correspondence seem to run in parallel lines and never touch one another. We reached the breaking point last evening but, thank God, we were unwilling to part.[80]

Even after the talks ended and Gandhi and Jinnah had been unable to resolve their differences, Gandhi stressed the value of what he appeared to consider a mutual friendship. At a press conference, Gandhi said he was entirely satisfied the talks had not been a waste of time, and that he and Jinnah "now know each other better than before."[81] When asked if he thought meetings in the near future were possible, Gandhi said: "I hope so. It is for the Press and for the public to make it possible and hasten the date. I assure you that we have not parted as enemies, but as friends."[82] In *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks*, Gandhi has stated or implied his concern for relationships, either his and Jinnah's, or for Hindus and Muslims. From the broader perspective, Gandhi also articulated his concern for the well-being of the whole of personhood. Two examples illustrate this concern.

On one occasion, in a rather lengthy correspondence with Jinnah, Gandhi expressed concern for the hardships and welfare of people who either may have or want to relocate should Pakistan be created:

> *As I write this letter and imagine the working of the resolution* [referring to the Lahore Resolution that Jinnah and the Muslim League had created urging the creation of Pakistan] *in practice, I see nothing but ruin for the whole of India.* . . . [in his aspirations to represent the entire population of India, Gandhi concerned himself with] *their misery and degradation which is their common lot irrespective of class, caste, or creed.*[83]

Gandhi thought that if Pakistan were created, there would be a massive migration of people to and from Pakistan, the results of which would be exceptionally burdensome to millions of people. As Gandhi and Jinnah proceeded with their talks, Gandhi reiterated this concern for the "rights of minorities,"[84] which he believed may be uprooted in the event Pakistan was to become a reality.

A consistent and recurring theme that emerges from an analysis of Gandhi's thoughts, life and work, then, is his concern for human relationships in particular and the well-being of personhood in general. Gandhi urged *Satyagrahis* to cultivate relationships with thieves and murderers who terrorized villages, and he recommended that Hindus mix with Muslims. Regardless of differences between people (such as Gandhi and Linlithgow), Gandhi believed people were capable of drawing nearer one another and seeing the situation more clearly. Friendship, suggested Gandhi, should bear the strain of differences. As a result of his talks with Jinnah, Gandhi claimed he knew Jinnah better than before and that they had parted friends. Gandhi's concern for relationships between

himself and interlocutors may have been an earmark worthy of noting, but his caring for humanity did not end with only those persons with whom he interacted, nor was he satisfied recommending that people should care only about those with whom they interacted.

Gandhi articulated concerns for the well-being of people of all nations, the whole of the human family. Nonviolence was capable of being expressed to all humanity and could regenerate and radically reform. Whereas the British bayonet *demoralized* both parties in the conflict, Gandhi believed that nonviolence could *moralize* both parties in a conflict. Specifically stated: violence dehumanizes, nonviolence humanizes.

Gandhi's concern for human relationships in particular and the enrichment of personhood in general can be viewed as the second consistent and recurrent theoretical unit of Gandhi's nonviolent communication theory. A third theoretical unit of Gandhi's nonviolent communication theory that emerged from Gandhi's thoughts, life and work is concern for openness.

OPENNESS

Openness, according to Gandhi's nonviolent communication theory, has to do with the willingness or desire to communicate. Gandhi was willing to sit down and talk. He believed in the basic rights of free speech and the right to make ideas known. Openness has been granted considerable attention by communication and conflict theorists,[85] and Gandhi was an advocate for openness and the expression of opinions.

Gandhi experienced various forms of censorship, and he became an outspoken proponent for the basic liberty of free speech; he was opposed to secret discussions. Gandhi so appreciated peaceful public meetings, voluntary associations, and the publication of information that he simply could not accept their prohibition, for he considered these means of communication "the breath, the food and the drink of public life."[86] The term that Gandhi used was *swaraj*, which meant freedom, self-rule, political independence.[87] *Swaraj*, according to Gandhi, could only come through free speech, association, and press.[88] Gandhi was so adamant about these issues that he believed if censorship occurred even a handwritten newspaper would be a "heroic remedy for heroic times."[89] Were speech and pen to be incarcerated, warned Gandhi, their power upon release would be increased.[90]

Free speech and association were critical to the accomplishment of goals such as independence, and Gandhi urged that, if necessary, "we must speak the truth under a shower of bullets. We must band together and face the bayonets. No cost is too great for purchasing these fundamental rights. And on this there can be no compromise, no parleying, no conference."[91] Gandhi was an unyielding proponent for various forms of interaction. He believed in the rights of free speech, and the only limitation he placed on persons who sought to exercise such rights was that they should not cause violence, either directly or indirectly.[92]

To meet, speak, and write openly were essential to Gandhi's theory. He was against secrecy--Gandhi believed that secrecy harmed the cause of *Satyagraha* and that to

use secrecy was to take away from the dignity of a *Satyagraha* campaign.[93] Near the end of his life, he had an "abhorrence of secrecy" because he believed that nonviolence should function in the open and against the heaviest conceivable odds.[94] He claimed that secrecy was a "sin and a symptom of violence. . . . hence all underground activity" was taboo.[95] Gandhi's fundamental objection to secrecy was that no secret underground movement could possibly have awakened the masses in India as had the program of open nonviolent action.[96]

Gandhi found many occasions on which to address this theme of openness. On one occasion, Gandhi stated that British officials had charged him and the Congress with making dangerous preparations for unlawful and violent activities, such as interrupting communications and organizing strikes.[97] Gandhi replied to the charges in a letter to Linlithgow, in which he asserted that the charges were "a gross distortion of reality. Violence was never contemplated at any stage. . . . Everything was openly discussed among Congress circles, for nothing was to be done secretly."[98]

The theme of openness in particular was strongly developed by Gandhi in *Harijan* during 1939-1940, prior to the November, 1940 censoring of the publication by the British. Gandhi sensed the impending censorship and possible closure and frequently made public statements regarding the significance of a variety of forms of open expression. In *Harijan*, for example, Gandhi wrote about the need to have free presses and about temporarily suspending acts of disobedience in order to bring about open and direct negotiations.

There were many instances in which Gandhi promoted freedom of the press. Following one of his visits with Linlithgow, who recently had imposed what was perceived as unacceptable limitations on the Congress and presses, Gandhi wrote:

> *The immediate issue is the right of existence, i.e., the right of self-expression which, broadly put, means free speech. This the Congress wants not merely for itself, but for all, the only restraint being complete observance of nonviolence.*[99]

This response came as a reaction to the British government's attempts to quiet the Congress in its opposition to the war effort.

The British were threatening freedom of speech and press, and Gandhi and others would not sit quietly by. A prominent *Satyagrahi*, Shri Vinaba Bhave, in conjunction with Gandhi, undertook a campaign of non-cooperation as a response to the British threats of censorship. Under British policy, Bhave could have been arrested and jailed for speaking publicly against the British cause. In addition, if *Harijan* publishers chose to publish Bhave's proclamations against the British cause, the presses could be stopped.

Onto this stage stepped Gandhi as he became a chief actor in this public drama. Gandhi advised the public that Bhave's campaign was to be confined primarily to Bhave and that they were not to be directly involved. However, Gandhi did believe the public was "indirectly involved, because the matter is concerned with freedom of speech [and]

the public will be involved to an extent."[100] Regarding the rights of expression and attempts at suppression, Gandhi stated: "Let me repeat the issue. On the surface it is incredibly narrow--the right to preach against war . . . or participation in the present war. . . . are matters of conscience for those who hold either view."[101]

So convinced was Gandhi about the necessity of openness, both for the presses and for the Congressional deliberations, that he believed the Indian Congress might vanish if members were suppressed:

> *And the Congress vanishes if, at the crucial moment, it suppresses itself for fear of consequence or otherwise by ceasing to preach non-violence through non-violent means. So when we probe the issue deep enough we discover that it is a matter of life and death for us.*[102]

Gandhi was of the opinion that India's presses should be free to openly state views and he was opposed to restrictions imposed on Congress.

At the same time, however, Gandhi admitted that from time to time, acts of disobedience may have to be suspended temporarily in order to facilitate open and direct negotiations[103] and to allow conflicting parties to meet for bargaining sessions. There were different reasons why a campaign might be called off. Reasons that Gandhi gave were that a campaign may be called off "in order to avoid popular violence," to provide a

way for an "honorable understanding," and "to educate people in the true way of *ahimsa*."[104]

Suspending acts of disobedience, Gandhi believed, also should lead to the opening of direct negotiations with authorities, and "[h]ence the first and last work of a *Satyagrahi* is ever to seek an opportunity for an honorable approach"[105] to direct negotiations. Should leaders of a civil disobedience have "active *ahimsa* in them" and should they believe in the possibility of a desirable outcome, then the way to negotiation would be open to them, Gandhi argued.[106]

On another occasion, during an interview with a representative of the *New York Times*, Gandhi stated his views regarding the importance of direct negotiations. The *Times* representative reminded Gandhi that he had said it "is possible for the best Indians to meet together and never to separate till they have evolved a formula acceptable to both."[107] Gandhi replied, "If the best Englishmen and the best Indians meet together with a fixed determination not to separate until they reach an agreement, the way will have been opened"[108] for the realization of the important goal of self-determination.[109]

Gandhi used a variety of channels through which to discuss secrecy, but *Harijan* was also a vehicle through which to state his views regarding secrecy. During one communication exchange in *Harijan*, Gandhi was encouraged by a reader to give his opinion about secrecy.[110] Gandhi stated his beliefs, lightly admonished *Satyagraha* participants who resorted to secrecy during a recent campaign, suggested how an absence

of secrecy could dignify a campaign, called for open records, and reaffirmed his conviction not to yield to those who thought secrecy was desirable:

> *I am quite clear that secrecy does no good to our cause. It certainly gave joy to those who were able successfully to outwit the police. Their cleverness was undoubted. But* Satyagraha *is more than cleverness. Secrecy takes away from its dignity.* Satyagrahis *have no reason to have secret books or secret funds. I am aware that my opinion has not found favor among many co-workers. But I have seen no reason to change it. I admit I was lukewarm before. Experience has taught me that I should have been firm.*[111]

Secrecy, open and direct negotiations, and free presses and public discussion were themes mentioned by Gandhi in *Harijan*. Each of these themes was said to relate to the larger idea of openness. On several occasions, openness was also addressed by Gandhi in *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks*.

Quite early during their talks, Gandhi wrote a letter to Jinnah that seemed to characterize his view regarding openness. Gandhi stated that he believed all parties in the conflict over partition should try to persuade and peacefully influence public opinion.[112] In another letter to Jinnah, Gandhi urged him to take a proposal Gandhi made to a Muslim Council and to give Gandhi a chance to address the Council.[113] If the Council

were to reject the offer, Gandhi proposed that the Council put the proposal "before the open session of the League."[114] The League, in this context, refers to the Muslim League, a body Gandhi believed could influence Jinnah. Gandhi believed that his proposal warranted public discussion, and he urged Jinnah to give him a chance to address the open session of the League.[115]

Gandhi was afraid that Jinnah would kill his proposal by refusing to take the proposal to the Council. He was also afraid that the Council might kill his proposal. If the council refused to accept the proposal, then Gandhi wanted the proposal to go to the Muslim League. At each step along the way, Gandhi wanted to meet for public discussion with the Council or League. Each step, as encouraged by Gandhi, was designed to widen the opportunity for open debate of Gandhi's proposal. In this example, Gandhi sought to include larger and larger groups of people who would be given an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process regarding partition. Gandhi ultimately believed the public should decide on this issue. He stated "it is the duty of the public to digest the situation and bring the pressure of their opinion upon us."[116]

Openness was manifested in Gandhi's rhetoric and is a characteristic of his nonviolent communication theory. For Gandhi, openness included communication practices such as free speech and press, public discussion, and direct negotiation. Gandhi also had a dislike for secrecy. At the root of Gandhi's openness was a desire to communicate, as well as the notion that channels of communication should remain open. He consistently and recurrently addressed the subject of openness in the literature

selected for this study. Another subject that Gandhi addressed in the literature selected for this study was flexibility; it is another strategy for accomplishing nonviolence in his communication theory.

FLEXIBILITY

Flexibility was manifested in Gandhi's willingness or desire to change, to co-create a social reality, or to yield if so persuaded by sound argument. By adopting a flexible negotiating position (the type advocated by Gandhi), persons are more likely to grow and change. Growth and change come about as humans discover, form, and refine concepts and ideas through the use of symbols.[117] Attempts to discover truth, nonviolence, and self-suffering are played out through interactions, through dialogue and through a wide variety of symbolic actions. If people practice acts and speech that are nonviolent and do so in the manner that Gandhi's precepts describe, then speech and acts take on flexible qualities. Such qualities as manifested in a conflict situation may bring about a *productive* conflict situation. Gandhi recognized the importance of flexibility in *Satyagraha*, and suggested that flexibility was important on many occasions.

Gandhi referred to himself as being similar to a scientist; he did not claim finality about his conclusions, but stated that he was far from infallible with regard to his conclusions.[118] Truths that were relative were his beacon and shield.[119] Gandhi wrote:

I never think of what I have said before. My aim is not to be consistent with my previous statements on a given question, but to be consistent with truth as it may present itself to me at a given moment. The result has been that I have grown from truth to truth.[120]

According to Gandhi, truths changed and his communication theory appears to have accommodated those changes. The indictments about the flexible nature of his views, at least from his own analyses, were easily refuted, as were the charges of inconsistency leveled at him.[121] Because truths changed, Gandhi believed that he should be "allowed to judge what is best under given circumstances"[122] and to adjust to the situation, even if the adjustment called for the lowering of demands during a *Satyagraha* campaign. After nearly thirty years of practicing *Satyagraha*, Gandhi wrote, ". . . the principles of *Satyagraha*, as I know it today constitute a gradual evolution."[123] His techniques for bringing about social change were ever changing, always in the process of becoming, and were forever between what they had been and what they would become.

Gandhi also seemed to be concerned with how the reverse of flexibility might be perceived by one's opposition. Once, when he advised religious *Satyagrahis*, Gandhi suggested they should "have equal respect and regard for the religious convictions and susceptibilities of those" who have different faiths because a narrow "outlook is likely to be reflected . . . multifold in the opponent."[124]

Several important benefits may result from a flexible communication stance, one of which is discovery. During a *Satyagraha* campaign, "dogma gives way to an open exploration of context. The objective is not to assert propositions, but to create possibilities."[125] The clash of opposing ideas is intended to bring about new circumstances in the form of "mutually satisfactory and agreed-upon solutions."[126] Adjusting one's opinions is necessary if one practices *Satyagraha*. Adjusting opinions may be accomplished by inviting others to "demonstrate the correctness of their position."[127] Gandhi spent a large part of his life refining his methods for carrying on interactions, and he increased his effectiveness over time; because of the living principles of *Satyagraha*, "it cannot be summed up in [an] inflexible set formulas."[128]

The fluid and dynamic nature of Gandhi's communication theory brought indictments of inconsistency, and he asserted that his goal was not to be consistent with previous statements, but rather that his goal was to be consistent with truths as they changed.[129] Flexibility may be considered another unit of Gandhi's nonviolent communication theory, and the flexible nature of Gandhi's theory was manifest through the publications selected for this study.

Yet another aspect of flexibility was sensitivity to opposing claims. Gandhi was a lawyer, and (very early in his career) he concluded that the true function of a lawyer was to strive toward compromise or reconciliation, rather than to exploit the law to one's advantage. He attempted to argue, negotiate, and reach compromises in a nonviolent manner, and he urged *Satyagrahis* to be sensitive to the claims of their opponents.[130]

Sensitivity to the claims of others would seem to result in possible compromises and more public discussion.

With the search for truth left open to those who want to seriously pursue it, "there will be a regeneration of public discourse."[131] During campaigns that were intended to bring about the resolution of conflict, persons should recognize that the spirit of flexibility and compromise may be beneficial to disputants.

For Gandhi, a flexible communication stance did not mean that people should freely and willingly compromise their positions. Gandhi clearly addressed those who held this mistaken view of flexibility. On one occasion, a writer asked Gandhi if nonviolent actionists should lower demands, and if so, how much? Gandhi's reply demonstrated his conviction that flexibility does not come from a position of weakness. He stated that immediate demands may be lowered in order to hasten progress toward a goal.[132] He added that the lowering of a position was not "out of weakness," but was done with an "appreciation of the local situation and the capacity . . . to cope with it."[133] In reference to a labor conflict, Gandhi further stated that in some cases, there can be no lowering if the "demand is in the lowest pitch. There is no room . . . for lowering anything."[134]

On another occasion, Gandhi referred to a conflict situation in which nonviolent actionists had decided to temporarily suspend civil disobedience. He supported the suspension, implied that the suspension may have the effect of narrowing differences, and reminded readers that "[o]ur aim must remain what it is, but we must be prepared to

negotiate for less than the whole so long as it is unmistakably of the same kind and has in it the inherent possibility of expansion."[135] Additional communication exchanges between Gandhi and others have demonstrated the same point--that lowering demands may be necessary, but such a lowering should not be done from a position of weakness, nor should the substance of the goal be compromised.

Gandhi developed the theme of flexibility in his ideas regarding the importance of preliminary conferences and bargaining, the atmosphere that may surround a conflict situation, and the effects of being flexible. In one report of an interview Gandhi had with a representative of the *Times of India*, Gandhi referred to a procedural concern for negotiating differences.[136] He said a preliminary conference, one in which representatives of constituencies could meet in order to make and consider alternative proposals, should occur so that members could "adjust their differences."[137] Preliminary conferences thus may be viewed as opportunities where rules for compromise may be established.

Gandhi also mentioned how flexibility may influence the atmosphere that surrounds a conflict situation. Lower your key, pitch your demands less high, and concentrate your energies on producing an atmosphere of non-violence, Gandhi suggested.[138] Gandhi also commented on the effects of flexibility--he stated that "I should be prepared to and actually give an ell [a British measure of 45 inches] when an inch is asked for."[139] Giving opponents more than what they asked for, implied Gandhi, could have some unusual effects. Effects of yielding the non-essential aspects of a

position may produce strange and pleasurable sensations to others and they may be confounded and "would not know what to do with me."[140]

Effects of flexibility, how flexibility may influence the atmosphere surrounding the conflict, and the procedural concern of preliminary conferences and bargaining each can be considered an important aspect of flexibility. The flexible quality of nonviolence appeared to concern some of Gandhi's critics, especially when flexibility and nonviolence were applied to governance. After all, India had been ruled for centuries by autocratic means.

Some people encouraged Gandhi to tell them what a government based on nonviolence would look like.[141] His reply was that he had "purposely refrained" from trying to specifically describe how a society based on nonviolence would appear: "I cannot say in advance what the government based wholly on non-violence will be like."[142] Gandhi's idea was that governance should be approached with the idea that flexible governing practices were desirable.

In another exchange with his readers, Gandhi personified the flexible qualities of nonviolence by stating: "I am evolving."[143] Gandhi's beliefs about the situational influences may have led him to the conclusion that civil disobedience had to evolve.[144] Gandhi believed that a *Satyagraha* campaign, led by him, would be shaped by conditions surrounding it: "What shape it will take, when it will come, I do not know. . . . I do not know how I shall lead you, what action I shall put before you."[145] The preceding statements are reflections of Gandhi's apparent ability to cope with uncertainty. He

appeared willing to begin an action without a specific plan in mind. A point to be made from the two previous selections is that, regardless of whether his views were applied to government, to a campaign, or to an individual, Gandhi's nonviolent communication theory was flexible. Some people indicted Gandhi by complaining that he was inconsistent.[146] Such complaints may have been rooted in an inability to understand the importance of flexibility.

Gandhi's belief that truths changed was demonstrated in an exchange over the interpretation of religious documents. Aligarh, a research scholar from the Muslim University, charged that Gandhi earlier had misinterpreted the *Koran.*[147] Aligarh's claims were that Muslims did not need a Hindu interpretation of the *Koran*; Muslims had been interpreting the *Koran* for thirteen centuries, and Gandhi should not indulge in his "own wishful interpretations."[148] Gandhi reasoned that scholars best of all should know that an error of interpretation that has been "handed down for generations" does not cease to be an error due to repetition.[149] Gandhi reasoned further:

> *It will be an evil day if the reading and interpreting of religious books are to be confined to those who wear particular religious labels . . . . No one has a monopoly on truth. All truth represented by imperfect humans that we are is relative.*[150]

By suggesting that even the *Koran* was open to a variety of interpretations, Gandhi implied that a flexible stance appeared more workable than an absolutist stance. Gandhi believed that truths were relative and that such an orientation was acceptable, whether interpreting a religious document or attending a meeting in which differences of opinion existed.

At one point in *Harijan*, Gandhi recalled an episode from his early days in Johannesberg in which flexibility was central:

> *I had gone to the meeting with no preconceived resolution. It was born at the meeting. The creation is still expanding. . . . Non-violence is a plant of slow growth. It grows imperceptibly but surely.*[151]

The creative possibilities of flexibility were believed to be limitless by Gandhi.[152] Time and again, in situation after situation, Gandhi's willingness to meet with other parties and to refrain from taking an absolutist position suggests that he was committed to a flexible communication stance. This does not mean that Gandhi thought his strategies were workable for all people in all situations. Rather, this may have been Gandhi's way of suggesting that co-creation of workable truths was desirable. He believed that situations influenced campaigns for change. Gandhi's flexible stance was one that encouraged change, creation, discovery, and invention. He was dedicated to the idea that situational influences surrounding interactions may stimulate the need for people to change their

minds. Gandhi sometimes told opponents that he hoped they would change his mind and samples of his rhetoric (found in *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks*) confirm this view.

Perhaps no other source better reflects Gandhi's flexibility and willingness to change than does *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks*. Partition and independence were inextricably bound, and Gandhi was seriously opposed to partition and very much in favor of independence. Yet, even though Gandhi was seriously opposed to partition, *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks* contains samples of Gandhi's rhetoric that suggests he was willing to change his mind on the question of partition.

In his correspondence with Jinnah, Gandhi began to deal with such issues as the possible creation of a provisional interim government for Pakistan.[153] If Pakistan was to be created, one question was: Who would govern Pakistan? Gandhi suggested to Jinnah that "any provisional government" that could "inspire confidence at the present moment must represent all parties."[154] He continued:

> *When that moment arrives I shall have been replaced by some authoritative person, though you will have me always at your beck and call when you have converted me, or I you, or by mutual conversion we have become one mind functioning through two bodies.*[155]

Implicit in this statement is that Gandhi was willing to change. By his admission, a provisional government, if Pakistan were created, should represent all parties. Gandhi

tacitly agreed to the possibility that Pakistan would become a reality. Gandhi also suggested he could be converted,although he held out that he still may convert Jinnah (or at least each would convert the other).

In the same correspondence, another sample of Gandhi's rhetoric suggests his flexible stance. In this correspondence, Gandhi and Jinnah dealt with questions of definition. The term they had difficulty defining in this instance was "absolute majority." The reference was to how Hindus and Muslims, in areas affected if Pakistan were created, would decide where and when Pakistan would be created. Gandhi asserted that his definition of "absolute majority" was consistent with "legal parlance," but that "you will perhaps suggest a third meaning and persuade me to accept it."[156] Gandhi repeatedly stated that his mind could be changed, even though he admitted that such changes might come only as the result of perseverance.[157]

The issues of who would decide if Pakistan were to be created, how the decision would be made, and where and when Pakistan would be created continued to be genuine concerns. Gandhi stated that "in my opinion, all people inhabiting the area ought to express their opinion specifically on this single issue of division. Adult suffrage is the best method, but I would accept another equivalent."[158] Gandhi's rhetoric suggests his willingness to be persuaded by Jinnah, as well as others. At one point, Gandhi stated, "I have . . . a suggestion. If we are bent on agreeing, as I hope we are, let us call in a third party or parties to guide or even arbitrate between us."[159] In perhaps one of the more

salient examples of Gandhi's willingness to accept change found in *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks*, Gandhi's rhetoric appears to reflect sentiments of desperation in his willingness to yield.

In a letter in which Gandhi appears bent on compromise, he proposed:

> *The wishes of the inhabitants of the areas demarcated should be ascertained through the votes of the adult population of the areas or through some equivalent method. If the vote is in favor of separation* [partition] *it shall be agreed that these areas form a separate state as soon as possible after India is free from foreign domination and can therefore be constituted into two sovereign independent States.*[160]

The compromise that suggests Gandhi's willingness to change is most clearly represented above in the phrase, "it shall be agreed that these areas form a separate state." In brief, Gandhi admitted that separate states were bound to occur and that he must begin to accept such a possibility.

Samples of Gandhi's rhetoric found in sources selected for this study consistently and recurrently deal with flexibility. A flexible negotiating stance was said to be productive in conflict situations. *Satyagrahis* were encouraged by Gandhi to have equal respect for people's divergent religious perspectives. The clash of opinions was said to create new, mutually satisfactory solutions. Gandhi's flexibility was manifested in his profession and during *Satyagraha* campaigns. Flexibility was not seen as a position of

weakness and, at the same time, was said to include the possibility of lowering or changing demands that may be called for by the situation. Gandhi recommended that interpretations of religious documents were subject to change, that meetings could begin without preconceived ideas, and Gandhi's rhetoric demonstrated the willingness to be converted.

Flexibility, along with openness, can be viewed as a consistent and recurrent theme that emerged from the sources selected for this study. Openness and flexibility thus can be considered the third and fourth theoretical units that constitute Gandhi's nonviolent communication theory.

CONCLUSIONS

Gandhi has offered us many explanations and descriptions of violent and nonviolent speech and acts and, of course, he urged us to refrain from the former. To my knowledge, no communication theorists, ancient or contemporary, specifically state that nonviolent speech and acts are central to their theories of communication. Gandhi's thoughts, life, work and his views on a nonviolent communication theory thus make a notable contribution to communication theory.

Gandhi contributes to communication theory because he predicted that from violent communications harm would result. Gandhi further contributes to communication theory by predicting that nonviolent communication contributes to the maintenance of peaceful relationships and to the enrichment of personhood. The maintenance of peaceful

relationships and enrichment of personhood has been offered as the end or goal of Gandhi's theory of nonviolent communication.

Gandhi's theory of nonviolent communication recommends means of achieving the end. Flexibility and openness were the means recommended by Gandhi. Through his thoughts, life, and work, Gandhi consistently recommended that people control their interactions and adopt a stance illustrative of flexibility and openness during communicative exchanges.

Finally, Gandhi's theory of nonviolent communication may be thought of as instrumental to the bringing about of communal harmony. Such communal harmony may be usefully thought of in any number of communication contexts ranging from intrapersonal to international and mass communication contexts. The widespread utility of his theory of nonviolent communication seems to be useful for peace educators to consider as we continue to stress the importance of nonviolence in a seemingly unlimited number of communication situations.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1 . M. K. Gandhi, *Satyagraha* (Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1951), p. 77.

2 . *Ibid.*, pp. 78-79.

3 . *Ibid.*, p. 87.

4 . *Ibid.*, p. 193.

5 . *Ibid.*, p. 194.

6 . M.K. Gandhi, *Young Indian: 1919-1922* (Triplicane, Madras: E.S. Ganesan, 1922), p. 55.

7 . *Ibid.*, p. 64.

8 . *Ibid.*, p. 623.

9 . Raghavan Iyer (gen ed.), *The Moral and Political Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), vol. 1: *Civilization, Politics and Religion*, by Mahatma Gandhi, p. 87.

10 . Gandhi, *Satyagraha*, p. 201.

11 . *Ibid.*, p. 56.

12 . Mahadev Desai, "The New Technique: My Laxity," *Harijan*, (Poona), 13 May 1939, p. 121.

13 . *Ibid.*

14 . Mahadev Desai, "The Decision and After: Cowardice Worse Than Violence," *Harijan*, (Poona), 17 June 1939, p. 166.

15 . Desai, "The New Technique: My Laxity," p. 121.

16 . *Ibid.*

17 . *Ibid.*

18 . M. K. Gandhi, "I Was Unjust Because Weak," *Harijan*, (Poona), 22 September 1940, p. 292.

19 . *Ibid.*

20 . M. K. Gandhi, "Question Box: How to Cultivate *Ahimsa*?" *Harijan*, (Poona), 21 July 1940, p. 215.

21 . M. K. Gandhi, "To the People of Rajkot," *Harijan*, (Poona), 18 March 1939, p. 53.

22 . M. K. Gandhi, "Causes," *Harijan*, (Poona), 28 October 1939, p. 320.

23 . *Ibid.*

24 . *Ibid.*

25 . *Ibid.*

26 . M.K. Gandhi, "Hindu-Muslim Unity," *Harijan*, (Poona), 7 October, 1939, p. 296.

27 . *Ibid.*

28 . M. K. Gandhi, "The Ol . Revoluationary," *Harijan*, (Poona), 30 September 1939, p. 292.

29 . *Ibid.*

30 . *Ibid.*

31 . Gandhi, *Satyagraha*, p. 342.

32 . Anima Bose, "A Gandhian Perspective on Peace." *Journal of Peace Research* 2 (1981), pp. 159-62.

33 . *Ibid.*, pp. 159-164.

34 . Jayantanuja Bandyopadhyaya, *Social and Political Thought of Gandhi* (Bombay: Allied, 1969), pp. 235-340; Guiliano Pontara, "The Rejection of Violence in Gandhian Ethics of Conflict Resolution," *Journal of Peace Research* 2 (1965): 197; Virginia L. Muller, "Orwell and Gandhi: The Future of Non-Violence," *Cogito* 1 (1983): 268.

35 . Bandyopadhyaya, pp. 235-340.

36 . *Ibid.*, pp. 341-75.

37 . Muller, p. 268.

38 . M. K. Gandhi, "Is Non-Violence Impossible?" *Harijan*, (Poona), 11 August 1940, p. 244.

39 . *Ibid.*

40 . *Ibid.*

41 . *Ibid.*

42 . *Ibid.*

43 . *Ibid.*

44 . M. K. Gandhi, "To Every Briton," *Harijan*, (Poona), 6 July 1940, p. 185.

45 . M. K. Gandhi, "There is Violence In It," *Harijan*, (Poona), 4 August 1940, p. 229.

46 . M. K. Gandhi, "Notes: A Striking Thought," *Harijan*, (Poona), 7 October 1934, p. 293.

47 . *Ibid.*

48 . M. K. Gandhi, "How to Combat Hitlerism," *Harijan*, (Poona), 22 June 1940, p. 172.

49 . *Ibid.*

50 . *Ibid.*

51 . M. K. Gandhi, "Not Yet," *Harijan*, (Poona), 1 June 1940, p. 148.

52 . M. K. Gandhi, "Conundrums," *Harijan*, (Poona), 30 September 1939, p. 288.

53 . *Ibid.*, p. 289.

54 . M. K. Gandhi, "Both Happy and Unhappy," *Harijan*, (Poona), 29 July 1940, p. 180.

55 . M.K. Ghandi, *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, Navajivan Trust* (Hereafter CWMG) (Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 1979) 70: xi.

56 . Gandhi, *CWMG*, 75: 190.

57 . *Ibid.*

58 . Gandhi, *CWMG*, 68: 81.

59 . Ved. Mehta, *Mahatma Gandhi and His Apostles* (Hammondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1983), p. 116.

60 . *Ibid.*

61 . Pyarelal, *Mahatma Gandhi: The Last Phase*, vol. 1: *Book One* (Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 1965), p. 172.

62 . M. K. Gandhi, "Requisite Qualifications," *Harijan*, (Poona), 25 March 1939, p. 64.

63 . Mahadev Desai, "Gandhi Seva Sangh," *Harijan*, (Poona), 13 May 1939, p. 119.

64 . Mahadev Desai, "Heart Searching," *Harijan*, (Poona), 6 May 1939, p. 113.

65 . M. K. Gandhi, "Gandhi's Speech at the A.I.C.C.," *Harijan*, (Poona), 29 September 1940, p. 304.

66 . *Ibid.*, p. 26.

67 . *Ibid.*

68 . *Ibid.*

69 . Desai, "Heart Searching," p. 113.

70 . Gandhi, "Question Box: How to Cultivate *Ahisma*," p. 215.

71 . *Ibid.*

72 . *Ibid.*

73 . M. K. Gandhi, "Fasting in *Satyagraha*," *Harijan*, (Poona), 13 October 1940, p. 322.

74 . *Ibid.*

75 . M. K. Gandhi, "Task Before Us," *Harijan*, (Poona), 10 February 1940, p. 444.

76 . Mahadev Desai, "Viceroy--Gandhi Correspondence," *Harijan*, (Poona), 6 October 1940, p. 314.

77 . M. K. Gandhi, "More About the Simla Visit," *Harijan*, (Poona), 13 October 1940, p. 323.

78 . *Ibid.*

79 . M.K. Gandhi, *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks* (New Delhi: The Hindustan Times, 1944), p. 38.

80 . *Ibid.*, p. 25.

81 . *Ibid.*, p. 43.

82 . *Ibid.*

83 . *Ibid.*, p. 14.

84 . *Ibid.*, p. 27.

85 . Richard L. Johannesen, "The Emerging Concept of Communication as Dialogue," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 57 (December 1971): 373-82; Johannesen, *Ethics in Human Communication*, pp. 42-56; Thomas B. Farrell, "Knowledge, Concensus, and

Rhetorical Theory," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 62 (February 1976): 1-14; Roderick P. Hart, Robert E. Carlson, and William F. Eadie, "Attitudes Toward Communication and the Assessment of Rhetorical Sensitivity," *Communication Monographs* 47 (March 1980): 1-22; Bose, "A Gandhian Perspective on Peace," pp. 159-64; Beverly Woodward, "Truth, Nonviolence, and Democracy: The Gandhian Paradign," *Humanities in Society* 6 (Winter 1983): 91-107; Arne Naess, "A Systemization of Gandhian Ethics of Conflict Resolution," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2 (No Date), pp. 140-55; Amrut Nakhre, "Meanings of Nonviolence: A Study of Satyagraha: Attitudes," *Journal of Peace Research* 13 (1976); Christopher Lyle Johnstone, "Ethics, Wisdom, and the Mission of Contemporary Rhetoric: The Realization of Human Being," *Central States Speech Journal* 32 (Fall 1981): 177-88; Joseph P. Folger and Marshall Scott Poole, *Working Through Conflicts: A Communication Perspective* (Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman, 1984): 6-7; Nathan Stoltzfus, "Gandhi for Today: Duragraha in the Light of Satyagraha," *Gandhi Marg* 73 (April 1985): 7-24.

86 . Gandhi, *Young India*, p. 971.

87 . Raghavan Iyer (gen. ed.), *The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*. 2nd edition. London: Concord Grove, 1983: 442.

88 . Gandhi, *Young India*, p. 947.

89 . *Ibid.*

90 . *Ibid.*, p. 946.

91 . *Ibid.*, p. 943.

92 . *Ibid.*, p. 897.

93 . Gandhi, *Satyagraha*, pp. 370-71.

94 . *Ibid.*, p. 380.

95 . Pyarelal, p. 35.

96 . *Ibid.*, p. 37.

97 . Gandhi, *CWMG*, 76: 407.

98 . *Ibid.*

99 . Gandhi, "More About the Simba Visit," p. 324.

100 . M. K. Gandhi, "Civil Disobedience," *Harijan*, (Poona), 20 October 1940, p. 329.

101 . *Ibid.*, p. 330.

102 . *Ibid.*

103 . M. K. Gandhi, "New Technique in Action," *Harijan*, (Poona), 10 June 1939, p. 153.

104 . *Ibid.*

105 . *Ibid.*

106 . *Ibid.*

107 . Mahadev Desai, "An Important Interview," *Harijan*, (Poona), 27 April 1940, p. 105.

108 . *Ibid.*

109 . *Ibid.*

110 . M. K. Gandhi, "Question Box: Secrecy," *Harijan*, (Poona), 13 April 1940, p. 89.

111 . *Ibid.*

112 . Gandhi, *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks*, p. 9.

113 . *Ibid.*, p. 32.

114 . *Ibid.*

115 . *Ibid.*

116 . *Ibid.*, p. 48.

117 . Henry Nelson Wieman and Otis M. Walter, "Toward an Analysis of Ethics of Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 43 (October 1957): 267.

118 . M.K. Gandhi, *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth.* Translated by Mahadev Desai. Boston: Beacon, 1957: p. viii.

119 . *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

120 . *Ibid.*

121 . *Ibid.*

122 . M. K. Gandhi, "An English Suggestion: Wanton Destruction in Bidar," *Harijan*, (Poona), 4 May 1940, p. 115.

123 . Gandhi, *Young India*, p. 11.

124 . Gandhi, *Satyagraha*, p. 203.

125 . Joan V. Bondurant, *The Conquest of Violence. The Gandhian Philosophy of* Conflict. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969: p. vii.

126 . *Ibid.*, p. 195.

127 . *Ibid.*, p. 196.

128 . Pyarelal, p. xii.

129 . Iyer, "The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi," p. 12.

130 . Beverly Woodward, "Truth, Nonviolence, and Democracy: The Gandhian Paradigm," *Humanities in Society* 6 (Winter 1983): 95.

131 . *Ibid.*

132 . M. K. Gandhi, "How Far?" *Harijan*, (Poona), 24 June 1939, p. 169.

133 . *Ibid.*

134 . *Ibid.*

135 . Gandhi, "New Technique in Action," p. 153.

136 . Mahadev Desai, "An Important Interview," *Harijan*, (Poona), 18 May 1940, p. 136.

137 . *Ibid.*

138 . Mahadev Desai, "The Decision and After: What Next?" *Harijan*, (Poona), 10 June 1939, p. 159.

139 . M.K. Gandhi, "To the Reader." *Harijan* (Poona), 10 November 1940, p. 333.

140 . *Ibid.*

141 . M. K. Gandhi, "Working of Non-Violence," *Harijan*, (Poona), 11 February 1939, p. 8.

142 . *Ibid.*

143 . M. K. Gandhi, "Non-Violence v. Violence," *Harijan*, (Poona), 8 July 1939, p. 192.

144 . M. K. Gandhi, "Civil Disobedience," *Harijan*, (Poona), 27 April 1940, p. 104.

145 . Mahadev Desai, "Gandhi's Speech at the A.I.C.C.," *Harijan*, (Poona), 29 September 1940, p. 305.

146 . Gandhi, "Conundrums," p. 288.

147 . M. K. Gandhi, "I Wonder," *Harijan*, (Poona), 29 September 1940, p. 297.

148 . *Ibid.*

149 . *Ibid.*

150 . *Ibid.*

151 . Gandhi, "Conundrums," p. 289.

152 . M. K. Gandhi, "Non-Violence of the Brave," *Harijan*, (Poona), 1 September 1940, p. 268.

153 . Gandhi, *Gandhi-Jinnah Talks*, p. 9. For a brief understanding of the interim government question, see especially Jinnah's September 11, 1944 letter to Gandhi, and Gandhi's September 14, 1944 letter to Jinnah.

154 . *Ibid.*

155 . *Ibid.*

156 . *Ibid.*

157 . *Ibid.*, p. 19.

158 . *Ibid.*, p. 22.

159 . *Ibid.*

160 . *Ibid.*, p. 26. While I believe the previous sample of Gandhi's rhetoric does indicate flexibility, there are two additional points worth noting. First, Gandhi agreed to separate states, but he did not agree to the creation of Pakistan. Second, he may have proposed adult suffrage knowing such a proposal was unacceptable to Jinnah.