The Power of Nonviolence

The Power of Nonviolence, written by Richard Gregg in 1934 and revised in 1944 and 1959, is the most important and influential theory of principled or integral nonviolence published in the twentieth century. Drawing on Gandhi’s ideas and practice, Gregg explains in detail how the organized power of nonviolence (power-with) exercised against violent opponents can bring about small and large transformative social change and provide an effective substitute for war.

This edition includes a major introduction by political theorist, James Tully, situating the text in its contexts from the 1920s to 1960s, and showing its great relevance today.

The text is the definitive 1959 edition with a foreword by Martin Luther King Jr. It includes forewords from earlier editions, the chapter on class struggle and nonviolent resistance from 1934, a crucial excerpt from a 1929 preliminary study, a chronology and bibliography of Gregg, and a bibliography of recent work on nonviolence.

Richard Gregg was a Harvard-educated lawyer who practiced law on the side of labor in the great rail workers’ labor strikes in the USA from 1916 to 1922. He moved to India and lived and worked with Gandhi from 1925 to 1929. He returned to the US and wrote several books on Gandhi’s practice of nonviolence in campaigns and Gandhi’s alternative, community-based economics (now called ecological economics). He became the leading theorist of Gandhian nonviolence and economics in North America, UK, Europe, and India from the 1930s until 1970. The Power of Nonviolence was used as a manual for nonviolent campaigns in the civil rights movements, and Gregg had a huge influence on Martin Luther King Jr. This work is considered one of the most important books on the theory and practice of nonviolence in the world.

James Tully is Professor Emeritus at the University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada. His works include Locke in Contexts: An Approach to Political Philosophy (1992), Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity (1995), Public Philosophy in a New Key (2 volumes, 2008), On Global Citizenship: James Tully in Dialogue (2014), and Nichols and Singh, eds.,
Freedom and Democracy in an Imperial Context: Dialogue with James Tully (2014). He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, Emeritus Fellow of the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation, and recipient of both the Killam Prize in the Humanities (2012) and the C. B. MacPherson Prize for Public Philosophy in a New Key. He was co-editor of the Cambridge University Press series Ideas in Context for twenty years.
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Chronology

This is based on the Richard Gregg website constructed by John Wooding (2017). I am deeply indebted to the scholarship of Kip Kosek, Janelle Bourgeois, and John Wooding for the biography and introduction. See Kosek, 2005, 2009; Bourgeois and Wooding, 2016; and Wooding, forthcoming.

1. Early Years: Experiencing and Rejecting Industrial Capitalism

1885 Born in Colorado Springs to James and Mary Gregg.
1903 Moves to Boston to commence undergraduate studies at Harvard.
1907 Graduates from Harvard University, science and mathematics. Teaches high-school mathematics and science at the Milton Academy, Milton, Massachusetts.
1908 Enters Harvard Law School.
1911–1913 Works at law office of Gaston, Snow & Saltonstall in Boston, MA.
1913 Visits India for first time with brother-in-law Albert Farwell Bemis. Sees India through Western eyes as less developed.
1914 Practices law with Warner, Warner & Stackpole in Boston, but decides it is not for him.
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1916 Secures a labor management position in the new firm of Robert G. Valentine and Orway Tead in Chicago; experts in personnel management and industrial psychology.

1917 Moves to Washington and the US Shipping Board when the US enters WWI, and works on the dispute between ship-owners and seamen and longshoremen.

1918 Accepts a position with the National War Labor Board (NWL). During the Bethlehem Steel strike Gregg is the examiner in charge. He writes “Ways in Which Bethlehem Steel Company is Derelict in this Award.”


1921 Accepts a job in the Railway Department Employees Union, an amalgam of unions of members who built and maintained the nations’ trains.

1921–1922 Nationwide railway strikes and violent repression involving over 400,000 workers. Gregg travels across the US in support of strikers. Railway workers are forced to capitulate.

1922 Disillusioned by war as means to settle conflicts, the violence of industrial capitalism, and the repression of the labor movement, Gregg becomes a farmhand in Phillips, Wisconsin, and takes courses on agriculture at University of Wisconsin at Madison.

1924 Writes to Gandhi. Gandhi was in jail. C. F. Andrews replies and invites Gregg to come to Gandhi’s ashram at Sabarmati. Writes letter to his family explaining his rejection of violence and industrial capitalism and reasons for moving to India.

2. India: Gandhian Satyagraha, Economics, and Constructive Programs

1925 Sails for India, January 1.

1925–1929 Lives and works with Gandhi in his ashram at Sabarmati, along with C. F. Andrews, Maganlal Gandhi (Gandhi’s
nephew), and Mirabehn (Madeline Slade). Teaches and writes on earth sciences, Gandhian technology, economics, agriculture, and nonviolence at schools Gandhi recommends; engages in farming and spinning programs (Khaddar) in the villages. Meets Rabindranath Tagore, G. Ramachandran, Jawahamal Nehru, Samuel Evans Stokes, and Rajendra Prasad. Teaches for Stokes at his school for three years.

1926 Publishes text on the craft of spinning cloth with Maganlal Gandhi, *The Takli Teacher*, and *A Preparation for Science*, explaining the value of Gandhi’s handicraft and agricultural technology.

Begins correspondence with W. E. B. Du Bois on the use of nonviolence and Gandhian economics in anticolonial, labor, and African American struggles against racism and inequality (see Kosek, 2005).

1928 Publishes *The Economics of Khaddar*, his first explanation of Gandhian nonviolent economics and its superiority to industrial capitalism.

Returns to the USA and lives with his sister in Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts.

1929 Marries Nonie Davies Tupper, an interior designer, on April 14 in New York City.

1929–1930 Publishes *The Psychology and Strategy of Gandhi’s Nonviolent Resistance* and *Gandhiji’s Satyagraha*.

1930 Visits India with Nonie, reunites with Gandhi and the Salt march. Returns to US and lives at Nonie’s studio on Boylston Street, Boston.

1931 Publishes *Gandhiism and Socialism* in India in defense of Gandhian economics.

1932 Publishes *Gandhiism and Socialism* as *Gandhiism versus Socialism* in the United States.


1936 Takes job at Pendle Hill Quaker retreat and study center in Pennsylvania to serve as Acting Director.

1936 Publishes *The Value of Voluntary Simplicity*.
In July visits the United Kingdom and the Peace Pledge Union (PPU) at the request of Dick Sheppard, who had founded the PPU. In UK he becomes friends with Aldous Huxley and Gerald Heard. Publishes Training for Peace, introduced by Huxley. Huxley recommends Power of Nonviolence in Ends and Means (Huxley, 1937b, pp. 139, 151).

1937 Gandhi publishes “What is Khadi Science?” in praise of Gregg’s Economics of Khaddar (Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi [CWMG], 70, pp. 288–90).

1938 Publishes “Non-Violence the Only Way.”

1939 Publishes Pacifist Program in Time of War, Threatened War or Fascism and “Gandhiji as a Social Scientist and Social Inventor.”

1939–1966 Gregg’s books and pamphlets are promoted by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the War Resister’s League, Congress of Racial Equality, Peace Pledge Union, and Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, among others.

1940 Gregg’s (1938) letter to Gandhi explaining his research plans “to try to get the Western world to realize the validity and practicalness of your entire programme” is published in Harijan: “Non-violence and Khadi.”

3. Nonviolent Direct Action and Voluntary Simplicity in the West

1941–1942 Gregg and Nonie sell house in Natick. Gregg works as a farmhand and apprentice in six-week course learning biodynamic, ecologically sustainable farming and gardening at Kimberton Farm, PA. Meets Evelyn Speiden, who would become his co-author and, much later, his second wife. Publishes A Discipline for Nonviolence, foreworded by Gandhi.

1942 Robert Swann, founder of the Committee on Non Violent Action and the Schumacher Center for a New Economics, meets Gregg at a workshop; it is his “first real contact with
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the intellectual ideas behind nonviolence.” They corre-
spond on nonviolence and organic farming (Swann, 2001).

1942–1943 Works at the dairy farm of a friend in west central
Vermont.

1942–1946 Participates in the School for NonViolence in Big Flats, New
York, a camp for conscientious objectors during WWII.

1944 Publishes second edition of PNV, introduction by Rufus
M. Jones.

Takes a position teaching mathematics in Putney,
Vermont, in order to care for his ill wife. Publishes
Primer of Companion Planting: Herbs, their Part in Good
Gardening, with Evelyn Speiden. Nonie’s health deterior-
ating (dementia).

1946 Resigns from position in Putney to care for his wife.

1947 Publishes “The Validity of Indian Handicrafts in this
Industrial Era.”

Last correspondence with Gandhi (November 11), on
the violence after India’s independence: “A Psychological
Explanation” (CWMG, 97, pp. 277–99).

moves to the cooperative, organic farm of Helen and Scott
Nearing in Jamaica, VT.

1948 Gandhi assassinated January 30. Gregg writes “My
Memories of Gandhi” years later (n. d.).

1949–1950 Visits India for six weeks and attends World Pacifist
Conference.

1951 Publishes Indian edition of PNV 1944 with new introduction.

1952 Publishes Which Way Lies Hope? An Examination of
Capitalism, Communism, Socialism, and Gandhi’s Program.


1956 Leaves the Jamaica, Vermont farm and marries Evelyn
Speiden.

Publishes Compass for Civilization.

1956–1958 Teaches Gandhian ecological economics in south India at
an education center for social workers that is the school of
G. Ramachandran to train young Indians to carry on
Gandhi’s program. (Gregg met Ramachandran in 1925 at
the school of Rabindranath Tagore.)

1956 Begins correspondence with Martin Luther King Jr., who was given a copy of PNV 1944 by Glenn Smiley.

1958 Returns to his home in Chester, New York. Publishes A Philosophy of Indian Economic Development, his most comprehensive account of Gandhian ecological economics.

Offers to help King have his “Stride toward Freedom” published in India (October 27). King thanks Gregg for his assistance, for sending A Philosophy of Indian Economic Development, and asks for assistance in planning his India trip (December 18).

1959 Meets King in February at War Resister’s League annual dinner.

King’s speech paraphrases some of Gregg’s arguments in PNV. King leaves for India with a list of people to visit provided by Gregg.¹

July 22–24, leads discussion group at King’s First Southwide Institute on Nonviolent Resistance to Segregation at Spelman College, Atlanta, Georgia (King, 1959).

Publishes third edition of PNV, foreword by Martin Luther King Jr. (called the second revised edition).

1960 October 14–16, teaches nonviolence workshop with King at the SNCC conference on “Nonviolence and the Achievement of Desegregation,” Atlanta, Georgia (King, 1960) www.crmvet.org/docs/6010_sncc_conf_agenda.pdf


Participates in the nonviolent protest at Polaris Action in Groton, CT against nuclear weapons.

1963 Publishes The Big Idol on decentralized currencies.

5. Last Years

1964 Moves to McMinville, Oregon, as his health begins to decline due to Parkinson’s disease. Publishes “The Best Solver of Conflicts” and “Satyagraha as a Mirror.”

¹ For the influence of Gregg’s PNV on King, see Miller, 1998, pp. 88–100.
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       First Schocken Press edition of PNV.
       Publishes *Companion Plants and How to Use Them* with Helen Philbrick.

1968  Moves to a retirement community, Cascade Manor, Eugene, Oregon. Publishes “A Possible Aid to Satyagrahis.”

1969  It is suggested that Gregg presents his article “Gandhi as a Social Scientist and Social Inventor” at the Gandhi Centenary Conference on Science, Education, and Nonviolence, October 11–17, 1969, at the Gujarat Vidyapith University, founded by Gandhi in 1920.

1974  Dies January 27.
The Works of Richard Gregg

Richard Gregg is the author of sixty-six works in 339 publications and seven languages. The Power of Nonviolence has been published in 121 editions in the period 1934–2013, and in five languages (www.worldcat.org/identities/lccn-n50-31468/).


Gregg, 1926b, with Maganlal K. Gandhi. The Takli Teacher (Ahmedabad: All India Spinner’s Association). CWMG 35.


Works of Richard Gregg

Gregg, 1930d. Gandhiji’s *Satyagraha or Non-violent Resistance* (Madras: S. Ganesan).
Gregg, 1933. “An American on Spiritual Fasts,” *Harijan* (December 8).
Gregg, 1939a. *Pacifist Program in Time of War, Threatened War or Fascism*, Pendle Hill Pamphlet 5 (April). https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.8b156699;view=1up;seq=6
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Gregg and Martin Luther King Jr. Correspondence. http://kingencyclopedia.stanford.edu/primarydocuments/
Editor’s Introduction

Integral Nonviolence

Richard Gregg’s *The Power of Nonviolence* (PNV) is one of the most important and influential texts in the history of nonviolence. It is even more important today, as many aspects of Gregg’s philosophy have stood the test of practice and time. It is a classic.

Although PNV has been published several times, it has never been issued with an introduction that situates it in the contexts in which it was written and received. Yet, if it is read without this broader context, the reader will be “left hanging in mid-air” and fail to understand its full significance. The reason for this is that PNV explicates only some, crucially important branches of nonviolence as Mohandas Gandhi and Gregg understand it:

War is an inherent, inevitable and essential element of the civilization in which we live. Our aim can be nothing short of building an entirely new civilization in which domination and violence of all kinds play a small and steadily decreasing part. We must change nonviolently and deeply the motives, functions, and institutions of our whole culture.

Footnote references to PNV are to pages in this edition. References to PNV 1934, PNV 1944, and to Gregg plus date are located in “The Works of Richard Gregg” above. Other author-date references are located in the “Bibliography” below.

1 Gregg, 1953, p. 9. (Compare PNV 196, Gregg, 1937, pp. 1–3). He sketches various branches of a nonviolent civilization, not in any “dogmatic spirit,” but “just as an anvil upon which others can hammer out their own ideas.”
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Editor's Introduction

The first step toward such a society is the development of people capable of making such changes, and this I have discussed at length in my book, *The Power of Nonviolence*. But to say no more than that would leave most people hanging in mid-air. Most of us want to know, also, what kind of outer world such people would try to create. For Gandhi and Gregg, nonviolence is a multifaceted alternative way of life, civilization, or “countermodernity” composed of many interrelated and interdependent branches, analogous to a living banyan tree in its biotic community.²

Accordingly, the aim of this introduction is to sketch the other main branches, as Gregg explicates them in other writings, so readers can see PNV as the crucial first step in creating and sustaining a nonviolent civilization. The “Chronology” above describes the major steps and contexts in Gregg’s journey to a life of nonviolence, while “The Works of Richard Gregg,” which follows, lists his writings on each branch. These should be read alongside this introduction.³ The first section provides a preliminary synopsis of the broader context of realizing a nonviolent world in the midst of a world of violence and domination. The sections that follow explore the ways PNV and other nonviolent branches work together to bring about this transformation.

Synopsis

The power of nonviolence, or *satyagraha*, is the intersubjective power of interacting “with and for each other” in cooperative ways in interdependent relationships with oneself (ethics), other humans, all life forms, and the spiritual dimension of existence. It is “power-with”: the type of power that animates and sustains all branches of a nonviolent way of life.⁴ An “entirely new civilization” is brought into being by people developing and exercising the capabilities to use the power of nonviolence with each other in and among the various branches of modern societies.⁵ In learning how to connect with, trust, exercise and be

² Gandhi, 1919a, pp. 443–44. Kosek calls Gregg’s “new civilization” a “countermodernity” (Kosek, 2005, p. 134b).
³ See above, x–xx.
⁴ The terms “power-with” to designate nonviolent power and “power-over” to designate violent and dominative power were introduced by Mary P. Follett (Follett, 1924). Gregg refers to her work in all PNV editions.
⁵ PNV 194, 196–200. Gregg’s description is very similar to the editor of Gandhi 1961a (Kumarappa 1961, p. v).
empowered by this “persuasive” form of power, humans participate in “spiritual unity” or anima mundi; the more general form of power—with that animates and sustains all interdependent life on earth.\(^6\)

In contrast, violence and domination are the general type of power exercised in violent conflicts and unequal relationships of domination and subordination that are imposed and backed up by force, or the threat of force, and various types of legitimation. It is “power-over” in its many forms.\(^7\) It is based on the false presupposition that humans are basically independent, insecure, and incapable of organization and dispute resolution without the exercise of violence and domination by a ruler. The violence and domination, and the exploitation it makes possible, give rise to increasing cycles of violent resistance, counter-violence and domination. These cycles are justified by the assumption that violent and dominating methods (wars or revolutions) can bring about peaceful and nondominating ends. But this is a false view of the relation between means and ends. The vicious cycles continue because means are autotelic: “the nature of the end reached in any endeavor is determined by the character of the means used to reach it.”\(^8\) Nonviolent cooperation is the only way to a peaceful and democratic world.

PNV is Gregg’s explication of how to develop and exercise the capabilities humans have to exercise the persuasive power of nonviolence in all relationships and branches. However, the central focus of the book is on the branch and subbranches that deal with the “greatest and most difficult human problem, that of violence and the handling of conflicts.”\(^9\) The solution is to learn how to exercise the ability to engage in conflicts nonviolently and resolve them by working up uncoerced relationships of cooperation together. Gregg shows how Gandhi developed a way of nonviolent contestation oriented to cooperation that can be used successfully in engagement with violent, as well as nonviolent, opponents. This way of nonviolent training, contestation (what Gregg calls moral jiu-jitsu), and cooperation (integration) has the capacity to transform and replace the systems of violent conflicts and dominantive

---
\(^6\) PNV Chapter 10. Compare Gregg, 1934d, pp. 403–09, PNV 1934, pp. 217, 287, and below, lvi. In Gregg’s generation in the West, this scientific view of humans as participatory members of the living earth was associated with Alexander von Humboldt and John Muir. See Worster, 1994, Wulf, 2015.

\(^7\) PNV 117, 156–60.


\(^9\) Gregg, 1948, p. 12.
relationships. This unique mode of contestation, resolution, and transformation of violent opponents and social systems is not simply war without violent weapons (unarmed resistance), but a different game altogether: nonviolent agonistics.

The problem of finding a “substitute” for war and violent revolution is the central challenge addressed to nonviolent movements of the twentieth century. Gregg concludes the central argument of PNV by stating that he has shown a substitute for both exists and that it works; whereas they produce cycles of increasing violence and domination.

Gregg argues that nonviolent contestation and cooperation can transform, reduce, and replace violence and domination only if the power of nonviolence is also cultivated in other branches of society and coordinated with practices of contestation. These branches are the “constructive programs” for and of a nonviolent civilization. Their participants create grassroots nonviolent lifeways within, around, and against the dominant institutions of modern civilization in ethics, the practices of everyday life, self-government, economics, technology, ecology, health and well-being, and education. By coordinating contestation and constructive programs, a peaceful and democratic world is brought into being by peaceful and democratic means. Given the autotelic relation between means and ends, this is the only way it can be achieved – by being the change.

Many forms of violent and nonviolent power relations exist in every society and criss-cross in complex ways. Internal reform alone is ineffective because violent power-over is “an inherent element” in almost every branch of modern civilization, shaping the “motives, functions and institutions,” as well as the values, assumptions, and forms of subjectivity of moderns. From within the prevailing mindset, nonviolent power is overlooked or perceived as subordinate, relegated to subaltern value spheres, dissimulated to gain power-over, and ridiculed as the soft power of the weak. It becomes difficult to see that the overlooked and misrepresented social and biological relationships of being-with, power-with, and cooperating-with are the background conditions that sustain all forms of life, and that the “civilization in which we live” parasitically depends on and destroys them.

Thus, to see the human condition from the nonviolent perspective and test its validity, it is necessary to move around and begin to be the change by participating in and experimenting with nonviolent constructive and...
agonistic ways of living and the corresponding ways of knowing these practices disclose to participants.\textsuperscript{14} Gandhi first sketched out this broader context of nonviolence as a way of life in \textit{Hind Swaraj} (1909) and Gregg in \textit{Gandhiji’s Satyagraha} (1930). Gregg argues that transformative social change by integrated small steps and tipping points is similar to the way all life systems regenerate and change.\textsuperscript{15}

**Editions of PNV**

Gregg wrote two preliminary studies and three different editions of PNV. \textit{The Psychology and Strategy of Gandhi’s Nonviolent Resistance} (1929) is an early version of what became Chapters 2–7 of the three editions of PNV. Gregg sent it to Gandhi on his sixty-first birthday with love.\textsuperscript{16} The materials and their arrangement differ somewhat in all three editions of PNV and the analysis is “longer, more exploratory, and more comprehensive.”\textsuperscript{17} Yet, \textit{Psychology and Strategy} contains the first formulations of several of his great insights and many sources are quoted fully in it that are deleted or relegated to endnote references in later editions. \textit{Gandhiji’s Satyagraha} (1930) is his longest and most comprehensive work. Almost all the branches of nonviolence as a way of life are discussed in eighteen chapters and five hundred pages. It is a compendium of preliminary studies for his later works. After 1930 he treats the different branches of nonviolence in separate books and articles.

The first edition of PNV in 1934 is the longest of the three editions, at sixteen chapters and three hundred pages. It expands the material from \textit{Psychology and Strategy} and draws material from \textit{Gandhiji’s Satyagraha} to create an integrated philosophy of “nonviolent resistance” in his broad sense of this phrase as the translation of “satyagraha.”\textsuperscript{18} It rapidly became the leading theory and manual of nonviolent action.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{14} Gregg explains that this is how he underwent the change to nonviolence; by moving to India and living and working with Gandhi (Gregg, 1948). For the best scholarship on this and other aspects of Gregg’s writings in context, see Kosek, 2005, 2009.

\textsuperscript{15} PNV 143–47. Compare Gregg, 1930d, pp. 388–410.

\textsuperscript{16} Gregg, 1929, Preface, no page number.

\textsuperscript{17} Barker in Gregg, 1929 [1972], pp. 10–11.

\textsuperscript{18} Gandhi and Gregg use “satyagraha” and “nonviolent resistance” interchangeably and in both a narrow (civil resistance) and broad (nonviolent way of life) sense. By the early 1940s both terms had taken on a wide range of contested meanings. See Paullin, 1944 and Schock, 2015, pp. 24–27.

\textsuperscript{19} Case, 1972 [1923], Ligt, 1989 [1937], and Shridharani, 1972 [1939] are the other major texts of the period.
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As a result of his experience with nonviolent movements during World War II, Gregg realized he needed to rewrite PNV 1934. World War II “created such confused thoughts and feelings, and raised problems which are so universal, so important, so difficult, and so insistent that it has seemed desirable to issue a new edition which will discuss the chief of these new problems.”20 He cut eight chapters from the first edition and added three new ones to the second (PNV 1944).21 He worked on the new chapters on training, discipline, and persuasion in his correspondence with Gandhi, two pamphlets on nonviolent war resistance, and The Discipline for Nonviolence (DFNV 1941).22 These new chapters mark the turn to the importance of training and constructive programs as the basis of successful nonviolent change, and to his life systems’ account of nonviolent social change. This edition was widely circulated as a philosophy of and training manual for nonviolence in the civil rights and African American movement of the 1950s.

The third, or “second revised,” edition of PNV was first published in 1959 in response to the new context of a much wider range of examples of nonviolent resistance, wars of mass destruction, possible nuclear annihilation, and escalating environmental destruction.23 This edition is republished here because it is Gregg’s final and most refined account of the power of nonviolence.

The chapters of PNV 1934 that were cut in 1944 and the chapters in Gandhi’s Satyagraha that were not included in PNV 1934 are important for a full picture of Gregg’s intellectual development. However, they do not have the crucial features Gregg introduced in 1944 and refined in 1959. All his prefaces, Gandhi’s foreword to DFNV, Rufus Jones’ foreword to PNV 1944, and Martin Luther King Jr.’s foreword to PNV 1959 are included because they throw significant light on the context of each edition. Gregg regretted having to cut the important chapter on class struggle and nonviolent resistance in 1944 and 1959, so it is included in this edition (as Chapter 8). Two paragraphs in Psychology and Strategy that help explain why he compares nonviolent contestation and transformation to moral jiu-jitsu are also included. Gregg’s moral jiu-jitsu has

---

20 PNV 12. 21 See 1944 Preface for the list of cut chapters (PNV 12).
22 See Gregg, 1937, 1938c, 1939a, and 1941.
23 See PNV 16. Resource depletion, environmental destruction, and biological suicide of modern industrial civilization is a central concern of Gregg’s in Gregg, 1930d, 1934, 1952, 1958.
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been interpreted in many different ways. These passages and their context enable readers to recover Gregg’s understanding of it.\textsuperscript{24}

**Influences: Gandhi, Gregg, and King**

The largest influence on Gregg was Gandhi and the many people he met through Gandhi. In 1930 he wrote:\textsuperscript{25}

> I want to express my gratitude especially to Mr. Gandhi, but also to all the other Indian friends, too numerous to name here, who so illuminatingly discussed these matters with me. There are also countless unknown, humble, poor, illiterate, Indian villagers whose attitude and action, all unknown to them, influenced me deeply.

Gregg’s writings cannot be fully appreciated apart from this transformative and generative experience. He researched and wrote the two preliminary studies of nonviolence while living and working closely with Gandhi in his Sabarmati ashram and teaching in Indian villages for four years (1925–1929). He returned to India (1930), corresponded extensively with Gandhi during the writing of the next two editions, and returned to teach after Gandhi’s death (1956–1958). Gandhi wrote the Preface to Gregg’s DFNV (1941), published his articles in Harijan, and recommended his writings. Gregg knew Gandhi better than any American except Louis Fischer, and they were close friends for twenty years.\textsuperscript{26}

Gregg states that his main task in writing PNV is to “restate and explain” Gandhi’s method of nonviolence “in modern Western concepts and terminology.” Translation is necessary because Gandhi’s explanations of nonviolence come out of “a background of thought, feeling and attitude of life very different from ours,” so they “fail to carry weight for most of us” in the West.\textsuperscript{27} The text is thus an exercise in transcivilizational understanding by a Western author immersed in Indian and Gandhian lifeways.\textsuperscript{28} His further task is to “explain and evaluate” the “principle” of nonviolence Gandhi discovered and practiced in India “in its application in any country, at any time, under any circumstances, and for any purposes.” He carries out these two tasks by drawing on an astonishing range of sources in “psychology, military and political strategy, political theory, economics, physiology, biology, ethics, penology, \textsuperscript{24} PNV 50–51. \textsuperscript{25} Gregg, 1930d, p. xii. \textsuperscript{26} See Gregg, 1948. \textsuperscript{27} PNV 16. \textsuperscript{28} Gregg, 1948, p. 23.
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and education.29 These Western sources enable readers to take intermediate steps from their familiar worldview to an understanding and appreciation of Gandhi’s satyagraha. Hence, the text is also a transnational or global guide to how Gandhian nonviolence can be employed in any context.30

PNV 1934 and 1944 and Gregg’s pamphlets became immensely influential throughout India, the United Kingdom, Europe, and the United States.31 Aldous Huxley and the Peace Pledge Union promoted them.32 In the United States, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, War Resisters League, Congress of Racial Equality, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee promoted them.33 This led to Gregg’s relationship with Martin Luther King Jr. King read PNV 1944 in 1956, recommended it, corresponded and met with Gregg, traveled to India on Gregg’s advice, wrote the Preface to the 1959 edition, and participated with Gregg in workshops on nonviolence in 1960.34 Gregg included Montgomery in his examples of nonviolent campaigns in the 1959 edition.

Thus, although Gandhi was well known and studied in America from the 1920s onward, and while King drew on many sources for his philosophy and practice of nonviolence, Gregg nevertheless provides a connection between Gandhi and King. Given the personal contact and praise both expressed for Gregg’s work, it is plausible to suggest that PNV connects the philosophies and practices of Gandhi and King in a pluralistic Gandhi–Gregg–King tradition of nonviolence. This now worldwide grassroots tradition of nonviolence as an ongoing way of life is standardly called “principled” or ethical nonviolence, and contrasted with nonmoral, “pragmatic” nonviolence as an episodic technique.35

29 PNV 11. 30 PNV 16.
32 Huxley introduced Gregg, 1937 and recommended PNV in Ends and Means: “The thing that makes for peace above all others is the systematic practice in all human relationships of nonviolence. For full and recent discussion of the subject the reader is referred to Richard Gregg’s book, The Power of Nonviolence” (Huxley, 1937b, pp. 138–39).
34 After reading PNV, King wrote to Gregg: “I don’t know when I have read anything that has given the idea of non-violence a more realistic and deepful interpretation. I assure you that it will be a lasting influence in my life” (King, 1966).
A Nonviolent Way of Life is Like a Banyan Tree

Nonviolent training, contestation, and transformation comprise one branch of a nonviolent way of life. “Satyagraha,” Gandhi writes, “is like a banyan tree with innumerable interrelated branches. Civil disobedience is one such branch, satya (truth) and ahimsa (nonviolence) together make the parent trunk from which innumerable branches shoot out.”

Gregg refers to these interrelated branches in PNV and discusses them in other writings. The “parent trunk” is nonviolent ethics manifest in the ethos or conduct of a nonviolent actor (satyagrahi). It is the actualization of the power of nonviolence in human life. Gandhi refers to it as “swaraj” (self-governance) in its primacy sense: the governance of the conduct of oneself by oneself in all relationships with others in all branches.

A central branch is “swaraj” in its second sense. This is participation in “constructive programs”: collective self-government in nonviolent communities of participatory democracy and nonviolent dispute resolution. Democratic swaraj begins in everyday activities, ashrams, cooperatives, community-based organizations, and villages. It scales out in concentric circles or networks of delegated representation to global swaraj federalism from below (purna or “integrated” swaraj). Participatory democracy is the people exercising the power of nonviolence with each other. These forms of participatory self-government are grounded in communities of various scales that are also economically self-reliant (swadeshi). Ecologically and socially sustainable economic self-reliance in turn is dependent on regenerative or cyclical resource use, human-scale, green technology, handicrafts, and waste recycling. The nonviolent ethical norm of the relationships of members of these communities to each other and the earth is sarvodaya: working and governing with each other and for the health and well-being of each other, the community as a whole, and the ecosystems on which they depend. Sarvodaya goes along with nonattachment to possessions and ends, and attachment to means.

Another complementary branch is public education integrated
with the branches it studies and for which it prepares students (*Nai Talim*). The branch that is immediately available to everyone is to live lives of nonviolent, ethical “voluntary simplicity” in appropriate ways in the relationships one inhabits in modern civilization here and now. These branches comprise the basic constructive programs of a nonviolent civilization.

Gregg lived, worked, and taught in nonviolent communities of practice in India and the United States. He wrote more books and articles on these than on nonviolent agonistics, and he is well known in the fields and movements of alternative economics, human-scale technology, and local self-government. *Economics of Khaddar, Gandhism versus Socialism, Which Way Lies Hope?, A Philosophy of Indian Economic Development,* and “The Validity of Indian Handicrafts” provide a comprehensive account of these constructive programs and their superiority to modern industrial civilization in its capitalist and communist varieties. His pamphlet, *The Value of Voluntary Simplicity,* presents the health, well-being, moral, intellectual, and spiritual benefits of nonviolent ways of life in contrast to the lives of competitive display and consumption that modern industrial civilization promotes and depends upon for its wasteful and destructive linear development. Drawing on Henry David Thoreau and others, this pamphlet brought the phrase “voluntary simplicity” into widespread use. It can be lived within capitalist modernity without constructive communities, yet both together are preferable. Finally, constructive programs exist within the broader communication and circulation networks of people, ideas, practices, technologies, and partnerships among constructive program citizens, citizens reforming modern institutions from within, and other social movements for change.

This integration of nonviolent agonistics (satyagraha) and constructive programs (swaraj) into a nonviolent way of life is the solution to two main problems encountered by ethical nonviolent movements. The first is that nonviolent actors tend to lack the self-discipline to be resolutely nonviolent in response to violent opponents. They tend to get caught up in anger and counter-aggression. Gandhi addressed this

41 Gandhi, 1962, pp. 84–97. This is how Gregg taught in India.
42 See Chronology and Works of Richard Gregg above.
43 Gregg, 1936.
problem in the 1919 article in which he introduced the banyan tree conception:44

We have found by bitter experience that whilst in an atmosphere of lawlessness, civil disobedience found ready acceptance. Satya and ahimsa, from which alone civil disobedience can worthily spring, have commanded little or no respect. Ours then is a Herculean task . . . We must fearlessly spread the doctrine of satya and ahimsa and then, and not till then, shall we be able to undertake mass satyagraha.

The second, related problem is that nonviolent contestation does not appear to persuade and convert violent opponents and their supporters to nonviolence immediately. These two problems and the criticisms they raise threatened to undermine the ethical nonviolent tradition.45

In “Non-Violence the Only Way” (December 1938) and another letter (April 1940) that Gandhi published as “Non-Violence and Khadi” (June 1940), Gregg took up this Herculean task and informed Gandhi that he was working on these two problems of “discipline for non-violence and non-violent persuasion and conversion.”46 His solution to the first problem is to argue that self-discipline in nonviolent campaigns depends on participation and training in constructive programs. This thesis is set out in DFNV (1941).

Participation in constructive programs generates an ethos of nonviolent self-discipline and concern for others that grounds resolute and effective nonviolent agonistics and civil defense. Participants acquire training equivalent yet superior to military training by means of integrated mental and manual work (handicrafts and agriculture), democratic cooperation, human-scale technology, sarvodaya, meditation, and other features of constructive programs. Participation creates a fourfold disciplined nonviolent ethos of the physical body, emotions, mind and spirit working together.47 It consists of the nonviolent dispositional virtues of courage, endurance, patience, self-reliance and mutual reliance, equanimity, poise, patience, love of truth, and cooperative, creative energy needed to sustain nonviolence in the face of violence and gain the respect

---

44 Gandhi, 1919a, cited above at notes 2 and 6.
45 See below, lv–lvii for the second problem. For these criticisms, see Martin, 2005a, Weber, 2007, Scalmer, 2011.
46 Gregg, 1938c, 1940, and Gandhi, 1940b, which includes Gregg’s 1940 letter.
47 Gregg, 1941, p. 33.
Members experience and identify with the interdependent self beyond the modern ego-self: the spiritual, biological, and social unity of all life in relationships of co-dependency and cooperation. “All these activities together,” he concludes, “provide a greater variety, engage a wider range of human faculties and potentialities, reach deeper and loftier levels of being, and are more mutually consistent than are military exercises and military discipline.”

The branches of constructive programs and voluntary simplicity also support nonviolent contestation branches in other ways. They are activities of noncooperation with the dominant institutions and the exercise of human capacities in constructing nonviolent, cooperative institutions. This is why “the spinning wheel is the symbol par excellence of nonviolence.” This double movement quietly weakens the dominant institutions and shows that another civilization is not only possible, but actual. Constructive programs manifest a better way of life for all to see. Gregg learned in the strikes of the early 1920s that people are unlikely to be persuaded to contest an unjust system on which they depend if there is no viable alternative. They are persuasive because they manifest sharing ways of life (sarvodaya) familiar to many people within family life, friendships, volunteer organizations, and spiritual traditions. They are safe havens for nonviolent activists to return to and regenerate their strength, health, spirits, and solidarity after suffering violent attacks in campaigns and prison time. They are also learning experiments in nonviolent arts of living, working, and settling disputes with people of different genders, religions, races, classes, and languages.

Hence, constructive programs are the support system of nonviolent agonistics. This is why Gregg recommends them as training for nonviolent contestation to W. E. B. Du Bois and King, sends them his books on Gandhian economics, and concludes PNV by recommending them. In his Preface to DFNV, Gandhi endorses the thesis and enjoins
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Indians to put it to the test of practice. Gregg incorporates these arguments into the two new chapters on training in PNV (1944, 1959). Thus, ethical nonviolence should be called “integral” nonviolence.

This integrated banyan tree conception of nonviolence is a countermordernity. Violence and domination as the means of conflict and resolution go along with large-scale private and public institutions and an ethos of aggressive, self-interested competition among individuals, groups, corporations, states, empires, and military-industrial complexes, and are said to be the way to world peace. Nonviolent contestation and resolution go along with small-scale, democratic communities and an ethos of nonviolent cooperation, and, because means are autotelic, they are the way to world peace. This is the meaning of “Non-violence the only way.” There is no way to peace; peace is the way.

Nonviolent Ethics: The Way

Nonviolent ethics of satya (truth) and ahimsa (nonviolence) is the trunk from which all branches of nonviolent ways of life grow. Nonviolent ethics comprises the virtues that constitute a nonviolent character formation or ethos. It is swaraj in the primary sense of a free, self-governing human being. A nonviolent ethos “realises” the persuasive power of nonviolence (power-with) by becoming aware of it (spiritual unity), grasping, and hanging on to it, being moved by and with it, exercising it well in all relationships and circumstances, continuously reflecting on its use and misuse, and beginning again. For Gandhi and Gregg, it is the

55 PNV 6.
56 Compare Gandhi, 1946, p. 32: A nonviolent society “will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance, but ever humble, sharing in the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral parts.”
57 For trees as models of sustainable social systems today, see McDonough & Braungart, 2002, pp. 72–77; Capra, 2002, p. 230.
58 Gregg, 1932, 1938. Edward Goldsmith introduced the terms “heterotelic” to describe these self-interested competitive social systems and “homeotelic” to describe cooperative, sarvodaya systems (Goldsmith, 1948). For Gandhi’s contrast between the two types of social systems, see Gandhi, 1918. Gregg’s critique of modern industrial organization was indebted to Mayo, 1945.
59 This famous mantra was coined by A. J. Muste. See Danielson, 2014.
way humans participate in the personal, social, ecological, and spiritual power or energy that animates all life: 

A person does not create moral power. It comes to him [or her] only after he [or she] has complied with certain principles. This compliance enables him to tap the spiritual power pervading the entire world, just as one by suitable connections and switches can tap an electric current from a power circuit. The moral power is created by the spiritual power, not by the person who makes the contact.

This is Gregg’s reformulation of Gandhi’s basic hypothesis of the power of nonviolence uniting all life.

Like Aristotelian and Eastern ethics, nonviolent ethics is comprised of virtues. Nonviolent virtues are the engaged, nonviolent dispositions or habits of the body, emotions, mind, and spirit of a nonviolent person integrated into a characteristic orientation and pattern of existence governed by satyagraha. They are manifest in the characteristic attitude and ways of feeling, thinking, and interacting in relationships with oneself and others – what Gandhi and Gregg call “conduct.” They are cultivated and integrated into a settled yet changeable ethos through examples, meditation, practice (yoga), discipline, and experimental trial and error.

Ethical self-awareness and self-formation take place in communities of practice and practices of the self. Nonviolent virtuous dispositions are cultivated in the very activities in which they are exercised, as in Gandhi’s Karma yoga tradition of selfless service to others, Aristotelian ethics, engaged Buddhism, and Schumacher’s economic virtues. Gregg learned them in Gandhi’s Sabarmati ashram beginning with morning group meditation on the Bhagavad Gita. The way one works on one’s ethical comportment is so closely interrelated to one’s conduct and one’s relationships with and responsiveness to others that a nonviolent ethos brings into being and sustains nonviolent ways of life. As Aristotle says,
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ethics is of “supreme importance.”66 This internal relationship between training, ethos, relationships, and social systems is the phenomenological basis of the Gandhi–Gregg thesis that means are internally related to ends, like seed to a grown tree.67

Whether we are considering the life of an individual or of society, that life is a process, a series of successive stages or steps. As long as life continues, each stage grows out of the preceding stage and uses the material and structure and method of the prior stage as the means for advance. The character of each stage forms the basis for the character of the following stage. Each successive step is the immediate goal of the preceding step. So each step is not only an accomplishment in itself, but also a means toward the immediate next stage and hence enters into the achievement of the final goal. So the character of the means qualifies and determines the end both immediately and finally.

The nonviolent virtues include all the qualities Gregg explicates so carefully throughout PNV. They are publicly displayed and put to the most challenging test in nonviolent contestation, which is where they can be seen and explicated most clearly. Gregg presents a synopsis of them in his portrait of a nonviolent person. Although it is surely a portrait of Gandhi, all women and men have the capacity to develop these dispositions with practice.68 The core nonviolent virtues from which all others derive are encapsulated in Gandhi’s concept of satyagraha.69

Satya (truth) refers to the virtue of forthright truthfulness and openness.70 It consists in the continuous search for truth. It involves asserting the truth courageously and fearlessly as one sees it to the powers—that-be, yet with the awareness that each person’s view of the truth is partial and thus that it is necessary to enter into a dialogue with all affected others to gain a many-sided understanding of the truth in any situation. Thus, the soft power way in which one asserts the truth openly as one sees it, yet with the virtue of epistemic humility, is of utmost importance as it must bring others around to see they can trust you and so enter into a dialogue in which they will be listened to and treated with reciprocal respect. The partiality of each participant’s grasp of the truth

68 PNV 46.
69 Gandhi, 1919b. For Gregg’s conversation with Gandhi on the meaning of satyagraha, see PNV 1934, p. 217.
70 It is similar to parrhesia in Greek ethics (compare Foucault, 2008).
rules out coercion, since coercion rests on the false presumption that one participant knows the truth monologically.  

The root of satya is sat (being). The ground of our being is the interdependent, life-sustaining relationships of mutual love (ahimsa). “If love or non-violence be not the law of our being,” Gandhi states, “the whole of my argument falls to pieces, and there is no escape from a periodical recrudescence of war, each succeeding one outdoing the preceding one in ferocity.” The virtue of love (ahimsa) refers negatively to the “non-harm” of any living being and positively to active understanding, compassion, care, and cooperation with all living beings (biophilia). It is the virtue appropriate to the belief in the oneness of all forms of life (spiritual unity and sarvodaya).  

For Gregg the virtue of love is “the origin of all the others.” Even truthfulness can be described as love of moral truth. “Love involves the very principle and essence of continuity of life itself.” It entails respect for all life, “even though it might result in sickness to mankind.” The West may see this as “dangerous and stupid,” but it “may be rather a long distance ecological wisdom.” Like Peter Kropotkin, he often describes relations of love as mutual aid or symbiosis in contrast to struggles for existence. The most important dimension of love in nonviolent contestation is its creative power (agape): the persuasive power that can motivate humans to reflect on and transform their violent and dominative habits into nonviolent ways. If the word love seems too “sentimental,” then “call it a sort of intelligence or knowledge.” It also includes the clear-headed strategic, nonviolent knowledge that learns from military knowledge but supersedes it by moving from power-over struggles to power-with.  

The graha of satyagraha refers to the virtue of nonviolent courage. It is the courage to grasp firmly and exercise power of nonviolence (truthfulness and love) in everything one does, including self-suffering in contestation and helping others in need. Whereas soldiers control their fear and are willing to die, they direct their disciplined anger and hatred at the
enemy and kill them. Nonviolent actors learn to control fear and anger and are willing to suffer and die, yet they also take the next step in human evolution if the species is to survive. They learn to sublimate their anger into the more powerful emotion and trained disposition of negative (nonharm) and positive (compassion) love for their opponents. It is no wonder Gregg says Gandhi “was an ascetic in the old Greek sense of that word, as training for a contest.” Paraphrasing Gandhi, if a person lacks the nonviolent courage to contest injustice in this demanding way, they should express their violent feelings in their actions honestly: “Courageous violence, to try to prevent or stop a wrong, is better than cowardly acquiescence.”

All the nonviolent virtues form an experimental ethos: an individual and collective life of “experiments with truth.” Truthfulness, love, and courage are not only autotelic. They orient humans to sustaining their own well-being in ways that co-sustain the well-being of all interdependent others (sarvodaya). To discover these ways they enter into dialogues of mutual learning and cooperation in which each learns how things appear from the perspectives of others (integration). Nonviolent virtues are the virtues of participatory democracy. Their exercise gives rise to a kind of knowing-with through working with each other in constructive programs and campaigns. Participants become aware of and care for the shared, social, ecological and spiritual self beyond the ego-self. Each exercise is a test with and of one’s knowledge of the virtues involved. By means of prior examples and present practices participants gradually build up defeasible bodies of knowledge in the social, ecological and spiritual arts and sciences of a nonviolent civilization.

The cultivation of a nonviolent ethos takes place in a world in which a violent ethos is normal in many circumstances. For Gandhi and Gregg, violence does not begin when people employ weapons. It begins long before in violent dispositions and attitudes:

Nonviolence is not only ethically superior to violence, it also can be stronger; but it is often diluted or contaminated by anger or enmity

---

81 PNV 68–69, 71–72. Hocking, 1928 was a major influence on Gregg on transforming habits.
82 Gregg, 1948, p. 13.
83 PNV 57.
86 PNV 185–90.
87 Gregg, 1956, pp. 91–126.
88 PNV 182–84; Gregg, 1939c.
89 Gandhi, 1933. This is a basic difference with the pragmatic tradition. See Schock, 2015, p. 45, and see below, l–li.
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and its power undermined . . . 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, and whether in thought, word or deed. It is a breach of satyagraha to wish ill to an opponent or to say a harsh word to him or of him with the intention of doing harm. And often the evil thought or the evil word may, in terms of satyagraha, be more dangerous than actual violence used in the heat of the moment. Satyagraha is gentle, it never wounds. It must not be the result of anger or malice. It was conceived as a complete substitute for violence.

Gregg presents a similar “tentative working formula for discussion”: “Violence is any act, motive, thought, active feeling, or outwardly directed attitude which is divisive in nature or result in respect to emotions or inner attitude; that is to say, inconsistent with spiritual unity.”

Gandhi calls these violent dispositions “duragraha”: being propelled by and subject to the charge of fear, anger and enmity, rather than satyagraha, in response to a disturbance. The former is an attitude of incivility; the latter of civility. For the ethical nonviolent tradition, this initial attitudinal violence is the root of all violence and domination. “Aggression really arises the instant we assert our separateness from others in respect to things of the spirit.” This is why nonviolent ethics is of fundamental and indispensable importance.

When disputes arise in everyday interactions, humans usually pause, collect themselves, and draw on the taken-for-granted, intersubjective relationships and resources of trustful nonviolence to discover the sources of the differences and work out mutually acceptable modes of conciliation. These are the background, being-with conditions of social life. This nonviolent way of conciliation preserves the background, life-sustaining conditions. If, in contrast, antagonism were the usual response, humans would have perished long ago. With duragraha, individuals and groups allow the emotional propulsion of fear and anger to disconnect, alienate themselves from, and override the background relationships of mutual trust, define themselves as separate, and

90 PNV 1914, pp. 221–22. He lists the same vices as Gandhi.
92 Gandhi, 1921. This is the first problem, see above, xxxi.
94 PNV 1914, p. 221; Compare PNV 78.
95 Gandhi, 1909, pp. 87–89; PNV 64, 78, citing Rivers, 1920.
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evince an aggressive or submissive attitude of distrust and enmity towards others. With this often involuntary movement, they move out of the world of power-with and into the power-over world.

This outwardly directed attitude of distrustful separateness affects relational others and they tend to respond in the same way. Gregg draws on Gestalt psychology to argue that the initial attitudinal interactions, if unchecked, tend to generate amplifying circular responses of mutual insecurity, ill-will and antagonism, as each tries to acquire the means to gain power over others. These competitions give rise to the violent military, political and economic power-over systems and struggles of modernity, and these have blowback effects on all social relations. These systems appear autonomous but they are the ongoing consequences of outwardly directed attitudes of separation, distrust, and insecurity, and the “impulse to dominate” of those subject to them.  

Without training in nonviolence, people who grow up in these social systems acquire the corresponding subject formation. Independence, insecurity, and antagonism, not interdependence and cooperation, now appear as the ground of being human; the natural condition of human-kind. The prior step of alienation from being-with relations is overlooked and forgotten. The only way to peace, cooperation, and security appears to be to impose order over and compliance to the institutions of aggressive competition in modern societies. Within this worldview, the focus is on victory over the opponent as success. The long-term destruction, domination, exploitation, and greed of the victors and the resentment and resistance of the victims are overlooked, yet they lead to further cycles of insecurity and struggle. If they are not transformed, these trends will lead to extermination by war or civilizational collapse by resource depletion.

Subjects of these systems are caught up in what Gregg calls “dual loyalty.” On the one hand, they are familiar with the power of nonviolence in everyday life to some extent and their spiritual and humanistic traditions teach these virtues. On the other, they participate in and depend on the dominant power-over systems and are constrained to set aside nonviolent virtues and act aggressively in order to survive. The

96 PNV 150, 156–59. Harding, 1941 was a major influence on Gregg.
97 PNV 163–64, 172–73. 98 PNV Chapters 8, 9, and 159.
99 PNV 16, Gregg, 1922. 100 PNV 150, 159–64.
resulting disintegrated personality of these shifting dual loyalties leads to pervasive “social neurosis” that further fuels the competitive cycles for power-over. 101

The primary role of nonviolent ethics, therefore, is to acquire the ability of “non-retaliation”: to pause and resist the emotional charge of duragraha or to transform the violent habitus once formed. Like Greek, Christian, and Eastern ethics, the cultivation of this ability involves three standard steps. 102 The first consists in becoming aware of the need to free oneself from the disposition to be motivated by fear, anger, and animosity in its undisciplined or disciplined forms. This is the step of nonattachment to retaliation and of remaining attached, or beginning to reattach, to relationships and dispositions of mutual care and concern. Since most people in modern civilization are subject to divisive dispositions in their dual loyalties, this step consists in “remaking” deep-seated habits and attitudes – self-transformation. 103 This turns another modernization assumption on its head; that systemic change precedes self-change. 104

The first step of dawning self-awareness goes along with the second step of beginning to practice the nonviolent ethics that bring about the self-transformation of one’s habitual dispositions. In Gregg’s case, step one was the experience of unequal capital–labor contests in the United States, his realization of the structural power of capital over labor, and then reading Gandhi. The second was his move to India and his immersion in the constructive programs of the Sabarmati ashram. Beginning with meditation on the virtues, these daily practices teach participants to pause, be mindful, compose themselves, and respond with an ethos of patient civility that integrates all the other virtues, as in DFNV. As they engage in practices of self-transformation in constructive programs and voluntary simplicity, they also acquire the corresponding form of self-awareness. The underlying spiritual, social, and ecological relationships of nonviolent cooperation come to awareness as they interact in accord with them. This dawning spiritual unity dimension of existence enables them to appraise the values and assumptions of the dominant ethos in contrast and to free themselves from them. 105

102 For these three steps of self-transformation in various traditions, see Gregg, 1956; Huxley, 1984 [1945]; Foucault, 2005, pp. 15–17.
103 PNV 160–62. 104 PNV 171–72, 197.
At some stage in this process of self-transformation they reconnect with and trust the intersubjective power of nonviolence and it animates their further efforts. This is the third step of reconnection, dealienation, and empowerment with the animacy of living earth. It is called rebound, gift-gratitude-reciprocity, grace, and attunement in different traditions.\footnote{Foucault, 2005, pp. 15–17 calls the third step a “rebound” (\textit{return}). Gregg, 1956 is a detailed analysis of the three steps of self-transformation.}

Gregg uses the analogy of learning to swim to elucidate all three steps of this moral conversion to nonviolence.\footnote{PNV 169–70. Compare Gregg, 1956, pp. 105–06, “Entering the Spiritual Life is Like Learning to Swim.”} At first he could not believe that water would buoy him up. He fought against it and sank. His friends encouraged him to keep trying and through practice he gradually acquired the ability to swim, not by fighting against the water, but by learning through practice how to become aware of, trust, and work with the background power of buoyancy of water, and so acquire the self-awareness, dispositional virtues, and self-confidence of a competent swimmer. Analogously, the three self-transformative ethical steps bring about a moral conversion from an ethos of separation and power-over to interdependence and power-with.

The cultivation of a nonviolent ethos is thus the way humans connect with and are empowered by the power of nonviolence and exercise it in animating all branches of a nonviolent way of life. It is Gregg’s translation of Gandhi’s hypothesis of a soul-force animating all life on earth and satyagraha as the way humans connect with it into the language of Western arts and sciences. His aim is to show that nonviolent ethics is the indispensable ethos of the way to a nonviolent world and how constructive programs and voluntary simplicity provide the milieu in which it is cultivated.\footnote{For the integration of swaraj and satyagraha in Gandhi, see Dalton, 2012.}

Nonviolent Agonistics

Nonviolent Ethics in Action

Nonviolent agonistics is a branch that grows in every other branch of the satyagraha banyan tree. Disagreements and disputes arise in any human relationship, including in constructive programs. Members learn the arts
of nonviolent contestation and resolution with each other and in response to the impulse to dominate whenever it irrupts. They then take this nonviolent savoir faire into their satyagraha campaigns with violent actors, their paymasters and supporters, and all the differently situated observers in the local, global, and intergenerational field of direct and indirect observation.

There are three phases of these campaigns. The first is to persuade violent contestants, their backers, and all observers to move to nonviolent ways of contestation and resolution. Gregg explicates this complex struggle with his analogy of moral jiu-jitsu. In the second phase contestants enter into nonviolent negotiations and reconciliation. He explicates this form of dialogue by analogy to the integration model developed by Mary Follett. Although it is a second phase, it is introduced by nonviolent actors speaking with and offering to listen to all sides and negotiate from the beginning in public dialogues. The third phase is to transform or replace the unjust relationship or system that is the object of the contest with an agreed-upon power-with relationship. The agreement is then accepted or rejected, worked out, implemented, contested, reviewed, and reformulated by the people engaged in the new relationship exercising their powers of nonviolent cooperation and contestation intergenerationally.

The aim of nonviolent actors is to assert truthfully and openly the injustice in dispute as they see it, and, simultaneously, to persuade violent actors and all observers, directly or indirectly, to become aware of nonviolent ways of contestation and their superiority relative to the power-over ways to which they are accustomed, and so to join them in critically examining and resolving their differences nonviolently.

Gregg calls this process of self-awareness and self-change “moral conversion.” Given the prefigurative character of means, the way they try to bring about this moral self-conversion of their opponents to nonviolence is by means of nonviolence: that is, by playing a nonviolent game of contestation with them, as if they were already partners in it.

They exercise the full range of persuasive powers of nonviolent ethics. By virtue of their training, they courageously refuse to retaliate with...
anger or hatred when attacked and abused, openly announce their plans
and campaigns, break off, apologize, and make amends whenever their
individual swaraj fails, present the truth as they see it from their limited
social standpoint, listen to the views of all affected, offer to enter into
negotiations, always act in trustworthy and humble ways, strive to accept
denigration, agents provocateurs, beatings, imprisonment, torture and
death with good temper, and all the other modes of ethical conduct
entailed by their commitment to satyagraha. They explain why they
believe their protests, sit-ins, marches, boycotts, noncooperation, occupa-
tions, strikes, and other types of campaigns are not coercive and
express their willingness to amend them if they are found to be.113
They treat everyone as moral agents and members of the “we” of spiritual
unity, never as enemies, and thus with the inner freedom to engage in
ethical self-change, as they have done.
Their ethical exercise of the power of nonviolence in the democratic
way they organize and interact among themselves and engage with their
violent contestants and observers enacts and “dramatizes” the alternative
nonviolent way of life for all to see and for many to experience.114 It is the
“persuasive assertion of the unity of the human species.”115 The whole
event is a public contest between two categorically different forms of
contestation and their contrasting lifeways. On the one side, the exempl-
ary, open exercise and offer of power-with, “the very principle and
essence of continuity of life itself,” and, on the other, power-over orga-
nization, secrecy, and the mobilization of violence and domination.116
Their objective in this great contest of contests is to encourage all affected
to reflect on the two contrasting ways of life on display and work through
steps of self-transformation and moral conversion towards trusting in the
power of nonviolence. As differently situated actors and observers begin
to reflect on the dramatic contest and change their attitude to the dispute
in different ways and temporalities, their silent or open withdrawal of
support, noncooperation, protests, and support for nonviolence begin to
undermine the social basis of support of the violent actors and the social
system they are defending.117

113 Nonviolent techniques are not coercive. They employ persuasive and compelling moral
pressure (PNV 121–24) Compare Shridharani, 1972 [1930], pp. 191–94, referring to
PNV 1934 at p. 191.
117 PNV 52–53.
In his last article on nonviolent agonistics Gregg returns to the analogy with swimming that he uses in the case of individual moral conversion. In the contest of contests the nonviolent actor is analogous to an exemplary swimming instructor showing students and bystanders how to trust and participate in the buoyant power of water. The exemplary nonviolent actor manifests the virtues required to trust and participate in the mutually empowering power of nonviolence and so be elevated to a higher plane of human existence than violent struggle, rather than fighting against it.

In Chapters 2–4 Gregg investigates the physical, moral, ethical, psychological, emotional, mental (reason), imaginary, and other psychological factors that influence contestants and observers engaged in the “subtle interplay of forces operating during the struggle.” He analyzes collective factors in Chapters 5–6. This is necessary due to the misunderstanding and skepticism concerning the transformative power of nonviolence. Although he has a small number of examples to draw on in Chapter 1, he hopes to contribute to the development of the young arts and sciences of nonviolent agonistics. His aim is “to understand how and why it works.”

There are three main reasons “why” nonviolent contestation works. The first is the well-substantiated hypothesis that everyone, including the most violent, dominative, and exploitive, “have in their hearts at least a spark of good spirit which can eventually be aroused and strengthened into action.” They also have memories of the spirit of nonviolent cooperation in their own lives and childhood stories. Nonviolent actors test the hypothesis by trying to ignite this spark and memory by enacting and dramatizing a life of spiritual unity with and for the violent actor and all affected. Their unusual conduct “suddenly presents the violent assailant with these startling new ideas,” all of which can spark the suggestion “there may be something in the world more powerful and desirable than physical force.” Gentle yet steadfast enactment creates
a suggestion and gradual realization in the personality of violent partners and observers of another “kind of power” and “stronger realization of human nature.” This “auto-suggestion” is the beginning of nonviolent self-change.\(^{125}\)

The second reason is that nonviolence, based in love, is more powerful than violence, based in fear, anger, and courage. Gregg takes the reader through all the reasons for the greater power, endurance, and appeal of love.\(^{126}\) As we have seen, while courageous violent actors remain at the level of antagonistic struggle, nonviolent actors sublimate their anger into the higher power of love with and for their fellow contestants and observers.\(^ {127}\) The well-integrated banyan tree form of organization of the nonviolent contestants is morally, mentally, psychologically, and physically more powerful than the command–obedience form of organization of violent contestants and modern industrial civilization on which it is based. Moreover, rather than dissipating energy in struggling against each other, they gently guide their opponents towards freely “joining forces” in nonviolent contestation and resolution.\(^ {128}\) In so doing, they gradually lift the struggle to a higher plane of nonviolent cooperative and contestatory energy and power of both partners working together (integration).\(^ {129}\) “Love is more powerful because it expresses forces of the whole.”\(^ {130}\)

The third reason is that nonviolence tends to surprise and throw violent actors off balance. They are trained to anticipate and fight with opponents who fight, flee, or submit. When nonviolent actors refuse to respond in these familiar ways and act otherwise, the savoir faire of violent actors does not work as expected. They, and the regime they uphold, tend to lose control of the situation as they “plunge forward, as it were, into a new world of values,” while well-trained nonviolent actors retain their savoir faire, poise, and equilibrium.\(^ {131}\) This unique situation is the emergence of the “how” of satyagraha campaigns: the transformative dynamic that Gregg famously describes as analogous in certain respects to “a sort of moral jiu-jitsu.”\(^ {132}\) It has the capacity to supersede war, violent revolution, and unethical civil resistance (duragraha) – the three dominant yet destructive and self-reproducing means of social change for centuries.

\(^{125}\) PNV 53, 59–60. \(^{126}\) PNV 55–60, 67–70. \(^{127}\) PNV 58, 68–69. \(^{128}\) PNV 68–69. \(^{129}\) PNV 69. \(^{130}\) PNV 131. \(^{131}\) PNV 50. \(^{132}\) PNV 50.
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A Sort of Moral Jiu-jitsu
Gregg constructed his metaphor of “moral jiu-jitsu” to translate specific dynamic features of the immensely creative power of satyagraha because the art of physical jiu-jitsu was familiar to audiences in India, the colonized world, and the West. Gandhi’s term “soul force” for this creative-transformative power, while “expressive and exact,” was unfamiliar and obscure. In addition, the negative term “non-violent resistance” is “so inadequate to describe the action and attitude under discussion.” “Love,” in the comprehensive, polysemic sense in which Gandhi and Gregg use it to characterize the totality of nonviolent virtues that comprise satyagraha ethics and ethos, is also an exact and expressive term for the “mode of action” and “general principle” of the moral and psychological dynamics involved in transformative, nonviolent contestation. As we have seen, it is Gregg’s preferred concept. However, this complex, creative-transformative sense of love is scarcely common usage and it does not disclose the precise nature of the transformative dynamic at the heart of Gandhian agonistics in an easily understood representation.\(^{133}\) As a result of this confusion, “most of its followers have failed to understand and apply fully and actively this creative factor in it,” and so it “has seemed weak” and ineffective “to so many people.”\(^{134}\) It degenerates into ill-will, anger, and animosity (duragraha) in many cases. While Gregg’s argument that satyagraha requires training, discipline, and nonviolent character formation in constructive programs responds to this problem, it does not explicate the dynamics of contestation.

Furthermore, the very idea that love might be more powerful than violence and aggression seems incredible to the vast majority of observers. Despite 1,900 years of preaching the Christian ethic of loving one’s enemies, the systematic training and practice of it was not discovered until Gandhi began experimenting with it.\(^{135}\) The dominant and deeply ingrained assumption and attitude is that the modern West has risen through stages of historical development and colonized the rest of the world by means of wars, aggressive competition, and struggles for

---

\(^{133}\) Gregg, 1930d, pp. 58–61; PNV 69–70. Chapters 12 and 13 of Gregg, 1930d are devoted to describing the transformative power of satyagraha in detail in terms of creative love. Compare King on love: King, 1991, pp. 12–21.

\(^{134}\) Gregg, 1930d, p. 305.

existence ("might makes right"). In 1929 Freud argued that the Christian duty to love one’s enemy is impossible and absurd. And, the Eastern idea of spiritual unity animating and sustaining all life is a nebulous oceanic feeling experienced by some susceptible people in response to childhood separation. Both give rise to the contemporary discontents with the necessary violence and aggression of modernization. Separation and aggression are primordial — "homo homini lupus (man is a wolf to man)." As we have seen, these are articulations of the alienated worldview of modern civilization.

Given the misunderstanding, misuse, and hostile milieu, Gregg had to find a language of redescription, other than love, that would show that satyagraha’s “moral dynamic” is the strong and effective solution to violent conflicts; and that violent methods, including physical jiu-jitsu and duragraha, are weaker and ineffective because they reproduce the power-over conditions of further conflict. This challenge included responding to an objection within the nonviolent movement that it is impossible to combine the “principled” and “pragmatic” dimensions of satyagraha: nonviolence is either principled (satyagraha) and ineffective or pragmatic (duragraha) and effective. Gregg had to show that satyagraha is both principled (ethical) and effective whereas nonethical, pragmatic civil resistance is ineffective. The widespread interest in jiu-jitsu provided the material for this Herculean task.

Jiu-jitsu (soft-art) was developed in Japan in the 1890s by Sadakazu Uyenishi and Jigoro Kano and brought to the West and the colonized world in the early twentieth century. Although centred on physical fighting, it is also a cultural, mental, and moral form of conduct. Its main features are nonretaliating in ways that cause the attacker to lose balance, gaining the upper hand, and making maximum use of mental and physical energy. It requires physical and mental training. It is also an ethos of nonviolent interaction and argumentation in everyday life in

136 For these arguments, see Darwin, 2004 [1871], and Huxley, 2002 [1888]. For responses in Gregg’s sources, see Kropotkin, 2006 [1902], Whitehead, 1933, MacLeod, 1917.
137 Freud, 2002 [1929], pp. 3–11, 45–53. This argument is directed against Romain Rolland, the French proponent of Gandhian nonviolence in the European peace movement during the interwar years.
138 This objection was articulated by Reinhold Niebuhr in his reviews of PNV (Niebuhr, 1934) and later by Gene Sharp (Sharp, 1990). For Niebuhr and Gregg see Kosek, 2004, 2009. For a recent defense of Gandhi’s satyagraha as principled, pragmatic, and effective, see Mantena, 2012.
139 Yorimitsu, 2011.
which “persuasion” is shown to be superior to force and manipulation. Training and practice in the physical and moral dimensions of jiu-jitsu also overcome disappointment and despondency, and build self-control and self-confidence.¹⁴⁰

Jiu-jitsu quickly came to be seen as the appropriate means of engagement in two types of struggles: decolonization and feminist movements against male power. Rather than mimicking the violent ways of Western colonization and patriarchy, anticolonial and feminist struggles would engage in jiu-jitsu movements, causing colonizers and pugnacious men to lose their balance and plunge into unfamiliar nonviolent, non-Western and feminist ways, enabling anticolonialists and feminists to gain the stronger position and “throw” their opponents.¹⁴¹

In 1905 and 1909 Gandhi criticized physical jiu-jitsu.¹⁴² Used as a technique to overthrow and defeat opponents, and integrated into military strategies, as in the war between Japan and Russia, jiu-jitsu is clearly a form of violent means, antithetical to satyagraha. Gregg agreed, yet, given its familiarity, he realized that specific features of the general dynamic in jiu-jitsu are somewhat analogous to specific features of the transformative dynamic of satyagraha in the moral and psychological realm. Thus, the redescription of these features of satyagraha in terms of moral jiu-jitsu enables readers to see perspicuously how the moral dynamic works, thereby clarifying the misunderstandings. In addition, by carefully showing the location of these features within the broader training, nonviolent ethics, and spiritual unity of integral satyagraha that gives them their transformative power, Gregg also exposes in contrast the poverty of physical jiu-jitsu as a model for decolonization and feminism. His radical argument is that the transformative method anti-imperialists and feminists are looking for in jiu-jitsu can be found only in satyagraha.¹⁴³

Gregg compares and contrasts the dynamic features of physical jiu-jitsu in his quotation by Uyenishi and the analogous dynamic features of moral jiu-jitsu.¹⁴⁴ In both cases, the violent aggressor and observers assume the superior power of violence. Both surprise the aggressor by refusing to retaliate, but they non-retaliate by different means; the jiu-jitsu actor by the lack of physical opposition, and the satyagrahi by the...
exercise of nonviolent ethics and goodwill. In moral jiu-jitsu the aggressor loses the moral and psychic support violent resistance normally provides (in Gandhi’s and Gregg’s sense of “violence” as any outward directed attitude of ill-will).\textsuperscript{145} Whereas in physical jiu-jitsu the actor lets the aggressor plunge further forward by physically moving along with them, the satyagrahi uses the nonviolent virtues of “kindness, generosity, and self-suffering” to pull them along. The attacker loses balance and their savoir faire becomes ineffective, whereas the jiu-jitsu master and the satyagrahi retain their balance and savoir faire (ethos). In the course of the interactions between violent action and moral jiu-jitsu, the violent actor and observers come to realize that the satyagrahi has a stronger character formation, position, and form of power than violence: that is, the nonviolent power of acting for and with others.\textsuperscript{146} That is, the prevailing assumption and attitude that violence is strong and love is weak is reversed in practice for all to see. Finally, the jiu-jitsu master uses their superior position to “throw” their opponent and gain power over them. The moral jiu-jitsu satyagrahi knows better and offers a helping hand.\textsuperscript{147}

Having shown the transformative dynamic of nonviolence over violence by means of this perspicuous moral jiu-jitsu analogy, he then proceeds to explain it in detail in terms of the nonviolent virtues employed in each step.\textsuperscript{148} As we have seen, he does this in the language of “love” as the virtue to which all others are related. Love (nonviolence) operates in the moral and psychological realm, where moral balance depends on “one’s relationship to moral truth,” and thus on one’s “character” or ethos.\textsuperscript{149} The contest continues until the violent actor and observer are persuaded of the superiority of nonviolence and agree to convert to its use in resolving the conflict (integration).\textsuperscript{150} The use of persuasion rather than any kind of violence is not only the autotelic way of change consistent with respect for the freedom and dignity of opponents and observers.\textsuperscript{151} Since winning the struggle, transforming oppressive social systems and securing genuine and lasting peace requires winning over the morale (hearts and minds) of all affected, according to

\textsuperscript{145} See above, xxxvii–viii.\textsuperscript{146} PNV 53–54, 56.\textsuperscript{147} PNV 58, see below, lii–iv.\textsuperscript{148} Chapter 7 has the same structure of argument in relation to the literature on military strategy.\textsuperscript{149} PNV 56.\textsuperscript{150} PNV 65.\textsuperscript{151} King emphasizes this in his preface (PNV 13–14).
both psychologists and military experts, it is also the only effective
means.\textsuperscript{152} As they are engaging in campaign maneuvers and coun-
termaneuvers, nonviolent actors also engage in public dialogue, present-
ing their arguments, asking others to present theirs, and offering to enter into negotia-
tions. They do not attack, dismiss, or destroy the opposing views. Rather, they engage in nonviolent ways of arguing with their dialogue partners that are similar to moral jiu-jitsu. They examine the components of their arguments to find values and assumptions with which they agree. Then they examine the values and assumptions they disagree with, give their reasons, present their alternatives, acknowledge their perspectival char-
ter, and request constructive responses. This epistemically humble form of “reasoning-with” public dialogue is the path to negotiations (integration). It ensures that each other’s points of view, needs and new ideas will be taken seriously.\textsuperscript{153} Without it any so-called resolution is just another power-over structure of domination. These critical public dialogues are necessary but insufficient. They need to be enunciated in campaigns and constructive programs that walk the talk.\textsuperscript{154} Gregg argues in this nonviolent way with his adversaries in all his writings. He often draws up lists of the components he agrees and disagrees with, and his alternatives.\textsuperscript{155}

All these satyagraha activities are oriented towards gently persuading violent actors and observers to consider reconnecting with the power of spiritual unity that the nonviolent actors are enacting and offering. Gregg compares this to holding up a mirror to them so they can stand back and compare their way of life with the nonviolent one on display.\textsuperscript{156} One aspect of this reflection is that the responses of violent actors appear inhumane and often brutal in contrast, and, as a result, onlookers are often moved by sympathy to criticize violent actors and support suffering nonviolent actors.\textsuperscript{157} Gregg agrees, but it is not the most important aspect. Rather, the self-suffering shows the “sincerity” and deep “convictions” of nonviolent actors. This resolute commitment to a
nonviolent way of life, come what may, elicits admiration and awe. It moves violent actors and onlookers to reflect more deeply on the two contrastive ways of life being performed. If, as in unarmed resistance (duragraha), nonviolent ethics are absent, resisters mobilize ill-will, fear, anger, and enmity, and engage in strategies to gain power over violent opponents, then both contestants are playing the same power-over game. It is war by other means.\textsuperscript{158} Such campaigns can replace power-holders and specific legislation.\textsuperscript{159} However, because there is no contrast between violent and nonviolent ways of life to reflect on, there is no possibility of transforming the power-over attitudes, struggles, and systems. Both contestants accept and reenact them.\textsuperscript{160}

Gandhi and Gregg make a similar point with respect to violent revolutionaries. If they use the same violent means as their opponents, the ends will be some kind of power-over regime with different power holders. Gandhi presents this antimimicry argument to Indian revolutionaries; Gregg to Marx, Lenin and Trotsky; King to violent Black Power advocates and Fanon; and Deming to Fanon. In each case, they begin in a moral jiu-jitsu fashion by stating the features they agree with in their opponents’ views – the ideal end of democratic cooperation in socialism for example. They then argue that their violent means undermine the ends they use to justify them.\textsuperscript{161}

As campaigns and public dialogues develop, the contrasts between the two ways of life being enacted and their respective support systems become deeper and clearer, as Gregg illustrates in the chapters on the state and class war. Public reasoning is freed from confinement within the rationality of the dominant discourses of modernity and opened to the critical power of comparative reasoning with an alternative way of life.\textsuperscript{162} Recall that the violent actors and most observers are socialized into the dual loyalties of modernity: of power-over and power-with in separate spheres.\textsuperscript{163} At the core of the power-over systems being challenged by the nonviolent actors, as well as the violence being used against them, is the presumption that these systems are the necessary means to peace,
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coopera  tion and security. The soft power of moral jiu-jitsu exposes the falsity of this position.

The presumptive necessity of power-over rests on the “rabble hypothesis” that humans are incapable of settling disputes and cooperating without the coercive imposition of power-over. The moral jiu-jitsu campaigns and constructive programs demonstrate that this is empirically false. Observers see ordinary human beings engaged consistently in nonviolent cooperation and contestation in all their activities, without dual loyalty, resolutely hanging on to it in the face of violence, giving their explanations of it, and offering it to others. This resonates with the observers’ spark and experience of nonviolence and calls into question the need for dual loyalty.

Power-over is also claimed to be the necessary means to peace, security and cooperation in the future. When observers turn and examine their own society in contrast, they see that the exercise of violent means undermines the ends that are used to justify them. Domination does not lead to democratic cooperation but to coercive compliance (and resistance) in the competitive economic institutions of modern civilization. Hierarchically organized violence in wars, revolutions, and repression of dissent does not lead to peace and security but to increasingly destructive cycles of violent struggles and insecurity. The dominant responses to this performative contradiction are justifications of faith in progress “to come” by means of more war and domination, and the excuse that there is no alternative.

For Gregg and his generation of peace activists this “security dilemma” is the fatal flaw in the global system of armed states and all power-over systems within them. The dilemma is that the means employed to resolve the initial insecurity and distrust reproduce them. In the course of moral jiu-jitsu campaigns and public dialogues the futility of violence and domination and their justifying assumptions, in the specific case at issue and more generally, comes into the space of

164 Mayo, 1945, p. 58, referred to in Gregg, 1952, pp. 29, 56, 58, 73.
167 For the most influential justification of more war as the means to and guarantee of world peace, see Kant, 2001 [1784, 1795]. For surveys of the justifications from Kant to the present, see Cortright, 2008, Tully, 2008, and Bowden, 2013.
questions and is exposed. And, the nonviolent alternative is enacted for all to see and share. Gregg’s succinct statement of the dilemma is that modern civilization tries to achieve by means of power-over what can be achieved only by power with and for others.

Gregg agrees that insecurity and distrust underlie the fear, anger, and antagonism that initiate the dilemma. Yet, unlike most modern theorists, he does not take this as given, as the initial condition. Rather, like Gandhi and Huxley, he argues that insecurity and distrust are brought into being by the initial step of separation and alienation from the given background intersubjective relationships of mutual trust and security (spiritual unity). The objective of moral jiu-jitsu is to bring to consciousness this whole background that is overlooked in the modern worldview. Nonviolent actors then present the way to dissolve the security dilemma by offering their opponents a trustworthy and secure helping hand; a power-with relationship.

When violent actors and the powers—that-be lose their equilibrium, as their local and global support declines, nonviolent actors refuse to “throw” their opponents, as in physical jiu-jitsu, bargaining, durgahra, revolution and war. Instead, they offer the gift of an open and sincere helping hand in order to create together a new plane of moral equilibrium in nonviolent relationships of contestation and cooperation (integration). For Gregg, this is the greatest and most important dis-analogy with jiu-jitsu and all violent methods. It is a radical offer of trust and security, backed up by the whole trustworthy pattern of conduct that precedes and supports it, because the way to generate trust in conditions of distrust is by being trustworthy and trusting, despite the vulnerability it entails. This gift of joining hands ignites recollection of and offers reconnection with the life-sustaining power of nonviolence: the intersubjective relationships of trust, security, and cooperation they separated and alienated themselves from in their fear, anger, and enmity.
This courageous, disarming gesture can change the whole dynamics of circular responses in exactly the way suggested by the reviewer of Follett that Gregg quotes immediately after his jiu-jitsu quotation.\textsuperscript{176} To accept this offer, perhaps only tentatively at first, is the initial step of self-transformation and moral conversion.\textsuperscript{177} Deming, a leading feminist theorist and practitioner of nonviolence, argues that the moral jiu-jitsu double movement of asserting truth to the powerful and offering a helping hand combines masculine and feminine characteristics into a new, androgynous synthesis: “the very genius of nonviolence, in fact, is that it demonstrates them to be indivisible, and so restores human community.”\textsuperscript{178}

The aim of joining hands is “to convert the opponent, to change his understanding and his sense of values so that he will join wholeheartedly with the resister in seeking settlement truly amicable and truly satisfying to both sides.” It helps to reestablish the violent attacker’s moral balance at a “level higher and more secure than that from which he first launched his violent attack.”\textsuperscript{179} The crucial point here is that “no conflict can be solved at the level of the conflict,” yet this is what all violent means of conflict try to do.\textsuperscript{180} The contestants have to move themselves into nonviolent relations of cooperation and contestation (spiritual unity). The power-with of satyagraha is the only means that can bring this self-transcendence about, just as it is in the individual case of ethical self-change. This condensed, concluding paragraph of Chapter 2 is the axis around which Gregg’s philosophy turns.

The cumulative effects of all interactions in the complex field of circular responses gradually move the participants to accept the offer of negotiations, or renegotiations if previous ones broke off. Gregg adapts Follett’s “integration” model of nonviolent negotiation. It is not struggle and victory of one side in arguing and bargaining, voluntary submission, or compromise. These power-over models suppress rather than overcome conflict.\textsuperscript{181} Integration consists in exercising the nonviolent virtues in dialogue to find ways of combining and resolving the energy of all partners.\textsuperscript{182} It is the continuation of nonviolent public dialogue in the negotiation phase. Participants compare and contrast the values and

\textsuperscript{176} PNV 51, 64. \textsuperscript{177} PNV 58, 64–65. \textsuperscript{178} Deming, 1984, pp. 229–30, Updegrove, 2014, p. 159. \textsuperscript{179} PNV 58. \textsuperscript{180} PNV 61, quoting White, 1916, for this crucial point. He develops it in detail in Gregg, 1956. \textsuperscript{181} PNV 65. \textsuperscript{182} PNV 69.
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assumptions of their conflicting views to search for shared or analogous aspects within them that can provide initial steps of agreement, which can then be used as the basis for further steps. These critical and comparative dialogues generate mutual understanding and compassion for the ways differently situated participants experience the injustice at issue.  

In the course of participation the former contestants are transformed into partners in nonviolent relationships of working together and creating ways of living together that they could not have imagined prior to the dialogue.

The most important feature of integrative negotiation is not the specific uncoerced agreement, which is always imperfect and open to nonviolent contestation in the future. Rather, in working towards agreement, they learn and acquire the virtues and arts of combining their energies and working with and for each other, and, in so doing, bring an intersubjective nonviolent practice of contesting and conciliating into being among them without subordination.

Human conflicts never end, but humans learn nonviolent ways of enacting, addressing, and resolving them as they learn the broader nonviolent way of life in which integration has its home. In Compass for Civilization Gregg presents a richer account of transformative integration. It should be read along with PNV.

The Process of Change

In addition to the first problem of discipline, the second problem that integral nonviolence faced in the 1930s and 1940s, and which it continues to face, is the widespread objection that it does not work. It is claimed that violent actors, their supporters, and most observers are not persuaded to support nonviolent contestation and integration. Satyagraha is then rejected, and discouraged people turn to unarmed civil resistance (duragraha) or violence. Gregg wrote the new chapter on persuasion in PNV 1944 in response. This objection, he argues, is based on “a failure to understand the process,” and the false assumption that conversion should happen immediately. The complex process of moral conversion

---

183 PNV 64–66.
186 For the first problem see above, xxx–xxxiii. For the second problem and rejection of Gandhian nonviolence see Martin, 2005a, pp. 5–6, and Scalmer, 2011, pp. 209–10.
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of differently situated actors and observers “takes time.” It is not the fast time of capitalism, social media, or crisis time. It is a “slow but sure” temporality, much like the civilized temporality of constructive programs, and it requires patience, perseverance, and resilience.188

The power of repeated, gentle perturbations and suggestions of loving kindness in nonviolent contestation work slowly and imperceptibly, as with many of the most powerful forces in the natural world, yet both bring about large changes in complex natural and social systems. Humans have the capacity to be moved to good or evil by good and evil suggestions, and nonviolent actors appeal to and ignite the spark of goodness in their acts of noncoercive persuasion. All education is premised on this feature. Persuasive nonviolence is more effective than violence and manipulation. Violence appears effective initially but acquiescence is soon reversed, whereas compassionate suggestions of truth seeking, self-suffering, and humility tend to bring lasting and positive change. Moreover, because nonviolent interaction is oriented to the well-being of each member and the cooperation of the whole (sarvodaya), it is known to be more powerful from an evolutionary perspective. It is the power of life itself. Just as the ecological cooperation of micro-organisms, photosynthesis, fungi, plants, forests, and animals heal the destructive effects of natural disasters and prevent future disasters, so too nonviolent constructive programs and agonistics “not only heal the effects of violence, but create relationships and situations which prevent violence.” Nonviolent social recovery and succession learn from ecological succession.189

Gregg reminds his readers that the process of transformation consists in persuading differently situated individuals and groups to engage in the self-critical task of reflection on the deep-seated assumptions on which their acquiescence in systems of violence and domination is grounded. To call these into the space of questions and test them takes time. The process requires the concerted effort and integrated momentum of ethics, creative campaigns, public dialogues, alternative constructive programs, voluntary simplicity, and education working together – the integrated branches of the nonviolent banyan tree. There can be no predictive

188 PNV 144, and see above, xxxi. For the context of Gregg’s response in the United States see Danielson, 2003, Kosek, 2005.
189 PNV 139–47, quotation at 147. For a contemporary systems view of life and succession, see Harding, 2013, Capra & Luisi, 2015.
theory of social change of different actors in such large-scale, complex, non-linear, relational social systems of autotelic circular responses. Rather, nonviolent social scientists require a new kind of “field psychiatry” that studies how to suggest and persuade all affected in their different subject positions, near and far, now and in future generations. He figures that such social transformation takes fifty to a hundred years.\footnote{PNV 144–45.} He summarizes the whole process of diffusion and conversion in a footnote.\footnote{PNV 215–16 note 14.}

A good example of the temporality of such change is attitudes to constructive programs and voluntary simplicity. Gregg’s arguments concerning the self-destructiveness of modern industrial economies and his arguments for the sustainability and well-being of community-based organizations, cooperatives, cyclical or ecological economics, regenerative resource use, human-scale technology, and participatory democracy were ridiculed and dismissed by liberals and Marxists as backward. Yet, in the generation after Gregg, these modernist assumptions were contested and today hundreds of millions of people are engaged in constructive programs and corresponding social and ecological sciences are taught in schools and universities around the world.\footnote{Commoner, 1971, Schumacher, 1973, Hardiman, 2003, Hawken, 2007, Restakis, 2010, Caradonna, 2014.}

Gregg’s favorite example of slow but sure transformative change is the Salt March and the Round Table negotiations (1930–1931). This involved Gandhi’s forty-six-day Salt March, thousands imprisoned for nonviolent activities, the inconclusive first Round Table conference in London, Gandhi and others being released from prison, a pact with Viceroy Irwin that ended civil disobedience, the second Round Table conference in London ending without results (1931), the breakdown of the Gandhi–Irwin pact, the resumption of civil disobedience, and Gandhi being imprisoned again. From the perspective of violent struggle as the means of change, it looks as if nothing much happened. From the perspective of nonviolence as a way of life, it is a classic example of transformative change.\footnote{Dalton, 2012, pp. 91–138, 229–30.}

The Gandhi–Irwin negotiations appear as a world-historical moment of the organized power of nonviolent persuasion overcoming force and
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violent struggle. The Salt March is a campaign of noncooperation with economic imperialism and cooperation with community-based salt and cloth production (swadeshi). The 390-kilometre, forty-six-day march is the ethos of constructive programs in motion. It dramatizes the temporality of slow walking, morning prayers, meditation and chanting, discussing local issues, meeting with thousands of people, explaining banyan tree satyagraha, preparing and eating local food together, spinning cloth in the evenings, boycotting British goods, training new recruits, making salt at Dandi, accepting imprisonment with calm resoluteness, using prison time to reflect on the experience, and beginning again. Gandhi took the same patient attitude to negotiations, writing to Gregg before the second Round Table that it would be good if they produced results, but just as good if they did not, since that would test India’s “mettle.”

Gregg argues that the thousands of ordinary Indians who participated aimed “at replacing a pre-existing order by a new order”: that is, “to put an end, among the masses, to the pre-existing fear of the government, and to stimulate courage, self-reliance, self-respect and political unity.” They decolonized themselves and reconnected with spiritual unity. Many police and hirelings joined them. It is a classic case of collective moral conversion, practice, and rebound. The whole sequence of campaigns from 1920–1921 through 1930–1932 to 1942–1947 show a slow but steady growth of support of nonviolence and independence. This classic exemplar of nonviolent agonistics, in comparison with many others, has been discussed by millions of oppressed people ever since and is now taught in courses on nonviolence worldwide.

A third example is the slow diffusion of Gregg’s arguments that wars do not lead to peace and, in an age of weapons of mass destruction, they are irrational and suicidal. With the discovery and practice of mass satyagraha, there is an “effective substitute”: unilateral disarmament and nonviolent civil defense. In Chapter 7 he shows that nonviolent civil defense is the “moral equivalent” of military virtues, training, and

---

194 Whitehead, 1933, p. 164. Gregg argues that Whitehead’s famous thesis that the power of persuasion is more powerful than force and struggles for existence in the natural and social worlds complements Gandhi’s hypothesis. See PNV 1934, p. 170.
196 PNV 71. For this self-organizing view of disciplined satyagraha, compare Prasad, 2009.
197 See Shridharani’s eye-witness account (Shridharani, 1972 [1939], pp. 36–37). He argues that this proves Gregg’s moral jiu-jitsu works.
198 PNV 29–34, 144–45.
199 For further literature see note 203.
engagement, in response to William James, and the “political equivalent” and effective substitute for (ineffective) war in terms of morale change, strategy and tactics, in response to Walter Lippmann. 200 This structure of argument gained wide support after the horrors of World War I but was widely seen to be discredited by World War II. Peace through military superiority and disarmament negotiations among superpowers became the dominant assumption. Yet, as Gregg notes, in 1958 a leading British military expert argued in detail that unilateral disarmament and nonviolent civil defense is the only way to avoid nuclear war and establish world peace. 201 Similar analysis rapidly followed, along with the development of nonviolent peace and conflict studies, antiwar protests, the War Resister’s International, scientists and physicians against nuclear war; and new antiwar and pro-nonviolent civil defense movements grew in response to the increasing human and ecological destructiveness of wars and war preparation after World War II. 202

Conclusion

What light can PNV throw on the period of nonviolence after the assassination of Gandhi and King? Clearly there has been considerable growth in the main branches and trunk of nonviolence: ethics, constructive programs, agonistics, unarmed defense, and education. There is also a nascent global network of research and learning from reflection on these diverse nonviolent experiments around the world. However, they have not been transformative of the dynamic global systems of violence, domination, exploitation, and inequality. Often they are overwhelmed and rolled back by them. From the perspective of PNV, the major reason for this is the dis-integration of the ethical trunk and branches of the nonviolent banyan tree into separate practices, movements, community-based organizations, and networks; and their alienation from the spiritual and ecological ground of the power of nonviolence. Nonviolent agonistics is splintered into civil disobedience, civil resistance, and nonviolence as

200 The quotation from Lippmann on page 101 is the chapter’s focus. Chapter 6 employs a similar structure of argument against violent revolution. Compare Shridharani, 1972 [1939], pp. 276–94, referring to PNV 1934 at p. 291.
201 King-Hall, 1958, cited at PNV 107.
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an integrated way of life.\textsuperscript{203} Gregg certainly agrees that nonviolence is a technique that can be used in almost any situation, but it is nonviolent and transformative only if grounded in ethics and training of power-with.\textsuperscript{204} For him, this dis-integration stems from the “failure to understand the process”\textsuperscript{205} of change. The process is the nonviolent way of life.\textsuperscript{205}

The ethical ethos acquired in meditation, constructive programs, and training, and exercised in all other branches, is a “slow but sure” way of transformation due to its temporality and mode of being. In the mindful approach illustrated in the Salt March, participants “make sure” that each cooperative step enacts the nonviolent virtues of the ends and does so in a way appropriate to the local ecosocial lifeways. Each step is full of care (love) for and with all affected. This way of being embodies and brings into actuality the power of nonviolence. Technology, economics, relations with the environment, self-government, tactics and strategy of agonistics, and education are all designed to sustain and complement this countermodernity movement. Without grounding and discipline in this nonviolent ethos, nonviolent actors, despite their best efforts, remain within the hegemonic world of power-over. They become partially compromised, distorted, and colonized by its fast temporality, delusion about means and ends, impulse to dominate, and dual loyalties in their relationships to oneself, others, our dying planet, and truth.

The only way out of this dilemma is to exercise one’s inner freedom in ethical steps of self-transformation in constructive programs and help others, through exemplary action in all branches, to do the same. This slow but sure process is the repair and reintegration of the nonviolent banyan tree. It reconnects participants and observers with the integral power of nonviolence, the only power that can grow to become greater than, and transformative of, the power of violence.\textsuperscript{206}

This process of transformative change is Gandhi’s and Gregg’s response to the disempowering problematic of misunderstanding,
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disintegration, indiscipline, impatience and duragraha of their time, and which has continued to our time. Although it needs updating, Gregg’s careful description of it provides what nonviolent movements require to join hands and reintegrate the banyan tree today: persuasive and inspiring narratives of slow but sure transformative change by means of integral nonviolence against seemingly insurmountable obstacles.\textsuperscript{207} His recommendation to “dig deep” into the ethical, social, ecological, and spiritual roots of nonviolence is as relevant now as ever.\textsuperscript{208}

---

\textsuperscript{207} For the importance of such narratives, see Macy & Johnstone, 2012.
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