

The Relevance of Nonviolent Politics in Nation Building: Gandhi's Lens

Onwe Jeremiah NGWU

*The Office of Director of Art and Culture of the Federation, Federal Secretariat,
Garki, Abuja Nigeria, jerryonwe@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this paper is to establish nonviolent politics in its praxis as a way forward in fostering unity, equity, justice, and nation building. No writer has a monopoly of knowledge or ideas. Therefore, this work is subject to objective criticism, evaluation, and recommendation if needs be. Not until we came in contact with the works of Gandhi, who saw *Ahimsa* as the foundation for nonviolent politics, as a virtue and as human nature, we may have all believed and argued that no man born of woman could live out in his/her life loving and nonviolent in political or social issues. We had committed ourselves to doubt the possibility of social and political, even religious transformation without violence against the group, individual; or, tribe against tribe, state against state, and religion against religion. Considering man's insatiable tendencies, we may have been led to say that nonviolent protest is an instrument of the weak scornfully, who cannot stand the wraths of war and would never be as effective as violent ways achieve political or economic freedom. Especially when human values (justice, human dignity, freedom, love, peace, etc.) are on the brink (students of Frantz Fanon will refute it with all their guts). To avoid being guilty of fallacy, the author would argue that even if it is possible for a small city/group to engage in peaceful protest and gain her/their desired goal, it is not possible for a problematic nation like Nigeria, with cultural diversity to apply the same method Gandhi used without shedding blood, especially from the side of the peaceful (nonviolent) agents, perhaps, nonviolence is possible tool even today to get evil policy in the government changed. After all, there must be a measure of resistance to defend oneself from the barbaric killings or being treated as mere animals. In short, violence is not an option for building a nation. Of course, no human society can promise its citizens qualitative education, a good network of roads and sustainable social amenities, well-equipped hospitals, good infrastructural development(s), or intelligent leaders amidst war (violence), corruption, and hatred.

KEYWORDS: nonviolence, politics, *Ahimsa*, foundation, nonviolent politics, civil disobedience, nation building

Introduction

The socio-political horizon unfolded by Gandhi's political ideology, based on love [nonviolence], surpasses a mere demand of human justice. That is to say, giving people [all human races] their due is imperative. The main object of love, we mean, nonviolence as practiced by Gandhi goes beyond treating others justly. To bring this to life, Gandhi sacrificed his resources, life and avoided material possessions [a kind of authentic life lived by

existentialists]. Consequently, his politics of nonviolence exemplified what the Holy Scripture admonishes us in 1 John 3:18, "let us not love in word or speech but indeed, character and in truth." This is linked to the life of Socrates of the ancient Greece, who willingly gave in to die a shameful death as for justice to prevail. Hence Jesus Christ of Nazareth's priceless love epitomizes it all. Nonviolent politics in Gandhi, however, took its peculiar routes to achieve justice. Meanwhile, his politics of nonviolence was both collective and personal efforts to eliminate social, political and economic injustices in human society. It was collective because Gandhi gained the support of Indian merchants, traders, lovers of political equity and human values; and elites living in South Africa and across the globe. On the other hand, it was personal because he chose the course to fight for justice, protect the interest of the poor citizens who were alienated in the Natal, and make his voice heard in the world political system. In order to achieve this, he employed self-discipline, a series of peaceful campaigns, including "salt March," and civil disobedience at the climax of impunities unleashed on Indian citizens. Similar to Socratic teaching, we subscribe that one must stick to his conviction no matter what the price, even death, when disobeying the existing government. For justice to reign, Gandhi believed that whoever wanted to eliminate injustice should be ready to eliminate violence and do it with all his might fearlessly. Perhaps, there will always be suffering which cries out for freedom and for the restoration of equality, peace, and justice in a society. Meanwhile, we may have doubted its possibility long ago. In our ceaseless quest for self-realization, none came into full consciousness that there are more civic, subtle, but powerful ways to gain liberty from the oppressors than the use of arms.

The nature of man hitherto has been calm, gentle, rational and passionate, but only when his rights and life are threatened wantonly, he uses any available means to reclaim his rights, yet he does not use violence since his natural instinct is rational and social. These psychological characteristics set man apart from animals. Their nature is in the other way round; they do not have passion similar to that of human beings, have no cognitive ability, and are violent in nature. Diwakar (1968, 4) puts it in more affirmative way. For him, man is non-violent in nature. And, non-violence, according to him, "is a rational principle based on the natural social instincts of man. It is, therefore, a socializing influence and to that extent it is a civilized force," he concluded. Man's passion from ages has been to attain self-realization; self-purity, and free himself from the bondage of ignorance, and uncivilized nature. Now, the driving force for him to attain this purpose is necessarily peaceful and nonviolence, since his nature has been good. However, man's passion ought to reflect his divine nature. Now, to observe morality and operate with the principle of love, he must master his mind and free himself from the concupiscent influence of the senses. Gandhi (1947, 55) noted the same point when he penned, "to observe morality is to attain mastery over the mind and our passion... hence, the mind is a restless bird; the more it gets, the more it wants, and still remains unsatisfied." To train the human mind in order to overcome this insatiability ought to be every man's greatest concern. Consequently, this stream of genuine experience and experimentations led Gandhi to establish the principles of nonviolence [satyagraha]; the virtue he lived to the end.

In the justification of violence, the rationale typically attached to political professions is invariably carried under the banner of regret and considered contextually in extreme cases. Often time, people who selfishly pursue their political interests, invariably, would at the end live to regret the methods they employed. Meanwhile, any human desire void of passion for preserving human life and improving the poor masses' wellbeing is not worth having. Life, Derrida (1997, 329) averred, "...has absolute value only if it is worth more than life." In the same vein, I assert life as the greatest value and an end in itself. Further, life as an absolute value, I vehemently contend, encapsulates Love, Nonviolence, Respect for human dignity, Peace, Justice and Truth. Therefore, violent life or war, instead of promoting common good, will destroy the divinity (dignity) of man. By and large, violence has universal condemnation

since its deplorable impacts in the II World War and Civil war-Biafra War, precisely. If man has learned that violence is to be avoided and as something tinged with profound human tragedy, why then the clamor for it?

People's supposition that Gandhian political thought was only a tool to turn British out of Indians' political and economic life and that it is strictly relative adventure has been defeated by nonviolent philosophers' demonstrations. In short, one can rightly say that Gandhi's politics of nonviolence was a practical thinking. For example, many states today like Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB) glamour for peace and resort to settle any burning dispute nonviolently. In the sojourn of political freedom, self-government, and socio-economic freedom, people must not necessarily engage in war/violence. Eritrea, for instance, was set free from Ethiopia without shedding blood, even though they fought for about 30 years, but later, they resorted to nonviolence agitations.

Understanding Nonviolence

To understand Gandhi's notion of nonviolence, it is important of course, to know what nonviolence is. According to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Hornby, Ashby, and Wehmeier 2000), nonviolence "is the policy of using peaceful methods, not force, to bring about political or social change." Nonviolence means the absence of violence or coercion. Thus, nonviolence is the self-practice of being harmless to oneself and others under every condition. This comes from the belief that hurting people, animals or the environment is unnecessary to achieve a social or political change. Gandhi insisted that one must abstain from '*himsa*'-violence if he must attain '*nirvana*'. Consequently, nonviolence has 'active' or 'activist' elements, in that, believers accept the need for nonviolence as a means to achieve political and social change. No wonder, the Tolstoy and Gandhian nonviolence beg for philosophical recognition.

For Gandhi (1921, 5), "strength does not come from physical capacity; rather, it comes from an indomitable will." Perhaps the human urge to avoid physical pains has always led him to apply his manly capacity instead of his 'will.' Now, nonviolence, which is necessarily man's nature, is superior to violence. However, it brings suffering to the believers and ardent students, yet 'Ahimsa'-non-violence is an active force to resist evil concupiscence of both material and latent needs. His inordinate wants must be guarded. Gandhi (1921, 6) wrote, "Nonviolence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering." Disciples of Gandhi and those who desire to serve other people to the detriment of their happiness do it with all their might and will, knowing that man's happiness lies in the service of others, not in self-service.

The parallels in *ahimsa*-nonviolence (i.e., Gandhian conception of love) with the Christian concept of love-agape are noteworthy. In that, Gandhi preached for unconditional love and sincere forgiveness, even when one's persecutors or enemies pierced his skin with lighted metal, a sort of practical extension of love to one's neighbor similar to the son-father relationship as exemplified in the Biblical parable of the prodigal son. In his book, *God is Love-Deus Caritas Est*, Pope Benedict xvi (2005,13) expounds on this point. He succinctly explored the link between human love, love of God and the inseparableness of man from God. Nevertheless, he adds, this was made possible through the indefinable love lavished on man, God who gave His only begotten son to die for our sin, even when he knew no sin. Love, he pens, "is indeed 'ecstasy' - a blissful state-, not in the sense of a moment of intoxication, but rather as a journey, an ongoing exodus out the closed inward-looking self towards its liberation through self-giving...." There is existing contrary between man's understanding of love and what Gandhi called 'the purity of human mind', in the former, man loses his rational prowess to self-driving emotion; he consciously pursues that which appeals and satisfies his flesh. Now, he is aware of when he has feelings for the opposite or same-sex. This, of course, is no different to selfishness-love of self. Nonviolence-*ahimsa*, Gandhi

argued, goes beyond self. It lacks the knowledge of self but embraces the alien, the enemies and the anti-nonviolent. Thus, “it doesn’t mean meek submission to will of evil-doers, but it means putting of one’s whole soul against the will of the tyrant (Gandhi 1921, 6).” By this single principle, it is very easy for one to defy the whole might of an unjust empire to save his honor, religion, and soul and lay the foundation for the empire's fall or extinction. Politics ought not to be a do-or-die affair. Neither is it worth being an enterprise of touts and thugs, where an inexperienced and uneducated group of people or individuals should occupy a position because of their military might. Politics is a noble and leadership art and science where the art of governance is practiced.

What is politics?

This time is an exciting era to be studying nonviolent politics. The whole world is facing political and economic crises now. Political, socio-economic crises and critical discussions in political activity have raised deep and perplexing questions about the nature of political activities, especially political unrest.

The definition of politics is as difficult as that of philosophy. This is because many political theories have emerged, and each claims to hold ground over the other. Despite these current debates, to what should be characterized as politics, the more universally accepted definition is that politics is the activity associated with the government of a country, which its prime aim is to improve the societal status or increase individual power. Politics is an art as well as science. It is art because it is a conscious and skillful field where creative and intelligent leaders explore their governance skills for nation building. It is a science because it is pragmatic in solving the problem of underdevelopment.

The term politics is a Greek word, 'Politikos,' that is to say, 'relating to citizens.' Plato critically envisioned a politics characterized by Statesman, a virtuous one who has the sound mind to discern right, just, and truth regarding decision-making in human society. Politics is the art of governing people virtuously with the aim to create a world free from political war, corruption and enlarge the mental estate instead of physical estate. This is what led Plato’s critics to insist that Plato’s version of politics is based on unrealistic utopianism. Hence, politics involves making a common decision for a group of people; it is exercising the position of governance with a great sense of human development, enlarging the horizon of social, economic, and religious values. Politics reflects how best human society and life should be arranged, such as social practices and political institutions; religious differences should be balanced, and mineral resources and manpower should be shared justly.

Nonviolence as part and parcel of Human Nature

In *Satyagraha’s Economy and its Relevance for National Development*, Onwe (2020, 16) wrote that “the classical conception of human nature establishes a principle of fundamental importance for all social and political thinkers who are interested in establishing objective grounds for the critique of inhuman behavior-violence, war and alienation of labour.” By this he means that living peaceable, good, and nonviolent life is not a matter of arbitrary opinion, but as such, anchored on creative mental tendency of man. This though, contradictory, but we cannot ignore it in order to appreciate Gandhi’s nonviolent politics. Obviously, nonviolence is part of human nature [life], wrote Gandhi (1967, 259). Every rational and moral agent has the tendency to be nonviolent in nature. Nonviolence, he enjoined, is much more than a mere strategy established by weak individuals, as some critics would argue. Rather “it is definitely an attribute of human society.” Gandhi’s devotion was to prove this point, even if he was to sacrifice his life. Admittedly, in this age of political and philosophic wonders no one will say that a thing or idea is worthless because it is new, or it is grounded

on pragmatism. We are witnesses to cases of nonviolent politics. As the author mentioned before, Indigenous People of Biafra is one of the nations that is on this same nonviolent pathway, and will achieve her political and economic freedom without war. To say it is impossible because it is difficult is again contrary to the spirit of the age of change. Change is constant, Heraclitus opined. Only Truth is constant-God can never change.

Nonviolence, therefore, is an indispensable part of human life, and also possible for all human races to possess, practice and live out fully. Nonviolence is actual law of the universe, with the same principle hold as the law of gravity. If we pursue nonviolence and positive development, our lives will bear the good fruits therein. Similarly, violence can only lead to further violence. Violence needs not to be taught, just as evil. Nonviolence as human nature, requires training to live it to the full. King Coretta S. (1969, 79), consented that “nonviolence in its truest sense is not a strategy [nor a lip-service] that one uses simply because it is expedient at the moment; nonviolence is ultimately a way of life that men [or community of men] live by because of its sheer morality.” Consequently, to accept the above notion, and the willingness to use nonviolence as a technique is a step forward. Whosoever that embraces human values is likely going to adopt nonviolence as part and parcel of life, which every moral agent should not struggling to live by it. Thus, nonviolence is therefore an inherently part of human life, which has led many nations to political, socio-economic and religious freedom. Above all, it has taught us the power of love, and inculcated us with spiritual sanity. In a more pragmatic sense, no development can thrive in amidst of misplaced goal. We are certain that nonviolence has a definite goal which is to advocate for justice, reclaim the lost civil rights, eradicate poverty, and to install peace in the society. To observe nonviolence, I mean here, is to be human centered, be fully concerned about others' wellbeing and avoid use of force, coercion or illegitimate means to acquire anything.

Nonviolent attitudes as one of the highest assets includes full control over the process of governance, societal development, without war either by words, thought, or in deeds, Gandhi explained. Every creature in human society is under virtue of being, governed by nonviolence instinct. Perhaps, protesters can opt for nonviolence because violence is not possible or out of a firm commitment for nonviolence (Abu-Nimer 2003, 15). Unlike Gandhi, who saw to it that Satyagrahis were all living by nonviolent principles, Martin Luther King Jr. did not stipulate that the freedom fighters had to apply nonviolence as attitude of life but stated that it was a means of protest, which accounts for the large spectrum of African-American applying nonviolent protest. Pragmatically, both Gandhi and King's means and end provided them with a positive image as it enabled both leaders to legitimate their demands to the world and won massive supports.

Interestingly, Walton (1971, 24) poses the question, “whether nonviolence could function in all cases as effectively without doctrine, like the one preached by Gandhi”? Doubtfully, it is intelligible to discuss nonviolence if it is devoid of ethical roots. Any ethical theory that defends nonviolence on practical grounds will inevitably also find violence appropriate on certain occasions. Oftentimes we see people who may resolve to be nonviolent in their protests to address social ills being frustrated by violence. Sometimes, police or even army forces are used, which in most cases, resulted in counter-violence. A good number of such incidents have happened in Nigeria. Nonviolence's foundation is morality. Hence, Gandhi's methods were for the conversion of the violent crusaders through justice, truth and love, a total transformation and renewal of the minds of one's enemies.

In fact, it is worth noting that most freedom fighters or rights protesters are sometimes uncomfortable with nonviolence and believed that they have the right to defend themselves, especially when their lives are wantonly threatened. Perhaps, nonviolence is still a way forward for addressing social, economic, religious or political injustices. Just like morality cannot be separated from politics, in the same way, nonviolence is inseparable from human nature.

***Ahimsa* as the Foundation for Nonviolent Politics**

Christian love (*Ahimsa*) constituted the core ethics of Gandhi's non-violent politics. Along with the observation of non-violent principles as preached by Gandhi, one must have sense enough and morality as well to love everyone, including his/her enemies. However, in a strict sense, *Ahimsa* is a holy strategy for social, religious or political revolution. And it fosters a sustainable development in a human society. *Ahimsa* means love that is inspired by will to liberate/save the voiceless masses. *Ahimsa*, Gandhi (1935, 180) penned, is the greatest weapon available to humankind. "It is mightier than the mightiest weapon of destruction devised by the ingenuity of a man."

Martin Luther King Jr. (1991, 19), wrote, "at the center of nonviolence [Gandhi's politics] stands the law of love," and that "alongside the way of life, someone must have sense enough and morality enough to cut off the chain of hate," in order to achieve political freedom. I wish to speak here based on where I came from. The most humiliated and alienated race politically, in Nigeria, though has the most ingenious persons in Africa and across the globe since the end of bloody civil War, is the Igbo race. Looking back, we are bitterly aggrieved of the deplorable experiences our grandfathers and fathers had, and we are still having with Nigeria government till today.

Ahimsa, a *sanskrit* language, is rooted in Gujarati, which means love/nonviolence, not hurting every creature. Gandhi believed that *ahimsa* evolved from the evolution of human civilization. It is a belief that all lives are one, including the nature-animals and vegetation. Thus Gandhi (1960, 99) picked this traditional belief and lifted it to the high pragmatic levels, in politics and religion. He penned, "the first condition of nonviolence is justice all round in every department of life." This is a problem that Gandhi's *ahimsa* is faced with. When do we say that one's act is violent either towards men or nature? How do we differentiate violence or nonviolence on nature and humans that can satisfy the demands of nonviolence as preached by reason? It is very simple. He who devotes his life to the votary of love, that is, nonviolence, must have to reduce his grossness for wants to a minimum. Gandhi (1947, 65) expounded further, that "he must bear in mind the poverty of others. And that his earnings would be free of dishonesty. The desires for speculation would be also renounced. His habitation would be self-restraint exercised in every sphere of life."

Indeed, at the root of nonviolence is the doctrine of self-training. Total self-restraint exercised in all spheres of life is the foundation of nonviolent politics. According to this disciplinary attitude of the human mind, the wealthy may not possess as much more than their neighbours. How? Can this happen without force/violence on the side of the wealthy citizens? Or should the wealthy citizens be dispossessed of their possessions? Naturally, this may result in violence.

The antecedents of nonviolent politics [*ahimsa*] are founded in antiquity, in the philosophical tradition, for example, in the social contract theories of Jean Jacques Rousseau "The Social Contract" (1762), Thomas Hobbes and other natural rights theorists. The question of social relation between natural and civil rights led Thomas Hobbes to coin his idea "The State of Nature". In this condition, individuals' actions are bound only by their own power and conscience. A kind of state born out of contract, where individuals surrendered their rights to selected few, emerged.

In absence of social, political and economic power, society would be characterized by 'war, and human life would be solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short'. Gandhi expounded the historical evolution of human society, in which he preached that not until humans entered into an agreement, entrusted their powers, whether natural, economic or political to the individuals who would in turn surrender theirs, violence would continue to thrive in a society. For Gandhi, the rich men would be left with their possessions, of which they have to play by the rule of conscience. They know that they are trustees whose openness to others, that is,

honesty is required for the development of society. Hence there is a need for the transformation of the mind. Thus, openness is an integral part of nonviolent politics since nonviolence itself is based on the principle of truthfulness. According to Gandhi (1966, 165), “as soon as man looks upon himself as a servant of society, earns for its sake, spends for its benefits, then purity enters into his earnings and there Ahimsa is ventured.” One may doubt the possibility of this, considering the fact in the history of human nature. Whatever becomes too impossible for men is very possible for them if they are guided by wisdom. After all, impossibilities are ever becoming possible. Isn't it amazing what is happening in the world politics today, and among the states who clamor for freedom? The future is a bundle of possibilities. Yet, no human is a mastery of the future. Lawful resistance of alienation and social vices is inevitable.

Civil Disobedience as an irresistible force

Civic resistance of corruption, injustice and alienation of man by men is a powerful force that can defile the might of arms and armories. A deliberate defiance of evil policies made to exploit and deny people their natural rights, or, a sort of intimidation orchestrated by corrupt elements in the state in order to remain in control of power, economy, etc, is what civil disobedience stands to fight. Henry David Thoreau (1849) and Leo Tolstoy (1893) were the first modern writers to articulate systematically the idea that citizens have a moral obligation to undertake positive action to resist unconscionable state policy. In their works, *Resistance to Civil Government* and *The Kingdom of God Is Within You*, respectively, pictured what is now generally known as Civil Disobedience. For them, citizens are obliged to resist evil, corruption, and unfavorable state policies nonviolently. Furthermore, they have the requisite rights to conscientiously resist the government's injustice, intimidation, and wicked policy.

Thoreau opined that individuals should see themselves as human beings first and subject to law second. Regard for what is right should precede regard for law. Conscience, he contended, provides a higher law, to which the morally upright citizen must have recourse. He argued further that it is not enough that citizens refrain from taking part in injustice; they must also take positive action to separate them from the state's injustice. Thus, they must resist that state and her injustice actively through non-cooperation. Therefore, non-cooperation is conscientious refusal to obey evil policy of the government; refusal to pay taxes, which Thoreau argued, is an art of slavery and what he saw as unjust war, he willingly went to jail. Thoreau argued that because the state depends upon the consent of the governed, upon which its power and authority are derived, citizens could withhold their allegiance with a clear conscience.

Obviously, civil disobedience, like development, cannot flourish in an environment of violence. Civil disobedience belongs to patriotic citizens; it does not in any way suggest hooliganism.

Nation building

There is no human society that can promise its citizens qualitative education, good network of road and sustainable social amenities-well equipped hospital, and good infrastructural development (s) amidst of war, corruption and hatred. However, no state is built in a day. It takes years and well laid plans inspired by love for a nation to be born with full of dreams and fulfilments. As Pope Benedict XIV, rightly pens, love of one's country inspired by love of others promises man eternal bliss (self-fulfillment). Therefore, no place in society is worthy of focusing its drives for power unless it advances human dignity for the greater good, like eradicating poverty, improving the learning environment, banning abortion, terrorism, child abuse, etc. All such things are only possible in the community of love.

NGWU: *The Relevance of Nonviolent Politics in Nation Building*

Nation building involves increment of mental and physical state of a nation or individual persons in a nation. To build a nation simply means to develop a nation according to international plans and standards for human existence. That is, to improve the living standard of a nation. This cannot be achieved by twinkling of eyes. It is a process as well as determinant of livelihood of citizens. If a nation does not focus on human development, for instance, the lives of its citizenry are on the way to animation. In a strict sense, the object of nation building is both matter and form (physical-infrastructure and spiritual-moral sanity). By extension, one can agree with me that the evidence of mental growth-development is tested via human response to his immediate world, his confraternal relationship, passion for helping those who are poor both in mind and in material needs, etc., but then, he is aware of his limits, therefore, he must not be controlled by material affinity. Building a nation, therefore, is human-centered. Stanley (2010, 37) captured this when he writes, "development typically involves improvement in a variety of indicators such as literacy rates, life expectancy, and poverty rates." In that, development ameliorates poverty and improves the living standard of a nation. This is best realized in a society free from selfishness, marginalization, ethnicism, political and economic violence, and nepotism. To build a nation, Jeremiah Onwe Ngwu (2020, 17) writes that selflessness is indispensable. For him, "selflessness as a global demand for national development, seeks for objective good without having any ill-consideration for self-advantage.

Gandhi's conception of building a nation is largely contrary to Marxist materialism. Gandhi rejected political materialism which believes in the creation of a paradise of material plenty, in raising the standard of living understood as maximizing consumption and optimizing the pattern of production. The principle of development is universal reality, it occurs wherever it is rightly applied. No nation can survive bombing, corruption, kidnapping and human trafficking, to mention but a few while she inspires to develop.

Conclusion

What are the best ways to practice politics without nepotism, corruption, and political injustice using nonviolence as the most effective tool? It is through relentless resistance of socio-political vices and undiluted love for humanity, inspired by the love of one's nation, by carefully obeying the wise counsels of our conscience. Indeed, no society, no matter how it is endowed with mineral resources, occupied by the highest number of elites without confraternal services propelled by national and human love, will survive. Now, how do we gain political change in a nation with multi-cultural heritage and socio-religious practices, a method that would integrate not only our place of origin but others without political war, whether with arms or in words? By putting our gross wants to check, and concentrate on objective value-moral sanity.

Truly, Gandhi's politics of nonviolence ought to be the praxis for political stability since its approach to political and social issues is based on self-suffering for the betterment of all in the society, including one's stunt enemy (a choice sort of adventure). And it is from this view that we argue that nonviolence is political and social force, and not only relative truth but universal reality, which even both black and white races can practice. Therefore, we avoid any claim that Gandhi's politics of nonviolence is philosophical hermeneutics, as some people would like to argue. Contrarily to our pursuit is Frantz Fanon's violent decolonization agenda. Though most nonviolent activists hated colonialism, colonial imperialism, black races' political bewitchments and its pretentious government, I often tell people never to engage with violence against authority or use of armory.

References

- Abu-Nimer, Mohammed. 2003. *Non-violence and Peace Building in Islam: Theory and Practice*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1997. "...and Pomegranates" in *Violence, Identity and Self-Determination*, ed. Hent de Vries and Samuel Weber Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Diwakar, R., R. 1968. *Introduction in Nonviolence after Gandhi: A Study of Martin Luther King Jr.* Ed. G., Ramachandran T. K. Mahadevan. Bombay: New Delhi.
- Gandhi, K. Mohandas. 1921. *My Non-violence*, comp. Sailesh Kumar B. India: Ahmedabad: Jitendra T Desai Navajivan Publishing House.
- Gandhi K., Mohandas. 1935. *Harijan*, 20 July 1935.
- Gandhi, K. Mohandas. 1947. *India of My Dream*, compiled, R., K., Prabhu. Ahmedabad, India: Jitendra T Desai Publishers.
- Gandhi K., Mohandas. 1960. *All Men Are Brothers*, ed., Krishna Kripalani. Ahmedabad: India: Navajivan Mudranalaya.
- Gandhi, 1966. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi: Encyclopedia of Gandhi's Thoughts*. Ahmedabad: Jitendra T Desai.
- Gandhi, K., Mohandas. 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, ed., R. K. Prabhu & U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad, India: Jitendra T Desai Publishers.
- Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version. Britain: Bible Society Resource Ltd, p.223.
- Hornby, Albert Sydney, Michael Ashby, and Sally Wehmeier. 2000. *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*, seventh edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Igwe, Stanley C. 2010. *How Africa Underdeveloped Africa*. Port-Harcourt: Professional Publishing Company.
- King, Coretta Scott. 1969. *My Life with Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Holt, Rinehart Winston Press.
- King, Martin Luther Jr. 1958. *Stride Toward Freedom-The Montgomery Story*. New York; NY: Harper & Row.
- King, Martin Luther Jr. 1991. *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King Jr.*, ed. James Melvin, 1st edition. Washington: San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Onwe, Jeremiah Ngwu. 2020. "Satyagraha's Economy and its Relevance for National Development. *In Specialty Journal of Accounting and Economics*, vol. 6, (1). Feldkirchner: Seiersberg, Austria: Science Arena Publications.
- Pope Benedict XVI. 2005. *God is Love, Encyclical letter of the Supreme Pontiff*. Nairobi: Africa: Pauline Publications.
- Thoreau, Henry David. 1849. *Resistance to civil government*. Auckland, New Zealand: Floating Press.
- Tolstoy, Leo. 1893. *The Kingdom of God Is Within You*. Page & Company, Inc.
- Walton Jr., Hanes. 1971. *The Political Philosophy of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Westport, Conn: Greenwood.