

Nonviolent Resistance in Modern Conflicts: Exploring Gandhi's Principles in Contemporary Situations

Dr. Basel Abou Rokba

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar college of law, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Abstract:

In today's world, where conflicts and tensions seem to be ever-present, the concept of nonviolent resistance is a powerful and thought-provoking approach to conflict resolution that has gained significance in contemporary situations. Inspired by the teachings and principles of Gandhi, this form of resistance offers an alternative to violence and advocates for social and political change through peaceful means. Gandhi's principles of nonviolence, also known as Satyagraha, are based on the belief that all people are created equal and deserve to live in dignity and freedom. He taught that violence is never the answer and that even the most entrenched oppressors can be won over through love, compassion, and perseverance. Nonviolent resistance has been successfully used in various modern conflicts, from the civil rights movement in the United States to the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa, and in the Arab countries during what so called the Arab Spring. These movements have demonstrated the power of nonviolence to bring about positive change, despite seemingly insurmountable odds. While nonviolent resistance is not a quick or easy solution, it is a powerful tool for promoting peace and justice in the world. This approach can be used to challenge a diverse range of injustices, from political oppression to social inequality and environmental destruction. In addition to its effectiveness as a tool for social change, nonviolent resistance offers several other advantages. It is a relatively low-cost and low-risk approach that can be used by people of all ages and backgrounds. Nonviolent resistance can also help build solidarity and trust among people from different groups, which is essential for sustainable social change. In conclusion, nonviolent resistance is a powerful and versatile approach to conflict resolution that can transform the world by exploring Gandhi's principles and their application in modern conflicts, we can learn more about the potential of nonviolence to create a more just and peaceful world.

Keywords: nonviolent resistance, Gandhi, Satyagraha, contemporary conflicts, conflict resolution, social movements.

1. Introduction

In the tumultuous landscape of modern conflicts, where tensions often run high and the consequences of violence are deeply felt, the concept of nonviolent resistance has emerged as a beacon of hope and a formidable tool for change. At the heart of this approach lies the timeless wisdom of Mahatma Gandhi, whose principles of nonviolent resistance have reverberated through history and continue to inspire countless individuals and movements worldwide. In this era characterized by complex geopolitical

disputes, social injustices, and environmental challenges, Gandhi's teachings provide a compelling framework for addressing contemporary conflicts through peaceful means.

Gandhi's philosophy of nonviolent resistance, often referred to as "Satyagraha," is rooted in the fundamental belief in the power of truth and moral force. At its core, Satyagraha encourages individuals to resist oppression and injustice without resorting to physical violence. Gandhi envisioned nonviolence not as a passive surrender to tyranny but as a dynamic force that actively confronts injustice through civil disobedience, non-cooperation, and principled resistance. It is a philosophy that values dialogue, empathy, and the unwavering commitment to justice and human dignity.

The relevance and importance of studying Gandhi's principles in the context of modern conflicts cannot be overstated. While the world has evolved significantly since Gandhi's time, his ideas continue to offer invaluable insights into the art of conflict resolution and social change. By examining the applicability of Gandhi's principles in contemporary situations, we can explore alternative approaches to conflict management that prioritize dialogue, empathy, and peaceful activism. Furthermore, the study of Gandhi's principles reminds us that nonviolent resistance is not merely an ethical choice but a pragmatic and effective means of achieving lasting change in an interconnected global society. As we delve into the multifaceted nature of nonviolent resistance in the following discussion, we will uncover the enduring relevance of Gandhi's principles and their potential to shape a more just and peaceful world.

The question that will be focused in this study is, How do Gandhi's principles of nonviolent resistance apply to and impact contemporary situations of conflict? Nonviolent resistance, as a powerful tool for social and political change, has played a significant role in shaping the history of conflicts around the world. Mahatma Gandhi, renowned for his leadership in India's struggle for independence, developed a unique philosophy and set of principles that guided his nonviolent approach. This topic will delve into the concept of nonviolent resistance in modern conflicts, exploring how Gandhi's principles continue to influence contemporary situations. By examining case studies from different parts of the world, we will analyze the effectiveness and relevance of nonviolent resistance in today's complex and volatile world.

The objective of this research is to examine the relevance and effectiveness of Gandhi's principles of nonviolent resistance in modern conflicts. Specifically, it aims to explore how these principles are applied and the outcomes they yield in various contemporary conflict situations.

2. Historical Background

After ten years of experimenting with civil resistance in South Africa, Gandhi made his way back to India in 1915. He invented the word "satyagraha" to differentiate it from passive resistance since he thought that nonviolent resistance was the only moral approach to handling and resolving conflict. He thought that the satyagraha had significantly benefited Indians in South Africa politically.

In 1917 and 1918, Gandhi led several resistance campaigns in Gujarat and Bihar, concentrating on specific regional socioeconomic concerns. These groups opposed British imperialism and aimed to discredit the assumed Indian collaboration that colonial power valued. The initiatives appealed to individuals beyond the educated elite who had historically dominated nationalist politics, garnering a wider spectrum of active engagement and more passive support than any previous political movement in India (Haksar, 2012).

However, owing to outbreaks of violence against the British or other Indians, Gandhi felt morally obligated to cancel the first two campaigns. Due to social control and the desire of important leaders and second-level participants to return to constitutional politics, civil disobedience waned in the 1930s and 1940s. Gandhi operated inside and through the Indian National Congress, the main political party that claimed to

represent Indian nationalism, but his interests and those of the majority of its members were extremely unlike (Borman, 1986).

In hindsight, citizen opposition didn't make British control impossible; rather, it made government work difficult by overcrowding prisons with eager inmates, targeting important income sources, or coercing village chiefs into ceasing their services. Additionally, it caused the government to worry about the allegiance of many of its important allies, including those who were very upset by Gandhi's treatment and the circumscribed character of political reform (Allen, 2007).

The 'Cripps Mission' in 1942 showed the catastrophic effects of the fight against the Raj in India. Assuming that India would obtain independence after the war, Sir Stafford Cripps promised to appease Britain's American friends and persuade Congress to work with the Raj throughout the conflict. However, by 1946, the Raj was losing both its physical and moral sway, which sparked disagreements among Indians over the makeup of their country and the nation-state that would follow. The final viceroy, Lord Wavell, said that the British had almost little influence over events and that the administration and machinery in the Centre were crumbling (Mantena, 2012).

The British understood that any more resistance efforts would have put their Indian workers and friends in an unacceptable situation, necessitating a boost in personnel and resources to restore the Raj for a sufficient amount of time. Large-scale spending on imperial rejuvenation, however, was no longer a possibility due to declining support from the British people, the country's allies abroad, and the value of India to Britain during the interwar era.

Gandhi, who held the idea that ahimsa, or non-violence, was at the core of morality and the good life, addressed these challenges in a particularly sensitive way. In his view, there could be no difference between goals and methods, and satyagraha (mutual integrity and agreement) would alter both sides of any dispute, preserving their integrity and fostering a clearer understanding of the truth.

Gandhi's objectives were clear and centred on giving Indians the knowledge they needed to understand the value of their cooperation and complicity with the British as well as the guts and fortitude to stop working with them within the unique conditions of British-ruled India. Real self-rule, or swaraj, was far more than just political freedom in his worldview (Sir Adam Roberts, 2009).

Gandhi, a well-known Indian revolutionary, requested satyagraha in 1919 and 1922 as a result of a rift with his supporters. Up until 1934, when he denounced the bloodshed in Quit India, he persisted in this behaviour. Gandhi's complicated and perhaps misconstrued views on violence were informed by his aversion to cowardice and his concern for Indian manhood. He thought that although ethically speaking, nonviolent resistance was preferable, violence was better in dire circumstances. Gandhi struggled to enforce rigorous non-violence and adherence to resistance tactics among those who followed him in civil resistance operations because doing so was necessary to uphold his high moral standards. He recognised that civil resistance was a kind of political theatre in which the audience was an essential component.

Gandhi struggled to identify civil resistance causes that would get broad support and preserve unity in a large nation with diverse regional, religious, and socioeconomic groups. Where his customers and followers were tiny, tight-knit groups, he found it simpler to lead and direct movements. His pan-Indian activities put certain Indian communities, such as northern Indian landowners and Indian Muslims, in greater danger of alienation. Gandhi experimented with organisational structures, used his networks of ideologically devoted followers, and used his power and reputation to promote and explain the cause in his efforts to design non-violent campaigns. He also debated how to best convey his non-violent actions via public rallies, travel, lectures, and journalism to a larger local and worldwide audience. Gandhi was a

self-taught politician and political analyst who saw that creating strategies for exposing the weaknesses of the opposition was essential to a non-violent campaign

Gandhi's satyagraha operations in India were intended to incite cooperative withdrawal and challenge the moral and practical tenets of British control. They were inspired by the British people's susceptibility to domestic public opinion and were created to be adjusted to particular circumstances and the vulnerabilities of adversaries. Gandhi's campaigns were effective at accomplishing the intended socioeconomic or political goals because the participants were tiny, homogenous groups that could be controlled mostly by themselves and were responsive to Gandhian discipline. However, the support for pan-Indian movements was more dispersed, and they often included organisations with diverse goals and interests. The British administration acknowledged in 1946 that it would be difficult and expensive to use force to maintain control over India against a nationally organised opposition. The British battled to manage Gandhi and his actions in a manner that wouldn't alienate the sizable audience of Indians and international well-wishers while still attempting to strengthen their network of cooperative relationships (Danielson, 2003).

Mahatma Gandhi spearheaded the satyagraha movement in India, a political movement that sought to empower Indians to reject British rule and create a society with fundamentally altered social and political structures. At best fragile, the movement saw a rising exodus of Muslim participants. Gandhi's pan-Indian initiatives served as a strong unifying force for the politicians who came into power in 1947. Participating in these non-violent conflicts, especially while imprisoned, became a recognised route to political power and influence. The historical accounts of Gandhi's nonviolent civil resistance in India raise important questions regarding this kind of struggle and the complexities of civil resistance under British control.

3. Application of Gandhi's Principles in Contemporary Situations

The second tenet of Gandhi's ideology was nonviolence, as was previously indicated. Gandhi referred to the nonviolence principle and characterised it as unconditional love, which means that we should exchange the adversary with love rather than with violence. Gandhi clarified that non-violence does not only refer to physical acts committed against another person. Instead, he said that nonviolence must also include ideas and emotions since they have the power to be more detrimental than physical deeds because they directly touch another person's emotions and damage their sentiments, which may result in complete violence.

In reality, I had to concur with Gandhi from a personal standpoint since, often, when someone is in a condition of total rage, they express or do things that offend the dignity of the other person, escalating the situation into one of extreme violence. The most egregious example of this is probably the hate speech we see today, which, together with racism, causes widespread violence that always results in the murder of innocent bystanders.

The practitioner must make a considerable lot of sacrifices according to the Gandhian approach to conflict resolution. It is what Gandhiji refers to as Satyagraha, which is the dedication to truth. In essence, Satyagraha consists of two parts: Satya is the Sanskrit word for truth. Sanskrit defines truth as SAT. Sat translates as "God is, there is no other." Thus, the closer we are to God, the truer we are. Only to the degree that one accepts Truth is one a moral actor. Graha denotes tenacity and emphasis on the truth. Graha refers to clinging tenaciously to the truth. Holding on to truth is the fundamental concept of satyagraha, therefore the term truth power. Gandhiji defined ahimsa as the practice of nonviolence. Gandhi often referred to Ahimsa. The Sanskrit term for ahimsa (Stephen Murphy, n.d.).

Ahimsa refers to the absence of harm or murder. Gandhi constantly advocated for the unity of all people.

Ahimsa, in Gandhi's view, is a good word that refers to a positive intention to work for the welfare of others, even at the cost of one's unity. Gandhiji's experience in South Africa, particularly his traumatic ordeal in Maritzburg, led to the development of his active nonviolence.

Gandhi once remarked that seeking and discovering truth are like the two sides of the same coin and cannot be done without nonviolence. To be a Satyagrahi, one must abstain from violence. Gandhiji was incapable of accepting violence as a "purifying force." Individuals or countries who practise nonviolence, he said, "must be prepared to sacrifice everything except honour." In light of this, "where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence" is a corollary. Because more perfect peace is the genuine goal of conflict, peace is more ideal than war. War is "mutual violence(Stephen Murphy, n.d.)," which always breeds animosity, retaliation, and bitterness—a terrible basis for lasting peace. Nonviolent resistance approaches a new settlement in line with Truth by bringing the concerns into the open.

Truth has always manifested as either love or nonviolence. The fundamental component of the Gandhian notion of Satyagraha is truth. It is the understanding of being, the basis for existence, and its goal. God is Absolute truth if we define God as an Absolute Being. The well-known adage "God is truth" was given an unexpected twist by Gandhi. He contends that the phrase "Truth is God" is more accurate than the more conventional "God is truth." Gandhiji developed Satyagraha as a practical and effective method of resolving disputes. Its primary components, truth and nonviolence, are interconnected as goals and methods(Stephen Murphy, n.d.). The pursuit of the "ultimate truth" is the goal of satyagraha, in Gandhi's opinion. As he sought the truth and nonviolence via his day-to-day experiences, his mind was always open, clear, and responsive(Sourav Jalotra, 2018).

A Satyagrahi is someone who consistently engages in Satyagraha(Aayushi Gupta, 2020), also known as militant nonviolence, nonviolent resistance, nonviolent direct action, and other variations in Gandhian philosophy. Gandhiji said that this method of satyagraha is appropriate in all situations, including individual and group disputes, conflicts at the national and international levels, and conflicts at all scales. He considers responsibility to be the ultimate basis of right. The satyagrahi's goal is to convert people, not to force good people to do good. More phases are involved in the conversion process, such as persuasion, moral argumentation, and self-suffering as an alternative to violence. Satyagrahi is kind and never causes injury. It must not be motivated by resentment or malice. It never becomes picky or irritated. Violence was completely replaced by it. Gandhiji's opinions were a culmination of information he received through his education, family, society, culture, and other sources. Truth and non-violence were the cornerstones of Gandhi's approach to dispute resolution(Stephen Murphy, n.d.).

For Gandhi, the image of God was the truth. He didn't have a personal deity, either. Gandhi believed that both God and truth are one. Gandhi wrote an autobiography titled "My Experiment with Truth" in which he made the statement that life is a laboratory where experiments are conducted and that truth may be attained via them. Gandhi's message might be applied to any nation or group of people. In other words,(Mahadev, 2011), his faith had no boundaries. His commitment to serving others was integral to his patriotism and did not exist in isolation from it.

Gandhi built his approach to and perspective on life on an integrated set of experiences and experiments. His views, which became known as his philosophy, were a result of his tenacious pursuit of the truth. The complementary nature of truth & non-violence. Every soul, in his opinion, is the secretary of truth. The practice of satyagraha not only changes the enemy's heart but also cleanses the practitioner's heart. It eliminates his nasty traits. However, Gandhiji also noted that it is very laborious work to maintain the

nation secure for Satyagrahis. Gandhiji said that satyagraha is not a weapon for the weak and that it requires a great lot of patience and sacrifice. Only those who are willing to endure any level of pain, including death, in defence of it. A Satyagrahi became brave in the most aggressive and ruthless manifestation because of this. Gandhi's approach or technique was developed from his nonviolent stance. Gandhiji suggested the use of coercive tactics like picketing, self-immolation threats, hunger strikes, and other similar tactics. But is seldom an appeal to the opponents' conscience. Later, the Gandhi Satyagraha was corrupted by the so-called gherao technique of coercing the decision-maker.

The gherao is profoundly wicked in that it involves besieging irregularly unarmed (Mahadev, 2011), rational, and defenceless persons or groups of men and holding out until all demands have been met. Gandhiji often said that satyagraha can purge society of all ills, including political, economic, and moral ones. Being a type of resistance to evil, satyagraha includes opposition to unfair laws as its most obvious manifestation in the context of social strife. Gandhiji believed that the same moral principles that should govern a person's behaviour should also govern how countries interact. In the Gandhian approach, the person enters a conflict situation as someone who is not inherently aggressive and has the freedom of choice to settle disputes without resorting to violence (Mahadev, 2011). Whether we concentrate on relationships between people, groups, organisations, or countries, conflict is a fundamental part of existence. Conflicts may take many different forms, including negotiation, coercion, transformation of conflicts, and prevention of conflicts to achieve a condition of cooperation. Gandhiji described his protest as a "satyagraha," a highly spiritual deed that was the moral equivalent of war. Gandhiji had the view that people make up society and that what we do affects the world around us.

He said that the course of history may be changed by a small group of focused souls who are fixed by faith in their purpose. The connection between a person and society, in his view, is one of the components that determines the entire. Marxists believe that a person's consciousness is determined by their social life. He thought that men were products of their environments. Human volition does exist, in Freud's opinion. According to the determinist viewpoint, as all occurrences are subject to universal rules, an act of will is also predetermined by the person doing it and their underlying motivations.

4. Case studies of nonviolent resistance in recent conflicts

As we previously explained, Gandhi's philosophy of nonviolence, or Satyagraha, was built on several key principles that continue to be relevant in modern conflicts. These principles include the pursuit of truth, nonviolence as a way of life, the power of love and compassion, and the willingness to suffer for one's cause. By examining how these principles are applied in contemporary situations, we can better understand the effectiveness of nonviolent resistance in achieving tangible and lasting change (Sourav Jalotra, 2018). The adoption by the United Nations Charter at that time of the policy of resolving international disputes by applying the policy of non-violence that Gandhi referred to can be considered the greatest evidence of the importance of the philosophy presented by Gandhi and which we referred to previously (Sourav Jalotra, 2018).

It must be noted that at the same time that Gandhi laid down his principles, many countries were suffering from the scourge of civil and international wars, which is what inspired countries, especially the occupied ones, to adopt Gandhi's ideas and seek their independence by implementing a policy of non-violence.

Nonviolent resistance is the strategy of enacting social change without resorting to physical force or the threat of physical force, such as via symbolic demonstrations, civil disobedience, refusal to cooperate in political or economic matters, or other means. Since ancient times (Bawa & Singh, 2017), nonviolent

resistance has been used as a weapon for change and has been effective in several instances both historically and globally. The civil rights movement in the United States under Martin Luther King, the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa under Nelson Mandela, and the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia under Václav Havel are some of the most well-known instances of nonviolent resistance (Aayushi Gupta, 2020).

Nonviolent resistance is a modern phenomenon as well as a historical one. Many individuals have fought injustice, oppression, and violence in numerous situations and areas in recent years using nonviolent means. Current nonviolent resistance movements include the following:

- **The Belarusian "Jeans Revolution":** Since August 2020 (*Belarusians Wear Jeans in Silent Protest - ABC News*, n.d.), tens of thousands of Belarusians have demonstrated in the streets in opposition to the rigged presidential vote that delivered Alexander Lukashenko a sixth term in power. Although the security forces brutally suppressed them, they remained nonviolent and innovative in their protests. They have demonstrated solidarity marches, human chains, and flash mobs while waving the white-red-white flag, which represents Belarus historically (Nepstad, 2011).
- Also, since 2013, millions of Americans have taken part in demonstrations, marches, vigils, boycotts, and internet campaigns to call for an end to institutionalised racism and police brutality against Black people. They have increased public awareness of the deaths of Black persons who were unarmed by police, like George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and several more. Additionally, they have pushed for racial justice, fairness, and change in several societal spheres (*Black Lives Matter | Definition, Movement, Goals, History, & Influence | Britannica*, n.d.).
- **The struggle of the Cuban dissidents:** Since July 2021, hundreds of Cubans have protested in the streets, calling for freedom, democracy, and human rights in opposition to Miguel Daz-Cannell's totalitarian rule. Despite being subjected to harsh crackdowns by the police and paramilitary organisations, they have persisted in airing their complaints and ambitions. They have shouted phrases like "Patria y Vida" (Homeland and Life), which is a play on the government's motto "Patria o Muerte" (Homeland or Death), and "No tenemos miedo" (We are not frightened) (*Cuban Dissident, Now in Spain, Says Struggle Will Go on without Him | Reuters*, n.d.).
- **The Tunisian Revolution 2010:** Lack of political liberties, a failing economy, and a corrupt government all contributed to the Tunisian revolt. Despite minimal opposition to President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, an atrocity on December 17, 2010, after police confiscated the vegetable cart of a street vendor who set himself on fire, sparked a large-scale uprising (Nepstad, 2011). The government enforced a curfew after thousands of solicitors and teachers went on strike. Ben Ali did not step down despite several strikes and protests. On January 17, Ben Ali fled to Saudi Arabia after realising he had no way of maintaining his authority since Army Chief Rachid Ammar refused to kill civilians (*Tunisia Timeline: Since the Jasmine Revolution | United States Institute of Peace*, n.d.).
- **The Egyptian Revolution 2011:** Egyptian civil resisters sought to topple President Hosni Mubarak, who had controlled Egypt for 30 years, and were motivated by the Tunisian uprising. On January 25, 2011, their first protest drew thousands of spectators. The demonstrations persisted despite the internet being banned and the deployment of the military. The military said it would not use force and stood with the opposition, refusing to fire on demonstrators. Mubarak made compromises to hold onto power, but civil disobedience activists demanded his resignation. He refused; therefore, they started a strike. Mubarak resigned on February 11, 2011, with tens of thousands of demonstrators still not giving up and the military prepared to remove him (Nepstad, 2011).

- **The Syrian Crisis 2011:** Syria's protests over high unemployment, falling living conditions, human rights abuses, and almost 50 years of emergency rule that severely curtailed political freedoms started at the same time as the Egyptian revolution. Through the use of emergency measures, the Syrian government was able to put an end to the demonstrations. However, opposition leaders subsequently urged people to participate in a "day of rage." Small rallies occurred over the next weeks, but the army put an end to them soon because the nonviolent protests escalated into armed clashes on both sides. But by the end of March 2011 (Nepstad, 2011), tens of thousands had demonstrated in Syria's cities. Expanding repression coincided with growing opposition (*Why Has the Syrian War Lasted 12 Years?* - BBC News, n.d.). The army dispersed the protests using tanks and snipers according to some reports. Although it has made certain adjustments, the Syrian government mostly used force to maintain power. As a consequence, since the revolt began, hundreds of civilian resisters have perished. During the summer of 2011, soldiers started defecting because they were troubled by instructions to assault defenceless people. In the northern town of Jisr al-Shughur, one of the bases had half of its personnel desert. Some of them escaped and sought refuge overseas. The Syrian government publicly executed others. Some of them established the Free Syrian Army intending to remove Assad from power by force. However, there are just a few thousand dissidents worldwide, according to estimates. In comparison to the Syrian army, which has 220,000 members, this is a modest quantity. The majority of the military continued to support the Syrian regime, making it impossible for the revolt to prevail (Nepstad, 2011).

These are just a few instances of how nonviolent resistance may be used in current conflicts to challenge the status quo and bring about good change. Nonviolent resistance is a powerful strategy that can mobilize people from various backgrounds and perspectives, expose the oppressors' brutality and unjust practices, win over allies and supporters, and change the structures and systems that uphold injustice. Nonviolent resistance is not a passive or weak form of action. Although it does not guarantee victory, nonviolent resistance is a brave and optimistic strategy for working toward a society that is more peaceful and fairer (M. R. Rajagopalan, n.d.).

5. The strategies and tactics employed by nonviolent activists:

In a world riddled with conflicts and turmoil, the concept of nonviolent resistance has emerged as a powerful force for change. From civil rights movements to political uprisings, nonviolence has proven its effectiveness in challenging oppressive regimes and bringing about lasting transformation.

Nonviolent resistance, sometimes referred to as civil disobedience and passive resistance, is based on the idea that change may be brought about without the use of force. According to this theory, tyrants are susceptible to moral and ethical arguments, and peaceful protests may make the evils of their reign known to the outside world. Famous people like Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. supported this strategy, paving the way for later contemporary movements (Karakaya, 2018). Examples of Notable Nonviolent Resistance United States' Civil Rights Movement: One of the most potent examples of nonviolent resistance is the Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s and 1960s. This campaign, led by Martin Luther King Jr., aimed to eradicate racial prejudice and segregation. They were able to overthrow the existing quo and bring about important changes in American culture via nonviolent demonstrations, sit-ins, and boycotts, which culminated in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Arabic Spring Millions of people revolted against repressive regimes throughout the Middle East and North Africa during the Arab Spring, which started in late 2010. Although the results varied, the

employment of nonviolent strategies(*Nonviolent Action, United States Institute of Peace*, n.d.), like as large-scale demonstrations and civil disobedience, was essential in overthrowing authoritarian governments in nations like Tunisia and Egypt(Nepstad, 2011).

As we previously established by providing several instances of nonviolent demonstrations and occasions that proved the power of philosophy, the methods by which persons with peaceful liberal ideas have also changed throughout history. We list the following as some of these methods:

1. **Demonstrations & Protests:** One of the most well-known types of nonviolent action is peaceful marches, gatherings, and demonstrations. They promote awareness of certain problems, foster cooperation among participants, and demonstrate the breadth of public support for a cause.
2. **Civil Disobedience:** To oppose unfair policies or practices, civil disobedience entails wilfully breaking laws, rules, or instructions. To contest the validity of the laws they disagree with; activists are willing to incur legal repercussions like arrest or fines.
3. **Boycotts:** Boycotting is the practice of refusing to support organizations, goods, or services that have oppressive values or methods. Economic pressure on companies or governments may be used quite effectively via economic boycotts.
4. **Strikes:** There are many different types of strikes, including labor, hunger, and consumer protests. They cause disruptions to routine activities and bring certain requests or complaints to light.
5. **Peaceful Assemblies** Activists may debate topics, exchange information, and develop alliances in gatherings, conferences, and forums. They encourage communication and cooperation among different parties.

Moreover, these methods were not limited to, but also included, Nonviolent Discipline, Legal Action, Lobbying and Advocacy(*Nonviolent Action, United States Institute of Peace*, n.d.), etc...

We notice, through studying previous cases of using non-violent methods for political change in the modern era, that most of the experiments, especially the successful experiments in the Arab region, derived their success from using peaceful methods and pressuring governments to make the necessary change, but the secret to the success of that change or not was dependent on the intervention of the army, Or not.

When we look at the Tunisian and Egyptian cases, popular protest alone was not enough to overthrow the government of Mubarak and Zine El Abidine, but the success of these protests depended on the army in both countries not supporting the governments of the two deposed presidents.

As for the Syrian experience, the reason for the miserable failure to make the required change was due to the division of the army and its support for the Syrian government, and from here we notice the main role that the military institution still plays in many countries.

6. The outcomes and consequences of nonviolent resistance with violent resistance in modern conflicts: Violence is the use of physical force or power to harm, injure, or kill someone or something. Violence can take many forms, such as war, terrorism, genocide, homicide, assault, rape, torture, and domestic abuse. Violence can also be structural, such as oppression, discrimination, exploitation, and injustice. Violence can have various motives, such as revenge, hatred, greed, fear, or ideology. Violence resistance is the use of nonviolent or violent means to oppose, challenge, or prevent violence. Nonviolent resistance includes methods such as protests, strikes, boycotts, civil disobedience, and dialogue. Violent resistance includes methods such as armed struggle, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, and self-defense. Violence resistance can have various goals, such as liberation, justice, democracy, or human rights protection(Jeyakumar et al., 2017).

The consequences and outcomes of violence and violence resistance depend on many factors, such as the context, the actors, the strategies, the tactics, the duration, and the intensity of the conflict. However, some general patterns can be observed from historical and empirical evidence.

Some of the main consequences of violence are **Human Suffering, international isolation, Economic Devastation, Prolonged Conflict, Refugees, and civilian movement**. Violence causes physical and psychological harm to both victims and perpetrators. Violence also causes material damage to property and infrastructure. Violence can disrupt social order and stability, create fear and insecurity, and erode trust and cooperation. Violence can also have negative effects on the environment, such as pollution, deforestation, and biodiversity loss.

One of the main outcomes of violence is resistance. Violence often provokes a reaction from those who are affected by it or oppose it. Resistance can be either nonviolent or violent. Resistance can also be either direct or indirect. Direct resistance confronts violence head-on, while indirect resistance avoids or undermines violence in subtle ways.

The consequences and outcomes of violent resistance vary depending on the type and effectiveness of the resistance. Nonviolent resistance can have positive effects on both the resisters and the oppressors. Nonviolent resistance can empower the resisters by enhancing their moral authority, solidarity, creativity, and resilience. Nonviolent resistance can also influence the oppressors by exposing their illegitimacy, increasing their costs, reducing their support, and creating opportunities for dialogue and negotiation (Jeyakumar et al., 2017).

Violent resistance can have negative effects on both the resisters and the oppressors. Violent resistance can weaken the resisters by increasing their vulnerability, isolation, fragmentation, and radicalization. Violent resistance can also harden the oppressors by justifying their repression, escalating their violence, mobilizing their allies, and closing off any channels for communication and compromise.

The outcomes of violence resistance also depend on the balance of power between the resisters and the oppressors. When the resisters have more power than the oppressors, they can achieve their goals more easily and quickly. When the oppressors have more power than the resisters, they can resist change more effectively and persistently. When the power is evenly matched or fluctuating between the resisters and the oppressors, they can reach a stalemate or a compromise.

We can also, based on the experiences witnessed in the international arena of violent and non-violent events, list the outcomes produced by liberation non-violent movements through the following:

- **Reduced Bloodshed:** Since nonviolent resistance strives to minimise physical violence, both the oppressors and the protestors often suffer fewer casualties. Nonviolent movements often get greater sympathy and support from the global community, including nations, nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), and people. Pressure on the oppressor diplomatically may result from this (M. R. Rajagopalan, n.d.).
- **Sustainable Change:** By laying the groundwork for an equitable and inclusive society, nonviolent resistance may result in more long-lasting and sustainable change.
- **Less Physical Devastation:** Compared to violent confrontations, nonviolent movements often inflict less physical devastation to infrastructure and property.

While the consequences of non-violence also might be listed as following:

- **Social Cohesion:** Nonviolent movements often work to foster harmony and social cohesion within their communities and among members.

- **Legitimacy:** The general public tends to see nonviolent movements as having higher legitimacy, which may be crucial for post-conflict peace-making operations.
- **Civil Society Development:** By empowering common people and promoting a culture of civic involvement, nonviolent movements may enhance civil society.
- **Political Transition:** Nonviolent opposition may result in the formation of democratic institutions and peaceful transfers of power (Jeyakumar et al., 2017).

In conclusion, violence and violence resistance are complex phenomena that have multiple consequences and outcomes. Violence causes human suffering and provokes resistance. Resistance can be nonviolent or violent. Nonviolent resistance has positive effects on both sides of the conflict. Violent resistance has negative effects on both sides of the conflict. The outcomes of resistance depend on the balance of power between the resisters and the oppressors.

7. The impact and sustainability of nonviolent movements compared to violent ones:

From the last point we addressed in comparing the consequences of violence and violence resistance we can say that, when compared to violent movements, nonviolent ones often offer definite benefits in terms of durability and long-term influence. The durability and long-lasting impact of nonviolent movements are influenced by a number of elements, while the success of any movement may vary depending **on the context:**

1. **Less Damage and Loss of Life:** Nonviolent demonstrations often cause fewer casualties, less damage to infrastructure, and less physical and mental suffering.
 1. This lessened damage promotes a more hospitable setting for post-conflict healing and peace-making.
2. **Moral High Ground:** In the view of the general public and the international world, nonviolent campaigns often possess the moral high ground.
3. The goals of the movement may get more sympathy and support as a result of this moral legitimacy.
4. **Wider Participation:** Nonviolent movements often draw a larger and more varied group of supporters, including women, kids, and senior citizens. Participation from a large number of people boosts the movement's flexibility and durability.
5. **Lessened Escalation:** Conflicts are less likely to escalate into lengthy, violent confrontations when nonviolent movements are used. As a result, there is a lower chance of violent cycles and protracted instability.
6. **Creating Civil Society:** Nonviolent movements often support the growth of grassroots networks, civil society organisations, and civic involvement. These components support societal advancement and the long-term viability of democratic institutions.
7. **Conflict Transformation:** Nonviolent movements prioritise addressing the core causes of disputes, promoting communication, and finding workable solutions. By addressing fundamental issues, this strategy fosters long-term peace and stability.
8. **Positive Social Change:** Nonviolent movements are often linked to more significant political and social transformations that advance justice, equality, and human rights. Because they address systemic problems, these adjustments often have a longer-lasting effect.
9. **Leadership Legacies:** Nonviolent leaders and activists often leave lasting leadership and inspiration legacies. Future generations and movements may continue to be influenced by these legacies.
10. **worldwide Impact:** Nonviolent movements that are successful may serve as models for other nations, sparking a chain reaction of change on a worldwide scale. Nonviolent movements may also be sustained through international cooperation and solidarity.

11. **Less Repression:** When nonviolent movements use peaceful techniques, authorities may be less likely to oppress them or use violence against them. Repression may be lessened, allowing the movement to go on and gain support.

Contrarily, violent movements often encounter issues with sustainability and long-term effects:

1. **Escalation and Protracted Conflict:** Violent conflict may endure for a long time, making it difficult to find a peaceful settlement or long-term stability.
2. **Devastation and Disruption:** Violent movements may seriously harm communities, businesses, and infrastructure, making it difficult to recover after a war.
3. **Limited Public Support:** Violence has the potential to alienate sections of the populace and erode public support, making it more difficult to realise the goals of the cause.
4. **Legitimacy Issues:** Violent movements may find it difficult to acquire international backing, which may restrict their diplomatic choices as the case of **Sudan, Syria, Russia with its invasion against Ukraine**, where the above-mentioned countries are now under diplomatic sanctions from most of the countries.
5. **Cycle of Revenge:** In violent disputes, cycles of retaliation and counterviolence often continue, creating enduring instability.
6. **Risk of Extremism:** Radicalization of violent movements might make the transition to peaceful democratic processes difficult (M. R. Rajagopalan, n.d.).

It's important to remember that every conflict and movement is unique, and that the success and viability of violent and peaceful tactics may differ significantly depending on the particular situation. The data, however, points to nonviolent movements as having a higher likelihood of bringing about long-lasting, sustainable change while minimising pain and devastation.

8. Conclusion:

In conclusion, it can be said that Gandhi's philosophy, which led to India's independence in the last century and which was part of the revolution led by Gandhi and known as the White Revolution, has not lost its importance at all to this day.

Also, this philosophy was not a religious and social philosophy pertaining to Indian society itself, but rather it was a political philosophy with international dimensions because it was characterized by a spirituality that is suitable for every time and place. This philosophy also proved that the power of conscience and good faith always prevails over the power of war, killing, and destruction, which do not benefit nations in anything except through more pain and suffering.

This philosophy has inspired many leaders throughout history, starting with Luther King Jr. and the Dalai Lama, to achieve their goals of liberation from all forms of slavery by following the policy of nonviolence, which was the cornerstone of Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy.

What confirms the continuation and success of Gandhi's philosophy in our current era is that most of the liberation movements that took place in most Arab countries, which were known as the Arab Spring, followed the teachings of the great teacher Gandhi by adopting a policy of nonviolence, and the success of these liberation movements shows the importance of adopting the philosophy that Gandhi put in The last century and its continued applicability in our current era, despite all the difficulties and changes that have occurred in societies, this philosophy will remain the only means to achieve just and comprehensive peace in the world.

Bibliography:

1. Aayushi Gupta. (2020). *Relevance of Gandhian Principles in the 21st Century - iPleaders*. Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law. <https://blog.ipleaders.in/relevance-gandhian-principles-21st-century/>
2. Allen, D. (2007). Mahatma Gandhi on violence and peace education. *Philosophy East and West*, 57(3), 290–310. <https://doi.org/10.1353/PEW.2007.0029>
3. Bawa, J., & Singh, H. (2017). *A Critical Analysis of Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict Resolution and Way Ahead*. www.iaset.us
4. *Belarusians Wear Jeans in Silent Protest - ABC News*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 28, 2023, from <https://abcnews.go.com/International/story?id=1502762>
5. *Black Lives Matter | Definition, Movement, Goals, History, & Influence | Britannica*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 28, 2023, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Black-Lives-Matter>
6. Borman, W. (1986). Gandhi and Non-Violence. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 46(3), 681–682. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/2056945>
7. *Cuban dissident, now in Spain, says struggle will go on without him | Reuters*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 28, 2023, from <https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/cuban-dissident-says-government-cut-off-his-communications-silence-him-2021-11-18/>
8. Danielson, L. C. (2003). “In my extremity i turned to Gandhi”: American pacifists, Christianity, and Gandhian nonviolence, 1915-1941. In *Church History* (Vol. 72, Issue 2, pp. 361–388). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0009640700099881>
9. Haksar, V. (2012). Violence in a spirit of love: Gandhi and the limits of non-violence. In *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* (Vol. 15, Issue 3, pp. 303–324). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230.2011.644422>
10. Jeyakumar, N., Jeyakumar, N., Program, M., & Seering, W. (2017). Understanding the Outcomes and Aftermaths of Nonviolent Resistance. In *MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY*.
11. Karakaya, S. (2018). Globalization and contentious politics A comparative analysis of nonviolent and violent campaigns. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 35(4), 315–335. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26959401>
12. M. R. Rajagopalan. (n.d.). *Violence And Its Dimensions*. GANDHI SEVAGRAM ASHRAM. Retrieved September 28, 2023, from <https://www.gandhiashramsevagram.org/gandhi-articles/violence-and-its-dimensions.php>
13. Mahadev, D. (2011). *Gandhi an Autobiography or the Story of my Experiments with Truth*. <https://www.mkgandhi.org/autobio/autobio.htm>
14. Mantena, K. (2012). Another realism: The politics of Gandhian nonviolence. *American Political Science Review*, 106(2), 455–470. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541200010X>
15. Nepstad, S. E. (2011). Nonviolent Resistance in the Arab Spring: The Critical Role of Military- Opposition Alliances. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 17(4), 485–491. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1662-6370.2011.02043.X>
16. *Nonviolent Action, United States Institute of Peace*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 28, 2023, from <https://www.usip.org/issue-areas/nonviolent-action>
17. Sir Adam Roberts, T. G. A. (2009). *Civil Resistance and Power Politics*. Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/civil-resistance-and-power-politics-9780199552016?cc=sg&lang=en&>

18. Sourav Jalotra, K. D. (2018). *A Study of Gandhi's Non-Violence Philosophy - Ignited Minds Journals*. Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education. <https://ignited.in/I/a/305544>
19. Stephen Murphy. (n.d.). *Brief outline of Gandhi's Philosophy | Articles on and by Mahatma Gandhi*. Gandhi Research Foundation. Retrieved September 28, 2023, from <https://www.mkgandhi.org/articles/murphy.htm>
20. *Tunisia Timeline: Since the Jasmine Revolution | United States Institute of Peace*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 28, 2023, from <https://www.usip.org/tunisia-timeline-jasmine-revolution>
21. *Why has the Syrian war lasted 12 years? - BBC News*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 28, 2023, from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-35806229>