

Chapter 10: Non-Violence

The common thread running through the previous chapters is that humanity has a great need for peace, and this goal must be achieved by means that are consistent with the goal. There can be no other means than pacifist ones. One of the best known methods is non-violence. It is obvious that the pacification of the world will certainly involve the use of non-violence. It is therefore important to outline the essential aspects of this approach. The core of this philosophy is sustainable success for all parties. It is a way of turning the opponent into an ally. The practitioner is ready to receive violence without giving it back. He wants to convince his opponent that he risks nothing from him. It is a very powerful method but very difficult to implement. In the first place, it is based on truth, on sincerity. This is the foundation stone of the method. It implies first of all being ready to question yourself. Being non-violent does not imply that you are right. It is possible that you are basing yourself on false knowledge or inappropriate attitudes and claims. To convince your opponent, you must be able to listen to him and take his expectations into consideration. This may be enough to break the deadlock, even if you did not get what you expected. The problem may come from the non-violent person. But if you apply the method, you will have the satisfaction of having corrected yourself, the satisfaction of having remained consistent with your principles of non-violence, and the satisfaction of not having used violence for an unfounded reason. Thus, non-violence is not a possible strategy to reach an objective. It is a state of being and the objective may need to be redefined in order to remain non-violent, not the opposite. To implement it, it is necessary to examine your conscience. Am I being truthful? Am I not lying to myself? Am I open to listening and can I admit that I am not in the truth? It is essential to know this before engaging in non-violent action, because you will have to convince your opponent of this, and perhaps take some hits. It would be a waste to suffer hardships that could be avoided by simple self-examination. Another very, very important point is that nonviolent action is not necessarily successful. Examine your conscience to see how far you are willing to go. It is also worth judging the importance to your conscience of what you stand for. Sacrificing your life for a coin may not be very useful, even if you stand for a right principle. Henry David Thoreau failed to stop the wars against the natives. But his conscience told him not to pay the taxes that funded them. He ended up in jail, but claimed he was free. Free for not contributing to a massacre. But his action was noticed and inspired many people long after.

Practicing non-violence is not easy, it requires great human qualities and awareness. It is necessary to be aware that these qualities are superior to domination by violence. Because this knowledge of the additional value that one possesses over the opponent allows one to bear his violence without hate and

without the desire to strike back. If when you are insulted or hit, it is very difficult for you not to retaliate, it is perhaps because you have not yet understood that it is useless... in the long run. Your opponent may get to you in the end and will eventually make you react with violence. He will have convinced you that he is right to use violence. You must also be aware that the road is sometimes long, very long, and that it is not because you have accepted a first act of violence without batting an eyelid that the fight is won. It is not a fight against the opponent but first against yourself. Sometimes it takes many long attempts to succeed. It may take a very high level of mastery to practice non-violence in all circumstances. Although it is a necessity, non-violence is not yet affordable for a significant part of humanity. Yet a large majority would like peace. If everyone really believed in non-violence, peace would be immediate. We are not there. Advocating non-violence is not enough. It must be practiced and taught in everyday life in order to propagate it. With children, for example. You will quickly see your limits of tolerance. You come to a situation where you want to admit that sometimes it is necessary to have limits or forbidden things, for the respect of others or yourself. But the child will not necessarily understand this. This allows you to question your certainties. To avoid constraint or force in such a situation, it is advisable to accompany the child in the effort that is asked to him. Make the effort with him to show him that you are making at least as much effort as he is so that he understands that it is important for you. Your moral superiority has thus been established by the fact that you have been able to endure the necessary suffering, not by a subjective a priori knowledge of what is right and what is wrong.

As I mentioned earlier, it is important to know that non-violence does not always lead to the desired result. However, it is possible to identify certain circumstances that are more favorable to success soon after its practice.

The most important criteria is the sincerity of the opponent. If he is sincere, it is possible to find common ground for dialogue, to understand his expectations and to be able to express and justify his own.

Next, another criteria favorable to the success of a non-violent approach is the opponent's feeling of superiority. History has taught us the lesson that the physically strongest is overcome by the most intelligent, who will develop strategies and technologies that will overcome the physically strongest. Today, the one who thinks he is superior, thinks it in relation to his intelligence or his humanity (or the community he represents). But this belief does not hold when he considers appropriate to use violence. He proves that he is on the level of physical strength and not intelligence or humanity. Sometimes the problem is a little more complex, when the person believes he is superior because he does not bother with humanistic considerations. He believes that he has more ammunition or weapons than his opponents. But today, humanity is at a level where it is necessary that the person who does not have humanity makes believe that he has it in order to have allies in sufficient numbers, otherwise he would be alone or rejected. Thus, even the person who has no humanity, his intelligence dictates that he needs to display humanity to others. The reciprocal of this statement is that the intelligence lacking real humanity,

will do everything to show that his opponent is grossly violent. Thus justifying its superiority and its right to use its force. Humanity is morally superior, in the sense that it does not induce the opponent to be violent, and that it does not wish to use violence against the other. Thus another aspect of non-violence is also to do what is necessary to prevent one's opponent from falling into violence. By repeating non-violent actions for a long time, the intelligent and powerful opponent or group will eventually drop its mask: one day or another he will be caught soaping the board of his opponent and will betray his bad intentions to everyone. And the multiple stratagems used in response to the previous non-violent actions will be revealed. Intelligence without humanity can then be seen for what it is: Machiavellianism, causing the disgust of all others. This is how humanism, incarnated in non-violence, is superior to intelligence. In other words, superiority can be recognized in the renunciation of violent action against others. Thus, an opponent who believes himself to be superior can be maintained and guided in a non-violent approach, which brings both parties to the ground of truthfulness, sincerity, and thus resolution of the dispute. It is in this context that Mahatma Gandhi forced the British to give up their domination. This is why an opponent who believes himself to be superior is a good candidate for a non-violent approach.

On the other hand, there are cases where considerations of sincerity, truth or even superiority are not present. It is usually greed that motivates these people. If other people stand between them and the coveted object with greed, it will be very difficult to achieve results with the non-violent approach. Massacring is absolutely no obstacle for some people. Any consideration can weigh against their desire. Showing opposition is experienced as a violent insult, which the aggressor will feel the need to compensate with violence. There were and still are people with this state of consciousness. It should be noted that the object is not necessarily material, it can be power or spiritual authority or honors. A simple "no" can unleash an extraordinary violence. Whoever wants to oppose this type of consciousness risks losing his life.

For this reason in particular, non-violence cannot be made an absolute rule. To ask someone to resist non-violently against this kind of consciousness is not wise. Defending yourself can be wise, if it is not an absolute rule either. So someone who defends himself even with violence does not have to be condemned automatically. It must be understood that the non-violent approach is above all a personal commitment to sacrifice oneself for the benefit of others as well as oneself.

This understanding about non-violence is essential in order to avoid its greatest trap: to submit because the greedy or cunning one tells you to be non-violent and let yourself be abused. No. That is submission, you don't want that for yourself and you don't want that for your opponent. The idea behind non-violence is to offer self-sacrifice to transform your opponent. If the opponent demands this sacrifice you cannot offer it and he sees your act as weakness, not as nobility, which will in no way encourage him to change. This is the trap that financial predators set with the doctrine of free trade. You must offer them the freedom to enslave you. The freedom to trade can be negotiated, but there must be some trade-offs, such as

freedom of speech, freedom to refuse a job, freedom to eat healthily, freedom to have a roof over your head, freedom to be in peace.

There are several possible ripostes to predation and greed. Let's take an example. Let's imagine two clans from a warrior culture who have a major conflict to deal with. They are about to declare war on each other as is their custom. But, the voice of a wise man emerges in one of the two tribes. He preaches non-violence and brotherly understanding. War only brings desolation and does not solve the conflict, except to exterminate everyone. And he manages to convince his clan to go and negotiate peace. The other clan does not accept, except on the condition that they get all their land and they leave. The wise man is a great spokesman and manages to convince his clan to accept the other clan's conditions. For this is the beginning of a new life, a better life. So the wise man and his clan move further away. But the first clan sees this surrender as a sign of weakness. In addition, the leaders maintain their power over their clan by their art of warfare ensuring the survival of the clan. They also maintain other beliefs that oppose those of the wise man. Thus, leaders identify that the action of withdrawing from the other clan invalidates the justification for their power over their clan. Members of their clan may demand a change in clan leadership. It becomes strategic for the rulers to remove that wise man and that clan from the Earth. When the wise man learns of the other clan's intentions, he knows that he cannot ask his clan for more effort. He has already achieved a revolution by asking to try to apply his wisdom, he cannot ask for more at this time. That would be to have them slaughtered and end his experiment of brotherhood and non-resistance. So, he accepts the way of the fight chosen by the opponent but reminds his clan of the objective to live in peace. He makes them accept rules of conduct during the fight, which allow to stop it as soon as possible. He also reminds them to always respect the opponent and not to fall into the vices of war that would close the way to reconciliation and peace. The fight takes place and the aggressors must retreat. Defections within the aggressor clan increase. After some time both clans ask to follow the path of the Wisdom. You may think this is utopian, but I think this story is quite similar to what happened at the birth of Islam, the birth of a religion of peace. The wise man is the prophet Muhammad.

How do I know this? By reading their texts and asking friends, work relations, everyday people like cab drivers, who are Muslims. The media messages about Islam do not match my reality. I suggest considering misleading principle number 4: false flag operation. When the media reports something that revolts you, done in the name of Islam, it is reasonable to assume that it was not a Muslim who did it. Even if the perpetrator claims loudly that it is Islamic values that make him do it. If the media is hammering this horror into your head over and over again, emphasizing the morbid details, it is misleading principle number 1 at work: to stir up strong emotion to spread the message that Islam is evil and violent. Remember that greedy and truly violent groups need to make their opponent look violent. Doesn't Islam clearly forbid usury? Is it not usury that allows people to accumulate huge amounts of money, as we have seen in the chapter on interest-bearing loans? To whom do the big media belong in France, if not to large wealthy people? Why do these big wealthy persons

invest in loss-making media? Where does their wealth come from? If it came from usury, wouldn't it be logical that Islam would be their opponent? Wouldn't it be logical that these wealthy persons invest to make Islam look like a violent religion? Seek the truth by yourself, ask the people you meet who are the Muslims of your daily life, therefore of your reality. You will then be able to see for yourself the media's inversion of the real nature of Islam.

Islam, in its wisdom to defend oneself against greedy predators, is not the only one to invoke the possibility of reacting to an aggressor. In the Japanese tradition, the Budo martial path is backed by a code of honor, Bushido. In its ultimate expression, the Aikido of Master Morihei Ueshiba, it also comes to the precepts of non-violence. This is what Master Ueshiba said: "Aikido cannot be anything else than a martial art of love. It cannot be a martial art of violence", "The aikidoka's state of mind must be peaceful and totally non-violent. In other words, he must have a special state of mind that leads from violence to a state of peace."

To require non-violence for another is not the way of non-violence. The only requirement of non-violence that it can be formulated, it is with yourself. It is first of all a work of inner purification. When violence manifests itself, dialogue to identify the source of this violence is a necessity. It can be the occasion to understand a great suffering of the one who committed the violence. Refusing to dialogue is a refusal to recognize the suffering of the other. It is necessary to accept that some people react when they are attacked in order not to die in indifference. Do you accept this? Even if those who do not want to dialogue label him a terrorist? All armed resistance fighters are called terrorists by the authoritarian regimes in place. General De Gaulle and all resistance fighters in France during the Second World War fit the criteria of terrorists. Refusing to dialogue with a terrorist is a condemnation to continue. Do you understand the sentence "It is normal that the weak resort to terrorism". It is only a rephrasing of "Some people do not want to die in indifference". It was Gaddafi who said it. And it is not an encouragement to terrorism, as some might imply, it is a key to trying to understand terrorism and stop it.

So what the West and France in particular did in the Libyan crisis was to require that Gaddafi not defend himself and his people against heavily armed groups. A practitioner of non-violence does not make such demands. What happened next showed that those who required non-violence then used violence with great excess. This is a case of greedy and authoritarian predators. What Patrick Mbeko reports in his book "Objective Gaddafi" is that, despite the slander and aggression he suffered, Gaddafi, throughout the ordeal, did not touch his people and kept his hand out for appeasement. Including the offer to withdraw. He did not make any threats or attempts to attack the interests of his aggressors. How to explain such an attitude, if not the confidence that the truth is on his side? He did not consider himself weak. He just said "you will regret it". The sooner we understand his position, the less we will suffer. And in order to keep the truth hidden, he had to disappear. These are the people who wanted the fall of Libya: greedy, cunning, powerful, authoritarian predators that perfectly executed non-violent actions cannot stop at once. I hope you will reflect and search with the will to know what really happened in Libya. Gaddafi

offered us an exemplary behavior so that there is no possible ambiguity about the nature of the visible or invisible forces that attacked Libya. These forces of predation have in their hand NATO which they have used. Is there a force greater than NATO that could stop them? Even if there was, is it reasonable to use it? On the other hand, if we let them do it, only the effects generated by the actions of their unconsciousness will stop them. That is, a large-scale cataclysm, a nuclear winter, a flood.... But if this does not happen or takes a long time to happen, then the vast majority of humanity will be under their control in misery, a minority will live in fear of this misery and will collaborate to maintain the misery of others. But all of them (99%) will be considered as cattle, even as waste. Let's face it, peace is a necessity. Any people that tries to live in emancipation will be reduced to nothing by these predatory and dominating forces. Disarmament is necessary.

Let's look at another case that is not the way of non-violence. Peacefully demonstrating in front of a leader's residence to ask him to leave is not enough to claim that the action is non-violent. First of all, the presence of a crowd in front of a man, even a protected one, imposes a relationship of force, it is not non-violent. If the crowd wants freedom, it is necessary to specify which measures it expects, and that this indeed represents the expectations of those who demonstrate. If the ruling power disappears as requested, how does that mean that freedom will be obtained? Once gone, another leader will take his place, but did the crowd plan a fair way to designate the successor? If it ever did, is this process accepted by all those who are not protesting but who will have to endure this new leader? Then there is the question of what measures will be put in place to achieve more freedom. Free trade? We come back to the same questions as for the appointment of the new leader... A non-violent approach begins with a project elaborated or supported by many supporters. Gandhi and Mandela created their Congress to define their project and gain widespread support. Martin Luther King Jr. did not ask for leadership, but for race equality laws to be voted on. Peace protesters, in order to take the path of non-violence, must remember to turn their opponent into an ally. The current leader must be brought in to implement the expectations of the people, with justice and general acceptance. It is not very important who is going to do it, but it is necessary to pay attention to what and how it is going to be done.

Now, I would like to draw attention to the fact of demonstrating without asking for something specific, like demanding democracy. Or in a logic of pure opposition, as for example, everything but the current leader. As explained before, nothing constructive can come out of it since nothing has been prepared. You have to ask yourself why certain people, parties or interests are working on such demonstrations. Because the issue is that a spark can trigger mob movements and panic. If the crowd is not deeply non-violent, it is possible for the demonstration to degenerate into an insurrectionary movement. It is then easy to move to the stage of changing the leader. By intentionally igniting the spark, a coup d'état can be organized in this way and passed off as a popular aspiration. Do you think that in these conditions the people will benefit? Yet the leader, as a last resort before leaving, offers concessions. But unidentified forces are working for his departure and for the

concessions to be forgotten. In his book on Gaddafi, Patrick Mbeko has noted in recent years that many regime changes have begun with anti-regime demonstrations and then the crowd being shot at with guns. Panic takes hold of the crowd, the media denounces this as crimes of the regime in place. Then the "international community" puts extraordinary pressure to change the regime. It supports groups with a name that includes the words democracy, human rights or freedom. But what they do is to try to overthrow the regime by violence. Patrick Mbeko investigated this phenomenon and was able to establish that the shooting of crowds is carried out by forces from outside the country, that strategists have defined and perfected their practices to carry out coups d'état and the first step is the pacifist demonstration. So before you demonstrate, find out what the organizers' intentions are, think about what your reaction will be if you are shot, and if the leader is replaced, make sure it is for progress. It can get really bad. Libya knows something about that. Tunisians tell me that there have been no significant positive changes since their "Arab Spring" revolution, but now they have contracted a debt to the IMF, insidiously putting their finger into the hell of usury.

The approach of authentic non-violence is first of all non-resistance. Opposition must be understood as a difference of position on ideas. It is not an opposition of persons. So when faced with someone of great greed or authority, it is more reasonable for you to leave, because leaving the place is an option. Sometimes there is no better way than to preserve yourself. The opponent who uses violence in these extreme cases will only evolve in suffering, when he suffers an injustice. He will only begin to question himself when he suffers a similar action, and perhaps he will make the connection with what he has done to others. This will be the beginning of compassion. It will be all the more activated as the first victim will not have expressed aggressiveness.

Finally, faced with the unconsciousness of greedy, authoritarian and violent aggressors, there are some wise people who accept to face death, without the slightest resistance, after having used all their wisdom to convince their relatives and opponents. They prefer to leave this world with the message of non-resistance and non-violence. They know that in their lifetime they will not be able to do better. They accept the otherness of the other who wants to see them dead at all costs. The most famous people who had this wisdom are Socrates and Jesus. They die, but their messages still resonate today. Since they have for them the Truth which is eternal.