Chapter 6

Mediated nonviolence as a global force: an historical perspective

Sean Scalmer

Social movements rest often upon the power of non-violence. From the early nineteenth century, non-violent acts, such as rallies, public meetings, demonstrations and marches, have served as among the most commanding of collective performances (Tilly, 1995, 2008). Since the rise of Britain's Chartists, advocates of 'moral force' have vied with champions of 'physical force' for leadership of mass movements (for a review of the Chartist literature, see Hilton, 2006: 676–82), and in a series of studies across the twentieth century, social scientists repeatedly identify the power and capacity of non-violent political techniques (e.g. Case, 1923; Gregg, 1960; Bondurant, 1958; Sharp, 1973; Ackerman and Duvall, 2000).

What role has the media played in the diffusion of these methods? A prevailing indifference to media studies among social movement specialists across disciplines (as noted in Downing, 2008) means that this question is seldom posed by scholars as noted in the Introduction of this book. Those studies that do ponder it overwhelmingly emphasize the contribution of new, digital media. New media promote diffusion in three ways. First, television undermines the previous importance of physical structures, broadcasting peaceful and theatrical actions from those immediately present to mass audiences in many other places (Meyrowitz, 1985: vii, 224–25). Second, alternative media, organized through the Internet, allow campaigners to share more sympathetic and accurate accounts of their protests than those provided by commercially owned news services (Meikle, 2002; Scalmer, 2002). Third, email helps in the rapid diffusion of information and in the coordination of actions across dispersed locations (Mayo, 2008: 314; Smith, 2008: 323–24).

Together, the new media are often thought to initiate a transformation in the nature of social movements. Castells (1997: 107) argues that the Internet provides the 'organizational infrastructure' of new, networked campaigns. Kahn and Kellner (2004: 88) describe the Internet as the 'basis' of an 'unparalleled worldwide anti-war/pro-peace and social justice movement' and Tarrow (2005: 103) suggests that the diffusion of contention 'has both increased and accelerated' in an era of global communications. Furthermore, others have argued that 'cyber-diffusion', operating through the Internet, ensures the 'diffusion of ideas and tactics [...] much more quickly' than in the past (Ayres, 1999: 133–35).

Unquestionably, the diffusion of protest tactics across national borders is among the most significant aspects of contemporary activism (Cammaerts, 2007). A large and growing literature ponders the effects of such diffusion and attempts to understand its dynamics (Chabot and Duyvendak, 2002; Tarrow, 2005; Roggeband, 2007). However, if contemporary forms of global diffusion frequently rest upon the capacities of the new communications

technologies, does this then mean that digital media are *essential* to the process? Some students have been careful to note the longevity of global activism, which dates back several decades, even centuries, before the present (Tarrow, 2005; Hanagan, 2002), but few scholars have ventured systematic historical analysis of earlier moments of transnational circulation. Though the revolutionary importance of print is sometimes recognized (Anderson, 1991), little is known of the relationships between 'movements' and 'media' that prevailed in earlier struggles. As a result, the novelty of the present is sometimes affirmed rather than established; the lessons of history and the possible continuities of past and present conventionally are overlooked.

This chapter attempts to redress this neglect. It offers a sustained historical treatment of a major episode in the history of global non-violence that occurred well before the rise of the digital media. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi organized, led and theorized the most effective and influential of all non-violent movements. In South Africa and then in India, Gandhi developed a distinctive version of non-violent and loving action that he called '*satyagraha*' (Gandhi, 1927: 239–40). Across three great mobilizations in India ('non-cooperation' in the early 1920s; 'salt satyagraha' in the early 1930s; and 'Quit India' in the early 1940s), mass satyagraha campaigns under Gandhi's leadership galvanized the populace and astonished their colonial overlords. By 1947, these actions had helped to secure independence from Britain.

Gandhi's campaigns attracted interest and provoked imitation around the globe. African Americans considered Gandhi's relevance to their own struggle for racial equality over several decades (Kapur, 1992). Pacifists debated the possibilities of 'nonviolent resistance' in the case of invasion (e.g. Huxley, 1969 [1937]). And in the years after Gandhi's death, a 'New Left' emerged in North America and Europe that owed much to the non-violent experiments of India's Mahatma (Scalmer, 2011). More recently, figures as diverse as Lech Walesa, Aung San Suu Kyi, Nelson Mandela and the Dalai Lama have been dubbed 'Children of Gandhi'. Indeed, Gandhian non-violence has been successfully deployed in a large number of collective movements across many places and times (on Gandhi's influence, see Hardiman, 2003; Sharma, 2007).

How was the global diffusion of Gandhism accomplished in a world that lacked the Internet or cheap international travel? And what lessons does this episode hold for those interested in media-movement relations over more recent years? In this chapter, I draw upon a longer historical study of Gandhian non-violence in India, the United Kingdom and the United States (Scalmer, 2011) in an effort to answer these questions. This larger study, *Gandhi in the West*, involved close reading of major newspaper sources (commercial, peace, socialist and African-American), many hundreds of biographical studies and monographs, the archival records of major institutions (the India Office; peace and radical organizations) and the voluminous writings of Gandhi himself.

Drawing selectively upon such research, in this chapter I outline two basic arguments. First, digital media technologies are not essential to the transnational circulation of mediated protest; Gandhian forms of protest were successfully dispersed through the use

of print technology, the telegraph, relatively slow forms of international transport, and steady, organizational labour. Second, although new technologies can sometimes assist in the more rapid spread of protest actions, this speed can sometimes be at the cost of understanding and longer-term efficacy. Without repeated and continuous exchange over a relatively long period, activists risk inadequate understanding of protest tactics, and without full understanding, successful application is unlikely, too.

'Old media' and global diffusion: the passage of Gandhism

Though Gandhi's activism extended back to the nineteenth century, he first emerged as a global figure in the years between the First and Second World Wars. Gandhi's rise rested upon significant developments in media history. The invention of the telegraph in the 1840s had made possible the transmission, with unaccustomed speed, of news reports across continents (Schudson, 1978: 4). Global news agencies were established in the years afterward (American Associated Press and United Press International served the United States, and Reuters the United Kingdom), so that even those journals without their own foreign correspondents could provide accounts of leading events and personalities (Boyd-Barrett, 1978: 192, 206–07). At the same time, heightened competition among newspaper proprietors brought prices down and sent readership up (Engel, 1996: 111, 122). By the interwar years, an elaborate machinery of mass reportage and reading enmeshed the globe. Mohandas Gandhi was among the many personalities caught up in its relentless circulations.

The Indian lawyer was among the first to understand the significance of the new media world and to manipulate its agents. Gandhi justifiably has been described as a media expert (Gordon, 2002: 337), blessed with great political and psychological shrewdness (Nandy, 1983: 49). He has also been labelled the 'first genius who understood the possibilities available in a society of mass communications' (Eco, 1978: 78). A retired Cambridge professor speculated that Gandhi 'is picturesque and knows it' (Hodson, 1941), and one of the British King's representatives damned him for being 'too keen on keeping in the limelight', and for 'keeping up the publicity stunt' (Viceroy, 1931). Gandhi's unfamiliar self-presentation in a *dhoti* (or shawl) of coarse *khaddar* entranced Western audiences and provoked great controversy (Bean, 1989). His oracular utterances, fasts and unorthodox rebellion incited even deeper interest. For Western students of Indian politics, the Mahatma is described variously as a dramatist, a publicity agent, a playwright, a producer, a stage manager and a star (e.g. Fisher, 1932: 47; Wheeler, 1944: 200).

Gandhi's political creativity made him a regular subject of reportage from the early 1920s. It was at this time that large metropolitan audiences first became aware of a major political movement, 'headed by a leader and conducted by methods which astounded and bewitched Occidental reporters' (Case, 1923: 347). Attention waned somewhat over the mid-1920s, but had rebounded by 1929. It reached unimagined heights in the first years of the new decade, as Gandhi's 'salt satyagraha' campaign mobilized participants across much of India.

Now a new generation of American correspondents joined an already substantial contingent of British newshounds. Negley Farson, Webb Miller and William Shirer were to become the most important of the visiting Yanks, alongside older British hands, E Ashmead-Bartlett and Robert Bernays, among others. Members of the South Asian community in America also took up the pen, and Gandhi's emissaries (including Sarojini Naidu, Madeleine Slade, and CF Andrews) visited the West (Gordon, 2002: 347).

Gandhi's open civil disobedience dominated the news (Seshachari, 1969: 58). In 1930 he was named *Time* magazine's 'Man of the Year', and the *New York Times* published more than 500 articles that referenced the Mahatma in that 12-month period alone. In fascinated and sometimes breathless news reports published at this time, an image of 'nonviolence in action' was compressed and shared with the Western world. The correspondence of Webb Miller and Negley Farson, initially censored, proved especially influential (Scalmer, 2011: 47). Newspaper coverage of Gandhi in the major broadsheets increased by one-half again over 1931. African-American newspapers also evinced considerable interest in the Mahatma at this time, as the early curiosity of the *Crisis* and the *Negro World* was succeeded by a more general enthusiasm for matters Gandhian (Kapur, 1992: 25, 45).

Metropolitan interest dulled slightly thereafter, as the Indian campaign subsided. But there was a later (though less elevated) peak of interest in the non-violent campaign Gandhi led as the Home Rule movement gained strength in the middle years of World War II, and then further attention upon Indian independence in 1947. Gandhi's assassination in 1948 served as a focus for reminiscence and argument, unleashing another 'flood of publicity', according to the reckoning of noted American pacifist, Muste (1948).

While the journalists scribbled, the photographers snapped. One critic of the Mahatma argued that 'his prestige owes much to the press photographer' (Hodson, 1941), and it is true that his unmistakeable figure graced the pages of the leading journals more frequently than did other Indian subjects, whether individual or collective. The craze to represent the Mahatma crossed from the newspaper to the art gallery and his unlikely cachet was used to market sandals and underwear to American consumers, and to sell novelty salt-shakers to the French (Scalmer, 2011: 28–9). Much more than a conventional leader of a political campaign, the Mahatma was eventually imagined into something of an icon. Whether the collective campaign for 'Home Rule' was relatively mobilized or quiescent, Gandhi - its symbol – maintained his newsworthiness. For adherents of the Indian cause, and for advocates of peaceful protest, this proved a substantial political resource. Always, the attention of the press could be expected.

But fascination with Gandhi stimulated book-length studies as well as more evanescent reportage. As early as 1908, European travellers were writing of brief appointments with the Indian leader. Gandhi's South African comrade, Joseph K. Doke, followed them into print with the book-length study *M.K. Gandhi: An Indian Patriot in South Africa* published in 1909. Oxford scholars penned appreciations during the First World War, thereby also spurring American theologians, such as John Haynes Holmes, to the writing desk. Romain Rolland published the first major biography in 1924: *Mahatma Gandhi: The Man*

Who Became One with the Universal Being. Much extolled, it was soon complemented by Gandhi's own version of his life: *The Story of My Experiments with Truth* (for a full review of the literature, see Scalmer, 2011: Ch. 1).

British and American readers were soon able to choose from a variety of sympathetic and critical accounts. In late 1931, British civil servant Lord Meston noted 'a steady flow of memoirs and sketches' on Gandhi's 'life and work' (Meston, 1931). A year later, one contributor to the *New Statesman and Nation* warned readers, 'The last five years have seen nearly as many new books about Indian questions as the preceding half century' (Garratt, 1932: 380). Perhaps more important, a series of more specialized publications began to weigh the import and provenance of Gandhi's political programme. Clarence Marsh Case's (1923) original contribution, *Non-Violent Coercion*, opened the field. The American Professor was soon swamped by more influential competitors: Richard Gregg's (1934) *Power of Nonviolence*, Aldous Huxley's (1937) *Ends and Means* and Bart de Ligt's *Conquest of Violence*, which was translated into English in 1937. Krishnalal Shridharani's (1939) *War without Violence* was the summit of this pre-war literature, and more was to follow in the later years of tumult and restored peace.

Gandhi was not simply the object of media interest. The canny leader also used the media directly to support his own claims and to share the virtues of the non-violent way. Gandhi composed press releases especially for enquiring journalists, and even for the news agencies themselves (Pyralel and Nayar, 1991: 15). He sent informative cables to expatriate Indians in the metropole. When marching and protesting he employed early forms of the sound bite (Hardiman, 2003: 253). The Mahatma edited independent publications that attained an influential circulation in the West (Gandhi's *Collected Works* eventually amounted to around a hundred thick volumes). He eagerly embraced any opportunity to use the radio, or directly to answer his critics in hostile newspapers (Scalmer, 2011: 63).

Alongside Gandhi, a cosmopolitan group of supporters emerged to publicize the Indian cause and to explain the intricacies of the Mahatma's approach. All became important to the full transmission of 'satyagraha'. From the West, Non-conformist Ministers Charles Freer Andrews, Horace Alexander, John Hoyland and Reginald Reynolds proved especially significant. Each had spent considerable time in India, and had come to know Gandhi well. Working independently and together, they used print technology to publicize the virtues of the non-violent way. Andrews edited the first significant collection of Gandhi's prose for a Western audience, *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas* (1929). Alexander penned *The Indian Ferment* (1929) and *India Since Cripps* (1944). Hoyland's output included *The Case for India* (1929) and *The Cross Moves East: A Study of the Significance of Gandhi's 'Satyagraha'* (1931). Reynolds acted as Gandhi's emissary to the Viceroy, helped to form an important organization – the Friends of India – in 1932, and composed a large number of works devoted to the Indian cause: *India, Gandhi, and World Peace* (1933), *Gandhi's Fast* (1932) and *The White Sahibs in India* (1937).

Several British women were prominent as Gandhi's translators and publicists. In 1931 social worker Muriel Lester visited Gandhi in India and hosted him on his visit to London a few years later. She acted as an ardent propagandist over several decades, and her works

included *My Host the Hindu* (1931), *Entertaining Gandhi* (1932) and *Gandhi's Signature* (1949). Agatha Harrison became the secretary of the major organization established to support Indian Home Rule, the Indian Conciliation Group. She laboured tirelessly as journalist, correspondent, go-between and lobbyist (Harrison, 1956). Madeleine Slade lived in Gandhi's ashram from 1925, gained notoriety as his companion in the early 1930s, and later travelled to Britain and the United States on lecture tours designed to combat misrepresentation of Gandhi's person and cause (Slade, 1960). Slowly, but effectively, each worked to make possible the diffusion of satyagraha.

Richard Bartlett Gregg, from the United States, shared a religious background (son of a Congregational minister) and an elite education (training at Harvard as a lawyer) with nearly all his British equivalents. Likewise, he lived in India for nearly four years in the second half of the 1920s, dwelt at Gandhi's Sabarmati ashram (for some seven months), and returned to the subcontinent later for periods of travel, teaching and writing. As an educator, Gregg passed on the Mahatma's teachings; as an author he penned perhaps the most famous translation of the method of satyagraha, *The Power of Nonviolence* (1934).

A succession of African American intellectuals also travelled to India to meet with the Mahatma and to learn more about the way of non-violence. Howard University's dean of religion, Benjamin E. Mays, made the trip in the mid-1930s. William Stuart Nelson, vice president of Howard, followed a decade or so later. Both became tireless propagandists upon their return to the Americas. This practice was to continue into the second half of the twentieth century. Civil rights leaders Bayard Rustin and Martin Luther King Jr also made the journey across the seas in order to deepen their understanding of non-violent techniques; they returned confirmed proselytisers of the Gandhian way (Kapur, 1992).

Traffic between India and the West flowed in both directions. Indian nationalist Syed Hossain trained at Oxford before composing his noted work *Gandhi: The Saint as Statesman* (1937). THK Rezmie organized an Indian Independence League from the United States; he used the platform of his new institution to contest inaccurate news despatches, and to explain the non-violent philosophy that underpinned Gandhi's campaigns. Other Indians drew upon their experiences in the struggle for Swaraj to interpret and promote the satyagraha way. Gandhi's personal physician, Dr Sushila Nayar, addressed civil rights campaigners in the United States. R. R. Diwakar penned a complete monograph, *Satyagraha* (1946). Haridas Muzumdar composed several works, including *Gandhi versus the Empire* (1932) and *Mahatma Gandhi: Peaceful Revolutionary* (1952). Krishnalal Shridharani, a veteran of the salt satyagraha and a graduate of Columbia University, was the most influential. One leading American pacifist described his *War without Violence* (1939) as 'the most important explication' of Gandhian principles yet published (cited in Anderson, 1998: 69–70).

The major Western institutions dedicated to peace – The Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Peace Pledge Union – also acted to publicize and promote the transmission of 'satyagraha'. From the early 1940s, the Fellowship of Reconciliation's 'racial-industrial' department in the United States organized conferences dedicated to the application of Gandhi's ideas to the problems of racial oppression and conflict (Scalmer, 2011: 128). Soon afterwards, a

fragment of the fellowship broke away as 'the Congress of Racial Equality', and began to experiment with non-violent direct action (Meier and Rudwick, 1969). A similar dynamic was evident in the United Kingdom. There, the Peace Pledge Union, for several decades, served as the home of vigorous debate around Gandhi's ideas. After many false starts, in the early 1950s those activists most convinced of the merits of satyagraha formed a new organization, 'Operation Gandhi'. This grouping later became the 'Non-Violent Resistance Group', which launched a series of non-violent campaigns.

These were the beginnings of a major cycle of protest. From the mid-1950s, movements for civil rights and against nuclear arms perfected satyagraha as a form of mass politics for the West. In Britain, the campaign to 'ban the bomb' encompassed invasions of rocket sites from 1958, and 'sit-down' demonstrations in central London from 1961. At Easter that year, 150,000 people joined the 52 mile march from the Aldermaston nuclear reactor to the national capital; in September 1961, 1300 were arrested for taking part in a knowingly illegal demonstration in central London. In the United States, the movement for African American civil rights mobilized earlier, and ranged even further. A boycott of segregated buses in Montgomery, Alabama began in December 1955, when 50,000 residents united under the leadership of a young pastor, a Dr Martin Luther King Jr. From February 1960, a 'sit-in' movement spread from Greensboro, North Carolina. Within a month, mass protest had jumped the borders of seven states; nearly 4000 demonstrators were eventually arrested in more than a hundred cities. A 'freedom ride' to desegregate bus terminals across the South left Washington DC in May 1961. Marchers converged upon Washington two years later, where a quarter of a million listened to Martin Luther King's dreams. Community-wide protest campaigns convulsed Albany in 1961, Birmingham in 1963 and Selma in 1965. In these heroic and thrilling acts, Gandhian non-violence became a powerful and enduring presence in the Western world.

With the adaptation of the Gandhian method, came reinvention and independent discovery. Both Britons and Americans improvised new tactics and non-violent acts. British radicals argued that the practice of going 'limp' upon arrest was an indigenous improvisation, and was dubbed by the local press the 'Swaffham' technique (derived from the place of demonstration where it was first used) (Arnold-Foster, 1960). When a larger group of protesters conducted a sit-down demonstration in central London – literally sitting down on the city street – this too became understood as a British invention: 'In the "sit-down" we have devised a useful tactic, which has already … been used … in several other countries' (Committee of 100, 1961). By 1963, young British radical Nicholas Walter was convinced that his countrymen had adapted an entirely new means of protesting. Writing in *Nonviolent Resistance*, Walter suggested that his non-violent peers differed from Gandhi in their attitudes to 'training', 'discipline' and 'opponents'. Indeed, he argued, their non-violent protests 'were not strictly Gandhian' at all (Walter, 1963: 30).

Across the Atlantic, the departures seemed more dramatic still. Surveying recent history from the vantage of the mid-1960s, Bradford Lyttle of the American organization, the Committee of Nonviolent Action, could catalogue a large number of apparently local inventions:

'The sit-ins, freedom rides, protest voyages of boats, trespassing of missile bases, climbing on submarines, long marches – these were all tactics developed by Americans for the American political scene. I can recall no exact parallel in the Gandhian movement' (Lyttle, 1967).

Fellow American radical, Dave Dellinger, pushed the contrast still further. In the campaigning of African Americans, Dellinger discerned numerous divagations from Gandhi's original model: a rejection of 'asceticism', a refusal to cooperate with legal procedures and a willingness to involve children. The 'indigenous, improvisatory' character of the campaign meant that 'integrationists are making their rules as they go along', Dellinger thought, 'constantly revising or expanding them'. His conclusion? American protest was successful precisely because it had departed from the strict demands of the Mahatma's approach. The way forward was to 'Forget about Gandhi!' and to beat an increasingly independent path (Dellinger, 1963).

Debates and experiments of this kind extended over many years, and a full history of the ferment of 1960s would, of course, require a far richer exploration than can be ventured here. Nonetheless, for those concerned with 'mediation and social movements', the foregoing historical sketch provides the basis for some unfamiliar and important insights. Mohandas Gandhi's distinctive approach to political change attracted considerable world attention over several decades. The movement for Indian Home Rule gained support in the United States and Great Britain, from at least the 1920s. Moreover, the method of 'satyagraha' was also reported, explained and advocated in a great variety of ways. Eventually, British and American activists experimented with Gandhian non-violence, applied it, adapted it and remade it. This complicated transnational episode forms a kind of 'pre-history' to the large and celebrated protests of the 1960s. Though it is seldom recognized (as noted in King, 1999: 175; Farrell, 1997: 5–6), it is clearly of great significance.

None of these achievements required the presence of new, digital media. In the decades before the Internet, Gandhi's campaigns successfully attracted the attention of newspaper correspondents, photographers, authors, publishers and Western political institutions. Over time, he recruited a network of supporters. In India and in the West, this community of Gandhians actively sought to promote satyagraha as a political tool. Together, they brought satyagraha to the West.

The diffusion of non-violence was neither rapid nor easy. But the very difficulty of the effort and the slowness of its rhythms helped to ensure creative and successful diffusion. Clearly, transnational diffusion is not a product of the digital world. Close study of the campaigns of the past provokes new doubts about the apparent novelties and the advances of the present.

New media, speed and diffusion

If the diffusion of protest did not require new information technologies, then how would the process of diffusion be changed by the introduction of newer and faster media? Would 'non-violence' be disseminated with still greater rapidity and force? Would it take on a

different dynamic? These questions do not require an elaborate 'thought experiment' because they were answered in the unfolding of the 1960s protests. The arrival and impact of television ensured that non-violent display was broadcast to a mass audience, with a speed and an emotional intensity never before experienced. What happened? Were the techniques of 'non-violence' also transmitted with greater effect?

The story is best told in two parts: first, the successes. Non-violent protest became television news. Gandhian-style acts at first were unusual, and that made them interesting (Gamson, 1990: 157). The initial Aldermaston marches, southern sit-ins and urban sit-downs all reached the nightly news bulletins. With generous media coverage came the prospect of powerful political effects. It was a pattern of attention most evident in the struggles of the civil rights movement in America's South. There, the initiation of peaceful protest was answered with a terrible violence; images of martyrdom were broadcast to the world (Arsenault, 2006: 165–66; Garrow, 1986: 239–40). The brutality of white police dramatized an obvious battle between good and evil (Kertzer, 1988: 92). In consequence, a new generation of supporters swept into the movement, and the notice of elites was riveted upon the disorder and its deeper cause (Gitlin, 1987: 144).

Martin Luther King Jr's 'Letter from a Birmingham Jail' analysed the working of non-violence in perhaps the most sophisticated and influential terms. As King explained, non-violent direct action possessed the capacity to 'create' a 'crisis' and to 'dramatize' an issue, thereby ensuring that it could 'no longer be ignored' (King, 1964: 78–9). Through the 'creation of tension', and the attraction of outside interest, change became newly possible:

> Like a boil that can never be cured so long as it is covered up, but must be opened with all its ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, before injustice can be cured it must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion.
>
> (King, 1964: 85).

The initial success of King's strategy had implications not just for the cause of racial equality, but also for the fact and the utility of non-violent protest. Television news captured the power and effectiveness of non-violent display. It thereby served as a means of recruitment to political campaigns. Over a few heady years, non-violent protests increased in size and in number. Soon, 'mass direct action' replaced smaller demonstrations (Bell, 1968: 17), and nationwide events became regular features of the activist calendar. The process was evident not only in the battle for racial justice, but also in movements for student rights, peace, women's rights and the environment. Indeed, successful mobilizations led by 'early risers' opened the way for a cluster of later challengers (Tarrow, 1998). 'New social movements' emerged as potentially transformative actors (Touraine, 1974).

The speed of mobilization reflected the immediacy of televisual display. But did the rapid diffusion of non-violent protest necessarily imply efficacy or genuine understanding? Gandhi's original approach of peaceful protest was rooted in a complex philosophy of

conflict. It encompassed an absolute refusal to harm the person or 'legitimate interest' of an oppressor (Gandhi, 1930: 694); a commitment to truth rather than to personal victory (Gandhi, 1917: 46); and a belief in the capacity of loving sacrifice to help an antagonist to 'see the error of their ways' (Gandhi, 1910: 224). Gandhi's initial Western disciples had shared these views (Scalmer, 2011: Ch. 5), but those younger activists drawn to the campaigns of the 1960s had little knowledge of Gandhi's principles or of the long debates around them. For them, non-violence was a 'tactic' or a 'utilitarian' practice, not a creedal commitment (Sutherland, 1965: 30; Ryan, 1988: 194).

Rapid growth, therefore, brought costs as well as benefits. In Britain, the anti-nuclear campaign was strengthened increasingly by the recruitment of young socialists and anarchists (Cadogan, 1972: 169). Many did not understand non-violence; others were unwilling even to listen to the arguments (McGee, 1964: 7). April Carter, secretary of the Direct Action Committee (one of the most significant British organizations at this time), noted, even in the early 1960s, that the tenor of non-violent protest was changing. She identified a 'move towards mass civil disobedience by a number of individuals who don't believe in n.v. [non-violence] in Satyagraha terms'. As such, she admitted that 'inevitable risks' were involved (Carter, 1960). The speed and budding size of the movement brought with it an accompanying dilution of understanding and principled attachment.

Writing a few years later in the United States, American sociologist Inge Powell Bell (1968: 26, 42–3) discovered a similarly 'shallow' view of non-violence in the civil rights movement, characterized by an emphasis on 'practical techniques' and an absence of 'soul searching' around the 'inner attitudes' of the activist. Eddie Gottlieb, considering the peace movement in the United States, also hit upon an equivalent view. Writing in 1968, Gottlieb looked back on what now seemed a too-rapid growth, as participation and expectations inflated unduly over a few exciting years. 'We were too successful for *our* own good', he felt

> [t]he Movement swarmed with newcomers who successively wanted to take off from each new height. They were enticed by the victories of the non-violent Movement but they looked for total success by the short cuts that violence seemed to offer.
>
> (Gottlieb, 1968)

This interpretation is confirmed by later historical analysis (e.g. Gitlin, 1980: 30, 128–29). Untutored or unbelieving, many participants in large protests rejected the non-violent faith. Also, as the size of the campaign grew, so the nature of the problem and the difficulty of asserting control expanded to equivalent dimensions. On both sides of the Atlantic, large demonstrations increasingly were disrupted by the activity of determined opponents of the satyagraha way. The sheer size of the developing movement made complete non-violence almost impossible (Goodman, 1967: 36).

A cluster of forces helped to confirm the shift away from non-violence. Peaceful appeals to wrongdoers were met most often with violence rather than conversion (Scalmer, 2011: 206–08); early advocates of satyagraha were exhausted or dejected by years of repression

(Farmer, 1968: v); and the increasing rejection of formal authority nurtured an 'anti-disciplinary protest' that made the order and control of Gandhism appear restrictive and somewhat old fashioned (Stephens, 1998). The turn to violence was fed by other forces: the mass media granted increasing attention to episodes of insurgency and physical conflict (Lee, 2002: 143–44; Bond, 2001: 31); and the growing conflict between protesters and police polarized radicals and convinced many that violence was now the only way (on polarization, see della Porta, 1995: 76–7, 137, 214).

The meaning and the significance of these transformations were the subject of heated debate at the time, and are issues that continue to be contested. This is not the place to evaluate the consequences of the turn away from Gandhi. But whether the rejection of 'satyagraha' is celebrated or mourned, the history of these fevered times undoubtedly offers some interesting lessons for those concerned with the relationship between movements and media.

The experience of the 1960s suggests caution. Although the new technology of television did promote the more rapid spread of protest actions, this speed was also associated with a poorer understanding and a longer-term failure. The protests of the American and British New Lefts were broadcast across the world. Impressed by their apparent victories, many activists swiftly took up the tools of non-violent protest. Hurried, excited and often ill-informed, these later practitioners of non-violence frequently adopted these methods without fully comprehending their history or ethics. Non-violence was overwhelmingly grasped as a tactical means of generating positive media images. Its underlying philosophy was typically disregarded or repudiated.

Conclusion

This chapter has brought a deliberately historical perspective to the study of mediation and social movements. Most sociologists are fixated on the present, but when recent events are placed within a longer history of global activism, then ample precedents may appear for apparent novelties. The history of non-violence clearly demonstrates that digital technologies are not essential to the transnational diffusion of mediated protest. It shows also that although newer and faster media can sometimes assist in the more rapid spread of protest actions, this speed may be at the cost of understanding and longer-term efficacy. The relationship between media and movements is complex and sometimes contradictory. It does not involve a simple or linear advance. The struggles of the past continue to offer lessons for the problems of the present.

References

Ackerman, P. and DuVall, J. (2000), *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict*, New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Alexander, H. G. (1929), *The Indian Ferment: A Traveller's Tale*, London: Williams and Norgate.

——— (1944), *India Since Cripps*, Harmondsworth and New York: Penguin Books.
Anderson, B. (1991), *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (revised ed.), London and New York: Verso.
Anderson, J. (1998), *Bayard Rustin: Troubles I've Seen*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
Andrews, C. F. (1929), *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas*, London: Allen & Unwin.
Arnold-Foster, M. (1960), '82 nuclear marchers arrested', *The Times*, 3 Jan.
Arsenault, R. (2006), *Freedom Riders: 1961 and the Struggle for Racial Justice*, New York: Oxford University Press.
Ayres, J. M. (1999), 'From the streets to the Internet: The cyber-diffusion of contention', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 566: 132–43.
Bean, S. S. (1989), 'Gandhi and Khadi, the fabric of Indian independence', in A. B. Weiner, and J. Schneidre (eds), *Cloth and Human Experience*, Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, pp. 355–76.
Bell, I. P. (1968), *CORE and the Strategy of Nonviolence*, New York: Random House.
Bond, J. (2001), 'The media and the movement: Looking back from the southern front', in B. Ward (ed.), *Media, Culture, and the Modern African American Freedom Struggle*, Gainseville, FL: University Press of Florida, pp. 16–40.
Bondurant, J. B. (1958), *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Boyd-Barrett, O. (1978), 'Market control and wholesale news: The case of Reuters', in G. Boyce, J. Curran and P. Wingate (eds), *Newspaper History: From the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day*, London: Constable, pp. 192–204.
Cadogan, P. (1972), 'From civil disobedience to confrontation', in R. Benewick and T. Smith (eds), *Direct Action and Democratic Politics*, London: George Allen and Unwin, pp. 162–77.
Cammaerts, Bart (2007), 'Media communication strategies of globalized activists: Beyond media-centric thinking', in Bart Cammaerts and Nico Carpentier (eds), *Reclaiming the Media: Communication Rights and Expanding Democratic Media Roles*, Bristol: Intellect, pp. 265–88.
Carter, A. (1960), 'Letter to Michael Randle, 28 September', in *Direct Action Committee Papers*, Commonweal Collection, J. B. Priestley Library, University of Bradford, Box 7, Bay E, Folder: 'Miscellaneous Papers'.
Case, C. M. (1923), *Non-Violent Coercion: A Study in the Methods of Social Pressure*, New York and London: The Century Co.
Castells, M. (1997), *The Power of Identity*, Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.
Chabot, S. and Duyvendak, J. M. (2002), 'Globalization and transnational diffusion between social movements: Reconceptualizing the dissemination of the Gandhian repertoire and the "coming out" routine', *Theory and Society*, 31: 697–740.
Committee of 100 (1961), 'Minutes of meeting, 30 September', in *Hannan Committee of 100 Papers*, Commonwealth Collection, J. B. Priestley Library, Box 1, Folder: 'Committee of 100 1961'.
De Ligt, B. (1937), *The Conquest of Violence: An Essay on War and Revolution*, London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd.
della Porta, D. (1995), *Social Movements, Political Violence, and the State: A Comparative Analysis of Italy and Germany*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dellinger, D. (1963), 'Forget about Gandhi!', *Peace News*, 26 July.
Diwakar, R. R. (1946), *Satyagraha: Its Technique and History*, Bombay: Hind Kitabs.
Downing, J. (2008), 'Social movement theories and alternative media: An evaluation and critique', *Communication, Culture and Critique*, 1(1): 40–50.
Eco, U. (1978), 'Silence is l(e)aden', in P. Foss and M. Morris (eds), *Language, Sexuality and Subversion*, Sydney: Feral Publications, pp. 77–81.
Engel, M. (1996), *Tickle the Public: One Hundred Years of the Popular Press*, London: Victor Gollancz.
Farmer, J. (1968) 'Foreword', in I. P. Bell (ed.), *CORE and the Strategy of Nonviolence*, New York: Random House.
Farrell, J. J. (1997), *The Spirit of the Sixties: Making Postwar Radicalism*, New York and London: Routledge.
Fisher, F. B. (1932), *That Strange Little Brown Man Gandhi*, New York: Ray Long and Richard B. Smith.
Gamson, W. (1990), *The Strategy of Social Protest* (2nd ed.), Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
Gandhi, M. K. (1910), 'Price of freedom', in R. Iyer (ed.), *The Moral and Political Writings of Mahatma Gandhi, Volume III*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, pp. 224–26.
—— (1917), 'Satyagraha – Not passive resistance', in R. Iyer (ed.), *The Moral and Political Writings of Mahatma Gandhi, Volume III*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, pp. 44–50.
—— (1927), *An Autobiography, Or, The Story of My Experiments with Truth*, Ahmedabad: Navajivan.
—— (1930), 'Letter to Lord Irwin, Viceroy and Governor-General of India, March 2', in C. Chatfield (ed.), *The Americanisation of Gandhi: Images of the Mahatma*, New York and London: Garland Publishing, pp. 694–99.
Garratt, G. T. (1932), 'India', *New Statesman and Nation*, 1 Oct.
Garrow, D. J. (1986), *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr, and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference*, New York: William Morrow and Company.
Gitlin, T. (1980), *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
—— (1987), *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*, New York: Bantam Books.
Goodman, P. (1967), 'The duty of professionals', *Liberation*, 12(8): 36–9.
Gordon, L. A. (2002), 'Mahatma Gandhi's Dialogues with Americans', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37(4): 337–52.
Gottlieb, E. (1968), 'Workshop in nonviolence, Chicago 1968', in *Fellowship of Reconciliation Papers*, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, DG 13, Series D, Box 72, Folder: 'FoR Ronald Young Files – Anti-war Movement, Mobilization, Chicago Aug. 1968'.
Gregg, R. (1934), *The Power of Nonviolence*, Philadelphia and London: J.B. Lippincott Co.
—— (1960), *The Power of Nonviolence* (2nd revised ed.), London: James Clarke and Co.
Hanagan, M. (2002), 'Irish transnational social movements, migrants, and the state system', in J. Smith and H. Johnston (eds), *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, Lanham, MD and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 53–73.
Hardiman, D. (2003), *Gandhi in His Time and Ours*, New Delhi: Permanent Black.

Harrison, I. (1956), *Agatha Harrison: An Impression by Her Sister*, London: Allen and Unwin.
Hilton, B. (2006), *A Mad, Bad, and Dangerous People? England 1783–1846*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Hodson, T. C. (1941), Letter to *The Times*, 24 Jan.
Hossain, S. (1937), *Gandhi: The Saint as Statesman*, Los Angeles: Suttonhouse.
Hoyland, J. S. (1929), *The Case for India*, London and Toronto: J.M. Dent & Sons.
——— (1931), *The Cross Moves East: A Study in the Significance of Gandhi's 'Satyagraha'*, London: George Allen & Unwin.
Huxley, A. (1937), *Ends and Means: An Enquiry into the Nature of Ideals and into the Methods Employed in Their Realization*, London: Chatto and Windus.
——— (1969), *Ends and Means: An Enquiry into the Nature of Ideals and into the Methods Employed in Their Realization*, London: Chatto and Windus.
Kahn, R. and Kellner, D. (2004) 'New media and Internet activism: From the 'Battle of Seattle' to blogging', *New Media and Society*, 6(1): 87–95.
Kapur, S. (1992), *Raising Up A Prophet: The African-American Encounter with Gandhi*, Boston: Beacon Press.
Kertzer, D. I. (1988), *Ritual, Politics and Power*, New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press.
King, Martin Luther, Jr (1964), 'Letter from a Birmingham Jail', in Martin Luther King, Jr, *Why We Can't Wait*, New York: New American Library, pp. 76–95.
King, M. (1999), *Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr: The Power of Nonviolent Action*, Paris: United Nationals Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
Lee, T. (2002), *Mobilizing Public Opinion: Black Insurgency and Racial Attitudes in the Civil Rights Era*, Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press.
Lester, M. (1931), *My Host the Hindu*, London: Williams & Norgate.
——— (1932), *Entertaining Gandhi*, London: Nicholson and Watson.
——— (1949), *Gandhi's Signature*, Los Angeles: Fellowship of Reconciliation.
Lyttle, B. (1967), 'A Gandhian perspective', *Fellowship of Reconciliation Papers*, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, DG 13, Series D, Box 72, Folder: 'FoR Ronald Young Files – Anti-war movement, Pentagon confrontation, Oct. 1967',
Mayo, M. (2008), 'Globalization and gender: New threats, new strategies', in V. Ruggiero and N. Montagna (eds), *Social Movements: A Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 306–15.
McGee, B. (1964), 'Ruislip action: Strategy and nonviolence', *Resistance*, 2(2): 7.
Meier, A. and Rudwick, E. (1969), 'How CORE began', *Social Science Quarterly*, 49(4): 789–99.
Meikle, G. (2002), *Future Active: Media Activism and the Internet*, New York: Routledge.
Meston, J. (1931), 'Gandhi', *Sunday Observer*, 4 Oct.
Meyrowitz, J. (1985), *No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Muste, A. J. (1948), 'Observance of Gandhi's Birthday', *Peace News*, 2 July.
Muzumdar, H. (1932), *Gandhi versus the Empire*, New York: Universal Publishing.
——— (1952), *Mahatma Gandhi: Peaceful Revolutionary*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
Nandy, A. (1983), *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
Pyralel and Nayar, S. (1991), *In Gandhiji's Mirror*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Reynolds, R. (1932), *Gandhi's Fast: Its Cause and Significance*, London: No More War Movement.
—— (1933), *India, Gandhi and World Peace*, London: Friends of India.
—— (1937), *White Sahibs in India*, London: Martin Secker and Warburg.
Roggeband, C. (2007), 'Translators and transformers: International inspiration and exchange in social movements', *Social Movement Studies*, 6(3): 245–59.
Ryan, A. (1988), *Bertrand Russell: A Political Life*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Scalmer, S. (2011), *Gandhi in the West: The Mahatma and the Rise of Radical Protest*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
—— (2002), *Dissent Events: Protest, the Media, and the Political Gimmick in Australia*, Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
Schudson, M. (1978), *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers*, New York: Basic Books.
Seshachari, C. (1969), *Gandhi and the American Scene: An Intellectual History and Inquiry*, Bombay: Nachiketa Publications.
Sharma, A. (2007), *The Gandhi Way: Peace, Nonviolence and Empowerment*, New Delhi: Academic Foundation.
Sharp, G. (1973), *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.
Shridharani, K. (1939), *War without Violence*, London: Victor Gollancz.
Slade, M. (1960), *The Spirit's Pilgrimage*, New York: Coward-McCann.
Smith, J. (2008), 'Globalizing resistance: The battle of Seattle and the future of social movements', in V. Ruggiero and N. Montagna (eds), *Social Movements: A Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 316–26.
Stephens, J. (1998), *Anti-disciplinary Protest: Sixties Radicalism and Postmodernism*, Melbourne, New York, and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sutherland, E. (ed.) (1965), *Letters from Mississippi*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
Tarrow, S. (1998) *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
—— (2005), *The New Transnational Activism*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
Tilly, C. (1995), *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758–1834*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
—— (2008), *Contentious Performances*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
Touraine, A. (1974), *The Post-Industrial Society: Tomorrow's Social History – Classes, Conflicts and Culture in the Programmed Society*, London: Wildwood.
Viceroy (1931), Letter to the Secretary of State for India, 12 Oct., India Office Library, MSS EUR E 240/5.
Walter, N. (1963), *Nonviolent Resistance: Men Against War*, London: Nonviolence 63.
Wheeler, P. (1944), *India Against the Storm*, New York: E.P. Dutton and Co.