

WHAT WOULD GANDHI DO?

(ms for comment only)

1. Mahatma Gandhi may be best known in the West for fostering nonviolent resistance to British rule over the Indian subcontinent. His image in homespun dhoti, sandals, and staff trekking through Indian villages suggests a rather simple conviction of self-denial as the way around the colonial regime—the way to Indian independence. In the mid-1920s Americans may not have been able to translate that into any kind of useful method for dealing with their own political problems, which (at least for white citizens) seemed minimal—a year of “normalcy”—“the business of America is business”, rising stock prices, liberated women, cars, movies, and jazz. Americans felt safe with recent wartime allies Britain and France extending their controls—sometimes conciliatory and often harshly repressive—in central Africa and western Asia to augment their holdings in south Asia and other parts of Africa. Unrest in those colonies was re-forming as resistance movements. Culturally and politically the new Marxist-Leninist Soviet Union was attracting interest.
2. Gandhi’s life and teachings, though unified, were complex. Yes, he was concerned with the structure of the British Raj and its dismantling, but his tactics of nonviolence were always underlain with moral and visionary principles of personal and social conduct and conviction. Committed nonviolent assertion was understood as *satyagraha*—“truth force”. In 1925, to enable followers to grasp these principles, Gandhi posted without annotation *Seven Social Sins* in his newspaper *Young India* for all to take to mind and heart in order to avoid committing them. If these precepts are to be helpful today—with institutionalized corporate greed, doomsday weaponry, and the climate crisis a greater challenge even than the Nazi surge in the 1930s—we must flip those sins into positive actions and systems for transforming global society to get along with the earth and each other.
3. Gandhi made them easy to memorize. Each sin was crystallized in two words—one a social realm and one the moral responsibility without which the status quo would be oppressive: *Wealth without Work*, *Politics without Principle*, *Pleasure without Conscience*, *Science without Humanity*, *Commerce without Morality*, *Knowledge without Character*, and *Worship without Sacrifice*. As we go forward in this paper we will try to translate these moral imperatives into current conditions, and then to suggest how they may be integrated systemically with *Power and Empathy*.

* * *

4. **Wealth without Work.** Wealth without work was the condition of many members of the colonial leisure class in the British Empire. But today it is no longer fashionable or convenient for wealthy people to do nothing but hobbies, flirtation, or gambling. To be proud a wealthy person must manage a foundation, deal in art, or flaunt a risky business at the margin of his or her holdings. But is it enough to manage, deal, or flaunt? Didn’t Gandhi or don’t we ourselves mean *productive work*? If pressed, Gandhi might even have said *productive work for the common good*, e.g., community administration, medical research, engineering a better toilet, or teaching as well as subsistence farming or infrastructure or craft work like spinning and weaving. Today he might include technology for recycling or the making of movies, preferably overlapping in the same persons as part of a share-the-wealth ethic, contrary to wealth-monopolizing patents. I’m not sure how Gandhi would judge the work of a middle-class student’s studying or mountaineering, or that of a wealthy old person practicing a hobby, writing a memoir or telling stories to young people.
5. Today the corporate chief executive officer (CEO), often combined with chairing the board of directors, may be the closest thing to the British colonial baron. As an American CEO’s “compensation” approaches 400 times that of an ordinary worker, we have to ask what kind of work this is which merits such income and a fortune of a billion dollars or more.*[Cite ratios in Europe, Japan, etc. : <https://www.bloomberg.com/quicktake/executive-pay> cf: \$15/hr needed for kids’ shoes]

Compensation for what? If a high proportion of a CEO’s pay is linked to company “performance” (reported quarterly earnings, share price rise) rather than enhanced company processes, resources, or product demand, his or her behavior is more likely to involve financial manipulation or report falsification. So in the Gandhian ethic this kind of work would

be unworthy of compensation (and wealth accumulation) as would showmanship, selfish deal-making, legislative manipulation, and harming competitors.

6. No doubt many CEOs spend as many as 70 hours a week trying to boost the earnings of their companies, but “trying” is subjective and may often be manifested in dubious engagement with financial advisers, fellow board members, lawyers, politicians, officers of other firms, and so on, rather than with managers, professionals, and other workers in their own firms. [Bandiera et al, 2011: <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/what-do-ceos-do>] Useful as such “outsider” engagement may sometimes be, it may only rarely be creative and profitable like the accomplishments of certain celebrated Silicon Valley CEOs or their employees.
7. Most often the content of CEO engagement is hard to describe or unknown, despite satiric highlighting of some business-oriented meetings and retreats, or at golfing, dining, hunting, and other recreation. But even with best use is a CEO’s time worth 200 times that of his or her average production worker? [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Executive_compensation_in_the_United_States#/media/File:CEO_pay_v._average_slub.png] Are company earnings the best criterion of success? Are long-term preparedness, employee morale, or value to community and ecosystem better measures? Or consider rural estates in India or Latin America or Africa: Is a landlord’s management (or landlord’s “opportunity cost”) worth 200 times the income of a peasant working the land? A good measure might be landlord net income versus income on the same land owned and operated by a worker-collective—a measure hard to come by when organizers are murdered with impunity. [<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/blog/2013/apr/02/chico-mendes-killing>]
8. In any event, for a wealthy person to be righteous (or “not socially sinful”) in the Gandhian sense, his or her work must be evident and valued in the eyes of ordinary people in the locality. (Trump supporters?) That can be easy in a traditional agricultural or craft sector, but difficult in sectors with complex professions and industries: distant or diverse supply and market conditions, division of skilled labor, necessity of elaborate equipment, group planning and evaluation, and so on. Not to speak of the obscure work in producing art, writing, theater, music, and so on, or the work of becoming a paid elected politician at higher and higher levels of government.
9. To judge the value of a wealthy person’s work there must not only be transparency (e.g., public information about income), but accurate behavioral information about performance. Additionally the burdens of work-life must be known: lack of compensation for domestic work or labors of love, necessary years of training sometimes in vain, stress of unavoidable risks, updating of contextual information, and so on, and these must be compared with the stresses of ordinary people: unexpected bills, unemployment, lack of access to work sites, lack of skill training, and so on. Perhaps a surgeon deserves an income 10 or 20 times that of a hospital janitor or even a social worker, but 200 times? Is it “sinful” to gain wealth steadily from sales or licensing fees of a monopoly guaranteed by a long-term patent, e.g., of a certain drug or a particular surgical method? Is it sinful to charge and take “what the market will bear”---the market being those buyers with substantial wealth or desperate need?
10. *Wealth without work?* To overcome this evil may require overcoming mystery. This can entail not only increased technical information on the part of the observer about the nature of the wealthy person’s work, and public confidence in the judgment of the technically competent observer, but a revisiting of “privacy”: information about personal history, assets, debt, and activities. Complete openness may be characteristic of the Gandhian few, but what about the secrets of ordinary people with fewer spiritual—not to speak of material—resources? Shall salary, inheritance, and net worth information be made public? Should slander and libel laws be rewritten? Should romantic deception and self-deception be suppressed? Would a world of total honesty be insufferably boring, socially chaotic, or mentally unsustainable? Perhaps Gandhi’s first sin should apply, but only to the most powerful.
11. **Politics without Principle.** Today’s turmoil may be unmatched in the history of politics—principled and opportunistic. But as with wealth and work, ambiguities and complexities emerge when we consider the principles of powerful leaders like Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping, or Narendra Modi. Closer to home we could hardly find a better case of “politics without principle” than Donald Trump and the Republicans vs. Hillary Clinton vs. Bernie Sanders, not to speak of countless state and local politicians and corporate leaders.

12. President Trump is especially interesting because ego and psychopathology are so prominently mixed with his politics and business. This is not to say that Putin, Xi, Obama, Stalin, Hitler, Qaddafi, Lumumba, Sukarno, Chávez, etc., and Gandhi himself weren't or aren't driven or limited by personality peculiarities, but Trump seems to come closest to everyday psychiatric conditions—narcissism, psychopathy, and intellectual incoherence combined. If Trump has structural principles they are self, money, and property. His spiritual principles are not Gandhi's or Jefferson's or Jesus' principles of humanity, fairness, and love, nor Hitler's of cleanliness and god-mythology, but the adolescent show of entitlement, acquisition, and smartness.

13. That's for "principle", but what about "politics"? Politics seems to have at least two dimensions: social (particular/universal), and temporal (immediate/enduring). An essential third dimension, featured by Gandhi, would be *force* (conscience/reason/coercion). If we assert that Trump illustrates the "sin" of politics-without-principle we are assuming Gandhi's meaning of politics and his meaning of principle—universal, enduring good achieved without coercion. In other words, Trump's politics on the "social" dimension are instead particular (himself and family and temporarily his allies the Republicans) rather than universal—Gandhi's all of humanity (or even just all of *white* humanity). On the "temporal" dimension Trump's politics are immediate (while tomorrow his apparent allies and demands may be different)*, with only himself and his family as long-term beneficiaries. On the "force" dimension Trump is eclectic and opportunistic—his encouragement of "reason" may derive from specious evidence of majority support, "criminal" traits of opponents or migrants, claims of fake news, and so on, while his "coercion" may take the form of firing operatives, expanding the scope of drug or border enforcement, or augmenting and displaying lethal arms (not to mention inciting goons in crowds).

*[Stanford law professor Mugambi Jouet in his book *Exceptional America* (2017) sees some of this self-contradiction as rational: "Donald Trump not only engaged in relentless disinformation and conspiracy-mongering to win the presidency. He additionally tended to systematically take self-contradictory positions, thereby enabling his supporters to hear what they wanted to hear... Trump's rhetoric evoked what George Orwell called 'doublethink' in the dystopia of *1984*: the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously and accepting both of them." This tends to qualify the social-psychological dynamic of "cognitive dissonance" perhaps under the experimentally demonstrated condition of suspected set-up by an external agent, thus suggesting a split internal-external ego or double agency for Trump.]

14. Trump's political principles share something with those of Russian ruler Vladimir Putin: loyalty to persons rather than to enduring, transpersonal principle. Lucrative (far beyond real cost) government contracts go to Putin's old friends who have appropriate managerial expertise rather than by merit/bidding. Loyalty to Putin or Trump rather than to a constitutional, technical, or moral principle is definitive. Putin's role comports with that of the feudal king who allows lords use (and profit) but disallows ownership of national assets and opportunities, based on personal grants rather than bureaucratic rules.*[Joshua Yaffa. "Oligarchy 2.0", *The New Yorker*, 29 May 2017, 46-55.] Trump's reliance on deal-making at his own initiative rather than that of the other bargainer is similar. It may not be coincidental that many of the oligarchs brought to heel by Putin were once Russian Mafiosi under Yeltsin, abetted by the Harvard Boys (professors of economics and politics), allowing destruction of citizen savings through hyper-inflation, and sanctioning neoliberal fire-sale privatization of public assets in post-Soviet Russia.*[Janine R. Wedel, "The Harvard Boys Do Russia", *The Nation*, 1 June 1998.] Trump had dealings with such millionaire operatives as early as 1987 when the Russian Mafia already rivaled Mikhail Gorbachev's Soviet government.*[Scott Feinberg, *The Hollywood Reporter* (online), 26 May 2017: <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/donald-trump-angled-soviet-posting-1980s-says-nobel-prize-winner-1006312>] The resulting informal but powerful system evidently fits well Trump's practice of deal-making.

15. While Karl Marx stressed the mass variables of class and technology, Gandhi focused on personal responsibility and leadership potential even while seeking Indian national independence. Trump also focuses on the personal rather than the collective, and as president—contrary to Gandhi's universalist vision—he continues to seek his personal enrichment at the expense of the common good of Americans.

16. **Pleasure without Conscience.** As a humanist, Gandhi wanted everyone—rich and poor—to be healthy, comfortable at a modest and equitable standard, and honored in the eyes of fellow beings, with harmless, measured pleasures. At the same time this supreme activist must have understood the pleasure that comes with initiative, adventure, and achievement—even the pleasure of succeeding at self-denial— as well as the pleasure that comes from helping and being appreciated. It was not without pride that Gandhi set out in khadi wrap and no money to walk through villages much as Jesus did centuries earlier. This understanding did not come without varied experience with pleasure and pain, confirmed by personal experimentation with indulgence and deprivation. Early in his life, admiring British strength and success, he and a friend experimented with eating beef as the British did despite the vegetarian tradition of his family. The meat gave gustatory pleasure as the act also gave pleasure of identity with rulers, but conscience gave anxiety and pain.*
[autobiography] He realized that the power of self-control and identification with the holy was superior to—more satisfying than?—the power of often-cruel domination.
17. What are the organs of pleasure? This of course is a leading question given the obviousness of the specialized sexual organs, the intensity of their sensations, and their near-universal covering in polite society. Unlike the milder pleasures of the smell of flowers and baking bread, the tastes of onion rings and ice cream, the sounds of the babbling brook and the string quartet, the feel of the masseuses' hands or the cat's fur, and so on, sexual pleasure is complicated by mutuality or coercion of another person. Beyond this there are the perverse pleasures of domination and submission, the celebrated pleasures of racing and winning, the subtle pleasures of creation in art and science, the unexpected pleasure of being praised or loved, even the pleasure of dreaming of success or glory. Where does conscience come in?
18. Sigmund Freud posited an intrapsychic “superego”, a sort of conscience based on parental values, controlling the id’s sexual and destructive demands as well as the ego’s strategies. While the normal balance among the educated ego, the primitive id, and authoritative superego more or less assured socially acceptable behavior, Freud’s clinical practice reflected on variations in these hypothetical structures to account for abnormal mental or emotional states. Hence a weak superego, at least in relation to id strength or ego complexity, would account for “pleasure without conscience”. Since these hypothetical structures theoretically are based on the person’s objective experiences during socialization as well as biological preconditions, a weak conscience would be expected in a spoiled or neglected child.
19. Gandhi probably had in mind adult sexual pleasure uncontrolled by proper upbringing or later training— pleasure at another’s expense, therefore sinful and dysfunctional in his pro-social ideal world.* [His ego probably also was influenced by a notion held by many in India at the time that semen contributed to mental and emotional superiority, and should not be wasted in frivolous sexual intercourse or masturbation. Gandhi was not a puritan, so had no problem with other positive pleasures in moderation, other than that they might waste time and mental concentration which could best be devoted to social and political solidarity and improvement.] But he might also have in mind the near sadistic pleasures of corporate profits through employee and customer exploitation or the military martinet’s vis-B-vis his soldiers and his enemies. These attributions to socialization of sinful pleasure have been common for centuries, certainly after the times when witches or The Devil were said to be responsible, if not plebeian parentage. But they help critics focus on the family behavioral backgrounds of celebrities such as George W. Bush, Donald Trump, and many CEOs. Despite the small prevalence of psychopathy in the population, psychopaths inordinately work their way to top organizational positions with great influence.* [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychopathy_in_the_workplace#cite_note-Boddy-1]
20. More contemporary, and perhaps eventually more practicable in prevention of perversion in selection of leaders in a democracy, is the neuropsychological approach. Studying anti-social personalities in the 1950s through ‘80s, experimental clinical psychologist David Lykken and his colleagues identified “primary psychopaths” as those who felt little pain during punishment and hence whose response to threat of punishment was fearless, and punishment did not work on them. Perhaps 2 percent of American boys are born with this low potential for

fear, blunting inhibitory socialization processes and resulting in some heroes and perhaps a million hard-core psychopaths in the US population at any time. In addition there would be several million “secondary psychopaths” and sociopaths whose condition is not so fearless but often antisocial by ignorance of circumstances or association with groups whose norms are antisocial. Many with a variety of social experiences are con men, experts at deception. The importance of distinguishing primary psychopaths is their intractability due to how their nervous systems are wired from birth. It is conceivable that Bush, Trump, and many CEOs are of this sort. While fear may not condition their behavior, Lykken’s experiments with psychopaths show that money will. But sociopaths, more numerous, may be the more tractable prototype of Gandhi’s pleasure-seekers without conscience.

21. These considerations of psychopathy may account for weakness or absence of conscience, but culture may account for the *shaping* of typical 21st Century American conscience. The variety of moral beliefs among today’s Americans suggests that there is no inborn human standard for moral conduct. Even the early Hebrews recognized that morality has to be cultivated, e.g., by commandments brought down from Mount Sinai, not to speak of the importance of instructional scriptures and commentaries in all major religions. However, media more potent today than religion include movies, advertising, fashion, rock concerts, journalistic customs, military service, corporate structure, and definition of responsibility by courts and prisons—any of which may legitimate a hedonistic, commodified culture by flaunting of sex, wealth, power, jargon, etc., or suppression of inconvenient truths and intelligent inquiry.
22. Conscience rarely goes beyond the limits of legitimacy set by law, and legislators and lawyers generally define what can be gotten away with, i.e., what privileges can be had with a quiet conscience such as corporate monopoly or authoritative entrapment—things that give pleasure to share-holders and prosecutors respectively. So lechers, racists, and petty tyrants need not do away with regulation, but only shape it to their convenience as illustrated by the “she dressed like a slut” defense, by open season on “illegal” migrants at the US border, or by signing on to a job as an “associate” rather than a regulated employee.
23. Martin Luther King, Jr., who emulated Gandhi, spoke of the long arc of the moral universe bending toward justice. Gandhi’s method of hastening this was “truth force”, implying that with enough open-minded exploration, education, disciplined nonviolent activism, and communal life the conscience of the majority can be immunized against such widespread but cynical manipulation, with pleasures channeled by knowing truths about selfish harms.
24. **Science without Humanity.** Were Gandhi alive today he would sound an alarm against the corporate takeover of controlling agencies of the world-wide public internet. The parallel with British rule in India is clear—demonization and silencing of political opposition while funneling vassal (Kshatriya) talents into administration of economic exploitation of the uneducated millions and the earth that sustains them. And now it is the British Tories again, led by prime minister Theresa May, that openly demand control of the internet. The technological triumph of the internet rests on research promoted with public funds by scientists and engineers working directly and indirectly for the US Department of Defense who needed to share information with one another and other scientists instantly, in depth, over a wide geographic area. Given the last forty years’ demon-and-dollar-dominated polity within the bounds of our constitutionally stereotyped system, it is amazing that the internet has been wide open to independent geeks, hackers, and the semi-educated millions for so long. The “net neutrality” movement, maintaining equal access to all sources at equal or no cost for all users, is challenging corporate takeover which would censor unprofitable or offensive web interactions and control traffic through pricing differences.
25. Computer science is key, but only one of the sciences affecting humanity today. Successes in medicine rest heavily on biological science and technology. Surgical technology enabled billionaire David Rockefeller to survive to the age of 101 through six heart transplants, while millions with little money die prematurely of heart

disease. Billions of poor people, especially in tropical zones, remain at risk for debilitating and deadly diseases controllable by sanitation, advanced agriculture, and advanced medicine.

26. But of today's Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, the worst threats may be the climate crisis and high-tech war. True, in ancient times 50,000 Romans, Gauls, and Carthaginians slaughtered each other in one day at Cannae.* [Will Durant. *The Story of Civilization, vol. 3: Caesar and Christ. p.50-51*] But seventy years ago US atom bombs instantly killed more than twice that number in two strikes on Japan, with greater numbers dying of radiation exposure in succeeding months and years. Today's hydrogen bombs could instantly kill far more, and in two years of nuclear winter bring disease and starvation, wiping out virtually all of humanity.
27. This organized terror is based on advanced science and engineering for the benefit of empire, though blamed on threats of a few thousand terrorists trained and equipped largely on the US-supplied free market. Meanwhile the NATO empire almost daily attacks mixed groups of opponents, killing about 50 civilians and perhaps 5 armed men for every NATO fighter killed. [ref?] The militarily more successful terrorists in this endless "low intensity" war are those for whom science and engineering systematically provided advanced defensive, locomotive, and offensive equipment—principally CIA drone controllers, Rangers, Seals, and mercenaries.
28. The climate crisis is due largely to the burning of fossil fuels during the last 200 years and especially since World War II chiefly for military, industrial, transportation, and heating purposes, producing CO₂ and other heat-concentrating gases. Another important factor is the meat-producing industry whose cattle burping, manure, and forest-burning for pasture produces a major portion of the highly potent methane gas and CO₂ now released into the atmosphere. [<http://timeforchange.org/are-cows-cause-of-global-warming-meat-methane-CO2>]
29. Air and water pollution and rising sea levels have been accelerated by melting of tundra, releasing unprecedented quantities of methane and melting of glacial ice accelerated by subglacial rivers while sea ice disappears leaving heat-retaining black water. Unabated, this crisis will flood coastal cities worldwide, creating unprecedented human migration with associated conflict for shelter and work, and plant and animal migration upsetting ecosystem functioning. Science and engineering has contributed petrochemical technology chiefly benefiting corporate shareholders and creating consumer dependencies as with plastics offering short-term convenience but longer-term problems. Science may produce partial fixes, but other unanticipated outcomes are likely. In general the genie which science and technology have loosed cannot be stuffed back into the cultural bottle, and further technological fixes are likely to bring further problems.
30. Responsibility for ecosystem restoration rests largely on politics whose salutary activity in turn will depend on non-corporate power, whose growth would seem to depend on social and cultural arousal abetted by progressive change in the social sciences. Until now psychology has not been kind, having fed into advertising and public relations of habit-forming corporations, and having helped socially disinterested corporations improve internal work processes. (cf *Bernays, Schein*) It remains to be seen whether anthropology and sociology together with complexity theory may help with resistance and new system development. So far funding of such research and development has been negligible, depending on United Nations agencies like the UN Development Program or independent foundations like the Social Science Research Council. Perhaps crowd-funded political movements with Gandhian goals will support apposite research.
31. The new "Maker" movement in technology, centered on cheap, fast, do-it-yourself construction, may prove revolutionary and consistent with Gandhi's self-sufficiency philosophy.* [*Lieberman & Fry*] Based on computer-program-driven 3D printing using local materials, makerism boasts more than a million free, proven, downloadable designs from small gadgets to houses, cars, food, guns, robots, and 3D printers themselves. Shared, such production obviates regular employment at corporate work sites, and promotes community through sharing inventive ideas, equipment, and products. The resulting independence and fellowship would defy corporate and agency controls, and may inhibit enlistment in armies and other apocalyptic organizations.

Last year alone (2016) there were 191 “maker faires” in 38 countries that attracted some 1.4 million people.* [http://www.businessinsider.com/maker-faire-2017-pictures-photos-2017-5/#but-there-were-lots-of-things-at-the-show-that-could-amaze-and-astonish-13]

32. **Commerce without Morality.** Liberal theologian Harvey Cox has discerned the idolatry of market-worship in our age, wherein the Market has tragically replaced God for millions in the capitalist world.* [*Harvey Cox. The Market as God. Harvard, 2016*] The laws and customs of property and the market have displaced the lessons of the Gospel if there ever was an age of true Christianity. Our task, then, is to reduce the market to a useful institution as it once was, subordinate to rather than overruling Christian (or any other religion’s) charity. Gandhi would agree: Commerce must be conditioned and controlled by morality—by thinking and doing good, not evil.
33. “Extreme materialism” was Martin Luther King’s term for one of the three greatest evils today, along with racism and militarism. We might say that this evil derives from capitalism, or that capitalism developed from materialism, but capitalism is what has shaped commerce for the last 200 years. Capitalism is a set of principles which reach well beyond commerce and which are so pervasive as to seem permanent— “There Is No Alternative” as Britain’s former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher famously said of capitalist neoliberalism. It happens that capitalism—the pursuit of wealth in the industrialized world—was the basis for the sacred British empire, so poor Ms. Thatcher had no alternative but this arrogant though vacuous pronouncement.
34. The material evils are well known: toxic mining and pharmaceutical wastes, air and water pollution from industrial and agricultural operations, destruction of forests, displacement of wildlife and food-growing land by housing developers, and so on. But capitalism’s human degradation is more subtle though similarly pervasive: seduction of consumers by advertising promising sex and success, merchandising to promote brand dependency, convenience, and so on; milking small-time investors and wishful entrepreneurs through false get-rich-quick schemes such as “multi-level (pyramid) marketing”. More demonic is international and indiscriminate arms sales killing millions in wars while perverting tens of thousands of young enlistees to think of themselves as heroes and then to suffer depression and unemployment if not themselves becoming white terrorists.
35. On its face, capitalism was democratic in its openness to common people beyond feudal subordination. But business aspirants of whatever background needed capital to get started. How would they get it? The pagan Vikings around the year 1000 with their sleek longboats got capital by force—plunder of towns on coasts and up every major river on the continent. At first this “capital” was not used to promote enterprise, but to bolster or prove the honor and splendor of their sponsoring chieftains. Moderated by the Church, they eventually did business by trade in places as far from Scandinavia as Russia, Turkey, Spain, and Greenland. *
36. Though forceful appropriation of goods, resources, slaves and money persisted through subsequent armed empires, *banking* developed—first to help ambitious princes (whose plunder repaid loans) and then enterprising churchmen and commoners whose burgeoning businesses repaid loans from profit. The lenders of course required profit, which came from interest on their loans. *Interest* then became the heart of capitalism, shaping its vital requirement for *growth*, without which interest on top of principal could not be paid. Today on Wall Street interest is boring; far more money can be made by manufacturing and selling new gambling tokens—derivatives, a zero-sum game chiefly benefiting the financial house.
37. Business schools, mired in the neoliberal philosophy of Saint Milton Friedman, condone myopic quarterly profit taking, foreign and minority labor exploitation, monopoly (e.g., through chain stores and patents), planned obsolescence, and so on, while largely ignoring the degradation of community and democracy necessary for sustainability as well as morality. In general, capitalism has promoted the pervasiveness of commerce—commodification and sale of everything and skill, and like poor Willy Loman of Arthur Miller’s *Death of a*

Salesman has promoted surrender of self to commercial institutions and pseudo-professions employing them. Gandhi's struggle for morality was also a struggle against commerce-perverting corporatism in empire.

38. **Knowledge without Character.** I don't know how Gandhi used the term "character" in this context, but I will assume it refers to value-laden context. Its importance cannot be overestimated. One of the greatest threats to privacy and democracy is the unlimited knowledge of every cell phone-user's or computer-user's personal thought, behavior, and situation, now indiscriminately tapped and archived if not immediately analyzed, by the National Security Agency and possibly other agencies. Further, private and corporate data banks are hacked and copied—or sometimes virally destroyed or altered—by private and governmental agents, domestic and foreign. This without warrant or reason, prejudicially or maliciously making every digitized inhabitant subject to blackmail, arrest, or criminal conviction even without indictment (through plea-bargaining) or to abuse by secret police or gangsters.
39. Apart from "cloak and dagger" concerns lie scientific, journalistic, economic, and political knowledge. Some scientific and engineering knowledge is gained without character from the start, but merely with the momentum of developments leading to the next step. For example, in 1999 protesters outside a convention hall in Boston challenged engineers or scientists emerging from a conference on the Cassini space shot of a satellite set to boomerang around Earth to gain momentum for its projected trip to Saturn. The satellite would carry lethal quantities of plutonium fuel which could devastate all life on Earth if it orbited too closely and burned.*[http://cjonline.com/stories/100606/opi_grossman.shtml#.WS7d3uvyuUk] Emerging from the conference hall, the scientists (or engineers) merely pumped their arms, almost "flipping the bird", and shouting "Push the envelope!"
40. Much, perhaps most, scientific knowledge is publicly accessible in libraries, concrete or digital, though more and more scientific journal articles can be read only by university or government agency affiliates whose institutions have paid a subscription fee. Some is proprietary and accessible only to authorized company agents. In any event, such knowledge has "character" by virtue of the article's stated theoretical and historical rationale, methodological description, and sound references. Character varies not only with the adequacy of these elements, but with the importance or triviality of the rationale, often dictated by the sponsor's or director's biases or limits, or those of the editorial reviewers. "Importance" in turn may require a forward view if we assume that everything is evolving and present-only characterization is insufficient. Epistemological characterizations such as "qualitative", "speculative", "unverifiable", or contrary to a "law" of thermodynamics, may sink a manuscript. Thus scientific character is not easy to judge.
41. Journalistic knowledge may be the most vulnerable to character assassination by opposed interests and writers. In the US, this is done regularly with impunity by TV commentators and columnists protected by the Constitution's first amendment. In Mexico and other corrupt or lawless places journalists are physically assassinated all too often, according to the character of their presentations and the audacity of those they may have offended. That character may have applied to the factual content, implications, or even the style and prominence of their presentations. On the other hand the pseudo-knowledge of propaganda is regularly spread with only symbolic opposition, given the expense, chanciness, and delay of slander or libel suits. Then there is "knowledge" published in mass audience text books, where those dealing with history and politics at odds with religion are systematically and legally censored in states like Texas which, as a market leader, affects knowledge available in schools in other states. The character of such knowledge is displayed in the insistence that equal time to be given "creationism" as an alternative to "evolution".
42. Almost unprecedented are President Trump's accusations of "fake news" coming from critical journals, where even President Nixon's questioners were not criticized as having invented facts. One may easily suspect that the source or Trump's accusations is a reflection of his manifestly own fakery ("alternative facts") —a clear case for Freud's defense mechanism of "projection". More commonly knowledge is slanted by "cherry-picking" of

evidence, e.g., when an orator or teacher quotes the Bible or a prosecutor or police witness omits exculpatory testimony, which may even be blocked or required by the presiding judge.

43. On the positive side, the 1930 case of reporting on Gandhi's Dharasana Salt March illustrates how the character of in-depth journalism may both reveal the truth and activate justice. United Press correspondent Webb Miller filed detailed reports of police brutality toward Gandhi acolytes every day of their attempt to occupy and shut down operations of an Indian Government monopoly salt factory providing unconscionable tax revenue for the colonial government. The many columns of nonviolent marchers were led by acclaimed poet Mrs. Sarojini Naidu since Gandhi himself had been jailed. Outrage from British, American, Indian and other readers stopped the brutality and eventually ended the tax, critically turning Gandhi's independence movement into success. Today's Indian weekly news magazine, comparable to *Time* and *Newsweek*, is called *Outlook*—at least symbolically characterizing its content as looking not to static facts, but to change. Holistically bucking the tide of neoliberal modernization, in 2006 the magazine featured the revival of Gandhism in India. Knowledge *with* character.* [If Gandhi is remembered in India today merely as "Father of Independence" and revered for non-violence, this is no less to be expected than memory of his contemporary Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal, forgetting detail—with passage of generations and prominence of new great issues such as nuclear war, climate crisis, and international rivalries in all of which India is a major actor.]
44. **Worship without Sacrifice.** Worship is the ritualized acknowledgment of a higher power than self or clan. It is the time-out from routine efforts to stay safe and strong—a time for getting things straight with the higher power than the temporal chieftain and habits of accommodation, for getting things straight with the power of life and death. So in ancient times the sacred form of sacrifice acknowledged life and death literally, with animal and even human sacrifice during worship in diverse cultures world-wide as a reminder of one's duty to a vengeful Deity and one's own mortality. The mundane function of human sacrifice served also to dominate inferior or hostile people—slaves, criminals, captive enemies. In the Hebrew tradition human sacrifice ended when an angel of God halted the rich but obedient Abraham in the act of stabbing and burning his son Isaac in obedience to an earlier commandment from God. Sacrifice went on, but using animals as offerings to God. This too ended following the cries of the prophets Micah and Amos who eschewed material sacrifice, saying that it was *justice* and the fostering of justice that God required.* [See Ignacio Castuera. "Gandhi's Seventh Sin: Worship without sacrifice", *BCA Dispatch*, Nov-Dec 2013.]
45. Roman overlords in Palestine routinely executed people who defied their rule, often by crucifixion. The Romans did not sacrifice people religiously, but his followers saw that profane execution of Jesus as a sacred offering to Humanity if not to God—Jesus dying for our sins, Jesus offering himself as a ransom to liberate believers from God's wrath for their sins. Those sins were defined not only by the followers of Moses, but by those who took seriously Jesus' admonition to love one another, including aliens and one's enemies as well. So the notions of human sacrifice and sacred responsibility mixed and fused in various ways. Catholic tradition has sinners compensating for their sins by acts of contrition and compassion. Protestants emphasized foresight and self-control—forestalling indulgences and being mindful of social consequences of their acts—living lives according to the gospel of *love*. This comports with Gandhi's basic beliefs, but he went further: admonition to overthrow social oppression by concerted and disciplined love—*satyagraha* (truth-force), nonviolent action. *Ahimsa*—nonviolence, listed as a virtue in the ancient Vedas, was paramount to the prophetic Gandhi, risking death, tragically including his own assassination by a fundamentalist Hindu following Gandhi's quoting from the Koran at Hindu ceremonies.
46. So what of sacrifice today? Sacrifice is morally required of those believing themselves to be good followers of any religion, but to mean anything that sacrifice must be of something of critical value today. Practicing Muslims, Christians, Jews, Hindus, Buddhists, etc., sacrifice money and many hours of their days or weeks in prayer or participating in religious community ritual and other activity—hours otherwise spent in paid work, recreation, or rest—or perhaps in fighting, raging, or ruminating. Religious leaders see those hours not as losses, but as devotion to the sacred and gains for community peace and pride, so sacrifice of time may be

viewed as a trade-off with political or social benefit. Indeed, working overtime (and sacrificing rest or recreation) may enable one to give (“more blessed than to receive”) and incidentally to earn respect and even leadership.

47. But these are common sacrifices, albeit not common enough. Gandhi is asking for extraordinary sacrifice, as when his hundreds of disciplined nonviolent satyagrahis advanced on the Dharasana salt works to certain beatings, and to possible death (four of several hundred died*). [Brian Martin. *Justice Ignited: The dynamics of backfire*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2007, p.39.]

We must understand that these sacrifices were not an exhibition of masochism—personal perversion. They were encouraged and sustained by a massive movement of civil disobedience promoted by Gandhi over several years, with ongoing boycotts of British textiles and liquor, tax refusal, ideological resignation of local officials, selection and training of stayagrahis, principled engagement of top colonial officials, sympathy for the frequently-jailed Gandhi, and so on. They encouraged modest forms of political sacrifice from scores of millions of ordinary Indians of all castes, religions, classes, ethnic groups and gender. These sacrifices were principled and widely shared with their practical consequences being thought through, not unlike the aims of Latin American liberation theology and popular practice of the late 20th Century suppressed under Pope Benedict XVI and now eased by Pope Francis. Generally, sacrifice for causes are deeply social.

1. What would Gandhi do today?

48. Today’s malignant societal problems as sensed in the West—ecological crisis, nuclear doom, civil surveillance and militarization, uncontrolled corporate greed, corruption of media, persistence of racism, weakness of democracy, planned destabilization of nations, and so on—equal or surpass those of Gandhi’s world. Some have agents who might be confronted, and many are directly influenced by the hegemonic power of the US government, personified in the Trump presidency, which Gandhi might challenge if he were alive.
49. In addition there are perplexing problems of peace and reconstruction or construction after successful nonviolent resistance: intergroup relations, ecology, education, participation, social order, defense, integration, “nation building”, adaptation, and so on. After developing *satyagraha* as the basis for addressing malignant societal problems, Gandhi turned to *sarvodaya* (the welfare or uplift of all) and his *Constructive Programme* for building a peaceful society. This centered on characteristics of an ideal community: “the dignity of labor, an equitable distribution of wealth, communal self-sufficiency and individual freedom”. * Wikipedia: “Sarvodaya”. Gandhi attempted to model and abide with such a community, at his ashram in the village of Sevagram. Today in India and the United States, Gandhi would face the development of more complex institutions to realize these ideals.
50. *Non-cooperation* was the leading principle in the application of satyagraha toward Indian self-rule, with boycotts, strikes, and refusal of military service among the many nonviolent tactics of resistance. Nevertheless 2.5 million Indians enlisted during the war against the Nazis and Fascists, whom Gandhi had denounced as well as war itself. Because Gandhi perceived and denounced violent and intolerant regimes and movements early in their development, we can assume that he would denounce the Republican movement if not its members and supporters, were he alive today. The same might also apply to the Democratic National Committee. In any event, our primary concern in the US before the 2018 elections is with resistance to the Republican regime.
51. To start our speculations about Gandhi’s approach to malignant problems, his proposed policy for the Jews of Nazi Germany and of Palestine is suggestive. In 1938 following several days of nationwide organized violence (Kristallnacht) in Nazi Germany against Jewish persons, businesses, and synagogues, Gandhi wrote an open letter to Jews urging nonviolent resistance. He likened their plight to that of Indian “Untouchables” under the Hindu caste system, and also to the situation of Indians in South Africa where satyagraha started and was fairly successful there after eight years of nonviolent struggle. Just as he was mistaken in 1930 in thinking that the

hearts of British-commanded police “would melt” when confronted by assertive but defenseless Salt marchers, Gandhi advised Jews in Germany to affirm that they belong in the country where they were born and work. He advised them to stand fast there against oppression and not migrate to a place, Palestine under British mandate, promised to the descendants of Abraham in an ancient text, the Hebrew Bible. Uprooting those long-resident Arabs would be a “crime against humanity”. Unforeseen by Gandhi was the murder of more than a million Jews in Germany and Nazi-occupied Europe even before the Nazi elite’s decision in 1942 to exterminate all European Jews. But the dark side of his logic was correct insofar as this Nazi “final solution” to “the Jewish problem” was critically encouraged by the near-absence of Jewish resistance.*[See testimony of top-ranking Nazi state police quoted in Raul Hilberg, *Destruction of the European Jews*, 1961.]

52. Gandhi maintained this satyagraha solution even in November, 1946, after the Nazi defeat, when the immensity of the genocide had been made known. He had completely overlooked the lack of religious conviction among German Jews that Jehovah could be relied upon to save them which Gandhi had advocated.*“The Jews”, by M. K. Gandhi - from *Harijan*, November 26, 1938. He believed them to be united in religious belief, while actually Napoleonic liberation and the religious Reform movement had realized their substantial secularization and dispersion from ghettos. Gandhi believed that by nonviolent resistance German Jews would “convert German gentiles to an appreciation of human dignity.” With *non-cooperation* basic to satyagraha he said nothing about any dependency or lack of dependency of the Nazi regime on Jewish enterprise. He said nothing about necessary organization and training for satyagraha, which for German Jews would have to have started years before Kristallnacht—the 1938 nationwide pogrom as preface to systematic persecution and genocide.
53. The persistence of Gandhi’s convictions regarding nonviolence suggests that if he were alive today that he would advocate satyagraha against Trump-Republicanism much like that with which he confronted British colonial authority in South Africa and India. He evidently didn’t reformulate his ideas even during the mass migrations and Hindu-Muslim fratricide following partition of India and Pakistan just before his assassination in January, 1948, by a Hindu supremacist.*[As many as 2 million lives lost* Wikipedia: Partition of India. On the individual level Gandhi at one point did say that violence resistance to tyranny was better than no resistance at all...] As with Chris Hedges, today’s guru of the American left, courageous assertion of truth was more important for Gandhi than winning. However, he was equally concerned with converting by example the violent adversary to respectful or loving brotherhood. Although Gandhi exchanged letters widely, it seemed that face-to-face interaction and dialog with adversaries was essential for satyagraha to work.
54. Face-to-face or hand-to-hand was the predominant mode of civil conflict in Gandhi’s time in South Africa and India as with ancient battles described in the mythic scripture *Mahabharata*. Today the modes of conflict are far more complicated by high-powered weapons, computerized communication, and robotization, all of which mostly preclude face-to-face interaction in battle, even in Special Operations night raids. On the other hand, video documentation selectively broadens the perception of violence as with Chelsea (nee Bradley) Manning’s video record of a US helicopter gunner’s shooting of civilian rescuers during street surveillance in Iraq. Gandhi may have been aware of the more remote mode of killing by bombing, ongoing in Spain and romanticized in 1935 by dictator Benito Mussolini’s aerial pilot son-in-law Count Ciano, who saw only blossom-like puffs of flame and smoke devoid of visible humans, where he had dropped bombs, in Ethiopia. Millions have been killed in World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and later bombings without the perpetrators seeing their victims face to face. And today young computer-soldiers who sit at drone controls in Nevada see their Afghan or Pakistani victims only impersonally as toys in a computer game, while the victims see no human face at all. Glimmers of conversion of combatants under these conditions would be practically impossible.

Confronting the Republican Establishment

55. Like most readers of this paper, Gandhi would want at least to stop the hostility of Republican officials and supporters toward progressive, radical, and “inferior” groups. But more importantly to Gandhi would be their

social, economic, and political morality. For this we can turn to his list of social sins, their priorities, and strategies for turning them around. First, priorities. *Politics without Principle*, *Wealth without Work*, and *Knowledge without Character* would be most salient in dealing with the Republican regime, followed by *(Economic) Science without Humanity* and *Commerce without Morality*, and finally *Pleasure without Conscience* and *Worship without Sacrifice*. With regard to *sarvodaya*—the social constructive principle—these priorities might be reversed, except that *Wealth without Work* would be among the top few.

56. We focus on political activity because Gandhi, the politician, was an active member among the top leadership of the Indian Congress Party until 1934. At that time he quit, partly because the Party accepted nonviolent resistance only as an expedient policy rather than an enduring principle.*[Gene Sharp, *Gandhi As a Political Strategist*. Porter Sargent, 1979.] Nevertheless he wished for solidarity within the Party and continued relationships with Jawaharlal Nehru and others as allies in the Indian independence movement while, during World War II, denouncing the war and Indians' participation in it with the British, especially since British diplomats continued to insist that the British own and control India.
57. Today and for the last thirty years the United States has led the world as “the greatest purveyor of violence” (--- Martin Luther King, Jr.) as well as dominating or destroying, directly or indirectly, many nations out of avarice and hegemonic jealousy while pretending to extend democracy. Leading these efforts have been both major political parties, one led by neoliberalism (empire mainly by corporate “free trade”), the other by neo-conservatism (empire mainly by force), both with deception. The Republican leaders and institutions are currently in charge, with intentions also of hyper-profiting the elite and destroying progressive institutions at the social and economic expense of “the 99 Percent”, making their interfaces with the establishment the most obvious fields for resistance. Though Gandhi would wish that *all* parties including the Democrats would cease violence and seek conciliation, he was enough of a strategist to now focus satyagraha action first on the Republicans, the immediate controllers of US policy.
58. Thus American satyagrahis would pinpoint *politics without principle*, demanding that Republicans state their principles clearly and truthfully. Popular hearings could be a tactic employing some kind of “popular subpoena”, or state-level hearings with genuine subpoenas. Teamed with *Knowledge without Character*, the knowledge basis for Republican principles would be made clear in large part by demands on the corporate media, campaigning for full and accurate reporting with relevant theories and the full range of valid data. Here the Federal Communication Commission might be supplemented with state-level or popular commissions. This process would include transparency as well as “instant fact checking” of televised data.
59. Also, in pursuit of *knowledge without character*, satyagrahis would target the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and other (perhaps corporate) organizations for their unprincipled surveillance programs yielding information which could be employed for purposes lacking character (uplift of all, as well as truth). Quite an order, but I believe Gandhi would want to implement or consider such campaigns. Of course education and training would go before, as well as selection and harmonizing of targets. All actions would respect Republican persons, many of whom may be susceptible to brotherly invitation, especially if alternative employment were available.
60. Wealth, of course, is a defining feature of the Republican movement. Inheritance is a major part of elite wealth, but so is gainful work. So Gandhi would expose what *work* a range of *wealthy as well as hard-up* Republicans do, honest or otherwise, and whether commensurate or incommensurate with time, effort, and preparation involved. Here *sarvodaya* principles would enter. Good and hard work could be celebrated, and reasons for lack of work (including employer demands, unemployment, and systemic lack of opportunity) highlighted. In all these efforts the “love” aspect of satyagraha would be essential lest they come to resemble witch hunts, the opposite of Gandhi's principles.

61. We should note that these tactics are not new to the United States, the land of Shay's Rebellion, May Day, and Occupy. Gandhi's contribution, rather like the Christian concept of loving one's enemy, is empathy with the "sinner", reaching out in understanding and friendship as much as possible. Gandhi himself was more idealist than pragmatist; he detested expedience and hypocrisy. He would hope that some people in every community or work group could similarly to himself serve as role models.
62. Secondary targets such as *(Economic) Science without Humanity* and *Commerce without Morality* could serve as incubators for new issue campaigns. The professional economics establishment with its iron laws of competition—and hypocritical disregard for stolen and vested wealth and for political and psychological manipulation—has been the bane of our democratic society. Economic theory seems more a justification for established business hegemony than understanding wealth and enterprise as transactional processes between ecological and human conditions. Thus the French and now burgeoning all-Western graduate student rebellion against the neoclassical canon.*[Edward Fullbrook "The Crisis in Economics: Teaching, Practice and Ethics." *Autisme-économie.org* May, 2003, online.] Graduate student and generally youth energy may enable a "new economics" satyagraha, especially as systemic corruption erupts in the Trump administration.
63. The departmentalization of science more generally, inherited from the nineteenth-century German academy, has produced a kind of perverse *swaraj* (self-rule) narrowing discoveries to those traceable to established theoretical formulations and analytic methods in psychology, sociology, political science, history, geography, and especially economics. Lost connections with nature, philosophy, history, literature, and with other sciences is regrettable, since analogies often lead to radical approaches, discoveries, and social experiments. On the other hand the development of computer science and methods has had broad impact, making complexity theory a growing tool for integration among sciences, nature, and society.*[Fritjof Capra & Pier Luigi Luisi. *The Systems View of Life*. Cambridge U. Press, 2014.]
64. *Commerce without Morality* would seem like a well-defined target for satyagraha. The heart of this is for-profit banking with minimal-work interest and fees, driving most businesses to the treadmill of growth if not mega corporate dictation—and periodic crash at public expense. Bankers are unlikely to respond positively to nonviolent resistance if it implies direct issuance of money by democratic government, depriving them of their money-creating monopoly (through trust-us only loans ten times greater than their capitalization), or if it implies publicly-owned banking common in Europe and Asia but virtually unknown in America. Thus satyagraha should include vision of realistic alternatives to the exploitation they are challenging. Whether Gandhi would agree is another question, because his heart was with voluntary sharing in myriad local communities. His goal was cultural revolution and only temporary acceptance of political reform.
65. Last among present-day resistance priorities in America might be *Pleasure without Conscience* and *Worship without Sacrifice*. Though these could be fundamental to the societal functions addressed above, they are everywhere and every-moment personal—diffuse and difficult to engage in terms of time and venue. The latter's sacrificial manifestation is not immediately visible, but can become known mainly through association over time. With regard to *pleasure without conscience*, Gandhi may have thought mainly of sex or sadistic thrill, but there is the special case of anti-social personality—sociopath, psychopath, aggressive or acquisitive narcissist, and so on, where only ego is to be satisfied. Insofar as psychiatry is supposed to deal with such conditions but prefers to ignore these dysfunctions, satyagraha could target professional organizations, publications, and medical schools. However, their control in the good society is more likely to be in educated daily interaction with regular people.
66. Two special cases may be police training and police sensitivity to non-respect of police authority, and the sociopathic CEO or president Trump interfacing other officials, political supporters, journalists, and institutions and citizens who experience the effects of his decisions and impulsive actions. Some of these may be discrete enough for satyagraha action. We should note that, as with secondary boycotting, targeting of the suppliers and

consumers of anti-social purveyors, cutting off their resources, may be more effective than direct confrontation. But again, Gandhi would be more interested in their conversion than mere inhibition, and these pathological cases might prove intractable as well as the feelings of ordinary people who know they've been conned.

67. Less speculative, *Sarvodaya* and *Constructive Programme* would feature *supported* sacrifice with worship among friends.

Conclusion: Power and Empathy

68. Gandhi's thinking was broad, deep, and long. This enabled him to work for a transformed world, not merely for reform within the present system. Breadth of social knowledge and experience enabled him to understand that nonviolence, long conceptualized in Hindu tradition as *ahimsa*, could be even more powerful than use of violence to achieve desired ends. Practiced again and again by large numbers of trained, brave people, it turns out that their odds of winning desired change are twice as great as with armed conflict, and also more likely to result in democratic than authoritarian governance.*[Maria J. Stephan & Erika Chenoweth. 2008. Why civil resistance works: The strategic logic of nonviolent conflict. *International Security*, 33, pp. 7-44.] Bravery, especially risking one's life even in relatively safe America (safe even among blacks compared with non-Western countries), is possible when training enables people to know what they're doing, and to have group support.
69. Having accepted a set of principles such as those inspired by Gandhi, structure of a transformed system would be developed by the people living in that system, not by a party's or leader's blueprint, though discussion and experimentation in community would be necessary. In the US today the narrowness of corporate mass media and standardized school curriculum tend to co-opt such discussion, which is also inhibited by long hours of work and commuting among the employed and lack of resources for attending meetings among the unemployed. However, only about five percent of the people voluntarily showing up for discussions, as in participatory budgeting meetings in some Latin American countries, is enough to seed widespread and effective action. India may know more privation than the US or even Brazil, but today's threats and uncertainties are motivating more and more people here to make use of alternative media, church basement forums, meet-ups, conference calls, coffee shops, livingrooms, kitchen tables, tailgates, and other venues of discussion. (Ref?)
70. Gandhi understood that the key to peace was open-status mixing. His greatest disappointment was disdain and fighting between Hindus and Muslims, and he traveled to centers of conflict to mediate. He abhorred the caste system, particularly the permanent assignment of millions to "untouchability" status. On the personal level Gandhi, of administrator-caste background, staffed the kitchen at his ashram with "dalits" (untouchables) equally with others.*[The great dalit leader B. R. Ambedkar saw this approach as weak and patronizing, and insisted that dalits form and lead their own party.] In the United States today the formal status of slave and owner is gone, but replaced by media false verities and laws of structural discrimination such as gerrymandering and school choice.
71. The mixing of Colonial settlers and Indians was a challenge we hear little about. Here the social problem is confounded with property rights. A clear contemporary example of the explosive energy of such mixing is the malevolence of Zionist settlers on stolen Arab land in Palestine. In the US the ethnic and racial purity of neighborhoods has been lethally enforced not only by residents but sometimes by police as well, the reverse being never heard of. Similarly, US media hardly ever stage conversations between advocates of opposite political ideals—"never the twain shall meet", a refrain which colonial era Rudyard Kipling demolished in the last sentence of his famous poem: "...But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth/ When two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the ends of the earth!" The racial/class divide is beginning to change, on alternative video media, university admissions, corporate staffing, and elective office.

72. It is time to add to Gandhi's paradigm a new, perhaps "master" sin: *Power without Empathy*. Power can be manifested in any or all of Gandhi's situations: wealth, politics, pleasure, science, commerce, knowledge, and worship. That power can be for good or for evil, from autocrats or from the many. One stereotype of power *with* empathy might be the legendary French King René who was said to go in plain clothes on walks through his medieval town stopping now and then to chat with folks. Real life examples might be certain senators talking with different constituents to learn how a certain law helped or hurt them according to their special problems, or your fifth grade teacher helping with your special project, or a church committee helping undocumented immigrant families to settle in a skeptical community. Clearly there are power differentials, and there is empathy derived from frequent or intense, respectful interaction. On the other hand Roman Emperor Nero is caricatured as a prototype of power *without* empathy, except perhaps for his horse,* [actually Nero was quixotic, often using empathy to control or kill others] with such psychology seemingly echoed in President Donald Trump making hollow promises to unemployed coal miners, or a stock broker looking for commissions by selling you derivatives, or your husband forcing himself upon you while thinking of his secretary.
73. The key responsibility for good is *empathy*. This is a big order for persons in positions of power, where temptations may be overwhelming for (in corresponding order to the seven situations) delegating, opportunism, nonchalance, fame, greed, warehousing, or hypocrisy. Each of these may be considered a form of corruption—only one featuring money, but all featuring immorality. Even the word "democracy" needs changing—do we want "people ruling", or "community harmonizing"? Gandhi would advocate and work for the latter, implying a new system.
74. In the US today an example of empathy as a strategy as well as a movement principle is the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), offering a glimmer of community harmonizing as a power principle. IAF operates through 52 local affiliates—budding institutions---including the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). An unusual feature of IAF and GBIO's recruitment process and organization-building, as in some union organizing, is relational meetings or "one-on-ones". Here the recruit visits with an established member in his or her home, sharing personal life stories. By this means the recruit and the member develop empathy for one another, leading to empathy for others whom one might contact, and a sense of empathy for all.
75. An example of GBIO's proud accomplishments is the razing of a decaying high school for girls and its replacement with a new STEM (science, technology, engineering, math) Academy public school in a majority-black district of Boston. GBIO and a partnering large church (Trinity Church in Copley Square) persuaded the mayor and city agencies—in large, demanding gatherings—to fund and carry out this expensive enterprise (though a boon for private banks and other bond buyers*), consistent with *satyagraha*. [*A publicly-owned infrastructure or central Bank of Massachusetts is in the offing and could finance such a project at lower public expense.] This project and several others were proposed and prioritized by ordinary citizens—GBIO members acting together—the normal way of IAF. The project supports a reform in city governance, well within the bounds of our capitalist system but outside its individualist/private contracting aspect. Further, the aims of the school are preparation for university and jobs/career, without mention of learning citizen dynamics. IAF, as presently constituted, piggybacks on existing identity aggregations— religious and civic. Gandhi might go along with these limitations even though *sarvodaya* asks more in community sharing. Still, such community organizational work presages decentralized government, part of a new system. In it ordinary people exercise power—"power with" as distinct from "power over".
76. Currently such "progressive" developments are being successfully thwarted by reactionary citizen organization, with sponsors in industry (Koch, Murdoch) and government (especially Republican leaders) whose persuasive powers are partially based on swamping voters with propaganda while providing self-aggrandizing benefits to communities. The seemingly spontaneous Tea Party may have been initiated with fairground demonstrations and tailgate meetings, but was built and funded largely by millions of dollars contributed by a few

ultraconservative industrialists. Nevertheless its image is populist, even with faux anti-corporatist and real racist overtones. Such organizations might be major targets for satyagraha.

77. Both these institutions are largely contrived by idealists and largely funded by established fortunes or public treasuries rather than members' major contributions of money and labor. Idealist leadership may also be true of Gandhi movements. But new systems will depend more on spontaneous or evolutionary movements. One well-known example is the development of popular government in Richmond, California. This multi-racial city was long dominated by Chevron Corporation with a world-class oil refinery employing many Richmond citizens and providing the city's largest share of tax revenue. Toxic fires at the refinery triggered sustained citizen anger and rebellious action regardless of police fealty to Chevron. Reform leadership arose from citizens, activists, journalists, and supporting local politicians who had been a minority on the city council. Black, white, and brown folks came together against Chevron practices, elected a progressive mayor (Gayle McLaughlin) and a majority to the city council and with a new chief brought the police more to the residents' side. Extensive and intensive interaction among these leaders and other denizens of the community expanded and intensified empathy, tamed Chevron, and persists in a healthy (in Gandhian terms) presence after roughly twenty years of community interaction—especially the five since the latest refinery fire.*[See Steve Early. *Refinery Town: Big oil, big money, and the remaking of an American city*. Beacon Press, 2017.]
78. After two-and-a-half centuries of violent revolutions—with some succeeding tolerably to this day and some falling to authoritarian dictatorship—and with a half-century of Gandhian nonviolent change movements (including Iran, Brazil, Serbia, and Ukraine), we find ourselves leaning toward the Gandhian for world salvation. Despite Gandhiji's proclivity for pre-industrial village life, we are faced with nuclear eco- and genocide and commitment to endless civilization-changing scientific and technological development beyond Gandhi's cause for rural sanitation. Two-and-a-half millennia of religious development have focused on kindness and mindfulness of the individual, but now this ethic must expand to the secular community in both small and large senses. If he were alive today, Gandhi would seek empathic relations to ensure truth and love. "Yes" to power *with* empathy.

David W. Lewit
Boston, 12 June 2017
(617) 266-8687