Sep 28,2014



AHIMSA CAN BE OUR WEAPON

OSHOSPEAK

- This whole society has been living with violence for centuries.

 Nonviolence is mere talk
- Nonviolence has become a means of fighting. Only fighting has any value in this world
- This society is full of violence. It teaches everyone to be hard, to be like stone

If a man sits down in front of your house and goes on a fast saying he will die if you do not do as he says, do you think it is nonviolence? If you don't listen to me, I will kill myself. This is violence; it is a direct threat. It is blackmail. This man is giving a clear threat that he will kill himself. He is trying to put your humanity to shame. He is saying, remember, you will repent your whole life. You have killed me.

ing. But the fight continues. There is violence in fighting, so how can nonviolence be made a means of fighting? It is nonviolence only in name. Within it is violence and only violence.

People think that M K Gandhi has gone beyond Buddha and Mahavira. It is untrue. The great revolution of Buddha and Mahavira has had water thrown on it. Nonviolence has also become a means of fighting. As if only means of

fighting have any value in this world.

love too is a way of fighting. Love so

that you can be victorious. Be nonvio-

lent so that you can push others down.

Everything is a means of fighting -

M K Gandhi went on a fast against B R Ambedkar, who wanted the lowcaste *shudras*, the *harijans*, to have a separate vote. If only Ambedkar had been rictorious, the incidents of barbarism that are going on all over the country today would not be happening. Ambedkar was correct in saying, "Why do you want to remain with these Hindus who have given such inhuman treatment to you? What is the meaning of our being with those whose temples we cannot enter, with those whose wells we can-

not drink water from, with those who we cannot socialise with, with those on whom even our shadow falling is sacrilegious? They have renounced us, so why are we still holding onto them?"

It is such a clear and simple matter; there cannot be two opinions about it. But M K Gandhi went on a fast. He was nonviolent; he initiated a nonviolent war. He went on a fast saying, "I will starve myself. This would be tremendously harmful to the Hindus. Harijans are Hindus and will always remain Hindus." He fasted long, his health was failing, and finally, Ambedkar had to yield. Ambedkar agreed, don't give a separate vote. And the Gandhian historians write: a victory for nonviolence! This is very strange: who is the nonviolent one in this? Ambedkar is nonviolent. Seeing that Gandhi would die, he dropped his insistence. Gandhi is the violent one in

this. He forced Ambedkar with this threat of killing himself. Understand it. If you threaten to kill someone else, it is violence and if you threaten to kill yourself, it is nonviolence: but what is the difference? One man holds a dagger to your chest and says take out whatever is in your wallet - this is violence. And another man holds a dagger to his own chest and says, take out whatever is in your wallet or else I will stab myself. Who is violent in this? I tell you Ambedkar is nonviolent, not Gandhi. It seems as if it was a victory for violence. Nonviolence has been defeated and violence has been victorious. Gandhi is behaving violently. One who cannot give any argument indulges in this kind of behaviour. This society is full of violence. It teaches everyone to be like stone. Death Is Divine, Osho International Foundation, www.osho.com