

Speech about non-violence

Dear audience,

today we want to talk about Mahatma Gandhi. A man, who had said the following Quote: "Non-violence is the greatest force at the disposal of mankind. It is mightier than the mightiest weapon of destruction devised by the ingenuity of man." Before anybody here is able think along with me, we all have to understand the quote. A possible translation into understandable English could be: Talking from face to face, instead of bombing each other, leads to a better world. Or; In a political protest you can achieve more with non-violence instead of violence. I assume that non-violence means a case where no one is able or willing to kill or hurt anybody else.

Before answering to Gandhi's quote, we have to ask ourself, what do we want to achieve? In times of war, do we want to cause the greatest physically damage? Or do we want to protest against a crimeful government? And then how crimeful is this government?

To create the biggest physically damage possible we could use hydrogen bombs. The biggest one was fired up in the 60s in the Sowjetunion. With a circle where the centre is Wiesbaden it destroyed everything from Rüdeseheim to Frankfurt. Then in a war you can destroy a whole country in days. But can you destroy that much just with words? Of course not, but you can get people to fight in you army.

Away from wars you can bring people to peaceful protests just with words. We all now Nawalny, on of the best known Russian opposition politicians. He died in a prison camp in the Russian arctic circle. He always tried to be peaceful in his fight against Putin and his horrible regime. He even went to back to Russia all tough he knew that he was going to get prisoned. In the end he died. Some people say he even got murdered by Putin. This raises the question, how is non-violence and peaceful protest able to consist against deathful crime and Putin?

Nawalny protested for years against Putin. He got supported from all over the world in his peaceful fight against Putin. And we all have to keep in mind, Nawalny didn't died an easy way and he died because of Putin. But even though he got poisoned by Russian agents a few years ago and almost died in Berlin in the Charitè, he lived a long time, fighting, peacefully, for a better democratic world. He always called for actions. Namely peaceful protest. And with this he managed to build humanrights-Organizations in Russia. He got supported by Amnesty International as political protester without violence. Besides Putin didn't achieved to stop all protest against himself, instead in Moskau the last week were a huge funeral ceremony whilst burying Nawalny. He had to bow down to this many people. He didn't arrested everyone of them. The whole world watched and saved the many people.

But where there really an other option? If Nawalny had used violence is his protests, would he gained this recognition and support from all over the world? He wouldn't had the support from international Human rights-organisations like Amnesty. They would just demand on a fair process not on the release of him. And the question is how many people would follow him on his way. Would there be enough for protests with violence? With the chance of getting prisoned?

This all excludes the fact that most of the times a protest in violence against a government is not a idea, because once violence is the normal way it doesn't find an end. We have seen this in many situations. The protests in the late 90s from left-orientated students with a bit of violence got brutally brought to end trough the police.

And then there is the question; are there situations where the use of violence is maybe the right way? The assassination, where a small group of people tried to kill Hitler. We all agree that would not have been bad, if Hitler didn't manage to kill millions of people. Violence for protecting many people from a even more violence.

Now please imagine a world in complete peace. Quite hard, right? Peace for everyone and everywhere. You may ask yourself, how did we get there? There are the highest representatives from all countries. And they all are talking – not bombing. And they all managed to change the world in a peaceful world without wars and armed conflicts. Some countries set back their wills to take in other countries they incorrectly thought belonged to them. No one would have to worry that Donald Trump allows Russia to take you over military, if your country didn't paid enough for the defence expenditures and the national army. In fact, there would be a competition in disarming – not upgrading. The money we saved we would spend on social issues like social inequality or climate change. So, look, it's a quite easy way to save the world, change it into the best world possible and then everyone is sitting on their balcony and enjoying the high-life. That's the solution for all our problems! Thank you for listening. Bye.

Ok, yes I know, that is way to short. But what you cannot deny is the fact that, obviously, it would be even more harder to set up a world like this, if there would be everywhere armed conflicts and wars. Again, a fact you can not deny is that we all are not able to think of a world in peace with wars. How can peace be wars? It's actually quite laughable to raise this question... Therefore non-violence is maybe the mightier way to gain world's peace than with definitely not peaceful bombing and firing.

Thank you for listening!