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ABSTRACT: The largest obstacle to saving people in today's world is from violence and wars. There is a long line of people waiting for peace so that they can survive the conflict. People will promise that no country can exploit another and that no country can produce weapons capable of mass murder. They believe that their plan can be realised by transforming the world's goodwill and efforts toward world peace into world peace in paradise. The whole world is waiting for a human universe that seems to be taking us to Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (Mahatma Gandhi). This article's main issue is an extinct political ideology that Mahatma Gandhi promoted many years ago as a supporter of nonviolent policy in search of the human world. Here, the communication style has been shown to have the missing Gandhian ideals. This post will attempt to analyse Mahatma Gandhi's policy & ideology in communication style as we approach his 150th birthday celebrations. Through extensive study, this article will attempt to determine how Gandhi's philosophy and communications relate to one another. As a method of exploration and analysis, Gandhi’s principles Nonviolence, and Chamber-Pots have been scientifically reviewed in this article.
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INTRODUCTION

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was a saintly personality, a moral revolutionist, and a person above praise and words. Gandhi has had a lasting impact on the world, which it desperately needed at a time when both peace and love are in short supply. Gandhi is more than just a regular person; he is also a political philosopher, a revolutionary, a charismatic leader of the people, and a proponent of nonviolence and peace for all peoples, not just those who live in India. Gandhian philosophy was perceived as being purely political and not appropriate in the context of social and cultural components of existence. People believed that Gandhi's beliefs were important just to help India get independence from British control, despite the fact that he spent the most of his life engaging in politics and remaining a fierce supporter of freedom. This is the reason why the majority of people did not share his belief in Truth and non-violence, and as a result, he had little influence on society. Gandhi's political theory is still very relevant today [1].

Truth and nonviolence are the two pillars of Gandhi's philosophy, which is regarded as the foundation of all of his philosophical writings. When they reach the pinnacle of experience, they converge and unite with God. Hindu philosophy is characterized by the belief that the ideal of reality is also the ideal of value. Gandhi consequently described God as being either Truth or Love (nonviolence in its perfection). Therefore, when the Unity of Man and God has likewise been attained, his objective of life, self-realization, is couched in ideal terms. Gandhi, however, is well aware that there is, in reality, a gap between man and God at the current level of human experience; in fact, this gap will never be entirely bridged as long as we are in this body. We can only acquire perfection once the body dissolves because we are compelled to be constrained by the shackles of flesh. But the gap may undoubtedly be closed while still inside this body [2]. Gandhi's advice, which he called "satyagraha," would be to follow the relative truth relentlessly in light of this recognition of the flawed character of man. This demonstrates how dynamic his ideas are. He recommended vow observance, which he defined as "doing at whatever cost that that one ought to do," as an ethical discipline to help reach this goal. Nevertheless, making a pledge does not imply that we can keep it entirely from the start, but rather that we must make "continuous and honest effort in thought, speech, and deed, with a view to its completion." It is undeniably true that in this way, the ideal's practise is extremely flimsy;
anything might be defended as adhering to the ideal. However, this is inevitable, just as it is with all ethical norms, whose adherence can hardly be a subject of strict objective scrutiny; it would ultimately depend on the spirit of the observer and which no outsider can fully determine [3]. However, it does not excuse the individual's moral failings; rather, this consciousness should spur one on to attempt to correct the flaws. Man, imperfect as he is, can only strive; he cannot dictate the outcome, which is why Gandhi chose nonviolence as a means of pursuing truth. Since God alone possesses perfect nonviolence, humans are unable to practise it. Man cannot help but take part in "himsa" that society's basic existence entails because he is a member of it. In order to avoid the violence that is inherent in life, Gandhi would therefore consider someone to be true to his faith. Gandhi's goal of nonviolence is put into actual practise in this way [6].

The principles of ahimsa (non-violence), satyagraha, and self-reliance are central to Mahatma Gandhi's teachings, which are well-known throughout the world. Because he carried the freedom movement on his shoulders and made sure that India gained independence, he is referred to as the Father of the Nation. Gandhi's educational philosophy illuminates the way for pupils to follow in order to become the greatest thinkers of the century. It can instruct us on how to improve the world and make it more equitable. A few sample essays are provided below for students to use.

When protest organizations are able to maintain their nonviolent stance in the face of violent repression, that is nonviolent discipline. Nonviolent discipline has been emphasized as a key component in the success of nonviolent campaigns, alongside elements like unity, organization, and leadership. Non-violent discipline is still not well studied, despite claims to the contrary. By creating a measure of nonviolent discipline, which will serve as the basis for qualitative and quantitative examination of the impact of nonviolent discipline on the success of protest movements, my thesis will fill this vacuum. Joe Llewellyn: Preventing the violence of nonviolence: An investigation of anarcho-pacifism as a remedy for the violence of practical nonviolence and as a different strategy for building peaceful communities (Garfield, 1979) [4].

Abstract: Understanding the nature of nonviolent movements has garnered more scholarly interest in recent years. According to the findings of this study, nonviolent movements are more effective and are more likely to lead to an improvement in human liberties. Gene Sharp's "pragmatic" approach to nonviolent conflict, which emphasizes the effectiveness of peaceful approaches in comparison to violent strategies, has largely influenced this research. Although 'pragmatic nonviolence' has often been successful in toppling dictators, it hasn't always resulted in nonviolent democracies. This thesis has two objectives. First, it will define and consider principled nonviolence as a useful contrast to pragmatic nonviolence. It will examine principles-based nonviolent alternatives that reject all forms of violence in further detail. The resulting theory or theories might then be applied in place of pragmatic nonviolence to assist prevent the emergence of violent post-revolutionary communities. It might also serve as the foundation for a fresh critical approach to peace and conflict studies. Second, the thesis will compile data on the current state of anarcho-pacifism and principled nonviolence [5].

"Only in a society where authority is distributed at the grassroots can there be full demilitarization. Henry David Thoreau encouraged free people to use nonviolent protest and civil disobedience whenever there was injustice in the nineteenth century. In any democratic society, civil disobedience and nonviolence are essential elements. Even in Western democracies, it sometimes seems as though the state is unstoppable, rendering us as individuals helpless and unable to make a significant impact. We must constantly be reminded that the only source of state authority is the agreement of the governed. The state cannot exist without the consent of the people. Even a strong military state that is virtually impervious to the use of violent force can be changed through grassroots nonviolence. We must learn how to use non-cooperation, civil disobedience, education, and organising as tools for change. Only when we insist that our leaders pay attention to us will direct democracies emerge. The basis of Green politics is this. The ability to make decisions does not come to us from above. We only need to use the power we already possess to change our societies into ones that are peaceful, ecologically sound. We, must, and need are all powerful words used by Kelly to persuade readers to feel the same way she does about nonviolence. In this text, Kelly conveys to us her ideas on what is happening in our world and what has to be done to change it by using the rhetorical terms rhetorical circumstance, pathos, and authority [7].

The saying "an eye for an eye makes the world blind" Welcome to the world of nonviolence, (Mahatma Gandhi), which is not like "Disneyland" but rather a small hamlet of philosophers covered in white, embellished with crystals, and teeming with doves; white symbolising peace, crystals for clarity and a pure spirit, and doves for. I guess my imagination has drove me, I don't know. Gandhi is pointing to nonviolent resistance as a counterargument to political violence. Gandhi may have made this statement while using a nonviolent strategy to contest the legitimacy and status quo of British control over the Indian subcontinent. Gandhi's nonviolent campaign was scorned and dismissed from the beginning. But the British eventually recognised the threat Gandhi's nonviolent movement posed when they discovered Gandhi's message was penetrating the heart and mind of the greater Indian
community. When the British turned to violence after realising they could no longer ignore Gandhi and his cause, Gandhi's move toward self-rule came about more quickly than they had anticipated. Gandhi and his movement were successful because of the gaps that were opened up between Gandhi's nonviolent tactics and the British government's use of force to suppress the peaceful protesters [5].

Movements against violence have the potential to have a good effect. When Mahatma Gandhi led the Salt March to urge Indian citizens toward freedom from British control, it served as an example of a nonviolent protest. The Syrian conflict, however, prevents this from happening. This battle began as a nonviolent protest after a group of schoolchildren were detained and tortured for writing anti-Assad graffiti, but the Syrian government swiftly turned it into a widespread revolt that demanded the president's departure. Syrian activists who were speaking out against the government's activities and calling for civil liberties and economic development were targeted by President Bashar al-Assad [8].

Since 2013, chemically armed missiles have killed hundreds of people, and the United States has threatened military action if the weapons are not eliminated. Four million individuals have left Syria as a result of the present Syrian state, and 7.6 million more have been displaced; together, these figures equal half of the state's pre-crisis population. A humanitarian crisis has resulted, and this has led to the highest number of refugees to ever evacuate a single incident.
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