

Education of the Mass as a Moral Armament against Civil Disobedience in the State

AUTHOR(S): KPA KOM Isidore

Abstract:

The ideology and practice of civil disobedience in the society constitute a major impediment to growth or progress in the society. This study unveils the background and meaning of civil disobedience, and the underpinning precursors of, and perspective to, the practice of civil disobedience in the society. It examines how some citizens manifest this vice in society either for mistaken patriotism resulting from an atmosphere of conviviality that surrounds them, or simply for economic, political and social desires. It is of primordial necessity to understand how and why such discrimination and the spirit of inequality manifest themselves in the state due to poor laws, inadequate educational programmes, and bad governance. Summarily, this paper seeks to balance the perennial needs to come out of this oblivion for a better future, by prescribing compulsory moral education of the mass as a vaccine and pedagogic panacea to eliminate the spirit of civil disobedience. The paper also views good laws as a mitigation to promote social justice and equality, in order to enhance cohesion. In addition, it deems it vital to inculcate good governance in all authorities or those in public position by means of a syllabus. This way, citizens will have no reason to resist or disobey the laws of their fatherland.

Keywords: Civil Disobedience, State, Moral Education, Laws, Governance,

CJAR

Accepted 3 February 2022
Published 28 February 2022
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6416473



About Author

Author(s):

KPA KOM Isidore,

PhD research fellow,
Specialty: Ethic and Political Philosophy,
The Department of Philosophy,
The University of Yaounde 1-Cameroon.
Telephone: + (237) 679631442



INTRODUCTION

Civil disobedience has been a debate and discussion for decades now, especially concerning issues of power, and economic and social interest. This phenomenon has persisted for years due to the exclusion of moral education in our curriculum and syllabuses; that is, no emphasis is laid on moral principles. No nation or state can boast of progress without a good educational program geared at shaping citizens to be academically fit, morally upright and socially balanced. The education of the mind and consciences is of special importance.

Despite the role of moral education in our communities, it is still neglected. Such neglect has rather armed citizens to disobey societal rules, pushing them to sometimes perpetrate violence and terrorism in the state as well as attempt revolutions, as a result of ignorance. The purpose of this paper is to explore idea and practices that project the need for governments to educate citizens not only academically but morally as well. This comes at a time when morality is seemingly almost absent in the academic scene. It is on this premise that one can affirm that education is a culture whose activity can be appreciated from well-trained citizens; the thought and culture of morality is primordial given that a well-informed immoral man is a bore to God's earth. This lack of moral education in societies has given rise to more serious concerns, as Hannah Arendt illustrates in an article entitled "Crises in Education".

A post-1954 study holds, and makes it obvious, that "modern education, in so far as it attempts to establish a world of children, destroys the necessary conditions for vital development and growth". However, it is strangely surprising that such harm to the developing child be the result of modern education, for this education maintained that its exclusive aim was to serve the child and rebel against the methods of the past since these had not sufficiently taken into account the child's inner nature and needs. "The century of the child", as we may recall, was going to emancipate the child and free him from the standards derived from the adult world. How then could it happen that the most elementary conditions of life necessary for growth and development of the child were overlooked or simply not recognised? How could it happen that the child was exposed to what, more than anything else, characterised the adult world, its public aspect, after the decision had been reached that the mistake in all past education had been to see the child as nothing but an underside growth-up?"¹ Such a child cannot fit into the society due to lack of moral values, as our children certainly learn from our examples and the society.

Significance of the Study

This work is, therefore, relevant in that it will not only equip citizens with knowledge but also arm them with moral rubrics to be able to co-exist in any human grouping or society. By this means, deviant attitudes can simply be overlooked or minimised. Education of the heart and consciences is the best way to achieve this, so that our children grow up with some moral values. In effect, if they are well-trained, we have no reason to punish them in the future, or to create prison, given that such education puts an inner judge in them. This way, our government will enjoy the much needed peace and tranquility, brought about by this new syllabus and cumulus to its citizens.

This explains why John Dewey, in an article entitled "Moral Principles in Education", suggested "An English contemporaneous philosopher has called attention to the difference between moral ideas and ideas about morality". "Moral ideas" are ideas of any sort which take effect in conduct and improve it, making it better than otherwise.

¹Hannah Arendt the Crisis in education, 1954, p.8.



Similarly, one may, are such ideas and pieces of information as leave conduct uninfluenced for either the better or the worst. Now, "ideas about morality" may be morally indifferent or immoral or moral. There is nothing in the nature of ideas about morality, of information about honesty or purity or kindness which automatically transmutes such ideas in to character or good conduct.²

To this effect it will be a vaccine and the much needed panacea if our governments enshrine moral education of the mass to its citizens as it will reduce the age-old grimness and oblivion, since this education will be a redeemer to the ignorant; this way, civil disorder and chaos will be reduced to their nearest minimal, if not completely eradicated, for peaceful living together. Unless this is achieved, the government will produce unpatriotic citizens who will rather be enemies of the state.

Classification of Concepts and Methodology

To understand this work, it will be relevant to clarify a number of terms like civil disobedience, violence and the state. Civil disobedience is the refusal, by means of peaceful political protest, to comply with certain laws considered unjust. Violence is injury done to that which is entitled to respect and the state is a territory considered as an organised political community under one government as well as a body of obedient citizens.

To attain the objective of this paper, we shall use an analytical method to examine and analyse some underpinning deviant attitudes of citizens in the society, which often escalate to violence and disorder in communities.

The Underpinning of Civil Disobedience (Society)

It is observed that in our societies or states today some citizens ignorantly or deliberately express mischievous attitude either for private gain or just for misappropriation of function. Worst of all, some endanger the life of the state and that of its citizens. Those individuals who attempt to jeopardize the unity of the sovereignty in any way are bad citizens with a poorly formed conscience. They strive for inordinate desires, such as the promotion of regional segregation or linguistic superiority, and the use of hate speech are equally perpetrated by these ill-behaved citizens.

More to that, those individual citizens, especially civil servants assigned specific functions, who unjustly acquire public funds for private aggrandisement to the detriment of the mass are enemies of the state. Instead of serving the public, they exercise cruelty towards the public, going as far as demanding extra fee for services. A clear-cut example of such poorly trained civil servants, who gain pleasure seeing commonwealth ruin can be found in public health centres – where medics, in case of an extreme emergency refuse to come to the aid of a victim or patient in agony until an extra motivation fee, which the victim may not be able to afford, is paid. Such medical practitioners are not just enemies of the state but also enemies to entire societies, and their actions are evidence of civil disobedience.

Added to them are those educationists who are concerned with amassing wealth for themselves while overlooking or minimising the intellectual, moral and physical upbringing of their pupils and students. At the same time abounding these kids are total beasts who are determined to ruin the future of the state. Such children will grow up with a morally deficient knowledge which is a bedrock for all sorts of crimes

²John Dewey, moral principles in Education HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, NEW YORK. CHICAGO. DALLAS. SAN FRANCISCO. THE Riverside press Cambridge, 2008, p.4



Which make up the underpinning work of bad teachers. This can further be illustrated when some of these children are employed by chance in any sector as grown-ups with poor moral; they often collect bribe from some desperate citizens.

This is the case with some corrupt law officers and law enforcers, who care less about honour, and use delay tactics knowing fully well that justice delayed is justice denied; reasons why, after selling their consciences, they might even use brute force to arrest and detain victims before investigation, and without a magistrate, thereby taking the laws of the land into their hands and placing themselves above the law. These are exactly enemies of the state, for disregarding the laws of the state. More so, those individual who promote tribesmen as the principal customers of a public office irrespective of competence and meritocracy are bad citizens. This phenomenon can also be explained from the view of Charles Binam Bikoi in a private newspaper Dikalo of April 1992 which holds that “The sharing of political and administrative appointment on regional basis or some manoeuvres to maintain a privilege hardcore of friends, the creation of class citizens above the laws of the state to pillage and sap the state of it resources, the marginalisation of competent elite and the suffocation of their creative and inventive genius to loss of the state, as well as the irresponsible waste of bank credits and revenue from customs collections and taxes are enemies of the state”³ who instigate civil disobedience and violence.

We equally see that those individuals who even carry arms against the state and those who smuggle in arms to the state in order to orchestrate violence are worse enemies of the fatherland. It is in this vein that Bernard Nsokika Fonlon posited that “if any man in a position of power shall, by delaying manoeuvres, reduce the functioning of the state into immobility and inertia let him be anathema, if the state shall allow those who embezzle billions to go Scott free while those guilty of trifle theft are imprisoned, tortured, moreover, kept in jail for years without trial, according to due process of law, let it be anathema. If justice itself shall, with rigour, peruse citizens guilty of small misdemeanours while letting hefty criminals untouched because they are covered up by men of influence, let it be anathema. If anyone is in charge of education, forgetful of Sophocles warring that of happiness the crown. And chiefs part is wisdom, and to hold the gods in awe...shall declare that no certificate, diploma or degree gained in religious studies of Koran or Bible or Tradition (supreme studies) shall be recognized by the state under the misguided and spurious argument that the state is lay, forgetful of this that a lay state is not an atheist state, let him be anathema, to inculcate into the minds of the young that, if religion counts for nothing in their studies it counts for nothing in their lives-an extremely dangerous mentality that spells the bane of the common weal. My argument and my views coming from somebody of no significance may be dismissed as so much irrelevant prating. But you may be swayed by testimony so weighty that it has been the foundation and hallmarks of whatever is good in western civilization for two thousand and five hundred years. The testimony of a people who were the first to conceive the idea of a Republic, the first to give trial: if we are not then let us not be surprised. If a few years from now we are visited by anathemas of the syllabus”⁴

³Daniel Noni Lantum, Dr. Bernard Nsokika Fonlon, An intellectual in p politics (Grown and Throne) Marquette, composition et montage: pentagon, SOPECAM, Yaoundé, 1992

⁴Ibid, p.4-5.



This hatred and poor attitude perpetrated by some misguided individuals due to ignorance is one of the reasons our societies has been visited by anathemas, civil disorder and violence among other enemies of the state. This implies that some individuals who are quite unpatriotic, as seen above, orchestrate civil disobedience within the state.

Background to the Civil State (society) which orchestrated disorder

Since civil disobedience is being manifested or practised by human beings in the society, it is therefore imperative to know how and why the civil state or political society came about. The state is a product of a social contract or an agreement between man and a fellowman. Since man first lived in a primitive state of nature and a lawless society, whose conditions were deplorable and unacceptable this mutual agreement of transition to a civil society and a lawful state became urgent, as man could not provide security for his property and life as an individual. Proponents of these view include Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau.

To Hobbes, “man previously lived in the state of nature and the natural condition was characterised by lawlessness, anarchy, brutality, savagery, individualism, egocentrism, a war of all against all and the spirit of survival of the fittest. No one had a legal rights or interests over any property. Each man struggled to protect himself and grab for himself what and how much he could. No one ruled the others. There existed no law. To him, man to man was a wolf. Man was no anti-social to a fellowman.”⁵ These evil consequences resorted to the abolition of the state of nature into an agreement or consensus to create the modern civil state where laws prevailed.

In the modern or civil state, man could now own property and respect the property, interest and right of others. Rights were conferred and duties imposed. Government was equally introduced. Individual (single) ruler represented this government, a monarch or a college of representatives with functions and laws enshrine for all to respect. Rulers enjoy absolute powers to make and enforce laws. This liberty makes some rulers to over step their bounds or abuse the powers conferred on them due to the atmosphere of conviviality that surrounds them, or the over exercise of power as mistaken patriotism. This then causes some individuals to question the absolutism of their authorities and civil disobedience became the order of the time especially to those who had had the ambition and desire to rule saw civil disorder as a model to change their rules and accent to power especially when normal channels and rubrics fail or impossible which is quite unpatriotic.

Hobbes in the leviathan had it that “for first, in a state anyone who does what, as far as can be destruction, even though something unforeseen happens which makes the outcome fortunate, has never there less acted imprudently, because what happens is unforeseen. It is understood that in calling the fortunate outcome “unforeseen”, Hobbes does not mean that it is necessarily improbable, but merely that it is not predictable with tolerable certainty. Therefore, that breaketh his covenant, and consequently declared that he thinks he may with reason do so, cannot be received into any society that unite themselves for peace and defence but by error of them that receive him. Nor when he is received, be retained in it without seeing the danger of their error. Which errors man cannot reasonably reckon upon as the means of his security, and therefore if he be left or cast out of society, he perished, and if he lives in society, it is by the errors of other men, which he could not foresee nor reckon upon,

⁵Samah Abang Mungwa, Certificate Philosophy, Catwa education, Yaounde, 2020, p. 4-7.

and consequently he has acted against the reason of his preservation. And so as all men that contribute not to his destruction forbear him only out of ignorance of what is good for them.⁶

This Hobbesian views entails that total submission should be practised as a respect of mutual agreement or social contract; by this, if any modification or changes must be done, then it should be upon consensus as a legitimate procedure to achieve an objective. To Locke he accepted that the modern civil is an evolution from the primitive state of native. He declares, "We are all by nature free and equal. To be in a condition of freedom and equally, prior to government, is to be in the state of nature, it is not an unsocial condition for people are naturally drawn together into families and communities; it is a circumstance which people acquire property and engage in commerce. It is not, as it was for Hobbes, a brutish condition, though it is unstable one.

In order to preserve our lives, liberties and estates, we choose to come out of the state of nature and enter into civil society by an act of consent known as the social contract, usually referred to by Locke as a "compact" the idea of a state of nature and social contract is central in political philosophy"⁷He recognises that, many existing government have their origin in force, fraud, conquest, usurpation and patriarchy. He concedes that, we were born under government, but not that this fact alone creates obligation: *de facto* power is not the same as morally legitimate power. However, all government may redeemed by consent. A conqueror or usurper can acquire legitimacy by the consent of the conquered as can a patriarch by that of his sons. The compact, is a jurally event not necessarily undertaken *ab initio*; it is an act of political will.⁸ Locke is therefore polemical when he also describes the evil of despotism. Nothing is more salutary than Locke's insistence that rulers are subjected to moral judgment and that it is just a patriotic to resist internal as external aggression. Locke reminds us that states sometimes sponsor terrorism against their citizens.

Tyranny brings about the desolation of government and urges people to establish a new and better one. When Locke describes the mark of tyranny he comes closest to narrating the event of his own time"⁹These Locke's prediction still manifest itself in our contemporal society due to ongoing debates in our societies about forms of government and ruler ship and how the living together contract can guarantee cohesion. Rousseau on his part believe that, in the state of nature, man entertained an extra-social relationship with fellow man, he emphasis that, man is extra-social and friendly towards his kind. To him the state of nature was peaceful and down-to-earth time. People lived solitary, uncomplicated lives. Their few needs were easily satisfied by nature. Because of abundance of nature and the small size of population, competition was non-existent and persons rarely even saw one another, much less had reason for conflict or fear. More so, these simple, morally pure persons were naturally endowed with the capacity for pity and therefore were not inclined to bring harm to one another.¹⁰

With time population increased, the means by which people could satisfy their needs changed. People slowly began to live together in small families and then in small communities. Division of labour was introduced, both within and between families, and discoveries and inventions made life easier, giving rise to leisure time, such leisure time

⁶Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Edited by Edwin Curley, Hackett publishing company, inc, 1994.PP. 91,92.

⁷John Locke; *Two Treatises of Government*, Edited by Mark Goldie, Everyman publishing, London, 1994. P xxiii.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid, Pxxxiii

¹⁰Samah Abang Mungwa, *Certificate philosophy for Cameroon GCE Examination*, Catwa Education Yaoundé, 2020, p.4-9.

inevitably led people to comparison between themselves and others, resulting in public values, leading to shame and envy, pride and contempt, most importantly, private property, which constituted the pivotal moment in humanity's evolution out of a simple, pure state into one characterised by greed, competition, vanity, inequality and vice. This marked man's fall from grace.

However, he believes that, having introduced private property, initial conditions of inequality became more pronounced. Some had property and others were forced to work for them, and the development of social classes began. Eventually, those who have property noticed that it would be in their interests to create a government that would protect private property from those who do not have it but can see that they might be able to acquire it by force. Therefore, the social contract was meant to solve the problems related to this bad state of affairs and to address the social and moral ills that had been produced by the development of society.

Precursor to Civil Disobedience in the Society

In our societies, all members have the obligation to obey laws. This submission to the law encourages the citizens to recognise and accept the legitimacy of the constitution and other just institutions. This obedience to the law, in turn, makes the citizens to be able to meet up with even unjust laws and policies of the government and not to deny the government's institutions by wrong means so long as the current injustice is not blatantly clear and proven. In this notion of obedience to the law, the citizens should never endeavour to exploit the mistakes of the institutions of the society in order to advance their own interests. Contrarily, the citizens should accept and learn how to cope with the weaknesses of these institutions. The citizens should be able to understand human limitations.

However, in a normal society, if any law or policy is made and is wrong, obviously unjust or represents a manifest abuse of trust and power, then the general duty to tolerate human imperfections collapses. A citizen under this situation of gross and visible injustice has not only a right but also a duty to disobey the unjust laws. This should be done with the sole aim of upholding only the just schemes of the society. Such a disregard of law is termed "*civil disobedience*," provided it is based on the principle of non-violence. This means that citizens peacefully protest the unjust laws without intimidation, be it moral or physical; in short, without any trace of violence.

In this regard, the problem of civil disobedience is simply a discussion of the citizen's relation to law in a democratic society. It could be defined as: "*a public, non-violent, conscientious yet political act contrary to law usually done with the aim of bringing about a change in the laws or policies of the government*". Civil disobedience is a response from those citizens who worry over government wrongs. It arises as a problem only in what can be called "*a nearly just society*," that is, one that is democratic, well ordered in most parts; but in which, nevertheless, some serious violations still take place. It occurs whenever a significant number of citizens have become convinced that their grievances will no longer be heard or acted upon. It can also be brought about by a government that is about to change its policy and has embarked upon doing so, and one that persists in modes of actions whose legality and constitutionality are highly questionable.

At this juncture, we shall briefly examine the philosophical background of the concept of civil disobedience and violence. This background knowledge constitutes the basis of Thoreau's theory of civil disobedience, and demonstrates how it differs from other forms of



political resistance. The main object of this section is to illustrate that the phenomenon of civil disobedience is centred on the principle of non-violence. The concern on the concept of civil disobedience relies to a large extent on a famous man in prison: Henry David Thoreau in Concord (United States of America). His conducts seem to prove that disobedience to law can only be justified if the lawbreaker is willing, and even eager to accept punishment for his act. H. D. Thoreau in particular, is credited for having formed the core of the modern argument for civil disobedience. Some great thinkers like Henry David Thoreau and the world's famous practitioners - Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. were all proponents to this concept.

David Henry Thoreau notion

According to the American philosopher, Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862), civil disobedience is an aspect of non-co-operation through boycotts. In his essay, *On the Duty of Civil Disobedience* (1848), he explains the idea that an individual should not obey a government that implements policies with which one disagrees. This, according to him, implies that a citizen should voluntarily stand publicly to oppose such policies. At the same time, the citizen should be ready to accept the consequences of his actions. Nowadays, Thoreau's expression, "to disobey the government," could be interpreted as acts of law breaking designed to bring about public attention to laws of questionable morality and legitimacy. He is credited for having introduced the notion of boycott in civil disobedience. This also includes the principle of non-co-operation with an evil system. In his own view, this non-co-operation embodies the withdrawal of support both in person and property from the government. In general, he recommends that the citizens should break the laws that rather intend to make them agents of injustice to one another.

Henry David Thoreau equally looks at the relationship between liberty and majority rule. He opposes all forms of government; he is really a violent anarchist. He never believes, moreover, in the principle of majority-rule in decision-making (democracy). Thoreau is opposed to majority rule, which is considered as the best principle in decision making because in his opinion, majority rule is not fair and morally correct. If it is practiced in democracy, it is because the majority rule simply lies in the hands of a majority of the people, who are physically the strongest. It is not fair to the minority of the people. Thoreau concludes that majority rule is a weak expression of the desire that liberty should prevail, for liberty can never prevail through the majority. He/she should be in charge of his/her liberty. He stated that the majority is always bound to be unjust, and, consequently, any government in which the majority tends to dominate in all domains cannot be just. The worst of this is that Thoreau sees nothing good in any government as a whole. He detests all forms of government. This is what he will say concerning his best form of government:

I heartily accept the motto "that government is best which governs least" and I should like to see it acted ...more rapidly and systematically carried out, it finally amounts to this, which I also believe - "That government is best which governs not at all," and When individuals are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government they will have.¹¹

Thoreau is an anarchist due to the fact that he sees little virtue in the action of the majority or the masses. This also means that government by majority, as defined by the

¹¹ H. D. Thoreau, *On the Duty of Civil Disobedience*, quoted by Lawrence J. R. Herson, in *Politics of Ideas*, Homewood/Illinois. The Dorsey Press, 1984, p. 125.



concept of democracy, has no assurance of wisdom or morality. In short, he stated that there is a lack of wisdom in democracy. Despite this, Thoreau does not consider democracy as the worst political regime. For him, democracy is the most tolerant form of government that can permit civil disobedience as a tactic of political dealings.

Thoreau contents that morality is a matter of conscience. Conscience should guide every moral man and no moral person should adjust to injustice. Moreover, no moral human being should be forced to do that which is not approved by his conscience. He interrogated:

Must a citizen ever for a moment, or in the fewest degrees, resign his conscience to the legislators? Why has every man a conscience then? I think that we should be men and subjects afterward. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law so much as for the right. The only obligation that I have as a right to assume is to do at any time what I think right.¹²

In the most recent trends, Thoreau approves civil disobedience as an inevitable means to achieve social justice. In his opinion, there are always many circumstances during manifestations that call for violent reactions. According to him, one may not want to be violent but could be pushed to violence. In brief, Thoreau put his theory into practice of civil disobedience on a more or less individual basis. The idea of boycott, derived mostly from the principle of non-co-operation with the government, is from him. He is basically the pioneers of the philosophical argument for civil disobedience. He inspired two world famous practitioners of civil disobedience – Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr.

Mahatma Gandhi conception

The core feature of civil disobedience for Gandhi (1869-1948) is a principle of non-violence. His main slogan for civil disobedience was non-violent non-co-operation. Gandhi uses two major concepts to explain his philosophy of non-violence - *Satyagraha* and *ahimsa*. Both concepts are rooted deep in Indian philosophy. However, Gandhi transforms their original Hindu meanings through the influence of personal experience and non-Indian sources such as John Ruskin, Leon Tolstoy, Henry David Thoreau, Jesus Christ and his sermon on the mountain.

His *Satyagraha* is literally translated as 'holding unto the truth'. This has been called the 'Truth- Force.' In his view, God and the truth were synonymous, so Truth-Force was also soul-Force. What is it all about? According to Gandhi, the Truth-Force is the efforts of the individuals to improve upon the social conditions of the society through the use of non-violent methods, rather than violence. According to him, the basis of non-violence is the Truth or God. Gandhi is also influenced by the Christian tradition. He believes that the consequence of the belief in Truth-force is the great amount of suffering that one will undergo. *Satyagrahi*, as he would prefer to say it this way, in pursuit of the Truth-ends would have to endure and must always be ready to face this task. The test of one's relative understanding of Truth as well as his strength and courage in his commitment to it would be manifested in his willingness to undergo personal suffering. In fact, Gandhi proves that it is only through suffering without fear, hatred nor retaliation that the non-violent resister would be able to appeal to the conscience and hearts of the opponents.

Gandhi also uses the notion of '*ahimsa*' to explain his philosophy of social action. He

¹²H. D. Thoreau, '*On the Duty of Civil Disobedience*', quoted by John J. Ansbro, in Martin Luther King Jr. Maryknoll/ New York, Orbis Books, 1982, p.114.

equated ahimsa with love. Etymologically, it simply means non-harm and in-offensiveness. It also signifies the determination to renounce the will to kill or to damage, and to reject the inner violent will of the spirit. The principle of *ahimsa* urges one to be objective when applying rules. The non-violent resisters must not be biased; they should be able to apply the same rules to their opponents as well as their friends. *Ahimsa* also requires one to seek a means of reforming an evil system, and this should be by actively opposing the system. It never permits a toleration of an evil system. *Ahimsa* requires one not to tolerate, but to actively oppose an unjust system by means of non-co-operation and non-violence.

Gandhi applies his philosophy and ethics of *Satyagraha* and *ahimsa* in basically two types of social action: non-co-operation and civil disobedience. In non-co-operation, he advocates and practices the withdrawal of participation in the ordinary and expected activities of the British Government which had obviously become corrupt and unjust. In his view, non-co-operation could be subtle, legal and illegal. When it is illegal, it is now referred to as civil disobedience. Though Gandhi identifies civil disobedience with illegal acts, most of his civil rights campaigns in India were legal; and were mostly based on the principle of non-co-operation. Nevertheless, he recognizes that mass civil disobedience in most circumstances is necessary. These are the circumstances in which the law is blatantly unjust or extremely violated that any further negotiations with the authority in power would not even improve the situation. Mass civil disobedience, therefore, is the last resort to redress the situation. According to Gandhi, non-co-operation does involve the withdrawal of support from the government. It embodies:

The boycott of British exports, schools, courts, jobs and honours the withdrawal from all forms of government services such as the civil service, the police, and the armed forces, the refusal to use such commercial services as banking and insurance, the withdrawal of labour, and the destruction of foreign cloth [. . .].¹³

The principle of non-co-operation also encouraged people to emigrate from the jurisdiction of a certain authority or area where injustice greatly prevailed. In his view, non-co-operation is only a means to an end. The end is that of making an unjust political system to become just. In other words, non-co-operation aims at correcting the wrongs of an unjust political regime. Co-operation is only prescribed when the government is just.

The second and most important form of non-violent resistance for Gandhi was civil disobedience. Here, he was greatly influenced by Henry David Thoreau, though he differs from him in method of approach. Gandhi found civil disobedience to be valid only when it is practiced non-violently. It is simply a rebellion without the elements of violence. Indeed, he takes it for: "*The open and public breaking of any immoral statutory law in which one is willing to suffer the penalty including imprisonment and even death.*"¹⁴ From this definition, it is clear that, for Gandhi, there exists a remarkable difference between non-co-operation and civil disobedience. He identifies non-co-operation with legal exercise of action, and civil disobedience as action that is illegal but morally upright. Civil disobedience, for Gandhi, was a stronger action of resistance than non-co-operation. This means that more caution and care must be taken in its use.

Those who volunteer to practice in this movement must be trained in methods and

¹³ M. Gandhi, '*Nonviolent Resistance*' [1961], quoted by Ervin Smith, in The Ethics of Martin Luther King Jr. Leviston/Queenston, The Edwin Mellen Press, 1981, p.7.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 108.

meanings of non-violence, how to abstain from violence, how to control crowd and restore order. They must make a pledge that includes or indicates their willingness to suffer cheerfully the consequences of their actions. In addition, they must, first of all, attempt by means of public inquiry to understand not only their own grievances but their opponent's case as well. Therefore, they must try to negotiate with the opponent with a twofold purpose: to appeal to his conscience and to arouse the sense of justice of the general public. Gandhi really felt that civil disobedience needs a higher degree of commitment and self-discipline. It should, therefore, be practiced only by a selected few and only as a last resort when all other attempts to political settlements have failed.

Martin Luther King Jr.'s Version

According to Martin Luther King Jr. (1929 -1968), civil disobedience is based on the features of non-violence and cooperation. He demonstrates that violence likely sets in when the manifestations of civil disobedience are not benefiting the expected results. King Jr. perceives his philosophy of non-violent resistance as Christianity in action. According to him, his ultimate Civil Right Movement is to create a beloved community; a community that would be based on love. Such a community would reject any law that tends to reduce and maltreat an individual and dirty his/her dignity. He asserts that his own nonviolent protests are towards the evil forces at work, and not against the persons who are involved in the administration of the system. He had a problem with the system and not the individuals. His non-violent resistance involved both active and aggressive struggles with the purpose of surprising the opponents with new methods, thereby causing them to alter their moral values. King Jr.'s official slogan for civil disobedience was "justice without violence."

King Jr.'s philosophy of non-violence is derived from a Hebraic Christian tradition coupled with the Gandhian concept of Satyagraha. Truth-Force. He considers non-violence as a powerful weapon that could enable one to absorb violence while struggling on with his demonstration. Non-violence, according to Martin Luther King Jr., depends on moral and spiritual forces. At the heart of his non-violence was redemptive love, love which was intended to rescue opponents from an evil system, and make them to become friends. By love, he means an understanding and goodwill towards all men and this love is what is really wanted in civil disobedience. Martin Luther therefore, suggested that his followers should love indeed: "loving enough to abstain from evil, and understanding enough to transform an enemy into a friend." Love, moreover, in his opinion includes deep interest and concern in people. This needs one to have profound knowledge of the real possibilities of human nature. King Jr. is certainly inspired by Gandhi who had earlier called for an overflowing love for all Gandhi was convinced that this type of love would achieve reconciliation and convert the opponent.

Perspectives

This Chapter focuses on the right attitude to adopt. The much needed vaccine to eliminate or reduce these problems at civil disobedience and violence and insecurity in our communities. This is to guarantee harmony and peaceful co-existence, even though, these phenomenon cannot be completely wipe off due to human emotions and desires. It is observed that, civil disobedience and violence are as old as the history of mankind. And since in any human community, there is bound to be misunderstanding which can always inevitably lead to violence and civil unrest, but there are also solutions to eliminate or reduce it, such as education of the mass, goods laws, good governance among many other strategies.



This is to say that, if the right attitude is adopted, which can only come from well-trained citizens through education, and the respects of society norms or laws will logically be guaranteed in a well ordered state given that, these barbaric act perpetrated by some individual citizens within a given society either consciously or unconsciously is as a result of poor educational training, this has actually cause a lot of insecurity in our communities such as terrorism, violence, revolutions among others and can only be overcome through the above mentioned.

Education of the Mass as a Moral Armament

All citizens have to be trained in such a way that they should be academically fit, morally upright and socially balance, this therefore means that, our curriculum must be adjusted to suite and meet up with the challenges in our societies, this entails that our system of education rather arm citizens with irrelevant training, which cannot longer be accepted in our communities. Such as poor training with complete lack of moral values, and this fallen standard of immorality has accounted for some of the outstanding moral decadence and of course has open more doors to insecurity.

However, this moral education of the mass must be upheld with much determination and hard work. More to this government to reinforce it in all sectors of social life, it has been observed over the years that, even when government launch competitive entrance to public service, they always exclude religious studies which are part, of molding the minds and moral armament. It is believe that if all institution reinforce ethical values and ensures these values goes down to every sector then our communities will experience peace and positive changes because the normal channel of change will be use adequately, either upon consensus, or through the legislative or executive and judicial proceeding.

The Law as Mitigation

Quality and relevant education of the mass will be a vaccine and panacea that will eliminate civil disobedience, as citizens will be aware and well educated on the laws of their communities and how to obey them, given that they may only use the normal channel of change to address their concerns and unjust laws, instead of public manifestation in the name of civil disobedience which might escalate to more disorder.

Good Governance as a Panacea

Every society has its form of ruler ship or government. This government as it is expected, is supposed to meet up with the needs and aspiration of its citizens. This implies that government machinery and all its arms must perform their functions such as the legislative and executive, to enact and promulgate good laws. Citizens will have no reason to disobey them because they are for a common good and interest. More to this when the judiciary enforce these laws and ensure that there is quality and social justice for all, then civil disobedience will be overlooked and if the government with the task to execute these laws and there is separation of power, civil disobedience will equally be minimize.

Conclusion

In all one can, therefore, established without bias that compulsory moral education of the mass is the much needed vaccine and panacea to the emergency and frequent civil disorder in societies. The undermining or absence of moral education in the academic scene is a serious concern as it has equipped citizens to destabilise the established order of their society. It is therefore argued that if this moral education of the mass is obliged to all citizens within societies, these negative values of civil

disobedience will then be avoided as even those in power will know how to work within the rubrics of law and social justice as well as for a common good. The underpinning of civil disobedience can be traced from human desires and actions, politically, economically and socially, as can be observed how the idea of the state or civil society came about, the abuse of these notion often escalate to civil disorder and proponent of the precursor to civil disobedience like Thoreau, Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr. have their various suggestions to this growing phenomenon, which can only be overtaken through good governance and compulsory moral education of the mass.

References

Hannah, A., *The Crises in Education*, 1954.

Jogn, D., *Moral Principles in Education*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, New York, 2008.

Noni. D. Nsokika Fonlon, B., *An Intellectual in Politics (Gown and throne)*, Maquette composition et Montage: Pentagone SOPECAL, Yaounde, 1982.

Thomas, H., *Leviathan*, Edited by Edwin Curley, Hackett publishing company, Inc. 1994.

John, L., *Two Treatises of government*, Edited by Mark Goldie, Everyman publishing, London, 1994.

Abang Mungwa, S., *Certificate Philosophy for Cameroon GCE Examination*, Catwa Education, Yaounde, 2020.

David Thoreau, H., *On the Duty of Civil disobedience*, quoted by Lawrence J.R. Herson, In *politics of ideas, Homewood/Illinois*, the Dorsey press, 1984.

Thoreau, H. D., *On the Duty of Civil disobedience*, quoted by John J. Ansloro, in martin Luther King Jr. Maryknolt/New York, Oribis Books, 1982.

Gandhi, M., *Nonviolent Resistance 1961*, quoted by Ervin smith, in the Ethics of Martin Luther King Jr. Leviston/Queenston. The Edwin Mellen press, 1981.

luther King, Jr, M., *facing the challenge of a New age*, phylon, 1957.

Cite this article:

Author(s), KPA KOM Isidore, (2022). "Education of the Mass as a Moral Armament against Civil Disobedience in the State", **Name of the Journal:** Commonwealth Journal of Academic Research, (CJAR.EU), P, 35- 48. DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6416473> , Issue: 2, Vol.:3, Article: 4, Month: February, Year: 2022. Retrieved from <https://www.cjar.eu/all-issues/> **Published by**



AND

ThoughtWares Consulting & Multi Services International (TWCMSI)

