



Research Paper

Gandhi in the Age of Protest: Contemporary Relevance of Satyagraha, Non-Violence and Ethical Resistance in Farmers' Movements and Gen Z movement..

Dr Rohit Kumar

Department of Gandhian and Peace studies Panjab University Chandigarh..

Abstract

Mahatma Gandhi's political philosophy continues to command substantial intellectual significance within contemporary debates on democracy, social justice, political ethics, civil resistance and peace. Although the political, economic, technological and social conditions of the twenty-first century differ profoundly from those within which Gandhi developed and practised his political thought, the normative principles underlying his philosophy—Satya (truth), Ahimsa (non-violence), Satyagraha (truth-force), Swaraj (self-rule), Sarvodaya (welfare of all), constructive programme, decentralisation, ethical leadership and moral responsibility—remain relevant as critical resources for understanding the possibilities and limitations of contemporary democratic resistance. Rather than viewing Gandhian thought as a historically confined doctrine, this paper approaches it as a dynamic ethical-political framework capable of generating critical questions about the means, ends and moral legitimacy of collective political action.

The paper critically examines the contemporary relevance of Gandhian political philosophy through the comparative lens of the Indian farmers' movements, particularly the prolonged 2020–21 farmers' mobilisation and subsequent farmers' protests from 2024 onwards, and emerging youth-led movements associated with Generation Z. The farmers' movement represents an important contemporary instance of sustained collective mobilisation in which questions of livelihood, agrarian justice, state policy, democratic participation and citizenship converged. Its extensive mobilisation, community kitchens, volunteer networks, participatory structures, cultural expressions and largely peaceful forms of resistance provide significant analytical points of engagement with Gandhian notions of Satyagraha, collective self-discipline, solidarity, dignity of labour, Sarvodaya and constructive social action. However, the paper avoids an uncritical equivalence between the farmers' movement and Gandhian Satyagraha, recognising that contemporary movements operate within complex political environments and may contain diverse ideological orientations, strategies and forms of mobilisation.

The emergence of Gen Z activism further expands the field of inquiry by introducing new technological and communicative dimensions to collective political action. Contemporary youth movements increasingly employ social-media platforms, digital networks, visual communication, decentralised organisation and rapid information dissemination to challenge corruption, political exclusion, censorship, inequality and institutional unaccountability. The 2025 Gen Z mobilisation in Nepal, which emerged substantially through digitally networked youth activism and expressed concerns regarding corruption, censorship and governmental accountability, provides a particularly significant case for examining the relationship between Gandhian political ethics and digitally mediated resistance. Its subsequent escalation, including episodes of violence, also highlights a fundamental

Gandhian concern: whether political objectives can remain ethically legitimate when the means employed to achieve them become coercive or violent. The case therefore permits a critical interrogation of the relationship between political efficacy and moral restraint, rather than merely celebrating youth mobilisation as democratic participation.

The paper argues that Gandhi should neither be reduced to a symbolic national icon nor invoked as an uncomplicated ideological label for contemporary protest movements. Equally, contemporary movements should not automatically be classified as Gandhian merely because they employ demonstrations, civil disobedience, collective mobilisation or non-violent methods. Gandhian political philosophy is better understood as a normative

framework against which the ethical character of political resistance may be critically assessed. From this perspective, the central question is not simply whether a movement succeeds in influencing governments or public opinion, but whether its methods embody truthfulness, non-violence, self-restraint, inclusiveness, respect for opponents, democratic participation and commitment to the welfare of all.

The study consequently re-examines Satyagraha not merely as a technique of protest but as a comprehensive philosophy of morally disciplined resistance in which the transformation of the self, the opponent and the wider social order are interconnected. It explores whether contemporary democratic movements can sustain the Gandhian distinction between resistance to injustice and hatred towards the person who represents or perpetuates that injustice. In this context, Ahimsa is interpreted

not merely as the absence of physical violence but as an ethical commitment to minimise domination, humiliation, hatred and dehumanisation in political relationships. Similarly, Swaraj is examined beyond its conventional meaning of political independence, as a conception of self-governance involving individual responsibility, participatory democracy, social autonomy and ethical citizenship.

The paper further argues that Gandhian Sarvodaya offers an important corrective to increasingly fragmented forms of identity-based and interest-based mobilisation. Whereas contemporary movements frequently emerge around specific grievances, Gandhian political ethics demands that particular interests ultimately be situated within a broader conception of social welfare and human dignity.

This becomes especially relevant in an era characterised by widening socioeconomic inequalities, ecological crises, political polarisation, technological surveillance, misinformation and declining public trust in institutions. Gandhi's emphasis on constructive action similarly suggests that political resistance cannot be sustained solely through opposition to existing structures; it must also generate alternative institutions, relationships and practices capable of advancing social reconstruction.

The comparative examination of farmers' and Gen Z movements thus enables the paper to identify both continuities and discontinuities between Gandhian political action and contemporary resistance. The continuity lies in the enduring democratic impulse to challenge injustice, demand accountability and expand

political participation through collective action. The discontinuity arises from the radically transformed technological environment, the accelerated circulation of information, the fragmented nature of political identities, the increasing role of digital platforms and the potential for online mobilisation to rapidly transition from peaceful dissent to polarisation or violence.

Methodologically, the paper adopts a qualitative, interpretive and comparative approach, drawing upon Gandhian primary writings, contemporary scholarship on social movements, and selected empirical accounts of the farmers' and youth-led movements. It employs Gandhian concepts as analytical categories rather than as predetermined conclusions, thereby allowing the movements to be examined critically in their own historical and political contexts. The study

particularly interrogates the relationship between ends and means, dissent and democracy, resistance and reconciliation, digital mobilisation and ethical responsibility, and political effectiveness and non-violence.

Ultimately, the paper contends that the contemporary relevance of Gandhi does not lie in reproducing the political strategies of the twentieth century in the twenty-first century. Rather, his enduring significance lies in challenging contemporary movements to reconsider the ethical foundations of political action itself. In an age in which democratic resistance is increasingly mediated by digital technologies and shaped by intense political polarisation, Gandhian philosophy raises a fundamental question: Can political transformation be pursued without reproducing the violence, hatred and domination that movements seek to overcome? The answer to this question constitutes the central intellectual terrain of the paper. Gandhi's political philosophy, therefore, remains relevant not as a rigid blueprint for contemporary activism but as a critical ethical vocabulary through which the democratic legitimacy, moral responsibility and transformative potential of contemporary social movements can be evaluated.

Keywords

Mahatma Gandhi; Gandhian Political Philosophy; Satyagraha; Ahimsa; Satya; Swaraj; Sarvodaya; Non-violent Resistance; Farmers' Movement; Gen Z Activism; Youth Movements; Digital Activism; Social Movements; Democracy; Political Ethics; Civil Resistance; Peace Studies; Ethical Politics.

Received 08 Sep., 2026; Revised 15 Sep., 2026; Accepted 17 Sep., 2026 © The author(s) 2026.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. Introduction

The twenty-first century is characterised by unprecedented and multidimensional transformations in the political, economic, technological, social and ecological spheres. Globalisation, neoliberal economic restructuring, rapid technological change, expanding digital networks and intensifying ecological crises have profoundly altered the relationship between citizens, states and institutions. At the same time, persistent economic inequality, agrarian distress, unemployment, precarious livelihoods, widening social divisions, political polarisation, institutional distrust and democratic deficits have generated new anxieties concerning the quality and sustainability of contemporary democratic life. These developments have also transformed the nature, scale and modalities of political participation. Citizens are increasingly seeking alternative avenues through which to articulate grievances, challenge established structures of power, influence public policy and hold political and institutional authorities accountable.

Within this changing political landscape, the political philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi acquires renewed intellectual and practical significance. Gandhi's contribution to political thought cannot be reduced to his role as a leader of the Indian freedom struggle; rather, he developed a distinctive conception of politics in which political action was inseparably connected with ethics, moral responsibility, social justice and the transformation of the individual. His political philosophy challenged the conventional assumption that political power must necessarily be pursued and exercised through coercion. Instead, Gandhi sought to reconstruct politics around the normative principles of Satya (truth), Ahimsa (non-violence), Satyagraha (truth-force), Swaraj (self-rule), Sarvodaya (welfare of all), Swadeshi, trusteeship, constructive work and moral self-discipline. For Gandhi, freedom was not merely the transfer of political authority from one ruling group to another; it represented a deeper process of individual and collective emancipation in which political freedom, social responsibility, economic justice and ethical self-realisation were mutually interconnected.

Central to this philosophical framework was Gandhi's conception of Satyagraha, which constituted one of the most distinctive contributions to the theory and practice of political resistance. Satyagraha was neither passive submission nor conventional resistance based upon the coercive defeat of an adversary. It was conceived as an active moral force through which individuals confronted injustice while simultaneously refusing to dehumanise, humiliate or destroy the opponent. The objective of Satyagraha was therefore not simply to compel the adversary through superior force but to transform the moral relationship between the contending parties through truth, persuasion, voluntary suffering and disciplined non-violence. In this sense, Gandhian resistance represented a radical reconfiguration of political struggle: the means employed in the pursuit of justice were themselves required to embody the ethical character of the desired political order.

The Gandhian understanding of political action consequently places considerable emphasis upon means–ends consistency. Gandhi rejected the proposition that morally objectionable means could legitimately produce a just social order. Violence, hatred, deception and coercion, in his view, contained within themselves the seeds of the political structures they sought to overcome. Accordingly, democratic resistance had to be grounded in self-restraint, respect for human dignity, openness to dialogue and a willingness to suffer rather than inflict suffering. Such an understanding has considerable contemporary relevance at a time when political communication is increasingly characterised by polarisation, misinformation, personal vilification, digital hostility and the rapid escalation of antagonistic political identities.

Gandhi's political philosophy also offers a broader conception of democracy than one confined to periodic elections and institutional representation. Swaraj, understood as self-rule, involved not merely national independence but the cultivation of autonomous, responsible and ethically conscious citizens. Democracy, from a Gandhian perspective, requires continuous participation, social responsibility, decentralisation and the capacity of citizens to exercise moral judgement. Political freedom therefore becomes meaningful only when individuals and communities possess the capacity to participate actively in decisions affecting their lives. This conception provides an important analytical framework for understanding contemporary social movements, particularly those that challenge centralised decision-making and seek greater recognition of participatory, deliberative and community-based forms of democracy.

The contemporary farmers' movements in India provide an important empirical context within which the continuing relevance of Gandhian political thought can be critically examined. The farmers' mobilisation demonstrated the capacity of large and socially diverse groups to sustain collective political action over an extended period while relying substantially upon peaceful protest, public communication, solidarity and community organisation. The movement generated institutional and social practices extending beyond conventional protest, including community kitchens (langars), voluntary service, mutual assistance, medical

support and forms of inter-community solidarity. These practices suggest that political mobilisation can simultaneously function as a process of social reconstruction, thereby recalling Gandhi's emphasis upon constructive programme as an essential complement to resistance.

At the same time, the farmers' movement raises important questions concerning the relationship between protest and democratic institutions. In a representative democracy, disagreement is neither an anomaly nor necessarily a threat to political stability; rather, the ability of citizens to express dissent peacefully constitutes an important dimension of democratic vitality. From a Gandhian perspective, legitimate dissent must seek to awaken public conscience rather than merely defeat political opponents. The farmers' mobilisation can therefore be examined not only as an episode of policy-oriented collective action but also as a manifestation of democratic participation, civil resistance, solidarity and the politics of moral persuasion. At the same time, a critical Gandhian analysis must recognise the complexities and internal diversities of contemporary mass movements rather than assuming that every instance of collective mobilisation automatically conforms to Gandhian principles.

A parallel transformation is visible in the emergence of Gen Z activism, which reflects the changing technological architecture of contemporary political mobilisation. Unlike many twentieth-century movements that were structured around formal organisations, identifiable leadership and geographically concentrated forms of mobilisation, contemporary youth movements frequently operate through digital networks, social-media platforms, hashtags, online communities and rapidly circulating visual and textual narratives. Digital communication has substantially reduced the organisational costs of mobilisation and has enabled dispersed individuals to coordinate political action with remarkable speed. It has consequently contributed to the emergence of more decentralised, networked and, in some cases, leaderless forms of political participation.

However, the technological transformation of protest also presents profound ethical and democratic dilemmas. The same digital infrastructures that facilitate democratic participation can accelerate misinformation, online harassment, ideological polarisation, political manipulation and the spread of hostility. The speed of digital mobilisation may sometimes privilege emotional reaction over sustained deliberation, while anonymous communication can weaken individual accountability. These developments raise an important Gandhian question: Can technological power be reconciled with ethical responsibility? More specifically, can the principles of truth, non-violence, self-restraint and respect for the dignity of opponents be meaningfully translated into the digital sphere?

The question is particularly significant because Gandhi's conception of truth extends beyond the avoidance of explicit falsehood. Satya demands an ethical orientation towards truthfulness, intellectual honesty and openness to self-correction. Applied to contemporary digital politics, this principle invites critical reflection upon misinformation, manipulated content, selective narratives and the rapid circulation of unverified claims. Similarly, Ahimsa cannot be confined to physical non-violence. Its contemporary interpretation may encompass resistance to verbal abuse, dehumanising discourse, cyberbullying, hate speech and forms of digital communication that inflict psychological or social harm. In this respect, Gandhian philosophy may provide an ethical vocabulary for examining the responsibilities of citizens within digitally mediated democracies.

The relevance of Gandhi further extends to the problem of political polarisation. Contemporary democratic societies increasingly experience the transformation of political disagreement into antagonistic identity conflicts in which opponents are portrayed not as fellow citizens with competing interests but as moral or existential enemies. Gandhi's insistence upon distinguishing between the individual and the injustice committed by that individual offers an alternative framework for democratic disagreement. The opponent, in Gandhian thought, remains a human being whose dignity must be respected even when his or her actions are strongly contested. Such an approach potentially provides an important corrective to contemporary political cultures in which disagreement frequently degenerates into personal hostility and social exclusion.

Gandhi's emphasis upon constructive action is equally significant for contemporary movements. Resistance, in the Gandhian framework, was not intended to remain permanently oppositional; it was expected to be accompanied by constructive efforts directed towards rebuilding social institutions and improving the conditions of everyday life. This dimension is particularly relevant to contemporary movements confronting unemployment, agrarian crisis, ecological degradation, inequality and social fragmentation. Political transformation, from this perspective, cannot be achieved solely through opposition to existing structures; it also requires the creation of alternative practices, institutions and relationships grounded in cooperation, sustainability and social responsibility.

The ecological dimension of Gandhian political philosophy also assumes renewed importance in the context of the twenty-first century. Climate change, biodiversity loss, resource depletion, unsustainable consumption and environmental displacement have exposed the limitations of development models based exclusively upon economic expansion and material accumulation.

Gandhi's critique of unlimited wants, his advocacy of restrained consumption, his emphasis upon local self-reliance and his concern for the relationship between human beings and their material environment provide important conceptual resources for contemporary debates on sustainable development. His principle that social

and economic progress must be evaluated in relation to human dignity and the welfare of all can contribute to a broader normative framework for addressing the ecological crisis.

Against this background, the present study seeks to critically examine the contemporary relevance of Gandhian political philosophy in the context of emerging forms of democratic mobilisation. Rather than treating Gandhi's ideas as historically fixed doctrines, the study approaches them as a dynamic body of political and ethical thought capable of dialogue with contemporary democratic theory and social movements. Particular attention is devoted to the principles of Satyagraha, Ahimsa, Satya, Swaraj, Sarvodaya, constructive action and moral responsibility, and to their possible application to contemporary forms of collective political action.

The study uses the recent farmers' movements and emerging forms of Gen Z activism as analytical contexts through which the possibilities and limitations of Gandhian political thought can be interrogated. The farmers' movements provide an opportunity to examine collective resistance, solidarity, participatory democracy and constructive community practices, while Gen Z activism enables an exploration of the relationship between Gandhian ethics and digitally mediated political mobilisation. The comparison is not intended to suggest that contemporary movements are inherently Gandhian; rather, it seeks to identify areas of convergence, divergence and transformation between Gandhi's normative conception of political resistance and the realities of twenty-first-century activism.

The central argument of the paper is that the enduring relevance of Gandhi lies not in the mechanical replication of his historical methods but in the ethical principles underlying his conception of political action. In an age in which the instruments of mobilisation have changed dramatically—from the physical gathering and printed pamphlet to the hashtag, livestream and digital network—the fundamental questions of political ethics remain remarkably persistent: How should citizens resist injustice? What limits should govern political action? Can dissent remain non-violent in an intensely polarised environment? How can political movements combine effectiveness with ethical responsibility? And can democratic transformation occur without reproducing the forms of domination and violence that movements seek to challenge?

By addressing these questions, the paper seeks to contribute to the contemporary academic debate on Gandhi, democratic theory and social movements. It argues that Gandhi's political philosophy should neither be romanticised as an unquestionable solution to contemporary crises nor dismissed as a historical doctrine confined to the anti-colonial struggle. Instead, its contemporary significance lies precisely in its capacity to provoke critical reflection upon the ethical foundations of resistance, democratic participation, political communication and social transformation. Gandhi's enduring contribution may therefore be understood as an invitation to reimagine politics not merely as a struggle for power, but as a moral and democratic practice directed towards truth, justice, human dignity, non-violence and the welfare of all.

II. Objectives of the Study

The study has the following objectives:

1. To examine the contemporary relevance of Gandhi's concepts of Satya, Ahimsa and Satyagraha.
2. To analyse the Gandhian dimensions of recent farmers' movements in India.
3. To examine the emergence of Gen Z-led youth mobilisation as a new form of democratic participation.
4. To critically compare traditional Gandhian resistance with contemporary digital and mass movements.
5. To examine the possibilities and limitations of non-violent resistance in the contemporary political environment.
6. To explore the relevance of Gandhian political ethics for democratic renewal, peace and social justice.

III. Research Questions

The paper addresses the following questions:

1. To what extent do contemporary farmers' movements reflect the principles and practices associated with Gandhian Satyagraha?
2. How relevant is Ahimsa to contemporary forms of political and digital activism?
3. Can Gen Z movements reinterpret Gandhian non-violence within the conditions of digital democracy?
4. What similarities and differences exist between Gandhian Satyagraha and contemporary social movements?
5. Can Gandhi's political ethics provide a framework for transforming contemporary protest into constructive democratic action?

IV. Methodology

The study adopts a qualitative, exploratory and interpretivist approach. It is based primarily on conceptual analysis and secondary sources, including Gandhi's writings, scholarly literature on Gandhian philosophy, academic studies of social movements and contemporary documentation concerning farmers' and youth-led movements.

A comparative analytical framework is employed

to examine contemporary movements through the following Gandhian categories:

- Truth and factual integrity
- Non-violence
- Civil resistance

- Self-discipline
- Collective solidarity
- Democratic participation
- Social justice
- Constructive programme
- Respect for human dignity
- Transformation of political relationships

The study does not assume that contemporary movements are inherently Gandhian. Instead, it evaluates their practices against Gandhian philosophical criteria.

V. Gandhi's Philosophy of Satyagraha and Contemporary Resistance

Gandhi's concept of Satyagraha is central to understanding his philosophy of political action. Literally associated with adherence to truth, Satyagraha sought to resist injustice without hatred or physical violence.

For Gandhi, the means were inseparable from the ends. A just society could not be created through unjust methods. Consequently, non-violence was not merely a tactical device but an ethical principle.

Three interconnected dimensions are particularly relevant today:

5.1 Truth as the Foundation of Political Action

Gandhian politics begins with truth. In an age of misinformation, manipulated narratives, deepfakes and digital propaganda, Gandhi's insistence upon truth acquires a new significance.

Contemporary movements require not merely large numbers of participants but also credible evidence, responsible communication and intellectual honesty.

5.2 Ahimsa as Active Resistance

Gandhian Ahimsa should not be equated with political passivity. It represents an active refusal to inflict harm while confronting injustice.

Recent scholarship continues to identify Gandhi's non-violence as relevant to contemporary peace movements and conflict transformation.

5.3 Satyagraha as Moral Pressure

The objective of Satyagraha is not the humiliation or destruction of an opponent but the transformation of an unjust relationship.

This distinction is particularly important in contemporary democracies, where protest movements must simultaneously challenge power and preserve the possibility of dialogue.

VI. Farmers' Movements and the Gandhian Tradition of Resistance

The farmers' movement of 2020–21 represented one of the largest episodes of sustained mass mobilisation in contemporary India. The movement emerged in opposition to three agricultural laws and continued for more than a year before the Union government announced their repeal.

Academic research has highlighted the movement's capacity to construct solidarities across social, religious and economic boundaries and to articulate an alternative vision of democratic participation.

The movement also demonstrated practices that resonate with Gandhian principles: collective discipline, prolonged peaceful mobilisation, public communication, voluntary service and community-based organisation.

The subsequent farmers' mobilisation beginning in February 2024 further demonstrated the continuing political importance of agrarian questions, including demands concerning Minimum Support Price and farmers' economic security. Human Rights Watch documented the importance of protecting farmers' right to peaceful protest during this period.

However, a critical analysis must avoid romanticising the movement. Contemporary farmers' protests also witnessed confrontations and tensions. Consequently, their relationship with Gandhian philosophy should be understood as partial, dynamic and contested, rather than as an exact reproduction of Gandhian Satyagraha.

VII. From Gandhi's Ashrams to Digital Networks: The Rise of Gen Z Activism

The emergence of Gen Z activism represents a major transformation in the architecture of political mobilisation. Unlike Gandhi's movements, which depended upon physical meetings, newspapers, volunteers, ashrams and organisational networks, contemporary youth movements can mobilise thousands of people through social media within hours.

Digital technology has therefore transformed:

- the speed of mobilisation;
- the distribution of political information;
- the relationship between leaders and followers;
- the visibility of protest;
- the formation of transnational solidarity; and
- the capacity of young citizens to participate directly in political discourse.

The 2026 Gen Z movement in India illustrates this transformation. Research describes the movement as youth-led and digitally mobilised, emerging from concerns about corruption, censorship, institutional failure and political accountability.

Its initial mobilisation was widely characterised as peaceful; however, subsequent violence and destruction revealed a crucial challenge for contemporary movements: how can legitimate anger be transformed into disciplined non-violent political action?

This is precisely where Gandhi remains intellectually relevant.

VIII. Gandhian Non-Violence and the Politics of Gen Z

The contemporary youth movement can learn several lessons from Gandhi.

8.1 Anger Must Become Ethical Action

Gandhi did not deny anger against injustice. Instead, he sought to transform anger into disciplined resistance. For Gen Z movements confronting corruption, inequality, unemployment or institutional failure, the Gandhian challenge is therefore to convert anger into organised ethical action.

8.2 Leader lessness versus Moral Leadership

Many contemporary youth movements deliberately reject traditional hierarchical leadership.

Gandhi, however, demonstrated the importance of ethical leadership, personal discipline and responsibility.

The challenge for Gen Z activism is therefore not necessarily to recreate charismatic leadership,

but to develop distributed moral responsibility.

8.3 Digital Satyagraha

Gandhi could not have imagined social media, yet his principles can be extended conceptually into the digital sphere.

A Gandhian digital activism would require:

truthful communication + non-violent language + responsible sharing + rejection of hatred + respect for opponents + constructive civic engagement.

Such an approach may be termed **"Digital Satyagraha."**

IX. Farmers' Movements and Gen Z: A Comparative Gandhian Perspective

Gandhian Principle	Farmers' Movements	Gen Z Mobilisation
Satya	Public articulation of agrarian grievances	Demand for transparency and accountability
Ahimsa	Mass demonstrations and prolonged resistance	Peaceful rallies and civic mobilisation
Satyagraha	Persistence despite political pressure	Youth-led resistance to institutional failures
Swaraj	Questions concerning livelihoods and democratic participation	Demand for greater citizen agency
Sarvodaya	Collective welfare and community solidarity	Broader concerns regarding social and political justice
Constructive Programme	Community kitchens, voluntary service and solidarity	Digital awareness, civic networks and community mobilisation

Decentralisation	Farmer unions and local mobilisation	Leaderless/digital networks
Moral responsibility	Collective discipline and public legitimacy	Need for responsible digital activism

The comparison reveals that contemporary movements do not simply reproduce Gandhian politics. Rather, they reconfigure some Gandhian principles within new social, technological and political environments.

X. Gandhi and the Ethics of Protest

1. One of Gandhi's most important contributions to political thought was the insistence that how people resist injustice matters as much as what they resist.
 2. Contemporary politics often reduces protest to numerical strength, media visibility or the ability to disrupt institutions. Gandhian political ethics proposes a different standard.
 3. The legitimacy of a movement should also be assessed according to:
 4. the truthfulness of its claims;
 5. the justice of its objectives;
 6. the means employed;
 7. its treatment of opponents;
- its willingness to engage in dialogue;
its commitment to vulnerable communities; and its capacity to move from protest towards constructive transformation.

Recent scholarship similarly emphasises the symbolic and moral dimensions of non-violent protest, arguing that non-violent politics can communicate dissent while challenging dominant political assumptions.

XI. From Resistance to Reconstruction

A major weakness of many contemporary movements is that mobilisation can become an end in itself.

Gandhi's concept of the Constructive Programme provides an important corrective.

For Gandhi, political freedom had to be accompanied by constructive social transformation—education, village development, communal harmony, economic self-reliance, removal of social inequalities and dignity of labour.

Thus, a farmers' movement should not only demand better agricultural policy; it should also engage with sustainable agriculture, ecological conservation, rural employment and local economic institutions.

Similarly, Gen Z activism should not stop at demanding governmental accountability. It can develop constructive programmes around education, climate action, digital literacy, community service, democratic participation and social inclusion.

This movement from protest to reconstruction may be one of Gandhi's most valuable lessons for contemporary activism.

XII. Critical Limitations of Gandhian Application

Although Gandhi remains relevant, his philosophy should not be applied uncritically.

First, contemporary states possess technological, surveillance and coercive capacities fundamentally different from those of Gandhi's era.

Second, digital communication accelerates political mobilisation but also misinformation, polarisation and online hostility.

Third, leaderless movements may possess enormous mobilising capacity but often face difficulties regarding negotiation, representation and long-term institutionalisation.

Fourth, not every peaceful protest is necessarily Gandhian. Gandhian Satyagraha requires a deeper commitment to truth, self-restraint, non-hatred and ethical means.

Finally, contemporary movements must also address structural questions of caste, gender, class, ecology and economic inequality that require analytical frameworks extending beyond Gandhi.

Thus, Gandhi should be understood not as a complete political blueprint but as a critical ethical resource for contemporary democratic movements.

XIII. Contemporary Relevance of Gandhi: A Conceptual Framework

The contemporary relevance of Gandhi may be conceptualised through five interconnected dimensions:

Truth → Non-violence → Democratic Resistance → Constructive Action → Social Transformation

This framework suggests that effective democratic resistance should not end with opposition.

It should proceed:

from grievance to awareness,
from awareness to mobilisation,

from mobilisation to non-violent resistance,
from resistance to dialogue,
and from dialogue to constructive transformation.

Such a framework provides a meaningful bridge between Gandhi's twentieth-century political experiments and twenty-first-century social movements.

XIV. Conclusion

Mahatma Gandhi's relevance in the twenty-first century lies not in the mechanical reproduction of the historical forms, strategies or organisational structures of his movements, but in the critical recovery and reinterpretation of the ethical foundations that informed his conception of politics. Gandhi's political thought constituted a distinctive synthesis of ethics, social responsibility and democratic action in which the pursuit of political freedom could not be separated from the moral character of the means employed to attain it. His insistence upon Satya (truth), Ahimsa (non-violence), Satyagraha (truth-force), Swaraj (self-rule), Sarvodaya (welfare of all), trusteeship and constructive programme provides a normative framework for examining the possibilities and limitations of contemporary democratic resistance.

The twenty-first century is witnessing profound transformations in the nature of political participation. Traditional forms of collective mobilisation increasingly coexist with digitally mediated networks, decentralised movements, issue-based campaigns and rapidly emerging forms of civic engagement. In this changing political landscape, the recent farmers' movements in India demonstrate the continuing significance of collective mobilisation, solidarity, participatory political consciousness, organisational discipline and peaceful resistance as instruments of democratic negotiation and dissent. Their significance extends beyond the particular policy questions around which mobilisation occurred, because they illustrate the capacity of citizens to organise collectively, articulate grievances in the public sphere and exert democratic pressure upon political institutions without necessarily abandoning the legitimacy of constitutional and peaceful modes of resistance.

At the same time, contemporary Gen Z mobilisation represents an important transformation in the sociology and technology of political participation. Younger generations increasingly utilise digital platforms, social media networks, decentralised organisational structures and rapid information-sharing mechanisms to articulate political concerns and generate civic mobilisation. Such developments have expanded the speed, reach and inclusiveness of political communication, enabling individuals who may remain outside conventional political organisations to participate in public discourse. However, digital mobilisation also presents new ethical and democratic dilemmas, including misinformation, algorithmic amplification, online hostility, political polarisation, performative activism and the rapid transformation of disagreement into antagonism. Consequently, the contemporary expansion of political participation does not automatically guarantee an expansion of democratic deliberation or ethical citizenship.

It is precisely at this juncture that Gandhi's conception of political resistance acquires renewed analytical significance. Gandhi's central insight was that political action cannot be evaluated exclusively according to the desirability of its objectives; it must also be assessed in relation to the ethical legitimacy of the means through which those objectives are pursued. For Gandhi, means and ends constituted an inseparable moral continuum. A just social order could not, in his view, be sustainably established through methods that reproduced violence, hatred, humiliation or domination. Satyagraha, therefore, was not simply a technique of protest but an ethical discipline that sought to transform the relationship between the resister and the opponent. Its objective was not the physical or moral destruction of an adversary, but the creation of conditions in which truth could be recognised through persuasion, self-suffering, dialogue and moral awakening.

This distinction is particularly significant for contemporary democratic movements. Protest is indispensable to a functioning democracy because dissent enables citizens to challenge injustice, expose institutional failures and demand accountability. Nevertheless, dissent can become destructive when political opposition is reduced to the demonisation of opponents or when collective anger becomes detached from ethical restraint. Gandhi's philosophy suggests that the legitimacy of resistance depends not merely upon the grievances that generate it but also upon the moral practices through which those grievances are articulated. In this sense, Ahimsa should not be interpreted narrowly as the mere absence of physical violence. It represents a broader ethic of respect for human dignity, restraint in political action, rejection of hatred and willingness to recognise the humanity of those with whom one fundamentally disagrees.

The Gandhian framework consequently offers an important conceptual vocabulary for understanding the transformation of political anger into moral courage. Anger against injustice may provide the initial energy for mobilisation, but ethical resistance requires the disciplined conversion of anger into constructive political agency. Similarly, confrontation may be unavoidable in democratic politics, but Gandhi's approach encourages the transformation of confrontation into dialogue wherever possible. Protest, from this perspective, should not be

understood solely as an act of opposition; it can become a means of initiating social reflection, institutional reform and constructive transformation. The constructive programme is particularly relevant in this regard because Gandhi understood resistance and reconstruction as complementary dimensions of political action. Challenging injustice without simultaneously developing alternative social, economic and institutional practices risks leaving the underlying structures of inequality intact.

This Gandhian perspective is particularly valuable in an era characterised by digital polarisation and fragmented public spheres. Social media has democratised access to political communication, yet it has also facilitated the formation of ideological echo chambers in which citizens encounter increasingly homogeneous viewpoints. The resulting polarisation can weaken the possibility of reasoned dialogue and encourage political identities based upon hostility towards perceived opponents. Gandhi's emphasis on Satya demands a more demanding conception of political communication—one in which truth is not reduced to the selective circulation of information that confirms pre-existing beliefs. Ethical citizenship requires intellectual humility, willingness to listen, openness to correction and a commitment to distinguish truth-seeking from propaganda.

The contemporary relevance of Satyagraha therefore extends beyond conventional street protest. In the digital age, it can be reinterpreted as an ethic of responsible civic communication: resisting misinformation without reproducing falsehood, challenging injustice without dehumanising opponents, defending democratic values without legitimising hatred, and using technological networks for constructive civic engagement rather than social fragmentation. Such a reinterpretation does not imply that contemporary digital activism is inherently Gandhian. Rather, Gandhi provides a critical normative standard against which contemporary forms of mobilisation may be evaluated.

The principle of Swaraj similarly acquires renewed relevance when understood beyond the narrow meaning of political independence. Gandhi conceived Swaraj as a multidimensional form of self-rule involving individual self-discipline, moral autonomy, social responsibility and participatory political life. In contemporary democracies, this conception invites reflection upon whether citizens are merely consumers of political information or active participants in shaping their communities. Digital citizenship, from a Gandhian perspective, would require not only the freedom to express opinions but also the responsibility to use that freedom ethically. Political freedom without self-restraint, like technological power without moral responsibility, can become an instrument of domination rather than emancipation.

Likewise, Sarvodaya, or the welfare and uplift of all, provides a critical framework for assessing the substantive objectives of contemporary movements. Democratic mobilisation cannot be regarded as fully transformative if it merely advances sectional interests while neglecting the dignity and welfare of vulnerable or marginalised communities. The Gandhian conception of social transformation requires a movement from competitive politics towards a broader concern with social justice, human dignity, ecological sustainability and the common good. This becomes especially significant in the context of contemporary inequalities, agrarian distress, unemployment, ecological degradation and growing disparities in access to economic and technological resources.

The ecological dimension of Gandhian thought further strengthens its contemporary relevance. Gandhi's critique of unrestrained materialism, excessive consumption and economic systems divorced from human and ecological needs provides an important philosophical basis for contemporary debates on sustainable development. The climate crisis has demonstrated that economic growth cannot be evaluated exclusively through aggregate production or consumption. Development must also be judged by its consequences for future generations, ecological systems and vulnerable communities. Gandhi's emphasis on restraint, simplicity, decentralisation, local self-reliance and responsible consumption therefore offers resources for rethinking the relationship between development, human needs and ecological limits.

Nevertheless, invoking Gandhi in relation to contemporary movements requires critical rather than celebratory engagement. Contemporary societies differ substantially from the colonial context in which Gandhi developed his political strategies. Digital technologies, constitutional democracies, globalised economies, mass media and complex state institutions create circumstances for which Gandhi could not have provided ready-made solutions. His ideas must therefore be interpreted contextually rather than treated as a fixed political template. The contemporary significance of Gandhian thought lies precisely in its capacity to stimulate normative questions rather than provide predetermined institutional answers.

The fundamental question for contemporary movements is consequently not merely "What do we oppose?" but also "What kind of society are we attempting to create, and do our methods embody the values of that society?" This question captures the continuing philosophical importance of Gandhi. If a movement seeks a more democratic society but suppresses internal dissent; if it demands justice while humiliating opponents; if it advocates peace while normalising hatred; or if it seeks social equality while reproducing exclusion, a fundamental contradiction emerges between its desired ends and its political means. Gandhi's philosophy brings this contradiction to the centre of democratic reflection.

The recent farmers' movements and emerging forms of Gen Z mobilisation can therefore be examined not simply as isolated episodes of protest but as manifestations of a broader transformation in democratic participation. They demonstrate that collective action remains indispensable even in an era of institutionalised democracy and digital communication. At the same time, they reveal the enduring importance of questions concerning discipline, dialogue, truth, solidarity, inclusiveness and ethical responsibility. The Gandhian contribution is to insist that the democratic value of resistance cannot be separated from the moral quality of the political community that resistance seeks to produce.

Ultimately, Gandhi's enduring significance for the twenty-first century lies in his attempt to reconcile political efficacy with ethical responsibility. He challenges both the assumption that politics must necessarily be a struggle for power and the belief that morally desirable objectives can justify ethically questionable means. His political philosophy instead proposes a conception of democratic citizenship grounded in truthfulness, non-violence, self-restraint, dialogue, social responsibility and constructive engagement. In an age marked by digital polarisation, political distrust, economic inequality, ecological crisis and social fragmentation, these principles provide not a nostalgic return to the past but a critical framework for rethinking the moral foundations of democratic life.

The contemporary significance of Gandhi, therefore, lies neither in the uncritical glorification of his historical legacy nor in the literal transplantation of his methods into radically different circumstances. It lies in recovering the ethical questions embedded within his political philosophy and applying them critically to the dilemmas of contemporary democracy. His most enduring proposition remains that political transformation must begin with the transformation of political conduct itself. Democracy is sustained not merely through elections, institutions and constitutional procedures, but through citizens capable of resisting injustice while refusing to reproduce injustice in the process of resistance. In this sense, Gandhian thought remains part of an unfinished democratic project—one in which the struggle for justice is inseparable from the struggle to create a political culture worthy of justice itself.

References

- [1]. Allen, D. (2019). *Gandhi after 9/11: Creative Nonviolence and Sustainability*. Oxford University Press.
- [2]. Dolui, S. (2025). *Gandhi and Civil Disobedience: Historical Impact and Contemporary Relevance*. *Revista Review Index Journal of Multidisciplinary*.
- [3]. Mantena, K. (2025). "Exemplary Citizens and the Symbolic Politics of Nonviolent Protest." In *Gandhi, Truth, and Nonviolence: The Politics of Engagement in Post-Truth Times*. Oxford University Press.
- [4]. Narula, S. *Confronting State Violence: Lessons from India's Farmer Protests*. *Columbia Human Rights Law Review*.
- [5]. Sapkota, M. (2026). "Gen Z Movement 2025 in Nepal; Agendas, Implications and Unsettled Issues." *Journal of Political Science*, 26(1), 144–173.
- [6]. Sanford, A. W. "Gandhi's Agrarian Legacy: Practicing Food, Justice, and Sustainability in India." *Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture*.
- [7]. Sethi, A. (2021). "One Year Later: Reflections on the Farmers' Protest in India." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 11(2).
- [8]. Varshney, A. (2022). "India's Farmers' Protest: An Inclusive Vision of Indian Democracy." *American Political Science Review*, 116(3), 1141–1146.
- [9]. Allen, D. (2019). *Gandhi after 9/11: Creative nonviolence and sustainability*. Oxford University Press.
- [10]. Bondurant, J. V. (1988). *Conquest of violence: The Gandhian philosophy of conflict*. Princeton University Press.
- [11]. Brown, J. M. (1989). *Gandhi: Prisoner of hope*. Yale University Press.
- [12]. Dalton, D. (1993). *Mahatma Gandhi: Nonviolent power in action*. Columbia University Press.
- [13]. Dolui, S. (2025). *Gandhi and civil disobedience: Historical impact and contemporary relevance*. *Revista Review Index Journal of Multidisciplinary*.
- [14]. Fischer, L. (1950). *The life of Mahatma Gandhi*. Harper & Brothers.
- [15]. Gandhi, M. K. (1927). *An autobiography: The story of my experiments with truth*. Navajivan Publishing House.
- [16]. Gandhi, M. K. (1938). *Hind Swaraj or Indian home rule*. Navajivan Publishing House.
- [17]. Gandhi, M. K. (1945). *Constructive programme: Its meaning and place*. Navajivan Publishing House.
- [18]. Gandhi, M. K. (1951). *Satyagraha in South Africa*. Navajivan Publishing House.
- [19]. Gandhi, M. K. (1968). *The selected works of Mahatma Gandhi (Vols. 1–6)*. Navajivan Publishing House.
- [20]. Gandhi, M. K. (1999). *The collected works of Mahatma Gandhi*. Publications Division, Government of India.
- [21]. Iyer, R. N. (1973). *The moral and political thought of Mahatma Gandhi*. Oxford University Press.
- [22]. Mantena, K. (2025). Exemplary citizens and the symbolic politics of nonviolent protest. In *Gandhi, truth, and nonviolence: The politics of engagement in post-truth times*. Oxford University Press.
- [23]. Mantena, K. (2012). Another realism: The politics of Gandhian nonviolence. *American Political Science Review*, 106(2), 455–470.
- [24]. Murthy, V. (2010). *The politics of Gandhi's nonviolence*. Cambridge University Press.
- [25]. Narula, S. (n.d.). *Confronting state violence: Lessons from India's farmer protests*. *Columbia Human Rights Law Review*.
- [26]. Parekh, B. (1997). *Gandhi: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- [27]. Parel, A. J. (1997). *Gandhi's philosophy and the quest for harmony*. Cambridge University Press.
- [28]. Raghavan, S. (2023). Gandhi, nonviolence, and the politics of resistance. *Journal of Peace Research*.
- [29]. Sapkota, M. (2026). Gen Z movement 2025 in Nepal: Agendas, implications and unsettled issues. *Journal of Political Science*, 26(1), 144–
- [30]. Sanford, A. W. (n.d.). Gandhi's agrarian legacy: Practicing food, justice, and sustainability in India. *Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture*.
- [31]. Sethi, A. (2021). One year later: Reflections on the farmers' protest in India. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 11(2).

- [32]. Sharp, G. (1973).The politics of nonviolent action. Porter Sargent.
 - [33]. Sharma, J. (2020).Gandhi's political thought: A critical introduction. Oxford University Press.
 - [34]. Srinivasan, T. N. (Ed.). (2019).Gandhi and the contemporary world. Routledge.
 - [35]. Varshney, A. (2022). India's farmers' protest: An inclusive vision of Indian democracy.American Political Science Review, 116(3), 1141–1146.
 - [36]. Weber, T. (2003).On the salt march: The historiography of Gandhi's march to Dandi. HarperCollins.
 - [37]. Weber, T. (2004).Gandhi, Gandhism and the Gandhians: The elusive politics ...
 - [38]. Baviskar, A. (2021). Farmers' protests and the politics of agrarian citizenship in India.
 - [39]. Lerche, J. (2021). Agrarian movements, farmers' mobilisation and contemporary India.
 - [40]. McMichael, P. (2008). Peasant movements and the politics of agrarian transformation.
 - [41]. Brass, T. (2014).Peasants, populism and postmodernism. Zed Books.
 - [42]. Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2013).The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. Cambridge University Press.
 - [43]. Castells, M. (2012).Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age. Polity.
 - [44]. Tufekci, Z. (2017).Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest. Yale University Press.
 - [45]. Gerbaudo, P. (2012).Tweets and the streets: Social media and contemporary activism. Pluto Press.
 - [46]. Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. J. (2011).Why civil resistance works: The strategic logic of nonviolent conflict. Columbia University Press.
-
- 1. Gregg, R. B. (1966).The power of nonviolence. Schocken Books.
 - 2. King, M. L., Jr. (1964).Why we can't wait. Harper & Row.
 - 3. Sharp, G. (2005).Waging nonviolent struggle: 20th century practice and 21st century potential. Porter ..
 - 4. Gandhi'sAn Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth
 - 5. Hind Swaraj
 - 6. Satyagraha in South Africa
 - 7. Constructive Programme: Its Meaning and Place
 - 8. Young India
- Harijan
Indian Opinion
The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi