

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The second and third chapters of the present volume illustrate how the major political ideologies have been animated by some of the Gandhian ideas. For his critics he was too implacably hostile to modernity to offer an adequate understanding of its nature, let alone provide answers to its malaise. He prevented social equality by mixing religion with politics and prevented both radical politics and ideology based political struggle by his conservative, pacifist and pro-bourgeois outlook. Gandhi's admirers take a radically different view. For them he was a man of both thought and action, a rare combination. As a man of thought, he saw through the madness of modernity, and offered an alternative vision that combined the best insights of both the pre-modern and modern world-views while avoiding the self-indulgent individualism and moral complacency of the currently fashionable post-modernism. He also discovered a uniquely moral method of political change in the form of *satyagraha*, and provided an effective alternative to violence. Although both the detractors and admirers make some valid points they both evaluate him and his intellectual legacy in both partial and superficial terms. We have observed that holistic nature of Gandhian political thought as reflected in the dynamic interaction of theory and practice in his case has been compromised in the recent efforts at contextualizing Gandhi or drawing relevance of Gandhi's ideas to widely disparate issues, movements and politics.

The most common way of relating Gandhi was to Anarchism. Contemporary critics appear almost unwilling to understand the implications of the Gandhian method. In anarchist criticism which is one of the more sympathetic there is an honest failure to recognize the potential of Satyagraha. Political methods as we find them

conventionally practiced as indeed, based upon himsa (which means more precisely injury or violence, and included hate). It is just in this understanding that Satyagraha makes its unique contribution. For politics based on Satyagraha does not carry with it elements of himsa, but of ahimsa. It still remains politics and may involve a government, state structure. Instead of violent sections, non-violent sanctions operate. Such a system is immensely difficult of conception for those of us who are steeped in the processes of modern politics and who understand law as a violently coercive order. But it is just this which anarchists should be brought to understand –for it is the solution to the problem of method which anarchism has consistently failed to solve. Occasionally anarchist thinkers have attempted to formulate a technique of resistance other than the destructive methods made popular by terrorist tactics. Benjamin Tucker in America recommended as did Thoreau, a passive resistance to modern governments. He and of course Tolstoy and other Christian Anarchists, enjoined refusal to pay taxes and the withholding of all other co-operation with governmental functions, with Tolstoy non-violence meant a quite different thing from Gandhian Satyagraha. It meant avoidance of all force in any form. It was in no case a technique for mass positive constructive action. The anarchists following Bakunin were well aware of the force inherent in any noncooperation of labour, syndicalists operated with the objective (real or ideal) of the general strike. Even Max Stirner whose extreme individualist anarchism allowed him little concern for social techniques held that “the laborers have the most enormous power in their hands, and if they once became thoroughly conscious of it and used it, nothing would withstand them” (Stirner, 1912, p.152). And Godwin had stated a basic element of civil disobedience when he reasoned that “if government be founded in the consent of the people, it can have no power over any individual by whom that consent is refused” (Godwin, 1926, p.96). Anarchists were, then, essentially aware of the strength of a people or a section of the people (notably labor), to resist

conventionally practiced as indeed, based upon himsa (which means more precisely injury or violence, and included hate). It is just in this understanding that Satyagraha makes its unique contribution. For politics based on Satyagraha does not carry with it elements of himsa, but of ahimsa. It still remains politics and may involve a government, state structure. Instead of violent sections, non-violent sanctions operate. Such a system is immensely difficult of conception for those of us who are steeped in the processes of modern politics and who understand law as a violently coercive order. But it is just this which anarchists should be brought to understand –for it is the solution to the problem of method which anarchism has consistently failed to solve. Occasionally anarchist thinkers have attempted to formulate a technique of resistance other than the destructive methods made popular by terrorist tactics. Benjamin Tucker in America recommended as did Thoreau, a passive resistance to modern governments. He and of course Tolstoy and other Christian Anarchists, enjoined refusal to pay taxes and the withholding of all other co-operation with governmental functions, with Tolstoy non-violence meant a quite different thing from Gandhian Satyagraha. It meant avoidance of all force in any form. It was in no case a technique for mass positive constructive action. The anarchists following Bakunin were well aware of the force inherent in any noncooperation of labour, syndicalists operated with the objective (real or ideal) of the general strike. Even Max Stirner whose extreme individualist anarchism allowed him little concern for social techniques held that “the laborers have the most enormous power in their hands, and if they once became thoroughly conscious of it and used it, nothing would withstand them” (Stirner, 1912, p.152). And Godwin had stated a basic element of civil disobedience when he reasoned that “if government be founded in the consent of the people, it can have no power over any individual by whom that consent is refused” (Godwin, 1926, p.96). Anarchists were, then, essentially aware of the strength of a people or a section of the people (notably labor), to resist

government authority. But even in those cases where anarchists attempted something more than a negative resistance policy (as the did in anarchist settlements especially those founded in Canada and the United States) the weakness of the effort lay in the failure to develop a technique of resistance or to delineate a method. Gandhian Satyagraha meets this problems and the non cooperation of Stayagraha has the necessary concomitant of co-operation among the resisters themselves. Co-operation functions not only in organizing the resisters for establishing a parallel social structure, but also in the program persuasion and conversion of the system against which the group is resisting. The Christian Anarchist Ludlow (Ludlow, 1950) tells us that if we were to subtract the socialist elements from Gandhi's thought we would have left an ideology and plan of action that would be truly anarchist and would thus reject the state as a form of government. It is true, as we have seen that there are essential socialist elements in Gandhian thought and that Gandhi was not prepared to abandon Political means or the state as an organizing factor. Nevertheless, with Satyagraha as the functioning Socio-Political technique of action, anarchism could conceivably result. We may also challenge the anarchist to show us how he intends to realize anarchy: what indeed, is the "plan of action" of anarchists?

Among the weaknesses of anarchist thought has been the persisting inability to show how the present state could be eliminated without violence. Anarchists have not denied that violence tends to militate against the very possibility of annihilating the present authority without substituting another authority equally objectionable. They, further, have not faced the problems of tactics - even violent tactics- insofar as they appear to expect a revolution to succeed without discipline and authority. It was such a faith which most notably marked the failure of Bakunin's practical efforts. There is no assurance that at the critical movement each individual will come forward to fulfill his function spontaneously and without disciplined direction. Yet, to be consistently anarchist means to refuse

a coercive organization implied in disciplined effort. Whenever we find attempts at application of anarchist theory we find that the failure has been one of method. Conflict, for the anarchist, was not only apparent but was essential. The anarchist has no constructive technique where-by he can struggle towards anarchist goals. Destruction is not enough, for the use of violence would necessarily subvert anarchist ends. In contrast to the Gandhian approach, the anarchist has not recognized the necessity for centering his prior consideration upon the development of constructive techniques.

The detractors often have regarded Gandhi as a Conservative. But when Gandhi was challenged by those truly conservative elements among the Hindu orthodox, he urged upon them constructions and interpretations which they were unprepared to accept. "What is this Varnashrama?" Gandhi wrote in reply to one orthodox Hindu. "It is not a system of water tight compartments", and, he explained : - "A Brahman is not only a teacher. He is only predominantly that. But a Brahman who refused to labour will be voted down as an idiot .... Nor have I the least hesitation in recommending hand weaving as a bread winning occupation to all who are in need of an honest occupation" (Young India, 1927). And so Gandhi pressed in campaign to overcome discrimination and the fear and weaknesses which arise from it. In so doing he undermined some of the most sacred institutions of his society. One further aspect of the criterion of conservatism we are here examining in a confirmed attitude towards the selective nature of leadership. To some extent Gandhi could agree with Ruskin and Carlyle that a rule of the wisest is the best rule. But, for Gandhi, wisdom did not necessarily inhere in those of superior birth. Nor did it bear any necessary relationship to the level of formal education. Criteria for leaders lay less in birth or station than in personal qualities. "Courage, endurance, fearlessness and above all self - sacrifice are the qualities required of our leaders", Gandhi wrote. "A person belonging to the suppressed classes exhibiting these qualities in their fullness would certainly be able to lead the nation; where as

the most finished orator, if he has not these qualities, must fail. (Ibid, 1921). Nor did Gandhi shore the conservative's distrust of the masses. Gandhi's faith in the people was, as he said, "boundless". "Let not the leaders distrust them", he urged, for "theirs is an amazingly responsive nature" (Ibid, 1920). He further believed that leadership comes only through service, and for himself he places service at the forefront of all his efforts, claiming leadership to be a less important by-product. Finally, his attitude towards the common man and towards leadership is reflected in the role assigned to public opinion. For Gandhi, "every ruler is alien that defies" public opinion, for a government is dependent upon it (Ibid, 1920).

In summary, Gandhi insisted that the individual look first to duty and not concern himself with rights. Nevertheless, it is clear that Gandhi believed that individuals have many claims upon the state in terms of rights. As we have seen, he believed that the state should exist to fulfill the needs of its members, that, "the supreme consideration is man", (Young India, 1927) and that when the state ceases to perform services for its members which will fulfill their needs, then the individual has the duty to disobey and to resist. This duty has the force of prerogative. The Gandhian Philosophy of conflict makes duty imperative, but the technique of satyagraha assures the acquisition of right. The Gandhian conservatism - if, indeed, the description can be used at all - would lead directly out of and beyond the conservative effect into the newer liberalism, the result of which might look very much like the welfare state. But here again Gandhian affinity with Liberalism is controversial. On a more conceptual plane, Parel tries to rescue Gandhi's definition of liberty for liberalism. Gandhi has moved away from a Hindu of self-transcendence to a this-worldly fulfillment (though surely this was always there in the role ascribed to the householder), though it remains a spiritual ideal of self-realization. But we have stripped this individualism of its antisocial possessive aggressive and dominative attributes. Gandhi's political practice is one that "presupposes a liberal state one that

recognizes the sovereignty of rights.” “He concludes: he has a theory of liberal which combines negative liberty and positive liberty. This may not entitle him to belong to the Berlin school of liberalism. But that in itself should not disqualify him from starting a school of his own” (Parel, 2002, Pp.296-297).

Less anxious to tie Gandhi to liberalism, more conscious to the uniquely, Gandhian, Bhikhu Parekh would also see him as founding his own school (Parekh.1989, Pp.371-383). Gandhi's was “a radically individualistic view of man”, so much so that Gandhi saw no cause to define human nature as such. Each individual must be free, within the constraints of not harming others, to pursue his own Satya, or truth. It is worth quoting Parekh at length: - Not how to be absolutely free or fully autonomous but how to change in harmony with one's truth was the central moral problem for Gandhi, as for most Hindu Thinkers. Faced with a ceaselessly changing world, the self must change or risk disintegration..... The central problem of human life was how to change and yet “remain true to oneself” how to grow without losing one's ontological moorings, how to assimilate and integrate the new and constantly to reconstitute one's being. A wise man resisted attractive but impossible ideals, knew and lived within the limits of his constitution and strove for goals that accorded with his truth the art of living consisted in knowing how to become a whole being, an integrated person an individual in the strict sense of an undivided and unfragmented being (Ali, 1950, p.378).

At the end, in no sense would we recognize in Gandhi a libertarian, above all in terms of personal relationship and sexuality, of that outlook we identify with the “Personal is political” rebellion of the 1960s. However, Gandhi may have offered his own version of such a personalized politics. But nor would we right to see Gandhi as a latter-day Victorian, though India itself is in many ways still a hundred year's out of date in matters of sexual morality. Gandhi seems to identify little with the aspiration of India's middle class and

this inevitably takes him away from a tradition of bourgeois liberalism. He did not endorse for example, that crucial middle class distinction between a public and a domain: he seems indeed to have had little interest in the whole concept of privacy. His was a rather alarming moral intrusiveness into the private lives of others. He showed little interest in the workings of India's emergent parliamentary institutions, though was happy to leave to others the task of their development. If he saw the struggle for freedom in a political and social context, his was still essentially one for spiritual freedom. And in so far as this was driven by the pursuit of self-realization, it tends towards a positive paradigm of liberty and there are some what alarming monistic tendencies in its pursuit of the truth. But Gandhi always recognized the uncertainties of where truth lay, acted on the right of others to their own version of the truth—he tolerated the views of the swarajists, Jawaharlal Nehru, the congress socialists, though drew the line in 1939 with Subhas Bose and this crucially compensatory way he veers back towards the negative paradigm and becomes a more recognizably liberal thinker. It could be that there is an analogy to this spiritual quest within the framework of dharma to the pursuit of political freedom under the rule of law. Gandhi may speak to the condition of persons in the modern pluralist democracies of our day though his speech can feel oblique.

Gandhi was not a “full-fledged” liberal given his lack of intellectual rigour about why he advocated what he did. He had strong liberal inclinations and intuition but no vision for human freedom as a whole (at least not one in which the proper mechanisms of freedom were fully defined). He was clearly not a Hayek and did not even understand the great moral character of capitalism. This is evident from his theory of trusteeship through which he sought (in his mind) a ‘compromise’ between freedom and economic equality. Gandhi did not grasp that these objectives are mutually contradictory. And so he needlessly hit out against capitalism. He wrote “I desire to end capitalism, almost, if not quite, as much as the most advanced

socialist or even communist. He also diluted his concept of equality somewhat by saying, 'Economic equality of my conception does not mean that everyone would literally have the same amount. It simply means that everybody should have enough for his or her needs' (Harijan, 1946). He then proposed a via-media of sorts- the theory of trusteeship, whereby the rich [capitalists] would use their 'wealth for the welfare of the community' (Harijan, 1939).

Was Gandhi a Socialist then? Decentralization of a political and economical power, a skeptical approach towards technology and large scale industrialization with an emphasis on self employment and self reliance are key features of Gandhi socialism. It is often forgotten that Gandhi was not looking for any theories but was searching for a truthful path, one that helped people live together with love and tolerance. Hind Swaraj is not a theory but an idea, an ideal. It is useful for those who want solutions for their lives, not for those looking to impose their ideas on other people (Gandhi, 1939). According to Gandhi real socialism has been handed down to us by our ancestors who taught: "All land belongs to Gopal, where then is the boundary line? Man is the maker of that line and he can therefore unmaking it". Gopal literally means shepherd; it also means god. In modern language it means the state, i.e., the people. That the land today does not belong to the people is too true. But the fault is not in the teaching. It is in us who have not live up to it. "I have no doubt that we can make as good an approach to it as is possible for any nation, not excluding Russia, and that without violence" (Gandhi, 1937, p.375). "No man should have more land than we needs for dignified sustenance. Who can dispute the fact that the grinding poverty of the masses is due to their having no land that they can call their own?" (Gandhi, 1940, p.97). While it is difficult to typecast Gandhi's economic idea into any one particular model, there persists an enduring misconception that Gandhi was a socialist and Nehru's socialism was a legacy of Gandhi's thought. Yes he endorsed the spirit of socialism and in that sense he can be classified as socialist by

intent. However he had correctly seen several of the flaws in socialism when it was still very fashionable in that era. Though he does not use modern economic Jargon, the essence is exactly the same and the words he uses to express them are fascinating and reflect intellectual honesty. In spite of some similarity between the Marxian and Gandhian views on socialism, the violence as a means, advocated by the former, makes all differences. Marx treats men merely as means for achieving certain ends e.g. socialism and he approves the use of violence for achieving them. But Gandhi does not approve violence. He says that violent revolutions can succeed only in that country in which government is disorganized. The problem for Gandhi was as practical as it was for Marx. For both the criterion of truth lay in meeting human needs. Both Marx and Gandhi probed into the problem as participate observers and leaders of their respective movements. But the distinction emerges when we find that Marx accepted the philosophy of history, which defined the content of those needs and indicated their satisfaction. Gandhi, on the other hand, perceived the necessity for developing an approach, a tool and a form, whereby the content, i.e. substantial human needs, could be met and the truth (the relative truth in terms of substantial human need) of any situation could emerge. Gandhi rejected also the Hegelian concept of reality and reason. He agreed with Feuerbach saying that "man is the measure of reason".

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was one of the few in his generation who recognized the central role of women in society. Gandhi perceived women as playing a distinct but nevertheless a complementary role to men. While he argued against stereotyping them as weak and inferior and while he condemned child marriage, dowry and the observance of Purdah (Seclusion), he also believed that women were duty-bound to serve their husbands, families and country in that order. Mumbai based Tushar Gandhi, the great grandson of the Father of the Nation, puts it this ways: - "I would say that Bapu was a champion of gender equality. But the moral strength

that he imputes to women has an almost in born, genetic complexion to it, which bears little or no relation to the exploitation, humiliation and hardship that has been women's lot, historically speaking. Bapu remained fixed on the symbolism of the mother. He was a passive picture of womanhood, of a person who undoubtedly possessed freedom but functioned within narrow parameters and defined boundaries" (Gandhi, 1956). According to Barbara Southard, Gandhian feminism stands two major pillars ... "gender equality in all respects at every level and gender specific role + differentiation" (Southard, 1981, p.403). Gandhi once said, "The man should look to the maintenance of the family, the woman to household management, and the two thus supplementing and complementing each other's labours. Gandhian Philosophy on gender emphasizes that social expectations from men and women differ and in turn their responses and responsibilities in the public and private sphere are also different from each other. Commenting on gender equality, he quotes widely from Hindu Shastras (texts) and asks that if every soul originates from Braham, then where do differences between men and women arise? He stresses that it is not the gender, but the individual's soul that matters. Commenting on the ole of scriptures, Gandhi said that all written in Smritis is not divine as there are false interpolations (Harijan, 1936).

In his Colonialism, Tradition and Reform, and Gandhi's Political Philosophy Bhikhu Parekh argues that Gandhism did not merely seek to replace colonial rule with Swaraj or self-government, but to restore to India its past, its culture and tradition. He argues that Gandhi, suffered distortion and corruption in the melting pot of Colonial rule, and was threatened, not only by colonial autocracy and the racial cultural idioms of superiority associated with it, but by the invasion of a despotic rationalist modernity. Bhikhu Parekh holds that Gandhi's greatest contribution was his ability to resist the onslaught of modernism and rationalism which had influenced all other strategies of anti-colonialism, reform and nation-building in India. Parekh

credits Gandhi with having profoundly redefined Hinduism (turning), it upside down in a way that no one had done before in a way which 'outsmarted' the cunning of 'the Brahmans', thus Gandhi attempted to do for Hinduism what Martin Luther had done to Christianity. In this sense, he argues, Gandhi was a radical traditional and a cultural revolutionary. Gandhi's programme of religious politics was a complex experiment which envisaged the traditionalisation of reform, the radicalization of tradition and politicization of religion in his challenge to colonial domination. Such a man was Gandhi, a deliverer who was to carry India towards moksha (liberation). Thus, Parekh presents Gandhi to the reader as a dharmaraj (one who rules in the true spirit of dharma), and his programme of Swaraj as a quest for Ramrajya. He was no ordinary man, but one in a millennium, a yugapurusha (symbolizing an epoch and its deliverer) Gandhism, therefore, is represented as the philosophy of this epoch and Gandhi himself as the deliverer of the Kaliyug, in the same fashion as Rama was for the Satyuga and Krishna for the dwapar and tretayugas. His path was a unique one, in that it sought to use age old cultural resources to regenerate 'Indian ness' among Indians and humaneness among humans. Gandhism offers the most radical programme for the liberation of India (and through it, the world), for it is the only philosophy of the modern period which draws upon the entire fabric of India's heritage – spiritual and socio-psychological and even sexual. Gandhi's experiments with sexuality were directed towards finding ways to channel sexual energy into building the national character through moral salvation, ultimately seeking the transformation of the sensual into the spiritual. Parekh admits that Gandhi was unable to argue convincingly against the orthodox Hindu interpretation of the caste system, and its justification of untouchability. Bhikhu Parekh claims that Gandhi started his 'epic fast' against separate representation for the depressed classes in the communal Award, thousands of prominent Hindu women accepted food from the hands

of untouchables and that 'scenes' of inter-caste public dining were repeated in almost every village and every city of India.

The ambiguities of Gandhi's position on the caste question quite understandably caused untouchable leaders to be suspicious of his intentions, most noteworthy among these was B. R. Ambedkar almost in anticipation of Parekh's declaration that Gandhi was a *yugapurusha*, Ambedkar's book *What Congress and Gandhi Have Done to the Untouchables* ends with the question, "... The Untouchables have ground to say Good God! Is this man Gandhi our Saviour?" (Ambedkar, 1946). Not surprisingly, Parekh judges Ambedkar's account as 'biased and uneven'. Ambedkar found it difficult to accept as the deliverer of the untouchables the same Gandhi who held that the caste system was a worthy institution because the 'law of Varna prescribes that a person should, for his living, follow the lawful occupation of his forefathers' and who declared in the same vein that 'one born a scavenger must earn his livelihood by being a scavenger' (Harijan, 1937). If Gandhi's Harijan Andolan was essentially a strategy against the British attempt to divide the Hindus, Ambedkar's was undoubtedly sincere in his fight to restore dignity to his fellow untouchables. Parekh's assertion that 'no one before Gandhi mounted a frontal attack against untouchability' is itself biased and uneven in its outright dismissal of the role played by scheduled caste leaders like Ambedkar in seeking their own liberation. Parekh's assertion that Gandhi was the first to fight untouchability is curious, for he appears to be aware of the contradictions in Gandhi's position on the subject. For instance, Parekh is no stranger to the fact that Gandhi and the Congress failed to give Ranga Iyer's untouchability Bill their unconditional support on the flimsy pretext that he had not taken the Congress into confidence. Parekh acknowledges that Gandhi and the Congress adopted this posture out of the exigencies of electoral politics, from the fear of losing the 'votes of caste Hindus'. Yet Parekh does not take this point further, and does not attempt to provide a theoretical account of the relationship between Gandhian

moral discourse and political practice (Parekh, 1989). On the contrary, where the evidence fails to fit into Parekh's picture of Gandhi, he has, on occasion, altered it to match his argument. Thus, for instance, Parekh ascribes to Patel the statement that if the Communal Award were to stand, 'untouchable hooligans will make common cause with Muslim hooligans and kill caste Hindus' (Desai, 1953, p.301). when in fact, these were Gandhi's own words. Gandhi's position on the caste question no doubt was politically expedient, his statements arguing that 'a scavenger has the same status as a Brahmin' can be understood as sound politics in the particular historical context in which Gandhi was placed, his euphemistic populism reflected the prevailing structure of social domination to suggest, however, as Parekh does, that Gandhi's words have a universal value and provide valid solutions to India's problem today. Parekh's immense admiration for Gandhi allows him to admit occasionally that his hero made mistake, it does not, however, allow room for the idea that there may have been some legitimacy in the arguments of Gandhi's opponents. Thus he holds that Ambedkar was 'wrong to question

Everybody now knows that scientific and technological development is at the root of ecological crisis. And yet, people are taking resort to the same science and technology for a solution of the environmental problem. Gigantic efforts are being made for the management of this problem. But its magnitude and viciousness are defying any proper and satisfactory solution. The reason is quite obvious. The actors responsible for the problem continue to aggravate the situation with much faster pace than the effort to control it. There is no control and management of environmental pollutions and degradations. The permanent cure of this dreadful problem lies in a suitable alternative life style in tune with nature. People now do realize the truth of it but the naked materialism of modern civilization becomes a roadblock in putting it into practice. Gandhi has clearly perceived this solution. His indictment of the modern civilization in the Hind Swaraj was intended to caution mankind against this

calamity. He made a relevant appeal to the people of his countrymen not be trapped by the allurements of this civilization. He also wanted the western society against its ill effects. As a front leader of the Indian nationalist movement and a Visionary and Planner of society and political systems of India after Independence, he drew a blueprint which accordingly rejected the western model based on the scientific-technological culture. To Gandhi, the main plank of the modern civilization is the insatiable and unending pursuit of material pleasure and prosperity. All modern western socio-economic and political theories and institutions are based on this cardinal principle and people in other parts of the world are blindly imitating it. If the trend is not arrested and a suitable alternative to it provided, Gandhi believed, the result would be disastrous. For instance, the modern western economic development is flourishing on the extravagant utilization of the non-renewable resources i.e., coal, oil and metal. So long it was confined to a few western countries; it did not create that much of a problem. But when the whole world is involving in this never ending venture, this will play havoc with nature. Nature is a sine qua non of existence and if men interfere with it beyond a point, he will be doing it at the cost of his own existence. Perfect and meaningful existence is possible only in harmony and conformity with nature. Gandhi fully understood the primordially of man-nature relationship and his theory and philosophy of life, society and politics are in consonance with it. It is this understanding of, and, reverence for, the salience and senility of nature for human existence which makes him an environmentalist par excellence. He is not an environmentalist who will analyse the causes and consequences of depletion in the ozone layer. He is not competent to recommend measures against environmental pollutions and safeguards against all kinds of environmental hazards. He belongs to the school which believes in remedy rather than cure. In Plato's ideal state, there was no place for doctors, for he advocated the practice of a life style in which nobody would fall ill. Gandhi also subscribed to this line of thinking. He is a

propounded of a kind of life, culture and society which will never lead to environmental problems. The universe is based on certain principles and governed by interoperable laws of the creator. Man has potentiality to unfold them. However, undue interference in the system is replete with dangerous consequence. Every created thing has specific meaning and purpose and therefore its autonomy is to be respected and safeguarded. Interactions among created things and their mutual give and take sustain the universe system. Gandhi believed in this universal co-existence and subscribed to the principle of reverence for all life. His non-violence is this way is universal law of life and it manifests in love for all creatures. This is the basic principle of life and no human endeavor, individual or collective, social, economic or political, should be in conflict with it according to Gandhi.

Gandhi's entire life and deeds, indeed is an environmental bequest for whole mankind. This is not because he wrote big volumes of books on environment, led a people's movement to oppose the construction of large scale-dam project or spent his life-time for clearing Ganga or whatsoever, rather because he was a true practitioner of environmentally sustainable development in the real sense, by his personal life-style, he has adopted in his day to day life. Here is a being, which is in harmony and place with environment and himself, although his all life was spent locked in an unequal battle with the mighty British Empire. His strength came to him on account of his spirituality and practice of non-violence and truth. In wider sense, these are the critical elements for the success of practicing sustainable development in true spirit. In brief, his whole life, was his message and a lesson on "Protecting and Conserving Environment along with the development process", not only for Indians, but also for the whole world to follow at large. However it would be too much to read an anthropocentric line in Gandhi or elements of "Deep Ecology" without the seminal concept of Swaraj.

Modern is a form of thought that loves to dichotomize. It separates subjects from subject from objects, the inner from the outer, the private from the public, fact from value, individuals from their communities, and rights from responsibilities, procedural justice from the good and religion from science. Constructive Post-modernists wish to re-establish the post-modern harmony of humans, society and the sacred without losing the integrity of the individual, the possibility of meaning, and the intrinsic value of nature. Constructive Post-modernists want to preserve the concept of world view and propose to reconstruct one that avoids and propose to reconstruct one that avoids the liabilities of both post-modernism and modernism. One of Gandhi's most basic assumptions appears to be thoroughly modernist. This is his firm belief in the integrity of the individual; "the individual is the one supreme consideration", and "if the individual ceases to count, what is left of society"? (Harijan, 1942). The most extreme position in modern political philosophy is anarchism, and Gandhi shares its fear of the power of state: "It does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress" (Bose, 1972, p.63). For Gandhi individuals must act on their own truth regardless of the consequences and regardless of whether others think they are in error. This proviso is foundational to Gandhi's experiments with truth. This affirmation of the integrity and reality of the individual is the principal reason why Gandhi cannot relate to post-modern forms of thought such as Advaita Vedanta. If individuals are ultimately illusory or even derivatively real, the very foundations of Gandhi's engaged ethics and political activism are undermined.

One could also argue that even though he differed with other Indian nationalists, his own nationalism was modernist in its main points, especially if it is seen in connection with his anarchism and utopianism. But his views appear more communitarian and thus post-modern when, in *Hind Swaraj*. Gandhi makes a significant difference between a genuine nation formed as community (Prajā) and a nation of individuals merely held together by state power (rastra). As Anthony

Parel states, "Hind Swaraj does not propound the modern concept of nation in so far as the latter is based on the notions of brute force, the priority of national interest, and a principle of exclusiveness based either religion, or language, or race". Even the relatively innocuous state apparatus of liberal democracy does not escape Gandhi's critical eye. Although it is theoretically designed to do so, liberal democracies do not empower individuals, rather, as Bhikhu Parekh so aptly phrases it, they abstract "power from the people, concentrate it in the state and then return it to them in their new (abstract roles) as citizen". This critique holds true only for the morally neutral procedural liberalism that is now being reformed by thinkers such as Gamwell, Macedo and Galston. Parel's and Parekh's views of Gandhi's political philosophy allow us to get our first glimpse of a post-modern Gandhi. His views of the nation state is arguably post-modern in that it offers India as a model for a new type of polity, one which has already proved itself, with some unfortunate exceptions, to be a success in bringing sixteen different major language groups and six world religions together, not by brute force but by the rule of law and representative democracy. The centralized Indian federal government and its five year plans are of course something Gandhi would have strongly rejected. Gandhi's post-modern vision of nationhood is one based on decentralized local control, assimilation and tolerance of cultural differences, and above all, non-violence. The "decentering" the self and its national analogues is the crux of all post-modern philosophy. Gandhi's position, however, definitely does not go as far as Jacques Derrida's view, which has been described as a "radical form of democracy, one without representation, and therefore one in which even individuals' representations of them would be drawn constantly into question" (MacDonald,1990. P.230). Gandhi's commitment to civil disobedience also appears to be modernist and is intimately related to the issue of Gandhi's professed anarchism. Gandhi called his village republicanism a form of "enlightened anarchy" in which "everyone is own ruler". (From this angle Gandhi's

village does not appear communitarian at all.) He agrees with Henry David Thoreau that "Government is best that governs least", and he believed that government is a necessary evil. Close scrutiny of Thoreau's on civil Disobedience and the Gandhian texts reveal that neither thinker is an anarchist in any of the traditional senses. Gandhi spoke fervently of his village communities as ideal states, but he was keenly aware of human fallibility and the limits of reason, especially the calculative reason of modern mass political organization.

As Rudolphs (2006) have argued, in 1909 Europe and the US were approaching the apogee of the belief in progress. Confidence in the future abounded. Accomplishments in science and technology and the capacity to use them in benign and productive ways seemed to prove that humans could master and harness nature, and direct and control social change. Before the irrationality and carnage of World War I shattered the illusion that material and social progress was inevitable and benign, progress seemed as certain as it was palpable. In formulating his inner and outer critique of 'modern civilization' in *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi challenged this view of progress. In doing so he became an early contributor to the intellectual lineage of postmodernism. Further, Gandhi's view of relative truth anticipates the postmodern turn to the contingent certainty of contextual or situational truth. Rudolphs further argue that Gandhi's postmodern emphasis on human capital, decentralized production, and 'appropriate technology', challenged modernity's emphasis on physical capital and its efficiency when deployed in Fordist mass production assembly lines. Gandhi's view of machines gained ground too. He welcomed machines when they served rather than enslaved workers. Gandhi's praise for the Singer sewing machine as liberating and productivity enhancing suggests that he would have welcomed the computer and the information technology revolution. That revolution has made it possible to work at home in the kind of amenity-rich 'villages' that Gandhi imagined. This image of Postmodern Gandhi

however cannot be sustained. It is debatable that Gandhi would have approved the way computers have been used at the expense of a physically active life and unequal benefits of technology. In 1924 he observed (parel, 1997):

What I object to is the *craze* for machinery, not machinery as such. The craze is for what they call labour-saving machinery. Men go on "saving labour" till thousands are without work and thrown on the open streets to die of starvation. I want to save time and labour, not for a fraction of mankind, but for all. I want the concentration of wealth, not in the hands of the few, but in the hands of all. Today machinery merely helps a few to ride on the backs of millions. The impetus behind it all is not the philanthropy to save labour, but greed. It is against this constitution of things that I am fighting with all my might.

. . . . scientific truths and discoveries should first of all cease to be the mere instruments of greed. Then labourers will not be over-worked and machinery instead of becoming a hindrance will be a help. I am aiming, not at eradication of all machinery, but limitations . . .

The supreme consideration is man. The machine should not tend to make atrophied the limbs of man.

Moreover, Gandhi unlike the Post-modern did not recommend ethical relativism.

The Chapter Four of the thesis clearly revealed that conceptual resources of Gandhian political thought can be brought to bare on major areas of controversies in contemporary western liberal thought for a balanced understanding of the debates on freedom, justice, multiculturalism and so on. We did not find that Gandhian analysis of power/'anti power' can be constructed out of the theory and practice Gandhi in relation to modern Republicanism but found strong grounds to believe that there has to be an effort to enrich the Republican tradition of political theory by supplying the Indian

contribution to a predominantly West centric discourse. One cannot miss a very strong similarity between modern republicanism and Gandhi's approach to different ideologies, like the republican care commitment to the ideal of non-domination we have in Gandhi a continuous reference to "Swaraj", his alternative to everything that he saw around or confronted. Like modern republicanism Gandhi lay stress on pragmatism and wanted to explain the acceptability of this point of view to the others, not rejecting as a whole any argument but not accepting as well the argument as a whole. The very approach of critical acceptance and rejection of any point of views characteristics of Gandhi as well as modern republicanism could be clear from his discussion on the popular Hindu tradition and the western civilization. Neither of them he accepted in full nor did he reject any one as a whole. He criticized the practices what could be called popular Hinduism never rejected the Hindu system of Varnashram. He off course tried to remove untouchability but that he wanted to do by elevating "The Harijans" at best to the rank of the Sudras. May be he was pragmatic enough not to impose his views on the others who would go by the Varnashram system at any rate. He wanted to wreck it from within by encouraging for example inters caste marriage. (Parekh, 1989).

We have seen that Modern Republicanism does not reject anything as such but wants to supplement it with its own point of view. The same was true of Gandhi. Starting with the basic argument that political independence is not Swaraj he seen to have accepted gradually both the principles of modern state craft and technological practices as enhancement of "real freedom" of the individual. We have seen that modern republicanism has been engaging with Communitarianism, Feminism etc. in similar manner. The question is not what others have found valuable in Gandhi but how Gandhi tried to accommodate others point of view while remaining true to his basic commitment to the marginal man that talisman that he offered was indicative or the openness with Gandhi displayed to any ideology

which he formally does not accept but would be willing to accept only on one condition, if only it would be beneficial to the marginal man. Gandhi, in a correspondence with Nehru (Parel, 1997) rephrased his ideas in Hind Swaraj in the following way:

*But it is my bounden duty up to my last breath to try to protect India and through India the entire world from such a doom. The essence of what I have said is that man should rest content with what are his real needs and become self-sufficient. If he does not have this control he cannot save himself. After all the world is made up of individuals just as it is the drops that constitute the ocean. I have said nothing new. This is a well known truth.*

*But I do not think I have stated this in Hind Swaraj. While I admire modern science, I find that it is the old looked at in the true light of modern science which should be reclothed and refashioned aright. You must not imagine that I am envisaging our village life as it is today. The village of my dreams is still in my mind. After all every man lives in the world of his dreams. My ideal village will contain intelligent human beings. They will not live in dirt and darkness as animals. Men and women will be free and able to hold their own against any one in the world. There will be neither plague, nor cholera nor smallpox; no one will be idle, no one will wallow in luxury. Everyone will have to contribute his quota of manual labour. I do not want to draw a large scale picture in detail. It is possible to envisage railways, post and telegraph offices etc. For me it is material to obtain the real article and the rest will fit into the picture afterwards. If I let go the real thing, all else goes.*

Gandhi however did not accept the republican idea of "Antipower" very seriously. When he tried to connect his political philosophy with the political programme that he felt was necessary to make political independence meaningful he spent more time in developing a decentralised polity rather than creation of parallel constitutional authorities. When he found that Congress was lacking

necessary political direction after securing political independence he proposed a draft Constitution on January 29, 1948 wherein he said;

Though split into two, India having attained political independence through means devised by the Indian National Congress, the Congress in its present shape and form, i.e., as a propaganda vehicle and parliamentary machine, has outlived its use. India has still to attain social, moral and economic independence in terms of its seven hundred thousand villages as distinguished from its cities and towns....Though split into two, India having attained political independence through means devised by the Indian National Congress, the Congress in its present shape and form, i.e., as a propaganda vehicle and parliamentary machine, has outlived its use. India has still to attain social, moral and economic independence in terms of its seven hundred thousand villages as distinguished from its cities and towns.during pleasure, regulate and command all the groups.

(As the final formation of provinces or districts is still in a state of flux, no attempt has been made to divide this group of servants into provincial or district councils and jurisdiction over the whole of India has been vested in the group or groups that may have been formed at any given time. It should be noted that this body of servants derive their authority or power from service ungrudgingly and wisely done to their master, the whole of India.)

....The Sangh shall affiliate the following autonomous bodies:

A.I.SA.

A.I.V.IA.

Hindustani Talimi Sangh

Harijan Sevak Sangh

Goseva Sangh

There is in this a definite direction towards institutional innovation. But the innovation should be directed by what Gandhi understood as Swaraj that as self-rule means inner freedom or positive freedom. Gandhi's argument that without swaraj as self-rule swaraj as self-government could degenerate into state oppression even in the so-called liberal societies with otherwise robust condition of non-domination, is worth pondering. In this context his definition of satyagraha in chapter xvii of *Hind Swaraj* is of great value: satyagraha is 'a method of securing rights by personal suffering'. 'Rights' here has a liberal meaning, albeit a meaning according to Gandhi's concept of autonomy, which is that to every right there is a corresponding duty. And even though Gandhi's Freedom is not the same as Republican notion of Non-domination that by itself does not disqualify its being a kind of Republicanism. For there may well be a Republicanism with a Gandhian face, a Republicanism suited to the Indian environment. In so far as this is the case, *Hind Swaraj* may be compared and contrasted with such text as Petit's 'Republicanism'.

Gandhi, as Terchek (1998) has shown is the thinker par excellence of the twentieth century who has "problematized" the question of autonomy in its twofold sense, that is it is built around two notions-autonomy and struggle. Gandhi was of course dealing with the problem of securing autonomy for India and Indians. The obstacles they faced came from various sources-from their own tradition, from colonialism, and from modernity. Thus they had to struggle against, among others, the caste system, the numbing poverty of the masses, and the obscurantist interpretations of the Hindu tradition. The struggle against colonialism led Gandhi to reflect deeply on the nature of political power, its concentration in the modern state, the need to disperse it more broadly throughout society, and on the need to reform civil society itself, so that it could act better as a countervailing force against the state. Gandhi's struggle against modernity was subtle in that he accepted some of the good that modernity brought with it, namely the notions of individual rights and

national self-determination. At the same time he repudiated its all too great reliance on science and technology, and the appalling neglect of the spiritual nature of the human subject, and the elevation of the value of economics over every other value. This element of struggle is not the highlight of Republicanism. The notion of autonomy implicit in Gandhi is more encompassing than the notion of non-domination or anti-power. The harmonizing part of Gandhian argument however resembles the modern Republican engagement with contemporary ideologies more than any other contemporary ideological traditions. This at least has once more testified to endless charm and inexhaustible potential of Gandhian ideas for any serious political enterprise today and for tomorrow. If the present work stimulates a Republican exploration of Gandhi our effort of relating Gandhi to modern Republicanism will open a new vista to contemporary political theory.