

Chapter 2

GANDHI AND MODERN IDEOLOGIES

In this chapter, we will compare Gandhi's political ideas with some of the major modern political ideologies. We begin with Anarchism.

Ideals of Anarchism: - Anarchism is a political philosophy grounded in the repudiation of all constituted authority and the complete emancipation of the individual from all forms of control. Oscar Jaszi denies it as "an attempt to establish justice (that is, equality and reciprocity), in all human relations by the complete elimination of the State (or by the greatest possible minimization of its activity), and its replacement by an entirely free and spontaneous co-operation among individuals groups, regions and nations". Professor E. M. Burns thinks that anarchism is opposed to government based on force, correctly defined, he says, "Anarchism means opposition to government based upon force. No Anarchist with pretensions to philosophical understanding has ever proposed to dispense entirely with government. He condemns the state conceived as an agency of coercion with armies, jails and police, but he regards government as at least potentially a beneficent institution"(Burns, 1960, p.37). Anarchism, according to Coker, "is the doctrine that political authority, in any of its forms, is unnecessary and undesirable. In recent anarchism, theoretical opposition to the state has usually been associated with opposition to the institution of private property and also with hostility or organizes religious authority" (Coker, 1962, p.192).

The Greek word anarkhia considered as the root of the English word anarchism. Other scholars are of opinion that anarchism is derived from anarchia. According concise Dictionary of politics

anarchy means "absence of government, disorder and confusion". Utter lawlessness or complete disorder is used to indicate anarchy. However, the term anarchy is used to indicate several situations all of which mean lawlessness or disorder. In politics when a civilized society is deprived of civilized administration that is prevalence of rule of law and work of the government in accordance with the rules we call it anarchy. The contractualist thinker Hobbes portrayed an anarchical picture of the state of nature as the premises for building up a civil society. Anarchy is opposite to harmony. In order to indicate the absence of harmonious relationship among various sections of society the term anarchy is normally used.

The term used in politics does not differ considerably from the above meaning. Sebastien Faure defines it in the following way – "whoever denies authority and fight against it to is an anarchist." To deny authority and to propagate it continuously is called anarchism. Anarchism may be said a faith or belief. It is sometimes called an ideology. Of course all do not subscribe to the last meaning. The concise Dictionary of politics precisely says that the specialized usage of the word differs markedly from common usage, which takes anarchism as synonym for moral and political disorder. In general terms the word is used in a pejorative sense.

George Woodcock a well known authority on anarchism makes the following observation. "Historically anarchism is a doctrine which poses a criticism of existing society; view of a desirable future society, and a means of passing from one to another" (Woodcock, 1962, p.7).

The said authority further says that it is chiefly concerned with the relationship between man and society. When the normal, orderly and civilized relationship between man and society deteriorates or collapses it is considered as anarchy. Hence anarchy may be treated as an attitude to any particular situation.

Anarchy or anarchism is a normative concept because it is held that the prevailing condition about law and order and deteriorating condition between man and society is not desirable. Something better or different is desirable. To put it in other words, anarchism indicates that people are dissatisfied with the prevailing situation and condition and they desire something better than the existing one. So anarchism speaks of difference between present and future. Anarchism is also compared with nihilism. Nihilism means the abandonment of all current doctrines and faith. Anarchism also believes that prevailing political situation is not conducive to the development of individual's qualities and for that reason it is to be rejected. It is also identified with terrorism. Both regard, it is said, that the existing regulations and authority are harmful or unnecessary. Anarchism advocates for new system. But it is not quite proper to identify anarchism with terrorism. The latter is quite different. But terrorism and anarchism are not identical terms, there are a number of differences (Das, 2006, Pp.507-508).

Anarchism is considered essentially a modern ideology, arising after and in opposition to the modern state. Though there are significant anticipations of anarchism in earlier philosophy (notably in Stoicism and Taoism), and while there are worthwhile examples of early anarchistic societies, the main intellectual work begins only in the late eighteenth century with the out break of the French Revolution.

Origin of Anarchism: - Generally French Revolution is regarded as the origin of anarchism or anarchist thought. During the revolutionary period common people squatted on the streets and agitated against the failure of the government to check the sky rocketing situation of food prices. They also demanded the overthrow of the Girondins and the establishment of the Jacobin dictatorship. In fact, during the Revolution there was no normal condition of law and order and

harmonious relationship; between the ruler and the ruled. There was practically no authority to implement the existing rules and regulations because people lost their faith on these rules. They believed that these could not serve their purpose and on that ground they violated the rules. In other words people reached the end point of their patience. To explain this situation the term anarchy was used. It has been observed by James Joll (*The Anarchists*) that the anarchists was the term adopted by Robespierre to attack those people on the left whom he had used for his own ends but whom he was determined to be rid of.

Originally the term anarchism was associated with the dismal economic situation. It was said that when ordinary men were deprived of day to day necessities and the prices of necessary goods were beyond their reach that could not be considered as a normal condition. It was definitely an anarchical situation. Anarchy also meant the absence of law and order in every sphere of life and that was clearly evident during the French Revolution. Subsequently the term gained wide publicity and became a part of political ideology.

Basic Concepts of Anarchism:- It is very difficult to state in a precise form the basic tenets or concepts of anarchism because of the fact that there is no single exponent of the theory. Woodcock has rightly said – “To describe the essential theory of anarchism is rather like trying to grapple with proteins for the very nature of libertarian attitude – its rejection of dogmas, its deliberate avoidance of rigidly systematic theory and above all its stress on extreme freedom of choice and on the primacy of individual judgment – creates immediately the possibility of a variety of view points inconceivable in a closely dogmatic system” (Woodcock, 1962, p. 10). Several exponent of the doctrine have stated the theory in their own ways which have created a lot of confusion about it. In spite of this primary problem certain basic concepts have been devised.

Anarchism stats that individual is the sovereign and he is the sole determiner of everything. Any sort of intervention in his affairs will be treated as harmful and undesirable. So anarchism may be regarded as an extreme form of individualism or liberalism. Both these do not recognize the importance of state or any other organization.

Anarchist theory of individualism is a different one. It never says that individual is a completely isolated unit and selfish. Rather he is cooperative minded. Like Bentham's utilitarianism he does not think of his own good at the cost of other's good. He gives priority to both and affects a compromise.

Anarchism believes that development of the inherent qualities of the individual is possible only through the recognition of his sovereign status. The meddling of any other authority or organization can achieve his goal. This is because of the fact that according to the anarchist thinker's individual is quite reasonable and he understands what is good and what is bad. So the individual should be left alone and if done so that will generate greatest welfare in the society.

There are some extreme anarchists and Max Stirner (1806 – 1856) is one of them. He says that each person should be given unrestricted freedom to do whatever he likes because in this way he can develop his own intellectual capacity. He is the centre of all activities and he is responsible for everything. Max Stirner rules out any sort of state interference in the affairs of individual. For this reason he is called an extreme anarchist.

Anarchism cannot recognize and tolerate collectivism or communism since they derecognize individual's worth and importance in the development of society and mobilization of resources. This view has been held by Benjamin Tucker (1854-1939). Tucker advocates no compromise with collectivism or communism.

Anarchism has laid great confidence upon the reasonability of individuals. The doctrine stresses that there shall be laws and regulations in any society but the individuals will on their own accord obey these laws.

Anarchism envisages an all round social progress but the only actor of this process will be the individual and not the state.

It is the anarchist belief that the state is the manifestation of supreme coercive power and violence and the sole usurper of individual liberty. The coercion deprives persons of their spontaneity and by doing this destroy their urge to do constructive work. The state is thus an enemy of individual's progress.

According to anarchism modern state is complex machinery. The machinery is so complicate that it is beyond the capacity of ordinary men to be acquainted with its functions. Such a state can not do any benefit for the common people. The state machinery is controlled by few intelligent people. In this way alienation is created between different classes.

Anarchists hold the view that modern society is the product of evolution. Naturally human actor cannot exist behind its management. This view of the anarchists goes against the social contract theory which believes the contribution of human factor behind the origin of state or society. If so every society shall be emancipated from the control of higher authority. The anarchists have also dealt with the organization of society. They have said that the society will be organized in the line of mutualism. Proudhon has defined the term mutuality as involving and constituting economic right or the application of justice to political economy. "In terms of organization society would be composed of workers' associations or cooperatives. Within each mutualist association the workers would be joint owners of the productive apparatus and entitled to a share in its

product. Each mutualist cooperative would exchange its product with other cooperatives. They would develop their skills and educate themselves" (Schwarzmantel, 1987, Pp. 242-243).

Varieties and options within Anarchism

Historically anarchism falls into two school – those who are individualists and those who have combined anarchism with socialism.

Though anarchism came into prominence in the 19th century, it had its roots in the past. The protestant principle of private judgment was an early manifestation of the extreme repudiation of traditional and social discipline in the name of the individual conscience, and the Anabaptists of Luther's name, followed by the quakers and others of the "free Churches" in Europe and America, have been the principal exponents of this idea. During the eighteenth century Enlightenment the idea of individual self-realization in opposition to pressures for political and religious conformity made its appearance, notably, in the writings of Rousseau, Kant, Fichte and Godwin. From these and other forerunners the more systematic anarchist thinkers of the nineteen century borrowed heavily. Among the most influential of these were the Frenchman Proudhon, the German Max Stirner and the Russians Mikhail Bakunin and Prince Alexander Kropotkin. The first two were especially important for their exposition of the philosophical foundations of the doctrine, while the latter two were primarily organizers and publicists. Bakunin was largely responsible for making anarchism popular among the working classes. He was a rival of Marx, who finally secured the expulsion of the anarchists from the socialist movement.

Max Stirner who is regarded as the foremost of the individualistic anarchists held that the individual was the only reality. The individual is entitled to freedom including the freedom to own and

dispose of property, and hence he is entitled to overthrow any authority established without his consent. In the United States, Josiah Warren and Benjamin Tucker popularized this doctrine, but it failed to make much headway in the country.

As a distinct socio-political theory, however, it is socialist anarchism that is important. The socialist anarchists condemned the institution of private property. Proudhon, the father of anarchism, characterized property as "theft." Bakunin and Prince Kropotkin considered private property as the source of injustice. All of them held that the state is an evil, which upholds property and protects the system of capitalist exploitation. In general, they visualized a state of society in which there will exist no property, no state, it is free society, from which all classes have disappeared. Society itself will own all materials and instruments of production, and every one shall work and enjoy the fruits of his labour and equal terms. It can be established by the formation of secret societies which shall organize violence and terrorism and destroy the state.

The doctrine of anarchism, though insignificant today, inspired a militant working class movement during the second half of the nineteenth century in Europe, gaining adherents especially in Italy, France, Spain and Russia. In the latter country the movement became identified with the terrorist strategy of the Nihilists. Rejecting all possibility of reforming the Czarist autocracy, the Russian anarchists instead tried to attack authority at its roots by direct action which typically involved the assassination of Czars and leading statesmen. By accepting the risk of being destroyed with their victims or incurring extreme punishment, if apprehended, the anarchists hoped to dramatize their struggle as one of heroic self-sacrifice. They also calculated that the rulers might be frightened into imposing such repressive police measures that government would become intolerable to all citizens, thus bringing about wholesale conversions to the

anarchist cause. Apart from their conviction that existing society could only be redeemed in “the purifying fires of violence”, the anarchists had only the most general notion of what would follow the revolution. They hoped merely that a renewed human nature, purged of its deadly proclivities toward domination and acquisitiveness, would spontaneously evolve new arrangements for collective living that would leave the individual completely free from all eternal regulations.

Anarchist ideas were very important in the Syndicalist movement, associated particularly with Georges Sorel and with labour organizations like the French confederation Generale du Travail and the International workers of the world in the United States. At present, anarchistic tactics may have been adopted by some minority sections of the “left movement” in some countries; but anarchist as a social and political doctrine is now a dead theory (Bhattacharyya, 2006, Pp. 396 to 397).

There are several recognized varieties of anarchism, among them; individualistic anarchism, anarcho-Capitalisms, anarcho-Communisms, mutualism, anarcho-Syndicalisms, libertarian Socialisms, Social anarchisms and now eco-anarchisms., these varieties are not particularly well characterized. They are by no means at all mutually exclusive. So far even a satisfactory classification is lacking. Usually something of a ragbag is offered. Textbooks single out of a very few varieties for scrutiny, invariably leaving out others that are as important.

Thus there is much anarchism, a rich variety of different types, some of them scarcely investigated or known. That anarchism composes such a plurality has proved puzzling to those who assume it must be a single ideology, either individual or collective. Indeed, the pluralist character of anarchism has led even apparently sympathetic critics to wonder whether anarchism is really an ideology at all, or merely a jumble of beliefs ... (Miller, 1984, p. 3).

Of course, the impression that anarchism is amorphous and full of paradoxes and contradictions is marvelously assisted by conflating degenerate anarchism and diluted anarchism with unadulterated anarchism, chaos with order, individualistic anarchism with socialistic with holistic ones, and so on. By properly regarding anarchism under a standard model of pluralism as a sheaf of overlapping types assembled around a core characterization, the problematic elements of anarchism as an ideology disappear. No doubt it is not an ideology like Marxism, but then Marxism is atypical in its set of paradigmatic texts, concentrated in the works of the master. Other ideologies such as liberalism or environmentalism afford better comparisons. While anarchism is an ideology (in both good and bad sense), it is not really a movement. There is not, anywhere really, such a movement in the way there has been a succession of liberation movements or there is a peace or a green movement.

Anarchists – over attracted, like others, to monistic schemes – have regularly attempted to advance their own schemes by introducing many further postulates that reach far beyond anything that flows simply from the basic characterization of anarchism. Some examples of optimal, and rejectable, extras from a recent anarchist manifesto including ...direct democracy, destruction of all hierarchies, maximization of freedom, total Revolution, no ends means distinction, no leaders, optimism about an anarchist future (Most of this Australian student manifesto may be sourced not only in classic anarchism but in recent work, e.g. Bookchin, 1989). But genuine anarchists are not bound by any of that.

Because of the expansive pluralism of anarchism, it overlaps many other ideologies. Indeed, it overlaps all that do not include, as a theme, unmitigated commitment to a state or like central coercive authority. Thus, while anarchism excludes fascism and is

incompatible with state capitalism, anarchism overlaps liberalism, democracy and even Marxism (since Marxism affords a future anarchism). There has been much confusion about these interrelations.

Anarchism does not entail democracy, as is sometimes claimed; advice of a select minority or of a sage could regularly be adopted, though the advice did not reflect the will of the people and its source was not elected or appointed by the people. Nor does anarchism entail the negation of democracy (Daul, 1989, p.50) it does not entail undemocratic procedures. There are, in the plurality of anarchism, forms that are democratic, in various ways, and others that are undemocratic. Democratic forms may well enjoy a better prospect of enabling genuine democracy than lie under the state. For as some have argued, "both the nation state and electoral democracy are inadequate as vehicles for democracy under modern conditions (Buruheim, 1985, p. 218).

Though there are many different strands that can be interwoven through the pluralistic out-fall from the basic characterization of anarchism, there are some broad tendencies common to virtually all anarchistic arrangements. These include ----

Reliance on self regulatory methods of organization that requires little or no intervention, as opposed towards centralism or paternalism. (This is one reason why markets are often favoured, but analogues of centralized control and coercive legal systems are rarely considered except in diluted forms).

Emphasis on voluntary methods, in place of imposed methods (Coercive methods are of course excluded by virtue of basic characterization, de facto power may remain, of course, but it will be without justification).

Favouring of de-centralization and de-concentration, rather than centralized or concentrated structures, (That does not imply there can be no downward relations, of course, under federal arrangements there will be and natural sideways relations as well, amounting to a full control system).

Discouragement of empowerment, encouragement of de-empowerment, with opposition to oppression and domination as a corollary.

But although each type of anarchist society will have such organizational features, they will differ in detail. A main distributional feature of a simple communist society may comprise a common storehouse from which members take according to need, whereas in a simple individualist society distribution will typically proceed through some sort of market exchange. More generally, different types of anarchism will offer different economic theories (Goodin and Pettit, 1998, Pp.231-239).

Anarchism in Modern Time:-

Though anarchism like Marxism failed to create a lasting impact upon the mind of the academics, it cannot be said that as an ism it completely failed. In the earlier decades of the 20th century the revival of anarchism does not surprise us at all. "Gandhi (1869-1948) and his followers responded to Kropotkin's populist message and his ideas of natural village communities spontaneously springing up Oscar Wilde was impressed by his personality and message" (Joll, 1979, p.142). Thus is an indication of the fact that the main tenets of anarchism did not die down. In several West European countries we witness the continuity of anarchist thought.

Gandhi and Anarchism

In modern political philosophy Gandhi stands apart for his unique concept of social transformation and development which

avoids standard western stereo-type ideas of change. Gandhi did not subscribe to western ideas of either legal constitutional reform or socialist revolutionary action of class war. Gandhi instead emphasized non-violent method of change to attain a society based upon truth and justice. As a philosophical anthropologist Gandhi's approach is different from others. Not man but cosmos was his starting point. Gandhi maintained that since the cosmic spirit informed and structured the universe, all creation was divine and one. Human society was similarly structured. Gandhi's theory of self was the basic of his epistemological, moral and social pluralism. Gandhi was not a system builder but with great understanding and insight, he could bring about the scheme of his concepts in an appropriate and relevant manner so as to suit the modern requirements (Veerraju, 1999, p. 91).

Gandhi makes inroads to social awareness by means of introducing the spinning wheel. It serves the twice fold purpose of mankind the right use of time and energy, arresting idleness and other social ill and simulating the true social spirit of cooperation and harmony in one and all (Chakraborty", 2000, p.7).

Gandhi believed that self-realization or God-realization was the highest goal that human could set for him. In the course of his life, he made it abundantly clear that the paramount goal of his life was this very realization or the realization of truth as God or Moksha (Varma, 2006, p. 5).

Gandhian Sarvodaya is not a mechanistic or deterministic manual but an ideal for human kind, for individual and social relationships and for human ecological relationship in varied and changing circumstances. It enunciates principles and sets the direction approaches and guidelines (Vittickal, 2002, p.11). Gandhi presents a balance view of life. Wealth, Power, Pleasure, aesthetic beauty, ethical integrity and freedom of spirit, these are goals that all

Indian seek. Gandhi explains how and why that seeking should be the basis of modern Indian Philosophy (Parel, 2002, p. 21).

In fact, the aim is to create an intellectual awareness amongst the people at large to view him as a moral preceptor symbolizing all that was best or valuable in the rich traditional cultural India on the eve of the Western encounter. The idea of Swaraj, the principles of Satyagraha and non-violence and their evolution in the context of anti-imperial movements organized by Gandhi, looking at how these precepts underwent change reflecting the ideological beliefs of the participants.

In the realm of political thought it is substantially easier to say what Gandhi was than what he was not. He was in one sense a conservative, in another a philosophical anarchist, he was on the one hand a socialist, and on the other hand a capitalist and yet again he was a primitive communist. For each of these assertions some evidence can be called from his writings and speeches. He belongs at once to all these camps and to none of them. For whatever else may be said of him, Gandhi was not a political theorist. He entered the practical realm suggested by one political creed only to make his own constructions and move into the next. It is inaccurate as it is insufficient to infer that he wished only the idealization of system. Gandhi saw at every hand the inequalities and imperfections of political and social organization. He raised, then, question of how but only occasionally those of what. Gandhi was, in the judgment of the man best qualified to assess his impact upon the Indian scene, “the greatest revolutionary” India has yet produced. Jawaharlal Nehru has said, “He brought about great changes and this is revolution”. Gandhi set on to transform the social and political system in which he found himself. An abiding awareness of social and political disabilities had first been forced upon him in South Africa. As he forged the tools with which he could fight such disabilities, he did not concern himself with

questions of ideal, social and political organization. It is possible that more than one “ideal” system could be formulated to meet Gandhi’s requirements. But essential to such a system would be a non-violent socio-political technique of action in the hand of the member of that society. Gandhi himself had “purposely refrained from dealing with the nature of Government in a society based on non-violence”, he wrote in 1939 (Bondurant, 1988).

Gandhi’s political philosophy is, indeed, elusive. If one is to understand the significance of Gandhi’s “experiments” for political thought, he must focus upon the potential of a dynamic end-crating method. To think of Gandhi and communism or of Gandhi as a conservative or of Anarchist element of Gandhian thought to think in this manner of Gandhi will bear little fruit. One must frame the questions in terms of conservatism or communism or Anarchism or capitalism or any other “ism” plus Satyagraha to discover the potential of the Gandhian approach. For the introduction of Satyagraha into any system would necessarily effect modification of that system. It could after the customary exercise of power and bring about redistribution and a resettling of authority. Satyagraha would guarantee the adoption of the system to citizen demands and would serve as an instrument of social change. The implications of the role which Satyagraha might play within a system of political thought will be suggested in the course of analyzing two of the most common classifications of the thought of Gandhi. It has frequently been said that Gandhi was a conservative or the other hand; there are those who place him within some school of philosophical Anarchism.

Gandhi had close acquaintance with Tolstoy who was a believer in Anarchism. Moreover there have been a number of similarities between Gandhism and Anarchism. Both express distrust for the state and demand its abolition. Gandhi was critical of the state because state represents violence in a concentrated form. Both favoured village

society instead of industrial society. For these reason Gandhi often is described as an anarchist. Instead of using the tem “Anarchist”, one could call Gandhi a “Communitarian”, a term that is commonly listed by today’s post modern political thinker (Gier, 2004). Bondurant uses the term “Philosophical Anarchism” (Bondurant, 1988).

The objective of Gandhi was to attain truth while Anarchist believes in absolute liberty which Gandhi opposed. The Gandhian approach points the way towards reconcile political organization with the ideas of Anarchism. C. Sankaran Nair in his book “Gandhi and Anarchy” (1972), described about Gandhi’s philosophy and ideas of Anarchism in India, Gandhi himself and subsequently Jayaprakash Narayan and Vinoba Bhave have dreamed basing Indian society or self – sufficient, self governing village republic. Both Gandhi and J. P. Narayan were dead against the sovereign power of state. They have denounced the western type of absolute sovereignty and in support of their contention they recommended decentralization of power to the grass root levels. Gandhi viewed state as embodiment o violence and coercion. For that very reason they have strongly advocated for the establishment of village republic or Gram Panchayat system which will ensure peoples participation in all affairs. Anarchists also hold the views that modern state is complex machinery. The machinery is so complicated that it is beyond the capacity of ordinary men to be acquainted with its functions. Such a state cannot any benefit for the common people. The state machinery controlled by the few intelligent persons. In this way alienation is created between different classes (Woodcock, 1962).

Both Gandhi and Anarchists has stressed upon the importance of mass movement. Even today we cannot deny its importance. Only the spontaneous mass movements are able to keep the state power within limits. Both Gandhi and Anarchists are extremely critical of the large-scale industrial enterprises (Das, 2006, p.535).

In one of the few analytical works on Gandhian political thought G.N. Dhawan asserts that Gandhi was a Philosophical anarchist. He reminds us that Gandhi strove for “the greatest good of all” and held that this end could be realized “only in the classless and stateless democracy of autonomous village communities based on non- violence instead of coercion, on service instead of exploitation, or renunciation instead of acquisitiveness and on the largest measure of local individual initiative instead of centralization”(Ibid, p.3).

Dhawan suggests further that where Gandhi did condone a degree of state organization he did so because he believed that an anarchical society was ideal but unattainable. He therefore sought to mitigate the oppressive nature of the state organization and to reduce government to the barest minimum. Dhawan shows the anarchist trend in Gandhi’s position, but he overlooks the key to “Gandhian anarchism” and fails to formulate the significance of the Gandhian modification at work upon a familiar political approach. I shall try to show that the Gandhi approach points the way towards reconciling political organization with the ideals of anarchism. The maximum cooperation of individuals operating through an organization based not upon the violent force of the state, but upon a non- violent sanction supplied by satyagraha, allows for the realization of the fundamental objectives of anarchism. Dhawan errs first in not recognizing the relative unimportance of end- structure in the Gandhian approach to the state, and again when he suggests that Gandhi’s democracy would be “...Based on non-violence instead of coercion...” for in the Gandhian ideal an element of Coercion is, in fact, retained. The distinguishing character of that Coercion is its non-violence.

In western political thought there have been seven distinct schools of anarchism, ranging from the irrational, and intuitionist

egoism of Max Sterner to the empirical, rational, evolutionary communism of Peter Kropotkin.

Anarchists firmly hold the undesirability of a state organization. They urge the necessary superiority of voluntary association or mutualist agreement. They differ from those political philosophers who hope that freedom will be won after the establishment of certain economic principles or programs, by insisting that freedom is a fundamental condition upon which all else must follow. They urge freedom from politics, rather than political freedom. Beyond these essential characteristics there is considerable variation among the several anarchist schools of thought. Gandhian thought stands in opposition to that at Bakunin, who considered direct violent action necessary to abolish the state. It is important that the extent at agreement with the Christian anarchists as exemplified by Tolstoy and the dissimilarity between Gandhian associationist thought and the prudhonian theory of "mutuality" Finally, We shall discover the essential contribution which Gandhi has made, how it solves the anarchist dilemma and points to success where anarchist program have failed. In a conversation reported by Mahadev Desai, Gandhi asserted that "a society organized and run on the basis of complete non-violence would be the purest anarchy "when asked if he considered this a realizable ideal, he replied; -

"Yes, it is realizable to the extent non-violence is realizable. That state is perfect and non-violent where the people are governed the least. The nearest approach to purest anarchy would be a democracy based on non-violence. The European democracies are to my mind a negation of democracy" (Bose, 1947, p.69).

Now it is clear that by a "democracy based on non-violence" Gandhi referred to a social and political structure developed through voluntary association "society based on non-violence", he said "can only consist at groups settled in villages in which voluntary

cooperation is the condition of dignified and peaceful existence" (Bose, 1947, p.69).

Gandhi agreed with the anarchist emphasis upon the individual. Gandhi held that "no society can possibly be built on a denial of individual freedom" (Harijan, February 1, 1942).

In a interview with N.K. Bose , he made explicit his fear of the state and the danger to the individual at an increase in state power :-
Q. then, sir, shall we take it that the fundamental difference between you and the socialists is that you believe that men live more by self-direction or will than by habit, and they believe that men live more by habit than by will that being the reason why you strive for self-correction, while they try to build up a system under which men will find it impossible to exercise their desire of exploiting others?

While admitting that man actually lives by habit, I hold it is better for him to live by exercise of the will. I also believe that men are capable of developing their will to a extent that will reduce exploitation to a minimum. I look upon an increase in the power at the state with the greatest fear, because, although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress" (Bose,1947). It is in Gandhi's approach to the individual vis-à-vis society and his especial interpretation of individualism that we find a distinct difference between Gandhi and that school of anarchism which follows Proudhon in his concept of "mutuality". For Gandhi individuality is necessarily accompanied in any non-violent organization by service to the group. We recall Gandhi's assertion, "I value individual freedom, but you must not forget that man is essentially a social being" and his reminder that man has risen to the present status by learning to adjust his individualism to the requirement of social progress (Harijan, May 27, 1939).

Service to the group without demand for return without suggestion of a necessary reciprocity is central in the Gandhian approach. It is a position directly opposed to Proudhon's doctrine of mutuality. Proudhon define his concept of mutuality "rather in an exchange of good services and products than in a grouping together of forces and in a community of labours" (Scantlebury, 1948, Pp.214-215). The concept is further described as a "reciprocity of services", based upon a "reciprocity of respect" which carries into the real order of economics the principle governing personal relations among individuals themselves... "Mutuality then is a different thing from association and it is clearly different from Gandhi's conception of a society organized on the basis of a functioning non-violent sanction. Instead of transforming the social order into a community, Proudhon would have society become a "vast network of organized exchange" (Scantlebury, 1948, p.215). Service for service, produce for produce, loan, assurance for assurance, credit for credit, security for security, guarantee for guarantee, etc. it is the ancient talion, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life, in a way reversed, transferred from the criminal law and the atrocious practices of the vendetta to the economic law, to the works of labour and the good offices of the Fraternity (Proudhon, 1948, p.215).

For Proudhon Individual rights were everything. The one norm which Proudhon set above all else and indeed, the only norm he recognized, was *pacta sunt servanda* -agreements are binding. In a societal network of individual agreements Proudhon found the solution to the problem of unity. Everywhere else he saw only "the materialism at the group, the hypocrisy of association, and the weighted fetters at the state'. It was only through his pattern of individual agreements that Proudhon could hope to find "the real brotherhood" (Proudhon, 1948, p.216). Proudhon recognized, as did Gandhi, the "Social bond" as the underlying principle of the "political"

order. But Proudhon's emphasis on the "social Bond" as uniting "reasonable and free creatures" held the ideal to be that- of freedom from all constraint. This suggests that Proudhon might have disagreed with Gandhi's Principle of Satyagraha. For in Satyagraha there is a force capable of operating to effect constraint.

It is at just this point that Gandhian thought is most fundamentally non-anarchist. (This is not to say that it is anti-anarchist.) And it is in the coercive possibilities of the technique of satyagraha that Gandhian doctrine stands where anarchism is not simply an idealization of chaos. For the "no authority" concept which is control to the theory of anarchism issues ideally in complete freedom of individual action against which there is to be no restraining force. The anarchist usually professes an abiding in the essential goodness or reasonableness of man is supporting his belief that societal life can proceed without external sanction. For Kropotkin, the element which assured order resulting from freedom was a sense of reasonable "social Solidarity ... "a formulation of the basic nature of man through which the principle of mutual aid necessarily operated. And for Proudhon, freedom was the mother, not the daughter of order". Once more we find that Gandhi could agree with this essential of anarchism if we add to it the technique of Satyagraha to utilize man's good and reasonable nature.

Now if anarchists oppose constraint because constraint by necessity implies violence, then we may suggest that they could, without contradiction, accept the Gandhian introduction of a coercion characterized by non-violence.(there is no evidence that they have , hitherto considered constraint to be possible without violence.) it is significant that one of the most serious failings of anarchists lies in their repeated resort to violence in attempting the annihilation of the system which they hold to be the root of societal evil. Their argument against authority usually centers upon and always entails opposition

to violence itself and the resulting destructiveness, for the individual. Of the state and of government based upon violence. But anarchists have no positive alternative. It was a weakness perceived by two outstanding anarchists in America, Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, who, after persistent efforts to propagate the abolition of government through violence, recognized that the method had failed. Even those anarchists who opposed violence as a method had only a negative solution of withdrawal from the existing state organization, and their efforts to establish anarchists' communities suffered from the failure to develop a method of active resistance. Anarchists may claim a positive philosophy, but they, like other political theorists, have rarely sought a positive technique where by a system could be realized. William Godwin, whose work *An Enquiry concerning political justice* is considered the first systematic exposition of anarchism, to find a suggestion which appears familiar to the Gandhian approach of non-violent action. Godwin's insistence upon the priority of individual "Private Judgment," it is again suggested in his insistence upon the propagation of truth through discussion. "The only substantial method for the propagation of truth," he reasoned, "is discussion so that errors of one man may be detected by the acuteness and severe disquisition of his neighbours" (Godwin, 1926, p.120).

Having rejected force as "Scarcely under any circumstances to be employed," he went on to ask "of what nature is that resistance which ought constantly to be given to every instance of injustice?" Godwin's answer followed: "the resistance I am bound to employ is that of uttering the truth, of censuring in the most explicit manner every proceeding that I perceived to be adverse to the true interests of mankind," (Ibid, P.129). In this political Justice, Godwin emphasized the necessity for gradual and non-violent elimination of political institution. That the process should be gradual and non-violent is an

aspect of Godwin usually neglected in commentaries on his political thought (Priestly, 1946, p.49). Indeed, non-violent and gradual procedure is popularly considered to be antithetical to anarchist doctrine. This follows from the tendency to regard Bakunin and the anarchist development subsequent to the split in second International as representative of essential anarchism. However there are other branches of anarchist thought, for anarchism is a Philosophy which has in many ages and in many places attracted Philosophers of politics. Among the Christian anarchists, Tolstoy is perhaps the most notable. In addition to his emphasis upon non-violent, non-resistant efforts to negate the state, Tolstoy assigned to reason a primary role. Man cannot deny reason by the use of reason, Tolstoy need, for reason which "illuminates our life and impels us to modify our action, is not an illusion and its authority can never be denied." Tolstoy took as "the substance of the teaching of all the masters of humanity" the injunction "to obey reason in the pursuit of good" (Tolstoy, 1885, p.124). In Gandhian thought, as in all anarchist thought, there is an effort to dispense with government. For Godwin, as for Tolstoy, as for Gandhi, the problem became one of how and to what extent government can be eliminated. Gandhi could agree whole heartedly with Godwin's assertions regarding political authority, that all men have the faculty of reason that no man is to preside over the rest that government is for the security of individuals, so that each man should have a share in providing for his own security, and that exercise of private Judgment and public deliberation are essential (Godwin, 1926, p.100). He would also agree that "Private judgment and public deliberation are not themselves the standard of moral right and wrong; they are only the means of discovering right and wrong..." (Ibid, 1937). The contribution of Gandhi lays his transformation of just such principles as these into the dynamic technique of action, satyagraha.

There are many other points of similarity between Gandhian thought and Godwin's political Justice. Priestley's statement that "Godwin's economic thought, like his politics. Is a branch of moral Philosophy, "and further, that "he is not concerned with economic problems as such, but with the correlated problems of morals and politics," (Priestly, 1946, p.62) Applies equally well- to Gandhi. It may, of course, be added that Gandhi was much more directly concerned with the practical aspects of the economic well-being of his fellow-man than was Godwin. There are many further points of similarity between Gandhian thought and Godwin political Justice. Gandhi's emphasis was consistently upon individual effort, local reform, and village-centered activity. He worked towards a societal organization based upon decentralized village industries and self- sufficient rural communities. Swaraj (Self rule) implied something beyond independence for India- it carried the meaning of an all- embracing self- sufficiency down to the village level. self- sufficiency translated into a concrete program of action in the Indian circumstances-led to the Swadeshi (home production) movement, and the central effort during the years of the nationalist struggle for Swaraj lay in the propagation of Khadi (hand-spun cloth). Swadeshi not only served an economic function in the actual supply of cloth, it also carried significant ideological implications.

Where orthodox anarchist most seriously failed- in supplying a positive alternative program of social organization- Gandhi again met with a measure of success. The constructive program was an essential component of the Gandhian revolution struggle for Indian independence. It was the constructive program which gave content to the Satyagraha frame work and applied Gandhian principles to the Indian circumstance this program, designed for conditions peculiar to the time and place, was subject to revision and adapted to changing conditions. In general, the program included the following points:

Communal unity

Removal of untouchability

Prohibition

Khadi

Other village industries

Village sanitation

New or basic education

Adult education

Uplift of women

Education in health and hygiene

Propagation of Rastra Bhasha (National language)

Promotion of economic equality (Gandhi, 1941).

Among these items, the production of khadi- the over-all khaddar program of hand - spinning and hand weaving-was central. If Proudhon's exchange bank would, in theory "absorb" the state, dissolving the government in the economic organism (Schuster, 1932, p.121), Khadi and the voluntary organization which grew up around it was used by Gandhi for much the same purpose. The Khaddar program pointed the solution to the Indian social and political problem. In hand- spinning Gandhi saw at once only the economic salvation of India, but also an answer to the psychological and political problems of the nationalist movement. The khadi Bhandar organization which flourished in India were reminiscent of prondhon's exchange Bank. To these Khadi centers anyone could take thread spun by hand directly exchange it for woven series or dhotis or piece goods which, in turn has been produced by hand weavers from the hand- spun yarn so collected. In an illuminating exchange of letters

between Gandhi and Saklatvala (Shapurji Dorabji Saklatvala, a Parsi from Bombay, was a communist member of parliament elected from a London constituency), Gandhi replied to a communist criticisms of his khaddar program by emphasizing its capacity to organize the country.

Khaddar has the greatest organizing power in it because it has itself to be organized and because it effects all Indian. If khaddar rained from heaven it would be a calamity. But as it can only be manufactured by the willing co-operation of starving million and thousands of middle class men and women, its success means the best organization conceivable along peaceful lines (Saklatvala and Gandhi, 1927, p.23).

For Gandhi, non-violence and centralized industry were incompatible. Mass production degrades the worker, he argued, and results in an implicitly violent power construct, small scale village industry, on the other hand allows little opportunity for fraud and speculation (Harijan, 1934). In the national Khaddam Program, he explained, "... Million of people can take their share in this work and progress can be arithmetically measured" (Ibid, 1940). Gandhi also instead that decentralization of industry "preserves the purity and compactness of domestic life, artistry and creative talent as well as the people's sense of freedom, ownership and dignity" (Dhawan, 1946, p.185). such points as there favoring decentralization are clearly in agreement with anarchist doctrine, S.N Agarwal, whose Gandhian plan for Economic development of india may be taken as the orthodox gandhian position, likes the Gandhian plan's stress upon small local units so that of syndicalism, Guild socialism and Anarchism (Agarwal, 1946, p.33). As has often been observed the followers of Proudhon and Kropotkin were attracted by the type of small community organization represented in the Old Russian Mir. The Indian village with a functioning Panchayat is similar to the early Russian system. The system designed by Agarwal took the panchayat as its basic unit and

altered this traditional institution in the Gandhian manner which has already briefly been noted in the discussion of conservative approaches. The suggested organizational structure clearly indicates where in the gandhian plan differs from true anarchism. In many respects, it more nearly approximates the Guild socialist program; though we do not find in the Gandhian plan the essential principle of functional representation the panchayat of the gandhian system was viewed as representing a self-sufficient village community -self sufficient at least in the basic necessities of life. Economic reconstruction would be from the bottom upwards and the village unit would constitute the "Foundation of our planning." (Dhawan, 1962, p.285). The panchayat would be autonomous in internal village administration. The departure from the anarchist tradition is marked in the hierarchical pattern to be established through linking the village panchayat with the taluka, district, division, Province and nation for purpose of common policy and interests" and by a system of indirect elections except at the village level. The necessity for government- and for an administrative Hierarchy, albeit characterized by evolutionary rather than devolutionary power channels - is recognized in this Gandhian approach.

As do anarchists, Gandhi opposed the absolute sovereignty of the state; however he could not accept the overall philosophical anarchist position. Dhawan, in his frequent assertions that Gandhi was a philosophical anarchist, finally concludes that he would "decide. Every case on its own merits," and despite his distrust of the state would "welcome" state action where it is likely to advance the welfare of the people". It is indeed clear that Gandhi held essential ideals in common with anarchists but that he was willing, as they are not, to accept a degree of state organization and control. He believed that Government to be best which governs least and yet be held that "there are certain things which cannot be done without political

power” even though there are “numerous other things which do not at all depend upon political power.” a nation is truly democratic, he said when it “runs its affairs smoothly and effectively without much state interference” (Harijan, 1936).

Dhawan suggests that Gandhi has retained the state as a second best society, a middle way. It would, of course, be incorrect to suppose that Gandhi thought of retaining the state as time intermediate step in a determined progress towards anarchical society, in the manner of Marxist thought. Satyagraha eliminates the ultimate danger which the anarchist fears from the state. The Satyagrahi need not wait until the state is abolished before he acts upon his principles of voluntary association and opposition to authority. A Given political system may immediately be attacked by non- violent direct action. Moreover, such action is not merely in the nature of attack. For at the same time that resistance against the state is launched, satyagrahis may undertake to establish a parallel system based upon the principals of non- violence. There is never the need for the satyagrahi to wait until all opposition has been liquidated. He proceeds by methods of direct resistance to that portion of state authority which he holds to be unjust. The constructive work not only accompanies and follows direct action to eliminate state authority, but it precedes it as well. Gandhi described this process as “one of automatic adjustment”. “If the government schools are emptied, “he said, “I would certainly expect national schools to come into being. If the lawyers as a whole suspended practice, they would devise arbitration courts and the nation will have expeditious and cheaper methods of settling private disputes...” (Young India, 1920). In the course of Satyagraha during the Indian independence struggle, parallel public service organizations were actually set up in districts where non- cooperation had paralyzed the government. This was one of the most vital functions of congress organizations entrusted with

the various aspects of the constructive program. The anarchist fear of political means was minimized for Gandhi who evolved control could be exercised and constructive results assured. Anarchist criticism of Gandhi still centers upon his use of political means. Undoubtedly Gandhi did, explicitly and intentionally, use such means. "To me political power is not an end," he said, but one of the means of enabling people to better their condition in every department of life," (Ibid, 1931). One of the steps in a Satyagraha movement which dealt with grievances against an established government included attempts at political negotiation. It was only when such negotiation entirely failed that Gandhi found it necessary to reject constitutional political means and to depend solely upon the direct action of civil disobedience and other Satyagraha direct action method.

Recent anarchist criticism of Gandhi's political methods reflects a disappointment that he "restrained faith in the state as an instrument of Justice," it is the political element argued Robert Ludlow, writing in the catholic worker, that " Will destroy Gandhi's teaching in India," for he did not realize that Satyagraha must be united with an anti-state philosophy...." Ludlow continued with an identification of Political methods with violent methods:-

... Political methods are bound to fail because they carry with them the elements of himsa (hate) and that in personal action alone and action by the people themselves will society be transformed. He understood well those things – it is only that he did not realize that" (Ludlow, 1950).

Contemporary critics appear almost unwilling to understand the implications of the Gandhian method. In anarchist criticism of which the above 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 government authority. But even in those cases where anarchists attempted something more than a negative resistance policy (as they 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 problem and the non-cooperation of Satyagraha 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.

Having made it clear that Gandhi's ideas cannot be reduced to Anarchism it is now time to look into Conservatism.

Ideals of Conservatism

The confusion of conservatism with the ideologies of the extreme right is more a matter of rhetoric, although it has some basis in political practice. Conservatives in a time of crisis have allied themselves with parties animated by other, more ferocious right-wing ideologies.

Conservatism is a long lasting body of political doctrine which is seldom now a day represented by a single party. It is, above all, the political doctrine of Burke. But it goes much further back in English history, at least to Hooker, and in the world as a whole, perhaps to Aristotle. Since Burke it has taken the form of a continuous tradition, culminating for the time being in Oakeshott.

The Central Doctrines:-

This main tradition of conservative thought derives from three central doctrines which are themselves connected. The first and most obvious of them is traditionalism, which supports continuity in politics, the maintenance of existing institutions and practices and is suspicious of change, particularly of large and sudden change and above all of violent and systematic revolutionary change. At its most rudimentary this is simply a widespread human disposition, present to some extent in every one, though by no means universally predominant, to love the familiar and to fear the unknown. Suspicion of change is not the same thing as rigid opposition to it. But, for the conservative, if there is to be change it should be gradual, with each step carefully considered, as though one were venturing on to ice.

The chief intellectual, rather than emotional, support for traditionalism is a skeptical view about political wisdom for the conservative is embodied. First of all, in the inherited fabric of established laws and institutions, this is seen as the deposit of a great historical accumulation of small adjustments to the political order, made by experienced political practitioners, acting under the pressure of a clearly recognized need and in a cautious, prudent way. It follows that the management of public affairs is best remitted to those with extensive direct political experience and not to theorists with their privately fabricated abstract systems. What is needed for successful political practice is skill or know-how. Even less welcome to conservatives than abstract principles, such as doctrines of universally applicable natural or human rights, are utopias, systematic proposals for comprehensive social transformation.

Political scepticism in its turn rests on the third central doctrine of conservatism, the conception of human being and society as being organically or internally related. Individual human beings are not fully formed, except in their basic biological aspect, independently of the

social institutions and practices within which they grow up. There is, therefore, no universal human nature. People have needs and desires and expectations differ, from time to time and from place to place. Social institutions generally and the state and its laws, in particular, should not be thought of as appliances, like a bicycle or a toothbrush, selected for an already formed purpose. Such an organic conception of the relations between individual and the society does not have to take a Hegelian, metaphysical form. It does not claim that a socially undetermined individual is somehow logically inconceivable, although that could be argued for in contemporary terms on the grounds that language essentially social and that it is language which makes human being human, and not just primates that walk upright. It is enough that it is a matter of fact.

Since individual and society are organically, internally related, it follows that their activities are not susceptible of the kind of abstract theorization that is characteristic of the natural sciences. Just as there can be no literal science of poetic composition or friendship, there can be no literal science of politics, from which a technology of state craft can be derived (Goodwin and Pettit, 1998, p. 245).

Conservatism (Latin: conserver, “to retain”) is a political and Social Philosophy that promotes retaining traditional social institutions. A person who follows the philosophies of conservatism is referred to as a traditionalist or conservative. Some conservatives seek to preserve things as they are, emphasizing stability and continuity, while others oppose modernism and seek a return to “the way things were” (McLean and Macmillan, 2009).

The first established use of the term in a political context was by Francois Rene de Chateaubriand in 1819, following the French Revolution, (The Scary Echo of the Intolerance of the French Revolution In America Today). The term, historically associated with

right-wing politics, has since been used to describe a wide range of views.

Edmund Burke, an Anglo-Irish Politician who served in the British House of Commons and opposed the French Revolution, is credited as one of the founders of conservatism in Great Britain (BBC, Burke, 1729-1797). According to Hailsham, a former Chairman of the British Conservative Party, “Conservatism is not to so much a Philosophy as an attitude, a constant force, performing a timeless function in the development of a free society, and corresponding to a deep and permanent requirement of human nature itself” (Hailsham, 1959).

So, conservatism in any political philosophy that favours tradition (In the sense of various religious, cultural or nationally-defined beliefs and customs) in the face of external forces for change, and is critical of proposals for radical social change. Some conservatives seek to preserve the status quo or to reform society slowly, while others seek to return to the values of an earlier time.

Classical conservatism does not reject change per se, but insists that changes be organic, rather than revolutionary, arguing that any attempt to modify the complex web of human interactions that form human society purely for the sake of some doctrine or theory runs the risk of running a foul of the law of unintended consequences or of moral hazards. As a general ideology, conservatism is opposed to the ideals of Liberalism and Socialism.

Conservatism generally refers to right-wing politics which advocate the preservation of personal wealth and private ownership (Capitalism) and emphasize self-reliance and Individualism. Conservatives in general more punitive toward criminal tend to hold more orthodox religious views, and are often ethnocentric and hostile toward homosexual and other minority groups.

Different cultures have different established values and in consequence, conservatives in different cultures have differing goals. Many forms of conservatism incorporate elements of other ideologies and philosophies, and in turn, conservatism has influence upon them. For example, nationalism shares many conservative values (although usually to a more exaggerated degree), and most conservatives strongly support the sovereign nation and patriotically identify with their own nation (although most conservatives distrust the xenophobic or racist sentiments that are prominent in some far-right wing groups).

The term “Conservatism” is derived from the Latin “Conservere” (meaning to “Protect” or “Preserve”) and from the French derivative “Conservateur”. Its usage in a political sense began to appear only after the French Revolution of 1789, and then only hesitantly, only taking its characteristic political connotation in the 1820s.

Conservatism as an ideology:-

There is a difficulty about treating conservatism as an ideology which should be confronted as soon as possible. Conservatism is distrustful of, or hostile to, theory. An ideology is a kind of theory. There can be no doubt that an ideology is, or essentially comprises, a theory. That is what differentiates it from mere political prescriptions, convictions or opinions, even from political principles and from systematic political ideals or utopias. An ideology derives political prescriptions or principles, even some time utopias, from theories about human nature and society.

Conservatism is an organic theory of human nature and society which implies a skeptical theory of abstractly theoretical political knowledge. These are taken to imply, in their turn, attachment to tradition, reluctance to change and a preference for politically experienced rulers. The crucial question is – does the theory which

conservatism rejects self-destructively include the kind of theory which, in its developed form as something more than an emotional disposition, it itself embodies? The conservative answer is that conservatism does not depend on a substantive theory about universal human nature, issuing in universal political principles, such as lists of the rights of man. No doubt it has been confused, both by supporters and opponents, such as a theory of which, for example, a monarch, a hereditary aristocracy of landowners and an established Church are ingredients. But the desirability of such institutions for a conservative is relative to the circumstances of a particular time and place, one in which they are historically established. (In modern Britain, for instance, they are largely, if not wholly, formal and vestigial). As an ideology conservatism is, then procedural or methodological rather than substantive. It prescribes no principles or ideals or institutions universally and so falls outside the scope of its own rejection of abstract theory.

The notion that conservatism is not an ideology, but only a dispositionm, or, more reductively, an expression of the self-interest of those who benefit from the status quo, is also assisted by its lack of an appropriately theoretical classic text. Liberalism has Locke's "Treatises of Government" and Mill's "on Liberty"; socialism has the "Communist Manifesto"; elitism has Plato's Republic". The nearest thing to a classic text it possesses is Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France. But that, like all Burke's mature political writing, is an occasional work, evoked by and principally concerned with the particular event mentioned in its title. The great bulk of it is taken up with polemic expressed with a measure of rhetorical excess, about attitudes to that event. The ideology has to be separated out from the highly concrete matter in which it is immersed. But it is unquestionably to be found there. (Goodwin and Pettit, 1998, Pp. 247-248).

Brief History of Conservatism:-

The beginnings of conservatism are usually traced to the reaction to the events surrounding the French Revolution of 1789, although it can be argued the 16th century Anglican theologian Richard Hooker (1554-1600) was proposing something very similar two centuries earlier.

The Anglo-Irish Philosopher Edmund Burke is often considered the father of conservatism in Anglo-American circles. He argued forcefully against the French Revolution, especially in his "Reflections on the Revolution in France" of 1790; (although he sympathized with some of the aims of the American Revolution of 1776-1783), and was troubled in general by the Rationalist turn of the Enlightenment. He argued instead for the value of inherited institutions and customs, including the time-honoured development of the State (built on the wisdom of many generations), piecemeal progress through experience, and the continuation of other important societal institutions such as the family and the Church, rather than what he called "metaphysical abstractions". Burke also claimed that man is unable to understand the many ways in which inherited behaviours influence their thinking, and trying to judge society objectively is futile.

The old established form of British conservatism since the late 17th century was the Tory Party, which generally reflected the attitudes of a rural landowning class. In the 19th century, a new coalition of traditional landowners and sympathetic industrialists constituted the new British conservative party. Benjamin Disraeli (1804-1881) gave the new party a political ideology, advocating a return to an idealized view of a corporate or organic society, in which everyone had duties and responsibilities towards other people or groups ("one Nation" conservatism). The conversion of the British conservative party into a modern mass organization in the 20th century was accelerated by the concept of "Tory Democracy",

attributed to win stone Churchill's son Lord Randolph Churchill (1911-1968). In the 1980's under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher there was a dramatic shift in the ideological direction of British conservatism economic liberalism. Social conservatism, libertarianism, Bio-conservatism and Religious Conservatism, as well as support for a strong military, small government and States' rights. It is mainly represented by the U.S. Republican Party, exemplified by Ronald Eagan (1911-2004) and George W. Bush and much of the conservative attitude is focused in the nation's heart land (rural areas with low population density), as contrasted with the more Liberal cities and college towns(Document,2008).

The Central Doctrines Defended:-

Traditionalism:-

There are three main arguments or families of arguments – against change, one direct, another more important one, indirect and third empirical.

The direct argument is that change is generally upsetting or distressing, all the more so if it is large and sudden. Stated at that level of generality it can be countered with the objection that surprises are often agreeable, at worst a relief in a time of tedium and monotony, at best an exciting transformation into a better state of things. An answer to that objection is that, for the most part, the changes we find most agreeable or acceptable are usually on a small, comparatively personal scale. Changes of a large, remote and imponderable nature are likely to inspire fear and anxiety. A new car, a promotion, a re-arrangement of the living room furniture is welcome because they can be controlled and even reversed. But large political change, heavy with un-predictable results, is a very different matter, like a volcanic eruption.

The strongest case in general terms for resistance to large and sudden change is, however, indirect. It rests on the great number of unintended and unpredicted consequences that will emerge from change of that kind. The prevailing political system influences numerous and various aspects of life. It is suddenly or violently transformed, a host of stabilities which provide a background of regularity within which life can be rationally and prudently led are jeopardized. A change of political system is likely to influence the whole social environment. It is not only that large political changes have many unintended results that are unwelcome. They also frequently fail to achieve their intended results or achieve opposite ones.

Conservative traditionalism does not rule out change. As Burke said in his *Reflections*, "A state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation". But change should be in response both to a change in Extra-political circumstances – increase in population, of the proportion of the population that is literate, a new balance between agriculture and industry – and to a widely-felt need arising from it, and it should be gradual so that unplanned detrimental side-effects be counteracted. A particular reason for hostility to revolutionary change is that revolutions, when serious and not to the place variety, bring about a large transfer of power and naturally, of wealth and status. The resentment of the newly deprived is likely to be violent. The ensuing civil war is likely to divert the revolutionaries from their original intentions.

The third argument, from historical experience of large and sudden political change, reinforces the argument from bad unplanned consequences with specific examples. The English civil War led not to the rule of the Saints but to a military dictatorship. Most of what it managed to achieve was undone at the Restoration and the democratic movement was driven underground for a century or more.

The French Revolution quickly degenerated into a brutal, if mercifully brief, despotism, followed by a military dictatorship that was at least glamorous. The commune of 1871 was rapidly extinguished by the violent reaction it provoked. About the more or less disgusting consequences of the Russian and Chinese Revolution of 1917 and 1947 it is hardly necessary to go into detail. Parliamentary control of the crown and the extension of the franchise in Britain were attained piecemeal by a long sequence of comparatively small steps.

Scepticism:-

The theoretical pretensions of revolutionaries and radical reforms which conservatives seek to undermine are not those of Political Science but rather those of abstract political theory. Political Science as an organized form of inquiry is comparatively modern, although anticipated from time to time, for example in much of Aristotle's *Politics*, in various essays of Hume, in the writings of de Tocqueville and Bagehot. Abstract political theory starts from certain propositions about ends, typically about the universal rights of man or the supreme political values, and proposes, usually in a fairly simple minded way, means to those ends. A utopia is a conception of society in which those ends are fully realized. A system of natural rights may be presented either as something whose guaranteeing is a necessary condition of political obligation or as an ideal which should guide policy. If the former than a state which does not provide the required guarantee should be overthrown by revolution. In the latter case there should be consistent pressure for reform in the desired direction.

Conservatives would agree that there are political ends but they would maintain, first that there are a considerable number of them. Besides the liberty and equality exalted by the two main kinds of reformer – liberal and socialist – they endorse security, both internal, the preservation of public order, and external, the defense of the community from enemies outside and also prosperity, the general

economic well being of the community and its members (Authoritarians make a fetish of security, free enterprise libertarians of prosperity). For the conservative, none of these is supreme, in the sense that it wholly overrides all the others. But security is, to a certain extent, primary, as being a condition of the effective realization of the others. Since there is an irreducible plurality of political values, none is an inalienable right; none should be pursued at the expense of all the rest.

Ends, then, are contestable and plural. This plurality raises the question of extend to which changes designed to augment the realization of any one of them are likely to undermine the realization of the others. The experience of revolution suggests that they are extremely likely to do so.

A conservative need not dispute the intellectual legitimacy of genuine political science which, unconcerned with ends as such, takes no one, prejudicially defined ends as axiomatic. Its concern will be with the way in which political institutions actually work, the way they act on and are acted on by the rest of society, and it will be conscious of the variety and complexity of these interactions. It is more calculated to endorse Burke's recommendation of a cautious prudence than the excited elimination of the existing order of things.

Organicism:-

The best argument for the view that human beings and the societies of which they are members are organically interrelated is empirical. There are cultures and, in particular, there are national cultures, typically if not quite universally, defined by language (where linguistic unity is missing its place can be supplied by a long and continuous history of nationhood, as in Switzerland). Another way of putting the point is to insist that there is such a thing as national character. People are not, in general, easily exportable like bicycles,

which function just as well in Denmark as in Thailand. The pains of exile are deep-seated, not just a matter of missing certain familiar conveniences and objects of affection.

A more direct empirical support for organics is the failure of attempts to export the political institutions of advanced western nations to other parts of the world.

A feature of the last century has been a large scale technological convergence of the world, so that every nation tries to take on as much of what may be called the material culture of the advanced western nations as it can; large scale mechanical industry, financial institutions, public utilities, scientific medicine, and so on. But this, as the case of Japan, the most brilliantly successful importer of western technology, shows, does not imply the incorporation of the rest of the culture of the West. It may lead gently in that direction, but it does not automatically bring it about.

To consider society as an organism is implicitly to compare it to the human body. The parts of the latter can not really flourish except in their places as parts of the whole. Conservatives would not, like metaphysical authoritarians of a Hegelian kind, press the analogy to the point of saying that the whole significance of the parts is exhausted by the functional service they give to the whole. In the social case it is the parts that are of primary importance even if they essentially require a social whole to be, or have been, part of. But conservatives would agree that where something is recognized to be wrong with the whole it is best to create conditions in which it can get better on its own, rather than to try to cure it by force. But in state craft as in medical treatment, there are no absolutes; emergencies can arise in which drastic measures are inescapable (an invasion, a revolution, a large natural catastrophe in the political case). Emergencies, however, are, by definition, exceptional (Goodin and Pettit, 1998, Pp.253-263).

Gandhi and Conservatism.

There were several aspects of conservatism at work among the influences which shaped Gandhi's development. The Vaishnavita, Jain society in which young Gandhi grew up is one of the most conservative in the whole of the Indian sub-continent. The social milieu into which Gandhi was born may be characterized as religiously orthodox and politically reactionary. However, there were other elements which conditioned Gandhi and among them was the impact of the writings of three westerns whom Gandhi recognized as having substantially influenced his thought: Tolstoy, the Christian Anarchist, Thoreau, whose experiments with civil disobedience attracted Gandhi and John Ruskin, the only systematic political theorist of the three.

In investigating the extent to which Gandhian thought is conservative, a further question is suggested: what, if any, modifications would be required of Conservative Principles for them to be properly characterized as Gandhian?

The problem of definition is delicate. In the following examination of conservative elements in Gandhian political thought. But it is necessary to adopt some criteria by which to judge the degree to which the Gandhian political approach agree with what is generally considered to be conservatism.

Conservatism, then, let us take to be attitude toward political institutions and a philosophy of social relationships which include ---

- (1) A respect for the wisdom of established institutions, especially those concerned with religion and property.
- (2) A strong sense of continuity in the historical changes of the social system,

- (3) Belief in the relative importance of individual will and reason to deflect societal change from its course and
- (4) A keen moral satisfaction in the loyalty that attaches the members of a society to their stations in its various ranks (Sabine, 1947, p. 617).

Gandhi was, in the judgment of the man best qualified to assess his impact upon the Indian scene, “the greatest revolutionary” India has yet produced. He not only “Shook” India, Jawaharlal Nehru has said “he brought about great changes”, and “this is revolution” (Nehru, 1946, Pp.5-6).

Gandhi set out to transform the social and political system in which he found himself. An abiding awareness of social and political disabilities had first been forced upon him in South Africa. As he forged the tools with which he could fight such disabilities, he did not concern himself with question of ideal social and political organization. It is possible that more than one “ideal” system could be formulated to meet Gandhi’s requirements. But essential to such a system would be a non-violent socio-political technique of action in the hands of the members of that society. Gandhi himself had “purposely refrained from dealing with the nature of Government in a society based on non-violence”, he wrote in 1939. “When society is deliberately constructed in accordance with the law of non-violence, its structure will be different in material particulars from what it is today. But I cannot say in advance what the Government based wholly on non-violence will be like” (Harijan, 1939).

The revolutionary character of the Gandhian movement in India does not in itself determine the political genre of Gandhi or Gandhism. For when out of power, conservatives tend to become revolutionaries in an attempt to re-establish a status-quo-ante (Michels, 1965, Pp. 230 to 232). From a quick reading of some of Gandhi’s writings, one

might conclude that such references as those to "Panchayat Raj" and "Rama Raj" suggest political reaction. His nostalgic recollections of India's past, coupled with his comments urging the rejection of aspects of modern technology, have led some observers to label Gandhi a traditionalist and a reactionary. But let us examine Gandhi's position more closely.

Panchayat Raj is ordinarily taken to mean a political structure, probably a federation, which has its base the village Panchayat, that is, the village council (Agarwal, 1944 and 1946). Traditionally the Panchayat consisted of five elder statesmen of the community, who functioned in the triple capacity of legislature, executive and judiciary. The number varied from place to place and from time to time as, indeed, did the manner of the Panchayat's Constitution and function. Now it is doubtful that Gandhi had any systematic notion of the political and sociological implications of the traditional village Panchayat (Gandhi, 1948, p.71).

The historical record, incomplete though it is, shows a range of variations in the manner of selection and operation of this institution. However, a few predominant elements stand out as characteristic of the ancient Panchayat system. The village Panchayat was traditionally organized with the group and not the individual as the unit. It was, in many respects, an extension of the Indian family system, and was strictly patriarchal in character (Mukerjee, 1921).

Now Gandhi's concern, as we shall see was consistently for the individual. By freedom he meant to no inconsiderable extent individualism. How, then, could he reconcile this position with that of the revival of the ancient Panchayat? The answer is, that he did not. For the Panchayat of his conception was very different from that typical of the ancient system. Gandhi drew upon his experience with the knowledge of the institutions of his own society for terms to express the concepts and objectives which emerged from his own "experiments

with truth". He seized upon Panchayat Raj to indicate a type of political organization of his own conception. The Panchayat Gandhi envisaged was to be annually elected by all the adult villagers – "male and female alike". "This village democracy (Harijan, July 26th, 1942) "Will be based on individual freedom and will be able to defy the might of a world became both the individual and the village will be ruled by the law of non-violence". The contrast between the Panchayat of Gandhi's conception and the patriarchal "assemblage of co-proprietors" of the traditional system. Analysis of the traditional system (Maine and Murray, 1871, p. 216) is to be found at the very heart of the institution. (For an outline of a Panchayat federative system on Gandhian lines (Agarwal, 1946, p. 103). In like manner, Gandhi used the term Rama Raj to communicate with a largely illiterate populace steeped in India's epic lore. The term Rama Raj derives from the Ramayana's classic depiction of the victory of Rama, symbolizing the forces of good, over Ravana, symbolizing the forces of evil, and the consequent establishment of a region of goodness and justice in the land. To orthodox Muslims, Gandhi's reference to Rama Raj, deriving as it did from Hindu scripture, aroused the fear that Gandhi intended a Hindu dominated state with Hindu leadership. Gandhi found it necessary explicitly to state that by Rama Raj he did not mean Hindu Raj; he meant merely "the kingdom of God", Rama and Rahim (one of the Muslim names of God) were the same, he said, and he acknowledged "no other God but the one God of truth and righteousness" (Young India, September 19, 1929). The ideal which Gandhi referred to as the kingdom of heaven on earth was defined, not in the traditional Hindu manner, but in his own way on the basis of social and political desiderata.

We find again and again Gandhi's use of the traditional to communicate new ideas, his use of phrases emerging out of established ways and familiar institutions to transmit newly created

values. The question of Gandhi's conservatism character may be further pursued through an examination of his position with regard to the institutions of religion and property.

Religious Institutions:

Gandhi insisted that there was, for him, no politics without religion and that he had entered politics because he was a religious man. (*Young India*, 1924). Certainly he had the conservative's respect for religion as an essential element of society.

Yet, when we enquire further into Gandhi's attitude towards religion and its institutions in the Indian setting, we discover less the conservative approach than that of the liberal, less the reformer than the revolutionary, Gandhi defended "the irreligious brother" (Gandhi, 1932). God is ethics and morality, God is fearless ness. God is the source of Light and Life and yet He is above and beyond all these. God is conscience. He is even the atheism of the atheist. (*Young India*, 1925). Repeatedly Gandhi expressed his belief in the "fundamental truth of all great religious of the world", (*Harijan*, 1934) and urged his followers to "remember that his own religion is the truest to every man even if it stands low in the scales of philosophical comparison (*Young India*, 1924).

Allied with this belief in the fundamental value of all religious was Gandhi's insistence upon equality among the various religious and racial communities of India. His was a constant struggle against the divisiveness of communalism. "In the Congress", he wrote, "We must cease to be exclusive Hindus or Musalmans or Sikhs, Parsis, Christians, Jews". And, he added, "while we may staunchly adhere to our respective faith, we must be in the Congress Indians first and Indians last (*Ibid*, 1930).

In this connection it is pertinent to recall what U. N. Ghoshal has called "the pronounced disinclination of the Hindu mind to

conceive the secular life as the antithesis of the religions" (Ghoshal, 1927). Gandhi did not hesitate to attack orthodox positions and as we shall see later, his position on such religiously sanctioned social institutions as caste gave serious alarm to orthodox Hindu elements -- an alarm which, fed from several sources of Gandhian activity, grew to such proportions that it ultimately effected Gandhi's assassination. Again and again Gandhi indicated that for him an ethic – principle superseded tradition. "Let us not deceive ourselves into the belief that everything that is written in Sanskrit and printed in Shastra has any binding effect upon us", he wrote, "That which is opposed to the fundamental maxims of morality, that which is opposed to trained reason, cannot be claimed no matter how ancient it may be" (Ibid, 1927). We have seen, in analyzing the Gandian non-violent technique, how the inner dynamics of Satyagraha may lead to the setting aside of Customary Practice on the precipitating of resistance of legal rules. The Gandhian philosophy of conflict renders impossible a rigid, unquestioning adherence to traditional institutions. It is bound to weaken, if not transform, this aspect of conservatism.

Property:-

Gandhi's economic doctrines have received some of the most serious of the attacks made by his critics. The Gandhian doctrine of "Trusteeship" has overtones of a conservative position with respect to property. By virtue of this doctrine Zamindars (landholders) had found in Gandhi at once a protector and a reformer. Zamindars, Gandhi said, should give their tenants fixity of tenure, take a lively interest in their welfare, provide well managed schools for their children, night school for adults, hospitals and dispensaries for the sick, look after the sanitation of villages and in a variety of ways make them feel that they the Zamindars are their true friends taking only fixed commission for their manifold services (Ibid, 1931) .They should, in short, act as trustees. What, then, if the Zamindar should fail to

perform his duties as a trustee? The Zamindari System, Gandhi said, "should be mended, not ended". (*Harijan*, 1938). The answer to the further question, to what extent should the Zamindari be mended, is suggested by Gandhi's position on economic equality.

Economic equality was one of the objectives outlined in Gandhi's practical constructive program (Gandhi, 1945, Pp. 20-21). But, he wrote, "Economic equality must never be supposed to mean possession of an equal amount of worldly goods by everyone." It does mean, however, that everyone will have a proper house to live in, sufficient and balanced food to eat and sufficient Khadi with which to cover himself. It also means that the cruel inequality that obtains today will be removed by purely non-violent means. (*Harijan*, 1940).

Gandhi would regulate the zamindar by non-violent tactics. He would tolerate landholders if they became trustees, they could be persuaded to become trustees through non-violence. But should they refuse to serve their tenants property the tenants could, through non-violent techniques, justifiably end the Zamindari. Gandhi even suggested that a non-violent State might find it necessary to equalize land distribution if both tenants and Zamindars were to fail in their efforts (Bose, 1935). Though he resisted any abrupt expropriation, Gandhi favoured sweeping land reform. With non-violent techniques in the hands of the peasants, the Zamandar would, indeed, be mended or ended. Further evidence relating to Gandhi's position with regard to property is found in his doctrine aparigraph (non-possession), "Bread-labour", and equitable distribution. Gandhi certainly did not consider property as good in itself. On the contrary, he taught, and in his own life very nearly achieved, the ideal of aparigraha: non-possession or voluntary poverty. This is consistent with his effort to achieve freedom from attachment to material things. It is the very negation of the institution of property. Recognizing that absolute non-possession is an abstraction and unattainable, Gandhi

suggested that “If we strive for (non-possession), we shall be able to go further in realizing a scale of equality on earth than by any other method” (Bose, 1935).

Gandhi held as an ideal, he tells us, equal distribution. But he recognized that “It is not to be realized”. And so, he worked for “equitable distribution” (Dhawan, 1946, p.81). His objective was that everybody should be able to get sufficient work to enable him to make two ends meet. He reasoned that this ideal can be universally realized only if the means of reduction of elementary necessities of life remain in the control of the masses. These should be freely available to all as God’s air and water are or ought to be, they should not be made a vehicle of traffic for the exploitation of others. Their monopolization by any country, nation or group of persons would be unjust ... (Young India, 1928).

In examining Gandhi’s views on industrialization one is at once reminded of John Ruskin. Gandhi could embrace without qualification Ruskin’s functional view of property. Tools in the hands of those who can use them and wealth restricted within fixed limits are principles which Ruskin and Gandhi held in common. Ruskin’s attack on the assumptions of political economy and the industrial system are systematically set forth in his *Unto This Last*. It was this work which found its way into Gandhi’s hands in South Africa, and which he credits with having inspired him to establish the community of phoenix in Natal on principles of bread-labour and the responsibility of the community organization to provide for the physical welfare of the worker who is its member. Gandhi’s response to Ruskin is a striking example of the realism and vitality which characterized Gandhi’s leadership. He tells us in his autobiography that he discovered some of his deepest convictions reflected in *Unto This Last* and that the book “Captured” him. He understood the message of Ruskin’s work to be –

That the good of the individual is contained in the good of all.

That a lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's in as much as all have the same right of earning their livelihood from their work.

That a life of labour, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman, is the life worth living (Gandhi, 1927, p.365).

The first of these, he explain, he knew, the second he had "dimly realized, but the third had never occurred to him. Unto This Last made it "as clear as daylight That the second and third were contained in the first". And then Gandhi concludes this chapter on "The Magic spell of a Book" by recalling this action so typical of him: "I arose with the dawn, ready to reduce these principles to practice" (Gandhi, 1927).

It is important to note here that it was Ruskin's ideas on political economy, and not his authoritarianism, which Gandhi assimilated into his own thinking. Ruskin provided Gandhi with ideas which were to reinforce the economic principles of ashram organization throughout the Gandhian development. As we shall see, Gandhi did not share the more conservative views of Ruskin which held the common man inferior, erected an aristocratic hierarchy, and denied the masses any political control on grounds of incompetence. The duty of physical labour, a precept Gandhi adopted from Ruskin, was also an essential principle for Tolstoy who issued the term "bread-labour" to describe it. (Tolstoy adopted the term" "bread labour"; from the Peasant writer Timofei Mikhailovich Bondarev whose work he introduced and elaborated). Gandhi understood bread-labour to mean "that everyone is expected to perform sufficient" body-labour" to entitle him to his daily bread. It is not necessary to earn one's living in this manner, but "everyone must perform some useful body labour, this principle is entered into the development of "Khaddar"

(handspun) economics with its tool and symbols the Charka (spinning wheel). With Gandhi and Ruskin alike, bread-labour fitted into the trusteeship approach. "If all worked for their bread, suggested Gandhi, "distributions of rank would be obliterated, the rich would still be there, but they would deem themselves only trustees of their property, and would use it mainly in the public interest (Gandhi, 1945, p. 50). In his application of the bread-labour principle, Gandhi went so far as to suggest it as a qualification for the franchise, a qualification which he urged, "should be neither property nor position but manual work". In this way "all who with to take part in the Government and the well-being of the State", could prove themselves, and the labour-test would be far superior to that either of literacy or property (Dhawan, 1962, Pp.435-436). Gandhi held that the voters, by becoming self reliant through this principle, could not become pawns in the hand of politician. He argued that the people would thereby have the capacity to resist misuse of authority and prevent the division of the state into a small class of exploiting rulers and a large class of exploited subjects (Dhawan, 1962, p.282).

There is perhaps no more telling an illustration of the inaccuracy of reading strict conservation into Gandhi's approach than this suggestion about the use of manual labour. For beyond the explicit statement, there lay implicit in Gandhi's suggestion a potential anything but conservation the undermining of caste itself. With all Gandhi's respect for the dignity of labour and for the need for men to partake of physical labour, he had an essentially utilitarian attitude towards machinery. Gandhi could have no consideration, he tells us, for machinery "Which is meant either to enrich the few at the expense of the many, or without cause to displace the useful labour of many." However, he work of public utility which cannot be undertaken by human labour has its inevitable place, but all that would be owned by

the state and used entirely for the benefit of the people. (Harijan, 1935).

Gandhi's attitude towards capital and labour was consistent with his views on the zamindari and the trusteeship ideal. He held that capital "should be labour's servant, not its master," both labour and capital should act as mutual trustees and should work in the interests also of consumers. The worker, however, need not wait for the gradual conversion of management. If capital is power, so is work. Either power can be used destructively or creatively. Either is dependent on the other. Immediately the worker realizes his strength, he is in a position to become a co-sharer with the capitalist instead of remaining his slave (Ibid, 1938). Both Ruskin and Gandhi sought the "conversion" of the upper class. Ruskin appealed for a change of heart and a transformation through which justice, rather than profit would be paramount. But Ruskin could not consider the masses of men as ends in themselves; rather, did he treat them as means to the ends of others (Ibid, 1938). Gandhi conceded the possible result that voluntary transformation might fail. He recognized power of the common man and placed before him the means whereby he could assure himself the "Justice" about which Ruskin could only speculate. Gandhi believed in the worth of the individual man and considered his welfare the ultimate social goal. The element which distinguished the Gandhi an approach is, again, the provision of a means to achieve that end—a technique of direct social action. Gandhi extended the conservative position that every right carries with it a corresponding duty to include the farther "corresponding remedy for resisting any attack" upon the right. Different situations and relationships produced different correlative rights, duties and remedies. Applied to the realm of industrial relations, this approach led Gandhi to reason that, were he a laborer, "the corresponding duty is to labour with my

limbs and the corresponding remedy is to non-cooperate with him who deprives me of the fruit of my labour "(Young India, 1931).

In this brief examination of Gandhi's approach to established institutions and traditional approaches, especially with reference to religion and property, unorthodoxy has emerged as the predominant characteristic. Gandhi's action, through the series of Satyagraha movements he led or inspired, effected revolutionary changes. The Satyagraha of the Champaran peasants against an established system in the indigo fields of Bihar effected a revision of revolutionary proportions. The applied Gandhism of non-violent strikes of labour upset the traditional pattern which assured a submissive labour force. The Satyagraha of Vykom for the right of untouchables to use a temple road undermined the entrenched Brahmanic authority. Where Satyagraha is applied to a system a change unpredictable in specific content may result. When Gandhi set out to reform, or as some might say, to "react", he did it with methods which he well recognized might lead to basic changes. He would "mend, not end" the Zamindari, but if reform failed to mend the system, Gandhi was prepared to bring about its end. Willingness to admit flexibility of ends is essential for those who believe that means are ends in the making (Bondurant, 1988, p.159).

Continuity in the historical changes of the social system:-

The main stream of conservative thought has been concerned centrally with the social organism. Edmund Burke treats society as such an organism governed by laws of growth beyond the competence of the individual will to alter (Burke, 1972, Pp. 100-101).

Law is typically the essence of social continuity and to break the law constitutes a breach of the overriding moral law. For Burke the study of the history of each people is essential for an understanding of its politics (Burke, 1972, p.204), and progress necessarily proceeds from

long established foundations and is determined by gradual trends within the historical depths of a nation.

We have seen how Gandhi used traditional precepts yet sought to change established institutions to make them sub-servant to the needs of the members of society – to the common good defined in terms of individual welfare. He insisted that he was not a worshipper of all that goes under the name of ancient (Desai, 1928, p.105) though he made reference to ancient Indian institutions and appealed to his countrymen to reject vain imitations of western patterns. He urged the abandoning of custom when it proved detrimental to the social welfare, “We must gladly give up custom that is against reason, justice and religion of the heart,” he said. And he urged Indians “not ignorantly to cling to bad custom” but to part with it “when we must, like a miser parting with his ill-gotten hoard out of pressure and expedience” (Young India, 1921). The treatment of society as an organism, a treatment common to many schools of conservation, is also familiar in traditional Indian thought. A general, if rudimentary, organismic theory of the state and society is to be found throughout the history of Hindu political theory. The Varna (caste) scheme of social organization lends itself to an organismic interpretation, for society is conceived as a unit consisting of differentiated classes, each functioning in its specific sphere for the good of the entire society.

Gandhi occasionally used familiar organismic analogies when he considered the role of the individual in his society. “True social economics”, he said “will teach us that the working man, the clerk and the employer are parts of the same indivisible organism”, where “none is smaller or greater than the other”. Their interest, he added, “should not be conflicting but identical and interdependent”. (*Ibid*, 1928).

Yet, Gandhi did not conceive of an organismic growth of society in the usual conservative manner with irreversible laws governing that growth. His emphasis was consistently on the equality of the

members. Nor did he understand equality in terms of a Shum Cuique (to each his own) formulation or of determined "Place" in the social structure. Where he does make use of the biological analogy he takes care to explain that he decries "distorted notions of superiority and inferiority". (Young Indian, 1928). For those who find in the organismic theory a doctrine repugnant to individual liberty, the greatest danger lies in the concept of the state as a natural organism, and the imputing to the state a supra-life—an hypostatization which lends itself, as in Hegel, to the transformation of the "is" into the "ought". However, Gandhi made the essential distinction between state and society, a distinction implicit in his doctrine of disobedience when Gandhi writes, as he did in 1939, "I value individual freedom but you must not forget that man is essentially a society being", he sets himself in agreement with the "new" liberalism of T.H. Green rather than with the metaphysical theory of Hegel. Man has "risen to the present state by learning to adjust his individualism to the requirement of social progress", continued Gandhi. Unrestricted individualism is the law of the beast of the jungle. We have learnt to strike the mean between individual freedom and social restraint. Willing submission to social restraint for the sake of the well being of the whole society enriches both the individual and the society of which one is a member. (Harijan, 1939).

For Gandhi, society must provide opportunities for the maximum growth of the individual, and the final decision as to what constitutes that growth lies with the individual."If the individual ceases to count," Gandhi asked, "what is left of society?" It is by virtue of individual freedom alone that an individual will be prepared to "voluntarily surrender himself completely to the service of society". And if that freedom is "wrested" for him, he becomes merely an "automaton" to the rein of society. No society can possibly be built on a denial of individual freedom. It is contrary to the very nature of man.

Just as a man will not grow horns or a tail, so he will not exist as man if he has no mind of his own. In reality even those who do not believe the liberty of the individual believe in their own. (*Ibid*, 1942).

T. H. Green's concepts of positive freedom, and the realization of the individual's fullest potential as possible only within the social structure, are very close to those of Gandhi. The idea of collective well-being or the common good as underlying any claim to private right is again congenial. Like Green, Gandhi would have no part in glorifying the state. The community ought simply to secure the conditions for the realization of an individual's best potential. For both, the aim was to make life morally meaningful for all people, and both viewed the community as held together not by compulsion but by the sense of a common interest or good (Sabine, 1973, p.674).

Although Green may be ranked on the side of liberalism, certain aspects of his thesis have conservative connotations. There is the danger inherent in identifying Political and moral obligation and linking this to the concept of collective wellbeing. But, for Gandhi, such difficulties were neatly averted, first by avoiding the confusion between society and state, and finally by the introduction of the technique of Satyagraha based upon a Philosophy of relative truths. A Gandhian tradition of civil disobedience secures the precedent for distinguishing moral from political obligation, and in this too, Gandhian thought deviates from characteristic conservatism. For Burke, law is the essence of continuity and to break the positive law involves a breach of the moral law. The social and political circumstances in which Gandhi developed his ideas and his techniques precluded any possibility of retaining this conservative characteristic. Resistance to the British regime was the effort. Civil disobedience becomes one of the primary tools by which that resistance was manifested. But there are, as well, other elements in the Gandhian Philosophy which call for a rejection of any especial

reverence for law. Gandhi was of the opinion that progress was impossible without the right to err, and an essential of political organization was "freedom to err and the duty of correcting errors" (Gandhi, 1932, p.388.) This concept follows from the Gandhian Philosophy of conflict where "truth" is relative and Satyagraha serves as a technique for discovering truth in a given conflict situation.

Gandhian thought is not in any real sense conservative by this second criterion. Throughout occasional reference to the social structure as organism, the emphasis is upon elements which are characteristic of the "new" liberalism common to T.H. Green, and to a further extent, to that other British liberal thinker, L.T. Hobhouse. Virtue was for Gandhi, as it was for Hobhouse and for Green, essentially social. But the concept of a collective well-being, as in Green, or the state as the guarantor of the rights of its members, as with Hobhouse neither of these concepts requires a trust in "the inherent logic of social growth" Such a position was basic, for example, to the political thought of Bernard Bosanquet or other Hegelian conclusions necessitating obedience to destiny or respect of the law as sacred. Similarly, the Gandhian insistence upon selfless service to society, upon duty to the community as the more important correlative of right, and the final concept of a social well-being these moral incentives provided by Gandhi, as by Green, could lead to nationalization of industries, socialization of health and education, and in general, a form of Liberal socialism (Sabine, 1973,p.677). The Philosophy underlying the method of Satyagraha once more sets the Gandhian approach out of the mainstream of conservatism. For, whatever the significance of history, whatever respects for laws, and whatever the organic nature of society, the individual may assert his freedom to test, to challenge, to disobey, and this is not only his prerogative, but his foremost duty. "It is not that I harbor disloyalty towards anything whatsoever", Gandhi asserted, "but I do so against

all untruth, all that is unjust, all that is evil". He wanted to make clear that he remained loyal to an institution "so long as that institution conduces to my growth and the growth of the nation". Immediately upon finding that the institution "instead of conduced to its growth impedes it", he considered it his "bounden duty to be disloyal to it." (Young India, 1925).

Truth, with Gandhi, is the one persisting goal. But conservatives are often seekers for peace rather than truth. This was so for Plato and it tended to be so for Burke. That "truth" was, for Gandhi, relative truth is of striking significance. For absolutes are more congenial to the conservative mind. The development of a technique for discovering relative truths, and for resolving conflicts among them, is Gandhi especial contribution.

Importence of Individual will and reason. Gandhi is surely not conservative by this further criterion of belief in the importance of individual will and reason to deflect historical changes in the social system. We have already touched upon Gandhi's reliance upon reason and his belief in the capacity of the individual to bring about fundamental change. The evidence is extensive and compelling.

Conservative thought assigns to man a very limited role. The locus of rationality for the conservative lies outside of man in the social process, in history, in the reified state. For Gandhi, however, man is the measure and as he tellingly demonstrated, the individual is capable of and, under some circumstances, responsible for pitting himself against the state. There is a strain in Hindu political thought which is idealist in form and conservative in effect. The concept of dharma which lies at the heart of ancient Hindu polity is reminiscent of aspect of the Hegelian metaphysical theory which L.T. Hobhouse has summed up in this manner: the individual attains his true self and freedom in conformity to his real will. This real will is the general will and the general will is embodied in the state (Allen and Urwin,

1918, p.43). The eminent Indian historian of Philosophy Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan has defined dharma as the complex of influences which shape the moral feeling and the character of the people and serve as a code of conduct, supported by the general conscience of the people. It is not a fixed code of mechanical rules, but a living spirit which grows and moves in response to the development of society (Radhakrishnan, 1945, Pp. 17-18).

The Hegelian metaphysical theory endeavors to exhibit the state as the embodiment of greatness and glory and an expression of the spirit or the absolute. The Hindu metaphysical concept of dharma could lend itself to a similar development. But the Gandhian approach could scarcely be reconciled with such an interpretation. As Hobhouse shows in his critique of the metaphysical theory of the state, there is no distinction between the real will and the actual. The will of the individual is not identical with the general will, and the rational order is not confined to the state organization. The Gandhian Position is basically in agreement with critics of the metaphysical theory. Gandhi held that “submission to the state law is the price a citizen pays for his personal liberty.” Therefore he argued submission “to a state wholly or largely unjust is an immoral barter for liberty”. A citizen who thus realizes the evil nature of a state is not satisfied to live on its sufferance, and therefore appears to the others who do not share his beliefs to be nuisance to a society whilst he is endeavoring to compel the state, without committing a moral breach, to arrest him. Thus considered, civil resistance is a more powerful expression of a soul’s anguish and an eloquent protest against the continuance of an evil state. (Young India, 1921). The technique of Satyagraha presupposes the will, and predicates a rational order not confined to state organization. Reason is the very basis of the Satyagraha method, and reason is defined, not in terms of history or hypostatized organizations, but in terms of the individual himself.

In the Gandhian view, the purpose of the state is to the fullest his potential, and the state should secure obedience from its members in return. When the state fails in achieving this objective, the individual must challenge its authority. It is for him to determine when disobedience is in order and this he is increasingly better able to do as he gains experience with Satyagraha.

"I have found that it is our first duty to render voluntary obedience to law, but whilst doing that duty I have also seen that when law fosters untruth it becomes a duty to disobey it. How may this be done? We can do so by never swerving from truth and suffering the consequences of our disobedience. No rules can tell us how this disobedience may be done and by whom, when and where, nor can they tell us which laws foster untruth. It is only experience that can guide us and it requires time and knowledge of facts" (Ibid, 1919).

Gandhi had no sympathy for the conservative principle that man is important to influence the course of change in society. For Gandhi, Satyagraha, a technique which may be wielded by an individual, precludes historicism, a metaphysical explanatory principle. Satyagraha may become an instrument of social change, and through it untruth can be deflected. Untruth is determined by the extent to which the needs of society's members are left unfulfilled. Oppression ceases, Gandhi taught his followers, "when people cease to fear the bayonet" (Ibid, 1919). Satyagraha, which disciplines the emotional response, is built upon reason the reason of the individual operating in any given social milieu.

Attachment of Members of A society to their stations: -

The fourth characteristic of conservatism is a keen moral satisfaction in the loyalty that attaches members of a station in its various ranks. It is this characteristic which is most clearly evinced in

Plato's well -structured class society. The Platonic concept of justice in the state is built upon the establishment and maintenance of the class -structure when each class in the city-state attends to its own business, including the money earning class as well as the auxiliaries and the guardians, then justice is realized (Popper, 1949, p.78).

Edmund Burke later argued that the perpetuation of society itself was largely dependent upon a hereditary landed aristocracy, whose duty and function it was to transmit social virtue. It was upon such a principle, he tells us, that the English House of Lords was based (Burke, p.53). The conservative view holds that duty is of greater importance and priority than right. The citizen finds his duty as a member of a given section of society. It is his moral obligation to fulfill these duties. These rights were not to be rigidly confined to rank and order, as we shall examining Gandhi's position on that conservative structuring of society arising out of caste.

Varna was the ancient social organization of the Hindus based upon the four class divisions. The institution degenerated into a rigid but fragmented caste structure which resulted in serious social disabilities for those of lower or of no caste. When Gandhi wrote of Varna, he tended to defend the ideal system of functional division into the prototypes, Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaisya and Shudra. In an article in Young India Gandhi expressed his belief in Varna which, he explained, "marks for universal occupations – imparting knowledge, defending the defenseless, carrying on agriculture and commerce, and performing service through physical labour" (Young India, 1937).

These occupations, he said, are common to all mankind and Hinduism had recognized them in the form of the "the law of our being" and had further used this law to regulate social relations and conduct. But Gandhi did not stop here in his commentary but should the reader who wished to understand the manner in which Gandhi seized upon the traditional only to transform it. At the same time that

Gandhi found value in an ideal, he looked about him to assess the real situation. His assessment with regard to the institution of caste led him to conclude that he did not believe in caste "in the modern sense". "It is an excrescence and a handicap on progress", he explained, and summed up his position with yet another assertion of the principle of equality: - "Nor, do I believe in Inequalities between human beings. We are all absolutely equal. But equality is of souls and not bodies. Hence, it is a mental state. We need to think of, and to assert, equality because we see great inequalities in the physical world. We have to realize equality in the midst of this apparent external inequality. Assumption of superiority by any person over any other is a sin against yod and man. Thus caste, in so far as it connotes distinction in status, is an evil ((Young India, 1938). Hobhouse has pointed to the fallacy of identifying moral and political obligation, in his argument against the metaphysical theory.

The revolutionary character of the Gandhian approach may be seen once in his opinion on the orthodox rules governing inter-dining. Such rules were, he held, hygienic in origin. "Given a proper confirmation with the rules of cleanliness there should be no scruple about dining with anybody" (Harijan, 1937).

Even restriction upon intercaste marriage Gandhi held to be "no part of Hindu religion". The restrictions "crept into Hinduism when perhaps it was in its decline" and were weakening Hindu Society (Harijan, 1938). Gandhi himself promoted many marriages across caste lines and his ashram society was organized entirely without caste distinction. The continuing Campaign Gandhi conducted against untouchability is, again, telling evidence of his abiding concern for the reconstruction of the institutions and approaches of his own society. He himself had suffered the bitter humiliation of discrimination. As he forged the tools with which the struggle could be pressed against social injustice, there emerged a philosophy of conflict which was

further to influence the development of his thought. The experience of social disability and the idea of structured class positions offended Gandhi's reason. He held the Harijan (untouchable) as capable of exercising responsible functions as the Brahmin. He knew no argument, he tells us, in favor of the retention of untouchability and he had "no hesitation" in "rejecting scriptural authority of a doubtful character" if it supported a "sinful institution". Here once more we find him asserting his rejection of all authority "if it is in conflict with sober reason or the dictates of the heart," and adding that "authority sustains and ennobles the weak" only when it is the "hand-work of reason", for when it supplants reason, it serves only to degrade. (Young India, 1920).

The law of Varna Gandhi believed to establish "certain spheres of action for certain people with certain tendencies", which had the effect at avoiding "all unworthy competition" (Bose, 1974). But in insisting upon flexibility in refusing to countenance any deferential privilege for a member of one group as opposed to a member of another, and by rejecting birth as the determining factor, he completely upset the traditional approach:-

"One born of Brahmin Parents will be called a Brahmin, but if his life fails to reveal the attributes of a Brahman when he comes of age he cannot be called a Brahman On the other hand, one who is born not a Brahman but reveals in his conduct the attributes of a Brahman will be regarded as a Brahman, though he will himself disclaim the label. (Harijan, 1934).

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 there qualities, must fail. (Ibid, 1921). Nor did Gandhi share 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 individual to have many claim 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 et 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.

Conclusion: - We are now some what closer to the answer to the question, was Gandhi a conservative? Had he not undertaken his "experiments with truth" the answer might have been "yes". Early in his life Gandhi discarded the belief in the relative importance of individual will and reason to defect the course of historical change. Once he had abandoned this criterion of conservatism, his experiments began. From those experiments emerged a Philosophy and a technique which were to transform the conservative and to fashion a radical in the truest sense of striking at the root.

So much with Gandhi's critical engagement with conservatism. Now let us turn to Liberalism and see how this immediate grounding that Gandhi shared with other colonial subjects influenced him.

Ideals of Liberalism

The word liberal is derived from the Latin liber, free and up to the end of the eighteenth century signified only "worthy of a free man." So that people spoke of liberal arts," "liberal occupations". Later the term was applied also to those qualities of intellect and of character, which were considered an ornament becoming those who occupied a higher social

position on account of their wealth and education. Thus liberal got the meaning of intellectually independent, broad-minded, magnanimous, frank, open and genial. Again liberalism may also mean a political system or tendency opposed to centralization and absolutism. In this sense liberalism is not at variance with the spirit and teaching of the Catholic Church. Since the end of the eighteen century, however, the word has been applied more and more to certain tendencies in the intellectual, religious, Political and economical life, which implied a partial or total emancipation of man from the supernatural, moral and divine order. Usually, the principles of 1789 that is of the French Revolution are considered as the magna charta of this new form of liberalism. The most fundamental principle asserts an absolute and unrestrained freedom of thought, religion, conscience, creed, speech, press and politics. The necessary consequences of this are on the one hand, the abolition of the divine right and of every kind of authority derived from god, the relegation of religion from the public life into the private domain of one's individual conscience, the absolute ignoring of Christianity and the church as public, legal and social institutions, on the other hand, the putting into practice of the absolute autonomy of every man and citizen alone all lines of human activity and the concentration of all public authority in one "sovereignty of the people." This sovereignty of the people in all branches of public life as legislation, administration and jurisdiction, is to be exercised in the name and by order of all the citizens, in such a way, that all should have share in and a control over it. A fundamental principle of liberalism is the proposition: "it is contrary to the natural, innate and inalienable right and liberty and dignity of man, to subject himself to an authority the root, rule, measure and sanction of which is not in himself." This principle implies the denial of all true authority. For authority necessary presupposes a power outside and above man to bind him morality.

These tendencies, however, were more or less active long before 1789; indeed, they are coeval with the human race. Modern liberalism adopts and propagates them under the deceiving mask of liberalism in the true sense. As a direct offspring of humanism and the reformation in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, modern liberalism was further developed by, the philosophers and literati of England especially Locke and Hume, by Rousseau and encyclopedias in France and by Lessing and Kant in Germany. Its real cradle, however, was the drawing-rooms of the moderately free -thinking French nobility (1739 -1789), especially those of Mme Necker and her daughter, Mme – de- steal. The latter was more than anybody else the connecting link between the free- thinking elements before and after the revolution and the centre of the modern liberal movement both in France and Switzerland. In her politico-religious views find their clearest exposition in her work “considerations surles principaux evenements de-la – Revolution francaise”. She pleads for the greatest possible individual liberty, and denounces as absurd the derivation of human authority from god. The legal position of the church, according to her, both as a public institution and as a property- owner is a national arrangement and therefore entirely subject to the will of the nation; ecclesiastical property belongs not to the church but to the nation; the abolition of ecclesiastical priviges is entirely justified, since the clergy is the nature enemy of the principal of Revolution. The ideal form of government is in smaller state the republic, in larger ones the constitution monarchy after the model of England. The entire art of government in modern times consists, according to mime-de-steal, in the art of directing public opinion and of yielding to it at the right moment (Herman, 1910).

So, liberalism from the latin liberalis is a political philosophy or world view founded on ideas of liberty and equality. Liberals espouse a wide array of views depending on their understanding of these

principles, but generally they support ideas such as free and fair elections, civil rights, freedom of press, freedom of religion, free trade and private property (The Economist, 2007).

Liberalism first became a distinct political movement during the age of Enlightenment, when it became popular among philosophers and economists in the western world. Liberalism rejected the nations, common at the time, of hereditary privilege, state religion absolute monarchy and the divine right of kings the early liberal thinkers John Locke is often credited with founding liberalism as a distinct philosophical tradition. Locke argued that each man has a natural right to life, liberty and property and according to the social contract government must not violate these rights. Liberals opposed traditional conservatism and sought to replace absolutism in government with democracy and rule of law. (all mankind being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or Possessions", John Locke, second Treatise of government.

The revolutionaries in the American Revolution, the French Revolution and other liberal revolutions from that time used liberal philosophy to justify the armed overthrow of what they saw as tyrannical rule. The nineteenth century saw liberal governments established in nation across Europe, Spanish America, and North America. In this period, the dominant ideological opponent of liberalism was classical conservatism. During the twentieth century, liberal ideas spread even further, as liberal democracies found themselves on the winning side in both world wars. Liberalism also survived major ideological challenges from new opponents, such as fascism and communism. In Europe and North America, classical liberalism became less popular and gave way to social democracy and social liberalism. The meaning of the word "liberalism" also began to diverge in different parts of the world according to the Encyclopedia Britannica, "In the United States liberalism is associated with the

welfare state policies of the new deal Programme of the Democratic administration of pres. Franklin D. Roosevelt, where as in Europe it is more commonly associated with a commitment to limited government and laissez faire economic Policies (Encyclopaedia Britannica). Today, liberal Political Parties remain a political force with varying degree of power and influence on all major continents.

Liberalism as a political movement spans the better part of the last four centuries, through the use of the word liberalism to refer to a specific political doctrine did not occur until the 19th century. Perhaps the first modern state founded on liberal principles with no hereditary aristocracy, was the United States of America, whose declaration of independence states that “all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, among these life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, echoing John Locke’s Phrase “life liberty and property. A few years later, the French Revolution overthrew the hereditary aristocracy, with the slogan “liberty, equality, fraternity”, and was the first state in history to grant universal male suffrage. The declaration of the rights of man and of the citizen, first codified in 1789 in France, is a foundational document of both liberalism and human rights (Gellner, 1996).

Gandhi and Liberalism

The concept of liberty is tied up with western civilization, in particular with its most recent phase, the rise of industrial capitalism that Gandhi’s critique of modern and western civilization has to be seen as germane to the debate. It was of cause just this modern phase that Gandhi rejected. He continued to hope the west would rediscover its more ancient Christian civilization. There is an almost swiften satire in Gandhi’s account and something of the horror and despair of a Michelet. At the same time his account always verged on caricature, as for example, in his extravagant comment that “hospital are institutions for propagating sin” (Gandhi, 1997, p.63) . Even working

of the force of love or of the soul (Gandhi, 1939, p.90). Only once did Gandhi make a specific reference to the west's most ardent exponent of liberty, J.S. Mill, and that was to deny that (for Indians) reading on liberty would be an education for freedom (Gandhi, 1939, Pp. 28-29). Yet Gandhi did carry overtones of Mill's ideas.

In that extraordinary statement launching the quit India Satyagraha, with its oddly personal references to Lord Linlithgow's son-in law and Charles Andrews, Gandhi saw India as the true home of freedom. "You shall limit my concept of freedom", he affirmed: "The English and American teachers, their history and their magnificent poetry have not said you shall not broaden the interpretation of that freedom. And according to my interpretation of that freedom I am constrained to say, they are strangers to that freedom which their poets and teachers have described, if they will know the real freedom, they should come to India. They have to come not with pride or arrogance, but in the spirit of earnest seekers of Truth. He concludes with a real clarion cry for freedom, "how is this vast most of humanity to be aflame in the cause of world – deliverance unless and until it has touched and felt freedom? (Parel, 1997). So freedom was a passionate commitment for Gandhi. But even if we can agree on what Gandhi might have meant by "freedom", this will still leave the more awkward question, has this understanding a great deal of relevance to the needs of today's liberal and Pluralist societies? It would be fanciful to expect a close fit between Gandhi's political philosophy and that of western liberalism – he came from so different a cultural background – unlike cinderella's proverbial slipper, the really interesting question is not where it fits but where it pinches (Parel, 2002, p.26).

In the Private Sphere:- One entry into the debate is to address the two ways Gandhi defines his central concept of Swaraj. Significantly, the same Gujarati word covers both, but in English, it implies both self rule and "home rule", or self government. This invites a debate on

the relationship between the conduct of any individual in the private and the public demesne. Drawing on the Gita Gandhi makes a distinction between two forms of the self, a lower, if you like the Dehin, the one involved in this – worldly activities, those of artha power, property and security and kama, pleasure and the avoidance of pain. This is the self directly involved in politics. For this self to function properly, it must work within the framework of dharma, but as Parel puts it, “The dehin can do so only if the mind maintains its freedom and exercises control over itself and the senses disciplined mind is a key to the successful pursuit of Swaraj “when that is attained, man is free like the king in the forest” (Gandhi, 1939). The struggle and Gandhi really seems to see no distinction between the inner pursuit of self rule and the outer for self – government, will lead toward the realization of the higher self or the atman. As Parel puts it, “self rule without self transformation is not Gandhian” (Gandhi, 1939, p.94).

But surely we should engage in this issue of the connection between the private and the public spheres through a far sharper separating out of the personal. We should always want to know how a person behaves in the private sphere, in family relationship, in matters of personal morality and above all sexually. We should initially judge a person’s commitment to liberalism or libertarianism in these contexts. And here of course, we are moving the goalposts. Not all would see in libertarianism were extension of the scope of liberalism, but it is certainly within the field of what we currently discuss as liberty. Whether there is dichotomy or correlation here with attitudes in the public sphere might give us a major clue, certainly at the temperamental level, to a person’s real proclivities towards freedom. How does Gandhi stand up to such scrutiny? The formal education of all his four children was to be neglected through Gandhi’s way of life. He seems to have turned away from his children in favour of his nephew, Maganlal, “dearer to me than my own sons,

who never once deceived me or failed me" (Chadha, 1997, p.283). Gandhi comes across very much as the Victorian paterfamilias. There are intriguing parallels here with another great twentieth- century moralist Bertrand Russell, equally to present a high moral profile to the outside world, but in many ways, conspicuously to fail in his family relationships (Parel, 2002, p.27).

Another test of his commitment to freedom in practice was his relationship with his wife Kasturbai. Here again were many examples of conflict, even if, in the end, there was something moving and triumphant about their long marriage. One famous incident was Kasturbai's threat to leave the new Sabarmati Ashram at the admission of an untouchable family. Gandhi gave her an ultimatum, come into line or leave. In his diary he wrote: "got excited again and lost temper with Bapu" (Chadha, 1997, p.210). Gandhi recognized how intolerant a moral taskmaster he could be. He confessed to a friend: "I do not know what evil is in me. I have a strain of cruelty in me, as others say, such that people force themselves to do things, even to attempt impossible things, in order to please me. Lacking the necessary strength, they put on a false show and deceive me. Even Gokhale used to tell me that I was so harsh that people felt terrified of me and allowed themselves to be dragged against their will out of sheer fear or in an attempt to please me.... I put far too heavy burdens on people" (Chadha, 1997, Pp.190-191). On this occasion Gandhi rubbed salt into Kasturbai's wound by proceeding to adopt daughter of an untouchable family. Gandhi comes across at his least libertarian in his attitudes toward sexual morality. Any branch, however minor, of the sexual moral code prompted an extreme response. Here is one example. Word came- Kasturbai the informant – of the sexual lapse of two inmates in Tolstoy farms: "news of an apparent failure or reverse in the satyagraha struggle would not have shocked me", wrote Gandhi, "but this news came upon me like a thunderbolt" (Gandhi,

1927, p. 208). Gandhi's attitudes towards women, one would be little inclined to see Gandhi as libertarian in his personal life.

IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE:-

The Law:- Gandhi was to draw a distinction between man made or positive laws and dharma. To quote Parel, for this is a difficult terrain and we need Guidance: "Modern legal positivism, according to Gandhi, corrupts the notion of law in that it makes obedience to positive law a political and a moral duty, independently of the question of whether such law is in harmony with dharma or not" (Gandhi, 1939, Pp.92). But has Gandhi merely transposed a legal constraint from a utilitarian tradition within the colonial state to an ancient moral and legal tradition? Not that we should dispose too easily of Gandhi's respect for the legal procedures of petition, and the practice of constitutional law as an essential means by which Indians could pursue their rights and eventual freedom. Certainly the role of lawyers was an important one for Gandhi (Parel, 1997, Pp. 288-289).

Human Rights:- Gandhi clearly believed in rights: "Passive resistance", his editor claims, "is a method of securing rights by personal suffering (Parel, 1997, Pp. 289-98). On the other hand, Gandhi privileged duties over rights clearly, whatever Gandhi's exposure to modern legal codes, he moved away into a more traditional religious of inalienable human rights (Gandhi, 1958, p.384).

The Role of the State:- Gandhi drew a distinction between mere home rule, where India would find itself still governed by a modern coercive state, and true home rule, with a limited and just state. If India were to acquire freedom without the spiritual transformation of self-rule, all that would happen would be the setting up of Engistan. Gandhi used the metaphor of a tiger for the modern state, and he had the extremists in his rights when he accused them of "wanting the tiger's nature but not the tiger" (Gandhi, 1939, p.28). Any discussion of

liberty and the state leads naturally to a discussion of those two dominant paradigms, so vividly sketched by Isaiah Berlin, of a negative and positive concept of liberty. But before connecting Gandhi's idea of freedom to these we first have to describe his views liberal institutions, liberal nationalism, and where the rival claims of liberty and equality intersected in his vision of society.

Liberal Institutions:- "Parliaments are really emblems of slavery" (Gandhi, 1939, p.38). Gandhi, if Gandhi be the editor, faulted the west minister parliament both for the opportunism and spinelessness of its MP's- "if any member, by way of exception, gives an independent vote, he is considered a renegade"- and the way parliament failed ever to come to any firm conclusions- "what is done today may be undone tomorrow. It is not possible to recall a single instance in which finality can be predicated for its work". The Prime Minister Pursnes his own self- interest. It is as if Gandhi distrusted the inherent pluralism of opinion in such liberal systems and drifted toward corporatist alternatives; "if the money and the time wasted by the parliament were entrusted to a few good men, the English nation would be occupying today a much higher platform" (Gandhi, 1939, Pp.31-32).The press likewise fell short of Gandhi's expectation that it was possible to present the truth: "the same fact is differently interpreted by different newspapers, according to the party in whose interests they are edited. Now, anybody writes and prints anything he likes and poisons people's minds" (Gandhi, 1939, Pp.32-36). On the other hand, Gandhi is seemingly benignly disposed to the role of minorities: "all reforms owe their origin to the initiation of minorities in opposition to majorities" (Gandhi, 1939, p.92).

Religious Toleration:- In seeming contradiction to this disaffection for pluralism in the civic environment, Gandhi was the strongest possible plea for tolerance in the religious. But it is not so wholly divergent a position. Gandhi does not appear to say that there are genuine

alternatives. He simply says that were any religious position to be stifled we risk losing some insight into the truth. Gandhi appears to follow the tradition of Ramakrishna and Vivekananda who defended a pluralism of faiths. But we also have to grapple with the skepticism of Wilhelm Halbfass who sees in the hindu claim of tolerance an evasive device for confronting real difference in other faith traditions and a hidden form of religious intolerance (Halbfass, 1988, Pp.47-48). Gandhi's pluralism was certainly greatly removed from J.S. Mill's rejoicing in the right to difference.

Liberal Nationalism:- Where did Gandhi stand regarding liberal nationalism? The struggle for swaraj was on behalf of Praja, the India word Gandhi used for "nation". Intriguingly, Gandhi did not see the nation as an alien import from the west. India had already discovered its own pre-political but national identity through its religious "one thought inspired us, our mode of life was the same". The Hindu saints had established its frontiers and fired the people with an idea of nationality in a manner unknown in other parts of the world. Any two Indians are one as no two Englishmen are" (Halbfass, 1988, Pp.48-49). He refused to be fazed by communal rivalries. India dealt with its religious Pluralism by cultural and political assimilationism. Such a spirit of nationalism would not, however, "interfere with another's religion". But he was emphatic: "in no part of the world are one nationality and one religion synonymous terms: nor has it ever been so" (Halbfass, 1988, Pp. 52-53).

Gandhi had drawn up the battle lines against Jinnah's two-nation theory well in advance. He confidently addressed the question of a national language. The role of English as a lingua franca was part of India's slavery: "a universal language for India should be Hindi, with the option of writing it in Persian and Nagri characters" (Halbfass, 1988, p.105). This was liberalism of a kind and fell short of the worst expression of linguistic chauvinism in movements for

integral nationalism. But there was no concession to the Dravidian languages. But Gandhi was opposed power politics, to India's becoming a militarist state, toward real politik in general.

But connecting Gandhi's version of nationalism to the liberal nationalism so dominant elsewhere remains problematic. Gandhi was turning his back on just this kind of liberal nationalism and taking India into quite a different direction, an anarchist vision of a village based society.

Was Gandhi a covert liberal?

India inherited a quasi-parliamentary west minister system and turned it into a mass democracy. One way of testing the character of Gandhi's version of liberety is to ask, to what extend did he contribute to this outcome? This should not turn into a familiar historical narrative, but only by a selective inspection of Gandhi's attitudes and tactics over time will an answer be obtained. A good deal of the answer lies in asking how Gandhi really thought of the law and its practice and in exploring the character of his political conduct in South Africa. While a lawyer there, he certainly worked within its constitutional and liberal structures. Admittedly, he came to reject an adversarial system of justice as incompatible with pursuit of the truth. Possibly, just because the Indians were a minority and clearly dependent on the colonial state, Gandhi does not seen seriously to have entertained the idea of bypassing the state and fashioning alternative form of rule. Only when up against the raj did thus ambition grow, and it is in the India context that we are more likely to get at the ambiguities of Gandhi's views on liberal parliamentary institutions. Into this frame come the Indian liberals, above all, Tej Bahadur Sapru, and it will be instructive also to see how Gandhi's intial heir apparent, Rajagopalchari, a devout Gandhian, turned in a liberal direction.

Non cooperation 1920-1922

Gandhis respect for Gokhale, and with Tilak increasingly his rival, Gandhi's more naturally relates to the moderate than to the extremist position, and at one stage we did seem to fit into the mold of the moderate liberal politician. But Satyagraha clearly took him in another direction and long before the break from empire over the Punjab atrocities Gandhi had signaled an anarchist over a liberal preference. But the first great test came with the non cooperation campaign of 1920-1922. As late as December 1919 at the Amritsar congress, the party had been ready to work the new Montfort reforms. Only at the special Calcutta meeting of September 1920 was the decision taken to go for a Gandhian noncooperation strategy, to be confirmed by the 1920 Nagpur congress. Under reading, the raj saw how vital it was to retain the support of the India liberals, ready, as they were, to work the constitution. Antony low shows how vital an intermediary group the liberals became between Raj and congress, and had Gandhi chosen to align himself with sapru and the liberals, real political concessions, together with Dominion status, could well have been won at this stage from a raj still guilty of the events of 1919. Reading held out the prospect in late 1921 of a roundtable conference. Law argues of the liberals: "Had Gandhi agreed in December or January 1921-1922 to attend a round table conference on the term which reading offered, there can be very little doubt that they would have formed a common front with him." But Gandhi preferred the escalation of conflict to civil disobedience. "Gandhi," argues Low," Never seems to have sufficiently appreciated that in the circumstances which existed. At the end of 1921 nothing was likely to bring a dramatic victory to the nationalist cause than a continued swing to the side of the moderates" (Low, 1996. P.46). So why did Gandhi reject this option? B.R.Nanda may have the answer: at the Calcutta congress, the entire old guard of the congress, including

C.R.Das, Makaviya, Lajpat Rai, Annie Besant and Jinnah had opposed the non-cooperation movement. If Gandhi had listened towards of "Sanity" and "moderation", and pinned his faith solely on negotiations with the British congress politics would have been indistinguishable from those of the liberal party, there would have been no Satyagraha campaigns, and the British would perhaps still be ruling over India (Nanda, 1995, p.176).

Gandhi had in a conscious attempt to win over the moderates, made much of government repressiveness and on 14th January 1922, had attended a leader's conference in Bombay. But clearly Gandhi would only team up with the liberals in his terms, and at this stage he was heading in an alternative direction.

The Swarajists 1923-1930:

Gandhi doubted the possibility of achieving much through legislature with limited powers set up by the British Government, he considered the policy of obstruction from within the councils neither feasible nor advisable, he was certain that more could be achieved through work among the people than through verbal fireworks in the councils. (Nanda, 1995, Pp.18-19).

But Gandhi rarely denied others their freedom, and besides, as he put it, many of his best friends were Swarajists, "I took it not that I could not do less than throw my weight with them as against other parties." Nanda adds: Gandhi could have out voted the Swarajists but a scramble for power was utterly repugnant to him."(Nanda, 1995, Pp. 18-19).

The underlying liberal tendencies of congress exist-in to its anglicized elite surfaced with a so called responsivist group, not only anxious to enter the councils, but to accept office. At this state Gandhi was deeply suspicious of what he saw as political opportunism. In Nanda's analysis Gandhi believed that the Swarajists

would in time become disillusioned and that their historical role had simply been “to till the political vaccum between two Gandhian struggles” (Nanda, 1995, p.22). With the renewal of civil disobedience with the salt Satyagraha Gandhi surely proclaimed his preference for radical nationalism over liberal constitutionalism.

All one can say of Gandhi is that he was all too happy to see the congress ministries resign in October 1939, disgusted as he had become by the self – interest conduct of many congress MP's. It is difficult to see in Gandhi any strong sympathy for these emergent liberal institutions and at best he left others to work for their creation. Though he shared C.R.Das's wish for a clean administration, there is nothing to suggest that he would have gone along with such assertion of state power- he was consistent in his rejection of a coercive state- though we can gain some insight into Gandhi's Political beliefs by reference to CR's Burkeanism.

Clearly Gandhi believed in freedom but this hardly adds up to his being a Convert liberal.

So, is there a Gandhian Definition of liberty?

In terms of village republics Gandhi came closest to portraying his preferred political system. If enlightened anarchy was not feasible, then minimum government was the next best alternative. Decentralization was crucial to Gandhi's concept of a nonviolent society. Gandhians have subsequently pressed for the implementation of this vision of Panchayat Raj. Little of this was done at the time of drawing up the constitution, though it belatedly featured in its directive principles. Balwantrai Mehta's committee in the 1950s came up with “a well thought out scheme of self-government in rural India” (Ali, 1950). But little was done till the introduction of the 75th constitutional Amendment Bill in 1991. This sought to strengthen the base of local government, the Gram Sabha, the body that elected the

panchayat officials and moves were made to strengthen the representation of women and untouchables. But Bunker Roy points out that the gram sabha lacks the power to replace incompetent or corrupt panchayat officials. The panchayat itself would acts as legislature judiciary and execution though again, legislation has so far failed to transfer to its remit local magistracy powers. The Gram Sabha meet twice a year and are activity involved in local policy making, drawing up, for example, village development plans. Can one share Mrs.Krishnamurti's optimism that "the age old wisdom of the villagers backed by an effective support system will usher in devolution of power and decentralize democracy"? (Ali, 1950, p.288)

And can we see in this strengthening of grass roots democracy the potential fulfillment of Gandhi's vision of the oceanic Circle, of self rule moving ever outwards from the village republic to the nation, even to the global villages of the world?

Liberalism and the individual:-

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 house holder), 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's philosophy was the most compatible with the ideas of freedom among Indian thinkers of his period. He placed great importance on individual freedom and independent action. In his mind, the individual remained the maker of his own destiny, with the state having only a very limited role in an individual's affairs. His views were based on a combination of his interpretation of Hindu ideas mixed largely with the ideas of the liberal American philosopher Henry David Thoreau (1817-62) Thoreau had said, "That government is best which governs least. Gandhi repeated that like a mantra on many occasions. In fact Gandhi merged the concepts of accountability from classical liberalism with those of the Karma Theory of Hinduism. His can be said to have been an eclectic synthesis of Hinduism and

liberalism. Despite its different contribution to liberty in the past, once an effort is made, it appears that just as Christianity can along with liberalism; Hinduism can also get along with liberalism quite well, arguably even more so.

Gandhi opposed the collectivist and centralized approaches of communism not on intellectual grounds but because of his “intuitive” grasp over the concept of accountability and justice. The quotations from Gandhi (Fischer) given below illustrate this:

1. Government that is ideal governs the least. It is no self government that leaves nothing for the people to do” (p.196)
2. “I look upon an increase of the power of the state with the greatest fear because, although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality which lies at the root of all progress” (p.304).
3. “Submission [.....] to a state wholly or largely unjust is an immoral barter for liberty [.....] civil resistance is a most power expression of a soul’s anguish and an eloquent protest against the continuance of an evil state’ (p.165).
4. ‘The means to me are just as important as the goal, and in a sense more important in that we have some control over them, where as we have none over the goal if we lose control over the mean’(p.305)
5. “I hope to demonstrate that real Swaraj will not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when abused. In the other words, swaraj is to be attained by educating the masses to sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority” (Fischer, 2006, p.202).

Sanjeev Sabhlok’s has found that the above views of Gandhi reveal his closeness to some of the liberal tenets. The government has a minimal role in a free society- a key message of classical liberalism (Sabhlok, 2010). Here Gandhi is reiterating the most fundamental

principles of a free society. The individual is the hub of the society; the individual must be allowed to develop self-knowledge self respect and become responsible and accountable. Liberalism resists tyranny, and nothing is generally more tyrannical than a state that barters liberty for immorality, as socialists governments have, in India. Gandhis chosen method of protest against supremely ethical and persuasive. There was no secrecy involved, no deception. Attacking people, as terrorists do, never change the beliefs that people hold. Liberalism focuses almost entirely on the process, or the means. The ends are seen as a natural consequence of the means. There is no coercion, only persuasion. Liberalism requires the active participation of each citizen in the regulation and control of their government. In a free society the best of its citizens come forward as representatives. There is no better way to prevent the abuse of authority than for freedom loving people to form the government.

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).

Unfortunately, this view seriously misrepresents the foundation of liberty and capitalism. For Gandhi to even imply tangentially that capitalists were not using their wealth for the welfare of the community was wrong. Businesses contribute to the welfare of society in many ways:

First, they do so through the services they provide. By applying their mental energy to combined natural and human resources with capital, they generate products and services that would not have existed without their efforts. These products and services increase our knowledge and improve our health and longevity. That is their most important contribution.

Second, businesses generate employment for thousands, if not million, of families, taking each such person employed out of the quagmire poverty. This is their second most important contribution.

In this manner, those who achieve wealth through their own initiative have already contributed so disproportionately in comparison to ordinary people that we should be ashamed of asking them to further look after the “welfare” of society.

Also, Gandhi was not a ‘system’ thinker and was unable to elaborate the design of institutions by which governments of free India would be held accountable. It is not enough to say that a ‘Government’ is best which governs the least.’ It is important to specify how this will happen. This inability to think at the system level, i.e., by building from the level of individual incentives right up to the social level, is perhaps a cultural trait of most Indians. We prefer to think with things at the margin or to appeal to the good intentions of people, rather than think about systematic incentives which will give us the results we want. On the other hand, the west has been very competent

in this area. And so, given Gandhi's rather limited understanding of systematic processes, we still need look to the advances of western economic theory such as the theory of public choice for a more complete picture of governance (Chandrasekaran, 2011). It's now time to take on Socialism in relation to Gandhi's political ideas.

Ideals of Socialism

Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics defines socialism as "a political and economic theory of system of social organization based on collective speaking active on state ownership of the means of production, distribution on exchange" C. E. M Joad thinks that socialism devotes "both a doctrine and a political movement" socialism consists of both economic and political doctrines. Bernard Crick in his small book socialism (Crick, 1998) describes socialism as: "invented system of society that stressed the social as against the selfish, the cooperative as against the competitive, sociability as against the individual self sufficiency and self interest, strict social control on the accumulation and use of private property, and either economic quality or at least rewards according to merit (merits judged socially) or rewards judged according to need" (Crick, 1998, p.29). Crick has not simply defined socialism as economic and political doctrine, he has briefly elaborated what is exactly meant by this concept strictly speaking socialism is not a Political and economic doctrine, it at the same time envisages method to reach certain goals which large number of man aspire to similarly capitalism, fascism and anarchism are also methods. But some adherents of socialism claim that it is not at par with them. It, as a method, is different from other methods. In this respect socialism has specialty.

Socialism is system an economic system characterized by social ownership of the means of production and co-operative management of the economy (Britannica, 2012). "Social ownership" may refer to cooperative enterprise, common ownership, State Ownership, citizen

ownership of equity, or any combination of this (O'Hara, 2003). There are many varieties of socialism and there is no single definition encapsulating all of them (Lamb, 2006, p.1). They differ in the type of social ownership they advocate, to degree to which they rely on markets or planning how management is to be organized within productive institutions and role of the state in constructing socialism (Nove, 2008). A Socialist economic system consists of a system of production and distribution organized to directly satisfy economic demands and human needs, so that goods and services are produced directly for use instead of for private profit driven by the accumulation of capital (Kotz, 2011). This understanding of socialism was held not just by revolutionary Marxist socialists but also by evolutionary socialists, Christian socialists and even archaists. At that time, there was also wide agreement above the basic institutions of the future socialist system: public ownership instead of private ownership of the means of production, economic planning instead of market forces, production for use instead of the profit.

Accenting is based on physical quantities, a common physical magnitude, or a direct measure of labour time in place of financial calculation. Distribution is based on the principle to each according to his Contribution. Marxist theory holds that the development of the socialist mode of production will give rise to a communist society, in which classes and the state are no longer present, there is access abundance to final goods, and thus distribution is based on to each according to his need (Bockman, 2011). As a political movement, socialism includes a diverse array of Political Philosophers ranging from reformation to revolutionary socialism proponents of state Socialism advocate the nationalization of the means of production distribution and exchange as a strategy for implementing socialism. In contrast libertarian Socialism oppose the use of state power to achieve such an arrangement, opposing both parliamentary politics and state

ownership democratic socialism seeks to establish socialism through democratic processes and propagate its ideals within the context of a democratic political system (vrousalis, 2011, Pp.211-226).

Modern socialism originated from an 18th century intellectual and working class political movement that criticized the effect of industrialization and private property on society. In the early 19th century, "Socialism" referred to any concern for the social problems of capitalism irrespective of the solutions to those problems. However by the late 19th century "Socialism" had come to signify opposition to capitalism and advocacy for an alternative system based on some form of social ownership (Gasper, 2005, p.24). Marxists expanded further on this, attribute scientific assessment and democratic planning as critical elements of socialism (Giddens, 1994, p.71).

Robert Eccleshaal and Vincent Geoghegan say that socialism in general Comprises three basic components and these are: it is a critique, it is an alternative and finally, it is a theory of transition.

In the first place, socialism is regarded as a critique. Socialism is a reaction against the deteriorating conditions of the Industrial Revolution. The socialists came to the conclusion that the deteriorating social, Political and economic conditions must be removed and for this purpose concerted efforts both at academic and practical levels are to be made. Geoghegan says that as a critique it is a form of egalitarianism. Some may raise question against this contention. But it is a fact that some sort of egalitarianism. Contains in it. It is again an alternative. The persons who criticize the illiberal, political and economic system have offered an alternative approach and it is socialism. They forcefully argue that only through the implementation of socialist principles the economic conditions of socialist principles the economic conditions of common men can be appreciably improved. Hence socialism is an appropriate alternative to capitalism (Das, 2006, Pp.348-349). As a theory of transition socialism indicates

how the improvements could be achieved through concerted efforts. So socialism is an alteration model to capitalism. Naturally setting up of a new social order is the goal of the socialists. The socialists aim at freeing the society from all the evils and at the same time they want to build up a new society taking the best elements of all political models. Change from one system another and so it is transition. It is a theory of transition in another sense also. A socialist society is built upon the ashes of capitalism, but the completion of this task requires continuous efforts and a number of revolutions

Andrew Heywood divides the ideological manifestation of socialism into five parts or categories. These are community, cooperation, equality, social class and common ownership. The exponents of socialism believe that (and it is their firm belief) society is not the conglomeration of separate individuals. The individuals are not only closely connected but they are also interdependent. Though they pursue their own respective interest and objectives in their own way they also know that their actions create impact upon others and their condition makes them alert about their action. From this attitude emanates the idea of collective thought and action and the socialist & diligently propagate it. The socialist, therefore, treat all persons as brothers and in the specific language of scholars individuals call themselves as comrades (Heywood, 2004).

This attitude of the socialist calls for a new approach to society and its various functions. It implies that all social actions should be done in a collective way. Socialism for this reason is called collectivism. The collectivist interpretation of socialism is collectivism or state socialism Joad interprets socialism in this light. To sum up, both political and economic actions are to be done in a collective way and in such a situation there is practically no scope of individual action in both economic and political areas this collectivism, socialism and state socialism are used by many interchangeably.

COOPERATION:-

Another way of looking at socialism is cooperation. Aristotle Said man is by nature a social animal and the sociability of men induces them to cooperate amongst themselves socialists believe that the individuals are quite aware of the fact that all are dependent on each other and keeping this basic concept in mind they always cooperate with each other. Lies the fundamental difference between socialism and liberalism or conservatism. Liberalism's basic tenet is that competition among men is the most important aspect of society and it is the powerful factors of social progress. According to socialism individual's cooperation makes social progress and economic development a reality. This socialism and liberalism are the concepts of opposite poles and this position is due to the objectives and methods suggested by each.

It has been pointed out by socialists that the cooperation among men and mutual aid towards each other are both spontaneous. This behind spontaneity there are moral grounds this will lead to disastrous consequences. But the socialists do not completely rule out the scope of competition. The competition takes place in a healthy atmosphere. It is a competition forward and academic development and not for pecuniary benefits. This is the basic concept of socialism is different from that of liberation. Again cooperation provides impartation to the collective thought and philosophy.

EQUALITY:-

Equality is another idea or principle of socialism and this respect socialism puts itself against conservatism and liberation. Particularly the former Socialism declares equality as its avowed principle and it will strive continuously for its attainment. It is the belief of the socialists that only through equality specifically social equality can there be justice or in John Rawls fairness. If there are

gross inequality among different sections of people and if this is economic inequality, in such a society justice cannot exist the socialists stress on the equality of status and of opportunity but maintain studied salience on differences in talents and capacities. They do not utter anything about the consequences of inequality in talents and capacities. Without cooperation and brotherhood socialism will be an academic doctrine, its real existence will be a subject of dream world. Liberals and conservatives however do not agree with the socialists. They are of opinion that if the inequality is talents and capacities are admitted there cannot be equality whatever way its manifestation be. The inequality in talents will lead to inequality in income, wealth and status. Hence socialists' concept of inequality is wrong.

SOCIAL CLASS:-

Another principle or ideal of socialism as an ideology is the formation of social class. It is generally thought that socialists society without social class is hardly to be stable. The counter revolutionaries and the remnants of the bourgeoisie will remain active ever after the setting up of a socialists society and they will conspire to dislodge the socialists from power through counter revolution. In order to stop this possibility the socialists plan to form a cohesive and integrated class comprising social groups who share almost similar political, economic and other views. If such a class is at all formed the administration of socialists society will be an easy task. Even after setting up to socialism manifold tasks remain to be performed and in such a situation the social class/ classes help the socialist's society. In this way a social class becomes an integral part of a socialists society. A social class also helps the socialist's society in other ways. A socialist's society is not a communist or classless society. Naturally such a society is to be freed from many elements which are opposed to

socialism and in this task both the society class and the socialist state will work in tandem. But the concept of social class is incongruous.

With Marxist Concept of state of society Marx and Engels thought of class based or economic interest. But the idea of social; class does not fall within the preview of Marxist concept. Moreover, it is herby related with the two class models of Marx. However, the social class idea has got special meaning in socialist society.

COMMON OWNERSHIP:-

The socialists and even some non Socialists have traced the origin of exploitations, growing impoverishment and inequality in income and wealth to the institution of private priority in general and private ownership in the means of production. They have concluded that in order, to bring about an end of inequality, poverty and exploitations the common ownership over the means of production must be established and system of private property should be done away with. In other words, the whole society shall be the owner of property. The system of private property means gross injustice because any type of property can never be the product of any single person and if so a particular individual cannot claim a property. In other words, the property is the joint product and it must be under the joint ownership. Again there is another means son. Private property means to create source of conflict. The socialists, in commiseration of all these, suggest that the best way is to abolish the system of private property. But the system of private property subsequently has created a lot of neat among the political scientists, socialists and intellectuals of all countries. Particularly the socialists and the liberals and conservatives are at loggerheads on the issue of private property. The fact is that the controversy between to have property and not to have it still persists (Das, 2006, Pp.352 to 354).

Socialists adhere to a diverse range of philosophical views. Marxian socialism is philosophically materialist as well as having at its centre a commitment to historical materialism. Many forms of socialist theory hold that human behaviours is largely shaped by the social environment. In particular, Marxism and socialists inspired by Marxist theory, holds that social mores, values, cultural traits and economic practices are social creations, and are not the result of an immutable natural law (Ferri, 1912, p.79)

The ultimate goal for Marxist socialists is the emancipation of labour from alienating work. Marxists argue that freeing the individual from the necessity of performing alienating work in order to receive goods would allow people to pursue their own interests and develop their own talents without being coerced into performing labour for others. For Marxists the stage of economic development in which this is possible, sometimes called full communism, is contingent upon advances in the productive capabilities of society.

Socialists generally argue that capitalism concentrates power and wealth within a small segment of society that controls the means of production and derive its wealth through economic exploitation. This creates unequal social relations which fail to provide opportunities for every individual to maximize their potential. “Socialists complain that capitalism necessarily leads to unfair and exploitative concentrations of wealth and power in the hands of the relative few, who emerge victories from free market competition-people who then use their wealth and power to reinforce their dominance in society” and does not utilize available technology and resources to their maximum potential in the interests of the public (Marx and Engels 1968, p.40). Capitalist property relation put a “fetter” on the production forces.

Types of Socialism:-

The word socialism refers to a broad range of theoretical and historical socio-economic system, and has also been used by many political movements through history to describe themselves and their goals, generating numerous types of socialism. Different self described socialists have used the term socialism to refer to different things, such as an economic system, a type society, a philosophical outlook, a collection of moral values and ideals, or even a certain kind of human character. Some definitions of socialism are very vague (Boyle, 1912, p.35). Boyle Quotes Pierrismo Joseph Proudhon as stating that socialism is “every aspiration towards the amelioration of society,” and then admitting that, under this definition, “we are all socialists”. While other are so specific that they only include a small minority of the things that have been described as “Socialism” in the past. There have been numerous political movements which called themselves socialist, some of these interpretations are mutually exclusive, and all of them have generated debates over the true meaning of socialism (Boyle, 1912).

We may also note Marxism as a distinct school of Socialism separately. The economic and political theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels that hold that human actions and institutions are economically determined and that class struggle is needed to create historical change and that capitalism will ultimately be superseded by communism ----a political theory favouring collectivism in a classless society; Lumpenproletariat: - (Marxism) the unorganized lower levels of the proletariat who are interested in revolutionary advancement.

Marxism – the doctrines developed from the political, economic and social theories of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and their followers: dialectical materialism, a labor-based theory of wealth, an economic class struggle leading to revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat,

and the eventual development of classless society, the contributions to these doctrines in the interpretations of Lewin (Ologies, 2008).

Marxism – the system of thought developed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, esp. the doctrines that class struggle has been the main agency of historical change and that capitalism will be inevitable be superseded by a socialist by a socialist order and class society (Kernerman Webster's college Dictionary, 2005). Marxist economic and political theory and practice originated by the German political philosophers Karl Marx (1818-83) and Friedrich Engels (1820-95), that holds and actions and human institutions are economically determined, that the class struggle is the basic agency of historical change, and that capitalism will ultimately be superseded by communism (Collins English Dictionary 1991, 1994, 1998, 2000).

Marxism – the political and economic philosophy of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in which the concept of class struggle plays a central role in understanding society's allegedly inevitable development from bourgeois oppression under capitalism to a socialist and ultimately classless society (The American Heritage Dictionary, 2009).

So, briefly, Marxism is a socio-economic and political world view or inquiry based on a materialist interpretation of historical development, a dialectical view of social transformation, an analysis of class-relations and conflict within society Marxist methodology informs an economic and socio-political enquiry applying to the analysis and critique of development of capitalism and the role of class struggle in systemic economic change.

In the mid to late 19th century, the intellectual tenets of Marxism were inspired by two German Philosophers: Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Marxist analysis and methodologies have influenced multiple political ideologies and social movements throughout history.

Marxism encompasses an economic theory, a sociological theory, a philosophical method, and a revolutionary view of social change (Britannica Encyclopedia).

There is no single definitive Marxist theory, Marxist analysis has been applied to diverse subjects and has been misconceived and modified during the course of its development, resulting in numerous and sometimes contradictory theories that all under the rubric of Marxism or Marxian analysis (Wolff and Resnick, 1987, p.130).

Marxism builds on a materialist understanding of societal development, taking as its starting point the necessary economic activities required by human society to provide for its material needs. The form of economic organization or mode of production is understood to be the basis from which the majority of other social phenomena –including social relations, political and legal systems, morality and ideology ... arise (or at the least by which they are directly influenced). These social relations form the superstructure, for which the economic system forms the base. As the forces of production (most notably technology) improve, existing forms of social organization become inefficient and stifle further progress. These inefficiencies manifest themselves as social contradictions in the form of class (Gregory and Stuart, 2003, p.62). According to Marxist analysis, class conflict within capitalism arises due to intensifying contradictions between highly productive mechanized and socialized production performed by the proletariat, and private ownership and private appropriation of the surplus-product in the form of surplus value (profit) by a small minority of private owners called the bourgeoisie. As the contradiction becomes apparent to the proletariat, social unrest between the two antagonistic classes intensifies, culminating in a social revolution. The eventual long-term outcome of this revolution would be the establishment of socialism – a socio-economic system based on cooperative ownership of the means of

production, distribution based on one's contribution, and production organized directly for use Karl Marx hypothesized that, as the productive forces and technology continued to advance, socialism would eventually give way to a communist stage of social development. Communism would be a classless, stateless, humane society erected on common-ownership and the principle of "From each according to his ability to each according to his needs.

Marxism has developed into different branches and schools of thought. Different schools place a greater emphasis on certain aspects of classical Marxism while de-emphasizing or rejecting other aspects of Marxism, sometimes combining Marxist analysis with non-Marxian concepts. Some variants of Marxism primarily focus on one aspect of Marxism as the determining force in social development – such as the mode of production, class, power-relationships or property ownership – while arguing other aspects are less important or current research makes them irrelevant. Despite sharing similar premises, different schools of Marxism right reach contradictory conclusions from each other (O'Hara, 2003 p.107).

For instance, different Marxian economists have contradictory explanations of economic crisis and different predictions for the outcome of such crises. Furthermore, different variants of Marxism apply Marxist analysis to study different aspects of society (e.g. mass culture, economic-crisis, or Feminism (Wolff and Resnick, Richard and Stephen, 1987). These theoretical differences have led various socialist and communist parties and political movements to embrace different political strategies for attaining socialism, advocate different programs and policies. One example of this is the division between revolutionary socialists and reformists that emerged in the German Social Democratic Party during the early 20th century.

M.K. Gandhi and Socialism

Socialists around the world never fail to use the name of Mohandas Gandhi to push their agenda .However, Gandhi was far from being a leftist, and his Political Positions were in direct opposition to the left.

In his autobiography, Jawaharlal Nehru lamented that Gandhi put up with Capitalism but considered socialism as an inherently violent system. He added that when Gandhi used the word “Socialist” to describe himself, he intended it as a peculiar form of “muddled humanitarianism” and did not mean it in the economic sense. According to Nehru, Gandhi’s opposition to the economic ideas of Socialism did not result from the ignorance of the subject as Gandhi had “read many books on economics and socialism and even Marxism, and [had] discussed it with others”.

Gandhi was repulsed by the Marxist concepts of class wars and violent revolutions, and as Nehru put it, “He suspects also socialism, and more particularly Marxism, because of their association with violence”. Nehru also complained about Gandhi’s advocacy of trust run by Wealthy people for the benefit of others and claimed that he was “always laying stress on the idea of the trusteeship of the feudal prince of the big landlord, of the capitalist”.

Elsewhere, Gandhi opposed the socialist position on private property when he told a group of land owners, “I shall be no party to dispossessing propertied classes of their property without just cause....But supposing that there is an attempt unjustly to deprive you of your property, you will find me fighting on your side”(Young India, 1934).

Economics is not the only field where Gandhi’s ideas clash with those of the left. Socialists in western countries are obsessed with the issue of abortion to such an extent that it is one of the main issues

which define them. According to the socialists, the inferior status of women in western societies is the result of woman giving birth to babies and women should undergo abortions in order to blunt the advantage of men and become their equals. This agreement has taken deep root in western countries where millions of infants are killed every year with a large numbers of these deaths classified as "live birth abortions." Gandhi wrote of the practice of abortion in Young India, "It seems to me clear as daylight that abortion would be a crime" (Young India, 1937).

Yet another issue which highlights the differences between Gandhi and the leftists is the right to own weapons. While the left wants to outlaw guns in general with only the communists entitled to the ownership of guns, Gandhi stated in his autobiography that depriving the whole nation of arms the blackest law passed by the British.

Gandhi also different from the left on the issue of cast. While the Marxists saw the existence of casts as an opportunity to cause division by pitting different castes against each other in order to spark a class war, Gandhi discerned the importance of castes which played the role of economic guilds. He wanted an economic system in which various castes cooperated with each other as equals by specializing in their trades. Gandhi was aware of the methods of communists and socialists who caused division among the people and stated that the communist and socialists "believe in generating and accentuating hatred" (Gandhi, 1948).

Apart from these issues, socialists opposed the principle of individual freedom and looked up to the government to solve all problems by imposing controls. In contrast, Gandhi opposed granting power to the state as he believed that "the state represents violence in a concentrated and organized form." Gandhi considered governments to be harmful as they destroyed individual freedom. He wrote in

favour of individual freedom, "I want freedom for the full expression of my personality. I must be free to build a Staircase to Sirius if I want to." Gandhi opposed all controls and when topic of food control was discussed in 1947, he stated that "Control gives rise to fraud, suppression of truth, intensification of the black market and artificial Scarcity" (Gandhi, 1942).

India's history books in the past sixty years have been written by Marxists, and Gandhi's views have been distorted to fit in with the Marxist agenda. These books suppress Gandhi's views on Marxism and socialism and instead present a sanitized version of history with Gandhi merely as a hero to be worshiped before invoking the doctrine of socialism. Instead of deifying Gandhi as a Mahatma and blindly worshiping him, Indians would do well to objectively examine his works and understand his political views (Kumar, 2012).

Gandhian Socialism: - Gandhian socialism is the branch of socialism based on theories of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. The theory is inspired from Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule written by Gandhi.

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 usefulfor those who want solutions for their lives, not for those looking to impose their ideas on other people (Gandhi, 1939).

BJP party leader Atal Bihari Vajpayee and other BJP leaders incorporated Gandhian Socialism as the concept for the party.

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).

Western Socialism: - "I have been a Sympathetic student of western social order and I have discovered that, underlying the fever that fills the soul of the west, there is a restless search for truth. I value that sprit. Let us study our eastern institution in that sprit of scientific inquiry and we shall evolve a truer communism than the world has got dreamed of. It is surely wrong to presume that western socialism or communism is the last word on the question of mass poverty" (ABP, 3-8-1934).

According to Gandhi, socialism was not born with the discovery of the misuse of capital by capitalists. As Gandhi has contended, socialism, even communism, is explicit in the first verse of Ishopanishad. What is true is that when some reformers lost faith in the method of conversion, the technique of what is known as scientific socialism was born. "I am engaged in solving the same problem that faces scientific socialists. It is true, however, that my approach is always and only through un-adulterated non-violence. I may fail. If it does, it will be because of my ignorance of the technique of non

violence. I may be a bad exponent of the doctrine in which my faith is daily increasing (Gandhi, 1937, p.12).

My socialism (According to Gandhi):- "I have claimed that I was a socialist long before those I know in India had avowed their creed. But my socialism was natural to me and not adopted from any books. It came out of my unshakable belief in non-violence. No man could be actively non-violent and rise against social injustice, no matter where it occurred. Unfortunately, western socialists have, so far I know, believed in the necessity of violence for enforcing socialistic doctrines. I have always held that social justice, even unto the least and the lowliest, is impossible of attainment by force. I have further believed that it is possible by proper training of the lowliest by non-violent means to secure redress of the wrong suffered by them. That means non-violent non co-operation." (Gandhi, 1940, p. 97).

"Whilst I have the greatest admiration for the self -denial and spirit of sacrifice of our socialists friends, I have never concealed the sharp difference between their method and mine. They frankly believe in violence and all that is in its bosom. I believe in non-violence through and through....." my socialism means "even unto this last" "I do not want to rise on the ashes of the blind, the deaf and the dumb. In their (i.e., Indian) socialism probably these have no place. Their one aim is material progress." "for instance, America aims at having a car for every citizen. I do not want freedom for full expression of my personality. I must be free to build a staircase to Sirius if I want to. That does not mean that I want to do any such things. Under the other socialism, there is no individual freedom. You own nothing, not even your body" (Gandhi, 1946, p.246).

Equality in Socialism:- "Socialism is a beautiful word and, so far as I am aware, I socialism all the members of society are equal-none low, none high. In the individual body, the head is not high because it is the top of the body, nor are the soles of the feet low because they

touch the earth. Even as members of the individual body are equal, so are the members of society. This is socialism" (Gandhi, 1946, p.247).

"In it he prince and the peasant, the wealthy and the poor, the employer and employee are all on the same level. In terms of religion there is no duality in socialism. It is all unity. Looking at society all the world over, there is nothing but duality in plurality. Unity is conspicuous by its absence. This man is high, that one is low, that is Hindu that is a Muslim, third a Christian, fourth a Parsi, fifth a Sikh, sixth a Jew. Even among these there are sub-division. In the unity of my conception there is perfect unity in the plurality of designs." "in order to reach this state we may not look on things philosophically and say that we need not make a move until all are converted to socialism. Without changing our life, we may go on giving addresses, forming parties and, hawk-like, size the game when it comes our way. This is no socialism. The more we treat it as game to be sized, the further it must recede from us" (Gandhi, 1946).

The Means:- Socialism begins with the first convert. If there is one such, you can add zeros to the one and the first zero will count for ten and every addition will count for ten times the previous number. If, however, the beginner is zero in other words, no one makes the beginning, multiplicity of zeros will also produce zero value. Time and paper and occupied in writing zeros will be so much waste.

This socialism is as pure as crystal. It, therefore, requires crystal-like means to achieve it. Impure means result in an impure end. Hence the prince and the prince and the peasant will not be equalized by cutting of the prince's head, nor can the process of cutting of equalized the employer and the employed.

One cannot reach by untruthfulness. Truthful conduct lone can reach truth. Are not non-violence and truth twins? The answer is an emphatic 'no'. Non-violence is embedded in truth and vice versa.

Hence has it been said that they are faces of the same coin. Either is inseparable from the other. Read the coin either way. The spelling of words will be different. The value is the same

The blessed state is unattained without perfect purify. Harbour impurity of mind or body and you has untruth and violence in you.

Therefore, only truthful, non-violent and pure-hearted socialists will be able to establish a socialistic society in India and the world. To my knowledge there is no country in the world, which is purely socialistic. Without the means described above, the existence of such a society is impossible (Gandhi, 1946, p.232).

The socialists and communists say they do nothing to bring about economic equality today. They will just carry on propaganda in its favour and to that end they believe in generating and accentuating hatred. They say, "When they get control over the state, they will enforce equality" (Gandhi, 1946).

"....I claims to be a foremost communist although I make use of cars and other facilities offered to me by the rich. They have no hold on me and I can shed them at a moment's notice, if the interests of the masses demand it" (Gandhi, 1946, p.64).

By education: - But it must be realized that the reform cannot be rushed. If it is to be brought about by non-violent means, it can only be done by education both of the "haves" and "have-nots." The former should be assured that there never would be force used against them. The "have-nots" must be educated to known that no one can really compel them to do anything against their will, and that they can secure their freedom by learning the art of non-violence, i.e., self suffering.

If the end is view is to be achieved, the education I have adumbrated has to be commenced now. An atmosphere of mutual respect and trust has to be established as the preliminary step. There

can then be no violent conflict between the classes and the masses (Gandhi, 1940, p.97).

Truth and ahimsa must incarnate must in socialism. In order that they can, the votary must have a living faith in God. Mere mechanical adherence to truth and ahimsa is likely to break down at the critical moment. Hence, Truth is God.

This God is a living force our life is of that force. That force resides in but is not the body. He who denies the existence of that great force denies to himself the use of that inexhaustible power and thus remains impotent. He is like a rudderless ship which, tossed about there and there, perishes without making any head way. The socialism of such takes them nowhere, what to say of the society in which they live.

If such be the case, does it mean that no socialist believes in God? If there be any, why have they not made any visible progress? Than, again, many godly persons have lived before now; why have they not succeeded in founding a socialistic state? It is difficult completely to silence these two doubts. Nevertheless, it is possible to say that it has perhaps never occurred to a believing socialist that there is any connection between his socialism and belief in God .It is equally safe to say that godly men as a rule never commended socialism to the masses.

Superstitions have flourished in world in spite of Godly men and women. In Hinduism itself untouchability has, till of late, and held undoubted Sway.

The fact is that it has always been a matter of strenuous research to know this great Force and its hidden possibilities.

"My claim is that in the pursuit of that search lies the discovery of Satyagraha. It is not, claimed that all the laws of Satyagraha have been laid down or found. This I do say, fearlessly and firmly, that

every worth object can be archived by the use of Satyagraha. It is the highest and infallible means, the greatest force" (Gandhi, 1928).

Socialism will not be reached by any other means. Satyagraha can rid society of all evils, political, economic and moral (Gandhi, 1947, p.240).

"I believe in private enterprise and also planned production. If you have only state production, men will become moral and intellectual paupers, They will forget their responsibilities, I would therefore allow the Capitalist and Zamindar to keep their factory and their Land, but I would make them consider themselves trustees of their property"(ibid). "I believe in the nationalization of key and principle industries as is laid down in the resolution of the Karachi Congress. More than that I cannot be present visualized. Nor do I want all the means of production to be nationalized. Is even Rabindranath Tagore to bee nationalized? These are day dreams" (Gandhi, 1939). "I believe in private enterprise and also in production. If you have only state production, men will become moral and intellectual paupers. They will forget their responsibilities .I would therefore allow the capitalist and the Zamindar to keep their factory and their land, but I would make them consider themselves trustees of their property" (Gandhi, 1939).

Even without control of the state there can be nationalization. "I can start a mill for the benefit of the workers." (ibid). So, Gandhi wasn't a socialist because he felt that every one needed to earn their own way without being so reliant upon the government. The government (In this case England as sovereign) love controlling people's lives because it kept them to power. As far as western style Capitalist industrialization Gandhi didn't really care unless the people in India were being affected. When he wanted to make a point to the English about all of their clothes in India he had giant clothes burning parties. They burned mountains of western style clothes.

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. Thought 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.

It can be easily demonstrated that destruction of the capitalist must mean destruction in the end of the worker and as no human being is so bad as to be beyond redemption, no human being is so perfect as to warrant his destroying him whom he wrongly considers to be wholly evil. We invite the capitalist to regard himself as trustee for those on whom he defends for the making. The increase of his capital. Nor need the worker wait for his coversion. If Capital is power, so is work Either is dependent on the other. Immediately the worker realizes his strength, he is in a position to become co- sharer with the capitalist instead of remaining his slave. If he aims at becoming the sole owner, he will most likely be killing the hen that lays golden eggs. Inequalities in intelligence and even opportunity will last till the end of time.

A man living on the banks of a river has any day more opportunity of growing crops than one living in the arid desert.

"I look upon an increase of the power of the state with the greatest fear, because although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress. We know of so many cases where men have adopted trusteeship, but none where the state has really lived for the poor....." (Gandhi, 2008).

"The socialists and communists say, they can do nothing to bring about economic equality today. They will just carry on propaganda in its favor and to that end they believe in generating and accentuating hatred. They say, when they get control over the state, they will enforce equality. Under my plan the state will be there to carry out the will of the people, not to dictate to them or force them to do its will" (Gandhi, 1939).

In the control of Ahmadabad textile strike someone asked Gandhi whether it is desirable to close down the mills he opined that we also need people who have the Capacity to make money. Some more excerpts:-".....That no matter how much money we have earned, we should regard ourselves as trustees, holding this money for the welfare of all our neighbors. If God gives us power and wealth, he gives us the same so that we many use them for the benefit of the mankind and not for our selfish, carnal purpose" (Gandhi, 1941). ".....my theory of trusteeship is no makeshift certainly no Camouflage. I am confident that it will survive allotter theories. It has the sanction of philosophy and religion behind it I am inviting those people who consider themselves as owners today to act as trustees, i.e., owners, not in their own rights, but owners in the right of those whom they have explicated. Supposing I have come by a fair amount of wealth- either by way of legacy, or by means of trade and industry – I must know that all that wealth does not belong to me, what belongs to me is the right to an honorable livelihood, no better than that enjoyed by millions of others. The rest of my wealth belongs to the community and must be used for the welfare of the community"(Gandhi, 1941).

The question how many can be real trustees according to this definition is beside the point. If the theory is true, it is immaterial whether many live up to it or only one man lives up to it. The question is of conviction.

"It is my conviction that it is possible to acquire riches without consciously doing wrong. For example I may light on a gold mine in my one acre of land. But I accept the proposition that it is better not to desire wealth than to acquire it, and become its trustee. I gave up my own long ago, which should be proof enough of what I would like others to do. But what am I to advise those who are already wealthy or who would not shed the desire for wealth? I can only say to them that they should use their wealth for service" (Gandhi, 1941). Several decades later most of the above stands vindicated. Most countries that tried to enforce equality by force have failed. The communist countries in their efforts to make a classless society simply ended up creating another layer of bureaucrats and middleman. There is very real difference in the abilities, intent and opportunities that each individual has. This will be reflected in the trajectories each individual follows in their life spans. Some will achieve more, some less so that endeavor to create equality cannot be forced to p down, there needs to be a bottom up approach Enduring change can only come through some real transformation of hearts. Narayan Murthy, founder of Infosys, once said he is a socialist at heart and a capitalist by profession. Gandhi wanted the capitalist or the wealth creators to be the trustees of wealth they create. In that trusteeship remains one of the most relevant of Gandhi's Concept, which something which most of us can easily relate. In 1952 there was a merger of the socialist party with the Kisan Mazdoor Paraja Party (KMPP), with the result that new socialist Party, Known as Praja Socialist Party, was formed. As the President of the P.S.P, Dr. Ram Monohar Lohia pleaded for a greater incorporation of the Gandhi ideas in Socialist thought. He asked the Indian Socialists to understand the importance of a decentralized economy based upon the resuscitation of cottage industries. He seemed to be against both Capitalism and communism on account of their fad for big and heavy machines. According to him, both the systems are wasteful and hence unsuitable for India. In

Contrast to them, Gandhi's ideas and action, Lohia strongly pleaded, may act as a filter through which Socialist Ideas would flow and get rid of their dross. He said, "Nobody would be happier than I if Gandhi's ideas were also to influence the other two systems, Capitalism and Communism, but one may reasonably doubt that this can be done" (Lohia, 1963, p.121).

Developing his argument in favor of Gandhi an economy, Lohia explained that the world today was in the grip of two systems, and third one was in making. He argued, "Capitalism and Communism are almost fully elaborated systems, and the whole world is in their grip, and the result is poverty and war and fear. The third idea is also making itself felt on the world stage. It is still inadequate, and it has not been fully elaborated, but it is Open" (Ibid, p.120).

Lohia called this idea the true Socialist idea. Is this socialist idea, according to him, is to be based on Gandhi's ideas of decentralized economy and village government. He, therefore, argued the importance of small machines which would utilize the maximum labour power with the small capital investments.

This type of thought -orientation was not liked by many of his colleagues.

About June, 1935, Asoka Mehta put forward his thesis of the "Political Compulsions of a Backward Economy" in which he tried to maintain that the ideology of the congress was coming near to that socialists, and hence he argued for an ideological alliance between the congress the P.S.P Lohia, as a Counterbalance to it, presented his "Equidistant theory" and asserted that the socialists were still as much equidistant from the congress as they were from the communists. He, therefore, did not like the P.S.P to have an alliance with the congress on policy matters. However, he saw no harm in making an electoral adjustment with the congress under special

circumstances (Lohia, 1963). Lohia came to believe that industrialization and mechanization of agriculture would not do much good to the human race as they would further accelerate the struggle for power on both national and international levels. Hence he advised the socialists to organize the state and society on the pattern Gandhi suggested in order to maintain steady progress in society and achieve harmony of human race. He stressed the need of original thinking and initiative on the part of Asian socialists. He advised them to frame their policies in the context of a civilization emerging from centuries old despotism and feudalism. (Lohia, 1956, p. 55).

The main objective of Asian socialism, Lohia tells that it should strive for the attainment of such concepts as the democratization of administration, small capital outlay such as small machines, socialized property and maximum attainable equality. And the method he suggested for their realization corresponds to the Gandhi a method of mass action. He dismissed communist class struggle as immoral and violent because of its faulty analysis of capitalism. Socialist class struggle, according to him, "must correspond to the aims of decentralized society, which alone can now produce good economic and spiritual results" (Lohia, 1963, p.377).

As an exponent of decentralized socialism, Lohia wanted to organize the state mostly on the lines Gandhi suggested. The socialist state, according to him, must aim at the decentralization of both economic and political powers. He called the socialist state a four-pillar state. In this state an attempt will be made to synthesize the opposite concepts of centralization and decentralization. Its four pillars – the village, the Mandal (the district), province and the central Government, will be so organized as to work on the principle of functional democracy (Lohia, 1963, p.523).

Discussing his "New Socialism", Lohia States that equality, democracy, non-violence, decentralization and socialism are the five

supreme principles not alone of India's Politics but' also of all world action. In his "Marx, Gandhi and socialism", Lohia states that today seven revolutions are taking place everywhere in the world. These revolutions are –

1. For equality between man and woman,
2. against political, economic and spiritual inequality based on skin colours,
3. against inequality of backward and high groups or castes based on long tradition, and for giving special opportunities to the backward;
4. against foreign enslavement and for freedom and world democratic rule,
5. for economic equality and planned production and against the existence of an attachment for private capital,
6. against unjust encroachments on private life and for democratic methods;
7. against weapons and for Satyagraha. According to him, the attainment of "New socialism" all over the world depends upon the success of these seven revolutions (Lohia, 1956, Pp.475-494).

Dr. Ram Monohar Lohia was a great follower of M.K. Gandhi and his ideas of socialism. Gandhi therefore dreamt of a society where there would be no state, no Political power. "In the find state, therefore, there is no state." As the society will be free from violence, complete democracy will be established. For democracy and violence go will together? A non -violent democracy alone can provide equal opportunities to all. This Stateless democracy is an ideal society. This is Gandhi's "Rama Raj," in which there would be righteousness, justice, equality and happiness as conceived by Gandhi. The future society will be based on decentralization. In this society life is self – regulated and every one fulfils his social obligations even in the

absence of coercive sanction. India of Gandhi's dreams will be a federation of non-violent democratic village republics. Both the federation and the rural communities shall be based on group autonomy, individual freedom and voluntary cooperation. Thus every village will be a republic or panchayat having full powers. It follows, therefore, said Gandhi, "that every village has to be self-sustained and capable of managing its affairs even to the extent of defending itself against the whole world. Such a society is necessarily highly cultured in which even man and woman knows what he or she wants and what is more, knows that no one should want anything that others cannot have with equal labour." Consequently, both the federation and the rural communities will have moral non-violent sanctions. There will be no system of punishment.

There will be not only decentralization of political power; the economy of Rama Raj will also be decentralized. There will be no place in the society for heavy transport, large scale production and big machinery, modern big cities, the modern system of education and modern medicine and professional doctors.

The economy would be based on the principle of "limited wants." Its salient features are:-

- (1) "Intensive, small-scale, individual, diversified farming supported by co operative effort as opposed to mechanized, large -scale or collective farming,
- (2) Development of cottage craft.....,
- (3) Cattle -based economy.....,
- (4) Proper balance of animal, human and plant life.....,
- (5) Voluntary Protection of both human and animal power against the competition of machinery as the price of social of insurance" (Gandhi, 1939).

The institution of private property would be replaced by the principle of trusteeship. Gandhi therefore stood against socialization of private property descended by the socialists. Therefore would be complete social equality, harmony And solidarity, and the relations between individuals, groups and rations would be regulated according to the principle of love and friendship and not force. Gandhi, however, did not expect that this social idea could be realized. An ideal condition is a project state and man cannot achieve perfection. Yet, the picture of the ideal decentralized society, like other ideas, has its value. It sets a goal to achieve and serve as the standard by which the presets way be assessed. To quote Gandhi himself: "It Euclid's point, though incapable of being drawer boy human agency has an imperishable value, my picture has its own for mankind to live. Let India live for this true picture though never realizable in completeness we must have a proper picture of what we want before we can have something approaching it" (Gandhi, 1939). So long as the state contuses, Gandhi would welcome a decentralized Parliamentary democracy in which ultimate authority should be vested in the common man, the peasants, and the labourers. He was a favour of indirect elections through village Panchayats. Village Panchayats should elect district administration which should elect state administration. These in their truth should elect the central administration. There should be fewer elections and fewer representatives to elect. Gandhi favored labour franchise and was against second chambers.

In Gandhi's "Economic and Moral Progress" and Marx's "The Communist Manifesto" essays, they discuss the topics of materialism and class distinction. Gandhi believes that through peace and non-violent protests, changes to society can be made. He also focuses strongly on individual morality and how morality can be related to social classes. Marx, on the other hand, urged people to use violence,

if necessary to create social change within the class systems. Marx sought after the way that the social structure could change and he focuses more on the growth of a nation ... rather than the individual. Although Gandhi and Marx have completely opposite approaches, it is made clear through their essays that the economy and social class are both main issues in which society is based upon.

Gandhi made his “Economic and Moral Progress” speech on December 22, 1916 at the Muir Central College Economics society in India. Gandhi makes clear his opinions about economic societies. In his speech, he says, “By economic progress, I take it, we mean material advancement without limit and by real progress we mean moral progress, which again is the same thing as progress of the permanent element in us”. Based on his experiences, he believes that the more progress a person undergoes economically, the less progress they will undergo morally, continuing on, he states that it is more important to be moral than it is to be financially stable (Gandhi, 1916).

He further goes on to say that, “In a well ordered society, the securing of one’s livelihood should be and is found to be the easiest thing in the world. Indeed, the rest of order loneness in a country is not the number of millionaires it owns, but the absence of starvation among its masses” (Gandhi, 1916). This quote describes that individual progress is measured not monetarily but rather by how giving people are of themselves. If people are greedy, selfish, and not willing to help others, then it will be much easier for these people to have more money because they only spend it on themselves. However, if the people that have money are willing to spend their money on those that are not as fortunate, then the Utopian society that Gandhi hopes for is created. Although Gandhi hopes for his type of “well ordered Society” he notes that throughout history, countries have suffered morally when achieving “high material affluence” (Gandhi, 1916). They become crazed with money and the more materialistic the

countries become, the less moral they become as well. Because of this and his various observations, Gandhi considers the poor to be morally superior to the rich.

Karl Marx's "The Communist Manifesto" develops ideas that also revolve around economics. Marx believes that the economy is dominated by a selected few who are very materialistic and who create distinctions, within the social class. These selected few, the "bourgeoisie", have power over the towns, major cities, property, and the means of production. Marx says that the bourgeoisie have "pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors", and has left no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous 'cash payment' It has resolved personal worth into exchange value" (Marx, 1913). This ruling class has become so revolved around money that the most "heavenly ecstasies of religious favor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of Philistine sentimentalism" have disappeared and been replaced with the importance of materialistic objects. Because of this obsession with money and materialism, Marx thinks that the bourgeoisie corrupt society.

From Karl Marx's essay, "Proletarians and Communists", the idea of Communism and equality is brought up. Marx believes that the segregation between the different social classes should not exist. He discusses private property and the fact that-

....the bourgeoisie have control over the vast majority of it, "Private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population, its existence for the few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenth. Therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property, the necessary condition for whose existence is the non-existence of any property for the immense majority of society (Marx, 1913). The bourgeoisie deprive the majority of the nation of what is their personal property. It is unjust the rich can have such an

overruling power over the rest of the nation. In Marx's eyes, the only efficient way to run society is by communism. He says that communism provides equality to all and is the only method that is beneficial to the nation as a whole – rather than to select individuals.

Lastly while Gandhi prefers to use peace and non-violent protests to convey his thoughts and opinions, Marx uses a different method. Marx hints at using violence to change the social structure. While talking about the bourgeoisie, he says, "This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way". He fully disagrees with the bourgeoisie and everything that they believe in. He thinks that the proletariats must rise above the bourgeoisie and" by means of a revolution".

Gandhi and Marx were both high influential leaders who felt very strongly about the way that society is run. They both think that the rich are inferior to the poor and that change within society and the social classes are needed in order to create a successful and well – balanced society. In order to achieve this ideal society, they both take action to convey their ideas: Gandhi through peace, and Marx through violence and action. Even though they both have completely different approaches, they both make clear the fact that the economy and social class are main issues in society (Marx vs. Gandhi, 2007).

It is believed that every social thinker is judged on the basis of his considerations of the socio-economic, political and religious condition prevailing before and during his life time and also by the ideas and concepts laid down by his fore-runners. Needless to say that Marx and Gandhi, in their respective approaches to socialism, class conflict, class-consciousness, trusteeship and various other concepts, appear to be quite close to each other. Yet each of them retains his own uncompromising distinction.

Concept of Socialism:-

As regards the ideal of socialism, the approaches of Karl Marx and M. K. Gandhi coincide with each other at several points but, at the same time, at certain stages there emerge gearing differences between the two. These differences are for example, the question of means and end, centralization or decentralization of power, capitalistic-system, class-struggle etc.

Nevertheless, it will not be out of place to mention that socialism, like all 'isms' is interpreted in different ways by different people. It bears different meaning to different persons,. The interpretations or meanings attached to, or derived from this term are subjected, on the one hand, to individual's own perception and on the other hand, to the geographical socio-economic and cultural conditions.

In spite of some similarity between the Marxian and Gandhian views on socialism, the violence e 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”.

Dialectical Difference:-

The contrast between the Gandhian dialectics and that of Marx or his for-runner, Hegel, is striking. Each ideal with a different level of abstraction and by comparing them the dynamic quality at Satyagraha may be illuminated.

Sidney Hook, while analyzing the criterion of dialectical thinking remarks, “only when that whole or unit of continuity, which has been destroyed by the presence of conflicting factors, has been restored or re-established in another wholecan we claim validity of our procedure.”

On this basis S. Hook defines that heart of Marxian dialectics in the following words: - “For Marx any material, which is the subject of man’s activity, generates its own normative ideals in relation to the way it succeeds in fulfilling human needs. From the reciprocal influence and interaction between the ideal and the actual a new subject matter is produced out of which in turn are born the means by which it will be changed” (Hook, 1936).

Marx was critical of the Hegelian dialectical method because it did not allow for the empirical approach. According to his interpretation, the dialectical process controls both the thought and the action. He retains the dialectics as a system of logic and applies to the human activity solely as an interpretation. The interaction is expressed in terms of social environment on the one hand and human needs on the other, and it results in the class-struggle. In other words, Marxian development of dialectics is directed to predetermine the content of both thesis and anti-thesis, creating the class-struggle,

and anticipates a synthesis in the realization of a classless society. Here lies the end of Marxian dialectical process. The content of Marxian dialectics is supplied through the dogma of class-struggle. It is at this point, where Marx introduces the content; the Gandhian dialectics of Satyagraha strikingly departs. Marxian method thus loses its true dynamic and creative quality of getting entangled with historicism.

Gandhian dialectic, which is quite distinct from that of Marx, describes a process resulting from the application of a technique of action of any situation of human conflict, a process essentially creative and inherently constructive.

Karl Popper, in his book, "The open society and its Enemies"(1949), writes, "Marx is responsible for the devastating influences of the historical method of thought – within ranks of those who wish to advance the cause of one society Marxian theory is a purely historical theory, a theory which aims at predicting the future course of economic and power, of political developments and especially of revolutions" (Popper,1949).

Gandhi agrees with Marx that beliefs can be tested through action alone. But he gets further to supply the empirical control which is sacrificed by the historicism of Marx. Marx introduces the subject and content, where he predetermines the structure and direction of conflict. But Gandhi has no such pre-determinations about structure or direction of conflict. He insists on process and the techniques only. For him techniques, such as 'Satyagraha', only lead to solutions yet unknown.

It can, therefore, be inferred that Gandhian Satyagraha assumes the rationality of man-rationality in the sense that man is endowed with reason, that man can utilize reason to direct his actions

and that a technique for conducting and resolving the conflict can appeal to the rationale in man"(Marx vs Gandhi, 2007).

Religion in Gandhian Socialism:-

Gandhi aim at the unity of religion and socialism. Socialism devoid of religion does not appear to him at all. He says that in terms of religion there is no duality in socialism, it is all unity. Looking at the society all the world over, there is nothing but duality or plurality.. Unity is conspicuous by its absence "This man is high, that man is low, that is a Hindu, that a Muslim, third a Christian, fourth a Parsi, fifth a Sikh, Sixth a Jew. Even among these three are sub-divisions. In the unity of my conception, there is perfect unity in plurality of designs. Socialism begins with the first convert. If there is one such, you can add zeros to one and the first zero will account for ten and every addition will account for then times the previous number".

Gandhian concept of socialism imbibes a strong belief in God. Marxian socialism has no such belief. It precludes religion all together. In connection with the unity of religion and socialism, as advocated by Gandhi, two questions have been leveled:

Does it mean that no socialist believes in God? If there be any, why have they not made any visible progress?

Many Godly persons have lived before now, but why have they not succeeded in founding a socialist state?

Gandhi answers that it has perhaps never occurred to a believing socialist that there is any connection between his socialism and belief in God. It is equally safe to say that Godly men, as a rule, never commended socialism to masses.

Gandhian socialism is also relegates with Satyagraha. Gandhi says that every worthy object can be achieved by the use of Satyagraha, and emphasizes that socialism can not be achieved by any other means.

As regards the birth of socialism, Gandhi has his own views, different than those of Marx or other western socialists. A writer has mentioned the similarity between the birth of democracy and socialism saying that when a few who ought to hold the economic power in trust for the others from whom they derive it, use it for their own self aggrandizement and to the detriment of the rest, the inevitable result is the deprivation of the few of the means of economic power by many i.e. birth of socialism." But Gandhi differs with this view and says that socialism was not born with the discovery of the misuse of capital by capitalists. According to Gandhi, socialism, even communism, originated from the opening verses of the "Ishopanishad" explains that God, the Ruler provides all those in this universe. So, renounce and dedicate all to "Him" and then enjoy or use the portion that may fall in your lot. Never covet any body's possession.

This is, therefore, the root from where the socialism, according to Gandhi, was born. He further says that when some reforms lost faith in the method of conversion, the technique of what is known as "Scientific Socialism" was born. Here Gandhi introduces his theory of Trusteeship.

Gandhi's Disagreement with Western Socialists:-

Gandhi disagrees with the socialists' belief that the centralization of the necessities of life will conduce to the common welfare when the centralized industries are planned by the state.

Gandhi disagrees also with the environment of violence power of non-violent resistance, Gandhi advocates the only way of honest working for the 'constructive programme' for an ideal non-violent state consisted of the following item:-

Communal unity, (2) Removal of untouchability, (3) Prohibition, (4) Use of Khadi, (5) Other village industries, (6) Village Sanitation, (7) Basic education, (8) Adult education, (9) Upliftment of women and

their education, (10) Education in health and hygiene, (11) Development of Provincial Languages, (12) National Language, (13) Economic equality, (14) Prosperity of Peasants – “Kisans”, (15) Labour, (16) Conditions of Adivasis, and (17) Care of Students (Gandhi, 1941).

Element of Sacrifice:-

The element of sacrifice bears a common feature in the approaches of both, Gandhi and Marx. In Marxian socialism, the element of sacrifice emerges with the violent conflict between capitalists and the working class. This conflict calls for a violent revolution where in the highest sacrifice i.e. sacrifice of life itself, is demanded.

S\sacrifice in Gandhian non-violent technique requires the same preparation, for offering the highest sacrifice of life itself as a possible outcome of using the technique. A Satyagrahi of Gandhian thought will stick to his own position so long as he holds it to be true. The determination may lead him to extreme endurance and even to death.

Marx was, however, opposed to this type of sacrifice yet he called for sacrifice in the circumstances of class-struggle. He calls for sacrifice of the individual life to the irrevocable march of history towards predetermined goals.

Both Gandhi and Marx conceived socialism on their own respective social, economic and political background. Marx came forward with ‘socialism’ as a solution to the problems confronting the European Society of his time, and, with Engel’s assistance, laid down a comprehensive programme in the form of ‘Communist Manifesto’ which served as a preparatory ground for radical revolution and food for a theory, later developed by Fascists, Gandhi on the other hand advocated ‘socialism’ of his own conception as a dynamic means to

attain a 'constructive – programme' for attaining his ideal of the socialist pattern of non-violent society.

Marx believed in the potentialities of forces of production whereas Gandhi believed more in the potentialities of man's nature and aimed at 'perfectibility' of human behaviour in particular and society in general.

Marx and his theory can be better explained in terms of social conditions, which are no less important in governing the economic condition. From such angle of social determinism, Karl Marx can very well be treated, rather claimed, as sociological thinker. Gandhi, on the other hand, is also claimed by many as a social philosopher because his social and political thinking is underlined by spiritual unity with a religious background. Religion of Gandhi is, however, universal and his spiritual unity comprises of truth, non-violence and belief in God. In any case, it will be a mistake on the part of those who, due to their inadequate understanding rush to dismiss his importance by merely calling him a Saint or a religious preacher. The efficacy and significance of Gandhian social thinking can be well imagined only if one has understood his tools of truth and non-violence along with the action technique of Satyagraha.

Access to the heart of the problem of social and political conflict is denied by the historicism of Marx. Marxian empirical approach is impregnated with the dogma of class struggle and the absolutism of his philosophy of history which strangles the development of dialectics on the level where it could enter into a technique of action. Gandhi, on the other hand, with his dialectical approach provides a dynamic control in the field of action through the fashioning of techniques for the creative resolution of conflict. Gandhian dialectics, which is thus quite distinct from that of Marx, describes a process resulting from the application of a superior technique of action to any situation of

human conflict --- a process essentially creative and inherently constructive.

Marxian thinking starts from his belief on productive forces as lever of social change. Economic conditions of human life are the basic foundation on which Marx develops his entire theory. Gandhian philosophy starts from his belief in Satya. The principle of "Satya" is identified by Gandhi with God, soul force, moral law etc., which holds the universe. As Dr. Dhawan has pointed out, it is the principle of spiritual unity around which the entire philosophy of Gandhi clusters. "Satya" being at the root, the unity of all life consists in serving and loving all with a view of "greatest good of all". This 'Satya' or spiritual unity can be realized by non-violence. To achieve this greatest good, Gandhi emphasizes that means should be as pure as ends. For cultivating non-violence Gandhi introduces a code of discipline 'Bramhacharya'. A non-violent or constructive "Satyagrahi" must, acquire 'Bramhacharya' i.e. control on thoughts, words and deeds, over all the senses (Sinha, 2008).

Gandhian social ideal lies in stateless and casteless society. But as 'ideal' can never be realized, he retains the state in the second best society as a concession to human perfection. Decentralization of political and economic powers, reduction in functions and importance of state, growth of voluntary associations, removal of dehumanizing poverty and superficiality, the new education and tradition of non-violent resistance to injustice – all these, according to Gandhi, will bring life with the understanding of man and make society and state democratic. Over and above, Gandhi never fails to remind us again and again that his philosophy has no finality. Its dynamic quality is aimed at searching for and experimenting with the truth.

Gandhi was a true Indian nationalist. There was no room for race – hatred in his concept of nationalism. Every thing of India attracted him India, according to Gandhi, has every thing that a

human being, within the highest possible aspirations, can want. To him, India appeared to be “Karmabhumi” (land of duty) in contradiction of ‘Bhogbhumi’ (land of enjoyment).

Gandhi's patriotism was subservient to his religion, which had no geographical limitations. His life was dedicated to service of India through religion of non-violence. The force of spiritual unity, derived from religious and cultural heritage of India, was so miraculous on Gandhi that he said, “I cling to India like a child to its mother's breast, because I feel that she gives me spiritual nourishment I need. She has the environment that responds to my highest aspiration. When that faith is gone, I shall feel like an orphan without hope of every finding a guardian”. Therefore, according to Gandhi, India, with non-violence as her creed and “Satyagraha” as a technique of action, is fitted for religious supremacy of the world. In regard to the National Government, Gandhi was all out adoption of non-violence to the utmost extent possible because that he thought, will be India's great contribution to the peace of the world and the establishment of a new world order.

Ambition of Gandhi was much higher than his desire for Indian independence. Through the deliverance of India, he sought to deliver the so-called weaker races of the earth from the crushing heels of the western exploitation.

In so far as survival and progress of mankind depends on non-violence, which, according to Gandhi, is the law of life, Gandhi, as the most authoritative exponent of non-violence in contemporary world, has made an invaluable contribution to social and political thought.

To express in Gandhi's own words greatest principles which no power on earth can wipe out. Thousands like me may die to vindicate the idea but Ahimsa will never die; and gospel of Ahimsa can be spread only through believers dying for the cause” (Sinha, 2008).

“If India makes violence her-creed, and I have survived, I would not care to live in India”. Such was the determination of Gandhi and he maintained it up to the last. Ultimately he met his irony of fate on January 30, 1948. Gandhi, the Indian patriot and the exponent of non-violence, fail fatal victim of violence (Sinha, 2008).

Bhikhu Parekh's presents Gandhi to the reader as a dharmarj (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 and epoch and its deliverer). His programme of struggle was not defined in ordinary social and economic terms, such as that of Lenin and Mao, and was therefore not transitory but an eternal message of salvation. Gandhism offers the most radical programme for the liberation of India (and through it, the world). Bhikhu Parekh's assessment of terrorism as an oppositional current to Gandhism suffers a similar lack of evenhandedness. In this context, he refers to Marxism only as an ideology of mindless violence, and contrasts it with the truthful non-violence of Gandhism. He dismisses Marxism as a doctrine of atheistic violence representing, to use the kind of allusion that Parekh prefers, adharma as opposed to the yugadharma of Gandhism. He attributed to Marx the sentiment that a bloodbath constituted the highest expression of human energy and freedom and cleansed away the psychological and moral mud of the ages. Not surprisingly, he compares the terrorist tradition favourably with his representation of Marxism. He argues that the Indian terrorist movement was “sober and restrained”, for it turned to violence as a regrettable method of last resort and not as a law of nature. To demonstrate his point, Parekh cites the words and actions of terrorists such as Madan Lal Dhingra, Savarkar and Aurobindo Ghosh, a selection that suits the purposes of his general argument, for all these men sought inspiration of Hinduism. Infect that those terrorists who converted to Marxism, in the twenties and thirties

spoke of their abandonment of violence as an instrument of social change is well known, it is inevitably, ignored in Parekh's analysis. Similarly, the creative aim of the Marxist wing of terrorists to "establish a new order of society in which political and economic exploitation will be impossibility" does not merit discussion (Parekh, 1989).

However, while Parekh compares the terrorists favourably with the Marxists, they come off badly in contrast to Gandhi. For the terrorists sought only to drive away the British from India, while Gandhi advocated a package of total revolution which would bring political independence and an end to economic and political servitude. By discovering the scientific of tradition and the openness of Hinduism, Gandhi's Philosophy of change is thus show to have presented a radical alternative both the western modernity and to Hindu orthodoxy. With this feat, Gandhi according to Parekh, solved the global crisis facing political philosophy - "His bi-culturally grounded and bilingually articulated political theory shows one way in which (a) global political theory required by an increasingly interdependent world can be constructed ..." (Parekh, 1989).

Parekh's theorization builds upon a series of binary oppositions, between Indianness and Westernism, between ancient and modern, and between historian and the community (Parekh, 1989, p.288).

The Fundamental Strategic problems faced by Mao and Gandhi in China and India were formally similar in some important respect. Although India, Western Imperialism had indirectly imposed itself on that country in the nineteenth century through a form of gunboat diplomacy against a decaying Manchu regime, in fact one of the important causes of the fall of Manchu dynasty was its inability to resist the increasing political and economic concessions wrested by the big powers from the proud inhabitation of the Middle kingdom. Besides, much of Mao's political career in opposition was taken up by

the resistance against Japanese imperialism in the thirties and forties. His fight against the Kuomintang in the last phase of the civil war had also powerful anti-western overtones, since the former received large-scale military and the economic assistance from the U.S.A. Hence, Mao's objective was the seizure of power from a national government, historical western imperialism in China, Japanese imperialism and western backing for the Chinese Nationalist Government gave his struggle the character of a fight by a predominantly agrarian and militarily weak population against industrially and militarily powerful adversaries – essentially the same kind of struggle that Gandhi had to organize in India against British rule (Bandyopadhyaya, 1973).

But Mao regarded the struggle against the Japanese and the Kuomintang as only a necessary precondition to the development of China along Marxist-Leninist lines, just as Gandhi regarded the ending of British rule as a mere prelude to the transformation of India according to his own ideological convictions. To both the leaders, the principal and long-term task was the general reconstruction of their societies. And in this respect also the strategic problem faced by them was essentially the same. Approximately 80 percent of the population in both the countries lived in the agricultural sector, which was characterized by semi-feudal and exploitative relations of production, fragmentation and sub-division of holdings, considerable tenancy, landlessness and disguised unemployment and abysmal poverty. It was this predominantly agrarian population which had to be not only the main force in the political struggle, but also the principal factor in the process of change. All political strategies and tactics, all plans and programmes of economic development, all social and cultural change including the style and content of education, and the general ideological framework had to be geared to the mobilization, galvanization and uplift of this amorphous, oppressed and famished peasant mass. Much of the thinking of Gandhi and Mao with regard to

Social transformation, as well as their practical experiments, can be understood only in the context of this fundamental, palpable and hard reality. The historical function of both Mao and Gandhi was to organize this intelligentsia politically and yoke it firmly to the service of the real people of their respective countries, namely peasantry (Bandyopadhyaya, 1973, Pp.112-127).

The political movements led by Mao and Gandhi had also a common Psychological basis of nationalism. In the nineteenth century Chinese nationalism was directed partly against Manchu imperialism and partly against western imperialism which the Manchu rulers had in turn been unable to resist. If the Taiping Rebellion was primarily anti-Manchu its aim, the Boxer Rebellion was primarily anti-western. The revolution of 1911, though resulting in the overthrow of the Manchu's, had strong anti-Western overtones. It was on this pre-existing base of Chinese nationalism that Mao tried to build the habitation of the internationalist ideology of Marxism-Leninism during the long struggle of the Chinese Communist Party for power. Anti-Western feeling in general and Anti-American felling particular has always been strong in Mao and his followers since the Treaty of Versailles when China felt let down by the U.S.A, but from the early twenties to the end of the second world war Chinese nationalism was primarily pre-occupied with Japanese imperialism. The latter, Mao argued during this period, had driven China's historical, conflict with western imperialism into the background. Infect he became a strong advocate of a policy of seeking aid from the western powers during the war of Resistance against Japan and even praised them for aiding and assisting China in the anti-Japanese struggle. It was not until the end of the Second World War and the beginning of the last stage of the civil war in 1946 that Mao started regarding the USA as the principal imperialist enemy. Since then the tempo of Chinese nationalism has been maintained by Anti-westernize in general and anti-Americanism

in particular, and since 1956 also by anti-Soviets. Mao has constantly glorified this Chinese nationalism (as Stalin did in Russia). Gandhi, too, in spite of his belief in the "voluntary interdependence" rather than unfettered independence of nations and his idealization of the human race as a global family, operated essentially within the broad framework of the Indian national movement which had developed a considerable extent before his return from South Africa and spectacular entry into the Indian political scene. In fact he was responsible, more than anyone else, for broadening the base of the national movement and increasing its organizational strength. Although he endeavored, with considerable success, to inform the entire nationalist movement with ethical and cultural values, and to keep in check the Chauvinistic and aggressive tendencies which are generally characteristic of all nationalisms, none of his political, economic or socio-cultural programmes, nor the major mass movements led by him, can be visualized except in the broad psycho-political context of the Indian national movement. In the given historical context, both Mao and Gandhi have been compelled to operate on the broad platform of nationalism in spite of their internationalist ideological convictions.

Even after the seizure of power by the Chinese communist party Mao felt the need for maintaining a broad common front of the masses for the purpose of the socio-economic reconstruction of China, and was rather cautious, in advocating open struggles among classes strictly in accordance with Marxist theory. Gandhi was opposed, like Mao and other Marxists, to the exploitation of the peasants and workers by the landlords and capitalists, and advocated active non-violent resistance to the latter on the part of the former, but in the given historical situation had to concentrate his energies on building the broadest possible mass front against British imperialism. He could not therefore, concern himself primarily with the problem of resolving

class contradiction in British India even through the non-violent method, since that would have divided the national movement and dissipated its energies internally, thus weakening its resistance against British rule. He has been criticized by Marxists in India and abroad for this policy of "class collaboration", but it is difficult to see what other policy he could have followed in the given historical situation, just as it is difficult to see how Mao could have avoided a similar policy of "Class Collaboration" in the given historical situation in China. The major difference between Mao and Gandhi in this respect seems to be that while Mao has tried to attempt the implementation of his radical programmes in a different historical situation, Gandhi did not. But the basic similarities in the historic-strategic situations faced by Mao and Gandhi were matched by equally important differences in the historical situation in which they found themselves. Perhaps the most important of these differences was the contemporary political conditions in China and India. Moreover, whereas the system of transport and communication in China was extremely backward, which partly explained the inability of the central government to extend its authority over the whole country and the ability of insurrectionary movements to sustain themselves in isolated areas, the British in India had built an elaborate network of roads railways, Post and Telegraph which facilitated the economic, political and administrative integration of the whole country. Finally, while the Sino-Japanese war threw the Chinese economic system completely out of gear, which now became predominantly characterized by falling production and runaway inflation, thus further aggravating distress and promoting political extremism, in India the economic system, though on the whole nearly stagnant, maintained a relative stability and even registered some gains during the Second World War (Mao, 1965, Pp.305-332).

Another major difference lay in the socio-political character of the peasantry in the two countries. Traditionally the Chinese Peasantry was infinitely more politicized and revolutionary than the Indian. From ancient times there had been hundreds of peasant insurrections in China, and practically every Chinese empire had been brought down partly by armed peasant uprising – a fact explained by Barrington Moore in terms of the economic and social alienation of a large section of the peasantry and the weak link between the peasantry as a whole and the government. Mao Tse-tung made a deep study of the peasant revolts in Chinese history, regarded them as unparalleled in world history in their intensity, frequency and dimension, and declared them to be the prime mover of Chinese history. There is no comparable history of peasant revolts in India, where the peasantry as a whole seems to have remained completely depoliticized from the ancient times, refusing to be concerned with changes of ruler or government – a fact which may perhaps be best explained by the Varnashrama Dharma or caste duty which made politics and welfare the responsibility of the Kshatriyas rather than of the Shudras that the peasants were. The Chinese peasantry, and for that matter of entire Chinese population, had a this-worldly, matter of fact and largely a religious outlook from ancient times. Social life as a whole in China had a broadly secular basis. In India, the peasant masses, like the people as a whole, were steeped in religion, had a somewhat fatalistic other-worldliness, and under the influence of Buddhism, Jainism and the devotional branch of Hinduism commonly called Vaishnavism, the bulk of the people had espoused non-violence to the extent that a large section of the population had become vegetarian on religious grounds quite early in Indian History. The western education of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries failed to produce even a ripple in the basically religious ethos of the vast Indian masses (Gandhi, 1959). In formulating their ideological approaches, politico-economic programmes and methods

of action, both Mao and Gandhi had to take serious note of these special characteristics of the peasantry – the bedrock of the social structure in their respective countries. The ideologies and programmes of Mao and Gandhi, therefore, developed pragmatically and dynamically over the course of their political career.

The ideological perspectives of Mao Tse-tung and M. K. Gandhi are both highly charged with values. Mao, following Marx, regards the true consummation of liberty, equality and fraternity as the ultimate goal of social transformation. According to Marx all social conflicts are fundamentally caused by class-contradictions and the socialization of production, by laying the foundations for a classless society and removing the alienation of the masses of working people, clears away the principal obstacle to human fraternity. The struggle for existence among men is replaced by the united struggle of a fraternal humanity against nature. The withering away of the state is merely an external symptom of the new inner social harmony. As is well known, Marx and Engel ridiculed the Feuerbachian theory of morals in which fraternity was treated as an absolute value independent of class divisions. Being a Marxist – Leninist, Mao naturally inherited this value oriented approach of Marxism to social transformation. To take only one example, he has observed that the principal task of Chinese people is “to build a new China of freedom and equality”. For the convenience of his people he has sometimes linked this socio-political goal to the Ta-Tung or great Harmony --- the classical Chinese Utopia which would be characterized by liberty, equality and fraternity on the basis of the common ownership of wealth – although he had little respect for the religious texts in which this idea had been enunciated. But being pragmatic political activist, he had never given a clear picture of China’s ultimate destiny in terms of Marxism – Leninism.

Gandhi also geared his entire ideological thinking to the same ultimate values, although his values have deeper metaphysical

moorings than those of Marxism – Leninism. His ultimate value goal is Truth, which empirically means justice. This synthetic concept of justice consists, in the Gandhan scheme of values, of ahimsa or non-violence which to his mind is a wider name for fraternity, Swaraj or liberty, both individual and collective, and Samata or an inclusive equality. The task of social engineering, according to Gandhi, is the progressive instantiation of these values through the reconstruction of both individual and collective social life. The tools of social transformation devised by him are expected to perform a value creating function and achieve, over a long period of time, a successive approximation to the ideal society in which the ultimate values would in theory be consummated, although he regarded all ultimate values as practically unattainable in their purity. This concern for ultimate values has inevitably injected a strong utopian element into both Marxism and Gandhism. But the classless, stateless and conflict less Marxian anarchist utopia, unlike that of Gandhi and other anarchists including Godwin, Tolstoy and Kropotkin, would have a highly developed technological and industrial base. Marx wanted the proletariat to seize and smash the political super structure of capitalist but to preserve and further develop its industrial and technological infrastructure. The reorganization of the relations of production by the proletariat under social ownership was intended to remove the restrained on productive possibilities which the capitalistic relations of production had imposed on them, to free man through relentless technological progress from the struggle for existence, and to make available to the masses of people the leisure which Marx considered to be the “room for human development”. The highly developed technological infrastructure of the Marxist utopia would also enable humanity to launch a promethean struggle against the blind and wanton tyranny of nature. The Gandhian utopia, on the other hands, though stateless, classless, no-hierarchical and conflict less, would be agrarian, simple and self-sufficient, living in harmony

with nature. Its horizontal organization would consist of oceanic circles of self-governing villages based on the barter system of exchange, agriculture and handicrafts, subsistence living, a high level of moral and spiritual well being and a low level of technology and material well-being. Since the ultimate values would be consummated or instantiated in such a society, Gandhi called it Ram Raj (Kingdom of Heaven) in which there would be Sarvodaya (equal development of all) and Poorna Swaraj (full freedom for all).

But the extent of this divergence is considerably reduced when we move from Gandhi's fully aware of the fact that his anarchistic utopia was only a utopia which represented more of an intellectual abstraction than a practicable social goal, more of a direction-indicator for purposes of social action than an immediately realizable social objective. He often likened it to the Euclidean point or straight line which exists only in theory but is nevertheless useful for solving the concrete problems of geometry. In Gandhi's practical ideology the economic system would be characterized by a good deal of complicated machinery and heavy industries, including heavy machinery for public utility and the still heavier machinery required to produce them, electricity and the machinery implied by it, shipbuilding, ironworks, medicine-making, as well as heavy machinery for producing such relatively small machines as sewing machines, printing presses, surgical instruments etc. He declared that some key industries were necessary, but refused to enumerate them. He also accepted railways, steamers and aero planes and obviously also the heavy machinery and factories required to produce them. Yet the differences between Marxian and Maoism and the operational ideology of Gandhi from this point of view is fundamental, one of kind rather than of degree. For Gandhi regarded all machinery as ideally undesirable and accepted a lot of it only as a machinery evil, and that also subject to the inalienable condition of maximum possible

economic decentralization, with the economic reconstruction of the village (Bandyopadhyaya, 1973).

Again the teleological unfolding of the utopia in Marxism-Maoism, especially Maoism, has some formal similarities with that in the operational ideology of Gandhi. In Marxism the anarchist utopia unfold itself first in the form of a dictatorship of the proletariat which involves a tremendous increase in the power of the state. By using this heightened state power dictatorially the proletariat is expected to destroy not only the exploiting classes, but also with them the apparatus of state power built by them supposedly only to oppress and exploit the underdog. With the occupation of the state as a mere instrument of exploitation gone, it withers away and transforms itself into the utopia. In Gandhi's operational ideology, too, the state is allowed not only to exist but also to increase its power and functions, especially economic functions. Here again it was the given historical and socio-political context and the conglomeration of forces in the Indian national movement that compelled Gandhi to present a more authoritarian picture of the State and its functions than his purely private beliefs would have permitted. In his practical ideology not only would the Government, Parliament, armed forces, political parties and the rest of the paraphernalia of a modern State system exist, but the State must own or control all heavy and large scale industries as well as large scale employment. He declared categorically in 1934 that although he regarded the state as ideally undesirable, State ownership of the means of production was, in his opinion, "better than private ownership". He fully supported the programme of the nationalization of key industries adopted by the Indian National Congress at Karachi in 1931. He wrote in 1937 that "heavy machinery for work of public utility which can not be undertaken by human labour has its inevitable place, but all that would be owned by the State and used entirely for the benefit of the people". Two years before his

assassination he further expressed his views on State ownership in the following words: - "Hence, without having to enumerate the key industries, I would have the State ownership; where a large number of people have to work together. The ownership of the products of their labour, whether skilled or unskilled, will vest in them through the State". Subsequently he added that "the State would look after secular welfare, health, communications, foreign relations, currency and so on", and even that "in the non-violent order of the future, the land would belong to the State", on several other occasions he also envisaged the possibility of cooperative farming by the peasants, subject to State ownership of land, although he did not develop the idea.

But apart from the fundamental differences between the tools to be used by Marx and Gandhi for what Karl Popper has called "utopian engineering", the time-scales on which the two thinkers visualize the transformation of the newly powerful State into the utopia are quite different, and in this respect it is Maoist rather than the Marxian view of historical dynamics which is comparable to that of Gandhi. As Engel explained in Socialism: Utopian and Scientific: "The first act by virtue of which the State really constitutes itself the representative of the whole society – the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society – that is, at the same-time, its last independent act as a State. State interference in Social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then dies out of itself, the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of the processes of production. The State is not abolished. It dies out. "Gandhi on the other hand, visualized a gradual, continuous and virtually perennial process of social transformation towards the distant utopia. He shared with Marx the grand vision of a utopian society but not Marx's belief in a sudden and quick method of bringing it's into existence. "A few thousand years",

he said, "are but a speak in the vast time circle. Someone has to make a beginning with a faith that will not flinch" (Bandyopadhyaya, 1973).

It was Mao who brought the Marxian historical dynamics close to the time-scale visualized by Gandhi, no doubt due to his prolonged revolutionary experience in the opposition, his experience of exercising power for the transformation of China and his study of Soviet political developments. An official Pamphlet published in Peking in 1964 says that, "For a very long period after the proletariat takes power, class struggle continues as an objective law independent of man's will, differing only in form, from what it was before the taking of power". The main reason is explained as follows—"The Socialist revolution on the economic front in the ownership of the means of production is insufficient by itself and cannot be consolidated. There must also be a thorough socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts. Mao has provided a rationalization for the continued existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the State ruled by this dictatorship purely in terms of internal necessity as distinct from the external threat of imperialism emphasized by Lenin and Stalin. In another essay on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Mao went even further and observed, "The contradictions in various societies differ in character, as do forms of their solution, but society at all times develops through continual contradictions. Socialist Society also develops through contradictions between the productive forces and the conditions of production. In a Socialist or Communist Society, technical innovations and improvement in the social system inevitably continue to take place Humanity is still in its youth. The road it had yet to traverse will be no one knows how many times longer than the road it has already traveled.... One contradiction will lead to another, and when old contradictions are solved, new ones will arise, even when a Communist Society is established. Hence there will still be struggle between people, though

its nature and form will be different from those class societies" (Mao, 1965).

But the indefinite prolongation of the period, in the ideologies of Mao and Gandhi, during which the State transforms itself into statelessness does not answer the question how power would evaporate into powerlessness. Gandhi has formulating his ideology in the context of a politically subject nation, and his programme of State ownership and control of key sectors of the economy was meant to apply to India immediately after independence. But he uphold the anarchist utopia till the last days of his life, and hence the logical, connection between the ideology and the utopia is a decisive factor in the direction of the entire process of social development.

There is a common dialectical element in the Marxist-Maoist and Gandhian approaches to social transformation, which is also more pregnant in either case with a social content than Hegelian dialectics (although Marx and Mao would consider it impossible for a philosophical idealist like Gandhi to have a dialectical lview of history with a social context). In Marxist theory contradictions are resolved by the dialectical process of negation of the negation and the restoration of the whole on a new and higher level of synthesis As Engels explained in Anti-Duhring: "All Indo-Germanic people began with common property. Among almost all of them it was abolished, negated, in the course of social development, extended by other forms – private property, feudal property etc. To negate this negation, to restore common property on a higher plane of development is the task of social revolution. Or, the Philosophy of antiquity was spontaneous materialism. The latter gave rise to idealism, spiritualism, negation of materialism, first in the shape of the anti-thesis of should and body, then in the doctrine of immorality and in monotheism. This spiritualism was universally disseminated through the medium of Christianity. The negation of this negation is the reproduction of the

old on a higher plane, modern materialism, which is contrast with the past, finds it theoretical conclusion in scientific socialism. Mao has further developed this theme in his famous essay "on contradiction" where he argues that the violent seizure of state power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the building up of a strong communist party armed insurrection and war are all negation or negation paving the way for a new synthesis. In his own words, "To consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat or the dictatorship of the people is in fact to prepare the conditions for abolishing this dictatorship and advancing to the higher stage when all state systems are eliminated. To establish and build the communist party is in fact to prepare the conditions for the elimination of the communist party and all political parties. To build a revolutionary army under the leadership of Communist Party and to carry on revolutionary war is in fact to prepare the conditions for the permanent elimination of war. These opposites are at the same time complementary (Bandyopadhyaya, 1973).

The Gandhian dialectic of social transformation is also based on the idea of negation of a negation, although he did not express it in this particular terminology. During the non-cooperation movement (1920-1922), which was the first Gandhian mass movement against British rule in India, Rabindranath Tagore criticized Gandhi for what he considered to be the negative character of the movement. India, he said, had always declared unity to be truth and separateness to the untruth. This unity "is that which comprehends all and, therefore, can never be reached through the path of negation." Gandhi replied that the existing relationship between Britain and India was an unequal and forcibly imposed relationship which itself was a negation. Real unity could be established on a positive basis only when the negative relationship involved in the imperialistic connection was ended and a voluntary relationship re-established on the basis of freedom and

equality. Rejection of the untruth, he argued, was necessary for the vindication of truth". Gandhi was deeply distressed by the inequality and exploitation which characterized the society around him, and regarded the negation of this negation as one of his major social objectives. The conflict between labour and capital, he believed, could not be resolved without eradicating the inequality between the two. In general he argued, "A non-violent system of government is clearly impossibility so long as the wide gulf between the rich and the hungry millions persists. The contrast between the palaces of New Delhi and the miserable hovels of the poor labouring class nearby cannot last one day in a free India in which the poor will enjoy the same power as the richest in the land". He advised the landlords and capitalists to accept his scheme of trusteeship under which the latter were to reduce them to poverty and live at the same economic and social level as the peasants and workers, drawing only a small commission for performing a managerial function. But if they did not yield to persuasion, which he considered highly probable, the remedy suggested by him was non-violent non-cooperation and civil-disobedience on the part of the peasants and workers.

Thus the difference between the Maoist and Gandhian social dialectics is not one of form, but of content. According to Mao, contradictions are of two kinds, namely, contradictions between the people and their enemies and contradictions among the people. The first kind of contradiction is antagonistic, and second non-antagonistic. For example, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the peasantry and the feudal lords, and between the colonies and the imperialistic powers are antagonistic, while those between the working class and the peasantry, among members of the communist party and between society and nature are non-antagonistic. In other words, domestic contradictions which are rooted in class-conflict and those between colonies and imperial

powers are antagonistic, while other contradiction is generally of a non-antagonistic character. But whether a particular contradiction must be operationally regarded as antagonistic or non-antagonistic is also contingent or historically relative tactical considerations (Bandyopadhyaya, 1973).

Gandhi, on the other hand, argued that no social contractions are really antagonistic in the sense that truth or justice cannot be vindicated without one side violently suppressing and even exterminating the other. Infect he believed that the suppression or annihilation of the opponent by direct or indirect violence would really perpetuate the contradiction instead o resolving it, since violence, in his opinion, constitutes not negation but an affirmation of and a contribution to the negation represented by various forms of injustice. "Those who seek to destroy men rather than their manners", he said, "adopt the latter and become worse than those whom they destroy under the mistaken belief that the manners will die with them. They do not know the root of the evil". The argument followed logically and inevitably from Gandhi's conviction, largely derived from the Hindu social tradition as embodied in the doctrine of Karma, that the end, meaning the actual result of social action, is determined by the nature and quality of the action itself rather than by the motive of the door. In Hind Swaraj (1909) he told the imaginary reader who was arguing in favour of the forcible overthrow of the British from India: "Your belief that there is no connection between the means and the end is a great mistake. Though that mistake even men who have been considered religious have committed grievous crimes. Your reasoning in the same as saying that we can get a rose by planting a noxious weed the means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree. I am not likely to obtain the result flowing from the worship of God by laying myself prostrate before SatanWe reap exactly as we saw". On a much later occasion he used the same argument in the following

words --- "As the means, so the Realization of the goal is in exact proportion to that of the means. This is a proposition that admits no exception". He explained that his primary concern had always been the conservation and progressive use of the means, since he knew that the end would inevitably follow from them. He put the matter in a nutshell when he said, "means and end are convertible in my philosophy of life". Therefore, he did not believe that liberty, equality or fraternity could be achieved through violent methods. "True democracy or the Swaraj of the masses", he argued, "can never come through untruthful and violent means, for the simple reason that the natural corollary to their use would be to remove all opposition through the suppression or extermination of the antagonists. That does not make for individual freedom. Individual freedom can have the fullest play only under a regime of unadulterated ahimsa". Equality, similarly, could only be established through non-violent means of social transformation, according to Gandhi, since violence would inevitably lead to tyranny and exploitation in one form or another. The "exploitation free" society visualized by him could only be established, in his opinion, when the "Supreme instrument of defending just rights lay within the grasp of the unarmed individual". Finally, as regards fraternity, it was obvious to Gandhi that this ultimate value could be realized not through a multiplication of violent acts, but by taking vertical leap in a confrontation of organized violence by organized non-violence (Gandhi, 1959).

Gandhi's anarchistic suspicion of power went hand in hand with his rejection of violence and expressed itself in his approach to the resolution of social contradictions not as the establishment of the power of one group over another, which is the central point of the Maoist approach, but as the transformation of social relationships which in fact is the substance of his definition of politics. "A non-

violent revolution”, he declared, “is not a programme of ‘Seizure of Power’ but it is a programme of transformation of relationships”. It is the transformation of both the elements in the contradiction, and, therefore, of the entire contradiction, rather than the elimination or liquidation of one element by the other, as in the Marxist-Maoist views of contradictions, which constitutes the essence of the social and political thought of Gandhi, and distinguishes it clearly from two other contemporary conflict theories, namely Marxism and Social Darwinism (including its political heir, Fascism) Indeed, it is the transformation of social relationships which is the essence of Gandhi’s definition of both religion and politics.

Gandhi had to adopt his idealistic belief in non-violence as a creed to the strategic compulsions of the historical situation in India, just as Mao had to adopt his Marxist ideological heritage to the strategic compulsions of the Chinese situation. The technique of political struggle and of social transformation which Gandhi thus adopted in India, as is well known, is Satyagraha. Gandhi would fundamentally oppose to communism as an ideology and to the Soviet system of government during his life time. He was opposed to communism which is imposed on a people, since the violent method adopted by the Soviet Government for the establishment of economic equality was repugnant to him. He accepted the communist goal of a classless society, he said, since his own ideal was one of abolishing all social distinctions, but he did not believe in eradicating evil from the human breast at the point of a bayonet. Gandhi was also fundamentally opposed to western capitalist democracy, because he felt that the industrialism on which this system was based necessarily led to violence, oppression, exploitation, the concentration of wealth, imperialism and inequality and because he regarded the acquisitive character of this system as detrimental to the moral development of man. He even argued, almost like Lenin, that capitalism necessarily

led to imperialism. The only difference between Gandhi and Lenin in this respect lies in the fact that while Lenin considered the relations of production characteristic of the capitalist economic system rather than industrialism as such to be the cause of imperialism, Gandhi thought that the roots of imperialism lay in the unrestrained growth of machinery and the resultant industrialism. The Hind Swaraj, a booklet written by Gandhi in 1908, is a frontal attack on what he considered to be the evils of civilization, i.e. western civilization, and in 1938, at the age of sixty-nine, he observed that he would not change anything he had written in it (Gandhi, 1939). By that time he had also witnessed the new civilization represented by Soviet Communism and German Nazism.

Gandhi was, therefore, convinced that if violence, exploitation, tyranny and other forms of injustice were to be permanently eradicated, the infrastructure of a just society based on economic and political decentralization had to be constructed over a long period of time to replace unrestrained industrialism and the associate concentration of power. He thus linked Satyagraha as a means of resolving contradictions to a massive but decentralized programme of constructive activity called the "Constructive Programme" (Gandhi, 1941). Although he formulated a particular constructive programme for the given situation in India, it was in fact a general technique of social reorganization applicable to other situations as well. As in the case of the Maoist techniques of people war and mass line, Satyagraha and the constructive programme are closely interconnected. Apart from the question of violence, a fundamental difference between the twin means of social transformation advocated by Mao and Gandhi respectively is that while people's war is primarily an instrument of the communist party for capturing power and is supposed to become redundant for domestic purposes once the communist party is in power, and the mass line emerges from secondary importance in the

first phase to primary significance in the second, both Satyagraha and the constructive programme, as understood by Gandhi, are perennial means of social transformation, irrespective of who runs the government. His distrust of power and violence made him fundamentally suspicious of all state systems, and he constantly declared that his main object was to free the Indian people not only from the British yoke but from any yoke whatsoever, that the Indian people should always remain prepared to fight against a brown tyranny or an Indian Rockefeller.

But there is a common dimension to the ideological approaches of Mao and Gandhi, namely, their common emphasis on the transformation of the consciousness of the individual, which is crucial to their operational ideologies as well as to the teleological link between these ideologies and the utopias to which they are supposed to be related. In his "On Practice" Mao argued, on the basis of the Marxian theory of knowledge, that the revolutionary consciousness of the individual can be awakened only through his participation in the productive process. But subsequently he laid great stress, especially during the Cultural Revolution, on the revolutionary transformation of the consciousness of every individual, including the communist party cadres, through a personal moral effort involving much more than mere participation in the productive process. During the Cultural Revolution Joan Robinson witnessed in China what she considered to be an attempt on the part of Mao to eliminate the ego of the individual. Stuart Schram has observed that "Mao tends to exalt the revolutionary will of human beings until it becomes not merely an important actor in history, but an all powerful force capable of reshaping the material environment in a completely arbitrary fashion." Franz Schurmann has similarly argued that "The Thought of Mao-Tse-Tung stresses the importance of the ideological transformation of the individual and that "what Mao hopes to achieve in such a spiritual

transformation of man that the new revolutionary attitudes and behaviour will continue beyond his death" (Mao, 1965). He had added that "given the mystery and intractability of human nature, regardless of race, colour or creed, a scientific campaign to change the soul of man seems to be a task which normally only God would have set him to accomplish" (Mao, 1965). Gandhi regarded the control of the self-interest of the individual as an essential prerequisite to the transformation of social relationships in terms of the ultimate values. The values must be inculcated in the individual before they can find true social expression. Like Mao he regarded theory as inseparable from practice, and believed that through such organized social action as the constructive programme and Satyagraha, the individual would be constantly trained to control his purely personal impulses. But he emphasized, unlike Marx, the need for a private moral effort on the part of the individual before he can qualify himself for social action. In order to engage in the task of transforming social relationships, the individual must observe, he said, the five vows enjoyed by the ancient Indian scriptures, namely, Satya (truth), ahimsa (positive non-violence or love), asteya (non-Stealing or non-exploitation), aparigraha (non-possession or non-acquisitiveness) and brahmacharya (control of animal passion). "Unless you impose on yourselves the five vows", he warned his workers, "you may not embark on the experiment at all". The most important practical work which helps the individual to realize the ultimate values in their own lives, according to him, is bread-labour, which Gandhi borrowed from Tolstoy, Ruskin, the Gita and the Bible, was defined by him as "the divine law that man must earn his bread by labouring with his own hands". It would eliminate exploitation as well as more direct forms of violence through a heightened social awareness, it would impart creative freedom to the individual and make him free of any external control, including that of the government, and by simplifying life and preventing the growth of the acquisitive spirit, it would lead to spontaneous economic

equality. Hence, according to Gandhi, "Bread-labour is a veritable blessing to one who would observe non-violence" Thus Gandhi agreed with Mao that participation in productive labour is the most important and effective way of achieving this transformation. The major difference between their ideas on the subject is that while the transformation and individual consciousness advocated by Mao is primarily a process of political self-education, that insisted on by Gandhi has a quasi-religious character – a fact which may be explained not only in terms of the Marxist atheism of Mao and the private religiosity of Gandhi, but also by a certain sociological factor namely, the relative atheistic character of the Chinese cultural tradition and the deeply religious character of the Indian.

It is obvious that the kind of social transformation both Mao and Gandhi have in view cannot be called "modernization", if the term means either westernization or the building of the political, economic and military infrastructure of State power. Both of them have been strongly opposed to the political and economic systems of the west, which they have considered to be basically detrimental to the realization of the ultimate values of liberty, equality and fraternity, and have tried to devise alternative systems for the emancipation of their peoples and the progressive realization of these values. As regards the power interpretation of modernization, there are strong anarchistic and populist elements not only in the utopias but also in the operational ideologies of both Mao and Gandhi which tend to go against this interpretation. Only if modernization is defined as a value-oriented and multi-dimensional process of political, economic and socio-cultural innovation, can one speak of their ideological perspectives in terms of modernization. But whether we characterize them as ideologies of modernization or not, the crucial question is whether and to what extent the methods by which the Maoist and Gandhian States are brought into existence, sustained and propelled

towards the ultimate values, do in fact lead to a progressive realization of these values in social and political life by successive approximation, and if not, what other consequences they may be logically expected to lead to. In other words, a comparative analytical and historical study of the Maoist innovations of people's war and mass line with the Gandhian innovations of Satyagraha and the constructive programmes, as well as of the State systems within which these are expected to operate, would be necessary in order to make an overall comparative assessment of social technology involved in the two ideologies. Prima-facie, the basis of people's war in military strength no less than in mass mobilization, the military and industrial power which is expected to sustain the socialist State, and the admittedly doctrinaire and dictatorial though broad-based one party system which would govern it, would together establish a very powerful State system which Gandhi found repugnant to the common ultimate values cherished by Mao and himself, and according to Mao, this kind of State will continue to exist for a very long and indefinite period of time, at least for several countries. Apparently, the mass line is the only technique by which Mao expects this state to transform itself very slowly in the very long run. Prima-facie also, the means Gandhi adopted for bringing the Indian State into existence, namely mass Satyagraha, the democratic and essentially decentralized character of the state visualized by him in spite of considerable State control, and the general and perennial character of Satyagraha and the constructive programme irrespective of forms of government, all indicate a state system with a relatively weak power structure (in the sense of military and industrial power) progressively weakening further with the passage of time, and therefore more consistent with the realization of the anarchist utopia. But whether such a state would be able to defend its external sovereignty in a real contemporary world, and whether the ultimate values cherished by Gandhi would truly be consummated in the kind of anarchist society

he has in mind, are questions whose answers are contingent upon the efficacy or otherwise of the social technology and State structure visualized by him as compared to those visualized by Mao, which in turn has to be ascertained by both logical analysis and empirical verification as far as practicable.

Both Mao's people's war and Gandhi's Satyagraha must be based on the broadest possible common front of the masses. Moreover, like Mao's Party Cadres, the Gandhian workers were constantly engaged in productive activities in the form of agriculture, cottage industries and handicrafts, so that they could be self-reliant as far as possible and thus free from government control or occupational obligations in times of struggle. A Satyagrahi, a Gandhi used to say, must always be in one of three possible conditions – engaged in constructive work, engaged in Satyagraha or in prison. The organizational link between the constructive work centres and Satyagraha was very close, and as Joan V. Bondurant has pointed out, the success of a particular Satyagraha was often in direct proportion to the organizational strength of the constructive programme. Usually Gandhi did not give a call for even a local Satyagraha unless there was a substantial network of constructive work centres in the area. Finally, Satyagraha is more universally applicable than people's war from the point of view of the immediate empirical consequences. If people war succeeds, the most immediate consequences, apart from the vast destruction of life and property, are the seizure of the state by a strong military power. If it fails, the only immediate consequence is the destruction of life and property. But whether Satyagraha succeeds or fails to achieve the immediate objective, it does not cause any loss of life and property. In either case it not only promotes the ultimate values but also adds to the moral power of those who participate in it. Not all Satyagrasas led or inspired by Gandhi in India were equally successful, in achieving their

immediate objectives, some were almost wholly successful, some only partially successful and a few wholly unsuccessful. But they all led to a cumulative addition to the moral and political power of the national movement.

As regards socio-cultural change, the greatest similarity between the mass line and the constructive programme lies in the sphere of education. But both advocated a reduction of the period of schooling as so to make education serve the practical needs of the people. Gandhi considered a schooling of seven years to be sufficient for most people. Within these seven years, he believed, all that was being taught in India up to the Matriculation Standard (except English) could not only be included but taught more effectively. Such a production oriented seven years Gandhi called "basic education" or nayee talim (new education). In it education would be centred round some handicraft, and even knowledge of other subjects like history, geography, mathematics and science would be imparted to the students through the medium of their craft training and productive labour. Moral instruction was to be a part of the syllabus (in Mao's educational system this is substituted by political indoctrination). If the members of any religious denomination wanted special denominational instruction for their children, they were to pray for it. Both Mao and Gandhi believed that when there was a great national cause involved, formal schooling was of relatively less importance. Gandhi gave a call to all students during the Non-cooperation Movement to leave their schools and colleges and join the national movement, as Mao did in China on several occasions, especially during the Cultural Revolution. But while Mao expected his educational system to accelerate the process of social transformation through the heightened class and revolutionary consciousness of the younger generation as well as the growth of science and technology. Gandhi believed that the nayee talim of his occupation would bring

about a non-violent and gradual transformation of social relations towards a low-technology anarchist society. The attempt of both Mao and Gandhi to give a mass basis to education and to dovetail the educational system into the productive process were great contributions, from the purely utilitarian point of view, to the social transformation of China and India in the context of mass illiteracy, poverty and unemployment (Bandyopadhyaya, 1973).

In the economic sphere, while the government leaders is independent India did not share the broad Gandhian bias against industrialism and rapid technological advance, the programme of economic development adopted by them has been basically tempered by the Gandhian view of industrialization as a means to the construction of a society representing certain ultimate values rather than an end in itself, even in the short run. Thus agriculture has been treated, not as a kind of colony to be squeezed to the uttermost limit for the sake of the maximum possible rate of industrialization, but as a relatively independent sector of the economy which, though vital to industrialization, must be treated tenderly for the sake of the overwhelming majority of people as well as for preserving the value structure aimed at. Instead of the collective farms and communes of China, which have been used primarily for establishing the total control of the party on the millions of small farmers, restricting agricultural consumption of the barest minimum, and thus extracting the maximum possible agricultural surplus, in India and attempt has been made to improve agriculture through such Gandhian and quasi-Gandhian institutions as Panchayati Raj Community development and agricultural cooperation, in addition to land reforms through legislative and administrative means. In the industrial sector, the same value-oriented approach has led to the adoption of a pattern of democratic planning, broadly supported by Gandhi, in which an attempt has been made to secure a relatively balanced development of

light and consumer goods industries on the one hand and heavy industries on the other, rather than to secure the maximum possible development of the latter at the cost of the former, as in the Soviet Union and China. Hence although the rate of economic development in India has been on the whole comparable to that of China, the latter has probably developed a stronger infrastructure of heavy industries and consequently a stronger power base for the State than India.

So, while the system and process of political change and economic development in India has been much more conducive to the ultimate values than the Chinese counterpart, the process of economic and social leveling, which is also vital to the value oriented transformation of a traditional society, has proceeded much faster and further in China than in India, thus making the Maoist model more attractive than the Gandhian to millions of people in Asia and other parts of the world. But while the establishment of such socio-economic equality as can exist within the ambit of a fundamentally compulsive political system to the strongest point of the Maoist model of social transformation, it is certainly not a weak point of the Gandhian, for the failure to achieve socio-economic equality in India has been due, as we have seen, to the abandonment of the Gandhian technique of mass mobilization and socio-economic leveling through constructive work and Satyagraha. The choice between a libertarian political system characterized by great socio-economic disparities on the one hand and a totalitarian political system characterized by a form of socio-economic equality on the other may as well be a matter of personal preference rather than of conclusive rezoning. But this surely is not a choice between the Maoist and Gandhian models; synthesize the maximum possible socio-economic equality with the maximum possible political freedom through the catalytic agent of the constructive programme and Satyagraha. But even this Gandhian model, as we have seen, is not wholly conducive to the preservation

and promotion of the ultimate values, in so far as it is heavily biased against rapid industrialization and technological progress (Sinha, 2008).

Gandhi presented a limited concept of man when he generally went against science and technology and over emphasized man's metaphysical nature. But perhaps, after science and technology have satisfied man's material needs, the Gandhian emphasis on the metaphysical nature of man would prove to be singularly relevant to the problem of the relation among men and nations in the nuclear and technetronic age. For high technology geared to violence – the common characteristic of western and communist states – will almost inevitably destroy the human race with all its achievements and aspirations, while, combined with non-violence, it may yet bring us close to some of the utopias, including the Maoist and the Gandhian, which rare and visionary human beings have dreamt of from time immemorial (Sinha, 2008).

How does one place Gandhi then in relation to major modern ideologies? Gandhi it could be seen never rejected any of these in an outright manner but evaluated each in terms of his core concept of *Swaraj* and the ideal of *Satyagraha*. In such an evaluation one can see an aspect of thought the hallmark of which is, to quote Rawls, a kind of reflective equilibrium, dynamic and critical.