

CHAPTER - V

Gandhi's Ideas on Nationalism and Internationalism.

Gandhi's Ideas on Nationalism

INTRODUCTION:

Gandhi (1869-1948) worked both as a thinker and as a man of action in facing all the major problems of his time. Colonialism gave birth to the multiplicity of groups based on social differentiation and stratification. In such a society, different values and norms of conduct surfaced to rule. He took notice of the Indian society reflecting heterogenous elements. His task was to erect the populace to the demand of national freedom. In this difficult mission, his unique position in socialisation and popular mobilisation remained unchallenged in the sense that his genius was much more effective than that of the earlier reformers.

I.A. Sociological Ideas on Nationalism:

Moral interpretation of Social problems:

Gandhi took notice of the prevailing ills of the Indian society and opted for their solution in a way unknown and hitherto unpractised on such a large scale. Gandhi was a moral purist; so, like other sociologists, he did not distinguish on the basis of caste, race, place of birth, religion, sex or class. On the other hand, 'it is literally a thorough and wholesale application of criteriology of good that constitutes the bedrock of the whole of Gandhian philosophy of action'.⁽¹⁾ To Gandhi, 'reality

is not merely a natural order but a moral order as well'. His
(2)
entire philosophy is permeated by moral imperatives.

To Gandhi, the colonial encounter was not between England and India or between the East and the West but between good and bad. To him, Europe and India suffered from the same disease, though European countries enjoyed political freedom. Afro-Asian countries were exploited by the European colonialists. On the other hand, common people in those European countries also suffered from exploitation by the rich class of their countries, in the name of democracy. Democracy was based on ^{the} use of force by the state which guarded the interest of the rich. So 'at the root, therefore, the disease appears to be the same as in India'.⁽³⁾ The same remedy was, therefore, desirable. As such, he pleaded for the end of exploitation as well as the end of the coercive power of the state with the use of the technique of non-violence-giving it a universal connotation.

Ahimsa - the end and means of social change.

His acceptance of ahimsa (non-violence) as an end, and
^{also} a means, in all individual and social ideas formed the core of his sociological thought. In Gandhian ideology, non-violence and suffering are interrelated and intertwined. To him, the test of love is 'Tapasya' and tapasya is 'self suffering' and the idea of suffering is the cornerstone of his philosophy. In his words, 'if we are to be non-violent, we must then not wish for anything on the earth which the meanest or the lowliest of human beings cannot

have'.⁽⁴⁾

He held that man's ultimate aim was the realisation of God and the only way to find God was to see him in his creation. This could only be achieved by service of all 'I can't find him apart from the rest of humanity. My countrymen are my nearest neighbours. They have become so helpless, so resourceless, so inert that I must concentrate myself on serving them.'⁽⁵⁾ To him, service to the countrymen, who were in need of it, was nationalism. He wanted political freedom of the country as the first condition but he underlined that mere attainment of political swaraj would not solve the maladies. So he outlined the philosophy of social integration and social change. Here again, his schemes had the universal appeal because in doing so, he did not suggest the imitation or improvement of British model. From another angle, in terms of modernity and tradition, Gandhian sociological thinking, both broke and continued with the tradition. But to Gandhi, modernism did not mean westernism.

A traditionalist with a difference:

Gandhi did not regard the advent of industrialism as the advancement of true civilisation which his critics took to be his traditionalism. It was further associated with the remark that everything western was disliked by him. But Gandhi revealed : 'I do not want my house to be walled on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the culture of all the countries to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be

blown off my legs! This is perhaps the realist approach to cultural internationalism. He added, 'mine is not a religion of prison-house'.⁽⁶⁾ While delivering a speech in Gujarat Vidyapith in 1920, before the commencement of his non-co-operation movement, he wanted the Institute to stand for the synthesis of the different cultures, naturally of 'Swadeshi' type, i.e. 'where each culture is assured of its legitimate place, and not of the American pattern where one dominant culture absorbs the rest, and where the aim is not towards harmony but towards an artificial and forced unity.' What does this reflect? Was he anti-western in synthesising the culture, or a traditionalist who stood for assimilation of that which was good and rejection of that which was bad. In the said article, he further proposed, 'it (Institute) rather hopes to build a new culture based on the traditions of the past and enriched by the experience of later times.'⁽⁷⁾ Talking about the future culture of India, he explained that 'there is no such thing as pure Aryan culture in India' whether Aryans were intruders or indogenous did not interest him what interested him were the remote ancestors blended with one another with the utmost freedom and he wanted the spirit of 'blending together' to retain. He took^{the} Indian culture as in the making. To him, many of us are striving to produce a blend of all the cultures which seem to be in clash with one another. No culture can live, if it attempts to be exclusive. There was no such thing as pure Aryan culture in existence to-day in India; whether the Aryans were indigeneous to India or were unwelcome intruders, did not interest him much. What

interested Gandhi was the fact that remote ancestors blended with one another with the utmost freedom and we of the present generation are result of that blend. Whether we are doing any good to the country of our birth and tiny globe which sustains us or whether we are burden, the future alone will show. (8) Gandhi wanted Indian culture should be revealed by its efficiency to serve the nation as well as the global community of men as a whole.

To brand him to be traditionalist is to suffer from intellectual myopia - failing to grasp the whole field of vision. His concept of nationalism revealed that any country might become free and if need be the whole country might sacrifice so that human race lived. (9) Striving to attain freedom was never colliding with the spirit of sacrifice for the ultimate good to mankind. As we know his philosophy was based on 'Individual' who was asked to sacrifice for the village, the village for the district and the district for the nation and the nation for the mankind. This was nothing but ultimately modern and intensely internationalistic. So he asserted, freedom for India did not stand for disappearance or the extinction of Englishmen.

If we make an assessment of 'Hind-Swaraj', it reflects antipathy towards industrialism because industrialism invited insatiable avarice for wealth which ultimately led to adoption of violent means to capture world market. Colonialism originated from this type of material pursuit. He held that the modern civilization was purely material and it was material quest, the economy of profit responsible for colonisation of Afro-Asian countries. The

countries in Europe, Germany and England, were living in the 'hall of death' in order to avoid being devoured. Material gain did not lead to moral growth. He was fed up with such industrialism and wanted its replacement by a non-exploitative humane economic plan. In doing so, he longed for a simple life, close to nature and God, as advocated by Rousseau and Tolstoy. (10) His views on concepts like capitalism, imperialism, state, democracy further reflected that he widened his outlook and could produce much more relevant social philosophy in the later part of his life.

However, he has been openly exposed before the critics. To a critique, like G.C. Sah, his philosophy was hundred percent Indian'. (11) On the otherhand, Paul F. Power, explained; 'Gandhi was vitally concerned with East - West relations, influenced by both civilisations. Bhikhu Parekh summed up; 'He knew how to tap and mobilise the regenerative resources of the tradition ... and instinctively knew how far not to go ... , Indeed, the very fact that he could not be fitted into any of the traditional Hindu categories baffled his countrymen and added to his charisma'. (13) As with Indian tradition, so with western tradition, he wanted to gain and profit. In 1940, he wrote, 'there is nothing to prevent me from profiting by the light that may come from the west only I must take care that I am not overpowered by the glamour of the West. (14) Gandhi was able to succeed where others had failed for a variety of reasons. He 'reduced tradition to a resource, located its essence in its general moral values

which commanded respect but left room for critical evaluation. Moreover, he had to march within colonial context facing the obstacles generated by 'capitalism' as well vestiges of 'feudalism' and of 'slave society'. What was required was the participation of all in the attainment of national freedom. So he had an extremely difficult task. The first national reaction to colonialism is always the search of national identity. As a corollary, it was often expected that colonized people would be able to fight against their domination by drawing upon the resources of their own unreconstructed self, by reaching deeper into the resources of their own distinct civilisation which was never traditionalism, rather a response to the effective demand of the situation. The dialectic of the nationalist discourse found in Gandhi a situational response.

Gandhism : a strange mixture of the old and new:

He was a strange mixture of the old and new, at the sametime, capable of projecting into future. He was quite aware of the fact that ^{the} British rule in India was primarily responsible for this many sided degradation but equally certain that the age-old customs and traditions leading to hierarchical stratification encouraged inequality. He addressed himself to the burning problems of India as well as problems which affected the whole world. His social over-view was applicable to his world-view. Gandhi was profoundly disturbed by the plight of the Indian

society. His life long pre-occupation with the regeneration and revitalisation of Indian society brought him into conflict with the age old tradition. To him, Hindu culture did not provide equality and justice, equal status to women, equal status to untouchables and labourers. He made 'wiping away every tear from every eye' the central test of morality. Though he was preceded by reformers like Raja Rammohun Roy who worked against 'sati' and polytheism, K. C. Sen and Lajpat Rai who worked against 'child marriage', Vidyasagar who worked against 'Kulinism' and the ban on 'widow remarriage', Dayananda against image-worship to name a few, 'Gandhi's reformist programme was far more comprehensive than any of his predecessors. (16)

He was convinced that ^{the} Hindu society needed moral regeneration and could not be developed out of the resources of the Hindu tradition alone so he benefited from the moral insight of the other religious traditions as well. In doing so, he tried to reconstruct the orthodox conception of tradition, in general, and of the Hindu society in particular, a kind of cross-cultural construction. For Gandhi, every community had to deal with perennial problems and that could be solved by the method of only trial and error. Some of its fundamental values were sound and represented its great contribution to mankind.

Individual freedom the base of Swaraj:

The first step to Swaraj lies in individual, and the Swaraj of the people means the sum total of the Swaraj of

the individuals. But his scheme of Swaraj tried to bring about an equalisation of status. On Indian pattern, he held that working class everywhere in the world was being treated as 'sudras'. To him, political was not the end but the means to achieve the desired goal. He did not prescribe more power to the state because it destroyed individuality which was the substratum of all progress.

He favoured democracy as a method of government, but with emphasis on non-violence. He held, 'I believe true democracy can only be an outcome of non-violence. The structure of world federation can be raised only on foundation of non-violence'. What was true to individual was also true in national and international context. 'I have envisaged, a democracy established by non-violence, where there will be equal freedom for all.'⁽¹⁷⁾ He mentioned, 'I work for India's freedom because ... she has a prior claim over my service ... but India's freedom, as conceived by me, can never be a menace to the world'.⁽¹⁸⁾ Freedom for the country did not mean the exploitation of others rather it would contribute to mankind.

The object of his leadership was to arouse social consciousness among the people and not to impose anything upon them. So he asserted 'my humble occupation has been to show people how they can solve their own difficulties.'⁽¹⁹⁾ He repeated again and again, 'my work will be finished if I succeed in carrying conviction to the human family, that every man or woman, however weak in body, is the guardian of his or her self-respect and liberty'.⁽²⁰⁾ Thus an

enriched moral interpretation of democracy was provided by Gandhi based on a rich interpretation of individual and social morality reflected through humanistic democracy.

To him, social work was more important than politics. He held, 'Politics encircle us like a coil of snake from which one can not get out'. His preference was for social reform but when he found without politics that was unachievable he took to politics. However, he held, 'work of social reform or self-purification ... is a hundred times dearer to me than what is called purely political work.'⁽²¹⁾ This is the exhibition of love, the service to humanity in different ways on different fronts. This has been explained very nicely by Gandhi himself; 'My life is one indivisible whole, and all my activities run into one another, and they all have their rise in my insatiable love of mankind.'⁽²²⁾

His sociological views were formed on the conditions obtaining in Indian society. In 'Hind Swaraj', Gandhi accepted the distinctions made between ^{the} state and ^{the} society, like Vivekananda and Tagore. For Gandhi, Swaraj meant more than political independence. In order to achieve that participation of the people was required at a larger scale. Hindu-Muslim questions, national language, cow slaughter, child and widow marriage, all the baffling questions got answer in him. His encounter with the problem of untouchability deserves special mention. He was in a hurry to provide Indian society a modern base. Under the spell of his leadership, Indian traditions have been refurnished, mobilised and galvanised

to serve new goals and objectives. His capacity for innovation was stupendous. Right from the Indian National Congress, he improved and organised so many social institutions and gave serious consideration to the social and valuational aspects of modern civilisation.
(23)

He created the machinery for the Congress, won the masses for it, with funds to carry on its agitation, and turned to 'Swadeshi'. The white cap of Khadi, captivated old and young alike, while at Madura on September, 1921, at 10 P.M. a barber was called to shave his head and ^{the} early next morning, he donned a loin cloth - and reported, 'he would do so until Indian rich and poor alike would be able to get an adequate supply of clothes'.

The Indian National Congress, in Sept. 1920, in Calcutta, passed a resolution in open session ^{with} 1852 ^{votes} in favour and 908 votes against : this Congress is further of the opinion that there is no course left open for the people of India but to approve of and adopt the policy of progressive non-violent non-cooperation until the said wrongs (Khilafat wrongs) are righted and swaraj is established'.
(24)

He transformed the machinery of ~~the~~ Congress into an essentially organised Indian institution with a strong appeal to the lower middle class for the existing upper middle class westernised institution. Literates as well as illiterates were attracted to Gandhi, particularly, the latter by his religious and moral appeal. So writes Penderel Moon, 'Gandhi
(25)
the politician would have been a failure without the saint.'

Further, the attention Gandhi paid to the public relations, propaganda, the preparations he made before the beginning of any movement, his decision to suspend some campaigns, his tactical withdrawals, negotiation he conducted, all deserve special mention. His thoroughness in capturing the organisation always helped him in the achievement of his social aims.

Untouchability.

Gandhi practised what he preached. He saw the discrimination against the outcastes by the caste Hindus. He addressed himself to the solution of the problem in order to remove the widening gap that existed inside Indian society. Furthermore, this was an exercise in the direction of the struggle for the intensification of the consciousness of people for social regeneration and to be fit for the attainment of swaraj. And much more than that, he considered untouchability a heinous crime against humanity and if Hinduism was to be regarded as an honourable and elevating religion, the sooner it purged itself of the sin the better.

In a speech at the Rangoon public meeting, Gandhi declared, all the religions in the world were engaged in the race of life, 'either Hinduism has got to perish or untouchability has to be rooted out completely. (26) In combating untouchability, he had to encounter opposition from Narasingha Mehta, saint poet of Gujrat. He ridiculed the 'vaisnavas' for not admitting them into their institutions. He prescribed public

workers to lead the movement against untouchability. He ridiculed the arrogance of the Brahmins in asking untouchables to turn their faces to the walls and treating them even inferior to their animals. (27) He launched movement on two fronts : he himself started cleaning latrines, interdining with the untouchables and adopted an untouchable girl as a God child. On the other front, he asked the youth to follow him and join the movement. In Young India of 14th January, 1926 Gandhi referred to a case where a Hindu Magistrate fined an untouchable Rs. 75 for a temple entry. Gandhi mentioned, it was a curious situation, we were impatient to establish swaraj. But we Hindu refused to see the one fifth of our co-religionists as worse than dogs. Much had been done, but it was all too little so long as criminal prosecutions for temple entry were possible. Fanatic Hindus were oppsed to beef-eating by the untouchables. In reply he held, 'boycott of beef eating might be proper in the past. It is improper and impossible to-day, if you went the so called untouchables to give up beef. You can do so only by means of love'. (28)

When the Simon Commission came to India, he termed 'the latest trade on untouchability adds to the ugliness of whole picture'. He wrote to M. L. Nehru to 'guarantee equality to the untouchables' in the framing of the constitution. (29) In one interview to Dr. John Mott, he reported, Malviya, the most orthodox Hindu, has started administering the mantra of purification to the untouchables and J. L. Bajaj opened his temple to the

untouchables. He called the untouchables 'Harijans' i.e. children of God and summed up the outlook; 'I expect the tide against, un-
(30)
touchability to rise still more swiftly.'

Returning after attending the Round Table Conference, within a week, he was jailed on 4th January, 1932. The Congress was declared illegal, more than a lakh of people were arrested and camp jails were opened. Gandhi, from Jail, wrote to Hoare, if the separate electorate for the depressed class was created, he would fast unto death. The British government announced Communal Award ignoring declaration of fast.

Gandhi started his fast on 20.9.32 and on ^{the} 24th, a pact was signed between Gandhi and Ambedkar and on ^{the} 26th, the British Government recommended the endorsement of the Poona pact by the parliament. Gandhi was not fasting against ~~the~~ Britain, he was fasting to remove the disabilities from Harijans so they would form a unit with ^{the} Hindus. Important events happened throughout India: the famous Kalighat temple of Calcutta, Ram Mandir of Benaras, citadels of Hindu orthodoxy, were thrown open to untouchables for the first time. In Bombay votes were casted 24, 797 in favour and 445 against the temple-entry. In Allahabad 12 Temples were opened and that became the case throughout India. In Delhi ^{the} Hindus and the harijans demonstratively fraternised in the street. The pact incorporated 'No one shall be regarded as an untouchable by reason of his birth.' The impact of Gandhi's fast, writes Fisher, 'marked a religious reformation, a psychological revolution, a purge of

(31)

Hinduism's millennial sickness ... food for India's moral health'. In a letter to Miss Slade, Gandhi explained, 'the fast was really nothing compared with the miseries that the outcastes have undergone for ages.' He handed over his 'Sabarmati Ashram' to a group of untouchables and in 1933 left on a Harijan tour for two months and from January' 1933 the weekly 'Harijan' started publication.

The problem of untouchability received special attention of Gandhi, and was removed to a greater extent. It is said, Harijan welfare must have indirectly helped to spread the message of nationalism to the lowliest, but the extension of the movement was restricted to the limit of social reforms'. (32) There is another side of the story that Gandhi rebuked Narendra Deva on 2nd August 1934 for forgetting to mention untouchability in the draft programme of Congress socialist party. (33) Bondurant revealed that the revolutionary character of Gandhian approach as to inter-dining, intercaste marriage and untouchability to raise the status of the women, protection of minority were the telling evidences of his abiding concern for the reconstruction of his own society. (34)

B. Ideas on Secularism:

Indian National Congress and Hindu-Muslim Relations:

The late 19th century and the early 20th century marked the beginning of national consciousness alongwith the birth and the growth of socio-political, philosophical ideas. On the

organisational level, in 1885, the Indian National Congress was established. After the establishment of the Indian National Congress, a mighty internal struggle surfaced between the 'Moderates' and the 'Extremists' regarding the 'ends' and 'means' of the nationalist movement. While ^{the} Moderates to name a few, like Ranade, Naoraji, Gokhale, accepted the divorce of religion from politics and maintained a secular view of politics. The extremists, on the other hand, combined the western ideas of patriotism with the religious symbolism of Hinduism. Nationalism combined with religion, became all absolute; India became the 'Mother' the goddess to whom fervent and undivided devotion must be given. The extremists such as, Tilak celebrated 'Ganesh' and 'Shivaji' festivals, Dayananda founded the Cow Protection Association in 1882. Tilak's scholarly commentary on the Gita created resurgent spirit of Hinduism both at the popular and scholarly level, 'but at the inevitable cost of alienating the Muslims'. In Bengal, Bankim Chandra immortalised through his poem 'Banda Mataram', (Hail to Mother) which later on became the nationalist song. Aurobindo held, 'nationalism is not merely a political programme : nationalism is a religion that has come from God'.⁽³⁵⁾ The cult of Durga and Kali (Hindu goddesses) greatly became associated with revolutionary terrorism in Bengal. B.C. Pal, a radical leader, wrote in the 'Soul of India that the 'traditional Gods and Goddesses who had lost their hold upon the modern Hindu mind were now being reinstated with a new nationalist interpretations. Behind this physical and geographical body, there is a being personality -- the personality of Mother. Going through this stage of religious overtones of the Hindus, Khalid B. Sayeed

wondered 'as to how Muslims could be expected to participate in the activities of the Congress which was very largely in the hands of the Hindus of Bengal and Hindus of Maharashtra'.⁽³⁶⁾ S. N. Banerjee also reported that the Congress failed in attracting many Muslims to its sessions.⁽³⁷⁾

Pan-Islamism:

Islam in India, took the course of revival and reformation of basic principles and outlooks. In Europe, this was marked in the Reformation. Indian Moslems also undertook several revivals and purifications. For Islam in India, 'an outstanding event whose influence is still felt was the emergence in the 18th century of the Wahabi movement with its stern insistence on a return to the original purity of the faith.

In Europe, the dismemberment of Turkey by Russia had been thwarted by Great Britain followed by favourite change in Anglo - Afghan policy. Consequently, at home, the British attitude towards the Muslims had changed.⁽³⁸⁾ All these external aspects had been playing very important role in shaping their policies. Furthermore, when confronted with the dual claims of nationalism and Islam, they were willing to subordinate the former for the latter.⁽³⁹⁾

Syed Ahmed Khan, who had earlier pleaded for Hindu Muslim unity, now condemned those Muslims who participated in the rebellion of 1857. He propounded his thesis in 1860 describing his

community as the loyal Mohemdens of India, and on this thesis (40) was constructed future Anglo-Muslim rapport and reapproachment. During the period, Hunter's work on the Indian Muslims was an eye opener to a select few who thought of the lot of that community from social economic and educational angles. But for Ahmed's effort, the Governor General of India laid the foundation stone of the Mohemden Anglo oriental college at Aligarh which became the centre from where the leaders of Aligarh projected their policies for safeguarding the interests of the Muslim community. An exhibition of political separation began.

But, when Bengal was partitioned in the year 1905, a complete division was marked in the behaviour of both the communities. The Muslims attended the thanks giving prayers (41) organised to celebrate the establishment of the new province. It culminated in the establishment of the Muslim League on 30th December, 1906 at Dacca to promote the feeling of loyalty to the British government, to protect and advance the political interests of the Muslims. The League emphasised the ~~human~~ bond of religion and believed that Hindus and Muslims formed two separate nations and democratic government and share in administration would be detrimental to the interests of the Muslims. Consequently, the Muslims should regard the British paramountcy (42) as the chief safeguard.

The very foundation of the League was based on the communal feelings which were just opposite to the Congress

policy which prevailed throughout the period till the partition was achieved. The Morley Minto reforms of 1909 provided the Muslims a separate electorate just within three years of the birth of the Muslim League.

Gandhi's view on Religion:

Religion played a significant role for Gandhi. Gandhi expressed in his autobiography that he could not think of politics apart from religion. He repeated in 1940 'I still hold the view⁽⁴³⁾ that I can not conceive of politics as divorced from religion.' He also advanced reasons in support of his preference for Hinduism. He was attracted to Hinduism because 'Hinduism did not derive its name from any prophet or teacher although it counted some of the greatest within its field'. In his words : 'My religion is Hinduism which, for me, is the religion of humanity and includes the best of all the religions known to me'. He added, 'I am being led to my religion by truth and non-violence i.e. love in the broadest sense of the term'.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Gandhi's religion did not take him to a cave in the Himalayas and he declared, he did not know any religion apart from human activity. To him, different religions were 'different roads converging to the same point' and as such 'a belief in the moral governance of the universe, transcending Hinduism, Christianity and Islam'.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Thus his religion was Hinduism to serve humanity based on truth and non-violence.

Gandhi established a close linkage between morality and religion. To Gandhi, 'an examination of the world's religion

showed that without morality religion could not subsist. To him, true morality, true civilisation and true progress always moved together. So Gandhi observed, 'there is nothing wrong in calling morality a religion'.⁽⁴⁶⁾ He further pointed out the close linkage between the society and morality. So long^{as} a man remained selfish and did not care for the happiness of others, he was no better than an animal. In his words : 'this applies to the religion of man that he should be of some service to others', and added, 'according to this no nation can rule another nation for selfish ends.'⁽⁴⁷⁾ Thus his concept of nationalism and internationalism depended on the moral nature of man and moral governance of society. Gandhi also mentioned the moral laws and compared them with the temporal laws and held, 'these moral laws are immutable and do not change so rapidly and therefore moral laws carry much more weight'. As a true moralist, his conception of religion was based on morality and if any one lost his moral base he ceased to be religious. In his words : 'there is no such thing as religion overriding morality'.⁽⁴⁸⁾ He broke with conservatism in his concept of religion by adding moral strength to it. Because to him true morality consisted 'not in following the beaten track, but in finding out the true path for ourselves and in fearlessly following it.'⁽⁴⁹⁾

To him, veneration for other religions and faiths was the same as for his own religion. He wrote, 'In God's house there are many mansions and they are equally holy.'⁽⁵⁰⁾ So he wanted to retain all the religions based on fellow-feeling,

morality but never believed in one universal religions. He believed in the fundamental unity of all the religions and equality of all religions for 'truth is not the monopoly of any particular religion'.⁽⁵¹⁾ We should remember that he was a saint of action rather than a saint of contemplation. He was throughout concerned with Hindu Muslim relations. Indian nationalism found its highest expression in Gandhi and he rightly understood that no social and political question could be separated from religion. He, therefore, found out the equilibrium suitably balanced than to discard religion outright. He was building nationalism on the basis of harmonious co-operation, co-existence and reconciliation rather on the basis of assimilation or amalgamation or fusion of different religions. Until his death, he was engaged in settling the problem of communalism. Even his prayer meetings communicated social economic and political view points. In his religion, there was no use of hereditary priests or of the established religious institutions. To a people, famishing and idle the only acceptable form in which God can dare appear 'is work and wage'. He held, 'to serve India is to serve its poor. God we can not see with our own eyes; it would do if we serve those we can see. The object of our public life is to serve the visible God that is poor'. In this scheme, he took the service to the untouchables, whom he referred as 'Harijans' (the children of God) and published a weekly paper 'Harijan'. Thus Gandhi preferred co-existence of people on the ground of religion. His religion was humanism based on morality where moral laws governed the man, the society

and the world. Each and every man had the independence to practise his own religion. His attachment to Hinduism helped him to cure Hinduism of its evil like untouchability on the other hand, he fought for 'Khilafat', the Muslim cause.

He recommended secularism as ^a political ideology to be followed in India. He was opposed to state aid partly or wholly, to religious bodies. He did not believe in the state religion even though the whole community had one religion', so, 'with Gandhi living and preaching in the way he did it became very difficult for the Hindu communalists to propagate anti-Muslim ideas'. (52) Gandhi was convinced that a state based primarily on adherence to a particular religion was worse than undemocratic', Donald Smith, added 'Gandhian non-exclusive Hindu philosophy also played a major role'. (53)

Role of Gandhi in the establishment of Hindu-Muslim Unity:

It was in South Africa that Gandhi's indoctrination in nationalism was confirmed. His success in South Africa encouraged him to launch movement against British imperialism in India. Religion did't bar him to have link with other religious communities rather, he worked unitedly. His parting message from South Africa was whether you are Hindus or Muslims. Parsis or Christians, work unitedly. (54) Gandhi arrived with a philosophy of his own and a new technique of political and social agitation. He was a man who had been struggling for the

mastery of the spirit over flesh, looked upon celibacy as a way of life. His views on non-violence, his ideas of women's liberation, his pro-Muslim policy, his obsession with Hindu Muslim unity, his love for religious tolerance, insistence on leading an ascetic life were settled ...' (55) It was in South Africa that his religious consciousness reached a mature level and took a different turn.

Though the Indian National Congress had the provision that both the Hindus and Muslims could be members, the reality was different. Before Gandhi, every body inside the Congress was frankly a Hindu or a Muslim. (56) Just since the birth of the Indian National Congress, Sir Syed Ahmed appealed frankly to the fears, prejudices and self interests of his co-religionists in order to keep them away from the Congress. The Muslims threw their lot behind the nationalist struggle with a degree of enthusiasm, not known before, under the leadership of Gandhi. Despite Gandhi's anxiety not to embarrass the British during the First World War he turned critical of certain actions which he deemed unjust such as the arrest of Ali brothers and Ajad in 1915-16. Gandhi protested, because he was prompted by his desire to cultivate Hindu Muslim unity. How much such calculations affected Gandhi's outlook at this stage became also clear in his decision to attend the annual session of the Muslim League in December 1916 where he pointed out ... that unity between the two communities was an essential precondition in securing self-government.' Thus for the first time a meaningful attempt for achieving communal unity was made on the large scale.

Things went on ^{in their} ~~its~~ own way: the Khilafat movement started and the Khilafat Conference launched the non-co-operation campaign. Gandhi was this time present in Khilafat Conference of 23rd November 1919 where, on the second day, Gandhi was voted to the Chair. In January 1920, Gandhi presented the programme of non-co-operation which was accepted at the conference at Meerut a few days later. (57) It attracted Hindus and Muslims alike. The words Khilafat and Swaraj were on everybody's lips. Hindu Muslim unity was at its height.

The immediate consequences of the Khilafat movement was that on this issue of communal unity the Congress was split again and Gandhi for the next 25 years or more continuously tried for Hindu - Muslim unity. The League lost its popularity and the religious leaders dominated in the name of Khilafat committee and Jamait-ul Ulema. Religion and Politics were confused.

Edward Thompson observed, 'Mr. Gandhi took up by the greatest mistake of his career - the Khilafat agitation, on behalf of the Sultan of Turkey.' (58) The Simon Commission counted 112 major communal riots in five years (1923-27). It was estimated that the Muslims were not so much fighting for freedom for India as they were fighting for the maintenance of Khilafat, whereas for Gandhi the Khilafat was a weapon which he could use to accelerate India's advance towards Swaraj. (59) But the fact remained that for the first time both the communities worked together under the leadership of Gandhi. We can mention here one example, horrified

by the atrocities of Kohat, Gandhi reached Delhi on 14th Sept. 1924 and undertook purificatory fast for 21 days in order to achieve Hindu Muslim unity. He also kept fast on every Monday for Mopla (riot) strain.

In 1927, Simon visited India and at that time the League was split into two. At that time, Jinnah and others were ready to give up the claim of a 'separate electorate' but a storm of protest came from ^{the} Muslim, in all parts of India. Thus for the first time it became difficult to work together. The Congress, at its best tried first on the basis of pure nationalism and if that was not possible even on the basis of appeasement. Simon Commission was followed by Nehru report which seems to be more suggestive in the parting of the ways. ⁽⁶⁰⁾ But this time the differences arose between Gandhi and Ali brothers for Kohat riots. Despite many serious attempts between 1924-29, relations between the two political parties worsened and hence, it was not an easy game for Nehru committee to frame a constitution for India. It was during this period, Gandhi moved resolution of Indian Independence and the Muslims devoted their attention more anxiously to a clear definition and proper security of their position. To Gandhi, the settlement with the Muslims was a must for Indian freedom because without ending the dispute, there was no hope of getting anything from the British.

Gandhi accepted, on behalf of the Congress, all the fourteen points of Jinnah, provided the Muslim representatives

joined him in political stand for full freedom. Therefore, the Congress Working Committee in April 1931 decided to send a deputation consisting of Gandhi, Patel and Bajaj to meet the Muslim leaders to settle the Communal question. Nothing happened. According to Ajad, Gandhi's approach to Jinnah ... gave a new and added importance to him which he later exploited to the full. (61) Ajad could have analysed the situation much better, 'but on the other-hand when we go through the views of Gandhi, we find the situation more complicated than Ajad had described.' (62) The Round Table Conference was convened to settle the communal problem. But the Hindu Muslim antagonism wrecked the Conference because 'there never was a minority problem like this in the history of the world'. (63) In the meantime, Gandhi had talks with Irwin, the Governor General of India, before going to attend Round Table Conference and clearly emphasised that the Congress was not prepared to attend without an assurance that discussion would concentrate on full independence. Instead of going to attend the First Round Table Conference, he launched civil disobedience movement. That ultimately led Lord Irwin to meet Gandhi culminating in Gandhi Irwin Pact. From the Congress point of view, this pact was regarded successful and for Gandhi his leadership was again established and without him the first Round Table Conference failed. Gandhi met the Viceroy on equal terms and it was claimed to be triumph of Indian nationalism. But this created in the minds of ^{the} Muslims serious apprehension.

Gandhi represented the Congress as ^{the} sole delegate in

the Second Round Table Conference. Before going to London, he met Muslim representatives at Bhopal in May, in order to settle the Communal problem but without any progress. Again in July 1931, the Congress Working Committee held its meeting and assured the minorities in clear terms the fundamental rights to culture, religion, script, education etc. Furthermore, Gandhi reassured acceptance of 14 points of Jinnah. It is in 1931 when at Karanchi, the Congress adopted : 'the state shall observe neutrality in regard to all religions'.⁽⁶⁴⁾ Before going to London, Gandhi wrote, 'Indian culture is therefore Indian it is neither Hindu, Islamic or any other wholly.'⁽⁶⁵⁾ One significant factor also deserved attention, as to the role of the Christians, who like Muslims, found it difficult to join political movement, but for the fact they served extraterritorial loyalty.

On the whole, in the Second Round Table Conference, Gandhi claimed that the Congress alone represented India. Gandhi reiterated, all other parties represent sectional interests Congress alone claims to represent the whole of India, all interests. It is no communal organisation; it is a determined enemy of communalism in any shape or form. Congress knows no distinction of race, colour or creed; its platform is universal ... it does represent all the minorities which have lodged their claim here.

Ironically, the Round Table Conference led to deeper conflict. Ambedkar held 'If Pakistan is a settlement it is a proposition worth consideration'.⁽⁶⁶⁾ However, Gandhi was very clear

and justified towards his policy. The result was the communal Award, published on 10th August 1932, splitting even the Congress from where Malviya and Aney resigned. Defending his argument Gandhi added 'divided we must fall. Any Third power may easily enslave India so long Hindus and Muslims are ready to cut each other's throat'.⁽⁶⁷⁾ But, 'there were forces working behind the scenes which made any such settlement impossible.'⁽⁶⁸⁾ There was 'rather obvious understanding and alliance between the more intransigent Moslems and certainly particular undemocratic British political Circle ... From Warren Hasting's time onwards men made no bones of the pleasure the Hindu Moslem conflict gave them : Even such men as El phinstone, Malcolm and Matcalfe admitted its value to the British.'⁽⁶⁹⁾ Consequently, the second session ended without any communal settlement. The communal award was published on the 10th August 1931. It was the Second occasion when the British government gave the Muslims more than they asked for.

Even though Gandhi was criticised, without the Congress, his attempt for communal unity continued. One such venture was anti-Communal Award conference in February 1933 at Delhi. The position of Gandhi was very clearly explained by Jawaharlal Nehru, 'Gandhi didn't like many of the communal demands ... but still he offered to accept the whole lot of them ... if the Muslim delegates there gained forces with him and the Congress on the political issues that is independence.'⁽⁷⁰⁾ The view is further supported in Gandhi's works : 'I am the same to Musalman to-day that I was in 1920-22 - Gandhi continued, 'I should be just as

prepared to lay down my life as I was in Delhi to achieve an organic unity and permanent peace between them, and I hope and pray that there will be, as the result of this upheaval, a spontaneous move in this direction, and then surely other communities can no longer stand out.' (71)

With the enactment of the Government of India Act of 1935, Indian history took a new course as it provided an All India Federation of autonomous provinces and princely states. For, this election took place in 1937 and the result was Congress secured overwhelming majority, the League failed to secure majority even in Punjab and Bengal where the Muslims comprised the majority. The Muslims accepted the office followed by the Congress at the instance of Gandhi. The immediate effect to the Congress advent to power was a sharp increase in communal hatred and Hindu Muslim antagonism.

Jinnah thought that Muslim League was the only representative of the Muslims in India and the Congress should recognise the fact. However, a number of letters were exchanged between Congress leaders such as : Nehru, Bose, Prasad and Jinnah but of no use. For assessing earnestness and sincerity of Gandhi, some lines of his letters would speak for themselves. In a letter dated May 22, 1937 he wrote, 'My faith in unity is as bright as ever, only I see no day-light out of the impenetrable darkness'. In another letter dated October 19, 1937 Gandhi mentioned, 'The whole of your speech is declaration of war. Only

I have hoped you would reserve poor me as a bridge between the two. I see that you want no bridge. I am sorry. It takes two to make a quarrel. You wont find me one'. Gandhi always wanted to accept the demands of the Muslims. In another letter, dated February 3, 1938, Gandhi wrote 'The proposals to form a basis for unity between the two communities, has surely got to come from you ... It is the cry of a friend, not of an opponent'. In another letter dated January 16, 1940, Gandhi wrote, 'I do not mind your opposition to the Congress. But you plan to amalgamate, all the parties opposed to Congress'. Thus for three years he wrote letter after letter sincerely trying to achieve communal unity and always moving the Congress to sacrifice something in favour of the demands of the Muslims. Jinnah, on the other hand, kept on changing his stand sometimes expressing 'India is not a nation' and the League the only representative of the Muslims and in 1940, the parting of the ways.

In March 1940, the Lahore Resolution was passed reiterating Government of India Act of 1935 as totally unsuitable and hence requested to reconsider whole plan so that areas in which Muslims were in majority should be autonomous and sovereign. About two weeks later Gandhi wrote that the Muslim League had created a baffling situation at Lahore. (72) He still continued for unity. The partition of India was a personal triumph for Jinnah. Now he was invited by the Viceroy to discuss Indian problems with him. Sir Stafford Cripps, came to India with

his proposals, but they were unacceptable to the Congress because it supported Jinnah's demand for Pakistan. (73) Gandhi, taking into account British design as one of the important factors, launched 'Quit India Movement' in August 1942 i.e. just within 6 months of Cripps's arrival. But Gandhi was arrested and on release from jail in 1944, tried to talk with Jinnah on Rajaji's formula as the basis. He did not agree with Jinnah's formula of two nations. The year 1944 has a great importance in the history of the communal problem of India because it was perhaps the last effort of Gandhi on behalf of the Congress to have talks with Jinnah to find out the solution.

During his talk with Jinnah in 1944, he tried his best and ultimately proposed in his letter dated 24th September 1944, that a plebiscite be held to ascertain whether people liked separation but Jinnah refused. Gandhi held, that his impression was that Jinnah did not want a settlement till he consolidated such position that he could dictate his terms to all parties including the ruler. (74) The controversy arose again at Simla Conference in June and July 1945. The Congress as a matter of principle opposed communal representation but agreed to accept it as temporary arrangement. The League would not agree unless the entire Muslim quota consisted of the League. The conference broke down. But this time the League, unlike 1937, had captured 425 out of 441 Muslim seats. As if

'one had contested the election on the basis of a united India, (75)
the other on the basis of a partitioned India'.

The Simla Conference was followed by the Cabinet Mission in 1946. The Cabinet Mission Plan ruled out the possibility of Pakistan and suggested a federation at the centre having foreign affairs, defence, communication and the finance required for these subjects and vested all other powers to the provinces and a constituent Assembly was proposed. The League accepted the plan in the hope of Pakistan and the Congress accepted with certain reservations. Ultimately, the League also withdrew its acceptance. Lord Mountbatten succeeded Lord Wavell in February 1947 and British Prime Minister Lord Attlee declared that the transfer of power would take place not later than June 1948. Mountbatten plan was accepted by all the parties concerned and finally became the basis of the Government of India Act of 1947. The power was transferred on 15th August 1947 with the separation and birth of a new nation.

Gandhi was totally against the partition and declared; (76)
'I have called it untruth. There can be no compromise with it.'
Gandhi wanted to cement nationalism to make it one, Jinnah wanted to use the dynamite of religion to make it two. Ironically enough, 'The irreligious Jinnah wished to build a religious state.' (77) It is further testified by Mountbatten's address before the Council of Royal Society in London on October 6th 1948, 'Gandhi did't approve of any kind of partition in April

1947 and refused until his death to approve of it.' (78)

the

Gandhi still believed in Hindu Muslim unity while his comrades in arms reconciled to constituent position. Gandhi held, 'I am opposed to any division of the country now as I always have been. No body can force one to accept this division. On 7th May, he went to Mountbatten and advised him if the British left India there might be chaos for a while, we would still go through the fire no doubt but the fire would purify us. (79) Gandhi saw no Pakistan was possible unless the British created it. But no body listened to Gandhi. So he took partition as a spiritual tragedy and held, 'I can not participate in the celebration of 15th August 1947' and proceeded to Calcutta on 9th August 1947. The city was riot stricken. On 2nd September, he launched a fast unto death. Just within two days, the situation became normal. On 4th, he drank a glass of sweet lime juice handed by Suhrawardy. On this Mountbatten complemented : 'our one man boundary force by his presence in Calcutta controlled the communal rioting whereas 55 thousand soldiers stationed in Punjab had been unable to prevent rioting there. After getting Calcutta normal, he proceeded to Punjab, where communal riots had spread and a great influx of refugees had started. But in Delhi, the situation was beyond control so Gandhi gave himself to the task of bringing Delhi to its senses. He went without escort to the camps where refugees lived without taking care of his health and devoted his time to serve them. He told the prayer meeting 'I will not rest till

every Muslim in the Indian union who wishes to be a loyal citizen of the union is back in his home'.

Gandhi might have preached a sermon or sent a message, but month after month, he tried to restore communal harmony in Noakhali. 'Do and die' was his slogan there. Do meant Hindus and Muslims should learn to live together in peace and amity or 'I should die in the attempt. (80) He tried to restore communal normalcy in Bihar. But his last attempt was fast at Delhi. His fast had restored normalcy in Calcutta and his presence reduced mass killing in Delhi. All these turned to be the 'seed of conscience and the source of hope'. He undertook the fast to break it only when Delhi became peaceful in the real sense of the term. It was during this fast/^{that} he got 55 crores Pakistan's due transferred. This showed that the moral force of one man whose desire (81) to serve was greater than his attachment of life.'

On the second day of the fast, Gandhi witnessed a bomb was thrown at from near^{his} garden-wall in his prayer meeting. The man was Madanlal, who had been evicted from the shelter he had in a mosque. Later, on 30th January, he was shot by Godse for the reason that Gandhi was siding with the Muslims. Thus, a life ended to the cause of achievement of Hindu Muslim unity, the task he undertook in south Africa and continued till the last moment of his life. One can share Nehru's view 'that the light shown in the country was not ordinary light'. He stands the only example who never deviated from his stand of Hindu-Muslim unity and

did't accept partition as solution.'

As has been observed, the Muslim attitude towards Indian nationalism was first and foremost shaped by the perception of their own identity, guided by their notion of superiority that since 12th century they ruled the sub-continent. But under British rule, particularly in the economic sector, they lacked capital, entrepreneurial skills and experiences to compete with the Hindus. Consequently, this brought far-reaching effect. The another venue for social mobility was education where they were late to arrive. 'Their abstension from English education served as a potential for Muslim seperation. Smith's argument that Muslim's separation could't have attained the strength that it did 'had the Muslim and Hindu sections of the classes concerned been at the same economic level'.⁽⁸²⁾ Syed Ahmed in his leadership brought about rapport and rapproachment with the Raj founding the Aligarh movement. So the last phase of the 19th cenutry revealed British Muslim rapport as counterpoise to growing clamour of political rights by the Hindus, under the banner of Indian National Congress. Aligarh leaders could forge these Muslim elites into a viable opposition to the Congress.

The emergence of institutionalisation of muslim politics in the shape of the Muslim League in 1906, followed by the Indian Council Act of 1909, which provided statutory recognition to the muslim demand for seperate electorates and weightage in the Indian Legislature formed the base for Hindu

Muslim antagonistic relationship. The publication of the Nehru Report touched off a heated controversy among ^{the} Muslim leaders in the country followed by the Round Table Conferences, and the Muslims thought it prudent to discuss with British than with the Congress the solution. It was Provincial Autonomy under the Government of India Act of 1935, for which election in the year 1937 took place defeating Muslim League candidates even in the provinces where the Muslims were in majority. The result was the demand of Pakistan formally placed in Lahore in 1940. Cripps Mission failed followed by talks in Simla, which also failed. This time Cabinet Mission came and in spite of disagreement formed a constitutional arrangement rejecting the partition plan. Wavell faced a lot of problems in the formation of the interim government of course both ^{the} Congress and the League joined. Mounthatten came and put forward creation of two autonomous states which was accepted.

The whole history of Hindu-Muslim relations under British rule clearly revealed that both the communities failed to achieve unity at any point of time. The Muslims, right from the Aligarh movement, never took India's independence as their goal on the otherhand they supported the British rule so that they would not be ruled by ^{the} Hindu Majority. Thus Indian nationalism was either Hindu nationalism or Muslim nationalism. Hindu nationalism was represented by Indian national Congress and the League represented Muslim aspirations. The relation, as we have seen in

the history, could not be softened because there was fundamental ^{the} difference in policy and aims between the Congress and/Muslim, League 'By all canons of international Law, Jinnah held, 'we are a nation, were a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilization, language and literature, art and architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, Legal Laws and moral codes, customs and calender, history and traditions, aptitudes and ambitions. (83)

There can be no doubt about the fact that Gandhi understood the relations between the two communities as well as the role of the British government in wooing the Muslims against the nationalist movement. What for he tried Hindu Muslim unity is a question which deserves answer. To Gandhi, partition was a bad history so he didn't accept it and as such was not present in the celebration of independence. To him, the Muslims were not ^{and} aliens. Alike Britishers/India was their home. He found 'no parallel in the history for a body of converts and their descendants claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock'. (84)

His logic for support of Hindu Muslim unity was his conception of secularism. It is important to remind ourselves to-day, from the vintage point of the 1990s, that Gandhi was not, as a religious thinker, fighting a battle against the inroads of secularism as many theologians feel they are doing to-day. Gandhi was, in fact throughout his life, concerned with very secular goals. (85) He was a protestant, in a challenging sense, whether

within the individual or society. Though references of scriptures are found in the boyhood, 'But this did't mean that in boyhood he had any living faith in God. He was somewhat inclined towards atheism or agnosticism. But from the discourses his father had with the priests on other religions, he learnt to be tolerant to other religions. (86). In case of understanding Gandhi's secularism, a proper assessment can be had only in the background of the epic struggle of South Africa. What we found the religion did not bar him to establish linkage with other religious communities.

While in Africa, he came into contact with people of other religions such as, Muslims, Christians and Buddhists. In 1909 he asserted that his life was devoted to demonstrating that co-operation between the two is an indispensable condition for the salvation of India. Not only this, he wrote about the plight of Muslims in South African Jail to private secretary of the Secretary of State for India, on 18th September 1909, where the Muslims had no place for their prayer and no facilities to observe the Ramjan fast. Thus, he fought for the fundamental right of religion of every man which is the basis of modern democracy. In Hind Swaraj, he wrote, India can not cease to be one nation because people belonging to different religions live in it ... In no part of the world are one nationality and one religion synonymous terms; nor has it ever been so in India. So to regard him not supporter of secularism does not fit in. He was quite upto

date in believing that the principle of 'one religion' can not be the basis of the formation of nation. In 1940, Gandhi wrote, I would any day prefer Muslim rule to British Rule.

C. Economic Ideas on Nationalism:

Gandhi was thinking and acting in terms of a social order in which the moral, social, economic and political orders were all but part of an integrated whole. The instrument which Gandhi used for the purpose was the constructive work, divorced from politics, but consciously linked with the worker's and people's mind to their political goal.

To Gandhi, the life of man consisted of those activities which could not be divided. In his words : 'I claim that human mind and human society is not divided into watertight compartments called social political and religious. All act and react upon another'. In this light, he explained 'Swaraj'; 'Let there be no doubt about my conception of Swaraj. It is complete independence of alien control and complete economic independence. So at one hand you have the political independence, at the other the economic'.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Three days before his death, he reiterated the Congress won political freedom, but it had yet to win economic freedom, social freedom, and the moral freedom. Thus, he was addressed to economic freedom, throughout his life. For that he did not provide certain copy book maxims, rather it was grounded on his experiences. The remedies he suggested came out of the

reality that confronted him. Spratt is right when he remarked ;
'His social and economic proposals have to be understood in rela-
(88)
tion to circumstances'.

A Gandhian 'man' is the micro-unit of the socio-economic system and his concept of social welfare totally depended on morality and ethics. To him that economics is untrue which ignored or disregarded morality and moral values. According to Gandhi 'true economics never militates against the highest ethical standard, just as all true ethics to be worst its name, must
(89)
at the same time be also good economics.' After Gandhi, true economics stands for social justice promoting the good of all including the weakest and is indispensable for a decent life. The strong plea for ethical values which is the first brick on which the whole edifice of entire Gandhian economy rests.

Primacy of man, his well-being, growth and unfoldment, has to be the primary object of the economy in all its aspects, the 'end', the 'means', and the 'measure' of the productive efforts and results. This applies to the use of machinery, machinery for man, and not man for machinery, which is the cardinal principle of mechanical production. Further, he pointed out that industrialisation, which involved mass production, depends on centralisation of initiatives, policy decision and power. Concentration of authority in the economy as a whole is undesirable and has to be reduced to the minimum. Industrialisation, even socialised, involved concentration of economic and political

power. This has to be avoided. Decentralisation will have to be promoted and realised to the utmost. In his scheme, this process of decentralisation would develop in agro-industrial economy consisting of small communities, in which agriculture and small industries would develop in terms of real need and resources. Emphasis would be on the maximum utilisation of labour force amounting to self-sufficiency. Small producers stood for economic and social democracy, reduction of inequalities within a very limited range and decentralised initiative.

Gandhi's economic doctrine was also that of investment in human capital. One could easily derive from his voluminous writings and speeches, covering a wide range of topics and issues, such as health, education and training, technological progress, economic and social development that he always insisted on investment in human capital. ⁽⁹⁰⁾ In terms of measurability of yield and the use of resources, he prescribed human capital formation. ⁽⁹¹⁾ As such, Gandhian philosophy 'is much broader and balanced'.

^{The}
In Gandhian concept of economy, 'works performed in the service of other human being, is 'bread - labour'. This principle was taken from 'Unto the Last', which meant, 'the good of the individual is contained in the good of all'. The lawyer's work has the same value as the barbar's; the life of labour is worth living. Gandhi reacted to this, 'I arose with the dawn, ready to reduce these principles to practice.' ⁽⁹²⁾ From that day onward, he believed and put this principle into practice. To him,

'the labour is not only for oneself but for others, when and when only alone it becomes Yagna or sacrifice,' The spirit behind this has labour of love. According to him, 'men will, no doubt, do many other things, either through their body or through their minds, but all this will be labour of love, for the common good'.⁽⁹³⁾ The work turned to be sacrifice and which 'conduces to the most to the welfare of the greatest number in the widest area.'⁽⁹⁴⁾ He suggested : 'If we cultivate this habit of doing this service deliberately, our desire for service will steadily grow stronger and will make not only for our own happiness, but that of the world at large.'⁽⁹⁵⁾ His scheme applied equally to the whole of humanity. 'If every body lived by the sweat of his brow, the earth would become paradise.'⁽⁹⁶⁾

He always thought in terms of humanity and his sources were also multi-national. But originally, he made experiments in India. In his words : 'I have indeed wept to see the stark poverty and unemployment in our country, but I confess our own negligence and ignorance are largely responsible for it, we donot know the dignity of labour as such.'⁽⁹⁷⁾ He preached 'Swadeshi', for gaining independence and elimination of imperialism containing the features : the religious, political and economic - a deeply national ideology. His concept of 'economic freedom was composite one partly economic, partly moral and partly spiritual.'⁽⁹⁸⁾

Gandhi wanted to rebuild India on the basis of his own conception of society and history'. To Gandhi, history has been

the record of the march of man from Himsa (violence) to Ahimsa (non-violence), from cannibalism to the present stage. Gandhi held, 'If we believe that mankind has steadily progressed towards Ahimsa, it followed that it has to progress towards it still further.'⁽⁹⁹⁾ His economic views had been structured on non-violence and that was his contribution to the whole world. In his words : 'I have been leading for the last fifty years for a conscious acceptance of the law and its jealous practice even in the face of the failure'.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ That is why, he always insisted if one took care of means the attainment of the goal was assured. He added, the attainment of goal would be in exact proportion to the purity of means.

Further, Gandhi's economic thinking was based on the principle of equality. His idea of society was that men were born equal and had right to equal opportunity. Economic equality was the masterkey. Everybody should have enough for his or her own needs. In his words : 'let no one try to justify the glaring difference between the classes and the masses, the prince and the pauper, because the former needed more, will be idle sophistry and travesty of my argument'.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ However, his scheme included that 'all the doctors, lawyers, teachers and others would get the same wages for all honest day's work'.⁽¹⁰²⁾ To Spratt, his protest was not so much against wealth as against inequality.⁽¹⁰³⁾ He was not satisfied with only equality in production but also insisted on equal distribution. He asserted : 'my ideal is equal

distribution, but so far as I can see it is not to be realised. (104)
I, therefore, work for equitable distribution'. Every human being had a right to live and therefore to find wherewithal to feed himself and where necessary to clothe and house himself. In assuring this he prescribed ; 'you and I must adjust our wants and even undergo voluntary starvation in order that they may be nursed, fed and clothed'. He did not want to dispossess those who have got possessions but his expectation was that those who want to see light out of darkness have to follow this rule. To him, the accumulation of wealth for personal end was immoral and ran counter to his idea of non-possession and 'aparigraha'. He suggested that 'we are thieves in a way if only everybody took enough for himself and nothing more (105) there would be no pauperism in the world'. Dandavate rightly held ^{that} his insistence not to overlook human values in the midst of material progress and his emphasis on limiting one's wants have great relevance in this connection. Gandhi's views (106) in this regard deserve deeper understanding and appreciation.'

A Critique of Capitalism:

Gandhi recognised 'Capital' as well as 'labour' equally essential for the production and hence interdependent. To him, 'there is no natural antagonism between them. ... but (107) their mutual relations will be subject to constant change. After him, the Lordship of capitalists over labour was immoral.

He branded them as thieves because they took more than they required, denying the millions their due share. His account totally disapproved the grabbing of surplus by the capitalists and hence he was quite alive to the exploitation perpetuated by the capitalists. He held the workers were many while the number of capitalists was much less. But while the capitalists were well organised labours were not. Hence the labours should be conscious of their strength and should learn the secret of combination. Only 'then' it would rule capital instead of being ruled by it. (108) Further he added : 'If the capital is power, so is the work. Either is dependent on the other. Immediately the worker realises his strength, he is in a position to be a co-sharer with the capitalists instead of remaining his slave'. (109)

In 1927, in reply to Saklatwala's letter Gandhi mentioned that 'The idea is to take from capital labour's due share and no more, and this not by paralysing capital, but by reform among labourers from within and by their self-consciousness; not again through cleverness and manoeuvring of non-labour leaders, but by educating labour to evolve its own leadership and its own self-reliant self-existing organisation'. He added that 'Labour ... must not become pawn in the hands of the politician on the political chess-board. He showed his respect for dissent in the following words, 'it is not given to all of us to agree with one another in all our opinions failed to act as trustees' Gandhi prescribed the use of non-violence technique to change their hearts. Many sided constructive activities were the limbs

of Gandhian ideology but trusteeship was its very life-breath. His association with the capitalists was interpreted differently. However, in an interview to Fischer, he expressed ; 'our gratitude to our millionaire friends does not prevent us from saying such things, as no compensation to zamindars.'⁽¹¹⁰⁾

Gandhi clearly mentioned; 'I would not dispossess moneyed men by force, but would invite their cooperation in process of conversion to state ownership'.⁽¹¹¹⁾ This remark of Gandhi brought him nearer to socialistic ideas. In the last stage, when a section of Congress men subscribed to socialism, he also began to call himself a socialist but certainly he maintained difference in the choice of his methods. Spratt observed, 'there is no insincerity or mere vulgar opportunism in it. It is due to sensitiveness to the feelings and thought of community and his sincere response.'⁽¹¹²⁾

Thus trusteeship was addressed to transformation of capitalist order into an egalitarian one. But, to his critic Hiren Mukherjee, Gandhi was at the same time conservative and revolutionary - he did not, for example, deny the moral validity of the institution of the rich, as such, though he sought to change the nature of its working, and ultimately even to eliminate it. Mukherjee explained : 'Gandhi's contribution was not so much in the sphere of bringing about actual and far reaching change' as in rousing social consciousness about the necessity of such change.'⁽¹¹³⁾ Prof. Mukherjee, an eminent Marxist, is right when he evaluates Gandhi's role in arousing consciousness to be very

important. It is the consciousness of people which is much more important in both demanding and achieving the desired goal. It is their participatory role based on certain value-based movement, if possible, peacefully, which makes Gandhi very much relevant for the time to come. Dr. Lohia, an eminent socialist, saw some affinity and kinship in between communism and capitalism. Lohia believed that communism borrowed from capitalism its forces of production, that were centralisation oriented, and sought to alter only the relations of production', and hence, 'for the developing world both capitalism as well as communism tended to become irrelevant'. On the background of the horrors of centralisation in the political and economic fields, Gandhi's concept of decentralisation of economy and devolution of power offers a ray of hope.

(114)

To claim Gandhi as pro-capitalist would be wrong, because he opposed accumulation of property and did not recognise right to property more than what would be permitted by the society. He was in favour of providing decent wage to each and everyone minimising the gap in term of 'bread labour' theory. The production he suggested, should be guided by the social necessity and equitable distribution, if not equal. In the later stage, he even approved legislation to curb property. However, the views expressed by T.K.V. Unnithan seems to be appropriate, to a greater extent, when he suggests, 'May be for the fact, that he (Gandhi) ignored it or tolerated in as a result of his convic-

tion that any attempt to question it would result in violence.'

Let us conclude with Sardesai who wrote : 'but of one thing I feel certain, with all his belief in love, persuasion and non-violence he would have never reconciled himself to the cynical and greedy exploitation of the poor by the rich, he would have always continued to stand by the poor against the rich, but in his own way.'⁽¹¹⁶⁾ So Gandhi's economic thinking stands for the emancipation of the neglected.

Economic Programme:

Village uplift was Gandhi's first concern and his thinking had pronounced rural bias. He was quite conscious of the fact that the majority of the Indians were villagers and they were leading very miserable life. In his words : 'no sophistry, no jugglery in figures, can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye. Gandhi felt no doubt whatsoever, that both England and town-dwellers in India would have to answer ... for the crime against humanity⁽¹¹⁷⁾ which was perhaps unequal in history.

He mentioned that three millions had to remain satisfied with one meal a day, so it was asin to amass wealth. Since 85% of the Indian population lived in villages their economic and social reconstruction was a sine qua non for freedom. He was pained to see how under imperialism, the centre of gravity had shifted from seven hundred thousand villages to a few cities,

dominated by a parasitic class of brokers between the colonial rulers and the Indian people, the landlords, the millioners, the moneyed men, the professional classes and the government servants. Gandhi lamented these cities served the evil purpose of drawing the life blood of the village. (118)

As we know, whatever Gandhi preached, he preached only after practising it himself. He settled in a village 'Sevagram' and started a number of institutions to take up the various strands of social and economic upliftment. His lessons included : to turn waste into wealth; education of the villagers in reviving village industries, village schools, to keep their village clean and to practise nutrition. This spelt his design of decentralisation of production through the revival of the cottage industries based on the principle of non-violent transformation into assisting democratic culture to grow right from the village Republics. Jone held, "Mahatma discarded the socialist armour of the west and took simple pebbles out of his national brook". (119) But Sardesai commented, 'it is given to everyone of us to tender the same respect for the opinions and actions of our fellows as we expect for our own.' (120)

Gandhi wanted the workers' participation in the management, and instead of remaining slave expected, they should remain co-sharer. Endowments of better ability and larger resources did not permit the capitalists to privilege of using these for personal gains. Gandhi expressed, 'what belongs to me is the right to

an honourable livelihood, not better than enjoyed by millions of others, the rest of my wealth belongs to the community.' (121) To him, all property was the gift of nature of products of social living and as such they did not belong to the individual but to the society.

He did not like state control over economy. So he advocated decentralisation of economy in thousands of villages closely linked to decentralisation of political power which was basic to Gandhi's idea of a non-violent society. (122) He apprehended that the increase in the power of the state would result in the destruction of individuality. In his words : 'I look upon an increase in the power of the state with the greatest fear because, although while apparently doing good by minimising exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress. (123) His fear has been aptly proved in socialist countries. He argued that there was no feasible way in which the exploitation could be avoided in imperialism based on industrialism. He pointed out that all the sources of modern imperialism generated exploitation. Due to the nature of the production in western countries, limitless desire for increase production and increased consumption became responsible for colonial possessions and they were moving with the same goal in India. It is proved, 'they entered India for the purpose of the trade. They remained in it for the same purpose.' He cited out the example of Napoleon who took Britishers 'as a nation of shopkeepers'. (124) Essentially, politi-

cian and active leader of the national freedom movement, he noticed the growing conflicts between the peasants and the landlords, the workers and the mill-owners and felt to solve them. In doing so, he advanced certain programmes which were quite different from others. His actions sprang from the inner recesses of his soul. Human life was his laboratory and he refused the glory of the machine. The political structure he suggested and the decentralised economy for which he stood aimed at making the village the pivot of all powers, political as well as economic. (125)

Trusteeship.

Since all forms of property and human accomplishments were either gift of nature or products of social living, they, therefore, did not belong to individual but to the Society. So the rising of the standard of the poor by changing the attitude of the rich would ensure that the capitalists served as a trustee. Every person should look upon his mental or physical talents or material wealth as a trust for society. It was not optional but obligatory. This transference from private ownership to trust ownership did not entitle claim for compensation. The tenure of trusteeship was not permanent - rather a transitory, leading to co-operativization of large scale property. The trustees were entitled to remuneration subject to the consent of the workers and sanction of the state to the amount mutually agreed upon. So was the case with the workers, they were entitled not for their personal aggrandisement but for the benefit of the society as a

whole. It provided capitalists the genuine opportunity to use their experiences and talents for the common good.

Thus, while all property was theft to Proudhon, all property was trust to Gandhi. Gandhi would say, he had no partiality to return to primitive methods; but he suggested the return to primitive methods 'because there is no otherway of giving employment to the millions of villagers who are living in idleness! (126) The fundamental problem of Indian economy, as Gandhi saw it, was unemployment and underemployment. So he warned technological determinism which had engulfed the world should be avoided. As per him, dead machines should not be employed against living machines. 'The common impression that he was opposed in principle to technology is erroneous; (127) Nehru explained the view of Gandhi, 'you talk about the machine, well I am not against the machine; he would say, but we have thirty crore machines in India, why should we not use them'. (128)

Khadi:

To Gandhi, Khadi was one such programme. In his words: 'Khadi is the true economic proposition in terms of the millions of villagers, until such time, if ever, when a better system of supplying work and adequate system of wages for every able bodied person, is found for his field, cottage or even factory in everyone of the villages of India.' (129) The Khadi Industry of Gandhi's vision had no room for surplus or the profit rent and interest. The industry was in the hands of spinners and was very much sustainable

with the increasing population. Time to time, he justified Khadi. In 1921, when Khadi was started on the large scale he claimed for Charkha, the honour of being able to solve the problem of economic distress in a most natural simple, inexpensive and business like manners. Commenting on Khadi, Philip Zealey held, the programme was stroke of genius, nationally it provided a rallying symbol of the humblest villager and to some extent it could check the rural underdevelopment. To Zealey, 'of all the non-violent weapons forged by Gandhi, Khadi was the nearest moral equivalent of the infantryman's rifle. It was conducive to national solidarity'.⁽¹³⁰⁾ Khadi was a technique which bridged the gap between the elites and illiterates, to give up westernised dress, to prove the dignity of the labour and to the wearer, a new feeling of community of freedom fighters, and emotional identification with an ever widening circle of patriots. The All India Spinners Association, had in a period of ten years, extended its activities to 53000 villagers and provided employment to 220,000 spinners, 20,000 weavers and 20,000 carders, and disbursed two crores of rupees in Indian villages. ... which represented the solid work. G.D.H. Cole, 'well known British economist concluded that Khadi, 'was not a mere fad of a romantic eager to revive the past, but a practical attempt to relieve poverty and uplift the standard of Indian villages.'⁽¹³¹⁾

Peasants and Landlords:

The particular socio-economic context of colonial

rule was under the control of landlords, big and small tax collectors, watchmen and guards, consuming surplus product produced by the cultivators. The Union of zaminders and moneylenders, was an unmitigated disaster. The British land policy in India was a plunderous tax policy followed by industry capital policy of feudal receivers of rent in the shape of zaminders obtaining their loyal allies. There was permanent settlement of zaminders in Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and temporarily settled zaminders in U.P. along with Roytbari in the Punjab, Bombay and Madras. In spite of (132) all-oppressive scenes peasants were not organised.

The largest popular element of the nation was peasantry roughly about 85% of the total population. It was Gandhian ideology which opened up the historical possibilities for its appropriation into evolving political structure of the Indian State. To Partha Chatterjee, 'Gandhism provided for the first time in Indian politics an ideological basis for including the whole people within the political nation'. (133) In doing so, he had to face the problem of landlord-tenants relationship. But according to Gandhi, the exploitation of the peasants could not be removed until and unless the peasants were conscious of their strength and organised. the method was non-violence.

It was in Banaras, as early as 1916, where he condemned the luxury of the zaminders. He addressed, 'I feel like saying to these noblemen (landlords) there is no salvation for India unless you strip of yourself of the Jewellery and hold it in trust for

Your countrymen in India'. And the idea hardened in 1936, when he reiterated, 'what can the poor zaminder do when the tenants say they will simply not work the land unless they are paid enough to feed, clothe and educate themselves and their children in a decent manner if the toilers intelligently combine, they will become an irresistible power'.⁽¹³⁴⁾ In June 1942, in an interview to Louis Fisher he asserted, 'No, that (compensation) would not be possible' our gratitude to our millionaire friends does not prevent us from saying such thing.⁽¹³⁵⁾ He started saying since 1937, 'all lands belong to Gopal, in modern language, to the state.'

Unlike Marx, Lenin and Stalin, he opposed collectivization though he asserted, 'land should belong to the cultivator and no cultivator should have more land than is necessary to support his family in a fair standard of living.'⁽¹³⁶⁾ He favoured, 'voluntary co-operation of the peasants as an ideal alternative to the self-centred individualism, of the peasant on the one hand and dehumanising experiment of forced collectivisation on the other. 'It may be recalled', points out Dandavate, 'many non-violent battles of the peasants had to be fought before a powerful public opinion for the abolition of zamindari system'.⁽¹³⁹⁾

Though Gandhi was oblivious to class struggle, he opted for persuasion and the organisation of Trusteeship. What attracted him most was his attempt for infusing consciousness

among the deprived people and to ask them to be organised so that their strength far superior to the landlords and capitalists would fetch the desired result. This technique had one other plus point i.e. the participation of the people on the largest scale in the movement. Its accompaniment with the non-violent means, further, assured its success since it was the power of the people. So Gandhi held : 'Public opinion for which one cares, is a mightiest force, than that of the gun-powder.' (438) To him, this can be achieved through satyagraha because it strived to reach the reason through heart and that was to awaken the public opinion.

Sarvodaya:

The most important feature of Gandhian ideology was its social idea of 'Sarvodaya' or the welfare of the all. Sarvodaya, was above all, committed to the task of bringing about fundamental social changes in favour of the unprivileged ~~humanity~~ humanity. Gandhi honestly and sincerely integrated struggle against colonialism. Sarvodaya was a move in the said direction.

Sarvodaya attached moral values that he sought to evolve in a social political and economic order, where the humblest, poorest the lowliest could become the ruler. He stood for the perestroika. Sarvodaya had its own world-view, view of history, philosophy, of social relations of technology and

values. His emphasis that it was through service to humanity that one should try to seek self-realisation, formed the basis of his concept of Sarvodaya. It meant to him the greatest good of all i.e. Sarvodaya which included social, political and moral emanipation.

As an ethical absolutist, Gandhi rejected the Benthamite formula. In his words : 'A votary of ahimsa cannot subscribe to the utilitarian formula, instead he would strive for the good of all. In Mahadeb Desai's diary, he is reported to have asserted : 'I do not believe in the doctrine of the greatest good of the greatest number. In its nakedness, in order to achieve the supposed good of 51% the interest of 49% should be sacrificed. (139) It is a heartless doctrine, and has done harm to humanity.

Sarvodaya is emphatic on the values of freedom, equality, justice and fraternity but opposed to the state. Gandhi wanted that it be based on the moral authority of the people i.e. moral sovereignty of the people. It is not possible to achieve any success through developing the power of the state. (140) Sarvodaya scheme did not favour party democracy.

In its world view, 'Sarvodaya is based on the concept of the unity of existence. and taught universal love as the only law of life, Sarvodaya is 'a comprehensive, social, economic, political, moral, and spiritual philosophy.' (141)

Marxists do not support his idea of Sarvodaya; rather,

they claim it to be a reformist measure. Kaviraj, held that the view of Soviet scholar, O Martysin, is not borne by facts who wrote, 'the popular and peasant ideal of Gandhi's Sarvodaya should not be confused with the bourgeois concept of the welfare State'. Sarvodaya aims at establishing public ownership of the means of production and abolishing exploitation of class by class, caste by caste and man by man. Against that, Kaviraj opined, 'So what Gandhi wanted was not a peasant utopia or peasant socialism or anything of that kind.'⁽¹⁴²⁾ However, the fact remained, Gandhi believed, all social efforts should be directed towards the all round development of the lowliest i.e. landless, labours, small peasants, petty craftsmen, untouchables and tribals in terms of freedom, equality, independence and relative comfort, quite consistent with the principles of justice and equality'. Gunnar Myrdal described Gandhi's message as : 'radically egalitarian, and added that he was ' a true westernised liberal, indeed a radical and revolutionary, whose demand for drastic changes in the social and economic order was heard throughout the subcontinent'.⁽¹⁴³⁾

In evaluating Gandhian political economy, one should take into account his two major tasks, one to get political freedom and the other to prescribe certain ways through which socially, morally politically and economically Indians could march ahead. In doing so, he produced a compact analysis and suggested some new measures.

To him, mere 'political swaraj' could not be the

substitute of true swaraj, in a society, which was under alien and aggressive political authority on the one hand and on the other, with a poor, weak, disunited and stratified social order. He declared, complete political independence from alien control, and at the sametime complete economic freedom. So he reiterated, time and again, that mere political freedom would not do and added that the system under British rule had to be restructured. If Britishers went back and their system continued there would be no difference. What Gandhi asserted was the need of the economic regeneration on anti-colonial, anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist and also anti-stalinist model. He did not subscribe to the then prevailing models rather supplemented them with his own. Partha Chatterjee has rightly held, 'it would indeed be gross error to regard Gandhi as merely another peasant intellectual' and adds, in its critique of civil society, Gandhism adopted a stand-point that lay entirely outside the thematic of post-Enlightenment thought. Gandhism was the ideology, conceived as the intervention in the elite-nationalist discourse of the time. In historical context, one could estimate the achievement, 'Perhaps the most important historical task for a successful revolution in a country like India.'

(144)

As an ideology, 'Sarvodaya' surpassed the utilitarian formula. Though 'he is dubbed as a social obscurrantist and reactionary for his social economic philosophy but little effort has been made to assess his socio-economic though in its correct perspective'. A fact based study would reveal 'that in no other

subject did Gandhi's view undergo such a progressive change' . (145)
Admittedly, Gandhi did not formulate a doctrine, his economic view tried to establish a relationship between economics and ethics, between man and his environment, man and machine, between labour and capital, between village and town.

There are some critics who regard his movement against imperialism revolutionary, but his social out-look reactionary. Gandhi's economic thought outgrew the vehemence of 'Hind Swaraj'. His attitude to mechanisation was not based on blind prejudice. To solve chronic unemployment and underemployment, he preferred to use machine only when it was essential and would remark ; dead machinery should not be used against the thirty crores living machines. He talked of village-swaraj which would ensure that each village was self-sufficient. Nanda Observed, Economists may have laughed at Gandhi's ideas in his lifetime, but they do so no longer. His conception of development related to man as a whole. His theory of trusteeship was offered as an alternative to both capitalism and communism. But he was radical and original in his support to the down-trodden. In his words : 'if the landlords, the zamindars, moneyed men, and those who are enjoying privileges - I do not care whether they are Europeans or Indians - If they find discriminated against, I shall sympathise with them but I will not help them. It will be a battle between the haves and have-nots'. (146) So the cause of the deprived was uppermost in his mind which he tried to solve non-violently, but his attitude hardened when he found the response from the capitalist end not-so-much-encouraging.

However, he has been criticised on the ground that he may sound theoretically good, ^{but} it is not yet made practicable. The concept of minimum want has also broadened. The modern world society, growing in intellectual, technological scientific, disciplines favour global growth due to world wide net-work of commerce and communication. So it is not positive brand of economics but a variant normative economics. Just opposite view is also placed that technology, as a source of economic growth, is often a fiction which covers up material degradation of nature and the related decline in the material standard of living of the majority of people'. The other internal contradiction, inherent in capitalist technology, between the growth of capitalism and the destruction of the resources and the ecological balance, has become the central issues in Indian political life. (147)

Thus, it would be quite wrong to judge 'Gandhi's economic views from the standard of western ideology. Whether one accepts Gandhi's solution or not, it must be conceded that his reaction against factory-civilisation and his plea for substitution of the same by self-sufficing decentralised village economy was ultimately rooted in his revulsion against concentration of economic power in the hands of a few, had an egalitarian humanistic content'. (148)

D. Political Ideas on Nationalism:

Gandhi's acceptance of 'Ahimsa' as an 'end' and a 'means' in all social ideas, application of 'Sarvodaya' in social, political and economic spheres, belief in God and toleration of all religions, formed the core of his egalitarian attitude to social philosophy. In guiding national movement, he did not subscribe to any particular political ideology advanced so far. One finds, that the problematic of nationalism under him has been shaped out of the thematic of universalism. And his solutions too 'is much meant to be universal, applicable as much to the countries of West as to nations such as India. (149)

Here, first of all, an attempt is made to assess the character of his movement and to judge how far it was democratic because democracy is the adjunct of nationalism and as such nationalism is inconceivable without democracy. The right to self-determination champions democracy. Nationalism provided the first scope of raising collective grievances. To Gandhi, history provided such an example in which there was no real involvement of the larger section of people in the violent struggle. He launched non-violent movements in the shape of non-co-operation movement, no tax campaign, strikes, hartals ensuring the highest and the widest participation of people. Due to such movements he had been able to achieve, when general Smuts, in South Africa, had conceded certain demands of Indians settled there. He retur-

ned to India with living experience of non-violent method and broadened people's participation making his struggle more democratic and participatory on Indian scene.

Gandhian Movements : Democracy:

In India, it was Champaran where he launched peasant movement and could end indigo-planters tyranny, the movement of Bardoli with no tax campaign and the Ahmedabad movement of labours. The technique of non-violence was adopted in 1920, 1930, 1940, 1942 which compelled Britishers to vacate India. This was a glowing tribute to the methodology of Gandhi in galvanising nation's latent power of resistance.' These movements had the largest participation of the people and as such they were truly democratic movements. The feature of his movement was that it attracted rich and poor, right and left, rural and urban, Hindu and Muslim alike making it to be the widest participatory movement. It was not reflecting the class character rather it was the mass movement. Describing the merits of the movement, Prof. Dandavate held that 'in the form of the struggle as well as in the social reconstruction instead of depending on the state he took straight to the people'. The Technique of non-violent mass action brought vast section of people within the ambit of struggle either directly or indirectly. (150)

Gandhi's leadership effected a sharp break, with the style of politics being practised before, by the Indian National

Congress. What gave these events a new dimension, and thereby made their impact more cataclysmic, was the technique that Gandhi deployed in welding-together diverse groups in Indian politics such as , traders, workers, peasants and low castes along with Muslims into the non-cooperation movement. Indian nationalism under the upheavals of 1920 had thus ceased to be the concern solely of the educated and the bourgeoisie concentrated in the urban centres. Thus mass based movement along with the mass orientation of Indian National Congress under the leadership of Gandhi emerged on the scene.

But the evaluation of the movement, which was certainly mass-based and democratic, had been made differently by different scholars. M. N. Roy, the pioneer Marxist, did not give any credit to Gandhi. In his words : 'The powder magazine was there and Gandhi set fire to it.' (151) Namboodripad held:

'Here was a movement in which a band of selfless individuals from the middle and upper classes identified themselves with and roused the common people against the powers-that-be in order to secure some well-defined demands'. (152) Dange interpreted that

'it was the Indian masses in their revolutionary mission that made Mohandas Karam Chand Gandhi, the Mahatma, and not the other way round'. Mohit Sen, the other Marxist held , 'it is to be regretted that more farsighted capitalists in India could clearly understand Gandhi than the representative of the working class. Without being conscious of it, the representatives of working class in India were following M. N. Roy rather than Lenin.' (153)

This showed that the Marxists tried to evaluate Gandhi from the class analysis context. But no one denied that the mass movement in 1920 in the shape of non-co-operation launched by Gandhi was having such a wider participation. A Soviet Marxist Scholar, M.A. Persists, mentioned : 'Gandhi (who) was sincerely concerned about the welfare of his people, especially the peasantry, which he regarded as the main force. ... realised that the success of the liberation movement depended upon the struggle of the masses for the satisfaction of their basic needs.'

(154)

Movements : Political, Social and Economic:

Gandhi also led social and economic movements. His insistence over building up a Web of centres of constructive activities, like Khadi, village industries and many others, campaigns for removal of untouchability proved to be the basis of mass contact for the strengthening of unity and integrity of the populace to the cause of nationalism. It helped to carry on the movement of national reconstruction as well as the attainment of national liberation. It further provided orientation to the people without depending on the state, an exercise to build democratic awareness, Pyarelal nicely summed up : 'The instrument which Gandhi used for the purpose was that of the constructive work, divorced from politics but consciously linked in the worker's and people's mind to their political goal.'

(155)

Gandhi organised Indian National Congress as a mass

organisation. The different movements launched under his leadership were ; peasant movement, labour movements, and also the movement of the political freedom. He was the first Congress leader who took the cause of Khilafat i.e. of the Muslims and for the first time brought Hindu and Muslims together under his leadership. So to reiterate that 'Nineteen hundred and twenty represents a watershed in the history of India nationalism'⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ is quite meaningful. His attempt for the establishment of Hindu-Muslim unity, based on his conception of secularism, was his major contribution. Even his critic Mohit Sen held : 'As for Gandhi's political programme especially his stress on Hindu Muslim unity, and the eradication of untouchability, it is again the left, particularly the communist who are the heirs.'⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ Gandhi held, 'Religion is a personal matter and if we succeed in confining it to the personal plane, all would be well in our political life'.⁽¹⁵⁸⁾

His method of non-co-operation based on non-violence was an attempt to awaken the masses to a sense of their dignity and to be fearless. It emboldened to secure justice no matter the ruler was the strong and exploiting the people. His movement was not restricted to political freedom but was launched for social change. In the words of Gandhi : 'by swaraj I mean the government of India by the consent of the people' and added, 'under it the weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest'. Freedom to him, was political, economic and social and that could be achieved only when inequalities, dependency and fear were removed. Democracy was instrumental to his larger

goals of non-violence and freedom. Mohit Sen held that the techniques used by Gandhi, 'while not invented by him and while existing in embryonic forms in earlier phases ... were sharpened and perfected. These too are the progressive parts of Gandhian legacy.' He further mentioned that the left and communists 'have done more than utilising Gandhian technique of struggle and infusing them with a new content.'⁽¹⁵⁹⁾

Lewi evaluated Gandhian movement and held, 'it stemmed from the practice of traditional Hindu virtues, such as renunciation, fasting, penance, celibacy and simplicity in speech food and dress.'⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ Whatever the background, the mass content was very logically expressed by Brown, she rejected such explanation which ascribed Gandhi's charismatic appeal responsible for the success of his movement. On the other hand she held, that was veiled to only a section of people, the lower class people. But Gandhi's success was due to involvement of the people who were 'new to politics and came both from politically backward provinces and regions and groups within the presidencies, which previously provided few members of the political elite.'⁽¹⁶¹⁾ However, the fact remained that eminent leaders and intellectual giants like M.L. Nehru, J. L. Nehru, Lajpat Rai, C.R. Das, Rajgopalachari, Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Subhash Chandra Bose also worked under his leadership. On the other hand, a study of Gandhian movement revealed that it was ~~was~~^{an} unprecedented mass-movement. Marxists criticised his movement on the ground that it was a bourgeois

movement and non-violent method was not altogether responsible for the attainment of India's freedom. Non-marxists did not regard him to be pro-bourgeoisie but took him to be a traditionalist who tried to find everything wrong with the modernity. However, we may safely regard his movement was a democratic movement and could claim his ideology different from the traditional liberalism of the west. The fact remained Gandhi had worked for the day when the violence would be outlawed in the inter-state conflicts. He knew that even in his party there were many who were opposed to non-violent technique. The initial acceptance of his method was due to the fact that 'he offered an alternative to constitutional agitation and terrorism, both of which had failed to make a real dent on the imperialist structure in India.' (162)

Gandhi believed in the sovereignty of the people. To him, any government was in power because the people allowed that government to stay. So the life of the government depended on active and tacit support of the people and no government could function without it. To him British ruled India because Indians allowed them to rule. In his words : 'The English have not taken India, we have given it to them.' During the second world war he appealed to the Germans, Britons and Japanese alike, to come forward and to check the war. Furthermore, with the help of method of non-violence, as he wanted to achieve freedom, equality and progress of the people. His scheme of non-violence was so devised that 'they contributed to the enrichment of the lives of

the individuals who participated in the struggle'.

He did not believe only in the sovereignty of the people but also took care of ensuring it. In his struggle and social reconstruction Gandhi awarded little importance to the state on the otherhand he encouraged local initiatives from the grass-root level. His insistence over, decentralisation of economy and political power amply demonstrated his support to the role of people.

In his scheme, he made an essential distinction between the state and society and opined that the government could not be more important than the people. Politics to him was not as important as social and moral upliftment of the people. Before Gandhi formulated his philosophy Tagore had emulated Vivekananda's tradition, 'first in the sharp demarcation ~~between~~ between the society and the state and the second in associating the society with Indian civilisation and the state with British.' (164) But the fact remained that Gandhi described it on a greater length with far more clarity which formed the basis of his conception of democracy. The distinction between the state power and people's power has been one of the legacies of Gandhi which was advanced by Vinoba and JayaPrakash. Gandhi repeatedly emphasised the supremacy of people's power, Evaluating the parliamentary democracy, J.P. Narain opined that India institutionalised a form of government that lacked both traditional and theoretical support, electorate system represented the wishes of the informed

public, served only a fragment of the body politic confusing voters who were manipulated by highly powerful, centrally controlled and financed political parties. But the most serious fault of parliamentary democracy lay in its inherent centralism. He proposed, the main remedy for this is to scrap the parliamentary system and replace it by communitarian democracy and decentralised political economy.' (165) The prevailing condition in our country amply bears testimony to this and all over the world decentralisation is being focussed upon.

State:

The State manifested violence in a concentrated and organised way. The main target of attack was the amoral, coercive state. He maintained that the state was a soulless machine and amoral and added that politics 'encircled us like the coil of snake and there was no limit to power in the modern state. According to Gandhi, 'it does ^{the} greatest harm to the mankind by destroying individuality which lies at the root of all progress.' (166) His was an idealist description of the state but he was the first among them to reduce the authority of the state. Unlike Hegel, state is not the march of God, nor, 'will, not force, is the basis of the state, as propounded by Green was valid to him. To him, state was a soulless machine.

His account of the state revealed that the state

was a means of exploitation both at national and international levels. The violent state, to him, was the agency of exploitation. To him, the accumulation of capital was 'impossible, except through the violent means'. To him, the society of the future was to be a society in which there was to be no distinction between rich and poor, or colour and colour, or country and country'. In his words : 'it is my firm conviction that if the state suppressed capitalism by violence, it will be caught in the coils of violence itself.' (167) So even for the improvement of the exploited he did not favour the use of violence. Thus he did not endorse Marxian method of violent change on the one hand and on the other the centralization of state power.

To him, political power was a means to a better condition of life but when national life became perfect it ceased to be important. State never provided satisfactory account. So he explained : 'But on the political field the struggle on behalf of the people mostly consists in opposing unjust laws'. (168) Thus, when the state failed to safeguard the interest of the people it was wise to curtail its power. He proceeded further and remarked for the ideal state, therefore, there was no need of political power. The ideal is never fully realised. Hence he endorsed the classical statement of Thoreau, 'that government is the best which governs the least'. (169) Thus he wanted to retain state only because ideal stage was not always achieved. Gandhi in order to curtail the authority of the state, proposed decentralisation

right from the grass-root level in the shape of village panchayat so that effective power remained with the people. In his words: 'in this structure, composed of innumerable villages, there will be everwidening, never ascending circles, life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be oceanic circle whose centre will be individual always ready to perish for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole become one ... Therefore, the outermost circumference will not wield power to crush the inner circle but will give strength to all within and derive its own strength from it.' (170) So, Dandavate reiterated: there is not the least doubt that in an age in which we are witnessing the evils of economic and political centralisation, Gandhi's call to strengthen power at the grass-root level alone will sustain and strengthen democracy.' (171)

Gandhi elaborated the picture by the outline of the village government. Here there was perfect democracy based on individual freedom. The individual was the architect of his own government. The law of non-violence ruled him and his government. He and his villages were able to defy the might of the world ... This reflected in him the tradition of Kropotkin and Tolstoy, in accrediting lesser role to the state, On the other hand, equally important, this placed him 'squarely in line with the thought of Vivekananda, Aurobindo and Tagore, who shared with him the suspicion of state authority and a firm desire for its decentralisa-

tion based on their common attitudes towards politics and power. To him, however, it was inconsistent with a non-violent structure of the society. Though Gandhi did not delineate the precise functions that would be retained by the Central government; the important point was that Gandhi advocated for independent India 'The maximum, possible decentralisation of the political and economic power and resources of the State'. (173) Vinoba and Jay Prakash Narayan enriched this aspect of Gandhism. J. P. Narayan reiterated that the worst evils of power come only when it was centralised. In his words : the problem is always with the concentration of too much power in the hands of a small group of persons, with more and more powers concentrated in the hands of the executive, (174) which in reality means one person, the Prime Minister. He suggested ^{that} the first aim should be to diffuse political and economic power on decentralised politico-economic structure.

Critique of Western Democracy:

These ideas he structured on the reading of western democracy right from the writing of 'Hind Swaraj', and found them valid with certain modifications throughout his life. He was a critique of the western democracy on the ground that the capitalist ethos and principles of utilitarianism militated against the substantive democracy in the west. He criticised the deceptive nature of western democracy. In his words : 'People of Europe have no doubt political power but no Swaraj. Asian and African nations are exploited for their partial benefit, and they on their part,

are exploited by the ruling class or caste under the sacred name
(175)
of democracy.'

Gandhi's indictment of western democracy was mainly based on three counts : exploitation of the weak by a few capitalist owners ; expansion of capitalism resulting into the exploitation of the weaker peoples; white racialism. In a talk to Louis Fischer, Gandhi remarked, 'America and Britain are great nations but their greatness will count as dust before the bar of
(176)
dumb humanity, whether African or Asiatic when fascism, during the second world war, was rated greater enemy than the imperialism Gandhi did not subscribe to that Buddhadeva Bhattacharyya mentioned 'we use the word 'genius' advisedly because his was the lone voice of political prudence and maturity when confusion reigned supreme'.
(177)
Gandhi was reacting to the legitimacy claim of the capitalist state whose imperialist and fascist manifestations revealed to them the false foundations of liberal democracy. Looked at from the bottom up, the contradictions of the late capitalist state were seen earlier in the periphery than at the centre of the world capitalist system. Pantham concluded, 'the untruth of the state's claim to democratic legitimacy', which Haberman sees today in the capitalist country, was seen earlier by Gandhi in the peripheral states of south Africa and India, which were the arena
(178)
of his experiments with truthful or aesthetic politics.'

Quite early in his life, he found untrue and hypo-

critical the British imperialist's claim of civilizing and democratising the colonies rather what they did was the opposite of their claim. The condition was more or less the same in other democracies such as America and France. In an interview to an American journalist Gandhi remarked : 'no country in the world to-day shows any but patronizing regard for the weak. The weakest you say go to the wall. Take your (American) case. Your land is owned by a few capitalist owners. The same is true of south Africa. These large holdings can not be sustained except by violence, veiled if not open. Western democracy, as it functions to-day, is diluted nazism or fascism. At best it is ~~xxxxxx~~ a clock to hide the Nazi and the fascist tendencies of imperialism'. (179)

Institutions of Western Democracy:

'Hind Swaraj' contained statements on fundamental elements of Gandhi's politics. He endorsed basically the views expressed in Hind Swaraj in his autobiography published in 1928. Long after in 1939 he claimed : 'whenever I have been obliged to compare my writings even of fifty years ago with the latest, I have discovered no inconsistency between the two. (180) Partha Chatterjee, unlike Roll who took Hind Swaraj 'as the negation of progress' and Iyer who found it, 'severe condemnation of modern civilisation' prefers it to be read 'as a text on fundamental critique of the civil society is no where more valied than in his assessment of institutions of western democracy.

As we know, sovereignty lies in the parliament and the

British parliament is the mother of all the parliaments. Britain is famous for the supremacy of parliament and Rule of Law. Though a staunch supporter of democracy, Gandhi was the vehement critique of British parliament in general and of British democracy in particular. Parliament he called 'a sterile woman and a prostitute' because, being a sovereign institution it was expected that she was not swayed by outside pressures and as such was unable to legislate independently and with the change in ministry the parliament has to shift allegiance. Secondly, Gandhi pointed out that 'members vote for their party without a thought'. That meant the interest of the party got predominance over people. The leader of the House, the Prime Minister, 'was found more concerned about his power than about the parliament, people and party. He added they certainly bribed the people with honours. Gandhi remarked : 'I do not hesitate to say that they have neither real honesty nor living conscience'. He further explained that individual identity and initiative were totally lost in the parliamentary system.

Gandhi also took into account the position of the voters and asserted that they were fed by different newspapers whose views reflected their support to particular political parties. In his words : 'the same fact is differently interpreted by different newspaper according to the party in whose interests they are edited.'⁽¹⁸²⁾ He also mentioned of the arrangement of parties, receptions to the voters. Long after i.e. in the year 1942, in an interview to Fischer, he mentioned that 'parliamentary

democracy is not immune to corruption'. (183)

Besides, 'the Rule of Law' appeared to Gandhi, as a deceptive principle of British democratic system. In his words : 'the lawyers, therefore, will as a rule, advance quarrels instead of representing them'. (184) Besides, the legal fiction 'equality before law' and the supposed neutrality of state institutions perpetuated the inequalities and divisions continuing in the society. So he pointed out : ' I do not think that a free India will function like the other countries of the world. We have our own forms to contribute.' (185)

The rule of majority had a narrow application in the sense it failed to guard the individual liberty on the one hand and on the other, it had ignored the great mass in the western countries. In his words: 'the rule of the majority has a narrow application, i.e. one should yield to majority in matters of detail ... Democracy is not a state in which people act like sheep. Under democracy individual liberty of opinion or action is jealously guarded. (186) At one place he explained the rule of majority might opt for terrorism. But here again, he showed his practical insight and explained : 'to support the majority however that support was not subject to the compromise of individuality and fundamentals. So Gandhi asserted, 'I have found by experience that, if I wish to live in society and still retain my independence, I must limit the points of utter independence to matters of first rate importance. In all others, which do not involve a departure for one's

personal religion, or moral code, one must yield to the majority.'
(187)

Gandhi posed certain basic questions as to the weakness of the majority rule, Could the rule of 51% of the electorate be equated with genuine democracy? Had the law of conscience any place in term of majority rule? Was not the minority protection responsibility of the majority? (188) He held, 'the rule of majority when it becomes coercive is as intolerable as that of bureaucratic minority'. He had no high regard for the quantitative principles of democracy but even then so long as better political system did not replace it, he preferred democracy. In 1931 he declared : 'I am wedded to adult suffrage.' (189) In 1947 he reiterated 'As to the franchise he supported franchise of all adults, male and female' i.e. universal adult suffrage.

Despite Gandhi's opposition to so many defects of western democracy he held, 'I realise that despite my views there will be a central government administration. However, I do not believe in the accepted western form of democracy with its universal voting for parliamentary representatives'. This was the answer which he gave to Fischer. What he aspired was 'True democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at the centre. It has to be worked about from below by the people of every village.' (190) Time has amply proved the farsightedness of Gandhi at least in India where more emphasis is being given on

grass-root planning and village panchayat, after the failure of system in India, to achieve social, economic, political and moral freedom of the majority Indians.

Political Party:

Gandhi was not favourably disposed to party system, because he did not want the intermediaries between the government and the people. He could not assign the high position to political parties in the politics of England. The role of political parties diminished in the British Political system. Furthermore, he heard from various quarters that ever since the acceptance of office in 1937, the Congress was abandoning its tradition of penance, sacrifice and service and was becoming an organisation of selfish power seekers. Naturally, Gandhi was not happy with the prevailing situation in the party. Gandhi apprehended that they would fall prey to white goondas of society in whose hands all power would pass. (191)

When India got freedom, Gandhi was very much disturbed about the future of ^{the} Indian National Congress. Though the Congress had won political freedom but it had yet to win economic, social and moral freedom. Gandhi believed these freedoms were harder to achieve than the political freedom. In order to achieve these goals he wanted to reorganise and revitalise the organisation. He emphasised the membership where 'no fake names get in and no legitimate name is left out.' He suggested that the organisa-

tion should have the proper representation of the villagers because it was mainly comprised of the city dweller 'so ranks must be filled in increasing members from villages. (192)

Lok Sevak Sangha:

Gandhi took politics to be the service, and expected only dedicated souls would join to serve the society. If the Congress was unable to rise to the occasion many parties might come to serve the people, 'but the very best will win'. To him this situation was the second best. However his views hardened and in the last public document of his life he suggested in order to achieve social moral and economic independence of 7000,000 villages, the Indian national Congress he banned and a 'Lok Sevak Sangha' he formed in place of the Congress. (193)

The composition of the Lok Sevak Sangha would start from the village electing five members and out of the two village panchayats i.e. out of ten members one leader would be elected. So out of 100 village panchayat 50 first grade members would be elected and the process will continue so long they cover whole of India. Every member shall be a habitual wearer of Khadi, and be a teetotaler, must abjure untouchability, believe in the inter-communal unity having equal regard for all the irrespective of race, creed or sex.

Apart from adhering to the above mentioned programme, they were to make village self-supportive through their agricul-

ture and handicrafts. It was their duty to educate the villagers in sanitation and hygiene, to impart functional education, to include every name entitled to voters list, and other functions to be added from time to time.

He, further, requested to affiliate A.I.S.I., A.I. VIA. Hindusthan Talimi Sangh, Harijan Sevak Sangh and Goseva Sangh, the autonomous bodies to Lok Sevak Sangh. In finance they were supposed to collect money from the villagers and others with special stress on poor. (194)

This proposed organisation of Gandhi wanted to secure political, economic, social and moral freedom of the villagers through the effort of the villagers themselves not depending on the state. This could have been a unique experiment in democracy from the grass-root level as well as a different organisation with so many features.

Democracy as an ethical concept and a way of social life:

Democracy is explained as a 'form of government', a form of state, a 'form of ethical life' and 'a way of social life'. To Gandhi, democracy came as an ethical concept, and a way of social life, destined to help individual in moral, economic, social and political upliftment. To him democracy came as a means to achieve non-violence and through non-violence freedom. Like democracy political power was a means to better the condition of human life which could be possible only when it was based

non-violence. The overriding tone in Gandhi's discussion of politics was of its subordinate or inferior status and the 'work of social reform or self purification of this nature was a hundred times dearer to him. He had an abiding faith in non-violence and (195) 'Gandhi is best known for his theory of non-violence'. Democracy, was instrumental to his larger goals of non-violence and freedom. Since institutional foundations of society promoted inequalities, dependency and fear he insisted the main thrust should be over the reconstruction of the society through non-violent means. The real purpose of democracy was 'under it the weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest' (196) which can be possible only when the government was not based on force.

But to Gandhi, the reform of the society was integral part. Gandhian methodology of change was guided by his attitude to individual and society. Because, in the struggle as well as social reconstruction he provided little role to the state rather encouraged men to fight the unjust laws and policies of the government. He expected, on the other hand, individuals to undertake the work of reconstruction so that political, economic, social and moral freedom i.e. square of freedom according to Gandhi, could be achieved. As we have seen, he took force and coercion at the disposal of the state chiefly responsible for exploitation, dependence and fear of the people and suggested that individual should march ahead with their faith in peaceful means. In his words : 'I look upon in increase in the power of

the state with the greatest fear because it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality', which lay at the root of all progress. (197)

Individual Freedom:

In order to estimate the status of individual in terms of freedom let us have a brief resume of his conception on freedom. Gandhi employed the term Swaraj in its specific and generic sense as an organic and integral view of freedom, both for the individual and the mass. To him : 'Swaraj for me means freedom for the meanest of my countrymen. I am not interested in freeing India merely from the English yoke'. Next year in 1925 he mentioned : no mere transference of political power will satisfy my ambition, even though I hold such transference to be a vital necessity of Indian national life.' (198) He always emphasised that the countries in Europe have political power but no swaraj. So he insisted, 'Swaraj will not come by the acquisition of capacity by all to resist authority when it is abused' i.e. swaraj is to be obtained by educating the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control their authority.' (199) He believed in the sovereignty of the people and wanted the government to be regularly run by the strength of public opinion. To him 'political' would be guided by the democratic will and not the vice-versa. According to Dr. Bondurant the contribution of Gandhian theory had been not alone to the development of social and political thought and challenged the substantial presuppositions of the

mainstream of political theory.

He was not supporter of the supremacy of the parliament because the laws passed by it, reflected the interest of the ruling party. Individual lost his initiative. So his democracy was: 'I mean the government of India by the consent of the people as ascertained by the largest number of the adult population male or female, native born or domiciled.' (201) His concept of freedom was quite suggestive in the sense that it safeguarded individual as well as mass freedom. His concept of freedom was all inclusive political, social, economic and moral, the 'square of swaraj'. In his words : 'Let us call it the square of swaraj, which will be out of shape if any of its angles is untrue'. (202) Budhadeva Bhattacharyya mentioned individual is the pillar of swaraj; ineret and emasculated people would never be able to attain freedom; fearlessness is the condition of freedom, (203) self-denial and self-restraint is the requirement of freedom. Gandhi outlined : 'It is my certain conviction that no man loses his freedom except through his own weakness' (204) was equally true for the nation and even the despotic government could not stand except for the consent of the governed. For Gandhi freedom meant that men and women should not be constrained by physical Rights : co-ercion, economic power, government or social position. He was equally conscious of the rights of the individual as well as nations. He was the champion of the rights of racially humiliated, colonially subjected economically disposed and socially depressed humanity. (205) But his scheme of rights was the moral equivalent of duty. Rights

Perfectly lay in the residence of duty. In his words : 'I learnt from my mother that all rights to be deserved and preserved come from duty well done' unlike utiliterians, whose preference of right exceeds duty.' Gandhi emphasised more over duty. Bondurant claimed Gandhian insistence over duty to be the legacy of Hindu tradition where even the king was supposed to perform his duty more than his claim of authority. Prof. Bhattacharyya opined : 'Gandhian rights pursue and realise values. However it would be safe to say that like freedom in his concept of rights he allowed all citizens to enjoy rights but that should lead to social good. (206) Gandhi continually connected duty with freedom and held that every one was responsible for the choices he made.'

Anglo-American liberal tradition generally insisted that individuals were the authors of their own desires and aversions and therefore only natural to pursue their interests. From a Gandhian perspective, there remained many flaws in utilitarian account, such as ; it sanctioned violence by the government, rights were enforced by the state authority and moral authority of the individual was demeaned. However, there was one place where both Gandhi and the liberate agreed that the power of the state be minimised but that too with their different intentions. Gandhi, like ^{the} liberals, believed that freedom was ~~examined~~ assaulted by the state but also pointed out that it was also assaulted on so many other fronts. Gandhi believed freedom was socially located and the obstacles to freedom came from numerous sources and he wanted to minimise the obstacles to freedom by

eliminating situations responsible for it. The liberalism ignored human needs but Gandhi insisted over the need for work. In his words : 'I must refuse to insult the naked by giving them clothes instead of giving the work, which they sorely need.'⁽²⁰⁷⁾ Gandhian freedom recognised the social basis of freedom which was self-maximising in liberal case. In his scheme of individual freedom he also emphasised the equality which meant 'that everybody should have enough for his or her needs',⁽²⁰⁸⁾ but he did not press for absolute economic equality. Equality, like democracy, was really instrumental to the goals of non-violence and freedom'. Pantham has very nicely portrayed ; 'Gandhi, compared to liberal democratic theorists, had a greater concern for individual freedom, also had a greater concern for social harmony'.⁽²⁰⁹⁾

Gandhi criticised the liberal democratic reification, objectification and technocratization of the political and alienation of the people's political rights. He also advanced the alternative of democracy⁽²¹⁰⁾ i.e. participatory democracy. To him the very essence of democracy was that every person represented all the varied interests only then both individual freedom and social harmony could be assured. Furthermore it was divorce of politics from morality which had created degradation. The moral law was superior to civil law and only through non-violence and truth one could legislate better laws. Gandhi argued if we adopted one dimensional concept of man and rely only on the structure of political machinery the stronger among the selfish would use the machinery for domination and oppression.

Gandhi's approach was essentially a moral one based on non-violence and truth having a practical application. He wanted to establish a genuine non-violent democratic society and economy. May be these views of Gandhi could be rationalised and given a more systematic form. However, writes Dandavate 'What is of importance is the General direction that aims at devolution of political and economic power and decentralisation of economy. In various schemes, structures, institutions and processes suggested by Gandhi what is relevant is not the form but the substance, not the framework but the guiding principle'. (211)

Gandhi's account of nationalism is democratic and his conception of democracy is not a traditional one. His scheme shows his regard for the sovereignty of the people with individual given the highest regards. He worked for the independence of the country not only from British rule but also from other ills of global as well as national character. It is here he took lesson from the world and contributed to not only India but to the whole world. To him India was under British rule because Indian kept them i.e. no power on earth can rule without the support of the people. Indians, mistakenly, harboured, the illusions of the so-called progressive industrial civilisation which made man a prisoner of luxury and the society captive of poverty disease, war, and suffering, not only in India but throughout the world. Furthermore, 'his criticism of the economy as long as the purpose of social production is to continually expand in order to satisfy an endless urge for consump-

tion, and as long as the process is based on ever increased mechanisation these consequences would follow inevitably! (212) His argument is universally applicable.

In case of India, he suggested that labour was in abundance and capital was scarce so small-scale and cottage industries be given a trial. However, no such seriousness in adoption of his method was given by the planning commission. The author writes 'the ominous dimension of our deepening economic crisis is a true index of the shift that has been brought about from the path shown by Gandhi'. He added Gandhian approach was simple and clear to mobilize the people to create wealth, let them develop village forests, and organic manure, dig canals and produce energy from numerous sources. Let peoples initiative be diffused as extensively as possible. He supports big capital intensive projects 'but let these be created and run by local resources', he would add. The author mentions the countries like China, Vietnam and Tanzania benefited from Gandhian type and hopes if the country has to be saved, the existing strategy of development have to be replaced by the Gandhian approach. We will have to return to Gandhi for redemption.' (213) His thought has immense relevances not only to India but also to the world.

He was a thorough-going critique of each of the constitutive features of civil society. He clearly revealed the representative government in England, the structure of parliament, the ministry, the party system and the Rule of Law simply allowed the

wealthy and powerful persons to enjoy disproportionate opportunities to manipulate. The 'rule of law' only perpetuated the inequalities and hence 'equality before law' was a misnomer. In fact this very process of law and politics which thrived on force and conflicts created a group of vested interests among politicians, State-officials and legal practitioners to perpetuate the social division. Partha Chatterjee rightly mentions the problems he has mentioned either to undermine the western culture or religion nor to show the superiority of Hindu religion. The solution he provides is valid equality to the west and the east. To him the true principles of religion are one.

Furthermore, Gandhi was concerned with the practical organisational questions of political movement. In doing so he advances 'nationalism' which stood upon a critique of the very idea of civil society, a movement supported by the bourgeoisie which rejected the idea of progress, the ideology of political organisation fighting for the creation of a modern national state' (214) and it was his contribution that he reconciled these two contradictory aspects.

II

Gandhi's Ideas on Internationalism:

Man is the central figure in Gandhi's political thought and 'Love of man', not hatred, the motive force behind his concept of nationalism and internationalism. He drew inspiration from his dominant belief in the fundamental unity of humanity. 'Love of man impelled Gandhi to be both a nationalist and internationalist' (215) He was all for 'individual' and stood against all establishments, against all wrong-doings concerning individual. His approach was individual-moral, since he believed that human heart held the key to all social and political dynamics. (216) This helped him to erect political boundaries on moral support. Though he did not visit foreign countries to spread his message yet he had to express his views on various international issues. People from different countries also came to see him and he was also in correspondence with people from abroad. His audience was thus not confined to the East, it included the people of the West as well.

Gandhi's views on religion also helped him to believe that all religions helped to extend notion of international brotherhood, having no demarcated frontiers to protect. In his words : 'My religion has no geographical limits. If I have living faith in it, it will transcend my love for India. (217) After eleven years, he reiterated the same , 'There is no limit to extending our services to our neighbours across state made frontiers. God never made these frontiers.' (218)

Concept of 'the nature of the man' stood at the root

of humanism. The Indian Renaissance never turned the mind and achievement of man away from the absolute, personal or

(219)
impersonal. To Gandhi, India was doomed unless reconsti-

tuted on the basis of new moral and political principles and in doing so, his thinking became quite co-herent and embraced international problems as well. In his words : 'My awadeshi teaches me that by being born in it and having inherited her (Indian) culture, I am fittest to serve her and she has a prior claim to my service. But my patriotism is not exclusive; it is not calculated to hurt another nation but to benefit all.' (220)

He repeatedly claimed that a man could serve his neighbours as well as humanity. Nationalism is the first indication of the people's emerging social consciousness of which exclusiveness is seen as the common feature. But Gandhi's nationalism was not exclusive rather it was intense internationalism. Swadeshi to him was the guide to universal brotherhood. In his words : 'patriotism is the same as humanity, I am a patriotic because I am human and humane. It is not exclusive.' (221)

His national movement was meant for the whole world and not for India alone. 'If the movement that I seek to represent has vitality in it and has divine blessing upon it, it will permeate whole world'. (222) His humanism had no hatred for others. Whether it was possible to love one's own country without hating others ? Gandhi reiterated that he faced the same question since 1894 and had always spoken

fearlessly of the many misdeeds of the British Government, the corrupt nature of the very system that ruled India. But, 'If I am true to mankind if I am true to humanity, I must understand that all the faults human flesh is heir to ... Yet in spite of vices, not hate but even love them.' He called British rule 'satanic' but even then his nationalism was humanitarian and internationalism extension of the same. In his words : 'Let us understand what nationalism is. We want freedom for our country. We do not want sufferings for another country.' (223)

'A good action is the expression of the goodman behind it,' Smuts remarked about Gandhi, while Gandhi was prepared to go all out for the cause which he championed, he never forgot the human background of the situation, never lost temper and succumbed to hate. (224)

as the

A. Nationalism/basis of Internationalism:

As a political concept nationalism came to him as the basis for internationalism. His idea of nationalism embraced 'mass' making it democratic in participation. As a practical politician, he could link independence of India to the furtherance of the cause of humanity. It was proof of his genius that he could integrate his philosophical faith with political acumen. He tried hard to lead India away from narrow and exclusive concept of Jingo-nationalism. He was quite aware of the fact that 'the world has shrunk to a pin-head, on which the slightest movement on one spot affects the whole'. (225) But he did not preach abstract internationa-

lism without being nationalist. Internationalism is possible only when nationalism is a fact ... It is not nationalism that is evil, it is narrowness, selfishness, exclusiveness ... which is evil'. He continued that the profit at the expense of other nations, had become the order of the day and if he made India a good nation only then he would be able and justified in serving humanity. In his words : 'I should be untrue to my maker if I failed to serve it (India) and if I do not know how to serve, then I shall never know how to serve humanity'. (226)

Gandhi was a nationalist as well as an internationalist. He never supported regionalism. He was not in favour of Africa for Africans or Asia for Asiatics. What he supported was that India should set such example by which the exploited nations of the world could learn something. The message of love should be transmitted to Europe from Asia against their sin and wickedness. He told a south African delegation, 'Asia for the Asiatics and Africa for the Africans is not a right slogan but the unity of all exploited races of the earth', and added, 'on India rests the burden of pointing the way to all the exploited races'. (227) By serving India he wanted to serve the exploited races of the world. Addressing the concluding session of the Inter-Asian Relations Conference on 2nd April 1947 in Delhi, Gandhi told, Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus, Mohammed, all were from East and not a single man from West could match their wisdom. The west was to-day pinning for wisdom, engaged in multiplication of atom bombs, responsible for utter destruc-

of the whole world. So the message of Asia was not to be learnt through western spectacles or by imitating the atom bomb. In his words, 'if you want to give the message to the west, it must be a message of love and the message of truth. I do not want merely to appeal to your head, I want to capture your heart.'⁽²²⁸⁾

B. His world view:

Thus, he was totally opposed to regionalism and favoured one world. In reply to a question whether he believed in one world Gandhi replied: 'I will not like to live in this world if it is not to be one and added, all the representatives who have come here will strive their level best to have only one world'.⁽²²⁹⁾ He further requested them not to wage war against any other country of Europe or America but to live on status of equality with other free nations. So wrote Hiren Mukherjee, a famous Marxist, 'Gandhi belongs, however, like all truly great men, not only to India but to the whole world'.⁽²³⁰⁾

In the 'Hind Swaraj', he emphasised, there was no impassable barrier between the East and the West, no such thing as western or European civilisation, but there was modern civilisation and which was purely material. His world-view showed that he took the world as one unit. To him, due to technological advancement, ^{the} British had been ruling India and increase of material comforts did not, in any way whatsoever,

conduce to moral growth. Though his views on 'industrialism' and machinery underwent changes, he moved within the matrix of values as postulated in Hind Swaraj. (231) Gandhi's antagonism, to a greater extent, was the result of the politics of persecution and racial discrimination of ruling white group in South Africa. The situational context of Hind Swaraj became the philosophical and sociological foundation of Gandhi wherein he tried to find solution on a different note for humanity at large. However, he could not withstand the materialistic aspect of western civilisation, otherwise 'Gandhi was vitally concerned with the politico-cultural relations of the East and the West'. (232) He defined civilisation as 'the mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty.' To him, the true principles of religion or morality were universal and unchanging and truth was moral and unified. (233)

To Gandhi, the colonial encounter was not between India and Europe, but between ancient and modern civilisations. This reformulation helped him to 'affirm the unity of mankind even within colonial context.' He was able to remind modern Europe of its great historical heritage and to alert it to the growing danger of losing it and added Indians were not fighting for themselves but for the entire mankind. (234) In case of modern imperialism, morality and politics were both subordinated to primarily economic considerations which resulted into the growth of unemployment and exploitation of the

village by the city. He remarked, 'what Adam Smith has described as pure economic activity was based merely on the calculations of profit and loss and is a selfish attitude'. So what appears on surface, is not the critique of western culture or religion, or the attempt to establish superiority of Hindu religion, 'but a total moral critique of the fundamental aspects of civil society.' Partha Chatterjee is right in arriving at the conclusion, 'At this level of thought, therefore, Gandhi is not operating at all with the problematic of nationalism ... applicable as much to the countries of the west as to the nations such as India'. He adds 'not only that, what is even more striking, but equally clear, is that Gandhi does not even think within the thematic of nationalism.'

Non-violence:

Gandhi provided the compact philosophy which was equally valid and applicable to individual, nation and also in ^{the} international context. And this compactness was revealed through the method of non-violence. In his words : 'It is my ambition to provide an instance and it is my dream that my country may win the freedom through non-violence.'

He held, 'in the adoption of non-violence lies the future of India and the world'. He was aware of the fact that no non-violent rebellion has so far succeeded. In his words, 'neither Jesus, nor Budha, tried non-violence in the political

sphere.' (239) It was the untravelled path which Gandhi selected to travel with the belief that it would be panacea to the ills of entire human society. 'I do justify and consider it possible in relation between man and man and nations and nations', (240) wrote Gandhi. He grew strong in his experiments of non-violence and asserted in 1946, 'Ahimsa is one of the greatest principles, which no power on earth can wipe out.' (241)

Non-violence was not a rare medicine but daily food for Gandhi. It was ^{the} panacea for all the evils and had its universal applicability. According to Gandhi, 'It might be used by individual or community 'may be offered against one's wife, or one's children, against rulers, against fellow citizens even against the whole world', (242) when applied on political scene on a mass-scale it became 'civil disobedience'. It embraced all walks of life, so Gandhi held, 'I can not be non-violent about one action of mine and violent about others! Non-violence as a method to Gandhi, was self-purification. There were two methods, explained Gandhi : 'one is that of fraud, force, and deceit, the other is that of non-violence, and held method alone interests me'. (244) According to him the first responsibility of a political leader was to strictly adhere to his principles of morality. To him, it was equally true with the masses. It was the moral failure of Indians responsible for ^{the} British rule in India, and so was the moral

failure of the modern civilisation, and to combat it, he announced, 'ahimsa should not fear the secret or open hands of imperialists.'⁽²⁴⁵⁾

Gandhi was able to evolve a method not only for a short-term resolution of conflict but for the total change of the present society. To him, non-violence was the agency through which he had tried to correct the ideologies, institutions both at national and international level. A visionary, he was claimed by many, but he was quite prolific in pointing out the ills of the present day world. Categorically he held, 'my contribution to the great problems lies in my presenting for acceptance of truth and non-violence in every walk of life, whether for individuals or nations'.⁽²⁴⁶⁾ In support of his achievement, Russian author, R. Ulyanovsky, remarked 'Gandhi was a brilliant leader of the mass non-violent method, because of the specific nature of international relations, non-violence proves to be more realistic in relations between states than in the sphere of class relations,fruitful conclusions about the need to strengthen friendship between nations and to establish just inter-state relations based on mutual respect, non-interference, and the resolution of all conflicts by means of negotiation.'⁽²⁴⁷⁾ Margaret Chatterjee favoured non-violence as a unique method of collective action, and found bankruptcy in the concept of collective action in the West. She referred to these dominant ideologies of the West such as

philosophical radicalism, utilitarianism and Marxism which failed to provide the method of collective action with mass participation. To her, Gandhi was able to provide a method based on non-class character in national movement in India, democratic in character with the people's participation at the large scale. (248)

C. His Criticism of Liberal Democracy:

Further, his method rested on purity of means. Morality and politics were merged together. No distinction was made between personal and public affairs. "What was ethically bad in an individual is equally bad for the community and a nation". Non-violence demanded sacrifice. So both the nation and the individual should be prepared to sacrifice their all except honour. He wanted freedom from political abjection, economic exploitation and social tyranny and thereby abhorred liberalism.

He criticised the liberal democracy where power belonged to a group, or to a party, or to a minority serving the interests of the strong neglecting the weak. The world is tied with economic exploitation, racial discrimination and imperialist domination due to political authority of the state. Glorification of state sovereignty based on force was exploiting the common people inside the territorial boundary. To him, the state was an organ of violence which included not only

physical coercion but also economic and social coercion. So he regarded the democracies that worked in England, America and France ^{as} were only 'so-called.' During the Second World War, he wanted to know what was the gain if the 'so-called' democracies won. His answer to the question was, war certainly would not end, since democracies had already adopted conscription and other forcible methods to compel and exact obedience. Answering a question of an American, he held, 'Western democracy as it functions today was diluted ~~max~~ nazism or fascism, at least it was merely a cloak to hide the nazi and the fascist tendencies of imperialism'. (249) The war was for the spoils and bagging of India by Britain was certainly not democracy. America kept a discreditable record of treatment of ^{the} negroes. In his words, 'it is to save such democracies that the war is being fought. There is something very hypocritical about it.' (250)

Of the two ideologies of the twentieth century, capitalism and socialism, Gandhi accepted neither; instead, he sought to evolve a new path which would attempt to minimise incentives to exploitation. And this was to be affected without the co-operation of the state and with large participation of the people in non-violent way. Thus the Gandhian praxis of the quest for communitarian truth through non-violence and self-suffering shook the foundations of both the pluralist, elitist and vanguardist bureaucratic variants of the late modern amoral, technocratic paradigm of government'. (251)

In his life and work, he emerged as antiracialist, anti-violence and finally as thorough anti-imperialist. To him nationalism had degenerated into self-aggrandisement, failed to provide economic freedom of the masses, created international rivalries for power and profit. He was the victim of colonial rule, the highest phase of capitalist exploitation and his unerring insight into the social, political, economic and much more on the moral basis led him to provide an account of imperialism generally different from others in many respects. His confrontation with imperialism was to culminate in its liquidation not only in India but in the rest of the world. (252)

D. Imperialism:

Gandhi's account of imperialism pointed out two defects of the system. First, it exploited the weak nations of the world, and secondly, it continued on the use of force. The second defect could be rectified through non-violence. The economic theory of Adam Smith, such as profit and loss did not hold good before him. The economic determinism, the spirit of imperialism, based on colonial exploitation of the world in the eyes of Gandhi, was the root of all ~~practical~~ problems of the world. He explained the vast aggregate of private wealth in the hands of some individuals constituting the ruling class who favoured violence as a defence mechanism of perpetuating their interests. And ^{the} so-called national interests were nothing but the interests of these private

capitalists and investors in foreign lands. To him fascism and nazism belonged to the same species as the so-called democracies. Indeed, 'fascists and nazis were the revised edition of so-called democracies.' Referring to British imperialism he expressed, 'it is like a fabled snake' Hobson and Lenin, both have discussed imperialism. Gandhi was contemporary to both, and had also explained imperialism. There is not an iota of doubt that Gandhi also understood the various facets of it and gave it a different interpretation. So Buddhadeva Bhattacharyya remarks that Gandhi did not systematically analyse the social roots of imperialism as was done by Lenin, still it can't be said for certain, that he seldom indicated capitalism as such for sustaining imperialism. (253) The fact remains that he denounced imperialism, holding it to be the outer expression of industrial democracy, dominating weak people inside and weak nations outside. Time and again, he took fascism and nazism as the revised edition of European democracy which had taken imperialist shape. He insisted on the moral bankruptcy of the so-called democracies.

Gandhi was very much addressed to 'imperialism' and his account was quite wider in connotation. It is right that his idea on imperialism changed with the change in the situation. His ideas evolved from a belief in imperialism's progressive character to a criticism of its motives and an ultimate rejection of its results. 'Experience has made me wiser', wrote Gandhi; 'I consider the existing system of government wholly bad,

I pray for its radical reconstruction or total destruction'.
Gandhi prevailed upon because he was in full engagement with life of the people and emerged as a symbol of protest against the evil of the age. He hoped, /'with the use of non-violence ^{that} the smallest nation will feel as tall as the tallest, the idea of superiority or inferiority will be wholly obliterated.'

E. Fascism and Nazism.

Contemporaries of Gandhi had seen both the World Wars. The Second World War was more devastating than the first. The responsibility for the same went to fascism and nazism, and, hence it had become the common practice to assess the views of any thinker of eminence about the totalitarianism as manifested under fascism. Gandhi occupied a unique position in condemning fascism and nazism, but nowhere he supported imperialism as carried on by other European powers.

Before going into details of ^{the} Gandhian views, it would be desirable to have a brief resume of fascism and nazism. Fascism represented the state as the supreme institution demanding Italians to submerge their class and individual interests to the state. Its vociferous apostles condemned every form of enslavement to the past, denounced liberalism, democracy, pacifism, quietism and everything that belonged to the past. They glorified war as the world's only hygiene. Imperialism, they believed, was an essential manifestation of

validity and renunciation thereof was a sign of weakness and death. Nazism, on the otherhand, grew out of the humiliation and despair of the German people and their feeling that any change would be for the better. Hitlerism emphasised that it was the leader, not the mass, who could improve the lot of the people. It preached ^{the} supremacy of race, despised the Jews as the most deadly enemy of Aryan race, marched for expansion on the belief that nature intended that the best land should belong to the energetic people. This way, both nazism and fascism were collectivist, authoritarian, nationalistic, militaristic and elitist in character. (255) Gandhi did not subscribe to any such idea, as preached under fascism. Furthermore, world-war was not in the interest of India because she had to share a big portion of expenditure incurred during war. The touch of fascism Gandhi felt under British Raj. In this situational context, and on the basis of his philosophy of non-violence, purity of means, international brotherhood, one should estimate his views on fascism. 'Gandhi's position was unique, in as much as, he rejected violence as a form of struggle; the word 'violence' was not to be found in his dictionary; that violence was brute force, the law of the jungle, and held non-violence a higher and purer form of struggle.' (256)

Gandhi consistently believed that war violated non-violence, the supreme law, and hence was unjustified. He wrote ^{that until} 1906, he simply relied on reason, but found ^{that} reason

failed to impress when the critical moment arrived in South Africa. He had to choose between violence or finding out some other method of meeting the crisis. 'Thus came into being the moral equivalent of war.' He held ^{that} he was loyalist, but the ^{the} disillusionment came in 1919 after the passage of Black Rowlatt Act. In 1920, he became a rebel'. In his words; 'since then the conviction has been growing upon me .. suffering is the law of human beings. War is the law of jungle'. He added, 'I and I have come to this fundamental conclusion ... (257) suffering is the badge of the human race, not the sword.' His concept of non-violence was integrated to justice, war and peace. But to socialists and Marxists the war revealed moral and social justification. Gandhi would uphold justice but not through the use of force. For, allegiance to non-violence was a fundamental creed with him. In his words : 'a believer in non-violence is pledged not to resort to violence or physical (258) force either directly or indirectly in defence of anything.'

F. Views on War:

Gandhi stood firmly for peace, but that did not mean that he was not concerned with war. He said, 'I cannot look at this butchery going on in the world with the indifference. I have the unchangeable faith that it is beneath the (259) dignity of men to resort to mutual slaughter'. Though, it might look strange, he supported the Allies in the second

World War against fascism and nazism but categorically held, 'My sympathy does not mean endorsement in any shape or form of the doctrine of the sword.'⁽²⁶⁰⁾ On the other hand, he blamed imperialists because both fascism and nazism on the one hand and imperialism on the other were responsible for this war. On the global scene both practised racial discrimination and exploitation of the poor nations. So he reiterated ; 'fascism and nazism are the revised edition of the so-called democracies.'

He denounced aggressive nationalism of nazism and fascism in no uncertain terms. His censure of nazism and fascism was the logical extension of his intense internationalism based upon international brotherhood, equality and finally the dignity of man. Right from the days of 'Hind Swaraj', he worked for a system based on non-violence, and throughout decried aggression and more so, when small and weak countries were party to that. Simultaneously, Gandhi launched severe critical overhauling against imperialism since 1920 and was bold enough to point out^{the} evils of nazism and fascism along with the imperialism, i.e. exploitation of small nations by big powers, - a philosophy which he cherished till the last moment of his life.

Gandhi's moralistic vision of the history of the Second World War was that the betrayal of the cause of Germans led to its outbreak. They, (Germans) had a rankling sense of injustice meted out to their people by the great

powers in the past ... it was the Treaty of Versailles that made Hitler. The professed aims of the first world war were the preservation of democracy, self-determination, and the freedom of small nations. But the victorious powers added largely to their colonial domains, the League was muzzled and strangled at the outset. So India National Congress resolved, 'We have no quarrel with the German people, or the Japanese people or any other people, but with the system which deny freedom and are based on violence and aggression'.⁽²⁶¹⁾ Thus, Gandhi did not find any attempt to advance the cause of self-determination or faith in British declaration. So Gandhi was not for help in a war which was conducted on imperialist lines and which was meant to consolidate imperialism in India and elsewhere. Commenting over the Working Committee resolution, he outlined, **Freedom** of India and of all those under the British Crown were the natural corollary of British professions about democracy. Though quite conscious of British design,^{he} was not in favour of putting pressure on England ⁱⁿ her crisis. He also appealed to Hitler, 'will you listen to appeal of one who has deliberately shunned the method of war not without considerable success? Any way, I anticipate your forgiveness, if I have erred in writing to you', Again, from Allahabad, he wrote to Hitler, 'It is quite clear that you are the only one person in the world who can prevent a war.'⁽²⁶²⁾ The fact remains, Hitler could not restore the lost prestige of the World War I. Germany, on the other hand, lost again in the Second World War.

Germany was divided after the Second World War. The right of the strong to rule, and exploit the weak, centred round the colonial question, and Hitler and Mussolini were never tired of reminding that, though both were defeated.

He appealed to Hitler, although he condemned fascism, his regard and faith in morality of man led him to assume that Hitler and Mussolini were not beyond redemption. To him, 'human nature is one and unfailingly responded to the advances of love and politically ^{any} dictator would have to pay heed to the public opinion.' If a man made an intellectual error, it might cause appalling losses and sufferings but it also meant that he could correct himself. The fact remained the nazis and fascists had the same nervous system. Gandhi appealed to Hitler, because he deserved appeal from a non-violence preacher, no matter Gandhi knew the limitations of such appeal. Gregg referred to Russel and held, 'against his will he was driven to the conclusion that complete pacifism is the only possible practicable policy'. (263) Gandhi never lost faith in the people. Though he condemned Hitlerism he appealed to the Germans. In his words, 'Germans are a great and brave people, their industry, their scholarship and their bravery command the admiration of the world. One hopes that they will lead to peace movement. ... All that is needed is transmutation of this marvellous energy for the formation of the progress of the world. Hitler is one man, enjoying no more than average span

of life. He would be a spent force if he had not the backing of the people, and added ' I must refuse to believe Germans as a nation have no heart or markedly less than the other nations of the earth.' (264) Thus he had the faith in people and trust in their collective wisdom.

Gandhi also appealed to the British for cessation of hostilities because, 'war is bad in essence, and on no condition you can win the war, you will have to be more ruthless than the nazis, and hoped, you do not enter such an undignified condition with the nazis'. (265) People called him to be visionary, but taking stock of the impact of his appeal to every Britons, like Carlyle, he held : 'Well, I happen to know that many more than one single heart have touched my appeal.' (266) His appeal rested on the strength of non-violence and impartiality shown in appealing ^{to} Germans and Britons alike. Furthermore, he was not at all satisfied with the existing political system. In 1931, when Hitler was yet to take over, he asserted that the state of Mussolini might have some good points but what was required was non-co-operation, with the system. He wrote : 'I said to myself there is no state either run by Nero or Mussolini which has no good points about it; but we have to reject the whole once we decide to non-cooperate with the system.' Just as on national level, so on international level, he appealed ^{to} all the nations, victims of nazi aggression, to non-co-operate with the attacker.

To him, if the Czechs, Poles, the Norwegians, the French and the English all said Hitler need not make his scientific preparations and assurance that he (Hitler) might destroy their non-violent army without tanks, battleships and airships. Hitler might have gained without fighting what he had gained after a bloody fight. Exactly the history of Europe, might (267) (but only might) have been written differently.

Gandhi also condemned ^{the} Japanese attack on China in identical fashion. He appealed to the Japanese people on 26.7.42. 'To every Japanese' he ^{requested,} 'I must confess at the outset though I have no ill will against you. I intensely dislike your attack upon China' and added: 'It was a worthy ambition of yours to take equal rank with the great powers of the world. Your aggression against China and your alliance with the Axis powers was surely an unwarranted excess of that ambition. And we are in the unique position of having to resist (268) an imperialism that we detest no less than yours and nazism.' Before that, Italy attacked Abyssinia, Gandhi asserted 'I cannot be indifferent about the war that Italy is now waging (269) against Abyssinia'. As stated earlier, he advised Abyssinians not to offer armed resistance. In reply to a question of Dr. Mott, Gandhi asserted the urgency of non-violence and expected the best minds of the world imbued to non-violence in order to avoid meeting gangsterism. In his words; 'for, ultimately force, however justifiably used, will

Sevagram, dated June 14, 1942, that he was always felt drawn to China and reminded him of his association with the Chinese since south Africa days. He submitted, if required in the interest of China India would not insist on British withdrawal of India. It was a unique magnanimity. In his words, 'I need hardly give you my assurance that as the author of new move in India ... whatever action I may recommend will be governed by the consideration that it should not injure China, or encourage Japanese aggression in India or China. He concluded the letter with the words that, he looked forward to the day when free India and free China will co-operate together in friendship and brotherhood for their own good, and for the good of Asia and the world. (274)

Gandhi's affinity with the Chinese, Poles, Czechs or with anyone was cordial and uniform. He was against war and wanted its termination. He condemned imperialism of British, German, Japanese and Italian model equally. He appealed to the people, the ultimate repository of conscience, to stand against war and formulate public opinion in favour of peace. Throughout his life he practised value - based politics and expected the same even on international scene. He wanted to serve the world through India. The world did not produce any barrier to him. But one should not lose sight of the fact that he was a moral critic of the existing system. As to his criticism of imperialism 'emphasising the greed of men, such an

analysis overlooked the motivating factors of prestige and adventure which have been significantly in the history of colonialism'. It should be noted, that Gandhi's economic critique of imperialism is non-marxist in origin. Taking back to the influences ⁽²⁷⁵⁾ of Naoroji, Ruskin, Gokhale and Tolstoy', Power is right, he did not take into account the amount of prestige involved in colonialists involvement. But to him, such prestige was false because he always preferred non-possession and suffering as his tool of non-violence. He was very much comprehensive in his statement when he held: 'Satyagraha as a non-violent force, are in keeping with Gandhi's idea that Ahimsa is dynamic and not piestic reference ⁽²⁷⁶⁾ to life or non-resistence.

G. International Organisation:

Apart from his estimate of war, Gandhi showed his keen interest in the formation of an international society. He was the ardent advocate of international collaboration and co-operation. But for such collaboration he imposed the condition that every nation should be free. He favoured, 'federation of friendly independent nations' with condition, to collaborate we must be free'. ⁽²⁷⁷⁾ He held, 'better mind of the world desires to-day, not absolutely independent states warring one against another, but a federation of independent states expecting our readiness for univer-

(278)

sal independence. This view of Gandhi was based on the idea that he had not the slightest difficulty in taking into account the rapid inter-communication and growing consciousness of all mankind. So he held, 'we must recognise that our nationalism must not be ⁱⁿ consistent with progressive internationalism.' (279)

India can not stand in isolation and unaffected by what was going on in the other parts of the world'. In reply to a letter to Frydman, an advocate of world federation, he mentioned, 'I was trying to take Congress towards world federation' and hoped, 'the world state will represent all the free states, no state will have military. There may be a world police to keep order, in the absence of universal belief in nonviolence. He declared times and again in his speeches and writings the need of the federation, or the world state. But before achieving that the first condition for Gandhi was the independence of the subject nations, and secondly that structure should be based on non-violence, In his words, 'the free structure of ^{the} world federation can be raised only on foundation of non-violence'. His Concept of Swaraj also reflected the spirit; 'My notion of purna Swaraj is not isolated independence but healthy and dignified interdependence.' (280)

So wrote Power, Gandhi's ideas about the league of Nations, the UNO showed the influence of his dedication to self-help and to anti-colonialism. (281)

H. Peace:

Gandhi was an apostle of peace; his philosophy

was based on moral responsibility and that of peace at any price. But his peace was not for the status quo; to him it meant positive state of affairs, the precondition being freedom from exploitation. In his words, 'we could see how the world is moving steadily to realize that between nation and nation and man and man, force has failed to solve problems. To him, peace is important but more important the future of mankind. So he wrote; 'I do not want peace at any price. I do not want peace that you find in the graveyard. To him, the concept of peace depends on man and 'not to believe in the possibility of permanent peace is to disbelieve in the godliness of human nature'. He expected that unless the recognised leaders of the world renounced the use of force 'world-peace' can not be achieved. He further held that they will have to renounce their imperialistic design. In his words : 'This again seems impossible without these great nations ceasing to believe in soul destroying competition and to desire to multiply wants and therefore increase their material possessions.

To Gandhi, inequality among the nations arose out of imperialism. It was responsible for wars, and hence peace was disturbed. Times and again he asserted; 'exploitation of one nation over another can have no place in a world striving to put an end to all wars. In such a world only the military weaker nations will be free from the fear of inti-

midation or exploitation.' (285)

He talked of disarmament and opined, 'peace will never come until the great powers courageously decide to disarm themselves'. He referred to his half a century's experience of unbroken practice of non-violence and assumed that mankind could only be saved through non-violence.'

Buddhadeva Bhattacharyya summed up 'the key point that one finds... that real disarmament cannot come unless the nations of the world cease to exploit one another,' and added that Dr. Ralf Bunche observed, the UN approach to world problems is very similar to the Gandhian approach. (286) His prophetic vision that disarmament could be possible only when the great powers courageously decided for it.

Gandhi was ^{eminently} practicable in his estimate that the world should be an assembly of free nations where exploitation was given good-bye and the use of force should be discarded. He believed, 'once the postulates of his doctrine of ahimsa are accepted, one finds no difficulty in comprehending the logical application of that doctrine in the realm of international relations.

Gandhi lived in an age when the fascist and imperialist powers showed naked violence against the weaker nations. The philosophy based on biological supremacy of strong race over the weak formed the pattern of the world

society culminating in the detonation of atom bomb. During ~~the~~ his long life span he had the taste of so many wars such as Boer War (1899), Russo-Japan War (1905), First World War (1914-19), and the whole of second world war (1939-45). In the two decades that spanned between the two world wars. His belief in the power of non-violence had grown with greater reflection and experience ' and as the threat of war grew he felt strongly that he had a message for the bewildered humanity.⁽²⁸⁷⁾ Further, he advised the weaker nations not to depend upon better-armed states for protection, because those schemes failed during the World War. He could emphasise his better understanding of the intricacies of war when he asserted; 'the atom bomb has dreadened the finest feeling that mankind has sustained for ages. There used to be so-called laws of war ... now we know the naked truth war knows no law except that of might.'⁽²⁸⁸⁾ His suggestion to the states not to use force could be presupposed as real steps towards internationalism. His scheme of internationalism always called for the extraction of exploitation of small countries by big powers. Whether his scheme was national or international, if he left no room for exploitation. It is difficult to say, writes Nanda, biographer of Gandhi, whether Gandhi's dream would come true, 'yet in the thermo-nuclear age, if civilization is not to disintergrate into the mass of torn flesh and molten metal, the premises of Gandhi have an

immediate relevance.' (289)

I. Conclusion:

As we have seen, his world view started with the individual who wanted Swaraj, Swaraj, or true democracy, could 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. So he invited people to enter with him 'into the sufferings not only for India but of those, whether engaged in war or not, of the whole world'. (290) The logical conclusion of ascrifice according to Gandhi : ' the individual sacrificed himself for the community, the community for the district, the district for the province, the province for the nation and the nation for the world.' A unique example has been cited by Gandhi that ^{the} individual is like a drop of the ocean when taken away perished away without doing good work, but if it remains a part thereof, it shares the glory of carrying on its bossom a fleet of mighty ships. In his words, 'I would say that the partnership giving the promise of a world free from exploitation would be a proud privilege for my nation, and I would maintain it for ever. But India cannot reconcile herself in any shape, or form to any policy of exploitation and speaking for myself, I may say that if ever the Congress should adopt an imperial policy I should never here connection with the Congress'. (291) Thus Gandhi's philosophical account provided directive

principles for world federation, world government, international co-operation based on the principles of equality, non-violence, sacrifice, democracy and humanitarian ethics for communitarian good, independent of liberal and vanguardist philosophy of internationalism.

REFERENCES:

1. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., Evolution of the Political Philosophy of Gandhi, (Calcutta Book House : 1969), p. 167.
2. Narvane, V.S., Modern Indian Thought, (Asia, Bombay : 1964), p. 64.
3. Young India., 3.9.1925.
4. Bose, N.K., Selections From Gandhi, (Navajivan, Ahmedabad : 1948), p. 16.
5. Harijan, 29.8.36.
6. Young India., 1.6.21.
7. Young India., 17.11.20.
8. Harijan., 9.5.36.
9. Iyer, Raghavan., The Moral and Political writings of Mahatma Gandhi, Vol. I (Clardan Press, Oxford : 1986), p. 347.
10. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., op.cit., p. 156.
11. Sah, G.C. (ed)., Marxism Gandhism Stanilism (Popular, Bombay, : 1963), pp. 242-47.
12. Power, P.F., Gandhi on World Affairs, (Allen and Reason Unwin : London, 1967), p. 88.
13. Parekh, Bhikhu., Colonialism, Tradition and Reason, (Sage, Delhi : 1989), p. 12.
14. Harijan., 13.1.40.

15. Parekh, Bhikhu., op.cit., p. 23.
16. Ibid., p. 17.
17. Bose, N.K. Selections, op.cit., p. 41.
18. Young India, 3.4.24.
19. Harijan., 28.6.42.
20. Harijan., 6.8.44.
21. Young India., 6.8.31.
22. Harijan., 2.3.34.
23. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., op.cit., p. 152.
24. Keer, Dhanajay., Mahatma Gandhi Political Saint and an unarmed Prophet., (Popular, Bombay : 1973), pp. 334-35.
25. Moon, Penderel., Gandhi and Modern India., (English University London : 1968), p. 289.
26. Young India., 4.4.1929.
27. Iyer Raghavan., op.cit., Vol. 1. p. 68.
28. Ibid., pp. 486-89.
29. Letter to M. L. Nehru, dated ; March, 3. 1928), Quoted in Ibid., p. 411.
30. Ibid., p. 456.
31. Fischer, Louis., The Life of Mahatma Gandhi, (Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay : 1955), pp. 121-24.
32. Sarkar, Sumit., Modern India, (Macmillan, New Delhi : 1985), p. 329.
33. Tendulkar, D.G., Mahatma, Vol. 8, (Times Publication, Bombay, 1951), p. 344.

34. Bondurant, J.V., Conquest of Violence : The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict., (Oxford, London : 1959), pp. 169-70.
35. Smith, Donald Eugene., India As a Secular State, (Oxford, London : 1963), pp. 89-91.
36. Sayeed, Khalid, B. Pakistan : A Formative Stage, (Karachi 1968), p. 23.
37. Banerjee, S. N., A Nation in the Making, (Oxford, Madras; 1925), p. 108.
38. Padmasha, Indian National Congress and the Muslims, (Rajesh, New Delhi : 1980), p. 14.
39. Suntharalingam, R., Indian Nationalism, (Vikash, New Delhi : 1983), p. 189.
40. Das, M. N., Indian National Congress Vs. British, (Ajanta, New Delhi : 1978), p. 26.
41. Desai, A. R., Social Background of Indian Nationalism, (Popular, Bombay : 1980), pp. 305-06.
42. Majumdar, R.C., Roychowdhury, N.C., Dutta, K.K., An Advanced History of India, (Macmillan, New Delhi :1960), p. 981.
43. Harijan., 10.2.40.
44. Nanda, B.R., Gandhi and His Critics, (Oxford, London: 1985), p. 7.
45. Harijan., 10.2.40.

46. Iyer, Raghavan., op.cit., p. 62.
47. Ibid., pp. 64-65.
48. Young India., 24.11.21.
49. Gandhi, M.K., Ethical Religion, (Ganesan, Madras : 1926), p. 6.
50. Harifan., 20.4.34.
51. Chirappanath, A.K., National Integration and Communal Harmony, Gandhi Darshan, (Publication Division, New Delhi: 1982), p. 39.
52. Sen, Mohit., The Mahatma : Marxist Evaluation, (Peoples Publishing House, New Delhi : 1977), p. 95.
53. Donald, E. Smith., op.cit., p. 52.
54. Keer, D., op.cit., p. 203.
55. Ibid., p. 207.
56. Padmasha, op.cit., p. 11.
57. Padmasha, op.cit., p. 25.
58. Thompson, Edward., Enlist India for Freedom, (London : 1940), p. 53.
59. Sayeed, Khalid., op.cit., p. 56.
60. Padmasha, op.cit., p. 30.
61. Azad, A.K., India Wins Freedom, (Orient Longmans, New Delhi: 1959), p. 93.
62. Padmasha, op.cit., p. 62.
63. Ambedkar, B.R., Pakistan, (Bombay : 1945), p. 166.
64. Nehru, Jawaharlal., The Unity of India, (John De Co., New York : 1948), p. 406.

65. Keer, D., op.cit., 415.
66. Ambedkar, B.R., op.cit., pp. 260-61.
67. Gandhi, M. K., Communal Unity, (Navajivan, Ahmedabad : 1949), p. 44.
68. Prasad, R., India Divided, (Hind Kitab Ltd., Bombay :1947), p.135.
69. Thompson, E., op.cit., 50.
70. Nehru, Jawaharlal,, An Autobiography, (Allied, Bombay: 1962), p. 294.
71. Kar, P.C., Romantic Gandhi, (Newman, Calcutta: 1933), pxxviii. p. 58.
72. Bhagat, K.P., Indo-British Relations, (Popular, Bombay: 1939), p. 97.
73. Padmasha, op.cit., p. 212.
74. Ibid., p. 225.
75. Aji., K.K., Britain and Muslim India, (London : 1963), p. 163.
76. The Statesman, Dated, 5.3.1940.
77. Fischer, Louis., The lifeop.cit., pp. 431-32.
78. Ibid., p. 241.
79. Ibid., p. 245.
80. Ibid., p. 231.
81. Ibid., p. 283.
82. Smith, William Cantwell,, Modern Islam In India, (London: 1972), pp. 163-64.
83. Fischer, Louis, pp. 431-32.

84. Ibid.,
85. Chatterjee, Margarat, Gandhi's Religious Thought., (Macmillan, New Delhi : 1983), pp. 4-5.
86. Keer, D., op.cit., p. 10.
87. Harijan., 2.1.37.
88. Spratt., P., Gandhism : An Analysis, (Husley Press, Madras : 1939), p. 510.
89. Harijan., 9.10.37.
90. Huq, A.M., Gandhi Marg, Vol. 102, ~~Sept~~ Sept. 1987, p. 365.
91. Narayan, Sriman., (ed.), The Selected works of Mahatma Gandhi, Vol. 6., (Navajivan, Ahmedabad : 1968), p. 506.
92. Gandhi, M.K., An Autobiography, (Navajivan, Ahmedabad: 1958), pp. 220-21.
93. Gandhi, M. K., Bread and Labour, (Navajivan, Ahmedabad : 1984), p. 5.
94. Ibid., p. 10.
95. Ibid., p. 12.
96. Ibid., p. 21.
97. Harijan., 26.6.35.
98. Huq, A.M., "Economics of Growth and Employment : The Gandhian Approach", Gandhi Marg, Jan. 1981, p. 576.
99. Harijan, 11.8.40.
100. Harijan, 22.2.42.
101. Gandhi, M. K., Constructive Progress (Navajivan, Ahmedabad : 1944), p. 12.
102. Harijan., 16.3.47.

103. Spratt, P., op.cit., p. 230.
104. Young India., 17.3.27.
105. Gandhi, M.K., Speeches and Writings, op.cit., p. 384.
106. Dandavate, Madhu., Marx and Gandhi (Popular, Bombay : 1977), p. 7.
107. Young India., 8.1.25.
108. Gandhi, M.K., Capital and Labour, (Vidya Bhavan, Bombay: 1945), p. 81.
109. Young India., 26.3.1931.
110. Fischer, Louis., A Week With Gandhi., (International Book House, Bombay : 1944), p. 43.
111. Harijan., 1.9.46.
112. Spratt., p., op.cit., p. 112.
113. Mukherjee, Hiren., Gandhi : A Study, (Peoples Publishing House, Delhi : 1979), p. 197.
114. Dandavate, Madhu., op.cit., p. 73.
115. Unnithan, T.K. N., op.cit., p. 230.
116. Sardesai, S. G., Gandhi and the C.P.I. in Mahatma : a Marxist Evaluation, op.cit., p. 90.
117. Young India., 23.3.1922.
118. Nanda, B.R., Critics, op.cit., p. 124.
119. Jone, E. Stanley., Mahatma Gandhi, op.cit., pp. 25-26.
120. Sardesai, S.G., op.cit., pp. 60-61.
121. Gandhi, M.K., Socialism of My Conceptions, (Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay : 1966), p. 157.
122. Nanda, B.R., Mahatma Gandhi : A Biography (Oxford, London: 1965), p. 378.

123. Interview, Modern Review, Calcutta, Oct., 1935.
124. Collected Works., Vol. 10, p. 23.
125. Dandavate, Madhu., op.cit., p. 75.
126. Dutta, D., Indian Economic Thought, (Tata, New Delhi : 1980), p. 185.
127. Nanda, B.R., Critics, op.cit., p. 125.
128. Karanjia, R.K., The Mind of Nehru, (George Allen and Unwin, London: 1960), p. 32.
129. Young India., 8.12.21.
130. Zealey, Comments on Khadi, Gandhi Marg, Vol. 2., No.4, p. 295.
131. Mukherjee, Hiren, op.cit., (quoted) p. 216.
132. Ulyanovsky, R., Agrarian India between the World Wars, (Progress , Moscow : 1985), pp. 18-45.
133. Chatterjee, Partha., Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World : A Derivate Discourse, (Oxford University Press, Calcutta; 1986), p. 11.
134. Harijan., 5.12.36.
135. Fischer Louis., A Week....., op.cit., p. 43.
136. Harijan., 20.4.40.
137. Dandavate, Madhu, op.cit., pp. 99-101.
138. Young India., 19.3.25.
139. The Diary of Mahadeva Desai, Vol. 1 (Navajivan, Ahmedabad : 1953), p. 149.
140. Narayan, J.P., A Picture of Sarvodaya Social Order, (Seva Sangh, Tangore : 1955), p. 43.

141. Varma, V. P., Modern Indian Political Thought, (Lakshinayan, Agra : 1978), p. 345.
142. Kaviraj, N., Gandhi Nehru Through Marxist Eyes., (Manisha, Calcutta : 1988), p. 34.
143. Myrdal, Gunnar., Asian Drama, (Pelican, London : 1968), p. 754.
144. Chatterjee, Partha., op.cit., p. 100.
145. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., op.cit., pp. 198-99.
146. Ganguly, B. N., Gandhi's Social Philosophy, (Vikash, Delhi : 1973), pp. 261-62.
147. Bandyopadhyay, J., Political Economy of Technological Polarisation, Economic and Political Weekly, Nov. 6, 1982.
148. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., op.cit., p. 280.
149. Chatterjee, Partha., op.cit., p. 93.
150. Dandavate, Madhu., op.cit., p. 51.
151. Roy, M. N., India in Transition, chapter VII, (Quoted in Suntharalingam, op.cit., p. 236.
152. Namboodripad, E.M.S., The Mahatma and the Ism, (National Book Agency, Calcutta; 1981), pp. 20-21
153. Sen, Mohit., Revolution in India Path and Problems, (Peoples Publishing House, Delhi : 1977), p. 77.
154. Persist, M.A., The Preparatory Stage of the Communist Movement in Asia. In R. Ulysnovsky (Ed), The Revolutionary Process in the East : Past and Present., Progress, Moscow : 1985), pp. 45-46.

155. Pyarelal, Quoted in Dandavate., op.cit., p. 55.
156. Suntharalingam., op.cit., p. 235.
157. Sen, Mohit., Revolution in India., op.cit., p. 108.
158. Harijan., 31.8.47.
159. Sen, Mohit., op.cit., pp. 106-07.
160. Lewi, G., Religion and Revolution., op.cit., p. 305.

161. Brown, J. B., Gandhi's Rise to Power in Indian Politics, 1915-22.

162. Nanda, B.R., Critics., op.cit., p. 154.
163. Dandavate, Madhu., op.cit., p. 49.
164. Dalton, Dennis., The Ideology of Sarvodaya, In Pathom and Deutsch (Ed), Political Thought ⁱⁿ / Modern India, p. 282.

165. Narayan, Jayprakash., A Plea for Reconstruction to Indian Polity., (Akhil Bharat Seva Sangha, Varanashi: 1959), pp. 68-69.

166. Bose, N. K., Selections from Gandhi, op.cit., pp.40-41.
167. Ibid.,
168. Ibid.,
169. Ibid., p. 41.

170. Young India., Published 'A Modern Review : 1935),
171. Dandavate, Madhu., op.cit., p. 79.
172. Dalton, Dennis., op.cit., p. 286.
173. Bandopadhaya, J., Social and Political Thought of Gandhi, (Allied, Bombay : 1969), p. 89.

174. Narayan, J.P., Towards Total Revolution, (Surrey Richard: 1978), pp. 133-35.
175. Gandhi, M. K., Democracy : Real and Deceptive, (Navajivan, Ahmedabad), ¹⁹⁴⁵ p.76.
176. Fisher, Louis., A week, op.cit., p. 51.
177. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., op.cit., p. 400.
178. Pantham, Political Thought of Modern India, op.cit., p. 326.
179. Gandhi, M. K., Democracy, op.cit., p. 11.
180. Harijan., 30.9.39.
181. Chatterjee, Partha., op.cit., p. 85.
182. Hind Swaraj., C.W., Vol. 10, pp. 17-18.
183. Fisher, Louis., op.cit., p. 45.
184. Gandhi, M. K., Hind Swaraj., op.cit., p. 33.
185. Fisher, Louis., op.cit., p. 45.
186. Young India., 2.3.1922.
187. Ibid., 15.7.20.
188. Ibid., 26.1.22.
189. Bose, N. K., Selections, op.cit., pp. 40-41.
190. Harijan., 18.1.48.
191. Harijan., 1.6.47.
192. Ibid.
193. Harijan., 1.2.48.
194. Harijan., 15.2.48.
195. Terchek, Ronald D., op.cit., p. 307.
196. Gandhi, M.K., Non-Violence, Vol. I, (Navajivan, Ahmedabad : 1948), p. 269.

197. Bose, N.K., Studies in Gandhism, (Indian Associated Publishers, Calcutta; 1946), pp. 202.
198. Young India., 12.6.24.
199. Young India., 29.1.25.
200. Bondurent., op.cit., p. 159.
201. Young India., 29.1.25.
202. Harijan., 2.1.37.
203. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., op.cit., pp. 385-87.
204. Bose, N. K., Selections, op.cit., p. 122.
205. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., op.cit., p. 388.
206. Ibid., p. 391.
207. Bose, N. K. Selections, op.cit., p. 50.
208. Harijan, 3.3.46.
209. Pantham, T., Beyond Liberal Democracy, in Political Thought in Modern India, op.cit., p. 335.
210. Ibid., p. 334.
211. Dandavate, Madhu., op.cit., p. 75.
212. Chatterjee, Partha., op.cit., p. 88.
213. Mishra, R., Economics of Poverty, (Deep Publication, Delhi : 1988), p. 197.
214. Chatterjee, Partha., op.cit., p. 101.
215. Datta, Dharendra Mohan., The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, (Winconsin Press, Madison : 1953), p. 144,
216. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., op.cit., p. 112.
217. Young India., 11.8.20.
218. Young India., 31.12.31.

219. Mukherjee, D.P., Diversities, (Peoples Publishing House, Delhi : 1958), p. 162.
220. Young India, 3.4.24.
221. Ibid., 16.3.31.
222. Harijan., 1.2.42.
223. Iyer, Raghavan., op.cit., Vol. 1, pp. 345-47.
224. Iyer, Raghavan., The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi, (Ed.), S. Radhakrishnan (Allen and Unwin, London : 1951),
225. Gandhi, M. K., Non-Violence,.....op.cit., p. 127.
226. Young India, 18.6.25.
227. Gandhi, M.K., Non-Violence, Vol. II, p. 14.
228. Ibid., p. 237.
229. Ibid.,
230. Mukherjee, Hiren., Gandhiji : A Study, op.cit., p. XII.
231. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva ., op.cit., p. 112.
232. Power, P.F., op.cit., p. 88.
233. Chatterjee, Partha., op.cit., pp. 96-97.
235. Collected Works, Vol. 59, pp. 205-06.
236. Chatterjee, Partha., op.cit., p. 93.
237. Young India, 12.11.1931.
238. Gandhi's Correspondence with the Government; (1942-44), (Navajivan, Ahmedabad : 1945), p. 170.
239. Harijan., 1.2.42.
240. Young India, 8.10.25.
241. Harijan., 19.5.46.

242. Gandhi, M. K., Satyagraha, (Navajivan, Ahmedabad : 1958),
P. 78.
243. Harijan., 12.10.35.
244. C.W., Vol. 43., p. 41.
245. Harijan., 25.5.47.
246. Harijan., 24.2.40.
247. Ulyanovsky, R., Present day problems in Asia and Africa,
(Progress, Moscow : 1980), pp. 172-73.
248. Chatterjee, Margaret., 'Collective Action in the West;
In S. C. Biswas, (Ed.), Gandhi Theory and Practice Social
Impact and Contemporary Relevance, (Indian Institute of
Advance Studies, Simla : 1969).
249. Gandhi, M.K., Non-Violence, op.cit., p. 217.
250. Ibid., pp. 285-86.
251. Pantham, Thomas., 'Beyond Liberal Democracy, Thinking
with Mahatma Gandhi' in Political Thought in Modern India,
op.cit., p. 346.
252. Nanda, B.R., Critics, op.cit., p. 57.
253. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., op.cit., p. 431.
254. Young India., 5.11.31.
255. Burns, E.M., Indias in Conflict, ~~SMITHSONIAN~~ (Methuan
Company, London: 1963), pp. 223-30.
256. Kaviraj., Nara hari., op.cit., p. 30.
257. Young India., 5.11.31.
258. Young India., 1.6.21.
259. Harijan., 20.7.44.

260. Harijan., 14.10.39.
261. Gandhi, M.K., Non-violence, Vol. I., op.cit., p. 236.
262. Harijan., 9.9.39.
263. Gregg, Richard., Non-violence the only way, in Non-violence, Vol., I., op.cit., p. 457.
264. Harijan., 9.9.39.
265. Harijan., 6.7.40.
266. Harijan., 28.7.40.
267. Harijan., 22.6.40.
268. Harijan., 26.7.42.
269. Gandhi, M. K., Non-Violence, Vol. II., op.cit., p. 118.
270. Harijan., 10.12.38.
271. Harijan., 8.10.38.
272. Harijan., 16.9.39.
273. Harijan., 30.4.40.
274. Gandhi, M.K., Non-violence, Vol. I., op.cit., pp. 424-26.
275. Power, P. F., op.cit., pp. 67-68.
276. Ibid., p. 87.
277. Fischer, Louis, A Week with....., ~~op.cit.~~ op.cit., p.74.
278. Young India., 26.12.24.
279. Gandhi, M. K., Non-violence, Vol. II., op.cit., p. 119.
280. Tendulkar, D.G., Mahatma, Vol. 8, op.cit., p. 230.
281. Power, P.F., op.cit., p. 79.
282. Young India., 23.6.19.
283. Young India., 19.1.22.

284. Harijan., 16.5.36.
285. Tendulkar., D.G., Vol. 7., op.cit., p. 2.
286. Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva., op.cit., p. 468.
287. Nanda, B.R., Biography, op.cit., p. 425.
288. Harijan., 7.7.46.
289. Nanda, B.R., Biography, op.cit., p. 522.
290. Harijan., 20.7.44.
291. Young India., 19.11.31.