

**Gandhi and Modern Republican Theory of
Freedom as Non-Domination: A study**

A Thesis

**Submitted for the Award of the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy (ARTS) in Political Science under the
University of North Bengal**

SUBMITTED BY

IPSITA HALDAR



**Assistant Professor in Political Science
Dewanhat Mahavidyalaya
Coochbehar**

Supervisor

PROFESSOR SOUMITRA DE

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL
RAJA RAMMOHUNPUR
WEST BENGAL - 734013**

Th
320.01
H159g

278426

31 MAR 2016

**Gandhi and Modern Republican Theory of
Freedom as Non-Domination: A study**

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This is to certify that Ms. Ipsita Haldar, Astt. Professor in Political Science at Dewanhat College, has completed under my supervision her thesis entitled "**Gandhi and Modern Republican Theory of Freedom as Non-Domination: A study**" and her thesis is now ready for submission under the PhD Ordinance (Old) of the University of North Bengal.

Dated, NBU

The 6th May, 2014.



(SOUMITRA DE)

Professor

Department of Political Science

University of North Bengal

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. I authorize University of North Bengal to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Sita Halder
06/05/2014.

DEDICATED

To

My Dear Mother

Smt. Aruna Haldar

***Who has been a constant source of inspiration and
energy behind all my endeavours***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
Preface	vi - viii
Glossary	ix - x
CHAPTER – 1 : Introduction	01 - 31
Statement of the Problem	09
Review of Literature	11
Research Gap	27
Research Questions	28
Methodology	29
CHAPTER – 2 : Gandhi and Modern Ideologies	32-188
Ideals of Anarchism	32
Origin of Anarchism	33
Basic Concepts of Anarchism	35
Varieties and Options within Anarchism	38
Gandhi and Anarchism	43
Ideals of Conservatism	63
Gandhi and Conservatism	75
Ideals of Liberalism	98
Gandhi and Liberalism	102
Ideals of Socialism	119
Gandhi and Socialism	131
CHAPTER – 3 : Gandhi and Contemporary Ideologies	189-255
Feminsm: Rise and Development of the Concept	189
Mahatama Gandhi and Feminism	196
Communitarianism: Ideals	206
Varieties of Communitarianism	207
Gandhian alternative	212
Envirnmentalism: Meanings and Ideas	215
Mahatma Gandhi's Views on Environment	221
Environmental Thought of Gandhi for a Green Future	233

Post-Colonialism or Post-Modernity	240
Gandhi's Critique of the Modern Western Civilisation	244
Gandhi and Post-Modernism	249
CHAPTER – 4 : Gandhi and Modern Republicanism	256-289
Republicanism	256
Modern Republicanism	276
Gandhi and modern Republicasnm:	287
Harmonising Dialogue	
CHAPTER – 2 : Summary and Conclusion	290-313
Select Bibliography	314-360

Preface

There is a veritable Gandhi 'industry' in the academic world. Numerous books are being published everyday and so many centers all over the world are exploring various aspects of Gandhi's ideas and works. The present research belongs to the tradition of political thought and theory rather than to the stream of Gandhian Studies. The present research seeks to re-examine key Gandhian themes in order to indicate their potential contribution to some contemporary debates centering freedom and justice. The emphasis on place-centered knowledge, as illustrated to Gandhian thought tempered by a "post-relativistic ethic", is to be highlighted by the proposed research as a valuable resource for appreciating contemporary debates in Political Theory primarily in the West and also to draw attention to the kind of enrichment that may be brought into such debate by incorporating Gandhian ideas into them. Those who take the view that individual rights must always come first, and, along with non-discrimination provision, must take precedence over collective goals, are often speaking from a liberal perspective that has become more and more widespread in the Anglo-American world. Its source is, of course, the United States, and it has recently been elaborated and defended by some of the best philosophical and legal minds in that society, including John Rawls (1971), Ronald Dworkin, Bruce Ackerman, and others. A further line in this area of debate has been opened by scholars like Pettit (1996) who has been reworking the Republican tradition of freedom that tries to steer clear off the so called Liberal – Communitarian debate by taking the autonomy of freedom to be subjugation, defenseless susceptibility to interference rather than actual interference. This attempt to break away from negative-positive dichotomy of freedom from universal and particular, needs, in our

opinion, to be evaluated in the light of Gandhian contributions on the discussion of freedom.

In every step of this thesis, I have extensively benefitted by my supervisor Dr. Soumitra De, Professor, Department of Political Science, University of North Bengal, who despite his academic schedule has provide guidance, encouragement, critical appreciation and all sorts of suggestions from time to time in preparing this thesis. I convey my sense of respect and heartiest gratitude to him. Without his extreme help and continuous support I could not have been able to complete the research work. I would like to extend my sense of respect and gratitude to my teacher Sri Dyutis Chakraborty, Professor and Head of The Department of Political Science for his valuable suggestions in different stages of my academic life. I would also like to extend my sense of respect and gratitude to my teacher Dr. Pradip Kumar Sengupta, Professor, Department of Political Science and Former Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Commerce and Law, University of North Bengal for his uninterrupted inspiration of my academic life. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to my teacher Dr. Manas Chakraborty, Professor, Department of Political Science and Director of the Gandhi Study Centre, University of North Bengal, who kindly allowed me to use the Library of Gandhi Study Centre and help me. I am also thankful and want to express gratitude to all my teachers of the Department of Political Science, North Bengal University for their inspirations.

I would also thank my class-mates cum friend Smt Ranjita Chakraborty, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, North Bengal University, for her incessant mental support to start the research work.

I am also thankful to all the Library staff of the North Bengal University and the Library and office staff of the Department of Political Science, North Bengal University.

I would like to extend thanks to all the members of the Governing Body of my college, Dewanhat Mahavidyalaya, Coochbehar for the grant of study leave of 56 days in favour of me to complete my research work. I owe special thanks to Sri Subir Das Mahanta for formatting my thesis at a short notice.

Finally, I owe a special debt of gratitude to my mother Smt Aruna Haldar and my elder brother Sri Kaushik Haldar those who have encouraged me in every stage of my academic life.

Dated, NBU
6th May, 2014

Ipsita Haldar.
06/5/2014,
Ipsita Haldar

GLOSSARY

Ahimsa	Non-injury
Aparigraha	Non-possession
Asteya	Non-stealing
Ashram	A retreat for research and study; an institution on monastic lines, but not necessarily of religious application
Bania	Of the class of traders and money lenders
Brahmacharya	Celibacy, chastity
Charkha	Spinning wheel
Dharma	Duty, right course of conduct or action, religion
Dharna	A form of sit down strike
Duragraha	Stubborn persistence
Harijan	Untouchable, people of God
Hartal	Closing of shops and suspension of Work, often as a sign of mourning
Hizrat	Voluntary, exile, mass emigration
Karma	The doctrine of existence conditioned by the sum of good and evil action
Khaddar	Hand-spun and hand-woven cloth
Lathi	A five foot club tipped with metal
Moksha	Liberation from earthly bondage, salvation
Panchayat	Originally a committee or council of five members, now a small local council
Parda (Purdah)	The veil, institution of seclusion of women

Sabha	Assembly, society
Sanatani	A strict follower of ancient vedic religion, orthodox
Satya	Truth
Satyagraha	Truth-force or the technique developed by Gandhi for social and political change, based on truth, non-violence and self-suffering
Satyagrahi	One who practices Satyagraha
Savarna	Orthodox
Swadeshi	Belonging to or made in one's own country
Swaraj	Self-rule, independence
Varna	Caste, color
Vanashrama	Four-fold division-of Hindu Society
Yoga	Hindu system of contemplation for effecting union of the human soul with the Supreme Being
Yogi	One who practice yoga
Zamindar	Landholder

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Gandhi's philosophy is the religious and social ideas adopted and developed by Gandhi, first during his period in South Africa from 1893 to 1914, and later of course of India. These ideas have been further developed by later "Gandhians", most notably, in India. Vinoba Bhave and Jayaprakash Narayan. Outside of India some of the work of, for example, Martin Luther King Jr. can also be viewed in this light. The twin cardinal principles of Gandhi's thought are truth and non-violence. It should be remembered that the English word "truth" is an imperfect translation of the Sanskrit, "Satya", and "non-violence", an even more imperfect translation of "ahimsa". Derived from "sat" – "that which exists" – "satya" contains a dimension of meaning not usually associated by English speakers with the word "truth". There are other variations too, which we need not go into here. For Gandhi, truth is the relative truth of truthfulness in word and deed, and the absolute truth – the Ultimate Reality. This ultimate truth is God (as God is also Truth) and morality – the moral laws and code – its basis. Ahimsa, far from meaning mere peacefulness or the absence of overt violence, is understood by Gandhi to denote active love – the pole opposite of violence, or "himsa", in every sense. The ultimate station Gandhi assigns non-violence stems from two main points. First, if according to the Divine Reality all life is one, then all violence committed towards another is violence towards oneself, towards the collective, whole self, and thus "self" destructive and counter to the universal law of life, which is love. Second, Gandhi believed that ahimsa is the most powerful force in existence. Had himsa been superior to ahimsa, human kind would long ago have succeeded in destroying itself? The human race certainly could not have progressed as far as it has, even if universal justice remains far

off the horizon. From both viewpoints, non-violence or love is regarded as the highest law of human kind.

Although there are elements of unity in Gandhi's thought, they are not reduced to a system. It is not a rigid, inflexible doctrine, but a set of beliefs and principles which are applied differently according to the historical and social setting. Therefore there can be no dogmatism and inconsistency is not a sin. Interpretation of the principles underwent much evolution during Gandhi's lifetime, and as a result many inconsistencies can be found in his writings, to which he readily admitted. The reader of Gandhi's works published by Navajivan Trust will notice that many are prefaced with the following quotation from an April 1933 edition of "Harijan", one of Gandhi's journals. He states straightforwardly: "I would like to say to the diligent reader of my writings and to others who are interested in them that I am not at all concerned with appearing to be consistent. In my search after Truth I have discarded many ideas and learnt many new things ... What I am concerned with is my readiness to obey the call of Truth, my God, from moment to moment, and therefore, when anybody finds any inconsistency between any of my writings of mine, if he still has any faith in my sanity, he would do well to choose the later of the two on the same subject." That there are inconsistencies in Gandhi's writings accords with the fact that the ideas are not a system. In coming to grips with Gandhi's way of thinking it is most important to understand that the perception of truth undergoes an ongoing process of refinement which is evolutionary in nature.

In Gandhi's thought the emphasis is on idealism, but on practical idealism. It is rooted in the highest religious idealism, but is thoroughly practical. One label (and almost the only one) Gandhi was happy to have pinned on him was that of "practical idealist". The important principle of compromise is relevant here, as is the acknowledgement that perfect truth and perfect non-violence can never be attained while the spirit is embodied.

Gandhism, if it can be called an Ism, is not an intellectual doctrine. Gandhi was not an intellectual. Rather, Gandhi's thought was conceived, to a great extent, out of action and as a guide to action, by a man of action. He hesitated to write about anything of which he did not have personal, first-hand experience. In the sense of it being a call to action, Gandhi's thought can also be seen as an ideology. As a guide to action, Gandhian philosophy is a double-edged weapon. Its objective is to transform the individual and society simultaneously (rather than in sequence, as Marxism describes), in accordance with the principles of truth and non-violence. The historic task before human kind is to progress towards the creation of a non-violent political, economic and social order by non-violent struggle. The social goal was described by Gandhi as Sarvodaya, a term he coined in paraphrasing John Ruskin's book *Unto This Last*, meaning the welfare of all without exception. Its political aspect centers on the following concepts and ideals.

- a. Political decentralization, to prevent massive concentrations of political power in the hands of too few; rather, to distribute it in the hands of many. The Gandhian political order takes the form of a direct, participatory democracy, operating in a tier structure from the base village level later upward through the district and state levels to the national (and international) level.
- b. Economic decentralization, to prevent massive concentrations of economic power in the hands of too few, and again, to distribute it in the hands of many. Therefore villages, which are anyway geographically decentralized, become the basic economic units. However, where unavoidable, certain industries may be organized on a more centralized basis, and their ownership and control come under the umbrella of the State.
- c. The minimization of competition and exploitation in the economic sphere, and instead, the encouragement of

- cooperation. Production on the basis of need rather than greed, concentrating where India is concerned first on the eradication of poverty (and on the worst extreme of poverty).
- d. Recognition of the dignity of labor and the greater purity of rural life.
 - e. The practice of extensive self-reliance by individuals, villages, regions and the nation.
 - f. Absence of oppression on the basis of race, caste, class, language, gender or religion.
 - g. A deep respect for Mother Nature, necessitating an economic system based upon the preservation rather than destruction of the natural environment. Such concepts clearly represent pillars for a new social order.
 - h. A theory closely linked to the concept of Sarvodaya, also developed by Gandhi, is that of Trusteeship. Its fundamental objective is to create non-violent and non-exploitative property relationships. Gandhi believed that the concepts of possession and private property were sources of violence, and in contradiction with the Divine reality that all wealth belongs to all people. However, he recognized that the concept of ownership would not wither easily, nor would the wealthy be easily persuaded to share their wealth. Therefore a compromise was to encourage the wealthy to hold their wealth in trust, to use themselves only what was necessary and to allow the remainder to be utilized for the benefit of the whole society.
 - i. The remaining central concept of Gandhi's philosophy is Satyagraha. Defined most broadly (as Gandhi defined it), Satyagraha is itself a whole philosophy of non-violence. Defined most narrowly, it is a technique or tool of non-violent action. Because of the intention here to keep this discussion as simple as possible, Satyagraha will be described here in its latter guise.

As a technique, Satyagraha was developed by Gandhi in South Africa to give the Indian population there a weapon with which to resist the injustices being perpetrated upon it by the colonial government. But Satyagraha can be practiced in any cultural environment – provided the necessary ingredients are present, not least Satyagrahis (those capable of Satyagraha). A Satyagraha campaign is undertaken only after all other peaceful means have proven ineffective. At its heart is non-violence. An attempt is made to convert, persuade or win over the opponent. It involves applying the forces of both reason and conscience simultaneously. While holding aloft the indisputable truth of his or her position, the Satyagrahi also engages in acts of voluntary self-suffering. Any violence inflicted by the opponent is accepted without retaliation. But precisely because there is no retaliation (which can make the opponent feel his violence is justified), the opponent can only become morally bankrupt if violence continues to be inflicted indefinitely.

It is apparent Gamnathi's philosophy has much in common with several Western philosophies which uphold the ideal of a more just and equitable society. For example, the Gandhian social order has been described as "communism minus violence". (However, Marxists have traditionally rejected Gandhi because of what they regard as his "bourgeois" outlook. Gandhi rejected violent class conflict and the centralization of political and economic power in the hands of the State as counterproductive to the development of a non-violent society). Nevertheless, Gandhian philosophy, particularly in the Sarvodaya ideal, does contain many socialist sentiments. In fact, such an entity as Gandhian Socialism emerged in theoretical literature during the 1970s and 1980. Gandhi's thought has been strands of Maoist thought (though not a Western philosophy), and even Western liberal thought. However, Gandhi is incompatible with many aspects of Liberalism and is virtually entirely incompatible with the modern,

intensely competitively ecologically destructive and materialistic capitalism of the West.

To sum up, Gandhian philosophy is not only simultaneously political, moral and religious; it is also traditional and modern, simple and complex. It embodies numerous Western influences to which Gandhi was exposed, but being rooted in ancient Indian culture and harnessing eternal and universal moral and religious principles, there is much in it, that is, not at all new. This is why Gandhi could say: "I have nothing new to teach the world. Truth and non-violence are as old as the hills". Gandhi is concerned even more with the spirit than with the form. If the spirit is consistent with truth and nonviolence, the truthful and non-violent form will automatically result. Despite its anti-Westernism, many hold its outlook to be ultra-modern, in fact ahead of its time – even far ahead. Perhaps the philosophy is best seen as a harmonious blend of the traditional and modern. The multifaceted nature of Gandhi's thought also can easily lead to the new that it is extremely complex. Perhaps in one sense it is. One could easily write volumes in describing it! Yet Gandhi described much of his thought as mere commonsense.

This research proposal seeks to re-examine key Gandhian themes in order to indicate their potential contribution to some contemporary debates centering freedom and justice. The emphasis on place-centered knowledge, as illustrated to Gandhian thought tempered by a "post-relativistic ethic", is to be highlighted by the proposed research as a valuable resource for appreciating contemporary debates in Political Theory primarily in the West and also to draw attention to the kind of enrichment that may be brought into such debate by incorporating Gandhian ideas into them.

Those who take the view that individual rights must always come first, and, along with non-discrimination provision, must take precedence over collective goals, are often speaking from a liberal

perspective that has become more and more widespread in the Anglo-American world. Its source is, of course, the United States, and it has recently been elaborated and defended by some of the best philosophical and legal minds in that society, including John Rawls (1971), Ronald Dworkin, Bruce Ackerman, and others. Among other features, this view understands human dignity to consist largely in autonomy, that is, in the ability of each person to determine for him or herself a view of the good life. Dignity is associated less with any particular understanding of the good life, such that someone's departure from this would detract from his or her own dignity, than with the power to consider and espouse for oneself some view or other. We are not respecting this power equally in all subjects, it is claimed, if we raise the outcome of some people's deliberations officially over that of others. A liberal society must remain neutral on the good life, and restrict itself to ensuring that however they see things, citizens' deal fairly with each other and the state deals equally with all. There are some like Charles Taylor (1994) who claims that a liberal society should also respect the right of a community to be different. A society with strong collective goals can be liberal, in this view, provided it also is capable of respecting diversity, especially when dealing with those who do not share its common goals, and provided it can offer adequate safeguards for fundamental rights. There will undoubtedly be tensions and difficulties in pursuing these objectives together, but such a pursuit is not impossible, and the problems are not in principle greater than those encountered by any liberal society that has to combine, for example, liberty and equality, or prosperity and justice. A further line in this area of debate has been opened by scholars like Pettit (1996) who has been reworking the Republican tradition of freedom that tries to steer clear off the so called Liberal – Communitarian debate by taking the autonomy of freedom to be subjugation, defenseless susceptibility to interference rather than actual interference. This attempt to break away from negative-positive

dichotomy of freedom from universal and particular, needs, in our opinion, to be evaluated in the light of Gandhian contributions on the discussion of freedom. In the area of political philosophy Rorty has made his name on the anti-foundation list and anti-re-presentationist stance. In his later and most accessible work, *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity* (1989), Rorty considers the consequences of this inevitable ethnocentrism and the tendency towards 'solidarity' with like-minded world-makers. The recognition that all claims to truth and knowledge of reality are contingent upon our spatial and temporal position in the world leads us to speak of what we believe with a strong sense of irony. The committed ironist accepts that the language of any other community could be just as real or true as our own. If this hint at relativism sounds alarm bells at the threat of might is right, then Rorty prescribes what he sees as the only social construction robust enough to avoid the threat of ethnocentric impasse: political liberalism. Part of the problem, as Rorty sees it, is the repeated attempt to fuse the private domain of self-realization, fulfillment, and perfectionism with the public domain of morality and justice. The ideal liberal society limits its concerns to the balancing of freedom, wealth, and peace whilst allowing its members the scope and opportunity to pursue their own ideas of how they ought to live. Any attempt at a fusion of the private and public tends in fact to privilege the public over the private and either redefine the private in terms of the public – and generally suppress many private practices – or make public the private practice of the strong or the majority. Rorty denies the possibility that humanity could one day be united by a common realization of the truth of how we ought to live. Indeed, he accepts that the best we can possibly open for is a consensus amongst a very large percentage of the population. What matters most is that there is a 'them' opposed to 'us' and that we are open to the possibility of changing our matters most is historical, contingent language-game to expand it to include others. Liberalism is the only political Philosophy,

to Rorty, that allows alternative language-games to co-exist side-by-side and thus keep open the possibility of us hearing the 'unfamiliar noises' of others and incorporating them into our world view. Gandhi with his reservation for this kind of relativism offers a contrast. Gandhian approach to truth is as flexible and dynamic than Liberalism. For Gandhi, theory and practice are an indivisible whole and one that only begins to make sense in the engagement of praxis. This is not to value activism at the expense of theory, or to establish them in an exclusive binary, but to stress their mutuality and interdependence. Coherence, therefore, is not to be found in theoretical comprehensiveness but in function, in the unity of ends and means – an approach that might well be utilized to lessen the degree of hostility found in some debates over freedom and also to guard against lapsing into relativism. It is suggested that a Gandhian framework can provide grounds for further explorations beyond the limitations of the foundationalism-relativism debate. The Gandhian emphasis on Swaraj and Swadeshi also open considerable potential to link to wider debates on the nature of liberation, particularly in the context of post-colonial theory (Nandy, 1987, Chakraborty, D. 1992).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

In the Oxford Handbook of political theory (2006) most of the commentators agreed on John Rawls's landmark book (1971) being an important source for current revival of political theory both by way of contribution and as an object of critical reaction. Following it political philosophers such as Sandel (1982), Taylor (1994), Walzer (1983), Barry (2001) and others continued to enrich political theory in which certain themes and issues recur prominently such as universalism vs particularism, debate over the self, citizenship, rights, democracy and now fashionable theme of social exclusion. Occasionally Gandhian concepts, principles and strategies have been brought into this animating discussion some of which we would be referring to in the subsequent section. However, illustratively we can refer to some areas

where relevance of Gandhian thought has been alluded to; namely peace studies, environmental movements and national liberation struggles. The persons who have openly acknowledged the intellectual indebtedness to Gandhi include Sukki, Martin Luther King Jr. and others. The US House of Representative (FEB 11, 2009) unanimously passed a resolution recognizing the influence Mahatma Gandhi had on Martin Luther King Jr. the great civil rights leader of America who has been source of inspiration to President Barack Obama. Passed by a roll call vote of 406 to 0, with 26 abstaining, the resolution commemorates the 50th anniversary of King's visit to India in 1959. On the question of relevance however dissenting voices have also been heard. Arundhati Roy in particular, commented sharply on the limitation that charismatic leadership imposes on the struggle for survival by local communities. To the extent Gandhian political ideas lack coherence such disparate drawing of relevance is understandable. These however are not that simple if we accept some amount of coherence or core elements in Gandhian Political ideas, particularly the relationship between theory and practice. Then we must decide whether it is an aspect of strength or weakness of Gandhian Political ideas that make way for electric use by both advocates of modernity and post modernity, foundationalism and anti-foundationalism, passivism and activist and so on. The problem that needs to be resolved is to determine whether there is something about Gandhi that makes it possible to be relevant in different ways, sometimes entirely opposed ways. Further, if there is any such quality in Gandhian thought whether it is possible to compare it in any meaningful way with other apparently coherent and systemic traditions of thought. In short the problem is to determine both the distinctiveness and generalities of Gandhian political ideas in relation to contending sides of the debates on contemporary issues. Anyone having some research interest in the area of Gandhian thought would notice a growing body of literature by way of

elaboration, clarification, revision, extension and sometimes rejection of Gandhian Political ideas. This would be clearer in course of our review of literature. But two areas have been highlighted more than any other area of Gandhian political thought, namely Satyagraha and Swaraj. To the extent these represent just two of several other major concepts it is quite possible that the question of relevance or Gandhian contribution to contemporary discussion on political theory can not be decided without making a systematic attempt at discovering the dynamic interplay or interdependence of core Gandhian concepts and comparing and contrasting these with principal traditions of political theory today. In this respect we need to first identify such areas where relatively less or no study has been undertaken along this line. We propose therefore to note by way of review of literature any possible gap in an effort to bridge the same.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In his book "Gandhi – A very Short Introduction"(1997), Bhikhu Parekh looks at Gandhi's spiritual view of Politics, his unique form of liberal communitarianism and his theories of oppression, non-violent action and active citizenship. After the publication of Bhikhu Parekh (1997), Anthony J. Parel's "Gandhi, Freedom and Self-Rule" (2002), Partha Chatterjee's "Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World" (1986) and similar works one need not press the claim that Gandhi cannot be studied as a political philosopher narrating serious study. However, here we would like to focus on studies that have placed Gandhi's idea in the context of major ideologies, while attempting to show the relation between those. Among the best known and early works in this connection was by Joan V. Bondurant's "Conquest of violence(1988):The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict".Bondurant discussed Gandhi in relation to the following ideologies viz. Anarchism-conservatism, Marxism etc. Bondurant also discussed Gandhi and Satyagraha, nonviolence and the Gandhian idea of

dialectic. Since the study did not place in relation to some other ideologies we may refer to some other works in this regard.

C. Sankaran Nair in his book "Gandhi and Anarchy" (1972) described about Gandhi's Anarchies Philosophy. Instead of using the term Anarchist, one could call Gandhi a "Communitarian", a term that is commonly used by to-day's post modern political thinker Nicholas F. Gier "The virtue of non-violence from Gautama to Gandhi" (2004). Bondurant uses the term "Philosophical Anarchism" in "Conquest of violence – The Gandhian concept of Philosophy" (1988). The objective of Gandhi was to attain truth while Anarchist believes in absolute liberty which Gandhi opposed. The Gandhian approach points the way towards reconcile political organization with the ideas of Anarchism. In modern political philosophy Gandhi stands apart for his unique concept of social transformation and development which avoids Standard Western Stereo-type ideas of change. Gandhi did not subscribe to Western ideas of legal constitutional reform or socialist revolutionary action of class war. Gandhi instead emphasized non-violent method and change to attain a society based upon truth and justice. As a Philosophical anthropologist Gandhi's approach is different from others. Not man but cosmos was his starting point. Gandhi maintained that since the cosmic spirit informed and structured the universe, all creation was divine and one. Human society was similarly structured. Gandhi's theory of self was the basis of his epistemological, moral and social Pluralism. Gummadi Veerraju in his book "Gandhian Philosophy – It's Relevance Today" (1999), said that Gandhi was not a system builder but with great understanding and insight. Gandhi could bring about the scheme of his concepts in an appropriate and relevant manner so as to suit the modern requirement. According to Mohit Chakraborty, "The Gandhian Philosophy of the Spinning Wheel" (2000), Gandhi makes inroads to social awareness by means of introducing the spinning wheel. It serves the three fold purpose of mankind the right use of time and

energy, arresting idleness and other social ills and stimulating the true social spirit of co-operation and harmony in one and all. According to Ravindro Varma, "The Spiritual Perception of Mahatma Gandhi" (2006), Gandhi believed the self-realization or God realization was the highest goal that human could set for himself. In the course of Gandhi's life, he made it abundantly clear that the paramount goal of Gandhi's life was the very realization of self or the realization of truth as God or Moksa. Among works that take Gandhian political ideas as important and focus on Sarvodaya there are both works by political leaders like Jayaprakash Narayan or Bhabhe and academic scholars. According to Thomas Vettickal (2002) Gandhian Sarvodaya is not a mechanistic or deterministic manual but an ideal for human kind, for individual and social relationship and for human ecological relationships is varied and changing circumstances. It enunciates principles and sets the direction approaches and guidelines. Anthony J. Parel, in his book "Gandhi's Philosophy and the Quest for Hermony" (2006), explained, Gandhi presents a balance views of life. Wealth, Pleasure, Aesthetic beauty, Ethical integrity and Freedom of Spirit, the Purusharthas are goals that all Indians seek. Gandhi explains how and why that seeking should be the basis of modern Indian Philosophy. The aim of Madhuri Wadhwa is to synthesize eastern tradition with western modernity in Gandhi. In fact, the aim is to create an intellectual awareness amongst the people at large to views him as amoral preceptor symbolizing all that was best or valuable in the eve of the western encounter in "Gandhi between Tradition and Modernity" (1997). Gopinath Dhawan in his book "The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi" (1962) explained Gandhian political ideas and Philosophy. Shriman Narayan Agarwal, in his book "Gandhian Constitution For Free India"(1946) discussed Gandhian basic principles, democracy, village, taluka and Panchayats, the idea of provincial government, central government, the Indian State, Indian Foreign Policy and also drawing up a suitable constitution. Robert

Ludlow in his book "The Gandhian Revolution" (1950) explained different Gandhian movement and his unique ideas. Max Stirner, in his book "The Ego and His Own" (1912) explained Gandhian idea into contemporary forms, designs and direction.

There is a voluminous collection of books on Gandhian Role in National Movement, some are by Gandhi's contemporaries and freedom fighters and some are of acadmic origin. Below we focus on some belonging to the later category. Gandhi was a great political activist. S.R. Bakshi's book "Gandhi and the Mass Movements" (1988) has dealt with Gandhi's arrival in India and new ideology which he used in an enlarged scale to achieve independence for India. Dr. Ravindra Kumar in his book "Champaran to quit India Movement" (2002) has dealt with practically all the Satyagraha movements i.e. Champaran, Khilafat, Bardoli etc. Gandhi awakened the masses through the strength of Ahimsa, by utilizing Satyagraha. Mazhar Kibriya in his book "Gandhi and Indian Freedom Struggle"(1999) deals with the views and opinion of Gandhi regarding the use of non-violence as a guiding principle, as a means and method for solving all types of problems of the individual, society and the State and also the role of Gandhi in the Indian National Movement. S. R. Bokshi again in his book "Gandhi and the Congress" (1996) deals with the significant contribution of Mahatma Gandhi who emerged as a national leader after the non-co-operation movement. Gandhi led the nation since his emerged on the political range of our Indian-continent during the critical years. Soon after the First World War, D. C. Jha in his book "Mahatma Gandhi – The Congress and Partition of India"(2004) said that, Gandhi totally opposed the partition and suggested to the British Government to hand over the power of Independent. India to any Indian Party of their choice. Gandhi also announced that he was prepared to face any consequences. In "Tilak and Gandhi Perspectives on Religion and Politics" (2001), Jyoti Sharma explained religion as the dominant mode of political thinking has been an integral part of

totality of culture. It has evolved in time that specific rise, continuation, decline or transition of different social situation. In "Manu, Gandhi and Ambedkar and others Essays" (2003), Madhu Limaye, deals with some burning issues that have agitated public opinion from the beginning of the New Year. In "Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, Vol. I (1989), Madhu Limaye discussed about freedom movement drew into hits fold the finest element from the various provinces of India.

Gandhi and his idea of Swaraj represent an area of scholarly attention. In his book "Rediscovering Gandhi" Vol. I (2005), R. P. Misra said, Gandhi's vision was different and higher than others and his goals far beyond political freedom. For him, real freedom was Swaraj, rule over one's sense and real progress was spiritual, not material. The Gandhian concept of "Swaraj" is not a new state but statelessness. The self regulated system of Swaraj stands for rule of conscience, not rule of law. Swaraj signifies spiritually free, independent and yet interdependent individual, living in self-sufficient villages. Swaraj is not merely self government but government over self. It is not merely political and economic but also moral and spiritual. It stands for an ideal society based on non-violence, justice and freedom of conscience. Dennis Dalton in his book "Gandhi's Power" (1993) said Gandhi was at the leader of the first mass political movement in India's history who said Satyagraha meets Swaraj. Bidyut Chakraborty in his "Social and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi"(2006) focuses on the idea of Swaraj, the principles of Satyagraha and non-violence and their evolution in the context of anti imperial movements organized by Gandhi, looking at how these precepts underwent changes reflecting the ideological beliefs of the participants.

Biographies constitute a major area of Gandhi related scholarly works. Louis Fischer in his "The Life of Mahatma Gandhi" (2006) deals with the life of M. K. Gandhi. Jayant Pandya in his book "Gandhi and

his Disciples" (1994) also sketches a biography Patricia Cronin Marcello's book "Mohandas K. Gandhi - A Biography" (2007) also an important biography. Jafar Mahmud in his book "Mahatma Gandhi" (2004) deals with the whole life of Gandhi. Bidyut Chakraborty's book "Mahatma Gandhi – A Historical Biography" (2007) is also important. This Historical biography is a critical Gandhian response to those who tend to be little the academic feats of any kind by referring to their 'Pipe-line' publication Robert Payne's book, "The Life and Death of Mahatma Gandhi" (1969) also an important biographical work. A. K. Chettiar's "In The Tracks of The Mahatma: The Making of Documentary" (2007) also an important for this purpose. Richard Attenborough's work "In Search of Gandhi" (1982) has also been an important biographical work. Anand Kumarasamy's "Gandhi on Personal Leadership" (2006) starts with a short biography of Gandhi, which highlights some of his formative experience and few of his most important achievements. It then clearly outlines the lessons of personal growth and transformation that we can learn from his life. D.G. Tendulkar's Mahatma, Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, Vol .I to Vol. VIII also deals with different part of Gandhi's life. Contemporary world and Gandhi represents a distinct thrust area of research. "Gandhi's Legacy and A new Human Civilization"(1999) edited by B. Mohanan deals with Gandhi and modern civilization, relevance of Gandhi's legacy and a new human civilization, Gandhi's views on the reconstruction of a new civilization, relevance of Gandhian social order etc. "The Global vision of Mahatma Gandhi" (2005), in this book Ratan Das explained Gandhi and his life, created a vision that reached all corners of the world and his vision grew more powerful in preserving the relevance after his death. Though some of his followers claim that Gandhi had certain rigid ideas, but in reality, the flexibility of his ideas enabled him to reach to the masses. Anil Dutta Mishra in his book "Challenges of 21st century"(2003) helps us firmly in the Gandhian line to fight against the challenges emerging

out of Liberalization, Globalization and Privatization and offer valuable insights on the most burning subjects of our times. "Gandhi and the world order" (1996) edited by Ramjee Singh and S. Sunderam deals with Gandhian concept of social and political change, Gandhian economics and contemporary society, Gandhi and socialist movement in India and also Gandhi and contemporary crisis. In "Gandhian after Gandhi" (1999), Anil Dutta Mishra interprets Gandhism in terms of new challenges and crisis which are gift of urbanization and globalization to mankind. Another book "Rediscovery Gandhi" (2002), Anil Dutta Mishra explained Gandhian ideas into contemporary forms, designs and direction. In "Inspiring Thoughts of Mahatma Gandhi" (2008), Anil Dutta Mishra and Ravi Gupta discussed different Gandhian ideas and Gandhian movement. The chief aim of this book is to elucidate the central concepts of Gandhism. The material for this book has been drawn from number of sources like Harijan, Young India, Hind Swaraj etc. Ramjee Singh in his "Gandhi and The New Millennium" (2000) deals with Gandhi and his fight for peace. Gandhi's mission was universal interdependence and universal religion. Hence, he has been undisputedly claimed as a man of the millennium. In "Gandhian Alternative to contemporary problem" (2004) Anil Dutta Mishra, Renu Kumari Singh and Sanjeev kumar Tiwari, focuses on the idea of Gram Swaraj, poverty and underdevelopment, concept of decentralization. Gandhian alternative can provide solution to contemporary problems. He was a man of commitment that came out in his writing, speaking and work for the betterment of people. D. G. Tendulkar in his book "Gandhi in Champaran" (1957) discussed about the Champaran struggle forms an important Chapter in India's non-violent war of independence. The present book is a close-up of the earliest phase of that struggle.

In his book "Gandhian Humanism" (1992), Mohit Chakraborty explained Gandhi and his idea about humanism. Another book "Gandhian Religion" (1994), Mohit Chakraborty looks at Gandhi's idea



of Religion, Society, Nationalism, Education etc. The vision of man as Satyagraha or Daridranarayana that Gandhi most dynamically attributes in a positive approach to social revolution. In "Gandhian Non-violence and the Indian National Struggle" (1992), R. K. Sinha deals with the background of Gandhian non-violence, Political Struggle or Satyagraha. This book is a humble attempt to analyze Gandhi's experiments, his life and works will inspire still hundreds. B. N. Roy in his book "Gandhigiri – Satyagraha after Hundred Years" (2008) deals with the birth of Satyagraha, philosophical foundations of Satyagraha, Satyagraha after independence etc. In his book "Gandhi's Doctrine of Civil-Resistance" Dr. S.A. Bari discussed about Gandhi's non-violence and civil resistance. K. S. Bharathi's "The Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi" (1998) deals with the life and work of Gandhi, his influences and also his ideas on religion, State, Society and Satyagraha in South Africa. In an another book "Thoughts of Gandhi and Vinoba – A Comparative Study" (1995), K. S. Bharathi deals with Gandhi and Vinoba looked upon spiritual life as the highest life and God realization and self realization in this very lie as the greatest achievement. In his book "The Making of Modern India: Rammohan Roy to Gandhi and Nehru" (1987), Dr. G.N.S. Raghavan deals with Gandhi and mass movement, major events of the freedom struggle etc. In his "Gandhian Thought" (2008), Ravindra Kumar deals with Gandhian Philosophy of Ahimsa, Gandhi awakened the masses through the strength of Ahimsa by utilizing Satyagraha. K. D. Gangrade in his book "Gandhi's Autobiography and other Essays" (2004) deals with M. K. Gandhi's autobiography and Gandhian approach. B. R. Nanda in his book "Gandhi – a – Pictorial biography" (1972) also deals with Gandhi's pictorial biography. Again Gregory Palmer in his book "Mahatma Gandhi – A Selected Bibliography" (1995) deals with the major work on Gandhi's life and thought.

In "Mahatma Gandhi, His Life and Ideas" (2005), Charles F. Andrews deals with Gandhi's religious ideas, Satyagraha, Tolstoy farm

and Gandhi's ideas etc. Again, in "Gandhi – The Spirit of India" (2003), K. C. Yadav deals with Gandhi, his life and work and also Gandhian thought. J. Dear in his book "Mohandas Gandhi – Essential writings" (2002), deals with Gandhi's Philosophy and Spirituality. In the book, "Education, Gandhi and Man" (2008), Akhtarul Wasey and Farhat Ehsas deal with Gandhi's ideas on education. Madhu Limaye in "Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru" (1989, 1990, 1991) deals with the ideas of Gandhi and Nehru. Ram Binod Singh, in his book "Gandhian Approach to Development Planning" (2006) discussed about Gandhi's economic thought, Gandhian concept of Man and Society, Gandhi and Environment, Gandhian Planning and Development. A. K. Sharma, in his book "Gandhian Perspective on Population and Development" (1996) explained Gandhian approach to population, planning and family planning methods at the grassroots level. R.P. Mishra and K. D. Gangrade's book "Gandhian Alternative, Non-violence in Action" (2005) deals with Gandhian idea of non-violence, peace, education etc. Lavanam Gora and Mark Lindley's book "Gandhi as we have known him" (2007) deals with Gandhi's idea of Hinduism, theism, atheism, secularism etc. J. C. Jain in his book "Gandhi the Forgotten Mahatma" (1987) discussed about M. K. Gandhi and achievement of India's Independence. This book points out how the teachings of the Mahatma are relevant to modern India. Shashi Pravha Sharma in her book "Gandhain Holistic Economics" (1992) deals with the Gandhian economic ideas. Raghavan Iyer in his book "The of Mahatma Essential Writings Gandhi" (1993) discussed about civilization, politics and religion. This concise collection could help a variety of people in different countries including India itself to form a fuller and more just appreciation of Gandhi's significant and compelling contribution to the 20th century and to the future.

Janardhan Pandey in his book "Gandhi and 21st century" (1998) said, the essence of Indian Philosophical tradition which was inherited by Gandhi and practiced for the hole of his life may be stated briefly

interns of doctrine of the Purusharthas and the goals are dharma, artha, karma and moksha. E.S. Reddy and Holger Terp's book "Friends of Gandhi" (2006) deals with Gandhi and his friends, correspondence with Gandhi including different letters. Ajay Shankar Rai, in his book "Gandhian Satyagraha an Analytical and Critical Approach" (2000) deals with the meaning and objective of Satyagraha. B. R. Nanda in his book "Mahatma Gandhi" (1958) deals with Gandhi's childhood; plunge into politics, religious quest and discovery of Satyagraha etc. It exhaustively documents the events in Gandhi's career and reveals the contours of his thought. Again B.R. Nanda in his another book "Gandhi and his Critics" (1985) deals with Mahatma Gandhi and his critics. The continuing interest in Mahatma Gandhi has generated some severe critical comments on his life and ideas. This book presents an analysis of Gandhi's work on the one hand and his critics on the other.

Anthony J. Parel in his book "Gandhi, Freedom and Self Rule" (2002) discussed about Gandhi's idea of Freedom and self rule. This book presents an original account of M. K. Gandhi's four meanings of freedom: as sovereign national independence, as the political freedom of the individual, as freedom from poverty, and as the capacity for self rule or spiritual freedom. In her book "Reading Gandhi" (2006) Surjit Kaur Jolly deals with Gandhi's different ideas-Hind Swaraj, Satyagraha, Sarvodaya, Trusteeship, Women, Untouchability, non-violence, Religion, Politics etc. This book also deals with relevance of Gandhism in modern world. R. P. Dwivedi in his book "Revisiting Gandhi" (2007) looks at Gandhi's ideas on ideal society and its' law. This book an attempt has been made to rediscover and re-interpret and revisit Gandhi and his thought. K.S. Bharati in his book "This Social Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi" (1998) discovered Gandhi's various items of the constructive work whenever he found them necessary to the historical situation in which he was placed. Thus it appears that the Gandhian constructive programmes are context

sensitive. R. P. Mishra in the book "Gandhian Model of Development and World Peace" (1988) help us recollect the values that Gandhi cherished and understand the spirit and practical wisdom underlying his thinking and work programme. Lion M. G. Agrawal, in his book "Freedom Fighters of India" (2008) discussed about women and different Gandhi based movement, women in Gandhi's struggle, feminism in British India etc. Romain Rolland's book "Mahatma Gandhi – The leader of the Universal Peace and Liberty" (1948) deals with M. K. Gandhi's different activities from South Africa and after that in India. K. D. Gandrade's book "Gandhian Approach to Development and Social Work" (2005) discussed, Gandhi was a great social activist but our social work practitioners do not find any material of relevance in Gandhi that would enrich the methods of the profession. Nirmal Kumar Bose, in his book "My days with Gandhi" (1974) describes different Gandhian views. Richard G. Fox, in his book "Gandhian Utopia" (1989) explains Gandhi and his experimenting deas. G. Ranjit Sharma, in his book "An Introduction to Gandhian Thought" (1995) deals with some important Gandhian ideas and some particular aspect of Gandhian thought. J. M. Upadhyaya's book "Mahatma Gandhi – As Student" (1965) covers the period of his childhood, adolescence and early youth and is based on authentic records. Ratan as in his book "Gandhi and Mao – in quest of Analogy" (2004) deals with Mao's ideal to eliminate hunger and poverty have to be inducted into the Gandian technique of revolution. Then only a news struggle of social change may emerge, which can be able to fight out the rampant exploitation. Jaladhar Pal in his book "The Moral Philosophy Gandhi" (2007) deals with Gandhiji and his Philosophical ideas. In his book "Satyagraha in South Africa" (1928), M. K. Gandhi said about the meaning of Satyagraha. He discovered this term during his endless non-violent resistance movement against radical discrimination in South Africa. Gandhi organized the Indian in South Africa and led a new kind of resistance movement against the unjust

laws under which they were then suffering, in his "Unto This Last" – A Para phase, M.K.Gandhi said about his idea of Sarvodaya. Sarvodaya was the title of series of nine articles, which Gandhi wrote and got published in Gujarati in the Indian opinion weekly in South Africa in 1908. In "Gandhi's social Philosophy" – Perspective and Relevance (1973), B. N. Ganguly deals with Gandhi's social Philosophy, his ideas of Anarchism, Humanism, Trusteeship, State and Social Control. The author has shown, for example interesting facts of resemblance between Gandhi, Marx and Mao as revolutionaries seeking a fundamental resolution of social conflict. A. H. Huq in his "Economics of Growth and Employment: The Gandhian Apoproach" (1981) said about Gandhian economic idea etc. In his book "Indian Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule" (1938), M. K. Gandhi located the socio-political and economic condition of India. Hind Swaraj is an alternative to modern socio-economic political thought. It is a book, which cannot be ignored in any discussion and debate on human progress socio-economic development and contemporary problems. It is a key to understanding not only Gandhi's life and thought but the present dilemmas arising out of technology, industrialization and globalization. The book, to quote Gandhi's own words has had a "Chequered Career". It is not only a book on how to win political freedom for India. It is a Magna Carta for freedom of mind and the evolution of human species from conscious and material beings to super-conscious and moral being. Nageshwar Prasaad edited "Hind Swaraj: A Fresh Look" (1985) based on Gandhi's Hind Swaraj, it still represents voice of the voiceless, voice of common man of India, and even of the common people of the world.

Devdutt in his book "Hind Swaraj: Context and Text" (1985) based on Gandhi's Hind Swaraj. The Hind Swaraj is a severe condemnation of modern civilization. It deals with Swaraj, civilization, lawyers, doctors, machinery, education, passive resistance etc.

Anthony J. Parel (edited) "Hind Swaraj and Other Writings" (1997)) based on Gandhi Hind Swaraj. All other writing of Gandhi are in the form of articles, statements, letters and speeches. K. Gandhi in his book "An Autobiography or the Story of My Experiments with Truth" (1927) deals with the life and different experiments of M. K. Gandhi.

Geoffrey Ostergaard and Melville Currell, book, "The Gentle Anarchists: A Study of the leaders of the Sarvodaya Movement for non-violent revolution in India" (1971) deals with Gandhian Sarvodaya movement, his ideas of Anarchism and also non-violent movement etc. M. K. Gandhi, in his books "The Constructive Programme: Its meaning and Place" (1941) deals with Gandhi's views on decentralization and politics. M.S. Patel's book "The Educational Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi" (1953) deals with Gandhi's Political Philosophies and educational ideas. Pushpa Joshi in her book "Gandhi on Women" (1988) deals with Gandhi's principles of equality, gender equality and also his idea about women, S. N. Agarwal in his book "The Gandhian Plan of Economic Development for India" (1944) deals with Gandhian economic ideas and economic development for India. M. K. Gandhi's, "Delhi Diary: Prayer Speeches from 10.9.47 to 30.1.48" is also important for us for his selected speeches. M.K.Gandhi's Yervada Mandir: Ashram observances" (1945) deals with Gandhian style-terse, simple and logical ways, his spiritual exercises, self help capacities and ashram based direction etc. M. K. Gandhi's "India's case for Swaraj" is also important for his selected speeches, writings, Interviews in England and India (September, 1931 to January 1932). Again, "Speeches and writings of Mahatma Gandhi is important for his writings and speeches. M. K. Gandhi's "Key to Health" (1948) deals with Gandhi's ideas of health and how to keep health. R. P. Sinha in his book "Mahatma Gandhi and Karl Marx: A Study of selected Social Thinkers" (2008) deals with a comparative study between Gandhi and Marx, similarities and differences between Gandhian ideology and

Marxian ideology. R. M. Lohia in his book "Marx, Gandhi and Socialism" (1963) also deals with a comparative study between Marx, Gandhi and Socialism. He describes different ideas of Socialism, Marxism and also Gandhian ideas. S. Abdul Sattar in his book "quintessence of Gandhian Thought" (2007) deals with the vision of truth in Gandhi, Gandhi's ideas of Feminism, relevance of Gandhi's conception of education etc. Again, S. Abdul Sattar in his book "Humanism of Mahatma Gandhi and M. N. Roy" (2007) presents a clear account of the Philosophy and humanism in general both in the east and the west and that of Gandhiji and M. N. Roy in particular. Ramjee Singh in his book "The Gandhian Vision" (1998) said, Gandhism is not an arm-chari Philosophy but an action ideology for non-violence social change. This book also deals with the idea of nation building, world poverty and Gandhian perspective, Terrorism and the Gandhian solution, Gandhian solution to the Kashmit problem etc. Janardan Pandey (edited) "Gandhi and 21st century" (1998) said, Gandhi provided the best option of the development of the 3rd world countries. His ideas on man-machine equilibrium could change the ace of the world by eliminating hunger and poverty from the globe and help maintain a balance between man and his environment. Ansor Harvani, in his book "Gandhi to Gandhi" (1996) deals with Gandhian ideas and thoughts. Mohit Chakraborty, in his book "Fire sans Ire – A critical study of Non-violence" (2005) deals with Non-violence and social change, spiritualism, religion and mysticism. Bindu Puri's book "Gandhi and the Moral Life" (2004) deals with Gandhi and his views about morality. Dr. Ramesh S. Betai in his book "Gita and Gandhiji" (2002) said about the influence of Bhagavad Gita in molding the life and thought of Gandhi. Ashu Pasricha's book "Gandhian Approach to Integrated Rural Development" (2000) deals with Gandhain approach to rural development. Anthony J. Parel in his book "Gandhi's Philosophy and the quest for Harmony" (2006) presents the four aim of life – Politics

and Economics, Dharma, Pleasure and Spiritual Liberation. David Hardiman in his book "Gandhi – In his Time and Ours" (2003) deals with Gandhian moral activism and his global legacy. Vishwanath Tandon in his book "Studies in Gandhian Thought and Marxism with Special Reference to Vinoba Bhave" deals with Gandhi, Marx and Marxists, the boodan, gramdan movement (1951-1974) etc. C.F. Andrews in his book "Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas" (1949) deals with ideas of M. K. Gandhi. Arvind Sharma's book "A New Curve in the Ganges – Mahatma Gandhi's interpretation of Hinduism" (2005) deals with M. K. Gandhi and the sources of Dharma in Hinduism, M. K. Gandhi and untouchability, caste system etc. Rahul Ramagundam in his book "Gandhi's Khadi – A History of contention and conciliation" (2008) deals with memories of a moral movement, Gandhi's Khadi movement etc.

Lloyd I Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph's book "Postmodern Gandhi and Other Essays" (2006) making our case for Gandhi as a post modern thinker and activist. We locate his version of post modernism in the complex of meaning, many controversial, many disputed, the term postmodern has acquired. Kamalapati Tripathi, in his book "Gandhi and Humanity" (1993) deals with Gandhi and his ideas of human intelligence. Narayan Hazary, Subas Chandra Hazary and Amareswar Mishra edited "Eternal Gandhi" (1998) deals with a comparative study of the Marxist and Gandhian models, Gandhi and Lenin, Gandhi and Mao, spiritual base of Gandhi's politics, socio-economic implications of Gandhian economic system, Gandhi and the issue of socio-economic development to-day etc. Ravindra Kumar in his book "Gandhian Thoughts – An overview" (2006) deals with the relevance and importance of Gandhian thought in the modern polity, problem of communalism etc. Himangsu Roy in his book "Poverty of Gandhian Philosophy" (2001) highlights the poverty in Plenty of Gandhi's Philosophy to build up his image clean of myths surrounding him. P.A. Raju in his book "Gandhi and His Religion"

(2000) deals with Gandhi and religion, Gandhi and God etc. Dharmpal in his book "Understanding Gandhi" (2003) deals with Gandhi and his technology. Atul Chandra Pradhan in his book "Mahatma Gandhi and the Depressed Classes" (2008) deals with M. K. Gandhi and his relation with depressed classes. Bernd Pflug in his book "Self Education – A Gandhian Perspective" (2006) deals with Gandhi and the conceptual aspects of self education. Crispin Bates's book "Subalterns and Raj – South Asia since 1600" (2007) explains some Gandhian movements – like non-co-operation, civil disobedience and Quit India Movement etc. Rajmohan Gandhi in his book "Mohandas - A True Story of a Man, his People and an Empire" (2006) deals with Gandhi Satyagraha, Great March, idea and Swaraj etc. Parmeshwari Dayal's book "Gandhian Theory of Social Reconstruction" (2006) motivates the younger generation to understand the message of Gandhi's life and realize that there is some power as "Soul Force" lying dormant within them. This book also deals with Principles of Social Reconstruction of non-violent society. Shankar Dayal Singh in his book "Gandhi's First Step – Champaran Movement" (1994) deals with Gandhiji and Champaran, report of Champaran, agrarian enquiry committee, the Champaran Agrarian Act, 1918. Coonoor Kripalani's book "Mahatma Gandhi – Apostle of Non-violence" (2003) deals with Gandhi's unique strategy of Satyagraha, a non-violent struggle using soul force, his idea of social change etc. Dr. K. Munirathnam Chetty in his book "Sarvodaya and Freedom – Gandhian Appraisal" (1991) deals with Gandhi's Sarvodaya Philosophy, Gandhi's conception of man and his role in society and freedom in Gandhian Philosophy etc.

M. Maharajan in his book "Mahatma Gandhi and New Millennium" (2001) deals with Gandhi and new world order, Gandhian approach to World Peace and Communal harmony, Gandhian concept of women welfare, relevance of Gandhian thought etc. S. Narayanasamy in his book "The Sarvodaya Movement" (2003) deals with Gandhi's Sarvodaya Movement in detail. Ajit Atri in his books

“Gandhi’s view of Legal Justice” (2007) deals with Gandhi’s approach to justice, justice and Punishment in Gandhi’s view, relevance of Gandhian approach in modern times. C. C. Biswas in his book “Bengal’s Response to Gandhi” (2004) deals with the partition of Bengal in 1905, after that Gandhi came with the proposal of non-violent, no n-co-operation with Swadeshi and boycott as tools. Girja Kumar’s book “Brahmacharya, Gandhi and his women Associates” (2006) deals with the theme of Brahmacharya, Gandhiji and women etc. Sudhir Ghosh in his book “Gandhi’s Emissary” (2008) simultaneously deals with Gandhi’s quest for Peace, Gandhi the lonely pilgrim, his spiritual ideas etc. Sukhendu Majumder in his book “Politico-Economic Ideas of Mahatma Gandhi – their Relevance in the present day” (2004) deals with Gandhi’s Political Philosophy, Varma dharma, trusteeship, controversy of large versus small scale industries, decentralization etc.

Ramchandra Guha in his recent work “Gandhi before India” (2013) concentrated on the first 45 years of Gandhi’s life before he became undisputed leader of India’s nationalist movement. This long book does not ready offer any new insight about Gandhi’s ideas. Most of the things Guha discusses about Gandhi in South Africa were already covered by Gandhi himself and by different biographers of Gandhi. Guha only brings out few letters from admirers of Gandhi from the archives in South Africa. Therefore, for anyone interested in the relationship of Gandhi’s ideas with contemporary ideologies would have very little to gain from this work.

RESEARCH GAP:

The above review of literature has clearly established certain areas as centers of primary attention by Gandhian scholars that include Gandhian role in nationalist movement, Gandhian philosophy, relevance of Gandhi for social movements, environmental movements and peace studies (Brown, 2008), apart from biographies and

commentaries on Gandhi's texts. However, comparatively lesser amount of work has been done by way of comparison of Gandhian political ideas and western tradition of political theory. Even in this area certain orientations, tradition and issues have figured prominently such as conservation, Anarchism communitarians and in recent years Environmentalism, Feminism, Post-modernity and post colonial critiques. It is surprising that no significant work has been done in relation to possible Republican resources in Gandhian political thought when both liberalism and communitarians have come under critical assessment from the point of view of the Republican tradition. Despite some attention on 'authority' issues in Gandhi, no systematic comparison has been made with the Republican tradition which has been the most systematic treatment of autonomy issues in relation to liberalism and communitarians. More so when one notices series scholarly works on Gandhian disaffiliation from liberalism and affiliation to Communitarians.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

In the light of our research objectives and research gaps noted above, following could be our research questions for the present research proposal.

1. To what extent conceptual resources of Gandhian political thought can be brought to bare on major areas of controversies in contemporary western liberal thought for a balanced understanding of the debates on freedom, justice, multiculturalism and so on?
2. Whether Gandhian analysis of power/'anti power' can be constructed out of the theory and practice Gandhi in and effort to enrich the Republican tradition of political theory by supplying the Indian contribution to a predominantly. West centric discourse?

3. To what extent Holistic nature of Gandhian political thought reflected in the dynamic interaction of theory and practice has been preserved in the recent efforts of contextualizing Gandhi or drawing relevance of Gandhain ideas to widely disparate issues, movements and politics?

METHODOLOGY:

A historical mode of inquiry is inexplicable requirement for our study in as much as what Gandhi wrote belonged to a different time than the one in which we live and in view of the fact that Gandhi is being contextualized presently in widely different ways, undoubtedly then methodological aspects of historical mode of enquiry become problematic. In fact methodological arguments advocating what is characterized as a more dependable or acceptable historical mode of inquiry for understanding political ideas and recovering textual meaning have become increasingly popular in recent years. One such argument advanced by Quentin Skinner (1978) has in fact stimulated a wider debate about the actual practice of interpretation. Generally speaking there are two opposite positions illustrated by Schleiermacher and Gadamer respectively (Gunnell, 1982). The former advised that '... it is the primary task of interpretation not to understand an ancient text in view of modern thinking, but to rediscover the original relationship between the written text and his audience.' The latter advised on the other hand '... every age has to understand a transmitted text in its own way ... the real meaning of a text, as it speaks to an interpreter, does not depend on the contingency of the author and whom he originally wrote for'. In the light of this contradictory advice how are we supposed to approach Gandhian political thought?

If Gandhian ideas were expressed through very distinctive vocabulary and Gandhian vocabulary was a particular expression of contingency how to account for their discovered relevance in recent

years? In one sense one has to grapple with the problem of particular vs. general which is not easy to resolve. Skinner was critical of textualism (such conception of 'timeless truth' or 'perennial wisdom' contained in a text) while appreciating that text is important in terms of its vocabulary. He was, also critical of contextualism (where a given text is said to 'reflect' or mirror respective societies or class positions) while acknowledging that the available vocabulary of an age sets a limit to what the author could have said. He was also critical of those authors who used to study 'History of Ideas' tracing overtime. To Skinner textualism leads to construction of 'authorial intention' by the reader, contextualism ignores "illocutionary force" of the text, and History of ideas ignores the vocabulary and its usage. His advice is to capture "authorial intention", by (i) capturing the range of description available to the author of the text and (ii) Capturing 'intention' within these terms, so as to determine what the author could have said and what he/she must have said.

Skinner's observation defends certain norm of historical investigation rather than constituting a method of interpretation. There are certain obvious facts associated with studying a text that have being neglected in Skinner's observations. Firstly, an author may inherit a set of vocabulary but far from being constrained by it; he or she may enrich the vocabulary by new insertions, as did Gandhi in the domain of Indian politics. Secondly, authorial intention is just one part of interpretation for a text. There may be a gap between author's intention as discovered in a text and the interpretations of the text as received subsequently. Here again a whole series of 'Anachronistic' readings on Gandhi illustrate the manner in which Gandhi has been globalize, that is, some of Gandhian ideas were used at different times and locations. Above considerations make the historical mode of inquiry complex and challenging. In our attempt to understand Gandhian political thought historically we would focus on the immediate context of Gandhian ideas and the context of their

receptions. Insights of 'New History' as advocated by skinner will not be ignored but specialized historiography will not be our methodological orientation rather our emphasis would be on conceptual analysis by way of comparison between those of Gandhi on the one hand and those within the traditions of political theory that we may find comparable with those of Gandhi, and the way of contextualizing in recent years, on the other. In short, while the discovery of contexts is wide open the texts are not necessarily closed either. Hence we propose to link up the Republican ideas on freedom with Gandhian texts, that may represent a goal of arriving at, through counterpoising ideas, interpretations and their contexts, to quote the memorable words of Gadamer, a 'fusion of horizons'.

Chapter 2

GANDHI AND MODERN IDEOLOGIES

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

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

The Greek word *anarkhia* considered as the root of the English word anarchism. Other scholars are of opinion that anarchism is derived from *anarchia*. According to Concise Dictionary of Politics

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Varieties and options within Anarchism

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Anarchism in Modern Time:-

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

Gandhi and Anarchism

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Communal unity

Removal of untouchability

Prohibition

Khadi

Other village industries

Village sanitation

New or basic education

Adult education

Uplift of women

Education in health and hygiene

Propagation of Rastra Bhasha (National language)

Promotion of economic equality (Gandhi, 1941).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Contemporary critics appear almost unwilling to understand the implications of the Gandhian method. In anarchist criticism of which the above is one of the more sympathetic there is an honest failure to recognize the potential of satyagraha. Political methods as we find them conventionally practiced as indeed, based upon himsa (which means more precisely injury or violence, and included hate). It is just

in this understanding that Satyagraha makes its unique contribution. For politics based on Satyagraha does not carry with it elements of himsa, but of ahimsa. It still remains politics and may involve a government, state structure. Instead of violent sections, non-violent sanctions operate. Such a system is immensely difficult of conception for those of us who are steeped in the processes of modern politics and who understand law as a violently coercive order. But it is just this which anarchists should be brought to understand –for it is the solution to the problem of method which anarchism has consistently failed to solve.

Occasionally anarchist thinkers have attempted to formulate a technique of resistance other than the destructive methods made popular by terrorist tactics. Benjamin Tucker in America recommended as did Thoreau, a passive resistance to modern governments. He and of course Tolstoy and other Christian Anarchists, enjoined refusal to pay taxes and the withholding of all other co-operation with governmental functions, with Tolstoy non-violence meant a quite different thing from Gandhian Satyagraha. It meant avoidance of all force in any form. It was in no case a technique for mass positive constructive action.

The anarchists following Bakunin were well aware of the force inherent in any noncooperation of labour, syndicalists operated with the objective (real or ideal) of the general strike. Even Max Stirner whose extreme individualist anarchism allowed him little concern for social techniques held that “the laborers have the most enormous power in their hands, and if they once became thoroughly conscious of it and used it, nothing would withstand them” (Stirner, 1912, p.152). And Godwin had stated a basic element of civil disobedience when he reasoned that “if government be founded in the consent of the people, it can have no power over any individual by whom that consent is refused” (Godwin, 1926, p.96). Anarchists were, then,

essentially aware of the strength of a people or a section of the people (notably labor), to resist government authority. But even in those cases where anarchists attempted something more than a negative resistance policy (as they did in anarchist settlements especially those founded in Canada and the United States) the weakness of the effort lay in the failure to develop a technique of resistance or to delineate a method. Gandhian Satyagraha meets this problem and the non-cooperation of Satyagraha has the necessary concomitant of co-operation among the resisters themselves. Co-operation functions not only in organizing the resisters for establishing a parallel social structure, but also in the program persuasion and conversion of the system against which the group is resisting.

The Christian Anarchist Ludlow (Ludlow, 1950) tells us that if we were to subtract the socialist elements from Gandhi's thought we would have left an ideology and plan of action that would be truly anarchist and would thus reject the state as a form of government. It is true, as we have seen that there are essential socialist elements in Gandhian thought and that Gandhi was not prepared to abandon Political means or the state as an organizing factor. Nevertheless, with Satyagraha as the functioning Socio-Political technique of action, anarchism could conceivably result. We may also challenge the anarchist to show us how he intends to realize anarchy: what indeed, is the "plan of action" of anarchists?

Among the weaknesses of anarchist thought has been the persisting inability to show how the present state could be eliminated without violence. Anarchists have not denied that violence tends to militate against the very possibility of annihilating the present authority without substituting another authority equally objectionable. They, further, have not faced the problems of tactics - even violent tactics - insofar as they appear to expect a revolution to succeed without discipline and authority. It was such a faith which

most notably marked the failure of Bakunin's practical efforts. There is no assurance that at the critical movement each individual will come forward to fulfill his function spontaneously and without disciplined direction. Yet, to be consistently anarchist means to refuse a coercive organization implied in disciplined effort.

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

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

Ideals of Conservatism

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

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

The Central Doctrines:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conservatism as an ideology:-

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

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

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

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

Brief History of Conservatism:-

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

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

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

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

The Central Doctrines Defended:-

Traditionalism:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

Scepticism:-

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

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

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

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

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

Organicism:-

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

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

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

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

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

Gandhi and Conservatism.

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

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

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

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

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

(3) Belief in the relative importance of individual will and reason to deflect societal change from its course and

(4) A keen moral satisfaction in the loyalty that attaches the members of a society to their stations in its various ranks (Sabine, 1947, p. 617).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Religious Institutions:

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

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

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

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

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

Property:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Continuity in the historical changes of the social system:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attachment of Members of A society to their stations: -

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

When Gandhi was challenged by those truly conservative elements among the Hindu orthodox, he urged upon them constructions and interpretations which they were unprepared to accept. "What is this Varnashrama?" Gandhi wrote in reply to one orthodox Hindu. "It is not a system of water tight compartments", and, he explained : - "A Brahman is not only a teacher. He is only

predominantly that. But a Brahman who refused to labour will be voted down as an idiot Nor have I the least hesitation in recommending hand weaving as a bread winning occupation to all who are in need of an honest occupation" (Young India, 1927).

And so Gandhi pressed in campaign to overcome discrimination and the fear and weaknesses which arise from it. In so doing he undermined some of the most sacred institutions of his society.

One further aspect of the criterion of conservatism we are here examining in a confirmed attitude towards the selective nature of leadership. To some extent Gandhi could agree with Ruskin and Carlyle that a rule of the wisest is the best rule. But, for Gandhi, wisdom did not necessarily inhere in those of superior birth. Nor did it bear any necessary relationship to the level of formal education. Criteria for leaders lay less in birth or station than in personal qualities. "Courage, endurance, fearlessness and above all self – sacrifice are the qualities required of our leaders", Gandhi wrote. "A person belonging to the suppressed classes exhibiting these qualities in their fullness would certainly be able to lead the nation; where as the most finished orator, if he has not there qualities, must fail. (Ibid, 1921). Nor did Gandhi shore the conservative's distrust of the masses. Gandhi's faith in the people was, as he said, "boundless". "Let not the leaders distrust them", he urged, for "theirs is an amazingly responsive nature" (Ibid, 1920). He further believed that leadership comes only through service, and for himself he places service at the forefront of all his efforts, claiming leadership to be a less important by product. Finally, his attitude towards the common man and towards leadership is reflected in the role assigned to public opinion. For Gandhi, "every ruler is alien th at defies" public opinion, for a government is dependent upon it (Ibid, 1920).

In summary, Gandhi insisted that the individual look first to duty and not concern himself with rights. Nevertheless, it is clear that

Gandhi believed that individual to have many claim upon the state in terms of rights. As we have seen, he believed that the state should exist to fulfill the needs of its members, that, “the supreme consideration is man”, (Young India,1927) and that when the state ceases to perform services for its members which will fulfill their needs, then the individual has the duty to disobey and to resist. This duty has the force of prerogative. The Gandhian Philosophy of conflict makes duty imperative, but the technique of satyagraha assures the acquisition of right. The Gandhian conservatism – if, indeed, the description can be used at all – would lead directly out of and beyond the conservative effect into the newer liberalism, the result of which might look very much like the welfare state.

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

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

Ideals of Liberalism

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Gandhi and Liberalism

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Was Gandhi a covert liberal?

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

Non cooperation 1920-1922

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

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

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

The Swarajists 1923-1930:

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, is there a Gandhian Definition of liberty?

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

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

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

Liberalism and the individual:-

On a more conceptual plane. Parel tries to rescue Gandhi's definition of liberty for liberalism. Gandhi has moved away from a Hindu of self-transcendence to a this-worldly fulfillment (though surely this was always there in the role ascribed to the householder), though it remains a spiritual ideal of self-realization. But we have stripped this individualism of its antisocial possessive aggressive and dominative attributes. Gandhi's political practice is one that "presupposes a liberal state one that recognizes the sovereignty of rights." "He concludes: he has a theory of liberal which combines negative liberty and positive liberty. This may not entitle him to belong to the Berlin school of liberalism. But that in itself should not disqualify him from starting a school of his own" (Parel, 2002, Pp.296-297).

Less anxious to tie Gandhi to liberalism, more conscious to the uniquely, Gandhian, Bhikhu Parekh would also see him as founding his own school (Parekh.1989, Pp. 371-383).

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

At the end, in no sense would we recognize in Gandhi a libertarian, above all in terms of personal relationship and sexuality, of that outlook we identify with the "Personal is political" rebellion of the 1960s. However, Gandhi may have offered his own version of such a personalized politics. But nor would we right to see Gandhi as a latter-day Victorian, though India itself is in many ways still a hundred year's out of date in matters of sexual morality. Gandhi seems to identify little with the aspiration of India's middle class and this inevitably takes him away from a tradition of bourgeois liberalism. He did not endorse for example, that crucial middle class distinction between a public and a domain: he seems indeed to have had little

interest in the whole concept of privacy. His was a rather alarming moral intrusiveness into the private lives of others. He showed little interest in the workings of India's emergent parliamentary institutions, though was happy to leave to others the task of their development. If he saw the struggle for freedom in a political and social context, his was still essentially one for spiritual freedom. And in so far as this was driven by the pursuit of self-realization, it tends towards a positive paradigm of liberty and there are some what alarming monistic tendencies in its pursuit of the truth. But Gandhi always recognized the uncertainties of where truth lay, acted on the right of others to their own version of the truth-he tolerated the views of the swarajists, Jawaharlal Nehru, the congress socialists, though drew the line in 1939 with Subhas Bose and this crucially compensatory way he veers back towards the negative paradigm and becomes a more recognizably liberal thinker. It could be that there is an analogy to this spiritual quest. Within the framework of dharma to the pursuit of political freedom under the rule of law. Gandhi may speak to the condition of persons in the modern pluralist democracies of our day though his speech can feel oblique.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Gandhi was not a "full-fledged" liberal given his lack of intellectual rigour about why he advocated what he did. He had strong liberal inclinations and intuition but no vision for human freedom as a whole (at least not one in which the proper mechanisms of freedom were fully defined). He was clearly not a Hayek and did not even understand the great moral character of capitalism. This is evident from his theory of trusteeship through which he sought (in his mind) a 'compromise' between freedom and economic equality. Gandhi did not grasp that these objectives are mutually contradictory. And so he needlessly hit out against capitalism. He wrote "I desire to end capitalism, almost, if not quite, as much as the most advanced socialist or even communist He also diluted his concept of equality somewhat by saying, 'Economic equality of my conception does not mean that everyone would literally have the same amount. It simply means that everybody should have enough for his or her needs' (Harijan, 1946). He then proposed a via-media of sorts- the theory of

trusteeship, whereby the rich [capitalists] would use their 'wealth for the welfare of the community' (Harijan, 1939).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ideals of Socialism

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COOPERATION:-

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

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

EQUALITY:-

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

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

SOCIAL CLASS:-

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

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

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

COMMON OWNERSHIP:-

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

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

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

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

Types of Socialism:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

M.K. Gandhi and Socialism

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Decentralization of a political and economical power, a skeptical approach towards technology and large scale industrialization with an emphasis on self employment and self reliance are key features of Gandhi socialism .It is often forgotten that Gandhi was not looking for any theories but was searching for a truthful path, one that helped people live together with love and tolerance. Hind Swaraj is not a theory but an idea, an ideal .It is useful for those who want solutions for their lives, not for those looking to impose their ideas on other people (Gandhi, 1939).

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

According to Gandhi real socialism has been handed down to us by our ancestors who taught: "All land belongs to Gopal, where then is the boundary line? Man is the maker of that line and he can therefore unmaking it". Gopal literally means shepherd; it also means god. In modern language it means the state, i.e., the people. That the land today does not belong to the people is too true. But the fault is not in the teaching. It is in us who have not live up to it. "I have no doubt that we can make as good an approach to it as is possible for any nation, not excluding Russia, and that without violence" (Gandhi, 1937, p.375). "No man should have more land than we needs for dignified sustenance. Who can dispute the fact that the grinding poverty of the masses is due to their having no land that they can call their own?" (Gandhi, 1940, p.97).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

While it is difficult to typecast Gandhi's economic idea into any one particular model, there persists an enduring misconception that Gandhi was a socialist and Nehru's socialism was a legacy of Gandhi's thought. Yes he endorsed the spirit of socialism and in that sense he can be classified as socialist by intent. However he had correctly seen several of the flaws in socialism when it was still very fashionable in that era. Though he does not use modern economic Jargon, the essence is exactly the same and the words he uses to express them are fascinating and reflect intellectual honesty.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Concept of Socialism:-

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

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

In spite of some similarity between the Marxian and Gandhian views on socialism, the violence as a means, advocated by the former, makes all differences. Marx treats men merely as means for achieving certain ends e.g. socialism and he approves the use of violence for achieving them. But Gandhi does not approve violence. He says that violent revolutions can succeed only in that country in which government is disorganized.

The problem for Gandhi was as practical as it was for Marx. For both the criterion of truth lay in meeting human needs. Both Marx and Gandhi probed into the problem as participate observers and leaders of their respective movements. But the distinction emerges when we find that Marx accepted the philosophy of history, which defined the content of those needs and indicated their satisfaction. Gandhi, on the other hand, perceived the necessity for developing an approach, a tool and a form, whereby the content, i.e. substantial

human needs, could be met and the truth (the relative truth in terms of substantial human need) of any situation could emerge. Gandhi rejected also the Hegelian concept of reality and reason. He agreed with Feuerbach saying that "man is the measure of reason".

Dialectical Difference:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Religion in Gandhian Socialism:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Gandhi’s Disagreement with Western Socialists:-

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

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

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

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

Element of Sacrifice:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bhikhu Parekh's presents Gandhi to the reader as a dharmaraj (one who rules in the true spirit of dharma), and his programme of Swaraj as a quest for Ramrajya. He was no ordinary man, but one in a millennium, a yugapurusha (symbolizing an epoch and its deliverer). His programme of struggle was not defined in ordinary social and economic terms, such as that of Lenin and Mao, and was therefore not transitory but an eternal message of salvation. Gandhism offers the most radical programme for the liberation of India (and through it, the world). Bhikhu Parekh's assessment of terrorism as an oppositional current to Gandhism suffers a similar lack of evenhandedness. In this context, he refers to Marxism only as an ideology of mindless violence, and contrasts it with the truthful non-violence of Gandhism. He dismisses Marxism as a doctrine of atheistic violence representing, to use the kind of allusion that Parekh prefers, adharma as opposed to the yugadharma of Gandhism. He attributed to Marx the sentiment that a bloodbath constituted the highest expression of human energy and freedom and cleansed away the psychological and moral mud of the ages. Not surprisingly, he compares the terrorist tradition favourably with his representation of Marxism. He argues that the Indian terrorist movement was "sober and restrained", for it turned to violence as a regrettable method of last resort and not as a law of nature. To demonstrate his point, Parekh cites the words and actions of terrorists such as Madan Lal Dhingra, Savarkar and Aurobindo Ghosh, a selection that suits the purposes of his general argument, for all these men sought inspiration of Hinduism. Infact that those terrorists who converted to Marxism, in the twenties and thirties

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GANDHI AND CONTEMPORARY IDEOLOGIES

Feminism : Rise and Development of the Concept

Feminists of the second wave adopted as their motto “the personal is political”. In so being, they challenged women’s exclusion from the public world of politics and economics, while reintroducing the personal experience of being female into the political discourse of the day (Evans, 1997, p.120). These feminists, in effect, disrupted the public/private dichotomy, a long held notion in western political thought that politics is the purview of a public male sphere. While “the personal is political” may have been the best known adage of second wave feminism, it was not the only major dualistic arrangement these feminists challenged as underlying sexual hierarchy in western thought. The culture/nature dichotomy, for example, was challenged also, albeit by fewer feminists. They recognized that this dualism, too, played a major role in constructing gender in a way so as to distort or exclude women.

Today many feminists believe they are constructing a third wave of feminism. This iteration of feminism, having the advantage of second wave’s theories, is developing a broader conceptual framework with certain important characteristics in common. Primary among third wave characteristics is the deconstruction of the notion of duality itself (Arneil 1999, Plumwood 1992). Further, unlike the general tendency among many, especially early second wave feminists who, while having different theories or explanations for women’s oppression, tended to work within foundational western political theories such as liberalism or socialism (Jaggar and Rothenberg, 1984), the perspective of third wave feminism “begins with women’s point of view, notably the diversity and difference in perspectives

among women". In reestablishing embodiment, third wave feminism, generally, begins to reweave the specific duality between nature and culture.

In the nature/culture dualism man was seen as representing culture, and needing to be unconstrained by and to have domination over natural processes, both of a nonhuman nature and of human embodiment. Men were identified with disembodied characteristics such as order, freedom, light, and reason, which were seen as better than, and in opposition to, women's allegedly more "natural" and embodied characteristics such as disorder, physical necessity. The use of the term "man" cannot be construed as generic here. The subtext is the association of women with nature, as women's embodiment generally, given its reproductive capacity, is harder to deny than men's. Early modern philosophers developing classical liberalism (e.g., Hobbes and Locke) continued the association of men with culture and women with nature. Further, in concurrence with the then new and highly proclaimed scientific method, early modern philosophers broadened the concept of culture to include an even more enlarged (Arneil 1999). This period was also marked by the rise of capitalism and rapidly increasing colonization in which the view of the colonized and enslaved people as "other" begins to intersect more thoroughly with the perceived "otherness" of women and nature. Man's (i.e., white, western and middle or upper class men) freedom and happiness, in both these ancient and modern western viewpoints, depended on an ongoing process of emancipation from nature, both human embodiment and the natural environment. The assumption by third wave feminism that the understandings of the relative importance of things in feminism should usually begin with women's situated and embodied points of view (Arneil 1999, Stone-Mediator 1998), begins to reweave the culture/nature duality, whose political philosophy in the west is largely based on notions of disembodiment.

Significant among the feminisms considered third wave today are generational/youth feminism, post-colonial feminism and eco-feminism. The patter of working to reweave culture and nature is woven throughout these feminisms. Youth or generational feminists, using each other's personal experiences as young women in a gendered society as resources, focuses on how young women's lives, from a multiplicity of social locations, interact with feminism today (Findlen 1995; Walker 1995). Post-colonial feminists regard the continuing ill effects of our colonial history as a focus for contemporary feminism (Norayan and Harding 1998). Still others consider eco-feminism important which, in addition to developing theory from the embodied perspectives of its participants, extends its values of diversity and interconnectedness to other species and the natural world, as integral to feminism today (Diamond and Orenstein 1990, Plumwood 1992).

Two of the feminisms discussed e.g. post-colonial feminism and eco-feminism, have roots in second wave feminism, illustrating how the movement between second and third wave feminism is an uneven one. In post-colonial feminism, earlier works by scholars such as Gloria Anzaldua (1987) and Chjandra Talpade Mohanty (1986), for example, called for the recognition of what feminism meant to women in non-Western cultures. Today, however, the inter-relationship of the local and the global, particularly the negative effects of the increasing globalization of capital on women and their children, is more evident in post-colonial feminism (O'Connell et 1995).

Eco-feminism, in the United States, originated during the second wave of feminism as (mostly) women in the peace movement began to perceive the inter-relationships of militarism, sexism, racism, classis and environmental damage (Sturgeon,1997, p.27). The theorizing of how this environmental damage was related to women's oppression and the oppression of other people, together with theorizing from the perspectives of the women involved, including

women in the so-called developing world (e.g., Diamond and Orenstein 1990 and Shiva 1989), became evident during the time period seen as the emergence of third wave feminism, the late 1980's and the 1990's (Arneil 1998). These approaches, however, were also taken earlier by Leonie Caldecott and Stephanie Leland (1983).

The evolution to a Third Wave Feminism:-

Second wave feminism has had considerable impact on women's lives, due, in no small part, to the various public policies these feminists brought about. While the public/private dichotomy was significant to the political analysis of earlier second wave feminists, these feminists, with the exception of radical feminists, most often developed their explanation from well established western political theories such as liberalism, Marxism, Socialism and Psychoanalytical theory. Each of these different forms of feminism tended to develop its own ideas about how to break through the oppression of women in the private sphere. Their analysis was done both by using and critiquing their perspective foundational theory.

The feminist theories prominent in the earlier second wave also tended to assume a universalization of their experiences as "women's" experience (Malson et al. 1989, Plumwood 1992). For example, liberal and socialist feminists, in making the argument that women needed to be accorded the same legal or economic treatment in society that men are accorded, were arguing that there is no difference between women and men, other than the superficial one of having been treated differently. Radical feminists, seeing women's nature as different from (and usually better than) men's, argued that women are essentially different from men and that women's differences needed to be accommodated in society just as men's had been. Nevertheless, in both of these arguments, the notion of a unified subject is implicit, in the first as a universal human nature and in the second as a universal female nature.

As the second wave of feminism progressed, however, lesbians, women of color, and third world women began asserting their voices into the debate, arguing that their social locations provided them with different vantage points and different conceptions of themselves other than those being articulated by white, middle class feminists (Fraser and Nicholson, 1990, p.33). In this regard some women of color authors, such as Gloria Anzaldua (1981) and Bell Hooks (1984), are also examples, of theorizing from embodiment, during this period, to call attention to the intersectionalist of racism and heteroecism with sexism, further illustrating the unevenness in the movement of second wave feminism into third wave feminism.

Demands from women color and/or third-world women that the differences among women occupying different social locations be acknowledged, facilitated recognizing the universalism inherent in both the feminist arguments for equality and for difference (Fraser and Nicholson, 1990). As a result, feminists became more likely to address the inter-sectionalist of various "isms" with sexism. As feminists increasingly took account of the differences that exist among women, many feminists also moved from the tenets of modernism with its notion of a unified subject, that is, a universal (female) nature, to several post-modern tenets, especially the notion of a multiple and socially construed subject (Malson, 1989). Third wave feminism emerged in the late 1980s and 1990s with the development of new considerations and emphases in feminism (Arneil, 1999). In addition to the recognition of the diversity of the subject women and their differing, often inter-related oppressions, feminists recognized other concerns and as a result, developed new emphases. Among these features is the tendency to move away from foundational theoretical schools, often accompanied by a loss of faith in the ability of established socio-political theories to account for women's situations. Third wave feminism, instead, thoughtfully selects from among the tenets of different foundational theories while expanding on an emphasis developed in the second wave of adding women's

perspectives to establish explanations. Like some authors in later second wave feminism, the third wave feminists work to make women's situated embodied perspectives "the" explanations while embracing the diversity and differences in perspectives among women. Third wave feminism, in particular, refutes dualistic thinking in general --- thinking that divides the world into hierarchical dichotomies with one aspect regarded as superior and the "other" regarded inferior, recognizing instead the existence of multiplicities. Today feminists commonly speak to the inter-sectionalist of various "isms" with sexism (Cohn et al 1997), recognize the social constructedness of categories (Malson et. al. 1989), question the related notions of dualism and hierarchy (Plumwood 1992), and work to further develop theories from women's situated and embodied perspectives (Arneil 1999).

Third wave is seen as an evolution, albeit a less than even one, in feminist thought generally, not a break from the past. While second wave worked for the need to include women in the public sphere, together with the need to recognize the private concerns merited public attention and later second wave began to work for a general recognition of the interrelatedness of class, race and heterosexism with sexism, third wave responds to additional concerns, some significant to its historical times. Among these problems is the fundamentalist backlash to the women's movement, the so-called "post-feminist" feminism, cultural sexualization of girls, traditional sex and gender categorization, an increasingly globalizing economy, with its accompanying "mal-development" projects, particularly their disproportionate effects on women and children, and increasingly precarious environmental problems. To no small extent, the higher educational opportunities allowed to women by second wave feminists' policymaking and the subsequent theorizing many of these women undertook, together with the significant contribution of women of color and/or third-world women's challenges, have contributed to the

expansion of feminist theory, enabling third-wave feminists' awareness of the concerns they respond to.

Three examples of feminism... generational feminism, post-colonial feminism and eco-feminism... in their present form, these feminisms illustrate many of the current expressions of third-wave feminism, particularly the reweaving of the nature/culture duality by theorizing from embodiment.

Western feminism generally has become increasingly interested in post colonial feminism. In the United States, this can be seen in the occurrence of several special issues of feminist journals featuring postcolonial feminism"(Hypatia,1995,1998,2001). Further examples can be seen in events such as the recent formation, by an international group of women's studies journal editors, of a "Feminist Knowledge Network to facilitate communication, including the printing of articles from one another's journals (Hall, 2003, p.132). The roots of postcolonial feminism extend back into second wave feminism. Gloria Anzaldua, bell hooks, Chandra Talpade Mohanty are examples of women calling for the recognition of the differing meanings for feminism in non western cultures, in the past.

Post colonial feminism today also operates more extensively across geographical and intellectual borders. Intellectually, it unsettles familiar and often comfortable frame works (Narayan, 1998, Pp.1-6). Paralleling the postmodern critique of universal knowledge claims , it criticizes the western scientific paradigm for its assertions of universality, arguing that its knowledge claims are simply knowledge's that have been developed by one group of people at one historical time"(Harding,1998,pp.146-167).

Theoretically, post colonial feminism works to extend the analysis of the intersection of Sexism and multicultural identity formation, to include the negative effects of Western Colonialism that still exist today (Scutte,1998, p.65).

Communication and Feminist Theory in North South Contexts, Part III, p. 65. The "Post" in Post colonialism, does not indicate that colonialism is over but, rather, that colonial legacies continue to exist. More recent phenomena the capitalist global economy, development projects in the southern Hemisphere, and events such as environmental racism in the United States, are viewed, in the post colonial discourse, as neocolonial. They can be seen as "a continuation of the European expansion begun in 1942" (Harding, 1998, p.154). The capitalist global economy and its impacts are now of crucial importance to postcolonial feminists. These feminists alert us to the fact that in the so called developing world, women and their children, in particular, are severely affected by insufficient food, the rising cost of living, declining services, and eroding economic and environmental conditions. These adverse neocolonial impacts often spawn protests by third-world women (Rocheleau, 1996). Some of the more familiar examples are in environmental and ecological movements.

Mahatma Gandhi and Feminism:

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was one of the few in his generation who recognized the central role of women in society. Gandhi perceived women as playing a distinct but nevertheless a complementary role to men. While he argued against stereotyping them as weak and inferior and while he condemned child marriage, dowry and the observance of Purdah (Seclusion), he also believed that women were duty-bound to serve their husbands, families and country in that order.

Mumbai based Tushar Gandhi, the great grandson of the Father of the Nation, puts it this ways: - "I would say that Bapu was a champion of gender equality. But the moral strength that he imputes to women has an almost in born, genetic complexion to it, which bears little or no relation to the exploitation, humiliation and hardship that has been women's lot, historically speaking. Bapu remained fixed on

the symbolism of the mother. He was a passive picture of womanhood, of a person who undoubtedly possessed freedom but functioned within narrow parameters and defined boundaries" (Gandhi, 1956).

Views on Sexuality:-

As for sexual relations between men and women, Gandhiji was orthodox in his beliefs, according to Tushar:

"A Strong believer in monogamy, sex to him was only meant to be an act for procreation. Early in his married life he had trouble in accepting his own sexuality and this seems to have determined his general view of sex", he observes.

In fact, when Margaret Sanger, the ardent advocate of contraceptive rights for women, met Gandhiji when she was touring India the Thirties, he is quoted as having told her, "It becomes a lustful thing when you take love for your own satisfaction. It is just the same with food. If food is taken only for pleasure it is lust. You do not take chocolate for the sake of your physical need. You take it for pleasure and then ask the doctor for an antidote. Perhaps you tell the doctor that whisky befogs your brain and he gives you an antidote. Would it not be better not to take the chocolate or whisky?"

Sanger went back from her meeting with Gandhiji, a disappointed woman.

"Terming sex a carnal desire of man, Gandhiji apparently did not think of women's own sexual desires other than their desire for motherhood," observes Sonal Shukla, Director, Vacha women's Resource Centre, Mumbai. She adds, "Perhaps this was because he regarded the sexual act as an imposition women. He actually supported women taking the Satyagraha (truthful insistence) strategy into their bedrooms in order to resist intercourse. It is not surprising; therefore, that celibacy was one of the 11 vows that Gandhiji's staunch followers were required to observe. Many inmates of his ashram --- his chosen ones --- would end up breaking this vow and

would have to own of to this when their wives became pregnant. They then had to pledge to be celibates all over again.” Daniel Mazgaonkar, 75, an activist associated with the Land – Gift Mission initiated by Vinoba Bhave, a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, does not believe that Gandhiji was against the reproductive rights of women.

A benevolent Patriarch:

“He believed in Stree-Purush Sahajeevan (man-woman togetherness). Bapu himself evolved from a stereotypical Indian man to a benevolent patriarch to being a gender sensitive social activist. He was surrounded by strong, articulate and fitted women who continuously challenged him”.

Gandhiji is believed to have made no compromises when it came to his wife. For instance, while he had no objection in Kasturba taking a lead against child marriage, he was strongly opposed to any attempt to make her the President of the All India Women’s Conference, observing with cruel candor that as an unlettered women she was being nominated to the post not because of her individual capability but because she was married to M. K. Gandhi.

But Mazgaonkar believes that Gandhiji’s relationship with Kasturba got transformed over time. “From being an authoritarian husband, he became a true friend to Kasturba”, he said.

Incidentally, Mazgaonkar still remembers his meeting with Bapu at Mumbai’s Juhu Chowpatty. He was all of eight, but he recalls the words Gandhiji pronounced on that occasion, mere liye gareeb ka ek rupaiya, ameeron k eek lakh se kahin zyada payar hai (I value a single rupee of a poor person more than a lakh of rupees from a rich person).

Believing in mutual respect:

According to Mazgaonkar, Gandhiji believed that society could not progress when there was a mutually respectful partnership between men and women and he definitely discouraged the practice of making women subservient to men.

During the worst of the communal riots in Noakhali and West Punjab, Gandhiji made it a point to depute women as peacemakers. He sent Jayaprakash Narayan's wife to run a refugee camp in Noakhali and he dispatched Mridula Sarabhai to administer a refugee camp in West Pakistan after telling her to be prepared to die rather than allow any of her wards, whether male or female, to suffer any atrocity. Ammu Abraham, well known feminist and women's activist, while acknowledging that Gandhiji did not sufficiently highlight the issue of gender injustice, is full of admiration for his vision and commitment to a pluralistic India (Abraham, 2008).

Gandhi a feminist?

Says Abraham, "His advocacy of non-violence has impacted the world, one can subject such historical personages to critical evaluation. After all, they too were products of their time and a deeper perspective on patriarchy was yet to emerge in that era. So was Gandhi a feminist? I do not think so. But one does not reject all past figures because they were not feminists, surely. Feminism is also a historical and evolving ideology".

But Abraham still finds it difficult to accept Gandhiji's early treatment of his wife, Kasturba. "I was shocked by the story about him having been violent towards Kasturba, allegedly because of her refusal to clean out the toilet of a Dalit. That Gandhiji should have flung his wife out on the road for this is a real sticking point for me even today".

The fact is that the Gandhian legacy vis-à-vis women are a mixed one. Here was a figure, which recognized and publicly spoke about the strength and contribution of women.

Yet, when he crowned the Indian women as the incarnation of ahimsa (non-violence) and lauded her incredible power to endure, as her greatest strength, he ended up glorifying the self-effacing, long-suffering Indian women, who was herself the pitiful product of a deeply patriarchal culture (Balil, 2009).

Gandhi wanted build a society based on justice, peace and equality. In order to achieve these three coordinal principles it was very essential to grant equality to the two builders of the society, men and women. This gender equality is a prerequisite for peace and development of the nation. Gandhi addressed women are glorifying terms, “women are the noblest of God’s creation”, “She is any way superior to in her religious devotion”, and she is “an incarnation of ahimsa.

Gandhi talks a lot about his mother in his writings and speeches. His mother and sister impressed him. His first lessons in Satyagraha were taught by his mother. After marriage, his wife Kasturba influenced him as did other women in the ashrama, especially Meeraben and Amrit Kaur, whose sincerity and commitment impressed him deeply (Jolly, 2006, p.233). According to Barbara Southard, Gandhian feminism stands two major pillars ... “gender equality in all respects at every level and gender specific role – differentiation” (Southard, 1981, p.403). Gandhi once said, “The man should look to the maintenance of the family, the woman to household management, and the two thus supplementing and complementing each other’s labours. Gandhian Philosophy on gender emphasizes that social expectations from men and women differ and in turn their responses and responsibilities in the public and private sphere are also different from each other. Commenting on gender equality, he quotes widely from Hindu Shastras (texts) and asks that if every soul originates from Braham, then where do differences between men and women arise? He stresses that it is not the gender, but the individual’s soul that matters. Commenting on the ole of scriptures, Gandhi said that all written in Smritis is not divine as there are false interpolations (Harijan, 1936).

If religion and religious scriptures teach unethical codes then they ought to be disobeyed. Gandhi went on to say, “Hinduism leaves the individual absolutely free to do what he or she likes for the sake of

self-realization or which and which alone he or she is born" (Young India, 1929). Gandhi rightly observed that the degenerated position of women resulted from historical circumstances and said, "The soul in both is the same. Each is a complement of the other But somehow or other man has dominated women from ages past, and women has developed an inferiority complex. She has believed in the truth of man's interested teaching that she is inferior to him. But the seers among men have recognized her equal status". There is no difference in the basic mental faculties of man and woman, and woman also deserves the same liberty and freedom (Harijan, 1940). As early as 1921, writing in "Young India", Gandhi said, "of all the evils for which man has made himself responsible, none is so degrading, so shocking or so brutal as his abuse of the better half of humanity to me, the female sex, not the weaker sex." Discerning the cause of the inequalities and injustice to women in general, he firmly believed that, "if I were born a woman, I would rise in rebellion against any pretension on the part of the man (Young India, 1927). As far as men and women's sphere of activity is concerned, Gandhi advocates the theory of separate spheres, while on the one hand the man is the bread winner, on the other the woman is responsible for tending to home and children. Gandhi's vision of women was one of nurturance and he believed that "woman is essentially the mistress of the house She is the keeper and distributor of the bread ... the art of bringing up the infants of the race is her special and role prerogative. Without her care, the race must become extinct." He did not regard marriage as an absolute essential for women (Harijan, 1940).

Even though he does not advocate an "active role" for women in the public sphere, however when the issue of women's suffrage was first raised in 1921, Gandhi supported it and even felt that the success of the Satyagraha Movement and the Dandi March was inextricably linked with the active participation of women. Picketing liquor shops and sellers of foreign cloth were activities, which were predominantly undertaken by women. By 1939, Gandhi was

thoroughly convinced that if the national movement had to be escalated to the level of a mass movement. Then women would definitely have to be included as active participants. He said, "I would love to find that my future army contained a vast preponderance of women over men. If the fight came, I should then face it with grater confidence, then if men predominated. I would dread the latter's violence. Women should be my guarantee against such an outbreak" (Harijan, 1939). According to Southard, Gandhi did not see his advocacy of women's participation in non-violent resistance campaigns as contradictory to his basic concept of women as nurturer and caretaker of the home. On the contrary, the participation of women in Satyagraha was seen as an extension of her special mission as the caretaker of humanity (Southard, 1981, p.405). Gandhi often observed that religion could be safeguarded only in the hands of women and not in those of men or religious Brahmins. He saw religion as a way of life and as an indicator of one's character or true nature. Addressing a women's meeting in Kaithal, Gandhi said, "the foundation of which society rests is the home and dharma is cultivated in the home. The fragrance in the home will spread all over the society" (Gandhi, 1921, p.63). He stressed that a women's real ornaments were her noble qualities, talents, her purity and chastity and therefore it was the soul that was important and should be the focus of self-improvement, rather than external beauty, which is skin-deep.

Today the world speaks of pure love, one family, and one husband and wife in a monogamous and faithful relationship, thus echoing Gandhi's teachings concerning the family. He considers the cohesive family to be the building block of a healthy society. Gandhi said that providing healthy, intelligent and well brought up children to the country is in itself a great service rendered by women. He also believed that the Hindu Law of Inheritance required changes and improvement. Women must be given equal rights where family property is concerned because the disinheritance of women from

family property is responsible for male dominance and women's subordination. Gandhi opined that women should not suffer from any legal disability. He said "I should treat daughters and sons on a footing of perfect equality" (Young India, 1929). The All India Women's Conference made a declaration to this effect in 1931, "This conference places on record its opinion that there should be complete equality between the sexes in the matter of inheritance and property" (All India Women's Conference, 1931). Purdah, another evil which still affects women's lives in certain section of society, has also been decried by Gandhi with the help of historical examples. Giving the evidence of ancient Indian history, he writes that women's lives during that period were less secluded and insular. They participated in public debates and discourses and lives were much fuller and less restricted when Purdah was unknown. Gandhi denounced Purdah as a "laborious customs" which had incurred incalculable harm to the country. In 1928 the All India Women's Social Conference that met in Calcutta passed a resolution against Purdah. Like other social reformer, Gandhi was against the custom of forcing a marriage without the consent of the boy and girl. He also opposed child marriage and when the children's Protection Act was brought up, Gandhi supported it whole-heartedly. In 1925 he said that the issue was not just rising the marriageable age for girl from 14 to 16, but rather not forcing marriage on any individual without their prior consent. Being a strong supporter of widow remarriage, he wrote, "I have repeatedly said that every widow has as much right to remarry as every widower. Voluntary widowhood is a priceless boon in Hinduism, enforced widowhood is a curse" (Harijan, 1935). Hence Gandhi's belief in equality and justice guided his stance on widow remarriage. Addressing people from various communities, he wrote, "If any child widow wants to remarry do not despise or outcast them" (Gandhi, 1919).

One of Gandhi's most interpretations of Swaraj or Self-rule concerned his regard for women and their emancipation. Commenting

on prostitution, one of the most derogatory conditions of women's existence and in the words of Gandhi, "a social disease", he often said that women are forced to sell their body due to sexual and economic exploitation and because of men this problem will continue to persist. Similarly, speaking against the devadasi tradition, Gandhi said that while "it is good to swim in the waters of tradition but to sink in them is suicide". Labeling the devadasi tradition as "moral leprosy", and "an insult to god", Gandhi was trying to break the decadent socio-cultural customs and rituals that had held women in a subordinate position for centuries. Dowry system has been another social evil, which has plagued the lives of women in India. Gandhi saw this as a hateful practice and termed marriage involving dowry as "marriage by purchase". He wrote that in marriage where wives and daughters-in-law are purchased there couldn't be any harmonious relationship. In 1929 Gandhi astounded his contemporary society by saying that, "if I had a girl under my charge, I would rather keep her a maiden all her life than give her away to one who expected a single pie for taking her for his wife"(Young India.1929). Gandhi advised people to boycott young men who expected dowry from their prospective bride's family. He saw inter-caste and inter-community marriage as a solution to this social evil.

In 1923-33, the All India Women's Conference passed a resolution that centres for dispensing information on birth control measures should be opened at the municipal and local levels. This resolution was passed by a thundering majority of 99 votes as opposed to just 7 votes against it. Although Gandhi expressed his admiration for this resolution and the feeling behind it, but he strongly believed that self-control is the only legitimate means of birth control. Gandhi did not like the use of contraceptives or other artificial means of birth control ((Harijan, 1936). According to him, "birth control by contraceptives no-doubt regulates to a certain extent, the number of newcomers, and enables persons of moderate means to keep the wolf from the door. But the moral harm it does to the

individual and society is incalculable. For one thing, the outlook upon life of those to satisfy the sexual appetite for the sake of it is wholly changed. Marriage ceases to be a sacrament for them" (Harijan, 1936). Gandhi believed that women had more self restraint and therefore he gave the responsibility of birth control through abstinence to women.

Gandhi supported education for both boys and girls. In his Basic National Education Scheme, in 1937, Gandhi proposed free and compulsory education for children of both from ages 7 to 14. As far as the curriculum of the syllabus was concerned, in his early years, in 1918 Gandhi had different ideas about girls' education and he suggested that girls' education programme should be planned in a such way so as to meet the special need of girls in order to prepare them to be mothers and home makers. However, by 1937, his views had undergone a change and he proposed that till the 4th or 5th standard girls and boys ought to have the same curriculum and then 6th standard onwards girls should also be taught courses such as domestic or home science (Patel, 1953, p.109). Gandhi believed that economic freedom could indirectly play a vital role in the empowerment of women. In the course of his speeches and writings, he was inspiring and motivating women to spinning yarn and weaving cloth. Addressing women at Nadiad in 1919, he emphasized, "You have two or three hours when you do nothing. You spend them in temples. Telling the beads in the temple is dharma, but at the present time real bhakti consists in this work for cloth... women in rich families should spin two or three hours everyday and pass it on to the store here or gift it... Anyone who spins for money will get 3 annas a pound (of yarn) every pie earned is useful. With the money so earned you can buy your needs. The more you earn the more you gain. This is an excellent means of earning (Joshi, 1988, pp.30-31). In fact, Gandhi realized that the success of the Swadeshi Movement was possible only if women spun yarn and wove cloth in large numbers, at the same time. He also saw that this would enable them to be economically independent. He writes in "Young India" that while

spinning yarn can add to the resources of the middle class, it can infect become a major source, sometimes even the sole source of subsistence for lower class families (Young India,1929).It is very interesting to see how Gandhi viewed women as victims of social and cultural exploitation and at the same time he also saw them as instigators of social change at grass root levels as mothers, wives, teachers and activists picketing at liquor and foreign cloth stores. He was an astute observer of women's social role in the family and society and vested in them the responsibility to change lives at the level of the family and that of the nation by placing them at the vanguard of the Swadeshi Movement as the producers of precious home spun yarn and cloth which was an essential prerequisite for the boycott of foreign cloth. His programmes of Swadheshi and Non-cooperation Movement are both inspired by women's traditional roles and attitudes. Historically speaking, women have universally been responsible for spinning and weaving cloth for household use and their main forms of protest in a male dominated world have been silent and non-violent. Amazingly, Gandhi adopted these two traits integral to women's culture and transferred the arena of activity from the family to the nation where metaphorically speaking Indians took on the female person and the British colonial rulers took on the male person and these two main female responsibilities and attributes were transferred on to the nationalist struggle. He thus gave importance to the so-called "women's work and labour", which usually went unseen and made it an important tool of the Indian National Movement.

Communitarianism : Ideals

Communitarianism, Social and Political Philosophy that is emphasizes the importance of community in the functioning of political life, in the analysis and evaluation of political institutions, and in understanding human identity and well being. It arose in the 1980s as a critique of two prominent philosophical schools --- contemporary liberalism, which seeks to protect and enhance

personal autonomy and individual rights in part through the activity of government, and libertarianism, a form liberalism (sometimes called “classical liberalism”) that aims to protect individual rights – especially the rights to liberty and property – through strict limits on governmental power.

There are strong communitarian elements in many modern and historical political and religious belief systems – e.g., in the Hebrew Bible (Old Testament) and the Christian New Testament (“Now the whole group of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one claimed private ownership of any possessions, but everything they owned was held in common”) in the early Islamic concept of Shura (Consultation), in Confucianism, in Roman Catholic Social Thought (the papal encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (1891), in moderate conservatism (“to be attached to the subdivision, to love the little Platoon we belong to in society, in the first principle ... of public affection”...Edmund Burke) and in social democracy especially Fabianism. Communitarian ideas have also played a significant role in public life through their incorporation into the electoral platforms and policies of western political leaders on the late 20th and early 21st centuries, including British Prime Minister Tony Blair, Dutch Prime Minister Jan Peter Balkenende, and U.S. Presidents Bill Clinton and Barack Obama.

Varieties of Communitarianism:-

The term communitarian was coined in 1841 by John Goodwyn Barmby, a leader of British Chartist movement, who used it to refer to Utopian Socialists and others who experimented with unusual communal life styles. It was not until the 1980s that the term gained currency through its association with the work of a small group of mostly American Political Philosophers who argued for the importance of the common good in opposition to contemporary liberals and libertarians, who emphasized the good for individuals, particularly including personal autonomy and individual rights. The Canadian

Philosophers Charles Taylor and the American Political Theorists Michael Sandel were among the most prominent scholars of this brand of communitarians. Other political theorists and philosophers who were often cited as communitarians in this sense, or whose work exhibited elements of such communitarian thinking, included Shlomo Avineri, Seyla Benhabib, Avner de-Shalit, Jean Bethke Elshtain, Amitai Etzioni, William A. Galston, Alasdair MacIntyre, Philip Selznick and Michael Walzer.

During the same p[eriod, students of East Asian Politics and Society used communitarianism to describe the social thinking within authoritarian societies such as China, Singapore and Malaysia which extolled social obligations and the importance of the common good and accorded much less weight to autonomy and rights. Indeed, these societies viewed individuals as more or less interchangeable cells who find meaning in their contribution to the social whole rather than as free agents. Scholars of this kind of communitarianism included the American political theorist Russell A. Fox and the Singaporean diplomat Bilahari Kausikan.

In 1990 Etzioni and Galston founded a third school, known as 'responsive' communitarianism. Its members formulated a platform based on their shared political principles, and the ideas in it were eventually elaborated in academic and popular books and periodicals, gaining thereby a measure of political currency, mainly in the west. The thesis of responsive communitarianism is that people face two major sources of normatively, that of the common good and that of autonomy of rights, neither of which in principle should take precedence over the other (Etzioni, 1990).

Indian Communitarianism:-

A communitarian and anti-individualist perspective has emerged in writings on Indian Society and Politics in recent decades. Social analysts like Ashish Nandy, Partha Chatterjee, Sudipto Kaviraj, T., N. Madan, and others have not only mounted a strong critique of

what they consider have been the dangerous consequences of trying to understand Indian Society and Politics through the lens of alien and individualist categories. The revival and strengthening of community has been put forward as a way of coping with the increasing alienation and violence of social life in India, and as a way of bringing us back into relationship with our cultural traditions. Charles Taylor would include a critical attitude towards western modernity and caution regarding the values of the western enlightenment which include liberal and secular values. Where Indian communitarians might differ from western communitarians however, would be in their insistence that colonialism and imperialism and racialism also were constitutive of modernity. Much of the power of communitarian critiques of colonial modernity and of the middle classes which became the bearers of modernist values comes from the way in which they have framed their critique. The role of the westernized middle classes has been much debated by historians of Colonial India and there is some continuity between those debates and the writings of social scientists like Partha Chatterjee and Sudipto Kaviraj (Michelguglielmo, 1990). Partha Chatterjee has argued that anti-colonial struggles did leave some space for the articulation of difference even while they fought for equal citizenship in the public sphere established by colonial state. There was an attempt to protect a sphere of indigenous culture from the influence of western modernity and in this sphere collective consciousness was organized around communities. It was in communities that the authentic indigenous culture was preserved. He has made a plea for the political recognition of community today (Chatterjee, 1994). Communitarians, whatever might be their other differences, have made a link between community consciousness and indigenous culture and this has supported their political project of reviving communities as political actor today. Although Indian Communitarians have been somewhat reluctant to offer concrete proposals for the restructuring of Indian Society they do offer hints about the possible shape of an alternative and better society. The

hints we get are about the need to build on the enduring civilization values of the society, and to try and restore some of the practices of the past.

Although it is possibly on account of shared concerns that some social scientists may have appropriated concepts and theories developed in the west to analyze Indian society but they have also defended this on the grounds that they provide better insights into Indian society that is possible within the modernist paradigm. It is in relation to such claims therefore that they can be assessed. For instance, responding to criticisms made to such appropriations Dipesh Chakraborty has defended the critique of enlightenment rationalism made from post modern perspectives (Chakraborty, 1995, Pp.751-60). The issue of communities and community consciousness is central to communitarian critique of modernity. Caste has also been implicitly defended as an indigenous form of community by others.

Community is presented by communitarians like Partha Chatterjee as an area of freedom, freedom as he puts it, to express oneself not in terms of rights and legal safeguards but through the rhetoric of love, and kinship and duty. A codified sense of community often had the effect of subverting the collective consciousness based on bonds of solidarity generated by the everyday practices of the pre-colonial period. But the sense of codified community links also contradicted the legal equality and constitutional relationships upheld by the colonial state in the public sphere. It is the earlier sense of social solidarity which communitarians would like to revive today. For Ashish Nandy fuzzy identities formed the basis of the tolerance which existed between local communities in the past and which might still exist for ordinary people in contrast to the impersonal and self-directed individualism of modern society (Nandy, 1988). Class is a term which finds little place in communitarian writings. Moreover, on undifferentiated identity of subaltern seems to make little sense today in the face of the humorous divisions which have emerged within

subaltern movements. Communitarian writings are in any event, not addressed to the subaltern thought they claim to speak for them.

All communitarians seem to be agreed that secularism has failed in India, citing increased communal antagonism and violence as evidence, as also the political manipulation of religion. But certain questions can be raised regarding this analysis. Social violence indeed have increased but one needs to ask whether it is secularism only which has failed or whether the increase of inter group violence should not also be understood in the context of wider social changes taking place in the society, not all of which could be traced back to the influence of modernity. Perhaps there is need to support secular policies of the state with the concern for related values such as equality or justice. This might not solve the problem of communal hostilities but it might at least widen the support base of the secular state.

Communitarians have opposed nation and community unlike western communitarian thinkers like Walzer and Taylor who have upheld republicanism as a way of invigorating nation-states today while they have at the same time advocated greater cultural rights for individuals and groups within the state. Indian communitarians are naturally cautious about republicanism on account of their fear about increasing the powers of the nation-state over groups and communities. But to give importance to communities without at the same time confronting the need for greater democratization of communities and state and without expressing commitment to egalitarian ideals could send all the wrong message about what is needed to strengthen inter-group tolerance in our society (Joseph, 1997, pp.2517-2523).

Gandhian Alternative:-

In his *Colonialism, Tradition and Reform*, and *Gandhi's Political Philosophy* Bhikhu Parekh argues that Gandhism did not merely seek to replace colonial rule with Swaraj or self-government, but to restore to India its past, its culture and tradition. He argues that Gandhi, suffered distortion and corruption in the melting pot of Colonial rule, and was threatened, not only by colonial autocracy and the racial cultural idioms of superiority associated with it, but by the invasion of a despotic rationalist modernity. Bhikhu Parekh holds that Gandhi's greatest contribution was his ability to resist the onslaught of modernism and rationalism which had influenced all other strategies of anti-colonialism, reform and nation-building in India. Parekh credits Gandhi with having profoundly redefined Hinduism (turning), it upside down in a way that no one had done before in a way which 'outsmarted' the cunning of 'the Brahmans', thus Gandhi attempted to do for Hinduism what Martin Luther had done to Christianity. In this sense, he argues, Gandhi was a radical traditional and a cultural revolutionary.

Gandhi's programme of religious politics was a complex experiment which envisaged the traditionalisation of reform, the radicalization of tradition and politicization of religion in his challenge to colonial domination. Such a man was Gandhi, a deliverer who was to carry India towards moksha (liberation). Thus, Parekh presents Gandhi to the reader as a dharmaraj (one who rules in the true spirit of dharma), and his programme of Swaraj as a quest for Ramrajya. He was no ordinary man, but one in a millennium, a yugapurusha (symbolizing an epoch and its deliverer) Gandhism, therefore, is represented as the philosophy of this epoch and Gandhi himself as the deliverer of the Kaliyug, in the same fashion as Rama was for the Satyuga and Krishna for the dwapar and tretayugas. His path was a unique one, in that it sought to use age old cultural resources to regenerate 'Indian ness' among Indians and humaneness among

humans. Gandhism offers the most radical programme for the liberation of India (and through it, the world), for it is the only philosophy of the modern period which draws upon the entire fabric of India's heritage – spiritual and socio-psychological and even sexual. Gandhi's experiments with sexuality were directed towards finding ways to channel sexual energy into building the national character through moral salvation, ultimately seeking the transformation of the sensual into the spiritual. Parekh admits that Gandhi was unable to argue convincingly against the orthodox Hindu interpretation of the caste system, and its justification of untouchability.

Bhikhu Parekh claims that Gandhi started his 'epic fast' against separate representation for the depressed classes in the communal Award, thousands of prominent Hindu women accepted food from the hands of untouchables and that 'scenes' of inter-caste public dining were repeated in almost every village and every city of India.

The ambiguities of Gandhi's position on the caste question quite understandably caused untouchable leaders to be suspicious of his intentions, most noteworthy among these was B. R. Ambedkar almost in anticipation of Parekh's declaration that Gandhi was a *yugapurusha*, Ambedkar's book *What Congress and Gandhi Have Done to the Untouchables* ends with the question, "... The Untouchables have ground to say Good God! Is this man Gandhi our Saviour?" (Ambedkar, 1946). Not surprisingly, Parekh judges Ambedkar's account as 'biased and uneven'. Ambedkar found it difficult to accept as the deliverer of the untouchables the same Gandhi who held that the caste system was a worthy institution because the 'law of Varna prescribes that a person should, for his living, follow the lawful occupation of his forefathers' and who declared in the same vein that 'one born a scavenger must earn his livelihood by being a scavenger' (Harijan, 1937). If Gandhi's Harijan Andolan was essentially a strategy against the British attempt to divide the Hindus, Ambedkar's was undoubtedly sincere in his fight to restore dignity to

his fellow untouchables. Parekh's assertion that 'no one before Gandhi mounted a frontal attack against untouchability' is itself biased and uneven in its outright dismissal of the role played by scheduled caste leaders like Ambedkar in seeking their own liberation. Parekh's assertion that Gandhi was the first to fight untouchability is curious, for he appears to be aware of the contradictions in Gandhi's position on the subject. For instance, Parekh is no stranger to the fact that Gandhi and the Congress failed to give Ranga Iyer's untouchability Bill their unconditional support on the flimsy pretext that he had not taken the Congress into confidence. Parekh acknowledges that Gandhi and the Congress adopted this posture out of the exigencies of electoral politics, from the fear of losing the 'votes of caste Hindus'. Yet Parekh does not take this point further, and does not attempt to provide a theoretical account of the relationship between Gandhian moral discourse and political practice (Parekh, 1989). On the contrary, where the evidence fails to fit into Parekh's picture of Gandhi, he has, on occasion, altered it to match his argument. Thus, for instance, Parekh ascribes to Patel the statement that if the Communal Award were to stand, 'untouchable hooligans will make common cause with Muslim hooligans and kill caste Hindus' (Desai, 1953, p.301). when in fact, these were Gandhi's own words. Gandhi's position on the caste question no doubt was politically expedient, his statements arguing that 'a scavenger has the same status as a Brahmin' can be understood as sound politics in the particular historical context in which Gandhi was placed, his euphemistic populism reflected the prevailing structure of social domination to suggest however, as Parekh does, that Gandhi's words have a universal value and provide valid solutions to India's problem today. Parekh's immense admiration for Gandhi allows him to admit occasionally that his hero made mistake, it does not, however, allow room for the idea that there may have been some legitimacy in the arguments of Gandhi's opponents. Thus he holds that Ambedkar was 'wrong to question (Gandhi's) commitment and enormous contribution', to the cause of Harijans and

that the untouchable leaders demand for separate electorates for India's untouchables represented the politics of frustration. Gandhi's alternative is celebrated by Parekh as both radically Hindu and genuinely India; it bears therefore great relevance to India today. So, Gandhism may appear to be based on traditional and conservative assumptions, Parekh argues that in fact it is the most radical school of thought of India. By discovering the scientific of tradition and the openers of Hinduism, Gandhi's philosophy of change is thus shown to have presented a radical alternative both to western modernity and to Hindu orthodoxy (Parekh, 1989, p.248). Eighties of the last millennium saw the rise of Feminism and Communitarianism and the nineties, the rise of Environmentalism. Scholars have then found elements in Gandhian thought relevant to the latter.

Enviromentalism: Meaning and Ideas

According to American Heritage Dictionary, environmentalism means advocacy for or work toward protecting the natural environment from destruction or pollution, the theory that environment rather than heredity is the primary influence on intellectual growth and cultural development. According to Britannica concise Encyclopedia, environmentalism means advocacy of the preservation or improvement of the natural environment, especially the social and political movements to control environmental pollution. Other specific goals of environmentalism include control of human pollution growth, conservation and natural resources, restriction of the negative effects of modern technology. Environmental advocacy at the international level by non-governmental organizations and some states has resulted in treaties, conventions and other instruments of environmental law addressing problems such as global warming, the depletion of the ozone layer, and the danger of trans-boundary pollution from nuclear accidents. Influential U.S. and British environmentalists have included Thomas-Robert-Mathus, John Muir, Rachel Carson, Barry Commoner, Paul R. Ehrlich and Edward O.

Wilson. In the Social Sciences, the term refers to any theory that emphasizes the importance of environmental factors in the development of culture and society. According to Oxford Dictionary of Geography, environmentalism means – a concern for the environment, and especially with the bond between man and the environment, not solely in terms of technology but also in ethical terms, we are reminded of the necessity for sharing and conservation. Man is seen as having a responsibility for his environment. The term may also be used as a synonym for environmental determinism, but stressing the influence of the environment rather than control by the environment. Again, according to Oxford Dictionary of politics environmentalism means a belief in and concern for the importance and influence of environment with a society.

Environment is derived simply from the French verb *environer*, to surround.. Our environment, literally, is no more and no less than our surroundings. The concept of environment, though, arose in the mid-nineteenth century. It was given force by a range of new ideas that human beings are, to an important degree, formed by their surroundings. These included Darwin's discovery that the survival of species depends on their suitability to their surroundings and the German geographer's theories of the importance of environment in determining economic and cultural differences between the peoples.

In the second half of the twentieth century environmentalism has come to refer to a combination of beliefs in the value and fragility of the environment, and a tendency to be conservationist with respect to it, leaving the expression environmental determinism to cover the old meaning of the word. Unfortunately, what was intrinsically a very broad concept has been further stretched to the point of meaninglessness. Just as environmental studies can embrace geography, biology, chemistry, law, history, politics and many other disciplines, the concerns of environmentalism can range from architecture to the stratosphere, from the water supply to the diversity

of species on the planet. Environmentalists can base arguments on virtually any known discipline or philosophical assumption, including those which are anthropocentric (concerned only with benefits to human beings) and those which are studiously opposed to anthropocentrism, and insist that non-human entities have value in themselves. Fortunately, some constructive limitation has been suggested by the eco-philosophers, principally Arne Naess, who, since the 1970s, have expressed suspicion of 'Mere environmentalism' which criticizes existing practices and policies affecting our surroundings only in terms of criteria derived from their effects on human interests. This suggests that environmentalism occupies a middle ground between those (rare) minds that see no disadvantages to current practices because of their effects on our surroundings and those eco-philosophers who seek to orient our entire approach away from anthropocentrism.

So, environmentalism is a broad philosophy, ideology and social movement regarding concerns for environmental conservation and improvement of the health of the environment, particularly as the measure for this health seeks to incorporate the concerns of non-human elements. Environmentalism advocates the preservation, restoration and improvement of the natural environment, and may be referred to as a movement to control pollution. For this reason, concepts such as a land ethic, environmental ethics, bio-diversity, ecology and the bio-philía hypothesis figure predominantly.

As its crux, environmentalism is an attempt to balance relations between humans and the various natural systems on which they depend in such a way that all there components are accorded a proper degree of respect. The exact nature of this balance is controversial and there are many different way for environmental concerns to be expressed in practice. Environmentalism and environmental concerns are often represented by the color green, but this association has been appropriated by the marketing industries and is a key tactic of green

washing. Environmentalism is opposed by anti-environmentalism, which takes a skeptical stance against many environmentalist perspectives.

Definitions:-

Environmentalism denotes a social movement that seeks to influence the political process by lobbying, activism, and education in order to protect natural resources and ecosystems. The word was first coined in 1922.

An environmentalist is a person who may speak out about our natural environment and the sustainable management of its resources through changes in public policy or individual behaviour. This may include supporting practices such as informed consumption, conservation initiatives, investment in renewable energy, improved efficiencies in the materials economy, transitioning to new accounting paradigms such as Ecological economics and renewing and revitalizing our connections with non-human life. In various ways (for example, grassroots activism and protests), environmentalists and environmental organizations seek to give the natural world a stronger voice in human affairs. In general terms, environmentalists advocates the sustainable management of resources, and the protection (and restoration, when necessary) of the natural environment through changes in public policy and individual behaviour. In its recognition of humanity as a participant in ecosystems, the movement is centered on ecology, health and human rights.

History:-

A concern for environmental protection has recurred in diverse forms, in different parts of the world, throughout history. For example, in Europe, King Edward I of England banned the burning o sea-coal by proclamation in London in 1272, after its smoke had become a problem. The fuel was so common in England that this earliest of names for it was acquired because it could be carted away from some

shores by the wheelbarrow. Air pollution would continue to be a problem in England, especially later during the Industrial Revolution, and extending into the recent past with the Great Smog of 1952.

Origins:-

In Europe, the Industrial Revolution gave rise to modern environmental pollution as it is generally understood today. The emergence of great factories and consumption of immense quantities of coal and the fossil fuels gave rise to unprecedented air pollution and the large volume of industrial chemical discharges added to the growing load of untreated human waste. The first large scale, modern environmental laws came in the form of the British Alkali Acts, passed in 1863, to regulate the deleterious air pollution given off by the Leblanc Process, used to produce soda ash. Environmentalism grew out of the amenity movement, which was a reaction to industrialization, the growth of cities, and worsening air and water pollution. In Victorian Britain, an early "Back to Nature" movement which anticipated modern environmentalism was advocated by intellectuals such as John Ruskin, William Morris and Edward Carpenter, who were all against consumerism, pollution and other activities that were harmful to the natural world.

In the United States, the beginnings of environmental movement can be traced as far back as 1739, though it was not called environmentalism and was still considered conservation until the 1950's, Benjamin Franklin and other Philadelphia residents, citing "Public Rights", petitioned the Pennsylvania Assembly to stop waste dumping and remove tanneries from Philadelphia's commercial district. The US movement expanded in the 1800s, out of concerns for protecting the natural resources of the West, with individuals such as John Muir and Henry David Thoreau making key philosophical contributions (Doyle, 2005).

1970s:-

Environmental movement gained rapid speed in the U, S. and around the world. The Chipko movement was formed in India; influenced by Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, they set up peaceful resistance to deforestation by literally hugging trees (leading to the term “tree huggers”). Their peaceful methods of protest and slogan “ecology is permanent economy” were very influential.

Another milestone in that movement was the creation of an Earth Day. Earth Day was first observed in San-Francisco and another city on March 21, 1970, the first day of spring. It was created to give awareness to environmental issues. On March 21, 1971, United Nations Secretary General U – Thant spoke of a spaceship Earth on Earth Day, hereby referring to the eco-system services the earth supplies to us, and hence our obligation to protect it. Earth Day is now coordinated globally by the Earth Day Network and is celebrated in more than 175 countries every year.

The UN first major conference on international environmental issues, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (also known as the Stockholm Conference) was held on June 5 to 16, 1972. It marked a turning point in the development of international environmental politics.

1980s:-

During the 1980s the growing awareness of global warming and other climate change issues brought environmentalism into grater public debate.

Today:-

Environmentalism has also changed to deal with new issues such as global warming, overpopulation and genetic-engineering. Many youth of today’s society have become more aware of the State of the planet and are deeming themselves environmentalists. School-Eco-Clubs are now working to create new ideals for the future through

sustainable schools and other minor changes in student lives like buying organic food, clothing and personal care items. In the future, many of the jobs opening up will have environmentalist aspects.

Criticisms:-

Criticisms of environmentalism tend to fall into two major categories: - environmental skepticism and anti environmentalism. Environmental skeptics, such as Bjorn Lomborg (the author of skeptical Environmentalist) dispute the claims of environmentalists, claiming they are either inaccurate or exaggerated. Anti-environmentalists, on the other hand, accept many of the claims made by environmentalists while simultaneously accepting that change is inevitable, regardless of cause and speed. They do not deny the impact of humanity, but they dispute the argument that humanity can kill the planet, citing life's several billion year history as evidence that it is more resilient than many environmentalists realize (Doyle, 2005, p.18).

Mahatma Gandhi's views on environment:-

The whole world knows that Gandhi was a political leader and a revolutionary of an extraordinary type. That he was a great thinker and a saintly figure is also well known all over the world. It is also widely known that he was a humanist and pacifist of international fame. But very few people know that he was an environmentalist too. This is primarily because the environmental problems have surfaced largely in the post Gandhian era and as such, the concern for environment has assumed importance only in recent years. Nevertheless, there were people in the past too who could foresee the future and visualize the dangers inherent in the kind of development the nation chose to go in for following the Industrial revolution in the west. Gandhi was one of such persons. Gandhi had bewildering insights and foresights. One is really appalled by his farsightedness so clearly and emphatically expressed in the Hind Swaraj almost a century ago in 1909 when few people talked of environmental

problems and hazards. Similarly one is overwhelmed by his grasp of the resultant human predicament and his ingenuity to suggest appropriate measures to root out the problem rather than search a solution to control it.

It needs hardly any mention that entire problem of environmental hazards and degradations are rooted in the scientific-technological development leading to large scale and speedy industrialization and the consequent socio-cultural upheavals the world over. True, the achievement of industrialization for mankind cannot be undermined. Industrialization has given to human society tremendous material pleasure and prosperity. But at the same time, it has also imperceptibly done irreparable loss of mankind. Reckless and limitless pursuits of industrialization by all nations are now posing serious problems for every existence of not only man but for all living creatures and all kinds of species on our planet.

Detection of depletion of the ozone layer, reported recurring of acid rain and warming up of the earth as a result of green house effect are serious pointers to the existential problems. Already numerous species of animals, birds and plants have become extinct. Desert formation is increasing with rapid speed. Deforestations and increasing emission of smokes and injurious gas are not only polluting the atmosphere, but also affecting adversely climatic conditions to the awful disadvantages of living beings, Mushrooming of the slum area (in most of the third world countries) as an unavoidable by-product of urbanization of the syndrome of our cherished mode of development is fatal to the physical atmosphere required for proper living. Disposal of industrial wastes and things like plastic and synthetic containers and used or discarded wares has already become a formidable problem not only in the developed west but also in the developed countries. The cumulative effect of all these factors on the health and living of human beings has caused an alarming concern among people in the entire world.

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

Gandhi has clearly perceived this solution. His indictment of the modern civilization in the Hind Swaraj was intended to caution mankind against this calamity. He made a relevant appeal to the people of his countrymen not be trapped by the allurements of this civilization. He also wanted the western society against its ill effects. As a front leader of the Indian nationalist movement and a Visionary and Planner of society and political systems of India after Independence, he drew a blue-print which accordingly rejected the western model based on the scientific-technological culture.

To Gandhi, the main plank of the modern civilization is the insatiable and unending pursuit of material pleasure and prosperity. All modern western socio-economic and political theories and institutions are based on this cardinal principle and people in other parts of the world are blindly imitating it. If the trend is not arrested and a suitable alternative to it provided, Gandhi believed, the result would be disastrous. For instance, the modern western economic development is flourishing on the extravagant utilization of the non-renewable resources i.e., coal, oil and metal. So long it was confined to a few western countries; it did not create that much of problem. But

when the whole world is involving in this never ending venture, this will play havoc with nature. Nature is a sine qua non of existence and if men interfere with it beyond a point, he will be doing it at the cost of his own existence. Perfect and meaningful existence is possible only in harmony and conformity with nature.

Gandhi fully understood the primordially of man-nature relationship and his theory and philosophy of life, society and politics are in consonance with it. It is this understanding of, and, reverence for, the salience and senility of nature for human existence which makes him an environmentalist par excellence. He is not environmentalists who will analyses the causes and consequences of depletion in the ozone layer. He is not competent to recommend measures against environmental pollutions and safeguards against all kinds of environmental hazards. He belongs to the school which believes in remedy rather than cure. In Plato's ideal state, there was no place of doctors, for he advocated the practice of a life style in which nobody would fall ill. Gandhi also subscribed to this line of thinking. He is a propounded of a kind of life, culture and society which will never lead to environmental problems. The universe is based on certain principles and governed by interoperable laws of the creator. Man has potentiality to unfold them. However, undue interference in the system of replete with dangerous consequence. Every created thing has specific meaning and purpose and therefore its autonomy is to be respected and safeguarded. Interactions among created things and their mutual give and take sustain the universe system. Gandhi believed in this universal co-existence and subscribed to the principle of reverence for all life. His non-violence is this way is universal law of life and it manifests in love for all creatures. This is the basic principle of life and no human endeavor, individual or collective, social, economic or political, should be in conflict with it according to Gandhi.

This is precisely the reason of his condemnation and rejection of modern western and socio-economic and political systems. Gandhi highlights the ills of industrialization which is the base of modern civilization. Industrialization leads to centralization of economic power, it flourishes on exploitation of both man and nature and has now become the greatest source of pollution. It leads to urbanization which makes life miserable according to Gandhi. He was highly critical of the growth of big cities like Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and Delhi in India. As our present day experience shows, mega polls and metro polls are the real pollution centre of the world. Gandhi had visualized this and as early as in 1910 gave a graphic description of the consequences of madness for urbanization in the following words:-

Nature works unceasingly according to her own laws, but man violates them constantly. In different ways and at different times, Nature tells man that there is nothing in the world is not subject to change ... And yet extraordinary occurrence startles us and sets us thinking. There has been one such in Paris. This river in Paris in such a heavy flood that huge buildings were washed off. A picture gathering was in imminent danger. Strongly built roads, on which millions of pound has been spent, sagged at places. Men were drowned. Some who escaped drowning were buried alive. Rats deprived of their food, attacked children. How did this happen? The people of Paris had built the city to last for ever. Nature has given a warning that even whole of Paris may be destroyed. It certainly would have been had the floods subsided a day later. Frequent occurrences of devastating flood, and dreadful earthquakes in recent times are consequences of our craze for development and its damaging impact of nature. Nations are mad after acquiring economic, military and political power in cutthroat compellation against each other. Very few states have at present nuclear power and keeping in view the destructive potentiality of the nuclear weapons, every nation is speaking against them. Nevertheless, those who do not have these weapons do not really cease to aspire for

acquiring them. Some of them indeed have been making clandestine efforts even at the neglect of their basic duties and necessities to become nuclear powers. The nuclear-haves, on the other hand, are vociferously advocating for disarmament, but in actual practice are not prepared to do anything to destroy or curtail their weapons. That the production and testing of these weapons are awfully detrimental environment and their use is fatal to both man and nature are not secret to anybody. Yet, nations are not desisting from resorting to suicidal exercise. When atom bombs were dropped on Hiroshima Gandhi had mankind to follow the path free from his danger in future. To quote him: "when I heard that the atom bomb had wiped out Hiroshima, I said to myself, the word adopts non-violence, it will spell certain suicide, for mankind"(Gandhi,1958).

Having thus clearly visualized the dangerous direction in which the modernizing was pushing the world, Gandhi alternative for man's peaceful and happy existence. In his non-violent systems and life-style, weapons of annihilations, which are produced at considerable cost of natural and human resource, become redundant.

Gandhi is a passionate champion of a life pattern based on three cardinal principles, simplicity, slowness and smallness. Modernity makes life complex by multiplying its day to day needs. In fact this kind of complexity is ingrained on it. A complex life can hardly peaceful and happy ultimately. On the contrary, tension and frustration are its attendant characteristics. A simple life is one which requires only bare necessities of life. It is a life of contentment, a pleasure some experiment in austerity. Modernity makes life very fast. Just imagine, mankind today has the fastest modes of travel. Life is equipped with all kinds of time-saving devices. And yet, paradoxically, everybody is always short of time.

Finally Gandhi believed that a good life can be lived only in a small community. To him, big cities were centers of corruption and all kind of vices. Therefore, he remained an ardent advocate of the village.

life throughout. He repeatedly said that India lived in her villages. What he tried to underline was that the soul of India lived there, that the village life is the ideal life and that India should live in the villages. Infact, this is his universal prescription for a good life. It is a life of peace and tranquility, a life of innate simplicity and a life in close proximity with nature. Such a life is also prone to the ethical.

From scientific point of view too, this kind of life alone can be based on renewable resources. The pastoral and agricultural predominance in the pattern of life is conducive to the preservation of environment. An eminent Gandhian has thus highlighted this:-

"A civilization built on renewable resources, such as products of forestry and agriculture, is by this fact alone superior to one built of non-renewable resources, such as oil, coal etc. That is because the former can last, while the latter can not last. The former co-operate with nature, while the latter roles sign of life, while the latter bears the sign of death. It is already certain beyond any possibility of doubt that the "OIL- COAL -METAL - ECONOMICS" cannot be anything else but a short abnormally in the history of mankind because they are based on non-renewable resources and because being purely materialist, they recognize no limits. The frantic development of atomic energy shows that they know their rate and are now appalling than the atomic or Hydrogen bomb. For here unregenerate man is entering a territory which to all those who have eyes to see, bears the warning sign 'keep out' (Schumacher, 1997, p.7). The real importance of Gandhi as an environmentalist lies not in his vision and his right understanding of man-nature relationship. He made honest efforts to translate his percepts in actual life. Even before he became an internationally known leader and a Mahatma, he patterned his personal life and that of a small community on these ideals. His Phoenix and Tolstoy Farms in South Africa testify to it. Subsequently, in India too he established Ashram as on that pattern. He did eulogize the village life but he was pained to see the poverty, illiteracy and unsanitary conditions in

Indian villages. Therefore, throughout his life he kept on telling people and giving demonstration on health, hygiene and Sanitation. Hardly any political leader of his stature in the world had ever devoted so much of time and energy on these problems with so much sincerity and dedication. There are also activist environmentalists no doubt. But M. K. Gandhi tried to carry the message to the mass through the life he himself led. This is what made him an environmentalist with a difference (Jha, 1995).

Gandhian Philosophy, Gandhi and Environment:-

In the course of development all sort of problems such as rapid population growth, production and consumption pattern causing stress and strain on natural systems, degradation and depletion of natural resources affecting the life support system (air, water, soil and bio-diversity), unpredictable global climate change, ozone layer depletion and sea-level-rise, unemployment, poverty, economic inequality, social injustice, poor condition of villages, big polluted cities, rivers and polluting industries, ...we have to think of these problems and try to find out the solution best suited to our needs.

Self-sufficiency of villages, promotion of small and cottage industries, control on the import of consumption goods, improved agriculture etc. are some of the ways to reach our goal. Importance should be given to the qualitative improvement of human resources, education. Better Sanitation, better living condition and better life, can be achieved only through the Gandhian ways today. A sustainable society has to aim at working in partnership with nature and conserve resources and energy, reduce wastes and avoid degradation of renewable. It should produce goods that are easy to recycle, reuse and repair after use. The methods of growing food and raising livestock have to be based on the use of soil and water conservation, bio-fertilizers, biological control of pests. The society should largely be a solar, wind, bio-mass based society together with a whole range of environment friendly technologies mainly based on renewable

resources. Hence, resources should be utilized prudently and the basic need of people is to be met without any serious detriment to the environment. In this context Gandhiji's thought, shall always remain relevant for the smooth global development.

Gandhi's entire life and deeds, indeed is an environmental bequest for whole mankind. This is not because he wrote big volumes of books on environment, led a people's movement to oppose the construction of large scale-dam project or spent his life-time for clearing Ganga or whatsoever, rather because he was a true practitioner of environmentally sustainable development in the real sense, by his personal life-style, he has adopted in his day to day life. Here is a being, which is in harmony and place with environment and himself, although his all life was spent locked in an unequal battle with the mighty British Empire. His strength came to him on account of his spirituality and practice of non-violence and truth. In wider sense, these are the critical elements for the success of practicing sustainable development in true spirit. In brief, his whole life, was his message and a lesson on "Protecting and Conserving Environment along with the development process", not only for Indians, but also for the whole world to follow at large.

Gandhi felt industrialization is going to be a curse for mankind. It can not provide jobs for its millions of citizen and in addition it would be creating pollution problems, whereas, developing thousands of cottage and village industries would provide an outlet for the creative facilities and resourcefulness of the people. It would also usefully employ many persons, who are in need of employment, which in return would add to the national wealth too. The big industries can never overtake the unemployed millions. Their aim is primarily to make money for the few owners. Dead machinery must not be pitched against the millions of living machines. If we compare between the Gandhian model of bottom up rural development and Nehruvian model of top-down industrial development, we can visualize

that Gandhian models lead to an economy of permanence and based largely on renewable, where damage to the environment is minimum and manageable, while the latter is based largely on non-renewable and causes environmental pollution. And de-pollution is far more expensive. Moreover in reality what we find today even after independence is the rich have become richer and the poor have become poorer.

Gandhi's theory of economic inequality went hand in hand with his theory of equal distribution of wealth. The real implication of equal distribution is that each man shall have the means to supply all his natural needs and nothing more beyond this. To bring this ideal into being, the entire social order has to be reconstructed; we must always bear the goal in mind and work continuously to achieve it. Gandhiji has suggested the practical way and means, how to bring this theory of equal distribution into reality. One should reduce one's want to a minimum, bearing the poverty of others in mind. His earnings should be free of dishonesty; there should be no desire for speculative earnings. Gandhiji was of the firm belief that work and culture, should not be separated. Really there is enough hands and fete, God has given everyone the capacity to work and earn more than his daily bread. No labour is too mean for one who wants to earn an honest penny. To be honest to oneself is to be life pro in protecting nature.

There is a perfect awareness that irrespective of all our economic planning, social philosophy, scientific discoveries, we have contributed to a situation which make the life impossible now on this planet earth. The water we drink is becoming poisonous and scarce too. It is estimated that in the next 20 years several cities and towns of many countries will not have sufficient surface or underground water sources. In addition, the marine forms are fast disintegrating and getting depleted. And may more such stories, news capsules tell how the earth is becoming and unworthy place to live in what really contributed to this situation is probably the greedy and selfish

manner in which we interpreted the concept of growth or development which is the central to the human existence. The law of growth presupposes that any growth will be subject to the innumerable constant factors, which govern the human life. Modern planners seem to have forgotten the simple truth that while something ought to grow, other ought to be diminishing. Schumacher has rightly pointed out – “unlimited material consumption in a finite world is impossibility”.

Gandhi abandoned the luxurious life, which he could have easily afforded and identified himself with less polluting poor people. This is because perhaps – one of the basic and profound tenants of Gandhian environmentalism, is that – “the earth provides enough to satisfy everyone’s need, but not for anyone’s greed”. Here is a statement that; makes Gandhi a prophet not of the past but also of the future. The statement related to the most basic and fundamental question as to what is enough for need based comfortable life style. If we take more than we need, we are actually taking from others we are also taking from the future and destroying environment. Gandhiji opted for voluntary simplicity so as to end over consumption is consuming more than our need, because ultimately that would be at the expenses of earth’s resources. According to Mr. Mustafa Jolba, former Executive Director (UNEP) - “unless we begin to use natural resources rationally and fairly, the world would face an environmental catastrophe as complete and irreversible as any nuclear holocaust”. Gandhiji felt, we can use the bounties of nature, but not with an element of greed. He was a vegetarian and had compassion for all forms of life. Infact, he advocated – “man has no power to create life, therefore has no right to kill any life also”. Gandhi also believed that – “Non-violence and compassion are not to be practiced only towards living beings, but also towards inanimate materials. Overuse of the latter, motivated by greed and the desire to undue profit at the expense of bio-sphere, is also violence, since it deprives others of the use of such materials.”

Gandhi addressed himself to the problems of sanitation and told – “sanitation should occupy the foremost place”. A Latin proverb says that – a healthy mind is possible only in a healthy body. He also said – Ahmedabad can not evade the responsibility of sanitation by pleading poverty. Anyone who fouls the air by spitting about carelessly, throwing refuse or rubbish otherwise dirtying the grounds, sins against man and nature. Man’s body is the temple of God. Anyone who fouls the air that enters that temple desecrates it, his taking the name of lord Ram is in vein”. “We like to have an enjoyable bath, but don’t mind dirtying the well tanks and river, by whose side of in which we perform ablutions. These practices should be considered as a great vice, which is responsible for the disgraceful state of our villages and the sacred bank of sacred rivers and for the diseases those springs due to the lack of sanitation”.

Gandhi’s environmentalism, was based on various ethical principles such as :- non-violence, practicing and preventing truth, shunning the use o materials obtained by illegitimate means, celibacy – as a means of population control, neither coveting or amassing materials and wealth beyond one’s need, sanitation of body, mind and surrounding, contentment with available resources austerity, introspection and meditation and even fasting for self purification and any dereliction of duties towards nature including human beings. In this process he controlled himself by himself, because, being a yogi, he had complete control over his body and mind. He did not preach anything that he did not practice himself. Other principles followed by him were emancipation and empowerment of women, and welfare of poorer sections of the society. These principles, those Gandhiji adopted ultimately gave him an internationally acclaimed acceptance of a great pacifist, a democrat, a defender of rights and privileges of downtrodden and of women and last but not least, a social and economic environment.

Once the great Nobel Prize winning Scientist, Sir Albert Einstein spoke on Gandhiji – “Generations to come, will scarcely believe that, such a person as this ever in flesh and blood, walked upon this earth”. The moral influence which Gandhi has experienced upon the thinking of the people of the world, may be for more durable than it would appear likely in our present age ... The best way to pay the proper homage to this immortal should today, is to adopt his basic principles and policies towards life through practicing the self-reliance and self-governance, which ultimately would help to achieve environmentally sustainable development, enabling us to return a “Green Globe” to our future generation, in fact from whom we have borrowed this planet (Document,2010).

Environmental Thoughts of Gandhi for a Green Future:-

We live in a world in which science, technology and development play important roles in changing human destiny. However, over-exploitation of natural resources for the purpose of development leads to serious environmental hazards. Infact, the idea of development is itself controversial in the present situation as in the name of development, we are unethically plundering natural resources. It is true that science does not respect nature's needs and development which does not respect people's needs threatens human survival. The green thoughts of Gandhi give us a new vision to harmonize nature with the needs of people. M. K. Gandhi was not an environmentalist in the modern sense. Although he did not create a green philosophy or write nature poems, he is often described as an “apostle of applied human ecology” (Khoshoo, 1995, p.9). It is a fact that environmental concerns were minimal in Gandhi's time, but eminent environmental writers like Ramchandra Guha consider him an early environmentalist (Guha, 1998, p.67). His views on nature are scattered throughout his writings. His ideas relating to Satyagraha based on truth and non-violence, simple life style, and development reveal how sustainable development is possible without doing any harm to nature and our

fellow beings. His idea that "nature has enough to satisfy every one's needs but not to satisfy anybody's greed" became one line ethic to modern environmentalism. Gandhi considered the earth a living organism. His ideas were expressed in terms of two fundamental laws – cosmic law and law of species. Cosmic law views the entire universe as a single entity. Nothing could malfunction outside the threshold limits built into the grand system that includes both living and non-living phenomena (Mishra, 2009, p.9). He believed that "the universe was structured and informed by the cosmic spirit, that all men, all life and indeed all creation were one" (Pal 1989, p.72). He wrote: - "I believe in the *advaita* (non-duality), I believe in the essential unity of man and for the matter, of all that lives. Therefore, I believe that if one man gains spiritually, the world gains with him and if one man fails, the whole world fails to that extent" (Young India, 1924). Regarding the law of species Gandhi believed that without the cooperation and sacrifice of both human and non-human beings evolution is not possible. Being rational human beings, we are the custodians of the rest of creation and should respect their rights and cherish the diversity. It is for this reason that taking more than the required resources is seen as theft. Gandhi evolved these principles from his vast readings and understandings of religious traditions of Hinduism, Jainism, Christianity and Islam. His social, economic and political ideas were framed on the understanding of interdependence of the whole universe. Truth, Non-violence and Satyagraha:-

Truth and Non-violence are the fundamentals of Gandhian Philosophy. Non-violence and *Ahimsa* means non-injury, but to Gandhi non-violence was much more than the absence of violence. He used it to mean non-injury in thought word and deed. *Ahimsa*, Satyagraha and Tapasya were the basic principles that guided his life. To Gandhi truth is that "which determines the spirit in which one lives or the religious and ethical criteria which governs the way in which he thinks and acts" (Richards, 1991, p.33). He believed that truth can be achieved only by means of non-violence. It affords the

fullest protection to one's self respect and sense of honor. The concept of Satyagraha gave practical expression to the religious and ethical ideas of truth and non-violence. Tapasya or self-sacrifice is necessary to achieve the highest truth. It involves freedom from fear and a willingness to die. Gandhi believed that Satyagraha is nothing, but Tapasya for the truth. The suffering that has to be undergone in Satyagraha is Tapasya in its fullest form (CWMG, 1965, p.13). The ecological scope of non-violence is unlimited. Gandhi's faith in non-violence and vegetarianism made him a votary of conservation of all diversity including all forms of life, societies, cultures, religions and Traditions. Arne Naess, the pioneer of deep ecology argued that ecological preservation is non-violent in nature (Naess, 1988, p.26). Naess introduced and Thomas Weber systematized the relation between non violence, self realization and mutual dependence of all living in the following points:-

- (1) Self-realization presupposes a search for truth;
- (2) All living beings are one;
- (3) Himsa (Violence) against one self makes self-realization impossible;
- (4) Himsa against a living being is himsa against oneself;
- (5) Himsa against a living being makes complete self-realization impossible (Weber, 2009.p.18).

Naess used these principles to evolve a broader philosophy of environmentalism i.e., deep ecology. He believed that Gandhi's utopia is one of the few that shows ecological balance (Naess, 2005). As Gandhi envisaged, non-violence has the power to solve all our problems, including ecological crisis. Many thinkers considered the Indian Environmental Movements like Chipko Movement, Narmada Bachao Andolan (NBA) etc as the living example of Gandhian Environmentalism and they consider Gandhi as a "man with deep ecological view of life, a view much too deep even for deep ecology"

(Sharma,2003,p.45). The key agenda of the Chipko Movement was that carrying forward the "vision of Gandhi's mobilization for a new society, where neither man nor nature is exploited and destroyed, which was the civilization response to a threat to human survival" (Shiva,2007,p.21). All these together made Gandhi an exponent of Indian environmentalism.

Gandhi's Critique of Modern Civilization:-

Modern industrial civilization has had a huge impact on human kind as well as on the environment. It made a small part of the population wealthy at the cost of exploiting the world's natural resources. Gandhi believed that it propagates nothing other than the hunger for wealth and the greedy pursuit of worldly pleasures (Roy, 1985, Pp36-38). Hind Swaraj, Published in 1909, criticized the modern civilization as "Satanic". He observed that machinery is the chief symbol of modern civilization, it represents a great sin. It is machinery that has impoverished India (Gandhi, 1938, p.81). The distinguishing characteristic of modern civilization is an indefinite multiplicity of wants, whereas ancient civilizations were marked by an imperative restriction upon, and a strict regulating of these wants. Gandhi believed that the ancient civilizations were religious in nature which would surely limit worldly ambitions (Young India, 1927)).

Gandhi believed that true civilization values are not present in modern civilization. In Hind Swaraj Gandhi argued that what we think as "civilization" today is an illusion, and that any civilization that ill treated outsiders could hardly avoid ill treating its own people, Gandhi's critique of western civilization and science emanates from his dissatisfaction with the divorce of science and progress from morality. He was not against the technology, but the technologism which creates a hierarchical relationship among men as well as between men and nature. Gandhi believed that the greatest achievements of modern civilization have been weapons of mass destruction, the awful growth of anarchism, the frightful disputes

between capital and labour and cruelty inflicted on innocent, dumb, living animals in the name of science and technology. He believed a science to be science only if it afforded the fullest scope for satisfying the hunger of body, mind and soul. Modern civilization involved an egregious amount of violence against nature which was largely seen as man's property. This undermined man's unity with his environment and fellowmen and destroyed stable and long established communities. Natural resources were ruthlessly exploited and their rhythm and balance disturbed while animals were killed or tortured for human needs. Gandhi believed that villages would soon disappear due to the urbanization which is part of modern civilization is a product. While the western environmentalist spread the message of "going back to the nature" Gandhi spread the message of "going back to the villages". He believed that "the blood of the village is the cement with which the edifice of the cities is built".

Ecological Economics of Gandhi:-

Modern economy is "Propelled by a frenzy of greed and indulges in an orgy of envy" (Schumacher, 2011, p.18). It makes man more materialistic at the risk of majority and the environment. Gandhi asserted that "true economics stands for social justice; it promotes the good of all equality, including the weakest and is indispensable for decent life" (Harijan, 1937). Dr. J. C. Kumarappa summed up Gandhian economic ideas as constituting philosophy that sought "economy of permanence" (Kumarappa, 1946, p.95). All nature is dovetailed together in a common cause". Kumarappa argued that "when this interconnection works out harmoniously and violence does not break the Chain, we have an economy of permanence". Gandhian economic concepts like Swadeshi, trusteeship, bread labor etc. received attention and acceptance from the whole world. The Swadeshi Spirit encourages us to consume commodities made from our own villages, thus promoting small scale industries which help ordinary farmers and weavers to live happily. Limitation of wants is

another important aspect in Gandhian economics. Our civilization, culture and Swaraj depend on the restriction of wants. Bread labor is another important economic concept of Gandhi. He valued bodily labor saying "the rains come not through intellectual feats, but through sheer bodily labor. It is well established scientific fact that where forests are denuded of trees, rains cease, where trees are planted rains are attracted and the volume of water received increases with the increase of vegetation"(Young India,1925). The Gandhian concept of bread labor encourages the use of human hands and body instead of machines to produce essential items like vegetable, cloth etc. The economic ideas of Gandhi differed from conventional economics and bore close resemblances with ecological economics. The term sustainable development was not much discussed at Gandhi's time, but his ideal vision of the world known as Sarvodaya safeguard the rights of future generations, through the welfare of all.

Gandhian Conflict Resolution and Environment:-

Conflict resolution is an emerging branch of social science which deals with the techniques to resolve conflicts between nations or between individuals. It can also be applied to address environmental issues. Whenever there is a mismatch between different interests, conflict arises. Gandhian non-violence or Satyagraha is accepted by many as an effective technique of conflict resolution. Gandhi never used the word "conflict resolution", instead he use terms like mediation and 'negotiation'. He never considered conflicts as problems; they were opportunities for moral growth and transformation. The contribution of Gandhi in conflict resolution was his "working hypothesis that the non-violent resolution of group conflict was a practical goal" (SWAN,1998, p.5). His philosophy of truth and non-violence contribute to the theory of conflict resolution. So far as the Indian environmental movements are concerned, the conflict is often between different interest groups or between the state and people, and are often led by peasant groups or tribal people. It is

often in the form of struggle for the protection of livelihood control over resources or same form of self-determination. Environmental injustice and marginalization are considered as instances of structural violence. As Gandhi believed violence and counter violence will never help to resolve conflicts, he considered Satyagraha as they “only force of universal application be that of Ahimsa or love” to fight these kinds of problems (CWMG, 1965, p.341). It is entirely different from mere passive resistance, where there is no scope for mutual love. In passive resistance, Gandhi believed “there is a scope for hatred” but “Satyagraha may be offered to one’s nearest and dearest” (CWMG, 1965, p.97). Environmental movements in India used Satyagraha as the moral equivalent of war. Forest Satyagraha was first used effectively in Chipko movement to protest against deforestation. Gandhain techniques like Padayatras were conducted to save nature. Conflict resolution techniques based on non-violence and self-sacrifice were used by environmental activities like Chandi Prasad Bhatt, Baba Amte, Sunderlal Bahuguna, Medha Patkar and others.

Several decades before the rise of environmental movements, Gandhi picked up fundamental environmental issues like over consumption, violence to man and nature and so on. There is several movements in different parts of globe fighting against environmental injustice. Some of them are violent in nature, but in India environmental movements have been forged by Gandhian tradition of non-cooperation and non-violence. The Gandhain definition of non-violence is far more than mere passive resistance, rather “it is a way of life, which affects everything from what a person eats through to how they relate to the world around them”. Gandhian Satyagraha often functions as a conflict resolution technique. Gandhi believed that “the economic imperialism of a single tiny island kingdom (England) is today keeping the world in chains. If an entire nation of 300 million took to similar economic exploitation, it would strip the world bare like locusts” (Doyle, 2005, p.18). Gandhi observed that the Indian situation demanded a new vision on economics which is centered as

central to his environmental philosophy. The tussle among different ideologies with distinct preferences made way for a strong relativistic outlook by the close of the previous millennium. Below we posit Gandhi in relation to this.

Gandhi and Post Colonialism or Post Modernity:-

Reading Ruskin's "Unto This Last" on the train from Johannesburg to Durban in 1904 Gandhi experienced a conversion. In his autobiography, - Gandhi says "I determined to change my life in accordance with (Ruskin's) Ideals" Of all the books that he had read, "the one that brought about an instantaneous and practical transformation in my life was Unto This Last. I translated it later into Gujarati, entitling it Sarvodaya (the welfare of all)". Gandhi summarizes Ruskin's anti-industrial utopianism in three main lessons:-

1. That the good of the individual is contained in the good of all.
2. That a lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's; in as-much as well have the same right to earning their livelihood from their work.
3. That a life of labor, it, the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman, is the life worth living (Gandhi, 1960, Pp.364-365).

Gandhi reframes Ruskin for the Indian context. Ruskin was anti-industrial, pre-capitalist communalism – the sort of communalism that Gandhi identified with traditional Indian village life. Gandhi and his advocacy of Khaddar, or home spun cloth, and of Swadeshi, which involved his rejection of British manufacture. In contrast to Marx, Ruskin defends imperialism not because the path to utopia for non-western societies lies through capitalism and industrialization but because those societies consist of inferior races that need to be ruled for their own good. Like many other partial critics of imperialism, Ruskin

sometimes criticizes what the British are doing in, say, India largely by upholding an ideal model of what they should be doing, of the right way to discipline barbarians. Ruskin can declare that "every mutiny ... every terror, and every crime, occurring under ... our Indian legislation, arises directly out of our national desire to live on the loot of India"(Sherburne, 1972, p.205).

Ruskin often advocates an idealized, Chivalric imperialism, as he sometime also – while damning modern, industrialized, democratic, or mass warfare – advocates war in Chivalric terms. Gandhi could not have guessed what Ruskin thought about India just from reading *Unto This Last*. However, Ruskin's greatest British disciple, William Morris, must have had difficulty reconciling the utopian, quasi-socialist, and at times anti-imperialist Ruskin with the authoritarian, imperialist, racist Ruskin.

The Anglo-Indian hybridity of the idea of Post Industrialism also suggests that the anti-machinery attitudes shared by Ruskin and Gandhi, Morris and Commaraswamy affected not only what Martin Wiener call "the decline of the industrial spirit" in Britain but the decline of British imperialism in India and elsewhere. Meanwhile "Modernization" and "Development" – euphemisms for the continued economic exploitation that, as early as 1965, Kwame Nkrumah called "neo-colonialism" – are the order of the day in India and apparently everywhere else around the globe (Kwame, 1965).

Was Gandhian Anti-industrialization or Post-industrialism – ever a realistic alternative to more and bigger industrialization, with its attendant scourges of economic exploitation and environmental degradation? Was there ever a moment during the emergence of Post-colonial India when a renewal of traditional village life was a viable option? Even after his assassination in 1948, Gandhi's vision of a new India based on non-violent, de-centered communitarianism rather than on centralized, violent, state socialism or capitalism has

continued to motivate the Sarvodaya movement associated with Vinoba Bhave's Bhoodan, or land re-distribution programme, and with the work of A. T. Ariyaratna in Sri Lanka. Gandhian communitarianism also informs the environmentalist movement and "Greens" both within and beyond India (Schumacher, 1973). Despite Gandhi and Gandhism, however, from Jawaharlal Nehru forward the Congress party leadership has favoured centralization and big technology – Tata Steel, Air India, and nuclear power. But the 1984 Union Carbide disaster at Bhopal, like the Chernobyl meltdown two years later, dramatizes the downside that all industrial so-called progress seems to entail. "To change to industrialism", Gandhi warned, "is to court disaster" (Nehru, 1960, p.325). Gandhi as growing more amenable to the idea that some large-scale industries are necessary and desirable as long as they are state-owned. Nehru also insists that the Indian National Congress "has ... always been in favour of the industrialization of India, and at the same time has emphasized the development of Cottage Industries and worked for this". But while agreeing that machinery could sometimes be useful, Gandhi consistently opposed large scale industrialization and state centralization. He can be considered an advocate of appropriate technology for a sustainable economy and environment and would have agreed with Panty and Coomaraswamy that, in so far as possible, workers exercising local, democratic autonomy should decide what machinery (if any) should be used for specific tasks.

Nevertheless, the subaltern studies collective and some other recent Indian theorists including Aijaz Ahmad take what can only be called a skeptical stance toward Gandhism. Thus Partha Chatterjee views Gandhi's anti-industrial communitarianism as a moral essentialism antithetical to historicism, "the dominant thematic of Post-Enlightenment thought (Chatterjee, 1993, p.97). Also, Gandhi was instrumental in consolidating "The national by decrying the modern", and Partha Chatterjee claims, Gandhi's anti-industrial critique of capitalism was merely the antithesis that has helped to

promote the thesis, industrial capitalism (Chatterjee, 1993, p.51). For Chatterjee in other words, Gandhism has helped to spawn precisely that which Gandhi must abhor. And Ahmad Treats Gandhi's anti-industrialism as little more than a Ruskinian "Romantic orientalism". But by viewing Gandhian utopianism as naïve, essentialist, and romantic, Chatterjee and Ahmad seem implicitly to affirm the course of industrialization that Post-colonial India has pursued. Do they mean also to affirm the Enlightenment "Project of Modernity"? A "Subalternist" perspective, emphasizing peasant and working class historical agency, might instead be expected to echo Gandhi, and also C. M. Bird wood and Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy, by valuing aspects of Indian Village Culture with its arts and crafts "Cottage Industries" that remain preferable to life in modernizing Bombay or New Delhi (Pandey, 1988, pp.233-348).

No doubt the utopian imagination has limitations; perhaps it is always romantic, nostalgic, backward looking. But, as Andre Gorz contends, "those who propose a fundamentally different society can no longer be condemned in the name of realism. On the contrary, realism now consists of acknowledging that 'industrialism' has reached a stage where it can go no further, blocked by obstacles of its own making" (Gorz, 1985, p.1). Another perspective on Gandhian anti-industrialism (less dismissive of it than are Chatterjee and Ahmad) might ask whether a renewal of pre or post-industrial village culture may not be a viable economic alternative and not just for India – an alternative that modernizing nation-states around the globe have buried in the ruins of their relentless pursuit of "the mirage of modernization". The idea of such an alternative path the non-industrial, non-violent, decentralized, democratic, communitarian and economically and ecologically sustainable path that Morris imagined and that Gandhi wanted India to follow – may turn out to be the only rational blueprint for survival. In any event, Gandhi was surely more insightful about the crisis of modernity that Chatterjee and Ahmad acknowledge. "If the village perishes", Gandhi declared, "India will

perish too". For a land of seven hundred thousand village", such a prognosis seems self-evident.

While Government in India, Africa, Latin America and elsewhere struggle to industrialize, much current discourse in Britain – once in the Vanguard of both empire building and industrialism is now gloomy focused on “the decline of the industrial spirit” and “de-industrialization”. The first modern nation state to industrialize, Britain may also be the first Post-modern nation state “to return across the watershed of industrialization” (Gable, 1985, p.37). Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy identifies the utopian tradition in western literature with what he calls the “inspired tradition” of the world’s great religions, including Hinduism. Citing Plato’s Republic, he writes, “Thus the ideal society is ... a kind of co-operative work-shop in which production is ... for use and not for profit ... the arts are not directed to the advantage of anything but their object ... and that is ... to satisfy a human need ... (thus serving humanity) in a way that is impossible where goods are made for sale rather than for use, and in quantity rather than quality. According to Anand Coomaraswami, as do Ruskin, Morris and Gandhi, that the most important product of industrialism isn’t progress, but the destruction of civilization – that is destruction of the very possibility of a social formation in which both justice and beauty prevail (Coomaraswami, 1977).

Gandhi’s Critique of the Modern Western Civilization:-

For Gandhi civilization was by definition a moral enterprise, “civilization is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty” (Gandhi, 1939). Hence it is the very basic ethos of this modern west that Gandhi sets himself against., The three recurrent themes in Hind Swaraj are:- Colonial imperialism, industrial capitalism and rationalist materialism.

Colonial Imperialism:-

Gandhi categorically insisted that “the English have not taken India; we have given it to them. They are not in India because of their strength, but because we keep them” (Gandhi, 1939). He was one of the earliest to realize that colonialism was something to be overcome in our own consciousness first. Unless this ‘Intimate Enemy’ was exorcized and exiled, unless we addressed this loss and recovery of self under colonialism, we would always be a people enslaved by one power or another, whether foreign or native. Certainly, Gandhi would not want to exchange an external colonialism for an internal one, a white Sahib for a brown one, or compensate the loss of ‘Hindustan’ with ‘Englishtan’ (Gandhi, 1939).

British India colonialism was first justified by a supposedly Christianizing mission, but very soon this was articulated in terms of a civilizing one. In rejecting this modern civilization, Gandhi is subverting the legitimacy of the colonial enterprise at its core. For there could be no colonialism without a civilizing mission (Nandy, 1983, p.11). Since it could hardly be sustained in India by brute force.

Industrial Capitalism:-

Gandhi sees capitalism as the dynamic behind colonial imperialism. Lenin too had said as much, and like Marx, Gandhi’s rejection of capitalism is based on a profound repugnance to a system where profit is allowed to degrade labour, where the machines are valued more than humans, where automation is preferred to humanism. It was this that moved Gandhi to his somewhat hyperbolic claim, “Machinery is the chief symbol of modern civilization, it represents a great sin” (Gandhi, 1939). However, by 1919 his views on machinery do begin to change right up to 1947, as he gradually comes to concede some positive aspects like time and labour saving, even as he warns against the negative ones of concentrating wealth and displacing workers (Parel, 1997, Pp.164-170). He was acutely sensitive to how machinery can dehumanize and technology alienate,

and he extends his critique to the professions of medicine and law (Gandhi, 1939). The poor hardly benefit from these professional services, though they are often their victims. He backs up his criticism of these professions in Hind Swaraj with a later suggestion for their nationalization (Gandhi, 1965, p.17).

Rationalist Materialism:-

Technology is the expression of science, which in modern civilization becomes an uncompromising rationalism. For Gandhi this is but a dangerously truncated humanism. His incisive remark is much to the point, "Just as dirt is matter misplaced, and reason misplaced is lunacy! I plead not for the suppression of Reason, but for a due recognition of that in us which sanctifies reasons itself" (Gandhi, 1965, p.106). However, Gandhi would test his faith with his reason, but he would not allow his reason to destroy his faith. What makes such technological rationalism even more destructive in Gandhi's view, is its flawed materialism. That is, the negation of the spiritual, the transcendent, or in other words, the denial of a religious world views.

For Gandhi truth was much more than could be grasped by science or reason. For him there was a reality beyond that perceived by the senses. It is this transcendent reality that gave meaning and value to our present one. Gandhi is very much in the mainstream of Hindu tradition. Indeed, most religious traditions would be similarly sensitive to such a transcendent world, even when it is not perceived as wholly other worldly. In a more secular world today we may not be sympathetic to such a worldview. And yet a materialism that is deterministic leaves no scope for human freedom and hope. Gandhi emphasizes this reaching out to a beyond, that gives this freedom and hope its dynamism and a reach beyond its grasp.

Relevance of Gandhi's Critique Today:-

Gandhi's critique of modern civilization does overlook many of its strengths, its scientific and critical spirit of inquiry, its human control over the natural world, its organizational capacity. Such achievement would imply a certain 'spiritual dimension' that Gandhi seems to have missed (Parekh, 1997, p.35). However, the focus of his criticism is modern civilization of a specific period, his condemnation of colonialism focuses on its imperialistic inspiration, his rejection of industrialism derives mostly from its capitalist context, his apprehensions about rationality regard its truncation by materialism.

However, once the real limitations of Gandhi's critique are acknowledged, then we can better contextualize and interpret his relevance for us today, whether this be with regard to politics in our neo-colonial world or technologies in our post-industrialist times, or culture in our post-modern age. These will now be some of the issues on which we must allow Gandhi to interrogate us. For "the kinds of questions Gandhi asked nearly eight decades ago are the ones which now face both the underdeveloped and post-industrial societies caught up in a deep upsurge of confusion and disillusionment" (Sethi, 1973, p.3).

Neo-colonialism:-

Gandhi's rejection of the supposedly civilizing mission of colonialism brings into question the whole legitimacy of colonial rule, at a fundamental ethical level. Thus, he opens up a host of ethical issues between the colonizer and the colonized, the dominant and the dominated, the oppressor and oppressed. The post-colonial era brought such issues into sharper focus across the world. Now with globalization leading to a unipolar world, such concerns with empowerment and disempowerment, dependency and interdependency, have gained, not lost their urgency. Moreover closer home this widening divide bears down on us more decisively than ever before. Thus, our post-colonial world can only be described as a neo-

colonial one, inter-nationally divided into developed and developing nations, as also intra-nationally between privileged and underprivileged citizens. Moreover, these divisions are mutually reinforced, not just economically and politically but culturally and socially as well.

For the colonial masters had stripped our collective identity of any intrinsic dignity by denigrating us as a cowardly and passive people. Gandhi sought to reverse this damage to our collective psyche by his "redefinition of courage and effective resistance in terms of or through non-violence (Roy, 1986, p.185).

Post-industrialism:-

With the new technologies there was much hope for a new freedom from degrading and monotonous work. However, what seems to have come into replace this degrading monotony is not a new dignity of labour but rather a compulsive consumerist society, which is but dehumanizing in newer ways. This should hardly surprise us since the ethic underlying post-industrialism is the same as that which underpinned industrial capitalism, namely the profit motive and the market mechanism. Gandhi's critique was precisely a condemnation of these. If we find his ideas of trusteeship a little naïve and impractical our environmental crises are surely a manifestation of this loss of innocence, even to the point when we want newer technologies to repair the damage already done by the older ones. Gandhi was precisely rejecting such a naïve "nineteenth century optimism which sought for the positive sciences the liberation of humanity" (Nandy, 1986, p.102).

Post Modernism:-

The excessive and aggressive rationalism of the age of reason now seems to have turned on itself with the post-modern revolt. But this has thrown up its own irrationalities. It seems to have lost the liberating project that was implicit in modernity. For the kind of

relativising and subjectivising of ethics that post-modernism has led to undermine the claims of any justice. For there can hardly be any mutually accepted legitimacy to arbitrate conflicting claims, when consensus irrevocably breaks down, so might becomes right and the power its own legitimation.

Gandhi and Post Modernism:-

Gandhi's critique of modernity was focused on modernist rationalism, but it was equally opposed to a post modern rejection of rationality. What Gandhi was pleading for is a richer concept of rationality and a Meta Theory of rationalism (Parekh, 1995, pp.165-166). He wanted to contain excessive rationality within reasonable bounds without an irrational revolt against reason itself, but he would emphatically reject any forced choice between totalizing rationalism and relativising subjectivism.

Gandhi has been severely criticized as impractical, as someone who took out an impossible overdraft on human moral resources. But this is to claim that human beings are not capable of a metanoia, a radical change of heart that can open up new perspectives, not just for individuals and groups, but for entire societies and whole cultures as well. We need organic intellectuals and transformative activists who can articulate and precipitate such a social movement. The cascading crises that our society and our world is experiencing, only underlines more emphatically the need to find new ways of redefining ourselves and understanding our problems, before we can begin to respond to the situation.

M. K. Gandhi as a Constructive Post-Modern Thinker:-

Modern is a form of thought that loves to dichotomize. It separates subjects from subject from objects, the inner from the outer, the private from the public, fact from value, individuals from their communities, and rights from responsibilities, procedural justice from the good and religion from science. Constructive Post-modernists wish

to re-establish the post-modern harmony of humans, society and the sacred without losing the integrity of the individual, the possibility of meaning, and the intrinsic value of nature. Constructive Post-modernists want to preserve the concept of world view and propose to reconstruct one that avoids and propose to reconstruct one that avoids the liabilities of both post-modernism and modernism.

One of Gandhi's most basic assumptions appears to be thoroughly modernist. This is his firm belief in the integrity of the individual; "the individual is the one supreme consideration", and "if the individual ceases to count, what is left of society"? (Harijan, 1942). The most extreme position in modern political philosophy is anarchism, and Gandhi shares its fear of the power of state: "It does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress" (Bose, 1972, p.63). For Gandhi individuals must act on their own truth regardless of the consequences and regardless of whether others think they are in error. This proviso is foundational to Gandhi's experiments with truth. This affirmation of the integrity and reality of the individual is the principal reason why Gandhi cannot relate to post-modern forms of thought such as Advaita Vedanta. If individuals are ultimately illusory or even derivatively real, the very foundations of Gandhi's engaged ethics and political activism are undermined.

One could also argue that even though he differed with other Indian nationalists, his own nationalism was modernist in its main points, especially if it is seen in connection with his anarchism and utopianism. But his views appear more communitarian and thus post-modern when, in *Hind Swaraj*. Gandhi makes a significant difference between a genuine nation formed as community (*Praja*) and a nation of individuals merely held together by state power (*rastra*). As Anthony Parel states, "*Hind Swaraj* does not propound the modern concept of nation in so far as the latter is based on the notions of brute force, the priority of national interest, and a principle of exclusiveness based

either religion, or language, or race". Even the relatively innocuous state apparatus of liberal democracy does not escape Gandhi's critical eye. Although it is theoretically designed to do so, liberal democracies do not empower individuals, rather, as Bhikhu Parekh so aptly phrases it, they abstract "power from the people, concentrate it in the state and then return it to them in their new (abstract roles) as citizen". This critique holds true only for the morally neutral procedural liberalism that is now being reformed by thinkers such as Gamwell, Macedo and Galston.

Parel's and Parekh's views of Gandhi's political philosophy allow us to get our first glimpse of a post-modern Gandhi. His views of the nation state is arguably post-modern in that it offers India as a model for a new type of polity, one which has already proved itself, with some unfortunate exceptions, to be a success in bringing sixteen different major language groups and six world religions together, not by brute force but by the rule of law and representative democracy. The centralized Indian federal government and its five year plans are of course something Gandhi would have strongly rejected. Gandhi's post-modern vision of nationhood is one based on decentralized local control, assimilation and tolerance of cultural differences, and above all, non-violence. The "decentering" the self and its national analogues is the crux of all post-modern philosophy. Gandhi's position, however, definitely does not go as far as Jacques Derrida's view, which has been described as a "radical form of democracy, one without representation, and therefore one in which even individuals' representations of them would be drawn constantly into question" (MacDonald, 1990. P.230). Gandhi's commitment to civil disobedience also appears to be modernist and is intimately related to the issue of Gandhi's professed anarchism. Gandhi called his village republicanism a form of "enlightened anarchy" in which "everyone is own ruler". (From this angle Gandhi's village does not appear communitarian at all.) He agrees with Henry David Thoreau that "Government is best that governs least", and he believed that

government is a necessary evil. Close scrutiny of Thoreau's on civil Disobedience and the Gandhian texts reveal that neither thinker is an anarchist in any of the traditional senses. Gandhi spoke fervently of his village communities as ideal states, but he was keenly aware of human fallibility and the limits of reason, especially the calculative reason of modern mass political organization.

Joan Bondurant has also taken issue with those commentators who have interpreted Gandhi's anarchism along traditional lines. Most anarchist theories are based on the idea of mutual self-interest and a rejection of all external sanctions. But Gandhi's practice of non-violence and self-suffering discourages self-interest and reintroduces constraint and coercion in a way unlike any other previous political theory. In addition to the two anarchist positions-violent overthrow of the authoritarian state or passive withdrawal from society altogether – Gandhi adds a third solution, which Bondurant believes solves the anarchist dilemma. Anarchists have always opposed the state because they believe that the only way it would assert its authority laws through violence. Gandhi's technique of Satyagraha (soul force) offers a non-violent way of restraining and persuading people to work for the common good. As Bondurant states, ---"Anarchists may claim a positive philosophy, but they, like other political theorists, have rarely sought a positive technique whereby a system could be realized" (Bondurant, 1988, pp.177-178). When Gandhi said that Indians should "Study [their] Eastern institutions in [a] spirit of scientific inquiry ... [to] evolve a truer socialism and a truer communism" this appears to be the synthesis of pre-modern and modern that we find in constructive post-modernism. His rejection of all political hierarchy is strong. "There will be ever-widening, never-ascending circles --- an oceanic circle whose centre outermost circumference will not wield power to crush the inner circle" (Gandhi, 1961, p.73). This is indubitably communitarian, but could Gandhi have realistically believed that these ever-widening circles will never ascend to national or international communities?

Gandhi's passionate belief in the unity of the world religious includes the integration of all cultures, accepting each of them on their own terms. At the same time, however, he would have insisted with equal passion that each and every person must be treated with equality and respect, and it would be difficult for anyone to believe that Gandhi would have rejected the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as an appropriate international framework.

Gandhi's principal problem with modernism is its separation of fact and value. The goal of modern life, especially in its most utilitarian forms, is simply the satisfaction of one desire after the other. In *Hind Swaraj* Gandhi equates modernism with sensual self gratification and condemns it primarily for this reason. The modern worldview not only alienates us from nature but also alienate our desires from any moral end. The teleology of the ancients, that which gave their life its ultimate meaning and purpose, has been eliminated in modernism. Ironically, the power promised by modernism has in many instances turned to importance – either in complete hedonistic dissipation or the clash land mutual cancellation of personal and national power.

Bhikhu Parekh lists five “distinctively human powers” – self determination, autonomy, self-knowledge, self-discipline and social cooperation – that Gandhi would have required for any great civilization. According to Gandhi, all five of these capacities are threatened by modern civilization, with the last three as the most weak and vulnerable. Except for the spiritual self determination land autonomy of the Yogis, which does not have a political or even a moral goal, these two characteristics have not been strong in Asian thought either.

We can now see what Gandhi meant when he said that his attack on modern civilization was not an attack on the west, because each of his basic human powers is part of the European tradition. The great irony is that Gandhi was initially inspired to recapture this lost

ground by European thinkers (Socrates, Leo Tolstoy, John Ruskin and Henry David Thoreau) and by English translations and expressions of his own Indian tradition. It is obvious that Socrates and Thoreau's "Soul Force" is strongly activist compared to the passive "Soul Force" of his Hindu tradition. Gandhi's own Vaisnava tradition is known for its dynamic spirituality but not for political confrontation, so Euro-American activism represents an important key to Gandhi's idea of Satyagraha and progressive non-violence.

Gandhi was so profoundly influenced by Socrates and Thoreau that his strong individualism appears to be a form of social atomism, which of course it can not ultimately be. Constructive post-modernism has generally sought a middle way between extremes of social atomism on the one hand and the dissolution of the self in Hegelian or Vedantist schools on the other.

Following the lead of Gandhi and constructive post-modernism's fusion of the inner and outer, non-violence would not be optional personal virtue but a required civic virtue. As future citizens, children should be taught that violence is never morally necessary and that conflicts should always be resolved peacefully. In a society not as steeped in violence as ours, the police such as British Bobbies could do most of their work unarmed, relying on SWAT teams only in extreme circumstances. The armed forces could also be established on the same principles with the use of violence only in a direct attack on the country. With regard to violence against animals, Gandhi's doctrine of vegetarianism, just as with his ideal of the ashram, will obviously not be practical. But the abolition of feedlots for cattle and fish farming would turn society in the right direction. Gandhi actually accepts this less than ideal State:- "A government cannot succeed in becoming entirely non-violent, because it represents all the people But I do believe in the possibility of a pre-dominantly non-violent society".

At the end of this chapter one is left in no doubt that Gandhi's ideas have been inexhaustible sources of inspiration to so many distinctive perspectives. However this very fact indicates a quality of Gandhi's approach to 'truths' where he does not reject any truth out of hand but extends it by enriching, extending, modifying or limiting that in a dynamic process, a quality, which we suggest, it shares with modern Republicanism, to which we will now turn in the next chapter.

GANDHI AND MODERN REPUBLICANISM

Republicanism:- Republicanism is the ideology of governing a society or state as a republic, where the head of state is a representative of the people who hold popular sovereignty rather than the people being subjects of the head of state. The head of state is typically appointed by means other than heredity, often through elections. The exact meaning of republicanism varies depending on the cultural and historical context. In general it implies the absence of monarchy, but it may indicate anything from rule by many people and by law, through oligarchy, to arbitrary rule by one person. Republicanism existed as an identifiable movement in the Roman Republic, where the founder of the Republic, Lucius-Junius Brutus, denounced the former Roman Kingdom and had the Roman people declare a solemn oath to never allow a monarchy to return again (Sellers, 1994, p.71).

Classical Republicanism:- In Ancient Greece several philosophers and historians analysed and described elements we now recognize as classical republicanism. Some scholars have translated the Greek concept of "Politeia" as republic, but most modern scholars reject this idea. There is no single written expression or definition from this era that exactly corresponds with modern understanding of the term "republic". However, most of the essential features of the modern definition are present in the work of Plato, Aristotle and Polybius. These include theories of mixed government and Civic Virtue. For example, Plato's dialogue on the ideal state, *The Republic* (although misnamed by the standards of modern political theory) places great emphasis on the importance of civic virtue (aiming for the good of the whole city) together with personal virtue ['Just man'] on the part of the ideal rulers, modeled after the character of his teacher Socrates.

Indeed in the famous passage in Book v, Plato asserts that until rulers have the nature of philosophers (Socrates) or philosophers become the rulers; there will be no civic peace or happiness number of Ancient Greek States such as Athens and Sparta been classified as "classical-republics", because they featured extensive participation by the citizens in legislation and Political decision making. Aristotle considered Carthage to have been a republic as it had a political system similar to that of some of the Greek cities, notably Sparta, but avoided some of the defects that affected them (e.g., the Spartan common meal without any state subsidy, which undermined the ostensible purpose of the practice).

Ancient Rome:- Both Livy (in Latin, living in Augustus' time) and Plutarch (in Greek, a century later), described how Rome had developed its legislation, notably the transition from a kingdom to a republic, by following the example of the Greeks. Some of this history, composed more than 500 years after the events, with scant written sources to rely on, may be fictitious reconstruction -nonetheless the influence of Greek ideas on governance is evident in the organization of the Roman Republic. The Greek historian Polybius, writing more than a century before Livy, became one of the first to describe the emergence of the Roman-Republic. Polybius exerted a great influence on Cicero as he wrote his political-Philosophical works in the 1st century BC. In one of these works, *De-re publica* Cicero linked the Roman concept of *res-publica* to the Greek "Politeia". However, the modern term "republic", despite its derivation, is not synonymous with the Roman *res-publica* among the several meanings of the term republic, it is more often translated "republic", where the Latin expression refers to the Roman state, and its form of government, between the era of the kings and the era of the Emperors. This Roman Republic would, by a modern understanding of the word still is defined as a true republic, even if not coinciding entirely. Thus, Enlightenment Philosophers saw the Roman Republic as an ideal system, because it included features like a systematic separation of

Powers. However, like most of the classical world, it also depended on Slave labour, which would taint it in modern eyes. Cicero's description of the ideal state, in *De-re-publica*, Does not equate to a modern day "republic," it is more like enlightened absolutism. His philosophical works were influential when Enlightenment philosophers such as Voltaire developed their political concepts. In its classical meaning a republic was any stable well governed Political Community Both Plato and Aristotle identified three forms of government – democracy, aristocracy and monarchy. However, mixed government was considered ideal. First Plato and Aristotle, and then Polybius and Cicero, developed the notion that the ideal republic is a mixture of these three forms of government. Cicero expressed reservations concerning the republican form of government. While in his theoretical works he defended monarchy or at least a mixed monarchy /Oligarchy, in his own Political Life, he generally opposed men, like Julius Caesar, Mark-Antony and Octavian, who were trying to realize such ideas . Eventually that opposition led to his death and Cicero can be seen as a Victim of his own republican ideals. Tacitus, a Contemporary of Plutarch, was not connected with whether a form of government could be analysed as a "republic" or a "monarchy". He analyzed how the powers accumulated by the early Julio-Claudian dynasty were all given by a state that was still nationally a republic. Nor was the Roman Republic "forced" to give away these powers, did it so freely and reasonable , certain in Augustus' Case, because of his many services to the state , freeing it from Civil wars and disorder . Tacitus was one of the first to ask whether such powers were given to the head of the State because the Citizens wanted to give them, or whether they were given for other reasons (for example, because one had a deified ancestor). The latter case led more easily to abuses of power.

Renaissance republicanism:-In Europe, republicanism was revived in the late middle Ages when a number of states, which arose from medieval Commonness, embraced a republican system of government.

These were generally small but wealthy trailing States in which the merchants class had risen to prominence. Building upon concepts of medieval feudalism, Renaissance scholars used the ideas of the ancient world to advance their view of an ideal government. Thus the republicanism developed during the Renaissance is known as "classical republicanism" because it relied on classical model. This terminology was developed by Zera Fink in the 1960's but some modern scholars, such as Brugger, Consider it confuses the "classical republic with the system of government used in the ancient world. Early "modern republicanism" has been proposed as an alternative term. It is also sometimes called Civic humanism Beyond simply a non – monarchy, early modern thinkers Conceived of an ideal republic , in which mixed government was an important element, and the notion that virtue and the common good were Central to good government Republicanism also developed its own distinct view of liberty. Renaissance authors who spoke highly of republics were rarely critical of monarchies. While Niccole Machiavelli's Discourses on Levy is the period's key work on republics; he also wrote "The Prince" on how best to run a monarchy. The early modern writers did not see the republican model as universally applicable, most thought that it could be successful only in every in very small and highly urbanized city – states. Jean Bodin in Six Books of the Commonwealth identified monarchy with republic.

Classical writers like Tacitus, and Renaissance writers like Machiavelli, tried to avoid an outspoken preference for one government system or another. Enlightenment philosophers , on the other hand , expressed a clear opinion. Thomas more, writing before the Age of Enlightenment, was too out spoken for the reigning kings taste, even though he coded his political preferences in a Utopian allegory. In England a type of republicanism evolved that was not wholly opposed to monarchy, thinkers such as Thomas more and Sir Thomas Smith Saw a monarchy, firmly constrained by Law, as Compatible with republicanism.

Machiavelli and Republicanism:-There was nothing in Machiavelli's account of the absolute monarchy corresponding to his obviously sincere enthusiasm for the liberty and self – government of the roman republic. The preservation of the states, as distinct from its founding, depends upon excellence of its law, for this is the source of all the civic virtues of its citizens. Even in a monarchy the prime condition of stable government is that it should be regulated by law. Thus Machiavelli instead upon the need for legal remedies against official abuse in order to prevent illegal violence and political out the political dangers of lawlessness in rulers and the felly of vexatious and harassing policies .in particular, the prudent ruler will abstain from the property and the women of his subjects, since these are the matters on which men are most easily stirred to resistance. He favored a gentle rule where ever possible and the use of severity only in moderation. He said explicitly that government is more stable where it is shared by the many and he preferred election to heredity as a mode of choosing rulers. He spoke for a general freedom to propose measure for the public good and for liberty of discussion, in order that both sides every question may be heard before a decision is reached. He believed that the people must be independent and strong, because there is no way to make them warlike without giving them the means of rebellion. Finally he had a high opinion both of the virtue and the judgment of an uncorrupted people as compared with those of the prince. They are unfitted to take a long view of intricate policies, but in matters that fall within their understanding , such as estimating the character of a magistrate, they are both more prudent and more sound in their Judgment than a sound in their judgments than a prince . Despite the cynicism of Machiavell's political judgments, there is no mistaking his eastern for liberal and lawful government It is this which explains the administration for him felt by constitutional like Harrington. More than any other thinker of his time he perceived that the interests of the nobility are antagonistic both to those of the monarchy and of the middle class, and that orderly government

required their suppression or extirpation. These "gentleman" who live idly on the proceeds of their wealth without giving any useful service, are "every where enemies of all civil government." "The only way to establish any kind of order there is no to found a monarchical government, for where the body of the people is so thoroughly by corrupt that the law are powerless for restraints, it becomes necessary to establish some superior power which, with a royal hand, and with full and absolute powers, may put a curled upon the excessive ambition and Corruption of the power full" (Machiavelli, 1938, p.55). Side by side with Machiavelli's dislike of the nobility stands his hatred of mercenary soldiers. Here again he had in view one of the most serious causes of lawlessness in Italy, the bands of hired ruffians who were ready to fight for who so ever would offer the largest pay, who were faithful to no one, and who were often more dangerous to their employer than to his enemies. Machiavelli had a clear perception of the advantage which France gained from nationalizing her army and consequently he was never tired a urging that the training and equipment of a citizen army is the first need of a state Machiavelli would have all able bodied citizens between the ages of seventeen and forty subject to military training. with such a force the ruler can maintain his power and extend the limits of the state, without it he becomes a prey to civil strife within and it the ambition of neighboring princes. But while the hope of peace and unity for Italy was a red motive of Machiavelli's thought, it was with him her rather a sentiment definite plan. A side from the belief that it must come under the leadership of an absolute monarchy, as he saw national unity being achieved in France and Spain, he had nothing that could be called a policy for Italian unification. He thought of it rather as a distant hope, without which the happiness and prosperity of the country could never be attained, he never really conceived government on a national scale. The government which evoked his sincerest enthusiasm was an expanding city state such as Rome, a city State Which, to be sure, should follow a far -sighted policy in attracting and

retaining the support of its allies, but which in Machiavelli's conception never rose to the height of stabilizing a nation-wide Citizenship (Sabine, 1973, Pp.325 to 328).

The most imported element of the nation state is the self sufficiency which means the state will have its own army, a strong and unified central government, unity and integrity and finally solid and independent economic foundation. A well organized central administration is another powerful element of nation state. Machiavelli gave highest priority to the integrity and unity of the State. Machiavelli's significant contribution to modern politics thoughts his concept of power politics. He seems "Politics as a battle a Constant struggle for power. All policies, in his sense are "Power Politicizes." Let us analyze the idea of power politics with the help of what he says in the Prince. In chapter xiv we find the following comment: "A Prince should therefore have no other aim or thought, nor take up any other thing for his study, but war and its organization and discipline, for that is the only art that is necessary to one who commands, and it is of such virtue that it not only maintains those who are born Prince, but often enables men of Private fortune to attain it that rank. When prince thinks more of luxury than of arms, they lose their state. The chief cause of the loss of states is the contempt of this art". Machiavelli was well-acquainted with the spectacular progress of trade, commerce, and industry and transport system of the Renaissance period. Only in republican form of governments healthy competition is to be found. Although Machiavelli speaks of the growth of wealth he does not deal with its equitable or rational distribution. Following Machiavelli we can make a brief comparison between monarchy and republics Prince is best suited for the original establishment of Political or legal institutions .But a popular government is best qualified to maintain them. Republics keep faith better than Princes through the slower working of their organ. The republic has an advantage over the monarchy. The character of the Prince will not change with the change of Conditions. In the

republican from of government people have ample opportunity to participate in the administration of the state and naturally there is no dearth of able personalities. Machiavelli's attitude towards absolute monarchy and republican from of government is considerably circumvented by actual situation of Italy and Progress of the Republican Rome. Machiavelli was not a royalist. He had a strong preference for republicanism. The arguments furnished by him in support to republican government still hold good. He has prescribed two different types of government for two issues. The main point is that he was basically a republican-minded person and he had enough practical knowledge and experience. Now the question is why he supports so strongly the republicanism? Most probably since he was greatly influenced by Renaissance, he had developed an admiration for antiquity. That finally led him to eulogise republicanism. There is another reason. He had no faith on the rule of upper class nobility. In his view, persons of this class were interested in the exercise of power and not in the peace and security of the state which common people desired. Again responsibility of government, he thought, could not be entrusted to the landless aristocracy. "The prince" is chiefly a study of kingship with unlimited power for the extension of Political domination. On the Country, "The Discourses" is the study of popular government in relation to same end. But in ultimate analysis Machiavelli may be said an advocate of republican from of government and this is manifested in the several passages of the Discourses. His appreciation of the republican government is as pronounced as that of Greek Philosopher Aristotle (Das, 2006, Pp.153-154).

Dutch Republication: Anti monarchism became more strident in the Dutch Republic during and after the Eight years war, which began in 1568. The Anti-monarchism was more propaganda than a political philosophy most of the anti monarchist appeared in the form of widely distributed pamphlets. This evolved into a systematic critique of monarchy written by men such as Johan - Uytenhage de-Mist,

Redlound Herman Scheel, Liven-de-Beaufort and the brothers Johan and Peter-de-la-Court. These writers saw all monarchies as illegitimate tyrannies that were intently corrupt. These authors were more concerned with preventing the position of stand holder for evolving into a monarchy, than with attacking their former rulers. Dutch republication also influenced on French Huguenots during the wars of religion. In the other states of early modern Europe republication was more made rate.

Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: In the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth republicanism was an influential ideology. After the establishment of the commonwealth of two nations republican supports the status quo- of having a very weak monarch, and opposed those who through a stronger monarchy was needed. These mostly the Polish – republicans such as Lukasz Gornicki, Andrzej Wolan and Stanislaw Konarski, were well read in classical and Renaissance texts and firmly believed that their state was a republic on the roman model and started to cal their state the Rzeczpospolita. Anypically, Polis-Lithuanian republicanism was not the ideology of the commercial class but rather of the landed aristocracy which would lose power if the monarchy were expanded. This resulted in an oligarchy of the great magnates.

Enlightenment Republicanism:- Oliver Cromwell set up a republic called the commonwealth of England (1649-1660) and ruled as a near dictator after the overthrow of King Charles I. James Harrington was then a leading Philosopher of republicanism. The Collapse of the commonwealth of England in 1660 and the restoration of the monarchy under Charles II discredited republicanism among England's ruling circles. However they welcomed the liberalism ad emphasis on right s of John Locke, which played a major role in the glorious Revolution of 1688. Even so, republication flourished in the "Country" party of the early 18th century, which denounced the corruption of the "Court" party, producing a political theory that

heavily influenced the American Colonists. In general the English ruling classes of the 18th Century vehemently opposed republicanism typified by the attack on John-Wilkes and especially on the American Revolution and the French Revolution. (Pocock, 1975).

French and Swiss thought:- French and Swiss Enlightenment thinkers, such as Montesquieu and later Rousseau, expanded upon and altered the ideas of what an ideal republic should be : some of their new ideas were scarcely traceable to antiquity or the Renaissance thinkers. Concepts they contributed or heaving elaborated were social contract, Positive law and mixed-government. They also barrowed from and distinguished republicanism from the ideas of liberalism that were developing of the same time.

Liberalism and Republicanism were frequently conflated during this period because they were both opposed to absolute monarchy. Both contributed to the democratic ideals of the modern world. An important distinction is that, while republicanism continued to stress the importance of civic virtue and the common good, liberalism was based on economics and individualism. It is clearest in the matter of private property which according to same, may be maintained only under protection of established positive law.

In the history of French Politics, republicanism was faced with many challenges. There were those who in actual practice promoted rule by a minority (sometimes a minority of one), including those Jacobins responsible for the Great Terror, and the emperors Napoleon I and Napoleon III, the imposition of monarchies in 1815 and 1830, the threat of dictatorship in the 1880's the Proto-Fascism of the Vichy regime in 1940-44, the threatened, coups of 1957 and 1968. But the republican system has survived in France (Berenson, 2011).

Republicanism in the United States: In recent years a debate has developed over the role of republicanism in the American Revolutions and in the British radicalism of the 18th century. For many decades the consensus was that liberalism, especially that of John Locke, was

paramount and that republicanism had a distinctly secondary role (Parrington, 1927). The new interpretations were pioneered by J.G.A Pocock who argued the Machiavellian Moment (1975) that, at least in the early 18th century, republican ideas were just as important as liberal are Pocock view is now widely accepted (Shalhope, 1982). Bernard Bailyn and Gordon Wood. Pioneered the argument that the American founding fathers were more influenced by republicanism than they were by liberalism. Cornell University Professor Isaac Kramnick on the other hand argues that Americans have always been highly individualistic and therefore Lockean (Shalhope, 1982).

In the decades before the American Revolution (1776), the intellectual and Political leaders of the Colonies studied history intently, looking for models of good government. They especially followed the development of republican ideas in England. The Whig canon and the Neo-Harringtonians, John Milton, James Harrington and Sidney, Trenchard, Gordon and Bolingbroke together with the Greek, Roman and Renaissance masters of the traditions as far as Montesquieu, formed the authoritative literature of this culture and its values and concepts were those which we have grown familiar a civic and patriot ideal in which the personality was founded in property perfected in citizenship but perpetually threatened by corruption, government figuring paradoxically as the principal source of corruption and operating through such means as patronage, faction, standing armies (opposed to the ideal of the militia), established churches and the promotion of a monied interest—though the formulation of this last concept was somewhat hindered by the keen desire for readily available paper credit common in colonies of settlement. A neo classical politics provided the ethos of the elites and the rhetoric of the upwardly mobile, an account for the singular cultural both and intellectual homogeneity of the Founding Fathers and their generation. The commitment of most American to these republican values made the American Revolution inevitable. Britain was increasingly seen as corrupt and hostile to republicanism, and as a

threat to the established liberties the American enjoyed (Bernard, 1967) in 1848 and claimed that American Republicanism played a crucial role in the development of European liberalism (Backer 2008, p 128).

Republicanism: - Republicanism, especially that of Rousseau, played a central role in the French Revolution and fore shadowed modern republicanism. The revolutionaries, after overthrowing the French monarchy in the 1790's began by setting up a republic, Napoleon converted it into an Empire with a new aristocracy. In the 1830 Belgium adopted some of the innovations of the progressive political Philosophers of the Enlightenment. Republicanism is a French version of modern republicanism. It is a form of Social-Contract, deduced from Jean-Jacques-Rousseau's idea of a General will. Ideology, each citizen is engaged in a direct relationship with the state, removing the need for identity Politics based on local, religious or racial identification. Republicanism, in theory, makes anti - discrimination law unnecessary, but some critics argue that colour-blind laws serve to perpetuate discrimination (The New York Times).

Rousseau's State or Republic: Rousseau's state is a public person. All its members are closely connected with each other and enjoy freedom of expression and right to participate in the deliberations leading to the general will. The participation in the open deliberation is a must for every subject. But everyone shall participate and cast his vote and also his vote is to be counted. It is a fundamental condition. So the state in Rousseau's concept is an instigated whole, that is a organic concept. Rousseau's main preoccupation was the preservation of freedom which the people of the state of nature enjoyed was subsequently lost as a result of the progress of civilization and science. The problem is to find a form of association which will defend and protect with the whole common force the person and goods of each associate, and it which each, while uniting himself with all, may still obey himself alone and remain as free as before - says Rousseau. This

association or state or republic or body politics is a collective moral body. The State or body politics has a will and this is general will be which everyone shall exhibit obedience. In the words of Rousseau "The body Politics is also a moral being possessed of a will and this general will, which tends always to the preservation and welfare of the whole and of every part and is the source of the laws, constituted all members of the state, in their relations to one another and to it, the rule of what is just and unjust."

Social contract establishes a state not of transitory purposes or character, but a just or right state. With the establishment of the state everything does not come to an end. People do not wash off their hands after setting up the state. They periodically assemble together to review everything of the state. Laws are the acts of the general will. The general will, is never the will of a class or a king or a magistrate. It is the will of the whole nation. Each citizen then moulds the laws of his country. Rousseau's state, it is observed has so many facts. Some call it a democratic state because the administrative of the state is run through the direct participation of all persons. Such a state is the manifestation of direct democracy. Other disagreeing with this view say that it is a totalitarian state because it makes no room for exercise of freedom on the part of the citizens. Particularly Rousseau's state rules out any difference of opinion by minority. The minority shall accept the decision of the majority and in all the absence of such it will be forced to concede to the demand of majority. Rousseau does not speak of any compromise between majority and minority. Overriding influence of majority is the negation of real democracy and harbinger of totalitarianism.

Machiavelli viewed the national state in terms of power. Bodin viewed it through the absolute, indivisible and inalienable sovereignty. Hobbes thought that the Supreme Authority of State. Coming Lock we find the wind changing its direction. The primary duty of the government is the preservation of life, liberty and property. But

Rousseau has added a new features to the national State. It is a collective moral person and its objective is moral upliftment of its subjects. Rousseau realized that the direct democracy was unsuitable for large state. So he was in favor of small body politics. Small state are also stable. Immanuel Kant was born at Konigsberg, Prussia in 1724. on concept of sovereignty and separation of powers, Kant followed Rousseau and Montesquieu. He believed that sovereignty and separation of powers, Kant followed Rousseau and Montesquieu. He believed that sovereignty in a state resides in the people as a whole and their will, which is called general will, is the source of all authority. The forms of state according to Kant are autocracy, aristocracy and democracy. Forms of government are two-republican and despotic. Any form of government that is not representative, Kant declares to be out of rational consideration. In England, a tradition of representative system developed and British people accepted this and adjust themselves with it. In fact, in England the representative form of government worked through these institutions. So they were the integral parts of the English representative system. In Germany there were no such representative institutions. So both Kant and Hegel formulated of a kind of distrust against these institutions. Barker Remarks, "Even Kant distrusts representative institutions, though he is less full of the Zeal for undivided Sovereignty than Hegel, he fears that the representatives will tend to be unduly dependent on ministers" (Sabine, 1973, p.21). To sum up, the state, law, sovereignty, institutions and everything else are, Kant thinks, manifestations of morality. Even freedom is a moral concept.

German idealism was influenced by Rousseau's general will. German Philosopher Kant tells us that while reading his "Emile" he reached the basic conclusions of his Philosophy. In fact there is no difference between Rousseau's general will and the German Philosophers' "will of the people". German Philosophers have also said that the will of the people is the will of the state. No difference they have drawn between individuals will and the will of all. Frankly

speaking, Rousseau's idealism creates the foundation of German idealism (Das, 2006, p 307).

Rise and Significance of Modern Republicanism:- During the Enlightenment, antimonarchism extended beyond the civic humanism of the Renaissance. Classical republicanism, still supported by philosophers such as Rousseau and Montesquieu, was only one of several theories seeking to limit the power of monarchies rather than directly opposing them. New forms of anti-monarchism, such as liberalism and later socialism quickly overtook classical republicanism as the leading republican ideologies. Republicanism gained support and monarchies were challenged throughout Europe.

Radicalism:- Radicalism arose in European States in the 19th century. All 19th century radicals supported a constitutional republic and universal suffrage, while European liberals were at the time in fervor of constitutional monarchy and census suffrage. Most radical parties later favored economic liberalism and capitalism. The distinction between radicalism and liberalism had not totally disappeared in the 20th century although many radicals simply joined liberal parties. For example, the radical party of the Left in France and the (originally Italian) Transnational Radical Party, which exist today, are more focused on republicanism than on simple liberalism. Liberalism, was represented in France by the orleanists who rallied to the Third Republic only in the late 19th century, after the Comte de Chambord's 1883 death and the 1891 papal encyclical *Rerum, Novarum*. But the early Republican, Radical and Radical-Socialist Party in France, and Chartism in Britain, were closer to republicanism, and the left-wing. Radicalism remained close to republicanism, in the 20th century, at least in France where they governed several times with other left-wing parties (Participating in both the Cartel- des- gauches Coalitions as well as the Popular-Front). Discredited after the second world war, French radicals split into a left-wing party the Radical Party of the Left, an associate of the

Socialist Party and the Radical Party "Valoisien", an associate party of the conservative Union for a Popular Movement (UMP) and its Gaullist predecessors. Italian radicals also maintained close links with republicanism, as well as with socialism, with the Patriot-radical founded in 1955, which became the Transnational Radical Party in 1989.

Republicanism becomes the dominant political value of Americans during and after the American Reevaluation. The "Founding -Fathers" were strong advocates of republican values, especially Thomas-Jefferson, Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, Thomas Paine, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton. In some countries of the British Empire, later the Commonwealth Nations republicanism took a variety of forms. In Barbados the government gave the promise of a referendum on becoming a republic in August 2008, but it was postponed due to the change of government in the 2008 election. In Jamaica, Prime Minister Portia- Simpson- Miller announced during her inaugural address, that Jamaica would begin the process of becoming a republic. In South Africa, republicanism in the 1960s was identified with the supporters of apartheid, in the treatment of the country's black population. In Australia, the debate between republicans and monarchists is still active and Julia Gillard the Former Australian prime Minister, has expressed her wish for Australia to begin the transition Phase to a republic on the death of Elizabeth II (B.B.C.). In Sweden, a major promoter of republicanism is the Swedish Republican Association, which advocates the abolition of the monarchy of Sweden. There is a renewed interest in republicanism in Spain after two earlier attempts: The first Spanish Republic (1873-1874) and the second Spanish Republic (1931-1939) movements such as Ciudadanos -Por-la-Republica (es), citizens for the Republic in Spanish, have emerged, and parties like United Left (Spain) and the Republican Left of Catalonia increasingly refer to republicanism. In a survey conducted in 2007 reported that 69% of the population prefer

the monarchy to continue, compared with 2% opting for a Republic. In a 2008 survey, 57.91% of Spanish citizens were indifferent, 16.2% favored a Republic, 15.7% were monarchists, and 7% claimed to be Juancarlistas (Supports of Continued monarchy under king Juan Carlos I, without a common position for the fate of the monarchy after his death).

Neo-republicanism:-Prominent theorists in this movement are Philip Pettit and Cass-Sunstein, who have each written several works defining republicanism and how it differs from liberalism. Micael Sandel is a late convert to republicanism from Communitarianism. He advocates replacing or supplementing liberalism with republicanism, as outlined in his *Democracy's Discontent*, *America in search of a Public Philosophy*. However, these theorists have had little impact on government. John W. Maynor, argues that Bill Clinton was interested in these notions and that he integrated some of them into his 1995 "new social Compact" State of the Union Address. This revival also has its critics. David Wotton, For instance, argue that throughout history the meanings of the term republicanism have been so diverse, and at times contradictory, that the term is all but meaningless and any attempt to build a cogent ideology based on it will fail. In the late 20th century there was convergence of democracy and republicanism. Republicanism is a system that replaces or accompanies inherited rule. There is an emphasis on liberty, and a rejection of corruption. It strongly influenced American Revolution and the French Revolution in the 1770 s and 1790s respectively. Republicans, in these two examples, tended to reject inherited elites and aristocracies, but two questions were left open: whether a republic, in order to restrain unchecked majority rule, should have an unelected upper chamber, with members perhaps being appointed meritorious experts, and whether it should have a constitutional monarch (Wood, 1969).

Although conceptually separate from democracy, republicanism includes the key principles of rule by the consent of the governed and

sovereignty of the people. In effect republicanism held that kings and aristocracies were not the real rulers, but rather the whole people were. Exactly how the people were to was an issue of Democracy-republicanism itself did not specify how (Palmar, 1959). In the United States, the solution was the creation of political parties that reflected the votes of the people, and which controlled the government. Many exponents of republicanism, such as Benjamin French, Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson were strong promoters of representative democracy. However other supporters of republicanism, such as John Adams and Alexander Hamilton, were more distrustful of majority rule and sought a government with more power for elites. There were similar debates in many other democratizing nations (Shalhope, 1982, Pp.334-356).

In contemporary usage, the term democracy refers to a government chosen by the people, whether it is direct or representative. Today the term republic usually refers to a representative democracy with an elected head of state, such as a President, who serves for a limited term, in Contrast to states with a here Monarch as a head of state, even if these states also are representative democracies, with an elected or appointed head of government such as a Prime Minister .The founding fathers of the United states rarely praised and often cruised democracy, which in their time tended to specifically mean direct democracy, James Madison argued that what distinguished a democracy from a republic was that the former became weaker as it got larger and suffered more violently from the effects of faction where as a republic could get stronger as it god larger and combats faction by its very structure. What as critical to American values, John Adams Insisted was that the government should be "bound by fixed laws, which the people have a voice in making, and a right to defend. Some countries (such as the United Kingdom, the Netherlands Belgium, Luxembourg, The Scandinavian Countries and Japan) turned powerful monarchs into Constitutional ones with limited, or eventually merely symbolic,

powers. Often the monarchy was abolished along with aristocratic system, whether or not they were replaced with democratic institutions (such as in the U.S. France, china, Iran, Russia, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Greece, Turkey and Egypt). In Australia, New-Zeland, Canada, Papua New-Guinea, and some other countries the monarch, or its representative, is given supreme executive power, but by convention acts only on the advice of his or her ministers. Many nations had elite upper homes of legislatures, the members of which often had lifetime nature, but eventually these houses lost power (as the UK house or Lords). Or else became elective and remained powerful as the US senate. (Mckenna, 1996).

Democratic participation may be the essential to the republic, but that is because it is necessary for promoting and enjoyment of freedom as non - domination, not because of its independent attractions, not because freedom, as a positive conception would suggest, is nothing more or less then the night of democratic participation. This point is important to stress because the term 'republican' has come to be associated in many circles, probably under the influence of Hannah Arendt (Arendt,1958,1973), with a communitarian and populist approach. Such an approach represents the people in their collective presence as master and the state as servant, and suggests that the people ought to rely on state representative and officials only where absolutely necessary, direct democracy, whether by assembly or plebiscite, is the systematically preferred option. The commonwealth or republican position, by contrast. The people as trust or both individually and collectively, and the state as trustee in particular, the people as trusting the state to ensure a dispensation of non-arbitrary rule. For this position direct democracy may often be a very lead thing, since it may ensure the ultimate form of arbitrariness, the tyranny of a majority. Democratic instruments of control will certainly be desirable and indispensable, but they are not the be-all and end-all of good government.

The broad republican tradition that has become the focus of interest for a recent school of historical scholarship (Fink 1962; Raab 1965; Baron 1966; Pocock 1975; Skinner 1978; Pagden 1987; Oldfield 1990; Bock et al 1990; Fontana 1994). This tradition had its origins in classical Rome, being associated in particular with the name of Cicero. It was resurrected in the Renaissance, featuring powerfully in the constitutional thinking of Machiavelli, and it played an important role in the self-conception of the northern Italian republics the first modern European Politics. It provided a language which dominated the politics of the modern west and had a particular salience in the Dutch Republic, during the English civil war, and in the period leading up to the American and French Revolution.

The big names of this more modern republican tradition include Harrington, Montesquieu, and perhaps De-Tocqueville; they also include Rousseau, of course, though they should only do so. The tradition often received its most trenchant applications, however, not in the works of well known writers, but in texts like *Cato's Letters* (Trenchard and Gordon, 1771) and the federalist papers. The first of these texts was associated with the so-called commonwealth man tradition that survived in England from the period of the English Revolution through until the late eighteenth century (Robbins 1959, Fink 1962, Raab 1965). The second of the two texts, and, of course, the one better known, was an outstanding formulation of the associated Transatlantic ideology, the ideology that lay behind the American Revolution (Bailyn, 1967).

The Republican tradition was unified across time, partly by a deference to the same textual authorities, partly by a shared enthusiasm for the ideals and the lessons of Republican Rome, partly by an emphasis on the importance of having certain institutions in place, for example an empire of law as it was often put, not an empire of men, a mixed constitution in which different powers serve to check and balance each other and a regime of civic virtue, under

which people are disposed to serve and serve honestly in public office. The most important unifier of the tradition, in the end, may be the habit of conceptualizing liberty in a distinctive fashion. Anti monarchism was often a feature of the republican traditions particularly during the English civil war and again after the American and French Revolutions. But republicans were anti-monarchists only so far as they considered that a monarch would inevitably seek absolute power and would offend against the sort of liberty they prized. Thus they were happy with the constitutional monarchy and they found in eighteenth century England "a Nation" in Montesquieu, (1989:70). Unmistakable reference: where the republic hides under the form of monarchy (Rahe, 1992). Republican themes found a particularly friendly climate when they began to appear in England in the Seventeenth Century. As the courts and the common law had developed from the middle ages in England (Berman, 1983) they had assumed a decentralized, no voluntaristic form and had given rise to firm assumptions about people's rights under the law – people's ancient rights as they were often described – even their rights against the powerful they had provided people with a sense that they lived under a constitution, and empire of law of ancient and unquestioned standing (Blackstone 1978, Pocock 1987, Blom 1995) This legal background may have been as important in the development of the eighteenth century Commonwealth man tradition as the independent republican ideas for which it provided such a nurturing climate. It meant that the newer republicanism always had a juridical cast in which a central place was given to the nation of rights – customary, legal and constitutional rights – as bulwarks against absolute power (Pettit, 1997, Pp.8, 19-21).

Modern Republicanism

Modern Republicanism, while inspired from the traditional republicanism is hardly similar to the moral language, social structure or institutional set up of traditional republican pre-modern regimes

like, the northern Italian cities of the renaissance. As (Pettit, 1997, p. 129) clarifies "my interest in the republican concept of liberty comes of the hope that it can persuasively articulate what form it ought to assume in the modern world. To elements in relation to traditional republicanism are central to this changed modern world, the emergence of nation state with subsequent exempted international or multinational networks, and emergence of democratic institutions with large constituencies and indirect representations. Not that these two elements are the chief characteristics of modern political experience reducing the others in importance like a changed mode of production, and instance technological moments or individuality as such. These are central in relation to two core features of traditional republicanism namely; small sized political community and direct democracy which are no longer familiar institutions of modern democracies. With this changed perspective modern republicanism represents a reflective engagement with our existing institutions and contemporary ideological concerns. It interrogates both the structure of state and the policies in place or being proposed with the core republican commitment to freedom as non-domination. To quote Pettit further (Pettit, 1997, p.131). "Politics has conversational deliberative aspects, and that the role of political philosophy is to interrogate the languages in which such conversation is carried forward and, if necessary, invent or reinvent terms and idioms that may aid clarification and facilitate convergence" (Pettit, 1997).

In the light of the above modern republicanism can best be understood as a critical perspective both in theory and practice as we may take note of some instance of these critical engagement it will be clearer that modern republicanism does neither accept nor reject any theoretical or philosophical position into to, while it deploys a characteristic language where autonomy in the sense of non-domination is posited both as an ideal or a point of reference for discerning limitations of the so-called non-republican discourses. The first instance of this may be the way modern republicanism looks at

the classical liberalism. While pointing out that classical liberal philosophy makes freedom as non-interference the be all and end all of all political good. Modern republicanism locates that concept in the rise of profit seeking entrepreneur's professional in the early days of industrial capitalism who wanted non-interference as a pre-condition of competitive success. Its sub plants this negative freedom with the idea of non-domination as transanding this original community, as an idiom that considers enslavement and subjection as great ills in a way that seeks to give validity to the ideal of non-domination across the full spectrum of contemporary democratic societies. Pettit makes it intention clear when he says that republicanism can give a hearing and a voice to different grievances and causes, such as environmentalism, feminism, socialism, and multi-culturalism.

The way in which modern republican argument is directed towards environmentalism highlights one important distinctive aspect of republican argument. Allowing a division between Radical environmentalism with its commitment to non-human world and less Radical form of environmental approach that calls for restructuring of state for sustainable development. Modern republicanism considers the first one as a particular perspective rooted in the sensibility of a particular group and therefore as a sectarian movement. It objects to the absence of recognition of plurality of sensibilities in such a sectarian perspective. The primary condition of engagement for the modern republicans is a pragmatic approach or recognition of the fact that there are reasonable differences of opinion which political argument must try to rich across. This flexible, accommodative or pragmatic approach highlights the strength or characteristic feature of modern republicanism. The same could also be found in the republican engagement with feminism. Modern Republican proposed that a ideal of non-domination sticks a chord with the feminist concern with arbitrary interference or domination. It accepts the feminist critic of gender and seeks to project no domination as untied to a masculinious picture of social and political life. In the same way

modern Republicans hope that the ideal of non-domination would appeal to the socialist. While there is a similarity between the socialist and the republican critique of freedom as non-interference the socialist may be further attracted to the support for collective action such as worker strike that they may get from the republican ideal of non-domination. It can be seen that modern republicanism has come a long way from pre-modern beneficiaries of freedom, such as, well resources men's or employers monopolies, but the same flexibility can also be seen with regard to communitarianism and multi-culturalism. Republican ideal of non-domination seeks to accommodate the multi-culturalist stand point by criticizing the domination by one main stream culture. It is clear by now that the modern republican engagement with diverse ideological or theoretical views, reveals a pluralist as well as dynamic character of the republican ideal. As it sees domination it is contextual or varied while closely like with an exercise of arbitrary power. It is also open to possibilities of discursive re-construal as people discover new sensibilities of domination and options for autonomy. This dynamism makes modern republicanism quite relativistic, non-systematic as well as electric. It is never complete and it refuses to offer any rudiment institutional set up and it is this aspect that reminds of the Gandhian alternative of Swaraj.

One cannot miss a very strong similarity between modern republicanism and Gandhi's approach to different ideologies, like the republican care commitment to the ideal of non-domination we have in Gandhi a continuous reference to "Swaraj", his alternative to everything that he saw around or confronted. Like modern republicanism Gandhi lay stress on pragmatism and wanted to explain the acceptability of this point of view to the others, not rejecting as a whole any argument but not accepting as well the argument as a whole. One of the best illustrations of this kind of similarity would be the exchanges between Gandhi and General Smut in South Africa (Gandhi, 1928).

Gandhi had been encouraged by what he saw as a change in attitude of the South African Government during the negotiation in 1914. He understood that the settlement with general smuts implied that no racial distinction would be made in any legislation affecting the Indian community. With the protection of vested rights, and the promise of generosity in administering existing laws, he hoped for a steady improvement of the position of the resident Indians, especially since the Europeans had no more reason to fear of unrestricted Indian immigration. The Smuts- Gandhi Agreement had dealt only with certain specific issues which hurt the self-respect of the Indian Community and formed the points of the Satyagraha. There remained numerous other discriminatory measures and grievances. Gandhi had made it clear in his letter of June 30, 1914, which forms part of the agreement that Indians "could not be expected so rest content until full civil rights had been restored". But he believed that the objective could now be achieved by a process of education of European opinion and the intercession of Indian and British Governments which had participate in the negotiations of 1914. Gandhiji hopes for an amelioration of the situation of Indians in short lived. An anti-Asiatic agitation began within a few years after he left South Africa, and he received frequent appeals from the Indian community for help. He tried to do his best, despite his immense pre-occupations in India, to publicize the situation and persuade the Indian Government to act (Gandhi, 1928).

He felt rather powerless and despondent after 1920 as he lost faith in the British imperial professions and became a non-co-operator. As he wrote in Young India of March 20, 1924, he developed "utter destruct of the British Imperial system". "---- I am able to no longer to rely upon verbal or written promises made by persons working under that system and in their capacity as officials or supporters. The history of Indian emigrants to South Africa, East Africa and Fiji is a history of broken promises and of ignominious surrender of their and trust by the Imperial Government and the

Indian Government, whenever it has been a question of conflicting interests of Europeans against Indians" (Young India, 1924).

Gandhi and Ramchandra Guha (Guha, 2013) had observed was the first political protester against apartheid. But as one looks at Gandhi's argument one finds that Gandhi was more concerned with removing the negative image of the Asian in the eyes of the European Colonizers the whole system of apartheid Gandhi did not reject gradations as such as did not consider the separation between 'civilized' and 'cafris', rather he wanted to prove that Indian had some commitment to nation and human sensibilities equal to those of the Europeans by taking up such activities as raising an ambulance corps. The story is interesting. According to Gandhi, "White would treat us all as 'coolis', insult us and look down upon us. The leaders among us received training in nursing the wounded and the sick, obtained medical certificates of physical fitness and sent a formal letter to the government. This letter and the eagerness we evinced to serve in whatever capacity the government would accept us created a very good impression. The government thanked us in reply but rejected our offer for the time. Meanwhile the Boers continued to advance like a great flood, and it was feared that they might reach Durban. There were heaps of wounded and dead everywhere. We were continually renewing our offer, and sanction was given at last for the formation of an Indian Ambulance corps. We had expressed our willingness even to do 'Sweepers' or scavengers' work in hospital. No wonder, therefore, that the idea of an Ambulance corps was perfectly welcome to us. Our offer had been made, in the first instance in respect of free and ex-indentured Indians, but we had suggested the desirability of permitting the indentured Indians too to join the rest. As government was then in need of as many men as they could get, they approached the employers and indentured labourers to allow their men to volunteer. Thus large and splendid corps composed of nearly eleven hundred Indians left Durban for the front. This contribution of the Indians in South Africa to the war was

comparatively insignificant. They suffered hardly any loss of life. Yet even a sincere desire to be of help is bound to impress the other party, and is doubly appreciated when it is quite unexpected (Gandhi, 1928, pp. 52-54). All this was a complete revelation to the English newspapers. No one expected that the Indians would take any part in the war. An Englishman wrote in a leading newspaper a poem eulogistic of the Indians with the following line as a refrain: "We are sons of the Empire after all".

Gandhi like the modern republicans put forward the concept Satyagraha as an weapon of both individual and collective protest, even when such collective protest would be voiced against economic exploitation and socio-economic inequality. Gandhi would appear to be acceptable to such equalitarian ideologies as socialism and feminism. Gandhi's notion of the Sarvodaya combined with his notion of Satyagraha creates a common ground with socialists who build on these ideas to formulate a line of Indian socialist like Rammonohar Lohia or J. P. Narayan. Much of the modern republican criticism against industrial capitalism could be found in Gandhi's appreciation of Ruskin's work unto the last.

Gandhi's rejection of industrial capitalism is based on a profound repugnance to a system where profit is allowed to degrade labour, where the machines are valued more than humans, where automation is preferred to humanism. According to Gandhi, "Machinery is the chief symbol of modern civilization; it represents a great sin" (Gandhi, 1938, p.63). However, by 1919 his views on machinery do begin to change right up to 1947, as he gradually comes to concede some positive aspects like time and labour saving, even as he warns against the negative ones of concentrating wealth and displacing workers (Parel, 1997, pp. 164-70). He was acutely sensitive to how machinery can dehumanize and technology alienate.

The very approach of critical acceptance and rejection of any point of views characteristics of Gandhi as well as modern

republicanism could be clear from his discussion on the popular Hindu tradition and the western civilization. Neither of them he accepted in full nor did he reject any one as a whole. He criticized the practices what could be called popular Hinduism never rejected the Hindu system of Varnashram. He of course tried to remove untouchability but that he wanted to do by elevating "The Harijans" at best to the rank of the Sudras. May be he was pragmatic enough not to impose his views on the others who would go by the Varnashram system at any rate. He wanted to wreck it from within by encouraging for example inters caste marriage. (Parekh, 1989).

One of the most striking features of Bhikhu Parekh's books (Parekh, 1989) and ideologies in opposition to Gandhi. In many cases the author's bias in favour of Gandhi leads him to make exaggerated claims of dubious historicity to demonstrate Gandhi's superiority and success; this is particularly true in his discussion on the caste question. Thus, for instance, he claims that a day before Gandhi started his epic fast against separate representation for the depressed classes in the Communal Award, 'thousands of prominent Hindu women accepted food from the hands of untouchables and that 'scenes' of inter-caste public dining were repeated in almost every village and every city of India (Parekh, 1989, p. 236). Parekh's account gives great importance to these symbolic gestures of caste togetherness. His claim that commensality was practiced in almost every village of India surely lacks historical validity. One may question whether such gestures were of much consequence, when at the same time Gandhi upheld the system of Varnashramadharma, or, indeed, whether the caste question can ever be solved within the cultural and class paradigms of the Varnashramadharma philosophy.

The ambiguities of Gandhi's position on the caste question quite understandably caused untouchable leaders to be suspicious of his intentions most noteworthy among these was B. R. Ambedkar. Almost in anticipation of Parekh's declaration that Gandhi was a

Yugpurusha, Ambedkar's books, "what Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables" (Ambedkar, 1946) ends with the question "...the untouchables ... have ground to say Good God! Is this man Gandhi our saviour?" Not surprisingly, Parekh judges Ambedkar's account as "biased and uneven" (Parekh, 1989, p. 207). Ambedkar found it difficult to accept as the deliverer of the untouchables the same Gandhi who held that the caste system was a worthy institution because the law of Varna prescribe that a person should, for his living, follow the lawful occupation of his forefather (Young India, 1927) and who declared in the same vein that 'one born a scavenger, must earn his livelihood by being a scavenger (Harijan, 1937). If Gandhi's Harijan Andolan was essentially a strategy against the British attempt to divide Hindus, Ambedkar's was undoubtedly sincere in his fight to restore dignity to his fellow untouchables. Parekh's assertion that no one before Gandhi mounted a frontal attack against untouchability is itself blazed and uneven in its outright dismissal of the role played by scheduled caste leaders like Ambedkar in seeking their own liberation.

Parekh's assertion that Gandhi was the first to fight untouchability is curious, for he appears to be aware of the contradictions in Gandhi's position on the subject. For instance, Parekh is no stronger to the fact that Gandhi and Congress failed to give Ranga Iyer's Untouchability Bill their unconditional support on the flimsy pretext that he had not taken the Congress into confidence (Parekh, 1989, p. 239). Parekh's acknowledges that Gandhi and the Congress adopted this posture out of the exigencies of electoral politics, from the fear of losing the votes of caste Hindus (Parekh, 1989, p. 239). Parekh ascribes to Patel the statement that if the Communal Award were to stand, 'untouchable hooligans will make common cause with Muslim hooligans and kill caste Hindus' (Parekh, 1989, p. 279), when in fact, these were Gandhi's own words. Gandhi's position on the caste question no doubt was politically expedient, his statements arguing that 'a scavenger has the same status as a

Brahmin' can be understood as sound politics in the particular historical context in which Gandhi was placed, his euphemistic populism reflected the prevailing structure of social domination.

Gandhi was aware of the strong points of western civilizations. His rejection of western civilization was quite pointed and specific (Parekh, 1989). Mahatma Gandhi described, "On reflection, we cannot help feeling that western civilization is as cruel as, perhaps crueler than, terrible expression on the face of the man in the cartoon. The sight which fills one with the utmost indignation is that of the cross in the midst of weapons dripping with blood. Here the hypocrisy of the new civilization reaches its climax. In former times, too, there used to be bloody wars, but they were free from the hypocrisy of modern civilization (Indian opinion, 1910). Mahatma Gandhi described, "Self-interest will make them fight among themselves, and too even today they are fighting. That is a characteristic aspect of western civilization. If we imitate the western people, we may succeed for a time in mixing with them but subsequently we would also be blinded by selfishness and fight with them and fight among ourselves too" (Indian Opinion, 1910). "This glamorous show is the product of western civilization. We can deem ourselves successful if we are not led away by it. I do not mean to say that Chhaganlal has succumbed to the temptation. He is, however, greatly affected by it and anyone would be so affected at first sight" (Gandhi's 1910-12, p. 111). Mahatma Gandhi described, "On my return to South Africa from England (1908), I published my views in the columns of Indian opinion and later brought them out in book form under the title Hind Swaraj. Gandhi described, "Machinery is the chief symbol of modern civilization, it represents a great sin" (Gandhi, 1938, p. 63). He was acutely sensitive to how machinery can dehumanize and technology (Gandhi, 1938, pp. 41 to 43).

Gandhi advised "to reject western civilization, that it is our dharma to do so. By western civilization I mean the ideals which people in the west have embraced in modern times and the pursuits

based on these ideals. The supremacy of brute force, worshipping money as God, spending most of one's time in seeking worldly happiness, breath-taking risk in pursuit of worldly enjoyments of all kinds, the expenditure of limitless mental energy of efforts to multiply the power of machinery, the expenditure of crores on the invention of means of destruction, the moral righteousness which looks down upon people outside Europe, this civilization, in my view, deserves to be altogether rejected" (Navajivan, 1920). Mahatma Gandhi described, "South Africa is a representative of western civilization while India is the centre of oriental culture. Thinkers of the present generation hold that these two civilizations cannot go together. If nations representing these rival cultures meet even in small groups, the result will only be an explosion. The west is opposed to simplicity, while oriental consider that virtue to be of primary importance. How can these opposite views be reconciled? It is not the business of statesman, practical men as they are, to adjudicate upon their relative merits. Western civilization may or may not be good, but westerners wish to stick to it. They have made tireless endeavors to save that civilization". (Gandhi, 1926, p.77). Mahatma Gandhi described, "Western civilization is material, frankly material. It measures progress by the progress of matter railway, conquest of disease, conquest of the air. These are the triumphs of civilization according to western measure. No of says, 'Now the people are more truthful or more humble'. I judge it by my own test and I use the word "Satanic" in describing it. You set such store by the temporal, external things. The essential of Eastern civilization is that it is spiritual immaterial. The fruits of western civilization the East may approach with avidity but with a sense of guilt" (Gandhi, 1932, p. 233).

We had observed that modern republicanism perforce to have a dynamic character, always open and developing, something which Gandhi expressed in his inimitable works. This can best illustrated by Gandhi's gradually mellowed down criticism of technology, as revealed through his interview with Fischer.

Gandhi and Modern Republicanism: Harmonizing Dialogue

We have seen that Modern Republicanism does not reject anything as such but wants to supplement it with its own point of view. The same was true of Gandhi. Fisher made this clear in connection with his observation on Gandhi's closeness to millionaire industrialist, Birla:

Gandhi's friendship gave Birla prestige and satisfaction and perhaps even business advantages, for he learned many political secrets from the Mahatma. But had the occasion demanded, Gandhi might have led a strike of Birla's mill workers, as he did in the case of his friend and financial backer, Ambalal Sarabhai of Ahmedabad. Gandhi was tolerant of capitalists even when he opposed capitalist exploitation; he was equally tolerant of Englishmen after he turned against the British Empire. He would undoubtedly have stayed in Churchill's house. He was too sure of his purity and purpose to think he could be contaminated. To Gandhi nobody was an untouchable, neither Birla, nor a Communist, nor a Harijan, nor an imperialist. He fanned the spark of virtue wherever he discovered it. He allowed for the diversity of human nature and the multiplicity of man's motives (Fischer, 1951).

A starting point for drawing on the similarities between modern republicanism and Gandhi may be to look into the motivational departure from standard notions of freedom. Such as the liberal notion of freedom as non-interference and Marxist notion of freedom as recognition of necessity an insightful debate in this context was one between Amartya Sen and Philip Pettit both of who engaged critically with the liberal notion of freedom as non-interference. For same non-interference would not protect basic entitlements and hence capabilities such as education, food security and increasing purchasing power are necessary to give meaning to freedom in a functioning democracy. In his various writings Sen has argued that development should be viewed as a process of expanding the "real

freedom” of people. Real freedom for Sen consists in the persons, “capability to achieve, valuable human functioning” (Sen, 1992; 1999) Pettit while appreciating these enlargement of the scope of freedom criticizes it for not making freedom to be “context independently effective” (Petitt, 2001). Petitt explained that even when one has the option of choosing A or B one can not be say to have decisive preference unless that question is asked whether that decisiveness is favour independent or favour dependent. According to Petitt freedom in order to satisfy “Robustness” condition there has to be institutional checks or anti-power placed against the ‘arbitrary’ use of power. The debate is interesting. For an illiterate villager who can not provide education to once children because there is no school, there would be enlargement of real freedom if the government or a philanthropic donor establishes a school there. Sen would approve of it as enhancing capabilities. But Petitt would point to the neighbouring village where there is no school either and nobody came to set up one and question the arbitrariness in selecting the first village as capability enhancing locally. At the end both seem to have succeeded in showing the limits of freedom as non-interference and both seen to agree that both context independence and capabilities is necessary dimension of freedom.

One cannot miss the same approach in Gandhi in so far as he accepted the major liberal, communitarian, conservative, socialist perspectives in so far as they were consistence with his understanding of Swaraj. Starting with the basic argument that political independence is not Swaraj he seen to have accepted gradually both the principles of modern state craft and technological practices as enhancement of “real freedom” of the individual. We have seen that modern republicanism has been engaging with Communitarianism, Feminism etc. in similar manner. The question is not what others have fund valuable in Gandhi but how Gandhi tried to accommodate others point of view while remaining true to his basic commitment to the marginal man that talisman that he offered was indicative or the

openness with Gandhi displayed to any ideology which he formally does not accept but would be willing to accept only on one condition, if only it would be beneficial to the marginal man.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A.I.SA.

A.I.V.IA.

Hindustani Talimi Sangh

Harijan Sevak Sangh

Goseva Sangh

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

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

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

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES:

Books

- Gandhi M. K., Constructive Programme: Its Meaning and Place, Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1941.
- Gandhi, M. K., An Autobiography or the Story of My Experiments with Truth, Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1927.
- Gandhi, M. K., Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule, Rev. ed. Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1939.
- Gandhi, M. K., Satyagraha in South Africa, Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1938.
- Gandhi, M. K., Satyagraha Ashram Ka Itihas (In Hindi), Translated from the Original in Gujarati by Ramnarayan Chaudhuri, Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1948.
- Gandhi, M. K., Collected Works OF MAHATMA GANDHI, THE PUBLICATIONS DIVISION MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, 100 Vols. Delhi, 1958-1994.
- Gandhi, M. K., Delhi Diary, Prayer speeches from 10.9.47 to 30.1.48, Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1948.
- Gandhi, M. K., From Yeravda Mandir: Ashram Observances, Translated from the original Gujarati by Valji Govindji Desai, 3rd ed. Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1945.
- Gandhi, M. K., Gandhi's Health Guide, California, The Crossian Press, 2000.
- Gandhi, M. K., India's Case for Swaraj: Being Select Speeches, Writings, Interviews etc. of Mahatma Gandhi in England and India, September, 1931 to January 1932, 2nd ed., edited by Waman P. Kabodi, Bombay, Yeshanand, 1932.

Gandhi, M. K., Key to Health, Translated by Sushila Nayyar, Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1948.

Gandhi, M. K., Mahatma Gandhi the essential writings Oxford World's Classics, J.; M. Brown, Oxford University Press, 2008.

Gandhi, M. K., Non-violence in Peace and war, Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1942.

Gandhi, M. K., Teaching of Mahatma Gandhi, Edited by Jag Parvesh Chander, Lahore, The Indian Printing Works, 1945.

Radhakrishnan S. OCCASIONAL SPEECHES AND WRITINGS, THE PUBLICATIONS DIVISION MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, New Delhi, 1956.

Tendulkar, D. G. Mahatma, Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, THE PUBLICATIONS DIVISION MISISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING GOVERNMENT OF INIDA, Vols., 1-8, New Delhi, 1990-91.

Articles:

Gandhi, M. K., "Statement on Caste Restrictions", Indian Social Reformer, November 12, 1932.

The Struggle with Congress, The Round Table, XXII, March 1932.

The Unrest on the Indian Frontier, The Round Table XXI, March 1931.

Document:

Gandhi – Jinnah Talks: Text of Correspondence and other Relevant Matters, July – October, 1944, New Delhi, Hindustan Times, 1944.

Nehru, Jawaharlal, A Bunch of Old Letters, London, 1958.

Newspapers:

Harijan (Ahmedabad), 1932-1951.

Young India (Ahmedabad), 1919-1932.

SECONDY SOURCES:

Books

- Ackerman, B., Social Justice in the Liberal State, New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press, 1980.
- Adam, Ian, Ideology and Politics in Britain Today, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Agarwal, M. G. Lion, Freedom Fighters of India, Vol. 1, to Vol.3, ISHA Books, New Delhi, 2008.
- Agarwal, M. G. Lion, Freedom Fighters of India, Vol. 4, New Delhi, ISHH Books, 2008.
- Agarwal, S. N. The Gandhian Plan of Economic Development for India, Bombay: Padma, 1944.
- Agarwal, Shriman Narayan, Gandhian Constitution for Free India, Allahabad, Kitabistan, 1946.
- Agawral, Khanna Suman, India's 50 years of Independence, 1947 to 1997, Status, Growth and Development, Delhi, B. R. Pub., 1999.
- Alexander, Horace, Gandhi through Western Eyes, Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1969.
- Ali, Sadiq, Political and Economic Decentralization in India, In Gandhi and Contemporary World, Eds. A Copley and G. Paxton, 1950.
- Alterman, Eric, Why Weire liberals, New York: Viking Adult, 2008.
- Ameer Ali, Syed, the Spirit of Islam or the Life and Teachings of Mahammed, Culcutta: Lahiri, 1902.
- Ambedkar, B.R., "What Congress and Gandhi Have Done to the Untouchables", Thacker, New Delhi, 1946.
- Anderson, Margaret, L. With Taylor, Howard Francis, Sociology: Understanding a Diverse Society, Cengage Learning, 4th edition, 2005.

- Anderson, P., *Consideration On Western Marxism*, London, New Left Books, 1976.
- Andrews, F. Charles, *Mahatma Gandhi Ideas*, New York: Macmillan, 1930.
- Anjaria, UJ. J., *An Essay on Gandhian Economics* Vora and Co., Bombay, 1944
- Appadorai, A., *Documents on Political Thought in Modern India*, Vol. I, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1981.
- Arblaster, A., *the Rise and Decline of Western Liberaoism*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1984.
- Arendt, H., *Totalitarianism* (1951), New York, Harcourt, Brace and World 1968.
- Arneil, Barbara, *Politics and Feminism*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1999.
- Arnold, N. Scott, *Imposing values: an essay on liberalism and regulation*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Ashe, Geoffrey, *Gandhi: A Study in Revolution*, Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1968.
- Ashu, Pasricha, *Gandhian Approach to Integrated Rural Development*, Shipra, Delhi, 2000.
- Atri, Ajit, *Gandhi's View of Legal Justice*, New Delhi, Deep and Deep Publications, PVT., LTD, 2007.
- Attenborough, Richard, *In Search of Gandhi*, New Delhi, B.I. Publication, 1982.
- Auerbach, M. Morton, *the Conservative Illusion*, Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Bailyn, Bernard, *the Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Bajaj, Karishma, *Precious Gems of Wisdom*, Mumbai, Magma Pub, 2007.

- Bakshi, S. R., Gandhi and Congress, New Delhi, Sarup and Sons, 1996.
- Bakshi, S. R., Gandhi and Indians in South Africa, New Delhi, Antique Pub., 1998.
- Bandyopadhyaya, J., Social and Political Thought of Gandhi, New Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1963.
- Bandyopadhyaya, Jayantanuja, Mao Tse Tung and Gandhi, Perspectives on Social Transformation, Bombay, Allied Publishers Private Limited, 1973.
- Bari, S. R., Gandhi's Doctrine of Civil Resistance, New Delhi, Kalamkar Prakashan Pvt. Limited, 1971.
- Barma, V., P., The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi and Sarvodaya, Lakshmi Narayan Agarwal, Agra, 1965.
- Barry, Brian, Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism, Oxford: Polity, 2001.
- Bates, Crispin, Subalterns and Raj – South Asia since 1600, New York, Abingdon, 2007.
- Bedekar, D. K., "Towards Understanding Gandhi", ed. Rajabhau Gawande, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1975.
- Beer, Samuel, the City of Reason, Cambridge, Harvard University Pres, 1949.
- Bernayes, Robert, Naked Faquir, New York: Henry Holt., 1932.
- Betai, S. Gita and Gandhi, Gyan Pub., New Delhi, 2002.
- Betai, S. Ramesh, Gita and Gandhiji, New Delhi, National Gandhi Museum, 2002.
- Bharathi, K. S., Thoughts of Gandhi and Vinobha – A Comparative Study, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1995.

- Bharathi, K. S., The Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi (Encyclopedia of Eminent Thinkers) Vol. I., Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1998.
- Bharathi, K.S., the Social Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1998.
- Bharathi, K.S., the Social Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, New Delhi, Concept Pub., 1991.
- Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva, Evolutional of Political Thought of Gandhi, Calcutta: Calcutta Book House, 1969.
- Bhattacharyya, Dinesh Chandra, Political Theory, Eight Edition, Vijaya Publishing House, Kolkata, 2006.
- Bhattacharyya, Hari Mohan, the Principles of Philosophy, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1944.
- Bhattacharyya, S. N., Mahatma Gandhi – The Journalist, National Gandhi Museum and Manak Pub. Limited, New Delhi, 1965.
- Bhattacharyya, Subyasachi, The Mahatma and the Poet, India, National Book Trust, 1997.
- Birla, G. D., In the Shadow of the Mahatma, Bombay: Orient Longmans Ltd., 1953.
- Biswas, C. C., Bengal's Response to Gandhi, Kolkata, Minerva Pub., 2004.
- Biswas, S. C. (Ed.), Gandhi: Theory and Practice Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance, Indian Institute of Advance Study, Shimla, 1969.
- Bolton, Glorney, the Tragedy of Gandhi, London, Allen and Unwin, 1934.
- Bondurant, Joan Valerie, Conquest of Violence – The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, Paperback, 1988.

- Bookchin, M., *Remaking Society*, Boston: South End Press, 1989.
- Bose, Anima, *Dimensions of Peace and Non-violence: The Gandhian Perspective*, Crian Publishing House, New Delhi, 1987.
- Bose, N. K., *Gandhiji the Man and His Mission*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay, 1966.
- Bose, N. K., *Selections from Gandhi*, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1972.
- Bose, N. K., *Studies in Gandhism*, Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1962.
- Bose, Nirmal Kumar, *My Days with Gandhi*, New Delhi, Orient Longman Limited, 1974.
- Bose, R. N. *Gandhian Technique and Tradition in Industrial Relations*, Calcutta: All India Institute of Social Welfare and Business Management, 1956.
- Bose, Subhas Chandra, *The Indian Struggle: 1920-1934*, London, Wishart, 1935.
- Bottomore, Tom (edicted), *Modern Interpretation of Marx*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1981.
- Bottomore, Tom (edited), *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, Second Edition, Maya, Blackwell, Oxford, U. K., 2000.
- Brennan, Andrew, *Thinking about Nature: An Investigation of Nature, value and ecology*, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988.
- Brick, Pantger, Simone, *Gandhi and The Middle East, Jew, arbs and Empirical Interests*, I. B. Tauris and Co. Ltd., London, 2008.
- Brown, Judith M., *Gandhi and Civil-Disobedience*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Brown, Judith M., *Gandhi's Rise to Power, Indian Politics, 1915-22*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

- Brown, Judith with M. Prozesky, eds., *Gandhi and South Africa: Principles and Politics*, Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1996.
- Brown, Judith, *Modern India*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Brown, M. Judith, *Gandhi Prisoner of Hope*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1992.
- Burke, Edmund, *An Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs*, London: Thomas M'Lean, Vol. VI, 1823.
- Burke, Edmund, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Philadelphia: Young, Dobson, Carey and Rice, 1972.
- Buruheim, J., *Is Democracy Possible?* Cambridge, Polity Press, 1985.
- Case, Clarence Marsh, *Non-violent Coercion: A Study in Methods of Social Pressure*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1923.
- Chacko, C. K., *Metaphysical Implications of Gandhian Thought* Mital Pub., New Delhi, 1986.
- Chakaborty, Mohit, *Gandhian Spiritualism*, Concept, New Delhi, 1993.
- Chakraborty, Bidyut, *Mahatma Gandhi – A Historical Biography*, New Delhi, Roli Books Pvt. Ltd., 2007.
- Chakraborty, Bidyut, *Social and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*, London, Routledge, 2006.
- Chakraborty, Dipesh, *Post Colonial and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for "India" Past?*
- Chakraborty, Mohit, *Fire Sans Ire – A Critical Study of Gandhian Non-violence*, New Delhi, Concept, 2005.
- Chakraborty, Mohit, *Gandhian Humanism*, New Delhi, Concept, 1992.
- Chakraborty, Mohit, *Gandhian Religion*, New Delhi, Gyan, 1994.
- Chakraborty, Mohit, *the Gandhian Philosophy of Spinning Wheel*, New Delhi, Concept Pub., 2000.

- Chatterjee, Margaret, *Gandhi and His Jewish Friends*, London: Macmillan, 1992.
- Chatterjee, Margaret, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983.
- Chatterjee, Partha, *Nationalist Thought and The Colonial World*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1986.
- Chatterjee, Partha, "Gandhism in the Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Post Colonial Histories", Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1994.
- Chettiar, A. K., *In the Tracks of the Mahatma: The Making of a Documentary*, Chennai, Orient Longman Private Limited, 2007.
- Chopra, Pran, *The Sage in Revolt: A Remembrance*, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1072.
- Choudhuri, Monmohan, *exploring Gandhi*, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1987.
- Cohen et al., *Women Transforming Politics: An Alternative Reader*, New York, New York University Press, 1997.
- Copley, Antony, and George Paxton, eds., *Gandhi and the Contemporary Word*, Chennai: Indo – British Historical Society, 1997.
- Copley, Antony, *Gandhi: Against the Tide*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Copley, Antony, *Religions in Conflict*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Copyright, David, *Gandhi and Beyond: Non-violence for an Age of*
- Dalal, C. B., *Harilal Gandhi: A Life*, Orient Longman Pvt. Limited, New Delhi, 2007.
- Dalton, Denis, ed., *Mahatma Gandhi: Selected Political Writ8ngs*, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1997.

- Dalton, Dennis, *Gandhi's Power (Non-Violence in Action)*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Das Gupta, Arun Chandra, *Non-Violence the Invincible Power, Its Primordially, Practicability and Precedents*, 2nd ed., Calcutta: Khadi Pratisthan, 1946.
- Das, P.G., *Modern Political Theory*, New Central Book Agency (P) LTD, Kolkata, 2006.
- Das, Ratan, *Gandhi and Mao – In Quest of Analogy*, New Delhi, Sarup and Sons, 2004.
- Das, Ratan, *The Global Vision of Mahatma Gandhi*, New Delhi, Sarup and Sons, 2005.
- Datta, D. M., *the Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953.
- Daul, R., *Democracy and its critics*, New Haven, Conn. Yale University Press, 1989.
- Dayal, Parmeshwari, *Gandhian Theory of Social Reconstruction*, New Delhi, Atlantic Publication, 2006.
- Dear, John, *Mohandas Gandhi – Essential Writings*, New Delhi, New Age Books, 2002.
- Dearlove, John, with Saunders, Peter, *Introduction to British Politics*, Wiley – Blackwell, 2000.
- Deo, John B., *Conceptual Planning: A Guide to a Better Planet*, 3rd ed., Reading MA: Smith Jones, 1996.
- Desai, Mahadev Haribhai, *A Righteous Struggle: A Chronicle of the Ahmedabad Textile Laborers Fight for Justice*, Translated from Gujarati by Somnath P. Dave, edited by Bharatan Kumarappa, Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 1951.
- Desai, Mahadev Haribhai, *The Gospel of Selfless Action or The Gita According to Gandhi*, Translation of the Original in Gujarati

with an additional introduction and commentary by Mahadev Desai, Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 1946.

Desai, Mahadev Haribhai, the Story of Bardoli: Being a History of the Bordoli Satyagraha in 1928 and Its Sequel, Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 1929.

Desai, Mahadev, Day-to-Day with Gandhi: Secretary's Diary (1917-1927), 9 Vols., Varanasi: Sagarva Seva Sangh Prakashan 1968-1974.

Desai, Mahadev, Haribhai, with Gandhi in Ceylon, A Journal of the Tour, with authorized version of all important speeches, Madras: Genesan, 1928.

Dewey, John, Human Nature and Conduct, An Introduction to Social Psychology, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1938.

Dewey, John, Logic, the Theory of Inquiry, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1949.

Dhani, S. L., B.A. Ambedkar: Man of Millennium for Social Justice, Kalpaz Publications, New Delhi, 2007.

Dharampal, Understanding Gandhi, Goa, Mapusa, 2003.

Dhawan, Gopinath, the Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1962.

Diwakar, R. R., Saga of Satyagraha, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1969.

Diwakar, R. R., Satyagraha: Its Technique and History, Foreword by Rajendra Prasad, Bombay: Hind Kitabs, 1946.

Diwan, Romesh, and Mark Lutz, eds., Essays in Gandhian Economics, New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation, 1985.

Doyle, Timothy, Environmental Movements in Minority and Majority Worlds: A Global Perspective, Rutgers University Press, London, 2005.

- Dr. Chetty, K. Munirathnam, Sarvodaya and Freedom – A Gandhian Appraisal, New Delhi, Discover7y Publishing House, 1991.
- Droke, J. J., M. K. Gandhi: An Indian Patriot in South Africa London: The London Indian Chronicle, 1909.
- Dutt, Dev, Hind Swaraj: Context and Text, in Nageshwar Prasad edited, Hind Swaraj: A Fresh Look, New Delhi, Gandhi Peace Foundation, 1985.
- Dutta Mishra, Ali et. Al., Gandhian Alternative to Contemporary Problem, Abhijeet Publications, New Delhi, 2004.
- Dutta, Mishra, Anil, and Gupta, R., Inspiring Thoughts of Mahatma Gandhi, Concept, New Delhi, 2008.
- Dutta, V. N., Gandhi and Bhagat Singh, Rupa and Co., New Delhi, 2008.
- Edile, Halide, Inside India, London, Allen and Unwin, 1937.
- Erikson, Erik H., Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Non-Violence, New York, Norton, 1969.
- Everdell, William R., The End of Kings: A History of Republics and Republicans, NY: The Free Press, 1983, 2nd edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Etzioni, Amitai, "The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda, Crown Publishers, New Your, 1993.
- Fink, Zera, the Classical Republicans: An Essay in the Recovery of a Pattern of Thought in Seventeenth Century England, North-Western University Press, 1962.
- Fischer, Louis, "The Essential Gandhi", George Allen and Unwin Limited, London, 1962.
- Fischer, Louis, "The Life of Mahatma Gandhi," New Delhi, Harper Collins Publishers, 2006.

- Fischer, Louis, "Mahatma Gandhi, His Life and Times", London, Jonathan Cape, 1951.
- Fischer, Margaret W. and Joan V. Bondurant Indian Approaches to a Socialist Society, Indian Press Digests Monograph No. 2. Berkeley (Institute of International Studies): University of California, 1956.
- Foot, Geoffrey, the Republican Transformation of Modern British Politics, Palgrave, Macmillan, 2006.
- Fox, G. Richard, Gandhian Utopia, Boston, Beacon Pub., 1989.
- Fromm, Erich, and Escape from Freedom, New York and Toronto: Rinehart, 1941.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth, and The Good Society: The Humane Agenda, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1996.
- Gandhi, A. Tushar, Let's Kill Gandhi! (A Chronicle of his Last Days, the conspiracy, Murder, Investigation and Trial), Rupa and Co., New Delhi, 2007.
- Gandhi, Arun, Daughter of Midnight – The Child Bride of Gandhi, London, Blake Pub. Ltd., 1998.
- Gandhi, M. K., Unto the Last – A Paraphrase – Original edition, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, India, Under the title "Sarvodaya" (Gujrati) Translated from Gujarati by Valji Govindji Desai.
- Gandhi, Rajmohan, the Good Boatman: A Portrait of Gandhi, New Delhi, Viking, 1995.
- Gangal, S.C., Gandhian Thought and Techniques in the Modern World, Criterion Publications, New Delhi, 1988.
- Gangrade, K. D. and Mishra, R. P., Conflict Resolution Through Non-Violence (Science and Ethics), Concept, New Delhi, 1990.

- Gangrade, K. D., *Gandhian Approach to Development and Social Work*, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Company, 2005.
- Gangrade, K. D., *Moral Lessons from Gandhi's Autobiography and other Essays*, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2004.
- Ganguli, B. N. *Gandhi's Social Philosophy Perspective and Relevance*, National Gandhi Museum, New Delhi, 1973.
- Gardner Villanueva Catherine, *Historical Dictionary of Religions, Philosophies and Movements*, No. 64, The Scarecrow Press, Inc., Lanham, Maryland, Oxford, 2006.
- Gaus, Gernold F. and Chandran, Kukathas, *Handbook of Political Theory*, London, U.K., New Delhi, India, Sage Publication, 2004.
- George, S.K., and Ramchandran, G., *The Economics of Place: The cause and the Man*, Peace Publishers, New Delhi, 1992.
- Ghosal, U.N., *A History of Hindu Political Theories: From the Earliest Times to the End of the Seventeenth Century A.D.* London, Bombay (etc): Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1927.
- Ghosh, Sudhir, *Gandhi's Emissary*, New Delhi, Routledge Pub., 2008.
- Giddens, Anthony, *Beyond Left and Right, The Future of Radical Politics*, Cambridge, England, U.K., Polity Press, 1994, Reprinted 1998.
- Gier, F. Nicholas, *the Virtue of Non-violence from Gautama to Gandhi*, State University of New York, New Your, 2004.
- Goodin, E. Robert and Petit Phillip edited, *A companion to contemporary Political Philosophy*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, U.K., 1993, Reprinted 1998.
- Goodwin, William, *An Enquiry concerning Political Justice, and Its Influence on General virtue and Happiness*, Edited and abridged by Raymond A. Preston, New York: A.A. Knopf. 1926.

- Gottliele, Robert, *Forcing the spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*, Washington Island Press, 1993.
- Green, Martin, *Gandhi: Voice of a New Age Revolution*, New York, Continuum, 1993.
- Gregg, Richard, B., *the Power of Non-violence*, Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1960.
- Guha, R., *India after Gandhi*, Pan Macmillan Ltd., London, 2007.
- Guha, Ramchandra, "Gandhi before India", New Delhi, Allen Lane, October 2013.
- Gulati, M.N. , *American – African Gandhi – An Analytical synthesis of Three Gandhi*, New Delhi, Manas Publication, 2000.
- Gunnell, G. John, *Interpretation and the History of Political Theory: Apology and Epistemology*, the American Political Science Review, Vol. 76, No. 2, June 1982.
- Hardiman. D., *Gandhi – In His Time and Ours*, Orient Longman Pvt., Ltd., New Delhi, 2003.
- Harman, A., *Gandhi and Churchill*, Random, New York, 2008.
- Harrington, Michael, *Socialism: Past and Future*, Arcade Publishing, New York, U.S.A., 1989.
- Harvani, A., *Before Freedom and after* Gian Pub. House, New Delhi, 1989.
- Harvani, Ansar, *Gandhi To Gandhi*, Gyan Publishing House, New New Delhi, 1996.
- Haupt, Georges and Fawcett, Peter, *Erichobsbawn, Aspects of International Socialism 1871-1914*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, Paperback edition, 2000.
- Hazary, N. et. al., *Eternal Gandhi*, A.P.H. Pub. Corporation, New Delhi, 1998,

- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, *Philosophy of Right*, Translated by S. W. Dyde, Hegels Philosophy of Right, London, G. Bell, 1869.
- Hendel, Charles W., *Jean Jackques Rousseau*, Vol. II, London, 1934.
- Herman, Gruber, *Liberalism*, The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 9, New York, Robert Appleton Company, 1910, Retrieved January 1, 2002, From New Advent.
- Heywood, Andres, *Political Theory: An Introduction*, Third Edition, 2004.
- Hick, John and Lamont Hemple, *Gandhi's Significance for Today*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1989.
- Hobhouse, Leonard Trelawney, *The Metaphysical Theory of the State: A Criticism*, Allen and Unwin, London, 1918.
- Holmes, J. H., Bridge, P. C. and James, F.E., *Mahatma Gandhi*, World Significance, C.C., Basik, The Research Home, Calcutta.
- Hook, Sidney, *From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx*, Victor Gollancz, London, 1936.
- Hoppe, Hans Herman, *A Theory of Socialism and Capitalism*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, From PDF.
- Howard, Connie, *In The Footsteps of Gandhi*, News Age International (P) Limited, 2000.
- Howard, M.. C. and J.E. King, *A History of Marxian Economics*, Vol. II, Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 1992.
- Hunder, Doris A. and Mallick Krishna, *Non-violence: A Reader in the Ethics of Action*, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1990.
- Hunt, James, *Gandhi and the Non Conformists: Encounters in South Africa*, Promilla and Co., New Delhi, 1986.
- Hunt, James, *Gandhi in London*, Promilla and Co., New Delhi, 1978.

- Huttenback, Robert A., *Gandhi in South Africa: British Imperialism and The Indian Question (1860-1914)*, Cornell University Press, London, 1971.
- Huxley, A., *Ends and Means: An Inquiry into the Nature of Ideals and into the Methods of Employed for Their Idealization*, Kegan Paul, London, 1937.
- Imhasly, Bernard, *Goodbye to Gandhi? Travels in the New India*, Penguin Books India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2007.
- Iyer, N. Raghavan, *the Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1973.
- Iyer, R. N. And Iyer, R., *the Moral and Political Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, Vol. 1 and 2, 1986 and Vol. 2, 1987.
- Iyer, R. N., *the Essential Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*, Book 1, Oxford University Press, U.S.A., 1991.
- Iyer, V. R., *Sublime Footprint*, Gyan Publ., New Delhi, 2007.
- Jack, A. Homer (Ed.), *the Gandhi Reader*, Samata Books, Madras, 1984.
- Jain, J. C., *Gandhi the Forgotten Mahatma*, Mittal Pub., Delhi, 1987.
- Jain, Rajula, *Vallabhbhai Patel and the Indian National Congress*, Gyan Sagar Pub., News Delhi, 1997.
- Jawed, Ajeet, *Jinnah – Secular and Nationalist*, Faiz Books, New Delhi, 2005.
- Jha, D. C., *Mahatma Gandhi – The Congress and Partition of India*, Indian Research Press, New Delhi, 2004.
- John S. Dryzek et. al., *Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2006.
- Jolly, S. K. (edited), *Reading Gandhi*, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2006.

- Joshi, P. C., Gandhi and Nehru in B. Nanda and P. C. Joshi (eds.)
Studies in Modern Indian History, New Delhi, 1972.
- Joshi, Pushpa, Gandhi on Women, Navjivan Publishing House,
Ahmedabad, 1988.
- Kalekar.Kaka, Stray Glimpses of Bapu, Navajivan Publishing House,
Ahmedabad, 1957.
- Kapur, Sudarshan, Raising up a Prophet: The African – American
Encounter with Gandhi, The Beacon Press, Boston, 1992.
- Karunakaran, K. P., Gandhi Interpretations, Gitanjali Publishing
House, New Delhi, 1985.
- Karunakaran, K. P., Indian Politics From Dadabhai Naoroji To
Gandhi, Gitanjali Pub., New Delhi, 1994.
- Khan, Afaq, Gandhian Approach to Communalism: A Critical Study,
Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1986.
- Khanna, Suman, Gandhi and the Good Life, B. R. Pub., Delhi, 1996.
- Kibriya, Mazar, Gandhi and Indian Freedom Struggle, A.P.H. Pub.
Corporation, New Delhi, 1999.
- King, Martin Luther, My Trip to the Land of Gandhi, Ebony (July
1959): 84-92.
- King, Martin Luther, Stride Towards Freedom, Harper and Row, New
York, 1958.
- Kripalani, G. B., Gandhi: His Life and Thought, Publications Division,
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India,
New Delhi, 1968.
- Kripalani, Coonoor, Mahatma Gandhi – Apostle of Non-violence, Rupa
and Co., New Delhi, 2003.
- Kripalani, Krishna (edited), All Men Are Brothers, Published by
UNESCO and The Columbia University Press, New York, 2007.

- Kuamar, R., Mahatma Gandhi In The Beginning of Twenty First Century, Gyan Pub., New Delhi, 2006.
- Kumar, Girija, Brahmacharya Gandhi and His Women Associates, Vitasta Publishing Pvt., Limited, New Delhi, 2006.
- Kumar, M. and Low, P., Legacy and Future of Non-violence, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1996.
- Kumar, R., Champaran To Quit India Movement, Mittal Pub., New Delhi, 2002.
- Kumar, Ravindr4a, Gandhian Thought – An Overview, Gyan Pub., New Delhi, 2006.
- Kumar, Ravindra (edited) Mahatma Gandhi in The Beginning of Twenty First Century, Gyan Pub., House, New Delhi, 2006.
- Kumar, Ravindra, Gandhian Thought, Kalpaz Pub., New Delhi, 2008.
- Kumar, Ravindra, Theory and Practice of Gandhian Non-violence, Mittal Pub., New Delhi, 2002.
- Kumarasamy, Aanand, Gandhi on Personal Leadership, JAICO Publishing House, Mumbai 2006.
- Lan, Abng. And Hermes Joke, Gender and Midia Consumption, In James Curran and Michael Gurevitch (eds.), Mass Media and Society , 2nd edition, Routledge, London, 1996.
- Lanza Del Vasto, lJoseph Jean, Gandhi to Vinoba: The Pilgrimage, Schoken Book, New York, 1974.
- Lenin, V.I., Marx and Marxism, edited by Sinha, B. P., Gansa Granthagar, Lucknow, 1948.
- Limaye, Madhu, Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, B. R. Publishing Corporation, Vol. I., Delhi, 1989.
- Limaye, Madhu, Manu Gandhi and Ambedkar other Essays, Gian Pub., New Delhi, 2003.

- Lindley, Mark and Gora Lavanam, Gandhi as we have known him, Gyan Pub., New Delhi 2007.
- Lindsay, A.D., The Modern Democratic State, Vol. I., Oxford University Press, Toronto, 1943.
- Lippincott, Evans Benjamin, Victorian Critics of Democracy, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1938.
- Locke, J., Two Treaties on Civil Government (1690), ed., Peterlaslett, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1967.
- Loghia, R. M., Towards New Socialism, Navahind Prakashan, Hyderabad, 1960.
- Lohia, R. M. Problem of the Asian Socialism in the Will of Power, Navahind Prakashan, Hyderabad, 1956.
- Lohia, Rammanohar, Marx, Gandhi and Socialism, Navahind Prakashan, Hyderabad, 1963.
- Lubac, Hanri De., The Un-Marxian Socialist: A Study of Proudhon, Translated by R.E. Scantlebury, Sheed and Ward, New York, 1948.
- Mackenzine, G. Calvin and Weisbrot, Robert, the Liberal Hour, Washington and the Politics of change in the 1960's Penguin group, New York, 2008.
- Mackinnon, C.A., Towards a Feminist Theory of the State, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass, 1989.
- Maharajan, M., Mahatma Gandhi and The New Millennium, Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi, 2001.
- Mahmud, Jafar, Mahatma Gandhi, A.P.H., Pub., New Delhi, 2004.
- Malgonkar, Manohar, the Men Who Killed Gandhi, Rli Books Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2008.
- Malson et. al., Feminist Theory in Practice and Process, the University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1989.

- Mandal, V.C., Dictionary of Public Administration Sarup and Sons, 2007.
- Manendra Gaur Manendra, Indian Political Parties, Vol. 2. Kaplan Pub., Delhi, 2007.
- Marcello, Cronin, Marcello, Mohandas K. Gandhi – A Biography, Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 2007.
- Markovita, Col., The Un Gandhian Gandhi, Orient Longman Pvt. Ltd., 2004.
- Martin Van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage, the Value of Republicanism in Early Europe.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, F., the Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1913.
- Marx, Karl, Capital, Vol. 1 Allen and Urwin, 1938.
- Masters, Rogers, the Political Philosophy of Rousseau, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1968.
- Mathai, M. P. et. al. (edited), Meditation on Gandhi, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 2002.
- Mathai, M. P., John, M. S. and Joseph, K. et. al. (eds.), Meditation On Gandhi – A Ravindra Varma Festschrift, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 2002.
- Mathur, J. S. (edited), Gandhi – In the Mirror of Foreign Scholars, Gyan Publishing, New Delhi, 2006.
- Maynor, John W., Republicanism in Modern World, Polity, Cambridge, 2003.
- Mazower, Mark, Dart Continent, Vintage Books, New York, 1998.
- Mazumder, Sukhendu, Political Economic Ideas of Mahatma Gandhi – Their Relevance in the present day, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 2004.

- McDonough, Sheila, *Gandhi's Responses to Islam*, D. K. Print World (P) Ltd., New Delhi, 1994.
- McKey, Iain (edited), *Are Their Different Types of Social Anarchism? An Anarchist FAQ*, Stirling: A. K. Press, 2008.
- Merton, Thomas (ed.), *Gandhi on Non-violence*, New Directions, New York, Paperback, 1964.
- Michael, Sandel, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982.
- Mishra, A.D. (ed.), *Perspectives on Human Rights*, Radha Publications, New Delhi, 2002.
- Mishra, Duta, Anil, *Fundamental of Gandhism*, Mittal Publications, New Delhi, 1995.
- Mishra, Duta, Anil, *Gandhian Approach to Contemporary Problems*, Mittal Publications, New Delhi, 1996.
- Mishra, Dutta, Anil and Gupta, Robi, *Inspiring Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*, Mittal Pub, New Delhi, 2000.
- Mishra, Dutta, Anil and M. S. Dadage, *Panchyati Raj: Gandhian Perspective*, Mittal Publications, New Delhi, 2000.
- Mishra, Dutta, Anil, *Challeng4s of 21ast Century*, Mittal Publication, New Delhi, 2003.
- Mishra, Dutta, Anil, *Gandhian after Gandhi*, Mittal Pub., New Delhi, 1999.
- Mishra, Dutta, Anil, *Ganmdhism after Gandhi*, Mittal Pub., New Delhi, 1999.
- Mishra, Dutta, Anil, *Rediscovering Gandhi*, Mittal Pub., New Delhi, 2002.
- Mishra, K. P. and Gangal, S.C., *Gandhi and the Contemporary World: Studies in Peace and War*, Chanakya Publications, Delhi, 1981.

- Mishra, Neeiam, the Sociaoiist Oreintation of Jawaharlal Nehru, Giyan Pub., New Delhi, 1989.
- Mishra, R. P. and Gangrade, K.D. et. al. (eds.), Gandhian Alternative, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 2005.
- Mishra, R. P. et. al (eds.) Gandhian Alternative, Vol. 5., Concept, New Delhi, 2005.
- Mishra, R. P. et. al. (eds.), Gandhian Alternative, Vol. 2, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 2005.
- Mishra, R. P. Gandhain Model of Development and World Peace, Concept, New Delhi, 1988.
- Mishra, R. P., et al. (eds.) Gandhian Alternative, Vol. I, Concept, New Delhi, 2005.
- Mishra, R. P., Rediscovering Gandhi, Vol. 1, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 2005.
- Mishra, R. P., Rediscovering Gandhi, Vol. 2, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 2007.
- Mishra, Sweta, Democratic Decentralization in India, Mittal Publications, New Delhi, 1994.
- Moggach, Doughlas (edited), Republican Rigorism and Emancipation in Bruno Bauer, the New Hegelians, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- Mohanani, B., Gandhi's Legacy and a New Human Civilization, Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, 1999.
- Mukalel, C. Joseph, Gandhian Education, Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi, 1997.
- Mukherjee, Hiren, Gandhi: A Study, People's publishing House, New Delhi, 1960.
- Mukherjee, Subrata and Ramaswamy, Sushila, Facets of Mahatma Gandhi, Deep and Deep Publications, New Delhi, 1994.

- Mukhopadhyaya, Maitrayee, *Legally Dispossessed Gender, Identity and the Process of Law*, Street Pub., New Delhi, 1988.
- Nair, Sankaran, S., *Gandhi and Anarchy*, Mittal Pub., New Delhi, 1966.
- Namboodiripad, E.M.S., *the Mahatma and the Ism*, People Publishing House, New Delhi, 1959.
- Nanda, B. R. *Mahatma Gandhi*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1958.
- Nanda, B. R., *Gandhi Pan-Islamism Imperialism and Nationalism*, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1989.
- Nanda, B. R., *In Gandhi's Footsteps – The Life and Times of Jamnalal Bajaj*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1990.
- Nanda, B. R., *Jawaharlal Nehru: Rebel and Statesman*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1995.
- Nanda, B.R., *Gandhi and His Critics*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1985.
- Nandy, A., *Tradition, Tyranny and Utopias: Essays in the Politics of Awareness*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1987.
- Nandy, Ashis, *At the Edge of Psychology: Essays in Politics and Culture*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1980.
- Nandy, Ashish, *"The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism"*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1980.
- Narain, Jai, *Economic Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*, Sehgal, New Delhi, 1991.
- Narayan, Shriman, *Selected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1956.
- Narayan, Sushila, *Mahatma Gandhi: Final Fight For Freedom*, Navajivan, Ahmedabad, 1997.

- Narayan, Sushila, Mahatma Gandhi: Preparing for Swaraj, Navajivan, Ahmedabad, 1996.
- Narayan, Sushila, Mahatma Gandhi: Salt Satyagraha, Navajivan, Ahmedabad, 1995.
- Narayanaswamy, S., the Sarvodaya Movement, Mittal Pub., New Delhi, 2003.
- Nauriya, Anil, the African Element in Gandhi, Gyan Pub., New Delhi, 2006.
- Nayar, Sushila, Mahatma Gandhi: India Awakened, Navajivan, Ahmedabad, 1993.
- Nayar, Sushila, Mahatma Gandhi: Satyagraha at Work, Navajivan, Ahmedabad, 1989.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal, Mahatma Gandhi, Signet Press, Calcutta, 1949.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal, the Discovery of India, John Day, New York, 1946.
- Nelson, B. and Chowdhury, N. (eds.), Women and Political World Wide, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1993.
- Nojeim, J. Michael, Gandhi and King, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1972.
- Nanda, B. R., Gandhi – A Pictorial Biography, Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1957.
- Ostergaard Geoffrey, Non-violent Revolution in India, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1985.
- Paare Lal, Mahatma Gandhi: The Discovery of Satyagraha, Sevak Prakashan, Bombay, 1980.
- Pal, Jaladhar, the Moral Philosophy of Gandhi Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, 2007.
- Pal, Jaladhar, the Moral Philosophy of Gandhi, Gyan Pub., New Delhi, 1997.

- Palmer, Gregory, Mahatma Gandhi – A Selected Bibliography, Greenwood Press, London, 1995.
- Pandey Janardan (edited), Gandhi and 21st Century, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1998.
- Pandya, Jayant, Gandhiji and His Disciples, Notational Book Trust, New Delhi, 1994.
- Parekh, Bhikhu, Colonialism, Tradition and Reform: An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse, Sage Publication, New Delhi, 1989.
- Parekh, Bhikhu, Gandhi – A Very Short Introduction, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1997.
- Parekh, Bhiku, Gandhi's Political Philosophy, Notre Dame University Press, Notre Dame, 1989.
- Parel, J. Anthony (edited), Hind Swaraj and Other Writings, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- Parel, J. Anthony, Gandhi Freedom and Self-Rule, Vistaar Publications, New Delhi, 2002.
- Parel, J. Anthony, Gandhi's Philosophy and the Quest for Harmony, Cambridge University Press, New Delhi, 2006.
- Patel, M. S., the Educational Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1953.
- Payne, Robert, the Life and Death of Mahatma Gandhi, Rupa and Co., New Delhi, 1969.
- Pflug Bernd, Self Education – A Gandhian Perspective, Gyan Pub., New Delhi, 2006.
- Polak, H.S.C., H. N. Brailsford and Lord Pethick, Lawrence, Mahatma Gandhi, Odham Press Limited, London, 1949.
- Popper, Karl R., the Open Society and Its Enemies, 2 Vols., Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1969.

- Power, Paul F., the Meaning of Gandhi, University Press of Hawaii, Honolulu, 1971.
- Prabhu, R. K. and Rao, U. R., the Mind of Mahatma, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1967.
- Prasad, Nageshwar, Hind Swaraj: A Fresh Look, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1985.
- Pruthi, Raj Kumar, Mahatma Gandhi and Education, Akansha Pub., New Delhi, 2005.
- Puri, Bindu, Gandhi and the Moral Life, Mittal Publ., New Delhi, 2004.
- Pyare Lal and Nayar Sushila, in Gandhiji's Mirror, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1991.
- Pyare Lal, A Pilgrimage for Peace: Gandhi and Frontier Gandhi Among N.W.F. Pathans, Navajivan, Ahmedabad, 1950.
- Pyare Lal, Mahatma Gandhi: The Birth of Satyagraha, Navajivan, Ahmedabad, 1986.
- Pyare Lal, Mahatma Gandhi: The Early Phase, Volume 1, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1965.
- Pyare Lal, Mahatma Gandhi: The Last Phase in 2 volumes, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1956, 1958.
- Pyarelal (Nair), "Mahatma Gandhi: The Last Phase", Vol. 1 to 2, Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1958.
- Radhakrishnan, S. (edited), Mahatma Gandhi 100 Years, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1968.
- Radhakrishnan, S. (edited), Mahatma Gandhi: Essays and Reflections on His Life and Thought, Kitabistan, Allahabad, 1944.
- Radhakrishnan, S., the Heart of Hinduism, 5th Edition, Natesan, Madras, 1945.

- Raghavan Iyer (Edited), the Essential Writings of Mahatma Gandhi, Oxford, New Delhi, 1993.
- Raghavan, G.N.S., the Making of Modern India, Gian Pub., Delhi, 1987.
- Rai, S. Ajay, Gandhian Satyagraha an Analytical and Critical Approach, Concept, New Delhi, 2000.
- Rajendra Prasad, At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi, Asia Publishing House, Bombay 1961.
- Rajmohan Gandhi, Mohandas – A True Story of a Man, His People and an Empire, Penguin Books, New Delhi, 2006.
- Raju, P.A., Gandhi and His Religion, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 2000.
- Ramagundam, R., Gandhi's Khadi – A History of Contention and Conciliation, Orient Longman, New Delhi, 2008.
- Rao, U. R., the Way to Communal Harmony, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1963.
- Rao, U.S. Mohan (eds.), the Message of Mahatma Gandmhi, Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, 1968.
- Rawls, J., A Theory of Justice, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass, 1971.
- Ray, B. N., Gandhigiri – Satyagraha After Hundred Years, Kaveri Books, New Delhi, 2008.
- Ray, N. R. (edited), Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. 1, Institute of Historical Studies, Calcutta, 1986.
- Ray, N. R. (edited), Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. 2, Institute of Historical Studies, Calcutta, 1990.
- Reddy, E.S., and Terp Holger, Friends of Gandhi, National Gandhi Museum, News Delhi, 2006.

- Roy Ramashray, "Self and Society: A Study of Gandhian Thought", Sage Publication, New Delhi, 1984.
- Rocheleau et al., *Feminist Political Ecologies: Global Issues and Local Experiences*, Routledge, New York, 1996.
- Rolland, Romain Mahatma Gandhi – The Leader of the Universal Peace and Liberty, Geol Pub., New Delhi, 1948.
- Rolland, Romain, Mahatma Gandhi, the Man Who Became One with the Universal Being (Translated by Catherine D. Groth), Shiva Lal Agarwala and Co. Ltd., Agra.
- Roy, Ramashray, *Contemporary Crisis and Gandhi*, Discovery Publishing House, Delhi, 1986.
- Roy, Rameshray, *Sounding in Political Philosophy*, Chanakya Publications, Delhi, 1984.
- Roy, Samaren, M. N., *Roy and Mahatma Gandhi*, Minerva Pub., Ltd., Calcutta, 1987.
- Rudolph Hoeber, Susanne and Rudolph, I. Lloyd, *Gandhi – The Traditional Roots of Charisma*, Orient Longman Pub., Limited, Hyderabad, 1987.
- Rudolph, I. and Rudolph, S., *Post Modern Gandhi and Other Essays*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2006.
- Ruskin, John, *Unto This Last and Other Writings*, ed., Clive Wilmer, Penguin, London, 1985.
- Sabine, George H., *A History of Political Theory*, Henry Holt, New York, 1947.
- Saklatvala, Shapurji and M. K. Gandhi, *Is India Different? The Class Struggle in India: Correspondence on the Indian Labour Movement and Modern Conditions*, Communist Party of Great Britain, London, 1927.

- Saraswati, N. S., Right to equality in the Indian Constitution – A Gandhian Perspective, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 2002.
- Sarma, P. V., (edited) Gandhian Philosophy and Human Development, Kanishka Publishers, New Delhi, 2008.
- Sattar, S. Abdul, Humanism of Mahatma Gandhi and M. N. Roy, the Associated Publishers, Ambala Cantt., 2007.
- Schuster, E.M., Native American Anarchism: A Study of Left – Wing American Individualism, Smith College Studies in History, Vol. XVII, No. 1-4, Dept. of History of Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts, 1932.
- Schweitzer, Albert, Indian Thought and Its Development, the Beacon Press, Boston (1936), 1952.
- Schumacher, E.F., “Small is Beautiful: A Study of Economics as if people Mattered” Vintage Books, London, 2011.
- Segal, Hugh, the Right Balance, Victoria, British Columbia, Douglas and McIntyre, Canada, 2011.
- Sethi, J.D., “Gandhian Values and 20th Century Challenges”, Government of India Publication Division, New Delhi, 1979.
- Sethi, J. D., Gandhi Today, Vikas Publishing House Pvt., Ltd., New Delhi, 1978.
- Sen, Amartya, “Inequality Re-examined, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992.]
- Sen, Amartya, “Development as Freedom”, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Sharma, A. K., Gandhian Perspective on Population and Development, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 1996.
- Sharma, Arvind, A New Curve in the Ganges – Mahatma Gandhi’s Interpretation of Hinduism, D. K. Pub., New Delhi, 2005.

- Sharma, G. Ranjit, An Introduction To Gandhian Thought, Atlantic Pub., New Delhi, 1995.
- Sharma, Jyoti, Tilak and Gandhi – Perspectives on Religion and Politics, Gyan Pub., New Delhi, 2001.
- Sharma, Shashiprabha, Gandhian Holistic Economics, Concept Pub., New Delhi, 1996.
- Sharp, Gene Gandhi as a Political Strategist, Porter Sarget Publishers, Boston, 1979.
- Sharp, Gene, Gandhi Wiolds the Weapon of Moral Power, Three Case Histories, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1960.
- Sharp, Gene, the Politics of Non-violent Action: Power and Struggle, Porter Sarget Publishers, Boston, 1973.
- Sheean, Vincent, Lead Kindly Light, Random House, New York, 1949.
- Shridharani, Krishnalal, War without Violence: A Study of Gandhi's method and Its Accomplishment, Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1939.
- Shukla, Chandrashanker, Reminiscences of Gandhiji, Vora and Company, Bombay, 1951.
- Sing Ramjee and Sundaram, S., Gandhi and the World Order, A.P.H. Publishing Corporation, New Delhi, 1996.
- Sing, Ramjee, the Gandhian Vision, Manak Publication, New Delhi, 1998.
- Sing, Sankar Dayal, Gandhi's Frist Step – Champaran Movement, D. K. Pub., New Delhi, 1994.
- Singh, R., Gandhi and the Future of Humanity, Manak Pub., Varanasi, 1997.
- Singh, RamBinod, Gandhian Approach to Development Planning, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2006.

- Singh, Ramjee, Gandhi and the New Millennium, Commonwealth Publishers, New Delhi, 2000.
- Sinha, R. K., Gandhian Non-violence and the Indian Struggle, H. K. Pub., Delhi, 1992.
- Sinha, R. P., Mahatma Gandhi and Kar. Marx, A Study of Selected Social Thinkers, Sociological Series No. 2, Printed and Published by Sinha, R. P. Singh Printing Press, Kanpur, 2008.
- Sisson Richard and Wolpert Stanly (eds.), Congress and Indian Nationalism – The Pre-Independence Phase, University of California Press, California, 1988.
- Sitaramayya, Pattabhi, Gandhi and Gandhism, 2 Volumes, Kitabistan, Allahabad, 1942.
- Skinner, Quentin, The Foundation of Modern Political Thought, Vol. I, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1978.
- Smith, Chris, Theory and The Art of Communication Design, State of the University Press, 1997.
- Sorel, Georges, Political Theorists in Context, Routledge, London, 2004.
- Sreedhar K., Gandhian Concept of Family System, Southern Books Star, Delhi, 2000.
- Stainlis, Peter, J. and Burke, Edmund, Selected Writings and Speeches, Transaction Publishers, New York, 2009.
- Stirner, Max, The Ego and His Own, Translated from the German by Steven T. Byington, A. C., Fifield, London and E.C. Walker, New York, 1912.
- Swan, Maureen, Gandhi: The South African Experience, Raven Press, Johannesburg, 1985.

- Tandon, Vishwanath, *Studies in Gandhian Thought and Marxism – With Special Reference to Vinoba Bhave*, National Gandhi Museum, New Delhi, 2006.
- Tansey, Stephen D., Jackson, Nigel, A., *Politics: The Basics*, Fourth edition, Routledge, U.S.A., 2008.
- Tanwar, R., *Reporting the Partition of Punjab*, Monohar, New Delhi, 2006.
- Taylor, C., *Sources of the Self*, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Taylor, Charles, *Politics and Recognition*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1994.
- Tendulkar, D. G., *Gandhi in Champaran*, Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, 1957.
- Terchek, Ronald J., *Gandhi: Struggling for Autonomy*, Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham and New York, 1998.
- Terrorism, Blackwell Publishing, *Religious Studies Review*, Vol. 33, No. 2, April 2007.
- Thomson, Mark, *Gandhi and His Ashrams*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1993.
- Thoreau, Henry David, *Walden and Civil Disobedience*, ed., Owen Thomas, Norton Critical Edition, New York, 1966.
- Tidrick, Kathryn, *Gandhi – A Political and Spiritual Life*, I.B. Tauris and Co. Ltd., New York, 1988.
- Tikekar, S. R. (Compiled), *Epigrams from Gandhiji*, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, 1971.
- Tolstoy, L. N., *My Religion*, Translated from the French by Huntington Smith, Y.T. Crowell, New York, 1885.

- Tolstoy, Leo, *The Kingdom of God Is Within You*, trans., Constance Garnett, University of Nebraska Press (1893), Lincoln and London, 1984.
- Tripathi, K., *Gandhi and Humanity*, Atlantic Publication, New Delhi, 1993.
- Upadhyaya, J. M., *Mahatma Gandhi – As Student*, Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, 1965.
- Uppal, J. N., *Gandhi Ordained In South Africa*, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1995.
- Varma, Ravindra, *the Spiritual Perception of Mahatma Gandhi*, Rupa and Co., New Delhi, 2006.
- Vattimo – Giani and Santiago Zabala – *Hermeneutic, Communism: From Heidegger to Marx*, Columbia University Press, 2011.
- Vettickal, Thomas, *Gandhian Sarvodaya: Realizing a Realistic Utopia*, National Gandhi Museum and Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, 2002.
- Watson, Francis and Tennyson Hallam, *Talking of Gandhi*, Sangam Books, Bombay, 1957.
- Weber, Max, *the Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, Translated by A. M. Henderson, edited by Talcott Person, Oxford University Press, New York, 1947.
- Weber, Thomas, *Conflict Resolution and Gandhian Ethics*, the Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1991.
- Wood, A., *Karl Marx*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1981.
- Woodcock, G., *Anarchism*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, London, 1962.
- Woodcock, George, *Gandhi*, Fontana Modern Masters, London, 1972.

Articles:

- Ahmad, Nizar, "A Note on Gandhi, Nation and Modernity, *Social Scientist*, Vol. 34, No. 5/6, May-Jun, 2006.
- Arendt, H., *Reflection on Violence*, *Journal of International Affairs*, No. 23, 1969, Pp. 1-35.
- Bondurant, Joan V. and Margaret, W. Fisher, *the Concept of Change in Hindu, Socialist and Neo-Gandhian Thought*, *South Asia Politics and Religion*, ed. Donald E. Smith, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1966, Pp. 235-248.
- Bose, N. K., "An Interview with Mahatma Gandhi", *the Modern REveiwe* (Calcutta), LVIII, October, 1935.
- Brailsford, H. N., "Why India Follows Gandhi", *the Forum*, LXXXV, May 1931.
- Britannica Encyclopedia, "Socialism", Retrieved, October 14, 2009.
- Brantlinger, Patrick, "A Post Industrial Prelude to Post-colonialism: John Ruskin, William Morris, and Gandhism", *Critical Inquiry*, Vol 22, No. 3, Spring, 1996.
- Bhavnani, et. al., "Feminism and Youth Cultures, Introduction", University of Chicago Press, Chicago, and *Sign: Special Issue* 23(3), 1998, Pp. 576-583.
- "Border Crossing: Multi-cultural and Post Colonial Feminist Challenges to Philosophy" (Part I and II), *Hypatia*, Special Issue, spring 1998 and summer 1998.
- Burke, Edmund, "An Appeal From the New to the Old Whigs", *Thomas M'Lean*, London, Vol. VI, 1823, P. 204.
- Booth, Charles, "Occupations of the People of the United Kingdom, 1801-81", *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, London 2(49), June 1886, Pp. 314-436.

- Bortkiewicz, Von, Ladislaus 1952 (1906-1907), "Values and Price in the Marxist System, International Economic Papers, P. 2 and Pp. 5-60.
- Bortkiewicz, Von, Ladislaus (1907), "On the Correction of Marx's Fundamental Theoretical Construction in the Third Volume of Capital, in Eugen Von Bohm-Bawerk 1984 (1896), Karl Marx and the close of his system, Orion Editions, Philadelphia.
- Buruheim, J., "Is Democracy Possible"? Polity Press, Cambridge, 1985, P. 218.
- Berenwson, Edward, and Duclert, Vincent, Introduction, in the French Republic: History, Values, Debates, 2011, Essays by 38 Scholars from France, Britain and U.S.A., since 1790, P. 3.
- Bock, Gisela, Skinner, Quentin and Viroli, Maurizio ed. "Machiavelli and Republicanism", Cambridge University Press, 1990, P. 316.
- Brugger, Bill, Republican Theory in Political Thought Vistuous or Virtual? St Martin Press, 1999.
- Cooke, Morris Llewellyn, "The Quaker Way Wins New Aderents", the New York Times Magazine, June 17, 1951.
- Collen Mach-Canty, "Third Wave Feminism and the Need to Reweave the Nature/Culture Duality, NWSA Journal, Vol. 16, No. 3, the John Hopkins University Press, Autumn, 2004, Pp. 163-164.
- Chandrasekaran, B., Gandhi, the Liberal in Perspective, a fresh look at Gandhian Economics, July 14, 2011, PDF.
- Chakraborty, Dipesh, "Radical Histories and the Age of Enlightenment Rationalism", Economic and Political Weekly, April 15, 1995.
- Drake, Jennifer, "Review Essay": Third Wave Feminisms, Feminist Studies 23(1), 1997, Pp. 97-108.
- Dichiro, Giovanna, "Defining Environmental Justice, Women Voices and Grassroots Politics", Socialist Review, 1993, P. 169.

- Dmitriev, V. K., 1974, *Economic Essay on Value, Competition and Utility*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- Guha, Ramchandra, "Mahatma Gandhi and Environmental Movement in India" in Arne Kalland and Gerard Persoon (ed), *Environmental Movements in Asia*, Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, Routledge, London, 1998.
- Gier, Nicholas F., "Non-violence as a civic virtue: Gandhi and Reformed Liberalism", *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 1/3, Feb, 2003.
- Grag, Aparna, An Article, "Gandhi a Feminist", from Internet, March 23, 2009.
- Garrison, Edinie, U. S. Feminism – Grrrl Style ! Youth Cultures and the Technologies the Third Wave, *Feminist Studies* 26:1, 2000, P. 155.
- Gandhi, M. K., On Socialism and Communism, Understading and Applying Gandhi, February 20, 2008.
- Hall, O. Kim, Voice from the Economic South, *NWSA Journal*, 15:1, 2003, P. 132.
- Hayek, Friedrich, interviewed by Hazlett, Thomas W., the Road of Serfdom, *Foreseeing the fall*, Reason Magazine, 1944.
- Heredia, C. Rudolf, "Interpreting Gandhi's Hind Swaraj", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXIV, June 12-18, 1999.
- Ibid.
- Jacob, Aparna, An Article, Gandhi – Promoter of Women's Liberation, from Internet, March 20, 2009.
- Joseph, Sara, "Politics of Contemporary Indian Communitarianism", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 32, No. 40, Oct. 4-10, 1997.

- Jha, Shreekrishna, "Mahatma Gandhi – An Environmentalist with a difference", Gandhian Institute of Studies, Rajghat, Varanasi, N.D.
- Keith M. Woodhouse, "The Politics of Ecology: Environmentalism and Liberalism in the 1960s", Journal for the Study of Radicalism, Volume 2, No. 2, 2009.
- Khoshoo, T.N., "Mahatma Gandhi: An Apostle of Applied Human Ecology, TERI, New Delhi, 1995.
- Kotz, David, M., Socialism and Capitalism: Are They Qualitatively Different Socio-economic System? University of Massachusetts, Retrieved February 19, 2011.
- Kumarappa, J.C., Economy of Permanence: A Quest for a Social order Based on Non-violence, Wardha, C., All India Village Industries Association, 1946.
- Lenin, Sochineniya (Works), 5th Ed., Vol. XLIV, 1917, P. 418.
- Lenin, Vladimir, "The State and Revolution", Marxists Internet Archive (In an English Translation), Retrieved May 17, 2011.
- Mahabal – Bali, Kamayani, An Article, Women's Features Service, October 2, 2009.
- Marxism and the National Question, Marxists Internet Archive, Retrieved May, 2011.
- Marxism - Leninism and Leninism, and article, from Wikipedia.
- Marx, Karl, Communism and Marxism (1818-1883), an Article, from Internet.
- Maoism, an article, from Wikipedia.
- Mishra, R. P., "Facing Environmental Challenges, The Gandhian Way", Anasakti Darshan, 5 July and 2 December, 2009.
- Miller, De, "Anarchism", Dent, London, 1984, P. 3.

- Michelguglielmo Torri, Westernized Middle Classes, Intellectuals and Society in Late Colonial India, *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 27, 1990.
- Michels, Roberto, Conservatism, *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, IV, 1935.
- Michael, R. Dillon, "The Perennial Appeal of Anarchism", in *Polity*, Vol.7, No. 2. (Winter, 1974), Pp. 214-247.
- Muralidharan, Sukumar, "Religion, Nationalism and The State: Gandhi and India's Engagement with Political Modernity", *Social Scientist*, Vol.34, No. 3/4 March-April, 2006.
- Naess, Arne, "Self-Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World" in John Seed, Jonna Macy et al (ed), *Thinking Like a Mountain: Towards a Council of All Beings*, Society Publishers, Philadelphia, 1988.
- Naness, A., *Selected Works, SWAN*, edited by Allen Drengson in cooperation with the Author, Netherlands, Springer, Vol. 2, P.LXViii, 2005.
- Narayan, Uma and Harding Sandra eds., "Introduction, Border Crossings: Multicultural and Post Colonial Feminist Challenges to Philosophy (Part I), in *Hypatia*, Special Issue, 1998, Pp. 1-6.
- Neil, Paul Cummins, "An Evolutionary Perspective on the Relationship between Humans and their surrounding: Geo-engineering, the purpose of Life and the Nature of the Universe", *Cranmore Publications*, New York, 2012.
- Nicholas, John Alden, "Germany After Bismort", the Caprivi Era, 1890-1994, Issue 5, *Harvard University Press*, 1958, P. 260.
- O'Hara, Phillip, *Encyclopedia of Political Economy*, Volume 2, *Routledge*, September 2003, P. 71.
- Ollman, Bertell, Schweichart, David, "Market Socialism: The Debate Among Socialist", *Routledge*, 1998, P. 7.

- O'Loughlin, Ellen, *Questioning Sour Grapes : Eco-Feminism and the United Farm Workers', Grape Boycott*, in *Eco-Feminism, Women, Animal, Nature*, ed., Greta Gaard, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1993, Pp. 146-166.
- Prasad, Shambhu, "Towards an Understanding of Gandhi's views on Science", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36-39 September, 2011.
- Parel, J. Anthony, "A Gandhian Liberalism". In *Gandhi and the Contemporary World* eds., Copley and Paxton, 1989, Pp. 296-297.
- Parekh, Bhikhu, "Is Gandhi Still Relevant"? In *Gandhi and the Contemporary World*, eds., Copley and Paxton, 1989, Pp. 271-383.
- Parekh, Bhikhu, "Colonialism, Tradition and Reform: An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse, Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 24, No. 48, Dec. 2, 1989.
- Priestly, F.E.L. ed., *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on Morals and Happiness by William Godwin*, Critical Introduction and notes, University of Toronto, Toronto, Vol. III, 1946, P. 49.
- Pennekoek, Anton, *State Capitalism and Dictatorship*, International Council Correspondence, Vol. III, No. 1, January, 1937.
- Pettit, Philip, "Capability of Freedom: A Defense of Sen", *Economics and Philosophy*, 17/1, 2001, Pp. 1-20.
- Purkis, Jonathan and Bowen James, "Introduction: Why Anarchism Still Matters," In Jonathan Purkis and James Bowen (eds.), *Changing Anarchism: Anarchist Theory and Practice in a Global Age*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2004, P. 3.
- Patsourasa, Louis, "Marx in Context", *Universe*, 2005, P. 54.

- Peter, Becker, Jurgen Heideking and James A. Henretta (eds.), *Republicanism and Liberalism in America and the German States, 1750-1850*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Pettit, Philip, "Capability of Freedom: A Defense of Sen", *Economics and Philosophy*, 17/1, 2001, Pp. 1-20.
- Paul, Avrich, "Anarchist Voices: An Oral History of Anarchism in America", A. K. Press, 2006, P.5.
- Pocock, J.G.A., "The Machiavellian Movement Revisited: A Study in History and Ideology", *Journal of Modern History*, 53(1), 1981, Pp. 49-72.
- Palmer, R. P., *the Age of the Democratic Revolution, Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800* (1959).
- Parel, Anthony J., (Review by), "Gandhi: Struggling for Autonomy" by Ronald J. Terchek, *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 61, No.3, Summer, 1999.
- Rees, Simon, "Historical Eye Com," Retrieved May 16, 2011.
- Rocheleau et. al., "Feminist Political Ecologies: Global Issues and Local Experiences", Routledge, New York, 1996, Pp. 71-72.
- Robin, Hahnel, "The ABC's of Political Economy, Pluto Press, 2002, P. 262.
- Rodgers, Daniel T., "Republicanism: The Career of a Concept", *Journal of American History*, 1992 in JSTOR.
- Rosenberg and Garofalo, "Riot Grrl: Revolution from Within". In *Signs: Special Issue, Feminisms and Youth Culture* 23(1), 1998, Pp. 810-811.
- Rogers, Mary F., "Contemporary Feminist Theory", MC. Graw-Hill, Boston, 1998, P. 17.

- Rojas, R. and Engel, F., *Anti – Duhring* (1877), Introduction with Some notes, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1857) Preface, Progress Publications, Moscow, 1977.
- Rosenblum, N., *“Another Liberalism”*, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Sahliyeh, Emile, F. *“Religious Resurgence and Politics in the Contemporary World”*, Albany, University of New York Press, New York, 1990, P.185.
- Saxna, Kiran, An Article, *“On and by Gandhi”*, *Gandhi’s Feminist Politics, Gender Equality and Patriarchal Values*, No Date.
- Sasikala, A.S., *“Environmental Thoughts of Gandhi for a Green Future”*, Comprehensive site by Gandhian Institutes, Sarvodaya Mandal and Gandhi Research Foundation, Bombay, N.D.
- Senton, James, *“Cultural Conservatism, Political Liberalism”*, University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Sen Mohit, *“Tolstoy, Gandhi and the Peasant”*, Vol. L, No. 41, September 29, 2012.
- Sellers, Mortimer, N.S., *“American Republicanism: Roman Ideology in the United States Constitution”*, New York University Press, New York, 1994, P. 71.
- Siegal Debarah, *“Theory in Feminism’s Third Wave”*, *Hypatia* 12(3), 1997, Pp. 47-75.
- Singh, Savita, an Article, *“Empowerment of women Miles to go”*, N.D.
- Shiva, Vandana and Bandopadhyay, Joyantho, *“Chipko in India’s civilizational Response to the Forest Crisis, in India’s Environment, Myth and Reality”*, Dehradun, Natraj, 2007.
- Sharma, R. C., *“Gandhian Environmentalism”*, Global Vision, New Delhi, 2003.

- Shalhope, Robert, E., *Towards a Republican Synthesis*, William and Mary Quarterly, January 29, 1972, Pp. 49-80.
- Shalhope, Robert, E., "Republicanism and Early American Historiography", William and Mary Quarterly, April 29, 1982, Pp. 334-356 in JSTOR.
- Sheean, Vincent, "Gandhi's Last Discourse", the Bombay Chronicle Weekly, February 22, 1948.
- Smith, T. B., "Democracy and Human Destiny", Human Destiny, I, 1951.
- Snyder, R. Clarire, *Citizen Soldiers and Manly Warriors: Military Service and Gender in the Civic Republican Tradition*, 1999, Online Version.
- Spitz, David, "Democracy and the Problem of Civil Disobedience", the American Political Science Review, June 1954.
- Tansey, Stephen D., Jackson, Nigel A., "Politics: the Basics", Fourth Edition, Routledge, New York, U.S.A, 2008, P. 97.
- Tocqueville, A. de., *Democracy in America* (1835), Random House, New York, 1964.
- Tolstoy, Leo, the Review of Reviews, Volume 9, 1894, P. 306.
- Trotskyism, an Article, from Wikipedia.
- Vrousalis, Nicholas, "Libertarian Socialism: A Beter Reconciliation between Self-Ownership and Equality", Social Theory and Practice 37, University of Cambridge, Faculty of Philosophy KU Leuven, Institute of Philosophy, July 5th, 2010, Pp. 211-226.
- Warren, "On Taking Empirical Data Serously", in *Eco-Feminism: Women, Culture, Nature*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1997, P.3.

Warren, Karen, J., "Eco-Feminist Philosophy: A Western Perspective on what it is and Why It Matters, Rowman and Littlefield, Lanhan, 2000, P. 37.

Weiner, Douglas R., Models of Nature: Ecology, Conservation and Cultural Revolution in Soviet Russia, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1988.

Wright, M., "Maquiladora Mestizas and a Feminist Border Politics: Revisiting Anzaldua", Hypatia 13(3), 1998, P. 115.

Williams, Leonard, "Anarchism Revived", New Political Science 29(3), September 2007, Pp. 297-312.

Wolff and Resnich, Richard and Stephen, "Economics: Marxian versus Neo-classical", the John Hopkins University Press, August 1987, P. 130.

Wood, Gordon, S. The Creation of the American Republic (1776-1787), 1993. From Internet.

Wood, Godon, S. The Radicalism of the American Revolution, 1993. From Internet.

Zoltan, J. Acts and Young Bernard, "Small and Medium Sized Enterprises in the Global Economy, University of Michigan Press, 1999, P. 47.

Journal and Writing Papers Downloaded from the Net:-

"Marxism – Leninism", Article from Wikipedia.

"Stalinism" - Article from Wikipedia.

Abhlok, Sanjeev, "Gandhi, A Liberal During Illiberal Times", in Liberty by Sanjeev Sabhlok's Revolutionary blog, "India I dare you to be rich!" on 'August 26, 2010.

An Article, Gandhi and Environment, from Internet, 20 January, 2010.

Article – Maoism, from wikipedia.

Article – Social land Democra cy, from Wikipedia.

Article – Socialism and Marxism, from Wikipedia.

Article – Socialism with Chinese Characteristics, from Wikipedia.

Article with Un-sourced Statement from April 2011.

Article with Un-sourced Statement from February 2013.

Article with Un-sourced Statement from October 2010.

Article, on Feminism:-[www.Sociology.Org. UK](http://www.Sociology.Org.UK), 2005.

Atticle – Trotskyism, from Wikipedia.

Bailey, Ronald, “Debunking Myths”, Reason.Com,From Beb, 2002 and also

Communitarianism, An Article <http://www.britannica.com>

Conservatism – By Branch, Doctrine, the Basics of Philosophy, MHTHL Document, 2008.

Conservatism, From Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia, Eccleshall, Pp. 2 to 43, n.d.

Emergence of the Roman Republic: Parallel Lives by Plutarch.

Environmentalism, Definition and More from the Free Merriam Webster Dictionary, Merriam Webstr.com.2010-08-13.

[http:// www. Parties-and-elections.de/content.html](http://www.Parties-and-elections.de/content.html)

[http:// www. Wnd. Com/2010](http://www.Wnd.Com/2010).

<http://reason.com/archives/2002002/01dubunking-green-myths>, Retrieved 2012-06-20.

<http://www.amet soc.org/slogn/clearnair/2005>.

<http://www.Gandhi-manibhaVab.org/gandhiphilosophy/philosophy trusteeship.htm>.

<http://www.merriam->

[webster.com/dictionary/environmentalism](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/environmentalism). Retrieved 2012-06-20.

<http://www.mKgandhi.org/gsr.htm>

<http://www.rediff.com/news/2005/apr/14 Kanch, htm>

<http://www.lessonplanet.com/directory/articles/elementary/science/lesson-plans/15-April/2010/360/eqarthday-activities>, 2010.

<http://www.hindu.com./2004/09/11/stories/2004091112771200.htm>

Liberalism-<http://www.Amazon.Com/New-Liberalism-Matthew-Kalkman/dp/1926991044/ref>.

Ludwig, Von, Misses (1990), Economic Calculation in the Socialist Commonwealth (PDF), Ludwig, Von, Misses Institute, Retrieved 2008-09-08.

Marxism and the National Question, Marxist Internet Archive, Retrieved May 25, 2011.

Saklatvala, S. and Gandhi, M. K., Is India Different? The class Struggle in India: Correspondence on the Indian Labour Movement and Modern Conditions, Communist Party of Great Britain, London, 1927, P. 23.

Saxena, Kiron, An Article, on and by Gandhi, "Gandhi's Feminist Politics, Gender Equality and Patriarchal Values", No Date.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy entry.

Wikipedia Commons has media related to Republicanism.

Others (Document, Interview, Report):-

Report of the All India Women's Conference, Seventh Session, 1931, P. 134.

Interview with Milton Friedman, Stanford, California, July 31, 1991.

Trotsky, Leon, Writings, 1931-33, P. 96.

The Legislative Assembly Debates (Official Report), Vol. IV, Government of India Press, Simla, 1931.

Selected Speeches, Writings, Interviews of Mahatma Gandhi in
England and India, from September 1931 to January 1932

Newspapers:-

Young India, Ahmedabad.

Harijan, Ahmedabad.

The Hindu.

The Indian Opinion.

Times of India, Bombay.

The New York Times.

Anandabazar Patrika.