

MODERN INDIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

BA POLITICAL SCIENCE

CORE COURSE

VI SEMESTER

(2013 ADMISSION)



UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT
SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Calicut University, P.O. Malappuram, Kerala, India-673 635

256-A

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

B.A. POLITICAL SCIENCE

(2013 ADMISSION)

VI SEMESTER

CORE COURSE:

MODERN INDIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

Prepared & Scrutinized by: Dr.G.Sadanandan
Associate Professor and Head.
P.G Department of Political Science
Sree Kerala Varma,College Thrissur

Layout & Settings: Computer Section, SDE

© Reserved

CONTENTS

PAGES

Module - I	05 - 18
Module - II	19 - 29
Module – III	30-45
Module –IV	46 -53
Module - V	54-63

Core Courses XI - POL6BO1: Modern Indian Political Thought

Module I: Indian Renaissance

- (A) Raja Ram Mohan Roy: As a Social reformer.
- (B) Vivekananda: Views on nationalism, democracy and social change

Module II: Hindu Nationalism and Muslim Thought:

- (A) Sarvarkar – Hindu nationalism, Social change and Social reforms
- (B) Mohammed Ali Jinnah – Views on Hindu – Muslim unity and a champion of Two Nations Theory.

Module III: Contributions of Gandhiji and Nehru

- (A) Gandhiji Contributions to Indian Freedom struggle: Techniques of political struggle – Satyagraha and non-violence. Views on socialism, Trusteeship, Ramarajya, decentralization etc.
- (B) Nehru – socialism, secularism and non-alignment.

Module IV : Socialist thinkers:

- (A) M.N.Roy - Radical Humanism
- (B) Lohia - views on socialism
- (C) Jayaprakash Narayan - Total Revolution

Module V : Social Justice:

- (A) Dr.A.B.R.Ambedkar views on social Democracy and Hinduism
- (B) Sree Narayana Guru - As a social reformer; his views on secularism and universalism.

MODULE I

INDIAN RENAISSANCE

Resurgence or Renaissance of modern Asia is one of the most significant phenomena of world history during the last two hundred years. Since the middle of the 19th century the mind and soul of Asia have definitely awakened. The intellectual renaissance of India has been a great casual factor in the rise of modern Indian nationalism. The awakening of the Indian spirit manifested its relativism first in the realms of philosophy, religion and culture and political self consciousness came as an inevitable consequence. The European Renaissance was mainly intellectual and aesthetic. But the renaissance in India was characterized primarily by moral and spiritual aspirations. Revivalism was far more dominant in the Indian Renaissance. Some of the leaders of the Indian Renaissance movement advocated a deliberate modeling and moulding of the present life on the basis of the past scriptures like the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas and Gita.

One of the greatest forces in the making of renaissance in India is the Brahma Samaj founded by Raja Ram Mohan Roy. The Brahma Samaj has done considerable cultural, humanitarian and social work in north India during the mid 19th century. The Brahma Samaj is based on a synthesis of stern monotheism, intellectual rationalism, the monism of the Upanishad and the religious principles of Christianity. Raja Ram Mohan Roy was one of the earliest scholars of comparative religions. In his writings and deeds, Roy launched a vigorous attack on the archaic social principles and mores dividing Indian along caste and religious cleavages. For him, the priority was to create a society free from decadent feudal values that stood in the way of attaining the goal of liberty, equality and fraternity. Arya Samaj, founded by Dayananda Saraswathi, has been another powerful religious and social movement successfully fought for Indian renaissance.

Arya Samaj has done a great service to Indian nationalism especially in Punjab. It created a new progressive and militant spirit among the Hindus. Another movement which has championed Hinduism in all its comprehensiveness was started by Swami Vivekananda, the foremost disciple of Ramakrishna. Vivekananda was a great intellectual and orator and had a remarkable insight both in the Vedanta scriptures and European philosophy. His historic role at the Chicago parliament in 1893 prepared the ground for the propagation of Hinduism in America and Europe. The renaissance in Northern India and southern India was mainly spiritual and religious in character.

RAJA RAM MOHAN ROY (1772-1833)

Raja Ram Mohan Roy stands in history as the living bridge over which India marches from her unmeasured past to her incalculable future. He was the arch which spanned the gulf that yawned between ancient caste and modern humanity, between superstition and science and between despotism and democracy. He was the first cosmopolitan religious thinker and father of modern

India. Roy was deeply imbued with the culture of the west and East, and was a scholar and reformer. He was a nationalist but had profound contempt for narrow-minded nationalism. In religion, Ram Mohan pointed to a universal inner spiritual synthesis, far from the external forms represented through meaningless practice. In pursuit of these religious objectives, Ram Mohan thought of a concerted action by a band of true reformers. His crusade against Hindu modes of worship roused in the orthodox and fanatical reaction against the reformer. Reformist propaganda was initiated through books, tracts, articles and translations from the Upanishads. Jeremy Bentham saluted him as “an admired and beloved fellow worker in the cause of humanity.”

Ram Mohan Roy was born in 1774 in the district of Hoogly in Bengal. Born in a notable Brahmin family in an era of orthodoxy, he grew up amid social evils and religious prejudices. At the age of nine, he had to marry two times, and subsequently one more, because it was impossible for him to escape the privilege of Kulinism. As a grown-up man he saw the burning of his brother’s wife a sati, a sight that shocked his conscience. A prisoner of society and religion, he nevertheless enjoyed certain advantages which even the Dark Age provided. Ram Mohan’s predecessors had held high offices under the Nawabs of Bengal. Because of the family status, he was sent to Patna to study Persian and Arabic. From his knowledge of Persian and Arabic he understood the essence of the Koran Sufi Philosophy; from Sanskrit, the deeper philosophies of the Hindu Upanishads. The inner meaning of Hinduism and Islam drew him to monotheism and created an aversion in him towards idolatry. With profound knowledge of Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian and English and with a deeper understanding of the philosophies of Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism and Christianity he became a rare intellectual of his time. He was in search of rationalism and felt resentful towards the prevailing socio-religious customs around him.

Ram Mohan’s vision was broad enough to encompass various aspects of human life. His movement covered religious, social, economic, educational, political and national issues. A Brahmin himself, he peeped into the inner substance of Brahminical Hinduism to discover the existence of one omnipotent being. The ideal of monotheism was itself a supreme force in Hinduism, as it was in Islam and Christianity. Roy was highly critical of the outer forms of Hinduism, notably, polytheism, worship of images, ritualistic ceremonies, and suspirations rites. Belief in one Almighty god is the fundamental principles of every religion, he said. He established his theories from the Vedanta, the Bible and Koran.

AS A LIBERAL POLITICAL THINKER

Like Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu, Ram Mohan Roy had a passionate attachment to the concept of liberty. He urged the necessity of personal freedom. Liberty is a priceless possession of the human being and, hence, Ram Mohan was a champion of personal freedom. But liberty is also needed for the nation. Roy had a passion for liberty and equality, yet he showed his respect for property and believed in the freedom of contract. Indeed, he pleaded for state intervention in

suppressing evil practices in society and held that it was the duty of the state to protect tenants against the oppression of the landlords;

Like John Locke, Thomas Paine and Hugo Grotius, Roy accepted the immutable sanctity of natural rights. He believed not only in the natural rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of property, but also championed the moral rights of the individual. His theory of natural rights, however, was constructed in the prevailing Indian conditions. Thus although an exponent of the theory of Natural Rights and freedom, he also advocated state legislation for social reform and educational reconstruction. As a champion of freedom and democratic rights and a believer in parliamentary democracy, Roy whole-heartedly supported the reform Bill agitation in England. In his opinion, the struggle between the reformers and anti-reformers was nothing but a struggle between liberty and tyranny throughout the world, between justice and injustice and between right and wrong. It should be remembered that Ram Mohan Roy championed the struggle for freedom and democratic rights, not for Indians alone but for the entire human beings in the world.

Ram Mohan Roy had a keen appreciation of the uncompromising freedom of the creative spirit. He wanted the people of India to develop a sense of self confidence, and was a crusader against unreason and superstition. He admired the English people who not only enjoyed civil and political liberty but was interested in promoting freedom, social happiness and rationalism in the areas where their influence extended. Bipin Chandra Pal while assessing the contribution of Raja Ram Mohan Roy to Indian freedom wrote: Raja was the first to deliver the message of political freedom to India. He so keenly felt the loss of this freedom by his people that even as a boy, yet within his teens, he left his country and travelled to Tibet, because he found it difficult to tolerate the domination of his country by another nation, though, subsequently, with close acquaintance with culture and character of the British people, who seemed to him to have been more intelligent more steady and moderate in their conduct ...’ Similarly, Raja Ram Mohan Roy felt quite happy to hear the news of the introduction of constitutional government in Portugal. He supported the struggle for freedom of the Greeks against the Turks. Again, Roy was opposed to the British occupation of Ireland. He collected funds for the relief of the famine stricken people of Ireland.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was one of the earliest champions of the freedom of the press. Like Milton and other scholars who fought for freedom of press, Roy championed the concept of freedom of written expression. Along with Dwarkanath Tagore, Harchandra Gosh, Gouri Charan Banerjee, Ram Mohan had written a petition in 1823, addressed to the Supreme Court, for the freedom of the press. When the Petition was rejected, and appeal was made to the king in council. The appeal contained Ram Mohan’s reflections on the governmental mechanism of the day. It stated men in power hostile to the liberty of the press, which is a disagreeable. Check upon their conduct, when unable to discover any real evil arising from its existence; have attempted to make the world imagine

that it might, in some possible contingency afford the means of combination against the government, but not to mention that extraordinary emergencies would warrant measures which in ordinary times are totally unjustifiable. Your majesty is well aware that a free press has never yet caused a revolution in any part of world, because, while men can early by represent their grievances arising from the conduct of the local authorities to the supreme Government,.....’ He strongly believed that not only would the freedom of press provide a device for ventilation of grievances it would also enable the government to adopt steps for their redressal before they caused damage to the administration.

Roy recognized and appreciated British rule in India. Although he despised colonialism, he appeared to have endorsed the British rule presumably, because of its historical role in combating the prevalent feudal forces. Not only was the British rule superior to the erst-while feudal rulers, it would also contribute to different India by injecting the values it represented. The continued British rule, he further added, would eventually lead to the establishment of democratic institutions as in Great Britain. Like any other liberals, Roy also felt that the uncritical acceptance of British liberal values was probably the best possible means of creating democratic institutions in India. He appreciated the British rule as a boon in disguise’ because it would eventually transplant democratised governance in India.

HUMANISM AND UNIVERSAL RELIGION

Being a champion of freedom and rights, Ram Mohan was a great humanist and believed in co-operation, tolerance and fellowship. Roy established the ethical concept of universal love on the basis of the doctrine of ethical personality of God. He was also the exponent of cosmopolitanism and stood for brotherhood and independence. He had begun with the study of comparative religion but later come to visualise the necessity of a universal religion. Finally, he formulated the scheme of a fundamental spiritual synthesis stressing the unity of religious experience based on the worship of a monotheistic God. Thus he carried forward the traditions of social and spiritual synthesis stressed by Guru Nanak, Kabir and other saints. Roy believed in universalism and regarded humanity as one family with the different nations and tribes as its branches. In his famous letter written to the French Foreign Minister in 1832, he suggested the establishment of a ‘Congress’ for the settlement of commercial and political disputes. He was a humanitarian and universalist, and like David Hume he also subscribed to the doctrine of universal sympathy. Jeremy Bentham admired Ram Mohan’s Universalism and humanitarianism, and in a letter to him, he said:

‘.....Your works are made known to me by a book in which I read a style which but for the name of the Hindoo I should certainly have ascribed to the pen of a superiority educated and instructed English man.,

Ram Mohan Roy advocated liberal humanitarian nationalism. Emancipation of man from the bondage for ignorance, and social tyranny, his freedom of thought and conscience and his equality

with other fellow men were considered as the fundamentals of liberalism. Such free and emancipated individuals, with feeling towards their mother land, could create national unity. It was through a spiritual and mental revival that Ram Mohan wanted to regenerate the Indian people and unite them into a national fraternity.

SOCIAL REFORMS

Raja Ram Mohan Roy is regarded as the father of Modern India and Indian renaissance. He was a social reformer par excellence. Most of the reform movements that have revolutionised Hindu society can be traced to his great son of India. He was himself the victim of social evils, and throughout his life he worked for the social and religious uplift of his community. His role in doing away with the evil practice of sati among the orthodox Brahmins was historical. By founding Brahma Samaj, Roy sought to articulate his belief in the Islamic notion of one God' in his conceptualization, social reform should precede political reform, for the former laid the foundation for liberty in the political sense. Given his priority, Roy did not appear to have paid adequate attention to his political ideas.

Abolition of sati and the formation of Brahma Samaj

As a crusader against social evils and unscientific and unhealthy practices prevalent in the traditional caste ridden Hindu society, Mohan Roy formed a number of social organisations in North India. In 1816, he started a spiritual society known as 'Atmiya Sabha' for religious and social purposes which were later extended to other fields of activity. Atmiya Sabha was sort of discussion club for scholars of religion and philosophy at other fields of activity. In 1818, he began his celebrated crusade for the abolition of sati, and on December 4, 1829, Lord William Bentinck, the then Governor General of India made Sati illegal by Regulation XVII. Thus the year 1829 may be taken as an important landmark in the social history of India. Ram Mohan Roy certainly won great renown by his crusade to free Hindu women from the dark practice of sati. It must however be noted that along with the European Sanskriti, H.H Wilson, Ram Mohan was opposed to any legal enactment for the immediate suppression of sati. He favoured that the practice 'might be suppressed quietly and unobserved by increasing the difficulties and by the indirect agency of the police.

The most important event which brought fame to Ram Mohan Roy was the establishment of the Brahma Sabha on 20th August 1828 which became famous as the Brahmo Samaj in 1830. After the failure of the British India Unitarian Association (1827), the followers of Ram Mohan felt the urgent necessity of establishing an institution solely devoted to Unitarian and monotheistic worship. Ram Mohan did not contemplate the Brahma Samaj as an institution of a new religious sect. He wanted the monotheists of all religions to use the premises of the Sabha as their own. He also wished this institution to be a meeting ground the people of all religious denominations who believed in one God, who is formless, eternal unsearchable and immutable. He told one of his friends that after his death the Hindus would claim as their own, the Muslims would do the same, and as also the

Christians, but he belonged to no sect as he was the devotee of universal religion. The Samaj stood for the 'worship and adoration of the eternal unsearchable and Immutable Being-who is the author and preserver of the universe but not under or by any other designation or title peculiarly used for and applied to any particular Being or Beings by any man or set of men whatsoever'. It admitted 'no graven image, statue or sculpture, carving, painting, picture, portrait or the likeness of everything'. It further stood for the promotion of charity, morality, piety, benevolence, virtue and the strengthening of the bonds of union between men of all religious persuasions and creeds.

Thus Ram Mohan began the first great religious movement of the 19th century since religion was the dominating force in Indian society, reform of religion meant reform of society. The Brahma Samaj was thus a socio religious reform movement. Ram Mohan raised his voice against the social abuses which rendered in calculable harm to Indian society. The caste system appeared to him as the greatest obstacle to national unity. Ram Mohan proceeded even beyond the frontiers of caste. He adopted a Muslim boy and gave the most daring example of human equality. Besides caste, the traditional Hindu society suffered from other social evils, such as, polygamy, degradation of women, untouchability, and, above all, the horrible sati system. Ram Mohan's endeavour to rouse opinion against these customs marked the beginning of an era of social change. If ultimately the evil practice of sati system was abolished, it was as much due to Ram Mohan as to the Governor General William Bentinck in whose time it was affected.

The principles and ideas of Brahma Samaj gradually spread far beyond Bengal and created an atmosphere of liberalism, rationalism and modernity which greatly influenced Indian thought. As Max Muller has rightly pointed out, 'If there is ever to be a new religion in India, it will, I believe, owe its very life-blood to the large heart of Ram Mohan Roy and his worthy disciples Debendranath Tagore and Keshab Chandra Sen.' But Max Muller's prophecy could not be fulfilled, because the condition attached to it- the emergence of a new religion in India was impossible of realization. Hinduism proved strong enough to counteract the growing influence of Brahmanism as it had done in the case of Buddhism.

The philosophy of Brahma Samaj left its decisive influence on the Indian thought. The death of Ram Mohan (1833) was no doubt a great tragedy for the Brahma Samaj since he was the centre of the entire movement. But the mission of the master was taken up by other daring souls. From the beginning, the movement was confined to the intellectually advanced and educationally enlightened minds who believed in reforms. It was not their aim to make it a mass movement, though the purpose was to educate the masses. It is beyond dispute that the legacies of Ram Mohan could not die after him as they were in consonance with the requirements of the time.

An assessment

Ram Mohan Roy was a multifaceted personality with foresight and vision. He was bold, sincere and honest and had the courage to preach his convictions. He was interested in the

emancipation and empowerment of women and was earliest feminist in modern India who revolted against the subjection of women and preached against the modern encroachments on the ancient rights of Hindu females. He was also a model social reformer who was highly a critical of the prevailing social evils in the traditional Hindu society. He was a prophet of universalism, a keen and ardent champion of liberty in all its phases and apolitical agitator for the freedom of the press and the right of the tenants. He has been called the father of modern India, the first earnest minded investigator of the science of comparative religion and the harbinger of the idea of universal humanism. He stands in history as the living bridge over which India marches from her unmeasured past to her incalculable future.

SWAMI VIVEKANANDA (1863-1902)

The process of Renaissance in Hinduism started with Raja Ram Mohan Roy and it was further developed by the Arya Samaj of Swami Dayanad Saraswathi, the Prarthana Samaj and the Satyashodhak Samaj of Jotiba Phule. Sri Ramakrishna Mission, founded by Swami Vivekananda, played a key role in renaissance and reformation of Hindu society. There was a new interpretation of Vedanta philosophy of Swami Vivekananda and Sri Aurobindo Gosh were two major interpreters of Neo-Vedanta philosophy. They were of the opinion that Neo-Vedanta philosophy would increase cultural strength of Hinduism and pave the way for the growth of nationalism in modern India. They interpreted Indian nationalism in the contest of reformation and rejuvenation of Hinduism.

Swami Vivekananda, whose real name was Narendranath Dutta, was born in an aristocratic Kshatriya family of Calcutta on the 20th January, 1863. He was a seer, an illumined soul, very much different from the ordinary run of mankind. His mind was inminous, he had that supreme knowledge of which the Gita speaks and which results from the realisation of oneness with the Supreme Being. Besides, he had within himself a fountain of energy to carry his message not only to the different parts of India but to the western countries also. Once Sri Ramakrishna said about his young disciple Narendra, who is known to the world as Swami Vivekananda ‘ He is not a pond, he is a reservoir. He is not a pitcher or a jug, he is a veritable barrel...He is not an ordinary sixteen - petalled lotus, he is a glorious lotus with a thousand petal .’ This beautiful summing up of Vivekananda personality suggests about his strength, vigor and endurance. The world knows him as a gigantic that employed his will power and energy to bring about a regeneration of India. He was a pilgrim of the city of God and a warrior for the cause of the suppressed and oppressed all over the world. His personality was notable for its comprehensiveness and deep sensitiveness to the evils prevalent in the socio-economic and moral structure of the country. Due to his heroic mood and sometimes even domineering character, Swami Vivekananda was called, the ‘Hindu Napoleon’.

PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF VIVEKANANDA’S POLITICAL THOUGHT

Vivekananda came under the influence of rationalist thought of his time. He was much impressed by European science, liberalism and democratic pattern of western society as expressed in

political and sociological literature. The sources of the philosophy of Vivekananda are threefold. First, the great Vedic and vedantic tradition. Vedantic philosophy of Sankaracharya influenced a lot to the social philosophy of Vivekananda. Vivekananda was an apostle of the Advaita Vedanta and he belongs to the tradition of the commentators on the Advaita system. He studied the ideas and principles of J. S. Mill, the philosophers of French Revolution, Kant and Hegel. He even entered into correspondence with Herbert Spencer and offered criticism of some of his ideas.

Secondly, a powerful source of Vivekananda's philosophy was his contact with Ramakrishna Paramahansa (1836 – 1886), one of the greatest saints and mystics of modern India. While Ramakrishna Paramahansa had preached his sermons in a style of prophetic simplicity and clarity, Vivekananda was the philosopher combined with the religious teacher. Hence he preached some of these same truths in more philosophical languages and used modern logical terminology. Thirdly, a rich source of Vivekananda's philosophy was his own experience of life. He traversed the wide world and to the interpretation of his experiences. Ramakrishna's death in August, 1886 brought a change in Vivekananda's life. After the death of his master, he embarked upon extensive travels from the Himalayas to the Cape Comorin (Kanyakumari) with an urge to spread the message of Ramakrishna and see the natural beauty of Motherland and visited all the important centers of Indian culture. Through his travels he not only saw India's cultural wealth, the strength of her traditions, but they also saw her socio- economic backwardness, evils of caste system and her mental inertia into which she had fallen.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL IDEAS OF VIVEKANANDA

Swami Vivekananda established the Ramakrishna Mission to serve the people. He wanted to find a new path of progress for Hinduism because he was not happy with the reform movements as they were mere imitations of the western world. He had three alternatives before him. First, to follow the path shown by Raja Ram Mohan Roy and join Brahma Samaj. Secondly, to follow the path of total renunciation and go to Himalayas to attain the goal of liberation. Thirdly, to follow the path of service to the society and create social awakening in the minds of people about modernization of the Indian society. Swami Vivekananda chose the third path and told the Indians to see Narayana (God) in the form of a poor beggar dying of starvation. Thus for Vivekananda the Ramakrishna Mission should stand for selfless service of the people, ceaseless efforts to find truth and thereby for reawakening of the spirit of India. During Vivekananda's life time and after his death, Sri Ramakrishna Mission played a key role in the renaissance of Hinduism.

HIS VIEWS ON RELIGION AND HINDUISM

Swami Vivekananda made a distinct and notable contribution to world religion in his championship of Hinduism as a universal gospel of ethical humanism and spiritual idealism. Hinduism had been the subject of intense misrepresentation at the hands of Christian missionaries. According to him, Hinduism was the mother of religions and this can be, to some extent, demonstrated historically. The ancient Vedic religion influenced Buddhism and the later was possibly a potent factor in the rise of Christianity. Vivekananda's exposition and defence of Hinduism at the parliament of Religions led the 'New York Herald' to remark that the swami was the greatest figure

in the parliament. It further added: 'After hearing him we feel how foolish it is to send missionaries to this learned land'.

Vivekananda was a representative of entire Hinduism from the Vedas to Vaisnavism. He did not emphasize the sanctities of the Veda to the same extent as did the late swami Dayananda. He defined religion as the vital and moral force which gives strength to a person or to a nation. According to Vivekananda, 'Strength is life, weakness is death'. In heroic words, Vivekananda declared: 'But this is not the time with us to weep, even in joy, we have had weeping enough; no more is this the time for us to become soft. This softness has been with us till we have become like masses of cotton. What our country now wants are muscles of iron and nerves of steel, gigantic will, which nothing can resist, which..... will accomplish their purpose in any fashion, even if it meant going down the bottom of the ocean and meeting death face to face. This is what we want, and that can only be created, established and strengthened by understanding and realizing the ideal of the advaita, that ideal of the oneness of all.' Jawaharlal Nehru in his 'The Discovery of India'. had pointed out that the great refrain of Vivekananda's teaching was fearlessness.

PHILOSOPHY OF NEO-VEDANTA

Swami Vivekananda was fundamentally a man of religion and philosophy. Vedanta philosophy was one of the most important ancient philosophies of India which believed that God above was real and the visible world was unreal and the absorption of individual soul in the one supreme soul was the goal of every human being. This is called liberation which could be achieved with the help of true knowledge. Vivekananda followed the Vedanta philosophy preached by his teacher which was rooted in the traditional Indian wisdom of Bhakti tradition. He did not ask people to perform their duties in the spirit of selflessness. There were three important principles of neo-Vedanta philosophy of Vivekananda. They were as follows:

1. Vedanta philosophy believed in the oneness between God and man and the solidarity of the universe.
2. It did not stand for a life of renunciation but stood for selfless action in the services of humanity. Hence, service for man should be treated as services of god.
3. It propagated the principle of universal tolerance and believed that different religious faiths were different paths to reach the goal of liberation.

According to Vivekananda, New-Vedanta philosophy stood for service, sacrifice and freedom. He was a metaphysician of the Vedanta school. He was one of the great interpreters of the Vedanta philosophy in modern times. He was the first great Hindu of modern period who made persistent and systematic efforts to realise the dream of the universal propaganda of Hindu religion and philosophy. He drew the essence of Hinduism from Upanishads, the Gita and the Sutra of Vyasa. He used the term Vedanta to cover the systems of thought expounded by Sankaracharya, Ramanuja, Madhava and others and maintained that there was no incompatibility between the various systems of thought

PROPHET OF NATIONALISM

Swami Vivekananda is considered as one of the prophets of the Indian nationalism because he tried to awaken Indian people who were lying in deep slumber. He wanted to see the emergence of a strong and self confident India which would give the message of the Vedanta to the world. He strongly believed that the Indians should be proud of their rosy history, tradition, culture and religion and should try their level best to reform them. The awakening of the spirit of India was the goal for young people. Hence he advised them to ‘arise, awake and stop not till the goal is reached’

Vivekananda believed that there is one all dominating principle manifesting itself in the life of each nation. According to him, religion had been the guiding principle in India’s history. He maintained thus: In each nation as in music there is main note, a central theme, upon which all others turn. Each nation has a theme: everything else is secondary. India’s theme is religion. Social reform and everything else are secondary’. He worked to build the foundations of a religious theory of nationalism which was later advocated by Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo Ghosh. Vivekananda was the passionate advocate of the religious theory of nationalism because religion, according to him, had to be made the backbone of the national life. He believed that the future greatness of the nation could be built only on the foundations of its past greatness.

Vivekananda was highly critical of the British rule in India because he held that due to their rule Indians lost confidence, famine engulfed the land, farmers and artisans were reduced to poverty and deprived. The British governments, East India Company etc., were exploiting Indians in all spheres of socio- economic activity. Due to discriminatory and exploitative economic policies of the British government, Indian’s could not develop their natural resources and raw materials.

According to Vivekananda, the national regeneration of India would begin when people became fearless and started demanding their rights. He asked the Indians to develop solidarity and oneness of the spirit by the eradication of social evils, superstitions and evils of caste system. He was of the opinion that the evils of caste system divided the Indian society into classes and created the feeling of inferiority and superiority among them. As a prophet of Indian nationalism, Vivekananda held that though there was a variety for languages, cultures and religions in India, there existed a common ground between Indian people. For the Indians religion was unifying force as the spirituality was Blood in the life of India.

Vivekananda was an ardent patriot and had tremendous love for the country. He was the embodiment of emotional patriotism. He had established almost a sense of identity- consciousness with the country, its peoples and its historic ideals’. According to him, it was the duty of the educated Indians to make its knowledge available to the people in their oneness and solidarity. He exhorted Indians not to get involved in the divisive issue of race and language and imbibe the spirit of unity. He said that Hindus should not blame Muslims for their numerous invasions because the Muslim conquest came as a salvation to the downtrodden masses in India. National unity, according to him, could not be fostered by caste conflict but it would be secured by raising the lower to the level of higher classes and not by bringing the upper to the lower level. For the growth of national spirit in

India, independence of mind was necessary. Indians should be proud of their motherland and declare that all Indians, despite their caste, linguistic and religious differences, are brothers.

The main component of Vivekananda concept of nationalism is as follows.

1. There was unity and oneness of the Indian people despite their outward diversity.
2. It was necessary to remove the evils of caste system in order to inculcate the spirit of social solidarity.
3. There was similarity in the teachings of different religions and India consisted of all religious communities.
4. National spirit in India could be developed by young people by devoting their life to social service and national awakening.

FREEDOM

One of the important contributions of Vivekananda to political theory is his concept of freedom. He had a comprehensive theory of freedom. According to Vivekananda, freedom is the keynote of spiritual life. The whole universe, he said, in its constant motion represented the dominant quest for freedom. He regarded the light of liberty as the only condition of growth. He not only stood for spiritual freedom but also wanted the material or external freedom of man. He believed in the natural right of man. He declared that liberty does not certainly mean the absence of obstacles in the path of misappropriation of wealth etc, by you and me, but it is our natural right to be allowed to use our own body, intelligence or wealth according to our wills without doing any harm to others, and all the members of society ought to have the same opportunity for obtaining well education or knowledge. According to him, freedom in its total aspects- physical freedom, mental freedom and spiritual freedom- had been the watchwords of the Upanishads.

Vivekananda considered freedom not only for maintaining religious harmony among various religious faiths and for realising the spiritual life by the individuals but he also thought that the individual freedom was equally dispensable for the realisation of his personality in the social and economic spheres. He, therefore, wanted to make freedom as the natural possession of individuals. He inspired that every individual must cultivate a free body mind and spirit. The strength and vitality of society depends on individual initiative and freedom. According to Vivekananda, society was only a social agency and it should not encroach on individual freedom. He held that liberty becomes meaningless without equality or rights. His recognition of the natural rights of an individual, in fact, puts to an end to all kinds of privileges in society and establishes the right to individual equality. However, individual freedom should not be viewed in an isolated way, and it must be studied in relation to society. In fact, his concept of individual freedom has a bearing on the problems of the individual's relationship with society.

Although Vivekananda concept of freedom was primarily spiritual, he did not ignore the social and material sides of it. To the wordly man, material life is as real as the social life. To deny material life to him is to condemn him to death. Thus, Vivekananda wanted to base the organisation

of society on a synthesis of material and spiritual life. It stands for a synthesis of the individual and social freedom, material and spiritual freedom.

CASTE SYSTEM AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Vivekananda social and political ideas followed from his Vedanta conception of the inner self as omnipotent and supreme. He wanted to get rid of all evil ideas of class and caste superiority and tyranny which have made the Hindu society loose, stratified and disintegrated. He mercilessly denounced the evils of untouchability and condemned all forms of inhuman practices prevalent in the traditional Hindu society. However, as a theoretician, Vivekananda rationalised the fourfold Varna divisions. According to him, the fourfold differentiation of the social order represents the ideal type. The Brahman priest stands for the rule of knowledge and the advancement of science. The Kshatriya stands for order. The Vaishya represents commerce and help in the dissemination of knowledge through trade. The Sudra represents the triumph of equality. He believes that if these four dominant principles could be synthesized that will be an ideal condition because the harmony of knowledge, protection, economic activities and equality is to be certainly desired. But this consummation is difficult of realisation because every order seeks to concentrate power in its own hands and that leads to degeneration. The Brahmas, for example, became monopolistic of knowledge and excluded others from the domain of culture. The Kshatriyas became cruel and tyrannical. Hence, Vivekananda rebelled against oppressions and repressions practised by the upper castes with the tacit support of the ruling regimes from time to time.

Vivekananda wanted an overall development of India and the eradication of poverty and degeneration of people. He was an opponent of feudalism and aristocracy. He pleaded for bridging the gap between the rich and the poor. He wanted to awaken the toiling masses (peasants, workers, untouchables etc) of the country. Vivekananda's theory of social change was based on the Indian conception of history. It was a theory of political cycle that visualized periodic and cultural change in the regimes on the basis of law of change, with the history of Greece, Rome and India. He held that in every individual, there prevailed three qualities of knowledge, valour and ignorance and in every society and in every civilisation, there existed four classes of the people. All societies which had developed division of labour had four classes namely Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudras.

According to Vivekananda in the first stage of human development, in almost all civilizations of the world, the power was in the hands of Brahmins or the priest. He ruled with the help of magic. His power was overthrown by the Kshatriyas or Warriors who formed monarchical or oligarchic governments. But the power of this class was overthrown by the Vaishyas or traders. He further says that the power of the Vaishyas would be over thrown by the Sudras. As per the law of nature wherever there was an awakening of new and stronger life, there it tried to conquer and take the place of the old and the decaying. Nature favoured the dying of the unfit and the survival of the fittest. The power of the Kshatriyas was brought down because of its dictatorship. He maintained that the real power of the society rested with the Sudras who produced wealth with the help of their labour power. The Sudras would become great not by acquiring the qualities of Brahmins, Kshatriyas or Vaishyas,

but by retaining their own qualities as producers of wealth. Thus in the political theory of Vivekananda the awakening and freedom of India was synchronised with the rise of Sudras and workers and peasants to political power.

Vivekananda was a believer in moderation with regard to social change. Social customs are the results of the arrangements of society for self-preservation. But if these regulations are perpetuated, society may suffer decadence.

VIEWS ON SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM AND DEMOCRACY

Swami Vivekananda was a social realist. He wanted the materialistic and dynamic west to imbibe the spiritual teachings of the yoga and the Vedanta. His message to the Indians was realistic and pragmatic. He was intensely conscious of the miseries of India's millions. His revolutionary statement read thus: It is mockery to offer religion to a starving man. The deep social realism of Vivekananda is also revealed in his statement that India's political slavery of a thousand years is rooted in the suppression of the masses. He mercilessly denounced the sophistication, the arrogance and the wickedness of the upper classes of Indian society. They have been responsible for exploiting the millions of masses throughout India's history. Once Swami Vivekananda declared thus: I am a socialist not because I think it is a perfect system, but half a loaf is better than no bread.' He can be considered a socialist in two senses. First, he had the historical vision to realise that in Indian history there has been the dominance of the two upper castes. The Brahmans and the Kshatriyas. While the later perpetrated political and economic exploitation, the former enchained the masses with new complicated ceremonies and rituals. He openly denounced caste oppressions and refused to recognise any social barrier between man and man. His gospel of social equalitarianism is fundamentally socialistic. Secondly, Vivekananda was a socialist because he championed the concept of equal chance. 'For all the inhabitants of the country. This concept of equal chances is definitely in the socialist direction.

Vivekananda was aware of the weaknesses of the western gospels of socialism and anarchism. He was in favour of violent revolution for achieving the goal of socialism. He was a great social realist who was conscious of caste oppressiveness in Indian society and who left the crying urgency of the solution of the problems of food and hunger. Marx stressed the need for an organised proletarian party for transformation from capitalism to socialism. Vivekananda wanted to train individual workers for the social awakening and change in the traditional caste-ridden Indian society. The fundamental difference between the Vedantic socialism of Vivekananda and Marxism is that although the former stressed the reformation of society, he put greater stress on the elevation of human consciousness into the divine' Marxism was born as a reaction against the disturbing and maladjusted situation created by the industrial revolution. The spiritually-rooted sociological doctrines of Vivekananda with their stress on the cultivation of purity and fraternity have been the restatement of the perennial philosophy of justice, love and universal compassion

Vivekananda was a great advocate of democracy and he wanted to awaken the young people to establish free and democratic government in India. According to him, the principle of liberty was

important because there could not be growth in society without liberty. He believes that everyone should have liberty of thought, discussion, food, dress etc. He was a supporter of equality of all men and pleaded for the abolition of caste and class privileges. Caste system was a hindrance to the development of India into a strong nation.

Vivekananda's plea for the individual freedom and social equality made him a firm believer in the institution of democracy. The liberation of the masses necessitates their participation in the activities of the government. Democracy, according to him, inculcates faith in self reliance and self – government; it eliminates the dependence of the individual on parliament. He viewed democracy both as a way of life and a form of government. As a way of life, democracy envisages freedom, equality, brother hood and their union. As a form of government he maintained that social evolution was possible through the cyclic rule of the caste system. He believed that democracy encourages individual initiative and self- reliance in administering the affairs of government. Democracy provides for them to uplift themselves and mould their future. He believes that religious tolerance was crucial for the growth of democracy because that alone could promote the cause of liberty, equality and fraternity.

An estimate

Swami Vivekananda was a great nationalist of India who wanted to revitalize the nation through the vitality of religion. He believed that religion constituted the 'centre, the keynote of the whole of music of national life of India. He is regarded as the patriot and prophet of modern India. It was due to his message of courage and fearlessness that he was described as 'tamer of souls' and 'cyclonic monk from India'.

MODULE II

HINDU NATIONALISM AND MUSLIM THOUGHT

V D SAVARKAR (1883-1966)

Vinayak Damodar Savarkar represented an unconventional strand of political thought in India in so far as he propounded a theory of cultural nationalism in contrast to the theory of territorial nationalism propounded by the leaders of the mainstream nationalist movement. The uniqueness of the personality and thinking of Savarkar may be gauged from the fact that while one school of thought calls him an 'ardent nationalist, heroic revolutionary and terrorist' the other branded him as an angry, resentful, vengeful, violent and intolerant prophet. In fact, Savarkar gave a systematic articulation to the opinions held by many people in the country that the true resurgence of India as a distinguished part of the comity of nations could be facilitated only by rooting Indian nationalism in the cultural ethos of the Hindu religion. As an ardent exponent of Hindu nationalism, Savarkar believes that the real personality of India could be restored to her only by reviving her glorious past and re-establishing Hindu Rastra. The political philosophy of savarkar appeared as a distinct ideological formulation having its focus on the homogeneity of the Hindu population living in a particular tract of land.

The tradition of intellectual explorations by Hindu revivalists found its articulation in two distinct streams that may be called as Hinduism and Hindutva. Despite having the same long term perspective of establishing the vitality, the two streams differed on the idea of conceptualising the Hindu view of life. Hence, the votaries of Hinduism tried to conceptualise the idea of Hindu view of life as essentially religious-personal in nature without any ramification for other aspects of life. As against the individualistic and restrictive conceptualization of the idea of Hinduism, the doctrine of Hindutva was evolved by radical elements of the Hindu way of life in India. In fact the proponents of the ideology of Hindutva tried to envisage a comprehensive blue print for the reconstruction of the politico-cultural system of the country in such a way that Hindu would get an absolute preponderance in the affairs of the country. The ideology of Hindutva, therefore, moves beyond the confines of religious and personal life of individuals and seeks to reconstruct a whole new world for Hindus by way of establishing the Hindu Rashtra in the country.

The ideology of Hindutva was essentially the ideology of Hindu nationalism. The first prominent Hindu nationalist ideology was V.D. Savarkar, He wrote a book called HIndutva in 1924 to explain the basic principles of Hindu nationalism. In 1925 the Rahtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh (RSS) was formed to protect the Hindus from the Muslim aggression. In the subsequent period, Savarkar an RSS propagated the Hindu nationalist ideology against the ideology of the composite Indian nationalism expounded by Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress.

Savarkar was born on 28 May 1883 in a traditional Brahman family in Maharashtra at a time when the Indian renaissance was manifested in diverse interpretations of the past, present and future of the country. While a section of the Indian society had started presenting an intellectual critique of the political and economic dimensions of the British rule in India, certain other sections were busy in

reviving the religious, cultural traditions and legacies of their people. Hence, Savarkar's childhood appears to have been made in deep inculcation of the values of the Hindu religion and culture and exhortations of reviving the glorious legacies left by the great Maratha rulers like Shivaji. Besides his deep pain at the beating to Hindus at the hands of people of other religions, Savarkar was equally anguished at the brutalities of the British rule in India. He, therefore developed a vengeful attitude towards British rule in India and expressed his willingness to die fighting for the cause and independence of India. Thus from his early childhood, two distinct persuasions of this life appeared to be his passion: to work for the cause of the Hindus and fight for the independence of the country.

His nationalist activities earned him the ire of the British and he was expelled from Fergusson College, Poona. However, with the recommendations of Lokmanaya Tilak, he was offered to study in London by the prominent Indian revolutionary Shyaniji Krishna Varma. Consequently Savarkar remained a student - revolutionary in London during the period of 1906 to 1910, after which he was arrested and sentenced to 50 years of imprisonment at Andaman. His stay and intimate interactions with Indian revolutionaries in London helped sharpen his understanding of the history and causes of the denigration of India as a nation for a long period of time. In fact, his innovative and pioneering interpretation of the revolt of 1857 as India's first war of independence came in the form of his book entitled. 'The Indian war of Independence of 1857'. After spending rigorous life of more than a decade in Kalapani (Andaman Nicobar Island) Savarkar was brought back to Maharashtra and interned at Ratnagiri till 1937. Thus more than two and half decades of solitary confinement of Savarkar offered him the opportunity to carry out his intellectual explorations into the various aspects of the problems and solutions to the past and present of the Indian people. He was released from confinement in 1937. Instead of joining the rank and file of the Congress party to fight for the independence of the country, he joined the Tilakite Democratic Swaraj party, a relatively unknown outfit espousing the cause of Indian nationalism based on the lines of the radical swaraj as advocated by Balgangadhra Tilak.

SOCIO- POLITICAL IDEAS OF SAVARKAR

Savarkar was a product of renaissance in western India and in his early days he was influenced by the philosophy of Gopal Ganesh Agarkar, a nationalist philosopher. Agarkar was deeply influenced by the ideas of Herbert Spencer, Jeremy Bentham and J. S. Mill. Savarkar was a supporter of positivist epistemology and accepted the direct evidence of the senses as the only valid source of knowledge. He rejected the sanctity of religious scriptures and maintained that all religious scriptures were man – made and their teaching could not be applied to all societies in all times. He favored the pursuit of science and reason and criticized irrational and superstitious practices of Hindus.

Views on Social Reforms and Caste System

V.D. Sasvarkar was great supporter of social freedoms and he exhorted the Hindus to accept modern practices based on science and reason and reject the religious superstitions and customs which were standing hindrance to the social progress. He believes that all the religious scriptures were man – made and they were subject to scrutiny of reason.

Savarkar was a believer in the idea of social change and argued that a dynamic society needed to keep on changing in accordance with the imperatives of the time. However, in perceiving the idea of social change, he was highly impressed by the philosophical traditions of European thinkers, from which he borrowed the three significant characteristics of human life. They are as follows:

1. In nature and in all human societies, the principle of life struggle determined the course of action because in this life struggle the fittest survived and those who could not stand the struggle got eliminated.
2. Violence was in –built in the creation of nature and nature abhorred absolute non-violence. But due to gradual development of human beings, both violence and non-violence got interviewed, hence, in this difficult life; man should acquire strength and power to overcome the problems he faced.
3. There was no absolute morality in the morality. Morality or immorality of a particular action was ultimately determined by the factors such as time, space and object.

Applying these principles of European philosophy in the Indian circumstances, Savakar emphasized the constant struggle one had to face in one's life. He, therefore, argued for a dynamic conceptualisation of social change, where by one needed to ensure one's survival in society and observe the values and norms of social conduct in relative perspectives of time, space and object.

Savarkar was a votary of social reform in the Indian society to get rid of the evil social practices on the one hand, and imbibe the virtues of modern science and reason, on the other. Criticizing the evil practices of caste system on the Hindu society, he repudiated the chaturvarnya system as the root cause of the caste system which had given birth to such inhuman practices like untouchability and unapproachability. The caste system encouraged and institutionalised inequality divided Hindu society into numerous compartments and sowed the seeds of hostility and hatred among the Hindus. Hindus constantly faced defends at the hands of invaders because of the caste system.

Savarkar wanted the Hindus to reject blinded faith in the Vedas and customs and tried to acquire material strength. They should accept the supremacy of machines and technology and break all bounds of blind faith and customs.

INTERPRETATION OF INDIAN HISTORY

Savarkar was a strong critic of the occupation of India by foreign invaders in the form of the Muslim and English rulers. He held the view that India rightfully belonged to Hindus and her forcible occupation by non-Hindus was a patent act of aggression which must be resented and repulsed by all Hindus of the country. The nationalist interpretation of history found its eloquent articulation in Savarkar in his work, Hindu Pad Padshahi, published in 1925 and written to analyse the rise of Maharashtra, even in the face of Muslim predominance in other parts of the country. He commended the valiance and superb military leadership of Shivaji and interpreted his victory as a befitting reply to the policy of barbaric aggression, violent usurpation of power, fanatical hatred and intolerance of the Muslim leaders. He praised the system of governance adopted by Shivaji as

conforming to the system of governance as envisaged in the religious scriptures of the Hindus. His appreciation for the Maratha polity emanated from his perception that it was based on the infallible principles of swadharama and swaraj. Thus, in his interpretation of the history of India during medieval times, Savarkar's theoretical format remained focussed on Hindu nationalism which seemed to be an article of faith for him.

Savarkar's interpretation of Indian history is marked by an intense and passionate glorification of Vedic Hinduism. He not only opposed to the cult of pacifism, forgiveness and generosity popularized by Buddhism but even asserts that 'the Buddhists often times betrayed the cause of Indian independence and Indian empire.

Similarly, in his interpretation of the history of India in modern times, Savarkar's nationalistic orientations came to their best when he called the revolt of 1857 (Sepoy Revolt) as India's first war of independence. He has tremendous admiration for the heroes of the struggle. He refuted the claims of British historian that the revolt of 1857 was just a sepoy mutiny having nothing to do with the general masses of the country and not reflecting any inherent disaffection of the people of India towards British rule in the country. Savarkar argued that the revolt of 1857 was India's first war of independence owing to the fact that it was the natural manifestation of the feeling of independence visiting the hearts and minds of the patriotic soldiers right from the western to the eastern parts of the country.

THEORY OF HINDUTVA

Savarkar was the first systematic exponent of the Hindu nationalism. He elaborately analysed his theory of Hindutva in his book entitled Hindutva published in Nagpur in 1923. In the process of developing his doctrine of Hindu nationalism, he rejected some of the arguments of territorial nationalism. He held the view that the existence of a mere territory did not make nation but nation, on the other hand, was made by the people who constituted themselves as a political community bound together by cultural affinities and traditions.

Hindutva as Cultural Nationalism

Savarkar was a supporter of cultural nationalism. He believes that identity formation was the essence of nationalism. India had received such identity from the Hindu religion. Despite having outward differences, the Hindus were internally bound together by cultural, religious, social, logistic and historical affinities. These affinities were developed through the process of assimilation and association of countless centuries. It molded the Hindus into a homogeneous and organic nation and above all induced a will to a common national life. This homogeneity was important because other sections in the society had divergent cultural traditions. Savarkar argued that it was cultural, racial and religious unity that counted more in the formation of the nation. While defining nation, Savarkar wrote that nation meant a political community which had occupied a continuous and adequate territory and developed independent national identity.

According to Savarkar, Hindus constituted nation because they had developed close affinities with the land bound by Himalayas to the Indian Ocean and the Indus River. Hindus considered India

as their fatherland and holy land. Thus Savarkar effectively excluded those people who did not consider India as their holy land-because their sacred religious places were not situated in India. For him, Hindu society and not Hindu religion came first; Hindus were a nation because they were a self-enclosed community. The Hindus shared a common historical past. Savarkar knew that ultimately, nationalism was a psychological feeling and it was necessary to cultivate national consciousness among the Hindus. The common affinities should be used to strengthen the national consciousness.

Savarkar accepted the cultural and organic solidarity of the Hindu nation. He had been devoted to the ideal of Hindu resurrection and believed in the cultural superiority of Hinduism. He stressed the moral and social regeneration of Hinduism. He said thus: 'Let Hinduism concern itself with the salvation of life after death, the concept of God, and the universe..... But so far as the materialistic secular aspect is concerned, the Hindus are a nation bound a common culture, a common history, a common language, common country and a common religion' The real development of the Hindus could take place only when there was a consolidation of their interests and responsibilities. The spirit of fellowships and community, hence, was to replace the pervasive isolationism of the Hindus.

According to Savarkar, a Hindu means a person who regards this land of Bharatvarsha, from the Indus to the seas, as his Fatherland as well as his Holyland that is the cradle land of his religion. There are three fundamental criteria for being included under Hinduism or being a Hindu. First, the territorial bond or rashtra is a primary requirement' A Hindu is one who feels attachment to the geographical region extending from the Sindhu river to the Brahmaputra and from the Himalaya to the Cape Comorin. Secondly, the racial or blood bond of the 'Jati'. A Hindu is one who inherits the blood of the race "whose first and discernible source could be traced to the Himalayan altitude of the Vedic Saptasindhu". A third criterion of being a Hindu is culture or sanskriti. A Hindu is one who feels pride in the Hindu culture and civilization represented in common historical memories of achievements and failures, in common artistic, literary and juristic creations and in common rituals or festivals or other media of collective expression.

According to Savarkar, the concept of Hinduism is a broader and more comprehensive than Hinduism. Hinduism has a religious significance and connotes the theology and ritualism of the Hindus, Hindutva comprehends within it this religious bond of Hinduism but goes beyond. Within Hindutva are included the social, moral, political and economic aspects as well. Hindutva connotes the notion of an organic socio-political body knit together by the three bonds of territorial belongings, blood or birth and culture.

Savakar firmly believes in the doctrine of Hindutva or Hindu solidarity. In a competitive world, full of tensions and struggles for power, the solidification of strength is the sole means of survival. According to Savarkar, Hindutva is not only a concept of organic socio – political unity, it is also the essential elements of nationalism. It is a movement as well as a programme of action. He favours inter-caste marriage between all sections of Hindus. He did not believe in the policy of

appeasement. He believes that there is no conflict between Hindutva and nationalism. He said, a Hindu patriot worth the name cannot but be an Indian patriot as well. To the Hindus, Hindustan being the fatherland and Holy land, the love they bear to Hinduism is boundless’.

The ideology of Hindutva as propounded by Savarkar, was, rooted in the vision of Hindu Solidarity. It was, in fact, a political construct whose antecedents lay in the cultural ethics of the Hindus. He maintained that despite having numerous external differentiations, internally, Hindus are bound together by certain commonalities which have been brought about by centuries of assimilation and association with each other. To Savarkar, in the making of the Hindu rashtra what counted more than else was the cultural, racial and religious unity of the people.

In a Hindu rashtra, Savarkar offered the minorities some degree of freedom and right to participation in the affairs of the state provided they accept a position of non-aggression to the interests and rights of Hindus. As he clarifies, ” We shall ever guarantee protection to the religion, culture and language of the minorities for themselves, but we shall no longer tolerate any aggression on their part on the equal liberty of the Hindus to guard their religion, culture and language as well. If non- Hindu minorities are to be protected, then surely the Hindu majority also must be protected against any aggressive minority in India”. He, therefore, opposed the demand of Muslim for the grant of separate electorate in India. Thus, Savakar’s Hindutva is not a narrow creed. It is claimed to be rationalistic and scientific. It is not opposed to humanism and universalism.

Assessment

Savarkar’s theory of Hindutva has been subjected to severe criticisms from different corners. He has been branded for providing the intellectual input for the present day right wing extremism in the country. AS Jyotirmaya Sharma has rightly pointed out, Savarkar politicised religion and introduced religious metaphors into politics. He pioneered an extreme, uncompromising the rhetorical form of Hindu nationalism in Indian political discourse. His life exhibited an unwavering pursuit of a single ideal to establish India as a Hindu nation. Even today, Savarkar remains the first, and most original, prophet of extremism in India.

Further, he has been charged as being an ideologue whose theoretical constructs failed to cut much ice with the people in the country. Savarkar’s ideology failed to realize its political goal because it lacked the strength that comes from the mass support. His unidimensional approach to politics – protection of Hindu interests against Muslim encroachment – had no relevance for the Hindu masses.

In addition to the above criticisms, there are obvious tensions and logical inconsistencies in the Hindu nationalism of V.D Savarkar. He could not properly define the concept of nationalism because Hindus, Muslims and Christians shared common traditions and affinities in India even in the religious field. His advocacy of reason, science and technology was instrumental in the sense that for him they were more useful because they helped him forge strong Hindu nation. Reason and science in the west were the culmination of the development of social philosophy which fought against religious

prejudices and superstitions. The same could not be used to strengthen the cause of religious nationalism. Also, his distinction between the nation and the state was not convincing because both of them could not be separated and they came together as nation state.

Notwithstanding the attacks on the thoughts of Savarkar from both theoretical as well as practical prospective, the fact cannot be denied that his intellectual explorations have gone to enrich and give newer dimensions to the body of political thought in India. From the stand point of political theory, the distinction made by Savarkar between Hinduism and Hindutva is remarkable. By and large, Hinduism is a religious and theological category. Hindutva is a political concept and comprehends social, educational, economic, political and cultural matters as well. It is beyond dispute that Savarkar was the first Indian thinker who declared that Hindus formed separate nation in India. He stood for a strong Hindu nation which would withstand and survive ferocious life struggle among nations, He sought to popularize the Hindu nationalism throughout his life with the help of the Hindu Maha Sabha.

MOHAMMED ALI JINNAH (1876-1948)

The Muslim thought in modern India can be understood properly only in its larger historical setting. It is important to note that the evolution and growth of the Muslim political thought was a complex phenomenon involving historical context of the Muslims' social cultural and political life and interactive process with the colonial rule which had been established in India particularly in the aftermath of the revolt of 1857. Several issues had emerged, such as relative backwardness of Muslims in relation to modern tendencies which had come in the wake of the establishment of the colonial rule. The question of accommodation of various social groups including Muslims in the existing and future power structures became an important issue which was widely debated among all groups. Equally important was the issue of religio-cultural identity of various communities which went through a process of redefinition in the late 19th century as well as the first half of the 20th century. All these issues emerged over the years with varying responses from different social groups which affected inter-community relations. While all these issues were matter of concern for all, it is important to recognise that the responses of the Muslims to all these issues was not uniform but varied since the Muslims did not constitute a monolithic community. They were divided on lines of language, region and class as any other religious community.

Mohammad Ali Jinnah (1876-1948) travelled long distances in his political career finally to become the founding father of Pakistan. He was born on 25th December 1876 in the family of a relatively prosperous business family of Jinnabhai in Karachi. After his initial education in Karachi and Bombay, Jinnah went to England to study law which he completed at the age of 18. At the age of 20 he returned to India to join the Bar first in Karachi and later in Bombay and soon established himself among the legal fraternity of the city. He has won great fame as a subtle lawyer and had acquired a great practice in the legal profession.

Jinnah became a part of the Congress led politics by joining the Indian National Congress in 1906. In 1906, he worked as private secretary to Dadabhai Naoroji. Gopalakrishna Gokhale had high

hopes from Jinnah as an ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity. Jinnah had the greatest respect and admiration for Gokhale and in a speech in Bombay in May 1915, he said that Gokhale was “a great political rishi, a master of the finance of India and the great champion of education and sanitation”. He was a nationalist in the earlier days. He had won great applause when he defended Lokmanya Tilak in the sedition case of 1916. In 1910 Jinnah was elected to the Imperial Legislative Council by the Muslim electorate of Bombay and in 1916, also he was elected to the Imperial Legislative Council by the same electorate.

JINNAH AND THE MUSLIM LEAGUE:

The All-India Muslim League was started in 1906 and its first session met at Dacca in December 1906 under the leadership of Agakhan. Jinnah was persuaded by the leaders of All India Muslim League to enrol himself as a member of the League. He, however, made it clear that his loyalty to Muslim cause would in no way prove an impediment to the comprehensive interests of the nation. In 1914, Jinnah went to England as a member of the deputation sent by the Indian National Congress in connection with the proposed reform of the Indian council. In October 1916, Jinnah presided over the Sixteenth Bombay provincial conference at Ahmadabad. He pleaded for unity between the Hindu and Muslims. He supported the necessity of communal electorates for awakening the Muslims. He also presided at the Lucknow session of the All India Muslim League in December 1916 and pleaded for Hindu-Muslim unity. With the beginning of the Non-Cooperation movement and the upsurge of mass awakening, Jinnah felt that he did not belong to the Congress. He opposed the main resolution on, Non cooperation at the Nagpur Congress in 1920. As a lawyer he had been a believer in constitutional methods of action and hence he could not fall in love with the radical policy of the Congress which took to non-violent direct action under Gandhi’s leadership.

Jinnah was opposed to the Nehru Report of 1928 although it had given more seats to the Muslims than they were entitled to on population basis. In opposition to Nehru Report, he put forward his fourteen points. The important points include:

- a) Federalism with residuary power in the provinces,
- b) A uniform measure of autonomy for all provinces;
- c) Adequate and effective representation of minorities in legislature
- d) Not less than one-third Muslim representation in the central legislature ie, separate electorates to continue.
- f) Full religious liberty for all communities etc.

In order to get the final approval of the Nehru Report, an All Parties Conference was convened in Calcutta in December 1928. In this meeting Jinnah made a fervent plea with members present there that for the sake of unity among various religious groups and communities particularly the Hindus and Muslim. He remarked thus: ‘It is absolutely essential to our progress that Hindu Muslim settlement should be reached, and that all communities should live in friendly an harmonious spirit in this vast country of ours’. He further added by way of caution, majorities are apt to be oppressive and tyrannical and minorities always dread and fear that their interests and rights unless clearly defined and safeguarded by statutory provisions, would suffer, Jinnah was shouted down in this all

parties conference. With disappointment Jinnah came back to Bombay and soon after left for England with an intention to settle down there practicing law.

All parties conference was a turning point in the political life of Jinnah. Determined to stay in England but on the persuasion of Liaquat Ali Khan, the first Prime Minister of Pakistan, Jinnah decided to return to India in 1934. Soon he was elected as the permanent president of the All India Muslim League. He worked hard to expand the social base of the League. Meanwhile, Jinnah grew into a relentless foe of the Hindu social system and the Congress. There was an opportunity to test the electoral strength of the League in the context of 1937 election which was held under the provisions of the Government of India Act of 1935. The Act was criticised by all including Jinnah. In the election the Muslim League could secure only 109 out of total 482 Muslim seats in all British provinces. It was nowhere close to forming the majority in Muslim majority provinces. Thus Muslim League adopted an aggressive attitude towards the Congress and the Congress - led ministries in various provinces. It charged them of pursuing anti-Muslim policies and started describing the Congress as caste-Hindu party instead of national party.

Jinnah: Hindu – Muslim Unity

Like other Muslim Schools, Jinnah was also keen to work for the well being of the Muslims. However, his concern for the Muslims was not meant to be at the cost of the Hindu – Muslim unity. It is important to note that till the elections of 1937 he believed that both the communities must join hands to remain strong in order to overcome the difficulties placed on the Indians by the British Government. Some reflection in this regard was manifest at the time of the Lucknow pact of 1916 which envisaged certain seat sharing formula between the Hindus and Muslims in which the Muslim gained better advantages in Muslim minority provinces such as United Provinces while they had conceded more ground to the Hindus and others in the Muslim majority provinces such as the Punjab and Bengal. Jinnah played an important role in bringing about this agreement.

Jinnah was one of the leaders who did not approve of mixing religion with politics. In the contested of the emerging Non-Co operation – Khilafat movement, he did not approve of religion being pressed in the service of politics. He was sounding certain note of caution that the consequences of such a strategy might prove to be counterproductive. During 1919 – 1920 strong religious feelings were stirred among the Muslims on the issue of the Khilafat, an Islamic institution in the hands of the Ottomans of Turkey for considerably, long time. However after the defeat of Turkey with First World War, it was feared by Muslims that soon Ottoman Empire would be fragmented and many Holy Places would fall in the hands of the non-Muslims, which was acceptable to them. In any case, for quite sometimes, pan - Islamic upsurge had already generated anti-colonial sentiments among the Muslims. Keeping all these developments in mind, Gandhiji decided to go along with the Muslims and agreed to lead the movement. In the context of all these developments the Indian National Congress, despite its initial reluctance finally decided to extend support to Gandhiji; this was the movement with which Jinnah did not agree at all and resigned from the Congress in 1920 not to come back to it ever again.

Two Nation Theory

In its opposition to the Congress, the Muslim League crossed limits and finally came around to the idea of describing the Muslims of India not as a religious community or a minority in a Hindu-majority country but a distinct nation. Thus according to the League's formulation, India was home to not one but two nations which led the demand that India be partitioned so that there could be separate home land to the Muslim as well. This understanding was put to crystallization in the annual session of the Muslim League held in here on 23rd March, 1940. The Resolution adopted here is popularly known as the Pakistan Resolution or Two nation theory. In this resolution it was said that the Muslims of India on account of religious, cultural and historical distinctiveness in contrast with the Hindus, constituted a nation into themselves. In an article contributed to the Time and Tide, March 9, 1940, he wrote thus: What is the political future of India. The declared aim of the British Government is that India should enjoy Dominion Status in accordance with the statute of West Minister in the shortest practicable time. In order that this end should be brought about, the British government, very naturally, would like to see in India the form of democratic institutions it knows best and thinks best, under which the Government of the country is entrusted to one or other political party in accordance with the turn of the elections.

Since then, the Muslim League, under Jinnah, did not look back and never consider any settlement which was not conceding Pakistan. In 1944, in course of Gandhi-Jinnah talks Jinnah vigorously and fanatically stuck to the concept that Muslim are a nation. He wrote in one of his letters to Mahatma Gandhi on September 15, 1944. 'We maintain and hold that Muslims and Hindu are two major nations by any definition or test as a nation. We are a nation of hundred million, and what is more, we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilisation, language and literature, art and architecture..... In short, we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life .By all canons of International law we are a nation.'

He was absolutely uncompromising and he insisted that partition was the sole solution to Hindu-Muslim differences. His views were not subscribed to by several Muslim organisations like Jamia-e-Ulema, The Abraras etc. He said on October4, 1944, in an interview to the representative of London News Chronicle:

'There is only one practical realistic way of resolving Muslim-Hindu differences'. This is to divide India into two sovereign parts, of Pakistan and Hindustan, by the recognition of the whole of the North –West Frontier Province, Baluchistan, Sindh, Punjab, Bengal and Assam as sovereign Muslim territories, as they now stand and for each of us to trust the other to give equitable treatment to Hindu minorities in Pakistan and Muslim minorities in Hindustan..... The fact is the Hindu want some kind of agreement which will give them some form of control. They will not reconcile themselves to our complete independence.

Jinnah had been inspired by the career of Mustafa Kamal but while Kamal was a modernist, Jinnah pinned his faith in theocracy and Islamic democracy. There was opposition to Jinnah's formulations of Muslim constituting a nation from within the Muslims, apart from the Congress and others.

Within one month of passing of the 'Two nation theory' various Muslim political formations from different parts of the country came to form a coalition called Azad Muslim Conference. In April 1940 a huge convention was organised in Delhi where 'Two Nation theory' was challenged, It was argued that while Muslims were a distinct religious community with their cultural world view, they did not constitute a nation as claimed by Jinnah and the Muslim League. In several places the Muslim League had to face electoral challenge from the constituent of this Azad Muslim Conference. It argued that Muslims were not a nation but a religious community and it was an integral part of the single territorial nationhood along with the rest of the people of India.

As a political leader, Jinnah was the product of the contradictions and confusions of Indian nationalism. One of his main supports was the British imperialist policy, of divide and rule. The Muslim population, which had received a new impetus from the educational impact of the Aligarh movement and the Pan –Islamist affiliations of Mohammed Ali and Shaukat Ali rallied devotedly round Muhammad Ali Jinnah in its crusade for the theoretic and communal demand for Pakistan.

MODULE III

CONTRIBUTIONS OF GANDHIJI AND NEHRU

GANDHIJI (1869-1948)

Mohandas Karachand Gandhi, popularly Known as Mahatma Gandhi continues to provoke interest even after more than half a century after his assassination in 1948. It is true that Richard Attenborough's film on Gandhi immensely popularised Gandhi all over the world though Gandhi remains an important topic of research and discussion among those interested in exploring alternative ideological traditions. Gandhi's own writings on various themes are plenty and less ambiguous. His articulation is not only clear and simple but also meaningful in similar contexts in which he led the most gigantic nationalist struggle of the 20th century. He wrote extensively in Indian opinion, young India, and Harijan, the leading newspapers of the era where he commented on the issues of contemporary relevance. Writing for the ordinary people he usually employed metaphors to teach Indians about their abilities and also their strong traditions. This was one of the ways in which he involved Indians in non violent struggles against British imperialism, untouchability and communal discord.

Contribution to Indian Nationalism

The contribution of Gandhi to Indian national movement was unparalleled. He made the Indian National Congress a people's congress and the national movement a mass movement. He made people fearless and bold and taught them the non violent methods for fighting against the evils of caste system and injustice. He had a strong passion for individual liberty which was closely bound with his understanding of truth and self-realisation. That Gandhiji was evident from his erstwhile nationalist colleagues was evident when he launched his satyagraha movements in remote areas of Champaran (Bihar), Kheda and Ahmadabad (Gujarat) instead of towns and cities that had so far remained the hub of the nationalist activities. His political strategies brought about radical change in the Congress that now expanded its sphere of influence even in the villages. These three movements projected Gandhi as an emerging leader with different kinds of mobilizing tactics. While explaining the rise of Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru thus argued, Gandhiji knew India for better than we did, and a man who could command such tremendous devotion and loyalty must have something in him that corresponded to the needs and aspirations of the masses.

Besides these local movements Gandhi led three major pan Indian movements. The 1919-21 Non-co-operation Movement was the first one that gained significantly with the merger of the Khilafat agitation of the Muslim against the dismantling of the Khalif in Turkey. The Civil Disobedience movement in which Gandhi reigned supreme. The 1942 quit India movement, also known as the open rebellion, was the last of the three Pan – Indian campaigns that Gandhi spearheaded.

PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF GANDHIAN PRINCIPLES

Gandhi's social and political thought is multidimensional. His political ideology was a radical departure from the past in the sense that it was neither constitutional loyalist of the Moderates nor extremism of the revolutionary terrorists. In his articulation of Indian nationalism he sought to incorporate the emerging constituencies of nationalist politics that remained peripheral in the bygone era. Gandhi was perhaps the only effective nationalist leader who truly attempted to transcend the class conflicts by devising a method which for the first time, brought about the national aggregation of an all India character. His social and political ideas were the outcome of his serious engagement with issues reflective of India's peculiar socio-economic circumstances. Gandhi simultaneously launched movements not only against the British rule but also against the atrocious social structures, customs, norms and values, justified in the name of Indian's age-old traditions. Hence, Gandhian thought is neither purely political nor absolutely social, but a complex mix of the two.

Gandhian philosophy was a profound engagement with modernity and its pitfalls. Against the evils of industrialisation, materialism and selfish pursuits, Gandhiji suggested swaraj, swadeshi, trusteeship and a minimal state vested only with co-coordinative powers. He was a deeply a religious man. This perspective shaped his politics his economic ideas and his view of society. However, the religious approach that he imbibed was markedly different from other religious man. He accepts the inner oneness of all existence in the cosmic spirit, and saw all living beings as representatives of the eternal divine reality. Gandhiji believed that man's ultimate goal in life was self-realisation. Self-realisation, according to him, meant seeing God face to face, i.e., realising the absolute truth or, knowing oneself. He believed that it could not be achieved unless man identified himself with the whole of mankind. This necessarily involved participation in politics.

According to Gandhi, man's ultimate aim is the realisation of God and all his activities social political religious have to be guided by the ultimate aim of the vision of God. It is only through the means of self-purification that self-realisation can be attained. The fasts, prayers and works of service that he undertook were all directed towards such an end. In his autobiography, Gandhiji says that self-realisation required self-purification as its ethical foundation. Men's moral life flows from such a search into this own self and express itself in outward activity of fellowship and concern to others. This ethical outlook is backbone of Gandhiji's political philosophy even as his ethics has for its foundation in his metaphysical principles. To him the moral discipline of the individual is the most important means of social construction. Gandhiji invoked the five-fold moral principles: truth, non-violence, non-stealing, non possession and celibacy. The observance of these moral principles would purify man and enable him to strive after self-realisation.

TECHNIQUES OF POLITICAL STRUGGLE: SATYAGRAHA AND NON-VIOLENCE

The basic principles of Gandhian techniques are the Satyagraha and Non-violence or ahimsa. Most authors on Gandhi seem to conflate the two. What is rather relatively less known is the fact that

during the period between his South African experiment and the agitation against the Rowlatt Act, it was Satyagraha that held the key to his entire campaign. Only in the aftermath of the 1919 anti-Rowlatt Satyagraha, was non-violence included as integral to Gandhi's Satyagraha campaign. There is no doubt that ahimsa always remained a significant influence in the conceptualisation of satyagraha, but it was not projected as crucial a component as it later became. As a technique or method, Satyagraha was always informed by ahimsa, though its role was not vividly articulated till their 1919 campaign against the Rowlatt Act. From 1919 onwards, Gandhiji paid enormous attention to both conceptualising and justifying the importance of ahimsa in political mobilisation by referring to the ancient scriptures in his defence. Gandhiji was preparing for a pan-Indian non-cooperation movement in the Satyagraha format in which ahimsa was to play a significant role in political mobilisation. The micro experiments of Satyagraha in Champaran, Kheda and Ahmadabad where ahimsa was constitutive of Gandhian model of anti imperialism, therefore, became decisive in Gandhi's social and political thought.

GANDHIAN DOCTRINE OF SATYAGRAHA

Satyagraha was a formidable weapon in the hands of Gandhiji. It is a natural outcome from the supreme concept of truth. Satyagraha is literally holding on to truth, and it means, therefore, Truth force. Satyagraha means the exercise of the purest soul-force against all injustice, oppression and exploitation. Suffering and trust are attributes of soul-force. Truth is soul or spirit, it is there for e known as soul force. It excludes the use of violence because man is not capable of knowing the absolute truth. Truth or satya, for Gandhiji, is go himself. He, therefore, changed the statement, 'God is truth' later in his life into 'Truth is God ' and suggested that it was one of the fundamental discoveries of his life's experiments. The life of man, for Gandhiji, is a march of his pursuit in search of Truth or God.

Satyagraha is not merely the insistence on truth, it is, in fact, holding on to truth through ways which are moral and non-insolent; it is not the imposition of one's will over others, but it is appealing to the reasoning of the opponent, it is not coercion but is persuasion. It means urge for satya or Truth. Gandhi highlights several attributes to Satyagraha. It is a moral weapon and does not entertain ill-feeling towards the adversary, it is a non violent device and calls upon its user to love his enemy, it does not weaken the opponent but strengthens him morally; it is a weapon of the brave and is constructive in its approach. For Gandhiji, a satyagrahi is always truthful, morally imbued, non violent and a person without any malice, he is one who is devoted to the service of all.

Gandhiji firmly believed that truth can be attained only through non-violence which was not negative, meaning absence of violence, but was a positive condition of love. Resort to non-violence is recourse to love. In its positive sense, it seeks non-injury to others, both in words as well as deeds.

Gandhiji recommends several techniques of Satyagraha. The techniques of Satyagraha may take the form of non-cooperation, civil disobedience, Hijrat, fasting and strike. Gandhiji believes that oppression and exploitation were possible only on account of the cooperation of the people. It

the people refused to cooperate with the government, the latter could not function properly. Non-cooperation may manifest itself in the form of hartals, Picketing etc. Hartal involved the stopping of work as a measure of protest and its objective was to strike the imagination of the people and the government. According to Gandhiji, hartals in order to be effective were to be voluntarily organized and non-violent method could be used. In the case of picketing also, no force was to be used. Picketing should avoid coercion, intimidation, discourtesy, burning of effigies and hunger strike.

Civil disobedience is another effective method recommended by Gandhiji for the realisation of satyagraha. It was regarded as a 'complete effective and bloodless substitute of armed revolt'. There can be individual as well as mass civil disobedience. According to Gandhiji, complete civil disobedience implying a refusal to render obedience to every single state made law can be a very powerful movement. It can become 'more dangerous than an armed rebellion' because the stupendous power of innocent suffering undergone on a great scale has great potency.

Another form of satyagraha suggested by Gandhiji was Hijrat which implied voluntary exile from the permanent place of residence. This was to be done by those who feel oppressed cannot live without loss of self-respect in a particular place and lack the strength that comes from true non-violence of the capacity to defend themselves violently.

Fasting is another method of Satyagraha. This method was considered by Gandhiji as a fiery weapon but it has to be applied only against those who are bound by ties of close personal affection. It required purity of mind, discipline, humility and faith. Gandhiji's views was that fasting stirred the sluggish conscience and fired the loving hearts to action.

Another method of Satyagraha was in the form of strike. Gandhiji's view of strike was different from that advocated by the socialists and communists. According to Gandhiji, strike was a voluntary, purificatory suffering undertaken to convert the erring opponent. He did not believe in the theory of class war. His view was that industry was a joint enterprise of labour and capital, and both of them were trustees. The strikers were required to put forward their demands in very clear terms.

Some scholars have tried to connect and identify the Gandhian doctrine of Satyagraha with passive resistance. While identifying the features of satyagraha in his Hind swaraj, Gandhi was of the opinion that passive resistance fails to convey what he meant. It describes a method, but no hint of the system of which it is only a part. In other words, the similarity between satyagraha and passive resistance was just peripheral since both of them were clearly defined methods of political resistance which were opposed to violence. Gandhi may certainly have drawn on passive resistance conceptually, but when he defined satyagraha he underlined its unique nature and characteristics. As he elaborated in Hind swaraj, passive resistance is a method of securing rights by personal suffering; it is reverse of 'repugnant to my conscience, I use social-force.'

Passive resistance can never be equated with satyagrah for the simple reason that it involved application of force as well, Hence he was most categorical by saying that passive resistance is an all sided sword, it can be used anyhow, it blesses him who uses at and him against whom it is used

without drawing a drop of blood, it produced for reaching results. Satyagraha was not physical force but soul force that drew on the spontaneous sacrifice of self by the participants, which according to Gandhi constituted the core of his campaign. Gandhi associated passive resistance with internal violence. It unleashed forces of prejudice and separatism rather than compassion and incisiveness.

Gandhiji's Satyagraha was not only a political doctrine directed against the state, it had also social and economic trusts relevant to and drawn on human natures. In contrast with the constitutional and extremist methods of political mobilisation, satyagraha was highly original and creative conceptualisation of social change and political action. The principles governing satyagraha and its participants are illustrative of his endeavour to organise mass protest within a strict format that clearly stipulates the duties and responsibilities of the individual satyagraha. It is beyond dispute that satyagraha was to be a continuous process seeking to transform the individuals by appreciating the human moral values that remained captive due to colonialism and various social prejudices, and justified in the name of religion.

NON – VIOLENCE

Gandhiji cannot be regarded as the inventor and propounder of this principle. He discovered the principle of non-violence from the pages of history and his greatness lies in the fact that he made it on the basis of his life and adopted to serve the needs of time. He transformed it into social and political technique. He regards it as the supreme concept for the reformation of politics.

According to Gandhiji, Non-violence or Ahimsa is the heart of all religions. Non-violence is truth itself; it's very soul, and its fruit. Truth and non-violence are two sides of a smooth unstamped metallic disc and are so intervened that it is very difficult to separate them. Gandhiji put more emphasis on truth than non-violence because he believed that truth existed beyond and unconditioned by space and time, but non-violence existed only on the part of all finite beings.

Non-violence is, in fact, the acceptance of spiritual metaphysics. It is not merely the negative act of refraining from doing offence, injury and harm to others but really it represents the ancient law of positive self-sacrifice and constructive suffering. Gandhiji interpreted it as signifying utter selflessness and universal love. The ultimate aim of non-violence is even to love the so-called enemies or opponents.

According to Gandhiji, there are three levels of non-violence. The highest form was the enlightened non-violence of resourcefulness or the non-violence of the brave. It was the non-violence of one who adopted it not by painful necessity but by inner conviction based on moral considerations. Non-violence was not merely political but embraces every sphere of life. The second kind of non-violence was adopted as a measure of expediency and sound policy in some spheres of life. That was the non-violence of the weak or the passive non-violence of the helpless. It is weakness rather than moral conviction which rules out the use of violence. It pursued honestly with real courage so long as it is accepted as a policy. It is capable of achieving results to a certain extent. However, it is not as effective as the non-violence of the brave.

The third level of non-violence is the passive violence of the coward. As Gandhiji has rightly pointed out, cowardice and ahimsa(non-violence) do not go together and more than water and fire'. The coward seeks to avoid the conflict and flies from the danger. Cowardice is an impotent worse than violence. Gandhiji believes that non-violence cannot be taught to a person who fears to die and has no power of resistance. There is a hope for violent man to be some day non-violent, but there is none for cowardice. This sound principle is based on the fact that despotism, could never have existed if it did not have fear as its foundation.

Gandhiji believed that self-suffering is an indispensable part of the struggle for the attainment of truth through non-violence. Self-suffering which he regarded as non-violence in its dynamic condition, had to be conscious. Conscious suffering means pitting of one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant. Ahimsa or non-violence, therefore, means infinite love. Gandhiji wrote thus: 'Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is also the last article of my creed.' It is the imperative duty of 'satyagrahi to make endless endeavours for the realization of truth through non-violence. Gandhiji used this technique of non-violent resistance not only in combating the British occupation in India but also in dealing with India's internal problems.

For Gandhi, ahimsa or Non-violence meant both passive and active love, refraining from causing harm and destruction to living beings as well as positively promoting their well being. Gandhi defined ahimsa in two contrasting ways: On the one hand, in its narrow sense, it simply meant avoidance of acts harming others, while in its positive sense, it denoted promoting their well being, based on infinite love. Jawaharlal Nehru characterized Gandhian principle of Ahimsa as 'a positive and dynamic method of action and it was not meant for those who meekly accept the statusquo'. Ahimsa, in its positive connotation, was based on highest moral values, epitomized in the unselfish self".

Ahimsa was complementary to Gandhi's model of conflict resolution that was certainly the most original and creative model of social change and political action even under most adverse circumstances. This was a theory of politics that gradually became the dominant ideology of a national political movement in which Gandhi reigned supreme.

A CRITIQUE OF WESTERN CIVILISATION HIND SWARAJ

Gandhiji was highly critical of both western civilisation and western democracies. He challenged the foundations of modern western civilisation. The sophisticated, aggressive and lustful aspects of modern western civilisation repelled him. The modern civilisation was equivalent to darkness and disease. He condemned bitterly western democratic politics because they were infected with threefold contradiction. They believed in limitless expansion of capitalism and this resulted in exploitation of the weaker sections of society. Some of them even took resource to fascist or totalitarian techniques. At best it is merely a cloak to hide the Nazi and the fascist tendencies of imperialism. He frankly stated that it was not through democratic methods that Great Britain had conquered India. He also criticised the policy of racialism followed in South Africa and the

southern parts of the USA. Gandhi stressed that non-violence could lead to true democracy. Democracy and violence could not be reconciled.

As an idea and strategy, swaraj gained remarkably in the context of the nationalist articulation of the freedom struggle and the growing democratisation of the political processes that already brought in hitherto socio-economic and cultural differences. Underlying its role in a highly divided society like India, swaraj was defined in the following ways;

- A. national independence;
- B. political freedom of the individual
- C. economic freedom of the individual and
- D. spiritual freedom of the individual or self-rule.

Although these four definitions are about different characteristics of Swaraj, they are nonetheless complementary to each other. Of these, the first three are negative in character while the fourth one is positive one in its connotation. While elaborating on Swaraj, Gandhiji linked it with swadeshi in which his theory of Swaraj was articulated. If Swaraj was a foundational theory of Gandhi's social and political thought, swadeshi was the empirical demonstration of those relevant social, economic and political steps for a society different from what exists.

According to Gandhi swaraj was not merely political liberation; it means human emancipation as well. In his own words, 'mere withdrawal of the English is not independence. It means the consciousness in the average villages that he is the maker of his own destiny, that he is his own legislator through his own representatives'. The real swaraj, he felt, will come not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when abused. Swaraj is the power of the people to determine their lot by their own efforts and shape their destiny the way they like. Swaraj is to be attained by educating the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority. Political freedom is the second important feature of swaraj. For moderates, political freedom meant autonomy within the overall control of the British administration. Even the most militant of the moderates like Surendranth Banerji always supported constitutional means to secure political rights for Indians within the constitutional framework of British India. Unlike the moderates, the extremists did not care much about the methods and insisted on complete independence, which meant complete withdrawal of the British government from India.

Economic freedom of the individual is the third dimension of swaraj. Economic swaraj stands for social justice, it promotes the good of all equally including the weakest, and is indispensable for decent life. For Gandhiji, India's economic future lay in charkha (Spinning Wheel) and Kadhi (Homespun cotton textile) 'If India's villages are to live and prosper, the charkha must become universal'. Rural civilisation, argued Gandhiji, "is impossible without the charkha and all it implies, i.e., revival of village crafts".

Fourth, self-rule is probably a unique dimension of Swaraj indicating its qualitative difference with political freedom. As a concept it denotes a process of removing the internal obstacles to freedom. Unlike the first three characteristics where Swaraj is conceptualised in a negative way, self rule as an important ingredient clearly indicates the importance of moral values which are relative to society. Gandhian idea of Swaraj as self rule seems to be based on the philosophical notion of advaita which is etymologically the kingdom or order or dispensation of self, myself or the truth. So Gandhian struggle for swaraj was rooted in Indian metaphysics and spirituality. He opposed large scale industrialism and mechanization, and condemned western commercialism, imperialism and secularism as disease.'

IDEAL STATE

Gandhian concept of ideal state or society was a non-violent and stateless society. He repudiated state on ethical, historical and economic grounds. A man is moral when he acts freely and voluntarily. According to Gandhi, the state represents violence in a concentrated and organized form. The individual has a soul but as the state is a soulless machine; it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence. Although he regarded the state as rooted in violence, he differed from anarchists. Unlike anarchists, Gandhi put emphasis on moral force and on the realisation of one's own self and his technique of establishing a stateless society free from violence. Hence there was no place for violence in Gandhi's ideal society. Further, Gandhi also did not want to abolish the state completely as did the anarchists. He admitted that his ideal state or society would have representative institutions and government. His ideal society would be a stateless society consisting of self-sufficing, self-regulating and self-governing village communities joined together in a voluntary federation, the maintenance of federation involved the necessity of government. Thus his ideal state is predominantly a non-violent state, and not a non-violent and stateless society as it is generally thought. He was only opposed to the oppressive authority and to the theory of absolute sovereignty of the state, but not to the ideal state itself.

Gandhian conception of ideal state was a non-violent democratic state where social life would remain self-regulated. In a democratic state everyone is his own ruler. According to Gandhiji, democracy lies not in the number of persons who vote, but in the sense to what extent masses imbibe the spirit of non-violence, and society service. In an ideal democratic state, the powers are to be decentralised and equality is to prevail in every sphere of life. Every individual is to be given fullest freedom to devote himself to social service according to his capacity. The structure of the state that is to emerge as a result of non-violent revolution is to be a compromise between the ideal non-violent society and the facts of human nature. He believed that democratic government was a distant dream so long as non-violence was not recognised as a living force, an inviolable creed, not a mere policy.

According to Gandhi, State is necessary due to the anti-social tendencies of certain individuals and groups. But the functions of the state are to be reduced to the minimum. Like

Bertrand Russell, G.K. Chesterton, G.D.H. Cole and other guild socialists, Gandhiji admitted that most of the functions of the state were to be transferred to the voluntary associations in order to have a real self-government in the country. There are certain things which cannot be done without political power, but there are also numerous other things which do not at all depend upon political power, and hence they should be left to the voluntary associations. When people come into possession of political and economic power, the interference with the freedom of the people is reduced to a minimum. He remarked thus: 'A nation that runs its affairs smoothly and effectively without much state interference is truly democratic. When such condition is absent the form of government is democratic in name.'

Gandhiji considered the state as an organisation of violence and force. Being an apostle of non-violence he was repelled by the coercive character of the state. He postulated that in the ideal state there will be the sovereignty of the moral authority of the people, and the state as a structure of violence would be extinct. But he was not for immediate ending of the state power. The increasing perfection of the state should be the immediate goal although the ultimate aim is philosophical and moral anarchism.

VIEWS ON STATE

According to Gandhi, the state represents violence in a concentrated and organised form. Gandhi's critique of the modern state emanated from its coercive aspect and its anti-human thrust. At a basic level, the mode of operation of the modern state constituted an infringement with his concept of non-violence. As early as 1931, Gandhi wrote in *Young India*, 'To me political power is not an end but one of the means of enabling people to better their condition in every department of life. Political power means capacity to regulate national life through national representatives. If national life becomes so perfect as to become self-regulated, no representation becomes necessary. There is then a state of enlightened Anarchy. In such a state everyone is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state, therefore, there is no political power because there is no state. But the ideal is never fully realised in life. Hence the classical statement of Thoreau that government is best which governs the least.'

One of the key elements in his critique was the concept of autonomy, which was made up of two distinct ideas. One was the idea that citizens should neither be dominated by others nor by the state. The other idea held that individuals should be self-governing, should bear moral standards for a self-evaluative assessment and accept responsibility for individual selection. He also criticised the impersonal character of the modern state. In his opinion the modern state could be equated with a machine without any one being apparently in control of it.

Another noteworthy feature of Gandhi's critique related to the intrinsic homogenising tendency of the modern state. Gandhiji believes that the state would not accept individual differences and diversity of opinions and attitudes. It would become 'Hostile to strong and independent-minded citizens groups and community lest they should become centers of independent

initiative and dissent. In a write-up published in *Modern Review* in the year 1935, Gandhi has made this point forcefully; “ I look upon an increase in the power of the state with the greatest fear, because although while apparently doing good by minimising exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress’. Thus it is clear from the above observations that the modern state was not compatible with the essential moral values associated with humanity.

TRUSTEESHIP

The theory of trusteeship is Gandhiji’s novel contribution in the sphere of political philosophy. The main thrust is on treating resources as a public trust with man being the trustee, so that the riches of nature and society are equitably used. The theory was intended to combine the advantages of both capitalism and communism, and to socialise property without nationalising it.

According to Gandhi, all material property was a social trust. The owner was not required to take more than what was needed for a moderately comfortable life. The other members of society who were associated with the property were jointly responsible with the owner for its management and were to provide welfare schemes for all. The owner and the rest of the people were to regard themselves as trustees of the property. In his editorial in *Harijan* (3rd June, 1939,) the concept of trusteeship was elaborately stated.: ‘Suppose 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 honourable 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.

It is reported that the theory of trusteeship had excited the attention of a group of socialists who had a long discussion with Gandhi regarding its nature and implication. The result was the writing of a draft on trusteeship. This draft was amended by Gandhi to strengthen its egalitarian thrust. The main principles of trusteeship are as follows.

1. Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capitalist order or society into an egalitarian;
2. It does not recognise any right of private ownership of property except in so far as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare.
3. It does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth.
4. Under state-regulated Trusteeship an individual will not be free to hold or use wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interest of society.
5. Just as it is proposed to fix a decent minimum living wage, even so a limit should be fixed for the maximum income that would be allowed to any person in society.
6. under the Gandhian economic order the character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed.

DECENTRALISATION

Gandhiji had envisioned for independent India a polity that would be based on the principle of democratic self government or self-rule. Democracy can function smoothly and according to the concept of swaraj only if it is decentralised. According to him, 'centralisation as a system is inconsistent with non-violent structure of society.' He wanted the centre of power to move from cities to villages. While conceptualising the decentralised system of rule, Gandhi advanced this theory of oceanic circle, which he explained in the following words:

"In this structure composed of innumerable villages, there will be ever-widening never ascending circles. Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the circle of villages till at last the whole becomes a life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral units.

The building blocks of democracy have to be villages. Gandhiji wanted each village to have an annually elected Panchayat to manage the affairs of the village. Each village following the oceanic circle theory would be autonomous yet independent. As Gandhiji argued "My idea of village swaraj is that it is a complete republic, independent of its neighbours for its own vital wants and yet inter-dependent for many others in which dependence is a necessity.

Gandhiji strongly believed that decentralisation of power was a key concept in his theory of democracy. However, he laid down certain conditions for the realisation of true democracy in India. He regarded it wholly wrong and undemocratic for individuals to take the law into their hands.

VIEWS ON SOCIALISM

Gandhiji was critical of the path both capitalist and socialist economies had taken. He was critical of capitalism because the institution of capitalism was a negation of ahimsa. He championed the revolutionary doctrine of equal distribution. There should be no accumulation and no useless possession. He also accepted the theory of spiritual socialism and said that swaraj could not be complete unless the lowest and humblest sections got 'all the ordinary amenities of life that a rich man enjoys'.

In the Gandhian conception of socialism the prince and the peasant, the poor and the rich, the employer and employee were to be treated equally. But this socialism was not to be attained by conquest of political power by an organised party. It was of the utmost importance that socialists should be truthful, non-violent and pure-hearted. They could affect a genuine transformation. Hence the emphasis in the Gandhian doctrine of socialism and politics is always on individual purification. The spiritual socialism which Gandhiji wanted was to begin with the moral regeneration of the individual. But this does not mean that Gandhiji was unmindful of changes in the political economic and social structure. His career offers the momentous example of a lone individual challenging the union of South Africa and the empire of Great Britain.

While he looked at socialism positively, he felt that it was deeply enmeshed in violence. He wrote in his Harijan thus: socialism was not born with the discovery of the misuse of capital by capitalists. I accepted the theory of socialism even while I was in South Africa. My opposition to socialists and others consists in attacking violence as a means of affecting any lasting reform'. Further, Socialism has only one aim that is material progress. I want freedom for full expression of my personality..... Under the other socialism, there is no individual freedom. You own nothing, not even your body”.

From the Gandhian application of socialism, however it must not be thought that Gandhi was a mystic or his socialism was only a matter of the mind. He was intensely practical and his principle was that the life of the individual should get all possible expression only in the context of society. The most particular and significant aspect of Gandhian socialism is the emphasis which a Gandhi laid on the internal aspect of life. Even in the case of the theory of sarvodaya and the sarvodaya samaj, Gandhi did not give much importance to external forces to organise the institutions. He did not believe that revolution or evolution when imposed from outside would bring about any fundamental change in human nature or in society. The entire responsibility of reconstruction in social, economic and political aspects must start with the individual himself; without the individual's consistent and constant attempt for reorientation no amount of effort will bring the socialistic order. The Gandhian idea of sarvodaya is the apex of Gandhian socialism.

Gandhian doctrine of Sarvodaya does not mean that majority alone is enough, the growth and upliftment of everyone is vitally necessary. In this respect, Gandhian socialism thinks of society as an organic whole where differences do not exist. The concept of organic unity, where all individuals have equal importance and the rise of everyone is dependent on the rise of every other, is a fundamental contribution to socialistic theory and practice. It opens a new approach in socialistic thought. The previous socialist thinkers had the belief that without a sizeable majority no social change can be effective. Gandhian socialism puts enormous emphasis on the capacity of the individual.

Gandhiji was not only a great individualist and a practical idealist but he was also a first-rate egalitarian and a socialist. He firmly believed that the ideal of non-violence could be achieved only if the gulf dividing the rich and the poor was made as small as possible. His idea of economic equality was that everyone would have a proper house to live in, sufficient and balanced food to eat, and sufficient khadi with which to cover himself.' He also said that the cruel inequality that obtained today would be removed by purely non-violent means. To achieve this goal, Gandhiji did not suggest any wholesale confiscation of property of the landlords and capitalists. Like Christian socialists he wanted to achieve his goal of economic equality by changing their mentality through love and persuasion.

Assessment

There is a remarkable consistency and continuity in the political ideas of Gandhiji. He considered man as embodying the spiritual principle in him which is divine. He argued that the divine nature of man makes religion to engage itself positively with the world. He did not agree that religion should be separated from politics. Politics devoid of religion, according to him, is meaningless. He thought that politics offers great opportunities to serve others and such service is an essential attribute of religion. He considered that ends and means are integral to each other. He applied this principle to the pursuit of truth as well, which he considered as God himself. Truth as end and non-violence as means are inseparable.

Gandhiji was a saint and a moral revolutionary. He believed that violence interrupted the real revolution of the social structure. He sincerely believed that violence would spell the doom of mankind. He thought that a peaceful solution of our problems was not only possible but was the only way to have a real solution.

Gandhism is not a systematic, well worked out political philosophy in the western sense. It does not claim to apply purely logical procedure and scientific methodology as the positivists do. There is, however, a pronounced realism in Gandhis' economic ideas. He regarded the villages as the centre of Indian economic organisation. His economic radicalism is brought out in his championship of the concept of equality of wages for the lawyer, the doctor and the scavengers. His idea of Panchayat raj remained a distant dream till recently, but his arguments for people's participation in governance provoked and also consolidated movements for what is suggested as deepening of democracy in India.

Gandhism is not merely a political creed, it is a message. His philosophy wants to bring about a transformation in human life by the supremacy of self-suffering love. He stressed peace, modesty, gentleness and a sense of devout respect for the religious views of others. This comprehensive orientation of Gandhian teachings makes it the moral foundation of socialism and democracy. Gandhi has been hailed as the greatest Indian since Gautama Budha. He made Indian liberation movement into a mass movement. His teachings of non-violence is greatly relevant to the modern world infected with militarism, terrorism, and power politics.

(B) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU (1889-1964)

Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the new nationalist leaders who remained critical both in the freedom struggle and its aftermath. Politically baptised by Mahatma Gandhi, Nehru was not blind follower of his leader, but redefined the nationalist ideology as and when he deemed it fit. In the aftermath of India's independence he strove to guide India towards a socialist pattern of society following a path based on his interpretation of socialism. He was both a philosopher as well as a practical political leader. He acquired a deeper appreciation of Indian history and philosophy and enriched the basis for subsequent thought and action.

Jawaharlal Nehru began his political activities by his association with the Home Rule Leagues established by Tilak and Mrs Annie Besant. His main contribution in the late twenties was that he

stood for the ideal of complete independence for India. With Gandhi's blessings Nehru became the president of the Indian National Congress at Lahore and the historic independence resolution was passed on the midnight of December 13, 1929. He was the president of the Congress again in 1936, 1937 and 1946. In 1946, he formed the Interim government of India till his death on May 27, 1964. He was an author of reputation and his 'Glimpses of World History', 'Autography' and the 'Discovery of India' are notable contributions to the realm of learning in Indian history and Indian political thought.

HIS VIEWS ON SECULARISM

Nehru had no attraction for any religion. According to him, behind every religion lay a method of approach which was wholly unscientific. But he recognises that religion provides some kind of satisfaction to the inner needs of human nature and give a set of moral and ethical values of life in general. Nehru was not a religious man, nor would he ever spend time, as a routine, for morning and evening worshipping. As Nehru had scientific temper, it was natural that he would be a secularist. Jawaharlal Nehru was an agnostic and not emotionally involved in religious disputations. Nehru's approach to the role religion played in social life is described by him in the following manner. He wrote thus,; Religion as I saw it practised, and accepted even by thinking minds, whether it was Hinduism or Islam or Buddhism or Christianity, did not attract me. It seemed to be closely associated with superstitious practices and dogmatic beliefs and behind it lay a method of approach to life's problems which was certainly not that of science. There was an element of magic about it a reliance on the super natural".

Nehru's understanding of secularism was a product of personal attitudes and historical circumstances. Secularism is basically the separation of religion from politics. Politics is associated with public activities. Religion is an individual or personal affair, giving every one the right to practise one's own religion. Referring to the concept of secularism, Nehru says 'Some people think that it means something opposed to religion. That obviously is not correct. What it means is that it is a state which honours all faiths equally and gives them equal opportunities; that as a state, it does not allow itself to be attached to one faith or religion, which then becomes the state religion".

Nehru did not take religion in a narrow sense; religion does not teach hatred and intolerance; all religions speak the truth ; that is the essence of each religion. He believes that the religious basis of politics does not help social progress. At the same time, Nehru had respect for Gandhi's view on the role of religion in politics. He was of the view that Gandhi had a moral view of politics. For Gandhi religion can teach that politicians to be moral and ethical; it has a role in society for teaching moral values and maintaining an ethical order. But at the same time he opposed the formation of political parties on communal or religious grounds. This will create hatred between different religions and hatred breeds violence and intolerance among people. Without social harmony, no social progress is possible.

Nehru was an out and out secularist. He disapproved both the Hindu communalism as well as the Muslim communalism. His loyalty to secularism has been a great relief to the minorities in India. He was a secularist in the sense that he transcended parochial consideration and looked from a broad humanistic perspective. His secularism was founded in India's extraordinary variety culture which was a product of unbroken history. According to Nehru, the Muslims were converts belonging to the original Indo-Aryan stock. In his *Discovery of India* he wrote that the 'fact of subsequent conversion to other faiths did not deprive them of their heritage, just as the Greeks, after their conversion to Christianity did not lose their pride in the mighty achievements of their ancestors, or the Italians in the great days of the Roman republic and early empire. 'Nehru's understanding of secularism has been strengthened due to his liberal cultural upbringing.

The concept of secularism as perceived and defined by Nehru constitutes the bedrock of Indian nationalism, which was subsequently incorporated into the Indian constitution. Nehru's understanding of secularism is primarily rooted in his emphasis on political and social equality. His exposition of secularism emphasises the following dimensions.

1. The State does not either encourage or discourage religion. It means freedom of religion and conscience, including freedom for those who have no religion.
2. It conveys the idea of social and political equality;
3. Nehru promoted secularism through social transformation and development. It means eradicating inequality and backwardness.

Despite his liberal approach towards religion, it is not easy to declare Nehru irreligious; he was, not opposed to religion. He frankly recognised that religion supplied a deeper craving of human beings'. His major concern was that the state should not intervene in religious matters. It is beyond dispute that Nehru was sincere in his advocacy of secularism as a political and cultural value. Due to his secular approach he succeeded in solving intra party and interstate politics.

Nehru view on Socialism

Nehru's socialism always remained 'humanism in action' by which the creative energy of man seeks liberation from the forces of insecurity of tomorrow and are utilized for creative purposes. He tried throughout his life to associate the entire Indian people in the great enterprise of a socialist India. He laid the firm foundations but left the word "Socialism to acquire further connotation and denotation with the passage of time... he ensured that there would be no going back on socialism."

Nehru's socialism was in fact enriched by three different streams of thought viz Fabianism, Gandhism and Marxism. From Marx he inherited inevitability of socialism and its scientific approach; from Gandhism purity of means and ethical aspect and from Fabianism he derived reformism, constitutionalism and gradualism. Nehru's socialism synthesises various trends of thought at the level of the ideal. There lay its appeal. In the words of P.C. Joshi "... Nehru neither propounded nor conformed to any single socialist theory or doctrine. His conception of socialism was synthetic to the

point of being elected, it is best to characterise it... as a vision which is as much socialist as humanist."

Nehru views on Non-alignment

India's standing for the oppressed and expressing sympathies for the aggrieved, prior to the achievement of independence, reflects that Nehru construed India's struggle for freedom as a part of the global struggle. Nehru's international outlook is evident from his pursuing the foreign policy on these lines.

Nehru represented the best traits of an Indian which were tolerance, sagacity and love for peace. Nehru was an internationalist in his outlook. He developed his international outlook by keeping himself interested in the international problems. In his ideas he always cherished to have a world free of wars and nuclear threats, a world of oneness, of growth and development to better the lot of masses or humanity.

Speaking in Constituent Assembly on December 4, 1947 he said, "We have proclaimed during this past year that we will not attach ourselves to any particular group. This has nothing to do with neutrality or passivity or anything else. Nehru favoured the polarisation of power and an increase in the number of non-aligned countries resulting in the isolation of super powers. In such an atmosphere of international relations, Nehru believed that there could be a possibility of replacement of mutual fear, suspicion, hostility and cold war by mutual good will, tolerance and peaceful coexistence.

Nehru's policy of non-alignment was not a negative policy. Some people regarded it as negative policy which meant India would remain neutral at all the time and in every situation. Nehru's doctrine of non-alignment was also positive and dynamic in its nature. In positive term it charted out an independent foreign policy posture for" the nation which object to lining up for war purposes, to military blocs, to military alliances and the like and wanted to work in the pursuit of peace".

India would try her best to have friendly relations with the countries of both the blocs and would extend all co-operation for ensuring peace among the family of the nations of the world. It will also be helpful for new independent countries of Asia and Africa. Thus according to Nehru the policy of non-alignment on the part of a big state like India was conducive to her own ultimate national interests as well as to the interests of peace in the world.

Nehru also defended the policy of non-alignment on economic grounds. Nehru believed that Economic Exploitation and economic backwardness also undermine the cause of peace. He contended that non-alignment policy was an absolute necessity for newly emerging and underdeveloped countries .The primary aim of these countries was economic development without economic development political stability was not possible. Political instability could become a hurdle in the way of world peace. Thus according to Nehru, the maintenance of universal peace was an economic as well as political necessity for these countries.

MODULE IV

SOCIALIST THINKERS

(A) M N ROY (1886-1954)

Manvendra Nath Roy, whose original name was Narendra Nath Battacharya was born on 1886 and died on 1954, in his early years M.N Roy was influenced by the writings of Swami Vivekananda, Bakim Chandra, Daynanda Saraswathi, Bipin Chandra Pal, Aurobindo Ghosh and V.D Savarker. In 1910 Roy was sentenced to imprisonment in connection with Howrah conspiracy case. Roy had the unique distinction of working with Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky. He began his political life as a militant nationalist and ended a radical humanist.

M.N Roy paved through at least three phases in his career. In the first phase, he was a national revolutionary, smuggling arms for the terrorists of Bengal. In the second phase, Roy was a Marxist engaged in active communist movement first in Mexico and then in Russia, China and India. In the final phase, Roy emerged as a radical humanist, completing his journey from Nationalism to communism and from communism to Radical Humanism.

In 1922, M.N Roy made a sociological study of contemporary India in his 'India in Transition in which differed from the proposed solutions of the problems of India in transition. Towards the end of 1922, he has published India's problem and His solutions. In this work he criticized the medievalism and conservatism of the Gandhi an social theology. In addition to these books, he has written several books and published several articles in reputed journals. By 1936 Roy has further intensified his campaign against Gandhism. He condemned Gandhism as a reactionary social philosophy teaching the impracticable concept of social harmony. In 1937, he founded his weekly Independent India which was later renamed Radical Humanist in 1949. He regarded the Gandhian concept of Non-violence as subtitle intellectual device for concealing the capitalist exploitation of the country

HUMANISTIC CRITIQUE OF MARXISM

The philosophical writings of Roy indicate a breakaway from his Marxian affiliations. As a person, Marx evokes great praise from Roy. He regards Marx as a merciless critic of social injustice. He considers Marx as a humanist and a lover of freedom. Hence, Roy wanted to restate the humanist, libertarian, moralist principals of Marxian after freeing it from the dogmas of economic determinism.

According to Roy, the materialism of Marxism is dogmatic and un scientific. Roy is critical of the empirical account of knowledge that Marxism provides thus neglecting the creative role of the human beings. Roy believes that the dialectical materialism of Marx is materialist only in nature. According to Roy, the Marxian interpretation if history is defective because it allows slender role to mental activity in the social process. History cannot be interpreted solely in the reference to materialistic objectivism. The intelligence of human being and their cumulative actions are very powerful social forces. Roy also criticizes the Marxian economic interpretation of history.

Roy also criticises Marxian theory of class struggle. According to Roy, Marx's theory of class struggle has subordinated individual consciousness. He was also critical of Marx giving too much importance to the working class. Roy believes that polarization of capitalist society into the

exploiting and the working class never takes place. Again, Roy did not regard surplus value as a peculiar feature of capitalism. He believes that the creation of surplus value and accumulation of capital were also in a socialist society

RADICAL HUMANISM

In the later years of his life (1947-1954) Roy became an exponent of New Humanism. Humanist elements of thought can be traced to several schools and epochs of western philosophy. There were humanist trends in Protagoras, Erasman, Buchanau and Herder. Roy felt that the advance of science was a factor for the liberation of man's creative energies. Science had enhanced the creativity of man and emancipated him from the dominated of superstitions and fears. Though Roy influenced by the scientific materialism of Hobbes, Ethics of Spinoza and secular politics of Locke, he reconciled all these to propound a rational idea of freedom with the concept of necessarily. The central purpose of Roy's Radical Humanism is to co ordinate the philosophy of nature with social philosophy and ethics in a monistic system. It is for this reason that Roy claims it a humanist as well as materialist, naturalist as well as rationalist, creativist as well as determinist

Roy theory of New Humanism revolves around Man. Man is the product of physical universes. It is the man who creates society, state and other institutions and values for his own welfare. As a Radical Humanist, his philosophical approach is individualistic. The individual should not be subordinated either to a clan or to a nation. According to Roy, man has two basic traits one reason the other, the urge for freedom. The reason in man echoes the harmony of the universe. He states that every human behavior is rational, though it may appear as irrational. Man tries to find out the laws of nature in order to realize his freedom. This urge for freedom leads him to a search for knowledge. While rationality provides dynamisms to amen, the urge for freedom gives him direction. The interaction of reason and freedom leads to the expression of co operative spirit as manifested in social relationship.

According to Roy, humanity is passing through a period of crisis. The fundamental problem is to ensure individual freedom against the encroachment of the state. Roy is aware of the coercive power of the state. He defines state as the political organization of society. The functions of state are the welfare of people. According to him, the state must exist and discharge its limited functions along with other equally important and autonomous social organizations. Thus, Roy reduces the functions of the state to the minimum. He pleaded for decentralization where maximum possible autonomy should be granted to the local units.

Roy distinguishes his new humanism from the French and German schools of Humanism of the 19th century. New Humanism is based on the researches of physical science, sociology, philosophy and other branches of knowledge. Its philosophical foundation is provided by materialism and its methodology is mechanistic. It professes confidence in the creative power of man. Man derives his sovereignty from his creative achievement in the understanding and partial conquest of nature. New Humanism, according to Roy, claims to reassert the sovereignty of man by emphasizing that history is the record of man's activities and state or society has no power to impose absolute power of man. New Humanism is based on a mechanistic cosmology and materialistic metaphysics.

Man derives rationality from nature through biological evolution. Thus Roy claims that humanism is a philosophy based on a synthesis of the achievement of modern knowledge.

Roy was in favour of abolition of party system in India. He advocates humanist politics. This will lead to purification and rationalization of politics. According to Roy "party politics has given rise to power politics". He laments about the evils of party politics that exist where innocent and ignorant people are exploited in the elections. Thus he favored the abolition of party system which will enable politics to operate without the incentive of power

Roy's New Humanism is cosmopolitan in its outlook. New Humanism is pledged to the idea of a commonwealth and fraternity of freeman. He advocated a world federation. In his well known work, Reason, Romanticism and Revolution, Roy wrote thus: New Humanism is cosmopolitan. A cosmopolitan common wealth of spiritually free men would not be limited by the boundaries of national states- capitalist, fascist, socialist, communist or any other kind which will gradually disappear under the impact of the twentieth century renaissance of Man'

Roy makes a distinction between cosmopolitanism and internationalism. He pleads for a spiritual community or a cosmopolitan humanism. Internationalism postulates the existence of separate nation states. Roy believes that true world government can be built only the decentralization of nation states

M.N Roy has been one of the most important political thinkers of the modern Indian political thought. His work 'Reason, Romanticism and Revolution' is a significant contribution to the history of western thought. He began his academic pursuit as a Marxist, but gradually restated all the propositions of Marx. He gave a moral restatement of Marxism.

(B) RAM MANOHAR LOHIA (1910-1967)

The growth of socialist thought as a philosophy of social and economic reconstruction is mostly the product of the western impact on India. One of the leading figures of the freedom struggle in India, Lala Lajpat Rai was considered by some critics as the first writer on Socialism and Bolshevism in India. The Marxist leader, M. N Roy was critical of Lala Lajpat Rai's writings and considered him as 'a bourgeois politician with sympathy for socialism' The socialist movement became popular in India only after the first world war and the Russian revolution. The unprecedented economic crisis of the 1920's coupled with the capitalist and imperialist policies of the British government created spiraling inflation and increasing unemployment among the masses. The failure of the two civil disobedience movements of 1930 and 1932 and the compromising attitude of the Congress at the two round Table conferences made a number of young leaders disillusioned. Accordingly, the frustrated leaders within the Indian National Congress formed socialist organisation in different parts of India. During the thirties, Jawaharlal Nehru was considered as a great champion of the socialist philosophy.

By 1934, many socialist groups were formed in different parts of the country. The birth of the Congress Socialist Party in May 1934 was a landmark in the history of the socialist movement in India. The Congress Socialist Party provided an all India platform to all the socialist groups in India. Ashok Mehta's 'Democratic Socialism, and studies in Asian Socialism', Acharya Narendra Dev's 'Socialism and National Revolution' Jayaprakash Narayan's 'Towards Struggle, and Dr. Ram

Manohar Lohia's *The Mystery of Sir Stafford Cripps* etc., played a significant role in spreading the messages of socialism in India.

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia may be regarded as the most unconventional and original theoretician among socialist thinkers in India. His speeches were severely critical and were packed with statistics. He played an important role during the freedom movement of the country. Like many other Indian thinkers, the thought process of Lohia was shaped by an activist life lived by him. Being a prominent leader of the socialist movement in both pre- and post independence times, his theoretical explorations in various issues confronting India were enriched by the empirical input drawn from various movements he led or participated in.

Born in a village in Faizabad district of Uttar Pradesh on 23rd March, 1910, Lohia was one of the few nationalist leaders in the country having his roots in rural India which probably conditioned his thinking process. Lohia's early initiation in the national movement was marked by two remarkable features. One, his meeting with Gandhi along with his father and listening to his views on like Stayagraha, non-violence and struggle for the independence of the country so much influenced the tender mind of Lohia that he became a Gandhian and remained so throughout his life. Two, imbued with the love for his mother land, he became a freedom fighter at an early age when he organised a small mourning shut-down of the death of Tilak in 1920. His participation in the national movement unabated till the liberation of India.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOCIALISM.

In 1952, as president of Congress Socialist Party, Lohia pleaded for a greater incorporation of Gandhian ideas in socialist thought. He advocated the significance of a decentralised economy based upon the resuscitation of cottage industries. He asked the Indian socialists to understand the importance of small machines which could utilise maximum labour power with even small capital investment. Developing his argument in favour of Gandhian economy, Lohia explained that the world today was in the grip of two systems and the third one was in the making. He argued that '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' Lohia called this idea the true socialist idea. This socialist idea, to him, is based on Gandhian ideas of decentralised economy and village government. He, therefore, urged the importance of small scale cottage industries as visualised by Gandhiji for meeting the socio-economic needs of rural people. However, this type of thought orientation was not liked by many of his colleagues. In June 1953, Ashok Mehta propounded his thesis of the political compulsions of the backward economy in which he tried to maintain that the ideology of the Congress was coming near to that of the socialists, and hence he urged for an ideological alliance between the Congress and the Praja Socialist Party (PSP). Lohia, as 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. However, he saw no harm in making an electoral adjustment with the Congress under special circumstances.

Lohia not only contributed to the development of socialist movement in the country but he also reflected on certain question of political importance and thereby tried to build up his own socialist theory. Contemplating the process of history, he tells in his famous work, 'Wheel of History' that history appears to move in an inexorable cyclical order and that it moves without emotion. He dismisses Hegelian and Marxist interpretations of history for their answers do not provide us with a definite clue to the working of history. Lohia believes that human history is characterised by a tussle between crystallized casters and loosely cohesive classes.

NEW SOCIALISM

Lohia's scathing attack on the western ideological constructs appears to be aimed at preparing the ground for establishing socialism as the most appropriate theoretical format for steering India on the path of an equitable and all-round socio-economic development. While he accepted socialism as the viable ideology for India and tried to conceptualise it in the light of the Gandhian inputs, he came out with the idea of New socialism in 1959 with the plea that it offers a comprehensive system of socio-economic and political life for the people of India.

Lohia in his theory of new socialism visualises a four pillar state. In this four pillar state, an attempt is made to synthesise the opposed concepts of centralisation and decentralisation. In this system, the village, the mandal (the district), the province and the central government all retain importance and are integrated in a system of functional federalism. The cohesive bond is provided by the performance of function.

His theory of new socialism had six basic elements. They are equalitarian standards in the areas of income and expenditure, growing economic interdependence, world parliament system based on adult franchise, democratic freedoms inclusive of right to private life, Gandhian technique of individual and collective civil disobedience, and dignity and rights of common man.

Lohia's socialist state has the following features.

1. One-fourth of all governmental and plan expenditure shall be through village, district and city panchayats;
2. Police shall remain subordinate to village, city and district panchayats or any of their agencies;
3. the post of collector shall be abolished and all his functions will be distributed among various bodies in the district;
4. Agriculture industry and other property, which is nationalised will, as far as possible, be administered by village, city and district panchayats;
5. Economic decentralisation, corresponding to political and administrative decentralisation, will have to be brought about through maximum utilisation of small machines;

Lohia was an exponent of decentralised socialism. The socialist state, according to him, must aim at the decentralisation of both economic and political powers. The world liberal as well as proletarian, has hitherto known only the two pillar state. But democracy, according to Lohia, can warm the blood of the common man only when constitutional theory starts practising the state of four limbs,

the village, the district the province, and the centre. Organically covered by the flesh and blood of equalities already indicated, this constitutional skeleton of the four- pillar state can bring to democracy joyous fulfilment. He also felt the necessity of creating a fifth pillar in the form of a world government. This is necessary for bringing about peace in the world.

Lohia was convinced that the traditional and organised socialism was a dead doctrine and a dying organisation. In its place, he urged for a new kind of socialism. While discussing his new socialism, he states that equality, democracy, non-violence, decentralisation and socialism are the five supreme principles, not alone of India's politics but also of all world action. 'New socialism' must aim at the attainment of these principles.

In his 'New 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, colour etc;
3. Against inequality of backward and high group or castes based long tradition, and for giving special opportunities to the backward;
4. against foreign enslavement and for freedom and world democratic rule,
5. For equality and planned production and against the existence and attachment for private capital.
6. against unjust encroachment on private life and for democratic method;
7. against weapons and for Satyagraha.

Thus Lohia advocated socialism in the form of a new civilisation which could be referred to as socialist humanism' He gave a new direction and dimension to the socialist movement in India. He wanted the power of the state to be controlled, guided and framed by people's power and believed in the theology of democratic socialism and non-violent methodology as instruments of socio-economic transformation. He urged all the socialist parties of the world to think in terms of an effective world union through world government.

(C) JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN (1902-1979)

Jayaprakash Narayan's life happens to be a life of endless quest for getting suitable ways and means to resolve the socio-economic and political conditions of the toiling masses of the country. Born on 11 October 1902 in a village in Chapra district in Bihar, he appeared to be an unconventional boy even from his early childhood. While in his studies he usually opted for the uncommon subjects defying the prevailing social norms of his time. His studies almost got ruptured in 1921 when under the influential exhortation of Maulana Azad, he made up his mind to quit studies and join the national movement under Gandhi. Sensing JP's growing inclination towards the national movement, his parents motivated him to go abroad for his higher studies in USA. As a student in USA he came in contact with east European left – wing intellectuals and became converted to Marxism. He was also influenced by the writings of M.N. Roy.

On his return to India in 1929, JP joined the national movement with the intention of practising socialism in India. His imprisonment in the wake of the civil disobedience movement at Nasik jail brought him close to the other likeminded nationalists which later on culminated in the formation of the Congress Socialist Party (CSP) in April 1934. However, his passion for Marxism was so strong that in 1936, J.P. Published a booklet 'Why Socialism' arguing that today more than ever before is possible to say that there is only one type, one theory of socialism – Marxism. The Marxist phase of JP's life seemingly continued during the decade of the 1930's after which he drifted to the philosophy of democratic socialism and finally turning out to be sarvodaya in the post independence times.

Total Revolution (Sampurana Kranti) was the last intellectual intervention of Jayaprakash Narayanan in his unending quest to seek and establish such a socio economic and political order in the country which would turn India into a democratic, federal participatory, equitable and prosperous nation in the world. The concept of total revolution was for the first time evolved by Vionoba Bhava during the 1960's to articulate his desire to the need of a comprehensive movement in the country which would transform all the aspects of life in order to mould a new man to change human life and create a new world. The idea was picked up by JP to call upon the people in 1975 to work for total revolution in order to stem the rot creeping into all aspects of public life and create a whole new world encompassing the basic elements of socio-economic and political order that he had been advocating in the name of Sarvodaya.

The context of JP calling for the total revolution was provided by the growing authoritarianism in the functioning of the government machinery headed by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. In fact, his call for sampurna kranti became the rallying cry for the movement against Indira Gandhi's government J.P's concept of total revolution is a holistic one. JP is indebted to Gandhi for developing the doctrine of total revolution. He wrote thus, "Gandhiji's non-violence was not just a plea for law and order, or a cover for the status quo, but a revolutionary philosophy. It is, indeed, a philosophy of total revolution, because it embraces personal and social ethics and values of life as much as economic, political and social institutions and processes.

JP has pointed out that the French revolution started with the mission of realising liberty, equality and fraternity. But it ended in Bonapartism and the humiliations at Waterloo. The Russian revolution started with the mission of redeeming the rights of the proletariat and the other suppressed sections of society. But power has not percolated to the Russian people and the cry of the withering away of the state is now relegated only to the field of antiquarian intellectual dialectics. Hence if the basic aim is to transfer decision-making policy execution and judicial arbitration to the people there has to be change in the technique of revolution. JP, hence, advocates, 'persuasion and conversion – social revolution through human revolution would necessarily postulate a comprehensive programme of radical social construction for total development and welfare.

Jayaprakash Narayan's doctrine of total revolution is a combination of seven revolutions- social economic, political, cultural, ideological or intellectual, educational and spiritual. He was not every rigid regarding the number of these revolutions. He said the seven revolutions could be grouped as per demands of the social structure in a political system. He said, 'for instance, the cultural may include educational and ideological revolutions. And if culture is used in an anthropological sense, it can embrace all other revolutions. He said, 'for instance the cultural may include educational and ideological sense, it can embrace all other revolutions. He said economic

revolution may be split up into industrial, agricultural, technological revolutions etc. Similarly intellectual revolutions may be split up into two - scientific and philosophical.

The concept of total revolution became popular in 1974 in the wake of mass movements in Gujarat and Bihar. He was deeply disturbed by the political process of degeneration in the Indian politics. He was deeply moved by the mutilation of democratic process, political corruption and full of moral standards more public life. In a letter to a friend in August 1976, JP defined the character of the total Revolution. He wrote. "Total revolution is a permanent revolution. It will always go on keep on hanging both our personal and social lives. This revolution knows no respite, no halt, certainly not complete halt.

JP's Total revolution involved the developments of peasants, workers, harijans, tribes and all weaker sections of society. He was always interested in empowering and strengthening India's democratic system. He was deeply disturbed by the growth of corruption in the Indian political system. He wrote that 'corruption is eating into the vitals of our political life. It is disturbing development, undermining the administration and making of mockery of all laws and regulations. It is eroding people's faith and exhausting their proverbial patience.'

The concept of total revolution aimed at reversing the tide of the political and economic system of the country ostensibly due to the concentration of political and economic powers in few hands and restoring the sanctity of institutions and procedures in those sheers of life by decentralising such powers in the hands of the masses. In the sphere of political system, JP noted the inherent fallacies of the prevailing parliamentary system of government as its basic features such as electoral system, party-based political processes and increasing concentration of powers in the hands of the Prime Minister etc, are bound to convert the system into a corrupt, tyrannical and farcical one. Hence, in his conceptualisation of total revolution, JP was firm on reforming the electoral system in such a way that the people can vote in an incorruptible manner and accordance with their free conscience. Moreover in such a system, there would be no place for political parties and the potential concentration of powers in few hands would be effectively curbed.

Like political power, JP was also convinced of the perverse effects of the concentration of economic power in the hands of few in the society. He, therefore, called for total recasting of the economic system of the country as well. JP visualised an economic order for the country where there would be progressive socialisation of the means of resources by way of establishing co-operative societies and voluntary associations to manage the resources with a view to ensure prosperity for all.

JP's call for executing the idea of total Revolution in 1975 was accompanied by some sort of blueprint for the volunteers to carry out the implementation of the scheme of holistic transformation of Indian society. He exhorted the people to rise against the authoritarian and inimical policies and programmes of the government. In its operationalisation, however, the idea of total revolution occasionally evoked misplaced perceptions in the minds of its practitioners.

Jayaprakash was a great humanitarian and his doctrine of Total revolution is not only a system of social and economic reconstruction of the Indian society but it is also a philosophy of moral and spiritual rebirth of the Indian people. Indeed he was the greatest mass leader in Indian history after Gandhiji. He was one of the greatest defenders of democracy in the 20th century. As an intellectual, he will continue to have an abiding place in the domain of the social sciences.

Module V

Social Justice

DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR

Babasaheb Ambedkar is one of the foremost thinkers of modern India. He is a unique thinker of the world who himself suffered much humiliation, poverty and social stigma, yet he rose to great educational and philosophical heights. He was a revolutionary social reformer who demonstrated great faith in democracy and the moral basis of a society. He was one of the principal critics of India's national movement led by Mahatma Gandhi. His advent into the socio-political scenario of India led to his emergence as the messiah of the depressed classes, which he decided to fight to its logical end. His major role was to bring about a transformation in the consciousness of the downtrodden, and attacked the very basis of sociological institutions.

Among the galaxy of thinkers in modern India, DR. B.R. Ambedkar stands on a pedestal quite different from others for a variety of reasons. First, his personality exemplifies the unique saga of an untouchable being able to fight the massive social disabilities by sheer formidable courage never-say-attitude to life to become an eminent constitutionalist, distinguished parliamentarian, scholar and jurist, and above all, the leader of the Depressed Classes. Second, he reinvented the entire notion of anti-untouchability and social reform movement not only in Maharashtra but the whole of India by evolving a flexible, well reasoned and multi-pronged strategy to argue with and fight against all those who mattered but resisted the struggle of the untouchables to secure a dignified and respectful place in the Indian society. Third, recognizing him as an innovator of sorts, Ambedkar may be credited with reconceptualising the whole notion of emancipating of untouchables in India by broadening the horizons of the concept of emancipation of untouchables to include within its ambit certain other critical aspects of empowerment which remained largely out of its ambit till date.

Ambedkar was born in the untouchable Mahar caste in Maharashtra on 14th April, 1891. His father and grandfather served in the army and were of well-to-do family, but the stigma of their being members of the Mahar community continued to influence their position in the caste-ridden society of Maharashtra. It is believed that Mahars were the original inhabitants of Maharashtra. The term Maharashtra was coined on the basis of Mahar Rashtra. However, Mahars were treated as untouchables by the caste Hindus. Hence, he suffered all kinds of social humiliations in childhood as well as his subsequent life on account of the stigma of untouchability. In the classroom he was not allowed to sit along with the rest of the students. In spite of all these hurdles, he successfully completed his matriculation certificate at Elphinstone High school in Bombay. He then enrolled, thanks to a scholarship, at the prestigious Elphinstone College, from which he graduated in 1912 with a BA Degree. Then he won another scholarship to pursue post graduate studies in the United States. He secured an MA from Columbia University in New York and then left in 1916 for London where he was admitted to Grays Inn to study law. He was influenced by the liberal and radical thought currents in America and Europe, more particularly with the thought he emerged following the French

revolution. His MA dissertation on Administration and Finance of the East India Company and his PhD thesis on the Evolution of the Provincial Finance in British India at Columbia University were brilliant contributions to the analysis of colonial economy and politics and to anti-colonial economic thought.

He then tried to settle down as a lawyer in Bombay but as an untouchable found it hard to attract clients. Deeply hurt, he decided to devote his life to campaign against the evils of caste system and in July 1924 set up an association for the welfare of the Ostracized which he held till 1928.

The 1930s marked Ambedker's transition to party politics. He demanded from the British a separate electorate for the untouchables. The British government partly concurred with his arguments in the arbitration which it announced on August 14, 1932. Gandhi, who feared that the measure would threaten Hindu unity, immediately went on a fast in jail at Poona. This move forced Ambedkar to relinquish his demand for separate electorates and to sign the Poona pact on September 24, 1932. In 1936 Ambedkar created his first Political party, the Independent Labour Party which contested 17 seats in the elections of 1937 in the Bombay province and won 15 of them. The Second World War and the demand of the Muslim League for Pakistan introduced new and complex issues in the national movement. 1942, he established a new organization known as the Scheduled Castes Federation replacing the Independent Labour party.

Ambedkar was elected to the constituent Assembly from Bengal and in the Assembly, made a plea for a united India with the Congress and the Muslim League working together. He was appointed as the chairman of the Drafting committee of the Indian constitution and became the law Minister in the Nehru cabinet in August 1947. In both these capacities he conceptualized, formulated and defended a free and equalitarian framework for public life in India with extensive safeguard for the minorities and marginalized sections. He resigned from the Nehru cabinet in 1951 and strove to work out an alternative to the lack of social and economic democracy in India and the inability of the constitutional democracy to effectively function in its absence. Such a search eventually led him to conversion to Buddhism and the proposal for the establishment of the Republican Party of India. He died on 6 December, 1956.

SOCIO -POLITICAL IDEAS OF AMBEDKAR

The social thought of Ambedkar basically revolves around the idea of understanding the dynamics of caste system in India and waging a tireless crusade against the curse of untochability. Drawn from his own experience in being subjected to numerous kinds of social indignities and discrimination at various stages and different walks of his life, he was convinced of the purpose of his life for which he remained steadfastly committed. Ambedkar, therefore, oscillated between the promotion of the untouchables in Hindu society or in the Indian nation as a whole, and the strategy of a break that could take the form of a separate electorate, or of a separate Dalit party and / or of conversion outside Hinduism. He searched for solutions, explored strategies and in doing so set the Dalits on the path of arduous emancipation.

VIEWS ON SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

As a liberal thinker, Ambedkar was a hardcore in the value of constitutional democracy having irrevocable elements of social and economic democracies, in additions to political democracy. Indeed the notion of social democracy situated in the framework of the constitutional democracy appeared dearer to him than political democracy, presumably because of the fact that it was the thing he found for thought out his life. According to him, social democracy means a way of life which recognizes liberty, equality and fraternity which are not to be treated as separate items in trinity. They form a union of trinity in the sense that to divorce one from the other is to defeat the very purpose of democracy. Liberty cannot be divorced from equality; equality cannot be divorced from liberty. Nor can liberty and equality be divorced from fraternity.

The complex web of democracy, thus, for Ambedkar was expected to consist of not only the sterile inputs mainly political in nature but also the dynamic elements of social and economic democracies with the balance weighing heavily in the favour of social democracy. Though as a framework of life, Ambedkar emphasized the social component of democracy as a system of government, he explicitly expressed himself in favour of British parliamentary model of democracy. Taking it as the system of providing a ample scope for reconciliation of the individual good and the social good, he was keen on imbibing the basic liberal values which underpin the functioning of parliamentary democracy.

On the basis of his extensive study and knowledge of the evolution of human society and social institutions, Ambedkar was convinced that democracy was the only form of government which ensured liberty and equality in the society. Addressing the first session of the round Table conference in 1930, he said, the bureaucratic form of government in India should be replaced by a government which will be the government of the people by the people and for the people.' Speaking on behalf of the depressed classes and denial of political rights to them, he said thus: "No share of political power can come, to us so long as the British government remains as it is. It is only in a Sawaraj constitution that we stand any chance of getting political power in our own hands without which we cannot bring salvation to our people".

Explain his notion of democratic society, Ambedkar holds the view that democracy is more than a government. It is a form of the organization of society. There are two essential conditions which characterize democratically constituted society;

1. absence of stratifications of society into classes;
2. A social habit on the part of the individual and groups which are ready for continuous readjustment or recognition of reciprocity of interests.

According to Ambedkar, even a democratic government would not be able to do anything if Indian society remained divided into classes and subclasses as each individual in such society would place class interest above everything and there would be no justice and fair play in the functioning of the government. Democratic government requires democratic attitude of mind and proper socialization.

Ambedkar was a protagonist of the idea of social justice as an inalienable part of the constitutional democratic framework in India. Ambedkar's notion of social justice was based on the concept of social democracy. Social democracy means a way of life which recognizes liberty, equality and fraternity as the principles of life. Social justice refers to a distinct aspect of the socio economic and political system of the country through which concerted and coordinated measures are initiated aimed at eliminating the disadvantaged position of the depressed classes in society. A unique point of the notion of social justice as propagated by Ambedkar was his insistence on providing statutory basis to such measures so that they become the policy compulsion of the government.

HINDUISM, CASTE AND UNTOUCHABILITY

The basic issue lying at the core of the Gandhi Ambedkar intellectual acrimony appears to be the fundamental differences between the perspective of the two leaders regarding the probable solution to the problems of untouchability and the other vices of caste system. Both Gandhi and Ambedkar stood for equality, justice and freedom to all, regardless of caste, creed or sense. Yet one finds serious differences on how such a social order could be achieved. Gandhi's views about caste or varna system were quite different from those of Ambedkar. Interpreting Hinduism Gandhiji said, "Caste has nothing to do with religion. It is a custom whose origin I do not know and do not need to know for the satisfaction of my spiritual hunger.....There is nothing in the law of varna to warrant a belief in untouchability". 'Dr. Ambedkar, totally disagreed with Gandhian notion of caste system. He maintained that caste system completely ruined the Hindu society. Reorganization of Hindu society on the basis of varna system was not possible because it was likely to degenerate into a caste system without proper legal control. Moreover, reorganization of Hindus on the basis of four varnas could prove harmful on it would have degrading effect on the mass by denying them opportunity to acquire knowledge.

During the 1920's and early 1930's, when the problem of untouchability was being sought to be resolved through the political empowerment of the untouchables, Gandhi evolved and persisted with a socio-humanist approach to the problem. Through his writings in Young India, he forcefully decried the practice of untouchability and asserted that no occupation attributes a social status to the people. Thus, his approach to the problem of untouchability rested on its eradication through self-enlightenment of the people which was in sharp contrast to the Ambedkar's approach of waging struggles for the same. Interestingly, even by 1940s, when Gandhi seemed willing to accept intermarriage as a means of eradicating the vices of caste system, he did not support the eradication of caste as a social unit which brought him in conflict with Ambedkar whose historical call for the annihilation of caste had presumably become one of cherished goals of his life. Sympathetic to the plight of the untouchables, Gandhi took a variety of measures. Hence, he declared that the untouchables are not inferior and they should be regarded as 'Harijans' or 'Gods people'.

In September 1932, under the patronage and supervision of Gandhi, an All India Anti-Untouchability League was formed which was later on renamed as Harijan Sevak Sangh. However, Dr Ambedkar did not appreciate the move. While Gandhiji wanted Hindu society to put an end to untouchability

and revert to the origin system of four Varnas, Ambedkar had serious differences with Gandhiji on this matters. In protest against Anti-Untouchability League, Ambedkar formed a parallel organization known as the Samata Saink Dal.

DIFFERENCES ON SEPARATE ELECTORATE

Ambedkar had differences with Gandhiji on the question of separate electorate and reservation of seats for the depressed classes. Ambedkar openly argued that as there was no link between the Hindus and the depressed classes, they must be regarded as a distinct and independent community. For Ambedkar, political rights preceded cultural reform. To this end, he fought against Gandhi who felt that since untouchables were a part of the Hindu community, there was no need for separate electorates or reserved seats. Ambedkar insisted that the depressed classes be given a separate electorate and reservation of seats in central and provincial assemblies. In the second session of the Round Table conference, Ambedkar stressed that power should be shared by all communities in their respective proportion. To quote Ambedkar. "We are demanding equal rights which are the common possession of the entire humanity, but due to inhibitions created by the shastras we have been denied these human rights". Thus he shared views with other minorities like Muslims, Christians etc., for securing political rights for depressed classes.

COMMUNAL AWARD AND POONA PACT.

Gandhi was highly critical of Ambedkar for entering into a pact with minorities. Gandhiji resented the recognition given to the untouchables as a separate political entity through the Communal Award of 1932, giving representation of minorities and untouchables in the provincial legislatures. Separate electorate, according to Gandhi, would make it a permanent feature giving rise to serious problem of human relationship. As a protest to the communal Award Gandhiji declared his fast unto death. Leaders of Congress persuaded Ambedkar to help save the life of Gandhiji. Reservation of seats in the provincial and central assembly was agreed for 10 years. A pact was signed between the Congress party and Ambedkar representing depressed classes in September 1932, known as Poona pact. It nullified the earliest communal Award and was later on incorporated in the Government of India Act, 1935.

ASSESSMENT

A survey of the thought and actions of Ambedkar reflects the solitary purpose of his life: the emancipation of untouchables in Indian society. Taking inspiration and lessons from his own life, Ambedkar remained an untiring crusader for the cause of untouchables during a life spanning over six decades. Hence he can be designated as the social prophet of the untouchables'. Dr. Jatav has rightly described Ambedkar as a 'social humanist'. After careful study of the history of human relations among Hindus in Indian society, he sincerely felt that it required serious and concerted efforts for reforms. There is no doubt that he was a patriot and would not be opposed to national integration.

(B) SREE NARAYANA GURU (1856-1928)

Sree Narayan Guru was a great saint and social reformer who stood for the cardinal principle of 'One caste, One Religion and one god for Man'. The message and teachings of Sree Narayana Guru are more relevant today than before. He was an embodiment of all virtues, values and rare qualities seldom found in human race. He was a mystic, a philosopher, a visionary and a poet blended into one within a period of less than half a century, who had metamorphosed the depressed and oppressed communities in Kerala from dust into men who could stand on their own legs as self-respecting human beings'

The state of Kerala once called by Swami Vivekananda as a 'Lunatic asylum' due to horrible caste distinction is now being called as 'the god's own country'. This transformation, within a short span of time has taken place with divine force at the hands of Sree Narayana Guru. Guru was a rare saint who used his spiritual attainment of the creation of a new man and new social order. Theosophical society of India described the Guru as Patanjali in Yoga, Sankara in wisdom, Manu in art governance, Budha in renunciation and Christ in love and humanity. To think Gurudev merely as a reformer, as the great scholar and genius or the founder of numerous institutions would be narrowing our own outlook and blurring our vision of the great truth. Guru was an extra-ordinary ascetic visionary and karma yogi who moved from place to place and his very presence transformed Kerala society free from the evils of caste system. Several leaders and scholars like Rabindranath Tagore, Mahatma Gandhi, Acharya Vinoba Bhave etc., visited Sree Narayana Guru at his ashram at Sivagiri Mutt, Varkala. They all paid glowing tributes to the Guru. Rabindranath Tagore paid the following tribute to Sree Narayana Guru". I have been touring different parts of the world. During these travels I have had the good fortune to come into contact with several saints and maharishis (Great Saints). But I have frankly to admit that I have never come across one who is spiritually greater than Swami Sree Naryayana Guru of Kerala –nay, a person who is on par with him in spiritual attainments. I am sure I shall never forget that radiant face, illuminated by self- effulgent light for divine glory and those yogic eyes fixing their gaze on a remote point on the distant horizon'

At the end of the 19th century, Kerala society presented a dismal picture of social and religious life, with individual being subjected to the tyranny of innumerable debased customs and manners. A silent revolution was set in motion by Sree Narayana Guru which had wider impact on the modern society in Kerala. This revolution, though started as a movement to remove the unnecessary customs and traditional evil practices prevalent among the Ezhavas, one of the avarna communities, which was numerically bigger than all the caste Hindus put together in Kerala, had produced results which evidently changed the face of the social, political, economic and religious life of Kerala as a whole.

Sree Narayaa Guru was born in 1856 in Chempazanthi, about 12 kilometres north of Trivandrum, the capital of then princely state of Travancore. His father was Madan ashan, a teacher and physician and his mother's name was Kutty. Guru's maternal uncles were vaidyas and Sanskrit scholars. Nanu was initiated into reading writing and arithmetic at the customary age of 5. Education in those days consisted mainly in learning the simpler works in Sanskrit, sometimes in Bramhi characters. The student Narayanan was quick to learn, never forgetting what he had learnt.

Sree Narayana Guru wanted to reform the traditional caste ridden Kerala Society. For the realisation of this objective, he has thoroughly studied the prevailing social laws carefully. As a social reformer, Narayana Guru based the foundation of all progress in the reformation of religious practices, social customs, and the daily habits of the people. He advised his followers not to say anything that would hurt the feeling of others. The result was that the broad minded leaders of the higher castes respected him and cooperated the movements for the uplift of the depressed classes.

In the traditional Kerala society, the avarnas or untouchables, were denied entry into temples. They were not permitted to install and consecrate idols in the temples and perform poojas. Under the able guidance and leadership of Sree Narayana Guru, the avarnas gained a fresh surge of vigour and they vehemently criticised and opposed the supremacy of the Savarnas. Guru worked out a planned strategy and got a temple constructed and ventured to install and consecrate an idol. On 10 February 1888, Guru consecrated an idol of Siva (Sivalingam) at Aruvippuram(Near Neyyanthinkara) which marked the beginning of silent social revolution in Kerala. As Murkaot Kunhappa in his autobiography, 'Sree Narayana Guru' has rightly pointed out, "At dead of night swami had a dip in the river. He came up after some time with a Sivalingam in his hands and walked into the make-shift temple and stood there with his eyes closed in deep meditation, his hands holding the Sivalingam to his chest, tears flowing down his cheeks, completely lost to the world. For full three hours, he stood still in that asana (Posture) while the entire crowd rent the midnight air with continuous cries of 'Om Namah Sivaya, Om Namah Sivaya", for full three hours. The whole lot of them appeared to have only one mind, one thought one prayer among them "Om Namah Sivaya-Obeisance to Siva". At three in the morning Swami placed the Sivalingam on the pedestal, consecrated it, and performed abhisheka (Holy bathing of idol)'.

A new era dawned in Kerala at that predawn hour on 10th February 1888. When a temple was built there later on, Sree Narayana Guru got the message of his life engraved in granite there.

‘Here is a model abode
Where men live like brothers:
Bereft of the prejudice of caste
Or the rancour of religious differences’

Guru wanted Kerala to be that model, the whole world to be its manifestation. ‘ One caste, one religion, one god for man’ is his message which has become famous all over the world and toward which mankind is striving halting and unsatisfactory though the progress seems to be:

Consecration of an idol of Siva by Sree Narayana Guru administered an electric shock to the crowd assembled there, Social reformation all round was the result of this shock treatment. It produced very strong and effective movement of reform among all the castes, such as Namboodiris, Nairs, Pulayas and Ezhavas, besides affecting other castes too. The leaders of these reform movements have themselves recorded how they were inspired by the movements initiated by Sree Narayana Guru.

In addition to the consecration of a Siva idol in Aruvippuram, Sree Narayana Guru went on establishing and consecrating several temples and idols in different parts of Kerala besides a couple or

so in Tamil Nadu , Karnataka and Sri Lanka. He wanted the temples to be the centres for purity and development. In the opinion of justice V.R. Krishna Iyer, the entire edifice of Brahmanism and the caste structure suffered a collapse when, by installing Siva in a temple built by him,. Narayana Guru worked a miracle of spiritual transmutation and social reformation.

Guru strongly opposed some of the evil practices, superstitious beliefs, rituals ceremonies etc., followed by backward class members. He observed that the Avarnas were worshipping their ancestors, tribal heroes, tragic persons whose life- stories had the sublime qualities of Greek tragedies. They also worshipped hills and rocks, stones and brooks, snakes and other fearsome creatures. These were corrupt practices that had to be stopped. Accordingly, in more than a hundred places, he unseated the gods whose names had associations with the killing of birds and consumption of liquor, replacing them by idols of Siva, Subramania and Ganesa and instituted poojas of the type performed in temples dedicated to them. Such poojas are technically known as Uthama pooja (the highest form of idol worship). The Ezhavas and some of the higher castes used to conduct a mock marriage prior to the regular marriage which took place only after a girl came to age. A small ornament called Tali was tied around the neck of the child by the person who conducted the ceremony. Guru declared that this ‘Tali Kettu’ function was meaningless and ordered its abolition.

Sree Narayana Guru believed that all the ills that bedevilled the society, social, economic, intellectual and political, emanated from the one root cause – caste. By eradicating that evil, the social liberation and consequent emancipation were possible to achieve. Through a process of self –purification, the lower castemen would be ready for receiving the benefits of modernization. The method he used was a process of sanskritisation – raising the untouchables to the status of Brahmins’. Accordingly he advised and compelled his followers to do away with their crude, uncivilized customs and usages, to adopt worship of Aryan gods in the place of tribal deities like Chathan, Pidari, Chudala Maden and the like, to educate their children, to take to industry and other productive means so as to earn material wealth, and to organize themselves in order to get strong as a social and political force. Thus Sree Narayana Dharma Paripalana Yogam (SNDP Yogam) was formed in 1903 which acted as a powerful pressure group in the erst while princely state of Travancore and later in Kerala State. Following the lead of Guru, Ezhavas and other lower castemen started agitating for the right of school – entry for their children which was denied to them in Travancore and Cochin till 1910. Within two decades the number of school going children of Ezhava community exceeded the number of children of all other caste of Hindu community.

Through self-purification and education, Guru tried to inculcate the ideal in the minds of his followers. More than any other modern social and religious reformer, he realized the importance of artha in the scheme of life. According to Guru, material advancement is necessarily the precondition for the attainment of spiritual progress.

Sree Narayana Guru provided guidelines on religion to the people at large - people who had to live an active rather than a competitive life. He wanted them to understand that religion was not a mere formula or a set of rites and ceremonies, but a way of life. Narayana Guru accepts Advaita as the metaphysical basis for man’s practical concern in the world and devoted his whole life to showing

the world that Advaita can be translated into action. The metaphysics of Advaita is based on soul force which should form the ultimate impulse of our normal principles in life. Advaita philosophy becomes meaningless unless it teaches men to treat their fellowman as equals. In Kerala the greatest impediment to such conduct was the evil practice of caste system. Naturally, therefore, the Guru's message of universal love was expressed in the idiom of the people of Kerala, when he said "One caste for man". The teachings of the Guru are meant for the people all over the world. This truth is stated more vividly when he proclaimed the essential unity of all religions: "whichever the religion, it suffices, if it makes a better man". Thus Guru's message became the cardinal principle of modern secularism.

Guru was seeking ways to better man's relations with his fellows and endeavoring to raise him to a truly higher status as Man by the realization of the oneness of all castes, creed and the gods. His universality cannot be mistaken for sectarian well being of the Ezhavas or Hindu alone; he had made it clear in the inscription on the wall of his Ashram:

'One in kind, one in faith one in God is man,
Of one same womb, one same form,
Difference none there is at all'

Gandhiji –Guru Debate on varna or caste system

Gandhiji believed in Varna of man and held fast to the rule of caste as the basis of social order. Eventhough Gandhiji wanted untouchability to go, he was for retaining caste, "as the matchless caste organisation' he said," was an instance of vast social service organisation..... caste regulated service in the event of disease, death and poverty'. According to Gandhiji, the Hindu concept of Varnashrama was a sustaining force. It means duties engendered by the caste in which one is born. Narayana Guru denied both Varna and caste and said that there is no basis for the existence of these in the scheme of life. When these two leaders met at Sivagiri, in Travancore, an argument took place between them on the validity of caste. Pointing out to the mango tree, Gandhiji said, as their leaves are of different kinds, so are members of the human race. Guru made it clear that these different kinds of leaves yield the same taste. In his later life Gandhiji had adopted this theory of Narayana Guru, as is evident from one of his speeches at Calcutta where he gave the same metaphor to prove the unity of all castes.

However for Narayana Guru negation of caste had a greater meaning in the scheme of life, not only a material but also a spiritual meaning. Guru wrote that ' We are all one and the same. Whatever may be the differences in men's creeds, dress, language, etc., - because they belong to all to the same kind of creation – there is no harm at all in their dining together , or having marital relations with one another. All distinctions between man and man are man-made not inherent in or related to creation. Selfish of one demands him to make some inferior than himself; it is not the social necessity that created jati, but individual greed and apathy that produced it. Caste is thus the very opposite of brotherhood. A relentless crusade against caste and its corollaries, untouchability and unapproachability was the most important aspect of the modernisation process initiated by Sree

Narayana Guru. As a philosophy it is pure advaita Vedanta but as a practical ideal it crosses the limits of metaphysics and directly enters the comprehension of ordinary intelligent man.

Guru appreciated and stressed the importance of education and organisation for the emancipation of untouchables. He wrote that 'Gain freedom through education and gain strength through organization'. He made it clear that universal education is indispensable and girl's education should be encouraged and should never be neglected. Adult literacy and establishment of libraries in every locality should be encouraged. As early as 1921 he stated that "Liquor is poison. It should not be produced, sold or consumed" anticipating the promulgation of prohibition by several years.

Thus it is clear from the above observations and principles that Narayana Guru is one of the most important social reformers in modern India. He made immense contributions to transform the traditional caste-ridden Kerala society into a God's own country by initiating silent social revolution. Romain Rolland in his book the 'Life of Ramakrishna' refers to the personality of "the Great Guru (Sree Narayana) whose beneficent spiritual activity was exercised for more than forty years in the state of Travancore over some faithful souls. He preached a Jnana of action, a great intellectual religion, having a lively sense of the people and their social needs. It has greatly contributed, to the uplifting of the oppressed classes in Southern India and its activities have in a measure been allied to those of Gandhi" By stressing the unifying power of religion, Sree Narayana Guru led his followers to the consummation of a silent revolution – constructive, permanent and far reaching results. There is no gainsaying the fact that the socio- religious movement inaugurated by Sree Narayana Guru was the for runner of the political awakening in Kerala. The stress he put on education and industry, should be viewed as the foundation of modern society in Kerala. It should be remembered that Guru advocated purely constitutional methods to gain the end of social justice and economic well-being . Wherever there are down-trodden, underprivileged groups in the world, message of Sree Narayana Guru, 'Educate that you may be free, organise that you may be strong ; industrialise that your financial status may improve' has relevance at all times. He is one of the secular and universal social thinker that the world has ever produced.