

MODERN INDIAN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THOUGHT

STUDY MATERIAL

FIRST SEMESTER

CORE COURSE : PS1C02

For

**M.A.POLITICAL SCIENCE
(2017 ADMISSION ONWARDS)**



UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

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

492

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

FIRST SEMESTER

MA POLITICAL SCIENCE

(2017 ADMISSION ONWARDS)

CORE COURSE :

PS1C02 : MODERN INDIAN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THOUGHT

Prepared by :

Dr. Nithya N.R.
Assistant Professor,
Department of Political Science,
Sree Kerala Varma College, Thrissur.

Layout: 'H' Section, SDE

©

Reserved

CONTENTS

Module	Title	Page No.
I	Indian Renaissance a) Raja Ram Mohan Roy: As a liberal political thinker Social Reforms b) Vivekananda Social and political ideas	06 - 26
II	Liberal and Extremist thinkers a) Gokhale Political Liberalism b) Tilak Militant Nationalism	27 - 37
III	Gandhi Contribution to Indian Nationalism, Techniques of Political Struggle Satyagraha and Nonviolence, A Critique of Western civilization (Hind Swaraj), Ideal state – Views on state, Trusteeship, Decentralization, Socialism.	38 - 62
IV	Socialist Thinkers a) M.N. Roy Radical Humanism b) Lohia – Views on Socialism c) Jayaprakash Narayanan – Total Revolution d) E.M.S. Namboodiripad – Application of Marxism to Indian conditions.	63 - 86
V	Social Justice a) B.R. Ambedkar Social Democracy, Ambedkar & Gandhi b) Sree Narayana Guru Social Reform Secularism Universalism	87 – 103
	<i>Suggested Readings</i>	104 - 105

INTRODUCTION

Social and political thought is linked with the interplay of factors involving society, economy and politics. Political thought is a generalized term which comprises all thoughts, theories and values of a person or a group of persons or a community on state and questions related to the state. The purpose of this introduction is not merely to document the political ideas of those thinkers who changed the course of India's freedom struggle, but also to analyse the socio-historical contexts in which these ideas evolved and also the socio-political changes that these ideas aimed at. Since the book is about modern Indian political thought, it's obvious focus is on ideas that critically influenced the articulation of nationalism in India. Even before nationalism emerged as a dominant ideology, there was a long tradition of political thought which provided specific perspectives in which several thinkers interpreted their views and ideas on different aspects. Two major thinkers, Kautilya (Ancient) and Zia-ud-din-Barani (Medieval) representing two different periods of Indian socio-political life put forward their views most systematically and ideologically.

Modern Indian political thought involves three related issues of 'nation' 'nationalism' and 'national identity'. This paper seeks to provide a contextual study of Indian political thought which was not exactly derivative of western sources. We can broadly divide modern Indian thought into two phases. The first phase was that of what has often been referred to as the phase of 'Social Reform'. Thinkers of this phase were more concerned with the internal regeneration of Indian society it was often referred to as the Indian renaissance. The second phase is the phase of Indian nationalism. This paper covers the various dominant trends of thought prevalent in India during the 19th and 20th century.

MODULE I

INDIAN RENAISSANCE

RENAISSANCE

The term 'renaissance' is derived from the French word meaning 'rebirth'. It is used to describe this phase of European history because many of the changes experienced between the 14th and 16th centuries were inspired by a revival of the classical art and intellect of Ancient Greece and Rome. The Renaissance also represented a break away from the conformist society and culture of medieval Europe. Renaissance marked the end of the feudal period or the dark ages. The period between 5th and 15th century A. D. is known as the feudal period or the 'dark ages'. The Middle Ages of European history was a time characterised by conformism. People who displayed creativity or diverged (moved away) from established methods of thinking and behaving, were often punished or outcast from society. Until the Renaissance, most Europeans followed the teachings of Catholicism because they had little exposure to any form of education beyond this. Science was not a well-understood concept and very little of what the Church taught people about life was challenged. Those who spoke out against the Church were accused of **heresy** and labelled a **heretic** (someone who holds unorthodox beliefs). Heretics were often subject to extremely severe punishments, such as being tortured or burned at the stake in front of the townspeople. During the Renaissance, however, things started to change.

The European Renaissance began in Northern Italy in the 14th century. The Tuscan city of Florence is considered the birthplace of the Renaissance. The most notable changes experienced during the Renaissance were in the fields of art and architecture, literature, philosophy and science. It was in these disciplines that new trends and fresh styles emerged, inspired by Europe's ancient history. The 14th through to the 16th centuries in Europe were a period of questioning and discovery. People started to think independently and experiment with new ideas and concepts. As more and more advancements were made in the arts and sciences, the Catholic Church began to lose the overwhelming power and influence it had once held over people's beliefs about the world. The Renaissance was also a time during which Europe's classical past was revisited and reinvigorated.

INDIAN RENAISSANCE

The socio intellectual revolution that took place in the nineteenth century in the fields of philosophy, literature, science, politics and social reforms is often known as Indian Renaissance. The 19th century is very important period in the history of India. It was a period during which English educated Indians were determined to reform Indian culture, society and religion. Indian Renaissance originated in Bengal during the latter half of the nineteenth century. The change that took place in the Indian social scenario is popularly known as the Renaissance. This period is generally considered as the dawn of a golden era in the history of India because of the presence of a galaxy of great men like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Keshab Chandra Sen, Dayananda Saraswathi, Ramakrishna Paramahansa and Vivekananda. They condemned evils

and abuses that had crept into Hinduism. The regality of caste system, sati, child marriage, unsociability, ideal worship, polytheism etc. they wanted to purge Hinduism of all these social evils and thus restore its pristine purity and ancient glory. The movement towards this goal is called, as “the Indian renaissance” was to prepare the ground for nationalism. The main objective of Indian Renaissance movement was to face the challenge posed by the importation of western ideas and values on Indian culture and social outlook. It tried to modernize Hinduism by discarding the irrational rituals, false doctrines, and monopolistic priest craft. The movement has universal rather than sectarian outlook. In India the renaissance started after the advent of the British Raj. The British rulers brought about many changes in India. The aim was the emancipation of the whole humanity from worldly miseries and the radical divine transformation of life.

BACKGROUND OF INDIAN SOCIETY

Indian Society in the 19th century was caught in a vicious web created by religious superstitions and dogmas. All religions in general and Hinduism in particular had become a compound of magic, animism, and superstitions. The abominable rites like animal sacrifice and physical torture had replaced the worship of God. The priests exercised an overwhelming and unhealthy influence on the mind of people. The faithful lived in submission, not only to God, the powerful and unseen, but even to the whims, fancies, and wishes of the priests. The origin of the caste system can be traced back to the Veda period. The classical Varna theory of the four fold division has its religious sanction as it was explicitly maintained in the law of Manu according to the Varna theory. The society divided into four classes as Brahmins Kshatriya Vysya and Sudra below whom also the out caste and untouchables. This caste division divided the society in the higher caste and low caste which lead to the domination of high castes in all spheres of life. High castes became the privileged class in the society and the law is made in favour of the privileged class the low caste continued to be peasants and became slaves of the caste Hindus. Low castes were the section of the society who were deprived of the socio political and economic rights. They became the victims of heinous customs and other evil rituals. Social injustice and economic inequality worsened their social life. They were denied of the right to education and equality of status.

Economically, India was a backward and traditional economy. Agriculture was the main occupation but it was in a pitiable condition. Farmers were poor but the landlords were rich and prosperous. Trade and Commerce had come to almost a standstill. Indian agriculture during the 18th century was technically backward and stagnant. The techniques of production had remained stationary for centuries. Even though the Indian villages were largely self-sufficient and imported little from outside and the means of communication were backward. The increasing revenue demands of the state, the oppression of the officials, the greed and rapacity of the nobles, revenue-farmers, and zamindars, the marches and counter marches of the rival armies, and the depredations of the numerous adventurers roaming the land during the first half of the 18th century made the life of the people quite despicable.

Social Conditions were equally depressing. The practice of untouchability is often associated with Hinduism and believed to be found only in India. The most distressing was the position of women. The birth of a girl was unwelcome, her marriage a burden and her widowhood inauspicious. Socially, illiteracy and ignorance were rampant. With religions attaching more importance to external form than to inner reality, religious superstitions, began to pervade all aspects of social life. Infanticide, child marriage, polygamy, the burning of widows and other social evils, were all interpreted as religiously valid, and hence there was no qualm of conscience even in most horrible performances. Similarly, such social systems as caste, untouchability, seclusion of women and slavery were all considered as sanctified by the shastras, and therefore, absolutely valid and estimable. Thus the eighteenth century was an age of the innumerable village communities over the length and breadth of the land led their self-contained and more or less secluded life as before. Social rigidity and irrational social practices became conspicuous feature of the eighteenth century India.

Politically the country had weakened. During the 18th century, European powers such as Dutch, French, Portuguese and the English began to establish their companies in India. Slowly and gradually, they started meddling with the Indian affairs. The country broke up into smaller independent states, which were always at war with each other for their selfish motive. All these factors made the country weak and provide ground for foreign forces.

CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF INDIAN RENISSANCE

Indian society underwent many changes after the British came to India. The British took a keen interest in introducing the English language in India. Though the British followed a half-hearted education policy in India, English language and western ideas also had some positive impact on the society. The spread of English language and western education helped Indians to adopt modern, rational, democratic, liberal and patriotic outlook. The western education helped the emergence of an elite class which drew attention to national problems. Some progressive Indians like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar etc. were the pioneers of western education in India. The old system of education was only perpetuating superstition and orthodoxy. English education was treated as the treasures of scientific and democratic thought of the west. English educated Indians like Raja Ram Mohan, Vivekananda, Gokhale, Dadabhai Naroji, Feroz Shah Mehta, Surendra Nath Banerjee etc. who led the social, religious and political movements in India were all English educated.

The introduction of the railways, telegraph and postal system linked different parts of India and promoted an exchange of ideas among the people, especially among her leaders. The improvement in communications eventually helped to foster a sense of unity among Indians. The concept of the country as a whole now took precedence over regional and provincial isolationism. Books, journals and newspapers circulated widely and were now easily available to educated Indians all over the country. The introduction of the railways in particular helped to break down barriers of religion and caste. People from different religions and social backgrounds, while travelling in a railway compartment, mingled with one another thereby

challenging the age- old orthodox notions of untouchability, caste- based eating habits etc. These are the fundamental gains for the development of Indian nationalism.

The British administration has had a far reaching consequence on the Indian economic system. During the British rule the land ceased to be the communal property; it became the property of the individuals. Ryotwari System was introduced by Thomas Munro in 1820. In Ryotwari System the ownership rights were handed over to the peasants. British Government collected taxes directly from the peasants. Thus, in certain parts the landlords and in the other tillers became the owners of the land. The Permanent Settlement benefited the landlords more than the government. Several towns had flourished as centres of trade. Major impact of these British policies was the expression of intense poverty and frequent famines. These again found their most dire reflections in rural India. The tragedy also found manifestations in the stagnation and deterioration of agriculture and the transformation of India into an agricultural colony of Britain.

The English language played an important role in the growth of nationalism in the country. The English educated Indians, who led the national movement, developed Indian nationalism and organised it. Western education facilitated the spread of the concepts of liberty, equality, freedom and nationalism and sowed the seeds of nationalism. When the British came to India, they brought new ideas such as liberty, equality, freedom and human rights from the Renaissance, the Reformation Movement and the various revolutions that took place in Europe. These ideas appealed to some sections of our society and led to several reform movements in different parts of the country. These movements looked for social unity and strived towards liberty, equality and fraternity.

Indian reformers of the nineteenth century did a lot to build a better society. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar, Vivekananda, Mahatma Gandhi, Dr Bhimrao Ambedkar, Jyotiba Phule, Anne Besant, Mother Teresa, Vinoba Behave, Sree Narayana Guru etc played crucial role in reforming Indian Society. We will look into the life and works of these extraordinary men and women and will appreciate their efforts in the making of today's India. Many Religious and social reform movements arose in Indian society. Brahmo samaj, Arya samaj, Shuddhi Movement, theosophical society, Sree Rama Krishna Mission, Prarthana Samaj, SatyashodhakSamaj and JyotibaPhule, BalshastriJambhekar, Student's Library and Scientific Society, ParamhansaMandalis, SatyashodhakSamaj, Servants of India Society, SNDP Movement, VokkaligaSangha, , Self-respect Movement, Temple Entry Movement, Wahabi/Walliullah Movement, Faraizi Movement, Ahmadiya Movement, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and the Aligarh Movement, Deoband Movement, Akali movement and SevaSadan are prime among them. These social reform movements arose among all communities of the Indian people. They attacked bigotry, superstition and the hold of the priestly class. They worked for abolition of castes and untouchability, purdah system, sati, child marriage, social inequalities and illiteracy.

With the growth of nationalism and English education the educated persons began to criticise social institutions, caste system, and untouchability. The latter half of the 19th century

witnessed the rise and growth of Indian Nationalism and from then onwards an organised national movement started in India. The year 1885 marks the beginning of a new epoch in Indian history. In that year All Indian Political Organization was set on foot under the name of the Indian National Congress.

The Indian Press, both English and vernacular, had also aroused the national consciousness. The introduction of the printing press in India was an event of revolutionary significance. Raja Ram Mohan Roy was the founder of nationalist press in India. His 'Sambad Kaumudi' in Bengali published in 1821 and 'Mirat-UL-Akbar' in Persian published in 1822, were the first publications with a distinct nationalist and democratic progressive orientation. The emergence of a number of nationalist and vernacular newspapers also played a very vital role in mobilizing public opinion and awakening national consciousness. Among them, Amrit Bazar Patrika, The Bengali, The Bombay Chronicle, The Tribune, The Indian Mirror, The Hindu, The Pioneer, The Madras Mail, The Maratha, The Keshari etc. had played important role in exposing the failure of the British Government in providing welfare measures to the people.

When Indians were developing a sense of inferiority complex being exploited under the colonial rule, the glorious heritage of India was revived by some western scholars like Max Muller, William Jones, Charles Wilkins etc. They translated some Sanskrit texts into English and attempted to prove the supremacy of ancient Indian culture, its heritage and philosophy. Some Indian scholars like R.G. Bhandarkar, H.P. Shastri etc. also helped in reviving the past glory of India. All these helped in regenerating a sense of self confidence and patriotism among the people.

Several movements and events in foreign countries also helped in awakening national consciousness. The Declaration of Independence by U.S.A. in 1776, the French Revolution of 1789, the unification of Italy and Germany in 1870, defeat of Russia by Japan in 1904 etc. inspired the Indians. They became confident that it would be possible to fight against the mighty British authority for their right of self-determination. World events thus, motivated Indians and promoted **the rise of nationalism**. Dayanand Saraswati and Vivekananda upheld Indian philosophy and culture. This instilled in Indians a sense of pride and faith in their own culture. The cultural and ideological struggle taken up by the socio-religious movements helped to build up national consciousness.

A major impact of the British rule in India was the beginning of a new middle class. With the rise of the British commercial interests, new opportunities opened to a small section of the Indian people. In the early decades of the nineteenth century there began internal movements within Hindu Society against its own customs and practices. In the light of the changing consciousness among the people, the Government too changed its policies. It was a coincidence that the British initiated social legislation when the Indian reformers created an opinion in their favour. The revolt of 1857 can be considered as the starting point of the nationalist movement in India. It was basically a revolt of the existing princely states against the East India Company. Several important measures and legislations were also taken. The Child Marriage Restraint Act

XIX of 1929 (popularly known as Sarda Act), Hindu Widow's Remarriage Act, 1856 and the Abolition of Sati Act. The Indian independence movement encompasses the efforts to free India from British rule from the Nineteenth Century until the granting of Independence in 1947.

RAJA RAM MOHAN ROY (1772 –1833)

INTRODUCTION

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was known as 'Father of Modern India', 'Father of the Bengal Renaissance and 'Father of Indian Renaissance'.' Raja Ram Mohan Roy was a prominent Indian social reformer and the founder of the Brahmo Samaj. Raja Ram Mohan Roy is considered as the pioneer of modern Indian Renaissance for the remarkable reforms he brought in the 18th and 19th century India. The title 'Raja' was bestowed upon him by the Mughal emperor Akbar II, in 1831. Though Roy was modernist in his approach, he always tried to link modernity with tradition. He attempted the creative combination of secularism and spirituality, of Western and Eastern philosophy. He wanted to present the concept of universal religion by combining the best features of all leading religions of the world. He was of the opinion that rationality and modernity needed to be introduced in the field of religion and that "irrational religion" was at the root of many social evils. This concept of universal religion meant not merely religious tolerance, but also transcending all the sectarian barriers of separate religion He was the founder of Liberal tradition in Indian political thought.

EARLY LIFE AND INFLUENCES

The 'Maker of Modern India' *Raja Ram Mohan Roy* was born on August 14, 1774 to Ramakanta Roy and Tarini Devi in Radhanagar village of Hoogly district, Bengal Presidency. Among his efforts, the abolition of the brutal and inhuman Sati Pratha was the most prominent. His efforts were also instrumental in eradicating the purdah system and child marriage. Besides Bengali and Sanskrit, Roy had mastered Arabic, Persian, Hebrew, Greek, Latin and 17 other leading languages spoken in the world. Roy's familiarity with such diverse languages exposed him to a va'riety of cultural, philosophical and religious experiences. He studied Islam thoroughly. The rationality and the logical consistency of Arabic literature in general and the mutajjil in particular impressed Roy greatly. The Sufi poets like Saddi and Haafiz made a deep impact on Roy's mind. The Quaranic concept of Tauhid or Unity of God fascinated Roy. Roy also had .studied the teachings of the Buddha Dhamma. It is said that in the course of his travels he reached Tibet. There he was pained to see how the principles of Buddhism were blatantly violated and how idol-worship, which had no place in the Dhamma of Lord Buddha, had come to be accepted. Roy admired the Bible as much as he did the Vedanta and the Quran. Many of his critics thought that two major features of Roy's Brahmo Samaj, namely, the opposition to idol-worship, and the practice of collective prayer were borrowed from Christianity. He also compiled "The Precepts of Jesus" with a view to proving how the teachings of Christ could be better adapted to rational man's use.

BRAHMO SAMAJ

The Brahmo Samaj (1828- The society of God) was the first attempt by Indians in the nineteenth century to reform Hindu society. It is a cosmopolitan religious organization based on

the positive sides of all the prevailing religion. Initially, the reform was named as 'Brahmo Sabha' in 1820 but later in 19th century, it was renamed as Adi Brahmo Samaj meaning the society of men believing in the worship of supreme power in spirit form but opposing the idol worship of the Almighty. The Brahmo Samaj was essentially a monotheistic reform movement in the Hindu religion. The Brahmo Samaj was a reflection of the Bengal Renaissance and took active participation in social emancipation, which included the abolition of sati, the caste system, child marriage, dowry and the betterment of the status of women in society. The core of the Brahmo Samaj was to understand that all human beings were related at a human level and hence no discrimination should be practiced, be at the level of caste, religion or gender. The Brahmo Samaj propagated the oneness of God, brotherhood, morality and charity and was against idol worship, polygamy, caste system, sati, child marriage and other meaningless rituals. The prominent leader of the Brahmo Samaj Keshad Chandra Sen, Jagdish Chandra Bose, Prasanta Chandra Mahalanobis, Satyajit Ray, Rabindranath Tagore, Debendranath Tagore. The Brahmo Samaj is credited with being one of the most important reform movements in India which led to the foundation of modern India. Its educational and social reform activities instilled a new confidence which, in turn, contributed to the growth of national movement. A number of Brahmo Samajists were later prominent in the struggle of Independence.

RAJA RAM MOHAN ROY: CONTRIBUTION AND SOCIAL REFORMS

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was a great social reformer. He modernized Indian society in many ways. Ram mohan as the 'first modern man' of India realized early that social reform was the precondition for the regeneration of the people of our country. Roy believed in, the progressive role of the British rule in India and sought government held in the matter of social reforms, especially in the form of socially progressive legislations. Roy's aim was the creation of a new society based on the principles of tolerance, sympathy and reason, where the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity would be accepted by all, and where man would be free from the traditional shackles which had enslaved him for ages. He yearned for a new society which would be cosmopolitan and modern. Roy's methods of social reform were multifaceted. He combined all possible means, including even those which were commonly believed to be incompatible. His reforms have been discussed below:

Abolition of Sati

Sati is described as a Hindu custom in India in which the widow was burnt to ashes on her dead husband's pyre. Basically the custom of Sati was believed to be a voluntary Hindu act in which the woman voluntary decides to end her life with her husband after his death. But there were many incidences in which the women were forced to commit Sati, sometimes even dragged against her wish to the lighted pyre. The Brahmins and other higher castes in the society encouraged it. Raja Ram Mohan Roy raised his voice against the Sati system. A few rulers of India tried to ban this custom. In 1818, Roy wrote his first essay on sati in which he argued that the woman had an existence independent of her husband and hence, she had no reason to end her life on the demise of her husband. The society had no right over her life. Right to life of both man and women was equally important. Roy found that ignorance of the women about their

legitimate rights, their illiteracy, customary denial of the property rights to the widow and the consequent helplessness, dependence, misery and humiliation were some of the causes behind this practice. According to Roy, Sati was nothing short of murder and was therefore a punishable offence under the law. It was Raja Ram Mohan Roy's efforts, bore fruits and this practice was stopped by an Act passed in 1829 during Lord William Bentinck. Thus, a long prevailing ugly practice of the Hindus was uprooted.

Religious Reforms

Ram Mohan raised his voice against idolatry. In his book *Tuhfat-ul-Muwahhidin* he championed the cause of Monotheism. He criticized idol-worship by the Hindus. He rejected polytheism, idol-worship and rituals of different religions. He advocated monotheism or unity among gods. He also advised people to be guided by the conscience. He inspired men to cultivate rationality. To all he appealed to observe the principle of unity of God. Further, he formed 'Atmiya Sabha' in 1815 to carry on discussions among scholars on religion and philosophy. Through this, he raised his voice against religious and social malpractices,

Champion of Women Liberty

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was a champion of women's rights in India. He laid the foundations of the women's liberation movement in this country. He revolted against the subjection of women and pleaded for the restoration of their rights. Raja Ram Mohan Roy advocated the liberty of Women. He was determined to give women her proper place in the society. Besides abolishing Sati, he advocated in favor of widow remarriage. In 1822, Roy wrote a book entitled *Brief Remarks Regarding Modern Enchroachments on the Ancient Right of Females*. He argued that like the sons, daughters have also their right over parental property. He also influenced the British government to bring necessary modification in the existing law. He raised voice against child-marriage and polygamy. He was the advocate of women education. Brahmo Samaj which he founded paid special attention to women's education. Thus, he advocated women's liberty out and out and awakened them.

Opposition to Caste System

The caste system was a very ugly practice prevailing in Indian society right from the later Vedic age. Raja Ram Mohan Roy's strongest objection to the caste system was on the grounds that it fragmented society into many divisions and subdivisions. The higher castes like Brahmins and Kshatriyas looked down upon the Sudras, Chandalas and other aboriginals. Ram Mohan opposed this ugly system of the Indian society. To him, Caste divisions destroyed social homogeneity and the integrated texture of society and weakened it politically. To him everybody was a son or daughter of the God. So, there is no difference among men. He was in favour of inter caste and inter-racial marriages, which he thought, could effectively break the barriers of the caste divisions. There should not exist hatred and animosity among them. Everybody is equal before God. Thus, ignoring differences among themselves they should embrace each other ignoring differences. Then, the true purpose of God will be materialized. By advocating this equality among men, Ram Mohan became the eyesore of many higher caste Indians.

Educational Reforms

Ram Mohan Roy was educated in traditional languages like Sanskrit and Persian. He came across English much later in life and learned the language to get better employment with the British. But a voracious reader, he devoured English literature and journals, extracting as much knowledge as he could. He realised that while traditional texts like Vedas, Upanishads and Quran provided him with much reverence for philosophy, his knowledge was lacking in scientific and rational education. He advocated the introduction of an English Education System in the country teaching scientific subjects like Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and even Botany. He paved the way to revolutionizing education system in India by establishing Hindu College in 1817 along with David Hare which later went on to become one of the best educational institutions in the country producing some of the best minds in India. His efforts to combine true to the roots theological doctrines along with modern rational lessons saw him establish the Anglo-Vedic School in 1822 followed by the Vedanta College in 1826.

Advocate of Western Education

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was a great scholar having sharp intellect in the Vedas, Upanishads, Quran, Bible and several other holy scriptures. He very well realized the importance of English language. He could visualize the need of a scientific, rational and progressive education for the Indians. During his time, when controversy was going on between the orientalist and occident lists, he sided with the latter and advocated in favour of the introduction of the English system of education. He liked Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics, Botany, Philosophy. At the same time he also desired that the Indian Vedic studies and philosophical systems were to be studied and analyzed properly. He supported the move of Lord Macaulay and championed the cause of the English system of education in India. His motto was to take Indians the path of progress. He established English school in 1816 and Vedanta College in 1825. He wanted to introduce modern system of education. Of course, he could not live to see the introduction of English system of education in India in 1835. However, his efforts and dreams were materialized into reality even after his death.

Freedom of Press

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was the 'Father of Indian Journalism'. He believed in the freedom of press. He fought for the rights of vernacular press. He edited a newspaper in Bengali named 'Samprad Kaumudi'. He was also the editor of Mirat- ul-Akbar. When restrictions were imposed on the publications of newspapers, he reacted sharply and criticized the British authorities vehemently. In his editorials, he reflected important social, political, economic, religious and other problems with which the Indians were grossly entangled. This brought public consciousness. His writings were so powerful that people were deeply moved by this. He could express his view in powerful English.

Champion of Nationalism

Raja Ram Mohan Roy believed in the political freedom of man. In 1821 he had written to J.S. Buckingham, the editor of the 'Calcutta Journal' that he believed in the freedom of European and Asiatic countries. He advised Indians to have self-freedom in thought and action.

He showed a bright example by condemning the Jury Act of 1826 which had introduced religious discrimination in the law courts. According to this Act a Hindu or a Mohammedan could be tried either by a European or a native Christian but not vice versa. Ram Mohan protested against it. Thus, his nationalism was blatant. He definitely fought for the legitimate rights of the Indians and championed the cause of Indian nationalism. Further, Ram Mohan Roy himself proceeded to London to plead a case on behalf of Akbar II, the Mughal Emperor. This reflected his nationalism.

The synthesizer of religion and morality

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was a noble soul. He brought a perfect blending between religion and morality. According to him a man must possess virtues like mercy, morality, catholicity, forgiveness and so on. These qualities will purify his soul. Further, man will be regulated by these qualities. By cultivating these noble qualities a man can acquire divine knowledge and devote for the welfare of the society at large. Further his religious catholicity will further bloom by the cultivation of these qualities. Thus, Raja Ram Mohan Roy was undoubtedly a synthesizer of religion and morality which aimed at the welfare of the society at large.

Love for Liberty and Constitutionalism

Liberty and constitutionalism were the two important aspects upon which Raja Ram Mohan emphasized. He preferred a constitutional form of Government for every nation. Despotism or autocracy, he hated from the core of his heart. He told that a constitutional government could only give guarantee of Individual freedom. Thus, he advocated individual liberty and constitutionalism. This clearly projects that Ram Mohan was a champion of human liberty.

Champion of Internationalism

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was the champion of internationalism. He wanted universal religion, synthesis of human culture and ideas, end of imperialism and peaceful co-existence of nations. Thus, he became the harbinger of a modern age. No Indian by that time had seriously thought about it what Ram Mohan advocated. He really advocated the principle of collaboration of mankind. Rabindranath Tagore commented that "Ram Mohan was the only person in his time to realize completely the significance of the modern age. He knew that the ideal of human civilization does not lie in isolation of independence but in the brotherhood of interdependence of individuals and nations."

ROY'S POLITICAL LIBERALISM

Liberalism is a political doctrine that takes protecting and enhancing the freedom of the individual to be the central problem of politics. Liberalism had emerged as the most valuable product of renaissance and reformation in Europe. Liberalism in politics is associated with non-authoritarianism, the rule of law, constitutional government with limited powers, and the guarantee of civil and political liberties. A liberal society is tolerant of different religious, philosophical, and ethical doctrines and allows individuals to freely form and express their conscientious convictions and opinions on all matters and live according to their chosen purposes and life paths. In economic terms, liberalism is associated with an unplanned economy

with free and competitive markets, as well as private ownership and control of productive resources.

Raja Rammohan Roy was one of the most outstanding personalities of the 19th century, as a pioneer of modernity, and a visionary of Liberal Democracy. It became the dominant ideology of the first phase of religious and social reform in India. Liberalism, in brief, stands for the value and dignity of the individual personality; the central position of Man in the historical development; and the faith that people are the ultimate source of all power. Roy advocated liberal principles in all walks of life. In the religious field Roy stood for tolerance, a non-communal approach to all problems and secularism. He valued the freedom of the individual to follow the dictates of his conscience and even to defy the commands of the priestly class.

Roy's Views on Liberty and Rights

Liberty was a pivot around which the entire religio-socio-political thought of Roy revolved. His protest against idolatry, his agitation against Sati, his demand for modern western education and his insistence on freedom of press, right of women, and his demands for "separation for powers" and for the codification of laws were all expressions of his intense love for liberty. For him, liberty was a "priceless possession of mankind". He was the first to deliver the message of political freedom to India. Although Roy recognised the positive gains India would get from British rule, he was never in favour of an unending foreign rule in India. He considered the British connection necessary for India's social emancipation. Political freedom was bound to follow. His love for liberty however was not limited to one nation or community. It was universal. He supported all struggles which aimed at human freedom. Freedom for him was indivisible. Freedom was the strongest passion of Roy's mind. He believed equally in the freedom of body and mind, so also the freedom of action and thought. He shunned all restrictions imposed by consideration of race, religion and customs on human freedoms.

Roy was the first to create awareness for civil rights amongst the Indians. He was grateful to the Britishers because they made available to Indians all those civil rights which were enjoyed by the Queen's subjects in England. Though Roy did not specifically enlist the civil rights, he seems to include in it the following rights. Right to life and liberty, right to have opinions and freedom of expression, Right to property, Right to religion etc. Roy gave the greatest importance to the right to freedom of opinion and expression. To him it included the freedom of creativity of mind and intellect, as well as the freedom of expressing one's opinions and thoughts through different media. According to Roy, freedom of expression was equally useful to the rulers and the ruled. Ignorant people were more likely to revolt against all that the rulers did, they could turn against authority itself. In contrast an enlightened public would be opposed only to the abuse of power by authority and not to the existence of authority itself. The free press, the Raja argued, had never caused a revolution in any part of the world. But many examples could be cited where, in the absence of a free press, since the grievances of the people remained unrepresented and unredressed, the situation had become ripe for a violent 'revolutionary' change. A free and independent press alone could bring forth the best in the government as well as the people. Roy, however, was not against the reasonable restrictions on

the freedom of press. He even accepted some additional restrictions on the Indian Press, which were not imposed on the press in England. Such restrictions, he believed, might be necessary here as some Indians were likely to encourage hatred in the minds of the natives towards the British rulers. Roy also justified the restrictions imposed with a view to check the seditious attempts of creating hostilities with neighbouring friendly states. He, however, strongly objected to the restrictions imposed by the bureaucracy in India. These restrictions, in his opinion, were arbitrary and uncalled for by the circumstances in this country.

In the Political field, Roy was a supporter of the impersonal authority of law and opposed all kinds of arbitrary and despotic power. He was convinced that the existence of constitutional government is the best guarantee of human freedom. He insisted on the use of constitutional means as when required to safeguard the rights. He preferred the gradual improvements of the condition of this country because, to him, such improvements were more lasting and profound.

In the economic sphere, Roy believed in the sanctity of right to property. Similarly, he believed that a strong middle class had an important role to play in socio-political dynamics. He was for the emancipation of poor peasants who were exposed to the exploitation of zamindars. He wanted the government to reduce its demands of landlords. He wanted to preserve the ryotwari system and rural basis of Indian civilization and also establish modern scientific industry. He however differed from the other western liberal thinkers in one important respect, viz. role of state and sphere of state activities. In his scheme of things, the state is expected to bring about social reform, in protecting the rights of the tenants against the landlords etc.

Roy's Liberal Perception on Law, Administration and International Co-existence

According to Roy, Law is the "creation of passionless reason". It was the command of the sovereign. Hence, even the highest officer in the East India Company did not possess the competence for enacting the laws for India. The king-in-Parliament alone could have that authority. What is more important is, before finalising every piece of legislation relating to India should take into account the views of the economic and intellectual elites in this country. Important contribution of Roy was in the context of law relates to the codification of law. He argues that the codification of law was in the interest of both the rulers and ruled and it should be done on the basis of the principles common and agreeable to all groups and factions in the society. In the course of codification, the long-standing customs of this country should not be overlooked. Of course, only those customs which are reasonable and conducive to general welfare of the people should be picked up. Codified law should be simple, clear and exact. Codification would make the interpretations of laws more impersonal and its application more uniform. Roy had a clear perception of the distinction between law, custom and morality. He accepted that evolving customs were an important source of law, but the two could not be identified. He also made a distinction between law and morality. Some laws, according to Roy, might be legally valid, but morally indefensible. Conversely, some practices might be morally sound but could not be given legal force. Principles of morality are relative to the social realities

and any law to be effective must take into account these ethical principles prevalent in a given society.

In his book entitled 'An Exposition of Revenue and Judicial System in India' Roy presented a profound discussion on urgent reforms in administrative and judicial matters. He stressed the point that the administration could not be efficient and effective unless there were official speaking in the language of the masses. There should also be several channels of communication between the administration and the people. Roy's suggestions of reform in the judicial field are more numerous because for him an efficient, impartial and an independent judiciary was the supreme guarantee of liberty. Roy believed that the association of the natives in the judicial process had to be an essential feature of judicial administration. Other measures advocated by Roy included: constant supervision of the judicial proceedings by a vigilant public opinion, substitution of English for Persian as the official language to be used in the courts of law, appointment of Indian assessors in civil suits, trial by jury, separation of judicial from executive functions, and the constant consultation of the native interests before the enactment of any law that concerned them. He also suggested the revival of the age-old Panchayat system of adjudication. Roy thus urged several - reforms and. corrections in the Indian Judicial system in keeping with political liberalism.

Though Roy was a liberal thinker, he did not believe in the policy of laissez-faire. He could never accept that the sphere of state activity was limited only to the political field. He had appealed repeatedly in his writings to the state authorities to undertake many social, moral and cultural responsibilities which did not strictly come under the category of 'political'. He wanted the state to protect the tenants against the landlords, to make arrangements for the useful and liberal education, to eradicate the ugly practices like Sati and to give equal protection to the lives of-both males and females, and to make efforts to create a new social order based on the principles of liberty, equality, fraternity and social justice.

His ambition was to change the educational system completely. He was convinced that only a modern, science education could instil new awareness and new capabilities in the Indian people. Without this kind of education, social reform in India would be very weak and the country would always remain backward. Though Roy himself was a great scholar of Sanskrit, he always felt that the Sanskrit learning was irrelevant to modern India and hence he strongly opposed it. He appealed to the rulers that instead of perpetuating irrelevant Sanskrit learning, they should help equip the new generations of Indians with useful modern scientific knowledge. Roy wanted instruction in useful modern sciences like chemistry, mathematics, anatomy, natural philosophy and not load young minds with grammatical complexities, and speculative or imaginary knowledge, Roy's views and activities were really pioneering in giving a new turn to the educational system in India. He was the first eminent advocate of women's education.

Roy was an ardent supporter of international coexistence. He was perhaps the first thinker of the 18th century who had a clear vision of internationalism. This vision might have occurred to him in the course of his search for universal religion. Roy, the prophet of universalism, argued that all nations of the world must be placed on an equal footing in order to

achieve global unity and a sense of broad fraternity. It is only then that the contradiction between nationalism and internationalism can be ended. Roy held that the different tribes and nations were merely the branches of the same family and hence, there must be frequent exchange of views and frequent give and take in all matters among the enlightened nations of the world. This, according to Roy, was the only way to make the human race happy and contented. Moreover, he was a liberal at heart is evident from the letter he wrote to Buckingham when he heard about the suppression of the people of Nepal at the hands of Austrians. He wrote: "I am obliged to conclude that I shall not live to see liberty universally restored to the nations of Europe and Asiatic nations, and especially those that are European colonies... under these circumstances I consider the cause of Nepolitans as my own and their enemies as ours. Enemies to liberty and friends of despotism have never been and never will be ultimately successful". Historian K.M. Panikar rightly remarked, for whom "Raja Ram Mohun Roy was the real founder of liberal tradition in India with his commitment to the principle of equality, religious freedom, women's right to freedom and establishment of a casteless society."

RAJA RAM MOHAN ROY- FATHER OF INDIAN JOURNALISM

The Press is aptly referred to as the fourth pillar of democracy other three pillars are Legislature, Executive and Judiciary. We consider press as free from bias and prejudice. Press reflects the realities of this world as wished by social and political world. Rammohan was a great champion of the freedom of the Press. Raja Ram Mohan Roy was described by Jawaharlal Nehru as a founder of the Indian press. His efforts to liberate the Press were made with the aim of education Indians about the affairs of the nation in their true perspective. He himself published newspapers in English, Bengali and Persian for the purpose of creating mass consciousness as a veritable check against the British authoritarianism. Besides being a great social reformer Ram Mohan also made a valuable contribution to Bengali literature and he is regarded as the father of Bengali prose. He was the first to realize the value of the newspapers as an instrument for diffusing intellectual light. He founded the *Sambut Kaumudi* (moon of intelligence) in 1821 in Calcutta. Due to the success of another rival newspaper named *Samachar Chandrika* Roy was forced to close it down in 1822. However it was revived the following year. Roy also started a newspaper in Persian '*Mirut ul Akhbar*'(mirror of news)in 1822.

The purpose Raja Ram Mohan Roy had in mind could not be served properly if there was no freedom of press. He championed the cause of press freedom. In 1823, Press Ordinance was promulgated. It prohibited the publication of newspaper or periodicals without previous license from the Governor-General-in-Council. Raja Ram Mohan Roy protested against it and submitted a memorandum to the Supreme Court arguing in favour of freedom of press in India. The British East India Company was against Freedom of press in India. But Raja Ram Mohan Roy strongly argued against this view. The company had the fear of public criticism under a free press. Ram Mohan Roy was successful in convincing the authority with his strong logic arguing that in India Freedom of press would not be harmful for the government as people had been loyal to it. Roy pointed out that a free press acted as a safety valve and did not give any scope

for sudden outburst. Freedom of press was helpful to both the government and the people. A free press acts like a channel of communication between the two and solves many problems. People come to know about the plans, programmes, policies and intentions of the government through it. People also express their reactions and grievances through it thus making the governance more effective. A free press helps disseminate knowledge and boosts intellectual improvement. It allows creativity: gives literary, cultural and artistic knowledge and pleasure. The government comes to know about the defects of its policies and administration and gets a scope to remedy those before any crisis arises. Raja Ram Mohan Roy argued that a free press fails revolution and does not nourish it. Ram Mohan Roy however, was not in favour of absolute freedom of press. In stead he wanted reasonable restrictions on it. He believed that those who try to incite hatred in the minds of the Indians against the British nation should be punished. Similarly, an attempt to provoke hostilities with neighbours and friendly states must be duly penalized.

CONCLUSION

Raja Ram Mohan Roy is hailed as "the Father of Modern India". He attempted to combine the western and eastern philosophy. His writings and ideas are an example of a synthesis of ancient Indian ideas with modern Western Political Principles. According to Roy, another factor responsible for the deteriorating political and social milieu was the social decadence of the Indian society. He wanted to build a new Indian society where principles of tolerance, sympathy, reason, liberty, equality and fraternity would be honoured. A multi-faceted personality, Roy carried on a relentless crusade against all kinds of injustices, exploitative practices and superstitions.

SWAMI VIVEKANANDA (1863 - 1902)

INTRODUCTION

Swami Vivekananda was a Hindu monk, and disciple of the famous Indian mystic Ramakrishna Paramhansa. Vivekananda played a key role in the introduction of Indian yoga and Vedanta philosophy in the West. He made a strong impression at the inaugural World Parliament of Religions in Chicago, 1893 – giving a powerful speech on the underlying unity of world religions. He taught a philosophy of traditional meditation and also selfless service (karma yoga). He advocated emancipation for Indian women and an end to the worst excess of the caste system. He is considered an important figurehead of India's growing self-confidence and later nationalist leaders often said they were inspired by his teachings and personality.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Swami Vivekananda was born Narendra Nath Datta on 12th January 1863 in an educated and well-to-do family in Calcutta. He studied the Western thought which ingrained in him the quality of critical enquiry and analysis. His inborn spiritual characteristics and his rational outlook were at tussle. He turned towards the Brahmo Samaj which rejected idol worship and formulated the formless worship of God. His meeting with Swami Ramakrishna in the year 1881 was the turning point in his life. He accepted Swami Ramakrishna as his friend, philosopher and guide. In all most all the fields of social or national life he

propounded his unique visions to help the ignorant mass of this country. His preaching regarding nationalism, universal humanism, education, socialism, equality greatly impressed the contemporary leaders and freedom fighters. He was a Hindu spiritual leader and reformer in India who attempted to combine Indian spirituality with Western material progress, maintaining that the two supplemented and complemented one another.

INFLUENCES: The philosophy of Vivekananda is born out of his strong awareness of the social, religious and economic conditions of Indian masses. He realized that the orthodoxy, superstitions, loss of faith in spiritual values etc., are the reasons for at least some of the social evils. The Hindu philosophy, especially, Vedanta which made him known as a Vedantist and the Buddhist philosophy made a great impact upon Vivekananda. Along with these Indian influences, he also carried, on his thought, the influence of Christianity. There were certain other influences too. For some time he was under the influence of Brahma Samaj. It also seems that he was also influenced by the personality of Dayananda Saraswati. The Gita was also a source of constant inspiration to Vivekananda. But it must be admitted that the profoundest influence was that of his master Swami Ramakrishna Paramahansa. It is right to say that swami Ramakrishna revealed him the spiritual path, unravelled and opened his soul, flooded the spiritual consciousness into his soul and removed the ignorance which obstructed and covered the wave and tide of the unbounded spirit within Vivekananda. David Hume, Kant, Hegel, Comte, J.S. Mill, Charles Darwin and became fascinated with the evolutionism of Herbert Spencer.

SOCIO-RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL IDEAS

Vedanta Religion and Socialism

To him religion is a key note of social and national life. This religion was the vedic religion. Vivekananda was a world spokesperson for Vedanta. Swami Vivekananda's vision of Vedanta is his lasting legacy to contemporary spiritual thought. Swami Vivekananda's ideas on nation-building in India come down to us through his concepts of 'Practical Vedanta' and 'Man-Making'. The Vedanta teaches men to have faith in themselves first. To him, the goal is to manifest this Divinity within by controlling nature, external and internal. He popularized yoga as the practical aspect of Vedanta. It elevates religion into spiritualism and at that stage all faiths, all scriptures, and idolatry appear to be different faces of the same truth. Swamiji felt that Indians are essentially bound by religious ties and only a spiritual elevation of religion could unite them beyond faiths, caste, community and sub-national and ethnic identities. Then and only then all Indians will be permeated by a common bond of nationalism. By the Neo-Vedantism of Swami Vivekananda is meant the new Vedanta as distinguished from the old traditional Vedanta developed by Shankaracharya.

Swamiji was an ardent supporter of Vedantic socialism. No doubt, Vivekananda took pride in the country's inheritance from the past, but he was not an obscurantist revivalist with indiscriminating admiration for all that had come down from the past. To him, India meant the people and the people meant the masses. Removal of poverty, eradication of illiteracy, restoration of human dignity, freedom from fear, availability of spiritual and secular knowledge

to all, irrespective of their caste and class and the ending of all monopolies, religious, economic, intellectual, social and cultural – all these formed a part of what he derived from his practical Vedanta or Vedantic socialism. Vivekananda's Vedantic socialism centres round his progressive ideas on education which are more modern than those of professional educationists who moulded the education of modern India. From the beginning of his mission, he stressed the importance of universal literacy as an essential condition for mass uplift and development. Though he laid great stress on the traditional values of chastity and family life for women, Vivekananda was totally against their subjection. Vivekananda's Vedantic socialism is also reflected in his endeavour to give India's traditional religions a new orientation of social service.

Social Reforms

Swami Vivekananda was a great social reformer. As a social reformer, he preached elimination of all exploitation. He has done many social activities to change the social problems. He felt that the three problems are the resistance of our progress: education, poverty and castism. Swami is considered as the messiah of downtrodden. Swamiji was the first leader in modern India to speak for the poor and the downtrodden masses. He travelled extensively within the country to understand their problem. He firmly believed that the main cause of Indians' downfall was the neglect exploitation of the poor.

According to Vivekananda religion is that will be equally philosophic, equally emotional, equally mystic and equally conducive to action. Religion is a social institution; worship is a social activity and faith a social force. Swamiji changed the focus of religion from God to Man on rather, to God in man. His master Sri Ramkrishna had taught him that service to man was service to God. Swamiji made this principle the basis of his social service programme. He taught that the best form of worship was to see God in the poor, the downtrodden, the sick and the ignorant and to serve them.

He was the first Indian represented India and Hinduism in the world parliament. Swamiji enhanced Indian prestige in the world through his speeches at the world parliament of Religion held in Chicago in 1893 and his subsequent work in America and England. Swamiji showed the universal relevance and significance of Indians ancient philosophy and spiritual culture in solving many of the problems associated with modern living. He enabled thousands of people in the west to appreciate Indian philosophy and culture.

He believed that socio economic change can be brought about through education. He wanted both moral and secular education to be imparted to the common man of this country. On 1 May 1897 at Calcutta, Vivekananda founded the *Ramakrishna Mission*—the organ for social service. The ideals of the Ramakrishna Mission are based on Karma Yoga. Swamiji laid the foundation for harmony amongst religions and also harmony between religion and science. He always said with his Guru, Ramakrishna Paramahansa, that, “religion is not for empty stomachs.”

Swami Vivekananda's birth anniversary, also called Swami Vivekananda Jayanti, is celebrated on January 12. The day is also observed as *National Youth Day*. Vivekananda had a

firm conviction that for the youth, life is larger than livelihood. Their aim is to break the shackles of the established society to revolt against whatever breeds inequality, injustice, bondage of mind and all kinds of backwardness. Vivekananda welcomed the youth to come forward and join in the struggle for achieving freedom of all kinds, political, economic and spiritual. Vivekananda's clamant call to the Indian youth "Awake, arise, and stop not till the goal is reached" is resounding all through India, rousing their social consciousness and kindling their damp spirits. He felt that because the youth had no possession, they could be sincere and dedicated souls. They can sacrifice everything for a noble cause.

Vivekananda on Nationalism

Swami Vivekananda was a true nationalist in heart and spirit. He believed that there is one all dominating principle manifesting itself in the life of each nation. He said, "in each nation, as in music, there is a 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. Vivekananda felt that Indian nationalism had to be built on the stable foundation of the post historical heritage. In the past, the creativity of India expressed itself mainly and dominantly in the sphere of religion. Religion in India has been a creative force of integration and stability. When the political authority had become loose and weak in India, it imparted event to that a force of rehabilitation. Hence, he declared that the national life should be organized on the basis of the religions idea. As supporter of this idea, he revived the eternal things of the Vedas and Upanishads to strengthen nation's growth and faith in its individuality.

Though growth of Nationalism is attributed to the Western influence but Swami Vivekananda's nationalism is deeply rooted in Indian spirituality and morality. He contributed immensely to the concept of nationalism in colonial India and played a special role in steering India into the 20th Century. Swami Vivekananda's nationalism is associated with spiritualism. He linked India's regeneration to her age-old tradition of spiritual goal. He said, "Each nation has a destiny to fulfil, each nation has a message to deliver, each nation has a mission to accomplish. Therefore we must have to understand the mission of our own race, the destiny it has to fulfil, the place it has to occupy in the march of nations, the role which it has to contribute to the harmony of races". His nationalism is based on Humanism and Universalism, the two cardinal features of Indian spiritual culture. He taught people to get rid first of self inflicted bondages and resultant miseries. Vivekananda was an ardent patriot and he had tremendous love for the country. He was the embodiment of emotional patriotism. A nation is composed of individuals. Hence Vivekananda stressed that noble virtues like manliness, a sense of human dignity and honour should be cultivated by all individuals. These individualistic qualities had to be supplemented with a positive sense of love for the neighbour. Without deep sense of selfless service it was mere prattle to talk about national cohesion and fraternity.

To him, the nature of his nationalism is not materialistic but purely spiritual, which is considered to be the source of all strength of Indian life. Unlike western nationalism which is secular in nature, Swami Vivekananda's nationalism is based on religion which is life blood of the Indian people. Deep concern for masses, freedom and equality through which one expresses

self, spiritual integration of the world on the basis of universal brotherhood and “Karmyoga” a system of ethics to attain freedom both political and spiritual through selfless service make the basis of his nationalism. He opined, “I am an Indian and every Indian is my brother.” “The ignorant Indian, the poor and destitute Indian, the Brahmin Indian, the pariah Indian is my brother.” “The Indian is my brother, the Indian is my life, India’s gods and goddesses are my God, India’s society is the cradle of my infancy, the pleasure garden of my youth, the sacred heaven, the Varanasi of my old age.” “The soil of India is my highest heaven; the good of India is my good.”

Vivekananda was a keen student of History. Analyzing the historical facts available he comes to the conclusion that four fundamental social forces are ruling society in succession: Knowledge, military power, wealth and physical labour. These forces are in the hand of four classes, Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaisya and Sudra. He point out the importance of each of the varna in social history and maintained that each will rule one after the other. After analysing the merits and defects of the three different kinds of rules Vivekananda prophesied that Sudra rule is bound to come in the near future: nobody can resist it. At the same time he predicted that during the Sudra rule, there will be spread of general education but the number of geniuses on talented people will be few. History shows that Sudras were condemned in society in different periods. They were deprived of all opportunities to receive education. If a Sudra is absorbed in a higher class he will be lost to his own community and may not feel any urge necessary uplift of his own community.

Swamiji was a great champion of the emancipation of women. In India there are two great evils. Trampling of the women, and grinding the poor through the caste restrictions. Manu, again, has said that God blessed those families women are happy and well treated. In western countries treat these women as well as can be desired and hence they are so prosperous, so learned so free and so energetic. But we have seen the opposite picture in our country, what is that our country is the weakest and the most backward of all countries. All nations have attained greatness by paying proper respect to women. That country and that nation which do not respect women have never become great. Their education must be an eye-opener in all matters.

India is a country and Indian is a nation this feeling is national integration. Vivekananda feel that the main characteristics of Indian culture are unity among diversity. Race, religion, language, Government - all these together make a nation. In India race difficulties, linguistic difficulties, social difficulties, national difficulties, all melt away before this unifying power of religion. Indian mind there is nothing higher than religion, deals that is the key note of Indian life. Swami Vivekananda’s message of nationality and universality is very much relevant in the present day world. All people without any distinction of caste, religion, race, gender on nationality. Human society has to wait for centuries for the advent of a leader of mankind like Swami Vivekananda.

Perception on Society and Social Institutions

Society is a divine institution. Vivekananda’s concept of society, though derived from Vedantik philosophy, seeks to integrate both the spiritualistic and materialistic interpretations of

both man and society; it is both individualistic and socialistic. Believing in the divine nature of man, Vivekananda seeks to establish a continuum between society, culture and civilization, like the wick, oil and the flame. This approximates the integral view of both man and society. "Love, renunciation and unselfishness are the three great manifestations of spirituality. In India love and sacrifice to be the basis of society. To him, in the tradition of Indian philosophy there is an organic relationship between individual and the society and therefore the good of either depends upon the other. The aggregate of many individual is called samashti (the whole), and each individual is called Vyashti (a part). Human beings are vyashti and society is samashti. It is an aggregate of numerous individuals whose self sacrifice is required for its welfare. Collective happiness becomes his own happiness. Religion is the backbone of this structure. Dharma or religion is the keynote of the social solidarity.

In Vivekananda's view, "The Western man is born individualistic, while the Hindu is socialistic—entirely socialistic." The Hindu demands that the individual shall bow down to the needs of society, and that those needs shall regulate his personal behaviour. As a result of these two attitudes, the West has granted freedom to society, so that society has grown and become dynamic, whereas the Hindu society has become cramped in every way. Life differs in the East and the West, because the goals are different. He asseverates, "Of the West, the goal is individual independence, the language money-making education, the means politics; of India, the goal is Mukti, the language the Veda, the means renunciation." In India, the emphasis on spirituality, reinforced by renunciation, has produced a type of culture that is different from that in the West.

According to the Indian view, society is not a human creation, but a divine institution. The Indian Monotheistic Doctrine of Creation holds that the universe of souls and matter is a cosmos, not a chaos, and not only that, it is also an entirely teleological or a purposive one. Like nature, society, too, is a perfect system. It is a full organic whole, a loving and a living union. Its basis is religion, its purpose, spiritualism, and its instruments scriptural injunctions. He asserts, "It is not a political organisation, not an economic unit and not a prudential concern at all." His concept of society is in consonance with the principles laid down in the Rig Vedic 'Purusa-Sukta', In this Sukta the whole of society has been conceived as a universal or social Man. Of Him, society is only a reflex; and the various vocational groups are His different limbs. This social Man, or Purusa, is pictured there as 'thousand-headed, thousand-eyed, and thousand-legged', who spreads over all the earth and rules over all living creatures. The four types of people are to be found in every society, though the classification gradually became crystallized in Hindu society because of some varnas claiming exclusive privilege and superiority over others. It should, however, be noted here that the varna classification was made on the basis of the congenial vocational temperaments and aptitudes of the people, and not to uphold the superiority or the privileges of some individuals because of their birth and heredity. To Vivekananda, an ideal form of society is that where the highest truth can be held, practised and lived by all.

Social stratification and varna system Vivekananda is inspired "by the ideal of social harmony and synthesis embodied in the theory of Varna (caste) system of ancient India. He says, "Caste is a very good thing. Caste is the plan we want to follow ...There is no country in

the world without caste. In India, from caste we reach to the point where there is no caste.” To him caste is a means to help everybody in attaining the status of a true Brahmin. A Brahmin is he who has killed all selfishness. To be a Brahmin is to be spiritually enlightened Vivekananda was against the abolition of the original caste system. He suggested that the caste in its degenerate state must be abolished. He pointed out, "From the time of Upanisads down to the present day, nearly all our great teachers have wanted to break through the barriers of caste, i.e. caste in its degenerated state, not the original system." He was of the view that the original idea behind the caste-system has rendered a great service to society. It was the most glorious social institution. Caste should not go, but should only be modified accordingly. Vivekananda advocates that the new method is the evolution of the old. He believes, "Within the old structure is to be found life enough for the re-building of two hundred thousand new ones. Vivekananda condemned the old orthodox Brahmanical doctrine of adhikaravada.

This doctrine propounds the exclusion of the Sudras from the benefit of the Vedantic knowledge. Samkara also adhered to this undemocratic dogma. But Vivekananda very strongly championed the concept of spiritual equality. He bitterly criticised the existing social order in India based upon inequality of privileges. To him, society is a stratified organisation. Man lives in groups and performs his own function according to his capacity. To him society is a stratified organisation. Man lives in groups and performs his own function according to his capacity. To him society is a stratified organisation. Man lives in groups and performs his own function according to his capacity. To him society is a stratified organisation. Man lives in groups and performs his own function according to his capacity.

SUMMING UP

Swami Vivekananda is generally approached as a patriot-monk *par excellence*. He is simply credited with revealing the soul of India to the Western world. He is mostly regarded as a spokesman of Hinduism. The spiritual dimension of his personality seems to have obviously got the better of the social. It looks as though the “Vivekananda” was drowned under the heavy weight of the “Swami”. A dominant theme of Vivekananda’s speeches was the universality and harmony of the world religions. Swami Vivekananda created a national consciousness amongst all Indians. Swamiji interpreted the significance of Indians ancient culture in the modern world.

Review Questions

1. Elaborate the broad contours of the early nationalist response in India
2. Define Renaissance and elucidate the causes and impact of Indian Renaissance.
3. Why is Raja Ram Mohan Roy called the ‘father of modern India’? Evaluate his role as the pioneer of social reforms in India.
4. Critically examine the salient features of the socio-political thought of Raja Ram Mohan Roy.
5. Illustrate Swami Vivekananda's ideas about nationalism and religion.
6. Describe the contribution of Swami Vivekananda to modern Indian Political thought.

MODULE II

LIBERAL AND EXTREMIST THINKERS

LIBERAL AND EXTREMIST IDEOLOGY IN INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

The development of modern Indian political thought is closely linked with the development of the Indian national movement. The nationalist movement was articulated differently in different phases of India's freedom struggle. The movement for India's independence began with the establishment of the Indian National Congress in 1885. During the course of the national movement two distinct streams of thought appeared within the Indian National Congress prior to the emergence of Gandhi as a prominent political figure. In contemporary historiography, the Moderate phase begins with the formation of the Indian National Congress (INC) in 1885 and continued till the 1907 Surat Congress when the Extremists appeared on the political scene. The basic differences between these two groups lay in their perception of anti-British struggle and its articulation in concrete programmes. While the Moderates opposed the British in a strictly constitutional way, the Extremists favoured a strategy of direct action to harm the British economic and political interests in India.

The liberation movement got a new aspiration and motivation through it. Previously, movements were organised only at the local or regional level, now for the first time they got a national base. Educated middle-class which drew inspiration from the Western liberal and radical thought led the national movement. During this period the Congress was dominated by moderate leaders. Gradually a section emerged which did not agree with the moderate policies and believed in aggressive action. Due to their aggressive posture this group was called the extremists. Both the groups believed in different political methods to oppose the British rule. Their differences led to the split in Congress in 1907. *Surat Split* refers to the splitting of the Indian National Congress into 'Moderates' and 'Extremists' after a violent clash at the session. The extremists were led by Bala Gangadhara Tilak, Lajpat Rai, Bipin Chandra and Aurobindo Ghosh and the moderates were led by Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Dadabhai Naoroji, Pherozeshah, M.G. Ranade Mehta and Surendranath Banerjee. The division into Moderates and Extremists – a contemporary characterization - has been since, the most dominant frame for understanding the dynamics of the pre-Gandhian nationalist movement. For Moderate leaders British rule was a boon, and they worked to ensure that the British government fulfilled the promises they had held out to their worthy colonial subjects. Extremist leaders on the other hand saw colonial rule and thus the British presence in the subcontinent as alien, exploitative and abhorrent, and hoped that a 'resurgence' of indigenous nationalism would oust the British from their position of power.

There were several factors that had contributed to the disillusionment of the Extremists with the Moderates. First, the growing government atrocities, especially in the wake of the 1905 Bengal partition agitation, clearly revealed the inadequacies of the constitutional and peaceful means. In fact, the Congress strategy of persuasion was usually interpreted as a sign of weakness by the British government and its supporters. Hence, there was a growing pressure for a change of strategy to force the authority to succumb to the demands of the Indians. Articulating the

feeling of the Extremist section of the Congress, Tilak thus exhorted that 'political rights will have to be fought for.

MAJOR DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MODERATES AND EXTREMISTS

The Moderates hailed the British rule as most beneficial in contrast with what India had confronted before the arrival of the British. Opposed to the Moderate stance, the Extremists always considered the British rule as a curse that could never render justice to the governed in India. Not only did they challenge the British government for its evil design against the Indians, they also criticised the Moderates for having misled the nationalist aspirations in a way that was clearly defeating. Second, the difference between the Moderates and Extremists was based on their respective approaches to the outcome of the nationalist intervention. While the Moderates stood for the attainment of self-government through gradual reforms, the Extremists insisted on complete swaraj. By demanding complete swaraj, Tilak, the most prominent of the Extremists, exhorted that 'swaraj is my birthright' and 'without swaraj there could be no social reform, no industrial progress, no useful education, no fulfilment of national life. Third, the Extremists were not hesitant in championing violence, if necessary, to advance the cause of the nation while the Moderates favoured constitutional and peaceful methods as most appropriate to avoid direct friction with the ruler. In contrast with these means, the Extremists resorted to boycott and swadeshi that never evoked support from the Moderates. Fourth, the Moderates appeared to be happy under the British, presumably because of their belief that Indians were not capable of self-rule. The views of the Extremists were, for obvious reasons, diametrically opposite. While articulating his opposition to this idea, Tilak argued that 'we recognise no teacher in the art of self-government except self-government itself. Fifth, in the Extremist conceptualisation of struggle against imperialism, the ideal of self-sacrifice, including the supreme sacrifice figured prominently, while in the Moderate scheme of political struggle, this idea appeared to have received no attention. Finally, while the Moderates drew upon the British variety of liberalism, the Extremists were inspired by the writings of Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay and the teachings of Vivekananda. In view of their faith in constitutional means of opposition to the British rule, Moderates preferred the path of conciliation than confrontation, whereas the Extremists espousing the demand for swaraj plunged into direct action against the government by resorting to boycott and strike.

From 1905 to 1907, the struggle between various trends within the nationalist articulation of freedom struggle was fought out also at the annual sessions of the Congress, culminating in the Surat split of December 1907. The flash point was the 1905 Bengal partition that appeared to have enabled the Extremists to provide a sharp critique of the Moderate strategies that had miserably failed. The Moderate method of constitutional agitation, articulated in three Ps—petition, prayer and protest—remained largely an academic exercise that seemed to have exhausted potentials with the consolidation of various groups championing direct action against the British

GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE (1866 –1915)

INRODUCTION

Gopal Krishna Gokhale was prominent leader of Indian Independence Movement. He was one of the political and social leaders during the Freedom Struggle of India. Gokhale's political thought revolves around the socio-political issues. He appreciated and welcomed the British rule in India. He was essentially a liberal thinker and preferred constitutional methods for attaining the goal of self government. He supported the idea of strengthening local self government institutions. Gokhale gave more importance to national unity and considered it as the first pre-requisite for the growth and development of Indian nationalism. He also stood for the principle of racial equality and expressed strong resentment against the policy of racial discrimination being pursued by the English. He was favoring in establishing a state based on western ideas. Thus he laid emphasis on the principles of individual liberty and social equality.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Gopal Krishna Gokhale was born on 9 May 1866 in Kothluk village of Guhagar taluk in Ratnagiri district of Maharastra in India. His parents Krishna Rao and Valubai. Gokhale was one of the founding political leaders during the Indian Freedom Movement against the British Empire. He regarded as *political Guru of Mahatma Gandhi*. His education tremendously influenced the course of his future career. In addition to learning English, he was exposed to Western political thought. The most profound influence on Gokhale was exercised by Mahadev Govind Ranade. Ranade also fully realized the potentialities of Gokhale and imparted him rigorous training which greatly contributed to the latter's success as a statesman. He was particularly impressed by the social and economic ideas of Ranade. He regarded Mahadev Govinda Ranade as his "Guru". Gokhale also worked with Ranade in a quarterly Journal, called "Sarvajanik". The Journal wrote about the public questions of the day in a frank and fearless manner. Contemporary liberal politicians in England such as Morley and others also had a considerable influence on Gokhale's political career. He also made him one of the Secretaries of the Sarvajanik Sabha of Poona, a prominent political institution of India. He became a member of Indian Legislative Council in 1902. Gokhale became a member of the Indian National Congress in 1889. After Congress was split into two groups- moderates and extremist, he tried his best to unite them. He was of the view that it will be difficult to achieve independence without the unity of it. Another notable accomplishment of Gokhale was the establishment if the *Servants of India Society* at Poona in 1905. The core aim of it was to give politically educate and training to youth of the country. It taught the youngsters to dedicate themselves to the service of the country. Thousands of boys and girls became members of this society. It was the first secular organization in that country to devote itself to the underprivileged, rural and tribal people, emergency relief work, the increase of literacy, and other social causes.

POLITICAL LIBERALISM OF GOKHALE

Gokhale's political thought revolves more around the socio-political issues of his times rather than any basic political concept like that of the state or nation or sovereignty. Liberalism,

as is understood in the western world is essentially about the liberty of the individual. It is the core idea and in all spheres of human activity, social interaction, political institutions, economic activities, culture, religion etc. The liberal ideas of Gokhale were slightly different from the British classical liberalism.

Gokhale's Faith in the English Conscience

Like most of the liberal Indian thinkers of his time Gokhale appreciated and welcomed the British rule in India. He had trust in the English conscience. He supported the British rule for two reasons. Firstly like all the moderates, Gokhale was convinced that it was because of British Rule that the process of modernization of the Indian society had set in. Secondly, the British upheld the concept of equality before the law. They introduced the principle of representative government and guaranteed freedom of speech and press. Gokhale was convinced that if British Rule continued for sometimes, India would be modernized completely. He also believed that in keeping with their traditions, the British would fulfill their pledges and bestow on India-self government once Indians qualified for the same. Gokhale's faith in the British sense of justice does not imply that he was their blind admirer. He bitterly criticized the policies of the British government on a number of issues. He condemned the British for keeping the Indians out of high position despite their professions of equal treatment to all. He also opposed the partitioned of Bengal.

Views on Liberalism

Gokhale was essentially a liberal thinker. But his liberalism was slightly different from the classical liberalism that existed in the 18th and 19th century. As a liberal Gokhale stood for individual liberty and certain basic rights which the people should enjoy. He felt that individual liberty could be usefully allowed only when individual behave with a sense of self-restraint. To him the right of free expression and freedom of the press were essential to realize the ideal of individual liberty. He therefore, opposed the Official Secret Bill in 1904. Gokhale also supported the right to private property and freedom of contract. In order to maintain individual liberty and essential civil rights, he proposed the establishment of the representative institution in the country. Gokhale did not demand universal franchise. For e.g. for the village Panchayat election he wanted that only such person should be enfranchised who paid a minimum land revenue. Thus Gokhale defended the right to private property, individual liberty and freedom of contract which essentially constituted the core of liberal doctrine. Gokhale also suggested the principle of special representation for the religious minority. Recognizing the communal differences between the Hindus and Muslims, he pleaded for separate representation of the Muslims. Gokhale's ideas regarding the role of state remarkably differed from that of classical liberalism. Classical liberalism stands for a laissez-faire state. But, Gokhale wanted state intervention to regulate the economic and social life of the country.

Here Gokhale differed remarkably from J.S. Mill. Gokhale wanted the Government to intervene in the economic life for the sake of industrial development and agricultural prosperity. He wanted the government to intervene not only in the processes of distribution but also in the process of production. According to Gokhale the purpose of government was to further the moral and material interests of the people. In order to realise this purpose the government cannot

remain unconcerned towards the unnatural restrictions in the path of development. According to Gokhale the government should remove these 'unnatural restrictions' and accelerate the pace of development. Thus to Gokhale the state should not be a 'police; state'-only, but it should embark upon welfare activities and intervene in the economic life of the country whenever necessary. We can conclude that Gokhale's liberalism was no doubt inspired by the liberalism of Mill but it significantly differed from the classical liberalism in two respects. On the one hand it did not advocate the extreme individualism, emphasising the negative meaning of liberty and on the other hand it pleaded for necessary state intervention in the economic and social life of the country.

Gokhale's Political Programme

Gokhale preferred constitutional methods for attaining the goal of self government. He argued that the chief merits of constitutional method were that it involved a minimum of disturbances in the existing arrangement and would help in winning the support of the freedom loving people of England. Gokhale's constitutional method includes passive resistance, non payment of taxes etc. avoiding violence, rebellion and abetting of foreign invasion. Gokhale strongly favoured the idea of strengthening local self government institutions. He stood for decentralization of authority. He felt that it was through this gradual decentralization and by way of forming an Advisory District Council for advising the District administration that India could progress. By self government he never meant complete independence for India. He wanted self government only within the limits of the British Empire.

Gokhale gave more importance to national unity and considered it as the first prerequisite for the growth and development of Indian nationalism. He tried to bind the people of different parts to a single unit by eliminating caste and creed considerations. He was also a strong advocate of Hindu Muslim unity and asserted that there could not be any future of India without the cooperation of these two communities. Like Gandhi, Gokhale also believed in the primacy of means. He insisted on the spiritualization of politics and wanted to use it as a means for serving the people. He laid more emphasis on building up of character and asserted that a nation must deserve liberty before it puts forward the demand for the same. Gokhale laid emphasis on the need of raising the moral and social standards of the people to fully involve them in the national movement.

SUMMING UP

Gokhale was a moderate and liberal political thinker. His political ideas were largely influenced by the liberal thinker like Bentham, Mill and Ranade. He was a liberal thinker but differed from the classical liberal thinkers in certain respects, particularly with their ideas regarding the role of the state and their insistence on laissez-faire policies. In contrast with the classical liberal thinkers Gokhale advocated a positive role for the state in developing and modernising society. Gokhale was an ardent social reformer. He favoured legislation in order to bring about certain social changes. His attitude towards social reform was essentially humanitarian and liberal. In short, in the field of politics Gokhale laid the foundations of constitutionalism. In the field of economics he encouraged the process of capitalist development and in the field of social reforms he tried hard to enhance the dignity of the individual

irrespective of his taste, race, religion, language and class. He suggest that considering industrial backwardness of India state should regulate industrial growth and contribute to create industrial employment. He was thus a modernizer of Indian society in every sense of the term.

BAL GANGHADHAR TILAK – (1856 – 1920)

INTRODUCTION

The extremist ideology created a leadership trio of Lala Lajpat Rai, Bal Ganghadhar Tilak and Bipin Chandr Pal, who altered the nationalist vocabulary by incorporating swadeshi, boycott and national education. Of the trio, Bal Gangadhar, Tilak, rooted in Maharashtra, was perhaps the most articulate militant leader of this phase of freedom struggle. Bal Gangadhar Tilak, born as Keshav Gangadhar Tilak (23 July 1856-1 August 1920), was an Indian nationalist, journalist, teacher, social reformer, lawyer and an independence activist. He was the first popular leader of the Indian Independence Movement. The British colonial authorities called him "Father of the Indian unrest." He was also conferred with the honorary title of "Lokmanya", which literally means "Accepted by the people (as their leader)". Tilak was one of the first and strongest advocates of "Swaraj" (self-rule) and a strong radical in Indian consciousness. His famous quote, "Swaraj is my birthright, and I shall have it!" is well-remembered in India even today.

A BRIEF LIFE SKETCH OF TILAK

Bal Gangadhar Tilak was born in a middle class family in the Ratnagiri district of Konkan on the west coast of India on 23rd July, 1856. The family was noted for its piety, learning and adherence to ancient traditions and rituals. His father, Gangadhar Pant was a teacher by profession and a Sanskrit scholar. This instilled in him a love for Sanskrit and respect for ancient Indian religion and culture. Believing that the best way to serve the country was to educate the people, he and his friend Gopal Gansh Agarkar decided to devote their lives to the cause of education. They started the New English School at Pune in 1876 and started their career as school teachers. However, Tilak started feeling that educating young children was not enough and that the elderly people also needed to be exposed to the socio political reality. Hence, in 1881 he started two weeklies, 'Maratha' in English and 'Kesari' in Marathi. In 1885 they set up the Deccan Education Society in order to start a college which was later named after the then Governor of Bombay as the Ferguson College. He was the founder member of the All India Home Rule League (1916–18) with G. S. Khaparde and Muhammad Ali Jinnah and Annie Besant.

Through his writings in the *Kesari*, he tried to make the people conscious of their rights. In his writings, Tilak very often invoked the tradition and history of Maharashtra. These writings made him very popular among his people. It however, antagonized the government and he was imprisoned because of it on several occasions. Tilak believed that the world is the field of God and is real. It is not an illusion or Maya. The individual has to live and strive in the world; it is

here where he has to perform his duties. The individual will, in this way, attain spiritual freedom and promote the welfare of his fellow creatures.

TILAK'S CONCEPT OF NATIONALISM

Nationalism basically refers to a feeling of unity, a sense of belonging and solidarity within a group of people. Tilak also accepted the significance of certain objective factors like common language, habitation on common territory, in promoting and strengthening the subjective feeling of unity and solidarity. Tilak's nationalism was also influenced by the western theories of national independence and self determination. In the famous trial speech of 1908, he quotes with approval of John Stuart Mill's definition of nationality. In 1919 and 1920 he accepted the Wilsonian concept of self determination and pleaded for its application to India. Hence, Tilak's philosophy of nationalism was a synthesis of the vedantic ideal of the spirit as supreme freedom and the western conceptions of Mazzini, Edmund Burke, J.S. Mill and Woodrow Wilson. Because of his spiritual approach, Tilak regarded that swarajya was not only a right but dharma. According to Tilak, a feeling of oneness and solidarity among a people arising mainly from their common heritage was the vital force of nationalism. Knowledge of a common heritage and pride in it fosters psychological unity. It was to arouse this pride among the people that Tilak referred to Shivaji and Akbar in his speeches. Besides, he felt that by developing a feeling of common interest, a common destiny which can be realised by united political action, the feeling of nationalism could be strengthened. Culture and religion had been the main basis of Tilak's nationalism.

Although the seeds of patriotism in modern Maharashtra were sown by Chiploonkar, Tilak was the real founder of a vigorous and valiant nationalism there. Through the Kesari he spread for nearly forty years the gospel of natural rights, political liberty and justice. He taught the people of Maharashtra the value of organised self help by deciding to serve the plague victims in Poona during the 1897, Tilak became a leader of the people who automatically were drawn to him for humanism. Apart from his role in serving the victims, he wrote several pieces in Kesari condemning the arrangement and the steps, the government undertook in combating this deadly disease. The cult of Ganapati and Shivaji gave to the Maratha people a renewed sense of patriotism, vitalism, and the capacity of political self assertiveness. He revived the concept of swarajya which was used to designate the polity of Shivaji. The people of Maharashtra thoroughly understood the meaning and message of Tilak. Majority of the Indians regarded Tilak as an invincible hero and as the antagonist of the British power in India.

TILAK ON MILITANT NATIONALISM

Militant nationalism represented a distinct phase in the anti-colonial struggle. It introduced new methods of political agitation, involved popular symbols for mobilisation and thus tried to broad base the movement. The militant nationalists' attitude was entirely different. To them, the alien government was a total evil. It was the cause of political, economic, cultural and spiritual ruin of the country. The foreign ruler could never be trusted to vacate the country

that he has gained by conquest. In militant nationalism, each one of the factors of nationalism named earlier territory, population, religion; race, etc. acquire an added emotional emphasis. For example, the territory of a nation is much more than geographical entity. It is a sacred land. The motherland is considered as greater than heaven. It is a divinity in physical form and the embodiment of its philosophy of life and dharma. The mountains and rivers of the country are also more than physical objects. The militant nationalists established close relation between tradition and national consciousness. They appealed to glory and greatness of the Indians' past. Militant nationalists were also profoundly influenced by the Bhagavadgita. They drew from it the lesson of duty. The performance of duty was to be selfless and free from egoism. Personal considerations and sentiments of love, attachment, dislike or hatred must be set aside. Our duty is to be performed as an offering to God without expecting fruit or reward in return. In this connection, B.G. Tilak's interpretation of the Gita needs special mention. He derived a philosophy of 'activism' which essentially implied the carrying out of one's duty /with devotion instead of abandoning it out of laziness and sloth.

Tilak believed that religion, which had powerful emotional appeal, should be harnessed for the dormant spirit of nationalism. Tilak recognized the tremendous symbolic significance of historical and religious festivals, flags and slogans in arousing a spirit of nationalism. Tilak was nationalist par excellence of Vedanta philosophy and orthodox Hindu rituals and practices. Tilak was accused of being sectarian in multi-religious India. That he upheld the most reactionary form of Hindu orthodoxy was evident in his opposition to the 1890 Age of Consent Bill that sought to raise the age of consummation of marriage of girls from 10 to 12 years. While the moderate spokesman Ranade hailed the bill for its progressive social role, Tilak found in this legislation an unwarranted intervention in Hindu social life. Similarly, his involvement in the cow protection society alienated the Muslims to a large extent from the extremist campaign. Tilak's argument in favour of law protection drew upon the sacredness of cow in Hindu belief, completely disregarding the importance of beef in Muslim diet. Tilak's nationalism had to some extent, a revivalist orientation. He wanted to bring to the front the message of the Vedas and the Gita for providing spiritual energy and moral enthusiasm to the nation. A revival of the strong and vital traditions of the old culture of India was essential. He said: 'A true nationalist desires to build on old foundations. Reform on utter disrespect for the old does not appeal to him as constructive work. We do not want to anglicize our institutions and so denationalise them in the name of social and political reforms'. He pointed out that the Shivaji and the Ganapati festivals had been encouraged by in because they served to link contemporary events and movements with historical traditions. Nationalism is essentially a psychological and spiritual conception. It is the modern version of the old deep sentiments of tribal patriotism which we find since prehistoric and ancient times. It is true that nationalism flourished best when there are objective entities which create sentiments of unity.

A common language, belief in common descent from an actual or a mythical race habitation on the same territory and profession of a common religion are very important objective factors which generate the feelings of nationalism. There must be the presence of a psychological unity fostered by the heritage of historical tradition. In spite of racial and linguistic diversities, this psychological bond of nationalism has been important in India. The overflowing continuity of the stream of India culture since olden times has contributed to produce this fundamental psychological unity in India. Besides the subjective experience of this psychological unity, another feature of nationalism also has been upper most in India namely spiritual nationalism. In India the spiritual side of nationalism has been stressed by Bankim Chandra, Vivekananda, Aurobindo Gosh and Tilak .

PROGRAMMES OF TILAK

Tilak presented the nation with a threefold programme or techniques for effective practical and political action. The three principles were *boycott, swadshi and national education*. Boycott initially involved the refusal of the people to purchase British manufactured goods. It was started as a measure designed to bring economic pressure on the British business interests, both in India and abroad. Boycott gradually moved from the economic into the political sphere. At the Calcutta Congress of 1906, Tilak supported the swadeshi resolution and spelled out the economic foundations of Indian nationalism. The swadeshi movement quickly became a movement of national regeneration: swadeshi was a practical application of love of country.

SOCIO, ECONOMIC, RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL IDEAS OF TILAK

In the economic field, he accepted Dadabhai Naoroji's 'Economic Drain Theory' and criticised the British Government for ruthlessly exploiting the resources of the country. British rule had impoverished the country. The Britishers' reckless policies had destroyed the indigenous industries, trade and art. The alien rulers had allowed a free inflow of European products and the Indian handicrafts etc. were forced to face unequal competition with them. But Tilak realized that a foreign government cannot be expected to accord protection to the indigenous industries. The twin political programmes of 'Boycott' and 'Swadeshi' suggested by Tilak were aimed at generating indigenous and independent economic development.

Swaraj, according to him, was full self-government-political, social, economic and spiritual. Thus, Swaraj was something more than mere home rule. For the realisation of this Swaraj, Tilak accepted the suitability of the western liberal institutions and concepts like constitutional government, rule of law, individual freedom, dignity of the person. and so on. To Tilak, the ultimate goal of the national movement was Swaraj. In order to involve people in the movement, he interpreted the goal of Swaraj in religious terms and insisted that Swaraj is our religious necessity. The religion and the philosophy of Vedanta emphasise equal spiritual status and destiny of each individual. This is against bondage of any kind and Swaraj is therefore, not only a political but natural and spiritual necessity Tilak held that Swaraj was a moral and religious necessity for every man and group. For his moral fulfilment and for the performance of

religious duties, man needs to be free. Without political freedom higher freedom is impossible. Thus Swaraj is our Dharma. To endeavour to attain it is our Karma- Yoga.

Tilak's role in the Indian National Congress was that of an agitator. He wanted that the Congress should have its roots in the life of the people. From 1905 to 1907 and from 1917 to 1920 he played a decisive role in the congress. He taught the gospel of self reliance and self-help at a time when some of the other leaders were mainly looking to British sympathy and support. He introduced extremist national sentiments in the Congress. The Congress so far was mainly middle class organisation. Tilak attempted to bring it to the Congress the lower middle-classes and the ordinary masses.

As one of the greatest makers of the Indian Nation, Tilak has won undying fame. He was not merely an agitator but was a statesman whose life work is the creation of the foundations of a strong nation. Tilak was a great politician and an all pervasive and exalted patriotism was the dominant theme of his life. The mission of his life was to rouse patriotic self- consciousness among Indians. But he was not merely the prophet of an aggressive nationalism. He was also a leader who made great efforts to execute his ideas into concrete action. Hence, Tilak did not remain a mere political intellectual but was a practical statesman of a high order, Tilak is a unique figure in several respects and for generations his memories will inspire the people of India and freedom lover all over the world. In political life, Tilak was the Bhisma of Indian nationalism. He was an intellectual giant, a statesman and a moral hero.

Tilak was a believer in the Advaita philosophy. He had a very comprehensive conception of Hinduism in his mind. He said in a speech of January 3, 1906 thus ; 'The term Sanatan Dharma shows that our religion is very old, as old as the history of human race itself. Vedic religion was the religion of the Aryans from a very early time. Hindu religion as a whole is made up of different parts correlated to each other as so many sons and daughters of one great religion. If this idea is kept in view and if we try to unite the various sections it will be consolidated in a mighty force. Religion is an element in nationality. The word Dharma means a tie and comes from the root dhri, to bear or hold 'what is there to hold together'. To connect the soul with god, and man with man, dharma means our duties towards God and duties towards man. Hindu religion as such provides for a moral as well as social tie.' Tilak has given a broad definition of Hindu. According to him, a Hindu is one who accepts the authoritativeness of Vedas. A Hindu moulds his conduct according to the injunctions of the Vedas the smritis and the puranas.

The metaphysical assumptions of Tilak influenced his political ideas. According to him, the metaphysics of non-dualism of the Vedanta implied the political conception of natural right. Advaita taught him the supremacy of the concept of freedom. Freedom is the very life of the individual soul which Vedanta declares to be not separate from God but identical with him. Freedom, according to Tilak, was a divine attribute. Freedom may be equated with the autonomous power of creativism. Without freedom no moral and spiritual life is possible.

Foreign imperialism kills the soul of a nation and hence Tilak fought against the British empire. Swaraj became the reason and justification for the entire programme and movement led by Tilak and other nationalists. He held that the attainment of swaraj would be great victory for Indian nationalism. He gave to Indian the mantra: 'swaraj is the birth right of Indians. He defined swaraj as people's rule instead of that of bureaucracy. For pushing his ideal of swaraj forward he started Home Rule League in 1916 with the co-operation of Annie Besant. Tilak contemplated federal type of political structure under swaraj. He referred to the example of the American Congress and said that the government of India should keep its hands similar powers to exercise them through an impartial council for the correct implementation of his programme. Tilak urged the method of nonviolent passive resistance'. Thus Tilak's method of action was democratic and constitutional. He had constructed practical objective. The swadeshi boycotted movement was an attempt at vindicating the rights of the people to self government and hence it used several techniques of political agitation as mass processions, big public meetings, strikes, picketing etc, which have been followed by later Indian leaders in their political movements.

ASSESSMENT

Tilak was one of the dominant political figures who gave to the people of India the first lessons in the consciousness of the right of swaraj. He enlightened the population of India into a political recognition of the general will of the nation. He has given us a theory of nationalism. His theory of nationalism was synthesis of the teachings of both eastern and western thinkers. Tilak was not merely a nationalist leader with tremendous political acumen. He himself represented a new wave of nationalist movement that created an automatic space for it by providing the most powerful and persuasive critique of moderate philosophy and articulating his nationalist ideology in language that was meaningful to those it was addressed.

Review Questions

1. Define Moderates and Extremists. What are the basic postulates and difference of their respective ideologies?
2. Evaluate the relative contributions of the Moderates and Extremists in the Indian national movement.
3. Elucidate Gokhale's contribution to liberal political ideas in the context of India.
4. Tilak is often called 'the father of Indian unrest' and 'a prince of patriots'. How far do you agree with these views about Tilak and why?
5. Bring out Tilak's concept of Militant Nationalism
6. Critically examine political and economic ideas of Gokhale.

MODULE III

MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI

INTRODUCTION

Gandhism ushered a new era in the history of political thought. It made the world believe that even the greatest political problems could be solved only by making personal sacrifices and making the opponent realise the excesses and mistakes committed by him. Gandhi is one of the most inspiring figures of our time. He was the preeminent leader of Indian nationalism in British-ruled India. Employing non-violent civil disobedience, Gandhi led India to independence and inspired movements for non-violence, civil rights and freedom across the world. For Gandhi, Non violence was the most suitable reply for violence and force. He wanted to establish an ideal society in which panchayathi raj based on real democratic principles was to flourish.

BIOGRAPHY AND INFLUENCES

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi is called as “Mahatma” was born on the 2nd October 1869, at Porbandar in Kathiawad. After becoming a lawyer, he got an offer from an Indian firm in South Africa and went there. In South Africa, he started his non-violent civil disobedience movement in protest of the Asiatic Act and Transvaal Immigration Act. In 1914, he returned India when he was 46. He spent the next four years touring all over the country and studying the Indian situation. As a freedom fighter and national leader, Gandhiji was peerless. As a politician, he stood apart from his contemporaries. He employed moral means to attain political ends. Gandhi was a prolific writer. One of Gandhi's earliest publications, *Hind Swaraj*, published in Gujarati in 1909, became "the intellectual blueprint" for India's independence movement. Gandhi also wrote several books including his autobiography, *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*.

His most important source of inspiration was Bhagavat gita. He found solution to every problem from and learned the philosophy of self control which he followed throughout his life. Shrimad Rajchandra, Jain poet was influenced Gandhi later he was his spiritual guru, Rajchandra's adherence to the principles of satya, ahimsa and dharma later became the fundamental tenets of Gandhism. From Buddhism and Jainism he learned the philosophy of non violence. Although Gandhi was an Indian and a staunch nationalist, there was a profound influence of the West on him. He was very largely influenced by Western thinkers and writers. Leo Tolstoy by his book "The Kingdom of God is within you" John Ruskin-Author of "Unto This Last" overwhelmed him very much. Gandhi had a strong inclination towards the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. Thoreau's plea for the supremacy of conscience under all circumstances appealed to Gandhi so much that he admitted that his technique of passive resistance found scientific confirmation in the former's essay on 'Civil Disobedience'. Gandhi was influenced by the political ideas of Gopal Krishna and considered him as his "Political Guru". Gandhi learnt his faith in non-violence from Jainism. The Bible gave him the sermon not to hurt anybody's heart. It also taught him to love and to do well to the others. Gita taught him to render selfless service.

CONTRIBUTION TO INDIAN NATIONALISM

The Indian Freedom Struggle was one of the largest democratic movements against imperialism and colonialism. The Indian Freedom Struggle provides the best examples of nationalism and patriotism which may be adopted and pursued in order to root out the undemocratic institutions of colonialism. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, popularly known as 'Mahatma Gandhi' or Bapu was a moral reformist. It is widely accepted that Gandhi was the back bone of the non-violent struggle for freedom of India.

First Phase of Gandhi's Leadership in Indian Freedom Struggle: 1914 - 1919

Gandhi played a pivotal role in the India's struggle for freedom. Gandhi's emergence as the undisputed leader of the Indian National Congress is an interesting story by itself. After twenty years' stay in Africa, Gandhi returned to India in 1914. He decided to guide India's political scenario. Soon after his arrival, and in pursuance of a promise made to Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Gandhiji began a years' tour of his Motherland. He spent next four years (1914-18) in studying the Indian situation and prepared himself and those who wanted to follow his path for satyagraha or the application of the soul force based on truth for the removal of the social and political inequalities from which then India suffered. But he was not simply an inactive observer during this period. In 1915, he established, the Satyagraha Ashram near Ahmedabad where a little group of man who had accepted his general principles settled.

Gandhi's Local Experiments:

1. *Champan Satyagraha:*

Gandhiji's first experience in satyagraha came in 1917 in Champaran, a district in Bihar. The peasantry on the indigo plantations was excessively oppressed by the European planters. They were compelled to grow indigo on at least 3\20th of their land and to sell it at prices fixed by the planters. Having heard of Gandhi's campaigns in South Africa, several peasants of Champaran invited him to come and help them. Gandhiji reached Champaran in 1917 and began to conduct a detailed inquiry into the conditions of the peasantry. The district officials ordered him to leave Champaran, but he defied the order and was willing to face trial and imprisonment. This forced the Government to cancel its earlier order and to appoint a committee of inquiry on which Gandhiji served as a member. It was Gandhi's first attempt of Civil Disobedience and it was successful.

2. *Ahmedabad Mill Strike*

In 1918, Gandhiji intervened in a dispute between the workers and mill-owners of Ahmedabad. He advised the workers to go on strike and to demand a 35% increase in wages. He insisted that the workers should not use violence against the mill-owners during the strike. He undertook a fast unto death to strengthen the workers resolve to continue the strike. His fast put pressure on the mill-owners who relented on the fourth day and agreed to give the workers a 35% increase in wages.

3. *Kheda Struggle*

In Kheda district of Gujrat, the crop failed, and famine conditions threatened. Many cultivators were unable to pay the tax. He drafted a petition and asked for the suspension of

revenue collection. But the Government rejected the petition. The struggle was withdrawn when it was learnt that the government had issued instructions that revenue should be recovered only from those peasants who could afford to pay. The Kheda struggle was a great step in the awakening of the masses of India to a sense of their rights and their own ability to get their demands accepted by the Government. These experiences brought Gandhiji in close contact with the masses whose interests he actively exposed all his life. In time he became the symbol of poor India, nationalist India and rebellious India

Second Phase of Gandhi's Leadership in Indian Freedom Struggle: 1919 - 1930

Agitation against Rowlatt Act

During the World War I, the Defence of India rules were in operation which gave arbitrary powers to the Government. When the war came to an end in 1919, the government again wanted to arm itself with such powers to suppress the revolutionary movement in the country. In 1919, the Government passed the Rowlatt Bills which empowered the government to arrest and try political leaders by special tribunals set up under this act. It could arrest any person without giving any reason, search any place without a warrant and imprison anyone without trial. The Rowlatt Acts were received with great discontent by every section of Indian public opinion. Consequently, the national leaders started an intense agitation throughout the country against the act. Mahatma Gandhi founded the Satyagraha Sabha and declared 6th April 1919 as Satyagraha day, a day of Hartals and protests against the Rowlatt Bill. It was a unique success. Some incidents of violence took place in Delhi. The people responded magnificently to Gandhi's call. March and April 1919 witnessed a remarkable political awakening in India. There were hartals, strikes, and demonstrations. The entire country was electrified.

Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy

The Government was determined to suppress the mass agitation. Gandhiji gave a call for a mighty hartal on 6th April 1919. The people responded with unprecedented enthusiasm. The government decided to meet the popular protest with repression, particularly in the Punjab. At this time was perpetrated one of the worst crimes in modern history. A large but unarmed crowd had gathered on 13 April 1919 at Amritsar in the Jallianwala Bagh, to protest the arrest of their popular leaders, Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew and Dr. Satyapal. General Dyer, the military commander of Amritsar decided to terrorise the people of Amritsar into complete submission. Jallianwala Bagh was a large open space which was enclosed on three sides by buildings and had only one exit. He surrounded the Bagh with his army unit, closed the exit with his troops, and then ordered his men to shoot into the trapped crowd with rifles and machine-guns. Thousands were killed and wounded. After this massacre, martial law was proclaimed throughout the Punjab and the people were submitted to the most uncivilized atrocities.

Khilafat movement

The Muslims under two brothers Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali, and Maulana Azad, organized a mass movement of the Indian Muslims known as the Khilafat movement. Gandhiji decided to extend their support to the Khilafat movement as this was to him and apportion duty of uniting the Hindu and Muslim. October 17, 1919 was observed as Khilafat Day when the

Hindu united with Muslims in fasting and observed a hartal on the day. He canalised the powerful currents which took the shape of united non-violent non-co-operation movement. The Congress held at Calcutta in 1920 endorsed Gandhiji's policy subsequently reaffirmed by the annual session of the Congress at Nagpur.

The Non-Cooperation Movement

Non-cooperation movement was nothing but a declaration of peaceful; and non-violent war against the atrocities of the British government which had gone back on its words. The non co-operation resolution was endorsed in the Nagpur Session of the Congress held in Dec1920. The programme of "non-violent non-cooperation" included the boycott of councils, courts and schools, set up by the British and of all foreign cloth. The Khilafat committee launched a non-cooperation movement on 31 August, 1920 and Gandhi was the first to join it. The congress met in a special session in September 1920 at Calcutta (Kolkata) and agreed to start the Non-cooperation movement. The decision was further endorsed at its Nagpur session held in December 1920. The leaders of the Khilafat movement also endorsed the Non-cooperation movement led by Gandhi. The non-cooperation movement was based on perfect non-violence. Gandhi regarded it not merely a political programme but also as a religious movement to clear Indian political life of corruption, terrorism and the fear of white race. The years 1921 and 1922 were to witness an unprecedented movement of the Indians. Thousands of students left schools and colleges and joined national schools and colleges. Women showed great enthusiasm and freely offered their jewellery. Boycott of foreign cloth were organized all over the land. Huge bonfires of foreign cloth were organized all over the land. Khadi soon became the symbol of freedom.

The Chauri-Chaura Incident

The volunteers participating in the Non-cooperation Movement protested against high meat prices in the marketplace. The demonstrators were beaten back by local police. Several of their leaders were arrested and put in the lockup at the Chauri Chaura police station. In response, a protest against the police was called for 4 February, to be held in the local marketplace. They had gathered to picket a liquor shop in the market place. On 5 February, 1922, when a large group of protesters, participating in the Non-cooperation movement, clashed with police, who opened fire. In retaliation the demonstrators attacked and set fire to a police station, killing all of its occupants. The incident led to the deaths of three civilians and 22 or 23 policemen. Chauri Chaura incident led Gandhi to call off the Non Cooperation Movement from Bardoli in February 1922. Gandhi was deeply hurt and called out Satyagraha movement. After this Mahatma Gandhi Was arrested and sentenced 6 years jail. After the Chauri Chaura incident, Gandhi decided to withdraw the Non-Cooperation Movement.

Simon Commission

In 1927, the British government appointed the Indian Statutory Commission, known popularly after the name of its chairman as the Simon Commission, to go into the question of further constitutional reform. All the members of the commission were Englishmen. This announcement was greeted by a chorus of protest from all Indians. What angered them most was

the exclusion of Indians from the Commission and the basic notion behind this exclusion that the foreigners would discuss and decide upon India's fitness for self government. The national Congress decided to boycott the Commission. The Muslim League and Hindu Mahasabha decided to support the Congress decision. On 3 February 1922, the day the Commission reached Bombay, an all India hartal was organized. Wherever the Commission went, it was greeted with hartals and black flag demonstrations under the slogan 'Simon Go Back'. The government used brutal suppression and police attacks to break the popular opposition. Lala Lajpat Rai succumbed to the injuries which he received in the police lathi charge at Lahore.

Nehru Report

The British Government justified the exclusion of Indians from the Commission on the plea that there were vital differences among the various Indian political parties. They also challenged them to produce and submit an agreed constitution. All important Indian leaders and parties tried to meet the challenge of the Simon Commission by getting together and trying to evolve an alternative scheme of constitutional reforms. Several conferences of leading political workers were held. The end result was the Nehru Report named after its chief architect, Motilal Nehru, and finalized in August 1928. Unfortunately, the All Party Convention, held at Calcutta in December 1928, failed to pass the Report. With few exceptions League leaders rejected the Nehru proposals. In reaction Mohammad Ali Jinnah drafted his Fourteen Points in 1929 which became the core demands the Muslim community put forward as the price of their participating in an independent united India. Objections were raised by some of the communal-minded leaders belonging to the Muslim League, the Hindu Maha Sabha and the Sikh League. Communalism began to grow steadily after this.

Lahore Congress and Poorna Swaraj

When the Nehru Report came before the annual session of the Congress in Calcutta in December 1928, the left lashed it out on the fact that it did not want the complete Independence and wanted only a dominion status. Independence of India League Meanwhile in April 1928, the "Independence of India League" was formed. The Indian National Congress held its annual session (The Lahore session) in December 1929. It voted for "purna swaraj" or complete independence as against a dominion status for India and passed a resolution fixing the last Sunday of January 1930 — it was coincidentally January 26 — as Independence Day. The Congress session also announced the launching of a civil disobedience movement. But it did not draw up a programme of struggle. That was left to Mahatma Gandhi.

Third Phase of Gandhi's Leadership in Indian Freedom Struggle: 1930 - 1947

The Civil Disobedience Movement and Dandi March

The Lahore Congress had left the choice of the methods of non-violent struggle for Poorna Swaraj to Gandhi. He placed 11 points of administrative reforms before the British government. His important demands were [a] Salt tax should be abolished, [b] salaries of the highest grade services should be reduced, [c] Military expenditure should be reduced, and [d] All political prisoners should be discharged. The government response to Gandhi's demands was negative. The Civil Disobedience Movement was started by Gandhi on 12 March 1930 with his

famous Dandi March. Together with 78 chosen followers, Gandhi walked nearly 375 km from Sabarmati Ashram to Dandi, a village on the Gujarat sea coast. On 6 April Gandhiji reached Dandi, picked up a hand full of salt and broke the salt law as a symbol of the Indian people's refusal to live under British made laws. This movement was an essential part of Indian Independence movement and non-violent resistance against tax. The movement spread very quickly all over India. Everywhere in the country people joined in hartals, demonstrations, and the campaign to boycott foreign goods and to refuse to pay taxes. A notable feature of the movement was the wide participation of women. They marched shoulder to shoulder with men in processions. The Government tried to crush the movement through ruthless repression, lathi charges and firing on unarmed crowds of men and women. Over 90000 satyagrahis, including Gandhiji, were imprisoned. The Congress was declared illegal. The nationalist press was gagged through strict censorship of news.

First Round Table Conference

In response to the inadequacy of the Simon Report, the Labour Government, which had come to power under Ramsay MacDonald in 1929, decided to hold a series of Round Table Conferences in London. The British Government summoned the First Round Table Conference of Indian leaders and spokesmen of the British Government in 1930 in London to discuss the Simon Commission Report. The first Round Table Conference convened from 12 November 1930 to 19 January 1931. Prior to the Conference, M. K. Gandhi had initiated the Civil Disobedience Movement on behalf of the Indian National Congress. Consequently, since many of the Congress' leaders were in jail, Congress did not participate in the first conference and it failed to achieve its goals.

Gandhi-Irwin Pact:

The British Government realized that the Indian National Congress needed to be part of deciding the future of constitutional government in India. The Government made attempts to negotiate an agreement with the Congress so that it would attend the Round Table Conference. Finally, Lord Irwin and Gandhiji negotiated a settlement in March 1931. The Government agreed to release those political prisoners who had remained non-violent and conceded the right to make salt for consumption as also the right to peaceful picketing of liquor and foreign cloth shops. The Congress suspended the Civil Disobedience Movement and agreed to take part in the Second Round Table Conference.

Second Round Table Conference: Gandhiji went to England in September 1931 to attend the Second Round Table Conference. The British Government refused to concede the basic nationalist demand for freedom on the basis of the immediate grant of Dominion Status. The Government prepared to crush the Congress. Government repression succeeded in the end, helped as it was by the differences among Indian leaders on communal and other questions. The Congress officially suspended the movement in May 1933 and withdrew it in May 1934. Gandhiji once again withdrew from active politics. The movement had succeeded in further politicizing the people, and in further deepening the social roots of the freedom struggle.

The Communal Award: The Government arrested Gandhiji in January 1932 and unleashed a reign of terror. The communal problem gripped the nation's attention. In August 1932 Ramsay Macdonald, the British Prime Minister announced the proposal on minority representation known as the Communal Award. It recommended to double the existing seats in provincial legislatures, to retain a system of separate electorates for minorities, to grant weightage to Muslims in provinces where they were in minority and to recognize depressed class as minority and make them entitled to the right of separate electorates. A separate province of Sind was created and the interests of minorities were safeguarded. The second Conference and Communal Award developed into of all things, a confrontation between Mahatma Gandhi and Ambedkar.

The Third Round Table Conference (17 November 1932 - 24 December 1932) was not attended by the Indian National Congress and Gandhi. The recommendations were published in a White Paper in March 1933 and debated in Parliament afterwards. A Joint Select Committee was formed to analyse the recommendations and formulate a new Act for India. The Committee produced a draft Bill in February 1935 which was enforced as the Government of India Act of 1935 in July 1935.

The Poona Pact

Gandhiji reacted strongly to the proposal of granting the right of separate electorate to the depressed classes. He regarded them as an integral part of the Hindu society. He resorted to a fast unto death. In an anxiety to save his life the Poona Pact was signed between Gandhiji and Ambedkar. The main provisions of the Poona Pact were: 1. It was agreed to allot 148 seats to the depressed classes in the provincial legislatures as against 71 promised by the communal award. 2. It was promised that a certain percentage of seats allotted to the general non Muslim electorate would be reserved for the depressed classes. 3. The principle of joint electorate was accepted.

Act of 1935

Government of India Act 1935 was passed by British Parliament in August 1935. The Provision were the establishment of an All India Federation at the Centre, consisting of the Provinces of British India and the Princely States. Division of powers into three lists viz. Federal, Provincial and Concurrent. The Congress ministries could not change the basically imperialist character of the British administration in India. But they did try to improve the condition of the people within the narrow limits of the powers given to them under the Act of 1935. The Congress ministries reduced their own salaries. Most of them traveled second or third class on the railways. They set up new standards of honesty and public service. They promoted civil liberties, repealed restrictions on the press and radical organizations, permitted trade unions and kisan organizations to function and released political prisoners including a large number of revolutionary terrorists. The Congress governments introduced prohibition in selected areas, undertook Harijan uplift, and paid greater attention to primary, higher and technical education and public health. Support was given to khadi and other village industries.

National Movement during the Second World War

The Second World War broke out in September 1939. The Congress urged the government to declare war aims. The British authorities issued contradictory statements about

the war aims. The British government involved in the war without consulting the national leaders. The Viceroy assumed emergency powers under the defence of India rules. Protesting against such policies of government, the Congress ministries in the provinces resigned in October 1939. The National Congress was in full sympathy with the victims of fascist aggression. It was willing to help the forces of democracy in their struggle against fascism. But, the Congress leaders asked, how was it possible for an enslaved nation to aid others in their fight for freedom? They therefore demanded that India must be declared free or at least effective power put in Indian hands before it could actively participate in the War. The government reused to accept this demand and tried to pit the religious minorities and Princes against the Congress. Therefore, the Congress asked its ministries to resign.

August Offer: In August 1940 the Viceroy announced an offer which proposed the expansion of Governor General's Council with representation of the Indians and establishing a war advisory council. The Viceroy promised the Muslim League that the British government would never agree to a constitution or government in India which did not enjoy their support. The Congress was wholly disappointed with the August Offer. Jawahar Lal Nehru said that the whole idea was "dead and doornail". The Muslim League said that it will not be satisfied with anything short of partition of India.

Individual Satyagraha: In October 1940, Gandhi gave a call for a limited satyagraha by a few selected individuals. The Individual Satyagraha was not to seek independence but to affirm the right of speech. It express people's feeling that they were not interested in the war and that they made no distinction between Nazism and the double autocracy that ruled India. The satyagraha was kept limited so as not to embarrass Britain's war effort by a mass upheaval in India. Vinoba Bhave was the first to offer satyagraha. By 15 May 1941, more than 25000 satyagrahis had been jailed.

Cripps mission

Two major changes in world politics occurred in 1941. Germany attacked Soviet Union and Japan attacked Pearl Harbour, an American fleet. Japan occupied Rangoon in March 1942. This brought the war to India's doorstep. The Congress leaders denounced Japanese aggression and once again offered to cooperate in the defence of India and the Allied cause if Britain transferred the substance of power to India immediately and promised complete independence after the war. The British government now desperately wanted the active cooperation of Indians in the war effort. To secure this cooperation it sent to India in March 1942 a mission headed by a Cabinet Minister, Sir Stafford Cripps. Important proposals of Cripps were [a] dominion status would be granted to India immediately after the war with the right to secede, [b] immediately after the cessation of hostilities a constitution making body would be set up, [c] The constitution so framed after the war would be accepted by the British government on the condition that any Indian province could, if so desired, remain outside the Indian union, and [d] the actual control of defence and military operations would be retained by the British government. The British government refused to accept the Congress demand for immediate transfer of effective power to Indians. The Indian leaders could not be satisfied with mere promises for the future. Gandhiji

termed the Cripps Mission as a 'post dated cheque on a crashing bank'. The Cripps mission failed to pacify Indians.

The Quit India Movement

In August 1942, Gandhiji launched the Quit India Movement also known as India August Movement or Bharat Chhodo Andolan ("Bharat Chhodo Andolan"). A resolution was passed on 8 August 1942 in Bombay by the All India Congress Committee, declaring its demand for an immediate end of British rule. The Congress decided to organize a mass struggle on non-violent lines on the widest possible scale. Gandhiji's slogan of 'Do or Die' inspired the nation. Every man, woman and child began dreaming of a free India. Gandhiji became more and more militant as Japanese forces moved towards India. The government's response to the movement was quick. The Congress was banned and most of its leaders were arrested before they could start mobilizing the people. The people, however, were unstoppable. There were hartals and demonstrations all over the country. Many nationalists were disappointed that the Quit India Movement had failed. The Congress Party in turn faced severe criticism from Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the leader of the All India Muslim League and the Communist Party on the failure of the movement. The importance of the Quit India movement lay in the fact that it demonstrated the depth of nationalist feeling that had reached in the country and the capacity for struggle and sacrifice that the people had developed. It was evident that the British would no longer find it possible to rule India against the wishes of the people. The Quit India movement was the last in the series of mass movements launched by the Indian National Congress under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi.

Indian Independence Act and Partition

In the March of 1947 Lord Mountbatten came to India and recommended a partition of Punjab and Bengal in the face of civil war. Gandhi was very opposed to the idea of partition and urged Mountbatten to offer Jinnah leadership of a united India instead of the creation of a separate Muslim state. But this arrangement was not acceptable to many nationalist leaders, including Nehru. In July Britain's Parliament passed the Indian Independence Act. According to it August 14 and 15 were set for partition of India. Thus came into existence two independent entities - India and Pakistan. India finally became independent in 1947 but Gandhi was unhappy with the settlement because it divided India into two states - India and Pakistan - the first largely for Hindus, the second largely for Muslims. Mahatma was completely shaken by the religious riots preceding India's partition. Gandhi did his best to pacify the violence between Hindus and Muslims and his work achieved some success. But in 1948 he was shot and killed by a fellow Hindu who believed Gandhi was betraying the Hindus by working for reconciliation. Gandhi was an all rounder in all fields of human life. Mohandas *Gandhi's* reputation as the *Indian* spiritual and political leader who coordinated and led a successful *national struggle for independence* against British imperial rule on the strength of a non-violent *movement* survives largely intact.

SOCIO- ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL IDEAS OF GANDHI

GANDHI'S PERCEPTION ON TRUTH

The word satya (Truth) is derived from Sat which means 'being'. Truth is the most cardinal principle of Gandhism. Mahatma Gandhi was a worshipper of truth. He believed that there is no good higher than truth. "Truth is God and God is Truth." He searched for truth throughout his life. He named his auto-biography, 'My Experiments with Truth'. Truth has a great deal of metaphysical, ethical, practical and even emotional significance for him. He achieved many successes by following the path of truth. He did not give up the path of truth even in times of failures. Gandhi accepts the fundamentality or primacy of the concept of truth over non-violence, satyagraha, God etc. in his political activism to establish justice he innovates non-violence, Satyagraha, trusteeship, the important moral ideals. Among all the moral ideals he takes truth as sovereign. He writes, 'for me truth is the sovereign principle which includes numerous other principles. This truth is not only truthfulness in word, but truthfulness in thought also, and not only the relative truth of our conception, but the Absolute Truth, the Eternal principle, that is God. From this it is obvious that he makes a distinction between the Absolute truth and relative truths. Anything that is objectively true or true on the basis of human experience can be taken as relative truth. What is empirically true can be considered as relative truth as different from absolute truth. Absolute truth transcends human experience. Absolute truth is the sum total of all that is there in the universe. Here Gandhi seems to attribute an ontological status to truth. He takes truth in the sense of ultimate existence or Reality or God.

According to Gandhi, and where there is Truth, there is also knowledge which is true. Where there is no Truth, there also is knowledge which is true. Where there is no Truth, there can be no true knowledge. He had to bear many sufferings for truth. Devotion to this Truth is the sole justification for our existence. All our activities should be centered in Truth. Truth should be the very breath of our life. According to Gandhi, satyagraha means "scrupulous regard for truth". He was of the opinion that a truthful person will not harm his opponents but will make them friends. He always considered truth as the ideal, and continuously strived for its achievement. He firmly believed that only a society based on truth can become an ideal society. Truth and truthful living constitute the guiding principle of Gandhism philosophy.

NON-VIOLENCE

Ahimsa is the central concept of the Gandhian ideals. Non-violence is the English translation of the word 'Ahimsa'. Ahimsa means non-injury, non-harm or inoffensiveness. Ahimsa requires the follower to respect all life. Infact, non-violence and truth were to him two sides of the same coin. A seeker of truth always follows the path of non-violence. Non-violence means not to harm any person, not even to one's opponent in any way. Gandhiji was against the propagation of violence in one's thought, words, actions and deeds. A follower of non-violence does not torture others through his words, actions and deeds. He tries to change the heart of others by bearing sufferings for himself.) Gandhi took Truth as the supreme virtue and for him truth without non-violence is no truth. Hence the realisation of Ahimsa was essential to realise Satya. He remarked "God is truth and truth is God." and when you want to find truth as God, the

only means is love and non-violence. Truth is the highest law of our life and Ahimsa is the highest duty.

Non-violence as stated is an approach of a person with a developed soul and when put in practice we get Satyagraha. The movement may be weak but the idea and the reason should be strong which allows one to be calm and exercise control even in the most difficult situations. Ahimsa is the active dissatisfaction from untruthful means that is not replied to by any force, anger or malice, this behaviour must be presented to all creations of god and man. Gandhi's ultimate aim of non violence is even to love the so called enemies. To him 'non violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of brute'. Gandhi's technique of non violence was aimed at promoting social change. To Gandhi Non violence is the soul force or truth force or truth seeking force'.

Types of non-violence

(i) Non-violence of the Brave:

It is the best form of non-violence. Here non-violence is not adopted under compulsion. The basis of the non-violence of the brave is morality and inner strength. Only a brave person can practise non-violence. This type of non-violence can achieve very good results.

(ii) Non-violence based on Expediency:

It is the non- violence of the weak. It is used as a matter of expediency or utility. It is the result of weakness and helplessness and not of moral conviction. It is used for the fulfillment of selfish interests. This form of non-violence can lead to a limited success only.

(iii) Non-violence of the Coward:

The non-violence of the coward is the worst form of non-violence Cowardice and non-violence can never really go together. A coward does not face danger, he runs away from it. Mahatma Gandhi would prefer violence instead of accepting the non-violence of the coward. He holds the view that if there is violence in one's mind it is good to use it openly rather than to practise non-violence to hide one's impotence. A violent man can become non-violent one day but there is no hope for a coward. Gandhism favours non-violence of the brave. It always advocates the use of non-violence for securing the objectives dictated by Truth. Now the United Nations has decided to celebrate each year 2nd October (Birthday of Mahatma Gandhi) as World Non-violence Day. It is a tribute to Mahatma Gandhi's love for Non-violence.

SOCIALISM

Socialism is an economic system of society. It includes social ownership of the means of production and co-operative management of society. Mahatma Gandhi wrote, "Socialism and communism of the West are based on certain conceptions which are fundamentally different from ours. One such conception is their belief in the essential selfishness of human nature. Gandhi was also never in favor of socialism propounded by Nehru, which emphasized on large-scale production. This massive production, Gandhi feared, would lead to greater exploitation and urbanization. It is this emphasis on decentralization that endeared Gandhi to Vinoba Bhave and Jayaprakash Narayan, and not to industrialists. Gandhi also gave his own definition to the word socialism. According to Gandhi, it does not refer to nationalization of the means of production, distribution, exchange, but faith in God, truth, non-

violence and equality. So, in simple terms, Gandhian socialism is based on the ideas of non-possession and trusteeship. Gandhian socialism was humanitarian in nature. It cared for the poor and it was a moral code of personal conduct than an economic ideology. It did not envisage the expropriation of the rich through violence or state action.

To Gandhi, "My concept of socialism implies that people should be self-reliant. That is the only way they can be prevented from being exploited. I have been trying to persuade the workers that if the capitalists have their gold and silver, we have our hands and feet. These too are assets. A capitalist will never be able to carry on without labour. Let no one misunderstand that the Sangh is going to serve the purpose of the capitalists, thereby making the workers slaves. Mahatma Gandhi wrote, "The basis of socialism is economic equality. There can be no Ramarajyain the present state of iniquitous inequalities in which a few roll in riches and the masses do not get even enough to eat. Mahatma Gandhi remarked, "Socialism is a beautiful word and so far as I am aware in socialism all the members of society are equal none low, none high.

GANDHI ON STATE

In Gandhi's assessment, the state (Western type) was the symbol of violence in concentrated form. In order to ensure allegiance from the citizens the state (which means its authority) applies coercion or violent measures mercilessly. Gandhi describes state as a 'Soulless Machine.', "The state represents violence in a concentrated and organised form. To Gandhi, "the individual has a soul but the state is a soulless machine, the state can never be weaned away from violence to which it owes its existence" It can never be weaned away from violence because its basis has been force." Gandhiji repudiated the state on historical, moral and philosophical basis. He argued that there was no illustration in history when the state had supported the case of the poor. State is based on force and its orders are enforced with coercive power. So it has no moral basis. He gathered experience in South Africa that more and more power to the state meant more and more violence or greater amount of coercion. Gandhi wanted the state to be free from its violent elements and sought to inculcate fearlessness in the minds of people.

Since Gandhi had no faith on state which is an embodiment of violence and coercion, he did not support any other branch of this political organisation. The state curbs the individuality of man and it creates hindrances in the way of economic progress. However, Gandhiji did not favour a complete abolition of the State. He accepted the role of state as an agency for providing security to the people. In the words of Gandhiji, "The state is not an end in itself, but a means of enabling people to better their conditions in every department of life." Gandhiji wanted the state to be a Service State. State should work for making the life of man better. Further, the state is not infallible and omnipotent. People can oppose the unjust laws and policies of the state. Gandhiji wanted to limit the functions of the State. Like individualists, Gandhiji regarded the State as a necessary evil. He wished to assign to it minimum functions. Like Thoreau, he believed that government is the best which governs the least. Self-government really means greater freedom from the control of the State. Undoubtedly, there are certain functions which cannot be performed without the state. However, a large number of functions can be performed

without the State. This can be done by the people solely through their own initiatives and mutual co-operation. To him violence is the biggest obstacle to the natural development of individual and social life of the state. Gandhi opposed the increasing power of the state; because it leads the state as coercive. He said that, "I look upon an increase in the power of the state with the greatest fear, because although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress."

Gandhi also viewed sovereignty in the light of morality. Though, in general view, sovereignty is a political concept, Gandhi did not admit its dissociation from ethics, morality and other universal ideals and values. For this reason the general view of sovereignty was not acceptable to him. Gandhi was an ardent advocate not of traditional state sovereignty but of popular sovereignty strongly advocated by one of the social contract theoreticians. In the scheme of Rousseau's popular sovereignty the citizens had the opportunity to assemble in open places periodically and to participate in the variety of functions of state. Gandhi contemplated the same type of popular sovereignty for India. The Gandhian theory of state is based not only on the principles of freedom, non-violence, morality, justice and truth but also on decentralisation. Gandhi described his ideal state as per his following words, "If national life becomes as 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 realized in life

GANDHIAN IDEAL SOCIETY OR RAM RAJYA

Ram Raj is an ideal social order based on equality, liberty and non-violence. It is sometimes described as 'Poorna Swarajyam', 'Dharma Rajyam', sometimes 'Swarajyam'. The Ram Raj is amoral Political organisation and it resembles Plato's ideal state and Rousseau's moral public person. Gandhi also wanted to build up the foundation of his Ram Raj on the universal principles including justice. An important aspect of Gandhi's Ram Raj is he has combined politics with ethics and morality. Gandhi clearly disowned the Machiavellian concept of separation of politics from morality and religion. He was firmly convinced that only the amalgamation of politics with religion and morality could provide a perfect social order. Gandhiji's ideal was a stateless democratic society. This society was to be a federation of self-contained and self-regulated village communities. It was to work on the basis of peoples' voluntary and peaceful co-operation. Every village was to be a small republic, having a panchayat with full powers.

Gandhi's ideal State was a non-violent state of enlightened anarchy where social life would remain self-regulated. In that State there is no ruler, no subject, no government or no governed. It is a perfect State consisting of enlightened persons, self-regulated and self-controlled following the principles of non-violence. The ideal State of Gandhi was to be governed, by the principle of manual work. Every individual should take up manual work for rendering his/her service to the State and wellbeing of his fellow individuals inside the State.

This will promote his service in the direction of welfare of the State. The ideal State of Gandhi should consist of villages which are from units. Each village, a component part of the State, should be a village consisting of non-violent Satyagrahis. They would form the life-breath of an ideal State and preserve and protect non-violence and truth in their entirety throughout the State. In an ideal State, authority should be decentralized. Gandhi was against centralization for it leads to absolutism. In decentralizing the authority, Gandhi gave scope to individual liberty. The State should guide the individuals by appealing to their morality. If State resorts to violence, it will damage the enthusiasm, initiative, courage, creativeness and nonviolent mind of individuals and as such, the State cannot prosper.

An individual in Gandhian ideal State should be selfless. He should not accumulate wealth. Accumulation of bread and controlling labour will bring poverty to the State. Thus, in the villages, means of production should be commonly won. This should generate love among the people of the locality binding them in the-common tie of love. Swadeshi should be promoted because that is the characteristic feature of Gandhian ideal State. Gandhi envisaged that the principle of non-violence should be the basis of State. Naturally, a democracy that will emerge out of it, will give vent to the majority of opinion. Here, neither property nor status or position but manual work should be the qualification of village republic. It will be a State devoid of corruption and hypocrisy. In a simple statement, democracy will be spiritualized.

To Gandhiji, State is not an end itself; it is rather a means to the end. It is meant to do greatest good of greatest number of the people. Neither force nor absolute sovereignty is the basis of State. Gandhi's ideal of a welfare State is always ready to promote the condition of its subjects. Gandhiji vehemently opposed the parliamentary democracy of western type. He criticized the universal suffrage system of the election held in western countries. The Parliament is not stable to the change of ministry from time to time. Further, the Prime Minister is always concerned about his own interest and the interest of his party members for retaining his power. So, Gandhi criticized it and as such, western democracy has no place in Gandhi's welfare State. Following the doctrine of Gita, Mahatma Gandhi told that the Varna system should form the basis of the ideal State. As Varna is related to birth, every Varna should render its labour to the betterment of the State. That will result in non-possession and economic equality. This will bring complete social and economic equality. Dharma is a novel aspect of Gandhi's ideal state. It is not a religion of a particular sector creed; rather it is moral and ethical code of conduct which preserves the culture of the nation. Further, it holds together the social order and brings harmony among the people uplifting their potentialities. Gandhiji prescribed for a minimum intervention of police force in the activities of the State. To him, crime is a disease and it must be cured. Accordingly, appeal to the conscience of the criminals will change their mind but not the police atrocity. Out and out, the State should be governed by the principle of Ahimsa where virtually, there is no place > of coherence.

Gandhiji put emphasis on duty rather than rights. If one becomes cautious for his duties, then rights will automatically be taken due care by the State. Rights are nothing but opportunities for self-realisation. It is the link of one's spiritual unity with others by serving them. The role of doctors and machines was to be ignored and traditional method it to be

adopted for curing the diseases. Gandhiji laid emphasis on basic education. By that he wanted to spread vocational education in the nook and corner of the country. Gandhi had realized that this will improve small-scale industry, which in turn, will bring a self-sufficient economy for every country.

Thus, Gandhi's concept of ideal State was based on non-violence and truth. Spiritualized democracy, emphasis on duties, considering State as a means to an end etc. were some of the factors which made Gandhi's ideal State distinct. Every village republic was to have the right to manage all its affairs. It was also to protect itself from foreign aggression through its own means. Such a society was to be highly civilized in which every individual was to be aware of its needs and necessity of working with others on the basis of equal labour. Gandhiji named his ideal society as 'Ram Rajya'. Truth and non-violence were to be the basis of Ram Rajya. In the Ideal society people were to lead a happy and peaceful life on the basis of moral and spiritual values.

GANDHIAN PERCEPTION ON DEMOCRACY

Mahatma Gandhi was an ardent believer in the theory and democracy. His belief was based on his own conception of democracy which was quite different from classical concept of democracy of the west. His innate love of equality, unflinching support of individual freedom, and his consistent plea for bringing about a just order through the brotherhood of man that recognized no barriers of sex, religion, language and culture testify to his faith in democracy of his conception. Gandhi believed that a democracy, which served the welfare of all, would be marked by minimum state intervention in social life. Gandhi was extremely critical of the parliamentary democracy and he called the British Parliament as a 'sterile woman and a prostitute' in his monumental book 'Hind Swaraj'. Although for him good government is no substitute for self-government. A true democracy can be set up only when India will achieve Swaraj. A foreign-ruled state cannot have a democracy. There is a second aspect of Gandhi's view about democracy. It must be associated with truth and non-violence. People can never set up a democratic structure with violent means and untruthful ways. To Gandhi, 'democracy as something that gives the weak the same as the strong'.

In order to be democratic a state must create a congenial atmosphere for the proper development of freedom and rights. He believed that if freedom is lost the entire individuality is also lost. Only Swaraj can ensure true democracy and in such a system there can exist freedom. The most important elements of Gandhi's concept of democracy are: participation of men in the affairs of state, people's right to protest the immoral and anti-people's acts of government, nonviolence, people's right to choose their own ways and prevalence of justice and equality. True democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at the centre. It has to be worked from below by the people of every village. He advocated that in democracy the independence must begin at the bottom. It means that at grass-root level people must be independent in making their policies and implementing them without any rigid and strict control from the above.

Gandhiji knew well that his ideal of stateless village based of self-government could not be realized in a short time. He therefore supported democracy as the best form of government.

However, the central point of his concept of democracy was Village Panchayat system. Panchayats were to play a special role in the Gandhian Society. The members of Panchayats were to be directly elected by the people. The right to vote was to be given only to those persons who were performing one or the other type of physical labour. Panchayats were to have sufficient powers to run the administration of villages. Above village panchayats there were to be district level panchayats whose members were to be elected indirectly by the members of the village panchayats. Each district panchayat was to manage the district administration. Above the district administration there was to be the provincial government whose members were to be elected by the district panchayats. Above the provincial governments, there was to be a central government. The members of the central parliament and the supreme executive were to be elected indirectly by all the provincial assemblies. The functions of the central government were to be kept limited. He stood for the improvement of villages and for success of democracy; democracy should originate from the grass root level. Gandhi wanted India to evolve a "True Democracy" and laid six conditions for its realization in India.

1. Satyagraha expressed through Charkha;
2. Growth of Village Industries;
3. Primary education through Handicrafts;
4. Removal of Untouchability; Communal Harmony; and
5. Non -violent Organization of labour

GANDHI ON DECENTRALIZATION

Decentralization is a concept of power sharing at all levels. It has various forms and dimensions like political, economic and administrative due to the pre-condition of centralized power structure. It is the essential part of the democratic system of government. Gandhi's greatest contribution to the social thought of this century is perhaps his insistence on decentralization of the means of production. According to Gandhi, men should do their actual living and working in communities. They permit genuine self-government and the assumption of personal responsibilities, federated into larger units in such a way that the temptation to abuse great power should not arise. The larger a democracy grows, the lesser becomes the rule of the people and the smaller is the way of individuals and localized groups in dealing with their own destinies. Political decentralization prevents massive concentrations of political power in the hands of too few; rather, to distribute it in the hands of many. Gandhian political order takes the form of a direct, participatory democracy, operating in a tier structure from the base of village-level tier upwards through the district and state levels ultimately to the national and international levels. Decentralization is one of the fundamental basic principles in Gandhian political philosophy.

The concept of decentralization occupies paramount importance in Gandhian scheme of rebuilding India from below upwards. Non-violence was understood to be the basic tenets of Gandhiji's concept of decentralization. Centralization is a system is inconsistent with the non-violent structure of society. Gandhiji's concept of decentralization was not an isolated concept but the outcome of his religio-ethical, socio-political and economic concepts and ideas. Village Swaraj was an essential component of decentralized polity or decentralized governance.

Swaraj is the best form of governance. Every village is a self sufficient republic or panchayat. The government of the village will be the panchayat of five persons annually elected by the adult villagers both male and female. It is considered as the unit of local-self government. It is the original custodian of all authority. The panchayat system as viewed by Gandhiji represents a village community. It is an autonomous Indian political institution as far as the internal village administration is concerned.

Gandhiji had evolved a three-tier system of Panchayat Raj linking up the village Panchayat with the Block and District levels. In Panchayat Raj system envisaged by Gandhiji people's independence begins from the village level. The individual has complete freedom to manage his own affairs. The spirit of non-violence coupled with individual freedom and equality provide the solid foundation for Gandhiji's concept of decentralization in the political sphere. He favoured decentralization in the economic field as well. Gandhiji's non-violent economy model stood for production by the masses rather than mass production. He had dreamt of an ideal economic order based on indigenous culture and civilization and hence became a trenchant critic of western civilization, mechanization and industrialization. Economic decentralization is related to rural economy and cottage industries located in the rural areas. He gave utmost importance to the freedom of the individual. The individual is nucleus around which revolve the other institutions. Through the decentralisation of political power individuals will get full scope to participate in the affairs of state and they can do it absolutely in non-violent way. Again, decentralisation is the best means for the realisation of all democratic rights and freedoms.

'Oceanic circle' describes Gandhi's vision of social organization. Gandhi believed that for a nonviolent society to achieve a lasting peace, it must be organized in a decentralized way. In such an oceanic circle, Gandhiji believed that the individual will rise to the occasion and will be prepared to sacrifice everything for the cause of his village. Under such a decentralized structure governing rural India "the outermost circumference will not wield power to crush the inner circle but give strength to all within and derives its own from the centre.

GANDHIAN TRUSTEESHIP THEORY

Trusteeship was Gandhiji's peculiar contribution to the technique of social change. The concept of Trusteeship flows from the ideals of aparigraha and ahimsa. Gandhi offered Trusteeship as an alternative. He called it "the technique of change of heart." A trustee is one who holds property or wealth in trust for others who are identified as the beneficiaries. Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capitalist order of society into an egalitarian one. It gives no quarter to capitalism, but gives the present owning class a chance of reforming itself. It is based on the faith that human nature is never beyond redemption. It provides a means by which the wealthy people would be the trustees of trusts that looked after the welfare of the people in general. The production should cater to the need of the society. No personal choice of the rich should guide the production pattern. Under trusteeship, any rich man can use his extra wealth for his satisfaction. He also cannot use the wealth for promoting anti-social activities. The State should guide the rich how to utilize the wealth for the benefit of the State. The wealth should not be won by any private fellow. It can only be done by the consent of

the people in the society at large. Trusteeship aimed at reforming the capitalist society. It advocated that rich people should change themselves and should come forward to use their property for the betterment of society.

To Gandhi, the State should come forward to regulate the system. In that case there would be no discrimination. The wealth of the rich will be appropriated by the State and regulated by the order of the State. Thus under state-regulated trusteeship, an individual will not be free to hold or use his wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interests of society. It will be done in the most peaceful way so that violence will not occur. It does not recognize any right of private ownership of property except so far as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare. 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. The difference between such minimum and maximum incomes should be reasonable and equitable and variable from time to time so much so that the tendency would be towards obliteration of the difference. Under the Gandhian economic order the character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed. The theory of trusteeship makes no distinction between private and non-private property.

It tries to reduce the gap between the rich and poor. It tries to reduce exploitation. It gives no quarter to capitalism, but gives the present owning class a chance of reforming itself. It is based on the faith that human nature is never beyond redemption. Gandhi's Concept of Trusteeship does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth. Gandhiji always stood for the change of heart. He was firmly of the opinion that the rich and the powerful should voluntarily surrender their wealth for the welfare of people as a matter of their duty. In the above context, Gandhi's concept of the oceanic circle appears to be of crucial importance today. Gandhi's trusteeship was based on brotherhood of men marked by co-sharing and cooperation. Here production was meant for the consumption of all the members of the society and not only for marketing and profiteering. Gandhi's trusteeship was based on such alternative motivation for human labour. Production being a cooperative venture, every member must contribute his/her might to that end.

GANDHIAN THEORY OF SATYAGRAHA

The concept of satyagraha and its practice in socio-political front constitute the essence of Gandhi's philosophy. Satyagraha is a term comprising two words; *satya* or truth, and *agrah* or insistence. Satyagraha is a relentless search for truth and a determination to teach truth through nonviolent means. It literally means holding on to truth. Gandhiji sometimes also referred to it as 'truth force or soul force'. Satyagraha is unique in its conception as opposed to other resistance movements which strive to prove wrong or to defeat the opponent. With satyagraha, Mahatma Gandhi ushered in a new era of civilian resistance on the political scenario of the world. Gandhi achieved success in the revolutions he led in South Africa by following the path of Satyagraha. Satyagraha is more than a political tool of resistance. It is a holistic approach towards life, based on the ideals of truth and moral courage. 'Satyagraha' was based on the principles of non violence, which was the founding principle of Gandhi's political ideology, that was based on as much as theological tenets of Jainism, Buddhism, Upanishads and the

Bhagwatgita, as on the political theories of Tolstoy, Ruskin and Thureau. On a personal front it involves a life committed to truth, chastity, non-attachment and hard-work. On the political front, satyagraha involves utilisation of non-violent measures to curb the opponent, and ideally to convert him rather than to coerce him into submission.

Features

Essential principle of Satyagraha is not to obliterate or wound the adversary, but to convert or win him by love, compassion, endurance and self-suffering.

- It is based on the metaphysical conviction that the oppressor may have power over the body and material assets of a Satyagrahi, but not greater than his spirit.
- Satyagraha, as a means of social action, is based on a strong moral substance. Self-suffering is its unique temperament which differentiates it from all other forms of violent techniques of action.
- In a comparison a single Satyagrahi's self-sacrifice is thousand times more powerful and reasonable than the million non-Satyagrahi's self-sacrifice in war like killing activities
- Satyagraha abstains from evil activities stimulate and encourage everyone in peace making through love, compassion, benevolence and doing good to others even our opponents.
- Satyagraha considered as the method for reconstructing, remoulding, and reshaping human nature through moralize human activities. It is not possible to compare the Non-violent non-cooperation with inaction or non-action. It is a vigorous denunciation of untruth, without violence, annoyance or hatred.
- The concept of Satyagraha has the wider scope in its application in the social movements where there is no hate or anger and violence.
- The most important characteristics of Satyagraha lies in making awareness and consciousness among the masses, educating about the socio-economic and political condition of the time, preserving the unity apart from diversities among the masses, converting them as the fearless soldiers, establish the common platform and strong organization and then give direction to them to non-violent struggle against the evils.
- The multi-class or non-class character of Satyagraha movement is distinct from other methods which mainly consist of the same class.

Techniques of Satyagraha

a. Non-cooperation

Non-cooperation mainly means the withdrawal of cooperation from the party. The purpose behind non-cooperation is not to extend any cooperation to an unjust authority. All social relations rest on the cooperation of the parties involved. If the party which is exploited or suppressed withdraws its support the relationship between the two will collapse. Gandhi's non-cooperation movement against the British government considered many practical measures like surrender of titles, refusal to attend government sponsored functions, withdrawal of students from government run educational institutions, boycott of government courts etc. It also includes refusal to join any government service, not to participate in elections, boycott of foreign goods, non-payment of taxes etc. Through the non-cooperation movement Gandhi tried

to create courage and fearlessness among the people. It may appear that the non-cooperation movement is to challenge the legal system of administration. But Gandhi's purpose was to make people conscious of their moral responsibility to fight against injustice. At the Calcutta session of the Congress in September 1920, Gandhi convinced other leaders of the need to start a non-cooperation movement in support of Khilafat as well as for swaraj (self rule).

b. Civil Disobedience:

Civil disobedience is another practical method of satyagraha. It means the breach of the unjust law or the statutory enactment of the government. Gandhi took this idea of civil disobedience from David Thoreau, the American naturalist. Gandhi made extensive application of civil disobedience in course of India's freedom struggle. When there is a conflict between the legal duty and moral responsibility Gandhi prefers the primacy of the moral. In case of a revolution or rebellion there may be disobedience of the law, but that is not civil disobedience. The basic motive behind civil disobedience is a well-defined moral principle and its method is non-violent. It can be practiced with great caution to avoid any outbreak of violence or lawlessness. Further civil disobedience may be offensive or defensive. Offensive disobedience includes disregard for the statutory enactment of the state and so to say a non-violent revolt against the administration. But defensive civil resistance or disobedience includes peaceful demonstrations, public meetings, rallies, publishing views, ventilating the unjust policies of the government, mobilizing public opinion etc.

c. Hijrat

Hijrat is an urdu word which literary means to migrate. According to Gandhi, hijrat is a protest against the dictator in order to expel him out of the nation. One of the main reasons for the people to resort to Hijrat is when they feel oppressed either due to loss of self-respect or honourable living; they attempt to migrate permanently to other places. In simple terms, it is a protest against the oppressor. Gandhi suggested this measure to the Harijans mainly due to their oppression, especially by the dominant classes in some places.

d. Fasting:

This was another strong weapon suggested by Gandhi in his non-violent struggle for freedom. Fasting is considered as the most effective weapon of Satyagraha to bring a change in the opponent. In the Gandhian scheme of things it is the purest form of self-inflicted suffering. But great caution is to be maintained in resorting to it. Only on rare occasion one can resort to it. Without purity of mind, discipline and humility one should not undertake a fast. It is the last resort of the Satyagrahi. A person who has transcended anger, selfishness and impatience can go for it only under special circumstance. Fasting unto death is the self-imposed suffering to bring a moral change in the mindset of the wrong-doers. The Satyagrahi should never take a fast as coercion on the opponent. Satyagrahi must be a man of moral strength and the cause for which he is fighting must be a serious problem.

e. Boycott

Gandhi's yet another tactic came in the form of boycotting goods. This method was very useful in pressurising the authority. Boycotting involves persons, goods, clothes, titles, persons.

In the non-cooperation and the civil disobedience both the movements the nation was called to boycott British goods and many of the institutions that were British were boycotted. It caused a breakdown in the law system and administration of the British and to make everyone aware that the satyagrahis were not partners in the wrong doings. Gandhi used this technique in various circumstances almost all of his movements had a faction of boycotting. Peaceful boycott put pressure and created consciousness among the masses. This method was experimented with in South Africa before it found roots in India.

f. Strike

It is mainly an instrument that a worker uses against employer. The colonial rule saw wide subjugation. Gandhi used this first during the 1918 mill workers strike in Ahmedabad and asked workers to not work until problem was solved. It was a means to solve political and economic problems but to be a success the strike must be non-violent and conviction should be nothing less than what is needed. Gandhi was not in favor of Marxist principle of class war and forceful takeover of the means of production from the bourgeoisie. He was of the opinion that a firm or an industry is like a trust either under the capitalists and the labour. A strike is meant to end injustice, inefficiency, corruption and short-sightedness of the capitalists.

Principles or Ideals of Satyagraha

- Nonviolence (ahimsa)
- Truth includes honesty, but goes beyond it to mean living fully in accord with and in devotion to that which is true
- Non-stealing
- Chastity (brahmacharya) includes sexual chastity, but also the subordination of other sensual desires to the primary devotion to truth
- Non-possession (not the same as poverty)
- Body-labor or bread-labor
- Control of the palate
- Fearlessness
- Equal respect for all religions
- Economic strategy such as boycotts (swadeshi)
- Swadharma

Qualifications of a Satyagrahi

1. Satyagrahi must have a living faith in God, for He is his only Rock.
2. Satyagrahi must believe in truth and non-violence as his creed and therefore have a faith in the inherent goodness of human nature which he expects to evoke by his truth and love expressed though his suffering.
3. Satyagrahi must be leading a chaste life and be ready and willing for the sake of his cause to give up his life and his possessions.
4. Satyagrahi must be a habitual *Khadi*-wearer and spinner. This is essential for India.
5. Satyagrahi must be a teetotaler and be free from the use of other intoxicants in order that his reason may be always unclouded and his mind constant.

6. Satyagrahi must carry out with a willing heart all the rules of discipline as may be laid down from time to time.
7. Satyagrahi should carry out the jail rules unless they are specially devised to hurt his self-respect.

GANDHI ON WESTERN CIVILIZATION/ HIND SWARAJ

Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj* is primarily known for its trenchant critique of modern civilization. In *Hind Swaraj* he also dwells on the condition of India as it has developed under the British rule and tutelage. He makes a basic formulation that under the impact of the British rule India is turning into an 'irreligious' country. He hastens to add that he is not thinking of any particular religion, but rather of that Religion which underlies all religions. We are turning away from God, he adds. He likens modern civilization to a 'mouse' 'gnawing' our people while apparently soothing them. In chapter XI of *Hind Swaraj* he argues that lawyers have contributed more to the degradation of India. Besides, they have accentuated the Hindu-Muslim dissensions, helped the British to consolidate their position and have sucked the blood of the poor of India. In the next chapter he describes how doctors have failed the Indian society. In his opinion, doctors have been primarily responsible for making the people 'self-indulgent' and taking less care of their bodies. He concludes his critique of modern civilization by comparing it to an *Upas* tree, a poisonous plant which destroys all life around it. In another chapter of the *Hind Swaraj* he examines the English educational system introduced in India and describes it as 'false education'. For him the basic aim of education should be to bring our senses under our control and to help imbibe ethical behaviour in our life. He attacks the newly emerged elite, a by-product of the Macaulay system of education, as they have enslaved India.

Gandhi opposed the Western Civilization because, it had been hedonistic nature in practice, in the sense of self-centred pleasure, pragmatic in the sense of immediate material benefit and individualistic in the sense of egocentric in the respect of sovereign individual oriented. Gandhi's views on the nature of western civilization are expressed in a little booklet he wrote in 1909, called *Hind Swaraj*. He was influenced by Edward Carpenter's *Civilization: Its Cause and Cure*. Gandhi found no morality or religion in western civilization and both these were essential elements in the structure of any society Gandhi supported or promoted. Gandhi criticized the Western civilization as a purely materialistic civilization that measures its progress in terms of money. Gandhi believed that despite their material comforts and everyday invention of new machinery they are not civilized like the Indians and that economic progress is no guarantee to moral progress. To him, the champions of western civilization behaved in actual practice and how wide the gap between what they practiced and preached. European civilization is no doubt suited for the Europeans, but it will mean ruin for India, if we endeavour to copy it.

Gandhi even criticized the Parliamentary form of governance that has its origin in the Western civilization. Gandhi never aspired for a Parliamentary democracy but Swaraj, wherein there is a scope for self-regulation and the state, though not withers away, it would govern the least. For Gandhi, fundamentals must not change. Gandhi is also in favour of technology although he is generally known as a vehement critic of modern technology. An individual's primary place in society can never be replaced by any other component of any type of system

and order. *Hind Swaraj* presents the broad contours of an alternative society - a new civilizational framework in a rudimentary form. In the chapter dealing with 'true civilization' he defines it as that 'mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty'. He further adds that moral behaviour is nothing but to attain 'mastery over one's mind'.

GANDHIAN SWARAJ

The term 'Swaraj' initially was used by Dadabhai Naoroji and Balgangadhar Tilak in political scenario for attaining the national Independence. The idea of 'Swaraj' or self-rule is one of the philosophical principles of Gandhian teachings, which stimulate man in conquering complete individuality and also reorganization of the society. Gandhi holds that self-rule or 'Swaraj' was nothing but self-determination of the individual while taking decisions without depending upon others. Gandhi used this term Swaraj with a definite meaning and significance. By Real Swaraj Gandhi meant the 'welfare and happiness of the masses'. He wrote Swaraj as "a scared word, a Vedic word, meaning self-rule and self-restraint, and not freedom from all restraint which independence often means. It is a fact that his Swaraj is meant for self-government. This idea is based on the spiritual thinking that anything authentic and real can come only from within. Gandhi used the term swaraj both at the individual and national levels. The individual swaraj means rule over one's self. Control over one's lust is the main condition for individual swaraj. In national level Gandhi meant that national self-rule in the fields of social, political, economic and moral. Gandhi thought that by educating the masses it will be possible to accomplish self-rule, he says, "swaraj is to be attained by educating the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority." According to Gandhi economic swaraj means self-sufficient individual, village and national economic freedom and also that means decentralized economic power to all. By his teachings of swaraj he wanted to eradicate the sect of haves and have nots and try to establish economy based on self-reliance. That's why Gandhi preached khadi, spinning wheel and trusteeship for self-depended economic power. Gram Swaraj or village self-rule is an essential thought in Gandhi's thinking.

SARVODAYA

The two terms in Sarvodaya are **Sarva** (all) and **Uday**, (rising). The literal translation of Sarvodaya would then be the 'rising of all'. The term was first coined by Mohandas Gandhi as the title of his 1908 translation of John Ruskin's tract on political economy, "*Unto This Last*", and Gandhi came to use the term for the ideal of his own political philosophy. Mahatma Gandhi was a humanist and radical revivalist who fought not only against the colonialism and imperialism, but also against the superstitious practices, religious hatred and casteism in India.

Principles of the Sarvodaya

- There is no centralized authority, and there is political and economic atmosphere in the villages.
- Politics will not be the instrument of power but an agency of service and *Rajnity* will yield place to *Loknity*.
- All people will be imbued with the spirit of love, fraternity, truth, non-violence and self-sacrifices. Society will function on the basis on the non-violence.

- There will be no party system and majority rule and society will be free from the evil of the tyranny of the majority.
- The sarvodaya society is socialist in the true sense of the term. All calling will be the same moral, social and economical values. The individual personality has the fullest scope for development.
- The sarvodaya society is based on equality and liberty. There is no room in it for unwholesome some competition, exploitation and class-hatred.
- Sarvodaya stands for the progress of the all. All individual should do individual labour and follow the ideal of non possession. Then it will be possible to realize the goal of: from each according to his work and to each according to his needs.
- There will be no private property, the instrument of exploitation and the source of social distinctions and hatred. Similarly, the profit motive will disappear, rent and interest to will go.
- The Sarvodaya Movement is based on Truth, Non-violence and Self-denial.
- The Sarvodaya Movement makes a sincere and bold attempt to create the necessary atmosphere to bring together such individuals with an unwavering faith in the Welfare of All
- The gain to the individual would be small. The development of each quality depends upon every other. If all the qualities are improved a little, then the individual would gain more.

RELEVANCE OF GANDHI

Gandhiji not only gave India its freedom but also gave the world and us a new thought on nonviolence and sustainable living. His teachings and experiments are more valid today than ever before Barack Obama, the present US President, sees Mahatma Gandhi as an inspiration and has a portrait of the apostle of peace in his office. He commented, *“In my life, I have always looked to Mahatma Gandhi as an inspiration, because he embodies the kind of transformational change that can be made when ordinary people come together to do extraordinary things.”* he fundamental precepts of *Gandhism* are more *relevant* today when caste, class and religious differences are so pronounced. Gandhism can never be outdated no matter what people may say and believe. In this world torn by violence and corruption, Gandhi's philosophy is the only hope that keeps the human race going. He is best known as the matchless political leader who evolved the new technique of "satyagraha". His fight against untouchability and the notions of superiority and inferiority by birth are also fairly well known. For India, his greatest service was, perhaps, the emancipation of Indian women.

Philosophy of non violence has great relevancy it contemporary 21st century. In India most of the conflict and extremist revolutions already selected & some are going to settle by non violence and peaceful means. Peace process in extremist movement, settlement of interstate conflict, Water dispute. The central concepts of Gandhi's philosophy is 'Satyagraha'. It is itself a whole philosophy of non violence. A Satyagraha campaign is undertaken only after all other peaceful means have proven ineffective. For extent of some period it was known as Gandhi's method of Satyagraha have no any relevancy but with the passing of time he proved

how it was important of protection of life, Liberty and property . Even know also all those strategies are highly relevant in India. Still people of India frequently following those methods for the fulfilment of demands. His political ideal based on ethical and spiritual grounds rising democratic values. At present, we see that politics is roused deceit and dishonesty and is bound to create greater deceit and greater dishonesty. Gandhian economy still relevant to our time. He was not against machinery as such. He was afraid that use of machinery on large scale would result in technological unemployment. He extend Ruskin's concepts of the equality of wages to all kinds of labour and equal distribution. The mad race in industrialization and urbanization has resulted in pollution of environment and Gandhi abundant of luxurious life. The concept of Decentralization occupies paramount importance in Gandhian Philosophy. Gandhi wanted political power to be distributed among the villages in India. He preferred the term 'swaraj' to describe what he called true democracy. Gandhian Democracy is still relevant in India. It is clear from the 73rd and 74th constitutional amendments of Indian constitution that is related only with rural administration of India. One significant provision of this amendments is decentralization of power upto the rural level. It has already been implemented in India in 1992. Gandhi promoted an educational curriculum called 'Basic Education'. He much emphasis on mother tongue should be the medium of education, women education.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, Gandhian philosophy is not only simultaneously political, moral and religious, it is also traditional and modern simple and complex. Gandhi is universally known as the most renowned theorist, philosopher and also the practitioner of truth, love, non-violence, tolerance freedom and peace. He was a leader of his people, unsupported by any authority. He was very much concerned with the nature, poor deprived and the downtrodden and he has intender to alter the evil, political, social, and economic system of the people. His mission was to reconstruct India from below upwards a decentralized socio-political and economic order with India's myriad villages as its base.

Review Questions

1. Illustrate the contribution and role of Gandhi in India's freedom struggle
2. Examine the value of non-violence (ahimsa) and satyagraha as the key features of the Gandhian thought and action.
3. How did Gandhi conceptualise swaraj? Explain in detail.
4. Write a critical essay on the basic precepts of the Gandhian political thought.
5. Examine the relevance of Gandhian thought in contemporary times.

MODULE IV

SOCIALIST THINKERS

Socialism is a political and economic theory of social organization which advocates that the means of production, distribution, and exchange should be owned or regulated by the community as a whole. It emerged as a response to the tremendous exploitation of the working class by the capitalist class which in turn was assisted by the industrial revolution and the rise of liberalism. The idea was differently interpreted, depending upon the conditions and social and political thought which is unique to that country. Communism and socialism are economic and political structures that promote equality and seek to eliminate social classes. Communist thought in India has its origins in the writings of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and their followers. Communist thought in India is an interesting account of the development of the Marxian thought and philosophy as it grew in the Indian conditions. The socialist thought in India was deeply influenced by the activities of anti-colonial struggle, British liberalism and Gandhian thought. So we find different ideas about socialism-which are unique to Indian context and drastically differ from European socialism - being emerging in India. Starting from Jayaprakash Narayan, was further developed by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. Communist thought in India was guided inspired by M.N. Roy and EMS.

MANVENDRA NATH ROY (1893-1954)

INTRODUCTION

M. N. Roy was a renowned international thinker and activist. He began his career as a nationalist revolutionary, later he was attracted towards Socialism and Marxism. He joined the Communist party of India. The original undivided Communist party of India He became an international figure in the Marxist world and finally developed his own philosophy of New Humanism or Radical Humanism, criticising the Marxian ideology. Unlike some other Indian thinkers of twentieth century, Roy has made a clear distinction between philosophy and religion in his thought. The radical or new humanism of M. N. Roy is the reflection of Marxist revolution against capitalism.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Manvendranath Roy was born in 1887 in Arbalia village of 24 Parganas district (near Kolkata) of West Bengal. His original name was Narendranath Bhattacharya. During his College days he started actively participating in the secret revolutionary activities. During his life time he changed his name several times to avoid prosecution. He was closely related to revolutionaries in Bengal like Prakashchandra Dey, Jatin Mukharjee. He visited Germany, Japan, China, USA, Mexico and USSR. In 1915 he was sent by Indian revolutionaries to Germany as their representative. Roy was a founder of the Communist Parties in both Mexico and India and was a delegate to congresses of the Communist International. He was expected to talk to the German officials and seek help for the Indian freedom movement. Dhangopal Mukherjee, gave him the new name – “Manvendranath Roy.” While in USA he came under the influence of Lala Lajpat

Rai. He was attracted towards the socialist ideology. He studied the socialist ideas and was attracted towards Marxism. Later he went to Mexico, participated in the Communist movement in that country, exchanged his ideas with other Marxist thinkers in Mexico and became a thorough Marxist. From 1936 to 1954 he gradually distanced himself from Communism and developed his own ideology. He was a member of the Congress party till 1940. In 1940 after his defeat in the election for the Congress President he left the Congress party. He established the Radical Democratic Party. Roy actively participated in international politics. He wrote elaborately on national and international problems.

POLITICAL IDEAS

He passed through three phases of development of his ideas – Nationalism (up to 1915), Marxism (1915-1946), and Radical Humanism (1946 -1954).

M.N. ROY'S CONCEPT OF MARXISM

Roy's baptism as Marxist began in Mexico in 1917 where, along with Bosodin, he accepted Marxism as a philosophy for excellence. He accepted all the major tenets of Marxism and, sought to interpret the Indian situation along Marxist lines. M.N. Roy held that revolution is concerned with the ultimate things, and that the first necessity of revolutionary is a philosophy and his first choice of philosophy was Marxism up to the early 1940s. He reformulated the Marxian philosophy in such a way that it appears as a philosophy of freedom. Roy was inspired by Marx's original humanism and by his social goal. He considered Marx as essentially a humanist and lover of human freedom. Like Marx, Roy regarded the physical being of man in constant relationship with nature, wherein man plays an active role. He was also inspired by Marx's basic doctrine "existence determines consciousness". He agreed with Marx that biological urge for self-preservation was the moving force. Again, Marx's socialism "as the kingdom of freedom" where human reason will overcome the irrational forces, which now tyrannies the life of man and as a rational being man will control his destiny was also his ideal. Roy does not identify Marxism with communism. Marxism is a philosophy while communism is a political practice. Roy believed in socialisation of the process of production. When labour is performed collectively, its product must be collectively owned. Private property must cease to be an economic necessity before it can be abolished. Roy rejects the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary to achieve communism.

M.N. Roy's Criticism on Marxism

To Roy, "I have never been an orthodox Marxist. My attitude to Marxism was critical from the very beginning". Roy differed from Marxism in several points. Though Roy criticized Marxist philosophy and sociology of historical materialism, he never commented on the technicalities of Marxian economics. He did not comment on issues such as Marxian theories of accumulation of capital, capitalist reproduction and the possible contradiction in the labor theory of value, the price production theory and the like. Roy was all praise for Marx as a person, the former through his philosophical and sociological writings indicated a clear breakaway from Marxist antecedents and affiliations. In essence, Roy considers Marx as a humanist and a lover

of freedom. As far as the teachings of Marx are concerned, Roy either rejected them or made significant modifications.

Roy pointed out that the very principle of Marx's dialectical materialism was absurd. To Roy, the methodology of dialectics could be applicable to the realm of ideology, not materialism. Therefore, the dialectical materialism of Marx was only in name, it was essentially an idealistic system. Thus, Roy is critical of Marx's rejection of autonomy to the human being. Marx though glorified class struggle, did not lay emphasis on the empirical individual. Though the movement through thesis and anti-thesis appears to be a logical argumentation, according to Roy, it is ridiculous to state that matter and forces of production move dialectically. He strongly believed that the dialectic materialism is materialistic only in name and dialectics being the cornerstone; it is essentially idealistic in nature. It is for this reason Roy believed that Marx rejected the scientific naturalism and also humanist materialism of Feuerbach and his followers.

Roy strongly believed that the Marxian interpretation of history is defective because it allowed no role to mental activity in the social process. History can never be interpreted solely with reference to materialistic objectivism. The intelligence of human beings and their cumulative actions are very powerful social forces. Further, consciousness is regarded as being posterior to reality. Roy criticized the economic interpretation of history as envisaged by Marx. To Roy, Marx made a false distinction between primitive man's intelligent effort to earn a livelihood and biological struggle for existence. Marx had wrongly held that the origin of society and subsequent human development were economically motivated. Physical urge and economic motive both were different to Roy. Roy criticized that Marx entirely ignored the entire process of becoming the man, before he entered into social relations. Thus, economic determinism does not necessarily follow as a logical corollary from the philosophy of materialism. Thus, it becomes clear that there is no necessary and inevitable connection between philosophical materialism and the economic interpretation of history. The ethical foundations of Marxism are relativistic and dogmatic owing to an untenable psychological basis. Marx believed that in the struggle with nature, man changes his own nature. In other words, Marx contends that human nature is not stable. It is this belief of Marx that made Roy opine that the psychological foundations of Marxism are weak. In opposition to Marxism, Roy states that human nature is stable and permanent and the basis for this proposition is the rights and duties. The subordination of humans to the factors of production is a neutralization of his autonomy and creativity. Moral consciousness is not a product of economic forces. Roy further stated that it is humanist ethics that exalts the sovereignty of man and believes in axiological hierarchy of freedom and justice. Marx rejected the liberal concept of individualism owing to the influence of Hegelian thesis of moral positivism over him. Marx neglected the value of individual autonomy and proved himself to be disloyal to his humanist Feuerbachian antecedents. Roy opined that this rejection of liberal and utilitarian concept of individual by Marx betrayed his earlier humanism.

Roy criticized the concept of sociology of class struggle. Though there are a number of social classes and despite the presence of tension among these classes, they are all operating in a

cohesive manner. Marx proved to be a complete failure with his prediction that the middle class would disappear. In fact, the expansion of economic process also leads to the increase in the number of the middle class. Roy believed in the concept of voluntaristic romanticism in revolutions. Revolutions are collective representations of emotions heightened to a pitch. In fact, a revolution denotes an effort by humans to make a better world. So, revolutionary romanticism is against the concept of dialectic determinism.

ROY ON RADICAL HUMANISM/NEW HUMANISM

Humanism is derived from the Latin word *Humanus*, meaning a system of thought concerned with human affairs in general. Humanism is an attitude which attaches primary importance to Man and his faculties, affairs and aspirations. The essence of Humanism is the importance placed on human being, the individual as the centre of all aspirations of human activities. Radical humanism is the major contribution of M. N. Roy towards political thought. Roy's ideas about Radical or New Humanism were inspired by the writing of Friedrich Engles, a German industrialist who co-authored the Communist Manifesto along with Karl Marx. In the later years of his life, Roy became an exponent of "New Humanism". Roy called this "new philosophy of revolution", which he developed in the later part of his life, "new humanism" or "radicalism". The essence of the philosophy of new humanism is contained in Roy's "Theses on the principles of Radical Democracy" or the "Twenty-two Theses of Radical Humanism". Roy further elaborated this philosophy in his *New Humanism - A Manifesto*, first published in 1947. He distinguished this from other humanist philosophy and termed it radical. Though Roy is influenced in his approach by the scientific materialism of Hobbes, Ethics of Spinoza and Secular politics as propounded by Locke, he reconciled all these to propound a rational idea of freedom with the concept of necessity. The central purpose of Roy's Radical Humanism is to coordinate the philosophy of nature with social philosophy and ethics in a monistic system. "It is for this reason that Roy claims it as humanist as well as materialist, naturalist as well as nationalist, creativist as well as determinist".

New Humanism, as presented in the Twenty- Two Theses, has both a critical and a constructive aspect. The critical aspect consists of describing the inadequacies of communism (including the economic interpretation of history), and of formal parliamentary democracy. The constructive aspect, on the other hand, consists of giving highest value to the freedom of individuals, presenting a humanist interpretation of history, and outlining a picture of radical or organized democracy along with the way for achieving the ideal of radical democracy. According to Roy, the central idea of the Twenty-Two Theses is that "political philosophy must start from the basic idea that the individual is prior to society, and freedom can be enjoyed only by individuals". Quest for freedom and search for truth, according to Roy, constitute the basic urge of human progress. The purpose of all-rational human endeavor, individual as well as collective, is attainment of freedom in ever increasing measure. The amount of freedom available to the individuals is the measure of social progress.

Radicalism consists of all positive elements of Marxism freed from its fallacies and clarified in the light of greater scientific knowledge. Roy's humanist intellectual work is greatly

influenced by philosophical radicals like Hutcheson, Shaftesbury and Bentham, who had a critical approach to the contemporary political, social and economic situations. These philosophical radicals advocated an individualistic approach towards moral problems. It was the reaction against the contemporary socio-cultural crisis. The manifesto of Radical Humanism laid down that, "the ideal of Radical Democracy will be attained through the collective efforts of spiritually free men and women united in a political party with the determination of creating a new order of freedom. The members of the party will be guides, friends and philosophers of the people rather than as there would be rulers consistent with the goal of freedom; Political practice of the party will be rational and ethical.

Features of Radical/New Humanism

Roy's idea revolves around Man. "It is the man who creates society, state and other institutions and values for his own welfare. Man has the power to change them for its greater welfare and convenience. His belief lies in "Man as the measure of everything". As a radical humanist, his philosophical approach is individualistic. The individual could not be subordinated either to a nation or to a class. The individual should not lose his identity in the collective ego of such notions. Man's being and becoming, his emotions, will and ideas determine his life style. He has two basic traits, one, reason and the other, the urge for freedom. The reason in man echoes the harmony of the universe. This urge for freedom leads him to a search for knowledge. He considers freedom to be of supreme value. While rationality provides dynamism to a man, the urge for freedom gives him direction. Roy's conception of human nature becomes the basis of society and state. He attributes their origin to the act of man for promoting his freedom and material satisfaction.

Roy presents a communal pattern of social growth. Groups of human beings settled down in particular localities for the cultivation and the organisation of society, Each group marks out an area as its collective domain. The ownership is common because land is cultivated by the labour of the entire community. The fruits of collective labour belong to all collectively. This does not last long. With the origin of private property, there arises the necessity of some authority to govern the new relations; this gives birth to the state. Roy defined state as "The political organisation of society. The evolution of the state is not only historical, but also natural. For him, the state must exist and discharge its limited functions. The basic feature of the radical democracy is that the people must have the ways and means to exercise sovereign power effectively. Power would be so distributed that maximum power would be vested in local democracy and minimum at the apex along with other equally important and autonomous social institutions reduces the functions of the state to the minimum.

He laid more emphasis to Education in Radical democracy. As a radical humanist, Roy came to believe that a revolution should be brought about not through class struggle or armed violence, but through education. Roy emphasised the concept of moral man. To him, politics cannot be separated from ethics. Roy traces morality to rationality in man. Reason is the only sanction for morality, without moral men, there can be no moral society. Roy advocates humanist politics. This will lead to purification and rationalisation of politics. To him, politics

can be practiced without power. "Party politics has given rise to power politics". To him any party government, at best, is for the people, but it is never of the people and by the people. In a country like India, he laments about the evils of party politics that exist, where ignorant conservative people are exploited in the elections. Thus, he preferred the abolition of the party system which will enable politics to operate without an incentive of power. In the absence of that corrupting agency, morality in political practice would be possible.

Roy advocated for 'Revolution by Consent of the people' to resist tyranny and oppression in a non violent means. Roy further has conceived humanism as cosmopolitan humanism because it denies the existence of autonomous National States. Roy does not agree with the pattern of Western Democracy. He feels that the Western Democracy is equally disappointing. According to Roy, the character of the party should be judged on the basis of the records of the government.

ROY'S PERCEPTION ON RADICAL DEMOCRACY

Roy suggests a radical democracy instead of political liberal democracy. Radical democracy is a kind of democracy that has been set on the basis of philosophical orientation. According to Roy, such an organisation of society can unfolds ample opportunity for man, it will replace the executive power of the state under the control of free individuals. Radical democracy should not be survived on the basis of the will of periodical elections. He further contends that government for the people can never be fully a government of the people and by the people. Democracy will be placed above parties. A radical democracy will be a kind of democracy which objective is to stimulate conscious and integrated effort amongst the people, which ensures freedom of the individuals, the spirit of free thinking, and the will of the individuals. Side by side it will resist external forces which would be detrimental to the progress of the state. Thus, a new Renaissance, based on rationalism, individualism and cosmopolitan Humanism is essential for democracy to be realised and capable of defending itself. Radical democracy can be attained through collective efforts of spiritually free men and women. As it has been accomplished by creating a new order of freedom of spiritually free men and women, it will function as the guides, friends and philosophers of the people rather than as dictator rulers. Their political practice will be rational with a coherent amalgamation of both reason and morality. To Roy, "Spiritually free individuals at the helm of affairs will smash all chains of slavery and usher of freedom of all".

Principles of Radical democracy

- Man is the archetype of society; co-operative social relationships contribute to develop individual potentialities.
- Quest for freedom and search for truth constitute the basic urge of human progress.
- The purpose of all rational human endeavour, individual as well as collective, is attainment of freedom in ever increasing measure.
- Rising out of the background of the law-governed physical nature, the human being is essentially rational.

- The economic interpretation of history is reduced from a wrong interpretation of materialism.
- Ideation is a philosophical process resulting from the awareness of environments
- For creating a new world of freedom, revolution must go beyond an economic reorganisation of society
- Communism or socialism may be the conceivable means for the attainment of the goal of freedom.
- The state being the political organisation of society, its withering away under Communism is a utopia which has been exploded by experience.
- State ownership and planned economy do not by themselves end exploitation of labour; nor do they necessarily lead to an equal distribution of wealth.
- The defects of formal parliamentary democracy have also been exposed in experience.
- The ideal of radical democracy will be attained through the collective efforts of spiritually free men united in the determination of creating a world of freedom.

CONCLUSION

M.N. Roy quite often regarded as one of the founders of communist 'movement in India, was one of those early Marxists who attempted a radical understanding of the issue of social transformation of Indian civilization as separate from the framework of nationalism. M'N' Roy had been considered as one of the most learned of Modern Indian writer on politics and philosophy. He was a nationalist, Marxist and above all a humanistic philosopher. His philosophy of Radical humanism is considered as the most important contribution, which could provide for a strong basis to Indian democracy. The core of the Radical Humanism of Roy lies in laying greatest emphasis on the personality of the individual as a human being. As a believer of freethinking irrespective of himself, his Radical Humanism is the outcome of his critical attitude towards Marxism. New Humanism is pledged to the ideal of a common- wealth and fraternity of free man. He pleads for a spiritual community or a cosmopolitan humanism.

RAM MANOHAR LOHIA (1910 – 1967)

INTRODUCTION

Ram Manohar Lohia occupied a unique place in the evolution of the socialist thought in India. He was the first socialist thinker in India who refused to accept the Russian or western model of Socialism for India. His dynamic and uninhibited approach to various problems distinguished him from other political leaders. Lohia showed great originality in his enunciation of socialism. Lohia rejected both capitalism and communism as unsuitable to the socio-economic climate of Indian and other South -Asian countries. He wanted to free the individual from ignorance, backwardness and all kinds of superstitions and prejudices. Lohia championed "the principle of equal irrelevance of capitalism and communism in respect of the creation of a

new human civilization." This 'new civilization' is called by Lohia 'socialism.' He was a champion of freedom and equality.

EARLY LIFE AND INFLUENCES

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was born in 1910 at Akbarpur in U.P. His family was deeply involved in freedom struggle. His father Hiralal was not only a nationalist but also a social reformer. Because of his family background Lohia became a great nationalist but also a social reformer. He was greatly influenced by leaders like Tilak, Gandhi, and Subhas Bose. Lohia wanted to make a synthesis between Marxism and Gandhian ideas. As a student of philosophy, he developed rationality and was able to critically analyze the issues pertaining to society. For his higher studies he went to Berlin. This was a new turn in his life. His return from Germany to India coincided with the Indian National Congress launching a fierce struggle against Britishers. Lohia also joined the Congress Party. Around 1934, Lohia who had firm ideas about socialism joined the Congress Socialist Party, which was working within the ambit of the parent party. He was one of the founders of the Congress Socialist Party and the editor of its chief organ 'Congress Socialist'.

LOHIA ON SOCIALISM AND NEW SOCIALISM

Lohia was a socialist who firmly believed that socialism, if it were to lead the people to progress and prosperity must be based on the Indian conditions. He envisioned socialism as a 'new civilisation.' Lohia wanted to give firm foundation to the theory of socialism by chalking out a programme of action for the realization of the final goal. His socialistic ideology developed in the Company of Acharya Narendra Dev, Achyut Patwardhan, Jai Prakash Narayan, Ashok Mehta and others. He did pioneering work in the advancement of new policy having link with the socio-economic development of the people of our sub-continent. Lohia emphasized the philosophy of his socialism in two 'big' words i.e. 'equality and prosperity'. Lohia felt that the interests of communism and conservatism are against socialism.

Lohia's ideas and perceptions on socialism was highly pragmatic. So, it had a distinction from the dogmatic and doctrinaire socialism expounded by the European socialists. Lohia was of the opinion that European socialism lacked a world outlook. Lohia pleaded that Gandhism alone could provide the proper base for socialism in India. Lohia cited his original thesis of Socialism, while presiding over the Panchamarhi Conference of Socialists in May 1952. The basic postulates of the new socialist theory were stated thus:

1. Both Capitalism and Communism are based upon centralized power which is incapable of bringing about a radical transformation in society.
2. Both capitalism and communism believe in the same method of production. The only difference between them is that in capitalism some individuals or groups make profit and in communism even though there is no individual profit system, a centralized power, class or party, monopolises the benefits. Society does not in reality enjoy economic, political and individual freedom.
3. If we look at communist countries and the so-called free democratic states and analyse the actual conditions of the people, there it is quite clear that both are incapable of ushering in

social transformation, people's freedom and people's culture. Therefore, both have to be eschewed.

4. Socialism does not believe in restricted capitalism or mixed economy. It does not believe that this would ever pave the way for socialism.
5. The political and economic objectives of socialism are to establish a free and decentralized society by eliminating capitalism and centralized political and economic influence from society.

Lohia socialism stands for socialization of the means of production. To Lohia, socialism stands for equality and prosperity. Lohia further tells in his Wheel of History that human history is characterized by a tussle between crystallized castes and loosely cohesive classes. The orthodox and organized socialism was, therefore, "a dead doctrine and dying organization", for Lohia. Lohia had made a plea for 'New Socialism'. He contributed in recommending a twin-approach to the creation of new society - economic development coupled with a systematic effort to change those social institutions, which are antithetical to modernity. Lohia outlined a six-point plan for this New Socialism.

1. Maximum attainable equality, towards which nationalization of economy may be one necessary step;
2. A decent standard of living throughout the world, and not increasing standard of living within national frontiers;
3. A world parliament and government "elected on some kind of adult franchise with beginning, towards a world government and world army;
4. Collective and individual practice of civil disobedience so that the unarmed and helpless little man may acquire the habit to resist tyranny and exploitation civilly;
5. Four-pillar state
6. Evolution of a technology, which would be consistent with these aims and processes

'SAPTA KRANTI' OR SEVEN REVOLUTIONS IN LOHIA'S SOCIALISM

Equality was central point of the Lohia's concept of socialism. In his own words, "Socialism is a doctrine of equality. Unless, we are careful it may deteriorate into a doctrine of inequality. Lohia's concept of equality was unique. According to him equality did not mean identity of treatment or identity of reward. He maintained that if there was no equality among the individuals and also among the nations, justice, human dignity, morality, brotherhood, freedom and universal welfare could not flourish in society. Lohia recommended 'seven-fold', revolution to fight against inequality and injustice.

1. Revolting for equality between man and woman

According to Lohia, of all injustices plaguing the earth, those arising out of the inequality between man and women was perhaps the bedrock. Inequality between man and woman had so become part of human habit and nature that it seeped into everything else. Woman's participation in collective life was exceedingly limited. He wants his woman to be bright, intelligent, handsome and the rest in short, a very living person. So long as this grievous clash

resided in the mind of man, a woman would not be allowed to acquire equal status in society. Giving her equal opportunity would not solve the problem of inequality between the sexes.

2. The abolition of inequalities based on colour

The colour of the skin was no criterion of beauty or any other type of superiority. The tyranny of colour was among the great oppressions of the world which was built upon error according to Lohia. The fair-skinned people of Europe had dominated the world for three hundred years.¹¹ They had possessed power and prosperity which the coloured people had not. The higher castes in India were generally a little fairer than the backward. Hence, the fair colour had captured people's imagination. An aesthetic revolution in the evaluation of beauty and its relations to the colour of the skin would blow the air of freedom and inner peace over all the world almost as much as political or economic revolution.

3. Elimination of inequalities of birth and caste

Lohia's approach to caste was revolutionary. He looked at the problems of socialism and democracy in terms of the abolition of castes as the most serious disease of Indian society. According to Lohia, caste was the biggest fact of Indian life. Those who condemned it were also victims of it. He supported Inter-caste marriages, were held only between groups within the high caste. Lohia held caste as the largest single cause for submission to foreign invasions. It was only when the bonds of caste had gone loose that India could defend and could not be subjugated. It was necessary for the abolition of the caste system that the political leadership should come from among the 'Sudras', it should be broadminded, truly national and respected by all sections of the society. To Lohia, caste was ossified class, and class was mobile caste. Lohia pleaded for continued awareness to check the poison of casteism. Therefore, "not equal opportunity, but preferential opportunity can pull down the walls of these narrow coteries

4. National freedom or ending of foreign influence

According to Lohia, "people's freedom has perhaps always been the grand passion of man. To overrun countries, to conquer people, to rule over them or at least to take tribute has been pastime of powerful armies in recorded history." National freedom was on the way to become man's irremovable property. The talk there was of national freedom in the political sense. People would not be allowed to exercise direct rule over another. Lohia felt that the world shall not be equal or peaceful unless all imperialisms were hunted out of their darkest lairs

5. Economic equality through increase in production

It was the revolution of the poor against rich, the little man against the big. In under developed countries the inequality existed in fabulous magnitude. Adequate scope for employment, reasonable wages, adequate leisure and other economic rights must be created in a society. Control over economic organization and its conscious directions in the interests of commonwealth were a basic requirement. The world had come to realize it and a procedural non-violent revolution was interpenetrating in the social and economic life of every country.

6. Protecting the privacy of individual life from all collective encroachments

The individual had been steadily losing his sovereignty to organization. That is not to say that his importance or welfare had necessarily gone down. They had in fact been going up, more so

in those areas where his sovereignty had been suffering. The individual's welfare and happiness, education and health, also his leisure and much of his life and thought were subject to planning of various kinds. This planning was rigorous in lands of communism, but a growing element of organizational compulsion was present everywhere. As such "rights of privacy and freedom must be recognized in all those spheres, which are not directly connected with property.

7. Limitation on armaments.

Weapons are always hated by good and virtuous persons. The discovery of thermo-nuclear fission has given a new character to weapons. Now they can only destroy and could no longer bring victory or cause defeat. Lohia had found civil disobedience as the weapon to fight against injustice and inequality. If even one-tenth of a people could become habitual and individual civil-resisters against native tyranny, they could be reasonably expected to act as a good deterrent against foreign invasion.

The Four-Pillar State and Socialism

"The four-pillar state", was one of the important features of the Lohia's socialism. In order to achieve true socialism Lohia evolved the concept of four-pillar state. Four-pillar state was an arrangement when a constitution was framed on the basis of the four-pillar state, the village, the district, the province and the centre, being four pillars of equal majesty and dignity. The four-pillar state was both a legislative and an executive arrangement. It was a way of life and to all spheres of human activity, for instance, production, ownership, administration, planning, education and the like. The four pillar state provided a structure and a way. The community of a state was to be so organized and sovereign power so diffused that each little community in it lived the way of life that it chose.

The state, therefore, was to be organized in such a manner that it could allow the widest opportunity for popular participation, "Sovereign power must not reside alone in centre and federating units. It must be broken up and diffused over smallest region where a group of men and women live." The idea of such a state however, did not represent the idea of a self sufficient village but of the 'intelligent and vital village.' In the four-pillar state the armed forces of the state might be controlled by the centre, the armed police by the province but all other police might be brought under district and village control. While industries like the railways or iron and steel might be controlled by the Centre, the small unit textile industry of the future might be left to district and village ownership. While price fixing might be a central subject the structure of agriculture and the ratio of capital and labour in it might be left to the choice of the district and the village. A substantial part of state revenues should stay with the village and the district.

Economic decentralization, corresponding to political and administration decentralization, might be brought about through maximum utilization of small machines. The four-pillar state raised above the issues of regionalism and functionalism. It diffused power also within people's organizations and corporations. Lohia opined that four-pillar state might indeed appear fanatic to many in view of the special conditions of the country, its illiteracy, its fears and superstitions and above all, its castes. Lohia believed that by giving power to small communities of men, democracy of the first grade was possible. The four pillar state ensured effective and

intelligent democracy to the common man. He was not in favour of ownership of property by the state exclusively at the centre as it was disastrous both for bread and freedom. Part of property must be owned by the village and the province as much as by the centre and by co-operative.

Planning in Socialism was undertaken with a view to reconstruct the nation's economy and to invigorate the people and not with a view to appease classes of interests. Complete accountability, democratic controls, and publicly known rules of disbursement of all plan and governmental expenditure would remove corruption and inefficiency on the one hand, and stop the breeding of petty tyrants, sycophants, and flatterers on the other. Planning shall wherever possible encourage the small units of production and trade. Prices would be so regulated as to remove disparity between those of agriculture and of industry. "In particular, the great robbery which causes steep fall of agricultural prices around the harvest and steep rise later will be stopped."

The ideas and programmes of Lohia's Socialism included democracy in all circumstances. Democracy meant the inevitable answerability of administration to elected assembly. It also meant recognition and respect of the limited personality of individual, party, government and state – four categories, which together constituted the agencies of political action. The external working of a state was determined by the internal working of its political parties. In the sphere of foreign policy, Lohia advocated his thesis of building a third camp. This was different from non-alignment preached by Nehru, which was termed by Lohia as passive neutrality. Lohia's concept of the Third Camp did not merely mean 'independence of the two blocs' but a positive and 'creatively independent' programme of mutual assistance among the developing countries fighting for freedom, peace and progress of the oppressed millions in the world. Lohia stressed the need for a constructive approach to world problems. Lohia pleaded for the establishment of a world Parliament powerful enough to enforce peace and economic development. Lohia's world Parliament was to be elected on the basis of adult franchise. The World Parliament would represent the collective conscience of mankind. Lohia's World Parliament would confine itself to matters of war and peace, to the relevant aspects of armed forces and foreign policy and to a minimum of economic subjects necessary for the basic health of the world. With the background of such a World Parliament, national governments, shall no longer divide tyrannously the human race and democracy shall for the first time come into free play. His World Government should take from each country according to its capacity of capital resources and give to each according to its needs.

Lohia believed that real socialism lay in planning done with a view to reconstruct the nation's economy and to invigorate the people and not with a view to please classes of interests. Lohia's socialism also included economic reconstruction of India. He wanted to reconstruct the economy of India to remove poverty which was necessary to establish true Socialism. Lohia's reconstruction of economy consisted of following items:

- (a) Reclamation of waste land
- (b) Small unit-technology
- (c) Equal distribution of land

- (d) Food army
- (e) Abolition of land revenue
- (f) Emphasis on small and medium schemes of irrigation.
- (g) Restrictions of expenditure and consumptions.

Lohia was in favour of small-unit technology to remove poverty. Lohia's concern for Socialism inspired him to advocate the small unit technology which was consistent with the demands of justice and equality and suited India in view of the peculiarities of India's problems. Therefore the solution consisted in "decentralized socialism with all its appropriate forms of small machines, cooperative labour, village government and so forth." Industrialization by means of the small-unit machine, according to Lohia, would have several advantages "Villages and towns of our country have abundant raw material of various kind. Lohia was of the view that large scale industry such as rail roads could be nationalized, the small-unit machines could be owned by state and village government as well as by producers and 'peasants cooperatives'. To strengthen socialism Lohia wanted reclamation of wasteland. To solve the food-problem, Lohia wanted to break the land monopoly and distribute land to the actual tillers of the soil. In Lohia's scheme of equitable distribution of land, "Land will belong to tillers. Lohia also pleaded for the abolition of land revenue on profitless agriculture and uneconomic holdings. Lohia wanted to have uniform pattern of education that is a uniform pay-scale for all the teachers and uniform standard of books for all the students.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Lohia was a political thinker having his indomitable faith in indigenous and traditional institutions and ideas of India. Lohia stood for establishment of a socialist society in India after independence. Various ideologies influenced him. He steadfastly carried out the socialist movement in post-independent India. He thought that democracy and national freedom, together with the need for change, should constitute the goals of Indian socialism. He tried to accommodate and assimilate some of the most important contributions of Gandhi to the theory and methodology of socialism. He developed his own frame of reference and accepted only as much of Gandhism and marxism as fitted into his framework. It is often said, "Lohia was a Gandhian among revolutionaries and a revolutionary among Gandhians". He was also a believer in the ideological purity of his thoughts and did not hesitate to break away from his socialist colleagues like JP and others when he found them tilting towards Congress for certain extraneous considerations.

JAYAPRAKASH NARAYANAN (1902-1979)

INTRODUCTION

Jayaprakash Narayan was an Indian independence activist and political leader. Popularly referred to as JP or Lok Nayak ("The People's Hero"), he actively participated in the civil disobedience movement against British rule in India for which he was imprisoned. Coming from an ordinary family he rose to the level of Loknayak, by dint of his integrity, ideological purity and a passion for social justice. Jayaprakash Narayan led the Bihar Movement which was

initiated by students in Bihar in 1974 in protest against the corruption in the government of Bihar. Believing that the existing socio-economic problems of India could be solved only within the Marxist–Leninist ideological framework, JP outlined a comprehensive scheme of radical reforms supposedly to bring about a socialist socio-economic order in the country.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Jayaprakash Narayan was born on 11 October 1902 in a village in Saran district of Bihar. He was attracted towards Gandhiji. His simplicity and plea for non-violence attracted Jaya Prakash. Tilak also influenced J.P. to a large extent. His interest in higher studies led him to USA where he stayed till 1929. His return to India in 1929 coincided with many political developments in India's struggle for independence. In 1934 Jayaprakash took the lead and formed the congress socialist party. This would act as a pressure group on the parent party to take more revolutionary path. From 1948 to 1951, J.P. and Lohia tried to build up an alternative to congress party. The Praja Socialist Party was formed. In 1954 he resigned from socialist party and withdrew from active politics. He became active in Sarvodaya movement. It was in 1973 he became active in politics and led a movement for total revolution.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THOUGHT OF JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN

J.P.'s thought was influenced by several ideologies. The chief among them is Marxism. As an intellectual he had clear perspective about how the post independent India should develop. He was a sincere believer in socialist economic model. In 1931 Karachi session of congress, Jayaprakash clearly spelt out an ideological frame work for economic transformation. The resolution said, "The state shall own or control key industries and services, mineral resources, railways, waterways, shipping and other means of public transport. J.P.'s thought was influenced by several ideologies. The chief among them is Marxism. As an intellectual he had clear perspective about how the post independent India should develop. He was a sincere believer in socialist economic model. In 1931 Karachi session of congress. Jayaprakash clearly spelt out an ideological frame work for economic transformation. The resolution said, "The state shall own or control key industries and services, mineral resources, railways, waterways, shipping and other means of public transport

JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN ON TOTAL REVOLUTION OR SAMPOORNA KRANTI

Total Revolution, as a concept, was put forward by Jayaprakash Narayan (at times referred to as JP) in the wake of Bihar Movement in Patna on June 5, 1974. Jayaprakash Narayan's concept of Total Revolution' is one of his most important contributions to modern Indian political thought. His reflections on Total Revolution crystallized out of his experiences during the sarvodaya phase of his life. It was also a reaction to the contemporary socio-economic and political situation of the country. As far as the context of Total Revolution is concerned, J.P. was dissatisfied with 1) the strategy and outcome of the sarvodaya movement and 2) the policies of the central and state governments in response to the Naxalite movement. Jayaprakash Narayan had set up an ashram at Sokhodeora on the land donated to him by Mr. J.R.D Tata, in 1954. Total Revolution signifies a radical transformation not merely of our material conditions but also of the moral

character of the individuals. The idea was implicit in many of Gandhi's writings and speeches. It was at this ashram that J.P. first came across a few practical problems associated with the sarvodaya movement. If Sarvodaya was his aim. Total Revolution was the means to achieve it. Total Revolution is basic change in all aspects of life. Following Gandhi, JP recognised the necessity of change in the individual, the individual who takes upon himself the task of changing society. "One of the unstated implications of satyagraha would be", JP says in his prison Diary, "a self-change, that is to say, those wanting a change must also change themselves before launching any kind of action". The three major steps of Total Revolution were:

- a) The creation and organization of people's power,
- b) Total and revolutionary change in all aspects of public life and
- c) Development of people's government from the lower level.

Characteristics of Total Revolution

The major features of Jayaprakash Narayan's concept of Total Revolution include: First, the concept of Total Revolution was based on non violence. But later on he realized the importance of non- violence. He had told Gandhiji that there was no need of violent social change in India. He explained that violence always led to further violence and to control the outbreak of mass violence, an instrument of organized violence is required. He also refuted the idea that violent revolutions could lead to 'swift and sure' result. Jayaprakash Narayan agreed to Tolstoy's famous remark which showed that at times the revolutionaries tend to exploit people in the name of revolution itself.

The second major feature of J.P.'s concept of Total Revolution includes his idea that one of the objectives of the revolution would be to maintain the democratic structure of the state. In his notes penned down on 23 August, 1975, while still in prison, he remarked, "Total Revolution has to be peacefully brought about without impairing the democratic structure of society and affecting the democratic way of life of the people." He also explained that the functioning of democracy was not restricted to elections, legislation planning and administration.

Thirdly, by his total revolution, J.P. meant a transformation in the internal life of individuals as well as in the entire social structure. To Fred Bloom, the meaning that Jayaprakash gave to Total Revolution was very simple: a transformation which makes what is truly human the centre of life.

Fourthly, J.P. believed that the Total Revolution was a permanent revolution. It would continue always and keep on changing our personal and social lives. As he put in 1976, "It will always go on and on...this revolution knows no respite, no halt and certainly not a complete halt." But he continued to add that the goals of the Toted Revolution would keep on changing according to the requirements of contemporary society.

Fifth, he assigned the role of leadership to the students. He felt that the students were better equipped to spearhead the revolution because they were neither swayed by power politics nor were they burdened by the day to day struggle for survival.

Lastly, Jayaprakash Narayam also mentioned the difference between class struggle and Total Revolution. In class organization, *Class Struggle and Social Change*, he wrote that during his association with the Sarvodaya movement, he admitted the view that class organizations and class struggle would lead to violence. Sarvodaya prohibited class struggle or any class organization. Hence, with regard to the content of Total Revolution, he had mentioned that, at different periods total revolution might assume different forms depending on the needs of time and place and on the forces that are contending for power

Components of Total Revolution

Total Revolution is a combination of seven revolutions. It is a permanent revolution and is expected to move on towards higher and higher goals. JP's concept of revolution is very comprehensive like that of Gandhi's. It consists of a wide spectrum of variables. There are seven components of Total Revolution – social, economic, political, cultural, ideological, intellectual, educational, and spiritual. JP himself thought that the Cultural Revolution could include educational and ideological. Similarly, social revolution, according to him, in the Marxian sense can cover economic and political revolutions and even more than that. He also thinks that each of the seven categories can be further split up into sub-categories.

In the **political** sphere the revolution would remove all vestiges of centralization. In the sphere of political revolution JP follows Gandhi. In other words, if power was shared among different echelons of the social structure starting from, say, the village upward, the danger of centralisation could very well be avoided. J.P's concept of democracy is logically a theory of decentralized power and that of a party less administration. It was this approach to decentralisation of power that led him to support the panchayati raj system. At the base of the new political organization will be the local or primary communities, neither so small that a balanced development of communal life and culture become difficult, nor so large that life in them becomes impersonalized. In plea for Reconstruction of Indian Polity, JP rejected the western model of democracy on the ground that it did not give full scope to the people to participate in the management of their affairs and is based on an atomised view of society, the state being an inorganic sum of individuals. In its place he pleaded for a model of democracy, based on an integrated concept of society and providing the fullest possible scope to the individual to participate in the management of his affairs, without the intermediation of political parties.

The **economic** base of Total Revolution was laid on "Marx's exploitation free society, Gandhian values of greedless society and appropriate technology which should come from best possible scientific research, ". J. P. was against the strategy of large scale industrialization and state capitalism, (introduced in the guise of nationalization of industries). Industrial development should be based on

small scale industries and labor intensive enterprises. In the economic sphere also J.P. emphasized on economic decentralization and balanced regional development. At the centre of economic development should be 'man' and hence every adult or head of a family should be given work and a minimum standard of living should be adopted. This obviously required moral and spiritual development of the people.

A **social revolution**, therefore, is basically an economic revolution in the Marxian formulation. Marx's use of the term was justified in the European context. In the Indian context, the term 'social' has a distinctive character. Due to caste divisions, a whole panoply of rituals, hierarchy, modes of inter-caste communication, sense of pollution, marriage norms and practices, social distance, and informal rules of behaviour have grown over thousands of years. The task of Total Revolution in this sense is iconoclastic. It has to break the caste barriers. And, in order to do so, Total Revolution must evolve new norms and practices replacing those based on caste. Inter-caste dining, abolition of dowry system, archaic marriage rules and regulations – all must enter the area of Total Revolution. It is in this sense that the social content of Total Revolution assumes quite an independent dimension.

Referring to the **moral and spiritual** revolution J. P. wrote: "I do not have asceticism in mind. That is for the spiritual seekers. For the average man, for all of us ...a full material satisfaction is itself a spiritual life. Craving excess, bad means to gather wealth, these are anti spiritual." He was a deeply moral person and felt that people must be taught to turn away from the consumerist way of life. This leads to the importance of value-based education. Education must ensure that the members of the community are well prepared to accept new ideas.

Cultural revolution which includes spiritual – moral, ideological, intellectual, and educational At a purely personal or group level, cultural revolution invokes a change in the moral values held by the individual or the group. In any debate of moral values, therefore, ends and means must enter. In the cultural sphere, he advocated a cultural resurgence based on a re evaluation of existing values including freedom, equality and brotherhood. JP used the term culture in a very comprehensive sense. The cultural aspect of Total revolution emphasized on a change in our way of living and thinking. His obvious aim was to bring change that will improve the quality of life and make "man more human, a minimum standard of living should be adopted. This obviously required moral and spiritual development of the people. Individuals must be taught to rise above the desire of material satisfaction.

Intellectual revolution: A change in regard to the ends – means relationship both in the individual and group life is bound to produce a corresponding change in the belief system, that is, the ideology of either the individual or the group. A new ideological revolution, therefore, is bound to ensure if the organic relationship between ends and means is accepted. As a natural corollary to this, an intellectual revolution cannot be avoided; for the entire ends-andmeans

approach in the context of Gandhian thought must give a new outlook to the individual or the group to view things around them. And this is what JP means by intellectual revolution.

The most important variable in the cultural change is education. JP's scheme envisaged a thorough change in the system. According to JP, education must be a powerful element of social change and it should be closely linked to national development. It should be biased in favour of the masses rather than in favour of the upper classes. It must create a new kind of awareness among the submerged and weaker sections of our society, so that they feel fully integrated with the society.

During the period of 1974-79, J.P. laid profound emphasis on the transformation of social customs and institutions. In particular he pleaded for the abolition of the caste system and spoke vehemently against the custom of dowry offered during marriages. In the cultural sphere, he advocated a cultural resurgence based on a re evaluation of existing values including freedom, equality and brotherhood. The cultural aspect of Total revolution emphasized on a change in our way of living and thinking. His obvious aim was to bring change that will improve the quality of life and make "man more human.

J.P. NARAYAN ON SARVODAYA

The word "Sarvodaya" is a Compound Sanskrit word comprising "Sarva" (all) and "Udaya" (rising) - meaning all round well being or good of all. This all "includes that the all living being. The word "sarvodaya" was coined by Gandhiji while he was in south Africa. The word "Sarvodaya" means the welfare of all. "Sarvodaya" is a concrete programme of social revolution. It offers us the picture of a new social order. Sarvodaya was a conceptual construct JP borrowed from Gandhi to cumulatively articulate his vision of a decentralised, participatory and egalitarian socio-economic and political order for the country. In the sense of J.P. Narayan there shall be redistribution of land and no one shall have more land than three times the economic holdings. "Sarvodaya" is integral revolution or double revolution as J.P. Narayan called it "Social Revolution" through "Human Revolution". In 1956 at the conference of the "Asian Socialist" J.P. presented "Sarvodaya" as the "True road to socialism. "sarvodaya" accepts the Universalization of self-government in which the people should actively participate in cooperative action. The political philosophy of "sarvodaya" is a powerful intellectual attempt to build a plan of political and social reconstruction on the basis of ethical idealism. According to J.P. the scheme of the reconstruction of Indian polity and economy involving increasing decentralization of power for the realization of "swaraj" is in line with the ancient Hindu traditions and institutional patterns of self-government. To him the revitalization of the sense of man's belonging in a community is to be the goal of a "Sarvodaya Worker".

ESTIMATE

Jayaprakash Narayan popularly referred to as JP or Lok Nayak. He advocated a program of social transformation which he termed 'Sampoorna kraanti,' total revolution'. Total Revolution was the ultimate expression of the power of the people (lok shakti); the common man who would rise up in revolt against blatant misuse of authority. J.P.'s

concept of Total Revolution aimed at the creation of a new man and a new consciousness through far reaching changes in the social political and economic life of the country. The concept of Total Revolution has had both Marxist and Gandhian origins. It is always expected to be total, touching all aspects of life. Thus, the conceptual interventions of JP in the realm of Indian political thought proved to be more of theoretical value than practical as 'JP was a dreamer and an idealist to a fault'.

E.M.S. NAMBOODIRIPAD (1909-1998)

INTRODUCTION

Ernakulam Manakkal Sankaran Namboodiripad was one of the architects of United Kerala, a renowned, brave and committed socialist, historian and Marxian theoretician who took an active part in the communist movement of India. He holds pride of place as the first Chief Minister of unified Kerala. A staunch and committed socialist, historian and Marxist theorist, he had the rare distinction of having led to power, through the ballot, the first democratically elected Communist government in the world. In his nearly seven decades of public life and revolutionary activities, E.M.S. Namboodiripad left an indelible imprint on the progressive and working class movement of the country. He was one of the key proponents of Aikya Kerala which led to the formation of Kerala as a unified linguistic state.

BIOGRAPHICAL PROFILE

EMS was born on June 14, 1909 in Perinthalmanna taluk of Malappuram district. Even from his early age, EMS was associated with the activities of 'Yogakshemasabha', the progressive reformist movement led by V.T. Bhattathirippad, which sought to fight against the casteism and reactionary conservatism that was prevalent among the Namboodiri community. His association with the magazine "Unni Namboodiry", a progressive publication under the auspices of V.T. Bhattathirippad, helped him immensely not only to mould his political outlook but also to hone the writing skill inherent in him.

During his college days, EMS was deeply associated with the Indian National Congress and the national movement for independence. He attended All India Congress meeting in Madras and State level meetings at Payyannur and Vadakara. He abandoned college studies in 1932, to take part in the Civil Disobedience movement. He was arrested in Calicut and sent to jail. His association with prison mates having socialist ideals, enabled him to get closer to the Congress Socialist Party, a socialist wing of the Indian National Congress. He was elected as the State Congress Secretary in 1934. In 1936, EMS was given membership in the Communist party, then secretly formed. The entire Congress Socialist Party wing became the Communist Party of India at the meeting held at Pinarayi in 1939. The very same year EMS was elected to the Madras Legislative Assembly.

EMS travelled to many north Indian cities to organise socialist groups within the Congress party. After independence, he devoted his life to the Communist movement and even when the party was banned, he continued to work in hiding. In the election that followed immediately after the formation of the State of Kerala, EMS was elected from Nileswaram. He

led the Communist Party to electoral victory and became the first Chief Minister of Kerala in 1957. The progressive legislations enacted by his government somehow invited the wrath of certain sections of Kerala society. Shortly afterwards the “Liberation Struggle” was launched leading to the dismissal of the Ministry. EMS was elected to the KLA three times from the Pattambi constituency in 1960, 1967, and 1970 and from the Alathur constituency in 1977. When the Communist Party split in 1964, EMS chose to stand with the CPI (M). He served again as the Chief Minister of Kerala from 1967 to 1969. A gifted writer also, EMS has to his credit many significant works. His famous works include his autobiography “How I became a Communist”, “Kerala Society and Politics: A Historical Survey”, “Nehru, Ideology & Practice”, “The Mahatma and the ism”, “Problems of National Integration”, “Kerala Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow”, “India Planning in Crisis”, “A History of Indian Freedom Struggle” etc. and many essays and travelogues. Through his several books, writings and speeches, EMS changed the outlook of Kerala society and helped lay the foundation, for what later came to be known as the “Kerala Model” of development.

E.M.S. ON MARXISM: APPLICATION OF MARXISM TO INDIAN SETTINGS

E.M.S. was a brilliant Marxist theoretician. He made outstanding contributions to the application of Marxism-Leninism to Indian society and in working out the strategy and tactics of the Indian revolution. His vast body of writings bear the mark of an original and creative mind which mastered the dialectics of Marxist theory. His writings on land relations, Kerala, society and politics and his writings on Marxist philosophy, literature and history -- mark him out to be one of the most influential communist thinkers of the country and the world. During the period between 1962 to 1964, Communist Party of India was rocked by a series of internal rifts which ultimately led to a split in 1964. EMS stood firmly behind the Marxist Communist Party. His staunch belief and his weighty contributions to the ideology he believed in helped the Indian Marxists a great deal. He was also one of the popular Marxist historians whose materialistic interpretation of history deserves special attention. As a political scientist, his interpretation of Marxist philosophy is popular.

E.M.S. is a striking figure of how an individual's life and work acquires a tremendous impact when harnessed to the theory and practice of Marxism. When the individual is a person of EMS's exceptional intellectual ability and depth of vision, veritably, theory becomes a powerful force and in the hands of a creative practitioner like EMS, it produces the impulses for a powerful movement. The creative thought and practice of EMS moved the people and changed the history of Kerala in the twentieth century as no other individual has done. What made EMS a pre-eminent leader was his ability to stay ahead of his contemporaries in applying Marxism to the specific conditions of Kerala and India.

E.M.S Namboodiripad belonged to the more militant wing of the Communist Party. E M S supports the idea that the Maoist notion of s peasant based revolution was nlore relevant to the Indian situation than the worker based ideas of Marx and Lenin remained committed to the Socialist ideas and his compassion towards the downtrodden working class made him join the

ranks of the communist for which he had to also go in hiding for many years. As a true Marxist-Leninist, EMS Namboodiripad emancipated the rural poor, he wage earner keeping in view the peculiar Indian conditions; land reforms were a great characteristic of EMS' communist ideology. He got the land reforms by way of Legislation and by strengthening the Kisan Movement which addressed itself to the problems concerning small landholders and agricultural labour.

EMS was a great communist theoretician who tried to relate the Marxian principles - to the Indian realities. In the process, he made his own Marxist interpretation to the Indian situation. That he stood for the toiling masses, the rural labourers, and the exploited workers is a fact of history. But he, as a centrist of the Marxian ideology, favoured the socioeconomic changes in the peculiar Indian conditions existing then. In agriculture, his method was cooperativisation; in industry, it was first the introduction of industrialisation and thereafter, its socialisation.

Namboodiripad, believed that Marxism was not a static ideology; under different circumstances, its interpretations can be different and for bringing about socio-economic changes, its strategy also differs in different conditions. The conflicting trends among various segments of the Communist party in India were because of competing ideological influences from native and alien social structures. To him, "the conflict here was between an outdated decadent ' indigenous social system and a foreign social system that was being newly evolved. While, on the one side, one section is eager to build a new society, another section is eager to protect its own land and the ancient customs and traditions characteristic of it. It is only through introducing the essence of modern society that came to the country through the foreigners, and modernising our society can we protect our country from attack by foreigners." Some of the leading members of the Communist party were in favour of having a common front with the Congress party. The decision regarding this was also taken up by the Vijayawada Congress of the party. The conference took a decision to develop an approach of struggle and unity which will enable the organisation to unite the democratic forces "following the parties democratic opposition. Namboodiripad was not in favour of his line in politics. EMS rejected the approach of People's Democracy of the Leftists. He said, "The origin and development of the inner-party differences which have led to the split of the party, should be traced, not to the evil interests of certain individual leaders, but to certain objective factors." There has been consistent ideological approach among the leaders of both the Communist parties - CPI and CPI(M).

MARXIST LENINIST THEORY

According to EMS, the First World War marked the beginning of the end of capitalist domination over the nation-state systems in different parts of the world. With the victory of the Communism in the October Revolution in Russia the history of humanity witnessed the victory of the working class over the capitalist class. The spirit of the Russian revolution influenced not only the Eastern Europe but also a major part of the international system. It changed the very political map of the world from capitalism to socialism. While discussing about the crisis of the capitalism and Marxist-Leninist theory, EMS stated, "In these crises a great part not only of the

existing products but also of the previously created production forces are periodically destroyed. Marx discussed about this crises in his classical work Capital. Not only both Marx and Engels discussed about the recurring cyclical crises steadily leading to its inevitable destruction but also pointed out that the active force which arises within womb of capitalism will surely destroy the capitalism itself. Marx said, "Not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons - the modern working class - the proletarians."

To EMS, the formation of the socialist camp comprising several nations would ultimately lead to the virtual end of the colonial systems. While analysing the central features of the world political scene he cautioned to be aware of the weaknesses and difficulties of the countries of the socialist world. He opined that the socialist world is not an island in the ocean of humanity. It coexists with the capitalist world. "While it is possible for the Socialism to exert its influence on the capitalist world, it in its turn faces the dangers of the penetration of the influence of the capitalist world." The present day crises in the capitalist world is bound to have its impact on the Socialist world. Therefore, one has to be careful to see that economic planning proceeds the well-tested principles of balanced and proportionate development. He emphasised that the long-term perspectives of the Socialist development programmes based on the step by step nationalisation, collectivisation and social control of all the means and instruments of production, including land. He cautioned both State and the party leadership not to neglect the supreme task of fighting the evil influences of alien class ideology which appears in various manifestations including the iron grip of religion on the minds of the people.

EMS's CONTRIBUTION TO WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

EMS made an original contribution to the development of a correct perspective for the democratic women's movement. In his first public activity against the hidebound orthodoxy of the Namboodiri community, a major issue was the status of Namboodiri women. The young EMS who participated in the social reform movement focussed on the oppression of Namboodiri women who were even deprived of the right to marriage and had to observe a form of purdah. Later in the development of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles in Malabar, EMS paid particular attention to the increasing participation of women in the democratic movement. At that time, he set out the broad outlines of the nature of the women's organisation. He noted that rights were accorded to women in most communities in traditional Kerala society unknown in other areas. He hoped this tradition would be renewed in the modern context which would enable them to play an equal role with men in the social transformation of society. It should encompass all sections of women belonging to different classes as they all suffer from a common gender oppression, at the same time, women coming from the working class and the peasantry would constitute the bulk of the membership as they suffer from the double oppression, both class and social. He pointed out three aspects that have to be taken into account. Firstly, of women as women who irrespective of their class status suffer from gender oppression in a bourgeois and semi-feudal society; secondly, women as workers who suffer from the class exploitation given their

position as agricultural or industrial workers and thirdly, women as citizens who have to struggle along with men for democratic rights, democracy and a just society. It is these three aspects combined together, which provides the correct orientation to draw in all sections of women in the struggle for women's equality and against class and gender exploitation.

EMS ON PROLETARIAN HEGEMONY

EMS made a distinctive contribution in articulating the role of the Left as a distinct force in Indian politics, tracing its roots from the anti-imperialist struggle. Having been an active Congressman in his early political career, then a leading Congress Socialist Party worker and eventually a Communist leader, EMS sought to put the whole experience of the anti-imperialist movement in a systematic manner in which the role of the Left could be delineated at every stage of the development of the anti-imperialist movement. The struggle within the Congress between the Right and the Left, from the Lucknow session when Nehru became president in 1935 to the Tripuri session when Subhas Chandra Bose won the elections; the role of the fledgling Communist Party; the impact of the October revolution and later the anti-fascist struggle; the formation of the AITUC and other class and mass organisations ---- these events were put together to provide a coherent narrative of how the proletarian/Left stream developed in the freedom struggle vis a vis the bourgeois dominated movement. From this influential work, which EMS himself recognised as one of his major works, the idea of the two streams, bourgeois and proletarian, within the freedom struggle, complementary to the overall aim of fight against imperialism but divergent in its class interests was worked out. Thus began the quest for constructing the proletarian challenge to the hegemony of the bourgeois political forces. Tracing the heritage of the Left in the anti-imperialist struggles and demarcating from the bourgeois and petit bourgeois trends of the Congress leadership, EMS subsequently paid a great deal of attention to the whole question of countering the ideological hegemony of the ruling classes. Not by economic struggles and political slogans alone can the ruling classes domination be countered. EMS right from the beginning of his revolutionary career recognised the importance of the role of the media, culture and intellectual work to project an alternative Left perspective. His lifelong and fruitful association with media and cultural activities was nurtured by this comprehensive understanding of a proletarian movement.

EMS'S SOCIALIST INTERNATIONALISM

His adherence to proletarian internationalism which was not circumscribed by loyalty to any particular communist party in working out the international understanding and application of Marxism-Leninism. While defending socialism from the onslaughts of imperialism whether it be in the case of the Soviet Union or China, the CPI(M) leadership, of which EMS was an integral part, firmly stood for an internationalism which was partisan towards socialism and unremittingly hostile to imperialism. However, it also refused to accept any direction or guidance on how the communists should work out their strategy and tactics in India.

His understanding of the socialist countries and the international working class movement had two distinctive trends in the later period -- after the splits in the international communist movement and in the post-Soviet Union era. In the first instance, while opposing revisionist and sectarian manifestations in the communist movement, he firmly maintained that each country and the revolutionary party there will have to find its own path to socialism and this cannot be strait-jacketed into any single model of revolution in the name of Marxism-Leninism or proletarian internationalism. Thus he could appreciate the immense contribution of the Chinese revolution and urge a more serious study of Mao Zedong's contribution to the theory and practice of Marxism, while at the same time, resolutely opposing any move to mechanically transpose them to Indian conditions. It is this consistent approach which led to the naxalite movement and Maoist ideologues in India targeting him for attack in the late sixties and early seventies. He urged the Party to undertake a thorough reappraisal of the experience of the building of socialism in the Soviet Union and the causes for its downfall and integrate it with a contemporary and comprehensive approach to the development of the international working class movement and the struggle for socialism

CONCLUSION

Communist thought in India has its roots in the Marxist - Leninist ideology. The Indian Marxists had never been the orthodox followers of Marxism. M N Roy moved, theoretically, from Marxism to radical humanism; while EMS Namboodiripad sought, in practical terms, a modernised developed society in India, especially in Kerala. As he himself admitted "elements of Gandhism were by and large inherent in my lifestyle" even after becoming a Marxist. As a leader, he had a democratic style of functioning. The political philosophy of EMS is indeed a valuable contribution to the growth of social sciences of the contemporary society. E. M. S. was the last of India's firebrand Marxist revolutionaries and theoreticians. As head of the world's first elected Communist government in his southern home state of Kerala in the 1950s,

Review Questions

1. Highlight the main features of Radical Humanism as propounded by M.N. Roy.
2. How far was M N Roy influenced by Marxism? On what grounds did he differ from Marxism?
3. Trace the indigenous strands in the social and political thought of Ram Manohar Lohia.
4. What is the basis of Lohia's critique of Western ideologies? Elucidate his notion of 'New Socialism'.
5. Write a critical essay on Jayaprakash Narayan's plan for a reconstruction of the Indian polity
6. Define the term 'total Revolution' and discuss its features and components
7. Highlight the contribution of EMS to united Kerala
8. Mention the contribution of EMS Namboodiripad to the communist thought in India.

MODULE – V

SOCIAL JUSTICE

Concept of Social Justice

Social justice is a political and philosophical concept which holds that all people should have equal access to wealth, health, wellbeing, justice and opportunity. It envisages rights regarding social, economic and political matters for the all over development of a person to live a healthy social life. The term social justice was first used in 1840 by a Sicilian priest, Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio, and given prominence by Antonio Rosmini Serbati in *La Costituzione Civile Secondo la Giustizia Sociale* in 1848. It has also enjoyed a significant audience among theorists since John Rawls book. A Theory of Justice has used it as a pseudonym of distributive justice. Social justice must be achieved by adopting necessary and reasonable measures. The Concept of Social Justice is Replete with multifarious connotations. The Idea of welfare state is that the claims of social Justice must be treated as cardinal and paramount. Social justice is the spirit and vision of the Indian Constitution. It is the duty of the state to secure a social order in which the legal system of the nation promotes justice on the basis of equal opportunity and, in particular, ensures that opportunities for securing justice are not denied to any citizen by reason of economic or other disabilities. Ambedkar and Sree Narayana Guru believed in equality, liberty, and social justice. Their concept of social justice stands for the liberty, equality and fraternity of all human beings. Both argued that caste system was the main hurdle for *social justice* of the land

BHIMRAO RAMJI AMBEDKAR (1891-1956)

INTRODUCTION

Ambedkar, popularly also recognized as Babasaheb was a great patriot, social –political thinker, educationist, economist and administrator, political reformer, parliamentarian, constitutionalist of high order and a revivalist for Buddhism in India. He was also the chief architect of the Indian Constitution.. He was a true renaissance man, a person who excelled in many different areas of inquiry. Ambedkar was champion of social justice. His thought is centrally concerned with issues of freedom, human equality, democracy and socio-political emancipation. Ambedkar has often been described as one of the chief architects of the constitution. He was a revolutionary social reformer who demonstrated great faith in democracy and the moral basis of a society. Ambedkar was posthumously awarded the Bharat Ratna, India's highest civilian award, in 1990. Ambedkar's life was shaped and influenced by his bitter and degrading personal experiences as untouchables.

LIFE AND INFLUENCES

Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar was born in the untouchable Caste in Maharashtra on 14 April, 1891. He suffered all kinds of social humiliations in childhood as well as in his subsequent life on account of the stigma of untouchability. In spite of all these hurdles, he successfully completed his graduation from Bombay University and went on to do his Master's

and Ph.D. from Columbia University in U.S.A. He was influenced by the liberal and radical thought currents in America and Europe, more particularly with the thought that emerged following the French Revolution. He formed the Bahishbit Hitkarini Sabha (Depressed Classes Welfare Association) in 1924. He started the fortnightly journal Bahishkrit Bharat in Marathi and formed two organisations, Samaj Samata Sangh and Samata Saillik Dal in 1927 to enforce the demand for equality of the depressed classes. In 1928, the Depressed Classes Education Society, Bombay was founded. 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. Ambedkar was a bitter critic of Gandhi and Gandhism.

His quest of knowing the roots of social evils can be seen in his writings of "The Untouchables", "The Shudra, Who were they and how they come to be the fourth varna of Indo-Aryan society", "Caste in India, its mechanism, genesis and development" , "Hindu Social Order: Its essential principles", "Philosophy of Hinduism" and 'Annihilation of Caste'. His social ideas were shaped during his formative years and matured in his later stages of life but it remained focus on the desire for the uplift of the down-trodden, which found expression in all his social ideas.

CONTRIBUTION OR SOCIO-POLITICAL IDEAS OF AMBEDKAR

Ambedkar made lot of contributions in the spheres of understanding individual, caste, Hindu Social order, champion of human rights, problems of Hindu women, Indian minorities, nation and nation building.

- **Opposition to Caste System:** The caste system is not just a division of labour, but a hierarchical division of labourers. According to Ambedkar, the Hindu scheme of social structure based on the four Varnas or Chaturvarna breeds inequality and has been the parent of the caste-system and untouchability which are merely forms of inequality. To him, the 'principle of graded inequality' was prevailing in Hindu society - divided the society both vertically and horizontally. He founded the 'Bahiskrit Hitkarini Sabha' for the upliftment of the depressed classes. He wanted the public services to be made responsive to the needs of the weaker sections. Annihilation of Caste is one of the foremost monographs published by Ambedkar aimed at explaining the exploitative nature of caste and calling for its annihilation in order to secure a social order based on equal status and dignity for all. Ambedkar was a practical reformer who after taking stock of the whole situation came to the conclusion that very little could be achieved in the practical field in the effort of abolition of caste system. He converted to Buddhism and is also credited with providing a spark for the transformation of hundreds of thousands of Dalits or untouchables to Theravada Buddhism. He suggested that 'education, organization and agitation' were the key elements needed for the same.
- Social reform was always the first priority of Dr. Ambedkar. He whispered that the economic and political issues should be resolved only after achieving the goal of social justice. Ambedkar distinguished the institution of **untouchability** from that of caste although the former too is stamped by the same principle of graded inequality as the latter. Untouchability is not merely an extreme form of caste degradation but a qualitatively different one as the

system kept the untouchable outside the fold and made any social interaction with him polluting and deplorable.

- Ambedkar dwelt extensively on major religions of the world, particularly Hinduism, Islam, Christianity and Buddhism. Ambedkar did not go against Hinduism, but he has heavily criticized Hindu caste/Varna system. For him, the Hindu social order is the root cause of various social evils perpetuated in various forms in the Indian society. Hinduism is responsible for the abominable conditions of the down-trodden, especially of lower caste and women. The inequality in Hinduism is a religious doctrine adopted and conscientiously preached as a sacred dogma. To him, the depressed class was denied basic right under systematic oppression in Hinduism. The triumphant Brahmanism began its onslaught on both shudra and women in pursuit of the ideal of servility. He blamed Manu for treating women in more or less similar way as the shudra.
- He was convinced that for social justice and progress of the nation it was essential that conditions of women should be improved a lot. He stood for the economic equality of women and vehemently pleaded for the spread of women education. Ambedkar's idea of social justice was based on our indigenous historical, social and cultural roots. His dream of a society based on socio- economic justice human dignity and equality. He challenged the existing beliefs and deep rooted sometimes of the society and changed the society to be the vehicle of modern values of objectivity and autonomy of reason in the affairs of men.
- Ambedkar drafted the provisions in the constitution of India that are guaranteed every citizens the social, economic, political and culture rights. Ambedkar's view was that, the government is answerable to all of society's problems, to socioeconomic political cultural civic. The essential sense of the State, as a political community, consists in that the society and people composing it are master and sovereign of their own future. In post-independence India, the inclusion of 'judicial review' was a necessary device to give teeth to the individual and group rights guaranteed under the Constitution. Ambedkar described the provision enabling the same as the 'heart of the Constitution'. He had a clear vision of an ideal or just society based on liberty, equality and fraternity.
- B R Ambedkar has given the constitutional remedies - milestones of public interest litigations. He wanted to incorporate legal safeguards in the Constitution of India and to bring regulatory reforms to bring equalities and to pave way for positive discriminations towards depressed classes including women.
- Ambedkar was a great admirer of Parliamentary system of Government. According to him, there are three inherent characteristics of the system. Firstly, free and fair elections from time to time. Secondly, in the form of government no single individual can presume the authority that he knows everything and that he can make the laws and carry the government. The laws are to be made by the representatives of the people. Finally, the elected representatives, the legislatures and ministers must have the confidence of the people renewed in themselves at given periodicity.
- Ambedkar favoured the functional theory of the state. The state was a legal and constitutional system that represented the principle of equality. He holds the liberal notion of the state

where the state represents the collective will of the society through law and hence becomes legitimized. Ambedkar's idea of a federal state attaches more importance to institutional means for the solution of human affairs.

- Ambedkar's ideas on justice are closely linked up with his concept of democracy both as a form of government and a "mode of associated life". Ambedkar also rejected Gandhi's Sarvodaya theory of social justice which associated both religion and the welfare of citizens. Ambedkar is also one of the proponents of social justice in Modern India. He tried to achieve social justice and social democracy in terms of 'one man-one value'. His view on social justice was to remove man made inequalities of all shape through law, morality and public conscience.

AMBEDKAR ON SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The most prevalent form of Government at the present time is 'Democracy'. In the West, the Greeks claim to have invented the Democracy. The term 'democracy' has derived from the Greek term 'demos' and 'kratos', means people and government. Aristotle, father of Political Science, defined democracy is a form of government in which supreme power is in the hands of freemen. This classical definition of democracy found echoes in John Stuart Mill and Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson preferred that form of democracy which provided a "government by its citizen in mass, acting directly and personally, according to rules established by the majority. To Walter Bagehot, democracy as "Government by discussion". Abraham Lincoln defined democracy as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. As a liberal thinker, Ambedkar was a hardcore believer in the value of constitutional democracy having irrevocable elements of social and economic democracies, in addition to political democracy. In fact, Ambedkar understood it very well that the Western pattern of democracy is not applicable to Indian scenario. He strived hard for the establishment of democracy in post-independence India. He expressed his anguish over the last of the entire past heritage.

Ambedkar viewed democracy as an instrument of bringing in relation to the change peacefully. Democracy does not merely mean rule by the majority or government by the representatives of the people. To him, the Hindu Social System divided the society into Varnas and Castes and also denied the existence of liberty, equality and fraternity which are the deepest concern of democracy. If in democracy liberty does not destroy equality and equality does not destroy liberty, it is because at the base of both there is fraternity. Fraternity is, therefore, the root of democracy. Democracy was lost in Brahminic India. Ambedkar interpreted the concept of democracy in Indian context. In his opinion, democracy is not as a fixed dogma, it always changes its form, it is not always the same in the same country and that it always undergoes changes in purpose. Ambedkar realized that a mere distinction between state and society, state and government and the state and nation are not enough to serve the purpose. The views of J.S.Mill, Harold.J. Laski and MacIver on democracy were not appropriate in Indian social system because it failed to focus on the social relationship between the people who form a society. Indian society, to Ambedkar, is based on Castes and everything is organized on the basis of caste. The Indian society does not consist of individuals; it consists of collection of castes with utter lack of bond of sympathy or co-operation. The existence of the Caste is a

standing denial to the ideals of democracy.¹⁰ He viewed “Democracy in this country is like a summer sapling. Without social unity, the roots of sapling cannot be strengthened. If social unity is not achieved this summer sapling of democracy, will be rooted out with gust of summer wind”. He said that there are certain fundamental considerations which go to the roots of democracy and which cannot be ignored without putting democracy in peril. Ambedkar considered democracy as a historical movement.

A government for the people is only possible when the attitude of each individual is democratic that means each individual is prepared to treat every other individual as his equal and is supposed to give him same liberty which he claims for himself. This democratic attitude of mind is the result of socialisation of the individual in a democratic society. Democratic society is therefore a prerequisite of a democratic government. By “Democracy” Ambedkar meant, “a form and method of government whereby revolutionary changes in the economic and social life of the people are brought about without bloodshed”. He further said that “Democracy was a state of policy where, the governing class failed to capture powers to govern others and where the majority takes the reign of the instrumentalities of the state”. For Ambedkar, “Democracy is not merely a form of government. It is primarily a mode of associated living of conjoint communicated experience and to be searched in the social relationship. It is essentially an attitude of respect and reverence towards fellowmen”. He believed democracy means no slavery, no caste, and no coercion. Democracy is not a gift of nature. It is a habit of social living and can be acquired by the people themselves for their emancipation and well being. He was a political realist; therefore, he regarded democracy in its practical aspect as the social organisation of the people in the sense that the people included all members of society. Thus he remarked, “A democratic society must assure a life of leisure and culture to each one of its citizens”. The main concern of his life was to make democracy safe for the common man and for the good of his country.

He regarded that the democratic principles of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness were essentials in human life. He supported the ideas of Constitutional separation of religion and state, the provision of fundamental rights, and the assignment of important functions to the Judiciary for strengthening the roots of democracy in India. For him, the purpose of modern democracy was to be about the welfare of the people. the perpetual rule of one class or a political party, the monopoly of the means of production in a few hands, the curtailment of civil liberties, the blind faith in democratic leaders, the atmosphere of fear and oppression, the misuse of political authority, the negative use of political recourses, etc., are some of the vices that can invariably damage the basic structure of democracy. The fundamental elements of his concept of democracy were liberty, equality, fraternity, natural rights and justice. He believes that these are essential for complete development of personality and capacities of every person. He believed that democracy offers every individual to achieve social equality, economic justice and political justice guaranteed in the Preamble of the Constitution. Therefore, in the Constituent Assembly he had stated that mere securing political democracy is not sufficient. It should be followed by establishing social democracy and economic equality. His vision was the foundation of social democracy in India. According to Ambedkar, “We must make our political democracy a social

democracy as well. Political democracy cannot last unless there lies at the base of it social democracy". Democracy is a mode of associated living. The roots of democracy are to be searched in social relationship, in terms of the associated life between the people who form the society.

Classification of Democracy

Ambedkar focused on three categories of democracy in India that are (1) Political Democracy (2) Social Democracy and (3) Economic Democracy. For him, Social and Economic democracy are the tissues and fiber of a political democracy.

Political Democracy

Ambedkar located the political power in the people thinking of that it is the key to all social progress. According to him, the soul of democracy is the doctrine of, "One man, one vote" and "one vote, one value". What he means each and every man to count for one. No man for more than one. It means every government should be on the anvil both in its daily affairs and also at the end of a certain period when the voter and electorate would be given an opportunity to assess the work done by the government. Democracy is unrealizable without freedom of political discussion. A right to vote gives a man no real part in controlling government unless he is free to form his own opinions about his vote, to hear what others have to say about the issues; and to persuade others to adopt his opinions. He further said that "Parliamentary system of government is much more than government by discussion. It is negation to hereditary rule. Whosoever wants to rule must be elected by the people from time to time. He must obtain approval of the people. There are two pillars on which the Parliamentary system of government rests and works. Those are (1) an opposition and (2) free and fair elections. In this system of government people should know the other side if there are two sides to a question. Hence a functional opposition is required. Opposition is the key to a free political life. No democracy can do without it". While visualizing high political objects, he said that democracy must in harmony with social aims. He regarded democracy as both a social way of life and political method. Ambedkar pointed out that there are *four premises upon which political democracy* rests:

- (1) The individual is an end in himself.
- (2) The individual has certain inalienable rights which must be guaranteed to him by the Constitution.
- (3) The individual shall not be required to relinquish any of his Constitutional rights as a condition precedent to the receipt of a privilege and.
- (4) The state shall not delegate power to private persons to govern others.

In democracy every party has the right to criticize and capture political power. The party in power tries to keep the power in its hands. According to him, the real test of the party system would come when the governmental power might shift from the ruling party to some other political party or parties. Understandably, Ambedkar realised that political democracy cannot succeed where there is no social and economic democracy because these are the tissues and fiber of a political democracy.

Social Democracy

Ambedkar viewed that social democracy means as a way of life which recognises liberty, equality and fraternity as principle of life. They are not separate, they are union of trinity. Democracy, to him is more than a form of government. It is a form of the organisation of society. There are two essential conditions, which characterise a democratically constituted society. First is the absence of stratification of society into four classes. The second is a social habit on the part of individuals and groups, which is ready for continuous readjustment of recognition of reciprocity of interests. He regarded a favorable social setting as a pre-requisite for the success of democracy: without this democracy would not last long. The formal framework of democracy was of no value in itself and would not be appropriate if there was no social democracy. Ambedkar regarded democracy as a way of life. It involved rational empiricism, emphasis on individual, the instrumental nature of the state, voluntarism, and the law behind the law, nobility of means, discussion and consent, absence of perpetual rule and basic equality in all human relations. He outlined that equality is the principle and the substance of democracy which must be sought through social revolution. If our society is to become democratic, the spirit of democracy should be slowly and peacefully introduced into our customs and institutions. In searching out the social design of democracy, he suggested the possibility that equality in one aspect, should be extended to other aspects of life, too. Democracy is incompatible and inconsistent with isolation and exclusiveness, resulting in the distinction between the privileged and the unprivileged. He regarded democracy as both a social and a political method.

To end the social barriers, the inequality of caste system, Ambedkar stressed the need of making political democracy a social and economic democracy. For him, political democracy could not last unless these lay at the base of it. Social democracy recognized liberty, equality and fraternity as the principles of life. They formed an inseparable trinity in a democratic social structure. Without equality, liberty would produce the supremacy of the few over the many. Equality, without liberty, would kill individual initiative. Without fraternity, liberty and equality could not become a natural course of social relationship. If the fact is recognized that there was complete absence of two things in Indian society: equality in social and economic life, then political democracy, the political authority, must strive for removing this contradiction at the earliest moment, or else those who suffer from inequality will blow up the structure of political democracy.

Economic Democracy

Economic democracy means that the economic needs of the people are to be satisfied. No person should die in want of food, clothing and housing, if democracy is to live up to its principle of one man, one value. He points out that the principle of graded inequality has been carried into the economic field. He viewed that the democratic order must minimize the glaring inequalities in society. In democratic society there must be neither an oppressed class nor an oppressor class. It is the duty of the state to prevent the monopoly of the means of production in few hands. To empower both the Dalits and non-Dalits economically, he proposed that the state should be given political power for the regulation and control of both key industries and

agriculture; to this end he proposed that economic powers should be incorporated into the body of the Constitution itself without abrogating Parliamentary democracy and without leaving its establishment to the will of democracy.

He was aware of the fact that capitalism makes democracy meaningless as it cannot protect the individual freedom and rights from the invasion of others rights. He, therefore, advocated for establishment of State Socialism to retain Parliamentary democracy and avoided dictatorship to safeguard individual liberty and to make it sure that the law of the Constitution prevailed to save both democracy and socialism. In his book, 'States and Minorities', he proposed for the adaptation of an economic political system as a new venture to benefit the poor masses of our society. Ambedkar suggested the following proposals:

- (a) Insurance shall be a monopoly of the state.
- (b) Agriculture shall be a state industry.
- (c) Land will belong to the state and shall be let out to villagers without distinction of caste or creed.
- (d) There will be no landlord, no tenant and landless labourer.
- (e) Rapid industrialisation of economy under the complete supervision and control of the state should be initiated

To protect the citizen against economic exploitation he proposed to include certain provisions on fundamental rights. He introduced the Directive Principles of State Policy with the object to establish economic democracy in India.

Challenges to Democracy in India

Democracy is understood to be a political instrument and where this political instrument exists, there is democracy. There are several factors that pose challenges to the democracy.

- The existence of the Caste system is a standing denial to the existence of ideal society and to the democracy. Thus, there is no room for the down-trodden and the outcastes in politics, industry, commerce, and in education.
- The Caste system accompanied by the principle of 'Graded Inequality' also put a great threat to democracy. It results into a separation of society, into a privileged and a subject class.
- The fixation of occupation in caste system also cuts the very roots of democracy.

Conditions for successful working of democracy

- (1) There must be no glaring inequality in the society. There must not be an oppressed class. There must not be a suppressed class. There must not be a class, which has got all the privileges, and a class, which has got all the burdens to carry.
- (2) The existence of an opposition;- The opposition is a condition precedent for democracy
- (3) Equality in law and administration;
- (4) Observance of constitutional morality;- violation of Constitutional morality would damage the Constitution and the democracy as well.

(5) No tyranny of the majority;- The minority must feel always safe that although the majority is carrying on the Government, the minority is not being hurt, or the minority is not being hit below the belt.

(6) Moral order of society: -Ethics is something separate from politics. If there is no moral order, democracy will go to pieces and

(7) Public conscience Public conscience means conscience which becomes agitated at every wrong or injustice.

Things necessary for maintenance of democracy

- Constitutional methods
- Not to lay liberties at the feet of a great man
- Make a political democracy a social democracy

AMBEDKAR ON STATE SOCIALISM

Ambedkar studied several features of Marxism and favoured some Marxist principles. He usually subscribed to the material view of history and agreed to the need for a total change for bringing in relation to the equality. He also accepted the thought of public ownership of property. Though, he did not become a Marxist. The other significant diversity of socialism was Democratic Socialism. Ambedkar's firm belief in democracy attracted him to this ideology. He felt that socialism necessity function within a democratic framework. Democracy and socialism need not be opposed to each other. Therefore, in 1947, Ambedkar propounded the thought of 'State socialism'. Even earlier, when he recognized the Self-governing Labour Party in 1937, he had adopted a broadly socialist programme. The name of the party itself designates that it was to be a party of all depressed classes. Its programme incorporated state management of significant industries and bringing in relation to the a presently economic system. The party wanted to ensure minimum average of livelihood for agricultural and industrial workers.

State socialism means that the state would implement a socialist programme by controlling the industrial and agricultural sectors. To him, the state will actively manage both the industry and the agriculture. This will ensure equitable sharing of wealth and protect the needy and the poor. Rapid industrial progress and welfare of all the parts of the civilization will be the responsibility of the state. Though, the democratic organizations such as the parliament will also remain intact. In 1947, Ambedkar suggested that the Constitution of India should incorporate the principle of State Socialism. This thought of State Socialism shows that Ambedkar was aware of the troubles of poverty and economic inequality. So, he attached much importance to the role of the government. Government, just as to him, has to perform the role of a welfare agency. It has to ensure rapid progress and presently sharing of the fruits of that progress.

CONCLUSION

Babasaheb Ambedkar is one of the foremost thinkers of modern India. Ambedkar was a great social revolutionary. 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 untouchability. He emphasizes that democracy is a tool in the hand of ordinary people to further their interests and safeguard human values and dignity. His vision was not to establish

a mere political democracy but social democracy, what he calls a way of life which recognises liberty, equality and fraternity as the principle of life. He endeavoured to rouse self consciousness and self respect among the Depressed Classes. Resting on Ambedkar's thoughts, the Indian Constitution guarantees equal rights to all, based on social justice and human dignity.

AMBEDKAR AND GANDHI

Mohandas K. Gandhi and Bhimjirao Ambedkar are among the major makers of modern India. Their public careers began early as Gandhi's in South Africa in the mid-1890s and Ambedkar's in western India in the early 1920s. They maintained the momentum in their struggles for justice and equality until the very end of their lives. Gandhi and Ambedkar offered specific goals for and pathways to the creation of a just social order in India. They differed over objectives as well as the methods for achieving their ends. In their long public careers, both of them addressed a number of crucial social and political issues. Both Gandhi and Ambedkar represented separate interest groups and to quote Arundhati Roy, "their battle unfolded in the heart of India's national movement. Both contributed to the equality, justice, freedom and to the social advancement of the downtrodden caste, social reforms, upliftment of women, sought social transformation through democratic and peaceful means. To Gandhi, freedom was never to be bestowed where as Ambedkar viewed that bestowing of freedom by the imperial rulers. Ambedkar mobilized people on the basis of caste and Gandhi mobilized people on the basis of religion.

However, both had fundamental differences on different political and social issues. If Gandhi idealized village India, Ambedkar rejected it for its backwardness, especially the oppression of untouchables. Unlike the Mahatma, Ambedkar was a moderniser with a tolerant eye for the West. Gandhi perceived depressed classes to be an integral part of Hindu society, whereas Ambedkar somewhat tried to advance a kind of two-nation theory-one is the ruling nation of high castes and another is the subject nation of untouchable classes. To Ambedkar, the Untouchables were not a part of the Hindus but "a part apart". While Ambedkar was in favour of annihilation of caste system as it was beyond reforms; Gandhi wanted to reform it by changing the hearts and minds of high Castes. Gandhi did not support the abolition of caste system or Varnashrama order. Ambedkar stood for the annihilation of caste. He saw untouchability as a fundamental result of it, and believed there could be no alleviation, no uplift, no relief without the abolition of caste. Gandhi was not simply a devoted Hindu, but also a fervent believer in his idealised version of "varnashrama dharma". He felt that what he considered to be the benign aspects of caste—its encouragement of a certain solidarity—could be maintained while removing hierarchy and the evil of untouchability. This was in fact the essence of his reformism. Gandhi believed in peaceful political struggles like non-cooperation and civil disobedience and other forms of Satyagrah, but Ambedkar had developed deep faith in the constitutional means of change and improvement. Gandhi's vision for future India was more broad-based as it considered the accommodation of all castes and communities. Ambedkar vision was confined to improvement and empowerment of depressed classes. Gandhi argued that caste conflict is not

the permanent feature of Indian society. Gandhi and Ambedkar have different opinion with respect to Gram Swarajya. While Gandhi gave a central place to village autonomy and self-sufficiency in his vision of future India, Ambedkar was highly critical of the village as a unit of local administration. He claimed that the village in India is a den of localism, communalism and narrow interests. The empowerment of village Panchayats would thus lead to erosion of individual liberty. Mahatma Gandhi was skeptical of powers given to the state and advocated more powers to the society itself. Whereas Ambedkar advocated more powers to the state and was skeptical of the society. Gandhiji advocated that in our country, religion could not be separated from politics while Nehru and Ambedkar differed greatly on the issue and promoted secularism. In 1931, Gandhi and Ambedkar continued to have serious differences. While the latter wanted reserved seats and separate electorates for the Untouchables, the former wouldn't hear of it. Gandhi's reason for opposing separate electorates was his fear that it would disrupt the Hindu community. He said. separate electorates will create division among Hindus so much that it will lead to bloodshed. The differences between Gandhi and Ambedkar still continue to haunt the various Dalit movements and reformist Hindu organisations. In sum, there were important, irreconcilable differences between Gandhi and Ambedkar.

SREE NARAYANA GURU (1856 –1928)

INTRODUCTION

Sri Narayana Guru was a prophet, sage and Hindu saint and also a social reformer of India. He was born in the family of Ezhavas, in a period when people from backward communities, like, the Ezhavas faced much social injustices in the caste-ridden Kerala society. Gurudevan, as he was fondly known to his followers, revolted against casteism and worked on propagating new values of freedom in spirituality and of social equality, thereby transforming the Kerala society and as such he is adored as a prophet. He preached for moral and religious universalism. Sri Narayana Guru had constructed temples that were open to all, irrespective of caste and gave prime importance to education as a tool for enlightenment.

KERALA SOCIETY DURING NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES

Kerala had a casteless society at the beginning of its history. The Aryan settlers foisted the division of the people into four well-defined castes on Kerala society by subtle methods. In the traditional Kerala society caste determined the socio-economic and political status of an individual or group. The Hindu society of the age was organized on the basis of the caste system. The 'Chaturvarnya System' which was believed to have invoked since the 11th century all over the subcontinent had its impact here also. The Brahmins stood at the top of the social hierarchy and among them the Namboodiris (the Malayalee Brahmins) were reckoned as the highest in rank. Next below the Nairs in social rank were the Thiyyas or the Ezhavas. Then there were the Kammalas or artisan classes, the Mukkuvas or the fisher-folk and several other castes like the Pulayas, Kuravas, Parayas etc; but they occupied only a low status in society and were subjected to all kinds of disabilities. The chief characteristic of Kerala society during nineteenth century was the deep social stratification based on the caste system.

The disabilities which the Depressed Classes suffered with regard to the use of amenities such as wells, roads and temples or status symbols such as dress and ornaments were generally more severe in Kerala. The untouchable communities like Pulayas, Parayas and other similar caste began to suffer from various kinds of disabilities viz. economic, education, social, occupational, political and religious. “Unapproachability” and “unseeability” were also part of untouchability was prevalent in Kerala. The common people were prohibited from walking through public roads and drawing water from public wells. The womenfolk of the Avarnas were forbidden to wear blouse or jacket and compelled to go half dressed. Seeing the state of affairs, Swami Vivekananda had called Kerala as “Lunatic Asylum”.

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIAL RENAISSANCE

Western colonisation stripped the traditional systems of society and tried to change the whole Socio-cultural systems. In the nineteenth century, Kerala witnessed a cultural and ideological struggle against the backward elements of the traditional culture and the ideological hegemony of the Brahmanas. Social mobility in Kerala was multi-dimensional. Its main goal was the eradication of all forms of discrimination and exploitation during the centuries. As a result of the colonial domination, the spread of education, the commercialisation of the new agrarian economic order, the development of transport and communication, the western concept of private property in land, the modernisation of public administration etc. brought about social change in the nineteenth century Kerala. The most important contribution given by the British government for the social change was in the field of education. With the joint effort of the Christian Missionaries and communal organisations, the British government did a praiseworthy work in providing educational facilities to all communities in Kerala. The foundation of western education was laid in Kerala at the beginning of nineteenth century. The Christian Missionaries did the spade work in the field of education, and they are considered the pioneers in English education and female education in Kerala. The activities in education improved the standard of Uteracy both in the higher and the lower strata of the society.

The indigenous renaissance movements can be seen in early days in Kerala society when the cultural and literary reformations had been developed by the activities of Tuiicattu Ramanujan Ezhuttacchan and the Bhakti movement. During the second half of the nineteenth century, as a result of colonial intervention in the society and the continuity of reacting to the tradition of indigenous thoughts brought with it the tendencies of modern renaissance movement in Kerala. It is not easy to determine the time of the beginning of this process. But the powerful modern movement came in to the society only after the colonial intervention in the state. Though there were many educated persons who had dexterity in western languages among the leaders of the Indian renaissance movement, some of them like, Swaminarayana in Gujarath, Mahima Gosai in Orissa and Ayya Vaikundar, Sri Narayana Guru and Chattampi Swami in Kerala had little knowledge in western ideas and languages. They are considered as the leaders of the transitional renaissance movement in India. Movements started by Sri Narayana Guru were transitional and the source of his ideas was indigenous. Sri

Narayana Guru was called transitional leader but most of his disciples and colleagues were well versed in English and educated in modern institutions.

SOCIO-RELIGIOUS REFORM MOVEMENTS

In the beginning of the nineteenth century synchronising with the starting of the intellectual awakening, arose social reformations throughout India. The Brahma Samaj formed in Bengal by Ram Mohan Roy and Arya Samaj in Punjab by Dayananda Saraswati set in motion a new wave of thought among the intelligentsia. The Movements in Kerala in the late nineteenth and the early decades of twentieth century was a by-product of the great socio-religious awakening witnessed all over India earlier.

The latter half of the nineteenth century witnessed various social reform movements in Kerala. The Kerala society awakened from the age long slumber by the activities of various social reformers and the society started showing the symptom of social renaissance. The co operation given by the colonial rulers through as a part of their political hegemony, provided, a new impetus for the social reform movements in Kerala. The most aspect of social reform movements in Kerala during the nineteenth century was the awakening of the lower caste people and their struggle against the evils of the Hindu society. This period marked an important turning point in the history of modern Kerala as it paved the way for the revolutionary changes in the social life of people. The famous social reformers of Kerala came from both lower and higher caste background. Their caste perspective was clear from the nature of the issues they espoused. But well organised movements were initiated and led by the middle class and the high castes under the influence of both traditional and western ideas.

The social condition of Kerala inspired many social reformers to come forward to fight against this social inequalities and evil customs existed in Kerala society. Sree Narayana guru was an important name in this regard. He provided significant contributions to the social history of Kerala by his commitment to the social activities. Sree narayana guru was a spiritual leader who shook the foundations of linguistic caste system prevailed in Kerala. Ideas and activities liberated the down trodden neglected masses of low castes from their age old sufferings and ignorance. He questioned the then existed evil customs and rituals. Thus he brought about changes in Kerala society to a large extent. He lead the low castes especially the ezhava community towards progress through education and helped that community to be self reliant through communal organization.

SREE NARAYANA GURU: EARLY LIFE AND REFORM WORKS

Sree Narayana Guru was born in the year 1856AD at Chempazhanthi in the suburbs of thiruvananthapuram, the capital of Kerala. He was born in a poor family and his father 'Madan Asan' as he title Asan shows, looked upon with respect by the villagers. His mother's name was Kutti Amma. They belong to the Vayalvaram family which is still existing near the Manakkal Bhagavathy Temple. His parents called him 'Nanu' he learned Tamil, Malayalam and Sanskrit from his father. In 1921, at a conference of all fraternity he proclaimed a message "Oru Jaati, Oru Matam Oru Daivam, Manushyanu"- One Caste, One religion, One God for mankind. Sri Narayana Guru has Given most attention for the education and spreading knowledge to the people. Education is the sole tool for the attainment of individual freedom and self respect.

Subdued for centuries by the Brahmin and the Nayar castes, regarded as outside the fourfold structure of the caste system, the Ezhavas, nevertheless, retained a pride even in their position as the leading caste of the outcastes, and during the nineteenth century developed a great will to rise above the limitations which society had laid upon them, a will personified most dynamically in the teachings of Sri Narayana Guru, who was himself an Ezhava. Revolution was motivated and catalyzed by a most unbelievable revolutionary, a conventional Shaivite vedantin, an ascetic and monk who wrote a number of devotional songs in Tamil, Sanskrit and Malayalam and he was Sri Narayana Guru.

When one discusses about Sri Narayana Guru, one uses superlatives in order to compare the great saint with a list of notables. Guru was the famous reformer in Hinduism to come out to the southern parts of India since the incomparable Adi Sankara. Narayana Guru was the champion of the rights of lower caste oppressed Hindus in the twentieth century, and was more flourishing than the better known Dr. Ambedkar and Mahatma Gandhi. He overturned the social system of entire Kerala, while following simple means unlike the works of EV Ramaswamy Naicker in the state of Tamil Nadu. The revolutionary reformer, whose call for self improvement and self reliance touched delicately the heart of the oppressed class all over the world.

In 1887 Sri Narayana Guru started his own career as a great religious and social reformer. He was very much affected by the social inequalities to which the low-castes had been subjected at that time. Sri Narayana Guru decided to resist the high caste for he upliftment of the depressed classes. In those days temples were under the exclusive monopoly of Brahmins. His first act was the challenge thrown against this monopoly of Brahmins through founding and consecrating temples by himself;

The Aruvipuram consecration of Siva was a landmark in the history of social revolution in Kerala was a great blow to caste-ridden- Hinduism. This great even happened on a shivarathriday in 1888. It was very simple and great as well. Narayana Guru picked up a stone from the river Neyyar and installed it on a pedestal with silent prayer. Thus the consecration of 'Sivalinga' completed. A large crowd witnessed this great historical event in the social and spiritual history of India. The right to conseration was vested only with Brahmins during that period. Guru was not a Brahmin and he was not even a 'Sudra'. He was totally outside of the fourfold 'Varnas' Guru gave a message to be engravel on the temple wall. It read Sri Narayana Guru wrote *Atmopadeshakasatakam*, an original Vedanta during his stay at Aruvipuram. Under the leadership of the Swami which was registered in June 1903 with twenty four member from the eleven yogams responsible for the management of the Aruvipuram Temple. In 1903 the Swami established the shivagirimutt at Varkala. 1905 Guru introduced certain changes in the marriage ceremony and expressed his desire for the eradication of customs like 'Thalikettu' Thirandu – Kalyanam', 'animal sacrifice' and drinking. Guru visited North Malabar in 1906 and he founded a temple at Trichur.

In 1904, an Ezhava conference was held at Paravur (Quilon) under Guru's Chairmanship for the uplift of the community. In this conference the Guru decided to put an end to the evil practices like 'Thalikettu', Thirandukuli, Pulikudi etc and to evolve a new code for the conduct of marriages. According to him the marriage must be simple and the

participants should not exceed ten persons - groom, their parents, one companion each of the girl and the groom, a priest and an important man of the locality. The Guru added that the priest is to hand over the garlands, his heart brimful of the thought of God. Marriage should be registered in the book kept for that purpose. The Guru was also concerned with educational and economic aspects besides the social problems. To the Guru education appropriate to the times was the sine-qua-non of all progress. Not only men but also women must be educated. The Guru encouraged adult literacy and establishment of libraries in every locality. Vivekodayam magazine started by the S.N .D. P. Yogam played an important role for the uplift of the community. Most of the temples he established have schools attached to them according to the Guru after education, industry is the next important thing for the uplift of the community. At Varkala, he established also a weaving school where pupils got free elementary instruction in weaving. It has helped man to acquire a means of livelihood. In order to make our economic power sufficient through industry and commerce, what is required is the involvement of the rich. Only moneyed people can import appropriate machinery and start small scale industries as well as handicrafts. Industrial progress is an important thing for social advancement and elevation of economic position of the community Guru as a Humanist The guru a unique 'knin of action' took the role of not only a saint and philosopher but also a humanist in his life. An assertion of the Guru "Man is not for Religion, Religion is for man" is a thorough going statement of the philosophy of humanism. Like Vivekananda, the true correlation between Karmayoga and humanism is found in him. In Atmopadesa Satakam the emphasis is laid on man. According to him the urge for freedom or salvation enables man to acquire knowledge and thus he conquers his environment by knowing. He stated that self- instruction is the best means to know one self and world. The Guru projected a God who would stand the test of reason and a religion which served progressive human and social purpose. The message such as 'One Caste, One Religion, One God, for Man1 and Whatever be the religion, it suffices if it makes a better man," propounded by the Guru reveals himself as a true humanist and internationalist. Even though he was a rustic saint he boldly envisaged the concept of 'One World' many decades back. This concept emerges only from a man who is an unstinted believer in humanity. According to the Guru caste was not determined by God. If caste is necessary, let everyone be a Brahmin. To call oneself a Sudra is to admit inferiority. The Guru's opinions were unambiguous and categorical. Both agreed in removing unouchability. At Sivagiri the Guru trained untouchable boys for priesthood along with other Hindu Children. As Shri Narayana Guru was a double pronged drive to reach the goal of love and fellow through social change. With the historic consecration of the Sivalinga at Aruvippuram, the thrust began. It was energetically followed up. One after the other, many more places of worship sprang up. "Simultaneously the temple sabha started at Aruvippuram became a broad based forum to agitate against social and political discrimination. Its goal was to usher in the new social order to make universal the model abode ideal the Guru had announced at Aruvippuram.

SREE NARAYANA DHARMA PARIPALANA YOGAM

The revolutionary activity of Sri Narayana Gum started an ideological battle against the caste discriminations in the society and the traditional evil practices prevalent among the Ezhava

community. The attempt of idol installation at Aruvippuram was his debut in the social activities of Kerala. It was the most important proclamation of human equality and had produced results which eventually changed the face of the socio-religious-economic-political life of Kerala. He found the man suggested by Swami Vivekananda and soon the SNDP was founded on May 1903. The first annual session of the Yoga was held at Aruvippuram in 1904 under the guidance of Sri Narayana Guru. The rise of SNDP Yoga dedicated to the cause of commons and social reform helped to supplement the activities of Sri Narayana Guru and other social reformers. The basic aim of SNDP was to popularise the message of Sri Narayana Guru and bring about the social and spiritual regeneration of the Ezhavas and other backward communities. Thus the SNDP movement through its numerous activities proved highly useful in the struggle for social equality. The movements of the SNDP Yoga brought about radical-socio-economic changes in the life of the people particularly that of the Dalits in Kerala. SNDP played quite decisive and distinctive role in the evolution of modern Kerala. The Yogam says it works for the welfare of the disadvantaged sections of the society, but essentially concentrates its activities among the Ezhava community, the single largest Hindu community in Kerala forming about a quarter of the state's population. The SNDP Yogam is now led by Vellappally Natesan as its general secretary for the past about two decades. One of the greatest achievements of *S.N.D.P.* Yogam was the consolidation of the entire Ezhavas of Kerala who were spread out in different regions under different names.

SREE NARAYANA GURU ON UNIVERSALISM AND SECULARISM

Sree Narayana Guru's attitude to religion is worth elaboration because of his profound scholarship, incisive intellect and independent thinking. He had understood the teachings of all religions and came to the conclusion that there was no fundamental difference between their basic principles. The aim of all religions is to attain happiness. The action leading to Self - happiness should be the gist of all religions. This is the only religion, according to the Guru

In the concept of religion the Guru tried to reveal the essential oneness of all religions. According to him, humanity is rooted in one single religion. The rivers emerging from various mountains, converge into the oneness of the ocean, so all religions merge into the single, eternal object. Different religions continuously strive for the attainment of this oneness. Thus, what is revealed from these endeavours is the irrefutable evidence that there is only one religion. he Guru's concept of One Religion is a call for human dignity which in essence gives every man the responsibility of preserving the honour and freedom of his fellow men to live in equality and well-being. According to the Guru, the aim of all religions is to attain happiness. Life is a sort of progression from the past to the future. In this process, it becomes inevitable for human beings to reckon with the unbridled sense of freedom on the one side and total dependence on nature on the other, and to harmonize these two extreme poles. Here comes the necessity in human life of harmonizing the free will of a person with the will of nature, otherwise known as destiny In this context, religions promise that people can reconcile their personal freedom with the overall flow of nature which seems to care for nothing.

Religion prepares us to perceive these two faces as pertaining to a neutral overall Reality and scheme of life. When the Guru declares “One Religion for Man”, his exhortation is to regain one’s universal identity with Self-knowledge. Self-knowledge well-known as *atma -vidhyais* understanding oneself, as an individual being in relation to his environment. It is because of this, Nataraja Guru defines religion as a whole-hearted relationship between man with his fellow men or with some unseen value - factors. To him, Happiness refers to a supreme human value in whose light all other motives are only secondary considerations or particular instances. Happiness as the aim of man gives unity to human purpose and brings all religions, faiths or creeds under its single sway. In India religion is called *dharma* because it sustains all the traditionally preserved essential values of life. Highlight the realization of the essential oneness of all religions, Narayana Guru organized a Parliament of Religions at Advaithashramam, Aluva, in 1924. This was the first ‘All Religions Meet’ organized in Asia.

In the envoi of the poem entitled *Anukampa Dasakam*, the Guru pays homage to the truth behind life as the highest human value applying directly to a spiritual life without any religious coloration. Accordingly, the Guru wants us to live as one single human community, whatever be the religion. This is very much the ideal place for mankind according to India’s ancient rishis - *Vasudhaiva Kudumbakam*. This is exactly spiritual globalisation, which Sri Narayana Guru did not name but since this is the era of globalisation we are honoured to honour Sri Narayana Guru as a first man to bring spiritual globalisation to the earth.

CONCLUSION

Sree Narayana Guru was an embodiment of all virtues, values and rare qualities seldom found in human race. He was a saintly contemplative man who could impart wisdom and give enlightenment to a seeker of truth. His teachings are straight forward and simple, bringing out spiritual, moral and material revolution. Sree Narayana Guru was treasure house of knowledge and wisdom. His greatness and purity is to be experienced by swimming through the ocean of knowledge revealed through his writings, lofty messages and personal life. Guru taught the people: “Gain strength through organization” and put this into practice. The message of Sree Narayana Guru was not intended for the Keralites alone, but to the whole of humanity. He longed to see human beings united in ‘one caste, one religion, one god for man’. The teachings of the Guru, especially to gain wisdom through education, are increasingly becoming relevant.

Review Questions

1. Evaluate the contributions of Ambedkar as the champion of the cause of untouchables in the Indian society.
2. Write an essay on the contribution of Ambedkar to modern India
3. Elaborate on Ambedkar's concept of social democracy
4. Compare and contrast the socio political ideas of Gandhi and Ambedkar
5. Assess the reason and impact of Kerala renaissance
6. Delineate the contribution of Sri Narayana Guru to Kerala Renaissance
7. Relevance of Sri Narayana Guru’s teaching to present Kerala society

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Alhuwalia, B. and Alhuwalia, M., *Raja Ram Mohan Roy and the Indian Renaissance*, New Delhi, Mittal Publications, 1991.
2. Appadorai, A., *Indian Political Thinking in the 20th century*, New Delhi, South Asian Publishers, 1987.
3. Balaram, N.E. *Keralathile Communiste Prasthanam* (The Communist Movement in Kerala), Trivandrum, 1973.
4. Bhattacharjee, Arun, *The Prophets of Modern Indian Nationalism*, Delhi, Ashish Publishing House, 1993.
5. Cashman, R.L., *Myth of Lokmanya Tilak and Mass Politics in India*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1975.
6. Chakaravati, G., *Gandhi: A Challenge to the Hindu Muslim Problem*, New Delhi, Eastern Books, 1991.
7. Chakrabartyn Bidyut & Pandey, Kumar, Rajendra, *Modern Indian Political Thought*, New Delhi, SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd, 2009.
8. Datta, Amlan, *Beyond Socialism*, Bombay, Popular Prakashan, 1993.
9. Desai, A.R., *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, Bombay, Popular Prakashan, 1996.
10. E.M.S. Nambudiripad, *The National Question in Kerala*, Bomabay, 1952
11. E.M.S. Nambudirpad, 'Basic Principles of Marxist Economy', in Public (General) Dept. G.O. 1351
12. Farquhar, J.N., *Modern Religious Movements in India*. Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal, 1967.
13. Ganguly, S.M., *Leftism in India: MN Roy and .Indian Politics 1920 1948*, Calcutta, Minerva Publications, 1984.
14. Ghose, Sankar, *Modern Indian Political Thought*, New Delhi, Allied Publishers. 1984.
15. Gore, M.S., *The Social Context of an Ideology: Ambedkar's Political and Social thought*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, 1993.
16. Griffiths, Percival, *The British Impact on India*, London, Macdonald, 1952.
17. Ingham, Kenneth, *Reformers in India*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1956.
18. Jayakumar, Vijayalayam, *Sree Narayana Guru: Oru Samagra Padanam* (Malayalam), Kottayam, 1990.
19. Jayaraman, P. *Swami Vivekananda. The Prophet of India*. U.S.A: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 2002.

20. Kapoor, S., *Sri Aurobindo Ghosh and Bal Gangadhar Tilak*, New Delhi, Deep and Deep Publications, 1991.
21. Masselos, Jim, *Indian Nationalism: An History*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, 1996.
22. Mehta, N.C., *Lohia A Study*, Delhi, Atma Ram and Sons, 1975.
23. Mehta, V.R., *Foundations of Indian Political Thought*, New Delhi, Manohar Publishers, 1992.
24. Morison, T., *Rise and expansion of British Power in India*, New Delhi, Deep and Deep Publications, 1988.
25. Nigam, R L, *Radical Humanism of MN Roy: An exposition of his 22 theses*, New Delhi, Indus Books, 1988.
26. Pantham, Thomas and Kenneth L. Deutsch (Eds.), *Political Thought in Modern India*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, 1986.
27. Parekh, Bhiku, *Colonialism Tradition and Reform: An Analysis of Gandhi's Political discourse*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, 1989.
28. Parekh, Bhiku, *Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination*, Hampshire, Macmillan Press, 1989.
29. Prasad, Bimal, *J.P. and Social Change*, New Delhi, Radiant Publishers, 1992.
30. Robin Jeffrey, 'Travancore: Status, Class and the Growth of Radical Politics, 1860-1940, in R.Jeffrey ed. *Peoples, Princes and Paramount Power: Society and Politics in Indian Princely States*, Delhi, 1978.
31. Roy, Dipti Kumar, *Leftist Politics in India: MN Roy and the Radical Democratic Party*, Calcutta, Minerva Associates, 1989.
32. Sarhar, Bibekbrata, *Nationalism and Marxism in India: Guest for People and Power*, Delhi, Kalinga Publications, 1990.
33. Sathe, Shanta, *Lokamanya Tilak: His Social and Political Thoughts*, Delhi, Ajanta Publications, 1994.
34. Selbourne, David (Ed.), *In Theory and Practice: Essays on the Politics of JP.*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1985.
35. Singh, Chandrakant, *Socialism in India: Rise, growth and Prospect*, New Delhi, D.K. Publishers, 1986.
36. Sreenivasan, K. *Sree Narayana Guru – Saint Philosopher Humanist*. Thiruvananthapuram, 1989
37. Terchek, Ronald J., *Gandhi: Struggling for Autonomy*, New Delhi, Vistaar Publications, 2000.