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The present chapter attempts to locate the theoretical framework of the ideology of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad'. Acharya Javdekar proclaims the ideology to be a synthesis of Gandhian and Marxist thought systems. These systems developed radical political ideologies for the emancipation of the entire humanity. However both prove to be inadequate to develop a practical-political solution, as they focus only on a specific aspect of the social life—either ideal or material. Acharya Javdekar felt that the need of the hour was to find out a political solution which will equally attend to the material and the moral problems before the world, Satyagrahi Samajwad was an attempt in that direction.

Outline of The Ideology

As stated earlier Acharya Javdekar's main political concern was the future of the Post-Independence Indian society. He terms this society as 'Modern India'. He expected the modern Indian nation to be an ideal for the entire World. The ideal Indian Society can be created if it successfully deals with the material as well as the moral-spiritual problems before it, Satyagrahi Samajwad provides a tool for the fulfilment of such an ideal. At one level it addresses the problems of the Indian Society. However the theoretical scope of the ideology is wider to attend the problems of the entire humanity. Satyagrahi Samajwad simultaneously operates on both these levels. It aspires
to cover the problems of the entire humanity in its theoretical scope and yet retains the indigenous character, Acharya Javdekar calls Satyagrahi Samajwad a revolutionary tool provided by India to the entire world. Satyagrahi Samajwad reformulates Marxian Socialism by using the notion of Satyagraha. Satyagraha was developed by Gandhi as a unique form of political resistance in India. According to Javdekar Satyagraha can also be treated as a symbol of Indian spirituality; which was superior to the material west. Therefore Javdekar treats Satyagrahi Samajwad as an indigenous ideology capable of addressing the problems of the entire humanity.

The theoretical scope of Satyagrahi Samajwad expands and enriches because it attempts a positive synthesis of Gandhi and Marx at various levels. Acharya Javdekar was well aware of the fact that the two thought systems are separate and autonomous. But he has not a dogmatic follower of either of the systems. In fact he firmly believed that the valid elements of both the systems can be brought together to create a fruitful solution to the problems of the world. The synthesis was possible because both Gandhi and Marx were trying to resolve similar problems. Ultimately they both sought to achieve the same objective of egalitarian and free human society devoid of any external compulsions on the individual. The realisation of such a society remains a utopia in both the systems of thought. The need is to work on a practical - political solution to move forward towards the attainment of the utopia. The practical-
political solution needs a revision of both the ideologies, such a revision is attempted in Satyagrahi Samajwad. The ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad believes that the Gandhian idea of moral emancipation has to be supplemented by the Marxian notion of material emancipation by dissolving the unjust social structures. Marxism provides a very useful and appropriate perspective on the nature of the material obstacles in achieving the human freedom. However, this perspective remains to be inadequate if it is not supplemented by the notion of the moral freedom of the individual. Human beings cannot be completely free unless they shed away not only external but the internal restraints on their selves. The internal restraints can be removed only if the human beings come out of their narrow material interests and identify themselves to be one with the entire world. The notions of Satya and Ahimsa in Satyagraha can help in such an understanding. Therefore, according to Acharya Javdekar the material and moral struggles are to be simultaneously fought. 'Satyagrahi Samajwad' can prove to be a useful tool to fight such struggles.

Satyagrahi Samajwad assumes that Mahatma Gandhi; as a true representative of the East, has made a valuable addition to the emancipatory thinking of the West. Many western ideologies have developed the visions of human freedom in a variety of ways. Acharya Javdekar sights Marxism, as the most appropriate emancipatory ideology developed by the West. However, the western thinking in general lacks the spiritual-moral perspective,
according to him. Therefore all the western ideologies; including Marxism are not able to cross the boundaries of material interests. The material interests are necessarily partial. The need is to supplement them with universal moral perspective. Acharya Javdekar is sure that the Eastern thought; based on spiritualism-idealism; can alone provide the necessary moral perspective. Among the eastern varieties of thought Satyagraha is the most appropriate political vision according to him. The orthodox thinking of the spiritual east is limited to the ideal of individual Moksha and is not concerned about the material pleasures and pains. Satyagraha becomes unique among them because it is aware of the material sphere of human life. Rather Satyagraha treats the material sphere to be equally important and suggests to realise the liberation in the material world. If such a vision of spiritual liberation is related to the material well being of the individual - the two fold problems before the human society can be adequately solved. Satyagrahi Samajwad finally aims at this ideal. At the same time, he is very well aware of the value of the material liberation of human societies. Therefore Satyagrahi Samajwad gives a due credit to both Gandhism and Marxism. At the theoretical level 'Satyagrahi Samajwad' creates a possibility of a third way out of Marxism and Gandhism according to Acharya Javdekar.

The real task for Satyagrahi Samajwad is not limited to the theoretical formulation. In fact Acharya Javdekar feels that the theoretical combination of Marxism and Gandhism can be
easily imagined because both the ideologies share the same utopia. The real work is to search for an appropriate political tool to realise the utopia. He engages himself in the exercise of Satyagrahi Samajwad to find out the appropriate political tool. In this sense Satyagrahi Samajwad attempts to provide certain directives to 'political action' to realise the ideals of both Gandhism and Marxism. At this level Satyagrahi Samajwad attempts to reformulate the Marxian notion of revolution with the help of Satyagraha.

At the third level of its application Acharya Javdekar tries to solve the problems before the Indian society; with the help of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad. He attempts to identify the social agencies present in Indian society; who will become the carriers of the 'Satyagrahi Samajwad' revolution in India. A large part of his writings on Satyagrahi Samajwad is devoted to this discussion. The discussion becomes very important even in the theoretical understanding of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad'. It raises certain key theoretical issues in Acharya's formulation of the ideology. Therefore it is necessary to discuss the practical strategies of Acharya Javdekar as part of the Indian experiments of politics; to understand the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad in a better manner.

In short the understanding of the ideology of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad' will take place at three levels. On the one hand the attempt will be to understand how Acharya Javdekar synthesizes Gandhism and Marxism at the theoretical level. The attempt will
be to see if Satyagrahi Samajwad claims itself to be a post-Gandhian and post-Marxian emancipatory ideology. In other words one has to understand the nature of the Utopia for 'Satyagrahi Samajwad'. At the second part of our discussion of the ideology, we have to look at the ideology as what Acharya calls 'the science of revolution (Satyagrahi Krantishastra). This aspect emphasises the role of the ideology as the practico-political tool to realise the ultimate goal. Acharya Javdekar has summarized this aspect of the ideology; by calling it 'Yugdharma' (the duty of the present age). At the third level; while discussing the application of Satyagrahi Samajwad to the Indian situation; one can look at the Satyagrahi Samajwadi political practice, and the social agencies leading such a political practice. The present chapter restricts itself to the understanding of the theoretical framework in which the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad takes shape. The next chapter will discuss the argument of the ideology in detail in the background of the attempted sketch of the theoretical framework.

**Development of The Ideology**

The final formulation of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad' in Acharya's thought system; gives priority to the Gandhian scheme of thought. However the development of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad coincides with Acharya's intellectual development, where he begins with the search for finding out an appropriate ideology to solve the problems of post-independence Indian society.
As stated in the earlier chapter Acharya's first political concern was the struggle for the political freedom in India. He was part of the nationalist politics and the nationalist framework always dominated his political thought at various levels. His argument of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad also develops through the nationalist framework. The nationalist movement of his time had started looking forward to ideal Indian society after realization of political freedom. The various ideological currents within the national movement continuously searched for a viable ideology to realise the ideal that they imagined. In this process Acharya was first acquainted with the political thought of the fabian socialists and was quite impressed by it. Earlier his politics had mainly taken place under Lokmanya Tilak's leadership. He was completely influenced by the Philosophy of Vedanta and the Karmayoga in Gita.

After Lokmanya Tilak's demise in 1920 Gandhi took over the leadership of the nationalist movement. During the same period Russian revolution took place (in 1917) and the ideology of communism became very popular in India. Acharya Javdekar was wholeheartedly participating in the Gandhian politics and the various Satyagrahi experiments. At the same time; he started the critical reading of Karl Marx's writings as well as the commentaries on Marxism and communism. It was during this period that he started the ideological construction of Satyagrahi Samajwad. His intellectual training helped him in critically understanding the political thought of Marx as well as Gandhi.
He was neither overwhelmed by Gandhi nor by Marx. However, he became aware of the emancipatory potentials of both the ideologies and started his theoretical exercise of bringing them together. The attempts of synthesis can be sighted in his writings around 1930. Even before that he was influenced by the Marxist political ideas. During the entire period he continuously looks for the exact solution to Indian problems. The answer he found was 'Satyagrahi Samajwad' which he continuously advocated for the last two and a half decades of his political life.

In this sense, we can state the development of the ideology of Sattyagrahi Samajwad has the background of two very important political events. The Bolshevik revolution in Russia and the Satyagrahi experiments in India. Acharya's main political concern was of course to solve the problems before the Indian society. He was searching for an appropriate ideological tool for this purpose. The search takes place in a staunch nationalist framework. As a student of Political Science, Acharya Javdekar had seriously studied the western ideologies of Individualism; Nationalism, Utopian varieties of socialism; Fascism and Liberal Democracy. He critically analysed their nature and pointed out the serious shortcomings of these ideologies. Among these he was attracted towards the Marxian arguments. However, he could not completely devote himself to Marxism on the background of the experiments of Satyagraha going on in India under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi.
Besides his intellectual background favoured spiritual-moral concerns over the material concerns of Marxism. The influence of Lokmanya Tilak's Karmayoga as well as his urge to realize the 'Indian spirit' (Bharatiya Aryatva) proved as additional factors in his search for the Indian variety of emancipatory ideology. As a result of all these factors his search for the appropriate ideology begins with the denial of the modern, western ideologies.

On the other hand Marxism provided him with an appropriate interpretation of the existing social system. Acharya Javdekar felt it to be quite rigorous and completely agreed with it. Satyagrahi Samajwad uses the Marxist insights to a large extent in formulating its ideological content. In fact Acharya Javdekar analyses Gandhism; continuously using the socialist categories.

The critical study of Marxism led him to the problems of Marxism. Satyagrahi Samajwad treats denial of spirituality and violence (actually related to each other) as the two basic problems of Marxism. It tries to overcome these problems with the help of the Gandhian insights. At this point Satyagrahi Samajwad develops with a critical interaction between Gandhi and Marx. This can be sighted as the second line of argument by Acharya Javdekar used for developing the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad. This line of argument points out the inadequacies of Marxism and attempts to overcome them with the
help of Satyagraha. In this sense Satyagraha plays a 'corrective role' to the ideology of scientific socialism. The corrective position, in the form of Satyagrahi Samajwad', attempts a complete reformulation of the Gandhian and Marxian ideologies. It aims at a 'synthesis' of the two. The present work attempts to understand the various levels of synthesis between Gandhi and Marx, as formulated by Acharya Javdekar.

**Idealism and Materialism**

The ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad basically attempts a synthesis of the philosophical positions of Idealism and Materialism with the help of Gandhi and Marx. To establish the synthesis it first clarifies how Gandhian and Marxian ideals are similar in content. Secondly it also explains how both Gandhism and Marxism; internally provide a space for balancing the elements of materialism and idealism respectively. Therefore an attempted synthesis of idealism and materialism can be treated as the philosophical foundation on which the ideology of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad' is constructed.

Acharya Javdekar continuously tries to synthesise Idealism and Materialism with the help of Gandhi and Marx. The synthesis also represents his attempt to bring together the East and the West. The elements of idealism and Materialism are synthesized in Satyagrahl Samajwad at various levels. The synthesis serves as a basis to the ideology of Satyagrahl Samajwad.

As stated earlier; Agarkar; Tilak; Marx and Gandhi
become the four 'gurus' for Acharya Javdekar. Agarkar oriented him towards an enlightened vision of social service. However, the synthesis of the elements of Idealism and Materialism mainly takes shape out of the influences of Tilak, Gandhi and Marx. Javdekar engages himself in a very subtle intellectual exercise to combine the political insights of the above mentioned political thinkers.

**Influences of Lokmanya Tilak**

Acharya Javdekar was completely under the influence of Lokmanya Tilak's political thought during the first spell of political life. Tilak introduced him to the concept of 'Bharatiya Aryatva'\(^8\) (the essence of Indianness). Tilak's Gitarahasya suggested him that the essence of the Indian nation lies in its spirituality. Gitarahasya attempted to establish the superiority of the East over the West. The superiority consists of the spiritual thought of the East. Gitarahasya celebrated the ancient philosophy of Vedanta by emphasising the 'Karmayogi' aspect of it. Lokmanya Tilak's Gitarahasya arrived within the nationalist framework. He felt it to be very essential to invoke the spirit of 'political action' among the Indian masses. Gitarahasya develops the 'Karmayogi Vedanta' in this background. Acharya Javdekar was completely influenced by the argument of Karmayogi Vedanta developed by Gitarahasya. Agarkar had already taught him to regard the social service as the first and foremost duty.\(^9\) Tilak's Vedanta helped him in relating the social service with the spiritual ideal of 'Moksha'. The orthodox versions of Vedanta considered the ideal of Moksha to be realized by the individual through complete renunciation of the material actions. Karmayogi
Vedanta relates the ideal of Moksha with material actions of the individual. The individual is to realise Moksha by performing duties of the material world. Physically he cannot renounce the material actions. However, Karmayogi Vedanta also states that the individual should completely part himself with the results or fruits of these actions. The indulgence in fruits will lead the individual to bindings of the material interests. The individual will not be able to attain the ideal of Moksha. The individual must undertake the material actions as determined duties. The logic of Karmayogi Vedanta denies both the crude materialism which develops its moral philosophy on the basis of the material (and therefore partial) interests. It also denies the orthodox version of Vedanta, which completely denies the existence of the material world. The Karmayogi Vedanta combines the ideal of Moksha with fruitful social action of the individual. At the same time it provides a sound moral basis to the social actions.

The argument of Gitarahasya has profound influence on Acharya Javdekar's intellectual development. It established the centrality of Bhagwadgita in his political thought. Acharya Javdekar considers Gitarahasya as the authentic and appropriate interpretation of Gita. According to him Gitarahasya develops a moral philosophy on the basis of the Karmayogi Vedanta. Karmayogi Vedanta formulates the ideal of Moksha as the identification of the self with the entire world. To attain the realisation the individual has to cross the limits of the narrow
material interests. To achieve this one has to engage in positive social actions (aiming at the good of all) without indulging in their results. That completes the ethical statement of Gitarahasya. The ideal expressed by Gitarahasya is that of the material as well as moral well-being of all the individuals.

The Centrality of Gita

Gitarahasya led Acharya Javdekar to a more careful study of Gita. Gita becomes a very important point of reference for him. He attempts to provide a specific interpretation of Gita taking insights from Tilak and Gandhi. Acharya is sure that Karmayoga; which advises intense activity for the realisation of Moksha, is the real essence of Gita. The basic preaching of Gita was to perform the duties but deny the fruits. The individual can be a Karmayogi only if he/she raises himself/herself above the selfish material interests. That will lead the individual towards positive social action.

The main question for Acharya Javdekar is of defining the positive social action. Gitarahasya suggests that positive social action is that which is oriented towards the material as well as moral well being of the entire humanity. The problem is to find out a specific criterion of action which will judge the individual's action as positive or negative. According to Javdekar Gitarahasya is unable to provide the criterion. In fact all earlier commentaries of Gita prove to be inadequate in this respect. Gitarahasya maintains that criteria of positive social
action are relative and depend on the existing social situation. It doesn't glorify Himsa but allows the use of Himsa under specific circumstances. The search for a criterion of positive social action leads Acharya to Gandhi. The reading of 'Anaskatiyoga' (1930) by Gandhi led him to recognise Ahimsa as the only criterion of positive social action. Earlier he was influenced by Gandhi's personality and his Satyagrahi experiments. Gandhian interpretation of Gita gave a completely new dimension to Acharya Javdekar's political thought. He started looking at Gandhism as an extension of Lokmanya Tilak's political thought. (The synthesis also comes out of the nationalist political compulsions. However it is not a mere strategic synthesis.) According to Acharya Javdekar Gandhi preserves the universal moral content of Gita but changes its social philosophy.

The universal moral content of Gita emphasises Moksha as its ideal. The achievement of Moksha is possible only through the practice of Ahimsa; according to Mahatma Gandhi. The selfish material interests lead the individual towards the path of Himsa. Therefore to cross the limits of the narrow material interests; one must practise Ahimsa. The concept of Ahimsa; completes Acharya Javdekar's search for a criterion of positive social action. He treats the Gandhian interpretation of Gita as the most appropriate one. It shows us the way to fight the injustices of the world without losing sight of the final ideal of moksha, according to Javdekar.
Lokmanya Tilak in his Gitarahasya stops at the establishment of necessary relationship of Moksha and Loksangraha-positive work of social welfare. However his ethical argument places the authority at the hands of the enlightened individuals in the society. The ordinary persons are not able to decide the criterion of positive social action. It is decided by the 'enlightened soul' considering the relative demands of the situation. Mahatma Gandhi places the authority in the hands of the ordinary individual, Gandhi's interpretation of Gita allows every individual to guide his own actions. Gandhi is aware that nobody can know the Satya- the Eternity. However every individual understands partial satya. If the individual supports such understanding with a strict use of nonviolence the action will be definitely a positive means of social well-being. This is seen as yet another important aspect of the Gandhian interpretation fo Gita.\textsuperscript{16}

Acharya concludes that the interpretation of Gita by Mahatma Gandhi opens up a way to organise the social relations; on a just basis-using the insights of Indian traditional thinking. Acharya Javdekar treats Bhagwadgita as a central text of Gandhism. While relating Tilak and Gandhi he emphasises the same point. Acharya's own intellectual framework gets two dimensions out of the Gandhian interpretation of Gita. He himself regards Gita as a central text of his ideological framework. Even before his readings of Gandhism; he would have accepted the centrality of Gita out of Tilak's influences on him. However, the Gandhian interpretation resolves his doubts about the use
of the spiritual framework of Gita for resolving the material questions. These questions become important for him because of his simultaneous reading of Marx.

Secondly the Gandhian interpretation led him to the acceptance of Satyagraha as the basic component of his political thought. He treats Satyagraha not only as a political weapon but a complete political philosophy - a world view.\(^{17}\) The world view of the political philosophy of Satyagraha is developed by Acharya by relating it directly to Gita and indirectly to the philosophy of Vedanta and the elements of spirituality. In other words he places Satyagraha entirely within the framework of Indian tradition. He treats Satyagraha as 'Sanatandharma.'\(^{18}\)

Both these points become interesting to understand and analyze as they formulate the basic framework of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad. The attempt is made here first to understand Acharya's own argument of Gita, his understanding of Vedanta; the meaning he attaches to Dharma and finally how he locates the Gandhian term of Satyagraha in this framework. Acharya's entire intellectual exercise is dominated by this framework. It is also very much useful in understanding his attempts of synthesis of Idealism and Materialism or Gandhi and Marx. The understanding of the framework begins by looking at the message of Gita according to Acharya Javdekar.

**The Message of Gita**

Gita provides a useful insight for the 'Modern
civilization' according to Acharya Javdekar. The first message of Gita is that the human social relations must have the basis of Dharma. Dharma is defined here using insights from Gandhi. Dharma cannot be equated with any religious sect. Dharma consists of the Duty. The individual should engage in the social relations with a enlightened sense of duty. The individual should not participate in the social activities with the intention of fulfilling his own interests; rather to satisfy the interests of the others. The duties should be performed with a sense of complete detachment towards the material well being of one's own. Such performance of the duties can alone lead to the achievement of Moksha. The thought of selfless action is a necessary factor of the Indian moral - spiritual tradition. The tradition provides the eternal basis to the moral systems of the human society. Gita becomes a representative of such tradition.

Gita transcends the material interests. It creates universal ideal of well being for the entire humanity. At this point it ends up the material rivalries and the notions of just and unjust human beings. The ideal before Gita is to enlighten and liberate everybody. The liberation is to be achieved in every aspect of social life. According to Javdekar the human life consists of four aspects - personal, social, material and the spiritual. Gita provides a way to enlighten each of these aspects of the social life. Javdekar interprets the concept of 'Yadnya' used by Gita; to mean the material well being of the society. The concept of 'Yadnya' implies and initiates the material well being of the members of society. Javdekar concludes that Gita pays equal attention to the spiritual and the material life of the
Gita describes a war between the just and unjust elements. Gandhi interprets it as a depiction of the continuous war going on in everybody's mind between the good and the bad qualities. Javdekar accepts this interpretation and suggests to fight the war using nonviolent means. Since the war is directed against one's own self, it becomes necessary to use only nonviolent means. In other words one has to develop a positive feeling of love towards everybody. Once this feeling is developed the individual identifies himself with the entire world. The social war becomes a war against one's ownself. The individual has to use nonviolent means to fight such a war.

As the last but very important point of his comments on Gita, Javdekar states that the social philosophy of Gita is outdated in the existing social context. As its social philosophy Gita glorifies the Varna system. Varna system proved to be a useful social system in the earlier ages. However, in the existing social context nobody can and should defend the social philosophy of Gita. Rather the social philosophy is always relative and must be derived according to the demands of the existing society. At this point Acharya Javdekar indirectly indicates towards Marxism as the appropriate social philosophy. However, we will relate his understanding of Marxism to the spiritual message of Gita; at a later stage of this dissertation. Acharya Javdekar also states that Gita does not provide a science of social-material revolution. Gita presents the eternal principles
on the basis of which human life can be organized. It defines good for human society. However, the techniques to realize the essence of good, change in every social epoch. Gita does not specify the technique. The technique of revolution - as a part of the existing social philosophy must be developed by us. The Gandhian concept of Satyagraha proves to be very useful in this respect.

Acharya Javdekar's interpretation of Gita accommodates the elements of Tilak's and Gandhi's arguments. Using the same insights; Acharya attempts to interpret the meaning of Vedanta and Dharma in a novel manner.

**Vedanta**

Vedanta is for the knowledge of Brahman, the knowledge of the Truth or the Eternal. The knowledge of the Eternal can be achieved by two ways. These two ways are treated by Acharya Javdekar as the two arguments of Vedanta. They represent the two approaches of the philosophy of Vedanta of striving towards the ultimate Satya. Once of the approaches is termed as the 'Vyatirek' approach and the other one as 'Anwaya' approach of Vedanta. The first approach regards the empirical world to be unreal and only Brahman as Satya. Acharya Javdekar considers this approach to be a orthodox approach of looking at Vedanta. The other approach tries to realize the Brahman
within the empirical; organic world.\textsuperscript{22} The orthodox Vedanta of Shankaracharya utilized the 'Vyatireki' approach. Therefore it neglected the material world. On the other hand the Vedanta developed by Vivekananda; Tilak; Gandhi as well as Vinoba crosses the limits of the orthodox version of Vedanta. In fact according to Javdekar these thinkers have created a new 'revolutionary' variety of Vedanta.\textsuperscript{23} In this respect he points out the limitations of the Bhaktimargi Vedanta developed by the Bhagwatdharma especially in Maharashtra. He recognises the contribution of the Varkari saints; in clearly distinguishing the lines of spiritual unity and material differences. The Bhaktimargi Vedanta revealed that the material differences like caste and Varna are limited and unreal. However, Acharya Javdekar also points out the limitations of the Bhaktimargi Vedanta; as it did not initiate any positive social action in the material sphere.\textsuperscript{24}

Bhaktimargi Vedanta uses the second approach termed as 'Anwaya' approach by Javdekar. It emphasises the essence of Brahman to be realized in the organic world. According to Javdekar both these approaches to Vedanta are inadequate. Upanishads and the Gita develop a novel approach to Vedanta which is based on the Vitarkwadi' (dialectical) logic.\textsuperscript{25} It combines the valid elements of both the earlier approaches. Neo-Vedanta of Vivekanand; Tilak; Gandhi and Vinoba is based on the same approach.

Karmayogi variety of Vedanta developed by Lokmanya Tilak is the appropriate interpretation of Vedanta according to Acharya
Javdekar, Karmayogi Vedanta initiates a positive social action on the part of the individual; by relating the individual to Brahman. The Brahman is to be realized by the individual in this world. To realize the Brahman the individual has to know the real nature of the external as well as the internal world. In other words the individual has to be aware of the real nature of the 'organic world'. At the same time the individual has to engage in a search of the real nature of his/her own self. The individual has to know the internal capacities within him/her. Acharya Javdekar states that the search for Brahman is actually a search to know the ultimate reality - both external and internal. There are certain unknown universal laws guiding the external and the internal worlds. (Javdekar uses the terms 'Drishya' and 'Drashta' meaning the phenomenon and the 'seer'). The search for Truth is the search to know the universal law guiding the external and the internal worlds. One cannot develop the material-social ideals without knowing the real nature of the world and the self. The knowledge of the self leads the individual to the knowledge of the world. Acharya states that the visions of the world of the ignorant and the enlightened soul are different. Therefore, the individual has to continuously strive for the knowledge - both spiritual and material - of the world and his own self. Such knowledge automatically leads the individual to the position of complete unity with the entire world. The unity with the world leads to the positive social action.\textsuperscript{26}

Vedanta enlightens the vision of the individual. It relates the individual with the Brahman. It advises the individual to
rule the world with the help of both the material as well as the spiritual knowledge. The thesis in Vedanta recognizes the freedom of the human will as well as the right to positively act to realize the social ideals. On the other hand it also recognizes the role of the 'universal laws of the nature.' In other words, the philosophy of Vedanta guides the individual to use his freedom within the framework of the laws of the nature according to Acharya Javdekar. This point again gets related to Acharya's interpretation of Marxism.

**Vedanta and Ahimsa**

The main point to note here is that Acharya utilizes the vision of the philosophy of Vedanta to accommodate the Gandhian thought in its fold. In fact, at this point he looks at Gandhism as a radical interpretation of the philosophy of Vedanta. In many of his articles, he relates the philosophy of Vedanta with Ahimsa. It is actually an attempt to relate Vedanta with Gandhism.

We have already noted that Javdekar looks at Gandhism as an extension of Lokmanya Tilak's thought. While comparing the interpretation of Gita by these thinkers, he reflects on the concept of 'Atmapramanya' (validity through the self) as a valuable addition by Gandhi to Lokmanya Tilak's political philosophy developed through Gita. Gita and the orthodox versions of Vedanta allow the use of 'Shabdapramanya.'
through the 'Enlightened'). Shabdapramanya leads to Theism on the one hand and non-action on the other. Acharya Javdekar clearly rejects Theism. He explains its historical emergence and utility. However, theism suppresses the motives of positive social activity. According to Acharya Javdekar even Lokmanya Tilak's Vedanta is not able to develop a clear argument against 'Shabdapramanya'. Mahatma Gandhi through his concepts of Ahimsa develops a clear argument against 'Shabdapramanya' and establishes the authority of the self validating the Truth of the World.28

The concept of 'Atmapramanya' plays a key role in Acharya Javdekar's political philosophy. The concept is adopted from Gandhi. However, Javdekar looks at it from a Vedanti framework. He attempts to locate the concept of Atmapramanya within the framework of the 'revolutionary' Vedanta. The revolutionary Vedanta recognises the freedom of the human will. The position leads to 'Atmapramanya' - where one is expected to guide himself/herself using his/her own knowledge. The position leads to positive social action.29

The concept of 'Atmapramanya' proves to be crucial because it emphasises the role of rationality. While making a decision; human reason becomes the only prominent agency which affects these decision. Atmapramanya proclaims that every human being should treat the rational capacities within himself/herself
as the only criterion for his choice. No other influences can and should dominate his/her choice in any respect.

The concept of Ahimsa in Gandhism provides a concrete criterion for 'Atmapramanya'. According to Gandhi every individual is capable of understanding partial Truth. Rather he insisted on the fact that the knowledge of the truth shall always be partial. The search is of course for universal Truth. The search is attempted by everybody. If the search for Truth is to be fruitful; each individual must look for a positive criterion of its own; which will enable him/her to validate his/her own Truth. Gandhi provides the criterion of Ahimsa as the tool of validation. 'Ahimsa is the means and Truth is the end' according to Gandhi. Ahimsa is personal and at the same time can become a universal principle. Acharya Javdekar utilizes the concept of Ahimsa; for the development of philosophy of Vedanta. It is very important to note here that he looks at the concept of Ahimsa within the framework of Vedanta. In fact his entire interpretation of Gandhism takes place from a Vedanti viewpoint. Acharya's interpretation of Vedanta can be treated as a very important component of the political philosophy of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad.' Further the point will serve as a background to our understanding of Acharya's interpretation of the Gandhian terms like Satya, Ahimsa and Satyagraha.

The combination of Vedanta and Ahimsa leads Acharya to
combine Vedanta-Darshan with Jainism and Buddhism. He mentions that orthodox Vedanta always treated these philosophies — especially Buddhism as opposite and inferior to it. However, the neo-Vedanta develops a vision of synthesis. It creates a possibility of accommodating the philosophical systems like Jainism and Buddhism under the Vedantic fold. The synthesis is possible because Vedanta has accommodated the concept of Ahimsa; which is the central concept of both these systems of thought. The argument about the synthesis of the Vedic and non-Vedic philosophical systems is not developed in detail by Acharya Javdekar. However, he clearly states that these can be 'accommodated' under the Vedic fold.

**Influences of Gandhi**

Acharya arrives at the synthesis of Vedanta and Ahimsa because of the Gandhian influences on him. The first spell of his intellectual life is dominated by Lokmanya Tilak's political philosophy. Formulations of the philosophy of Vedanta and Gita are mainly the outcomes of this influence. The philosophy of Vedanta can also be treated as the first point of reference for the ideology of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad'.

The second stage of Acharya's intellectual development begins with his understanding and interpretation of Gandhi's thought. He looks at Gandhism as an extension of the philosophy of Vedanta. His argument on Gandhism later develops to view
the vision of Vedanta from a Gandhian framework. Acharya's simultaneous reading of Marx compels him to look at Gandhism especially the concept of Satyagraha as a 'corrective' to the shortcomings of the ideology of scientific socialism. Acharya's understanding of scientific socialism is discussed later on in the same chapter. The point to note is that Satyagraha emerges as the basic concept of Acharya's political thought, out of the influences of both the Vedic framework and the socialist insights. Satyagraha becomes the most important concept of the theoretical framework of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad'. Satyagraha is the essence of the Gandhian political thought according to Acharya. Therefore it becomes necessary to discuss Acharya's overall understanding of Gandhism and his specific interpretation of Satyagraha as the key points in the theoretical foundation of the ideology of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad'.

As stated in the earlier chapter Acharya Javdekar wholeheartedly participated in the Gandhian experiments of Satyagraha during the Indian struggle for political independence. However, earlier he was influenced by Gandhi's charismatic personality. Gandhi's political philosophy did not convince him. As stated earlier the reading of 'Anasktiyoga' changed his attitude towards Gandhi. He looks at Gandhi as the 'revolutionary religious leader.' Gandhi is a revolutionary because he initiated a process of revolutionising the religion. The basic framework in which Gandhi develops his thought remained to be religious. In fact Acharya Javdekar views Gandhism essentially
through a religious framework. For him Gandhi is religious leader and Satyagraha is the moral-spiritual category developed out of traditional Indian religious thought. Acharya Javdekar's interpretation of Gandhi further helps him in combining Idealism and Materialism. At the same time he utilizes Satyagraha to reinforce the superiority of eastern spiritual thought over the western materialist thought.

**Interpretation of Dharma**

Acharya Javdekar treats Gandhi as a genuinely religious leader. At this point he clearly defines the nature of religion according to Gandhi and completely agrees with it. Religion for Gandhi was never confined to the narrow boundaries of sectarianism. In fact Acharya Javdekar prefers the use of the word Dharma over religion to underline the same difference. Javdekar states that Gandhi basically equated Dharma with morality. Dharma was the highest kind of moral order which human beings are expected to follow. The use of Dharma in this sense; prohibits its use for the satisfaction of the material ends. It also negates all sorts of blind faiths and even the belief in God, according to Acharya Javdekar. He maintains that the Gandhian use of Dharma was possibility of maintaining the moral spiritual elements of human mind without appealing to God. The belief in God shifts the authority to some external power ruling over the human beings. The Gandhian concept of Dharma; attempts to completely place the authority at the hands of the human beings. The Dharma, as interpreted by Acharya Javdekar, leads the human beings towards positive social action. Yet it
maintains the existence and importance of spiritual element. The moral-spiritual element in Gandhian Dharma gives a stable; universal ideal for the human actions. In other words Dharma orients the human beings towards social activities to change the material social relations. At the same time it provides a way of uplifting oneself from the mere narrow material concerns. Gandhian interpretation of Dharma leads it to the concept of Satyagraha as a moral-spiritual category.

In one of his articles on the nature of Dharma, Acharya Javdekar quotes Gandhi as stating that ...

'Religion does not mean sectarianism. It means a belief in the ordered moral government of the universe. - This religion transcends Hinduism, Islam, Christianity etc. It does not supersede them. It harmonizes them and gives them reality.'

Acharya Javdekar fully agrees with the Gandhian interpretation of Dharma. It treats the religion as the 'ordered moral government of the Universe'. With this conception Gandhi tries to radically interpret the Hindu religion. Javdekar explains that Gandhian Dharma cannot be equated with any sect. It represents the basic human instinct of realisation of real nature of the self. In traditional categories the ideal of this search is Moksha. The ideal of Moksha is based on intense efforts on the part of the individual to find out the Reality; to be one with the Brahman. Gandhi translates the ideal of Moksha as the
search for Truth. He conceptualises the final reality in terms of Satya. According to Javdekar the search for Satya is the search for finding out one's own self. To find out Satya is to find out the moral order of the universe. Javdekar states that the existence of the universe is conditioned by two types of destiny the physical and the moral. It is the duty of the saints and seers to visualise the moral destiny of the world. Gandhi visualizes it in terms of Satya. The way to realise it is through the use of Ahimsa.  

Dharma as the realisation of Satya; goes beyond the limitations of sectarianism. It becomes a moral basis for all the social relations. Gandhi himself often related the fields of religion and politics. According to Gandhi, 'Religion should pervade everyone of our actions.' In this, religion becomes a guiding principle for all the social activities. The social activities are mainly related to the material interests. Dharma constantly remembers the individual of his/her moral functions. The individual behaviour is constantly purified by Dharma. Dharma has the function to guide all the human actions. The basic moral instinct within the human beings is termed as 'Atmaprerana' by Acharya Javdekar. 'Atmaprerana' becomes a basic mark of the human beings. The concept utilizes Gandhian ideas of basic human nature. According to Gandhi human nature is basically good and it is capable of 'becoming good.' The capability is the basic moral instinct assumed by Acharya Javdekar. Dharma is based on the basic moral instinct within
the individual. It constantly orients the individual towards the attainment of Moksha. It helps in the purification of the individual soul. It opens up the basic spiritual nature of the human beings. According to Javdekar Atmaprerana is the basis of all religions. It is the basis of all the systems of morality. It helps the real development of the individual towards the attainment of realisation of the self. The earlier interpretations of Dharma have suggested various ways of attainment of Moksha. Among these the Gandhian interpretation proves to be most appropriate according to Acharya Javdekar.

Gandhian interpretation radicalizes the essence of Dharma by changing content of the ideal of Moksha. Moksha according to Gandhi is the realisation of Satya. Gandhi's maxim of 'Truth is God' is very important to Javdekar in this respect. It replaces the concept of God by Truth. The earlier religious philosophies like Buddhism and Jainism also attempted to realise Moksha without accepting the authority of the God. Javdekar himself is very keen to differentiate between Theism and Dharma. His interpretation of Dharma clearly negates Theism. The real function of Dharma according to him is to lead the individual towards Moksha and not towards God. Theism is a limited version of Dharma which may be negated. However, Dharma can never be negated by the humanity as far as the basic moral instinct is alive within the individuals. Therefore all the social activities of the individual must be based on Dharma.
Moksha

As stated earlier the basic contribution of Gandhian interpretation of Dharma is to change the content of ideal of Moksha. Moksha, through Satya is interpreted in moral terms. In established terms the ideal of Moksha can be achieved by the individual through personal salvation. The Gandhian concept relates it to the social sphere. Moksha is interpreted in terms of Satya. The search for Moksha is the search for Satya. The search for Satya takes place at two levels. The individual wishes to realise the true nature of his own self. At the same time individual also strives to know essence of the organic world around him/her. The two way search for Satya automatically and necessarily relates the individual with the whole world. Acharya Javdekar goes further to state that individual's relationship with the entire world culminates/must culminate into universal love for everything in the world. Without the feeling of love individual cannot feel one with the world. The universal relationship of love is expressed through concept of Ahimsa in Gandhian framework. In other words Gandhi interprets the ideal of Moksha in terms of Satya and Ahimsa.

Gandhian concept of Moksha does not stop at relating individual with the universal. It orients individual efforts towards social liberation. Moksha cannot be realized by individual at personal level. The individual has to work for social attainment of Moksha. The ideal establishes a necessary relationship between the personal and the social sphere. The
individual exists in the social sphere and for the social sphere. That becomes the real nature of the individual. The process of realisation of Satya leads the individual towards positive social action; towards attainment of Moksha for everybody. Gandhian understanding of Moksha arrives within the framework of Vedanta. However, it adds to the philosophy of Karmayogi Vedanta through the concept of Satyagraha. Satyagraha provides a sound method for the realization of Moksha for everybody within the organic world.\textsuperscript{40} The later discussion will look at Acharya Javdekar's understanding and interpretation of Satyagraha in detail. At the moment it is essential to note how the Gandhian concept of Dharma is seen as completely different from the orthodox versions of Dharma according to Javdekar. It is different and unique because of the changed content of the ideal of Moksha.

**Revolutionary Role of Dharma**

According to Acharya Javdekar Dharma should become the basis of the social revolution. Establishment of the real Dharma must be the ideal of the social revolution. He further states that the social revolution will be incomplete without such ideal. Social activities of the individual are basically related to the satisfactions of the narrow material interests. Social liberation must be followed by the moral liberation of the individual. In the process of moral liberation the individual develops the feeling of oneness with the entire world. Identification of the individual with the universal completes the process of human liberation. In other words the process of social revolution must
be accompanied by the process of moral revolution according to Acharya Javdekar. Dharma provides the basic insights for the process of moral revolution. Social revolution may help to change the external world. Moral revolution helps the change in the internal world.\textsuperscript{41}

Javdekar takes a note of the objections of 'European revolutionaries' to the role of religion in the process of social change. According to Javdekar their first objection is regarding the neglect of the rational capacities of the individual by religion. According to them religion denies the autonomy of the individual to act independently according to his/her own rational capacities. Religion establishes the external authorities over the individual. (like those of religious texts). Javdekar answers the objection by claiming that Dharma reestablishes the authority of 'rationality'. Especially the Gandhian insistence on the search for Truth; underlines the autonomy of the individual and denies the external compulsions. However the rationality is to be guided by the universal moral concerns. The western concept of rationality becomes completely individualistic and is devoid of any universal concerns. The Dharmaic enlightened rationality guides the individual towards the universal moral concerns. Acharya Javdekar clearly states that the spiritualists have developed a more positive concept of rationality which is helpful in the overall revolution in the human life.\textsuperscript{42}
The second criticism discusses the religious sanction to social inequality and the negation of individual freedom. Javdekar takes a historical review of the function of religion; especially in Asia. He clarifies that the ancient and the medieval social systems were based on social inequality and religion legitimized these systems. However, that is realist and therefore transitory part of religion. He argues how the systems of production in those periods compelled religion to support inequalities. However, religion maintained its noble nature with its continued efforts of the devoted religious leaders. In every society we can identify a group of the 'Sadhus' who denounced social inequality as well as material pleasures to maintain the true spirit of religion. According to him most of the European social revolutions were also initiated by the religious believers.

The real values of religion never support narrow social ideals. Social philosophy of the religious systems may change but the moral philosophy remains the same. The same point is discussed by Acharya Javdekar in analysing the message of Gita. He relates it to the Gandhian interpretation of Dharma. According to him the Gandhian interpretation negates the outdated social philosophy of Hindu Dharma but maintains the universal spirit in it. In fact it attempts to replace the outdated social philosophy with the new philosophy of Satyagraha.

The true spirit of Dharma always helps the social revolution. It protects the eternal values and not the transitory
social systems. Rather it initiates the change in the social systems to protect the universal moral values. Javdekar takes examples of the changes initiated by Shrikrishna; Buddha; Mahaveer as well as Mohammad Paigambar to make his point. Gandhi belongs to the same tradition of religious revolutionaries according to Javdekar.

For the Asian societies; the revolutionary role of Dharma gets an added dimension. The ethos of these societies works within the religious framework. Therefore the message of social revolution needs to be constructed within the religious framework. However, Acharya Javdekar is also clear that Gandhi is not using the religious ethos of the Asian societies merely strategically in order to supplement his aims of social revolution. In fact Gandhi is deeply and genuinely influenced by Dharma. Gandhi's formulation of the essence of Dharma may contradict the orthodox, sectarian versions of religion in these societies; especially in India. However, Gandhi believes that the ordinary citizens of these societies preach and practice the real Dharma which he supports. According to Javdekar that is the main reason why Gandhi maintains the term Dharma to express his moral philosophy.

The same point applies to Acharya Javdekar's own world view. The entire discussion of his interpretation of Dharma establishes his thought within the religious - spiritual framework. He negates the philosophy of Theism. Using the Gandhian tradition he locates the meaning of Dharma within the
moral framework. However, he maintains Dharma to be the basis of morality. Here the use of the religious categories is not strategic. Acharya Javdekar treats himself as an integral part of the religious tradition in India. He uses the Gandhian insights to radically reinterpret the essence of the religion. However, the interpretation is treated as an extension of the old religious ideals. In this connection, it is very important to note Acharya's statement about the relationship between the old and the new religion in India. Gandhian Dharma brings about a total revolution in the Indian religious thinking. However, his understanding of 'Dharma' in essence follows the ideals established by the ancient Indian religion. To repeat he treats Gandhi and himself as an integral part of the Indian religious tradition. It is also important to note here that he identifies the Indian religious tradition mainly with the Vedic tradition. The use of the religious categories like Vedanta, Brahmanya, Moksha cannot be reduced to the strategic levels. They become an integral part of Acharya Javdekar's philosophical framework. The religious framework becomes a very important part of the ideology of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad'. Acharya Javdekar's understanding of the Gandhian terms like Satya and Ahimsa takes place within the same framework.

Satya and Ahimsa

The Gandhian ideal of Moksha is to be realised through Satyagraha. Satyagraha implies the search for Truth. It provides the tools for the search for the Truth. Therefore Satyagraha is both the end and the means. According to Acharya Javdekar
the concept of Satyagraha-paves an appropriate path for the social as well as the moral spiritual revolution for the entire humanity.

Gandhi treated the concept of Satyagraha as the ever-growing ideal for the humanity. The essence of Satyagraha is to be developed by the experiences of the human societies. However, Gandhi provides two concrete terms for the realisation of the essence of Satyagraha. These terms are 'Satya' and 'Ahimsa'. Acharya Javdekar looks at Satyagraha as a moral-spiritual category. To explain the moral-spiritual essence of Satyagraha he uses the categories of Satya and Ahimsa.

As stated earlier Satya symbolises the ultimate reality of the world. Gandhi replaces the ideal of Moksha with Satya. Every human being has the ability to engage in the pursuit of Satya. The pursuit of Satya is the pursuit of the moral essence of one's self. Acharya Javdekar specifies three dimensions of the concept of Satya. According to him the search for Satya takes place at three different levels. These are the fields of material; social as well as moral-spiritual knowledge. Every individual is engaged in the three-way process of realisation of Satya. The search for Satya cannot be complete if either of the above mentioned fields of knowledge is neglected by human society.  

Natural sciences work to know the natural laws behind the order of the organic world. These sciences attempt to arrive at the material-physical truth. Success in the scientific
discoveries enables the human race to lead its material life more comfortably. According to Acharya Javdekar the last three hundred years of the human civilization have significantly added to the development of the material knowledge.

Individuals enter the field of social truth when they wish to apply the material knowledge for their well being. At this point the 'social' priorities are to be decided. Social truth attempts to discover the appropriate laws for the organising the relations among human beings. These are the social laws. Social revolution is a result of the discovery of the new social laws. The sphere of social truth necessarily gets related to the moral sphere of human life. Decisions about the appropriate social laws are always moral decisions. However, the discovery of appropriate laws does not necessarily lead to appropriate moral decisions. The vision of social truth becomes inadequate to adopt a universal-moral position. Social truth remains engulfed in the material concerns. Social truth is bound to be a partial vision of the truth.

To realise the Truth completely one has to enter the field of moral-spiritual truth. Realisation of moral truth consists of one's identification with the entire world. Understanding of moral truth helps the individual in finding out appropriate social rules for the well being of entire society. Social truth is held to be partial because it remains within the fold of material concerns. Material concerns always divide the individuals into
rival camps. The individual is not able to think of entire society's welfare. The search for moral truth breaks the barriers of the narrow-material concerns and unites the individual with the entire world. In other words moral truth provides a positive dimension for the social laws. Therefore it becomes the highest category of truth.\textsuperscript{48}

According to Gandhi every individual is capable of the search for the moral truth and no individual can realise perfect truth. In this sense the attainment of Satya is always going to be 'Utopia'. However, every individual must continuously strive towards the attainment of Satya. Satya is the essence of the individual life. The search for Satya at the individual level is the search for realisation of the essence of one's self. Gandhian thought recognises the human freedom for the pursuit of Satya. According to Gandhi every individual naturally possesses complete autonomy to conceptualise his/her own version of truth. In this respect Satya always remains 'an ideal in making'.\textsuperscript{49}

The pursuit of moral truth is essentially related to the social aspect of truth. Morality is always a social concept. Partial visions of moral truth of every individual have to be converted into some kind of a uniform rule to organise the social relations on the basis of it. The function of such a rule will be to pattern the human relations upon an agreed, proper basis. According to Gandhi the category of Ahimsa can be termed as
the most appropriate criterion of arriving at a uniform social rule. At this point Ahimsa gets related to Satya within the Gandhian framework.

The link between the concepts of Satya and Ahimsa is a very important point within the Gandhian framework. Gandhi describes 'Satya as the end and Ahimsa is the means'. Gandhian theory of 'means and ends' is clear about the fact that only pure means can lead to pure end. This is because the means and the end cannot be separated from each other. Means and ends are integrally related to each other. In fact means are ends in making. The theory about means and ends is applied to the concepts of Ahimsa and Satya. Ahimsa can be an appropriate means for the realisation of the ideal of Satya. Acharya Javdekar explains the Gandhian logic of the relationship between the two concepts of Satya and Ahimsa.

Ahimsa in its negative connotations means the negation of any sort of violence. The use of the term violence is very significant and peculiar in the Gandhian framework. Violence includes not only actual or physical expression of violence but violence of thought and speech. It is basically intentional wrong done to others. The obvious positive connotation of Ahimsa is positive love towards the entire world. Without the feeling of positive love towards everybody the individual will not be able to identify him/herself with everybody. To realise moral truth; it is necessary to identify oneself with the others. Violence
implies the defence of the selfish interests. The process of acceptance of non-violence is the process of loss of selfish interests. At the social level the degree of Ahimsa practised; may reveal the moral level of the entire society. Ahimsa becomes an appropriate means working at the social level towards the achievement of moral truth. Human relations must be organised on the basis of Ahimsa. Ahimsa can become the agreed; uniform rule on the basis of which moral truth may be sought by the society. The entire argument attempts to establish integral relationship between Satya and Ahimsa at the theoretical level. Satya remains a moral and spiritual category in this argument. Acharya Javdekar relates the category of Satya with the ideal of Moksha. Satya is arrived at by reinterpreting the traditional ideal of Moksha. Ahimsa becomes the means working at the material level to attain the ideal of Satya at the spiritual level. Satya and Ahimsa become the central concepts of the political philosophy of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad.' They develop the concept of Satyagraha will be used both as the moral appeal and political strategy. Acharya Javdekar's understanding and interpretation of the concept of Satyagraha may be treated as the most important part of his framework of thought. The entire ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad utilizes the vision of Satyagraha as its basis.

Satyagraha

Satyagraha is firm insistence on Satya. The vision of Satya is always partial. Therefore, Satyagraha conditions itself
with the strict observance of Ahimsa. Acharya Javdekar looks at Satyagraha as a revolutionary category developed by Mahatma Gandhi. Satyagraha becomes the central concept of Gandhian framework because it brings together all the three spheres of the pursuit of Satya. The goal for Satyagraha is of course the achievement of Satya. However, it provides a vision to arrive at the moral Satya through the material struggles. Satyagraha as commonly understood is the technique of political resistance. Acharya Javdekar regards it as the complete philosophy; a total perspective of looking at life or a world view. It helps in completing the task of Gandhism. A realisation of Moksha within the organic world. Karmayogi Vedanta establishes the ideal by changing the orthodox version of Vedanta. Gandhian concept of Satyagraha further develops the vision of Karmayogi Vedanta; by finding out a way to achieve the ideal. Satyagraha provides the way by combining the concepts of Satya and Ahimsa.

Political non-violence is the most important contribution of Mahatma Gandhi according to Acharya Javdekar. A narrow interpretation of political resistance leads to the struggles against the state. However, Acharya Javdekar clearly relates the political struggles to the struggles against injustice caused by any agency. Satyagraha, through the use of political non-violence works to remove the basic causes of injustice. It aims at a two fold revolution in the society—the moral as well as the material revolution.

Satyagraha does not assume a permanent division between just and unjust parties. One's understanding of justice and
injustice remains partial and limited because of partial understanding of truth. That is the main reason why Satyagraha fights; not against unjust individuals but their unjust acts. Non-violent resistance includes a process of minimizing injustice and maximizing the elements of justice. Therefore non-violent resistance included in Satyagraha becomes a novel form of resisting injustice according to Javdekar.

Political non-violence is to be realised with the use of 'Atmabal' (literally the soul force). Gandhi uses the term Tapa or self-suffering. Satyagraha employs its struggle against injustice by encouraging the use of soul force of the individual. Acharya Javdekar treats the concept of Atmabal as yet another basic concept of the philosophy of Satyagraha. He develops the concept in his ideological argument of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad'. At his point it is important to note how the concept of Atmabal gets related to the moral-spiritual understanding of Satyagraha. Atmabal or soul force of the individual is actually the spiritual strength he/she possesses. Spiritual strength is related to the level to which the individual has travelled on the path of moral Satya. Identification of the individual with the entire universe increases its soul force. Soul force will be utilized by the individual to fight injustice at the social level. The resistance to social injustice is an essential part of the achievement of Moksha. In this way the concept of Atmabal relates the material struggles with the ideal of Moksha.
Acharya Javdekar regards Satyagraha as both the philosophy of life and method to realise the ideal of individual life. As a philosophy of life Satyagraha provides the noble aim of realisation of the self by identifying the moral-spiritual essence of the self. As a method of achieving the ideal Satyagraha develops a Krantishastra (a strategy of non-violent revolution). Both aspects of Satyagraha are developed by the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad.

Acharya develops Satyagrahi Krantishastra by utilizing the visions of Marxism. However, the category of Satyagraha essentially remains a moral, spiritual category. The category is developed out of Indian tradition. Acharya Javdekar metaphorically calls it as nectar of Indian civilization. It was possible for Gandhi to develop the category of Satyagraha because of the availability of the spiritual-moral perspective in the ancient Indian tradition. Gandhi utilizes and reinterprets these traditions to develop a revolutionary concept applicable not only to the Indian conditions but for the emancipation of entire world. In his final formulation of Satyagraha Acharya Javdekar claims that it becomes a universal category because it accommodates the essential elements of Marxism in it. In this process Satyagraha attempts a synthesis between materialism and idealism. To complete the discussion of the theoretical framework of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad; it is essential to discuss these two points in detail.
Materialism and Idealism

Acharya Javdekar's analysis of Marxism begins with the understanding of the logic of dialectics, and dialectical materialism. He looks at dialectical materialism as the theoretical basis of scientific socialism. Scientific socialism takes a clear materialist position. On this ground it automatically gets related with the other materialist ideologies. However, Marxism has to be differentiated from such other ideologies because materialism in Marxism is based on the logic of dialectics.

According to Acharya Javdekar the materialists are those who regard the origin of the universe to be material rather than spiritual. The matter originates the living world including the nature and the human beings. The human society is of course a part of the evolutionary process of natural, material development. Materialists apply the natural, physical laws to the human society as it is a part of the nature. Scientific socialism agrees with the main tenets of materialism. However, according to Javdekar, it does maintain the autonomy of the human will within the limitations of the material conditions. Mechanistic materialist ideologies do not see any possibility of human freedom. As a part of the material world; the human beings are completely governed by the 'material laws'. They cannot be treated differently from the other parts of the nature. In other words the lives of the individuals are completely determined by the physical conditions in which they live.
Acharya Javdekar concludes that the mechanistic materialism leads to determinism and a kind of permanent bondage to the nature. At a very subtle level of discussion he clarifies his position against mechanistic materialism and the reasons for that. Javdekar discusses ontological and the ethical position of mechanistic materialism. Mechanistic materialism holds that the real nature of the human society can be completely understood in the framework of the natural laws as it is completely determined by them. According to Javdekar the position becomes completely amoral and therefore is not useful in discussing the positive change in human society. Any argument discussing the change in human conditions; presumes some kind of moral position. Mechanistic materialism takes amoral stand because it binds the human society with the natural laws. The determinism included in mechanistic materialism automatically leads to the amoral position. Mechanistic variety of materialism doesn't provide any space for the independent political activity of the human agents for the betterment of their material conditions. It assumes a deterministic philosophical position which overtly negates any ethical position. However, Acharya is clear that ultimately mechanistic materialism supports the ethical position of hedonism and utilitarianism.

The other point of rejection of mechanistic materialism is found in Acharya Javdekar's deep concern and respect for the philosophy of Vedanta and the element of spirituality in it. Acharya Javdekar's framework of mind gives priority to
individual freedom. Even before accepting Marxism as a basic component of his political thought; he accepted the ideal of human liberation with the help of positive intervention of the human beings in their material surroundings. The nationalist context in which he was working provides an additional dimension to his acceptance of such an ideal. The ideal also comes out of his acceptance of Tilak's Karmayogi Vedanta which gives a very important place to the human 'action.' To reinforce the importance of human freedom Javdekar denies the existence of God. He explains that belief in the existence of God; places the decision making power outside the human will. At one stage of his life he tilted towards materialism (of whatever variety) to negate the role of the God; as a controlling agency of the human world. However, pre-Marxian varieties of materialism were not able to provide a satisfactory answer to him. Mechanistic materialism merely replaced the authority of God; by the authority of Nature over human beings. Therefore he couldn't accept the materialistic vision. He wanted to presume the element of spirituality in his thought to recognise the ultimate authority of the human will. The acceptance of the dialectical materialism gives him a chance to do so. Dialectical materialism retains a space for the active intervention of the human beings. That opens up a chance for the realization of the ideal of human freedom.

The position of dialectical materialism is different from the orthodox version of idealism or spiritualism. These versions treat the essence of the world to be ideal and do not recognise the importance of the material conditions. The ideal before
spiritualism; the realisation of the spirit or in Indian terms Moksha; can be achieved by the individual without changing the material conditions around him. The futility of orthodox spiritualism was obvious for Acharya Javdekar. He essentially wants to relate the ideal of human freedom to social change out of the influence of Lokmanya Tilak and Mahatma Gandhi. Marxism, especially the logic of dialectical materialism shows him the way to relate the elements of spiritualism and materialism. In other words Javdekar sees in dialectical materialism a possibility of synthesis of materialism and idealism. That is the main reason why he rejects mechanistic variety of materialism and accepts Marxism at theoretical level. However the also recognises the crucial importance of Marxism in developing a penetrating critique of capitalist system. The theoretical framework of Satyagrahi Samajwad takes shape out of Acharya's understanding of Marxism.

The understanding of Marxism

Acharya Javdekar was influenced by fabian socialism in the early years of his life. While discussing his own intellectual development he states that till 1930-32 he was not able to grasp the crux of Marxism. The ideology of socialism was first available to him through the writings of fabian socialists. However he was sure of the limitations of the constitutional variety of socialism. According to him the situation in Great Britain and Indian was totally different. Therefore constitutional democratic socialism would not be helpful in India.' It shows the fact that since his young age the basic message of socialism (that
of the equal distribution of the resources) was already accepted by Javdekar. Still during 1920s to 1940s his search continued for an appropriate variety of socialism. In 1926, he started reading Marx. After ten years of his studies he started feeling that he had grasped the crux of Marxism.61

It is important to note what exactly was the message of Marxism for him; according to Acharya Javdekar. He became a revolutionary in spirit, after reading Marx. Earlier he was a spiritualist; later on socialist and now a revolutionary socialist. It was commonly held that socialism was against spiritualism. Acharya Javdekar has no problem in calling himself a spiritualist and a revolutionary socialist simultaneously. Acharya's views about the synthesis of spiritualism and materialism will be discussed later on in detail. The point to note here is that the study of Marxism helped him in such a synthesis according to him.62 He could differentiate between the mechanistic materialism of the earlier socialists and the dialectical materialism employed by Marx in understanding the nature of the world. The method of dialectical, materialistic interpretation of history provides a space for the independent, 'moral' activities of the individual within the material framework available to him/her. Acharya Javdekar sees this as a point from which one can view Marxism from an 'Indian' standpoint. In other words he looks at the logic of dialectical materialism as a process where the East and the West may meet.
Acharya Javdekar also clarifies that he gained a completely new vision of looking at the social relations; once he studied Marxism. According to him modern Europe has not produced any other visionary thinker as Marx. Marx developed a scientific variety of socialism. He revolutionized the methodology of the social sciences. He stated a science of revolution for the positive social change and he also depicted the nature of the ideal society after social revolution. Acharya Javdekar completely accepts the Marxian analysis of the capitalist society. He is sure that demolition of capitalism becomes the precondition for the emancipation of the human society. Socialist revolution becomes the essential step in the process of complete liberation of the human beings. These arguments in the Marxist thought led him to accept Marxism as one of the basic components of his political thought.

The visions of spiritualism develop the ideal of Moksha for Acharya Javdekar. Gandhism defines the content of the ideal of Moksha. Moksha is essentially related to the betterment of the organic world. Not only personal material well being but the material welfare of the entire society becomes the precondition for Moksha. The ideology of socialism defines the content of the material well being of the entire society. It also emphasizes the betterment of the material situation as the necessary precondition of Moksha. Socialism also develops a method of social transformation.
Acharya Javdekar's understanding and acceptance of Marxism takes place in the framework of the already developed Gandhian ideal. In his actual intellectual development, he was simultaneously reading Gandhi and Marx. He is aware that the thought systems of Gandhi and Marx possess the potentials of emancipation. However, his understanding of both Gandhi and Marx leads him towards a combination of the two. The ideology of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad' views both Gandhism and Marxism to be of equal importance. However, it accepts the Gandhian ideal as the final aim. It interprets Gandhian ideal to be going beyond the Marxist ideology. Acharya Javdekar attributes a 'corrective role' to Gandhian thought.

The corrective role of Gandhism takes place at two levels. Gandhism attempts to provide a new dimension to the notion of relative morality in Marxism. Marxism relates the system of morality to material conditions. Moral rules in any society are dominated by material realities. Gandhism goes beyond the notion of relative morality to Javdekar. Satya provides a firm basis to the system of morality. Material conditions limit the moral choices of individual. However, ultimately Satya presumes absolutely free individual. Individual's moral choices would be dominated by the consideration of Satya under Gandhism. Javdekar is aware that the ultimate aim of Marxism coincides with that of Gandhism. Marx aims at a communitarian ideal of complete freedom of individual from all external
restraints. The ideal of Satya emphasises the need to get rid of internal restraints over individual according to Javdekar. Related to the question of relative and universal morality is the problem of violence. At this point also Acharya is aware that Marx never advocated unconditional use of violent means to achieve the aims of socialist revolution. However, Marx does not categorically condemn it. That creates a possibility within Marxism to legitimize violence in socialist revolution. Gandhism categorically denies the use of violence. It explains the relationship between violence and the narrow material interests. The use of violent means cannot lead to universal moral ideals. Therefore at the political level Satyagrahi Samajwad replaces the violent means by Satyagraha.

Still Acharya regards Gandhism and Marxism to be equally important for the development of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad.' It is because he is aware that the realization of socialist ideal is the essential condition for the achievement of Moksha. Therefore, his practico-political aim takes shape as a synthesis between the two ideologies, in the form of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad.'

The Idea of Synthesis

Acharya Javdekar's development of the notion of synthesis can be treated as the final point of the theoretical framework of Satyagrahi Samajwad. It is a peculiar quality of Acharya Javdekar's entire thought system. The ideological formulation
of Satyagrahi Samajwad is an attempt at synthesis. It is essential therefore to understand Acharya Javdekar's idea of synthesis as a basic component of his political thought. Some of his critics have criticised Acharya's notion of synthesis as a eclectic intellectual exercise. However, Acharya Javdekar himself accepts the notion as the final point of all the theoretical exercises and scientific versions of thought. Acharya's attempts at synthesis are completely different from the compromises sought for practical political purposes. It is an attempt to relate the relevant aspects of apparently contradictory philosophical systems. It is possible because all the thought systems and human activities finally lead to 'Satya'. The apparently contradictory philosophical systems are the expressions of the 'partial truths.' Ultimately they all lead to the same Satya. He genuinely believes in the synthesis of the two contradictory poles.

Acharya's notion of synthesis actually develops within the Gandhian framework. In fact he develops the notion of synthesis itself by combining the insights of Gandhi and Marx. He utilises the Marxian logic of dialectics to explain that everything in the world is transitory and continuously changing. The Marxian notion of synthesis accepts that truth (synthesis) is derived by combining the relevant aspects of the contradictions. The process of synthesis negates the non-relevant aspects of the contradictions. However, the truth achieved in Marxian process of dialectics is a 'relative' truth. Javdekar accepts the laws of dialectics but not the notion of 'relativity
of truth'. He explains the process of synthesis by accommodating it into the Gândhârian framework. The notion of relative truth is replaced by the notion of Satya. Every attempt of synthesis is directed towards the realisation of Satya. The awareness of the existence of and the search for the Satya must be reflected in every (including the practico-political) aspect of the human thought. It leads to the conclusion that the human mind should continuously strive to go beyond the apparent contradictions while developing social ideals.

The perspective of synthesis becomes a distinguishing character of Acharya Javdekar's entire political thought. Acharya Javdekar uses the perspective at the theoretical, ideological and the practico-political level. At the practical level he relates Tilak and Gandhi, Gandhi and Nehru, Nehru and Jayaprakash etc. At the theoretical level he attempts to combine Idealism with Materialism; Gandhi and Buddha or Vedanta and Ahimsa. The ideological political culmination of the perspective of synthesis is the development of the ideology of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad'. Acharya Javdekar's use of the notion of synthesis proves to be the final point of the theoretical framework of Satyagrahi Samajwad.

The present chapter presents an outline of the theoretical framework in which the argument of Satyagrahi Samajwad develops. It discusses the influence of Marx and Gandhi on Acharya Javdekar's thought. It also describes how Acharya utilizes these influences to formulate the argument of Satyagrahi
Samajwad. Javdekar's attempt is to combine the insights of Gandhi and Marx. Marxism provides the most appropriate analysis of capitalism to him. Marxism also underlines the need to fight out material struggles to solve moral problems. Satyagraha; or Gandhian thought - plays a corrective role to socialism at one level by eliminating the influence of violence and altering the notion of relative morality. On the other hand Satyagraha is the ultimate ideal. It helps in realization of Moksha - which is necessarily related to the ideal of welfare of all. Acharya Javdekar's theoretical framework utilizes the insights of Gandhi and Marx as the basis of his political thought. The next chapter deals with the actual development of Javdekar's argument of Satyagrahi Samajwad.
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1. Javdekar's most important book is titled as 'Aadhunik Bharat' (Modern India). The book discusses appropriate strategies of nation building by synthesising the ideals of Satyagraha and socialism.


3. Javdekar mentions the texts of and commentaries on Marxism that he read mainly during the period of his imprisonment. Prominent among them are -

1. Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx - Sidney Hook.
2. Karl Marx's Capital - A.D.Lindsay.
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5. Javdekar discusses the point especially in the second part of Aadhunik Rajyamimansa.
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