CHAPTER II

A critical and conceptual exploration

Socialism:

Socialism is a broad concept allowing various interpretations. Though at the outset, it might appear to be cryptic and evasive, it significantly connotes meting out equal treatment to all sections of society. In other words, it falls back upon the idea of equality. However, it is to be admitted that equality accommodates difference. Socialism, thus signifies giving justice to all sections, but it emphasizes upon bringing the down trodden, particularly the labour class to the level of the community of ‘haves’. Ultimately, it aims at the evaporation of the distinction altogether. It is the fact that individualistic attitudes and antisocial spirit among the individuals make a division of people into ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’. The concept of socialism is handed down from the Vedic period and literature where it is said that, “All land belongs to Gopala” and “All are enveloped and pervaded by God.” The Isa Upanisada says that God pervades everything without exception.

Socialism as a thought refers to the vision of a new civilization governed by equality and fraternity. At the root of this doctrine lies the universally acknowledged fact that the capitalistic economy militates against the socialistic value. Thus, when the acquisitive instinct and the greed of some are associated with economic and political power, it gives rise to exploitative economy. When people lose faith on this type of formation and method of the society, ‘Socialism’ as a theory, comes into being.

Probably, no ideology in political philosophy remains as vexed today as socialism. It requires a considerable intensive survey of historical, sociological and politico-economic processes through which modern socialism has evolved to shape itself into the various facts of contemporary socialism.

Modern socialism is a doctrine chiefly concerned with eradicating inequality in a capitalistic and technology-oriented civilization. Whether violent transformation from capitalism to socialism or peaceful transition from capitalism
to socialism is possible and desirable or not, constitutes a dilemma, and a considerable bulk of literatures are there regarding this. However, the process of transition or the methodology under relevant circumstances matters much in socialism. The task of achieving a just social order is an ever-continuing one and that justice is a goal to be strived after rather than finally obtained.

A good number of writer, i.e., Owen in England and Fourier and Saint Simmon in France and even Ricardo, the economist have emphasized the evils of capitalism and underlined the need to replace it by worker's ownership or control of industries or co-operative associations in such other way. This group of socialists is characterized as Utopian socialists. For them, industrial and technological progress is inconceivable without exploiting labourers. The labourers are distinguished from 'idlers' who are not merely the privileged classes but also those who without taking part in production or distribution live on their incomes. Thus St. Simmon assigns labour a dignified place.

"At the root of this doctrine is the notion that the essential task and duty of man is to labour and that in new social order, no respect would be paid to any man save his proportion to his service through labour to the community".

The Utopian socialists dislike large scale production, mechanization and centralization in all their forms and believe that future control of the means of production and social affairs will lie mainly with the producers.

**Historical Approach:**

History gives us the evidence that Fabianism was a movement by the intellectual middle class. It was an ethical and social attempt at equalization. The advocates of this movement believe that the greatest happiness of the greatest number could be achieved by extensive action in the economic field. They had faith more in evolutionary socialism than on revolutionary. The principal activity of the society was to educate the people on socialist line. They wanted to assure equal opportunity having collective ownership and democratic control of the economics resources of the community. The Fabians wanted to keep aside the method of violence from socialism and made it respectable by appealing to the method of gradual and voluntary evolution. But because of the slowness of the
process it could bring only the middle class and the intellectuals within its fold and not the masses.

Syndicalism was a form of socialism, which took shape in France in the 19th century. This theory believed that "the class war is the dominant characteristic of modern society and the method of social change; the working class must achieve its own liberation from the employer authority; the wage-system and the oppressive state". It thus encourages class-war by making revolution through a syndicate or a trade union. But the achievement of social welfare seemed remote in the hands of the Syndicalists because certain individual merchant could make a syndicate of power in order to protect and promote his interests.

Another form of socialism which took shape in ancient India and mediaeval Europe is "Guild Socialism". This socialism is a modern attempt towards the welfare of a mercantile class. The guild never went beyond its circle. It neither was universal nor all pervading.

Marxist:

It was Marx who could put forward the concept of "class war" which was totally absent in the vision of the early Utopianists and borrowing the 'theory of value' from Adam Smith and Ricardo, identified labour as the source and measure of all value. It is Marx who alone held the banner of the poor aloft. He could reveal the secret of the capitalistic production through 'surplus value'. He regarded socialism as an economic doctrine implying social or state ownership of the means of production and aiming at the eradication of inequality from society and concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. The idea it includes is the abolition of private ownership and establishment of the state ownership of the means of production. For the establishment of socialism, the re-organization of the economic and social life of the country, the socialization of the forms, key industries etc. are required.

Marx saw around him the labour being exploited and therefore, looked deep into the structure of the capitalistic society and could find that every political controversy has an economic content.
"The capitalist buys the labour power of the destitute workman, applies it to the machinery and raw materials, which he owns and as a result produces a commodity having 'exchange value'. That is, a commodity which can be sold for a price which is greater than the amount expended in the payment of the workman's wages and the upkeep of the factory. This difference between the exchange value of the manufactured commodity and the price paid to the workman for his labour is called 'surplus value'. It is in fact the unpaid labour".\(^3\)

Marx therefore, raises the slogan 'workers of the world unite'. He wants to mean that every step need be taken for the transformation of the society, which means the absolute change of the economic and the political structure of the society. This ultimately will evolve a violent struggle till the inner contradiction in the society is obliterated. Marx's is called scientific socialism for he not only envisages a socialistic pattern of society but also he lays down the means and stages through which this must evolve. In this society Marx extols the dignity of man, where he lives on his practical ability and where one's individual personality is revealed, but not on the philanthropy of others. Marx, therefore, has categorically said that in the process of evolution the state will wither away and the poor people will capture the power. The working hands can fruitfully replace the idle rich in any management. In such a society the distress of man caused by capitalism can be reduced and social justice can be established, but the only reservation about Marxist socialism is that Marx suggests to establish such a society even after a blood-bath, if necessary.

**Other Contemporary Thinkers:**

Swami Vivekananda who claimed himself a socialist advocated that the doctrine, which demands the sacrifice of individual freedom to social supremacy, is called socialism. For him, 'the doctrine which demands the sacrifice of individual freedom to social supremacy is called socialism'. Vivekananda's concept of socialism is based on the old foundation of universal salvation and equality. His socialism stands not for economic equality but for cultural and spiritual fraternity in which there would be not only economic socialization and political freedom but also moral and intellectual kinship.
Suvas Chandra Bose, the radical leader of Indian nationalism did not feel that socialism took birth from Karl Marx. Rather he thought that it has its origin in the thought and culture of India. He described Indian socialism as a synthesis of the material and the spiritual values.

Jawaharlal Nehru’s socialism, as he claims, is not a doctrinaire. His socialism is the outcome of his anti-colonialism mentality. The socialism of his conception believes in curbing the profit motive, promoting public ownership of key industries and in using the machinery of the state to regulate economic activity. Under the scientific knowledge and education of the west, Nehru had developed in him the modern and scientific attitude towards the social, economic and religious life of the people. For him “He who have eaten the apple of Eden can not forget the taste and go back to primitiveness”4 Though Nehru was considering Gandhiji’s non-violent, non-co-operation movement as a sort of revivalist movement and he was mentally opposed to it, but as it had a practical and pervasive appeal to the masses, he himself became powerless to intervene. Nehru has his reservation towards Gandhian trusteeship of the capitalists and self-sufficiency not only of a nation but also of a village. Nehru in turn, asks Gandhiji as to why for the upliftment of the oppressed and down trodden, supports a system, which is obviously decaying. Nehru’s westernized socialism wants to establish social order with a controlled regulation of production and distribution and not much beyond that. He also at the same time emphasizes the need for reduction of rent and the spread of education, sanitation and other benefits. He sympathetically sides with Marxism and the western type of socialism, but at the same time he feels that socialism in India must be adopted to suit Indian conditions and to that extent he wants socialism to be practical and indigenous. Nehru does not belong to any orthodox school of socialism. His socialism as Narendra Dev says can best be called as ‘democratic socialism’. Nehru’s socialism is the outcome of a deep attachment to the values of ethics and social justice. He writes that while progress in science, technology and production are desirable, “We must not forget that the essential objective to be aimed at is the quality of the individual and the concept of Dharma underlying it”5
Socialism in Shastras:

The ideas of socialism is seen in the great epics in the Vedic and post-Vedic periods. From Mahabharata to Kautilaya's Arthashastra and Manusmriti, there is a line of development of kingship and statecraft. Social duty is prescribed both for the king and the people towards each other. The Taittriya Upanisada establishes the sociability when it says that an aspirant should not refuse anyone at his residence and at the same time says that he should, therefore, acquire abundant food by any means whatever. It is for the sake of the guest that the food has been prepared. In the same time Mahabharata tunes the performance of action with large heart, and open hands. It directs people to attain proficiency and skill in profession, earn profusely and distribute the fruits of his labour to the needy as liberally as he earns. It is true that Rajadharma cannot be maintained without wealth yet a king should acquire wealth by righteous means. But attachment to Kama and Artha should not lose the guiding principal of Dharma and Moksa.

In the Valmiki Ramayana Sri Rama advises Bharata that if those who are engaged in agriculture and cattle breeding adhere carefully to take it as a vow (Vrata), the country is bound to move towards peace and prosperity. The king must arrange for their contentment. He again is of the view that the affairs of the state are bound to run aground if all those who deserve the attention of the king fail to receive it inadequate measure.

Again when it is said that 'All land belongs to God', the Upanisada says that it not only is land but all that exists in the world and is produced by man, does not belong to him but to God and he is entitled to take only his due share and hence it is suggested to enjoy with renunciation. This entails the end of private property and contributes towards the establishment of socialism. Whatever may be the time of the epics, the only surprise is that in all of them the fundamentals don't change.
Critical Evaluation:

An analysis of the above views reveals that the above-discussed theorists are in support of the establishment of an ideal society. Some are practical revolutionaries and some theorists. But all of them agree and surrender to the spiritualism of Gandhiji. All others except Gandhiji were suspicious of the practicability of non-violence in all the spheres of life particularly, in individual and societal level. Nehru, for example, expressed that an individual might make non-violence a religion, but no organization can do so because of its high idealism, yet as a matter of fact, after the death of Gandhiji, Nehru realized the full and inner significance of non-violence and called upon all the nations of the world to follow Gandhism not as a policy but as a creed.

Again, the difference between the other socialists and Gandhiji is that other adherents emphasized on the welfare of the society to be the uppermost, while Gandhiji emphasized upon the realization of the ideal of social upliftment from within the individual, not from without. The realization of social justice without self-rule will lead to blind goose-chase. What is still more important is that Gandhiji voluntarily accept suffering and ascetic life and poverty on the ground that socialism or social justice is achieved not by the multiplication of wants, rather by deliberate and voluntary restriction of wants which can promote contentment and happiness. This is what most of the socialist thinkers hesitate to accept. The difference, therefore, is basic and fundamental. The most significant thing that all the socialist thinkers admit of Gandhiji is, 'means and ends' that evil means can never lead to good ends' and a good means can make us reach the goal of a good society that is socialism.

The thoughts of other thinkers are more constitutional and less moral or ethical, but that of Gandhiji is moral and spiritual as well. In the former case, people suffering from starvation and death have to wait for the decision in the parliament or till the next election for their problem to be solved. This constitutional method may be proved incapable of achieving the redress. But Gandhian method of civil disobedience stands as a priceless weapon to combat injustices and unjust laws.
However, most of the socialist thinkers have agreed with Gandhiji that socialism is a cultural movement based on humanist foundation. This is why Gandhiji welcomes all noble ideals from every culture even from the west though he is quite antagonistic to the inculcation of the bad elements of the western culture.

Gandhian socialism is value-based and practical oriented. He does not accept value as a role model but experiments with it and translates it into action. For example, while talking of economic justice he does not inspire the working class to raise rebel against the authorities but he decries the degradation of this class and elevates their physical, mental and moral standards to be on par with the so-called elite class. Thus, social justice does not become a formal concept but it becomes the practical ideal without which the individual or the society cannot thrive.

**Gandhian Model:**

Man in spite of being modern and advanced groans under a pressing weight of hopelessness and feels inclined to look back into the repositories of the great sayings in order to find out a formula for his survival. The Sarvodaya thought is the formula which is based on compassion for others and selflessness for one self. "Fifty three Noble prize winners, men and women of science, letters, peace, of different religions, history and culture who have been honoured because they look for and celebrate truth in life and life in truth warned us of an unprecedented holocaust encompassing all the horrors of extermination and extending the frontiers of barbarism and death. Strongly enough they all look to one man Gandhi and his non-violent action to fight the most fundamental battle of human rights- the right to life."  

It is seen that property and possession are the main driving force in mundane life and human attitude towards property and possession is very old and the human agony, therefore, is very old. The furious battle between Kirata and Arjuna as described in "Kiratarjuna" is a symbol of man's undying impulse towards worldly possessions. Yet the evolution of the non-acquisitive spirit in man is also an undying stream of thought. Upanisads recommend religious
injunctions not to covet other's property as all belongs to and pervaded by God in
order to reduce social array. From the above two extremes, the idea of common
ownership, trusteeship and other form of social thinking originate. Attainment of
prosperity is concerned with the availability of the basic needs such as food,
clothing and shelter for its continuance for which money is required. Hence
money has to be acquired. But wealth if acquired with acquisitive spirit it leads to
social imbalance. Hence wealth should be earned with moral and spiritual
consideration.

Sarvodaya of Gandhian ideal brings a balance in human mind and soul
and puts man on the right track, which may lead him to real social happiness.
J.P.Narayan points out that mere 'economic development' is not a measure of
socialism. It is one in which an individual voluntarily treats the larger interest of
the society to be higher than his individual interest. This could be possible only
when Gandhian method of 'internal change in man' is taken, as the tool. Mixing
of science with politics leads to annihilation, but Gandhian philosophy is science
and spiritualism together. In JP's view, therefore, the socialist way of life is a way
of sharing together. The more willingly this sharing is practised, the less tension
and coercion in society and more of socialism. R.A.Prasad holds the same line of
thought when he says that what is permanent in socialism is not this or that
programme, but a consistent relationship with emotive impulses in man, which
leads them to seek equality in society. This is why socialism is said to be a
product of human nature.

Marx, in recognizing labour as the ultimate value, recognizes two classes
of labourers such as hand labourers and intellectual labourers. Man is neither
body alone nor brain alone. But for Gandhiji as the different parts of the body
have their equal importance, so are the members of the society and this is his
socialism. And if all work together in a mutually coordinated way for their bread
the distinction of rank will be no more. While Marx considers labour as the source
and measure of all values, Gandhiji considers labour as the source of life and the
basis of human existence. Gandhiji's struggle with the authorities in favour of the
labourers in South Africa proves 'labour' to be the centre of his socialist thought.
Gandhiji's programme of Khadi, Swadeshi, Charkha and Boycott of foreign clothes is intended primarily to defend the cause of the textile labourers. Gandhiji treats labour as the source of the means for the social transformation and for the establishment of an egalitarian society. Gandhiji adopted 'bread labour' to be the basic principle. In his words, "Just as both prince and peasant must eat and clothe them selves, so must labour for supplying their primary wants." Hence for every one 'no labour no meal'.

"Gandhiji was working for an agro-industrial set-up, such a set up would not begin with heavy industries, it would not aim at a very high standard of living, it would not be competitive, never the less it would ensure a stable and contended society functioning on the basis of trust and non-violence or the principle of Sarvodaya."

The important ground for which Gandhiji rejects technological society is that every body need do some physical labour not on the basis of justice, rather it is a physical necessity. Every body in a free society should be given the fullest liberty to develop and exercise his special aptitude and abilities consistently with equal opportunity granted to all. At the same time, all men whatever may be the nature of their special abilities will be subject to the law of bread labour. This means that every able-bodied person should perform at least that amount of manual labour, which will produce the equivalent to what he consumes for physical sustenance. This labour should be in the production of the basic necessaries of life like food, clothing and shelter. Although one might not find time to perform the full measure of bread labour, yet it is possible to perform a substantial portion of it in spite of other occupations. Of course the case may be different in case of diseased and disabled. To allow free meals to able-bodied, is to allow laziness, idleness, hypocrisy and even crime. The intellectuals claim their works to be of superior quality and of higher social significance. They constitute the privileged class consisting of doctors, engineers, professors, bureaucrats, business executives etc. and claim for themselves higher pay and better facilities. Gandhiji, while discussing about 'Varnāshramadharma' talks of sādhāranadharma, which is different from Swadharma. Swadharma is one's own
duty pertaining to his social life and one is assigned to do his swadharma in the best possible way as this is the law of the being. Varna is determined by birth but can be retained only by observing it obligatorily.

Varna is not a man made institution but the law of life universally governing the human family. Fulfillment of the law makes life livable, ends all clashes and conflicts, puts an end to starvation and pauperization. Hence there is the importance of dharma or morality in every sphere of life, since life backed by dharma is the supreme life of his conception. Here individual is the starting point of his philosophy and every individual in order to make him able to contribute to such an ideal society must perform Sādhāranadharma, the duty that is common to all in the society. S.rira Shrama or physical labour is one. Hence intellectual labour though important can not lay its importance on his right to live. Intellectual work is important and has an undoubted place in the scheme of life. What he insists on is the necessity of physical labour and no man should be free from that obligation because it will serve to improve the quality of his intellectual output.

As a matter of fact, if all the people in the society contribute to the duty and responsibility of manual labour then the so called difference between the rich and the poor, big and small can be removed. Through out the world there is a conflict between the capitalists and labourers. But if both the classes do manual labour for their sustenance then there can be no such difference, nor conflict nor even exploitation. Obedience to the law of bread-labour will bring about a silent revolution in the structure of the society. Man's triumph will consist in substituting 'the struggle for existence' by 'struggle for mutual service'. The law of brute will be replaced by the law of man. Gandhiji's slogan 'back to the village' means a definite voluntary recognition of the duty of bread labour. Bible, thus, says: 'earn thy bread by the sweat of thy brow'. Prosperity depends on work, not on exploitation. Above all manual labour is essential for healthy body and a sound body entails a sound mind. Hence such a manual labour is prescribed for the Intellectuals. Therefore, Gandhiji says, 'work is worship' and 'an idle mind is devil's workshop'.

The law of manual labour is the first moral law of life. All men have a share in common toil for the maintenance of human life upon earth. Such toil serves to deepen the sense of fellowship among men. A civilization based on freedom and equality is possible only if men recognize the law of bread—labour and also the place of talents, whether material or moral, whether self-acquired or inherited in terms of existing laws, at the disposal of the community for common human welfare. Hence every one ought to realize the dignity of labour. If a barber or a shoemaker attends a college he ought not to abandon his profession. The profession of a barber is as good as the profession of a doctor. For Gandhiji, labour is the law of nature and its violation is a cause of our present economic muddle. Manual labour is a practical remedy for unemployment particularly among the educated. Self-employment, diversion of educated youth to agriculture and rural industries are the remedies that are being advocated now. Some sorts of manual labour have also been prescribed as a corrective for emotional stress and strains by modern psychologists. Manual labour will not be prescribed to any particular class and no particular work or worker will acquire a kind of social stigma. It will help to promote 'equality of man' the modern and scientific division labour is based on this doctrine.

In the field of labour capital relation Gandhiji stands for non-violent settlement of differences. He does not believe in any inevitable and irreconcilable antagonism between labour and capital. Both should work as equal part in a joint venture. They are the co-trustees for the society. Not that the capitalists alone should not exploit labourers, the labourers too should not exploit capital. In order to bridge the gap between them and for the establishment of socialism, Gandhiji feels it easy to convince and convert the former than the later and this can be done only by persuasion by non-violent means. This will make:

"The rich take the initiative in the dispossession with a view to a universal diffusion of the spirit and contentment. If only they keep their own property within moderate limits, the starving will be easily fed and will learn the lesson of contentment along with the rich".⁹
For this mere theoretical or philosophical deliberation won't suffice rather one has to make a move. It is true that hundred miles of walk starts with one step forward. Hence socialism starts with the first convert. Gandhiji’s suggestion is that zero added to zero is always zero. Hence every one should think and make him self the first one. It is thus that a socialistic society can be built by the efforts of the truthful, non-violent and pure hearted socialists.

For Marx, introduction of highly developed technology even in the production of bare necessaries of life can make man happy, since the production of comforts and even luxuries will be affluent and exploitation shall have no place in the society. Man will have much of leisure at hand for merry making. Manual labour, therefore, is required but not an essential for human existence. Gandhiji, on the other hand, opposes Marx and prefers production by masses and not mass production by machines. His suggestion for manual labour is not anti-machine rather a genuine need. The fact is that the more one gets, the more he wants to get and still remains unsatisfied. If satisfaction of desire is taken to be the basis of happiness, then since all the desires cannot be practically met, then there is no hope of attaining happiness. Hence our need is to be minimized so that the minimum needs can be satisfied and there is the hope of attaining happiness. Again, if technological production, as suggested by Marx creates leisure, it becomes still more problematic. It is easy to create leisure but it is difficult to find task to spend the leisure. There is no joy in modern labour, hence this clamour for leisure. To Gandhiji, ‘the lure of leisure’ is a dangerous moral trap because the problem of rightly utilizing leisure will be even more difficult that the problem of finding leisure and the want of sufficient work will generally lead to physical, intellectual and moral dissipation. The true craftsman has no leisure but only rest. The modern problem of leisure is a symptom of the ‘vast social neurosis’, which is one of the outstanding facts of our time. It is against the constitution of things that Gandhiji fights with all his mights. He often says that the only question that a lover of India and the humanity has to address himself is how best to devise practical means of alleviating India’s wretchedness and misery. No scheme of irrigation or other agricultural improvements that human
ingenuity can conceive, can deal with the vastly scattered population of India or provide work for masses of mankind who are constantly thrown out of employment. So our minimum needs require satisfaction and our production should not be more than what we need.

Gandhiji of course, means that there may be a degree of intensity of needs. Once the basis needs such as food, clothing and shelter are satisfied, the rest may be accommodated there in. Since all the needs can not be satisfied let our needs be minimized and let the production be in accordance with the needs. The more and more production merely satisfies Kama or sense. Let there be no consumption, which is harmful to body and in the way stealing and let there be no more production. Again the surplus products and the unnecessary exhaustion of natural resources need protection. Hence one need to adopt the principle of 'Aparigraha', which propounds that one should not possess any thing for tomorrow. If one possesses what one actually needs then no one would be in want and all would get contentment.

"Perfect fulfillment of the idea of non-possession requires that man should like birds have no roof over his head, no clothing and no stock of food for tomorrow" 10.

It is a principle that applies to thought as well. It means that one should not possess useless thought or knowledge. Gandhiji often says that one has the right to live if he renounces even his body that he possesses for the service as long as it exists. This can be done by perfect love. To possess more is to deprive others of some and in a sense stealing and hence sin. In the economic field the golden rule is resolutely to refuse to have what the millions can not. This non-possession in social level abolishes exploitation. The adoption of the principle of aparigraha requires one to have control over the indriyas. One need be a master of passion but never a slave of it. A real ideal civilization consists in deliberate and voluntary control over wants and not its multiplication. One can do this by perseverance, which contributes to a healthy body and peaceful mind. The control over senses that includes control over palate, control over thought, word and deed is called brahmacharya. Brahmacharya is that type of conduct, which
makes one able to touch the highest ideal. The principle of brahmacharya when adapted to the economics of production and distribution then the production is according to the need. Ruskin says that our science is simply the science of getting rich. The modern political economy stands on a precisely similar basis, for it assumes that man has a body but no soul, no sympathy and social affection, If there is only a crust of bread in the house and mother and children are starving, their interests are not the same. If the mother eats it, the children want it, if the children eat it, the mother must go hungry yet it does not necessarily follow that there will be 'antagonism' between them. Although self-preservation is a natural impulse in all the living beings Ruskin believes that the highest pleasure and satisfaction of life lies for man in noble works that elate the soul, no matter it demands self-denial or mortification.

**Trusteeship Formula:**

The doctrine that 'paternal authority' comes from paternal responsibility takes the form of 'trusteeship' formula in the philosophy of Gandhiji. Not only this is a key word in his economic thought rather a key to his entire Sarvodaya programme. All the individuals are not born with equal talents. If any body produces more because of his individual talent, either physical or intellectual he must use it for the cause of the society. The general principle that preoccupied Gandhiji is that Artha is governed by Dharma. His view is that in order to contribute to the well-ordered economic system of his sense the capitalists and the land lords should not think that to accumulate wealth is their god given right, otherwise this may lead to class war and the end of this war would mean the end of the rule of capital. Gandhiji emphasizes on economic equality by which he means that each individual must have the right to supply for his minimum and natural needs. In a non-violent society such an ideal can be achieved. If one keeps what one does not require for his immediate natural needs, he thieves it from some body else, but in order to be moral he should remain aloof from stealing. If one concentrates sharply he can get rid of quite a number of his wants and this can be done by the observance of the principle of non-stealing.
In fact Gandhiji wants to give the present owning class a chance of reforming itself as he has undying faith in the innate goodness of human nature. He suggests for the rich and the wealthy his doctrine of 'trusteeship', and the idea is that the rich and landlords should spend what they reasonably require for their elementary needs and should act as trustees for the remainder to be used for the society and honesty of the trustee need be assured.

Love and exclusive possession are contradictory. If one loves others he must adopt the principle of *aparigraha*. Where there is perfect love there must be perfect non-possession. The rich should, therefore, love spontaneously to contribute to the establishment of an ideal society. In this context a distinction may be made between 'possession' and 'possessiveness'. If one has the quality of possessiveness, it will continue to remain with him even if he is snatched away of all his possessions by violent means. It may even increase more, but by the change of heart that 'possession' and 'possessiveness' of an individual can be dispensed with. As a matter of fact, if the rich don't becomes trustees, Gandhiji would suggest that violent means should not be applied, for the society will be poorer and it will lose the gift of man who knows how to accumulate wealth. The forces of non-violent circumstances will compel them to be so. In a non-violent state, public opinion can do what violence can not. By non-violence and non-cooperation of those whom the rich or the exploiter requires for the accumulation and use of his wealth that a change in his heart can be brought about and the wide gulf between the rich and the poor can be abridged. For Karl Marx, of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie to day, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary, but for Gandhiji the revolution must be for the transformation and hence must be a non-violent one.

Trusteeship idea provides a possible escape from the dilemma: make men free and they become unequal and make them equal and they cease to be free. If a man is left free, as we understand roughly, to exercise his talent in what so ever way one may think to be better then there, no doubt, will be inequality of economic status of individuals according to the variation of the individual talents.
On the other hand, if men are made equal democratically and controlled by the state, they can not exercise their freedom in what so ever way they like.

The idea of trusteeship means that, the rich should give up private ownership of properties and should create out of it a fund valid in the eyes of law and managed democratically. A trustee has no heir but the public. Again the question of inheritance may seem problematic. But Gandhiji suggests that the successor can be decided on the basis of the choice of the original owner who is the first trustee and his choice must be finalized by the state. This arrangement puts a check and balance on the state and the individual as well.

Gandhiji could foresee that the acquisitive instinct may lead to further inequalities of income and wealth in a normal course. It is, therefore, essential to foster outstanding talent and hold it in trust to be used in the interest of the society, otherwise it would again give rise to a privileged class in whatever name. Hence Gandhiji's idea of trusteeship is applicable not only in case of economic wealth but also in case of human talents. All the talented persons should hold their talents in trust for society. Since, talented persons are the part of the nation's property they should use their talents not only for the self but also for the entire social structure. In Gandhian sense, to keep the talents idle is inhuman and to misuse also is inhuman. This implies that the theory of trusteeship has a permanent value in human society. All our time and our talents are society's own property and we are no more than servants entrusted with the task of its proper utilization. The fruits of our labour ought to be at the disposal of the community within which we live and we take from the community no more than what it affords to give us. Thus the self-acquired property under the world's existing arrangements is no more our own than what has been handed down under the existing law of inheritance. We are trustees on behalf of the community of all we hold. But we don't have the right and duty to misuse it, rather to adopt to sacrifice. It is like Gita's 'Jaina', which means to take prasad after offering or like 'Tyaga' and 'Bhoga' of Isopanisada, which means enjoyment after renunciation.

By the joint effort of the two extreme hostile classes, Gandhiji wants to bring about a new constitution of the society and all men serve the society
willfully and joyfully through a complete re-orientation of life's value in a new direction. Society, on the other hand, through economic equality will be able to secure for all its members full and equal opportunity to develop physically, mentally and morally and the products of those talents will be shared by all in the society in common. By the introduction of the theory of trusteeship the barriers between communities are progressively reduced. Mankind, by practising this ideal can progress towards a deeper realization of the essential unity of life and it is, as Gandhiji subscribes, the surest method to evolve a new order of life of universal benefit.

In going to understand Gandhiji, the purity of the means of earning money as on spending should be emphasized; otherwise it is impossible now a days to earn crores by moral means, so that one can remain a trustee, for it does not arise. If purity of the means is observed then crores can not be accumulated at all and the difficulty of spending for the society will assume a minor prospect.

There is nothing in this theory, which is beyond the grasp of intellect; though it is difficult, not impossible to practise. If people concentrate on it constantly and try to act up to it, the life on the earth would be governed far more by love than it is at present. But one must have to strive for it to achieve this end. So Gandhiji's suggestion is self-restraint in every sphere of life. If capital is power so is work. Either is dependent on the other. Soon the worker realizes his strength, he is in a position to become a co-sharer of his capital. Every man has an equal right for the necessaries of life even as birds and beasts have. Every right carries with it a corresponding duty and a corresponding remedy of resisting any attack upon it. The corresponding duty is to labour with the limbs and the corresponding remedy is to non-cooperate with him who deprives one of the fruits of his labour. Right and duties are regulated by the principle of interdependence and reciprocity. In Gandhiji's scheme of things duties have a pre-dominance over the rights of the individuals. He believes that for every right there is a responsibility. Right is a privilege and duty is obligatory for individuals. Such a concept of rights and duties arose out of his ideas of Dharma. Dharma is morality and still more-spirituality. Justice is in accordance with strict morality,
that which can be claimed by way of rights and duties. But morality, which cannot be claimed but given voluntarily, is spiritual. It is otherwise called as Tyaga or Seva. Love is the highest of spirituality leading to bhakti. Concrete form of love is expressed in deriving pleasure out of a man's duty only. Dharma involves the unfettering performance of one's duty, which can go a long way in securing one's interest and harmonizing such interest with the interest of the other individual in the society. The rule is applicable to the king or the ruler. The duty of the ruler is to serve the country as a king but not to rule the country by sword. They have wisdom and potentiality to rule the country by sword. They have wisdom and potentiality to rule the subjects and this need be utilized as a result of which the subjects will be submissive to the authority. But if this simplicity and fundamental way is diversified, then the subjects will think it their duty to object such high handedness and it will be treated as their right to do so. The power, which makes one render his duty properly, that germinates Satyagraha power. All sorts of rights are the outcome of doing the duty appropriately.

It can easily be demonstrated that destruction of the capitalists must mean destruction in the end of the workers and no human being is so bad as to be beyond redemption. Gandhiji never thinks that the peasants and the workers are justified in carrying on a just war for economic and social emancipation so that they can be free once for all from the burdens of supporting parasitic classes in society. But he believes in non-violent revolution. War certainly unites people quickly, but what Gandhiji wants more is that men should also be united in peace in the constructive endeavour to build up a new society, which is free from the weakness of the present. Again Gandhiji said that the state is born of force and sustained and nourished by them. He, therefore, wants to revolutionalise politics by the application of ethical principles. The political problem is basically a moral problem or a problem of value. Hence unless we bring ethical values to regulate the field of political activity, there is a real risk of mankind being greatly crippled and even wiped out of its existence in the event of the nuclear war. Therefore, Gandhiji wants not exactly a state-less society rather a state-free society—not that there is no state but that there is no requirement of a state. He also wrote in
Harijan that as the ideal state of statelessness is not fully realized, at least that state is treated to be the best, which governs the least. For Gandhiji, religion is the essence of life and even politics is to be transformed by the religious spirit of love and spirit. It should be guided by the highest ethical & spiritual values.

Gandhiji aims at a casteless, classless and stateless society and his economic philosophy is not a systematic fancy of academic theories rather his theories have developed gradually along his experiment with truth. Any untruth is negation of God and unbearable to Gandhiji. As we cannot change any body's ideas and ideologies through some external physical force, the real revolution should always be a fundamental change in our ideas and ideology, ethos and values of life. Gandhiji's instrument of social change is moral equivalent to war.

"To understand Gandhiji's activity it should be realized that his doctrine is like a huge edifice composed of two different floors or grades. Below is the solid groundwork, the basic foundation of religion. On this vast and unshakable foundation is based on political and social campaign."

Socialism and Indian Value System:

As he himself says, he is not going to say anything new rather his attempt is to retell the old Indian thought in the present day. His thought is based on the basic idea of the four Purusarthas, i.e. Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Moksa, as has been enunciated in Indian scriptures.

By Artha we mean Vitta or money or wealth or even economic power. But it not only means money rather it means any kind of material prosperity. It is just a means to Kāma, but there is no hope of attaining Moksa by Artha itself. From one's worldly experience one can well imagine that Artha is not desired for itself.

Kāma means in one-way desire and desire cannot be Purusarthā. Kāma can be a satisfaction of desire leading to pleasurable experience. In Upanisada, it is called preyas meaning pleasurable. It refers to any kind of sense experience.

Dharma in Indian tradition does not mean religion, rather it is the way of right living. Dharma as a whole stands for morality but in a restricted sense means duty. Morality is religion understood as spirituality and this morality is the foundation of Hindu law. It means spirituality, which is more than morality.
Dharma has two earlier definitions in Mahabharata-(1) Dharana, which means holding together. It is the principle that holds the people together. A society is possible because of the presence of a principle or Dharma. (2) Prabhava, which means worldly prosperity. So the aim of Dharma is social stability and social prosperity as well. As governing the social life it may be called 'moral law' and as governing the personal life it may be called 'spiritual law'. Dharma, therefore, has been called 'Abhyudaya' meaning all sided prosperity both individual and social.

Artha alone can not give social stability. It itself must be controlled by Dharma because mere production in economics is not Dharma. distribution also is required to constitute it. Artha is necessary but not sufficient to constitute Dharma. One cannot earn money without having a rule to conduct it. Artha being regulated by certain principle can not attain Kama without Dharma. Again as Artha stands for material prosperity no material prosperity can bring happiness in the true sense of the term. Dharma stands in between the material prosperity (Arth) and Moksa. Dharma is the necessary condition of Artha and Kama on the one hand and Moksa on the other. Dharma has also full control over Kama. Lord’s view in Gita is that Kama following Dharma is my Bibhuti and Gita’s Bibhuti is that it is Kāma, which is responsible for creation. Kāma has its own limitation. It is required when anybody is related to the whole world and only when he retires it is called Niskāma.

Moksa is the supreme ideal of life and Dharma cannot exercise control over it. It is of the nature of Ānanda or bliss which is otherwise known as the attainment of spiritual freedom.

Let us see how Gandhian socialism is accommodated in the value framework or Purusārtha. The economic system of society, which is the real basis, may be called the sub-structure. And it is on this sub-structure that religion, ethics, law, institution of the society stand as the super-structure. The constituents of the super-structure are found to reflect the interest of the dominant class. Hence care need be taken to form an ideal sub structure for the establishment of an ideal socialism.
Gandhiji wishes to establish an ideal society, which he calls 'Sarvodaya' in which all the features of socialism are ingrained. In that socialistic society everybody whether rich or poor has the chance to develop and since it aims at the greatest good of all that it is named 'Sarvodaya'. Sarvodaya does not mean only economic equality, rather all-sided development, political, social and moral as well. Hence the economic sub-structure, which is represented by Artha need be controlled by Dharma so that it can pave the way for Moksa.

Gandhian socialism may be studied in the context of the Indian value system as reflected in the Purusārthas, originally Trivarga i.e., Kāma, Artha and Dharma and culminating in Moksa, thus constituting Caturvarga. The four valued system or Caturvarga constitutes an important and significant requirement in the socialism of Gandhiji. For him, true socialism, which is based on the spiritualistic model, transcends the boundaries of the other forms of socialism discussed previously. The idea of Sarvodaya does not merely mean the all-round development of the human life as a whole. In other words, it means the development of the different aspects of life such as the material prosperity, the ethical equilibrium and the spiritual excellence. The material prosperity starts with the basic appetite for it, which is known as Kāma. But the fulfillment of this appetite is realized in the acquisition of means, which is known as Artha. But the equilibrium between Kāma and Artha cannot be maintained without the regulative principle known as Dharma. Dr. Rajendra Prassad in his discussion accepts these three as the fundamental which constitute the value system. Moksa is the later addition to this three-valued system, which, according to him, is the personal value system. However, in so far as the Indian value system is concerned, Moksa is the culmination of the Trivarga for the reason that Gandhiji accepts, that Moksa ultimately means Sarvodaya which can be realized only when the individual as well the society transcends the levels of material prosperity and the ordinary morality as well.

Kāma cannot be treated as Purusartha if not governed by Dharma. When Gandhiji talks of socialism specially in economic field, Artha and Kāma stand for material prosperity and acquisitive instinct or exclusive possession respectively.
When Dharma exercises control over Artha and Kama, in Gandhian economics, it takes the form of love and acceptance of trusteeship, which contributes to the formation of ideal socialism or Sarvodaya where God dwells and a state of Moksa is achieved.

In political field, Artha refers to power backed by economic and political strength and Kama for the ambition to regulate national life. Since state is an instrument of coercion, it may sacrifice the individual for the state. But Gandhiji over weighs individuality, which lies at the root of all progress. Thus, when Artha and Kama are regulated by Dharma in the political field, it becomes not a state­less society but a state-free society and the political government is replaced by a popular government. Man under the influence of Kama seeks to have the crude material objects and power but he ought to pursue the real ideal, which has an eternal value, the Paramapurusártha, the Moksa. Sarvodaya is such ideal, which Gandhiji hopes to attain here in this world and this is his God whom he wishes to see face to face.

In the social field also Gandhian Sarvodaya is found to be based on these ideals. When, for example, Gandhiji prescribes manual labour for all, he does not mean that every body should do any and every type of work, rather duties are assigned according to one’s personality and ability. Swadharma is one’s own duty assigned to him in a particular station pertaining to social life and to do the duty in the best possible way is the law of the being. Dharma involves the unfettering performance of one’s own duty, which can go a long way in securing one’s interests and harmonizing such interest with the interest of the other individuals in the society.

Thus, Artha stands for economic value, Kāma for psychological value, Dharma for moral value and Moksa for spiritual value. Thus the Purusārthas are not mere theoretical concepts, rather they are the guiding principles for individual as well as social living.

For Gandhiji Moksa is the highest ideal. Artha or the entire economic system which constitutes the sub-structure of the society and Kama, the natural impulses if controlled by dharma or the moral principles it will lead to the
attainment of Moksa, that is ultimately identified with Gandhian Sarvodaya. This state of socialistic society is called Rāmarājya or the kingdom of God on earth. For Gandhiji, the immediate service of all human beings becomes necessary because the only way to find God is to see Him through His creations. Thus in the ultimate analysis Gandhian socialism may be equated with his Sarvodaya ideal which again is nothing but the state of Moksa and the manifestation of spirituality.

Man desires perfect happiness or Moksa but pursues Kama. This is due to his ignorance, mistaking Kama to be Moksa. We are not following as we are diverted but we ought to follow it. Moksa means the revelation of the true nature of the self. Māyā or the clouds of unknowing is conceived here as illusory. It is in this special sense that Moksa can be described as Śādhyā and regarded as value in Advaita philosophy. Brahman, for Sankara, is itself the state of Moksa. The only way to dispel illusion is to discover the truth. But consistent effort is necessary to follow the right path leading to truth. Acharya Vinoba Bhave once remarked in a humorous strain that he did not know of any person in the whole world who enjoyed a higher standard of living than he. He says: ‘I am able to live in a house every day. I sleep under the canopy of the vast sky, the shining stars and the moon giving me a glimpse of the infinite.’ It is because one has not lead a practical moral life that he can not taste the sweetness of spirituality of human life. Hence one has to come out of his greed to lead a life of the sort lead by Buddha, Christ and others. For Gandhiji, the path leading to truth is Ahimsa. Truth is the ultimate goal—the life of Moksa. In going to retell the old truth Gandhiji holds that:

"Nothing is or exists in reality except truth (being). Devotion to this truth is the sole justification for our existence. Without truth it is impossible to observe any principle or rules of life."¹³

For a seeker of truth or for the maintenance of a Dhārmic life there is no relevance of other (Material) things except truth, which involves Dharma with Niskāma Karma. It is in this sense that only truth exists and all other things seem relevant because of ignorance. The observation of the law of truth means truth in
thought, truth in speech and truth in action. Since all knowledge is included in truth, to know the truth is to know everything. There can be no inward peace without true knowledge.

"If we once learn how to apply this never failing test of truth we will at once be able to find what is worth doing, what is worth seeing and what is worth reading."14

And this truth can be realized by single-minded devotion and indifference to all other interests in life. Without ahimsa it is not possible to seek and find truth. They are so intertwined that any attempt to separate them fails. It is only by firm adherence to truth that one can live non-violently in a world, which is full of violence. This, however, does not leave us without any guidance what so ever. The experiences of sages are available to us as examples and they will be available for all times to come. Thus, it follows that practice of ahimsa, which is the way to truth is the ideal life.

Gandhiji's frame of reference is real life. His understanding of truth is based on experience. He can know the limits of the intellect and realize that 'knowledge by separation' is inferior to 'knowledge by identification'. For him 'being' is 'knowing'. With his total identification of life nothing is irrelevant to his all-consuming zest for living. Hence duty is of primary importance to attain truth. Again Ahimsa is hurt not only by evil thoughts, evil words and evil deeds, but it also is due to our holding on to what the world needs. So long as we are attached to our body we are violent and freedom from attachment is the realization of truth. This is Lord's Niskamakarma. Renouncing in Yoga (being united with god) one should do one's duty. This is the life of Sthitaprajna. This is the last stage when the man is not disturbed. The last word of Indian culture is 'Shanti'.

Again Gandhiji's economic philosophy has some basic principles. For him, a philosophically adequate understanding of the economic aspects of life would be possible only if we relate economics to ethical and moral values. For Gandhiji economics without the dimension of morality or spirituality would be dehumanizing. Such a total understanding of economic life would, therefore,
presuppose an adequate understanding of human nature in its totality and that of society.

The basic principle of Gandhiji’s conception of man, therefore, is the foundation for his economic thought. In the Gandhian image of man the two central moral principles are: (a) self-discipline and (b) responsibility towards others. The emphasis on self-discipline in economics takes the form of limitation of wants, simplicity of need fulfillment and hard work. For Gandhiji the basic distinction would be the limitation of consumption. For this purpose the distinction between needs and wants becomes all-important. Limitation of consumption in the Gandhian perspective has some important functions. From the point of view of individual, limiting our desires is necessary for building up of the moral strength of character and since Gandhiji sees freedom of the individual in terms of moral integrity, limitation of desires is necessary for the freedom of the individual. From the point of view of the society limitation of desires serves two purposes: (I) from Gandhiji’s point of view modern mechanized production and technology are ultimately conditioned by increasing wants and demands. Hence control of desires is the basic condition for controlling technological production, (II) moreover limitless desires necessitate exploitation of scarce resources for one’s own use. This leads to social injustice which in turn provokes social conflicts and violence in the society. Hence from the point of view of social harmony also limitation of desires becomes necessary. The basic principle is that limitation of desires is good both from the point of view of the individual and society.

From Gandhji’s point of view, therefore, a just production system as well as a just distribution system would be possible only if there is control of consumption. Here perhaps there is the basic difference between Gandhiji and liberalism on the one hand Marxian socialism on the other. For the liberalism, distribution is the basic problem where as for Marxism production is crucial. However, for Gandhiji, a just economic system pre-supposes control of consumption. If consumption would be brought under moral control then social justice could be achieved without class struggle. This is possible because moral
control of consumption can pave the way for the ethics of trusteeship. If the rich could accept control of their wants then the power of production need not be used for selfish purposes. On the other hand, the element of responsibility could be introduced in production itself. If this were possible then without destroying capitalistic class, economic exploitation could be overcome. At the same time control of production would limit the expansion of machinery and this would increase the stability of the society itself. Dr. Baidyanath Mishra, a renowned economist observed that even though there has been considerable increase in the rate of growth of income since the beginning of plan period, unemployment, under employment and poverty continue to be the major maladies of the country. Even increase in the rate of income did not reduce unemployment. What is most distressing is that the gap between the urban and rural areas has increased in recent years. There are also glaring disparities between different groups of people in the country. Only about 10% of people may claim to be in privileged position. He, at the same time, suggests that it is only Gandhian concept of values, which can help us to escape from the maladies that engulf us. These human values imply rules of conduct and action for living together, social living and mutual benefit.

Evolution of progress is always experimental. All progress is gained through mistakes and their rectifications. No good comes fully-fashioned out of God’s hand, but has to be carved out through repeated experiments and repeated failures by our selves. This is the law of individual growth. So one has to light one’s small candle because even such feeble lamps added together would at least in some measure dispel the darkness around us and create an atmosphere of faith, hope and confidence. Socrates says that:

"Ideal life lay in simplicity only .......... and to want nothing is to resemble gods, and that to want as little as possible is to make the nearest approach to gods: that the divine nature is perfection and that to be nearest to perfection."15

In Plato’s Republic, justice is the basis of the state and it becomes the symbol for an ideal social structure and an ideal state. Plato echoes that the demand for justice has not ceased to reverberate through all these centuries; it is
the over cry of the people. Plato could distinguish between the virtues unlimited consisting of power and wealth and could foresee that virtue unlimited can help man to enliven his life. Hence he envisages the rule of philosopher kings who could deliver happiness and release from all sufferings.

As a river after a tortuous journey for miles through hills and rocks broadens into a fresh stream on the plane grounds and gathers waters from numerous tributaries, so also Gandhian Sarvodaya has achieved a wide acceptance by Christianity, Islam and different other religions too and gains life from them. One of Christ's commandments is: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbours as thyself.' And this love of neighbour widens into the love of nation and the horizon of love expands into love of mankind in general. Likewise alm-giving or helping the needy out of fellow feeling and brotherliness and without pride and vanity is one of the main obligations of Islam. Gandhian socialism gathers support from Rousseau when in 'the social contact' theory he says that all government must rest upon the consent of the governed. His concept of nationalism is that 'my country may die, so that the human race may live'. Today apart from being political imperative, world-government has become an economic necessity.

Man does not live an isolated life. He has certain relationship with nature, with his fellow men and with the trans-human world. The gradual loss in the direct relationship between man and nature is because of man's urge to conquer and dominate and exploit it through a system of techniques and tools. Man's relationship with his fellow being of the type of producer consumer, employer-employee have been vitiated by his vested interests and modern technology, though his other relations with his fellowmen like friendly, conjugal, social and filial etc. are some how compromising. Man's relationship with the trans-human world arises from the need of his spirit, which is often ignored and evated by social scientific theories. Thus we see that the three-fold relationship of man has been radically disturbed in modern times. Yet the gradual emergence of a new and beautiful society is foreseen. "It is quietly and imperceptibly in the minds and hearts of men". So "we should concentrate to see that we pave the way so that
in our life time one can have a world without boundaries of some sort of a federal world.”17
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