Gandhi said of himself: "I am not a man who sits down and thinks out problems syllogistically. I am a man of action. I react to a situation intuitively. Logic comes afterwards, it does not precede the event." As is well-known, he was a political actionist and a practical philosopher; he was not a theorist." To quote Prof. Mirmal Kumar Bose: "In the traditional language of ancient India, he is Kshatriya, not a Brahmin. But his greatness lies in the fact that he has accepted and advocated the law of love as the supreme law of our being and has lived his life accordingly; he can be regarded as a warrior-Brahmin, but he cannot be said to be a sage-philosopher Brahmin." How mistaken was Montagu's judgment about Gandhi: "he lives practically on air and is pure visionary!"

Gandhi did not set before himself the task of a systematic presentation of his views about the nature of political activity. The construction of a system of political philosophy did never interest or bother him. His ideas were thrown off as comments on given, concrete realities and were intended to give a new shape to events and for the re-making of man as a moral person. It was in the nature of the circumstances that Gandhi did not, nor could he possibly, evolve a definite and clear-cut political theory. For him "theory is all grey - evergreen is life" (Goethe). The place of theory was subordinate to that of organic unity i.e., life. He raised questions of how but only occasionally those of what. It would be an unrewarding task to look for a consistent, systematized body of thought in Gandhi's writings for he owed absolute allegiance to none of the prevailing schools - anarchist, Marxist, liberal democratic etc. And construction of any rigid, fixed 'ism' was alien to his nature - a continually evolving personality that he was. One may, on close examination of Gandhi's writings, may come to the conclusion that his political philosophy.

* "In dealing with living entities, the dry syllogistic method leads not only to bad logic but sometimes to fatal logic." - Harijan, 14-8-37, p. 212.
is, indeed, elusive. But that does not make any the less significant the basic core of his thought. As has been pointed out by Prof. Joan V. Bondurant, the contribution of Gandhian political theory has been not alone to the development of a new social and political method. It extends further into the realms of political thought and challenges the substantial presuppositions of the mainstream of political theory. It is in this challenge to the current political theories lies its significance. The study of Gandhi's political theory is relevant from that point of view.

**Methodology**

From the standpoint of methodology, Gandhi's approach was deductive, empirical and pragmatic. He deduced certain conclusions from his basic assumptions - metaphysical and ethical. Metaphysics, Ethics, Economics, Sociology and Politics were intertwined. He was for, in Toynbee's language, 'etherialization' of politics or spiritualisation of politics. Spiritualising meant for Gandhi moralising as we have seen elsewhere. But he was no moral fadist. Any student of Gandhi's political thought and his eventful life will readily see for himself that he developed a keen empirical outlook towards life in general and political and social events in particular. He observed, experienced and suggested the way out. His pleas for the removal of untouchability, his indefatigable mission for communal amity, his solutions for the economic regeneration of poverty-stricken India bear testimony to his rich experience of life based upon empirical investigation. As was his wont he looked at things empirically and pragmatically. This note of pragmatism is evident in his political thought. But who can help being pragmatist in this pragmatic world? And pragmatic approach necessarily leads one to eclecticism. He was eclectic enough to draw from different sources and schools what fitted in with his basic outlook of truth and non-violence. The 'eclectic alchemy' of Gandhi's political philosophy has evolved an amalgam out of heterogeneous founts of his fundamental faith and inspiration.

His approach to politics was indeed moral. And that lends a special significance to his theory in this age of amoral politics. It is true that he did not care much for the historical and quantitative methods of politics as has been noted by Dr.V.P.
but the deficiencies that follow therefrom have been more than compensated in the form of giving a moral direction of politics. This moral orientation is evident in his analysis of the concepts of political theory viz., State, democracy, freedom, rights etc. It is from a normative or valuational standpoint - norms or values as he understood and accepted to be fundamental - that he elaborated his concepts of political theory.

One may tend to infer that in such an approach of Gandhi's there is more of ethics than of politics. Dr. Benoy Sarkar rebutted this point of view. To quote him: "Such a criticism can come only from those who by politics understand solely or chiefly the constitution making, programme-planning or party-bosoming. But in this kind of ethics of politics Gandhi is in very good company with Fichte, as author of the Gedan an die Deutsche Nation, and Sukracharya as author of the Vitisara, may, with Plato, as author of the Republic." 8

Philosophy of State.

The methodological standpoint being delineated, we shall proceed to make a brief outline-survey of his philosophy of State. Some preliminary remarks are seemed to be necessary before we engage ourselves in that task. As he was not committed to any exclusive school of political thought, and as his writings had been responses to particular situations, though within a basic conceptual framework, it is indeed a problem to categorise his thought. His concern was more in the substance of things than in attributing label to what he thought and for the realization of which he worked. For a Western student of Gandhian political theory it is rather difficult to comprehend the indigenous terms like Ram Raj etc., which he used on different occasions in defining his political ideal. But Gandhi was no traditionalist to cling to the age-old meanings of those terms. It was quite characteristic of him to add new meanings to them, so that, in quality, they became quite different from what they popularly stood for.* As has been noted by Prof. Nirmal Kumar Bose: "Perhaps this

* "I use the old words giving them a new meaning." - K.K. Gandhi, see article 'Source of My Sympathy' in Harijan, 16-9-39.
was one of the mechanisms by means of which Gandhi kept himself rooted in the past, and yet tried to carry India forward in directions radically different from ancient tradition. The French historian and sociologist Prof. Louis Massignon has aptly remarked: "He was a genius in investing common words with unique meanings." Hence one must try to understand the terms employed by him in the sense he did so and the connotation he attributed to those terms. One faces another difficulty in a theoretical analysis of his concept of state. Gandhi being "built of tremendous opposites" - a unique combination of a prophet and a politician of genius - sometimes spoke and wrote in terms of the ultimate ideal and sometimes in terms of immediately realisable objective. And there emerged two Gandhis - one philosophical and the other practical politician eager to come to grips with the realities, with a keen sense of the objective. The citizen-leader Gandhi moved with the times and his theory underwent a continuous process of evolution. This evolution, as we have noted previously, is a distinctive note of Gandhian theory. Gandhi would have been marked as a political leader of least significance if he could not have moved with the times and reflect the historical urges and aspirations of the Indian masses. There was, indeed, a gap between the ideal political order he envisaged and the national democratic state for the creation of which he led the Indian nation. This hiatus between the ideal and the actual was not of his making; it was in the given objective situation in Gandhi's India. This was not a case of political opportunism as has been sometimes alleged but a clear expression of astute realism which speaks of his sagacity and political maturity.

We have discussed in chapter II the background of Gandhi's political philosophy, and as such there is no use referring to the socio-historical roots and the sources of intellectual influence which shaped his political thought to a very great extent. But it would be worthwhile to refer to some of these, in as brief as possible, as that would help us in having a correct perspective of Gandhi's political theory.

First, Dharma is the basic concept of Hindu political thought, broad in its implications and open to several definitions. Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan has
defined dharma as the complex of influences which shape the moral feeling and the character of the people and serve as a code of conduct, supported by the general conscience of the people. It is not a fixed code of mechanical rules, but a living spirit which grows and moves in response to the development of society. Two major meanings of dharma are that it is a source of political, social and religious duties which is capable of changing them; and that it is an agency of absolute truth executing these duties in the world of men. As has been rightly observed by Dr. Paul F. Power Gandhi made use of both meanings, but generally tended to understand dharma as a universal morality to which the affairs of men and states should correspond, much as the first view suggests. Gandhi while not accepting the orthodox versions of dharma on many vital matters adhered to the broad tradition of Hindu thought. *

Secondly, his concept of universal morality transcended the Hindu concept in the sense that he assimilated the Christian ethic and his concept of fundamental morality was a synthesis of the best of the Hindu and Christian traditions.

Thirdly, he was considerably influenced by modern political traditions. As has been noted by Prof. Humayun Kabir, he was an inheritor of the liberal tradition, of the tradition of philosophical anarchism and of the tradition of the collectivisation

* Prof. Joan V. Bondurant observes: "There is a strain in Hindu political thought which is idealist in form and conservative in effect. The concept of dharma which lies at the heart of ancient Hindu polity is reminiscent of aspects of the Hegelian metaphysical theory... (which) endeavours to exhibit the state as the embodiment of greatness and glory and an expression of the spirit or the Absolute. The Hindu metaphysical concept of dharma could lend itself to a similar development. But the Gandhian approach could scarcely be reconciled with such an interpretation... The Gandhian position is basically in agreement with critics of the metaphysical theory." - Conquest of Violence (Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1959), p. 165.
Fourthly, elemental humanism is the essence of Gandhi's attitude to the state.

Fifthly, his role as the supreme commander of the nation engaged in fight with
the mightiest state organisation of the world.

Keeping this background in view let us proceed to discuss the Gandhian concept
of state. This section should be read along with the section on Gandhi's concept of
Freedom which would enable us to form a clearer picture of the state he envisaged.

3) State as the organ of violence.

Gandhi held that violence is evil. Violence includes not only physical coercion
but also economic and social coercion. Power of physical coercion belongs to the
state. In the modern absolute state there is no limit to the extent of this power.
This power of the state to coerce is, according to Gandhi, a kind of organised vio-
ence in which lies the essence of the modern state. To quote Gandhi:

"I look upon an increase in the power of the state with the greatest fear,
because, although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it
does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality which lies at
the root of all progress.

The state represents violence in a concentrated and organized form. The indi-
vidual has a soul, but as the state is a soulless machine, it can never be
weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence.

What I disapprove of is an organization based on force which a state is." 17

Gandhi's characterization of the state as the organ of 'violence in a concentrated
and organized form' indicates how repelled he was at the omnipotence and coercive
character of the state. As one who believed in the sanctity of individual and for
whom non-violence was a fundamental creed it was but natural that he would charac-
terize the state in such a term. But creed or subjective faith apart, he drew enough
lessons from the world he faced - a world where imperialist domination, economic
exploitation and racial discrimination were inseparably tied up with political
authority.
Objectively considered the following events and factors might have influenced Gandhi to develop such an attitude towards the state. 1) His direct experience of the Zulu 'rebellion' (1906). Gandhi's *Autobiography* records that at that time he considered himself a citizen of Natal and he then believed that the British Empire existed for the welfare of the world. A genuine sense of loyalty prevented him from even wishing ill to the Empire. The rightness or otherwise of the 'rebellion' was, under the circumstances, not likely to affect his decision. So he made an offer to the Government to raise a Stretcher-bearer Corps for service with the troops. The offer was accepted. The scene on battlefront was indeed ghastly and revolting for such a sensitive soul as his. To quote Gandhi:

"The Zulu 'rebellion' was full of new experiences and gave me much food for thought. The Boer war had not brought home to me the horrors of war as with anything like the vividness that the 'rebellion' did. This was no war but a man-hunt." (emphasis added.)

2) General Smuts' breach of faith during the Satyagraha movement (1907-8) for the repeal of the Asiatic Registration Act shocked him badly. The 'fool play' of this 'heartless man' might have been instrumental in making a deep impact on his thought process.

3) The vulgarity and monstrosity of British domination and the sub-human existence of the people of this country had struck him to the roots of his being and there emerged a rebel who organized and mobilized the non-violent strength of the nation against the 'leonine violence' of the political power represented by British government.

His encounter with the racialists in South Africa and British imperialists in India could only lead him to see the essentially violent character of the state.

b) Gandhi on Political Sovereignty

The premise of the theory of absolute sovereignty of the state is that the laws of the state are the highest arbiter of the conduct of the citizen irrespective of the conformity of the laws to the general interests of the community. The obligation of the citizen to the state, according to this theory, is unlimited.
and unconditional. Gandhi resisted political sovereignty understood as absolute, non-responsible power. The validity of the absolutist theory of sovereignty has been questioned from different premises by pluralists, anarchists and Catholic humanists like Jacques Maritain. As we are not concerned here with the grounds of political obligation but with the limits of it, it may be pertinent to note that in recent political thought the question of political obligation has become secondary. There is a wider/higher obligation and when that higher obligation comes into conflict with political obligation resistance to the state becomes just and moral. Both Hindu and Western political theories give sanction for such resistance. To many of these thinkers the problem of political obligation is essentially moral. The English liberal thinker T. H. Green said: "The general principle that the citizen must never act otherwise than as a citizen does not carry with it an obligation under all conditions to conform to the law of his state, since those laws may be inconsistent with the true end of the state as the sustainer and harmoniser of social relations." (Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation, para. 143). For Gandhi, as for Green, the relevance and the justification of politics is an expression of moral life. The state is to be judged by the qualities of its citizens whose moral development it can help or hinder. It may be said that for both Green and Gandhi the two crucial questions of politics are those of obedience to law and the employment of force. 20

"Our first duty", Laski wrote, "is to be true to our conscience." 21 For Gandhi "disobedience to the law of the state becomes a peremptory duty when it comes in conflict with the law of God." 22 As early as 1909 he wrote in Hind Swaraj: "It is contrary to our manhood, if we obey laws contrary to our conscience... So long as the superstition that man should obey unjust laws exists so long will their slavery exist." 23 And later in 1921, "Submission to a state wholly or largely unjust is an immortal barter for liberty. A citizen who thus realizes the evil nature of a state is not satisfied to live on its sufferance, and therefore appears to the others who do not share his belief to be a nuisance to society.
whilst he is endeavouring to compel the state without committing a moral breach to arrest him. Thus considered, civil resistance is a most powerful expression of a soul's anguish and an eloquent protest against the continuance of an evil state."

To Gandhi, "political power is not an end in itself but one of the means of enabling people to better their conditions in every department of life." This attitude to the state stands counterposed to the Hegelian metaphysical theory which endeavours to exhibit the state as the embodiment of greatness and glory and an expression of the spirit or the Absolute.

Glorification of the sovereignty of the state was, according to Gandhi, a challenge to the moral right of man to shape his own destiny. Even the moderate version of parliamentary sovereignty would make little impression on his mind. He believed in the "sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority." But this should not be taken to mean that the 'moral authority' should take the place of state sovereignty. In our discussion of the Gandhian theory of Trusteeship (See pp... we have noted that he did have a decided preference for self-reliance and voluntarism. But the theory of trusteeship does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth. He would even go to the extent of dispossessing the rich through the instrument of state with the minimum exercise of violence. He would prefer trusteeship but if it was unavoidable, he would support a minimum of state ownership. This leads us to the question of compatibility or otherwise of anarchism with sovereignty which will be discussed in connection with the Gandhian ideal of state.

* L.T. Hobhouse, the English Liberal thinker in The Metaphysical Theory of The State: A Criticism (P.43) summed up the Hegelian Metaphysical theory in the following terms: "The individual attains his true self and freedom in conformity to his real will. This real will is the general will and the general will is embodied in the state."
Gandhi made the essential distinction between state and society. In modern political theory this distinction has been taken note of. Prof. Barker in his celebrated book *Principles of Social and Political Theory* has drawn the distinction between state and society, and further between "within the state" and "in terms of the state" and "the area of society" and "the activity of social thought". Political obligation is due within the state and in terms of the state it may be granted that it is unconditional. But there is a sphere of activity in man's life, which transcends sometimes even the well-known sphere of the political state and entering the wide arena of society. Here political obligation is to be qualified and becomes conditional. Barker observes that the area of society is voluntary co-operation, its energy is good-will and its method is elasticity; while the area of the state is mechanical action, its energy is force and its method is rigidity. He says: "A new and a super political obligation enters as soon as we take into our view the socially created and socially developed idea of justice; an obligation which we may call 'social'." Barker considers the social obligation to be higher. One may recall here the position of Rabindranath who enunciated the philosophy of indifference to the state in *Swadeshi Samaj* (1904).

The above discussion shows that Gandhi was opposed to the absolute sovereignty of the state as propounded by Hobbes, Austin and Hegel. He might not have come across any of the writings of these theorists but that is of no consequence. What is relevant is that he could very well hit at the core of the problem of sovereignty - a concept that has raised many conflicting issues yet to be resolved. His objection to the state sovereignty may be presumed to be based on the following grounds:

First, his metaphysical belief in the primacy of spiritual authority over temporal authority. Secondly, his faith in the inner moral conscience of individual as superior to the organised might of the State. Thirdly, his belief in sovereignty of the people based on moral authority as against the organised power system of the legal sovereign.
If the individual ceases to count', Gandhi asked 'what is left of society?'\textsuperscript{31} Gandhi regarded the individual as the centre of authority and value. He was categorical in his estimate of the relation between individual vis-a-vis the state. To quote him: "Ultimately it is the individual which is the unit."\textsuperscript{32} He held that the state and government derive their existence and power from the individuals. This concept of the ultimate authority of the individual logically paved the way for the enunciation of the theory of non-violent non-co-operation with the state and exploitative system that stand in the way of the all-round evolution of the individual. For Gandhi "The individual is the one supreme consideration."\textsuperscript{33} (emphasis added) This emphasis on the moral authority of the individual is the keynote of Gandhian philosophy. His anguish and indignation expressed in the pages of \textit{Hind Swaraj} against modern civilization - inclusive of modern power-system - was based on this fundamental belief. And he insisted on this fundamental belief till his last day.

In 1916 on the occasion of the opening of the Benares Hindu University, Gandhi called himself an anarchist,\textsuperscript{*} but of another type\textsuperscript{34} (the reference was to the

\begin{quote}
* 'Whoever denies authority and fights against it is an anarchist', said Sebastian Faure. Few doctrines or movements have been so confusedly understood in the public mind, and few have presented in their own variety of approach and action so much excuse for confusion that a definition of anarchism seems to be of prime importance. George Woodcock writes on this point: "Faure's statement at least marks out the area in which anarchism exists. All anarchists deny authority; many of them fight against it. But by no means all who deny authority and fight against it can reasonably be called anarchists. Historically, anarchism is a doctrine which poses a criticism of existing society; a view of aiming at a desirable future society; and a means of passing from one to the other. Mere revolt does not make an anarchist, nor does a philosophical or religious \end{quote}

contd....
violent revolutionaries or terrorists as they were generally called). One may not be
sure that the distinction that he made between the two types of anarchism was a re-
result of his acquaintance with the prevalent literature of anarchist political
philosophy. But as is generally known, he was influenced by Tolstoy's The Kingdom
of God Is Within You to a very considerable extent while he was engaged in his
rejection of earthly power. Mystics and Stoics seek not anarchy, but another
kingdom. Anarchism, historically speaking, is concerned mainly with man in his
relation to society. Its ultimate aim is always social change; its present
attitude is always one of social condemnation, even though it may proceed from
an individualist view of man's nature; its method is always that of social,
rebellion, violent or otherwise.

But even among those who recognize anarchism as a social-political doctrine,
confusion still exists. Anarchism, nihilism, and terrorism are often mistakenly
equated... The stereotype of the anarchist is that of the cold-blooded assassin
who attacks with dagger or bomb the symbolic pillars of established society.
Anarchy, in popular parlance, is malign chaos.

Yet malign chaos is clearly very far from the intent of men like Tolstoy and
Godwin, Thoreau and Kropotkin, whose social theories have all been described as—
anarchists. There is an obvious discrepancy between the stereotype anarchist
and the anarchist as we most often see him in reality; that division is due
 partly to semantic confusions and partly to historical misunderstanding.

In the derivation of the words 'anarchy', 'anarchism', and 'anarchist', as
well as in the history of their use, we find justifications for both the con-
flicting sets of meanings given to them. Anarchos, the original Greek word,
means merely 'without a ruler' and thus anarchy itself can clearly be used in
a general context to mean either the negative condition of unruliness or the
positive condition of being unruled because rule is unnecessary for the pre-
experiments of Satyagraha in South Africa. Stefan Zweig described Tolstoy as 'the boldest heretic' and 'revolutionary anarchist'. Tolstoy did not call himself an anarchist, because he applied the names to those who wished to change society by violent means; he preferred to think of himself as a literal Christian. Nevertheless, he was not entirely displeased when, in 1900, the German scholar Paul Elitzbacher wrote a pioneer survey of the various trends of anarchist thought and Tolstoy's ideas among them, demonstrating that, while he repudiated violence, his basic doctrine — and particularly his categorical rejection of the state and of property — fitted clearly into the general anarchist position. Gandhi, it may be noted here, did not regard Tolstoy as a philosophical anarchist. Digression apart, Tolstoy's anti-authority-state and church-philosophy influenced Gandhi in choosing and formulating his political ideal.

One may guess that Kropotkin also had influenced Gandhi's political thought though no authentic evidence in support of this is at hand. D. G. Tendulkar,

(Contd. from previous page)

Enrico Malatesta's comments on the terms anarchy and anarchism is as follows: "Before such an organization (viz., the anarchist society) had begun to be considered possible and desirable by a whole class of thinkers the word anarchy was taken universally in the sense of disorder and confusion and it is still adopted in that sense by the ignorant and by adversaries interested in distorting the truth."


* George Woodcock observes: "he (Gandhi) was encouraged in his idea of village communes by an assiduous reading of Kropotkin." - Anarchism, p. 218.

But he has not substantiated this statement with any evidence.

* Horace Alexander writes: "Although I have no direct evidence that Gandhi has been influenced by the writings of Kropotkin, I should not at all be surprised to learn that he has been. On the other hand, it may simply be that his experience and his own thought have led him to similar conclusions." - Social and Political Ideas of Mahatma Gandhi (Indian Council of World Affairs, New Delhi, OUP, 1949), p. 10.
the biographer of Mahatma records: "Gandhi's three years stay in London (1888-1891) was eventful. Those were the years of great intellectual activity and unhindered freedom of thought and speech. The country as a whole had become a living university ... Kropotkin's Mutual Aid was appearing serially in the Nineteenth Century and Kropotkin himself was propagating his ideas in England." It seems likely that Gandhi's young mind was exposed to the anarchist philosophy preached by Kropotkin.

Sources of influence apart, Gandhi it may be presumed, when he described himself as an anarchist did not mean in the sense of unfulfilness (negative condition) but in the positive sense of being unruled because rule is unnecessary for the preservation of order.

As has been observed earlier, there were two Gandhis - the idealist and the realist. In his role as the foremost leader of the national liberation movement the realist in him was sufficiently awake to the objective reality and he pressed forward for the establishment of a democratic political order. In our discussion on the evolution of his economic thought (see ch. XXX) we have seen that in 1924 he told an interviewer that he wanted the unavoidable heavy machinery to be either owned or controlled by the state. But it would be a mistake to infer that he shifted his loyalty, in so far as his ultimate philosophical standpoint was concerned, from anarchist ideal to socialist programme of state-ownership. Speaking of his own ultimate political ideal he wrote in 1931: "If rational life becomes so perfect as to become self-regulated, no representation becomes necessary. There is then a state of enlightened anarchy. In such a state every one is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state therefore, there is no political power because there is no State. But the ideal is never fully realised in life. Hence the classical statement of Thoreau that that Government is best which governs the least." Mahadev Desai reported a conversation on the same subject in Harijan (21-7-40, p. 211).

But are we not being driven to philosophical anarchism? Is that not an
These questions were asked by a philosophical friend.

"Does anyone know true non-violence?" he asked. Gandhiji immediately replied: "Nobody knows it, for nobody can practise perfect non-violence."

"Then how can it be used in politics?"

"It can be used in politics precisely as it can be used in the domestic sphere. We may not be perfect in our use of it, but we definitely discard the use of violence, and grow from failure to success."

"You would govern non-violently. But all legislation is violence."

"No, not all legislation. Legislation imposed by people upon themselves is non-violence to the extent it is possible in society. A society organised and run on the basis of complete non-violence would be purest anarchy."

"Do you think that non-violence or democracy that you visualise was ever realised in the olden times?"

"I do not know. But if it was not, it only means that we had never made the attempt to realise the highest in us. I have no doubt in my mind that at some stage we were wiser, and that we have to grow wiser than we are today in order to find what beauties are hidden in human nature. Perfect non-violence is impossible so long as we exist physically, for we would want some space at least to occupy. Perfect non-violence whilst you are inhabiting the body is only a theory like Euclid’s point or straight line, but we have to endeavour every moment of our lives."

In the same year in a conversation at Santiniketan, in answer to the question ‘can a State carry on strictly according to the principle of non-violence?" Gandhi replied, "A government cannot succeed in becoming entirely non-violent, because it represents all the people. I do not today conceive of such a golden age. But I do believe in the possibility of a predominantly non-violent society. And I am working for it."

In 1946, he wrote: "There remains the question as to whether in an ideal society, there should be any or no government. I do not think, we need worry ourselves about this at this moment. If we continue to work for such a society, it will
slowly come into being to an extent, such that the people can benefit by it.

Euclid's line is one without breadth but no one has so far been able to draw it and never will. All the same it is only by keeping the ideal line in mind that we have made progress in geometry. What is true here is true of every ideal." 41

We have seen above that Gandhi's ultimate political ideal was stateless democracy. The stateless society of self-regulating harmony is ideal in the Platonic sense that it is a model to strive towards, not a goal that can be attained. But as the 'golden age' was far off he thought it practicable to work for the realisation of a 'predominantly non-violent society'. This attitude towards the ultimate ideal, in the sphere of politics in this context, fits in quite squarely with his general philosophical attitude. We have seen in our discussion of Gandhi's concept of human nature (see ch. IV.) that he believed not in the perfection but in the perfectibility of man. "Let us be sure of our ideal. We shall ever fail to realize it, but should never cease to strive for it." 42

Dr. G. N. Dhawan interpreted this 'unbridgable gulf' between the ultimate ideal and realisable goal in the following terms: "The ideal non-violent society of Gandhiji, unattainable due to human imperfection, indicates the direction rather than the destination, the process rather than the consummation. The structure of the state that will emerge as a result of the non-violent revolution will be a compromise, a via media, between the ideal non-violent society and the facts of human nature. It will be the attainable "middle way" of Gandhiji, the first step after the revolution, towards the ideal." 43

* Gandhi once said: "Having ascertained the law of our being, we must set about reducing it to practice to the extent of our capacity and no further. That is the middle way." - Quoted in Gopinath Dhawan, The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi (Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1951), p. 328 ff.
The ultimate ideal of 'purest anarchy' or stateless society being unrealizable, Gandhi's political thought was moving in the 'direction' of the evolution of a predominantly non-violent state. The word 'non-violent state' was used by Gandhi himself in Harijan (25.8.40.), who wrote, "the ideal non-violent state will be an ordered anarchy." A non-violent State is a contradiction in terms because the State represents violence in a concentrated and organized form. Dr. Dharan elaborated the concept of non-violent or satyagrahi State. In an explanatory footnote he explained 'non-violent State' in the following terms: "By a non-violent State we mean the State that is predominantly non-violent. A State depending as it does more or less on coercion is the negation of non-violence. The completely non-violent State would no longer be a State. It would then be the Stateless society and society can be Stateless when it is completely or almost completely non-violent. This is an ideal that may not be fully realized. What we may get in actual practice may be a predominantly non-violent State advancing towards, though perhaps never reaching, the Stateless stage." One may object to employment of such contradictory terms in defining an ideal from the semantic point of view. But the essence of the term is understood and as we have observed earlier, Gandhi was not much interested in giving name to things, but he was more concerned with substance of things. It is from that view that the term "the ideal non-violent State" is to be understood.

(For a systematic discussion of the socio-economic structure and functions of the non-violent state one may refer to Dharan's dissertation, chapter XI.)

Gandhi's occasional reference to 'enlightened anarchy' as his ultimate political ideal has given rise to varying interpretations. Some interpreters call him a 'philosophical anarchist' while some hold the viewpoint that though some of the elements of Gandhian political thought bear resemblance to some of the anarchist thinkers he cannot be categorised as an anarchist thinker. In terms of the ultimate ideal of Stateless society, anarchists, Marxists and Gandhi would agree. But the differences are there. Each of these theories carry a distinctive note of its own. A student of Gandhian political theory shall have to find out where Gandhi stood in
relation to anarchism and Marxism. It is in the background of an all-round survey of his theories of freedom, democracy etc. that a fuller treatment of this question can be tackled and as such we would take it up at the close of our survey.

**Gandhi's Concept of Freedom.**

Abraham Lincoln, in the midst of the Civil War, in a gathering at Baltimore in 1864, spoke of freedom as follows:

> "The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty, and the American people just now, are much in want of one. We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself and the product of his labour; while with others, the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men and the product of other men's labour. Here are two, not only different, but incompatible things called by the same name, liberty. And it follows that each of the things is, by the respective parties, called by two different and incompatible names - liberty and tyranny."

The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as his liberator, while the wolf denounces him for the

---

> "In the vocabulary of political thought, the two words "freedom" and "liberty" are interchangeable. Although there has been a tendency in the English-speaking world to treat "liberty" as something "French, foxyish and frivolous", and "freedom" as "English, solid and sensible", there is no ground whatever for the distinction. Freedom is, of course, older in the Anglo-Saxon tongue, but the two words have been employed in English thought as substantially identical in meaning since the fourteenth century. In their deeper origins, in fact, they possessed strikingly similar characteristics." - Charles A. Beard in *Freedom: Its Meaning* (ed. Ruth Nanda Anshen, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1942), p. 7.
same act, as the destroyer of liberty, especially as the sheep was a black one. Plainly, the sheep and the wolf are not agreed upon a definition of the word liberty; and precisely the same difference prevails today among us human creatures, even in the North, and all professing to love liberty. Hence we behold the process by which thousands are daily passing from under the yoke of bondage hailed by some as the advance of liberty and bewailed by others as the destruction of all liberty. Recently, it seems, the people... have been doing something to define liberty, and thanks to them that, in what they have done, the wolf's dictionary has been repudiated." 45

In Lincoln's day the problem of liberty or freedom seemed simpler than it does now. Then it was primarily a question of overcoming one specific violation of human freedom, that involved in chattel slavery. To day, as well as in Gandhi's day, the problem is tremendously more complicated both in fact and in theory. Our world has other ways than chattel slavery whereby some men can do as they please with other men and the products of their labour. That the term freedom needs constant redefining is both a tribute to its unlimited breadth of meaning and to its ubiquity among us. No word has been more dear to the modern heart or more often on modern lips. But what does freedom mean? The term is commonly supposed to be obvious, clear, self-explanatory. There is a sense in which this is true. But as generally used, it requires definition and clarification, and as Lincoln so eloquently showed, it means contradictory things to different persons in modern society based on political subjugation, economic exploitation and racial discrimination. Of all the varied and often contradictory meanings given to the term freedom, the most dominant in our age, the one most invoked and most heralded, is that of freedom as synonymous with political democracy. Gandhi, with his ear to the ground, close to the toiling masses of India, was able to give a concrete meaning to freedom or Swaraj and we shall see, as we closely pursue Gandhi's concept of freedom, that he repudiated 'the wolf's dictionary'.

Gandhi, it may be noted at the outset, employed the term Swaraj in its specific and generic sense, to borrow an expression of Green. While he organised the Indian
masses for Swaraj conceived as a constitutional, democratic political order, he at the same time stressed on its economic, mass, or "organic" content. Swaraj which first acquired political meaning (of independence) through its use in that sense by Naoroji, and popularised by Tilak afterwards is closely allied with the meaning of tapas as renunciation. Swaraj literally means 'self-rule' and in its original connotation meant autonomy of the moral self (as in the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad) where strict control is exercised over the senses. The philosophical meaning of Swaraj, as Gandhi conceived it, shall be discussed in a subsequent section. That is relevant here to note is that he seized upon a traditional religious notion and transformed it into a meaningful part of the technique which was to operate not for individual salvation alone, but within the sphere of social polity. Asceticism and sacrifice, which had characterized the efforts of the devotee withdrawn from social contact, were drawn back into the mundane arena and rendered means whereby common social ends might be attained.

Gandhi for the first time enunciated his ideal of Swaraj in Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule. While drawing a comparison between Italy and India, he wrote in 1909:

* Lord Ronaldshay & Sir Sankaran Nair accused Gandhi of making an insidious attempt to use the popular movement to put the doctrines of Hind Swaraj into effect. He denied the charge: "I am sorry that the Swaraj of the Congress resolution does not mean the Swaraj depicted in the booklet (Hind Swaraj). Swaraj according to the Congress means Swaraj that the people of India want, not what the British Government may condescend to give. In so far as I can see, Swaraj will be a Parliament chosen by the people with the fullest power over finance, the police, the military, the navy, the courts and the educational institutions." 

** Gandhi once wrote that Swaraj was first used in the name of the nation by Dadabhai Naoroji - D.G. Tendulkar, Mahatma, (The Publications Division, GOI, 1961), vol. 2, p. 326.
"If you believe that because Italians rule Italy the Italian nation is happy, you are groping in darkness. Mazzini has shown conclusively that Italy did not become free. Victor Emmanuel gave one meaning to the expression; Mazzini gave another. According to Emanuel, Cavour and even Garibaldi, Italy meant the king of Italy and his henchmen. According to Mazzini, it meant the whole of the Italian people; that is, its agriculturists. Emanuel was only its servant. The Italy of Mazzini still remains in a state of slavery. At the time of the so-called national war, it was a game of chess between two rival kings with the people of Italy as pawns. The working classes in that land are still unhappy. They therefore, indulge in assassination, rise in revolt and rebellion on their part is always expected. What substantial gain did Italy obtain after the withdrawal of the Austrian troops? The gain was only nominal. The reforms for the sake of which the war was supposed to have been undertaken have not yet been granted. The condition of the people in general still remains the same. I am sure you do not wish to reproduce such a condition in India. I believe that you want the millions of India to be happy, not that you want the reins of Government in your hands. If that be so, we have to consider only one thing: how can the millions obtain self-rule? You will admit that people under several Indian princes are being ground down. The latter mercilessly crush them. Their tyranny is greater than that of the English, and if you want such tyranny in India, then we shall never agree. My patriotism does not teach me that I am to allow people to be crushed under the heel of Indian princes just as much as that of the English. By patriotism I mean the welfare of the whole people, and if I could secure it at the hands of the English, I should bow down my head to them. If any Englishman dedicated his life to securing the freedom of India, resisting tyranny and serving the land, I should welcome that Englishman as an Indian." 47 (emphasis added)

Gandhi's conception of government, as one reviewer has correctly noted, was in harmony with Mazzini's—that is he tested government's every move, every scheme, every
law by its effect on the nameless many. "He was not a class fighter in the Marx-
ian sense, yet he came near to the philosophy of proletarianism." 48

In 1924 he wrote:

"Swaraj for me means freedom for the meanest of our countrymen. I am not
interested in freeing India merely from the English yoke. I am bent upon
freeing India from any yoke whatsoever. I have no desire to exchange 'king
log for king stork." 49

The mere form of political self-government cannot satisfy the desiderata of
my essentially democratic concept of freedom or Swaraj. In 1925 he wrote:

"I, however, feel that fundamentally the disease is the same in Europe
as it is in India, in spite of the fact that in the former country the people
enjoy political self-government. No mere transference of political power
will satisfy my ambition, even though I hold such transference to be a
vital necessity of Indian rational life. The peoples of Europe have no
doubt political power but no Swaraj. Asian and African races are exploited
for their partial benefit, and they, on their part, are being exploited by
the ruling class or caste under the sacred name of democracy. At the root,
therefore, the disease appears to be the same as in India. The same remedy
is, therefore, likely to be applicable. Shorn of all the camouflage, the
exploitation of the masses of Europe is sustained by violence.

"Violence on the part of the masses will never remove the disease. Anyway
up to now experience shows that success of violence has been shortlived. It
has led to greater violence. What has been tried hitherto has been a variety
of violence and artificial checks, mainly dependent upon the will of the
violent. At the crucial moment these checks have naturally broken down. It
seems to me, therefore, that sooner or later, the European masses will have
to take to non-violence if they are to find their deliverance. That there is
no hope of their taking to it in a body and at once does not baffle me. A
few thousands years are but a speak in the vast time circle. Someone has to
make a beginning with a faith that will not flinch."
even of Europe, will respond, but what is more emergent in point of time is not so much a large experiment in non-violence as a precise grasp of the meaning of deliverance.

"From what will the masses be delivered? It will not do to have a vague generalisation and to answer from "exploitation and degradation". Is not the answer this that they want to occupy the status that capital does today? If so it can be attained only by violence. But if they want to shun the evils of capital, in other words, if they would revise the viewpoint of capital, they would strive to attain a juster distribution of the products of labour. This immediately takes us to contentment and simplicity, voluntarily adopted. Under the new outlook multiplicity of material wants will not be the aim of life, the aim will be rather their restriction consistently with comfort. We shall cease to think of getting what we can but we shall decline to receive what all cannot get. * It occurs to me that it ought not to be difficult to make a successful appeal to the masses of Europe in terms of economics and a fairly successful working of such an experiment must lead to immense and unconscious spiritual results. I do not believe that the spiritual law works in a field of its own. On the contrary, it expresses itself only through the ordinary activities of life. It thus affects the economic, the social and the political fields. If the masses of Europe can be persuaded to adopt the view I have suggested, it will be found that violence will be wholly unnecessary to attain the aim and they can easily come to their own by following the obvious corollaries of non-violence. It may even be that what seems to me to be so natural and possible for India, may take longer to permeate the inert Indian masses than the active European masses." 50 (emphasis added)

As the basic argument in favour of non-violence in relation to the self-rule

* "Whatever cannot be shared with the masses is taboo to me." - Gandhi, Harijan, 2-11-34, p. 301.
of the masses or Swaraj has been clearly and precisely formulated in the passages quoted above that these have been reproduced in extenso. One comes across this plea of non-violent Swaraj in many of his writings stretched over a long period of time. (Ref: Young India, 1-12-20 in Young India 1919-22, S. Ganesan, p. 581, Young India, 21-5-25, p. 178, Harijan, 27-5-39, p. 143, Constructive Programme, 1945 Edition, p. 7.).

Discussing the more concrete question of political power and its organization, Gandhi wrote in 1925:

"By Swaraj I mean the government of India by the consent of the people as ascertained by the largest number of the adult population, male or female, native-born or domiciled, who have contributed by manual labour to the service of the State and who have taken the trouble of having registered their names as voters.... Real Swaraj will come not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when it is abused. In other words, Swaraj is to be obtained by educating the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority." (emphasis added)

Constructive Programme (1941) conveys the same idea:

"We have long been accustomed to think that power comes only through Legislative Assemblies. I have regarded this belief as a grave error brought about by inertia or hypnotism. A superficial study of British history has made us think that all power percolates to the people from parliaments. The truth is that power resides in the people and it is entrusted for the time being to those whom they may choose as their representatives. Parliaments have no power or even existence independently of the people. It has been my effort for the last twenty one years to convince the people of this simple truth. Civil Disobedience is the storehouse of power. Imagine a whole people unwilling to conform to the laws of the legislature and prepared to suffer the consequences of non-compliance! They will bring
the whole legislative and executive machinery to a standstill. The police and the military are of use to coerce minorities however powerful they may be. But no police or military coercion can bend the resolute will of a people who are out for suffering to the uttermost." 52

The intervening years between 1920 and 1930 were significant years in the history of the national movement of India. A new wave of radical and socialist ideas made its onrush and there arose a number of independent economic and political organizations during this period. The radicals inside the Congress voiced the demand for a clearer definition of Swaraj. The Indian National Congress passed an important resolution on Fundamental Rights in its Karachi Session(1931). 53

Prior to Karachi Congress, Gandhi wrote in Young India (1-5-30):

"The Swaraj of my ... our ... dream recognizes no race or religious distinctions. Nor is it to be the monopoly of the lettered persons not yet of moneyed men. Swaraj is to be for all, including the farmer, but emphatically including the maimed, the blind, the starving toiling millions." 54 (emphasis added)

Similarly he wrote on another occasion (Young India, 26-3-31):

"The Swaraj of my dream is the poor man's Swaraj. The necessaries of life should be enjoyed by you in common with those enjoyed by the princes and the moneyed men. But that does not mean that they should have palaces like theirs. They are not necessary for happiness. You or I would be lost in them. But you ought to get all the ordinary amenities of life that a rich man enjoys. I have not the slightest doubt that Swaraj is not Poorna Swaraj until these amenities are guaranteed to you under it." 55

In the same month of that year he clarified his concept of Poorna Swaraj or complete independence as follows:

"Poorna Swaraj - 'Poorna' complete because it is as much for the
prince as for the peasant, as much as for the rich landowner as for the landless tiller of the soil, as much for the Hindus as for the Musalmans, as much for Parsis and Christians as for the Jains, Jews and Sikhs, irrespective of any distinction of caste or creed or status in life.

"The very connotation of the word and the means of its attainment to which we are pledged - truth and non-violence - precludes all possibility of that Swaraj being more for some one than for the other, being partial to some or prejudicial to others." 56

Gandhi's Swaraj was equalitarian and secular. On the eve of his voyage to England in 1931 he said:

"It has been said that Indian Swaraj will be the rule of the majority community i.e. the Hindus. There could not be greater mistake than that. If it were to be true, I for one would refuse to call it Swaraj and would fight it with all the strength at my command, for to me Hind Swaraj is the rule of all the people, is the rule of justice. Whether under that rule the ministers were Hindus or Musalmans or Sikhs, and whether the legislatures were exclusively filled by the Hindus or Musalmans or any other community, they would have to do even-handed justice. And just as no community in India need have any fear of Swaraj being monopolised by any other, even so the English should have no fear. The question of safeguards should not arise at all. Swaraj would be real Swaraj only when there would be no occasion for safeguarding any such rights. I may tell you that the Congress does not belong to any particular group of men; it belongs to all, but the protection of the poor peasantry, which forms the bulk of the population, must be its primary interest. The Congress must, therefore, truly represent the poor. But that does not mean that all other classes - the middle classes, the capitalist or Zamindar - must go under. All that it aims at is that all other classes must subserve the interest of the poor." 57 (emphasis added)
or,

"I will therefore state the purpose. It is complete freedom from the alien yoke in every sense of the term, and this for the sake of the dumb millions. Every interest, therefore, that is hostile to their interest, must be revised, or must subside if it is not capable of revision." 58

(for a similar statement See Young India, 10-9-31, p. 225)

And freedom 'for the sake of the dumb millions' can never mean a form of political freedom merely for the sake of it, it must include economic freedom which alone enables the people to enjoy the fruits of political freedom. He knew well enough that political freedom, devoid of its economic content, was a mere philosophical abstraction. Gandhi was quite categorical and emphatic on this point: To quote him:

"Let there be no mistake about my conception of Swaraj. It is complete independence of alien control and complete economic independence. So at one end you have political independence, at the other the economic. It has two other ends. One of them is moral and social, the corresponding end is Dharma i.e. religion in the highest sense of the term. ... Let us call this the square of Swaraj, which will be out of shape if any of its angles is untrue." 59

Reflections

A brief outline that we have drawn of Gandhi's concept of Swaraj are fairly suggestive. First, it was Gandhi who for the first time in Indian history gave a mass or democratic orientation to the concept of freedom. Political independence in the sense of transfer of power from one set of rulers to another set did not satisfy him. The freedom he sought was not merely absence of alien bondage. It was something more than that. His perceptive mind could easily diagnose the basic malady of political self-government unaccompanied by economic freedom. It did not require him much intellectual attainment to see that politically free nations were nominally free in the sense that power did not belong to the people.
This keen sense of reality led him to enunciate his ideal of Swaraj. As he was interested not in name but in the substance of things it was only natural that he would prefer the content and not the shell or outward form of political self-rule. His politics was not power-oriented* in the current sense of the term. But he knew well enough that power was necessary as one of the means to enable the people to better their condition in every department of life. But power to whom? Who will wield the power?** Gandhi did not suffer from equivocation on this point as was the case with many nationalist leaders of his time. The key point of his concept of Swaraj was that power must belong to the people. It was not legal sovereignty that he aspired for, the sovereignty or supreme power that he wanted was for the people at large. The people was not an abstract concept for him. A careful study of his writings would suggest that he meant by the people—primarily the toiling people in the fields and factories. As India was (and still is) a predominantly agricultural country he spoke more in terms of the Indian peasants.*** It is true indeed that he represented peasant India —the real India as Gandhi used to call it—more than anybody else. It was for this toiling and suffering humanity that he wanted freedom—freedom from political abjection, economic exploitation and social tyranny—and his concept of Swaraj was evolved not out of academic theorising but from his personal encounter with living reality.


**"Gandhi's vision was landlocked." - Asoka Mehta, Studies in Asian Socialism (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1959), p. 90.

He understood that constitutional Swaraj - a liberal political concept - would not touch the fringe of the basic problems that India suffered from. His realistic mind and sensitive soul could see through the inadequacy of upper-class Swaraj - Swaraj of moneyed men and educated classes. That explains why he always insisted on poor man's or people's Swaraj.

Secondly, Gandhi believed that real Swaraj could only be established by awakening the masses into a sense of their power and dignity. This could only be achieved, he thought, through non-violent non-co-operation and ancillary programme. He held that violent revolution would fail to bring about the desired state as it would, because of its inherent nature, bring political power to a minority section of the population, or to a party or the elite of that group. In that state of affairs the masses would have no effective power to exert their will since they would remain under the rule of a small coterie. Such a condition is not Swaraj or rule of the masses. He was of the opinion that non-violent method was a more potent weapon to bring about Swaraj of the masses. Non-violent strength would elevate the masses to a new sense of dignity and fortify the humblest of citizens to stand up to any authority, if power be abused. One may or may not subscribe to Gandhi's creed of non-violence but the argument he advanced in favour of ushering in Swaraj through non-violent revolution deserves proper consideration. The history of revolutions betrayed and of powers usurped may be re-read in the light of the caution given by Gandhi.

Thirdly, the true Swaraj that Gandhi envisaged was a multi-class Swaraj, no class or strata of the society being excluded. While admitting that his inclination was towards the toiling masses and that he tried to give a new dimension to the concept of national freedom he at the same time, it should be noted, conceived of Swaraj as an all-class state. One may argue that this was in essence a bourgeois-liberal concept, its chief purpose being to enlist the support of the masses and mobilise them for gaining national sovereignty which would pave the
way for native capitalist rule. One may further add that true it is that he had sympathy for the masses but the theory and practice of Gandhi was the philosophic rationalisation of bringing about a bourgeois-democratic revolution and no further than that. We submit that this sort of judgment flows from mechanical understanding of the processes of history and of the role Gandhi played in Indian political life.

Gandhi indeed pleaded for a multi-class approach and all-inclusive Swaraj composed of all classes. Here his Swaraj presents itself as 'being not partial to some or prejudicial to others' but at the same time he was emphatic in his statement that every interest, antagonistic to the interests of the poor, shall have to go under. It was not merely a question of sympathy for the poor, as was often made out, it was more in the nature of feeling of solidarity and identification with the masses. And this oneness with the toiling people of India that he symbolised in his self - in his thought, words and deeds - gave a new content to the basically bourgeois concept of nationalism. The Gandhian concept of Swadeshi and Swaraj marked a departure from the orthodox remedy. The remedy he suggested for putting an end to political domination and draining of national resources was something different from the conventional capitalist way of setting things right. The poverty and exploitation of India he judged to be the result of its being drawn into the system of capitalism - 'the vortex of mad and ruinous competition.' And that is why he being over-zealous of individual power to resist exploitation tried to introduce a new system of production. The remedy he suggested may be all wrong but one cannot miss the bias in favour of the underdogs which is more than pronounced.

* "Gandhi expressed this solidarity in his very way of life: this solidarity was not only verbal but existential." - William Robert Miller 'The Dilemma of Middle-Class Pacifism' in GANDHI MARG, vol. IV, No. 4, p. 303.
Fourthly, one notices that Gandhi, who in *Hind Swaraj* was trenchant in his criticism of Parliamentary form of government, came to acquiesce in the demand for Parliamentary Swaraj. One should take the aid of history to note that while endorsing the demand for Parliamentary Swaraj he did not forsake his earlier position enunciated in *Hind Swaraj*. It may be presumed that as the tallest leader of the nation he supported Parliamentary Swaraj as the immediate political objective, but as an ideal to strive for, he pinned his faith in *Hind Swaraj*, rule of all of the people or rule of justice as he called it. There was certainly a gulf between India of his dream and the immediate objective of the nation. As we have observed earlier, this gulf was not of his making but it was in the given, concrete situation of India. His keen sense of realism found its expression in a letter he wrote to Jawaharlal Nehru as early as 1 April, 1928. "I am quite of your opinion that someday we shall have to start an intensive movement without the rich people and without the vocal educated class. But that time is not yet." Inauguration of bourgeois-democratic state was on the agenda of history, the class question remaining in the background and as an astute politician he could well read the situation and he moved, he had to, within the confines of history. The law of history is inexorable.

Fifthly, his ideal of rule of justice or rule of all the people may be subject to a fundamental criticism. Strictly speaking, rule of all the people is an amorphous term. A Marxist or even a Laski would argue that the state is not above classes. It does not transcend particular interests and lead to the expression of the total good of society. It is not a way of moving towards the fulfilment of the desires of its citizens. It does not seek to realise the rights they must claim in order to maintain the full dignity of their capacity as moral beings. The fundamental question relates to the basic postulates of social relations on which the state is based. Gandhi did not approach the problem of power from a class point of view. Considered from such a standpoint, Gandhi's theory suffers from
limitations. This may be considered to be an element of weakness but there are some positive points in Gandhi's favour. P. Spratt observes: "The Gandhian scheme would not depend solely upon the interests of a class. It could probably mobilise both nationalistic and revolutionary idealism, and idealism is no less important than class-interest." Another point. His stress on the people as the ultimate repository and wielder of power - bias remaining on the side of the downtrodden - carried a new note at the time when political freedom was conceived as an end in itself. In the sense of giving a new jolt to the conventional way of political thinking, it was indeed a great departure and as such Gandhi's concept of poor man's or people's Swaraj bears an impress of its own.

**Personal and Civic Freedom.** Personal and civic freedom is the foundation of political freedom.

Gandhi upheld the dignity and authority of the individual throughout his life. He advocated and fought for recognition of civic freedom. In Champaran, where he conducted his first struggle in India, he was served with a notice (dated 16 April, 1917) to leave the district. But he refused to comply with the direction and a summons came upon Gandhi to appear before the court. He pleaded guilty and read a brief statement before the court wherein he said: "I have disregarded the order served upon me not for want for respect for lawful authority, but in obedience to the higher law of our being, the voice of conscience." Gandhi was of the opinion that "The person of a citizen must be held inviolate. It can only be touched to arrest or to prevent violence." As a true democrat, he upheld the principle of freedom of opinion. Genuine democracy means that public opinion is in a real sense self-forming. Gandhi wrote: "Public opinion alone can keep a society pure and healthy." There can be no public opinion without free press, free platform, free association etc. In an article in *Young India* (12-1-22) entitled 'Liberty of The Press' he wrote: "Liberty of speech means that it is unassailed, even when the speech hurts; liberty of the Press can be said to be truly respected only when the Press can comment in the severest terms upon and
even misrepresent matters, protection against misrepresentation or violence being secured not by an administrative gagging order, not by closing down the Press but by punishing the real offender, leaving the Press itself unrestricted. Freedom of association is truly respected when assemblies of people can discuss even revolutionary projects, the State relying upon the force of public opinion and the civil police, not the savage military at its disposal, to crush any actual outbreak of revolution that is designed to confound public opinion and the state representing it.” 66 The Karachi Congress in its Fundamental Rights resolution guaranteed civic freedoms viz., Freedom of Association and combination, Freedom of Speech and of the Press, Freedom of conscience, religious freedom etc. Gandhi’s hand in drafting the resolution is too well known to be recounted here. Writing in 1939 in connection with the States’ people’s movement he observed: “Civil liberty consistent with the observance of non-violence is the first step towards Swaraj. It is the foundation of freedom. And there is no room there for dilution or compromise. It is the water of life. I have never heard of water being diluted.”67 With the outbreak of the Second World War, India was made a party to the war. Rigorous curbs were put on civil liberties of the Indian people. Gandhi strongly pleaded in 1940 for freedom of speech as an inviolable fundamental right of the citizen, even during the pendency of the war. “I claim the liberty of going through the streets of Bombay and say that I shall have nothing to do with this war and in this fratricide that is now going on in Europe.” 68 He wrote: “... freedom of speech and corresponding action is the breath of democratic life. Freedom of propagating non-violence as substitute for war is the most relevant when inhuman savagery is being perpetrated by the warring nations of Europe.” 69 In a speech before the AICC meeting in September, 1940 he said: “Freedom of speech and pen is the foundation of Swaraj. If foundation stone is in danger, you have to exert the whole of your might in order to defend that single stone.” 70 Explaining his thought at greater length he observed: “But if they (the British) fight unto death for their freedom and if they are reasonable, they must recognize
our right of free speech. ... It is our duty to fight for that right. ... This liberty is a concrete issue, which needs no defining. It is the foundation of freedom, especially when it has to be taken non-violently. To surrender it, is to surrender the only means for attaining freedom." 71

Synthesis of Swaraj and 'Swaraj'

To Gandhi, freedom or Swaraj was an all-inclusive concept—political, economic, social and moral. He called this, 'the square of Swaraj' (excerpt given above). It was but natural for a man who conceived life as an organic whole to define Swaraj in this manner. Gandhi observed in Hind Swaraj that: "Real home-rule is self-rule or self-control." 72 He always insisted on this subjective aspect of freedom throughout his life for it was an article of faith with him. Once again reiterating his personal faith in the ideas enunciated in that booklet, he wrote in 1920: "Government over self is the truest Swaraj, it is synonymous with moksha or salvation." 73 Or "for me the movement of Swaraj is a movement of self-purification." 74 He held that "the first step to Swaraj lies in the individual. The great truth: "As with the individual so with the universe". 75 The same idea was elaborated further: "Self-government depends entirely upon our own internal strength, upon our ability to fight against the heaviest odds. Indeed, self-government which does not require that continuous striving to attain it and to sustain it, is not worth the name. I have therefore endeavoured to show both in word and in deed, that political self-government—that is self-government for a large number of men and women—is no better than individual self-government, and therefore, it is to be attained by precisely the same means that are required for individual self-government or self-rule." 76 Similarly he wrote in 1939: "Swaraj of a people means the sum total of the Swaraj of individuals." 77 Freedom or Swaraj, as Gandhi conceived it, is wider than political independence. "The word Swaraj is a sacred word, a Vedic word, meaning self-rule and self-restraint, and not freedom from all restraint which 'independence' often means." 78 Citations
from Gandhi’s writings can be multiplied to show that he pinned his faith in self-Swaraj as of prime importance in the fight for Swaraj in the collective sphere. Gandhi taught that “there is no greatness except greatness within one’s own kind; no universality except the universality within one’s own province; no freedom except the freedom within one’s own belonging.”

Gandhi believed in the dictum ‘life is larger than living.’ And he wanted to see life grounded on moral principles without which life loses its significance. Freedom is the basic recognition of this morality for there can be no morality without freedom. Freedom is thus a right which is inherent in every individual conferring upon him the power of doing things worth doing. Man is often called as a being of the senses subject to natural necessity. But he is a rational being and hence free. Reason is the very basis of Gandhian philosophy, and reason is defined, not in terms of history of hypostatized organizations, but in terms of the individual himself.

True freedom, as Gandhi conceived it, is obedience to law, not so much to law in the narrow legal sense but to moral law, the inner conscience, the law of one’s true being. It impels man to seek the good and attain it. All desires that are in harmony with this end are worthy. If subjective desires act as a brake on one’s moral progress, they have to be suppressed. Freedom as reason implies self-control or restraint and self-transcending dedication to a noble cause or object. In such a concept of freedom, reason and will (not actual but real) become identical in being the expression of the self-realising principle. The will is determined by its object which, in turn, is determined by the end. Ultimately, therefore, it is self-determined and free.

Such freedom, as Gandhi conceived it, is conquest over self. Constant vigilance and continuous striving can alone enable a man to acquire this mastery over self. Fearlessness is the first thing indispensable for attaining freedom. He urged on his followers and the people to shed all traces of fear.

“Fearlessness connotes freedom from all external fear – fear of disease,
bodily injury and death, of dispossession, of losing one's nearest and dearest, of losing reputation or giving offence and so on." 82 And further, "We must give up all external fears. But the internal foes we must always fear. We are rightly afraid of animal passion, anger, and the like. External fears cease of their own accord, then once we have conquered these traitors within the camp. All such fears revolve round the body as the centre, and will therefore disappear, as soon as we get rid of attachment for the body. We thus find, that all external fear is the baseless fabric of our own vision. Fear has no place in our hearts, when we have shaken off attachment for wealth, for family and the body." 83 In his opinion, "The votary of non-violence has to cultivate the capacity for sacrifice of the highest type in order to be free from fear. He reckons not if he should lose his hand, his wealth, his life. He who has not overcome all fear cannot practise ahimsa to perfection. The votary of ahimsa has only one fear, that is of God." 84 Freedom involves an arduous discipline. Hence he stressed the rigid adherence to the code of Mahavratas *. He urged upon his followers never to doubt the

* The vows obligatory for an ashram inmate were as follows:

1) The Vow of Truth 2) The Doctrine of Ahimsa 3) The Vow of Celibacy 4) The Vow of the Control of the Palagte 5) The Vow of Non-Thieving 6) The Vow of Non-Possession 7) The Vow of Swadeshi 8) The Vow of Fearlessness 9) The Vow regarding the 'Untouchables' 10) Education Through The Vernaculars 11) The Vow of Khaddar (Manual Labour) - From an address delivered in the M.C.A. Auditorium, Madras, on 16 February 1916, explaining the vows observed by the members of the Satyagrahasram, Ahmedabad. Quoted in The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi (ed. R.K.Prahbu and U.R.Rao, Oxford University Press, Madras, 1946), pp. 177-186. For further explanation of these vows, see From Varada Mandir. The five Yamas of Patanjali's Yoga Sutras ahimsa, truth, abstention from theft or greed, continence and renunciation which he read in 1903 (See An Autobiography, 1959 Popular Edition, p. 194) were incorporated among the vows of Satyagrahasram at Sabarmati.
necessity of vows for the purpose of self-purification and self-realization. 85

Hindu philosophy teaches that freedom can be obtained only through bonds of discipline and surrender of personal inclination. To secure the freedom to acquire and to enjoy we have to limit ourselves and bind our will in certain ways. 86 Gandhi adhered to this concept of self-discipline and purification.

Freedom, thus conceived, is freedom only for the ideal and not for the actual. Gandhi held that the individual is free to speak the truth, not free to lie; free to serve, not to exploit, free to sacrifice himself but not free to kill or injure.

Gandhi's ideas on sex and Brahmacharya which have often been referred to as 'the great obsessions' of his mind have to be understood in the context of his views on inner freedom. To quote Gandhi: "The conquest of lust is the highest endeavour of a man or woman's existence. Without overcoming lust man cannot hope to rule over self. And without rule over self there can be no Swaraj or Rama Raj. Rule of all without rule over self would prove to be as deceptive and disappointing as a painted toy-mango, charming to look at outwardly but hollow and empty within. No worker who has not overcome lust can hope to render any genuine service to the cause of Harijans, communal unity, Khadi, cow-protection or village reconstruction. Great causes like these cannot be served by intellectual equipment alone, they call for spiritual effort or soul-force. Soul-force comes only through God's grace, and God's grace never descends upon man who is a slave to lust." 87

Gandhi's insistence on Brahmacharya as a discipline of natural instincts and impulses earned him the reputation of being an ascetic. But Gandhi refused to be called an ascetic. For a student of political theory, it would be some sort of intrusion to try to delve deep into his inner mind for such 'asceticism'. Leaving the field open for the psycho-analyst for such a study, we can better appreciate it in the background of his philosophy which was evolved out of the cultural milieu he lived in and of his personal experiences. A close look at his 'asceticism' would suggest that he developed this attitude for disciplining life not
from any abstract and academic point of view, rather the logic and compulsion of public life - a life of service and struggle - led him to adopt this view. Let Gandhi speak for himself: "It is wrong to call me an ascetic. The ideals that regulate my life are presented for acceptance by mankind in general. I have arrived at them by gradual evolution. Every step was thought out, well-considered, and taken with the greatest deliberation. Both my continence and non-violence were derived from personal experience and became necessary in response to the calls of public duty. The isolated life I had to lead in South Africa whether as a householder, legal practitioner, social reformer or politician, required, for the due fulfilment of these duties, the strictest regulation of sexual life and a rigid practice of non-violence and truth in human relations." (emphasis added)

Gandhi's Autobiography records how he came to accept and practise Brahmacharya: During the period of Zulu "rebellion" (1906) he became convinced that brahmacharya and poverty were essential for public service. On his return to Phoenix, he took vow on both subjects. The sexual restraint which he had been observing since 1900 had been mainly for an inferior object. Even at this period he took the vow not with the religious purpose to attain the vision of God, but in the interests of public service. Brahmacharya was yet to develop as an essential discipline for attaining moksha or salvation. In the Autobiography we read: "It was borne in upon me that I should have more and more occasions for service of the kind I was rendering, and that I should find myself unequal to my task if I were engaged in the pleasures of family life and in the propagation and rearing of children."

* The idea of renunciation was for Gandhi, Dr. Verrier Elwin observed, "a temporary ethic, an ethic for an interim period." "Then he (Gandhi) told his followers", Dr. Elwin continued, "that they mustn't marry, that they must have no sexual relations, it was not out of any absolute spiritual philosophy, it was rather a political expedient for the time being. And we must remember that for him ethics and politics were the same." - Francis Watson and Maurice Brown, Talking of Gandhi (Orient Longmans, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, 1957), p. 28.
"In a word, I could not live both after the flesh and the spirit. On the present occasion ('nursing the wounded Zulus'), for instance, I should not have been able to throw myself into the fray, had my wife been expecting a baby. Without the observance of brahmacarya, service of the family would be inconsistent with the service of the community. With brahmacarya they would be perfectly consistent." 99

Again,

"But," Gandhi told Mrs. Polak, "you do believe that people who have a great mission or work to do should not spend their energy and time in caring for a little family when they are called to a bigger field of work?" 90

Brahmacarya, according to Gandhi, is a necessary disciplining factor in the life of a public servant. It is not, as with the mediaeval Christians, it is argued, a case of mortification of flesh for its own sake. It may be harmful to suppress the*

---


Acharya Kripalani says: "... in no healthy normal society can his life be considered as one of the mortification of the flesh." Quoted in Ibid, p. 56.

P. Spratt holds a different view. To quote him: "Some of the expressions Mr. Gandhi uses about Brahmacharya suggest mediaeval Christian rather than Hindu asceticism. Brahmacharya is esteemed by Hindu tradition as part of an ascetic discipline, but there did not develop from this point of view which was commonly held by the early and mediaeval Christian propagandists - it is far from dead even now - that sexuality is peculiarly degrading and sinful. He uses terms - "beastly" and so forth - which recall the Christian middle ages and Victorian England." Gandhism (The Huxley Press, Madras, 1939), p. 150.

Elsewhere quoting Mrs. Polak's reference to Gandhi's "preference for the uncomfortable" he comments: "It is evident that by this time (1921) asceticism for its own sake had become his habit." - Ibid, p. 80.

We agree with Spratt that Gandhi's concept of Brahmacharya was different from the traditional Hindu concept. Gandhi's ideas on sex might lend the impression that he was more a mediaeval Christian in outlook or a Buddhist as was alleged by Tagore. Gandhi himself admitted that his ideas on brahmacharya had been modified by his long contact with the West. (N.K. Bose- My Days With Gandhi, Nischana, 1953, Calcutta), p.174. His intimate Christian association, it may be presumed, cast a permanent influence on his concept of sin, purity and sexual morality.

Prof. N. K. Bose observes: "he (Gandhi) represented a hard, puritanic form of self-discipline, something which we usually associate with mediaeval Christian ascetics or Jain recluses." (Ibid)

The essential point in our study would, however, be to find out the roots of his developing such an idea.
Gandhi insisted that desires should be rationalized and synthesized in an integrated life in order to attain the moral height which differentiates man from brute.

Another postulate of the enshrinement of Swaraj as moral and spiritual freedom is anasakti which comes as the consequence of will and reason leading to concentration of energy. The Gita taught him this lesson. Renunciation, according to Gandhi, does not mean abandoning the world and retiring into the forest. Gandhi who consecrated his life to the service of his fellow Indians and humanity at large could only say that 'there is no higher law than the law of Dharma, the Law of Service.'

Gandhi's attitude towards freedom was integral. He held that "The outward freedom that we shall attain will be in exact proportion to the inward freedom to which we may have grown at a given moment." This being his view of freedom, it was logical that he would insist that "our chief energy must be concentrated upon achieving reform within." While Gandhi insisted on individual reform he certainly did not ignore the external conditions necessary for attaining true freedom. His life-long struggle against racial discrimination, colonial subjugation, social tyranny and economic exploitation and his advocacy and organised effort for moral regeneration of man bear testimony that he had a comprehensive and integral concept of freedom.

Reflections

Gandhi approached the problem of freedom from the philosophic idealist point of view. And that was in harmony with his basic approach towards moral and spiritual matters. His philosophical convictions provide an adequate background for such a concept of freedom. One may, according to one's own philosophical commitment, accept or reject his view of freedom as authentic or otherwise, but that does not make any the less rewarding our study of his concept. One need not be a Gandhist to analyse and appreciate the essential points of his philosophy of freedom which have extra-philosophical and sociological significance.
The essential points that a student of social and political theory finds in Gandhian concept of moral freedom are the following: First, the individual is the pillar of Swaraj. This emphasis on the individual characterises Gandhi's concept of Swaraj. Gandhi, as has been noted earlier, believed in the sanctity and moral authority of the individual. Does it lead to unrestricted individualism? Certainly, No. Gandhi was for striking a mean between individual freedom and social restraint. 95 Gandhi's individualism was also not of the Hindu salvationist type. In Gandhi's opinion, moksha or salvation has to be attained in course of and through active participation in mundane affairs. He earnestly believed in the divine spark in all men. His insistence on individual Swaraj or reform from within has to be understood from a different plane. Gandhi lived and moved in India which was typically "a community of obedience" as opposed to a "community of will", to borrow an expression of H. G. Wells. In this objective background that was necessary was that of unreachable character and conduct and grim determination based on ironing of wills. He faced a country where medieval degradation in all walks of life paralysed the spirit of the people. Cultivation of the bourgeois ideals of individual character and conduct could only give a new shock to the torpid condition of our country at that time. Stripped of its religious coverings, religion was indeed of prime importance to Gandhi, his call for inculcation of individual virtues like the qualities of discipline, voluntary loyalty and solidarity and a degree of internal freedom signified a new outlook of life. And Gandhi was engaged upon the task of giving this sort of outlook to the Indian people. 96

Secondly, he realised that an inert and emasculated people would never be able to attain freedom. Therefore, he went to the root of the weakness of the people. He knew that for straightening the backs of the semi-paralysed people and for galvanising the spirit of the nation, a new set of values have to be introduced. Individual consciousness could only, Gandhi perhaps thought, lift the people out of the rut of servile life. And that is why, it seems, he tried to tackle the problems of life at individual level.
Thirdly, Gandhi considered weakness, cowardice and fear as sins against the human spirit. Abhaya or fearlessness was the greatest legacy that Gandhi bestowed upon us. Fear of imprisonment, fear of loss of property and fear of death demoralized the spirit and crippled the growth of the Indian people. His first task was to revive the spirit of self-respect of his countrymen. Once this was done, resistance to evil would be easy. He carried the message of fearlessness. The message was to be given a concrete shape. During the non-co-operation days he asked his followers to overcome the fear of imprisonment. Once the fear of jail had disappeared, he felt the time had come for a second step. Civil disobedience movement sought to destroy the fear of impoverishment and loss of property. And then the last step, 'Do or Die' - one must risk death to attain freedom. He made heroes out of common clay. This is indeed a positive achievement.

Fourthly, self-restraint or self-denial as he sometimes called it which caused a lot of furore and hostile criticism should be viewed with an objective detachment. Brahmacharya, as Gandhi explained it, may not be acceptable to a modern man of scientifically trained disposition. But Gandhi's personal faith apart, Brahmacharya as a disciplining factor in the sense of self-training, control of mind and body, should be looked upon as a device for enabling the Satyagrahi to devote himself to service. Brahmacharya which means control of all the organs of sense might have been particularly necessary for Gandhi in his struggle with himself. He himself admitted that his mind was of the extroverted type.

* "Fearlessness was his greatest gift..." - Jawaharlal Nehru in Talking of Gandhi by Francis Watson and Maurice Brown (Orient Longmans, Bombay, Calcutta etc., 1957), p. 37.

"...the greatest single gift which Mr. Gandhi has conferred upon his fellow-countrymen is the power of conquering... fear complex." - John S. Hoyland in Mahatma Gandhi: Essays and Reflections (ed: S. Radhakrishnan, Jaico Publishing House, Bombay, Calcutta etc. 1956), p. 116.

** In reply to P. Spratt's question.
We have traced in our earlier discussion how the idea of Brahmacharya germinated in his mind. Gandhi's Brahmacharya, disguised unfortunately but perhaps inevitably under a religious covering, was in its inspiration primarily secular. One may not accept his theory of Brahmacharya but the inspiration is not to be missed.

Fourthly, a puritan discipline, however disagreeable it may appear and one may not accept it as an absolute principle of life as was urged upon by Gandhi on some occasions, should be related to the historical situation when the code of discipline was enunciated and sought to be made a part of one's regime. Thus considered, the puritan discipline of self-conquest, non-attachment, renunciation etc. might have had its relevance in the day when it was presented for acceptance. Dedication to a cause demands self-control or restraint another name of which is, according to Gandhi, personal swami. Gandhi was right when he said that "the path of service can hardly be trodden by one, who is not prepared to renounce self-interest." One may hold that the Gandhian discipline is too exacting for human nature as it is; one may reject the Gandhian schema for its unrelatedness to the basic urges of human life, and its puritanical strain and over-emphasis on individual reform; but the key-point of service and sacrifice, for which this rigorous discipline was conceived, in first instance, as ideals to be sought for—has its validity even today when the objective conditions have been changed as compared to the days when this doctrine was propounded.

Rights

Closely allied to the concept of freedom is the theory of Rights. As a votary of freedom and dignity of the individual, Gandhi throughout his political life championed the rights of the racially humiliated, colonially subjugated, economically dispossessed and socially depressed humanity. The theory of Satyagraha is based on the notion of the individual's inalienable right to resist a coercive injustice, social and political system. He hoisted the standard of non-violent revolt against...
bondage and denial of rights. In all his activities a passionate desire for the
reign of right is evident. Whether in South Africa, or in India he championed the
cause of individual conscience as against the violently imposed dictates of
political power. We need not recount here the glorious and singular role played
by him for the assertion of civil and political rights. One commentator has aptly
remarked: "Gandhi's philosophy of right is a cardinal point in his philosophy of
politics." As the prophet of Satyagraha, he stood for the inalienable, moral
right of man to stand against untruth and injustice. But one of the greatest
fighters for the assertion and vindication of human rights that he was, he was
also a constructive thinker. He stressed the correlation between rights and duties.

Gandhi thought that rights are the opportunity for self-realization. They are
inmate in the sense in which moral values are innate. Vedanta teaches that
right to self-realisation accrues through self-culture and spiritual self-
determination of the reason-endowed individual, free, equal and divine in nature.
The way to self-realization is the realization of one's spiritual unity with others
by serving them and doing one's duty by them. It is in duty towards the social
good that the true source of rights is to be found. This was one of his basic
faiths which changed very little with time. Gandhi who believed in the Gita
gospel of selfless action wrote in 1925:

* Dr. R. S. Sharma in his study cites a parallel statement from Green.

Green said: "They (rights) are innate or natural in the sense in which
according to Aristotle the state is natural; not in the sense that they
actually exist when a man is born and that they have actually existed as long
as the human race, but that they arise out of, and are necessary for the
fulfilment of, a moral capacity without which a man would not be a man. There
cannot be innate rights in any other sense than that in which they are innate
duties, of which, however much less has been heard." - Gandhi As A Political
"The true source of rights is duty. If we all discharge our duties, rights will not be far to seek. If leaving duties unperformed we run after rights, they escape us like a will-o'-the-wisp. The more we pursue them, the farther they fly. The same teaching has been embodied by Krishna in the immortal words: 'Action alone is thine - Leave thou the fruit severely alone.' Action is duty; fruit is the right." 101

And,

"No people have risen who thought only of rights. Only those did so who thought of duties. Out of the performance of duties flow rights, and those that knew and performed their duties came naturally by the rights. ...He who thinks not of the right gets it, and he who thinks of it loses it. That is the rule of conduct which I would like to place before you." 102

"While championing the cause of equal right for everyman to the necessaries of life, he stressed on the corresponding duty. He wrote in 1931:

"Every man has an equal right to the necessaries of life even as birds and beasts have. And since every right carries with it corresponding duty and the corresponding remedy for resisting any attack upon it, it is merely a matter of finding out the corresponding duties and remedies to vindicate the elementary fundamental equality. The corresponding duty is to labour with my limbs and the corresponding remedy is to non-co-operate with who deprives me of the fruit of my labour." 103

Similarly he said in 1939:

"Rights accrue automatically to him who duly performs his duties. In fact, the right to perform one's duties is the only right that is worth living for and dying for. It covers all legitimate rights. All the rest is grab under one guise or another and contains in it = seeds of himsa." 104

In a cable to H. G. Wells, in reply to his on the Rights of Man, Gandhi wrote:"
"You will permit me to say that you are on the wrong track. I feel sure that I can draw up a better charter of rights than you have drawn up. But what good will it be? Who will become its guardian? If you mean propaganda or popular education, you have begun at the wrong end. I suggest the right way. Begin with a charter of Duties of Man, and I promise the rights will follow as spring follows winter. I write from experience. As a young man I first began my life by seeking to assert my rights, and I soon discovered that I had none— not even over my wife. So I began by discovering and performing my duty by my wife, my children, my friends, companions and society, and I find today that I have greater rights, perhaps, than any living man I know. If this is too tall a claim, then I say I do not know anyone who possesses greater rights than I." 105

In the same vein he told Julian Huxley, the then Director-General of UNESCO in 1947:

"I learnt from my illiterate but wise mother that all rights to be deserved and preserved come from duty well done. Thus the very right to live accrues to us only when we do the duty of citizenship of the world. From this very fundamental standpoint perhaps it is easy enough to define the duties of man and woman and correlate every right to some corresponding duty to be first performed. Every other right can be shown to be a usurpation hardly worth fighting for." 106

While repudiating "the divine right of kings to rule", he at the same time spoke against "the unabashed assertion of rights of the hitherto downtrodden millions" as equally injurious. 107

Gandhian theory of rights lays emphasis on social service rather than on self-regarding propensities of the individual. As Gandhi wrote: "... people who obtain rights as a result of performance of duty, exercise them only for the service of society, never for themselves." 108
Gandhi's position is in quite contrast to the Utilitarians for whom the assertion of rights is more fundamental than the performance of duties. As is known to a student of political theory, Bentham advocated that rights properly so called are the creatures of law properly so called. But for Gandhi, rights are created, not by the State or any other group, but by the individual himself as he acquires and develops fitness for the right by pursuit of satya and ahimsa. The State does not create rights; it only recognizes rights. Individual freedom and social obligation being not incompatible in Gandhian thought, rights will not require the long arms of the State for their enforcement in the ideal society envisaged by him.

Gandhi's stress on duties as prior to rights may lend the impression that his outlook was conservative. The conservative view holds that duty is of greater importance and priority than right. The citizen finds his duties as a member of a given section of society. It is his moral obligation to fulfill these duties. In one of Gandhi's writings on the subject one comes across a statement of like nature. He wrote in 1939: "... rights of true citizenship accrue only to those who serve the state to which they belong." But was Gandhi truly a conservative? Prof. Joan V. Bondurant's observations deserve attention. She says: "In traditional Hindu polity, emphasis upon duty is extended to the king. The king, above all others, is obliged to fulfill his kingly duties towards his people, and proper fulfillment of such duties is the sole justification for expecting his subjects to obey him. Gandhi, who would make every man a king, consistently emphasized duties as prior to rights. But the effect of his reasoning was not precisely conservative in nature." "Rights accrue automatically to him who duly performs his duties", Gandhi wrote. But these rights, Bondurant argues, are not to be rigidly confined to rank and order on the conservative structuring of society arising out of caste. (For discussion of Gandhi's views on Caste & Varna, see..."
Gandhian rights, fundamentally, are rights to pursue and realize values. The supreme right to human freedom becomes then not mere absence of restraint, the detachment of the individual from all relations and bonds, but freedom to achieve things, made possible only (a) by the overcoming of obstacles, (b) by assuming the obligations of co-operative effort. Gandhi's emphasis on duty as prior to rights can be explained in terms of the social obligation that an individual owes. Other-regarding activities or devotion to an ego-transcending cause implies service. Service is the outward expression of an obligation that an individual feels for other selves and collectively to the society. Service was the master-passion with him as we have said elsewhere. His concept of Swaraj as personal Swaraj underlies this assumption of the obligation of co-operative effort of individuals. This subjective stress in Gandhian thought is evident in all his writings. It was his sincere belief that only reformed individuals can realize freedom, the supreme right and reformation from within enables one to stand up against unjust and immoral laws of the state. Thus he synthesized the relation between rights and duties.

On Equality and Justice

Liberty to be authentic must be accompanied by equality. Gandhi was an ardent champion of equality - the term being understood in its comprehensive sense. Gandhian theory of rights incorporates political, racial, social and economic equality. Engelman said of Rousseau: "Equality to him is as precious as liberty and the great proprietor who makes men poor is for him, as detestable as the despot who makes men slaves. Social injustice and political injustice sustain themselves mutually." As one reviewer of Gandhian philosophy of State has rightly observed: "Almost every word of this estimate of the greatest political thinker of France is true of Gandhiji." 113

Equality did not mean for Gandhi, dead uniformity. He said: "All men are born equal and free is not nature's law in the literal sense. All men are not
born equal in intellect, for instance, but the doctrine of equality will be vindicated if those who have superior intellect will use not for self-advancement at the expense of others, but for the service of those who are less favoured in that respect than they." 114 But biological inequality or what Prof. Haldane has called the inherent "inequality" of man apart, inequality in the social and economic sphere is the core of the social problem. Gandhi was alive to this aspect of the problem. While the Rousseauic dictum is not true in the literal sense, it is true in the sense that all have a moral right to equal opportunity. Equal opportunity is the indispensable condition for the full flowering of individuality which, in Gandhi's opinion, lies at the root of all progress.

We need not recount here how he reacted to racial inequality in South Africa, social inequality in the form of untouchability in India or economic inequality between the haves and have-nots in this country. A detailed discussion of his concept of economic equality has been made earlier (see pp....) He devoted his life to the removal of untouchability which was the source of social inequality. (For his views, see pp....). The main point underlying his concept of socio-economic equality may be summarized briefly in his own language. He wrote: "I want to bring about an equalization of status. The working classes have all these centuries been isolated and relegated to a lower status. They have been Shudras, and the word has been interpreted to mean an inferior status. I want to allow no differentiation between the son of a weaver, of an agriculturist and of a school-master." 115

One of the main problems of society which drew Gandhi's attention was the social status of women. Gandhi's role in the cause of regeneration of Indian women is too well known to be recapitulated here. As for his views on the subject, let us cite a few of the many observations he made as and when occasions demanded. As early as 1921, he wrote: "I passionately desire the utmost freedom for our women. ... Women must have votes and an equal legal status." 116
he continued, "the problem does not end there. It only commences at the point where women begin to affect the political deliberations of the nation." He could visualize women only "as man's companion, gifted with equal mental capacities," possessing "the right to participate in every minute detail in the activities of man" and "an equal right of freedom and liberty with him." Gandhi was emphatic in his assertion that "Women will enjoy the same rights as men." He regarded legislation to remove the inequalities of women as essential. But in consonance with his general approach towards social problems, he considered it better for the enlightened women of India to fight for the repeal of all legal disqualifications and the abolition of all social discriminations. "...every right in a non-violent society proceeds from the previous performance of a duty, it follows that rules of social conduct must be framed by mutual co-operation and consultation. They can never be imposed from outside." 

Gandhian theory of equality is rooted in his basic faith of the dignity of the individual. A moral reverence for life suggests equality of all men. His belief that "we are all equal before our Maker - Hindus, Musalmans, Parsees, Christians, Worshippers of one God," was the philosophical foundations of his theory of equality. His deep attachment for social and economic justice is integrally related with his creed of non-violence, for justice is the first condition of non-violence.

On Democracy

The idea of Democracy has had a long pedigree from the Greek City-States to modern times. Some are of opinion that it is a mistake to think that it is only a Western concept. Democracies and republics, like that of the Vrijjis at the time of the Buddha (Sixth Century B.C.) were working in India centuries before Christ and probably some of them were earlier than the Greek republics. It is not necessary for us to trace its history here. The idea is simple. In the political sphere, it is the idea of participation by the whole community in the political process. It bases political authority on the will of individuals who by a process of co-operation
make decisions that are binding on all. This is the modern parliamentary democratic form of government. The basic assumption on which parliamentary government rests relates to the nature of society it presupposes. It is the well-known assumption of 'natural harmony' between man and man and individuals and society. But democracy is not so much a form as a principle of government and not only a principle of government, but a principle of social life. Democracy is not only a form of political system; it is also a way of life. Gandhi considered democracy from that larger principle of social life. He scathingly criticised the governments which, in their institutional basis and political form, were democratic but form from the philosophical standpoint or the end point of view were negations of the same.

Gandhi held that violence and democracy are incompatible. It is only on the basis of unadulterated ahimsa that genuine democracy can be built up. Both non-violence and democracy are but means; the end is obviously to attain and establish a universal community of human beings which shall be peaceful, happy and progressive in the physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual fields and which shall give, at the same time, full and free scope to each man and woman to attain the highest of which he or she is capable or in other words the full flowering of one's personality.

Gandhi's theory of Democracy will be discussed in three sections: i) Critique of Western Parliamentary Democracy, ii) Views on institutional basis of Democracy and iii) Foundations of Democracy.

i) Critique of Western Parliamentary Democracy:

_Hind Swaraj_ contains Gandhi's indictment of the British parliamentary practices and procedures. To quote:

"That which you consider to be the Mother of Parliaments, is like a sterile woman and a prostitute. Both these are harsh terms, but exactly fit the case. That Parliament has not yet, of its own accord, done a single
good thing. Hence I have compared it to a sterile woman. The natural condition of that Parliament is such that, without outside pressure, it can do nothing. It is like a prostitute because it is under the control of ministers who change from time to time.

"... as a matter of fact, it is generally acknowledged that the members are hypocritical and selfish. Each thinks of his own little interest. It is fear that is the guiding motive. ... When the greatest questions are debated, its members have been seen to stretch themselves and to doze. Sometimes the members talk away until the listeners are disgusted. Carlyle has called it the "talking shop of the world." Members vote for their party without a thought. Their so-called discipline binds them to it. ... Parliament is simply a costly toy of the nation.

"... they (the Prime Ministers) cannot be considered really patriotic.

... I do not hesitate to say that they have neither real honesty nor a living conscience.

"If India copies England, it is my firm conviction that she will be ruined." 121

Gandhi wrote to Maganlal Gandhi on April 2, 1910:

"It is very difficult to get rid of our fondness for Parliament. It was, no doubt, barbarous when people tore off the skin, burned persons alive and cut off their ears or nose; but the tyranny of Parliament is much greater than that of Genghis Khan, Tamerlane and other... Modern tyranny is a trap of temptation and therefore does greater mischief. One can withstand the atrocities committed by one at individual as such; but it is difficult to cope with the tyranny perpetrated upon a people in the name of the people. ... The common man in India at last believes that the Parliament is a hoax." 122

We have seen in our earlier discussion on Swaraj that he accepted Parliamentary
Swaraj as the immediately realizable objective of the nation. While he did not forsake the ideal pictured in *Hind Swaraj*, his 'corporate activity was undoubtedly devoted to the attainment of Parliamentary Swaraj' (Young India, 26 January, 1921). The compulsion of the given stage of development of nationalist struggle might have dictated him to take up this position as we have argued earlier. But he was alive to the basic malady of parliamentary democracies. In 1925 he wrote:

"The peoples of Europe have no doubt political power but no Swaraj. Asian and African races are exploited for their partial benefit, and they, on their part, are being exploited by the ruling class or caste under the sacred name of democracy." (also cited in our discussion on Swaraj, see p. 448).

In 1938 he wrote:

"Democracy of the West is, in my opinion, only so-called. It has germs in it, certainly of the true type. But it can only come when all violence is eschewed and malpractices disappear. The two go hand in hand. Indeed malpractice is a species of violence. If India is to evolve the true type, there should be no compromise with violence or untruth." 123

In another issue of *Harijan* of the same year (1938) he wrote:

"Democracy and violence can ill go together. The States that are today nominally democratic have either to become frankly totalitarian or, if they are to become truly democratic, they must become courageously non-violent." 124

The European democracies were subject to Gandhi's trenchant criticism for they were not, from the standpoint of non-violence, qualitatively different from the States which tore off their democratic veil. Writing in 1939 Gandhi remarked:

"The democracies, therefore, that we see at work in England, America and France are only so-called, because they are no less based on violence than Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy or even Soviet Russia. The only difference is that the violence of the last three is much better organized than that of
the three democratic powers. Nevertheless we see today a mad race for out-
doing one another in the matter of armaments. And if, when the clash comes, as it is bound to come one day, the democracies win, they will do so only because they have the backing of their peoples who imagine that they have a voice in their own government, whereas in the other three cases the peoples might rebel against their own dictatorships. 125 (emphasis added).

An American journalist trekked to Sevagram in April, 1940 for an interview with Gandhi which was in the form of questions and answers.

Q. "Why do you say that democracy can only be saved through non-violence?"
A. "Because democracy, so long as it is sustained by violence, cannot pro-
vide for or protect the weak. My notion of democracy is that under it the weak-
est should have the same opportunity as the strongest. That can never happen except through non-violence. No country in the world today shows any but patron-
izing regard for the weak. The weakest, you say, go to the wall. Take your own case. Your land is owned by a few capitalist owners. The same is true of South
Africa. These large holdings cannot be sustained except by violence, veiled if
not open. Western democracy, as it functions today, is diluted Nazi or
Fascism. At best it is merely a cloak to hide the Nazi and the Fascist tend-
encies of imperialism. Why is there the war today if it is not for the satis-
faction of the desire to share the spoils? It was not through democratic methods
that Britain bagged India. What is the meaning of South African democracy? Its
very constitution has been drawn to protect the white man against the coloured
man, the natural occupant. Your own history is perhaps blacker still, inspite of
what the Northern States did for the abolition of slavery. The way you have treated

# Gf. "There are no Democracies in the West. They are only rank plutocracies, all of them now fascist to the finger-tips." - George Bernard Shaw.
treated the Negro presents a discreditable record. And it is to save such demo­
cracies that the war is being fought! There is something very hypocritical.
about it."

We make no apology for reproducing a rather long excerpt for this statement
of Gandhi is a document of much significance as it contains the basic grounds of his opposition to the so-called Democracies.

Gandhi told Louis Fischer when he visited him in June, 1942:

"I see no difference between the Fascist or Nazi powers and the Allies.
All are exploiters, all resort to ruthlessness to the extent required to
compass their end. America and Britain are very great nations but their
greatness will count as dust before the bar of dumb humanity, whether
African or Asiatic. ... They have no right to talk of human liberty and
all else unless they have washed their hands clean of the pollution...
Then but not till then, will they be fighting for a new order."

In a conversation held in 1940 (Mahadev Desai's report cited above, see p."
he unequivocally stated: "The European Democracies are to my mind a negation
of democracy."

Gandhi's indictment of western democracies stood on three fundamental
grounds: i) exploitation of the weak 'by a few capitalist owners'; ii) ex-
pansion of capitalism resulting in the exploitation of the weaker peoples;
iii) white racialism. According to Gandhi, any sort of exploitation is inhuman.

"There is a fundamental difference between fascism and even this imperialism
which I am fighting." - Gandhi's speech before AICC meeting on August 7,1942.
Quoted in Tendulkar, Mahatma (The Publications Division, GOI, 1962), vol.VI,
p. 167.

One may allege inconsistency between these statements. But his overall judg-
ment seems to be that there was no difference between imperialism and fascism
as systems. If there was a difference, the difference was only in degree.
indistinguishable from violence. He could very well comprehend the fundamental contradictions of modern age. It was his genius to pierce the outer shells of western democracies and expose violence in its nakedness.

We use the word 'genius' advisedly because his was the lone voice of political prudence and maturity when confusion reigned supreme. While the pronouncedly progressive forces in and outside the country, the official Congress leadership not excluded, were busy rationalizing the distinctions between the fascist or Axis powers and democratic or Allied powers, he was the only political leader who could expose the basic coercive character of capitalist democracy. It may not be irrelevant here to refer to the formulation made round about that time by the professedly most advanced and radical force of the world world, viz., the Communist International. According to Manuilsky, one of the top leaders of the Communist Party of Soviet Union as well as of the Communist International:

"The growing menace of world imperialist war is causing all class, national and state forces to separate into two camps: the camp of war and the camp of peace. The centre of forces which are operating to bring about war, to accelerate its outbreak is FASCISM; in Europe the most reactionary and aggressive form of Fascism exists in Hitlerite Germany. In Asia, it is in military-fascist Japan... Italy stands fully armed..."

This logic led the official world Communist movement to brand fascism as 'greater enemy' and imperialism as 'lesser enemy' which culminated in a broad peace front composed of Communists and the 'democratic' imperialists. The history of transformation of 'peace front to people's war' and then to 'People's Age' is the history of unabashed betrayal of the fundamental interests of the colonial peoples and working men of capitalist countries wearing the label of democracy. Incidentally, this appraisal of the world situation in characterising imperialist powers as 'democratic' violates the fundamentals of international socialism as propounded by Marx, Engels and Lenin. The military-diplomatic alliance between
Soviet Union and capitalist democracies of Britain, France and America was presented as the camp of peace. In the words of Stalin:

"It may now be considered indisputable that in the course of war imposed upon the United Nations by Hitlerite Germany a radical demarcation of forces and the formation of two opposite camps has taken place—the camp of the Italó-German coalition and the camp of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition." (emphasis added)

So there appeared to the world Communist movement and all the units owing allegiance to the Communist International a radical or qualitative change in the character of 'democratic' imperialism. Objective analysis of the basic character of imperialism—capitalism was tabooed; independent judgment was declared a heresy. The fundamental characteristics of the imperialist democracies turned 'prisoners in the people's camp' were ignored and the injunction was issued that in order to defeat fascism, suspend your criticism, not to speak of organised action of the peoples, of 'democratic' powers. In such a situation, Gandhi, while remaining indifferent to the theoretical niceties of social dynamics, could, by his incisive political insight, easily get at the root of the problem. Therein lay the superiority of his political acumen. Unlike the 'progressives' who branded him as a 'social reactionary' and 'an agent of the Indian capitalists', Gandhi was uninhibited in his outlook and thinking. That dogma-free attitude enabled him to look at world affairs in clear perspective while the 'vanguards' sang to the tunes set by the bandmaster at the citadel of world revolution.

ii) Views on Institutional Basis of Democracy: The fundamental institution on which the parliamentary system of government is based is that of periodic elections. In fact, elections have become the linchpin on which the entire constitutional apparatus of parliamentary government hangs. The enormous importance given to elections tends to equate democracy with majority rule. In effect, this so-called
majority rule is only the rule of a minority. Under a system of franchise as we 
have in India or in Great Britain, it is possible for a government to command a 
majority of seats in the Parliament on the basis of a minority of votes. It is 
an unavoidable adjunct of the present system. Taking for granted that a genuine 
majority rule i.e. rule of 51% of the electorate is established, can it be 
equated with genuine democracy? Gandhi's concept of democracy was not limited 
to formal adherence to the external mechanism of the parliamentary type of 
government. His approach was essentially moral. He did not believe in the 
priority of political mechanism to one's own conscience.

In 1920 he wrote:

"In matters of conscience the Law of Majority has no place." 130

The next year he commented:

"Let us not push the mandate theory to ridiculous extremes and become 
slaves to resolutions of majorities. That would be a regnal of brute 
force in a more virulent form. If rights of minorities are to be respected, 
the majority must tolerate and respect their opinion and action... It will 
be the duty of the majority to see to it that minorities receive a proper 
training and are not otherwise exposed to insults. Swaraj will be an 
absurdity if individuals have to surrender their judgment to the majority." 131

Individual freedom, according to Gandhi, is the essence of democracy. In an 
article (Young India, 2-3-22) he opined:

"The rule of majority has a narrow application, i.e. one should yield 
to the majority in matters of detail. But it is slavery to be amenable 

* In an article entitled 'The Law of Majorities' Gandhi wrote in Young India 
(14-7-20):

"I have found by experience that, if I wish to live in society and still retain my independence, I must limit the points of utter independence to matters of first rate importance. In all others which do not involve a departure from one's personal religion or moral code, one must yield to the majority." -Young India, 1919-22 (S. Ganesan, Madras, 1922), p. 208.
to the majority, no matter what its decisions are... Democracy is not a state in which people act like sheep. Under democracy, individual liberty of opinion and action is jealously guarded. I, therefore, believe that the minority has a perfect right to act differently from the majority..." 132

Gandhi wanted a government not based on coercion even of minority but on its conversion. 133 In his opinion, the rule of majority, when it becomes, coercive, is as intolerable as that of a bureaucratic minority. 134

On September 28, 1944 in a press conference attended by Indian and foreign journalists, he explained his view of real majority.

"The way of approaching a question is not to examine the numerical strength of those behind the opinion, but to examine the soundness of opinion on merits, or else we will never reach a solution, and if we reach one, it will be a blind solution, simply because it is the wish of the largest body. If the largest body goes wrong, it is up to me to say you are wrong and not to submit."

"The rule of majority," he then added, "does not mean that it should suppress the opinion of even an individual, if it is sound. Opinion of an individual should have greater weight than the opinion of many, if that opinion is sound on merits. That is my view of real democracy." 135

He had no very high regard for the quantitative principle of democracy. On the other hand, he attached the highest importance to quality irrespective almost of quantity. 136 As a believer in the first principle of moral rectitude of an individual, he asked "not to be cowed down by the thought of a small minority." 137 For to be in a minority is sometimes a privilege and he would love to be in the minority of one. Gandhi's life shows that he literally lived the life of 'a minority of one' and treaded a lonely furrow for the vindication of the principles he thought to be true.

Hind Swaraj records that elections as the mechanism of determining the will
of the people did not appeal to Gandhi. He moderated his views later. Voicing the demands of Indian people for the inauguration of a democratic political system, he wrote in *Young India* (29-1-25, p. 40) that by Swaraj he meant the government of India by the consent of the people as ascertained by the largest number of the adult population (excerpt cited above, See. on Swaraj, See p. 46). A democrat in the true sense of the term, he wanted elementary political right for the people. In 1931 he declared:

"I am wedded to adult suffrage.... I cannot possibly bear the idea that a man who has got wealth should have the vote but that a man who has got character but no wealth or literacy should have no vote, or that a man who works honestly by the sweat of his brow day in and day out should not have the vote for the crime of being a poor man." 138

In 1940 he wrote:

"If independence is born non-violently all the component parts will be voluntarily interdependent working in perfect harmony under a representative central authority which will derive its sanction from the confidence reposed in it by the component parts." The Central power, he added, would be based on "universal suffrage exercised by a disciplined and politically intelligent electorate." 139

Again in 1947:

"As to the franchise, he swore the franchise of all adults, male and female, above the age of twenty-one or even eighteen. He would bar old men like himself. They were of no use as voters. ... Thus he would have a bar against persons beyond a certain age, say fifty, as he would against youngsters below eighteen." 140

Side by side with adult franchise — or even before that he would have universal education not necessarily literary except perhaps as an aid, but also education for life including education in the rights and duties of citizenship. 141
We have seen above that in *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi was not favourably disposed towards the party system. He maintained this point of view for the rest of his life. A question may be raised that why did he then associate himself with the Indian National Congress? It should be noted here that the Indian National Congress, in pre-independence days, was not a political party in the sense a party is understood to function. A heterogeneous organisation like the Congress was more of a broad political anti-imperialist platform of struggle rather than an agency of coming to power through normal constitutional channels. It was more of a movement than a party political machine. We have observed earlier that Gandhi did not struggle for power as an end in itself; it was for him a means of rendering service to the people and of investing them with authority. A few days before the meeting of the All India Congress Committee in November, 1947, Gandhi mooted the idea that the political goal of the Congress having been achieved with the attainment of independence, the Congress ought voluntarily to liquidate itself. Because of the changed character of the Congress, turned a party of the owning classes of India since independence, Gandhi could carry nobody with him in that direction. The day before he was assassinated, he outlined his ideas on the reconstitution of the Congress in a draft plan, which subsequently came to be known as his "Last Will and Testament." (see Appendix II) The preamble of the draft ran: "Though split into two, India having attained political independence through means devised by the Indian National Congress, the Congress in its present shape and form, as a propaganda vehicle and a parliamentary machine, has outlived its use. India has still to attain social, moral and economic independence in terms of its seven hundred thousand villages as distinguished from its cities and towns. ... For these and similar reasons, the A.I.C.C. resolves to disband the existing Congress organization and flower into a Lok Sevak Sangh." The idea conveyed here suggests that he wanted power as a means of service and not as an end in itself.

As Gandhi had to operate within a given concrete historical situation,
his corporate or political activities were directed towards—which ultimately paved the way for the creation of a national democratic state order. He was alive to this development. But so far as his theoretical concept is concerned he did not move from his original position. The following excerpt from a conversation with Louis Fischer will bear out this statement.

"I realize," Gandhi said, "that despite my views there will be a central government administration. However, I do not believe in the accepted Western form of democracy with its universal voting for parliamentary representatives."

"What would you have India do?" Fischer asked.

"There are seven hundred thousand villages in India. Each would be organized according to the will of its citizens, all of them voting. Then there would be seven hundred thousand votes and not four hundred million. Each village, in other words, would have one vote. The villages would elect their district administrations, and the district administrations would elect the provincial administrations, and these in turn would elect a president who would be the national chief executive."

"That is very much like the Soviet system," Fischer said.

"I did not know that," Gandhi admitted. "I don't mind." 143

Pursuing the discussion further Gandhi reminded Fischer, "Parliamentary democracy is not immune to corruption." 144

It may be pointed out here that at the Round Table Conference, Gandhi suggested indirect election through the Panchayats. 145

Gandhi had his own concept of representative democracy * backed by a

* Gandhi was opposed to bicameral legislature and to representation of special interests as they violate the fundamental principles of popular democracy. See The Nation's Voice (ed: Rajagopalachar & J.C. Kumarappa, MPH, Ahmedabad, 1958), pp. 18-19.
non-violent sanction. In an interview with Gandhi a few days before his death, Mr. Vincent Sheean asked: "If those who believe in the ideal of non-violence keep away from government, government will continue to be carried on by the use of force. How is then the transformation of the existing government to be brought about?"

Gandhi admitted that ordinarily government was impossible without the use of force. "I have, therefore, said that a man who wants to be good and do good in all circumstances must not hold power." "Is all government to come to a standstill then?" Mr. Sheean asked. "No," Gandhi rejoined. "The man of non-violence can send those to the government who represent his will. If he goes there himself he exposes himself to a corrupting influence of power. But my representative holds power of attorney only during my pleasure. If he falls a prey to temptation, he can be recalled. I cannot recall myself. All this requires a high degree of intelligence on the part of the electorate. There are about half a dozen constructive work organizations. I do not send them to the parliament. I want them to keep parliament in check by educating and guiding the voters."

"You mean to say that power always corrupts?"

"Yes," said Gandhi emphatically. 146

Gandhi wanted to evolve a political system suited to the genius of Indian people. 147 He told Fischer: "I do not think that a free India will function like the other countries of the world. We have our own forms to contribute." 148 And that form was Village Swaraj or Panchayat Raj or in plain English, democracy from below. "True democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at the centre. It has to be worked from below by the people of every village." 149 Before outlining his concept of Village Swaraj let us proceed to consider the Gandhian concept of the foundations of democracy.

iii) Foundations of Democracy

In a foregoing section on Swaraj, we have seen that he believed essentially
in the sovereignty of the people. (See p. x, for the excerpt from Constructive Programme.) Institutional framework of democracy does not guarantee power of the people. So that is not enough. "Democracy is an impossible thing until the power is shared by all ... Even a pariah, a labourer ... will have his share in self-government." 150

But how to achieve this democracy? The essence of democracy lies in non-violence, Gandhi reminded us. In our earlier discussion on his criticism of Western democracies we have seen that his fundamental objection rested on the ground that these nominal democracies were founded on violence. We have also seen his concept of integral relationship of non-violence with Swaraj of the masses (See p...). We need not, therefore, engage ourselves in a detailed discussion. But for the sake of systematization, we shall briefly refer to his views.

Gandhi held the view that "without the recognition of non-violence on a national scale there is no such thing as a constitutional or democratic government." 151 It was his conviction that "Science of non-violence alone can lead one to pure democracy." 152 He stated his belief in no uncertain terms: "True democracy or Swaraj of the masses can never come through untruthful and violent means, for the simple reason that the natural corollary to their use would be to remove all opposition through the suppression or extermination of the antagonists. That does not make for individual freedom. Individual freedom can have the fullest play only under a regime of unadulterated ahimsa." 153 Addressing the historic August (1942) session of the All India Congress Committee Gandhi re-iterated his faith once again that violent means lead to the concentration of power in the hands of a few and frustrate the ends of popular revolutions." I read Carlyle's History of the French Revolution while I was in prison, and Pandit Jawaharlal has told me something about the Russian Revolution. But it is my conviction that inasmuch as these struggles were fought with the weapon of violence, they failed to realize the democratic ideal. In the democracy which I
have envisaged, a democracy established by non-violence, there will be equal freedom for all. Everybody will be his own master." 154 And "true democracy can only be the outcome of non-violence. The structure of a world federation can be raised only on a foundation of non-violence, and violence will have to be totally given up in world affairs." 155

Gandhi said in the same speech: "Ours is not a drive for power." So far Gandhi himself was concerned, the statement was more than proved. But for others, namely the leadership of the Congress, it was a different case. He told Dr. Zakir Hussain in December, 1947: "Today everybody in the Congress is running after power. Let us not be in the same cry as the power-seekers... but keep altogether aloof from power politics and its contagion. The objective of the constructive work organisations is to generate political power, not to capture it." 156 (emphasis added)

This is a key-point of Gandhian political philosophy. Gandhi had an ethical attitude towards politics undoubtedly, but to dismiss this essential point as moralistic would be to miss the essence of Gandhian theory. The plea for generating political power has deep-rooted sociological and political significance. This means that power is not to be imposed from above, it has to evolve upwards and in Gandhian scheme dissemination of power is only possible on a non-violent basis.

Democracy was not merely a matter of power-form with him; he laid much stress on the cultivation of democratic spirit. He stated in September 1934:

"I hold that democracy cannot be evolved by forcible methods. The spirit of democracy cannot be imposed from without. It has to come from within." 157

The democracy of Gandhi's conception does not demand dead uniformity; toleration is one of the essential basis of such a concept. He wrote in Harijan (31-5-42, p. 172):

"Evolution of democracy is not possible if we are not prepared to hear
the other side. We shut the doors of reason when we refuse to listen to our opponents, or having listened, make fun of them. If intolerance becomes a habit, we run the risk of missing the truth. Whilst, with the limits that Nature has put upon our understanding, we must act fearlessly according to the light vouchsafed to us, we must always keep an open mind and be ever ready to find that what we believed to be truth was, after all, untruth. This openness of mind strengthens the truth in us."

Democracy presupposes freedom of thought. Of the fundamental rights of the individual, the right to freedom of thought and expression, in an ultimate as well as in an instrumental sense, is amongst the most essential basis. Gandhi accepted this liberal (in its original sense) view of democracy and fostered real freedom of thought in all his activities. But that was not the distinctive note of Gandhi in the history of political theory and action. What marked him off from other political theorists was his insistence on the means to arrive at Truth that is, to say, in the application of Satyagraha method. Self-suffering, he used to say, is the law of man as violence is the law of the brute. Civilization, he held, consists in the substitution of intolerance and violence by methods of toleration and persuasion wherever conflicts occur in human relations. (For the underlying principles of Satyagraha, see pp...). This attitude of toleration in human relations flows from his philosophical belief of Truth appearing in fragments. "The golden rule of conduct, therefore, is mutual toleration, seeing that we will never all think alike and we see Truth in fragment and from different angles of vision. Conscience is not the same thing for all. Whilst, therefore, it is a good guide for individual conduct, imposition of that conduct upon all will be an insufferable interference with everybody's freedom of conscience." 158 (cf: From Yerendra Handir, ch. on Truth, especially p.3., 1957 Edition). Method of persuasion and conversion that is the non-violent way, is the best way, so argued Gandhi, of attaining democracy.
Democracy to be genuine needs an appropriate mental climate of the citizens. Toleration of and respect for others' opinions help in the growth of such a climate. Gandhi pointed to that direction. As Prof. Himal Kumar Bose reminds us: "One of Gandhiji's greatest contributions to India has been this insistence upon the philosophical foundation of democracy." 3-59

This philosophical approach holds the key to an understanding of his concept of state being a secular one. 160 In his opinion, "The state should undoubtedly be secular. Everyone living in it should be entitled to profess his religion without let or hindrance, so long as the citizen obeyed the common law of the land." "If I were a dictator", he said in 1946, "religion and state would be separate. I swear by my religion. I will die for it. But it is my personal affair. The state has nothing to do with it... That is everybody's personal concern." He did not believe in state religion even though the whole community had one religion. He was opposed to state aid, partly or wholly, to religious bodies. This does not mean, Gandhi explained, that the state schools would not give ethical teaching. In his opinion, teaching of fundamental ethics is common to all religions. But the state cannot concern itself or cope with religious instruction. It is superfluous to add that by religion he meant denominational religion and not fundamental ethics which in his opinion, "is common to all religions."

Secularism as a concept is integrally related with democracy. Gandhi underlined the kernel of democracy by stressing on this aspect. Apparently this bears little significance. But a close examination will lead to a different conclusion. First, because of the obvious historic limitations imposed on India, the pattern of the development of modern Indian history did not resemble the classical democratic type; secondly, as a corollary to the same, the forces of obscurantism, social orthodoxy and communal reaction were firmly rooted in the body-politic. They had social base to stand upon. Sociologically speaking, the pre-capitalist values (in the classical sense) held sway over a large mass of the Indian people. Gandhi preached secularism at a period when the forces of
social back-log tried to thwart the course of national development on a democratic basis. His emphasis on the secular character of the State reflected the advanced opinion of the community or nation. His advocacy of the idea helped in accelerating the pace of national democratic development. Therein lies its significance.

Decentralization

Gandhi declared: "The end to be sought is human happiness combined with full mental and moral growth. I use the adjective moral as synonymous with spiritual. This end can be achieved under decentralization. Centralization as a system is inconsistent with non-violent structure of society." 161 Gandhi's opposition to Centralization was based on a fundamental ground. He held:

"Centralization cannot be sustained and defended without adequate force." 162 We have seen above that his programme was not power-maniac oriented; it was not, in his words, a 'drive for power' for it was his conviction that a 'skirmish for power' is 'ungainly' in the ultimate sense of investing the people with authority to shape their own destiny. Centralization leads to concentration of power in a few hands and that, in turn, robs the people of its supreme authority in the matter of determination of public issues. Not only that, in an over-Centralized State man loses his human dignity and becomes a cog in the wheel of vast and impersonal State machine. Man becomes de-personalized. His programme of 'generation of power', he hoped, would avoid the incompatibility of people's power with Centralized State power. That is why he laid much stress on Constructive Programme, *the modus operandi* of non-violent revolution. For him, democracy is "the art and science of mobilizing the entire physical, economic and spiritual resources of all the various sections of the people in the service of the common good of all." 163 In order to mobilize the total resources of the nation a sense of belongingness, on the part of the people, must be imparted and institutionally organized. Decentralization of power - economic and political - seemed to Gandhi, to be the antidote to the anomie that a
modern man, product of factory-civilization and vast state-complex, suffers from. He wanted to give a new direction to politics and for that he went to the roots. He believed that power to be effective and genuine, from the standpoint of the masses, must lie with the people which could only be possible in small communities of villages. "Society based on non-violence can only consist of groups settled in villages in which voluntary co-operation is the condition of dignified and peaceful existence." Hence he cried for Village Swaraj, Panchayati Raj or democracy from below.

The term 'Panchayat Raj' needs to be clarified since the employment of this and allied terms have been misunderstood in certain circles. A hasty and cursory glance at some of Gandhi's writings might suggest political reaction. As had been noted by a keen student of Gandhian political theory, his nostalgic recollections of India's past, coupled with his comments urging the rejection of aspects of modern technology, have led some observers to label Gandhi a traditionalist and a reaction-ary. But, she continues, "we find again and again Gandhi's use of the traditional to communicate new ideas, his use of phrases emerging out of established ways and familiar institutions to transmit newly created values." 165

What was the picture of rural democracy that Gandhi envisaged?

"My idea of village Swaraj is that it is a complete republic, independent of its neighbours for its own vital wants and yet interdependent for many others in which dependence is a necessity.

"The government of the village will be conducted by a Panchayat of five persons annually elected by the adult villagers, male and female, possessing minimum prescribed qualifications. These will have all the authority and jurisdiction required. Since there will be no system of punishments in the accepted sense, this Panchayat will be the legislature, judiciary and executive combined to operate for its year of office.

"Any village can become such a republic today without much interference, even from the present Government whose sole effective connection with the
villages is the exaction of village revenue. I have not examined here
the question of the relations with the neighbouring villages and the
centre if any. My purpose is to present an outline of village government.
Here there is perfect democracy based upon individual freedom. The in­
dividual is the architect of his own government. The law of non-violence
rules him and his government. He and his village are able to defy the
might of the world. For the law governing every villager is that he will
suffer death in the defence of his and his village's honour." 166
Conveying the same idea again, four years later in Harjian he wrote:
"In this structure composed of innumerable villages, there will be
over-widening, never ascending circles. Life will not be a pyramid with
the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose
centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the
latter ready to perish for the circle of the villages, till at last the
whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their
arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of
which they are integral units." 167
The plea for village Swaraj and Panchayat Raj, because of its traditional
association with the past, might suggest a call for going back to the olden
days. But did Gandhi advocate the literal revival of village panchayats? In his
romantic reaction against the modern civilization in Hind Swaraj he held that
in olden days the Indians enjoyed true Home Rule. 168 One may conclude from a
perfunctory reading of that book that he wanted to go back to that phase of
history. Gandhi himself said in 1939 that his was not an attempt to go back to
the ignorant, dark ages. 169 Now let us see for ourselves whether he wanted a
literal revival of ancient Indian village republics. To start with, it seems
doubtful that Gandhi had any systematic notion of the political and sociological
implications of the traditional village panchayat. 170 The historical record,
incomplete though it is, shows a range of variations in the manner of selection and operation of this institution. However, a few predominant elements stand out as characteristic of the ancient panchayat system. The village panchayat was traditionally organized with the group and not the individual as the unit. It was, in many respects, an extension of the Indian family system, and was strictly patriarchal in character. But Gandhi's concern, as we have seen above, was consistently for the individual. How, then, could he reconcile this position with that of the revival of the ancient panchayat? The answer is, we agree with Prof. Bondurant, that he did not. For the panchayat of his conception was very different from that typical of the ancient system. He drew upon his experience and knowledge of the institutions of Indian society for terms to express the concepts and objectives which emerged from his own 'experiments with truth'. The ancient panchayat was a patriarchal 'assemblage of co-proprietors', if Maine's account is to be taken note of, while Gandhi's village democracy 'will be based on individual freedom' with the annual election by all the adult villagers - male and female alike - as an instrumental right of the villagers. The contrast between the two is too glaring to need further elaboration.

Gandhi foresaw a decentralized Indian state where power was transformed into legitimate government. It may be noted in this connection that he illustrated his ideas about the decentralization of power when he led the struggle against foreign domination in 1920-22. The programme of non-co-operation with the administrative apparatus of the British government is too well known to be sketched here. In place of the bureaucratic state machinery he expected to establish a parallel state based on reconstituted village councils, a local system of native justice, and the national schools using Indian languages. He envisaged a radical shift, not one for mere change of personnel, but for a change of the system and the methods. These ideas underwent later reformulations in the context of attaining the immediate political objective in the form of constitutional democratic government. But he did not move away from the ideal
position so far as he himself was concerned. Rather it may be maintained that with the passage of years he inclined more towards a decentralised democracy based on the village unit.

Incidentally, his advocacy of decentralised political power has led a number of commentators to suggest that the core of his political thought is philosophical anarchism. Whether this suggestion is tenable or not shall be discussed in a subsequent section in detail. The relation of decentralization of power with anarchism may be a matter of opinion but it must be recognised that he clung to this idea till his last. About a month before his sudden assassination, Prof. S. N. Agarwal drew Gandhi's attention to the fact that the Draft Constitution for Free India did not make even a passing reference to the principle of decentralised democracy. Gandhi replied in the columns of the *Harijan* (21-12-47) observing:

"Principal Agarwal says that there is no mention or direction about Village Panchayats and decentralization in the foreshadowed Constitution. It is certainly an omission calling for immediate attention if our independence is to reflect the people's voice. The greater the power of the panchayats, the better for the people."

Decentralization of power meant, for Gandhi, greater freedom for the people. The problem of democracy is as L. T. Hobhouse said, "how to secure any expression of will from the ordinary man." Thus the elections under modern democracies are clearly incapable of securing. The vast State machinery does not favour the growth of a climate where the ordinary man can feel that he has something to contribute in public affairs. It is only in small communities that such participation can be envisaged. A host of modern western writers like Prof. Bryce, Prof. Cole, Prof. Joad, Aldous Huxley, Mannheim, Adams, Laski, Lewis Mumford, Sorokin, Arthur Morgan and others have expressed their opinion in favour of decentralization and devolution of power. Prof. Agarwal in *Gandhian Constitution for Free India*, which received the approval of Gandhi, has quoted many leading western authorities on this subject.
to establish the Gandhian formulation about decentralization of power.

Gandhi had another point to argue in favour of decentralization. In his opinion, "Rurally organized India will run less risk of foreign invasion than urbanized India, well equipped with military, naval and air forces." From the defence point of view, decentralization affords better protection against aerial attacks in these days of aerial bombardments.

To sum up. Democracy to be successful, in Gandhi's opinion, must be decentralized. Decentralization is necessary for the effective participation of the people in matters concerning themselves. It does not plead for atomistic existence; but for a life based on organization and interdependence, and if necessary, these should reach world-wide proportions. Such interdependence will be of a voluntary and cooperative character. Coercion of any variety will have no place in such a scheme. Individual freedom is sacrificed in a centralized, authoritarian state which can only be ensured in a decentralized polity.

One may acclaim the Gandhian thesis as the only sure panacea for the ills of over-centralization of power while another may reject the Gandhian scheme as 'conservative' in spirit. Examination of these views is a matter of detailed study and investigation. We are not going here to make a detailed survey of the arguments in favour of and against the Gandhian theory of decentralization and the means he advocated for attaining such a decentralized state. What is relevant here is that Gandhi being repelled at the sight of concentration of power in the hands of a few wanted to build up power on a new basis. His solution might have contained elements of non-feasible and impracticable utopianism; it might have betrayed lack of sociological appraisal of the problem of power. But the animus of his reaction against over-centralization and impersonalization of pyramid-structured state machinery bears relevance. The end of human happiness that the theory of decentralization advocates has an enduring appeal in the days when State has assumed the form of Leviathan.
On Nationalism and Internationalism

Louis Fischer says: "In modern times, the urge towards nationhood has been elemental, natural, and instinctive. Gandhi is the most forceful Indian exponent of this urge." Subjectively he incarnated the very spirit of nationalism, its profound indignation against foreign enslavement and heroic will and determination to end that enslavement. The consciousness of Gandhi was also completely free from even the faintest trace of provincial particularism or communalism. He was not a Gujarati or a Hindu but an Indian, a nationalist par excellence. But his concept of nationalism had a wider connotation. In our earlier discussion of his concept of Swaraj, we have seen that his nationalism embraced and emphasised the interest of the masses as opposed to the classes. In the discussion to follow we shall see that the nationalist Gandhi did not preach jingo nationalism. On the other hand, he tried to lead India away from the path of narrow and exclusivist nationalism into a recognition of her duty as a member of the international fraternity of nations based on interdependence as a recognised principle of public life.

Gandhi's early introduction to nationalism, in the main a western ideology, was evident during his stay in London. It seems quite likely that Gandhi, who was born in an age in India when nationalism swept the imagination of the advanced and educated sections of the population, was influenced by it to some extent in his younger days. But his nationalism effectively dates from his South Africa days when he actually experienced the humiliation of racial discrimination. His nationalist feelings developed since his arrival in India in 1915. Intimate contact with the suffering millions of India made him a staunch opponent of foreign slavery and an ardent nationalist. The most remarkable thing that one finds is that his philosophy of nationalism was not based upon race hatred and chauvinistic feelings. It was his genius to blend nationalism with internationalism. His patriotism transcended geographical frontiers and was conterminus with humanity.

In 1921 he wrote:

"For me patriotism is the same as humanity. I am patriotic because I am
human and humane. It is not exclusive. I will not hurt England or Germany to serve India. Imperialism has no place in my scheme of life. The law of a patriot is not different from that of a patriarch. And a patriot is so much the less patriot if he is a lukewarm humanitarian. There is no conflict between
private and political law." 180

In his famous article 'The Great Sentinel' he wrote:

"Indian nationalism is not exclusive, nor aggressive, nor destructive. It is health-giving, religious and therefore humanitarian." 181

Similarly he wrote in 1924:

"I live for India's freedom and would die for it, because it is part of Truth. Only a free India can worship the true God. I work for India's freedom because my Swadeshi teaches me that being born in it and having inherited her culture, I am fittest to serve her and she has a prior claim to my service. But my patriotism is not exclusive; it is calculated not only not to hurt another nation but to benefit all in the true sense of the word. India's freedom as conceived by me can never be a menace to the world." 182

The following is a graphic description of nationalism as conceived by Gandhi.

To quote him:

"We want freedom for our country, but not at the expense or exploitation of others, not so as to degrade other countries. I do not want the freedom of India if it means the extinction of England or the disappearance of Englishmen. I want the freedom of my country so that other countries may learn something from my free country, so that the resources of my country might be utilized for the benefit of mankind. Just as the cult of patriotism teaches us today that the individual has to die for the family, the family has to die for the village, the village for the district, the district for the province, and province for the country, even so, a country has to be free in order that it may die, if necessary, for the benefit of
the world. *My love therefore of nationalism, or my idea of nationalism, is
that my country may become free, that if need be, the whole country may die,
so that the human races may live. There is no room for race-hatred there.
Let that be our nationalism." 183 (emphasis added),

In 1925 he wrote:

"I want India's rise so that the whole world may benefit. I do not
want India to rise on the ruin of other nations." 184

"I do want to think in terms of the whole world. My patriotism includes
the service of humanity.

"I would like to see India free and strong so that she may offer herself
as a willing and pure sacrifice for the betterment of the world." 185
(emphasis added)

Speaking of his mission he said in 1924:

"My mission is not merely brotherhood of Indian humanity. My mission is
donely freedom of India, though today it undoubtedly engrosses practi­
cally the whole of my time. But through realization of freedom of India I
hope to realize and carry on the mission of the brotherhood of man. My
patriotism is not an exclusive thing. It is all-embracing and I should re­
ject that patriotism which sought to mount upon the distress or exploitation
of other nationalities. The conception of my patriotism is nothing if it is
not always, in every case without exception, consistent with the broadest

* Gandhi used to quote with approval a verse from Hitopadesha (Vikratalaka, Verse 115). "For the sake of the family, forsake the individual; for the sake of the village, forsake the family; for the sake of the country, forsake the village;
and for the sake of the soul, forsake the whole world." This verse is also
recorded in the ancient collection of moral instructions associated with the
name of Chanakya; and thus formed part of India's traditional heritage. "It is
interesting", comments Prof. Kimal Kumar Bose, "that Gandhi utilized the
verse and gave it a completely new meaning." -
good of humanity at large." 186 (emphasis added)

In 1931 he remarked:

"Our nationalism can be no peril to other nations in as much as we will exploit none, just as we will allow none to exploit. Through Swaraj we will serve the whole world." 187

Similarly he wrote in 1933:

"I am a humble servant of India and in trying to serve India, I serve humanity at large. ... After nearly 50 years of public life, I am able to say that today my faith in the doctrine that the service of one's nation is not inconsistent with the service of the world has grown. It is a good doctrine. Its acceptance alone will ease the situation in the world and stop the mutual jealousies between nations inhabiting this globe of ours." 188

He told Louis Fischer in June, 1942:

"For the time being, India disappears from my gaze. I never wanted independence for India's sake alone. I never wished to play the role of frog-in-the-well." 189

For Gandhi, there was no antithesis between nationalism and internationalism. He did not preach abstract internationalism. He knew that one must be a good nationalist in order to become a true internationalist. He explained in his writings that there could be no genuine international co-operation without national independence. In 1925 he wrote:

"It is impossible for one to be internationalist without being a nationalist. Internationalism is possible only when nationalism becomes a fact, *

i.e. when peoples belonging to different countries have organized themselves and are able to act as one man. It is not nationalism that is evil, it is the narrowness, selfishness, exclusiveness which is the bane of modern nations which is evil. Each wants to profit at the expense of, and rise on the ruins of, the other. Indian nationalism has struck a different path. It wants to organize itself or to find full self-expression for the benefit and service of humanity at large. ... God having cast my lot in the midst of the people of India, I should be untrue to my Maker if I failed to serve them. If I do not know how to serve them I shall never know how to serve humanity. And I cannot possibly go wrong so long as I do not harm other nations in the act of serving my country." 190

Again in 1931:

"You want co-operation between nations for the salvaging of civilization. I want it too, but co-operation presupposes free nations worthy of cooperation. If I am to help in creating or restoring peace and goodwill and resist disturbances thereof, I must have the ability to do so and I cannot do so unless my country has come to its own. At the present moment, the very movement for freedom in India is India's contribution to peace. For so long as India is a subject nation, not only is she a danger to peace, but also England which exploits India. Other nations may tolerate today England's imperialist policy and her exploitation of other nations, but they certainly do not appreciate it; and they would gladly help in the prevention of England becoming a greater and greater menace every day. Of course you will say that India free can become a menace herself. But let us assume that she will behave herself with her doctrine of non-violence, if she achieves her freedom through it and for all her bitter experiences of being a victim of exploitation." 191

Co-operation of subject India with the Allies during World War II was a pesteroous proposition. Gandhi, though an ardent advocate of international
collaboration and co-operation, minced no words in reminding Louis Fischer that "to collaborate we must be free. Slaves do not fight for freedom." 192

Gandhi fought and led the nation for national freedom but, as has been seen above from his own writings, he did not advocate for an isolated independent existence. In fact, his stress was on a 'federation of friendly interdependent states' and as national independence was the pre-condition for such an existence, he waged battle against foreign domination.

As early as 1924 he wrote:

"Isolated independence is not the goal of the world States. It is voluntary interdependence." 193

Again in the same year:

"The better mind of the world desires today not absolutely independent states warring one against another, but a federation of friendly interdependent states. The consummation of that event may be far off. I want to make no grand claim for our country. But I see nothing grand or impossible about our expressing our readiness for universal interdependence rather than independence. I desire the ability to be totally independent without asserting the independence." 194

Similarly he told a gathering in Bombay in 1931:

"My notion of Purna Swaraj is not isolated independence but healthy and dignified interdependence. My nationalism, fierce though it is, is not exclusive, not designed to harm any nation or individual. Legal maxims are not so legal as they are moral. I believe in the eternal truth of 'sic utere tuo ut alienum non loedas.'" 195

In a letter to Jawaharlal dated 14 September, 1933, he wrote as follows:

"For have I the slightest difficulty in agreeing with you that in these days of rapid intercommunication and a growing consciousness of the oneness of all mankind, we must recognize that our nationalism must not be inconsistent with progressive internationalism. India cannot stand in isolation and
unaffected by what is going on in other parts of the world. I can, therefore, go the whole length with you and say that 'we should range ourselves with the progressive forces of the world.' 196

He again asserted this principle of international co-operation and solidarity in 1939:

"A free democratic India will gladly associate herself with other free nations for mutual defence against aggression and for economic co-operation. She will work for the establishment of a real world order based on freedom and democracy, utilizing the world's knowledge and resources for the progress and advancement of humanity." 197

It may be recalled here that the democratic world federation he visualized could only be raised on the foundation of non-violence. (See p. [194]) He envisaged the establishment of a world federation as the necessary condition for world peace.

In a letter dated Sevagram, 28-7-48 addressed to Maurice Frydman who was very much interested in the idea of world federation, Gandhi wrote:

"I told you that I was one with you and that I was trying to take the Congress and everybody towards world federation. I also told you if it ever comes, it will come through Sevagram or the Sevagram way. I want Free India, too, for that purpose. If I can get freedom for India through non-violent means, power of non-violence is firmly established, empire idea dissolves and the world-state takes its place in which all the states of the world are free and equal, no state has its military. There may be a world police to keep order in the absence of universal belief in non-violence." 198

In 1947 Gandhi said in reply to a question that the only condition on which could the world live was that it should be united under one Central Governing body composed of representatives of the component parts. 199
"I would not like to live in this world if it is not to be one world." I would certainly like to see that dream realised in my lifetime," Gandhi declared in Inter-Asian Relations Conference held in the last week of March, 1947. He urged, "If you work with a fixed determination, there is no doubt that in our own generation we will realise this dream." 200

Gandhi's intense nationalism or the concept of Swadeshi fitted in quite well with his one-world idea. He repeatedly asserted that the concept of Swadeshi was not based on narrow exclusivism. The spirit of sacrifice underlying Swadeshi should go beyond a man's own community and should embrace the whole of humanity. He believed in the truth implicitly that a man could serve his neighbours and humanity at the same time, the condition being that the service of the neighbours was in no way selfish or exclusive i.e. did not in any way involve the exploitation of any other human being. 201

Gandhi discussed the reason why Swadeshi, which he called "the mea sacra of universal service" 202 implies preference for the nearest and the immediate. One may refer to From Yerawda Mandir for a clearer exposition of the doctrine of Swadeshi. Swadeshi recognises the scientific limitation of human capacity for service. 203 Thus understood, Swadeshi serves the cause of international brotherhood.

Gandhi's fundamental religious belief that all are equal before God explains to an extent why he adhered to the concept of human brotherhood as opposed to national exclusivism. In the memorable article 'The Doctrine of The Sword',

---

* Gandhi told Prof. Catlin in 1946 that there could be no "one world" unless it were founded upon union in respect for truth and ahimsa. - See George Catlin, In The Path of Mahatma Gandhi (Macdonald & Co., (Publishers) Ltd., London, 1948), p. 281.
Candhi wrote: "My religion has no geographical limits. If I have a living faith in it, it will transcend my love for India herself." 204 There is no limit to extending our services to our neighbours across State-made frontiers. God never made those frontiers." 205 This statement made in 1931 is not just a cobbled-out isolated statement to prove our point that Gandhi's supreme concern was humanity at large. In 1947 on the eve of independence he was asked the question, 'If a neighbouring state is in want, what should Free India do?' His categorical answer was that a truly independent India was bound to run to the help of its neighbours in distress. 206

Speaking of Gandhi's concept of nationalism and internationalism, Dr. Dhirendra Mohan Datta observes: "Indian nationalism drew its inspiration from the dominant Indian belief in the fundamental unity of humanity in spite of its diversity, and the consequent belief in the reasonableness of human equality. So nationalism logically led on to internationalism. Love of man impelled Gandhi to be both a rationalist and an internationalist." 207 While we express our complete agreement with Dr. Datta where he ascribes humanism to be the motive force of Gandhi's rationalism and internationalism, we fail to persuade ourselves to accept the earlier portion of his statement as valid where he analyses the source of Indian rationalism. Indian rationalism is a modern phenomenon. It came into being during the British period as a result of the action and interaction of numerous subjective and objective forces and factors which developed within the Indian society under conditions of the British rule and the impact of world forces. 208

As Asoka Mehta and Achyut Patwardhan argue:

"...a historical approach is necessary, for history is to a student of politics what a laboratory is to a man of science. It provides him a frame of reference with which to test the validity of political ideas. From history then we have to find out how and at what time the group-feeling..."
called nationality first—become conscious and vocal. We have, for instance, in Atharva Veda, which even at the lowest estimate is 4,000 years old, the famous Prithvi Sukta or hymns of praise and gratitude to Mother Earth. The content of some of these hymns is strikingly similar to that of some of the modern national anthems. But will that justify us in attributing a feeling of nationality to the Aryan Mahis who sang these hymns? Certainly not, for it would be absurd to call this simple love of Mother Earth patriotism or attribute any national feeling to it." 209

Besides his deep religious convictions and natural humanism, the advanced thought-currents and objective forces helped to mould Gandhi's ideas about nationalism and internationalism. His idea of internationalism was not to be viewed merely as a projection of his advaita faith; it was there but the political aspect should not be lost sight of. We find him to recognise the essential political bearing of the problem of internationalism and world order. It was his genius that he could intergrate his philosophical faith with political acumen.

His native sense of realism enabled him to discover the mutual interconnection between creative nationalism and genuine internationalism. The goal remaining the establishment of world brotherhood, he realized that slaves had no place in that fraternity. As early as 1909 he could assert: "Slaves ourselves, it would be a mere pretension to think of freeing others." 210 As a practical politician, he did not think it worth while to mouth fashionable phrases of internationalism but he moved in the direction of an international order of free nations by working for the establishment of a free and democratic India. It was his earnest belief that India could further the interests of internationalism only by freeing herself from the shackles of bondage. That is why he devoted almost all his energy and time for the attainment of freedom of his country. As he himself said, his patriotism was both exclusive and inclusive, exclusive in the sense that he confined his attention to the land of his birth,
but inclusive in the sense that his nationalism was not of competitive and antagonistic nature. For Gandhi, nationalism was not an end in itself but a stage, though a necessary one, in the political evolution of man. One may find parallels between Gandhi's and Mazzini's ideas about nationalism. 211 "God", Mazzini used to say, "has engraved a message on the cradle of every nation which it has to give to the world." His nationalism was not exclusive; it was informed with a moral purpose. It had meaning as a new "tie" for humanity and the emphasis was always on its "fraternal and liberal development." 212 In the name of nationality itself he denounced the narrow spirit of nationalism and "the stupid presumption on the part of each people that they are capable of solving the political, social and economic problems alone; and their forgetfulness of the great truth that the cause of the peoples is one." 213 One may also recall that Gandhi felt himself closer to Mazzini's concept of independence. (See Hind Swaraj)

Nationalism carried a distinct meaning for Gandhi; it could enlist his allegiance only when its political and moral boundaries were conterminous.

Sandhi's attitude towards Imperialism and Fascism

It was in the heyday of nationalism that Mazzini came forward. But the later history of nationalism in Europe records that it had degenerated into a cult of self-aggrandizement. In countries which had already developed into nation-states, the economic development made liberalism an inadequate creed. It had either to broaden internally - by extending democracy from political rights to economic freedom of the masses - into social democracy, or expand externally as imperialism.

There was thus a duality in nationalism. The Western States sought a solution in imperial adventure. As J. A. Hobson records in his pioneer study Imperialism (1902), Great Britain set out its sail 'in forcing bad markets and finding speculative fields of investment in distant corners of the earth, adding millions of square miles and of unassimilable population to the area of the Empire.' Imperialism, tied to the politics of power and profit, created international rivalries and the constant threat of war. 214 The corollary of which was militarism. And
militarism negated the political and social gains of democracy.

Gandhi experienced this transformation of nationalism into imperialism. As is well known, he led the greatest battle against the mightiest empire. We shall not engage ourselves in outlining the role he played in that battle but to make a study how his ideas evolved from belief in its progressive character to criticism of its motives and rejection of its results.

Gandhi recorded in his Autobiography that during his student days in London he developed the habit of reading newspapers like The Daily Telegraph, The Daily News, and The Pall Mall Gazette. The last named daily was independent under the editorship of William T. Stead and then Edward T. Cook during Gandhi's London phase, its policy adhered to J. R. Seeley's conception of the civilizing role of imperialism throughout the world. For the following score of years Gandhi, too, was attached to this view of the empire. In the first decade and a half of his South African phase, he was generally loyal to the British Empire. In the preamble declaration of Gandhi's Indian Opinion we read:

"The Policy of the paper would be to advocate the cause of the British Indians in this sub-continent. But while it would insist upon the rights of the community, it would not be slow to point out to its responsibilities also as members of a mighty empire. It would persistently endeavour to bring about a proper understanding between the two communities which Providence has brought together under one flag." 216

Speaking of 'Ourselves' the same issue carried the editorial note to the effect that "there is nothing in our programme but a desire to promote harmony and good-will between the different sections of the one mighty Empire." 217

He had warm praise for British justice. In an article in Indian Opinion entitled "A well-deserved Victory" dated 14-5-1904 he wrote:

"In British Dominions, no matter how high preju...
always a haven of safety in the highest Courts of Justice." 218

Appealing to the Potchefstroom Vigilants to desist from violence and incitement, he wrote:

"The history of British rule is the history of constitutional evolution. Under the British flag, respect for the law has become a part of the nature of the people." ("The Potchefstroom Vigilants and British Indians" in *Indian Opinion*, 24-12-1904) 219

The strain of racial discrimination practised by the colonialists in South Africa had its impact on his mind. Gandhi's faith in the civilizing mission of empire received a serious jolt. To him, imperialism appeared as a concomitant of western industrial civilization. "Let us pray", he wrote in the conclusion of his paraphrase of Ruskin's *Unto This Last*, "that India is saved from the fate that has overtaken Europe, where the nations are poised for an attack on one another, and are silent only because of the stockpiling of armaments. Someday there will be an explosion, and then Europe will be a veritable hell on earth. Non-white races are looked upon as legitimate prey by every European state. What else can we expect where covetousness is the ruling passion in the breasts of men?" 220 We see Gandhi, at this period, growing alive to the nature of European economic penetration. India provided the classic example. About the British East India Company he wrote in *Hind Swaraj*:

"That corporation was versed alike in commerce and war. It was unhampered by questions of morality. Its object was to increase its commerce and to make money.... To protect the latter it employed an army....

"Napoleon is said to have described the English as a nation of shopkeepers. It is a fitting description. They hold whatever dominions they have for the sake of their commerce. Their army and their navy are intended to protect it.... They wish to convert the whole world into a vast market for their goods." 221

During the First World War Gandhi had placed a moratorium on his criticisms of imperialism and militarism. But from 1920 onwards full-throated denunciation of
British imperialism marked his political career.

Replying to his alleged inconsistency he wrote in Young India (17-11-21):

"I know now, that I was wrong in thinking that I was a citizen of the empire. But on those occasions (Gandhi's service during Boer War, Zulu 'rebellion', raising ambulance corps in London in 1914 and enlistment of recruits during world war I - BB.) I did honestly believe that in spite of the many disabilities that my country was labouring under, it was making its way towards freedom, and that on the whole the Government from the popular standpoint was not wholly bad and that the British administrators were honest though insular and dense. Holding that view, I set about doing that an ordinary Englishman would do in the circumstances. I was not wise or important enough to take independent action. I had no business to judge or scrutinize ministerial decisions with the solemnity of a tribunal. I did not impute malice to the ministers either at the time of the Boer War, the Zulu revolt or the late war. I did not consider Englishmen nor do I now consider them as particularly bad or worse than other human beings. I considered and still consider them as capable of high motives and actions as any other body of men and equally capable of making mistakes. I therefore felt that I sufficiently discharged my duty as a man and a citizen by offering my humble services to the Empire in the hour of its need whether local or general.

The whole situation is now changed for me. My eyes, I fancy, are opened. Experience has made me wiser. I consider the existing system of Government to be wholly bad and requiring special national effort to end or mend it. It does not possess within itself capacity for self-improvement. That I still believe many English administrators to be honest does not assist me, because I consider them to be as blind and deluded as I was myself. Therefore I can take no pride in calling the..."
empire mine or describing myself as a citizen. On the contrary, I fully
realize that I am a pariah, untouchable of the empire. I must therefore
constantly pray for its radical reconstruction or total destruction.... 222

The excerpt is given above in extenso for it lays bare the evolution of his
idea about the British empire.

Another significant document that explains his evolution from 'a staunch
loyalist and co-operator' to an uncompromising disaffectionist and non-co-operator
is his written statement before the Court in the historic trial (March, 1922). 223

In 1929 in an article in Young India he indicted exploitive colonialism as
the first cause of the war. "Is not the prime cause of modern wars the inhuman
race for exploitation of the so-called weaker races of the earth ?" 224 While
taking to an American interviewer in 1940, he asked : "Why is there the war today,
if it is not for the satisfaction of the desire to share the spoils ?" 225 However,
Gandhi distinguished between the imperialism which he criticised scathingly and
its agents who administered the decisions of imperial government. For he regarded
man above institutions and he believed in the redemption of man. (For Gandhi's views
on the subject, see ch. on Human Nature).

Gandhi held that imperialism had its origin in man's covetousness or greed.
This might have been due to influence of the Upanishadic tradition that he inheri-
ted. The parallel is to be found in Tagore who held that greed was the seed of
all that polluted the sense of human unity. Dr. Paul F. Power observes in this
connection:

"As to Gandhi's economic interpretation of imperialism emphasizing the
greed of men, such an analysis overlooks the motivating factors of prestige
and adventure which have been significant in the history of Western
colonialism. It should be noted also that Gandhi's economic critique of
imperialism is non-Marxist in origins, tracing back to the influences of
Naroki, Ruskin, Gokhale and Tolstoy. He seldom indicted capitalism as much
for sustaining imperialism as have Marxists drawing from Lenin's *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism.*

While it is true that Gandhi's ideas about imperialism and economic drain of national wealth were to a great extent influenced by the above-mentioned thinkers but it cannot be said for certain that 'he seldom indicted capitalism as such for sustaining imperialism.' Gandhi, it is true, did not systematically analyse the social roots of imperialism as was done by Lenin. He was not built up that way. But his unerring insight penetrated into the social basis of imperialism as can be illustrated from his interview to an American Friend wherein he said that 'your country is owned by a few capitalist owners.' (See Section on Democracy, p. ?? for the excerpt quoted) In our discussion on Gandhi's critique of Western democracy, we have seen that he charged capitalist democracies for expansionism. And what else is imperialism but loot of markets and financial investment outside one's own country. And further, 'prestige and adventure' might have played part in the history of western colonialism but in our opinion, 'the motivating factors' were in essence economic. The factors of 'prestige and adventure' were ostensible and those sentiments were called forth to put a covering on the sordid aspect of the whole thing. Whether one agrees or not with Gandhi's analysis of imperialism and his suggested solution 'for the liquidation of the same, it cannot be gainsaid that he grasped the nature of the phenomenon. This unprejudiced comprehension, we are sure, was not a product of a theoretical analysis but he arrived at the truth from his experience. His method, it may be said once again, was empiric.

Italian Fascism and German National Socialism were the clearest expression of the autocratic and intolerant nationalism. The whole philosophy of Nazism and Fascism was based on the premise of the sacrifice of the individual at the altar of the nation or the State. "Fascism", said Hitler in a speech delivered on 10 March, 1933, "is against individualist abstractions founded on a materialist
basis of the type of the 18th century. It is not the individual but the nation which is at the centre of the Law. The merging of the individual into the nation was one of the outstanding characteristics of totalitarian nationalism. As has been said, Hegel's Absolute State and Bismarckian nationalism culminated in modern totalitarianism. Jingo nationalism believed that violence was the *ultima ratio* of human endeavour.

We have seen above that Gandhi had strong repulsions against aggressive nationalism based on force and as could be expected he denounced Nazism and Fascism in no uncertain terms.

On his way back from Round Table Conference while he paid a visit to Rome, Gandhi called on Mussolini. The Fascist dictator asked Gandhi whether he expected to win independence for India through non-violence and what he thought of the Fascist state which he had built. With disconcerting frankness, Gandhi told Mussolini that he was only building a house of cards. Gandhi was not at all impressed by the dictator's personality: "His eyes are never still." Gandhi censured Fascism within his anti-colonialism. The *Diary of Mahadev Desai* records (entry dated May 27, 1932):

"Fascist propaganda is being carried on even in England. There are some Fascists in Parliament, and that Winston Churchill is a great admirer of Mussolini's." 229

In 1938, Gandhi denounced the militarist philosophy of Hitler and Mussolini:

"The philosophy for which the two dictators stand calls it cowardice to shrink from carnage. They exhaust the resources of poetic art in order to glorify organized murder.... They are ever ready for war." 230

In another article entitled 'How to combat Hitlerism', dated June 18, 1940 he wrote:

* This refers to Oswald Mosley, British Fascist leader.
Whatever there Hitler may ultimately prove to be, we know what Hitlerian has come to mean. It means naked ruthless force to an exact science and worked with scientific precision. 231

Gandhi considered violence as a transitory phenomenon corrected by non-violent resistance. While explaining his weapon of violence to two Negro visitors in 1937, Gandhi told them: "A violent man's activity is most visible, while it lasts. But it is always transitory. Hitler and Mussolini on the one hand and Stalin on the other are able to show immediate effectiveness of violence. But it will be an transitory as that of Jhenghis's slaughter." 232

Despite the worst demonstration of naked violence of Fascism and Nazi tyranny, Gandhi did not lose his faith in the redemptive nature of man. He told a delegation of Christian leaders in December, 1938: "... belief in non-violence is based on the assumption that the human nature in its essence is one and, therefore, unfailingly responds to the advances of love." 233

The belief that powerful dictators are not beyond redemption is to be found in Gandhi's letter to Hitler dated Abbotabad, 23 July, 1939: "It is quite clear that you are today the one person in the world who can prevent a war which may reduce humanity to the savage state. Must you pay that price for an object however worthy it may appear to you to be? Will you listen to the appeal of one who has deliberately shunned the method of war not without considerable success? Anyway, I anticipate your forgiveness, if I have erred in writing to you." 234

"This manslaughter must be stopped. You are losing; if you persist it will only result in greater bloodshed," Gandhi wrote about May 1940 to Lord Linlithgow, the then Viceroy of India, concerning the war. "Hitler is not a bad man. If you will call it off today, he will follow suit. If you want to send me to Germany or anywhere else, I am at your disposal. You can also inform the Cabinet about this." 235

Gandhi addressed a second letter to Hitler, dated Wardha, December, 24th., 1941.
Needless to say, the Censor intervened and he was not allowed to publish it, nor presumably did it ever reach Hitler. He had intended to address a joint appeal to Hitler and Mussolini and he expressed hope that Mussolini would take the letter as addressed to him also with the necessary changes. He wrote:

"We have no doubt about your bravery or devotion to your Fatherland, nor do we believe that you are the monster described by your opponents. But your own writings and pronouncements and those of your friends and admirers leave no room for doubt that many of your acts are monstrous and unbecoming of human dignity especially in the estimation of men like me who believe in universal friendliness." He continued to add: "We resist British imperialism no less than Nazism. If there is a difference, it is in degree. One fifth of the human race has been brought under the British heel by means that will not bear scrutiny. Our resistance to it does not mean harm to the British people. We seek to convert them, not to defeat them on the battlefield. Ours is an unarmed revolt against the British rule. ... We know what the British heel means for us and the non-European races of the world. But we would never wish to end British rule with German aid." After elaborating upon his doctrine of non-violent resistance he appealed to Hitler "in the name of humanity to stop the war." This letter indicates that, as in relation to British imperialism, he regarded man as above the system he upholds.

At times Gandhi's view of fascism was a paradoxical mixture of appreciation and criticism. "It is not that people would necessarily be unhappy under fascism," he said in 1934. "We may leave aside Hitler, but under Mussolini Italy is certainly better off than before. Some of the public utility works undertaken there are commendable. The standard of living has improved. But what does it all avail? There is no freedom there. Whoever dares to oppose Mussolini's policy invites death. And now even killing has become unnecessary. People have adapted themselves to the new condition and are content with it. He has done the
work more cleverly than Hitler." 238 Another mixed comment is to be found in
his article 'How to combat Hitlerism' referred to above. * They (the Germans)
will honour Hitler as a genius, as a brave man, as a matchless organizer, and
much more. But I should hope that the Germans of the future will have learnt
the art of discrimination even about their heroes."*

In the same letter, he urged upon the victims of Nazi oppression to defeat
Hitlerism not with counter-Hitlerism but by organizing non-violent defence and
he fervently hoped that the moral force of non-violence would ultimately

Though Gandhi knew that the basis of imperialism, Nazism and Fascism was
rooted in violence and that there was no qualitative difference between these
systems; if there was a difference, the difference was only in degree. But as he
said in 1939, his sympathies were wholly with the Allies 239 which did not
mean endorsement, in any shape or form, of the doctrine of the sword for the
defence of even proved right. 240 His attitude in relation to the Second World
War speaks of the evolving pattern of his pacifism.

Gandhi's attitude towards war: A pacifist?

The famous German General Clausewitz told long ago that 'war is the con-

"Humanitarian opposition to the brutalities and carnage which wars entail
and aversion to the horrors of personal participation in battle are potent
motivations for pacifism." - Norman Angell in Encyclopaedia of The Social Sciences
vol. XI, p. 528.
unjust. Was Gandhi a pacifist in the popular or accepted meaning of the term?

Acharya Kripalani says: "Gandhiji was not a pacifist in the accepted sense of the term." 241 Prof. Tsurumi says: "Gandhiji was not a mere lover of peace, justice and human compassion, but he was ... a militant pacifist of outstanding courage and fearlessness." 242 The Rev. Jack C. Winslow calls Gandhi's pacifism 'aggressive'. 243 Unlike the Conservatives who are often seekers for peace rather than truth, Gandhi consistently held that truth, not peace, is the ultimate good. Further, he was the nationalist leader par excellence as we have seen earlier. The demands of his nationalism upon his idealism explain why he did not or could not apply the standards of absolute pacifism persistently. For these reasons his opinions about the character of war sometimes differ from those of Western pacifists who hold that in every respect war is the negation of justice. 244

One notices, interestingly enough, an evolution of Gandhi's ideas about war. Dr. Paul F. Power observes: "Rather vexingly, Gandhi's ideas about war cut across unqualified pacifism, conditional pacifism and patriotic realism. Divergent and sometimes conflicting positions can be traced throughout most of the years of his public career, although one may dominate the others during particular phases." 245 We shall try to give a brief outline of his views about war within a chronological framework.

The first military conflict that Gandhi encountered was the Boer War (1899). His loyalty to the Empire drove him to side with the British in that war. He felt that, if he demanded rights as a British citizen, it was also his duty, as such, to participate in the defence of the British Empire. He held then that India could achieve her complete emancipation only within and through the British Empire. 246 We have seen above that his evaluation of the Empire changed with the times and he admitted that he was wrong in thinking that he was a citizen of the Empire. One must bear in mind that at this time though he was inclining towards it, he had not yet made non-violence a fundamental ethical principle.
His attention was upon fear, which is incompatible with self-respect, and must be got rid of. Obviously service in the Boer War was part of his campaign of inspiring the Indian community with courage, discipline and enterprise, and no doubt in that respect it was valuable. 247

During the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), Indian Opinion adopted an editorial policy in admiration of the 'epic heroism' of the Japanese. The journal urged upon the South African Indians to 'emulate to some extent at least the example of Japan'. Having eulogised Japan's 'bravery and sagacity', Gandhi's paper welcomed the war's end and hoped that in the future nations would use pacific means to settle their differences. 248

One may infer that Indian Opinion took the position it did partly because Britain then supported Japan as a deterrent against Russian expansion in Asia, and partly because nationalists were enthusiastic about Japan contesting a Western power. 249 It may be recalled here that the victory of Japan over Russia in 1905 was hailed in India as "the dawn of a new era for the whole of Asia". Incidentally, Tolstoy wrote bitterly against Russia concerning the Russo-Japanese War. We find Gandhi, during the Russo-Japanese War, to indicate his belief that in war one side can possess justice and that a positive good can emerge from war. He did so while maintaining that peace is superior to war.

Gandhi's participation in the Zulu 'rebellion' in 1906 was dictated by his 'genuine sense of loyalty' though he had doubts about the 'rebellion' itself. 250 Indian Opinion made a special appeal to the white colonists "to make use of, for purposes of war, one hundred thousand Indians who are perfectly loyal, and who are capable of good training." 251 Gandhi's desire to earn status and respect for his countrymen through wartime service was implicit in his paper's policy.

The Zulu 'rebellion' was an eye-opener to Gandhi. He saw the naked atrocities of the Whites against the sons of the soil. The racialist policy pursued
by the colonists set him thinking in terms anew. His disillusionment with British imperialism developed as we have seen earlier in a discussion of his views on imperialism. "The British Government in India," he wrote in his English preface to Indian Home Rule, "constitutes a struggle between the Modern Civilisation, which is the Kingdom of Satan, and the Ancient Civilisation, which is the Kingdom of God. The one is the God of War, the other is the God of Love." He indicted modern civilization as one "grown as terrible as a wolf through its hunger for wealth and its greedy pursuit of worldly pleasures." During this phase he considered war as a degrading and brutalizing instrument of politics and commended self-suffering as a superior weapon of resolving conflicts.

When the World War I broke out, Gandhi raised recruits in India as well as he raised an ambulance corps in London in 1914. He faced a spiritual dilemma at that time. As a matter of fact, he recorded in his Autobiography, the very same line of argument that persuaded him to take part in the Boer War had weighed with him on that occasion. It was quite clear to him that participation in war could never be consistent with ahimsa. But he thought that England's need should not be turned into Indians' opportunity and he had hoped to improve his status and that of his people through the British Empire. In a letter to the Viceroy, April 30, 1918, Gandhi wrote:

"I recognize that in the hour of its danger we must give, as we have decided to give, ungrudging and unequivocal support to the empire of which we aspire in the near future to be partners in the same sense as the dominions overseas. But it is the simple truth that our response is due to the expectation that our goal will be reached all the more speedily." Another added reason was that while he was in England in 1914, he enjoyed the protection of the British fleet; consequently he had felt obligated to the process of potential violence and impelled to pay his debt by service in the
Some pacifists criticized him for having participated in the Boer, Zulu and the Great European War. The main charges were that he deviated from the strict principle of ahimsa and he preferred expediency and subordinated principle to the interests of the former. In an article in Young India dated 17-11-21, he himself posed the question: "What was my duty as an out-and-out believer in the religion of ahimsa—non-violence?"

"My conception of ahimsa impels me always to dissociate myself from almost every one of the activities I am engaged in. My soul refuses to be satisfied so long as it is a helpless witness of a single wrong or a single misery. But it is not possible for me, a weak frail, miserable being, to mend every wrong or to hold myself free of blame for all the wrong I see. The spirit in me pulls one way, the flesh in me pulls in the opposite direction...."  

"I was again an ordinary citizen no wiser than my fellows, myself believing in ahimsa and the rest not believing in it at all but refusing to do their duty of assisting the Government because they were actuated by anger and malice. They were refusing out of their ignorance and weakness. As a fellow worker, it became my duty to guide them aright. I therefore placed before them their clear duty, explained the doctrine of ahimsa to them and let them make their choice which they did. For under Swaraj too I would not hesitate to advise those who would bear arms to do so and fight for the country." 257

In Autobiography we read:

"All of us recognized the immorality of war. ... It was quite clear to me that participation in war could never be consistent with ahimsa. But it is not always given to one to be equally clear about one's duty. A votary of truth is often obliged to grope in the dark." 258
Then again,

"When two nations are fighting, the duty of a votary of ahimsa is to stop the war. He who is not equal to that duty, he who has no power of resisting war, he who is not qualified to resist war, may take part in war, and yet whole-heartedly try to free himself, his nation and the world from war." 259

One critic alleged that his conduct in World War I had violated his interpretation of the Gita which says that we should never act with a view to the fruits of our action. To this Gandhi replied:

"The verse referred to from the Gita has a double meaning. One is that there should be no selfish purpose behind our actions. That of gaining Swaraj is not selfish purpose. Secondly, to be detached from fruits of actions is not to be ignorant of them, or to disregard or disown them. To be detached is never to abandon action because the contemplated result may follow. On the contrary, it is proof of immovable faith in the certainty of the contemplated result following in due course." 260

Gandhi's non-absolutist pacifism is well illustrated in some of his answers to criticism of his wartime service and his general remarks. Any student of Gandhian philosophy will be well advised to consult the files of Young India for reading Gandhi's mind at first hand.

For obvious reason, it is not possible to exhaustively deal with this question but we shall refer to and quote at length, for purpose of illustration, from a few of the many articles that he wrote in the columns of Young India in reply to Western pacifist criticism.

* Consult Young India, 17-11-21, 23-3-22, 5-11-25, 8-3-28, 15-7-28, 13-9-28, 7-2-1929, 9-5-29, 31-12-31 etc. For relevant materials in one volume one may also consult M. K. Gandhi, Non-Violence in Peace and War, Vol. I.*
The famous Dutch pacifist Rev. B. De Ligtc strongly criticized Gandhi's participation in the Boer War and then the Great War of 1914 and invited him to explain his conduct in the light of **Ahimsa**. Gandhi covered all the grounds of criticism leveled against him in his two articles (Young India, 13-9-28, 9-5-29) in reply to B. De Ligtc and as such we shall concentrate on those.

To quote:

"There is no defence for my conduct weighed only in the scales of *Ahimsa*. I draw no distinction between those who wield the weapons of destruction and those who do Red Cross work. Both participate in war and advance its cause. Both are guilty of the crime of war. But even after introspection during all these years, I feel that, in the circumstances in which I found myself, I was bound to adopt the course I did both during the Boer War and the Great European War, and for that matter the so-called 'Zulu' rebellion of Natal in 1906.

"Life is governed by a multitude of forces. It would be smooth sailing, if one could determine the course of one's actions only by one general principle whose application at a given moment was too obvious to need even a moment's reflection. But I cannot recall a single act which could be so easily determined.

"Being a confirmed war resister I have never given myself training in the use of destructive weapons in spite of opportunities to take such training. It was perhaps thus that I escaped direct destruction of human life. But so long as I lived under a system of government based on force and voluntarily partook of the many facilities and privileges it created for me, I was bound to help that Government to the extent of my ability when it was engaged in a war, unless I non-cooperated with that Government and renounced to the utmost of my capacity the..."
privileges it offered me. *

"... I could not, it would be madness for me to, sever my connection with the society to which I belong. And on those three occasions I had no thought of non-co-operating with the British Government. My position regarding that Government is totally different today, and hence I should not voluntarily participate in its wars, ** and I should risk imprisonment and even the gallows, if I was forced to take up arms or otherwise take part in its military operations.

"But that still does not solve the riddle. If there was a national Government, whilst I should not take any direct part in any war, I can

* What do you say to my recruiting campaign? It is for me a religious activity undertaken for the sacred doctrine of ahimsa. I have made the discovery that India has lost the power to fight - not the inclination. She must regain the power and then, if she will, deliver to a groaning world the doctrine of ahimsa. She must give abundantly out of her strength, not out of her weakness. She may never do it. That to me would mean her effacement. She would lose her individuality and would be like the other nations - a worshipper of brute-force. This recruiting work is perhaps the hardest task yet undertaken by me. I may fail to gain recruits. I shall still have given the best political education to the people. - Letter to H. S. Polak quoted in Incidents of Gandhi's Life, edited by Chandreshankar Shukla, Vora & Co., Publishers Ltd., Bombay, 1949, p. 245.

** Reinhold Niebuhr comments: "Here the important point is that the violent character of government is recognised and the change of policy is explained in terms of a change in national allegiance and not in terms of pacifist principles." - Moral Man and Immoral Society (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1947), pp. 243-44.
conceive occasions when it would be my duty to vote for the military training of those who wish to take it. For I know that all its members do not believe in non-violence to the extent I do. It is not possible to make a person or a society non-violent by compulsion.

"Non-violence works in a most mysterious manner. Often a man's actions defy analysis in terms of non-violence; equally often his actions may wear the appearance of violence when he is absolutely non-violent in the highest sense of the term and is subsequently found to be so. All I can then claim for my conduct is that it was, in the instances cited, actuated in the interests of non-violence. There was no thought of sordid national or other interest. I do not believe in the promotion of national or any other interest at the sacrifice of some other interest.

"... For me non-violence is not a mere philosophical principle. It is the rule and breath of my life. I know I fail often, sometimes consciously, more often unconsciously. ... I am painfully aware of my failings.

"But the light within me is steady and clear. There is no escape for any of us save through truth and non-violence. I know that war is wrong, is an unmitigated evil. I know too that it has got to go. I firmly believe that freedom won through bloodshed or fraud is no freedom. ... Not violence, not untruth but non-violence, Truth is the law of our being." 262

In another article (II, 9-5-29) he reminded the Dutch pacifist that he was "uncompromisingly against all war". But in the same article, he urged upon the western pacifists to appreciate 'one vital difference' between them and him.

"They do not represent exploited nations; I represent the most exploited nation on earth. To use an unflattering comparison, they represent the cat and I represent the mouse." * He alleged that "fellow war-resisters in the West are

---
* Elsewhere in a dialogue with European War resisters, Gandhi pointed out that he opposed alien rule while they dealt with states to which they felt some loyalty. -- See Muriel Lester, Entertaining Gandhi (Ivor Nicholson & Watson, London, 1932) p. 161.
participants in war even in peace time inasmuch as they pay for the preparations that are being made for it and otherwise sustain governments whose main occupation is such preparation. * He reminded them that *all activity for stopping war must prove fruitless so long as the causes of war are not understood and radically dealt with.* (emphasis added).

One commentator has aptly said: "An escapist, self-righteous, moral neutrality is incompatible with the tenets of Gandhism. * * 263

Gandhi's conditional pacifism or non-absolute position regarding war can be best illustrated if we take into account his pronounced sympathy with the Allies during the Second World War and the victims of Fascist aggression. He wrote in Harijan (4-11-39, p. 327): "It is open to a war resister to judge between two combatants and wish success to the one who has justice on his side. By so judging he is more likely to bring peace between the two than by remaining a mere spectator." (emphasis added)

* Gandhi told the Conscientious Objectors of Europe in 1931: "Merely to refuse military service is not enough. ... Military service is only a symptom of the disease which is deeper. I suggest to you that those who are not on the register of military service are equally participating in the crime if they support the state otherwise. He or she who supports a state organized in the military way - whether directly or indirectly - participates in the sin. Each man, old or young, takes part in the sin by contributing to the maintenance of the state by paying the taxes. ... Refusal of military service is much more superficial than non-co-operation with the whole system which supports the state." - Young India, 31-12-31, p. 426.
He wrote on "Conundrums":

"And yet, strange as it may appear, my sympathies are wholly with the Allies. Willynilly this war is resolving itself into one between such democracy as the West has evolved and totalitarianism as it is typified in Hitler." 264 (For similar statements one may refer to Harijan 16-9-39, 14-10-39, 29-9-40 etc.)

Further:

"I believe all war to be wholly wrong. But if we scrutinize the motives of the two warring parties, we may find one to be in the right and the other in the wrong. For instance, if A wishes to seize B's country, B is obviously the wronged one. Both fight with arms. I do not believe in violent warfare, but all the same B, whose cause is just, deserves my moral help and blessings." 265 (For a similar statement, Harijan 21-10-39, p. 309).

Gandhi considered righteous and wished success to the Spanish republicans fighting Franco, the Chinese struggling against Japan, and the Poles resisting Germany, though in each case he wished that they could have offered non-violent resistance. 266

Speaking about Nazi Germany's oppression of Jews, he said: "If ever there could be a justifiable war in the name of and for humanity, a war against Germany, to prevent the wanton persecution of a whole race, would be completely justified. But I do not believe in any war." 267

Dr. Power suggests that paradoxically intertwined with Gandhi's conditional pacifism are views as absolute as those of any western pacifist. 268 For instance, after 1st World War, Gandhi branded that the Great European War of 1914 was "a war of aggrandizement on either part. It was a war of dividing the spoils of the exploitation of the weaker races - otherwise euphemistically called the world commerce." 269 He alleged that the Allies had been as
deceitful, cruel and selfish as Germany, and that they had been a menace to the world because of their secret treaties and military record.

"... today these dictators (Hitler and Mussolini) feel satisfaction in defying world opinion because none of the so-called Great Powers can come to them with clean hands, and they have a rankling sense of injustice done to their people by the Great Powers in the past. Only the other day an esteemed English friend owned to me that Nazi Germany was England's sin and that it was the Treaty of Versailles that made Hitler." 270

In April 1939 he wrote:

"After all, what is the gain if the so-called democracies win? War certainly will not end. The democracies will have adopted all the tactics of the Fascists and Nazis, including conscription and all other forcible methods to compel and exact obedience. All that may be gained at the end of the victory is the possibility of comparative protection of individual liberty." 271

During the early phase of Second World War (from 1939 to the spring of 1942) Gandhi generally found no righteousness in the Allied cause. To cite one instance. He wrote to G. D. Birla on 21-5-40: "Europe is at present the meeting ground of people gathered together for mutual destruction just as the Yadavas did. Be that as it may, my heart is hardened." 272 Any careful student of Indian freedom movement must have noticed the rigorous pacifist stand that Gandhi advocated during this period. As Maulana Azad recorded in _Indiawins Freedom_ Gandhi's view was that India must not participate in the Second World War in any circumstances, even if such participation meant the achievement of Indian independence. 273

At the meeting of the Congress Working Committee held in September, 1938 Gandhi wanted the Congress to declare that a free India would eschew all violence.
and would have no army to defend the country against aggression. The question was again raised by him when war broke out in September, 1939. At Ramgarh meeting of the AIOC (March 1940) he raised this question for the third time. The Wardha meeting of the Working Committee (June 1940) again considered his advice. 274 It is a known fact that Gandhi and the majority of the Congress leadership differed on this fundamental question.

The 'Boyden affair' gives an excellent illustration of Gandhi's absolutist pacifism during World War II. When the war of 1939-45 came, and after some weeks of agonised indecision, Maude Boyden, who still believed herself to be a pacifist, knew that she had no faith at all in the ability of any European or American nation to use the weapon of spiritual power. She could not help feeling that those who recognised this 'dreadful truth' and went out to fight evil with weapons they could use, had been trained and disciplined to use, were in the right. When Gandhi learned of her decision he rebuked her and asked her to cling to her faith in pacifism. 275

His absolutist stand was misinterpreted in certain circles 276 to imply that he was prepared to negotiate with Japan. But as he said he had no desire to substitute British rule with any other foreign rule. What he wanted was unadulterated non-violence. In his public letter 'To Every Japanese' he warned Japan:

"I would ask you to make no mistake about the fact that you will be sadly disillusioned if you believe that you will receive a willing welcome from India. The end and aim of the movement for British withdrawal is to prepare India, by making her free for resisting all militarist and imperialist ambition, whether it is called British imperialism, German Nazism or your pattern."

Referring to his appeal to Britain he added: "Our appeal to Britain is coupled with the offer of free India's willingness to let the
Allies retain their troops in India. The offer is made in order to prove that we do not in any way mean to harm the Allied cause, and in order to prevent you from being misled into feeling that you have but to step into the country that Britain has vacated. Needless to repeat that if you cherish any such idea and will carry it out, we will not fail in resisting you with all the might that our country can muster. 277

The offer of free India's willingness to let the Allies retain their troops in India marked a signal change. As Nehru has recorded:

"His (Gandhi's) love of freedom for India and all other exploited nations and peoples overcame even his strong adherence to non-violence. He had previously given a grudging and rather reluctant consent to the Congress not adhering to this policy in regard to defence and the State's functions in an emergency, but he had kept himself aloof from this. He realized that his half-hearted attitude in this matter might well come in the way of a settlement with Britain and the United Nations. So, he went further and himself sponsored a Congress resolution which declared that the primary function of the Provisional Government of Free India would be to throw all her great resources in the struggle for freedom and against aggression and to co-operate fully with the United Nations in the defence of India with all the armed as well as other forces at her command." 278

Nehru recorded later in a reflective mood:

"It was no easy matter for him to commit himself in this way, but he swallowed the bitter pill, so overpowering was his desire that some settlement should be arrived at to enable India to resist the aggressor as free nation." 279

In his letter to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek dated June 14, 1942 *,

* Its publication was withheld at that time. It was published in Hindusthan Times, August 15, 1942.
Gandhi made it perfectly clear that India wanted to prevent in every way Japanese aggression. He assured the Generalissimo:

"I would personally agree, and I am sure the government of free India would agree, that the Allied powers might, under treaty with us, keep their armed forces in India and use the country as a base for operation against the threatened Japanese attack." 280 *

Though in the same letter he reiterated his firm faith in non-violence. But the realist politician that he was, he could realize that "India today has not that faith and belief, and the government in free India would be formed from the various elements composing the nation." 281 Asked by American journalists in June 1942 if free India would declare war against Japan, he replied: "Free India need not do so. She simply becomes the ally of the Allied powers, out of gratefulness for the payment of a debt, however overdue. Human nature thanks the debtor when he discharges the debt." 282 Whatever might have been reason for the 'new move', it marked an important change from his earlier position as can be further illustrated from Gandhi's draft resolution for the Allahabad Working Committee meeting dated April 27, 1942 wherein it was stated:

"... it is harmful to India's interests and dangerous to the cause of India's freedom to introduce foreign soldiers in India. It is a crying shame to bring foreign troops in spite of India's inexhaustible manpower and is a proof of the immorality that British imperialism is." 283

After being suddenly released from the prison, owing to his illness, on 6 May 1944, Gandhi made an offer to the Viceroy with regard to the political situation. On July 27, he wrote to Lord Wavell: "I am prepared to advise the Working Committee to declare that in view of changed conditions mass civil disobedience envisaged by the resolution of August 1942 cannot be offered and that full cooperation in the war effort should be given by the Congress, if a declaration of immediate Indian independence is made and a National Government responsible to the Central Assembly be formed subject to the proviso that, during the pendency of the war, the military operations should continue as at present but without involving any financial burden on India." (emphasis added) The offer was however rejected. But it is interesting to note that Gandhi moved a long way from his earlier stand of rigorous pacifism. One may recall that a precedent existed in Gandhi's past for the shift of his outlook on war in mid-1942-44, namely, his support of British imperialism in World War I following earlier declarations of Hind Swaraj days.

The Second World War ended in 1945 with the seed of third World War already sown. The dropping of atom-bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 gave an indication of the shape of things to come. During this phase, we find Gandhi to revert back to unconditional pacifism. Writing two months before the end of hostilities in Europe, on March 7, 1945, Gandhi observed:

"The war will end this year or the next. It will bring victory to the Allies. The pity of it is that it will be only so-called... That victory will be assuredly a prelude to a deadlier war..." 285

On the death of President Roosevelt, he called on the 16th April a message of "condolence and congratulations" to Mrs. Roosevelt:

"The latter because your illustrious husband died in harness after war had reached a point where Allied Victory had become certain. He was spared the humiliating spectacle of being party to a peace which threatens to be a prelude to war bloodier still if possible." 286
Gandhi told Mr. Ralph Coniston of the Colliers Weekly that war itself was a crime against God and humanity. The mention of war criminals brought forth the response that they "are not confined to the Axis Powers alone, Roosevelt and Churchill are no less war criminals than Hitler and Mussolini." 287

The wanton destruction of human life that the atomic warfare introduced had serious impact on Gandhi's mind. In Harijan (7-7-46) his repulsion found its expression:

"So far as I can see, the atomic bomb has deadened the finest feeling that has sustained mankind for ages. There used to be the so-called laws of war which made it tolerable. Now we know the naked truth. War knows no law except that of might. The atom bomb brought an empty victory to the Allied arms but it resulted for the time being in destroying the soul of Japan. What has happened to the soul of the destroying nation is yet too early to see. Forces of nature act in a mysterious manner."

He suggested non-violence to fight this monster of destruction.

On February 10, 1946 Harijan was revived after the lapse of three years and a half. In the very first issue he addressed his readers:

"There has been cataclysmic changes in the world. Do I adhere still to my faith in truth and non-violence? Has not the atom bomb exploded that faith? Not only has it not done so, but it has clearly demonstrated to me that the twins constitute the mightiest force in the World. Before it the atom bomb is of no effect. The two opposing forces are wholly different in kind, the one moral and spiritual, the other physical and material. The one is infinitely superior to the other which by its very nature has an end. The force of spirit is ever progressive and endless. Its full expression makes it unconquerable in the world. In saying this I know that I have said nothing new. I merely bear witness to the fact." 288

From Gandhi's point of view, atomic war was all unjust because of its supreme
indifference to human life and naked violence. This absolutist position, as a matter of inherent logic, rejected current diplomatic theories of 'balance of terror' as a way out for maintaining world peace.

Gandhi told Prof. George Catlin in 1946: "We must always hold fast by non-violence. Who are we to be judges what is aggression and what is not?" 289 This statement may be taken for an expression of absolute pacifism. One may find a parallel, as does Prof. Catlin, in Kant who held that there never had been or could be "a just war", where there was no agreed judge to adjudicate upon what was just. "No man can be judge in his own cause." 290 Or, one may hold, keeping in view the background of the situation, that the Big Power politics thoroughly disillusioned him and as such the statement is to be read as an expression of his anguished soul.

Later again he stood for justice and moved away from unconditional pacifism. The division of the country on communal basis was marred with blood and tears of the millions of the countrymen. "The one Man Boundary Force" that Gandhi symbolised in himself need not be recounted here. But unfortunately his voice of sanity and goodwill seemed to have lost its magic appeal. The complacency of persons on whom rested the moral responsibility of bringing about partition disturbed him. In the face of flagrant contravention of elementary justice by Pakistani authorities he did not maintain a morally neutralist position. At his prayer meeting on September 26, 1947, he remarked that he had always been an opponent of all warfare. But if there was no other way of securing justice from Pakistan, if Pakistan persistently refused to see its proved error and continued to minimise it, war would be the only alternative left to Government. War was no joke. That way lay destruction. But he could never advise anyone to put up with injustice. As for Gandhi himself, his way was different. He worshipped God, which was Truth and ahimsa. 291

Gandhi's remarks about the possibility of war between the two Dominions, if
Pakistan did not mend its ways, raised quite a storm. There were anxious telegrams. Friends in India and abroad asked whether he had really begun to advocate war. Even Mountbatten felt perturbed. But Gandhi stuck to his position. Wedded to non-violence for all time as he was, he said, he was the last person to advocate war. But he knew that Governments which possessed arms and armies could not act in any other way. 292

In his prayer speech on 27 September, he said that he could never advocate war. In a state run by him there would be no police and military. But he was not running the Government of the Indian Union. He had merely pointed out the various possibilities. India and Pakistan should settle their differences by mutual consultations and failing that fall back upon arbitration. But if one party persisted in wrong doing and would accept neither of the two ways mentioned above, the only way left open was that of war. 293

And further on 29 September:

"We have among us the superstition that the mere mention of a snake ensures its appearance in the house in which the mention is made even by a child. I hope no one in India entertains such superstition about war."

"I claim that I rendered a service to both the sister states by examining the present situation and definitely stating when the cause of war could arise between the two states. This was done not to promote war but to avoid it as far as possible. I endeavoured, too, to show that if the insensate murders, loot and arson by people continued, they would force the hands of their Governments. Was it wrong to draw public attention to

* "At any rate, I won't be there alive to witness it," he remarked to Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, referring to the possibility of a war between India and Pakistan. "Is our independence going to end in such a fratricide?"

the logical steps that inevitably followed one after another?

"India knows, the world should, that every souse of my energy has been and is being devoted to the definite avoidance of fratricide culminating in war. When a man vowed to non-violence as the law governing human beings dares to refer to war, he can only do it so as to strain every nerve to avoid it." 294

A correspondent remonstrated: "It would be well not to discuss even by way of a joke the possibility of war between our two states." Gandhi replied that it was undoubtedly true that the possibility of a war between the two states should not be discussed by way of a joke. But if the possibility were a reality, "it would be a duty to discuss it ... folly not to do so." 295

Gandhi expressed his appreciation of the Indian Union Government's action in rushing troops for the defence of Kashmir. 296 He said that he would not mind if the whole of the military and the people of Kashmir died at their post in defence of fair Kashmir. 297

A correspondent rebuked him for having dared to advise Churchill, Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese, when they were likely to lose all, that they should adopt his technique of non-violence. The writer of the letter then went on to say that if he could give that advice when it was safe for him to do so, why did he abandon his non-violence when his own friends in the Congress Government had forsaken it and even sent armed resistance to Kashmir. The letter concluded by inviting Gandhi to point out definitely how the raiders were to be opposed non-violently by the Kashmiris.

Gandhi answered that he had repeatedly said that he had no influence in the matter over his friends in the Union Cabinet. He held on to his views on non-violence as firmly as ever, but he could not impose his views on his best friends, as they were, in the Cabinet. He could not expect them to act against their convictions and everybody should be satisfied with his confession that he had lost
his original hold upon his friends.

His ahimsa forbade him from denying credit where credit was due even though the person to whom credit had to be given was a believer in non-violence. Though he did not approve of the use of arms by the Union Government for aiding the Kashmiris and though he could not approve of the Kashmiris resorting to arms, he could not on that account possibly withhold his admiration for either for their resourcefulness and praiseworthy conduct, especially, if both the relieving troops and the Kashmiri defenders died heroically to a man. He knew that if they could do so, they would perhaps change the face of India. But if the defence was purely non-violent in intention and action, he would not use the word 'perhaps', for, he would be sure of change in the face even to the extent of converting to the defenders' view the Union Cabinet, if not even the Pakistan Cabinet. 298

Sum Up

The outline survey given above of Gandhi's views on war during different phases of his public career suggest that Gandhi consistently believed that the actual process of war was unrighteous because it violated ahimsa, 'the supreme law of our being'. "The children of violence will commit suicide and perish.

"* Referring to despatch of troops to Kashmir, Jawaharlal Nehru said publicly in March 1948 after Gandhi's death: "It has been and is a moral issue with us, apart from other aspects of the case, and because of this, at every stage and at every step, I consulted Mahatma Gandhi and had his approval." - Independence and After (The Publications Division, GOI, 1949), p. 83.

unless they turn away from violence", he told M. Cartier in a discussion of
war. However, his views differ on whether the belligerents can be just.

As an unconditional pacifist, he held that participants in war were not
righteous and that nothing of value was produced from armed conflict. This view-
point can be traced in his ideas during the period 1909-14, in his observations
about western democracies immediately after the Great European War of 1914 and
during the early years of Second World War. His condemnation of atomic warfare
was also without any reservation and qualification.

It may seem baffling to understand, or one may ascribe confusion on Gandhi's
part, that while maintaining his unqualified pacifist position during the early
phase of Second World War, he pronounced his sympathy for the Allied cause. And
how could he do that when he held the opinion that western democracies were no
better than fascism? (For his opinion on Euramerican democracies, see pp.479-81
above) Let us try to solve the riddle, if it is such at all. First, his sympathy
with England and France was not of a political nature; it was purely from the
humanitarian standpoint, as he repeatedly asserted. Secondly, his pronounce-
ment that there was no distinction between imperialism and Fascism-Fascism was an
expression of his overall judgment of imperialism and Fascism as systems, both of
which were based on exploitation and violence. This should not be confused with
the relative justice of the cases of the contestants. Gandhi wrote:

"Rightly or wrongly, and irrespective of what the other powers have done
before, under similar circumstances, I have come to the conclusion that
Herr Hitler is responsible for war". 301

That explains why he extended his moral sympathy, it was not a question of
material co-operation with the Allies, for the Allied cause even at the period
when he maintained a rigorous pacifist position.

As a conditional pacifist he found that justice rests with one party and
as he could not tolerate injustice to prevail he lent his sympathy to the party.
upholding the cause of justice though he did not approve of the means of armed warfare in resisting aggression. Evidence of this position is seen in his debates with the western pacifists, and in a number of his comments during the 1930s when he endorsed the cause of the victims of Nazi tyranny and fascist-militarist aggression. This sense of justice again impelled him immediately after the political transfer of power in India and Pakistan to point out the inevitable possibility of war, if Pakistan did not heed the voice of reason. Justice should not suffer was his main point. And then again he could not withhold his admiration for the brave Kashmiri defenders and the Indian military for the defence of that land. This position of assertive and qualified pacifism can be best appreciated if we take into consideration the dynamic non-violence which is to be sharply distinguished from passive inaction. * "The first condition of non-violence is justice", he remarked. (For his concept of non-violence, see p. 343.)

Reinhold Niebuhr is mistaken when he alleges that Gandhi's ethic of love is divorced from justice. Gandhi's non-violence, it may be recalled here, recognized different species of violence-defensive and offensive. And a non-violent person is bound, he observed, when the occasion arises to say which side is just. 303

The third approach of Gandhi to war represents 'the flexible adjustment of his idealism to the demands of his nationalism'. Evidence of this approach is found in comments during world war I, in subsequent explanations for aiding the

* "...a false antithesis having been made between peace and justice, Christian pacifists in most cases chose a passive conception of peace. ... It is from this ethical fog that Gandhiji has done much, at last to rescue us." - see Reginald Reynolds's 'Mahatma Gandhi and Christian Pacifism' in Gandhi Memorial Peace Number, The Vaish-Bharati Quarterly (Eds: Khitis Roy, Santiniketan, 1949), p. 137, p. 141.
British Empire, and later during mid-1942 when he conceded that free India might be used as an operation base for the United Nations. This flexibility of approach speaks of 'his intense and many-sided realism'.

Gandhi disclaimed any motive of expediency in his participation in World War I and asserted that his motive was peace and that he was actuated in the interest of non-violence. What Gandhi really meant is that even violence is justified if the cause is moral. But he was equally insistent that non-violence is usually the better method of establishing a moral cause. As Niebuhr says: 'He is probably right on both counts.'

The fundamental consideration that weighed with him, during this phase, in our opinion, was his sense of loyalty to the British Empire at that time and of his belief in the goodness of the Empire. The shift in his attitude regarding India's participation in war during mid-1942 suggests that political considerations, not merely humanitarian as was the case during 1938-40, might have played a part. Nehru has recorded: 'Our mutual discussions led to a clarification of much that had been vague and cloudy, and to Gandhiji appreciating many international factors to which his attention had been drawn. His subsequent writings underwent a change and he himself emphasized these international considerations and looked at India's problem in a wider perspective. But his fundamental attitude remained ...'

The predominant element that one finds in his philosophy is objective and non-absolute non-violence. However idealist Gandhi's world outlook might have been, he was objective enough to realize that the prime cause of war is the inhuman race for exploitation of the weaker nations of the earth by a few stronger nations. (excerpt cited above, see p.511) This sense of objectivity has distinguished him from the ranks of absolute pacifists. A pacifist is neutral a priori. A pacifist's neutrality is an avoidance of moral responsibility, not the sublime detachment of a god who stands "above the battle". Behind such a neutrality is a
fundamental moral irresponsibility. Objectivity, on the other hand, is responsibility. This sense of objectivity and moral responsibility enabled him to take political decisions, not fundamentally opposed to his basic convictions of truth and non-violence. He was, even non-pacifists as Marxists are, however, on common ground with pacifists in believing that the inevitable cruelty of war are not in themselves creative and that only positive goodwill can bring a new society into existence.

We have seen above that Gandhi's concept of non-violence was integrally related with justice. But did he believe, as the socialists do, in 'just' war? 'Just' war implies the moral and social justification of the use of violence inasmuch as it is a measure of defence on the part of the majority of the community or the victim of the aggression against the horrors of war, poverty and exploitation and aims to establish a new society free from exploitation. While Gandhi would uphold the cause of justice and would throw his full weight against aggression and exploitation he would not, at the same time, approve of the violent means employed in such a 'just' war or would participate in such a war for allegiance to non-violence was a fundamental creed with him.

Gandhi on Peace

Gandhi has often been described as an apostle of peace. Certainly, he was. He strove and died for peace. He advocated 'peace - but not at any price' for his philosophy was a philosophy of commitment - it was based upon the concept of moral responsibility, as well as 'peace at any price' which underlay his ethic of intention.*

* "I am a man of peace. I believe in peace. But I do not want peace at any price.

I do not want the peace that you find in the grave; but I do want the peace which you find embedded in human breast, which is exposed to the arrows of a whole world, but which is protected from all harm by the Power of the Almighty God." - M.K. Gandhi, Young India, 19-1-22, Quoted in Teachings of Mahatma Gandhi (ed: Jag Parvesh Chander, The Indian Printing Works, Lahore, 1945), pp. 441-42.
This may sound paradoxical. But he moved from 'truth to truth' through a tangle of paradoxes.

Gandhi's philosophy of peace is to be sharply distinguished from the conservative plea for 'peace at any cost' which is, in essence, a plea for the maintenance of status quo. Peace, he advocated, is integrally related with justice. Gandhi wrote: "Peace must be just." Peace is not mere cessation of hostilities. Gandhi did not share the diplomatic view of peace. Peace, for him, connotes a positive state of affairs the precondition being freedom from exploitation. What he advocated was non-violent and just peace which alone, in his opinion, could ensure lasting peace.

Let us proceed to see what, in his opinion, constitutes the secret of peace and the way for establishing it.

As an earnest believer in the universality of Satyagraha he wrote in Young India (23-5-1919):

"It may be long before the law of love will be recognized in international affairs. The machineries of Governments stand between and hide the hearts of one people from those of another. Yet ... we could see how the world is moving steadily to realize that between nation and nation, as between man and man, force has failed to solve problems, but that the economic sanction of non-co-operation is far more mighty and conclusive than armies and navies." 308

* The thesis that peace is not, and never can be, a direct object of policy, is developed at great length in Edward Hallett Carr, The Twenty Years' Crisis (Macmillan and Company Ltd., London, 1940), pp. 68-69; see also E. H. Carr, Conditions of Peace (Macmillan and Co., Ltd., London, 1944), p. XXIII.
The Italian invasion of Abyssinia moved Gandhi to send a message to the Editor of The Cosmopolitan, New York, one of the first of his appeals against the wave of darkness that was to sweep the whole world:

"Not to believe in the possibility of permanent peace is to disbelieve in the godliness of human nature. Methods hitherto adopted have failed because rock-bottom sincerity on the part of those who have striven has been lacking. Not that they have realized this lack. Peace is unattainable by part performance of conditions, even as a chemical combination is impossible without complete fulfilment of conditions of attainment thereof. If the recognized leaders of mankind who have control over the engines of destruction were wholly to renounce their use, with full knowledge of its implications, permanent peace can be attained. This is clearly impossible without the great powers of the earth renouncing their imperialistic designs. This again seems impossible without these great nations ceasing to believe in soul-destroying competition and to desire to multiply wants and, therefore, increase their material possessions."

Gandhi explained his concept of non-violent peace while taking to the Christian missionaries in early December, 1938:

"Peace will never come until the Great Powers courageously decide to disarm themselves. It seems to me that the recent events must force that belief on the Great Powers. I have an implicit faith - a faith that today burns brighter than ever, after half a century's experience of unbroken practice of non-violence - that mankind can only be saved through non-violence..."

"There will be no peace", Gandhi reiterated his conviction on the eve of San Francisco Conference, "for the Allies or the world unless they shed their belief in the efficacy of war and its accompanying terrible deception and fraud and are determined to hammer out real peace based on freedom and equality of
all races and nations. Exploitation and domination of one nation over another can have no place in a world striving to put an end to all wars. In such a world only the militarily weaker nations will be free from the fear of intimidation or exploitation." 312

Similarly he told a director of an influential British daily paper in 1946:

"I have no doubt that unless big nations shed their desire of exploitation and the spirit of violence of which war is the natural expression and atom bomb the inevitable consequence, there is no hope for peace in the world." 313

What did Gandhi think of various devices to bring or maintain peace? Arbitration, world government, international organization, disarmament and world police and defence force are the traditional solutions suggested for preventing aggression.

Gandhi's preferred method of resolving interstate questions was what he called 'arbitration'. "How I wish Herr Hitler would respond to the appeal of the President of the United States and allow his claim to be investigated by arbitrators in whose choice he will have an effective voice as the disputants!" 314

Incidentally, Roosevelt did not mention 'arbitration', nor did he suggest a disinterested panel selected by the disputants. He said that his message came from a 'friendly intermediary', not even a 'mediator', asking Hitler to promise not to attack specified European nations for a minimum of ten years, and called himself a 'post office' that would secure guarantees from other powers. 315

---

* International Arbitration was defined by the Hague Convention of 1907 as "the settlement of disputes between states by judges of their own choice and on the basis of the respect for law." This definition seems too narrow, for arbitration includes every submission of a dispute to final decision by an impartial judge or court. — see Encyclopaedia of The Social Sciences (Editor-in-Chief: Edwin H.A. Seligman, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1957), vol. II, p. 157.

By 'arbitration', Gandhi meant any informal effort by a third party to mediate, conciliate or use good offices.
Gandhi indicted Hitler for his refusal to 'arbitrate' German claims to Danzig and the Polish corridor. "I do not judge his claim. It is highlty probable that his right to incorporate Germany is beyond question, if the Danzig Germans desire to give up their independent status. It may be that his claim is a just claim. My complaint is that he will not let the claim be examined by an impartial tribunal." Technically, Roosevelt's appeal was not for arbitration. But Gandhi was not much interested about the procedural devices of international diplomacy; he was more interested in the spirit of the matter and as such Roosevelt's appeal of acting as a 'post office' impressed him.

On national questions Gandhi did not favour third-party settlement for resolving disputes. Referring to the question of linguistic redistribution of provinces, he hoped, he said in his prayer speech on January 25, 1948, that Indians would not need a Boundary Commission to delimit the frontiers on the new basis. That was the foreign way which they had discarded, he added. The best thing, in his opinion, would be for themselves to determine the boundaries on the new basis by mutual agreement and consent. To go to a third party in the shape of a Boundary Commission for a settlement would be a negation of independence, he held. Nevertheless he supported the arbitration of debt between free India and the United Kingdom. We find him again as an advocate of arbitration when the question of right or wrong of Junagadh episode was posed. He observed that appeal to the sword was not to be thought of. The only honourable way out, in his opinion, was the ancient method of arbitration in the usual manner. What Gandhi said about Junagadh equally applied to Kashmir and Hyderabad.

As is well known, Gandhi was no enthusiastic admirer of legal positivism. If we bear in mind his general attitude towards the Great Powers, then it would not be of much difficulty to appreciate his reservations about the efficacy of international law as an instrument for the solution of inter-state disputes.
Commenting on the Kellogg Pact of 1928 - which 'renounced war as an instrument of national policy' but preserved the right of western nations e.g. Great Britain, France, U.S.A. to take up arms in defence of its interests in certain regions which they considered 'vital' to their welfare - Gandhi wrote: "I have no difficulty in agreeing that the Kellogg Pact has great possibilities, the patent insincerity of many signatories notwithstanding.... The parties to the Pact are mostly partners in the exploitation of the peoples of Asia and Africa. ... The Peace Pact, therefore, in substance means a desire to carry on the joint exploitation peacefully." 320

But this unfavourable reaction towards international treaties etc. should not be construed to mean that he was indifferent to the problem of inter-state obligation and the citizens' duty as individuals to maintain world peace. As we have seen above in our discussion of his views on rights and duties, he maintained that the very right to live accrues to us only when we do the duty of citizenship of the world. For Gandhi, it was a question of man's moral responsibility to build a new world free from the horrors of war.

Gandhi fervently hoped for "a world federation of free and independent States." 321 (See also pp.... for his views on this topic). The Western declarations of the Atlantic Charter did not inspire him because it was based on a denial of self-determination to the subject peoples of British Empire. Churchill made it explicit that this charter had no application to India. Quick came the response from Gandhi: "It went down the ocean as soon as it was born!" 322

Gandhi's concept of world government (See pp....above) transcended the traditional thinking; the pattern of conventional international organizations could not satisfy the conditions for bringing in genuine peace. He held that "Peace cannot be established through mere conferences." 323 One may recall here Tolstoy's review and forceful criticism of the London Peace Congress of
1890 to the effect that the state system based on power is beyond reform by either public or private initiative. Dr. Power suggests that Gandhi's ideas about League of Nations, United Nations show the influence of his dedication to self-help and to anti-colonialism, and of 'weak internationalist tendencies in his composite world-view'. Also, the critical attitude of Tolstoy toward international peace efforts may have influenced Gandhi. The analysis, in broad outline, being acceptable, a point is to be controverted. The criticism relating to 'weak internationalist tendencies' betrays non- recognition of the objective background of Gandhi's reservations about international bodies, as well as the criticism does not take into account the integral relationship of nationalism and internationalism that was advocated by Gandhi. It should be repeated once again that internationalism was not an abstract concept for Gandhi; it was a question of attainment which could only be possible through freedom of India and other subject peoples of Asia and Africa.

Hakim Saheb Ajmal Khan and Dr. Ansari on their return from a prolonged tour on the Continent including Syria drew the attention of Gandhi to 'the utter callousness of the French and their utter disregard for the elementary rights of the people of the mandated territory in Syria' and requested him, as the President of the Congress, 'to send a cable to the League of Nations which has granted this mandate to France'. Gandhi could not see his way to accept their advice. He scathingly criticised the Great Powers: "I do not believe in making appeals when there is no force behind them, whether moral or material... And what is the League of Nations? Is it not in reality merely England and France? Do the other Powers count? Is it any use appealing to France which is denying her motto of Fraternity, Equality and Justice?... If we would appeal to England, we need not go to the League of Nations. But to appeal to her is to appeal to Caesar against Augustus." He then added, "Relief of Syria lies through India." Gandhi exposed the hollowness of the pretensions of Anglo-French powers and..."
correctly pointed out that Indian freedom from foreign domination could only be a lever for extending moral and material support to another nation groaning under the heels of colonial, mandatory administration was a courteous figure of speech, subjugation. It speaks of his realistic sense, and not of his 'weak internationalist tendencies' as has been alleged. Incidentally, Lenin also taught that genuine internationalism rests on intensification of national struggle against imperialism where it is entrenched. Gandhi, we agree with Dr. Amiya Chakravorty, defined the right perspective and gave a new sense of proportion. He made the Indians aware of the true basis of internationalism.227

The League of Nations could not effectively assert itself as the genuine guarantee against war. Gandhi criticized the League when he visited its headquarters at Geneva in 1931 for its failure to 'enforce peace' as the League was pledged to do.228 During Italian invasion on Abyssinia (1934-36) Gandhi could not remain indifferent to the situation. He wrote an article "the greatest force" in Harijan (12-10-35): "If Abyssinia were non-violent she would have no arms, would want none. She would make no appeal to the League or any other power for an armed intervention. She would never give any cause for complaint. And Italy would find nothing to conquer if the Abyssinians would not offer armed resistance, nor would they give co-operation, willing or forced. (emphasis added) It was an advice of non-violent resistance and non-co-operation with the aggressor.

Referring to Gandhi's stand vis-à-vis this war, Dr. Power offers a comment which we fail to persuade ourselves to accept. He observes: "he (Gandhi) had no suggestions to offer the League, other than to imply that it should employ no sanctions against Italy. ... Throughout the Ethiopian crisis he failed to appreciate that the League's economic penalties against Italy were non-violent and similar to his own economic boycotts against British imperialism."230 Since Gandhi had no high hopes about the effectiveness of the League as an
instrument for ushering in world peace it was not quite illogical on Gandhi's part to abstain from offering suggestions. The reading of implications in Gandhi's taking up such a position is Dr. Power's own and that is a matter of opinion. But we join issue with the learned professor when he equates League Sanctions with non-violent non-co-operation.

Let us be permitted to recapitulate here the basic Gandhian concept in this regard. It was a fundamental position with Gandhi that he preferred 'international non-co-operation' to 'continued physical compulsion' and that clarifies the concept of non-violent resistance. Non-violent resistance, right or wrong whatever it may prove itself to be in the future, was no half-hearted gesture on Gandhi's part. The 'economic sanction of non-co-operation' that he advocated was based on a distinct philosophy of non-violence while the professed declaration of the League to 'enforce peace' was at its best, 'a little more than gesture' and at its worst a device of hoodwinking the war-weary world. While we need not go into the details of the case, let us recall a few of the salient points in connection with the sanctions imposed against Italy for its violation of the Covenant of the League. Article XVI of the Covenant laid down that in circumstances of any Power resorting to war contrary to its undertaking in the Covenant 'severance of all trade or financial relations etc. should follow. The only occasion on which the imposition of Sanctions by members of the League was attempted was in October 1935, when Italy by her wanton invasion of Abyssinia rendered herself liable to them. The defining and administration of the Sanctions was entrusted to a Co-ordination Committee, which imposed an embargo on the exports of arms and ammunitions including the prohibition of the supply to Italy of certain commodities. It should be noted that petroleum, iron and steel, coal and coke, all essential to Italy in the conduct of the war were, however, not included. A proposal was made that the export of these commodities also should be prohibited, but this proposal was smothered. In these circumstances Sanctions were little more than a gesture, and by April 1936 the Governments that
had imposed them began to reverse their policy. Such is in short the story of League's 'economic penalties'. One may rightly conclude that "the fundamental notion that the League sanctions constituted a practical instrument of pacification was erroneous." Does the criticism of Gandhi's alleged failure to 'appreciate' the efficacy of League Sanctions stand the test of objectivity? We, however, feel that it is rather difficult for a Westerner to appreciate the concrete significance of world peace in the context of colonial dependence.

The United Nations Organization which was set up in 1945 at San Francisco Conference could not evoke Gandhi's unqualified approval. He had strong reservations on the future of the organization. He was rather pessimistic about the realization of the professed goals viz., to maintain international peace and security, and to achieve international co-operation in economic, social, cultural and humanitarian questions. In a statement issued on April 17, 1945, Gandhi said: "I very much fear that behind the structure of world security sought to be raised lurk mistrust and fear which breed war." He added, "An indispensable preliminary to peace is the complete freedom of India from all foreign control. ... Freedom of India will demonstrate to all the exploited races of the earth that their freedom is very near, and that in no case will they henceforth be exploited."

In answer to a question by Don Campbell of Reuters whether Gandhi believed that the United Nations Organization, as at present constituted, could maintain a lasting peace, he replied that he was afraid that the world was heading towards another showdown. "But if all goes well with India, then the world may have a long peace. It will largely depend on ... British statesmanship." A few months hence Gandhi spoke of the failure of the United Nations to Vincent Sheean.

The reference of the Indo-Pak dispute on Kashmir to U.N. and Gandhi's advice on the issue has been subject to varying reading. Alan Campbell-Johnson implies that Gandhi gave prior approval to the Indian Union Government's decision of December 30, 1947 to make a formal reference to the Security Council of UN.
in regard to Pakistan's aggression in Kashmir. 336 Pyarelal, a close associate of Gandhi, records that "Gandhiji was not enamoured of taking any Indo-Pakistan dispute to an outside organisation. It would only get them monkey justice, he warned". 337 Were the Union and Pakistan always to depend on a third party to settle their disputes? he asked in the course of his post-prayer address on December 25. 338 He pleaded for an amicable settlement with the assistance of impartial Indians. 339 He pleaded for amity and goodwill which could enable the Union's representation to the UNO to be withdrawn with dignity. This, he was sure, the UNO itself would welcome. 340 Pyarelal notes that Gandhi had never concealed his disapproval of the Indian Union's taking the Kashmir dispute to the UNO instead of treating it as a domestic issue which ought to be settled amongst themselves. But Gandhi did not wish to confuse those who were handling the question in the way they knew by dividing their mind. So, when India's representative to the UNO, Gopalaswamy Ayyengar, came to see him prior to his departure for the U.S.A., to represent India's case during the debate on Kashmir, Gandhi said to him: "You must understand that your way and mine are different. You should, therefore, either make up your mind to follow my path and settle the issue by direct negotiations, using the good offices of anyone you like from amongst ourselves or, if necessary, with the help of any country in Asia, or frankly and openly take an independent line." 341 It is significant that while he was agreeable to the extent of seeking the help of any Asiatic country for settlement of the dispute, he did not mention the UN mediation as a formula for coming to such a settlement. It suggests that he was not much optimistic about UNO.

Gandhi believed that the doctrine of non-violence holds good also as between states and states. This conviction impelled him to recommend unequivocally total disarmament - unilateral or multilateral. His idea of disarmament is to be distinguished from the Western Powers' plea for progressive disarmament, a policy
suited to the interests of 'security' of national states. In 1925 he wrote to a German correspondent:

"It would be absurd that before general disarmament in Europe commences, as it must some day, unless Europe is to commit suicide, some nation will have to disarm herself and take large risks. The level of non-violence in that nation, if that event happily comes to pass, will naturally have risen so high as to command universal respect. Her judgments will be unerring, her decisions will be firm, her capacity for heroic self-sacrifice will be great, and she will want to live as much for other nations as for herself." 342

He was optimistic enough to advocate unilateral disarmament:

"If even one great nation were unconditionally to perform the supreme act of renunciation, many of us would see in our lifetime visible peace established on earth." 343

His call for unilateral disarmament expresses his idealism while the realist Gandhi appreciated that on the establishment of a democratic world federation disarmament would be practicable in all countries. 344

He believed that disarmament is only possible only through 'the matchless weapon of non-violence'. 345 And it was his hope that 'India will ... prove herself worthy of being the first nation in the world' to give a lead to other nations for 'the delivery of the earth from the burden' of war. 346

Gandhi's anxiety for disarmament may be illustrated from his reply to a Swiss friend's question:

Q. Since disarmament chiefly depends on Great Powers why should Switzerland, which is a small state and a neutral state, be asked to disarm itself?

A. It is from the neutral ground of your country that I am speaking to all other powers and not only to Switzerland: ... And seeing that
Switzerland is a neutral territory and non-aggressive nation, there is all the more reason why Switzerland should not need an army. 347

Gandhi knew that the Great nations could hardly be expected in the ordinary course to move spontaneously in a direction the reverse of the one they had followed. But an irrepressible optimist that he was, he did not give up hope. "It is, however, open to the Great Powers to take it up any day and cover themselves with glory and earn the eternal gratitude of posterity. If they or any of them can shed the fear of destruction, if they disarm themselves, they will automatically help the rest to regain their sanity. But then these Great Powers have to give up ambitions and exploitation of the so-called uncivilized or semi-civilized nations of the earth and revise their mode of life. It means a complete revolution." 348

The key-point that one finds in Gandhi’s views on disarmament is that real disarmament cannot come unless the nations of the world cease to exploit one another. Exploitation must go—that is the essential precondition for the establishment of a world free from blood-spilling and destruction.

It is significant that his view on world police force as an agency for maintaining peace and repelling aggression underwent evolution. As late as 1938 he denied that such an agency would be an advance over conventional way of settling disputes through armed might. During the Second World War his views were modified, though the reservations were there. His endorsement of 'a world federal defence force' as envisaged in the historic August resolution of 1942 is a significant departure. His letter to Maurice Frydman dated 28. 7. 42 may also be cited as an instance. (See p. 546 above for the text of the letter). In 1946 he told Prof. Catlin: "If, of course, we could get a really impartial body, then we would all welcome a world police force." 349 "By the time", Gandhi held at the same time, "that men have been educated to be impartial in the use of force, they can be used in non-violence." 350
This shows, as has been observed by Prof. Gatlin, his willingness to be
plastic, to compromise in detail, once the principle is accepted or not involved.

Gandhi flung a challenge before the world in advocating Satyagraha as the
sure and potent weapon to combat inter-state aggression. Satyagraha is universally
applicable, he held. (See pp:... above) Non-violence, according to Gandhi,
excludes war and ushers in peace.

Gandhi’s ideas about peace point out that the solution he offered for
effecting world peace transcended the frontiers of historical international
diplomacy. The chief limitation of international diplomacy that it is based
upon the recognition of power system. The Gandhian way claims to stand for non-
violent and non-exploitative social order which alone can ensure just and en-
during peace. Dr. Ralph Bunche observed : "The United Nations approach to world
problems is very similar to the Gandhian approach." 352 This statement of the
world-famous mediator, albeit his sincerity, does not commend itself for agreement.
The United Nations - however useful it may be in certain aspects and is certainly a
marked improvement upon the previous international organizations - cannot be credit-
ed even with giving a lead in the direction of moving towards a ‘world without
war’. "The world of tomorrow will be, must be, a society based on non-violence",
Gandhi asserted. 353 The United Nations, because of its very inherent constitu-
tion, is not in a position to advocate such an order of future society. While
Gandhi pointed towards "a distant goal, an impractical Utopia" although, accord-
ing to him, "not in the least unobtainable," the UN has been engaged in crying
for peace giving the least shock to the foundation of power-politics. 354

One may argue that the Gandhian declarations for peace suggest some practical
difficulties for being implemented in the present-day world. But Gandhi would not
counteract such a ‘practical’ difficulty. He would counterpose by saying; If
an individual can practise non-violence, cannot whole groups of individuals?
Whole nations? He believed that one must make a beginning and the rest would
The Gandhian concept of world peace should be viewed as an integral part of his philosophy of life and one should try to appreciate his attitude within the general framework of his philosophy of ahimsa. Once the postulates of his doctrine of ahimsa are accepted, one finds no difficulty to comprehend the logical application of that doctrine in the realm of international relations. But the postulates themselves being unacceptable, his concept of peace ipso facto loses its appeal. The question should, therefore, be treated at a fundamental level.

However 'utopian' Gandhi's plea for unilateral disarmament might have been, one must concede that this idea has caught the imagination of many peoples. The demand for unilateral disarmament is no longer an idealist's faith; it has assumed the proportion of a mass movement in Europe. In that sense of kindling that faith, Gandhi had a definite contribution to the cause of world peace.

Secondly, one may point out that Gandhi's approach was essentially subjective and idealistic in philosophical outlook; with his statement - "If there were no greed, there would be no armaments". We have traced earlier the influence of Indian Upanishadic tradition (p.514) that might have led Gandhi to take such a view of things. But his insight did not fail him, as we have argued earlier, to spotlight the canker of Power-dominated world. This was of no mean significance when the olive branch was held aloft by the imperialist powers only to conceal the standard of Eagle from public view.

Ram Rajya or Perfect Society.

Ram Rajya embodied Gandhi's dream of the perfectibility of man and society. The term Ram Raj derives from the Ramayana's classic depiction of the victory of Rama, symbolizing the forces of good, over Ravana, symbolizing the forces of evil and the consequent establishment of a reign of righteousness and justice in the land. Gandhi's reference to Ram Raj aroused fear and suspicion in the minds of the Muslims and provoked a host of critics to aver that he wanted to
go back to the mythical Golden Age. At the very outset we have seen that as a means for communicating with the common people he employed traditional terms and gave them new meanings, as he himself admitted.

In his presidential address at the Third Kathianad Political Conference held at Bhavnagar, January 8, 1925 Gandhi said:

"Rama did justice even to a dog. By abandoning his kingdom and living in the forest for the sake of truth Rama gave to all the kings of the world an object-lesson in noble conduct. By his strict monogamy he showed that a life of perfect self-restraint could be led by a royal householder. He lent splendour to his throne by his popular administration and proved that Rama Rajya was the acme of Swaraj. Rama did not need the very imperfect modern instrument of ascertaining public opinion by counting votes. He had captivated the hearts of the people. He knew public opinion by intuition - as it were. The subjects of Rama were supremely happy. Such Rama Rajya is possible even today. The race of Rama is not extinct. In modern times the first Caliphs may be said to have established Rama Rajya. Abubaker and Hazarat Umar collected revenue running into crores and yet personally they were fakirs." 356

But later Gandhi modified his position. In 1927 he said that "I assure you will find nothing there (in Gandhi's heart) but love for Rama whom I see face to face in the starving millions of India." 357 This is an instance of his utilising a mythical symbol in the interest of public service. He said in 1947: "Rama, Krishna etc. are called incarnations of God because we attribute divine qualities to them. In truth they are creations of men's imagination. Whether they actually lived or not does not affect the picture of them in men's minds. The Rama and Krishna of history often present difficulties which have to be overcome by all manner of arguments". 358 And "My Rama, the Rama of our prayers, is not the historical Rama, the son of Dasaratha, the king of Ayodhya. He is the
eternal, the unborn, the one without a second."

The picture of Ram Rajya that Gandhi visualized was an expression of his yearning for a just and perfect society - the Kingdom of Righteousness on earth. Ram Raj meant more than Swaraj or political self-government.

In 1929 he wrote:

"I warn my Musalman friends against misunderstanding me in my use of the words 'Ramaraj'. By Ramaraj I do not mean Hindu Raj. I mean by Ramaraj Divine Raj, the Kingdom of God. For me Rama and Rahim are one and the same deity. I acknowledge no other God but the one God of truth and rightness. Whether Rama of my imagination ever lived or not on this earth, the ancient ideal of Ramaraj is undoubtedly one of true democracy in which the meanest citizen could be sure of swift justice without an elaborate and costly procedure."

That he did not advocate Hindu Raj but the Kingdom of Righteousness may be illustrated from many of his statements made towards the close of his life.

Referring to the criticism of the employment of Ram Raj as his ideal society, he said:

"It is a convenient and expressive phrase, the meaning of which no alternative can so fully express to millions. When I visit the Frontier province or address predominantly Muslim audiences I would express my meaning to them by calling it Khudai Raj, while to a Christian audience I would describe it as the Kingdom of God on earth."

In 1937 Gandhi described Ramraj as sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority, as distinguished from the British, Soviet or Nazi system of rule.

Later, Gandhi added a concrete meaning to the term. In an editorial on "Independence" (Harijan, 5-5-46) he wrote:

"Friends have repeatedly challenged me to define independence. At the
risk of repetition, I must say that independence of my dream means Ram Raj, that is, the Kingdom of God, on earth. I do not know what it will be like in heaven. I have no desire to know the distant scene. If the present is attractive enough, the future cannot be very unlike.

"In concrete terms, then, the independence should be political, economic and moral.

" 'Political' necessarily, means the removal of the control of British army in every shape and form.

" 'Economic' means entire freedom from the British capitalists and capital, as also their Indian counterpart. In other words, the humblest must feel equal to the tallest. * This can take place only by capital or the capitalists sharing their skill and capital with the lowliest and the least.

" 'Moral' means freedom from armed defence forces. My conception of Ram Raj excludes replacement of the British army by a national army of occupation. A country that is governed by even its national army can never be morally free and therefore, its so-called weakest member can never rise to his full moral height." 365 (His concept of 'square of freedom' may be recalled here. see p. 41?)

Nearly a year ago before he made the above statement he drew a similar picture of Ram Raj.

Q. What is Rama-Rajya?

A. It can be religiously translated as Kingdom of God on Earth; politically translated it is perfect democracy in which inequalities based on

---

"Rama-Rajya of my dream ensures rights alike of prince and pauper." — Anrita Bazar Patrika, 2-6-34, Quoted in Nirmal Kumar Bose, Selections From Gandhi (Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1957), Sec. 301, p. 91.
possession and non-possession, colour, race or creed or sex vanish. In it, land and state belong to the people, justice is prompt, perfect and cheap and, therefore, there is freedom of worship, speech and the Press - all this because of the reign of the self-imposed law of moral restraint.

Such a state must be based on Truth and Non-violence, and must consist of prosperous, happy and self-contained villages and village communities. It is a dream that may never be realised. I find happiness in living in that dreamland, ever trying to realise it in the quickest way." 366

Gandhi held that "there can be no Ramrajya in the present state of imiquitous inequalities in which a few roll in riches and the masses do not get even enough to eat." 367

The political transfer of power in India did not enthuse him. In a prayer speech dated 2-12-47 he said that "the independence of today stifled him. It was unreal and unstable." 368 He looked beyond the present for the state that would belong to the people. His pronouncements on the subject made during the last days of his life indicate that he improved upon his earlier abstract concept.

To sum up, Ramraj, notwithstanding its religious tenor and nostalgic reference, stands for an egalitarian non-violent democratic order, moral values forming the base of such an order. 369 Gandhi did not like the ancient myth to be transformed into reality but he, on the other hand, envisioned a future which goes beyond the present to become a reality. Whether this 'utopia' is realizable through the method he advocated is a matter of sharp controversy - for it is a question of one's intellectual preference - but the urge behind this vision can hardly be ignored. It inspires.

Gandhian Ideal of State: A Comparative Evaluation

Gandhi's ultimate ideal was Stateless Society. Self-government, according to him, means continuous effort to be independent of government control. 370 Anarchism, despite many distinct conceptions and tendencies within its fold, stands for
Elimination of state as an institution and its replacement by an entirely free and spontaneous co-operation among individuals, groups, regions and nations. While anarchism stands for the abolition of the State, Marxian Communist ideal is the withering away of the State. Anarchism, Marxian Communism and Gandhism stand on a common philosophic ground, the underlying sentiment being the establishment of jus naturale. But the difference between Marxism and Anarchism is so fundamental—in respective attitude towards man, society, politics and in the application of method—that the two schools of thought stand removed farthest from each other.

It is not, however, necessary for our study to go into that age-long controversy. What is relevant here is to assess, in as brief as possible, Gandhi's ideal of state in relation to these two political philosophies.

We have seen above (p.47) that Gandhi did not approach the problem of Power from a class point of view on which the Marxian theory of state puts its primary emphasis. Briefly summed up the Marxist political and state doctrine is as follows:

1. The State is the product of the irreconcilable class antagonism and the instrument of oppression by which the ruling class holds down the subject and exploited classes. The State is therefore by no means an instrument of class reconciliation poised above classes and parties as is put across the mass of the people in the phrase "civil truce".

2. The public power erected by the ruling class (Standing army, police, prisons, and so on) is strengthened in proportion to the sharpening of the class antagonism within the state. It acts by force, internally and externally (the plunder policy of imperialist states).

3. The civil service, including particularly of the democratic republic, shows itself likewise to be an organ of capitalist rule (the corruption of public servants and the brotherhood of government and capital).

4. Indispensable for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie is the revolutionary seizure of state power by the proletariat. Only when the communist society
is completed does the State wither away altogether.

5. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the state of the proletariat, organized as the ruling class, with the object of carrying socialization through.

6. The bourgeois, parasitical and oppressive state machine cannot be taken over and carried further by the victorious proletariat. On the contrary, the bureaucratic-military state machine must be smashed.

Gandhi while asserting that the State is the embodiment of violence in a concentrated and organized form would not, however, agree with a Marxist that this violence is in its essence, violence of class domination.

Secondly, the Gandhian programme is not 'the revolutionary seizure of power', # as Marxism holds to be the sine qua non for the higher phase of Communism, the stage of withering away of the State, but 'generation of power' from below.

Gandhi would never approve of centralization of state power even as a temporary expedient or as a transitional phase like the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Thirdly, the difference lies in the method. It is generally supposed that Gandhism and Marxism, while sharing the common ideal, depart from each other on the question of means. It has been the special accusation against Marxism that it advocates the dictum: Ends justify means and as such it places its reliance on violence as an instrument of capture of power. Gandhi himself while appreciating the ethical ideal of Communism was opposed to Marxism on this ground, the basic philosophical belief apart. We submit, however, that this is not a correct reading

# "A non-violent revolution is not a programme of 'seizure of power'. It is a programme of transformation of relationships ending in a peaceful transfer of power." - Gandhi in Harijan, 17-2-46, p. 14.
of Marxism. Marxism is not Machiavellianism. Marxism recognizes the dialectical inseparability of means and ends. This interrelation of means and ends in no way implies that any end justifies any means. It implies rather that means and ends are so inextricably connected that the question cannot be answered by any simple 'yes' or 'no'. The means to social progress must be adapted to their end and be harmonious with it. According to the Marxian doctrine, the means by which the moral goal of socialism can be achieved in an immoral world are determined not only by the nature of socialism as the end but also by the nature of capitalist state power, the degree of democratic development, the relative strength of the opposing forces, specific situations and so on. Marxism does not advocate violence for its own sake (its condemnation of individual terrorist method is too well known); violence is thrust upon the oppressed by the ruling class and the majority of the population as a measure of self-defence and of establishing the ethical ideal of non-exploitation represented by Communism takes resort to just and necessary violence. The amount of violence which must be employed is a function of the intensity of the resistance which is encountered. Gandhi, on the other hand, like any other ethical idealist would urge upon us that we must confine ourselves to means that are in themselves good. Violence is all evil and therefore to be eschewed, Gandhi held. A Marxist may allege that Gandhi in his eagerness to stick to the moral failed to draw a distinction between what is evil and what is morally wrong. The difference between Marxism and Gandhism is, therefore, fundamental and lies in the domain of ethics.

Fourthly, according to the Marxian theory of state only in the Communist

society, when there are no classes (i.e. when there is no difference between the members of society as regards their relation to the social means of production) the state as such ceases of itself: the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and the direction of the process of production. The State is not abolished, it withers away. But during the transitional period of the dictatorship of the proletariat a series of restriction on the freedom of the oppressors, the exploiters and the capitalists are imposed simultaneously with an immense expansion of democracy, which for the first time becomes democracy for the poor, democracy for the people. Democracy for the vast majority of the people, and suppression by force i.e. exclusion from democracy of the exploiters and oppressors of the people this is the change democracy undergoes during the transition from capitalism to communism. Gandhi, on the other hand, would not approve of forcible suppression of adversaries under any circumstances. He would stand for conversion of the adversary through non-violent non-co-operation. There is never the need for the Satyagrahi, according to Gandhi, to wait until all opposition has been liquidated. * Voluntary associations of the people would spring up from the present, not at a distant future, which would regulate, as far as possible, the economic and political life of the community. The constructive programme of Gandhi, it may be noted here, not only accompanies and follows non-violent direct action to eliminate state authority, but it precedes as well. Gandhi described this process as 'one of automatic adjustment'. In other words the chief difference between Marxian socialism and Gandhi's anarchist ideal lies in the fact that in the latter the process of the elimination of state authority begins from the immediate present ** while 'withering away of the state' presupposes

* "I will not wait till I have converted the whole society to my view but will straightway make a beginning with myself." - Harian, 31-3-45, pp. 63-64. 'Gandhiji 'a Communism' by Fyarelal.

** Dr. Mahadev Prasad comments: "Like orthodox Marxists, Gandhi does not dream of withering away of the State but in scattering away of it." - Social Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi (Viswavidyalaya Prakashan, Gorakhpur, 1958), p. 237.
'expropriation of the expropriators' and the dictatorship of the proletariat. 372

Was Gandhi a philosophical anarchist? Gandhi's reference to 'sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority' and other similar statements expressing abhorrence of State as an institution have lent the impression that he was a philosophical anarchist. Dr. Gopinath Dhanan and a host of scholars 373 subscribe to this view. To quote Dr. Dhanan: "To Gandhiji the end is "the greatest good of all". He is a philosophical anarchist because he believes that this end can be realised only in the classless Stateless democracy of autonomous village communities based on non-violence instead of coercion, on service instead of exploitation, on remuneration instead of acquisitiveness and on the largest measure of local and individual initiative instead of centralization... Gandhiji ideally speaking repudiates the State as such." 374 Gandhi has often been described as a religious anarchist or a pacifist anarchist like Tolstoy. 375

Dr. Benoy Sarkar observed that Gandhi was "an almost literal paraphrase of Tolstoy as regards denunciation of the state and advocacy of non-violence. Stripped of all metaphysics, his non-co-operation away from the state = anarchism (cf. Jakunin, Kropotkin, Tolstoy) one remembers likewise the anti-statal Spencerian indifferentism of Tagore's Swadeshi Samaj." 376

But the opinion that Gandhi was a philosophical anarchist has not been shared by all. P. Spiatt while recognising the influence of Tolstoy on Gandhi refuses to call Gandhi an anarchist. 377

Dr. Himan Behari Majumdar observes:

"Mahatma Gandhi condemned the existing social and political order as unjust and he opposed the centralising policy of the state but he never advocated the destruction of the state itself. He may be more aptly described as an upholder of co-operative socialism but unlike the Guild Socialists, Syndicalists and Industrial Unionists, he laid all the emphasis on handicrafts and cottage industries." 378
Dr. Power comments:

"Unlike Tolstoy, Gandhi did not endorse a stateless society for the temporal world. To do so would have precluded him from struggling for national India's own sovereignty. His approach to the ethical nature of the state agrees with Max Weber's view; that the state is a technical tool rather than something of intrinsic worth."

Baridas T. Muzumdar says:

"In spite of his proclaimed belief in the least government as being the best, Gandhi had nothing in common with anarchism."

Prof. Bondurant in her masterly study observes that the Gandhian approach points the way towards reconciling political organization with the ideals of anarchism. She criticises Dhanaw's standpoint in not recognising the relative unimportance of end-structure in the Gandhian approach to the state, and again then Prof. Dhanaw suggests that Gandhi's democracy would be "... based on non-violence instead of coercion". For in the Gandhian ideal, she argues, an element of coercion is, in fact, retained. Another point of her criticism relates to Dhanaw's description of non-violent state as the second best society, a middle way. Prof. Bondurant holds that it would be inaccurate to suppose that Gandhi thought of retaining the state as an intermediate step in a determined progress towards anarchical society, in the manner of Marxist thought. Carrying the argument further, she comments that politics based on Satyagraha does not carry with it elements of himsa, but of ahimsa. It still remains politics and may involve a government, state structure. Gandhi held essential ideals in common with anarchists but that he was willing, as they are not, to accept a degree of state organization and control. Gandhi, according to Bondurant, could not accept the overall philosophical anarchist position. Another important point that she mentions is: Anarchists, like other political theocrats, have rarely sought a positive technique whereby a system could be realized. The contribution
of Gandhian political philosophy centres upon the role which Satyagraha as a technique of action, together with the philosophy of conflict which lies behind it, may play in a social and political system based upon them. It is in the potential of a dynamic end-creating method of Gandhian Satyagraha that one must try to find answer and therein lies the distinctive superiority of the Gandhian approach, so argues the learned American scholar. 381

Now, to come to the conclusion. We have argued earlier that there were two Gandhis - the idealist philosopher and the realist politician - who, paradoxically enough, represented a singularly unified character. - Dr. Atindranath Bose correctly noted that Gandhi's "methodology had a pragmatic and an idealist aspect while his philosophy was purely idealistic." 382 That explains why the latter went far ahead of his time and reality. Gandhi dreamt of an enlightened anarchy and led the movement for the establishment of a free democratic state. The contradiction between the abstract and the concrete, the ideal and the real, we repeat again, can only be appreciated if we take note of the gap between the role that history assigned Gandhi * and his subjective yearning for perfection. His astute sense of realism led him to fight for the creation of a sovereign national state, which he knew would be far from perfect. Gandhi did not, unlike some anarchists, contemplate dispensing with the machinery of the State so long as it was a necessity. His concession-preference for control or ownership of the means of production lying with smaller decentralized, more or less autonomous units - in regard to State ownership of heavy industries brought him close to the socialist programme. Here his position is distinctly different from the anarchists who are out to 'abolish' the State. Secondly, while the anarchists are a-political

* "the task put before him (Gandhi) by history is circumscribed..." J. B. Kripalani, Gandhian Thought (Gandhi Smarak Nidhi, New Delhi, Orient Longmans Ltd., Bombay Calcutta etc., 1961) p. 56.
Gandhi was intensely political. As a politician he knew that politics refers to the disposition of power. And so he moved for a shift of power from the hands of foreign imperialists to a democratic national state. Here a point is to be re-stated. As the champion of the disincorporated he would certainly like to see the interests of the toiling peoples in such a state to have the priority. Prof. Nirmal Kumar Bose succinctly sums up the position when he says: "Gandhi's conception of the State is neither completely like that of the Anarchists nor of the Communists. It approaches the former with regard to its aim of political and economic decentralization, and that of the latter in that the interest of the toiling millions will have a dictatorial position within the State."

One notices that Gandhi did not ignore the demand or underrate the value of the immediate and the temporary for the sake of the ultimate. It was somewhat unique on his part to reconcile the apparent contradiction; in his corporate activity he laid stress on the immediate - one step was enough for him - only to draw further sustenance for attaining the ideal he cherished. Gandhi in a rather exalted philosophical mood could well share Shelley's anarchist vision of man in a world which still lies outside history and outside time but the realist in him would awake again to come to grip with the realities with a grim determination to reshape this timebound world. The distinctive merit of Gandhi lies in the fact that he could dream as well as act.

"The loathsome mask has fallen, the man remains sceptreless, free, uncircumscribed, but man Equal, unclassed, tribeless and nationless Exempt from awe, worship, degree, the king Over himself; just, gentle, wise:"
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