Chapter 4

Swaraj and Nation as Class

In this chapter, the claims of swaraj to socialist/communist ideals are measured against the theories of nation\(^1\) propounded by the leftist thinkers. If the rightist thinkers valorize nation as an organic idea rooted in metaphysics, the leftists see nation as a class construct, a capitalistic conspiracy, a unit of economic exploitation, a false category so on and so forth. If the rightists hold state to be sacred construct, to the leftist the liquidation of state is the cherished ideal. Instead of locating nation in the abstract, the leftists define nation in terms of economics or to use typical marxist jargon, in terms of 'dialectical materialism'. The focus in this chapter is not on as much Marx\(^2\) as it is on his later disciples. Russian thinkers – Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky – have been studied in the first part. Among the thinkers of the new left, the views of two leading thinkers – Gramsci and Althusser have been incorporated in the second part of the chapter. Indian thinkers of socialist leanings
M.N. Roy, Subhash Chandra Bose, Nehru, Vinoba Bhave, Jaya Prakash Narayan and Ram Manohar Lohia are discussed in the third part of the chapter. The fourth part exclusively deals with Gandhi's swaraj as a socialist ideal. The fifth part of the chapter brings out subtle difference between Gandhian socialism and Russian socialism, between Gandhian socialism and European socialism, and most significantly between Gandhian socialism and Indian left.

Before any discussion of socialism or Marxism is undertaken, it is important to underline the doctrine of state as visualized by Marx and Engles. The entire discussion of Russian marxism or even later on of European or Indian left on nation as class construct has to be contextualized or at least seen against this basic frame of state:

1. The state is a coercive structure. It is a concentrated and organized violence of society.
2. The state is an instrument of class domination. It represents the particular interests of the bourgeoisie.
3. It is not the state which conditions and regulates civil society, but it is the civil society which conditions and regulates the state.
4. The state is a transitory institution. The progress moves from state to society, and not from society to state.

In Marxist thought, the state is not seen as a divine scheme meant for the betterment of all people. Nor is it privileged as a democratic universalist kind of institution serving the interests of all classes.

Lenin steers the middle path between the anarchists and those who worship nation as organic state. If in the beginning he demands abolition of police, army and even bureaucracy, later on he changes his stance. He stands for the State for the time-being: “For the present we stand unconditionally for the State; and as for giving a description of socialism in its developed form, where there will be no State – nothing can be imagined about it except that then will be realized the principle ‘form each according to his capabilities, to each according to his needs’. ” To proclaim the demise of State in advance, according to Lenin, will be a violation of historical perspective. Nation-state is not the cherished ideal of Lenin, but it has a transitional significance. State is indispensable in
the era of transition from capitalism to socialism. Lenin thus provides “an essentially pragmatic but principled approach which did help communists politically to orient themselves towards the national movements of his time.”

Stalin’s theory of nation as state is on one side a refutation of Marxism, on the other it is a liquidation of Leninism. If Marx and Lenin uphold the mechanistic view of state, Stalin views at the institution of state as a living organism. State is seen as embodiment of nation in the communist frame of Stalin. Stalin evinces little enthusiasm for internationalism, and as supreme ruler he shifts the entire propaganda emphasis towards Russian nationalism. The marxist ideal of ‘withering away of the State’ is turned upside down under the despotism of Stalin regime.

Stalin always insists on revising canonical marxism in the light of practical exigencies which Soviet Russia was undergoing after the October Revolution. He accounts for the absolute necessity of State in terms of two new phases the Russia as a Socialist State is passing through thus:
Since the October Revolution, our Socialist State has in its development passed through two main phases. The first phase was the period from the October Revolution to the elimination of the exploiting classes. The principle task in that period was to suppress the resistance of the overthrown classes, to organize the defence of the country against the attack of the interventionists, to restore industry and agriculture, and to prepare the conditions for the elimination of the capitalist elements. The second phase was the period from the elimination of the capitalist elements in town and country to the complete victory of the Socialist economic system and the adoption of the new constitution.⁵

Stalin even underlines the necessity of state even when Russia attains complete communism. As long as there is a capitalist encirclement of Soviet Russia, the State as an institution is indispensable. Such a position is highly inconsistent with not only classical Marxism but also with Leninism. Lenin does refer to the prematurity of the very idea of withering away of state in the first phase, but in the second stage he does not see
any interventionist role of state. Thus the continuance of State even under communism, as visualized by Stalin, reduces the idea of withering away of the State into a ritualistic final goal.

Instead of dreaming world revolution or what Trotsky terms as 'permanent revolution', Stalin proposes the doctrine of 'socialism in one country'. Trotsky while enunciating his doctrine of 'permanent revolution' "concentrates on three main issues in the chronological sequence: i. the role of peasantry in a workers' revolution, ii. the bourgeois features of the revolution and its transition to a socialist or collectivist phase, iii. the importance of world revolution". Stalin's narrow approach to socialism created skepticism even among communists. The emergence of unbridled bureaucratism was seen as a kind of 'bourgeois restoration'. Trotsky terms this as 'counter-revolution'.

II

The thinkers of the New Left extend classical Marxism by way of defining state/nation in terms of class dominance which gradually and subtly seeps into culture and takes on a
moral validity too. The mere economism of the conventional marxism, they believe, needs to be seen in and against the larger frame of culture. They, in their own distinct ways, try to decipher and decode the process where economic dominance takes on the form of cultural dominance too. From mere materialism as the basis of society/nation they move to cultural materialism. They deconstruct the process through which class dominance seeks to totalize itself as all-informing principle of state-control. The ruling class not only wields economic power, it forms the cultural canon too.

Gramsci's concept of hegemony, in this context, is very significant as it tries to describe how materially strong elite eventually manages consent and consensus and takes on the intellectual and moral leadership too. The conception of hegemony has certain very important consequences in relation to the way in which Gramsci envisages the nature and the role of the state. The state/nation is seen as the organ of one particular group destined and designed to create favourable conditions for the latter's maximum expansion. Gramsci is more interested in the mechanism through which the ruling group keeps the balances of power in its favour almost eternally. He studies in detail the modus operandi through
which the particular ruling group presented itself as national and universal and coordinates concretely with the general interests of the subordinated groups. He identifies three distinct moments of political consciousness that represent three corresponding degrees of ruling elite slowly and gradually hegemonizing society/state thus:

- **a. the primitive economic moment** in which the consciousness of a group's own professional interests are expressed but not as yet their interests as a social class;
- **b. the political economic moment** which is one in which the consciousness of class interests is expressed, but only at an economic level;
- **c. the third moment** is that of hegemony which is one in which one becomes aware that own corporate interests, in their present and future development transcend the corporate limits of the purely economic class, and can and must become the interests of other subordinate groups too.  

For Gramsci the third moment is the moment where the specifically political moment is situated. It is characterized by
ideological struggle which attempts to forge unity between economic, political and intellectual objectives. All the questions around which this struggle rages happen to be on a "universal", not a corporate level, thereby creating the hegemony of a fundamental social group over a series of subordinate ones.

When the dominant class completes the process of hegemonization by way of co-opting protests from subordinate classes, the dictatorship of the dominant becomes almost irrevocable. An integral state comes into being. Such a concept of state goes beyond the economistic conception of the state envisaged by marxists. In the integral state, the ruling dominant class adopts the interests of the popular classes to create a national will. "The development and expansion of this particular group are conceived of, and presented as being the motor force of universal expansion, of a development of all national energies".9 Hegemony leads to a higher synthesis than simple class alliance. This synthesis of the dominant and the popular functionally speaking remains in the favour of the former. Nation in nutshell, according to Gramsci a hegemonic construct.
Louis Althusser is another ‘structuralist’ philosopher to emerge in the revival of Marxist theory. According to Althusser, Marx along with Freud are responsible for a ‘decentering’ of the human subject. Mere ‘economism’ is distortion of Marxism because it makes politics, for instance, either a reflection of, or an unimportant by-product of the economic. Dominance is not to be defined in terms of class only. Production relations are social relations, and what they condition is all other social relations. Societies are ordered combinations of economic, ideological, political practices and even theoretical paradigms, none of which is reducible to any of the others, and each of which has its own specific weight in the shaping of the whole.

The view of history as a linear sequence of epochs or stages, the succession of modes of production through which humankind passes en route to communist self-realization had become identified with Marxist orthodoxy. Althusser rejects this position for according to him major historical transitions are always contingent, always exceptional. Not only is the view of history as a process of human self-realization to be rejected, but so also is any notion of autonomous individual agency, as the source of social life. Individuals are bearers of social
relations. The self is an outcome of the social process which is itself the *modus operandi* of dominant ideology. Althusser’s apparent denial of individual autonomy outraged humanist Marxists and non-Marxist social historians alike.

Nation/state, in Althusserian terms, is a space of dominant ideology which the ruling elite evolves. This overarching ideology super-ordinates all classes and lends social stability. The individual has no identity in this kind of set up.

III

Indian left has its own peculiarities and indigenous characteristics. Though primarily informed by the mainstream leftist ideology of Marx, Lenin, Mao etc., it is equally located in the tradition-conscious India. The pulls of culture, history, mythology etc. substantially blunt its radicalism and absolute Communism. The complex Indian situation has forced practically all of the Indian leftists to revise their stance and opinion about India as a nation. In the process they devise their own homespun marxism(s) which is (are) not as radical or deterministic as the canonical marxism is. Indian socialists
visualize a classless, egalitarian nation where castes or communities exist in a hierarchy-free frame. Nation, unlike the canonical leftist thought, remains a mainstay of their vision.

Among Indian socialists those who are contemporary of Gandhi, M. N. Roy, early Nehru and Subhas Bose figure as three important champions of socialism in India.

Nehru, to begin with evinces clear socialists leanings. In his famous 1936 Congress presidential address, he distinguishes Indian nationalism with Western nationalism on the basis of former's foregrounding in socialist struggle as against the latter's ideological allegiance with capitalism thus:

Capitalism, in its difficulties took to fascism with all its brutal suppression of what Western civilization had apparently stood for; it became, even in some of its homelands, what its imperialist counterpart had long been in the subject colonial countries. Fascism and imperialism thus stood out as the two faces... of decaying capitalism...

Socialism in the West and the rising nationalism of the Eastern and other dependent countries
opposed this combination of Fascism and Imperialism. Nationalism in the East, it must be remembered was essentially different from the new and terribly narrow nationalism of fascist countries; the former was the historical urge to freedom, the latter the last refuge of reaction.  

Nehru does not recommend the use of the term socialism as synonymous with humanitarianism. He refers to its specific economic connotations. In the same speech, Nehru suggests some of the specific ways through which socialism can be usefully applied to Indian situation:

I see no way of ending the poverty, the vast unemployment, the degradation and the subjection of the Indian people except through socialism. That involves vast and revolutionary changes in our political and social structure, the ending of the vested interests in land and industry, as well as the feudal and, autocratic Indian states system. That means the ending of the private property except in a restricted sense, and the replacement of the
present profit system by a higher ideal of cooperative service.  

Mere metaphysical construction of India as a nation is not enough to build India. Nehru, always insists on a more tangible and pragmatic frame for the modernization of India as an upcoming nation. In fact Nehru gravitates towards socialism precisely for its anti-theological, scientific, material and this worldly concerns. At times his distrust for the glorification of an abstract India becomes quite forceful: "For a hungry man, truth has little meaning, he wants food; for a hungry man God has no meaning, he wants food, and India is a hungry, starving country . . ."  

Nehru sees communism as an anti-dote to fascism. If India does not look up to socialist ideals, there is a possibility that it might go the fascist way. His diagnosis of rise of fascism is rooted in his faith in communism. He observes that the fear of communism has driven many liberals and other middle groups in Europe to Fascism. Later Nehru, becomes much more a pacifist than a revolutionary. He opts for the humanist liberal tradition. He valourizes the values of democracy and
republicanism etc. His association with Gandhi also blunts his youthful fascination for socialism.

M.N. Roy, a contemporary of Gandhi, contributes a lot to the evolution of Indian left. Influenced by the climate of militant nationalism, Roy begins as radical nationalist. Later on during his sojourn to US, he is attracted towards communism. He joins Congress as well, but is expelled because of his support to the Nazi regime of Hitler during the World War I. After his brief stint in Congress, he becomes a convert to radical humanism. Roy's growth from being a radical nationalist to a radical humanist also reflects the dilemmas, the inner contradictions of communism in India.

As an Indian, Roy fails to reconcile with Marxism; liberalism too is seen with lot of skepticism; Gandhi's religious socialism also does no fit in the scientific and individualistic order which ultimately he gravitates into. In his book *One Year of Non-Cooperation* in a thoroughly Marxist vein, he criticizes the medievalism and conservatism of the Gandhian concept of swaraj. In this book, he observes that Gandhism is not revolutionism, it is only "weak and watery" reformism. Roy holds man to the centre of universe.
Contrary to canonical Marxism, Roy places man prior to society. He does not see man being moral and rational at the same time. Morality within man grows as rationality develops.

Roy's humanist philosophy never represents a transcendental society. His radical humanism is based on humanism as against internationalism. Internationalism suggests the need of nation-state as a pre-condition for world brotherhood. Roy disfavours the very idea of national frontiers. He rather prefers a vision which involves entire mankind, and not political segments termed as nations in the political parleys. In fact he blames Gandhi for being fascist in his approach towards the British.

Subhas Chandra Bose, posed a real threat to the undisputed claims of Gandhi to national leadership not in terms of personality alone, but also significantly on the level of ideology. Though he had tremendous respect for Gandhi, yet he did not like his non-violent strategies of struggle against the imperial Raj. Also he wanted to exploit the uneasy international scenario to the disadvantage of English, to which Gandhi was totally opposed. Like Gandhi he did not have moral scruples. He was a champion of aggressive nationalism as
against the non-violent nationalism of Gandhi. Secondly he sought total isolation of the capitalists from Congress Party, the main political force of political freedom from the English.

Subhas foresees a rise of the left-wing which will a clear programme, ideology and plan of action. In his “A Glimpse of Future”, he charts out the likely orientation of this left wing thus:

1. The Party will stand for the interest of the masses, that is, of the peasants, workers, etc., and not for the vested interests, that is, the landlords, capitalists and money-lending classes.

2. It will believe in a sound system of state-planning for the re-organization of the agricultural and industrial life of the country.

3. It will seek to abolish landlordism and introduce a uniform land-tenure system for the whole of India."
Besides these overtly socialist inclinations of the so-called left Party of the future, this party will also evince strong authoritarian militaristic nationalist tendencies:

1. It will not stand for a democracy in the mid-Victorian sense of the term, but will believe in the government by a strong party bound together by military discipline, as the only means of holding India together and preventing a chaos, when Indians are free and are thrown entirely on their own resources.

2. It will endeavour to unite all the radical organizations under a national executive so that whenever any action is taken, there will be simultaneous activity on many fronts. \(^{15}\) (p.350)

Another important characteristic of this Party would be its deft exploitation of international political platforms to the advantage of nation. In fact, Subhas uses an 'immoral' words like 'propaganda' in the context of international politics. Such a usage is not only prohibited in Gandhian vision of swaraj it is blasphemous to think of national struggle in terms other than holy or sacred. Without mincing words, Subhas would his Party
of the future to "resort to international propaganda . . . to strengthen India's case for liberty."  

Subhas Bose seeks to combine nation with the working-class, or nationalism with socialism. He, almost reversing Nehru's position of holding communism as an anti-dote to fascism, forecasts a "synthesis of Communism with Fascism" that will decide the future course of world history. Not that he is unaware of the contradictions involved in this kind of a synthesis between two ideologies of communism and Fascism, yet very much like many other Indian socialists he seeks a merger of the two dissimilar ideologies in one working whole for India which is undergoing double exploitation, one the exploitation of the Indian capitalists/landlords on the petty peasantry, and another the exploitation of India as country by the colonialists. He enlists the commonalities of two ideologies thus:

Both Communism and Fascism believe in the supremacy of the State over the individual. Both denounce parliamentary democracy. Both believe in the party rule. Both believe in the dictatorship of the party and in the ruthless suppression of all
dissenting minorities. Both believe in a planned industrial reorganization of the country. ¹⁸

Subhas knows that Communism being anti-Church of anti-religion may not prove to be a practical proposition. It is in this sense he does not want India to be “a new edition of Soviet Russia” ¹⁹. And it is in this sense that he seeks a blend of nationalism and communism.

Vinoba Bhave, a disciple of Gandhi extended the concept of swaraj to a programme of actual social upliftment of the poor and the landless through his detailed programme of sarvodaya. However it needs to be observed that even in the hands of Vinoba sarvodaya remained a project inspired by the spiritual ideals of swaraj. Like swaraj, sarvodaya needed voluntary participation, it was not supposed to be a state-run show, it had to stem from people’s power. In fact Vinoba was against the coercive powers of the state. He distinguished this with “people’s power” ²⁰. Sarvodaya is another term for swaraj as like swaraj it “does not mean good government or majority rule, it means freedom from government, it means decentralization of power.” ²¹
It is only with the active arrival of Jai Prakash Narain sarvodaya attained a sharp political Marxist character. The difference between the approaches of Vinoba and JP is well explained by the monographer of Vinoba thus:

Vinoba’s approach was basically spiritual. He regarded himself an instrument in the hands of God and believed in doing his best, leaving the fruits to Him. They were, no doubt the touchstones on which the correctness of the methods could be tested, but, after all, they were beyond the control of human beings ... But it was different with JP, whose approach was primarily societal, as he himself had once said. With him results counted much more and there was a limit to his patience. That accounted also for his big stride from Marxism to Sarvodaya via democratic socialism.22

Jayaprakash Narayan is another Indian socialist who seeks to combine the two revolutionary impulses of pure nationalism with economic revolt against colonial exploitation. As a founding member of Congress Socialist Party, he tried to create an alternate ideological platform within Congress. The socialist
nationalism of JP is well spelt out in his Meerut speech, also also known as Meerut thesis of JP, thus: "The immediate task is to develop the national movement into a real anti-imperialist movement aiming at freedom from the foreign power and the native system of exploitation. For this it is necessary to wean the anti-imperialist elements in Congress away from its present bourgeois leadership and to bring them under the leadership of revolutionary socialism. This can be accomplished only if there is within the Congress an organized body of Marxian socialists". Unsatisfied with the moderate politics of Gandhi and the alienation of Communist Party leaders from nationalist movement, JP saw the possibility of socialism as different from dogmatic marxism, as one of planks of carrying forward the unfinished and unaccomplished tasks of freedom movement being led by Congress. It needs to be mentioned here that in terms of composition, Congress Socialist Party was a queer assortment of all sorts of people. "Fabian socialists, Marxists, Kautskyites, Stalinists, Leninists, Trotskyites, Rosa Luxembergites and even Gandhites and Vedantists constituted the conglomeration that CSP was." 

According to JP, nationalism is meaningless if it does not promise total social reconstruction. He prefers socialism
precisely because it aims at re-organization of the whole social life. JP seeks socialization of means of production to be meaningful must also be accompanied by socialization of the means of exchange and distribution, i.e., banks, commercial institutions, transport etc. He formulates the Marxist dictum regarding the distribution of wealth thus: “Social ownership means that all wealth is held in common and shared equitably, the basis of distribution being, initially, the amount and character of work done and, finally, the needs of the individual.”

After independence, JP revises his stance. The period between 1948 and 1956 is usually styled as the second phase of his democratic socialism. This is followed by what is known as sarvodaya period (1957 to 1968). JP turns pro-Gandhian and pro-Vinoba. The first notable shift is visible in his emphasis on ‘people’s socialism’ as against the state socialism. JP rejects the very idea of Western democracy for it conceives of society as “an inorganic mass of separate grains of individuals; the conception is that of an atomized society”. Also, democracy breeds centralization of power as nation state becomes powerful at the cost of the individual: “At one extreme of its political spectrum is the nation state and at the other the
individual voter, with a blank in between”\textsuperscript{28} JP, instead envision a ‘communitarian society’ and partyless polity. Power should flow not from top to bottom, it should flow from bottom to top. Both politically and economically, the structure of society is that of an inverted pyramid: “It is not only the political structure of society that resembles an inverted pyramid: the economic structure also presents the same fantastic picture.”\textsuperscript{29} It is in this context that he wants each village to a self-sufficient unit. The state as a monolithic machinery is relegated to the background.

JP lays down some principles for reconstruction of economy. First he prefers community’s welfare over the welfare of an individual. Community welfare consists in cooperation and harmony among its members: “The community’s economy is neither exploitative, nor competitive; it is cooperative and co-sharing.”\textsuperscript{30} An extended blue print of community welfare ultimately leading to nation’s prosperity has been suggested by JP. JP favours labour-intensive small scale industries over huge technology-intensive industries. This is because apart from the fact that the small-scale industries will offer employment on a mass scale and ensure wide distribution of wealth, it will also ensure maximum
utilization of local and regional resources, human and material, to the satisfaction of local and regional needs.

From 1969 onwards, from the lok-niti of sarvodaya, JP switches over to the raj-niti of 'total revolution'. However it needs to be kept in mind that there are no fundamental differences between sarvodaya and 'total revolution', the latter marks the intense politicization of the former. Important aspect of this total revolution is that it is "not only national in its basic character but also implies in its objectives the freedom, oneness (unity) and approximation in comparative equality of the whole of mankind".  

JP does not stand for an all-out state ownership and state intervention. Ownership may vest in the state, in an individual or company, such as village assembly ('gram sabha'), assembly of a group of villages (parghat sabha), district council (zilla parishad), or it may be a combination of all these forms of ownership. As far as leadership and organization needed for 'total revolution' is concerned, JP does not endorse the idea of having a hegemonic national level government. Instead, he wants people's committees at the local village and district level. He wants people's committees in the constituencies to
keep a watch over those elected to power. The national laws invariably fail at the local level. JP promotes youth for taking over local leadership to remove many social evils like the problems of high and low castes, of untouchability, of dowry, of the status and treatment of women. These evils cannot be properly uprooted by the laws and machinery devised for their execution by the national elite.

Ram Manohar Lohia is truly a post-independent, post-Gandhian socialist thinker who rejected canonical communism in favour of socialism which as a doctrine must ever "grow". So much so that Lohia even goes on to say that "no living doctrine is ever fully founded or closed". Yet he goes onto elaborate the basic tenets of his brand of socialism: "The establishment of social ownership over existing means of production, their further development and mass production, and some kind of a planned economy are acknowledged in varying degrees as the economic aims of socialism". But these tenets coincide with communism too. Therefore Lohia adds quite significantly some more attributes to socialism which are at variance with communism thus: "The preservation of national freedom, democracy, and human rights, and the securing of peace and of what are variously termed as the values of culture
or the spiritual qualities of life are believed to be the general aims of socialism\(^\text{34}\). Lohia has the uncanny perception of locating a dictatorial tendency in-built in the discourse of communism. Lohia is in favour of a socialist nation, as against a communist nation.

Over-all Indian socialism represents a curious mix of spiritualism and socialism\(^\text{35}\). More than just an empirical approach socialism in the Indian context is a principle of ethic and morality. All Indian socialists quote extensively from Buddha, Vivekananda, Kabir and other bhakti-saints. To hold Indian socialism as another theory of materialism is therefore unfair and lop-sided. Moreover Indian socialism in its formative years was more an approach of anti-colonial protest than simply a battle cry against the capitalist. That is, Indian socialism must be placed in the specific historical context of colonialism. It is self-defeating to dissociate nationalism from Indian socialism. Indian socialists see state as an agency that can effect socialist programme and possibly save the poor from the unbridled greed of the capitalists. This is not to say that they at times do doubt the totalitarian tendencies of the state. Indian socialist, instead of advocating one-party rule, underline the need of democracy and multi-party rule. Also, unlike
Russian brand of socialism, Indian socialism has strong faith in decentralization and pluralism. In fact many extreme Maoist groups in India hold India to be a multinational state, while other moderate socialist groups hold India to be an organic nation.

IV

Hind Swaraj is not just a critique of Euro-centric modernism or a theory of decolonization, it is a blueprint of development. The development model in-built in swaraj has a socialist sub-text which even Marxist nationalists acknowledge and swear by. There are many statements in Hind Swaraj which any staunch Marxist would like to make part of his manifesto. Here are some of the statements/ideas from Hind Swaraj which have a distinct socialist bearing:

1. There is an emphasis on manual labour. "[O]ur real happiness and health consisted in a proper use of our hands."  

2. Indian socialists see cities as sites of capitalism. To Gandhi "Large cities were a snare and a useless encumbrance." He is too "Satisfied with small villages."
3. Though Gandhi is in favour of division of labour or varna-ashrama, but never does advocate hierarchy in professions.\textsuperscript{41}

4. Each one to follow one's traditional occupation or trade.\textsuperscript{42}

5. Means have an irrevocable bearing on the ends. Purity of means. "The means may be likened to a seed, the end of to a tree; and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree. I am not likely to obtain the result flowing from the worship of God by laying myself prostrate before Satan. If, therefore anyone were to say: 'I want to worship God, it does not matter that I do so by means of Satan' it would set down as ignorant folly. We reap exactly as we sow." \textsuperscript{43}

6. \textit{Hind Swaraj} also envisages change, but not a violent one. To Gandhi, the change in the social set up can be brought about through soul-force (as against the brute force). Change effected through violence is short-lived.

7. Self-discipline and self-control at all levels is the hallmark of swaraj. In Gandhian scheme of socialism, mere economic empowerment is no guarantee of social-emancipation. Satyagrahis as true socialists "have to observe perfect chastity, adopt poverty, follow truth and cultivate fearlessness." \textsuperscript{44}
8. Gandhi has little faith in Parliament. There is hardly any place for institutionalized parliamentary democracy.

It is not just a question of picking us some statements from *Hind Swaraj*, in fact the entire text has an unmistakable socialist tenor.

Gandhi never employs the rhetoric of class war. While underscoring the intimate relationship between the capital and the labour, he employs what some critics of Gandhi describe the “blandest metaphor” of family or platitudinous concept of 'trusteeship'. Time and again Gandhi underscores the need that “capital and labour should be a great family living in unity and harmony with the capitalists serving as the ‘trustees’ for the moral and material ‘welfare of the labouring classes’” (YI, 20Aug, 1925). Repeatedly Gandhi tells millowners:

> What I expect of you, therefore is that you should hold all your riches as a trust to be used solely in the interests of those who sweat for you, and to whose industry and labour you owe all your position and prosperity. I want you to make your labourers co-partners of wealth.
Self-control or swa-raj is the keyword when it comes to describing the relation of capital with labour. Neither labourers should raise demands which are unpractical and non-viable, nor capitalists should exploit the labourers.

Never does Gandhi give hint of his being influenced by Soviet brand of socialism. Perhaps he is the only nationalist who is not swept off his feet by the tide of Bolshevik Revolution. This does not mean that Gandhi is indifferent to this epoch-making event. He is all for socialism but not the way it has been realized in Soviet Russia. As an ideal socialism does enamour Gandhi, but when it comes to adopting the 'right' means to attain this ideal, he has his own strong and uncompromising moral predilections. He seeks socialist revolution provided it is purged of the evil of violence and totalitarian tendencies.

Also unlike Russian communists Gandhi does not endorse the idea that nation is unreal unit or that it is just a transitory unit/ arrangement in socialist revolution. As a swarajist,
Gandhi would never compromise his nationality. Swaraj is not mere a question of economic space, it is question of cultural identity. Economics cannot be the basic foundation of society. Gandhi instead holds religion, morality and metaphysics as cardinal principles of healthy self-enhancing social set-up. Trotsky's idea of 'permanent revolution' does seem to approximate Gandhian endless struggle for the vindication of truth, but beyond that the two differ widely. Gandhi does not envisage revolution in terms of class war or overturning the capitalists. His endless pursuits derive their basic validity and legitimacy from moral ideals.

Opposed to canonical marxism, Gandhi seems much closer to New Left in terms of its understanding of how ruling elite hegemonizes power in the name of the majority rule and how a consensus is manufactured by the power-elite in its favour, but beyond that Gandhi charts his own course of ethical or metaphysical socialism. Whereas New Leftists distrust the motives of the ruling elite, Gandhi continues to confide in its benevolence. Hegemony is negative principle as it smacks of totalizing the power, in Gandhian frame it would mean undertaking the responsibility of uplifting the entire society. What Gramsci terms 'hegemony', Gandhi terms that
'trusteeship'. Gandhi never does blast the capitalists for their alleged complicity with the Raj; nor does he distrust them for being less national or social.

When it comes to Indian left or socialists, Gandhi beacons socialists of all hues. In fact most of the post-independence socialists happen to be overtly Gandhian. Gandhi is the guru of Indian socialism. Vinoba Bhave, later JP, Lohia, Sampuranand etc owe their evolution as socialists to Gandhi. One can even say that Indian socialism is a natural corollary of Gandhian swaraj. The concept of sarvodaya which was given so much credence first by Vinoba’s bhoodan and later on by JP’s ‘sampoorn kranti’ is grounded in the philosophy of swaraj only. The thrust of Indian socialists on decentralization and panchayati raj is very much a part of Gandhian swaraj. JP views ‘total revolution’ as “not a mindless application of Gandhiji’s ideas, but their dynamic and revolutionary adaptation". At another place JP acknowledges Gandhi as the originator of sarvodaya as a modern concept and then proceeds to show sarvodaya and total revolution as falling in line with the Gandhian thought and practice. Both Gandhi and Jayaprakash are staunch critics of parliamentary democracy. JP constitutes ‘radical Gandhism’. In fact, Gandhi, Vinoba and
Jayaprakash form an ideological continuum. Gandhi’s swaraj forms the basis of sarvodaya.

There is no fundamental clash between Gandhi’s swaraj and Lohia’s ideal of socialism. In fact even Lohia dismisses the so-called conflict between satyagraha and class struggle. To, Lohia as well as Gandhi, “a genuine class struggle is civil disobedience”\(^50\). This is how Lohia rationalizes the two ideals:

Satyagraha and class struggle are but two names of a single exercise in power, reduction of the power of evil and increase in the power of the good. That a change of heart does take place is evident more so in the ranks of the good doctrine, in so far as they acquire greater determination and organization and capacity for action, but also in the ranks of the opponents, some of whom begin to be classed. It must be repeated again that an act of satyagraha or class struggle must pass the test of immediacy and it must not make use of lies or deceit or violence. Crude practices should be eliminated.\(^51\)
Very much in the tradition of Gandhi, Lohia advocates a non-violent approach to socialism. The quality of means is more important than the desired end. Corrupt practices falsify even noble ends. Swaraj is very a socialist ideal, and Lohian brand of socialism is nothing but an re-affirmation of Gandhian credo.

The differences between Gandhi and Bose were not merely differences between two strong individuals or two mass leaders. There are serious ideological dissimilarities between the two. Gandhi never seeks freedom which is begotten through dictatorial means. Bose's handshake with Hitler to oust the British from India is grossly unethical from the swarajist paradigm of Gandhi. Swaraj is not simply a synthesis of nationalism and socialism, it is the very site of whole life. Therefore, Gandhi never valorizes the significance of parts to achieve some temporary success, he wants freedom in its entirety. India's independence is not a political enterprise, it is a sacred mission, a spiritual pursuit, a vindication of the moral self; any short-term alliance with totalitarian forces is detrimental to the very concept of independence.
To put it succinctly, Gandhi's integrationist frame of swaraj subsumes all subsequent Indian socialists. With minor difference in terms of priorities or accent, Indian socialists despite their loyalties to Marx could not grow out of the shadows of Gandhi.

VI

For Gandhi nation is not a material construct. Therefore in his vision development is not solely material. It is moral and based on values of truth and inner harmony. From a strictly materialistic perspective, it can be surmised that swaraj seems to exalt poverty, illiteracy and general backwardness. After all what is Gandhi doing when he dismisses railways, hospitals, courts, machines - the so-called markers of progress - as evils of modern civilization? What are Gandhian indicators of development then? The paramount parameter of progress is quality of human life. It means just and true living - living which ensures safety and security of everyone, even protection of environment. This is how Gandhi defines happiness: "...that the happiness was largely a mental condition. A man is not necessarily happy because he is rich, or unhappy because he is
poor. The rich are often seen to be unhappy, the poor to be
happy.” 52

Western socialists were/ are not against industrialization,
all they seek is equal distribution of capital or an equal control
of the working classes in the means of production. Despite its
criticism of capitalism, socialists do not doubt the very
tenability of industrialization as means of development. The
class-less society which they envisage is firmly entrenched in
industrialization which is benign and labour-friendly. Gandhi’s
socialism casts serious doubts on the very project of
industrialization, particularly the way it has been realized in
the West at the cost of the local handicraft industry. Machines
are harbingers of capital greed. 53 Gandhi therefore argues:

God forbid that India should take to
industrialization after the manner of the West. The
economic imperialism of a single tiny island
kingdom is today keeping the world in chains. If an
entire nation of 300 million took to similar
economic exploitation, it would strip the world like
locusts. 54
One might even blame Gandhi for being conservative and backward looking, one who wanted to turn clock back. Is Gandhi preaching some kind of pre-historic socialism, or socialism in the state of nature? Or is not Gandhi anticipating development of society along lines which are now being hailed as post-modern and nature-friendly?

In fact when looked closely one realizes that swaraj as an economic programme is turning the "clock fast forward." It demand urgency in seeking ways of development which are eco-friendly, and which at the same time do not create hierarchy between the rich and the poor. It insists on developing technology which is compatible with the needs and requirements of the local people. As opposed to Western model of development, swaraj "is a model of development which is concentrated in rural India, employing alternate technologies, local means, manual labour. It improves the standard of living of the people without polluting and destroying their environment, without displacing and uprooting them. Instead it empowers individuals, generates local wealth, and prevents the migration of impoverished peasants to the cities."
Gandhi’s swaraj is inclusive. It does not seek redistribution of wealth by snatching property from one to help the other. Swaraj is closely aligned with sarvodaya, i.e., the good of every one. It means it aims at uplifting the entire society, not just a section of it. Gandhi’s swaraj ultimately coalesces into Jaiprakash’s sarvodaya.

Another difference between Marxists and Gandhi is over the question of democracy. Both socialists and swarajists distrust the democratic model of polity as is practiced in countries of Western Europe. But the reasons of distrust vary. Socialists realize that parliamentary democracy only suits the capitalists as he can always manipulate members. Therefore they prefer a totalitarian regime as the necessary evil to realize the class-less society. Swarajists reject parliamentary democracy because it snatches power from the people. Instead of advocating dictatorship of the proletariat, swaraj do no want any delegation of power to any representative.

Religion continues to be the main stay of socialism in-built in swaraj. Canonical socialism holds religion as false consciousness, an opium of the masses, but for swarajists, religion is the very fulcrum of social behaviour. One might call
Gandhian socialism as spiritual socialism as against the material socialism of the West.

There is no place for any cataclysmic revolutions in swaraj. Swaraj is a gradual process of realizing one's self. It therefore shuns the very idea of radical communism. Gandhi spells out his basic differences with Boleshevism thus: "I am yet ignorant of what exactly Boleshevism is... I do not know if it is for the good of Russia in the long run. But... in so far as it is based on violence and denial of God, it repels me." Once again, in November, 1928 he says: "All that I know is that it [Boleshevism] aims at the abolition of private property. This is only an application of the ethical ideal of non-possession in the realm of economics, and if people adopted this ideal of their own accord or could be made to accept it by means of peaceful persuasion, there would be nothing like it. But from what I know of Boleshevism, it only does not preclude the use of force but freely sanctions it for the expropriation of private property and maintaining the collective ownership of the same. And if this is so I have no hesitation in saying that the Bolshevik regime in its present form cannot last long."
Gandhi does acknowledge the role of socialist ideology in the re-making of society. He even holds socialism as an ideal which as the time passes would become purer. The swarajists are against capitalism, but not against capitalists as such.
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