CHAPTER - V

GANDHIAN APPROACH TO CONTEMPORARY COMMUNALISM

Mahatma Gandhi was one of the great activist theoreticians of the Twentieth century. He has exercised immense influence on the lives and thoughts, not only of Indians but of all people of the world. He has been variously depicted as a politician, a social reformer, an economist and a religious thinker. Though he confesses ‘I am not built for academic writings. Action is my domain’ there is ample evidence in his writings that he has well acquainted with the Philosophical darsanas both of Indian and western origin. He tried to unify all his activities in different areas by directing them all towards one ultimate goal: to realize Truth or to see God face to face. Though he claimed to be an Orthodox Sanatani Hindu, he was yet the greatest reformer Hinduism had ever seen. He was “the real architect of the Neo-Hinduism, as A.L. Basham remarked, and Hinduism after him is not the same as it had been before him. R.C. Zaeher is right when he says that Gandhi was the “conscience of Hinduism that hungers and thirsts after righteousness in defiance of the better of the law of gods and men.”

It is not easy to present Gandhi’s ideas systematically. He himself was not a systematic Philosopher or theorist. He aptly called himself “a practical idealist” He was primarily a man of action. Whatever Philosophical formulations he made were inspired by and directed towards the solving of problems in the society. Hence he wrote incessantly and his writings are capacious. As S.J. Samartha observed:
His writings are so voluminous, his statement. So repetitive and the context in which he wrote them so utterly different that sometimes one is at a loss to understand the exact import of his words.⁵

This fact is to be taken very seriously in examining any of the ideas of Gandhi.

There were basic disagreements regarding Gandhi’s method and Philosophical formulations by figures such as Tagore, Subhas Bose and M.N. Roy. Yet he earned immense respect from his critics and detractors. While Bose called him the ‘father of the Nation’, Tagore described him as ‘Mahatma’.

Gandhian era enormously exhibits religious rivalry and hostility. The intensity of the religious hatredness pained him much. He devoted his whole life to bring about harmony and peace among the followers of different faiths and sacrificed his own life for that cause. Before analysing his approach to communalism, it is essential to look into the landscape, in which Gandhi had invested his whole life and to analyse the forces that generate communal tensions in the Indian sub-continent.

A. COMMUNAL LANDSCAPE OF GANDHIAN ERA

Gandhi entered as a leader in the Indian National Movement in the year 1919 after his two decades of struggle against racial cruelties in South Africa. It was there he evolved the technique of Satyagraha based on truth and non-violence. When he entered in the National scene, it seems he had to face four kinds of defiant forces based on socio-political cultural nationalism fleeting one another in
the National Movement. They are (a) Indian National Movement (b) Hindu National Movement (c) Muslim National Movement (d) Subaltern Movement.

The Indian National Congress was founded in 1885. The Congress leaders of those days believed that they could achieve freedom through constitutional methods, and British rule could be reformed from within. Those who followed this policy were called the ‘Moderates’. C.H. Heimsath says that ‘early Indian nationalism developed an ideology which could properly encompass all Indian cultures and religions.’ However a radical wing grew within the congress opposed Moderates ideology and adopted a radical method of political agitation. They were called ‘Extremists’. The Extremists’ wing was led by Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Bipin Chandrapal and Lala Lajpat Rai. They asked people to look into the glory of the Indian past, so that they could develop in themselves national pride and self-confidence. Tilak started two newspapers ‘Kesari’ in Marathi and ‘Mahratta’ in English, to inculcate the national feeling among the people. He gave importance to the cultural foundation of the Indian society. He followed the path of his predecessors such as Dayananda Saraswati and Vivekananda. Vivekananda affirmed that ‘India alone had a spiritual message, where as the west was steeped in sensuality.’ “U.P, India and conquer the world with your spirituality.”

There arose cultural controversies in the National Congress. By the end of the nineteenth century there were mighty struggle for the control of Congress.

Moderates and Extremists have different views on proper end and means of the national movement. While Dadabhai Naoroji, Mahadev Govind Ranade and Gopala Krishna Gokhale promoted reforms in Hindu Culture, the Extremists
glorified Hindu culture and opposed any kind of reforms. Moderates envisioned a modernization of India with liberal ideas of adoption from west. But Tilak was against it and glorified the deeds of the Vedic civilization. Tilak considered solidarity among Hindus. So S.M. Michel says that he emphasized the superiority of Hindu religion, encouraged revivalism, politicized the Ganapati festival and converted Shivaji into a cult figure, these serving both religious and political objectives. Tilak alienated Muslims and invoked the spirit of resurgent Hinduism to fight the national cause. So he identified nationalism with Hinduism, emphasized the factor of Indian society, which is the feeling of ‘Hindutva’. This has been discussed in the earlier chapter of Savarkar and Golwalkar. The Extremists tend to reflect a kind of Kṣatriya world view, value system, symbols, myths and behaviour pattern. Thus they presented Indian culture as exclusively Hindu culture and encouraged the growth of militant nationalism in India. This seems, in the hands of Extremists Hindu religion has tended to be less ‘religious’ and more ‘ideological’, it is accepted not so much in the spiritual and ethical sense but in a political and ideological sense. They tried to protect secular interests through religious means, that is religion is used as a political ideology.

The Bengal partition in 1905 created Muslim majority in eastern region of Bengal. This act of Curzon widened breach between Muslims and Hindus. Terrorists Movements arose in different parts of the country. V.D. Savarkar was one of their leaders. He was a secular modernist like Jinnah. The British policy of ‘divide and rule’ encouraged the upper class Muslims (Ashrafs) to form their own organizations against Indian National Congress, branded the Congress as a movement of Hindus. Thus the Muslim League was formed in 1906. Jinnah became the leader of the Muslim League. He was a secular person, he used
religion as a powerful ideology to unite people for political purposes. As a result of the intensification of Hindu-Muslim tensions, a new influential militant organization Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh was established in 1925 by Hedgewar, who was deeply influenced by Tilak and Savarkar’s treatise of ‘Hindutva’. They wanted to promote one culture, one nation with one race and language.

The demands for the maintenance of a racial unity in a nation necessitates the assimilation or inextricable fusion of non-Hindu population. The non-Hindus should merge fully into an original national race. Golwalkar even suggests the model of Germany, where they tried to eliminate Jews for a racial purpose. This intensified the gulf between Hindus and Muslims. Hence Muslims demanded for a Muslim nation and Muslim nationalism irreducibly increased.

One of the strategies of the Hindu nationalists ‘Sudhi’ movement could only strengthen the Muslim suspicion, and they started ‘Tablique’ and ‘Tanzim’ among the Muslims aimed at promoting conversion to Islam. Thus the communal politics wanted to increase their numbers, through conversion or re-conversion and motivated the interests of their own communities. Only the upper classes were benefited by the activities of the communalists. They hardly bothered to improve the lot of the downtrodden sections of their co-religionists.

An alternative cultural vision of Indian nationhood movement was arose at this by the subaltern leaders. This was mostly against the upper caste Hindus and their notion of Hindu national culture. The upper caste Hindus derived their Hindu culture from Vedic times and as fundamentally a creation of the Aryan people. They accept Varṇa dharma and Varnāshrama dharma as inherent parts of their culture. As it is seen, they not only made use of high caste religious
symbols in their mass organizing, they also made a crucial use of the 'Aryan theory of race' in interpreting cultural traditions. It is in this context of nature of the Indian national culture and its glorification, an alternative vision provided by prominent non-Aryan or non-Brahmanic leaders within India. They tried to create a counter culture as against the Aryan culture. The main leaders were Jotirao Phule, E.V. Ramaswami Periyar, Baba Saheb Ambedkar, Sri Narayana Guru in (Kerala), Acchutanand in (UP) and Mangoo Ram in (Panjab). Only the first three will be discussed here.

**Jotirao Phule** (1826-1890) aimed to construct a social order, on the basis of social equality, justice and reason. It is seen that the European Orientalist Theory was an important moral boost to high caste Indians. Thus Indian civilization was seen as primarily derivative from Āryan civilization and caste system was landed as a means by which people of diverse racial and cultural backgrounds were brought together and subjected to the civilizing influence of Āryans. Phule argues that *Shudras* and *āti-shudras* were the original inhabitants of the country, enslaved and exploited by the conquering Āryans, who formulated a caste based Hinduism as a means of deceiving the masses and legitimizing their power. Hence the ancient history of India was nothing but the struggle between Brahmins and non-Brahmins. He sees the seeds of the Brahmin’s power, supremacy and privileges lay in their scriptures and *Purāṇas*. He saw religion as an ideology legitimizing domination. The *avatārā* concept in the *Purāṇas* is for legitimizing the Aryanization. Therefore he formed Satya Shodhak Samaj, which is an anti Brahmanic Movement. He is also known as the father of Indian Revolution (N.G. Pawar).
E.V. Rama Swami Naicker (1879-1973) seeks to depend the right of the Dravidians as against Aryan Domination. He started self-respect movement. He blamed Āryans introducing an unjust and oppressive social system in the country. According to Periyar, Rama and Sita are despicable characters not worthy of imitation or admiration even by the lowest of fourth rate humans.¹²

Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar (1891-1956) was a revolutionary, and rejected caste because it was unjust and immoral. He was against the teachings of Dayananda Saraswati and Mahatma Gandhi on the issue of casteism. He emphasized a society of equality, liberty and fraternity. He believed that no development would affect humans without having structural change in the social hierarchical system. Ambedkar and his companions asserted that the Manusmṛiti is the creation of high caste people, the sole basis for the rigid caste system and untouchability in India. This denied shudras reading or even hearing Vedas. So the bonfire of Manusmṛiti was quite intentional. He said that ‘we made a bonfire of it because we see it as a symbol of injustice under which we have been ground down under despicable poverty, and so we made the ash, started at, took our lives in our hands and performed the deed.’¹³

The above Phule/Periyar/Ambedkar tradition represents the effort to construct an alternative cultural identity of the people based on non-Aryan and low caste perspectives. That was critical not only of the oppressiveness of the dominant Hindu Caste society but also of its claim to antiquity. Here also the issue was basically not racial but cultural, a matter of group identity.

One can question, whether the subaltern revivalism and movements were really point to communal. These may not be considered as communal movements
but were reactions against the upper caste Hindu religious nationalism and cultural exclusivism.

The Subaltern movements were retaliation against the Brahmanical hegemony who denied the non-Āryan culture and its antiquity which goes beyond the religion and culture of the Vedas. Hence it was a revival of the values of the non-Aryan religion and culture of the ancient history in the multi religious context of India. In a sense the subaltern leaders did not want to negate Indian culture, but they wanted to revive Indian culture with a solid basis of non-Āryan elements, which is all-inclusive not exclusive like Āryan culture.

When Gandhi entered in the national scene, he had to face the above competing ideologies, which were trying to establish their own cultural and religious identities in the Indian sub-continent. He found the above theocratic ideologies linked with oppressive structures and interpretations were a real hindrance to social change and development in the country.

He observed that the concept of nationalism has turned into an excessive form of group egoism, which by its hidden and powerful impulses and emotions can become a force of oppression. A sense of national pride is necessary in areas of rapid social change. This national pride tends to impel the people to accept political autonomy and political order. This was completely eroded by the ethnic pride in his time.

A sense of national identity is imperative for human solidarity and community. The creation of nationhood is possible only by generating national consciousness among the people. But at the time of Gandhi, instead of national
identity, people followed more sectarian religious identity and equated religion with nationalism.

Again in order to have national development, people must have national loyalty and common social obligations by the accompanying spirit of service. But in the Gandhian era the loyalty of people to the nation has turned in to their religion and to impostered culture. Gandhi found the real meaning of religion has been distorted by the leaders who used ‘religion’ as an ‘ideology’ to manipulate their own ends. Gandhi observed their demand for religious nationalism and cultural exclusivism tend to establish a worldview, system of values and community organizations and relationship as according to their own interpretations of scriptures have become a perennial threat to the national integrity and unity of the people. Religion has become a divisive force through its exclusive dogmatic interpretation rather than a spiritual force for synthesis of various cultures and faiths.

Gandhi believed that no revolution is possible till we build our national character Gandhi was aware that without having a national unity, a revolution in the Indian society cannot be achieved. No social revolution is possible without having a cultural change. Since religion is the matrix of culture, religion gives impetus to cultural change and that subsequently gives room for a social revolution. Social change itself will not have any lasting impact if it is not interiorized through a cultural transformation Gandhian approach to contemporary communalism, was for a cultural transformation by providing a religious bare, in the real sense of the term ‘religion.’

Gandhi was well aware of the problems of religious pluralism. He knew that as long as each religion makes exclusive claims for itself there would be no peace
on earth. In order to counter communalism Gandhi preached the doctrine of equality of all great religions of the world. According to him equality of religions means:

1. All religions are true more or less, that is, there are elements of truth in every religion and no religion is absolutely false.

2. All religions are imperfect and have some error in them that is no religion is absolutely true.\(^{14}\)

A careful analysis of the writings of Gandhi will make it clear that he evolved the doctrine of equality of the principal religions of the world on two major grounds:

1. **Practical and Pragmatic**
2. **A New Hermeneutics on philosophical and theological.**

**Practical and Pragmatic**

Gandhi was perfectly practical and realistic in approaching the problems that faced him. For him religious pluralism was not merely a philosophical problem about the rival truth claims but a matter of living together peacefully in the community. As Margaret Chatterjee observes:

His (Gandhi's) own experience of living in a multi religious society, something he shares in common with all who live on the Indian subcontinent, provides constant reminder that the discursion of religious truth is not a mere theoretical matter but has a direct bearing on how men behave towards each other bearing with each others creedal and 'observational' differences, and that the whole question is infact intimately related to whether men of different persuasions can live together in harmony or not.\(^{15}\)

Gandhi strongly believed that Swaraj would be an impossible dream if Indians were divided and disunited on the basis of their religious affiliations. Hence he continuously worked for the Hindu-Muslim unity. He declared, "I have strives
for Hindu-Muslim unity because India cannot live free without it, and because we would both deny God if we considered one another as natural enemies.\(^\text{16}\) He threw himself into the struggle to heal the tensions that existed between the two communities and strove to become "the best cement" between them. Hindu-Muslim unity, for Gandhi was not unity only between Hindus and Muslims but between all those who inhabited in India, no matter to what faith they belong. He believed that there would be no peace in this country, even after the attainment of political freedom, if the people of different faiths revile each other in the name of God, if there exists mutual fear, hatred and distrust among them. They can live together in peace and harmony and work together for the development of the country only if there is mutual respect and tolerance at all levels. He wrote in Harijan, "Insistence on a particular form or repetition of a credo may be a potent cause of violent quarrels leading to bloodshed and ending in utter disbelief in religions, i.e., God Himself."\(^\text{17}\) This mutual acceptance and harmony can be attained only by accepting the concept of equality of all religions by all.

B. TOWARDS A NEW HERMENEUTICS FOR A SYNTHETIC CULTURE

It has been noted above that Religion played an increasingly important role in perpetrating the communal culture in India. The powerful elites and middle class distorted religion and its values by using it as a powerful ideology to legitimise religious domination. The communal interpretations of \textit{Sruti}, \textit{Smriti} and \textit{Purāṇas} literature have become totally oblivious and barricade to impart great values of love, peace, empathy, justice, sharing, co-operation and co-existence in the society. Then the elite communal culture gave birth to a culture of domination and de-humanization. Gandhi observed that there are humanizing elements in
religions. But these elements are lost in the darkness of oppressive culture of Hindus. Gandhi wanted to revive those humanizing elements in religion, so that it will be a force to inculcate a new culture of pluralism. It will liberate the downtrodden people from the tears of despair to the sparks of hope. This pluralistic approach will create a new society mainly based on ethical and moral component of religions. He also observed that pluralism is the key to the national unity. According to Gandhi, the root cause of major evils that humanity is faced with lies in the moral degradation of humanity. For Gandhi the real progress means moral progress and that is the true mark of an ideal culture. He firmly believed that the moral progress would be provided to humanity only through religion. Hence religion will become a transforming force to combat communalism in India.

Enormous literature has come out on the topic of Gandhian approach to communal conflicts by different scholars. Most of them concentrated on Gandhi’s practicability on this issue. Yet there are scholars who have come out with Gandhian metaphysical and phenomenological approach, to this problem. Since many scholars have come out with practical approach, this section is not intended to look into such approaches. This is intended to concentrate on how Gandhi as a synthesizer of Āstika and Nāstika religions of the Indian sub-continent to promote an inclusive culture for a peaceful living. Though Gandhi was not a philosopher in the true sense of the term, Gandhi wanted to promote an inclusive approach to different Indian originated philosophers to have a sound philosophical basis for a synthetic pluralistic culture. Without having a sound philosophy of life there will not be a sound culture and civilization. Hence Gandhi was trying to build for an integral philosophy to have an integral pluralistic culture in the Indian sub-continent. He found cultural exclusivism and subsequent cultural nationalism
based on exclusive interpretation of theology and philosophy as the root cause of communalism in India. In order to counter this exclusivism he was in favour of having a pluralistic interpretation or Hermeneutics of scriptures and philosophies.

The present face of communalism Gandhi perceived as a retaliation against Semitic religions, because those religions both Islam and Christianity ruled India for centuries, and Hindus were only subjects under their rules.

The Christian missionaries and their education immensely influenced both the marginals and the elites. This initiated both religious and national consciousness among the people; especially the low castes began to think about their freedom and identity. The western enlightenment literature introduced in India created an awareness about their down trodden condition, and that initiated them to redeem from this pathetic situation imposed on them through religious cultural legitimation. Thinking to get release from the stigma of untouchability many have joined to Christianity and Islam through conversion and Tablique. The missionaries enlightenment enterprise helped to emerge subaltern leaders, who interpreted their religious antiquity to the Pre-vedic tradition, and some of them were against Vedic traditions and Vedas. The conversion movements and the subaltern opposition greatly moved Gandhi to work for an integral community.

The Nāstika religions like Jainism and Buddhism do not believe in the authority of Vedas. But these religions greatly influenced the Indian people through its spiritual values, especially through the ten-meritorious\textsuperscript{18} deeds and eight fold paths\textsuperscript{19} of Buddhism. Pancasīlas of Buddhism\textsuperscript{20} and five great vows of Jainism\textsuperscript{21} immensely influenced Indian spirituality and Gandhi.
The great emperors of India like Srenika Bimbisaran, Chandragupta Maurian and Kharavelan of Orissa encouraged the growth of Jainism. At the time of emperor Ashoka and Kanishkan Buddhism developed its missionary activity. Gandhi was also born and brought up in Gujarat where Jainism was prevalent and prominent and Gandhi was influenced by Jain spiritualities. Guptas were tolerant Hindus. Gandhi wanted to revive these tolerant attitudes of 'eclecticism' or 'syncretism' of early Hindu kings, so as to accommodate and co-operate with other religions to have a synthetic culture in India.

Gandhi found there are ample religious literature both in Āstika and Nāstika religions supporting for a pluralistic approach to religious and cultural diversity. Some of the Indian religious leaders have taken those concepts and have already shown a pluralistic path. Gandhi was only trying to revive those concepts and paths from the Indian religious traditions.

It seems he has taken "the Advaita concept" of Āstika religion and 'Anekāntavāda' concept of Nāstika religion for an integral approach to religious pluralism in India. It was Gandhi who first took the philosophy of 'Advaita' as the basis of radical social change in India.

This section is intended to discuss and analyse the above concepts and seek how far these concepts are valid for cultivating a cultural pluralism in the Indian sub continent. This section is divided into two parts. The first part will be discussed on 'Advaita' and its implication. The second part is an analysis on Gandhi's views on Anekāntavāda in the light of religious pluralism.
1. **GANDHIAN INTERPRETATION OF ADVAITA**

Gandhi by his own confession subscribed to the *Vedantic* view of the universe. In a couple of significant statements Gandhi affirms his faith in *Advaita Vedanta*.

'I believe in the *Advaita*. I believe in the essential unity of man and for that matter of all that lives.'

In another statement Gandhi says:

"In my opinion there is no such thing as inherited or acquired superiority. I believe in the rock bottom doctrine of *Advaita* and my interpretation of *Advaita* excludes totally any idea of superiority at any stage what so ever..."

Again Gandhi affirms:

"I am an *Anekāntavādī*. This is the most important thing that I have learnt from Jain Philosophy. It is implicit in Vedanta Philosophy."

"I believe in the absolute oneness of God and therefore also of humanity, what though we have many bodies? We have but one soul. The rays of the sun are many through refraction. But they have the same source."

In his forward to Maha Dev Desai's book 'Gītā According to Gandhi', he sets forth the *advaita* position. Gandhi was profoundly influenced by Sankara and also by Swami Vivekananda who was a strong Champion of *advaita*. What is *Advaita Vedanta*? And what is its central concept? Literally *Vedanta* means 'the end of the *Vedas*', the concluding part of the *Vedas*, the culmination of the *Vedic* teachings and wisdom. The *Vedanta* is also known by the term 'Upanisads'. It has claimed that the Upanisads made explicit what is already contained implicitly in the *Vedas*. The views of the Upanisads also constitute the final aim of the *Vedas*. 
'That which is hidden in the secret of the Vedas, even the Mystic Doctrines (Upanisads) Brahma knows that as the source of the sacred word (Brahman)’

(Svet. Up. V: 6)

The Upanisads contain four important Mahāvākyas (statements). “I am the Brahman (Aham Brahmasmi), the Ātman is the Brahman (Aham atma Brahma), that thou art (Tatvamasi), and all this is the Brahman (Sarvam Khalu idam Brahma).

The Upanisadic teaching of the Brahman-Ātman relationship may be traced back to the Rig Veda especially Rig Veda X: 90. Rig Veda X: 90 is generally known as Purusa-Sukta. Purusa-Sukta holds that every thing, the sun and moon, the wind and all creatures have come from the first Purusa. Purusa was sacrificed by the gods and was dismembered into various things of the world.

Thus RV. X: 90 reads: 27

3. So mighty is his greatness; yea, greater than this is Purusa.

   All creatures are one-fourth of him three-fourths eternal life in heaven.

12. His mouth became Brahmana
   And his two arms the Ksatriya;
   His thighs became the Vaisya-class
   And from his feet the Sudra sprang.

13. The moon was gendered from his mind,
   And from his eye the Sun was born;
   Indra and Agni from his mouth,
   And Vayu from the breath was born

14. Forth from his navel came the air,
   And from his head evolved the sky;
   Earth from his feet and from his ear
   The quarters: Thus they framed the worlds.
Though the *Puruṣa-Sūkta* shows a monotheistic tendency, yet monist trend appears to be far more pronounced. The world does not appear to be created by the *Puruṣa*, but emanates or proceeds from the *Puruṣa*, and ultimately the whole universe forms the various elements of the *Puruṣa*. Yet He is not only immanent but is also transcendent reality beyond the world. Because of this transcendence *Puruṣa-hymn* ceases to be completely pantheistic. The term pantheism is referred to where the God is identified with the universe. It seems ancient thinkers practice and consider the ultimate reality with eclectic and syncretic view with a prospect to avoiding mutual conflict. The early seers search for an ontological power, which could be either impersonal or semi-personal. They never hinted that all other gods were false but one. They also said that the Supreme Impersonal Reality can only be an object of realization and not of worship. *Advaita* follows the same principle, that the ultimate object of man is self realization. While analysing Gandhian interpretation of ‘*advaita*’ Gandhi also follows the path of the ancient thinkers with a view to avoid mutual conflict and with an emphasize of centripetal approach of self-realization. At the time of Gandhi, the country has witnessed intense social tensions, conflicts and even frequent riots between communities in the name of religion. In this scenario it would be worthwhile to look at Gandhi’s views on ‘*advaita*’ and its original proponents *Gaudapada* and *Sankara*.

*Gaudapada*, the 7th century thinker was the teacher of Govinda and Sankara was the disciple of Govinda who revived the non-dualist tendencies of *Upaniṣads* in a systematic manner. The Gaudapada Karika or the Mandukya Karika also known as the *Agama sastra*, has four chapters. The third Chapter establishes the *Advaita* theory.
In the third chapter Gaudapada says the Ātman like space, the individual selves are like space in jars. When jars are destroyed their spaces merge into space. So do the jīvas merge into Ātman, when ignorance is destroyed by the right knowledge. Spaces in jars differ in forms, functions and names, but there is no difference in space, similarly jīvas differ in forms, functions and names, but there is no difference in the Ātman.\(^{29}\)

The same idea can be viewed in Chāndogya Upanishad:

“Just as my dear by one piece of clay every thing made of clay may be known – the modification is merely a verbal distinction, a name: the reality is just clay.” (Ch. Up. VI. 1-4).

No doubt, things made of clay appear to be separate and different and many because of their varying shapes and sizes. But these differences are mere name and form (Nāma – rūpa). No matter by whatever name we call different things of clay, the underlying stuff of each is simply clay. In this way, if we survey all things then we find that they differ in name and form only. Their underlying reality is the sole reality of Brahman. Hence the Upanisads declares: “Verily all this is but Brahman.” Therefore, Brahman is the supreme underlying reality of both the external and inner world of subjective and objective things. The same thought is repeated in Brihadāranyaka Upanisad, III 2:13 also. Non-duality is the ultimate truth. Gaudapada propagates non-duality (advaita) even between unity and diversity.

Gaudapada identifies the unborn and the non-dual Absolute with the Ātman or Brahman or tūrya or advaita which can be directly by Right knowledge or Asparśayoga.
It has been noted above that Gaudapada's philosophy is essentially based on the \textit{Upanisads} particularly on the \textit{Māndukya}, the \textit{Brihadāraṇyaka}, and the \textit{Chāndogya}. He has also drawn upon the \textit{Brahma-Sūtra} and the \textit{Gītā}. He was much influenced by the \textit{Sūnyavāda} and \textit{Vijnana vada} of Mahāyana-Buddhism. His mission is to prove that \textit{Mahayana Buddhism} and \textit{Advaita Vedanta} are not two opposed systems of thought, but only a continuation of the same fundamental thought of the \textit{Upanisads}.\textsuperscript{30} Sankara himself makes the confession that the absolutist (\textit{advaita}) creed was recovered from the \textit{Vedas} by Gaudapada.

Gaudapada teaches, "the merciful \textit{Veda} prescribes three different spiritual stages for the three kinds of people, of lower, middle and higher intellect. \textit{Karma} and \textit{Upāsana} are taught to the lower and the middle, while \textit{Jñāna} is taught to the higher"\textsuperscript{31} He further contends, "it is only the dualists that quarrel with one another in order to strengthen their respective views. The \textit{Advaitin} quarrels with none."\textsuperscript{32}

Sankara referred to Gaudapada complemented him for having recovered the \textit{Advaita} doctrine for the \textit{Vedas}. Sankara is also called a non-dualist (\textit{advaitin}), because he did not accept the ultimate difference between the \textit{Atman} and the \textit{Brahman}. Sankara does not mean that I, the infinite being as such, is identical with the \textit{Brahman} but the \textit{Atman} in man is the same as the \textit{Brahman}. \textit{Brahman} is the unchanging reality underlying the variety and multiplicity of phenomena. \textit{Brahman} according to Sankara is, "the cause from which proceeds the origin or subsistence and dissolution of this world which is extended in names and forms."\textsuperscript{33} Like the \textit{Vijñāna} of the \textit{Vijñānavādins}, it is beyond all attributes (\textit{nirguna}) and all categories of the intellect (\textit{nirviṣesa}); but unlike their \textit{Vijñāna}, it is eternal and it is Being itself. It is not \textit{sūnyā}, which is neither Being nor non-being.\textsuperscript{34} Ultimate reality according to Sankara is \textit{Brahman}, which is existence, consciousness and
Bliss (*Sat-cit-anand*) Brahman is the Self of all. The individual self as it appears is but an appearance only, while the ultimate truth is the true Self which is one for all, as pure Existence, pure Consciousness and pure Bliss. The Brahman is the Absolute and is impersonal; but God is not the Absolute, he is personal. He is not a separate being from the Absolute. The *Brahman* as God is called *Isvara* (the Lord, the Ruler of the world).\(^{35}\) Brahman associated with its potency (*sakti*) *maya* or *Mūlavidya* appears as the qualified Brahman (*Saguṇa* or *apara Brahman*) or the Lord (*Īśvara*) who is the creator, preserver and destroyer of this world which is His appearance.\(^{36}\)

The main **three tenets** of Sankara’s *Advaitism* are:

\[\text{Brahmasatyam Jagan mitya} \\
\text{Jivo Brahmaivana parah.}\]

1. The world is illusory, though has empirical reality.

2. There is supreme reality of *Brahman* popularly styled as *sat, cit, ānanda*. This alone is *paramārtika satya*.

3. The world is an illusory super-imposition on Brahman, which is the indescribable support.

Gandhi was immensely inspired by *Advaita Vedanta*, which Hinduism teaches in its loftiest form. Gandhi said, “I believe in *Advaita*. I believe in the essential unity of man and for that matter of all that lives. Therefore, I believe that if one man gains spirituality the whole world gains with him, and if one man fails, the whole world falls to that extent.”\(^{37}\) This is the basic insight of *Advaita* in Gandhi’s standpoint. The basic insight of *Advaita* is that Reality is one, and non-dual (*ekam sat*) existence is one (*advaitiyam*) without a second. Sankara refers to the supreme truth as “the oneness of self” (*ātmaikatva*) as ‘the all--self nature’
In his autobiography Gandhi contends his standpoint as follows:

“To see the Universal and all pervading spirit of truth face to face one must be able to love the meanest of creation as oneself.”

Advaita holds that the entire universe has been emanated out of a single divine source. Hence there is no room for any kind of discrimination in it on any score. Since there is a spiritual unity of mankind, self-realization consists, not in advancing the good of isolated individuals, but the good of all. For Gandhi thus implies the love of all, that is to share the lot of the poorest and the lowliest. Hence P.T. Raju observed, “It may be traced also to Advaita Vedantic idea that no individual salvation is possible but that one has to wait until the whole world is ready for salvation”

Though Gandhi did not explicitly pronounced on Puruṣa-Sūkta, his ideas about the relationship of human being with the ‘One’ has its affinity to Rig Veda, and he said his concept of Varnāśrama dharma is Vedic, not in its present popular and crude sense. He said, “I believe in the absolute oneness of God and therefore also of humanity. What though we have many bodies, we have but one soul. The rays of the Sun are many through refraction. But they have the same source.” He identified Ultimate reality with truth and as One infinite spirit (ekam sat). It is seen that the Rig Veda had affirmed the absolute unity of all things in the Supreme (Ekamevam advaitiyam). What is ‘One’ the sages in their poetic conceptions presented as Many. Hence Gandhian interpretation of ‘Advaita’ may be traced to its roots in the Vedic tradition itself.

Further Gandhi observes that there is an indefinable mysterious power that pervades everything. “I feel it though I do not see it. It is this unseen power

(Sarvātmabhāva).
which makes itself felt and yet defies all proof because it is so unlike all that I perceive through my senses. To reject this evidence is to deny oneself. Here Gandhi sees “the One” as a mysterious power, and to understand this mystery is possible only through experience and experiment. Since it is experiment with truth there is every possibility of defying. Hence religion according to Gandhi, is that which underlines all religions which brings us face to face with our Maker. It is non-sectarian because it transcends different formal or customary religions like Hinduism, Christianity, Islam and others. Gandhi states that it does not supersede them. It harmonizes them and gives them reality.

It seems Gandhian interpretation of ‘Advaita’ viewed religion in a rather wider perspective of what the Indian tradition is known as Dharma. Madhuri Wadhwa says, Dharma is synonymous with universal morality and a universal code of conduct and all-inclusive world culture. As it is seen from the Gaudapada’s contention that it is only the dualists quarrel with one another in order to strengthen their respective views. The Advaitin quarrels with none. The Advaita concept is not exclusive; what attracted Gandhi to Advaita was not its religious prescriptions of the rituals or the mystic experience, but its propensity to accommodate the positives and eliminates the negatives of different religious persuasions. Hence Gandhi finds the Hindu concept ‘Advaita’ has unique qualities of tolerance and synthesis. Gandhi once remarked that the Indian civilization “is a mingling of the cultures represented by different faiths and influenced by the geographic and other environment in which cultures have met.” Gandhi firmly believes that the Indian civilization built on this worldview (advaitic) and system of values was always receptive to every new culture and was prepared to shed its dogmatism and rigidity in order to work out a new synthesis. Gandhi was
convinced that Hinduism emerged stronger and richer with the historical interactions with the alien religions, like Islam, Buddhism and Christianity. For Gandhi, the Indian civilization was hospitable to criticism and reform. Hence C.F. Andrews rightly observed that it imbibed the quintessence of all religions to the extent that it exercised tremendous influence in the shaping of his philosophy and action. Hence Gandhi embodies a *Vedantic* vision of a core of truth in all religions and teaches not only tolerance of, but respect for all religions. P.T. Raju observed that Gandhi’s idea that the God is the ultimate truth and also that the law and the lawgiver are one may be traced to the *Advaita Vedanta.*

(a) **Arguments On Gandhi as an Advaitin**

Dr. D.M Datta, a devoted follower of Gandhi, argues that Gandhi was rather a theist than *advaitic* level, should not be regarded as a follower of Sankara. Sankara was a believer in an Indeterminate, Attributeless, Impersonal Absolute (*Nirguna Brahman*). The reasons that Datta gives are (1) Gandhi was born in a family of *Vaiṣṇava* who followed Vallabhacarya and Vallabha did not accept Sankara’s interpretations of *Vedanta.* And Gandhi remained a *Vaiṣṇava* all his life.

Since Gandhi has faith in the grace and in the efficacy of prayer, he is a theist. Gandhi says in his autobiography “... perfection or freedom from error comes only from grace ... without an unreserved surrender to this grace complete mastery over thought is impossible.” Dr. Datta argues this statement is typical of theist *Vaiṣṇava* and Sankara and his followers do not believe in grace but in knowledge as the path to liberation.
(2) For Gandhi the world is not mere appearance, while it is for Sankara. Moreover Sankara looked upon the world as 'resting on the ignorance of individual, i.e., God's creatorship of the world is no more real than the magicians creation of a show.'\(^\text{50}\) Gandhi who was a \textit{Vaiṣṇava} did not reject the world as what is unreal. And more over, his strong sense of duty towards suffering fellow being exhibits, his consideration about the reality of this world. In \textit{Harijan} 21 July 1946 he writes:

> Joy or what men call happiness may be, as it really is, or dream in a fleeting and transitory world.... But we cannot dismiss the suffering of our fellow creatures as unreal and thereby provide a moral alibi for ourselves. Even dreams are true while they last, and to the sufferer his suffering is a grim reality.\(^\text{51}\)

(3) According to Sankara, the self and Brahman are absolutely identical in reality. The \textit{Vaiṣṇava} school do not accept the doctrine of Sankara. Gandhi's conception of the relation of individual to God shows again his general affinity to the \textit{Vaiṣṇava} thinkers rather than to Sankarites.\(^\text{52}\)

(4) Gandhi considered the basic principles of theism to be found in those faiths of Islam and Christianity and accepted it. After long study and experience Gandhi says, "I have no hesitation in regarding the \textit{Quran} as revealed, as have none in regarding the Bible, the Zend Avesta, the Granth Saheb and any other clean scriptures as revealed. Revelation is exclusive property of no nation, no tribe. If I know Hinduism at all, it is essentially inclusive and ever growing, ever responsive.... I can pay full respect to the \textit{Quran} and the prophet..."\(^\text{53}\) Again Gandhi observed all religions valid and none exclusive. He says, "I do not believe in the exclusive divinity of the \textit{Vedas}, I believe in the Bible, \textit{Quran} and Zend Avesta, to be as much divinely inspired as the \textit{Vedas}.'\(^\text{54}\)
5) In another passage Gandhi says that he is an *advaitist* and yet can support *dvaitism* (dualism) and also declares that he has no objection to being called an *anekântavādi* or *Syādvādi*. Dr. Datta concludes: ‘But suffice it to say, that his own words clearly show that he is not the *advaitist* in the sense of Sankarite who would neither support dualism nor the logic of *Syādvāda*. This is also supported by Ramjee Singh in his introduction to ‘*Gandhi and the Future of Humanity*’.

Now the question is whether one can believe in a personal God and the same time be convinced that the ultimate reality is the non-dual Brahman. While it is time that *advaita* seeks to go beyond theism, the supreme reality is absolutely unconditioned, it is super-personal. But T.M.P. Mahadevan opined, ‘it appears as if personal in order to serve as the ground of the universe and as the other object of adoration of man.’ Thus God is greatly significant for the *Advaitin*. Again T.M.P. says that ‘the idea of God is not to be brushed aside as irrelevant postulation or as an impossible and inconsistent concept. The place of God in *Advaita* is neither pernicious nor precarious: on the contrary the concept is quite pertinent to and precious for the *Advaita* experience.’ *Advaita* does not seek to abolish the distinction. Vivekananda one of the greatest proponents of *Advaita does not negate Dvaita or Viśiṣṭādvaita* in his philosophical formulations, yet considers it as stages to attain in the *Advaita* position. Vivekananda says “I accept all the religions that were in the past and worship with them all; I worship God with everyone of them in whatever form they worship him.” Hence Gandhi was a close follower of Swami Vivekananda, he was an *Advaitin*.

Sankara compares God to the sea and soul to its wave, then it would be proper to say that the wave belongs to the sea and not the sea belongs to wave.
has been said that duality assumed for the sake of devotion is more beautiful than even non-duality.

Self-realization is the ultimate goal in the Philosophy of Advaita. Self-realization is a process. In the process of self-realization Atman and Brahman seem to have distinction. When it is achieved in the goal there is no distinction. It means God is a reality in achieving self-realization. Vivekananda also accepts this, and says there are three kinds of Vedāntins and all Vedāntins believe in Īśvara. They also believe that Vedās are the words of Īśvara (apouruseya), it means it is the expression of the Īśvara Jñāna.

When Sankara says this world is illusion, it does not mean it is not real. Jagat (this world) is not real in Paramārtika dristi, but it is real in Vyavahārika dristi. More over Sankara himself expresses Īśvara as Saguna in his Upanisadic interpretations. Īśvara is the Upadānakārana (material cause) and nimittakārana (efficient cause) of this world. Hence Isvara is object of Upāsana, and is adorable.

If there is a place for God in Advaita and that a key place, it follows as a consequence that there is an important place for God’s grace and also for prayer. On this account Gandhi’s emphasis on the need for grace and prayer is quite consistent with his Advaita conviction. It is a well-known saying that even the inclination towards Advaita comes from God’s grace alone.

Isvarānugrahād evapuṁsam advaita vāsana
Mahād-bhaya – Parītrana dvitrānām Upajāyate

Sankara says that it is by divine grace that wisdom is gained and the supreme goal reached. ‘It is by knowledge caused by God’s grace that release is gained.’
Commenting on the Gitā 18:56 Sankara says:

‘He who has resorted to God as his Sole refuge gains, the eternal Vaisnava status through God’s grace.’

Although Gandhi began his life as a conventional believer in a personal God, there is evidence to show that he went beyond it as he grew up and came to be convinced of the highest truth of the non-dual spirit. I don’t regard God as a person, declares Gandhi, ‘truth for me is God... I have come to the conclusion that God is Truth. Two years ago I went a step further and said that truth is God. You will see the fine distinction between the two statements. “God is Truth” and Truth is God.” I came to the conclusion after a continuous and relentless search, after Truth, which began fifty years ago.

Another argument is, since Brahman is the sole reality, the world according to Advaita is non-real. No theist can subscribe to this view. And Gandhi who was a theist could not reject the world as unreal. Now the question is, whether Gandhi believed in the reality of the world? Was the world to him as real as Brahman? Dr. Datta admits that sometimes Gandhi speaks like Sankara and calls the world unreal. That is, Gandhi believes that the world is unreal. Then what does he mean by the word unreal? It is only impermanent or transitory. Gandhi explicitly says in a very striking sentence, about the reality of Brahman and the unreal aspects of all else. He says:

The wonderful implication of the great truth—“brahma satyain jagan mitya” (Brahman is real all else unreal) grows on me from day to day.”

Now the question is, does the advaitin not grant any reality to the world? Does Gandhi believe as Dr. Datta alleges, that the world rests’ on the ignorance of the
individual? The answer is a definite ‘no’. While from the standpoint of the absolute truth the world is not real, from the empirical standpoint it has a relative reality; it has empirical existence *Vyavahārika satta*. The empirical world is not totally unreal, for it is a misapprehension of the real Brahman. The general *Advaitic* view is that the world is neither real nor unreal, nor both real and unreal, and it is the projection of Brahman as endowed with Maya. Even the dream world has a degree of reality it has *pratibhāsika satta*. And so Gandhi is perfectly right in saying that ‘dreams are true while they last.’ Gaudapada says that creation is Lord’s sport (*kridārtham*) that is God’s nature or māya (*svabhāva*). Therefore, *Advaita* would have no objection to the descriptions of the world as God’s sport, *līla*. Hence Gandhi is right in accordance with *advaita* when he says ‘Therefore, it is that Hinduism calls it all his sport, *līla*, or calls it an illusion, māya.’

It does not seem to be right to hold that if *advaita* accepted as the final experience there would be no place for social service, for redressing social and political ills, for bringing comfort to the suffering and to the lowliest and lost. Swami Vivekananda was a great advocate of *Advaita*, but his Philanthropic ministry to the poor is exceedingly remarkable. It is from Vivekananda, Gandhi received great inspiration in formulating his service programmes. Hence *Gandhi* can be placed as a votary of *advaita*.

Why did Gandhi place himself as a votary of *Advaita*? Gandhi believes along with Gaudapada and Vivekananda that the conventional theism is exclusive, which will create conflict in the society. The conventional theist will hardly admit that any brand of theism other than his own is as valid as his. Since centuries some of the faiths claimed that they had the exclusive possession of God and that other faiths were mistaking anti-god for God. Gandhi believes that in order to see
the unity of religions one should go beyond them, one should at least conceptually or intuitively have a vision of *Advaita*. If religions as Gandhi rightly says, are but different roads converging upon the same point, then that converging point must exceed them one of the essential insights of *Advaita* pertains to the transcendental unity of religions. *Advaita* educated all a technique of ‘looking at all religions with an equal eye.’ Hence T.M.P. Mahadevan has rightly observed that ‘the teachings of Sankara’s *Advaita* is the same as that of Gandhi in regard to religious unity: The one religion is beyond all speech’, ‘true knowledge of religion breaks down the barriers between faith and faith’ ‘the soul of religion is one, but it is encased in a multitude of forms.’

Gandhi declared explicitly that he was a believer in *Advaita*, the essential unity of God and man and all that lives. The doctrine of man’s oneness with God and humanity has several implications.

*Advaita* holds that the entire universe has been created out of a single divine source. Hence there is no room for any kind of discrimination in it on any score. It disallows all discrimination between man and man and even between human beings and all other living things. Now when all living beings are to be looked upon and treated as equals, a whole gamut of consequences flow from it, like social and economic equality, self determination and democracy, civil liberties and freedom of the conscience, equality between men and women and so on.

Though *Advaita* had been accepted as the first article of faith by many religious sects in India, Manmohan Chaudhiri says nothing that revolutionary had happened here in the previous one thousand years or so. Indian society had become rigidly stratified and divided into castes. Untouchability flourished.
Social and economic inequality was rampant and gender inequality was at the zenith.

(b) Universal Brotherhood

Gandhi had preached universal brotherhood on the basis of Advaitic principle with greater need, meaning and relevance today than ever. In India, a huge country weighed down by communal disharmony, charged with regionalism, torn apart by linguistic cultural and especially religious tensions, the message of universal brotherhood as lived and proclaimed by Gandhi should grip every person of goodwill to dedicate his/her life to establish peace, harmony and brotherhood among the people. Gandhian concept of universal brotherhood is derived from the Advaita concept— that the entire universe has been created out of a single source, which the Puruṣa-Sūkta of Rig Veda (X:90) clearly depicts.

His concept of universal brotherhood is very much linked with his idea of non-violence (ahimsa) and the concept of the welfare of all (Sarvodaya) since self realization is the ultimate goal of advaita, Gandhi believed, that can be possible only through service and identification with the poorest. He was gravely disturbed by the inhuman plight of the untouchables and the communal rivalries between Hindus and Muslims, all in the name of religion. This concept of universal brotherhood enabled him to work for the removal of all social and religious discrimination based on caste, creed, birth and sex. He vowed to bring about unity between Hindus and Muslims.

(c) Universal Fatherhood.

It is seen that the entire universe has been created out of a single divine source. Hence this single divine source is the nucleus, all other elements revolved
around this center. Gandhi calls this single divine source as God. Because of the limitedness of human beings they know God through his various attributes and call him by different names. Since all are the Children of the same father, all become brothers and sisters to each other. Therefore, Gandhi says:

“We are all Children of the same father whom Hindu, the Muslim and Christian know by different names...The Allah of the Islam is the same as the God of the Christians and the Ishvara of Hindus... and little man has tried in his humble way to describe Mighty God by giving him attributes.”

God being the source of the universe and all the beings in it, He is held as the father. This we see in the Bhagavad Gītā IX: 17

“I am the Father of this world, the Mother, the Dispenser and the Grand Father...”

The Advaita postulate that Reality is one and indivisible, he considered the entire universe to be a manifestation of God, the Ultimate Reality, Isavasyamidam Sarvam as the Isavasya Upanishad puts it. It implies not a mere unity of all that lives but an essential oneness of all creations. Therefore, Gandhi said:

“I believe in the absolute oneness of God and therefore also of humanity. What though we have many bodies? We have but one soul...”

The universal “brotherhood” and “fatherhood” of Gandhian interpretation on “Advaita” concept has profoundly influenced to reduce the stigma of the untouchability. Gandhi did not consider untouchability an integral part of Hinduism. On 19 January 1933 he wrote in Young India:

Untouchability is not Satan. The devil has always quoted scriptures. But scriptures cannot transcend reason and truth...The spirit of the Vedas is purity, truth, innocence, chastity, humility, simplicity, forgiveness, godliness, and all that makes a man or a woman noble and brave.

Again on 11 Feb. 1933 he stated in the Harijan that “it has no sanction whatsoever in the Hindu Shastras taken as a whole.” In fact, it “degraded both
the untouchables and the touchables.” It stunted the growth of about forty million human beings who were denied even the ordinary amenities of life.⁷⁶

It is seen that in Rig Veda, Puruṣa-Sūkta places person at the centre and head of every thing. He is all, at the beginning of all, and from him is everything else, including class and castes of people. Hence Chettimatom, is right when he says that Purusa-Sūkta synthesizes various theories concerning the origin of universe and of man of moral code.⁷⁷ Since the ‘essence of reality’ in Purusa, the Supreme Lord and the essence in human beings and creatures is one, there perceives a vertical unity and horizontal unity, in the Veda. Because there emerged a ‘unity’ between human beings, Gandhi did not believe in the superiority or inferiority by birth and observance of different forms of restrictions on social interaction. He did not believe that either God or scriptures had created this. He asserts:

> God did not create men with the badge of superiority or inferiority; no scripture which labels a human being as inferior or untouchable because of his or her birth can command our allegiance; it is a denial of God and Truth which is God.⁷⁸

And he firmly stated:

> If I found that Hinduism really countenanced untouchability, I should have no hesitation in renouncing Hinduism itself.⁷⁹

Gandhian period increasingly experienced the Subaltern movement against the upper caste hegemony and untouchability. The Subaltern leaders like, Phule, Periyar, Ambedkar and Sri Narayana Guru emphasized a society of equality, liberty and fraternity. Some of them were against the Vedas and Smritis, thinking that, those scriptures legitimize the caste hierarchy, under which low caste people have been ground down under despicable poverty as Swami Vivekananda observed. He says:
In this country of ours, the very birthplace of *Vedanta*, our masses have been hypnotized for ages. To touch them is pollution, to sit with them is pollution! Hopeless they were born, hopeless they must remain! and the result is that they have been sinking, sinking, sinking and have come to the last stage to which a human being can come. For, what country is there in the world where man has to sleep with cattle?....Our aristocratic ancestors went on treading the common masses of our country under foot, till they became helpless, till under this torment, the poor, poor people nearly forgot that they were human beings. They have been compelled to be merely hewers of wood and drawers of water....They cannot rise try however they may. They sink lower and lower every day, they fed the blows showered upon them by a cruel society,...They have forgotten they too are men. And the result is Slavery.  

This is the situation of India, while Gandhi entered in the National Scene. Thinking to get deliverance from the age-old bondage of slavery many low caste people joined Christianity and Islam through Conversion or by *Tablique*. They thought this would improve their social acceptance.

Gandhi said:

If they as mass give up Hinduism they will do so because of these common disabilities, which brand them as lepers of Hindu society. Hinduism is passing through a fiery ordeal. It will perish not through individual conversions, not even through mass conversion but it will perish because of the sinful denial by the so-called Savarna Hindus of elementary justice to Harijans. Every threat of conversion is therefore a warning to the Savarnas that if they don't wake in time it may be too late... 

According to him, the very idea of Conversion is “the deadliest poison that ever sapped the fountain of truth.” The RSS and the VHP were quite against the policy of conversion. They see this as an anti-National activity. Golwalkar even advocates, militant means (*dharma yudha*) to put down these anti-National activities of the ‘aliens’ and the hostiles. This created great turmoil among the communities. Hence on the basis of *Advaita*, Gandhi wanted to synthesize all religions and cultures, he preached equality of religions. Gandhi wanted to bring
the low castes *dalits* to the main stream of Hindu religious tradition, by reducing social segregation, humiliation, discrimination and injustice, so that they may gain social acceptance, which was the main argument of subaltern leaders especially Ambedkar. Gandhi understands, the concepts of ‘universal brotherhood’ and ‘fatherhood’ will elevate the status of the *dalits* and will develop a kinship in the community. Then they will not go after conversion. He was against conversion of one person by another. Therefore he wrote:

I disbelieve in the conversion of one person by another. My effort should never be to undermine another’s faith but to make him a better follower of his own faith. This implies belief in the truth of all religions and therefore respect for them... 

Again Gandhi asserts:

India in my opinion, there is no sanction in Hinduism, Islam or Christianity for the *Suddhi, Tablique* or proselytization respectively, as it is going on today...

Equal respect for all religions is central principle in Gandhi’s creed because *Advaita* holds that there is an essential unity between God and individual selves.

Men may differ in size, colour, talents etc. but “the soul that is hidden beneath his earthly crust is one and the same for all men and women.” He compared the humanity to a large tree having countless branches and leaves through all of which throbbed the same life. Although the universe is full of endless variety, there is nevertheless an all embracing fundamental unity underlying the outward diversity.

*Advaita* extends oneness of life not only to human beings but to all forms of life. Therefore, he wanted to realize brotherhood or identity not merely with the beings called humans but with all life, even with such things that crawl on earth. Since both human and non-human beings have a common descent from the same
God and all life is essentially one, no being can be exploited by man for his/her purpose.

Here Gandhi posits a strong bond between religion and social order. On the one hand, religion is regarded as a socially unifying force, which generates and reinforces social solidarity in the society as a whole, on the other hand religion is viewed as an instrument by the dominance of the elite, who uses available mechanism, to usurp and maintain power and privileges in the society. It seams Gandhi interprets ‘Advaita’ as a universal religion, not as a customary religion. This universal religion refers to dharma, a moral order and is a unifying force of all denominational religions like Hinduism, Islam and Christianity. There is no exclusivism in this universal religion, but only inclusivism. It has space to include all religions and cultures of Āstika, Nāstika and Semitic. It can accommodate not only the religions proposed by Dayananda Saraswati, Vivekananda, Savarkar, Hedgewar and Golwalkar, but the religions of antiquity of the Subaltern leaders like Phule/periyar/Ambedkar/Sri Narayana Guru. This universal religion is ‘Hindutva’, not the Hinduism, of the Sangh Parivar preached and practised, exploited its vote catching potential as Ram Jethmalani has explained. But it is a way of life or a state of mind as the Supreme Court of India has recently described. Mahatma Gandhi practiced this Hindutva in thought, word and deed.

He found no conflict in reading and reciting the scriptures of all religions in his prayer meetings. Hence he said:

My Hinduism is not sectarian. It includes all that I know to be best in Islam, Christianity, Buddhism and Zoroastrianism. I approach politics, as everything else, in a religious spirit. Truth is my religion and Ahimsa is the only way of its realization...
(d) Advaita As Universal Religion

In *Advaita* Gandhi could see a universal religion, all comprehensive, all embracing, all inclusive, rather than exclusive, a synthesis of man’s religious creeds a *sumnum bonnum.* Thus Christianity, Islam Buddhism, Zoroastrianism all find a place in the structure of his Hindu faith, which is thoroughly a syncretic outlook with a universal worldview, comprised the values of *Satya, Ahiṃsa* self determination, autonomy, self knowledge, self discipline, social co-operation and community relationship of Universal brotherhood and fatherhood. Gandhi believes that the above worldviews, value system and community relationship would bring a new culture and civilization. It is a synthesis of different cultures that have come to stay in India, and influenced Indian life; and that, in their turn, have themselves been influenced by the spirit of the soil. As Sadiq Ali Says, ‘Indian culture is therefore Indian. It is neither Hindu nor Islamic nor any other wholly. It is a fusion of all and essentially Eastern. And everyone who calls himself or herself an Indian is bound to treasure that culture.’

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan very rightly named Indian culture as ‘rain bow culture’. There are no totalitarian claims but only tolerance, compassion, acceptance and rationality. Hence recently the Supreme Court has described this culture as ‘Hindutva’ synonym of ‘Indianisation’, namely the development of a uniform culture by peaceful adaptation and change. Unity out of diversity is its goal. Hence Ram Jethmalani says this ‘Hindutva’ culture is the powerful shield, which protects our minorities, their religious beliefs and cultures. This synthetic culture promote Nationalism, National pride, National identity, National loyalty and Social obligation in the place of group egoism, ethnic pride, sectarian religious identity and loyalty. Gandhian interpretation of *Advaita* promotes *Sarvadharma*
Samabhāva, which was one of the fundamental principles that guided him to work for an egalitarian community towards an alternative cultural paradigm.

2. GANDHIAN INTERPRETATION OF ANEKĀNTAVĀDA

It has been noted that Gandhi, as a synthesizer of Āstika and Nāstika religions, has taken the Advaita concept of Āstika religion and gave a new hermeneutic to have a pluralistic inclusivism, so that it can accommodate all religions of lower and higher. This interpretation also gave emphasize to love, compassion, forgiveness, justice and respect for other religions and people hoping to create a new paradigmatic society devoid of communalism. Gandhi also finds Nāstika literature pointing to a pluralistic approach; which not only tolerate other religions but give equal respect for other religions. Jaina concept of Anekāntavāda is one such. This part is intended to discuss Gandhian interpretation of Jaina concept of Anekāntavāda, and analyse, how far it will be a paradigmatic significance to a religiously plural context for peaceful co-existence.

Gandhi by his own confession subscribed to the Jaina concept of Anekāntavāda or Švādvāda. In a couple of significant statement he affirms his faith in the Anekāntavāda of Jainism.

He affirms:

"I am an anekāntavādi. This is the most important thing that I have learnt from Jain Philosophy. It is implicit in Vedanta Philosophy, while in Jain Philosophy it is explicitly stated..."92

In 5 March 1922, he used the same word 'Anekāntavādi', when he wrote letter to Devadas Gandhi.

This raises some importance questions (i) What is Anekāntavāda? (ii) Though Gandhi was a Sanātani Hindu, why did he take and affirm the Jaina
concept of *Anekāntavāda*? (iii) Jainism is a *Nāstika* religion, which neither accepts the authority of the *Vedas* and nor has faith in any God, i.e., it is not a theistic religion. Gandhi as a true believer in God and in the *Prasthānatrayas*, why did he give importance to the Jaina concept? (iv) Gandhi explicitly said *Anekāntavāda* is implicit in the *Vedanta*. Then what is the relation between *Anekāntavāda* and *Vedanta*. (v) And How did he utilize *Anekāntavāda* concept in a religiously plural context and how far this is relevant for an alternative paradigm to counter the contemporary communalism in India?

**(a) Emerging Paradigms from the Theory of *Anekāntavāda***

In a religiously plural context, where conflicting truth claims compete with each other for superiority and identity and religious diversity raises number of issues. But the theory of *Anekāntavāda* seems to offer paradigmatic significance. It provides axiom that, truth is many sided and relative. No group or proposition can claim monopoly of truth. Not only does it de-absolutise truth, it offers a relational view of reality and provides an epistemology for dialogue. It employs *anekānta drsti* perspective for an integral approach to religious diversity.

**(i) Non-Absolutist StandPoint***

The emergence of this *Anekāntavāda* theory is in the context of two contrary philosophical systems, represented by *Vedāntic Advaitism* on the one hand and the Buddhistic Philosophy on the other. Jainism here attempts to bridge the two views by affirming both identity and difference in the Real. How did Jainism attempt to reconcile the *Āstika* and *Nāstika* philosophies?

In Indian Philosophy there are two main currents of thought. One has its source in the *ātma* doctrine of Upaniṣads of *Āstika* religion. The other is the
\textit{anātma} doctrine of Buddhism of Nāstika religion. The Upaniṣads and Brahmanical tradition conceive reality on the pattern of inner core or soul (ātman) immutable and identical amidst an outer region of impermanence and change. This is known as the substance view of reality (ātma Vada). Its radical form is Advaita Vedanta. It accepts only Ātman as real. It denies all other reality as impermanent. On the other hand the Buddhists, there is nothing called immutable. Everything is in a state of flux.

Existence for Buddhist is momentary (Kṣanika). They advocate a Model view of reality. The substance was rejected as illusory.\textsuperscript{94} It is in this context, where one holds identity and permanence and the other holding difference and change that the Jains apparently reconciles both these opposed views. TRV Murthy further opines that the Jains accord equality to substance and its modes. There is no substance without modes and no modes without substance. According to Jainism Reality is manifold (anekāntātma). It is not of one nature. It is unity and difference, universal and particular, permanent and yet changing.

According to Jainism, a substance is characterized by Utpāda (coming in to being). Vyaya (going out of being). Therefore a substance is always infected with its non-being (Utpāda and Vyaya). Without accepting the identity of being (dhrauvya) and non-being (Utpāda and Vyaya), the empirical world of daily life will become inexplicable. In Āstika religion both Sāmkhya and Advaita of Sankara accept the principle of A is A and regard ‘A is not A’ as self-contradictory. But indirectly they bring in the principle of change or non-being. For Sāmkhya Prakriti alone is active, but it posits also an extraneous reality of Puruṣa, and the relation between Puruṣa and Prakriti becomes inexplicable. In the same way Sankara brings the principle of Māya which alone accounts for changes.
But what is the result? The world as *Maya* is neither *Sat* or *asat*. It becomes inexplicable *Sadāsat-Vilaksāna*, a mystery. Hence in contrast with the principle of pure identity of Sankara and pure difference according to the Buddhist theory of momentariness, i.e., discrete moments, Jainism accepts the principle of identity cum-difference, which explains the world much more satisfactorily.95

It is seen that the Jaina doctrine of reals which are multi-dimensional in their ever-changing spatio-temporal events, a thing has many aspects. As man in his bondage is extremely restricted in knowing all aspects, so our judgement is relative to a few aspects only. Hence, there are two things here, namely the various perspectives or standpoints from which a thing can be viewed, and, the various possible judgements about a thing in its various perspectives. This way of analysing the various perspectives is known as *nayavāda* (*naya* means stand points or views or perspectives).

According to Sankara the world is an illusory manifestation of Brahman, His theory is known as *Vivartavāda*, became the world is an illusory super-imposition an Brahman is, predicate (*P*) is not identical with subject (*S*). *P* is an illusory projection of *S* (Brahman).

As against this, for Buddhist *P* is more significant than *S*. A thing is only an aggregate of passing moments. According to Buddhist passing events (differences) alone are real.

But for Jaina *S* (subject) and *P* (predicate) both are important because a thing is what it is through its changes. Hence, the Jaina denies both the Sankarite doctrine of Brahman and the Buddhistic doctrine of soullessness (*anātmavāda*)
Nobody can remain in the Parmenidean Being. Even Sankara has to devise a way out of the following dilemma:

"If the world were real, then the jīva would never be able to extricate himself; and if the world were unreal, then it would not be able to bind the jīva". 96

Therefore, Sankara the world is not absolutely unreal (asat) or tuccha (non-significant). The world belongs to a third kind of reality, namely, Sadāsadvilakṣaṇa i.e. it has both being and non-being in a peculiar way. Does not Sankara then commit himself in self contradiction?

Against this the Jainism accepts the view of the world is real and it can bind soul under the influence of avidya (nescience). The individual jīva in bondage, which means the intermixing of spirit and matter, can work out his Salvation by getting rid of his kārmic matter.

This world contains reals in their mutual inter-relatedness, which means that each thing is in some way, positively and negatively, in all the rest. This theory of cosmic immanence is implicitly contained in Hegelian Idealism, where to know a thing is to know the whole world. Therefore according to Jainism the full knowledge of any thing is inextricably bound up with the complete knowledge of every thing else and vice versa. Since jīva is bound up with restrictions, has only a finite range of perception and knowledge. Hence any perception and knowledge can only be partial and relative. This relativism is expressed by the theory of Nayavāda therefore any judgement can be made only conditionally.

Since a thing is multifaceted (anekāntavāda), what is true from one perspective is true only relatively and partially. It admits at the same time the possibilities of other viewpoints with regard to that very thing.
Hence Jainism represents the stream of Indian philosophy lying midway between the two extremes of ātmavāda and anātmavāda. It synthesizes their view and emerges as a third view. Hence C.D Sharma argues Jainism becomes a theological *mean* between Brahmanism and early Buddhism.⁹⁷

The most important feature of Jaina Philosophy is its respect for all opinions. This attitude of Jainism, i.e., forging conciliatory approach in the midst of conflicting philosophical disputes is what make Jainism significant for Gandhi. According to Jaina metaphysics, Reality is a key concept, which primarily means ‘theory of Reality.’ It also includes in it a general philosophy of life and a definite worldview.

Jainism identifies Reality with existence. Jainism does not accent for a transcendental Being as Reality.⁹⁸ S. Gopalan observes that, for Jainism, Reality is existence and Existence is Real.⁹⁹ M.L. Mehta contends that Jains do not make any distinction among substance, reality and existence etc.¹⁰⁰ P.S. Jaini, too maintains that the term for ‘existent’ is sat (literally Being) in Jaina thought. This term designates an entity comprising of three aspects: Substance (*dravya*) quality (*guna*) and mode (*Paryaya*).¹⁰¹

The Jaina theory of *Anekanantavāda* is nothing but the explanation of the Jaina theory of Reality. They hold that Reality is a complex Phenomenon having Pluriformity. The Jain employs the theory of *Anekāntavāda* to explain the manyness or manifoldness of Reality. It is precisely because of this that Jaina metaphysics has been characterized by scholars as realistic relativistic pluralism and pluralistic realism.¹⁰²
The doctrine of *Anekāntavāda* holds that the Reality is many sided and can be looked at from different standpoints. This many-sided approach to Reality enables *Anekāntavāda* to present a synthetic view of Reality. It is this character which enables M. Hiriyanna to observe that the nature of Reality cannot be expressed by one aspect alone because in its concrete richness it admits all predicates.\(^{103}\) The theory of *Anekāntavāda* can be considered as the foundation of the Jaina Philosophy. Jaina metaphysics can thus be called also *Anekāntavāda*.

(b) **Etymology of Anekantavada**

*Anekāntavāda* consists of three different Sanskrit words. Those are *aneka*, *anta* and *vāda*. *Aneka* means many, *anta* is used in the sense of attribute viewpoint or aspect. *Vāda* means statement or a proposition. According to Jainism a real or thing is not one fixed nature. It is multifaceted; it has more than one feature. To possess many features means to be *anekānta*.\(^{104}\) The opposite of this is to view from only one point of view. i.e. *ekāntadrṣti*. The basic argument of Jains to reject Vedantic and early Buddhistic conception of Reality is because they affirm only one point of view. B.K. Khadabadi thus maintains that philosophically speaking *anekanta* is the name of Reality. Complexity is characteristic mark of Reality. Every object possess infinite aspects of characteristics.\(^{105}\)

Hence *Anekānta* is a more synthetic and broader outlook of viewing things. It aims to synthesize the *Vedantic* and Buddhistic view of Reality. According to *Vedantic* understanding (Chand. U.P. VI) in all changes the clay matter remained permanent. Hence that alone was true. The form and state that change are but appearances. They are mere *nāma-rūpa* characterization.
On the other hand Buddhist hold that changing qualities alone are true which can be perceived. There is no unchanging or permanent substance. Every thing is in a flux. The Jains say that both these strands contain partial truths. They would say that experience teaches us that when a jug is made, it means that the clay lump has been destroyed, a jug has taken origination and the clay is permanent substance in it. We hold that, production implies the destruction of old qualities, some new ones brought in and some part of it is permanent. S.N. Dasgupta observes that:

"The nature of being (sat) then is neither the absolutely unchangeable, nor the momentary changing qualities or existences, but involves them both..." The Jains accommodate change and origination in the midst of permanence. This common sense experience enables Jains to reconcile the two extremes of Vedāntic and Buddhistic conception of Reality. The Jains argue that, viewing Being (sat) as only a single aspect (ekānta) either as eternal (nitya) or non-eternal (anitya) is a defective proposition.

Y. Padmarajiah thus observes that, this theory not only postulates the multiplicity of ultimate reals constituting the cosmos, but also that manifoldness or inherent complexity within each of the reals in universe is there.

In other words

Reality is not merely multiple but each real, in its turn, is manifold or complex to its care. Reality is thus a complex web of manyness (Aneka) and manifoldness (Anekānta).

It is thus affirmed in Jainism that a thing has got an infinite number of characteristics of its own.
(c) **Identity and Difference**

In comprehending Reality, Jaina Philosophers accept both identity and difference as equally significant. Y. Padmarajiah contends that identity in difference is the most fundamental ontological pre-supposition of *Anekānta* ontology.\(^{109}\)

The Jaina view is that identity and difference are necessarily co-ordinate or equal elements in Reality. Here one can perceive conflict with *Vedantic* and Buddhistic views. The *Vedantist* accepts the continuity of things and dismisses changes to be an illusion. Buddhist accepts change without continuity. The Jains accept both continuity and change as essential notes in the constitution of Reality.\(^{110}\) The *Vedantic* objection is put forward by Sankara commenting on the aphorism of Badarayana.

It is as follows:

*Naikasminnasam bhavat* (Brahma Sutra 2:2:33).

On account of the impossibility (of contrary attributes) in one and the same thing (the Jaina doctrine is) not true.\(^{111}\)

Sankara makes a scathing attack on Jaina Philosophers for holding both being and non-being belonging to one and the same thing. But for Buddhism identity of objects is an unreality, which may be grounded on the basic truth of the fundamental Buddhist dictum:

"It cannot be right to affirm and deny a thing at once, affirmation and denial being mutually contradictory."

Jaina Philosophers by maintaining identity and difference purports to grasp the polarity of truth.
C.D. Sharma maintains that, *Anekāntavāda* asserts that the Real has infinite attributes because it is identity and difference. The very nature of Reality is infinitely complex. It being an identity and difference, admits of contradictory attributes from different points of view which are all partial and relative.\(^{113}\) M.L. Mehta makes note that, Reality is considered by the Jains as a synthesis of opposites – identity and difference, permanence and change, describability and indescribability, oneness and manyness.\(^{114}\)

Y. Padmarajiah observes that while *Anekāntavāda* is the heart of Jaina Metaphysics, then *Nayavāda* and *Syādvāda* are its main arteries. He further observes that, the bird of *Anekantavada* flies on its two wings, which can be called *Nayavāda* and *Syādvāda*.\(^{115}\)

K.P. Sinha notes that:

*Nayavāda* is the analytical method by which a thing is ascertained from a particular point of view, while *Syādvāda* is the synthetic method by which different view point arrived by *Nayavāda* are harmonised.\(^{116}\)

Hence the Jaina Philosophy of *Anekāntavāda* has the faculty to amalgamate contradictory attributes of the very nature of Reality perceived from different standpoints. It holds manyness of Reality and complexity. Since Reality is multiform and ever changing nothing can be considered to be existing everywhere and at all times. What Jainism wants to say is that Reality cannot be defined absolutely. It affirms the relational aspect of a real. A real is a unity and diversity in one, and the relation involved is neither one of absolute identity nor one of absolute otherness, but something different from both. It is *suigeneris*. Hence it is determined by Absolute criteria.
C. ANEKĀNTAVĀDA AS A BRIDGE BETWEEN ĀSTIKA AND NĀSTIKA RELIGIONS

Gandhi's affirmation that he has no objection to being called an Anekāntavāda expresses his hermeneutical approach to other religions. It has been noted that Gandhi preached the doctrine of equality of all religions of the world as a viable solution to the problems of religious pluralism. His whole life he devoted to bring about harmony and peace among the followers of different faiths. He firmly believed that exclusive claims of each religion are the main causes for hatred and rivalry in the nation. In order to make a harmonious living, Gandhi believes, all religions should come closer, accept one another and assimilate eternal values. For this he finds a need for having a pluralistic hermeneutics of different scriptures. Hence Gandhian interpretation of Anekāntavāda is a methodology to counter exclusivism or absolutism propounded by many religions, which promote communalism in India. Gandhi believes the theory of Anekāntavāda may offer a paradigmatic significance by providing an axiom that truth is many sided and relative, and would reconcile the Āstika (orthodox) and Nāstika (heterodox) religions.

Āstika and Nāstika rivalries were a continuous predicament since the arrival of Aryans in the Indian sub-continent. Many of the Rig Vedic hymns also present the struggle between the Āryan god Indra and non-Āryan gods (asuras). The struggle between Brahmanism and Buddhism was very strong from the period of the Buddha. Pāli texts express the hostile attitude of the Brahmanas towards Buddha and his followers. Baudhāyana Dharma Sutra denounced Buddha as an asura (demon) and advocated that “the wise should not honour his name.” Kumārila Bhatta accused Buddha as one who “transgressed dharma laid down for
\textit{kṣatriyas} and he took himself to the profession of a religious teacher", one who "deceives himself" and act contrary to the \textit{Vedas}.\textsuperscript{119} The laws of Manu ordain that the \textit{pāśādins, haitukas} and such should never be honoured "even by greeting" (4:30).

The \textit{Puranas} and other works branded Jains and Buddhists with contemptuous names such as \textit{pāśādins (heretics), nagnas (naked), atipāpith (wretched sinners)}. The \textit{Viṣṇu Purāṇa} (3:18) and \textit{Brāhmarādiya Purāṇa} (11:17, 24-25) and 14: 69-71 warn people against talking to, looking at or having any contact with the Buddhists:

One who enters the house of a Boudha, even in great distress has no escape (from sin) even by (practicing) hundreds of penances.... A twice born man, if he has any regard for the \textit{Vedas}, must not look at them. (One acquires sin), in case one enters the house of a Boudha knowing or unknowing. There is no escape (from sin if one does so) knowingly. This is the decision of the \textit{Sastras}.

The \textit{Smṛiti Candrika} of Devanabhatta quotes from \textit{Sathrimsanmata} says:

A man should bathe with all his clothes on if he chances to touch the Boudhas, the \textit{Pasupatas}, the Jains,... and those Brahmanas who have taken up the duties not meant for them...\textsuperscript{120}

The passages quoted above reveal the strong Brāhmanic hostility and antagonism towards Buddhists and Jains. Also the following three passages from Swami Vivekananda reveal the hostile relation between Brahmanism and Buddhism

i. The Hindus strongly attached to their Brahmanical tradition, do not acknowledge their debts to Buddhist ideas and ideals... that is the Orthodox Hindus, because to them the Buddhists are heretics.\textsuperscript{121}

ii. Hinduism threw away Buddhism after taking its sap.\textsuperscript{122}

iii. Buddhism and Vaisnavism are not two different things. During the decline of Buddhism in India, Hinduism took from her a few cardinal
tenets of conduct and made them her own, and these have now come to be known as Vaisnavism.\textsuperscript{123}

Later S.W. Bakhle cited from Swami Vivekananda refers to the Hindu religious tradition as a synthesis of Sankaras \textit{advaitism}, Ramanuja's \textit{Bhakti-Marga} and the humanism of the Buddhists.\textsuperscript{124} Gandhi also followed the same line with Swami Vivekananda on the Synthetic aspect. It has been noted that the Jaina theory of \textit{Anekāntavāda} attempts to bridge the \textit{Vedantic advaitism} and the Buddhistic Philosophy of non-existence. Hence it seems Gandhi has taken this concept of Jainism as a tool to reconcile the \textit{Āstika} and \textit{Nāstika} religions.

Further many scholars argue that Jainism holds its origin goes beyond the \textit{Āryan} invasion, thus to the \textit{Pre-Āryan} period. Sir Sanmukham Chetty notes succinctly that:

Jainism was the religion of the Dravidian people who were the Pre-Āryan inhabitants of India. I am tempted to believe that Jainism was probably the earliest religion prevalent in India and that it was the flourishing religion when the Aryan migration came in India and when the religion of the \textit{Vedas} being evolved in the Punjab.\textsuperscript{125}

M.L. Mehta too notes in the same manner that Jaina culture represents the Brahmanic culture in India. It is \textit{non-Vedic}, \textit{non-Āryan} and non-Brahmanic.\textsuperscript{126} At the time of Gandhi, he finds the 'extremists' glorified Hindu culture and encouraged a revivalism of \textit{Vedic} spirituality. They reflected a worldview, value system, symbols, myths and behaviour pattern of a \textit{Kṣatriya} culture. Then there arose an alternative cultural vision represented by the depressed class. They argue that \textit{Shudras} and \textit{āti-shudras} were the original inhabitants of the country and claim that the original Indian spirituality goes beyond the religion and culture of the \textit{Vedas}. Hence the Subaltern leaders want to revive the values of the \textit{non-Āryan}
religion and culture. This they say is not exclusive, but inclusive and adaptive. There are no totalitarian claims in this culture but tolerance, love and compassion to other religions. It seems Gandhi was profoundly influenced by the moral values propagated by Jainism, especially the virtues of satya, ahimsa, asteya, Brahmacharya, and aparigraha. These are the five great vows of Jainism. Gandhi understands non-violence was central to the Indian civilization, firstly because it cherished the ideal of non-violence and gave it a pride of place in it hierarchy of moral virtues. Secondly a small group of sages and seers had experimented with and successfully practiced it in all rigour and left behind examples of truly non-violent lives. Thirdly in ancient India non-violent was widely practiced and formed the basis of its social structure: fourthly non-violent was the virtue of the brave. Gandhi finds this non-violent virtue has its profound expression in Jainism, Buddhism and in Upanisads and especially in the Gita.

At the time of Gandhi, the Indian civilization, although fundamentally sound in non-violence, had become degenerated and needed urgent attention. Gandhi thought Hindu fundamentalists as Dayananda Saraswati and Savarkar who were all in his view ‘Europeaning’ Hinduism and destroying it in the name of affirming it. Thus they subverted the very basis of Indian civilization. Gandhi wanted to revive the age-old spirituality of Indian civilization. This non-violent (ahimsa) civilization has a cohered character. It was capable of ‘absorbing’ and ‘assimilating’ values. He believed that Indian civilization is the best and no culture has treasures so rich as ours has. He finds the ‘absorbing’ and ‘assimilating’ character has suffered erosion. By reviving these characters, Gandhi wanted to synthesis both Aastika and Nastika religions, by elevating the spiritual values of truth, non-violence, renunciation and other moral values. Thus
he wanted to present Indian culture perfect without any ills, with a solid basis of non-Āryan and Āryan religious values. Hence Gandhi finds his interpretation of Anekāntavāda of Jaina concept would be a solution to the widening gulf between the increasing religious nationalism in the hands of the ruling elite (Hindutva) and the Subaltern revitalism of self consciousness of basic communities in India namely Dalits and tribals (untouchables). Therefore Gandhi finds Anekāntavāda concept can be employed as an antidote to fight against the social evils of Indian society especially to the one sided or absolutistic interpretation of scriptures.

For Gandhi the Indian civilization was essentially plural and non-dogmatic. From the very beginning it had realized that the ultimate reality was infinite and inexhaustible and that different individuals grasped different aspects of it. None was wholly wrong and none was wholly right. Every one was therefore allowed—and even encouraged to live out the truth as he saw it and discover for himself its limits and possibilities. This is why Hinduism did not believe in one and definitive divine self-revelation and allowed its adherents freedom of choice between the different religious texts. It did not regard its religious texts as incorrigible and final but open to new interpretations in the light of new experiences.

It has been observed that the concept of Anekāntavāda or its corollary Syādvāda is a theological mean between Brahmanism and Buddhism because it affirms any perception on reality and knowledge can only be partial and relative. Hence it has the capability to synthesis different perceptions on reality. In Gandhi’s view Indian civilization was essentially dominated by the spirit of ‘Synthesis’ in nature. Since it held, men perceived ultimate reality differently, that they must live by the truth as they saw it, and that a richer view could only be
attained by encouraging a ‘dialogue’ between them. It welcomed and showed utmost tolerance to different cultures, religions and races. It was an open civilization with permeable boundaries allowing new influences to flow in and vitalize the old. Thus the whole civilization renewed itself. The Indian civilization has the capability to blend with one another with the utmost freedom and made India a microcosm of the world.\textsuperscript{131}

Gandhian period increasingly experienced the emphasis in the exclusive arguments of ethnic and racial bond. The \textit{Hindutva} proponent Savarkar argued for a typical Brahmanical Hinduism, in which the untouchables and other ethnic groups have no place. His emphasis on the identity consciousness of Hindus placed the non-Hindus under a disturbing cloud of suspicion and hostility. The spirit that he introduced to the Hindus ‘that they alone are the true sons of the soil’ gave strong impetus to reject all other cultures especially of Islamic and Christian. The cultural nationalism promoted by the \textit{Hindutvāvādis} negated even the values of enlightenment brought by the migrated religions. But Gandhi was against the approach of \textit{Hindutvāvādis}. Gandhi finds Indian civilization was a ‘Synthesis’ of different cultures that have come to stay in India that have influenced Indian life and that, in turn have themselves been influenced by spirit of the soil.\textsuperscript{132} The spirit of the soil is absorption, assimilation, co-existence and Synthesis. Absoluteness and finality cannot claim by this spirit. This energetising spirit of accommodation and adaptability. Gandhi finds in the concept of Anekantavāda or \textit{Syadvada}, which directly promote a mingling of the cultures represented by the different faiths and influenced by the geographic and other environment in which the cultures have met. It was not ‘wholly Hindu, Muslim or Christian, but a fusion of all of them. He observes that India has a history of tolerance and synthesis; a
unique spirit had grown up in India and become an integral part of its way of life. Indeed India has developed an unusual faculty, the faculty of assimilation and an amazing tolerance of opposite ideas. Gandhi firmly believed that every individual is liable to error, every proposition is true but it is fragmentary. This is same as the thinking of Syādvāda or Anekāntavāda. Hence Gandhi says, "I have therefore no objection to calling it real and unreal, and thus being called an anekāntavādi or Syādvādi. But my Syādvāda is not the Syādavāda of the learned, it is peculiarly my own. I cannot engage in debate with them." From this Gandhi proposes an individual should ready to admit the truth of other's views from their standpoints. This spontaneously leads to tolerance for the views of other persons and this is one of the salient features of non-violence. Thus Jaladhar Pal says that Anekāntavāda or syādvāda had a far reaching effect in the movements led by Gandhi. More over Gandhi's humanitarian out look urged him to interpret the traditional concepts in his own way through which he tried to redress the suffering millions.

(1) Organic Inter-relatedness of Religions

In Advaita concept it has been noted that, since all human being are emanated from the ‘Sat’ or Reality, there is an organic inter-relation among them and with the Ultimate reality. Hence Gandhi finds a universal brotherhood and fatherhood in the Advaita concept. Though in Jaina Philosophy there is no such teaching on God as such, but it’s teaching on the doctrine of manyness of reality (anekāntavāda) vividly express a reality. Universe is seen as an integral organism of spatio – temporal processes. A.N. Whitehead categorically asserts:

Connectedness is the essence of all things of all types. ...Abstraction from connectedness involves omission of an essential factor in the fact considered. No fact is merely itself."
This worldview re-iterates the point that humans become humans only in and through integrative relationship with each other and environment. Such a worldview offers a radical approach to inter religious relations. This organic view of reality becomes an alternative paradigm in our search for viable theology of religions. This calls each religion to view their beliefs, convictions as organically interrelated and inter dependent to other religious traditions. Each tradition gets enriched by assimilating elements from others. The pluralistic inclusivistic approach comes close to fulfilling this aim. It affirms that, there is a possibility of the fulfilment of the theological and spiritual content of one’s faith in and through the contributions of other faiths.

This view envisages a relational convergence of religions. It promotes a spirit of mutual transformation in inter-religious relations. Gandhian interpretation of religions and his ideas are derived from his basic metaphysical pre-supposition of the unknowability of the Absolute by finite beings with a view of organic inter dependent to other religious traditions. It is out of this premise that he developed the idea that all religions are partial imperfect and relative. It was Gandhi’s firm conviction and faith that Truth has infinite facets and what man knows of it is necessarily partial and relative. “As for Truth”, Gandhi says“ we can know only a fraction of it. Perfect knowledge of Truth is difficult of attainment for man”, so long as he is imprisoned in his mortal body. In this view he was very much influenced by the Jaina theory of Anekāntavāda. Hence Gandhi said all religions are true but none is perfect. Therefore Gandhi finds an organically interrelatedness among religions.

In Gandhian period he finds the Extreme nationalists increasingly tried to mould the Indian culture based on one religion i.e. Hinduism. To build a national
culture in a pluralistic society based on any one religion is a serious mistake. This fascist tendency is described by Kappen as an expression of the ideology of hegemonic racism aiming to recast Indian society according to racial categories. Gandhi was against any type hegemony based on religion especially by Hinduism because Hinduism is not a religion, since it does not have any well defined creed or cult binding on all. But it is dharma and a way of life and a civilization of cultures. Hinduism has many darśanas for salvation. Hinduism has many ways to reach the goal and accepts Anekānta darśana. It is an ideal or principle to combine divergent cultures into one organic whole. Therefore Gandhi rejects the hegemonic nationalism by the extremists, which characterized by the hegemony of the Hindu community over the minority communities. Gandhi wanted to synthesis all the communities of India, i.e. Āastika, Nāstika and Semitic communities for a national culture. Therefore, he said:

The Hindus, the Mohammedans, the Parsis and the Christians who have made India their country are fellow countrymen.  

Hence Gandhian interpretation of Anekāntavāda envisages a relational convergence of all religions Āastika, Nāstika and the Semitic religions like Islam and Christianity. Gandhi finds Jaina view of anekāntavāda promotes reconciliation of all the conflicting views. It aims to harmonize the conflicting viewpoints and to synthesis them into an organic whole. Gandhi wanted to cultivate this synoptic and many-sided outlook of Jainism in interpreting the existing religious scriptures in India to have a synthetic culture, for a harmonious and peaceful living.
(2) Anekāntavāda Interpretation an Answer to the Problem of Conversion

One of the major issues in the context of religious Pluralism is the problem of conversion in the sense of change from one religion to another. It has been noted that Gandhi was against all forms of conversions whether it is known as Śuddhi by Hindus, Tablique by Muslims or proselytizing by Christians. He had many reasons for his objections, especially based on his Philosophical or Theological, practical or pragmatic principles. Here the discussion is intended to concentrate only based on his Philosophical principles. His doctrine of equality of religions tended him to oppose all forms of conversion from one religion to another. He firmly believed that truth is perspectival and truth cannot be absolutised and monopolised. The multiplicity of truth claims envisages each response valid, based on experience. If all we have is but a fragmentary view of truth, we have no right to impose our fragment on others. The Gandhian interpretation of Anekāntavāda concept also maintains that the reality can be seen from limitless number of perspectives, and any religious claims from one perspective is erroneous. Therefore proselytizing activities certainly violate the right of a person to follow the truth, as he understands it. Further Gandhi sees a good amount of co-ercion is used in attempting to convert which is contrary to the principle of Ahimsa by which alone one can reach truth.

Therefore Gandhi’s says:

"... I very much like this doctrine of the manyness of reality... My anekāntavāda is the result of the twin doctrine of Satya and Ahimsa".\(^{141}\)

According to Gandhi conversion assumes the exclusive possession of truth by one religion, and all other religions are false. This is against the doctrines of
manyness of reality of *Satya* and *Ahimsa*, which he professed in his doctrine of equality of religions. Conversion also assumes that God can be approached through only one way. It maintains that other faiths are inadequate and insufficient in realizing the supreme goal in human life, Gandhi challenged all such assumptions and asked to eradicate the arrogance and "the secret pride that our religion is more true and another is less so." He maintained that since all religions are true but imperfect, there is no meaning in converting from one religion to another.

Then there arise a question that since all religions are true and equal, what harm is there in changing from one religion to another. The answer according to Gandhi is, that the equality of religions does not mean, that all religions are equally effective and valid for all. What he maintains is that each religion is effective and sufficient only for its adherents and it is in this sense that all religions are equal. That is why Gandhi insists that one should firmly adhere to one's own faith. The religion in which a person is born is the most effective one for him. This is what the principle of *swadeshi* applied to religion means, and it asks every one not to change his ancestral faith, but worship God according to his *svadharma*. Gandhi proposed the essential unity of all religions and he clarified his position thus:

> God has created different faiths just as he has votaries thereof. How can I even secretly harbour the thought that my neighbour's faith is inferior to mine? As a true and loyal friend, I can only wish and pray that he may live and grow perfect in his own faith. In God's house there are many mansions and they are equally holy.143

Hence the Gandhian interpretation of *Anekānīvatā*da, clearly envisages an essential unity of all religions and insists one should firmly adhere to one's own faith, and opposed any form of conversion.
In a religiously plural context of India, the work of conversion means intolerance, mutual decrying of rival faiths, exclusive claims for one faith or for the other, all of which give rise to mutual hatred and conflicts. Gandhi saw the danger very clearly. In course of discussion with C.F. Andrews he expressed his fear thus: “This proselytization will mean no peace in the world.” So Gandhi found it necessary for the peaceful co-existence of people that the proselytizing activities of all religions should be discouraged, on the basis of his philosophical/theological principles. Further he said:

“...Looking at all religions with an equal eye, we would not only not hesitate, but would think it our duty, to blend into our faith every acceptable feature of other faiths”.

Hence Gandhi in his interpretation of Anekāntavāda, is he not only opposes conversion but also enunciates integration of other faiths.

(3) Anekāntavāda Epistemology as a Paradigm for Dialogue

The Jaina theory of Anekāntavāda affirms that every object has innumerable characters. Hence it is called anantādharmanakam vastu. Nayavāda holds that our knowledge concerning the object is only partial and relative. Syādvāda holds that absolute affirmation and negation is impossible.

These theories make Jaina position to Catholic in its outlook. Syādvāda in particular holds that, one part of a pair opposites cannot be taken into account. Each proposition should be balanced by the simultaneous acknowledgement of its counter statement. Hence according to it, Truth can only be gathered by samvāda i.e., gathering of conclusions from different aspects. In inter-religious circle the term Samvāda is called “dialogue.”
Dialogue may be described as, that encounter where people holding different claims about ultimate reality can meet and explore those claims in a context of mutual respect. Over against isolation, hostility and competition dialogue establishes relationships between people of different faith traditions. This dialogical relationship is imperative for better relations among religions. As David Loch head maintains, a truly dialogical relationship has no other purpose than itself. Dialogue is the end of dialogue. 147

In a dialogical relationship differences are not narrowed down but finding scope for mutual enrichment. It follows with the concept of 'unity with diversity.' Those who hold the pluralistic position argue that dialogical approach fosters better relationship among religions. Paul F. Knitter calls inter-religious dialogue as a 'hermeneutics of Praxis.' John Hick encourages truth seeking dialogue where different religions can be mutually criticized, enriched and transformed. 148

The dialogical relationship is an appropriative relationship among religions. It is a two-way encounter. On the one hand, there is a deepening of one's own religious commitment as one seeks to share one's faith experience; on the other hand, one maintains a profound respect and reverence for other person's religion. Such an attitude fosters a spirit of acceptance for a worldview different from one's own.

Martin Buber expounds the importance of dialogical relationship in human existence in his famous book 'I and Thou.' According to him "relation is reciprocity" and "we live in the currents of universal reciprocity." 149 In inter-religious dialogue there is this reciprocity of action, a simultaneous accomplishment of teaching others and learning from others. It is this inter-facing of religions that spells out the aim of inter-religious dialogue. The focus is neither
on the commonality nor particularity as such but emphasizes the possibility of mutual learning and teaching. But in this process the diversity or many sidednesses is emphasized out rightly. It is because of that dialogue does not become superficial. Mark Heim rightly points out the primary goal of inter-faith dialogue as:

To lay bare the fundamental differences between different religions so that people of different faiths can realize that they are seeking after different things rather than competitors for the same thing. Such realization makes it possible for different religions to tolerate each other.150

The dialogical relationship will enable each religion to be illumined by the other. Mutual interaction and enrichment on equal footing is inevitable reality for today. Then pluralistic inclusivistic standpoint too argues for a relational convergence of religions and emphasize more specifically for a dialogical theology. It is only in a dialogical relationship that there is scope for enrichment.

It has been noted that Anekāntavāda epistemology affirms a synoptic and many sided out look and acknowledge that truth can only be gathered by Samvāda or dialogue. Thus the Anekāntavāda epistemology offers the possibility of not only gathers the truth, it also de-absolutises and relativises truth. It also acknowledges that the religious resources are the common property of the whole humanity on an equal footing because the essence of religions is the same.

Though Gandhi does not use the word dialogue, it seems he firmly believes in the importance of dialogical relationship for a peaceful living. Therefore, he said:

"For me the different religions are beautiful flowers from the same garden, or they are branches of the same majestic tree. Therefore they are equally true, though being received and interpreted through human instruments equally imperfect."151
In his dialogical approach he emphasizes the necessity of learning from other religious scriptures. Therefore he says:

"I hold that it is the duty of every cultured man or woman to read sympathetically the scriptures of the world. If we are to respect other's religions as we would have them to respect our own, a friendly study of the world's religions is a sacred duty."\(^{152}\)

He also believes that this enables people to keep their religion pure and rid it of blemishes.

The *Anekāntavāda* interpretation proposes truth is relative to our standpoints and one-sided view of reality is bound to be parochial in nature. This emphasizes, truth is perspectival but also pluralistic. Hence on the basis of this pluralistic standpoint Gandhi says, that the spiritual progress of humanity depends on the capacity to assimilate or synthesis the spiritual values from other religions and cultures. Therefore Gandhi expounds:

"For me all principal religions are equal in the sense that they are all true. They are supplying a felt want in the spiritual progress of humanity..."\(^{153}\)

He also emphasizes the importance of dialogical relationship among religions in order to perpetuate lasting peace on earth. Hence Gandhi affirms:

I am a believer in the truth of all great religions of the world. There will be no lasting peace on earth unless we learn not merely to tolerate but even to respect the other faiths as our own. A reverent study of the sayings of different teachers of mankind is a step in the direction of such mutual respect."\(^{154}\)

Further, Gandhi does not foresee a time when there would be only One Religion on earth in practice. He says:

"In theory since there is one God, there can be only one religion. But in practice, no two persons I have known have had the same and identical conception of God. Therefore, there will, perhaps, always be different
religions answering to different temperaments and climatic conditions. But I can clearly see the time coming when people belonging to different faiths will have the same regard for other faiths that they have for their own. I think that we have to find unity in diversity... We are all children of one and the same God and, therefore, absolutely equal.”

Hence Gandhian interpretation of Anekāntavāda, and its emphasis on Samvāda or dialogue expresses the pluralistic epistemology of Indian spirituality.

It is ‘Religion’, which moulds the mind, and ‘Religion’ is the matrix of culture and the essence of all religions are one. Gandhi says fellowship between religious people would help a Hindu to become a better Hindu, a Musalman to become a better Musalman, and a Christian a better Christian.

Indian spirituality and culture was open to the influence of every new culture that came its way and learnt from it whatever it had to teach. It encouraged it to enter into a relaxed conversation with the other, helped it overcome its dogmatism and rigidity, and found a place for it within its hospitable framework. No culture or religion that came to India ever remained exclusive and dogmatic for long. The ‘dominant spirit’ of Indian civilization, that is the ‘faculty for assimilation’ and an amazing tolerance of opposite ideas’ subtly and imperfectly loosened its rigidity, smoothened its sharp edges and brought it in harmony with the rest. Gandhi did not explain how India had developed its synthetic or pluralistic spirit. More often, however, he attributed it to India’s pluralistic epistemology. Since it sincerely believed that truth was infinite, all human perceptions were necessarily limited and partial, and that his moral integrity required that every individual should live by the truth as he saw it. Thus India developed a spirit of not just tolerance but also mutual respect, curiosity and dialogue. Therefore, Bhikhu Parekh opines India’s
epistemological pluralism led to social pluralism and formed the basis of its social structure. 157

Anekāntavāda and its corollary Syadvāda epistemology moulded the Indian culture with a spirit of cultural democracy, which always opened platform to enter into a sympathetic dialogue with other cultures. This spirit of ‘dialogical’ cultural encounter is the main force that foment for the Indian renaissance started from Raja Ram Mohan Roy. It seems through these interpretations, Gandhi wanted to revive the ancient spirituality of religions, which was always hospitable to criticism and reform. It has tried to imbibe whatever was good in each of those religions. The key to the survival of Hinduism is its manner of self-renewal. But in the Gandhian period age-old spirituality and culture was hidden under an entrenchment of crudeness’. The dialogical and synthetic spirit of Indian civilization was hidden under the crude monolithic claims of both Āstika and Semitic religions. Gandhi wanted to revive the age-old spirituality of co-existence of religions and respect for other religions with a view to build a new culture based on the traditions of the past and enriched by the experience of later times. This synthesis, he wishes will naturally be of the swadeshi type, where each culture is assured its legitimate place. 158 Hence his interpretation of Anekāntavāda provides a new paradigm for dialogue to mould a synthetic culture in India.

In the stage of mutual dialogue one religion tries to listen and learn about the other, thus removing prejudices and pre-conceived ideas and paving the way to mutual recognition and respect. This also promotes a principle of complementarity. This does not mean one religion becomes another religion. But it accepts and unitedly holding together the basic values in different religions such as love, non-violence, truth, peace, etc. This trans-religious spirituality should
complementarity. This does not mean one religion becomes another religion. But it accepts and unitedly holding together the basic values in different religions such as love, non-violence, truth, peace, etc. This trans-religious spirituality should help one religion to hold divine values, which are very much present in every religion, because the soul of religions is one, but it is encased in a multitude of forms. Gandhian Ashram life style is a model of this synthetic culture.
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