CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
Gandhi is a very complex figure in the history of modern thought. The complexity largely springs from the fact that he was not only a man of thought but also the supreme leader of the nationalist movement in India for over three decades. During his lifetime, this man turned the national movement which was hitherto confined to a few sections of society into a truly mass movement. He formulated a strategy of political action which was destined largely to determine the form of natural protest and struggle against the British reaching its culmination in the independence of India in 1947. He was certainly not the first to formulate the policy of swadeshi and boycott but the way in which he integrated it with the idea of a non-violent satyagraha was unique. Gandhi was not only a man of action but also a prophet of modern India who truly attempted to transcend the class conflicts of society by devising a method which for the first time, brought about the national aggregation of an All-India character. The fact that he created an ideology of national struggle which transcended class divisions and further devised a political strategy to achieve this ideal in the minimum possible time, is the secret of his remarkable and enduring place in the history of thought.
However, his strategy is not comprehended by many, which was truly remarkable, or his understanding of the class relations in society, which though dated was full of insight and effectiveness, his idea of the individual community relationship, concepts of society, freedom and the state, technological civilization and the question of alternatives are matters for debates. Gandhi had a profound faith in the grandeur of the simple man. He was deeply involved in the freedom movement and therefore, did not have sufficient time to write a book on political philosophy. His writing was diffuse and repetitive, except in Hind Swaraj which he wrote before he plunged headlong into the national movement. But, despite all this, all his writings have a coherent vision of man and society. In a way while Aurobindo developed the idea of national identity, synthesizing tradition and modernity, East and West at the grandeur level of metaphysics and abstract philosophy, Gandhi did so at the level of the common man. He was the son of a Dewan in a small state of Gujarat, and was brought up in an atmosphere in which Jainism had intermingled with Vaishnavism. Quite early in his life he had also come in the contact with the writings of Ruskin and Tolstoy and was influenced by them. He assimilated from Jainism the emphasis on non-violence, from vaishnavism the catholicity of outlook, from Ruskin and Tolstoy their contempt for industrial civilization and ideas on passive resistance. There was also the background of his struggle in South Africa and the nationalist movement in India. Gandhi
was a very effective writer too. He had a style of his own, biblically simple, elegant and yet very effective.

The coherent vision of Gandhian thought has been referred. It is reflected in two aspects, in his critique of the modern civilization and in his search for alternatives to the present structures such as the State, technology and property. These two aspects of his thought are complementary and inseparable in all that he wrote Liberals had a tremendous faith in man's progress. They had repudiated tradition, religion and customs and had prized rationalism and science. Theirs was the philosophy of the advancing bourgeois civilization. In India, as has been seen, while liberals had sung poems in the glory of the British raj, conservatives were alarmed at the prospect of the European culture, particularly its materialistic dimension finding a foothold in India. They thought that the ancient civilization of India would perish if it so happened. The idea of a calculated, rational, self-interest append pernicious to them and as totally disruptive of human relationships and community was of life. Indian civilization, they thought, was based on a more satisfactory view of man's place in the cosmos because it had given due place to spiritualism and the search for the soul.

They were convinced that materialism imported from the west would destroy this by releasing forces towards atomization as well
as mechanization of life. They feared that the pursuit of unbridled self
interest in the form of material interest would accentuate conflict in
society. Such a society would turn its back on the tradition and go
headlong in blindly limitating the west and, as a consequence, repeat
the macabre consequences of a philosophy such as growth of
capitalism, atomization of society and the alienation of the individual,
mechanization of life and increasing unemployment as had happened in
Europe. They had argued that spiritualism and traditional institutions
could preserve the social cohesion and values which Indian had
nourished and cherished. This outlook was reflected in some of the
movements in the late nineteenth century and was shared by all
conservative sections of Indian society.

Gandhi, too, shared this sceptism of modern civilization, but
instead of harking back to tradition he tried to look for an alternative.
Like Vivekananda and Aurobindo he had welcomed the destruction of
those institutions which has drained Indian society of its life. He
particularly found the exploitation of the scheduled castes and did more
than anyone else to improve their social status. But Gandhi also
denounced the evil consequences of political democracy and the
industrial revolution, which according to him, were based on self-
interest. Gandhi had a deeply religious outlook. But it must be
remembered that he had a quest for ethical values such as truth and
non-violence.
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"He dismissed liberal democracy as a fish market, Parliament a prostitute in which people compete for their own self interest.¹

While he believed that consent was the basis of all good government, he wished to conceive the ideal state as the rule of selfless individuals. According to him, the English people were governed by a Parliament which was full of ostentation, pomp and show and in which decisions were not taken on the basis of wider interests. He condemned it as sterile and barren. He repeated Carlyle's indictment of it as a talking shop in which people play fantastic tricks on each other. He had published in Gujarati a translation of Plato's Apology and there is no doubt that he was deeply influenced by Plato's idealism and concern for moral values. According to him, democracy as practiced in Britain, was bad because it believed in counting of heads, those who won 51 percent votes carried the day. The minority had to submit to the majority. Gandhi shared enthusiasm of his predecessors like, Vivekananda and Aurobindo on consensus and co-operation which transcended the majority principle and pursued the welfare of all. Like a true democrat he always thought power resides in the people. But for him, institutions and procedures were not as important as the substance of democracy. Democracy according to him meant that the weakest should have some opportunity as the strongest. He complained, democracy had come to mean party rule, or to be more exact, rule in the hands of the Prime Minister who often lacked honesty of purpose.
In it, he held each party thrives in horse-trading and sensationalism which is blown out of all proportions by the press.

Gandhi further argued that subordination of life to materialism had led western democracies to the exploitation of the colonial world. He was aware of the fact that the ruling classes had shared their exploits, with the masses but concluded that “masses are being exploited by the ruling class or castes under the social name of democracy”. He added, “shorn of all the camouflage, the exploitation of the masses of Europe is sustained by violence”.2

Gandhi was against imperialistic exploitation of the peoples of Asia and Africa by the democracies of the west and identified the rise of Nazism and Fascism as a culmination of this process in western democracy. He wrote “the best it is merely a cloak to hide the Nazi and the fascist tendencies of imperialism”.3

Gandhiji’s critique of modern civilization was no less trenchant. He was a notary of the ancient ideal of simple, moral and pious life. Praise for such a life is all-pervasive in his writings. He was a firm believer in God and thought that only the simple and the pure can communicate with him. Brought up in a deeply religious environment, he yearned for spiritual emancipation, he declared: “For me morals, ethics, and religion are convertible terms. A moral life without reference to religion is like a house built upon sand”.4 His religion was the religion
in the service of mankind. He had said, "I do not know any religion apart from human activity. It provides a moral basis to all other activities which they would otherwise lack, reducing life to a thing of sound and fury, simplifying nothing". In this he was deeply influenced by the Bhakti cult and the Bhagwat tradition. He was one of the few leaders of modern India who intensely believed in a personalized God and exploited the richness of this concept to the full. Following it, he examined the modern civilization subjectively, in terms of its impact on the immediate concerns of the common man, and this largely explains his misjudgement and exaggeration on so many points. He never tried to construct a philosophical system and never reported his moral concerns from personal experience.

Gandhi loathed the material civilization and particularly detested the industrial revolution. He believed that it was destroying deeper values. He was convinced that Rome suffered a fall when it attained too much material affluence. So did Egypt, the descendents and kingmen of the royal and divine Krishna too fell when they became too rich. Gandhi declared that "the modern civilization represents forces of evil and darkness, it is immoral". The lost war has shown, wrote Gandhi, "as nothing else the Asuric nature of civilization that dominates Europe today. Every canon of public morality has been considered too foul to be uttered. Europe today is only nominally Christian. In reality it is worshipping Mammon".5
Gandhi reiterated this idea again and again. This craze for the material had, he bemoaned, led to the ever-widening circle of wants without any sense of direction or purpose. He pointed out that science is meaningless because it does not provide any answer to the question “what shall we do and how shall we live. This craze for wants had led to series of wars, imperialism, colonization, loss of sense of moral prestige and human injustice and decline of deeper spiritual values”. Indeed the more important reason for this was his concern for culture of society and preservation of Indian values.

The reaction against industrial society of the west and the glorification of the rural life, however, had a more pragmatic reason behind it. Gandhi thought that in a predominantly over-populated, rural society in which people depended on agriculture, the introduction of labour-saving devices would play havoc with the life of the people. However, as years rolled by his opposition to technology and industrialization decreased in ferocity. He began to welcome only form of industrialization which would not increase unemployment and destroy the village craft as well as the simplicity of rural life. He said that every machine that helps the individual has a place but, to quote him, “there should be no place for a machine, that concentrates power in a few hands and turns the masses into mere machine minders, if indeed they do not make them unemployed”. He thought that besides saving us
from the ills of technology, the small industries would provide immediate employment.

Gandhi indeed repudiated both machine and property as a means of power. Indeed so great was his revision against the industrial society that he condemned the doctrine which seeks to displace the synthetic medicine of earlier times. He even rejected railways which, according to him, had become a vehicle for the spread of moral corruption in society. He was clear that the railways had been introduced in India not to serve popular interest but to strengthen the foundations of the British imperialism. In fact even in labour-saving machines he pleads more for communal ownership. For instance he wrote: "If we should have electricity in every village home, I should not mind villagers plying their implements and tools, with the help of electricity. But then the village communities or the State would own power houses just as they have their grazing postures". According to Gandhi, "the whole emphasis must shift from power to service: production is inevitable but it must be not for private accumulation but social service". His antipathy to all forms of power is reflected in his ideas on the state with the greatest fear, because although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress".6
Statement of the problem:

"The Relevance of Gandhiji's Economic Ideas in the context of Globalization Process in India" is the problem studied.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To study the Gandhian Philosophy and its influence.
2. To understand the Gandhiji's Economic Ideas.
3. To analyse the Globalisation Process in India.
4. To examine the Relevance of Gandhiji's Economic Ideas in the context of Globalization.

Methodology:

The source material has been collected mostly from the secondary sources. The method followed is historical and descriptive. The material has been collected from Sri Krishnadevaraya University Library, Anantapur, Sri Venkateswara University Library, Tirupati and District Library, Anantapur. The literature and material collected has been thoroughly analyzed and used purposefully.

Chapterisation:

The first chapter 'Introduction' is a study on Gandhian Philosophy and importance, objectives, methodology and chapterisation.
The second chapter 'Gandhian Philosophy' deals with New skepticism, no cultural imperialism, strategy of satyagraha, Gnadhian socialism, women and Rowlett Bills of Mahatma Gandhi.

The third chapter 'Gandhiji's Economic Ideas', explaining economic equality, supremacy of man, full employment, swadeshi, khadi and hand-spinning, village industries, decentralized economy, dignity of labour, bread labour, the place of machinery, the evil of industrialism, economics and ethics.

The fourth chapter 'Globalisation process in India' is a study on definitions of Globalisation, globalization as internationalization. Globalisation as liberalization, Globalisation as Universalisation, Globalisation as Westernization or modernization, globalization as deterritorialisation, Globalisation and inequality and trade and technology.

The fifth chapter 'Relevance of Gandhiji's Economic Ideas in the context of Globalisation' examines, Relevance of Gandhian Thought, Giant Corporations, Decentralisation of Power, Ideal of Trusteeship, Concept of Socialism, Pollution of Air and water, Globalisation.

The sixth chapter Conclusion deals with summary and conclusion of the research study.
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