CHAPTER V

The tumultuous and tempestuous history of humanity during the four decades of the twentieth century, after Christ, has been written and revolved around a score or so of great names. Mahatma Gandhi is not only one of these luminaries, but he is unique, "sui generis" even among them. Because he has been the solitary apostle of non-violent spirituality and morality in politics and economics. "Gandhi is unique", says Albert Einstein, "in political history. He has invented an entirely new and humane technique of the liberation struggle of an oppressed people and the moral influence which he has exercised upon thinking people throughout the civilized world may be far more durable than would appear likely in our present age, with its exaggeration of brute force. The work of statesman is permanent only in so far as they arouse and consolidate the moral forces of their peoples through their personal example and educating influence".

"We are fortunate and should be grateful that fate has bestowed upon us so luminous a contemporary - a beacon to the generations to come."

Gandhiji was a spiritual and moral giant. He was in these spheres one of the greatest reformers in the history of kind. He was therefore called by the people the "Mahatma". It should also be noted that, in addition he was a great socioeconomic and political thinker and reformer, a statesman of the

1. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan: Mahatma Gandhi, Essays and Reflections, 1956, P.64.
first rank who judged aright the political and economic situation in India and devised well-conceived scientific measures to meet it. "His revolutionary application of moral and spiritual principles to group life would never have succeeded, if he had not been able to assess properly the political and economic situation in the country and take requisite action at appropriate and psychological moments. If he had not been a shrewd statesman and a wise politician, all his spiritual zeal and moral fervour could not have achieved the freedom of the country entitling him to be called "Bapu" "The Father of The Nation."

According to Gandhiji, freedom of the individual consists in pointing out to him a line of action which will lead to self-realisation. "Government over self is the truest Swaraj, it is synonymous with moksha or salvation." \(^2\) Gandhiji goes a step forward and says, "The outward freedom that we shall attain will only be in exact proportion to the inward freedom to which we may have grown at a given moment. And if this is the correct view of freedom, our chief energy must be concentrated upon achieving reform from within." \(^3\) He also makes clear the intimate relationship of the individual and the nation or the social structure surrounding the individual. He said, "I value individual freedom but you must not forget that man is essentially a social being. He has risen to his present status by learning to adjust his individualism to the requirements of social progress. Unrestricted individualism is the law of the beast of the jungle. We have learnt to strike the mean between individual freedom and social

---
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restraint. Willing submission to social restraint for the sake of the well-being of the whole society, enriches both the individual and the society of which one is a member. "1 So "every individual must have the fullest liberty to use his talents consistently equal use by his neighbours but no one is entitled to the arbitrary use of the gains from the talents. He is part of the nation as say the social structure surrounding him. Therefore he can use his talents not for self only but for the social structure which he is but a part and on whose sufferance he lives."2 It does not mean that individual has no value. "If the individual ceases to count, what is left of society?"3 asks Gandhiji. "I dual freedom alone", he continues, "can make a man voluntarily surrender himself completely to the service of society. If it wrested from him, he becomes an automation and society is ruin. No society can possibly be built on a denial of individual freedom. It is contrary to the very nature of man. Just as a man will grow horns or a tail, so he will not exist as man if he has no soul of his own. In reality even those who do not believe in the liberty of the individual believe in their own."4 Thus "individual liberty and interdependence are both essential for life in society."5 Political independence is not "an imitation of the British House of Commons, or the Soviet rule of Russia or the Fascist rule of Italy or the Nazi rule of Germany."6 Gandhiji describes it as "Rasharaj i.e., sovereignty of the people based..."
pure moral authority."¹ It is the moralised concept of liberty.
Gandhiji based his faith in democracy upon his unshakable faith in
the intrinsic worth and dignity of the individual. "Man is not
all body but he is something infinitely higher."² Gandhiji,
despite being a moralist and a firm believer in spiritual efficacy,
was a stark realist. In his concept of democracy, he blended
material idealism and ethical realism. He based his idealism on
realism. Whatever he idealised, he translated it into concrete
reality. With regard to democracy too, he applied the same.
Though he attributed maximum degree of moral and spiritual fervour
to democratic ideal, yet at the same time he pointed out that the
first and foremost duty of a democrat must be to serve the society
through practical measures. "A democrat must be utterly selfless.
He must think and dream not in terms of self or party but only of
democracy."³ He must learn to broaden (his) outlook so as to
include in (his) ambit the service of the people as a whole."⁴
"Man becomes great exactly in the degree in which he works for the
welfare of his fellow-men."⁵ Thus his belief in political
democracy is based upon his firm belief in the spiritual democracy
of the entire humanity.

Gandhiji enunciates the political ideal thus, "To me
political power is not an end but one of the means of enabling
people to better their condition in every department of life.
Political power means capacity to regulate national life through
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national representatives. If national life becomes so perfect as to become self-regulated, no representation becomes necessary. There is then a state of enlightened anarchy. In such a state everyone is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state therefore, there is no political power because there is no state. But the ideal is never fully realized in life. Hence the classical statement of Thoreau that that government is best which governs the least."

Gandhiji's political theory of anti-statism or indifferen­tism to state and the conception of an ideal state are an essential corollary and an integral part of his social outlook on life which consists of his metaphysical convictions, Epistemological implications, ethical principles, and psychological assumptions. A prefatory account of his social outlook on life is necessary for the clearer understanding of his political ideas and ideals. It must also be noted that the science of politics is systematised body of knowledge regarding the relation of man as a political animal to society. So, to build a sound system of political thought, a knowledge of what is society is indispensable. Gandhiji views about man and nature are to be found implicit in his religio­metaphysical background. It is from this background, the moral truths, that is, what an individual ought to do, are derived. His political thought is merely the application of moral truths to the facts of social and individual life. Thus his political thought is based on his ethics which in its turn is founded on his religio­metaphysics.

1. Young India: 2-7-1931 and also Harijan: Dec. 2, 1938.
Aronold Brecht points out that belief in the existence of a Supreme Being who has devised and created the universe is clearly a relevant factor in the study of the state, independent of the fact that such a Being's Existence or non-existence is not provable modern science. The relevance of such a belief lies in its influence on political ideas, motivations and institutions.¹ In Gandhiji one finds certainly the intertwining of metaphysics and political notions.

The guiding principles of politics, according to Gandhi, are the spiritual and moral values and he finds them in religion. For him "there is no politics without religion",² and "politics are subservient to religion".³ For him politics bereft of religion is a death-trap because it kills the soul. Therefore politics like other human activities must be governed by religion. Thus Gandhian politics, links up the immediate with the ultimate the pattern of immediate politics with the ultimate picture of society and in this attempt it necessarily puts very great emphasis on truth and non-violence and other ethical principles as abiding values of individual and collective life.

For Gandhiji "The individual is one supreme consideration, so the state is not an end, but one of the means for enabling individuals to realize their goal in life. Then what are the grounds and limits of political obligation? The concept of political obligation involves some ethical standard by which politics
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actions can be appraised or criticised. In other words, a moral principle is required for supporting our obligation to the state. It is in the light of an ethical ideal that the justification of the state is to be evaluated.

According to Gandhiji, the ideal is self-realisation. The justification of the state depends on its contribution to this ideal. That is to say, the state must foster those conditions which help the realisation of this ideal. But as this ideal is ethical in nature, the state cannot enforce it and only through individual initiative it can be realised. For this end the essential condition is individual liberty. Hence Gandhiji lays great emphasis on individual liberty. According to him liberty lies in acting in conformity with the dictates of good will and becoming the best. Again the individual is not an isolated individual; individually a Robinson Crusoe, but is considered in the entire gamut of his relations with society. Hence the good of the individual is intimately connected with that of the society. And the task of the state is to safeguard and foster all those relations and provide suitable opportunities for the realisation of the ideal.

Thus for Gandhiji, the grounds of political obligation lie in the ideal of self-realisation. And the duty of man is to realise this ultimate aim. For this individual liberty is indispensable. The state through the enforcement of a system of rights and duties can facilitate conditions to bring out that best form of liberty which enables the individual to develop, to the maximum extent, his inherent capacities so as to attain self-realisation.
Rights, according to Gandhiji, represent opportunities necessary for self-realisation which is the greatest duty. They are innate in the sense in which moral values are innate in man. Gandhiji says, "Every right carries with it a corresponding duty." He emphatically says, "Rights accrue automatically to him who performs his duties. In fact, the right to perform one's duties is the only right that is worth living for and dying for. It covers all legitimate rights. All the rest is garb under one guise or another and contains in its seeds of himsen" and "duty well-done undoubtedly carries rights with it, but a man who discharges his obligations with an eye upon privileges generally discharges them indifferently and often fails to attain the rights he might have expected, or when he succeeds in gaining them they turn out to be burdens."3

Thus the true source of rights is duty. "A man can give a right, but he may not give up a duty without being guilty of grave dereliction."4 And "every duty performed confers upon one certain rights, whilst the exercise of every right carries with certain corresponding obligations. And so the never-ending cycle of duty and rights goes ceaselessly on."5 Gandhiji warns against neglect of duties. He says, "If we all discharge our duties, rights will not be far to seek. If leaving duties unperformed we run after rights, they will escape us like a will o' the wisps. The more we pursue them the farther will they fly."6 In this

1. Young India: 26-6-1931.
2. Young India: 27-12-1930.
respect, Gandhiji follows the teaching of Krishna, the author of the Bhagawad Gita. He continues, "The same teaching has been embodied by Krishna in the immortal words: Action alone is this. Leave thou the fruits severely alone. Action is duty, fruit is right."  

Gandhiji makes clear what he means by rights and duties. He says, "There is no right but is legal. Divorced from legal, moral right is a misnomer. And therefore you either enforce or fight for it. Whereas nobody asserts one's duty. He humbly performs it. I shall take an illustration. You are here. I feel like preaching to me the Gospel. I deny the right and add to go away. If you regard praying for me a duty, you will quit go away and pray for me. But if you claim the right to preach you will call the police and appeal to them for preventing my obstructing him. That leads to a clash. But your duty no one question. you perform it here or elsewhere..... duty is a debt. Right belongs to a creditor."  

Gandhiji holds that the rights need only be recognised the state for the purpose of enforcement. The rights are not created by the state. The state, in the words of T.H. Green, in order to give fuller reality to rights already existing. Gandhiji also, rights are the precedent conditions of law and does not create rights. The imperfections of the individuals

1. Young India, 25-12-1925.
2. Harijan, 6-4-1937.
the resultant conflicts of rights are responsible for the neces-
of the enforcement of rights through the big machinery of the

The discussion of rights and duties gives rise to the ques-
tion, how can the law of the state serve a moral purpose?
deals with external acts and its sanction is external compulsive
But, ethics, on the other hand, is interested in internal moti-
well as external acts. If one performs the external action as
required irrespective of the internal motives, the demands of I
fully satisfied. But in the case of ethics, the performance of duties often requires a certain motive and disposition. Thus
is a clear distinction between the nature of law and the nature
ethics. But that does not mean that there exists no relation
all between law and morality. Though law is unable to make a
moral, it can help to create suitable conditions to make moral
possible. It should try to secure necessary external conditions
conducive to the realisation of the moral ideal. Thus law at
best represents a system of external conditions required for a
smooth working of morality. In so far law creates the conduct
atmosphere by providing suitable external conditions and remov-
the thorny hindrances in the road of moral activity, thereby a
morality possibility, it serves a moral end.

Gandhiji recognised such a distinction and correct rela-
of law and morality. A. act is good when it is performed by an
individual with a responsible sense of duty. But the state is
able to inculcate in the individuals this sense of duty. That's
why Gandhiji cannot find any place for state in his ideal soci
But in the situations as actually exist, he rightly has under- 
the necessity of state regulation for bringing in conducive ext- 
conditions for the proper discharge of one's duty and correct 
performance of moral acts. The laws which seek to create such 
credible conditions become the laws in their perfection.

The individuals must obey the state which enforces such 
There should be no tug of war between the 'individuals' obligat 
to moral values and to the state; because the state through its 
is helping to make morality possible. The state which creates 
proper external conditions by removing obstructions and helps t 
smooth flowing on of moral stream without unnecessary breaks at 
side of compulsion, punishment and curtailment of freedom and 
thereby provides all with the opportunity to realise the moral 
must be obeyed. By fulfilling his obligation to the state, th 
individual is also serving the moral purpose.

This does not mean that the state should become powerfu 
with no consideration for the individual. For Gandhiji, indiv 
is an end in himself and never a means. Civil institutions ha 
right to existence only in so far as they recognise the intrin 
worth and dignity of the individual personality. This belief 
restricts strictly the power of the state and also the choice o 
political means to further the ideal and. Gandhiji advocates 
democratic form of state as it is the only form of government w 
has as its fundamental principle "the individual is an end in h 
himself". The first article of democratic creed is the belief 
humanity, in man not as a means but as an end unto himself.
Democracy is that form of government which is the reflex not only of the will of the people, but it also represents the will of the people in the conduct of the government affairs. Its mental assumptions are that all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that all citizens equal in the eye of law; that sovereignty rests in the people that all are eligible to equal opportunities for all emoluments and dignities and that every citizen is allowed to have the freedom of thought, speech and worship. It also implies that free participation in social affairs is more productive than coercion, and that in diversity is more desirable than uniformity. It is also feasible to the fostering of political virtues and conforming means to ends. Thus democracy recognizes the individual not merely as social unit, but also as a living soul, as a being who has to perform his individual duties and also pursue truth and attain self-realization, and also his assigned part in the truth and law of society. Hence the recognition of the right of all individuals as members of the society to the free and vigorous life and all-round development of their personality follows as a corollary. It provides opportunities for the full development which they are individually capable.

Gandhiji firmly believed in an ideal of spiritual democracy. He said, "democracy must in essence mean the art and science of mobilizing the entire physical, economic and spiritual resources of all the various sections of the people in the service of the good of all." It must promote to speak in the words of Thir...
Ehave, "lok riti, politics of the people, as opposed to "raj n. politics of the power-state." ¹ Gandhiji did not like the western system of democracy. He said that "at best it is merely a cloak to hide the Nazi and the fascist tendencies of imperialism".² Maximum emphasis on numerical superiority, increase of wants, completely the moral and spiritual quality of man. He considered unethical - deprived of moral fervour. He said that he had great regard for the great man- Abraham Lincoln-, who for the first time had the moral courage to stand and declare that government must be by the people, for the people and not of a self-dictator or tyrant, nor of a band of oligarchs and that it should be conducted in conformity with the wishes of the masses. He dedicated his entire attention, even this life to the cause of equality of human beings. Gandhiji expressed his concern about the loss of the essence of Lincoln's concept of people's rule, for it was being made mechanical. "The spirit of democracy is not a mechanical thing to be adjusted by abolition of forms. It requires a change of the heart."³

"The democracies of Europe and America steer clear of notion of morality having to do with politics".⁴ But any pol... system which contains no moral code and no ethical sanction be it would be ash and trash and dust, a mere maze of 'sound and signifying nothing.' Thus the first and foremost quality of democracy is its moral force and spiritual strength. He did

¹ Harijan: 27-5-1939.
² Vinoba Bhave: Democratic Values, 1962, P.56.
³ Young India: 16-5-1927.
⁴ Young India: 23-1-1930.
favour the western type of democracy, because it was based on and sustained by violence which has led the western nations to exploit the weaker nations and 'the mad race for outdoing one another in the matter of armaments'.

"One thing is certain", says Gandhiji. "If the mad race for armaments continues", he warns, "it is bound to result in a slaughter such as never occurred in history. If there is a victor left, the very victory will be a living death for the nation that emerges victorious. There is no escape from the impending doom save through a bold and unconditional acceptance of the non-violent method with all its glorious implications. Democracy and violence can ill go together. The states that are today nominally democratic have either to become frankly totalitarian or if they are to become truly democratic, they must become courageously non-violent."

As "the method of violence cannot do good in the long run," non-violence must be made "a living creed, an inviolable creed, not a mere policy." "True democracy or the swaraj of the masses can never come through untruthful and violent means, for the simple reason that the natural corollary to their use would be to remove all opposition through the suppression or extermination of the antagonists." For "difference of opinion would be an indication of healthy independence of mind which is the law of life" and healthy public opinion can be built up only when we have "requisite non-violence in us" which would characterise our public life "with utmost toleration." "Public opinion becomes intolerable when it becomes violent and aggressive."

---

According to Gandhiji, "the truest test of democracy lies in the ability of anyone to act and behave as he likes, 'so long he does not injure the life or property of anyone else. It is impossible to control public morals by hooliganism. Public opinion alone can keep a society pure and healthy." Thus "evolution of democracy is not possible if we are not prepared to hear the side. We shut the doors of reason when we refuse to listen to opponents, or having listened, make fun of them. If intolerance becomes a habit, we run the risk of missing the truth. Whilst the limits that nature has put upon our understanding, we must fearlessly according to the light vouchsafed to us, we must always keep an open mind and be ever ready to find that what we believe be truth was, after all, untruth. This openness of mind strengthens the truth in us and removes the dross from it, if there is any.

Thus Gandhiji did not like that type of democracy which founded on and sustained by violence, for "it cannot provide for or protect the weak."

My notion of democracy is that under it weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest that never happen except through non-violence." Gandhiji pointed that "true democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at centre. It has to be worked from below by the people of every village." For "until the power is shared by all" democracy becomes "an impossible thing." He distinguished between two of power. "One is obtained by the fear of punishment and the

2. Harijan: 31-5-1942.
5. Young India: 1-12-1927.
by arts of love". True democracy favours the latter. "He described the weapons which India would adopt for evolving true democracy, i.e., without violence." They are "those of satyagraha expressed through the gharakha, the village industries, primary education through handicrafts, removal of untouchability, comm

harmony, prohibition, and non-violent organisation of labour. These mean mass effort and mass education. There are "big agencies" which are "purely voluntary, for conducting these activities, ... and their only sanction in service of the lowlies

And individual freedom can be quite safe and secure an

"can have the fullest play only under a regime of unadulterate ahimsa", i.e., true democracy. But freedom does not mean unbridled licence, but it means balanced liberty. "In a democracy the individual will is governed and limited by the social will which is the state, which is governed by and for democracy. Every individual takes the law unto his own hands there is no state, it becomes anarchy, i.e., absence of social law or stat

That way lies destruction of liberty. Therefore, they should subdue their anger and let the state secure justice."

He has also laid great emphasis on the importance of necessity of discipline. The truest test of democracy is discipline. He said, "The highest form of freedom carries with the greatest measure of discipline and humility. Freedom that comes from discipline and humility cannot be denied, unbridled

1. Young India 8-7-1929.
2. Harijan 18-5-1940.
4. M.K. Gandhi, Delhi Diary, 194

P. 18.
Lascivious is a sign of vulgarity, injurious alike to self and one's neighbours."¹ For Gandhi "a born democrat is a born disciplinarian".² Freedom of four hundred million people the purely non-violent effort is not to be gained without learning the virtue of iron discipline not imposed from without but sprung naturally from within. Without the requisite discipline non-violence can only be a veneer."³

Gandhi has greatly emphasised on the spirit of democracy not the accomplishment of perfection but perfectability. His concept of "Spiritual democracy" provides a model for the state to impel itself on that basis. As such, political obligations of the individuals are also not fixed or static, but they also vary as the expansion of the vision of man, society and state.

Thus democracy is the ideal form of government which is conducive to the attainment of self-realisation. But the actual democratic state may fall short of the ideal and the individual have to face a situation which calls for the withholding of his allegiance and co-operation with the state. This leads us to the problems of the limits of obligation and of resistance.

According to Gandhi, the ethical ideal which justifies the power of the state and the individual's obligation to it, determines limits of such obligation and justifies even resistance.

1. Young India, 3-6-1926.
3. The Hindustan Standard, 6-8-1944.
to the laws of the state if the latter cease to serve moral
purpose. If and so far as the state ceases to become an indis-
pensable instrument, means to the ethical end and does not express
support and sustain in its law the ethical ideal, then the
individual's obligation to that extent ceases and his disobedience
to the state may be justified. It may even be carried to the
length of non-co-operation and resistance. Gandhi says that
the obeying of laws contrary to one's conscience is contrary to one's
manhood. He considers the obeying of unjust laws which act would
lead to slavery, as the superstition.

The Gandhian state is based not merely on its power, its
command of force or on merely the habitual or passive acquiescence
of the governed, but on their active and intelligent co-operation.
The same idea is implicitly stated by T.H. Green in his well-known
phrase, "Will, not force, is the basis of the State." Gandhi says that even for the most despotic government the consent of the
governed is the basic condition and the despot procures it through
the application of force. But if the people cease to fear the
despotic force, his power also ceases. According to Gandhi, a
passive spectator and tolerator of tyranny is an accessory to
evil. To obey and submit to immoral laws is, therefore, is to
participate and lend support to evil. As such, it becomes the
duty of every citizen to refuse to co-operate with the laws of
the state the moment he understands that those laws are immoral
and are not meant for the common good. "Non-cooperation is a
protest based on non-violence against this unintelligent and
unreasonable participation in evil."
For Gandhiji the ideal cannot be attained through violent means, because the end grows out of the means. This brings the problem of ends and means. For him the end and the means are very intimately related, so much so that the former emerges out of the latter. For Gandhiji "As the means so the end."¹ He says "That there is no connection between the means and the end is a great mistake. Through that mistake even men who have been considered religious have committed grievous crimes...... The end may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree; and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree."² Spiritual unity is his of life. This "can be achieved only by the use of good, that say of intrinsically unifying means." He further says, "the clearest possible definition of the goal and its participation fail to take us there if we do not know and utilize the means achieving it. I have, therefore, concerned myself principally the conservation of the means and their progressive use. I know that if we can take care of them, attainment of the goal is assured. I feel, too, that our progress towards the goal will be in exact proportion to the purity of our means...... This may appear to be long, perhaps too long, but I am convinced that it is the shortest."³ As a result, Gandhiji lays very great emphasis on the truth that to achieve the ideal of the greater good of all and thereby spiritual unity, means must approximate the end. "Realisation of the goal is in exact proportion to

¹. Young India; 17-7-1924.
of the means."¹ He explains it further, "if I want to deprive you of your watch, I shall certainly have to pay you for it; if I want to buy your watch, I shall have to pay for it; and, according to the means I employ, the watch is stolen property, my property or a donation. Thus we see three different results from three different means."² That is why the state cannot attain the ideal State of Gandhi (which is a non-violent spiritual democracy) as means are tainted with violence. Gandhi was "an uncompromising opponent of violent methods even to serve the noblest of causes. Experience convinces me that permanent good can never to be the outcome of untruth and violence."³

Gandhiji's theory appears to be the only correct view of the relation between the end and the means. The other theory, the end justifies the means, even the violent means, is ethically unsound and dangerous in practice. Plato allowed his philosopher king to tell lies, deceiving both its enemies and its own citizens for the benefit of the city."⁴ This trend of thinking, which constituted the kernel of Machiavelli's thought-structure, had travelled a long way in history, and finally became an article of faith with the Fascists and Communists. This theory gives ing recourse to falsehood. Fraud, untruth, opportunism, deceit and violence. These, instead of helping us to move briskly on the path of progress, force us to regard men as means rather than ends, and damp the very sap of our finer feeling resulting in

¹ Young India: 17-7-1924.
² Hind Swaraj, P.40.
³ Young India: 11-12-1924.
⁴ Quoted by Popper in The Open Society and its Enemies, Vol.I.
oppression and cruelty. In this view, an action requires to be judged solely by the motive underlying the action. If the motive is good, the action is justifiable whatever might be the means. But it is dangerous ethics to make the success of a policy or an action the criterion of its propriety. Inevitably it will make politics essentially amoral and a matter of expediency, and seek to set up double standard of morality.

The "Gandhian way" which involves an interweaving of means and ends, is a moving protest against this political tradition of expediency. He believes that by treading an immoral path of falsehood and violence, it is impossible to reach the temple of truth and non-violence. Good means alone lead mankind to lasting peace and progress, while the victory won through the violent means is short-lived and its gains become burdens. Thus good means is indispensable for realising a noble mission in life. As John Stratchey puts it, "If we have learnt anything in our epoch, it is that the means and methods profoundly condition the good." Beside violence, fraud and falsehood and other bad means have always been the driving forces of human disunity, disruption and disintegration. But good means act as the unifying force. Aldous Huxley ably argued that "a state of greatest possible unification" can be reached, by essentially unifying i.e., good means and not by divisive or separative i.e., bad means. Humanity can be united on a higher plane only through practice of the means of non-violence to achieve the end of truth in individual and corporate conduct.

1. Stratchey, Contemporary Capitalism, P.276.
According to Tolstoy, "All that tend to unify mankind belong to the Good and the Beautiful. All that tend to disunite are Evil and ugly." 1

Gandhiji's stress on the importance of means should not be misunderstood as conveying the meaning that the end is, with him, only a secondary consideration. He believes in the inseparable connection of the end and the means and he eagerly advised that the means should not in any way mar the moral character of our end. Hence he repeatedly insisted that our means must be as pure as our end and that with regard to our means we must take our stand on the firm solid ground of unadulterated good." His sincere attempt to give concrete expression, in the form of Satyagraha, to the maxim of moral approximation of the end and means is, perhaps, his most unique contribution.

Gandhiji with his emphasis on interlocking of means and ends would counsel resort to satyagraha for resisting the evil forces of tyranny and injustice. Gandhiji always championed the cause of people's upsurge against injustice. As he said, "It is right recognized from times immemorial of the subjects to refuse to assist the ruler who misrules." 2 In his view, "The important weapons of corporate action are non-co-operation, civil disobedience, fasting, hijrat, picketing economic boycott and social ostracism." 3 He believes that only when the ruler...
cooperate with a government, it can perpetuate injustice. Thus withdrawal of cooperation from 'unrighteous and unrepentant' rule would paralyse the government. According to him, non-co-operation with evil is as much a duty as is co-operation with good. Non-co-operation ultimately develops into civil disobedience which, as Gandhiji observed, is "the breach of unmoral statutory enactments." People disobey the unjust laws of the despotic or tyrannical government in a civilised manner. Civil disobedience is the union of revolution with an abiding sympathy.

For Gandhiji the ideal is the greatest good of all. The achievement of this ideal demands classlessness as well as statelessness. Gandhiji's repudiation of the state is due to the compulsive and exploitative nature of the state authority which damages the moral value of the individual actions, and also to the impossibility of weaning the state from violence in which the state finds its roots. "The state represents violence in a concentrated and organised form. The individual has a soul, but as the state is a soul-less machine, it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence."2 Gandhiji looked upon "an increase in the power of the state with the greatest fear, because although while apparently doing good by minimising exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress."2 The state is justified in so far as it helps the realisation of an ideal, by creating necessary

1.Dhawan: The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, P.238.  
3.Ibid.
conditions for making morality possible. The primary requirement of a moral life is individual initiative and freedom. The structure of the state must be such as to facilitate this requirement. The human imperfections give birth to the necessity for legal enforcement. But the more the individuals understand and practise the ethical virtue of non-violence, the lesser the necessity of the state. Ultimately, in the ideal state, individual initiative and freedom will replace the state compulsion. So, a completely non-violent state could hardly be called a state.

would be a non-violent stateless democracy, the state of enlightened anarchy. "In such a state (of enlightened anarchy) everyone is his own ruler. Everyone rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state, therefore, there is no political power because there is no state." How to bring about this?

In the famous address delivered before the Missionary Conference, Madras, while defining Swadeshi spirit Gandhiji as

"In the domain of politics, I should make use of the indigenous institutions and serve them by curing them of their proved defects. It is in these basic units of village communities and local bodies which "unaffected by political revolutions have helped to preserve the culture of the race." Gandhiji finds a political organism of a non-violent society and asserts, "Society based on nonviolent cooperation is the condition of unified and peaceful existence."

1. Young India, July 2, 1931.
2. Young India, 14-2-1916.
A federation of more or less self-sufficing and self-governing Satyagrahi village communities constitute the ideal democracy. Gandhiji remarks, "Independence must begin at the bottom. Thus every village will be a republic or panchayat having full powers. It follows, therefore, that every village has to be self-sustained and capable of managing its affairs to the extent of defending itself against the whole world. be trained and prepared to perish in the attempt to defend it against any onslaught from without. Thus ultimately, it is individual which is the unit. This does not exclude dependence on and willing help from neighbours or from the world." If he observed, "In this structure composed of innumerable villages there will be ever-widening never ascending circles. Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes a life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance, but ever humble, sharing the majority of the oceanic circle; they are integral units. Therefore, the outermost circumf will not wield power to crush the inner circle but will give strength to all within and derive its own strength from it." Thus Gandhiji looks upon "centralisation" with the greatest fear, for it would lead to concentration of power and exploi

2. Ibid., July 28, 1946.
"Centralisation as a system," he says, "is inconsistent with the non-violent structure of society." ¹ "I suggest that if India, to evolve along non-violent lines it will have to decentralize things. Centralization cannot be sustained and defended with adequate force." ² He feared that it would curb the individual initiative — and individuality which, according to Gandhiji, ³ is the root of all progress.

Such a solution to the problem of getting rid of the growing hindrances of the totalitarian state may appear to be utopia. But it is very interesting, indeed, to find that even most of the modern political thinkers have started to think along the same line. Cole believed that "Democracy is hos to centralisation, for it is a spirit which wants freedom to assert itself immediately and on the spot wherever the need for the expression of a collective will arises. To canalise it, so as to make it all flow into a single central channel, is to destroy spontaneity, and to make it unreal." ³ According to Joad, "men's faith in social action is to be revivified the state must cut up and its functions distributed." ⁴

Thus Gandhiji's ideal is the decentralised democratic communities in which the activities of which will be conducted on a cooperative basis and in which the individual will have acquired almost complete self-control developing a high-level of non-violence. Continuously understanding the spiritual reality, he will let

¹ Harijan, January, 18, 1942.
² Ibid. December 30, 1939.
⁴ Modern Political Theory, Pp. 120-121.
life of simplicity and renunciation with social service as his goal. Such a democratic community of self-contained villages where there are no military, police, law-courts, lawyers, heavy transport, the modern system of medicine, will be a perfect democracy based on individual freedom. To Gandhiji, like Bak freedom is not merely a negative term. It means more than the mere absence of external restriction on one's powers and faculties.

It means the capacity to act well in response to the character impulses of a rational being. The true liberty of the individual postulates on the one hand, a recognition and respect of his freedom by the other members, and, on the other hand, an equal recognition and respect on his part for the freedom of others. Gandhiji's ideal is akin to anarchy in which every individual so enlightened that his life is self-regulated and he feels no need for any external authority. "Self-government," says Gandhiji, "means continuous effort to be independent of government control whether it is a foreign one or whether it is national. Swaraj Government will be a sorry affair if people look up to it for the regulation of every detail of life."2 .... The individual is the architect of Government. The law of non-violence rules him and his Government. He and his village are able to defy the might of the world. The law governing every villager is that he will suffer death in the defence of his and his village's honour.3

But how will the non-violent democracy adjust the old society and the individual and reconcile individual freedom

1. Vide Coker: Recent Political Thought, 1934, P. 206.
3. Harijan, July 26, 1942.
social cohesion and obligation, the task which the state at present tries to achieve through the exercise of coercion in the last resort? In the non-violent democracy non-violence will reconcile individual freedom with social restraint. There is another non-violent factor which makes the individual conscious of his obligations. This is what Hindu social thinkers call dharma. Dharma is not a static code of mechanical rules, but a living spirit which grows, moves and develops in response to the development of the society. Its function is to hold together harmoniously the social order and serve as a guide to the conscience of the individual in such a way as to train him to realize his potentialities. Dharma or social ethics of the non-violent democracy which will exert strong moral pressure on the individual and thus reinforce his conscience, will be a vitally important factor in sustaining social cohesion.

This ideal non-violent democracy, however, is attainable only when the individuals have acquired complete self-control and personal swaraj and are able to observe social obligations spontaneously without the operation of and exercise of coercion by the state. But this ideal, according to Gandhiji, will always remain an ideal unrealized and unrealizable. He said "the ideal is never fully realized in life". In answer to the question, "Can a state carry on strictly according to the principle of non-violence?" Gandhiji replied, "A Government cannot succeed in becoming entirely non-violent, because it represents all the people. I do not today conceive of such a golden age. But I do believe in the possibility..."
of a predominantly non-violent society. And I am working for it."\(^1\) Thus Gandhi being a practical idealist seems to tolerate the existence of state, perhaps, for the transitional state. The ideal non-violent democracy which is unattainable due to human imperfections, represents the direction rather than the destination, the process rather than the consummation. The state that will come into vogue as a result of the non-violent revolution will be a compromise, a via media, between the ideal and the facts of human nature. It will represent the attainable "middle way"\(^2\) of Gandhi, the first step, towards the ideal.

To Gandhi even this state is not an end in itself but one of the means to secure the greatest good of all. Thus he rejects the Hegelian view of the state as the final goal of human society. He is also against the theory of absolute sovereignty of the state. He believes in the Swaraj which means self-rule and has its source in Hindu social thought. "The word Swaraj is a sacred word", he says, "a vedic word, meaning self-rule and self-restraint, and not freedom from all restraint which independence often means."\(^3\) This predominantly non-violent state will correspond to quality of non-violence evolved by the individuals, until it finds its consummation in the ideal non-violent democracy. It cannot, therefore,
be described in terms of any one form of society. He once described it as "Ramraj". 1

With regard to the political constitution of the non-violent state, it is not inconsistent with a representative system of government. He defined it as "the government of India by the consent of the people as ascertained by the largest number of population, male or female, native born or domiciled, who have contributed by manual labour to the service of the state and have taken the trouble of having their names registered as voters. Again, "If independence is born non-violently all the component parts will be voluntarily interdependent working in perfect harmony under a representative central authority which will derive its sanction from the confidence reposed in it by the component parts. The central power, he further adds, will be based on "universal suffrage exercised by a disciplined and politically intelligent electorate". 4

Gandhiji did not believe that the idea of representative institutions was something new and not conducive to the Indian atmosphere. In 1917 he demanded parliamentary Government. He was ready to accept it as a transitional stage only. He in 1920, "My swaraj is the parliamentary Government of India, a modern sense of the term, for the time being.....", 5 though against a complete copying of the west. 6 In 1942 he told Louis Fischer that he did not favour the accepted western form of

1. Ramraj is "the Kingdom of Righteousness". "By Ramraj I mean Hindu raj. I mean by Ramraj Divine raj, the kingdom of the ancient ideal of Ramraj is undoubtedly one of true democracy." Young India, May 28, 1931, Sept. 19, 1929.
2. Young India, II, Pp. 488-89.
3. Harijan: October 13, 1940.
4. Ibid., 13-10-1940.
5. Young India, I, P. 873 also P. 885 and the introduction to H. Swaraj, P.VIII. 6. Louis Fischer, A Week with Gandhi, P.
democracy with its universal voting for parliamentary representatives.\(^1\) It should be noted that Gandhiji attached more importance to the spirit behind a constitution than to its ex form.

But more than the institutional form Gandhiji stress the importance of the moral equipment of those who run the government. According to him, a candidate for election should be free from the mad craze for office, self-propaganda, evil desires to run down his opponents and psychological exploitation of voters. He must be selfless, capable and incorruptible and should be motivated by the love of social services and not by selfish interest. The candidate seeking election must win votes not by canvassing but by virtue of service rendered by him. All public offices must be held in a spirit of service without the least expectation of personal gain. Gandhiji, if he could have his way, would like the democratic state to be administered by a representatives elected by the people and removable at the will of the people. A reduction in the number of representatives in a predominantly non-violent state would be practicable due to the decentralisation of political and economic power, the restriction of functions of the state and the consequent and correspondingly increased importance of voluntary associations.

---

1. Louis Fischer: A Week with Gandhi, P.55.
As for franchise, Gandhiji advocates a wide adult franchise and would have no distinctions based on sex or property. He would also not have any special weightage given to any sect of the community. He was convinced of the necessity of moral development both on the part of the ruler and the ruled. Though he understood the importance of literacy in franchise, he did not believe that education could bring about the moral regeneration of the people; he rather emphasised the moral character of the individual. He would rather have manual labour which he looked up as a training in moral discipline when voluntarily undertaken, an essential qualification of franchise. "The qualifications for franchise should be neither property nor position but manual, literary or property test has proved to be elusive. Manual labour gives an opportunity to all who wish to take part in the government and the well-being of the state."¹ Labour franchise is the application to politics the ideal of bread labour which aims at making life self-sufficient and people courageous and self-reliant. The intelligent and conscious adoption of this ideal will guard voters against becoming mere helpless pawns in the hands of politicians.² It will develop in them an ability and fear of grit to resist the misuse of authority and prevent the division of the state into a small class of self-seeking, arrogant and exasperating rulers and a large class of helpless, exploited masses repressing, unthinking and unquestioning obedience.

With regard to age limits of the voters Gandhi ji favo-
"the franchise of all adults above the age of twenty-one or e-
eighteen. He would bar old men like himself. They were of
use as voters. India and the rest of the world did not belo,
those who were on the point of dying. Thus he would have a
against persons beyond a certain age, say fifty, as he would
youngsters below eighteen." Thus he would reserve the right
vote only for those persons who are between eighteen and fift
fit to contribute through body labour to the service of the s
In this Gandhi ji seemed to have been influenced by the Hindu
idea of four-fold succession of the stages of life (Ashrams)
the durations of 25 years each. At the age of fifty, one co
the stages of studentship and a householder and enters the at
a vanaprastha "forest recluse" to lead a life of inquiry and
meditation. Hence people over fifty will have moral influen
though they will not have political authority through the vot
Gandhi ji is thinking of political authority essentially in te
of social duties and not in the sense of satisfaction or adju
of the interests of the individuals classes as the utilitaria

gandhi ji favoured indirect election through the vill
panchayats. In 1942 he again advocated the system of ind:
election at the Round Table Conference. According to him:
hundred thousand villages of India will be organised in con.
1. The Four Ashramas being - Brahmacharya, Grihasta, Vanapras
and Sanyasa.
2. C. Rajagopalachari and J.C. Kumarappa, eds. The Nation's
with the will of the citizens, all of them voting. These vil
each having one vote, will elect their district administration
which in turn, will elect provincial administrations. The la
will elect a president. He will become the national chief
Executive. This will lead to decentralisation of power among
thousand hundred thousand villages which will co-operate in ti
of administration voluntarily. This voluntary cooperation wi
produce real freedom. 1 "Non-violence with its technique of
Satyagrha and non-cooperation will be the sanction of the vil
community....... The government of the village will be conduct
the panchayat of five persons annually elected by the adult
villagers, male and female, possessing minimum prescribed qual
cations. These will have the authority and jurisdiction requi
since there will be no system of punishment in the accepted as
this panchayat will be the legislature, judiciary and executiv
combined to operate for its year of office. 2

This indirect election should not be considered as und
ocratic. Its merit lies in supplying able representatives tri
and tested in the life of groups and in replacing passive rep
station by active representation. 3 The chief considerations
appear to be Gandhiji's emphasis on personal contact between 4
voters and their representatives and the reduction of election
expenses. It should be understood in the context of decen
ation and limited functions of the state. At the Round Table
conference, Gandhiji was also not favourable to second cham
to special representation as these are not democratic.


In a democracy, majority rule has to be the basis of practical action. But if the majority completely scoffs at the views of the minority, then democracy would fail in its mission of upholding individual liberty. To hold that there is greater wisdom in the opinion of the majority than in that of the minority is to argue unreasonably. "..... No school of thought", says Gandhiji, "can claim a monopoly of right judgment. We are all liable to err and are often obliged to revise our judgment...... And the least, therefore, that we owe to ourselves as to others is to try to understand the opponent's viewpoint and, if we cannot accept it, respect it as fully as we expect him to respect ours. It is one of the indispensable tests of a healthy public life".\(^1\) Again "The rule of majority does not mean it should suppress the opinion of even an individual if it is sound. An individual's opinion should have greater weight than the opinion of many, if that opinion is sound. That is my view of real democracy."\(^2\) But actual democracies always fall short of the ideal and there is always the danger of the tyranny of the majority. Gandhiji was always at pains to eradicate this danger. The only institutional safeguard that he offers is his scheme of decentralisation, i.e., federation of more or less free village republics. But he relies more on considerations and "forces, intellectual and moral, which must always lie behind institutions"\(^3\) rather than on institutional safeguards. In the predominantly non-violent state, there will be no tyranny of majority. Gandhiji would expect the majority

\(^{1}\) Young India, Vol.II, P.227.
\(^{2}\) Gandhiji's statement on the break-down of Gandhi. Jinnah Talks, September 26, 1944.
to convert the minorities through persuasion or self-suffering. This does not, of course, mean the tyranny of the minority, but what he calls, "the magnanimity of the majority," on the other hand, the duty of the minority is to yield to the decisions of the majority if they do not offend their moral sense. For otherwise, no social life and no corporate self-government is possible.

"There is no principle involved and there is a programme to be carried out, the minority has got to follow the majority."2

"The rule of majority", observes Gandhiji, "has a narrow application, i.e., one should yield to the majority in matters of detail. But it is slavery to be amenable to the majority no matter what its decisions are...... Democracy is not a state in which people act like sheep. Under democracy, individual liberty of opinion and action is jealously guarded. I, therefore, believe that the minority has a perfect right to act differently from the majority."3 Indeed, "in matters of conscience the law of majority has no place."4

In the predominantly non-violent state of Gandhi, although crime will be considerably reduced through the rationalization of all institutions which will be based on real equality, justice and genuine brotherhood5 brought about by the non-violence of the brave, through not regarding or treating anybody as criminal6 and through the pressure of social ethics which will encourage spontaneous conformity to the demands of social obligation, yet there will be some anti-social, parasitic persons, who might, being victims of

social ills, disobey laws and commit violent acts due to lack of self-control. Referring to crimes, Gandhiji said, "some of it will go on perhaps till doomsday as thieving will."\textsuperscript{1}

According to Gandhiji, punishment by itself is an evil. Indeed he did not believe in the system of punishment for crimes whether private or public.\textsuperscript{2} If he had his way he would throw open the doors of the prisons and let out even murderers.\textsuperscript{3} But that being an unrealizable ideal under present conditions of society he said, "I have personally not found a way out of punishment and punitive restrictions in all conceivable cases."\textsuperscript{4} Again, "I am quite capable of recommending even punishment to wrong-doers under conceivable circumstances; for instance, I would not hesitate under the present state of society to confine thieves and robbers, which is in itself a kind of punishment. But I would also admit that it is not satyagraha, and that it is a fall from the pure doctrine. That would be an admission not of the weakness of the doctrine but the weakness of myself. I have no other remedy to suggest in such cases in the present state of society."\textsuperscript{5} Now the purpose of punishment is satisfied if the criminal is prevented from committing the crime again, and if others are deterred from committing similar crimes. Regarding the former, Gandhiji laid more emphasis on the reformation of the accused. He said, "under a state governed according to principles of ahima, ..... a murderer would be sent to a penitentary and there given a chance of reforming himself."\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{1}\textit{Harijan, July 31, 1937.}
\textsuperscript{2}\textit{Harijan, Sept. 4, 1937.}
\textsuperscript{3}\textit{T.C. Tendulkar and others: Gandhiji, His Life and Work, p.381.}
\textsuperscript{4}\textit{Harijan, October 23, 1937.}
\textsuperscript{5}\textit{Young India, Vol.II, p.862.}
\textsuperscript{6}\textit{Harijan, April 27, 1940.}
He considers 'crime "a disease like any other malady and is a product of the prevalent social system." This gives the impression that Gandhiji is advocating a psychological or sociological theory of punishment, a view completely at variance with his fundamental ideas. If we respect personality, we must also give equal respect to responsibility. If we respect responsibility, then the right of punishing the offenders for their crimes must also be respected. But Gandhiji never intended to deny individual responsibility. What he wished to emphasise was the enormity of the part played by the social conditions and also the responsibility of society as a whole for the wrongdoer's action by not providing the proper conditions needed for the development of his individuality. Gandhiji also does not deny the deterrent character of punishment. He said that it would go very hard with the public if the criminals were given to understand that they would be set free or be very much better treated when the swaraj was established. Even in reformatories, by which he would like to replace every jail under swaraj, discipline would be extracted.

With regard to death sentences, he said that the difference between capital punishment and other forms of punishment is not only one of degree, but also of kind. He says, "I can recall the punishment of detention. I can make reparation to the man upon whom I inflict corporal punishment. But once a man is killed, the punishment is beyond recall or reparation. God alone can take

life, because He alone gives it.\textsuperscript{1} That nobody is beyond mortal redemption is explicitly recognised by Gandhiji.

With regard to the reformation of the criminal, Gandhiji laid more emphasis on education and training of the criminal. Accordingly, he suggested many prison reforms based on his personal experiences of life in jails. He insisted on transforming jails into educational reformatories, workshops and financially self-sufficient and self-supporting instead of being merely spendthrift and punitive departments. Gandhiji's plan was that "all industries that were not paying should be stopped. All the jails should be turned into hand-spinning and hand-weaving institutions."\textsuperscript{2} He wanted prisoners to be treated as defectives, not criminals to be looked down upon.\textsuperscript{3} ...... all criminals should be treated as patients and the jails should be the hospitals admitting this of patients for treatment and cure. No one committed crime for fun of it. It is a sign of a diseased mind. The causes of particular disease should be investigated and removed.\textsuperscript{4} He advised the warders to "cease to be the terrors of the prison, but the jail officials should be their friends and instructors. " ...... The outlook of the jail staff should be that of physicians and nurses in a hospital. The prisoners should feel that the officials were their friends. They were there to help them regain their mental health and not to harass them in any way. Thus the humanistic approach of Gandhiji aims at restoring the initiative and self-respect of the prisoner.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1.] Young India, Vol. II, P. 362
  \item[2.] Harijan, July 17, 1937.
  \item[3.] Harijan, 17-7-1937.
  \item[4.] Harijan, Nov. 2, 1947.
  \item[5.] Harijan, 17-7-1937.
  \item[6.] Harijan, 2-11-1947.
\end{itemize}
With regard to the police and military, though under ideal conditions there is no place for these two, yet in actual practice Gandhiji concedes the necessity of both police and military.\(^1\)

This, Gandhiji admitted, is a sign of imperfect ahimsa. While thus retaining the police force, he would completely transform its present character by curing it of its violent methods. He writes, "The police of my conception will, however be of a wholly different pattern from the present day force. Its ranks will be composed of believers in non-violence. They will be servants, not masters, of the people. The people will instinctively render them every help and through mutual cooperation they will easily deal with the ever-decreasing disturbances. The police force will have some kind of arms but they will be rarely used, if at all. In fact, the policemen will be reformers. Their police work will be confined to robbers and decoits. Quarrels between labour and capital and strikes will be few and far between in a non-violent state, because the influence of the non-violent majority will be so great as to command the respect of the principal elements in society. Similarly there will be no room for communal disturbance.\(^2\)

Gandhiji would allow the police to bear arms, for one of their duties would be to arrest those who commit crimes for non-violent treatment in prisons. He would permit them to use physical force to restrain, for example, a lunatic run amuck with a

---

1. Young India, I, pp. 284, 641 and 1086; Harijan, Feb. 10, 1940 and March 6, 1940.
2. Harijan, Sept. 1, 1940; See also Mashruwala: Practical Non-violence, p. 21.
murdering tendency.

As for military, the same rule holds good. Though under the Swaraj of Gandhiji, there would be no room for military. under practical situations he was willing to retain it. He was, however, in favour of a non-violent army who would act 'unlike armed men as well in times of peace as of disturbances' and who 'would be constantly engaged in constructive activities'. Gandhiji did not favour the use of military for maintaining civil liberties and internal peace. He also expressed his disapproval definitely against the use of military as a means of defence against foreign aggression. He had always been 'against compulsory military training in every case and even under a national Government.'

But though Gandhiji himself did not believe in the use of arms, yet he would not hesitate to advise their use by those who did not believe in non-violence. He said, "if there was a national Government, whilst I should not take any direct part in any war, I can conceive occasions when it would be my duty to vote for the military training of those who wish to take it. For I know that all its members do not believe in non-violence to the extent I do. It is not possible to make a person or a society non-violent by compulsion." Thus it is quite clear that Gandhiji though would not allot any place to the military in his ideal of Swaraj, was prepared to recognise that the military would exist as long as public opinion

1. Young India, I, Pp. 641 and 1086, Young India, II, P. 924.
2. Harijan, March 26, 1938.
3. Harijan, October 23, 1937.
4. Young India, Sept. 9, 1925.
5. Young India, Sept. 13, 1928.
wee not equal to renouncing its use. That is why, he said: "Alas! In my Swaraj of today there is room for soldiers."¹ "I agree too that a sudden withdrawal of the military and the police will be a disaster if we have not acquired the ability to protect ourselves against robbers and thieves."² When Kashmir acceded to Indian Union, Gandhiji did not object to the despatch of Indian troops for the defence of Kashmir.³

As with police and military, so with the courts, while retaining them, Gandhiji would change their characters. There will be laws and courts under Swaraj, but they will be guardians of people's liberty and not, as they now are, mere instruments in hands of a bureaucracy which has emasculated and is interested in further emasculating whole nation.⁴ Gandhiji was a severe critic of lawyers, judges and the administration of justice. Having studied and practised as a barrister in South Africa and India, he had an intimate personal knowledge of modern judicial system's failings. He criticised lawyers and judges whom he called "cousins" and much of what he said to lawyers applied to judges: "The legal system teaches immorality.... The lawyers.... advance quarrels, instead of repressing them.... their interest exists in multiplying disputes."⁵

As for courts, he held that it was wrong to consider they were established for the benefit of the masses. "Those

¹ Young India, Vol. II, P. 924.
² Young India, Vol. I, P. 641.
³ J. G. Tendulkar, Kabatma, Vol. 8, P. 204.
⁴ Young India, 9-3-1922.
⁵ Hind Swaraj, P. 42.
want to perpetuate their power do so through these courts. If people were to settle their own quarrels, a third party would not be able to exercise any authority over them." Thus the court's object was the permanence of the authority of the Government which they represented. In so far as they were the supporters of an unrighteous governments the courts were not "the palladium of a nation's liberty", but "crashing houses to crush a nation's spirit."

Gandhiji's great complaint was that the justice administered was much too expensive. To remedy these he would like to transfer most of the judicial work of the state to the "village panchayats," according to his general scheme of decentralisation. He says, "Administration of Justice should be cheapened..... parties to civil suits must be compelled in the majority of cases to refer their disputes to arbitration, the decision of Panchayats to be final except in cases of corruption or obvious misapplication of law.

Multiplicity of intermediate courts should be avoided. Case law should be abolished, and the general procedure should be simplified. Lawyers may remain, but they should not claim any superiority to their profession. Their true duty is to unite the parties that have been driven asunder. Ideally speaking, lawyers and judges must depend for their living on some form of bread-labour and serve people free. However, as a second best ideal, "all bhagis, doctors, lawyers, teachers, merchants and others would get the same wages for an honest day's work."

2. Young India, I, P. 351.  
3. Young India, I, P. 350.  
4. Young India, II, P. 436.  
Thus Gandhiji would minimise the judicial work of the state. In the non-violent state crimes and disturbances will be less and people will ordinarily avoid courts and settle their differences by mutual compromise or private arbitration. And in the few cases that will come before the courts of the state, justice will be cheap, speedy and efficient.

Gandhiji did not intend his scheme of decentralisation to promote narrow or parochial sympathies. His nationalism is not aggressive, exclusive and destructive. On the other hand it is constructive, because the means it employs to fulfill its purposes is non-violence and the method of conversion and not of coercion. In addition, it is inspired by the ideal of world unity based on the highest truth, the spiritual oneness of humanity and represents a country which lives not by exploiting others but by serving others and even dying for the benefit of others. As such, non-violent nationalism is the essential pre-requisite of sound internationalism. Thus Gandhiji said in 1925, "...... it is impossible for one to be an internationalist without being a nationalist....... It is not nationalism that is an evil, it is the narrowness, selfishness, exclusiveness which is the bane of modern nations which is evil.... Indian nationalism...... wants to organise itself or to find full self-expression for the benefit and service of humanity at large." Again, "we want freedom for our country but not at the expense or exploitation of others...... I want the freedom of my country so that other countries may learn something from my free country, so

1. Young India, II, P. 1292.
that the resources of my country might be utilised for the benefit of mankind. Just as the cult of patriotism teaches us today that the individual has to die for the family, the family has to die for the village, the village for the district, the district for the province, and the province for the country, even so a country has to be free in order that it may die, if necessary, for the benefit of the world..... My idea of nationalism is that my country may die so that the human race may live. There is no room for race-hatred there." 1

Indeed this basing of nationalism on truth and non-violence is in itself the greatest service to humanity.

By national freedom Gandhiji does not mean absolute freedom which is inconsistent with progressive internationalism. "The better mind of the world desires to day not absolutely independent states warring one against another but a federation of friendly interdependent states." 2 Gandhiji envisages an international League comprised of representatives of the free component parts and it should be freely established and maintained by non-violence which can solve easily all the problems. Gandhiji advocates the establishment of just political and economic international relations and the ending of the domination and exploitation of one state by another. For the elimination of imperialism, he said that it was necessary for great nations to destroy unhealthy and unjust competition and the desire to multiply wants and material possessions.3

1. Mahadev Desai, Gandhiji in Indian Villages, 1927, P. 176.
2. Young India, II, P. 438.
3. Harijan, 20-4-1940.
Non-violence also manifests itself in the foreign policy of the non-violent state. The non-violent Indian state, when it comes into vogue, will try "to live on the friendly terms with its neighbours, whether they be great powers or small nations, and shall covet no foreign territory." By sharing its material and moral resources with people across its boundaries and neither exploiting, nor being exploited, it will live at peace with the rest of the world. Through its non-violence which will command universal respect and arouse the goodwill of its neighbours, it will work for the total disarmament and also for the establishment of a non-violent international order. Thus "the non-violent state will be a genuine democracy because it will be based on the largest possible measure of liberty and of equality of consideration. It will minimize exploitation and replace the master-servant and the capitalist-labour relationships by a new co-operative order based on rural culture. Equality of political rights will be have a reality it lacks today, for it will be accompanied by decentralization and social and approximate economic equality. Functions will be related to capacities and the emphasis will be on service. Thus society will be simple enough to be within the grasp of the average man and yet rich in opportunity for a conscious life of freedom and individuality, service and constructive criticism."2

To sum up, like Marx, Gandhiji also visualises the withering away of the state the final stage of individual's journey towards self-realisation. He paints 'an enlightened anarchy'.

1.Harijan, April 20, 1940.
where everyone is his own king. But Gandhi ji and Marx differ, as poles differ, on the middle way which just precedes the final way. The Marxists at this stage want to build up an elitist, complex and authoritarian order where power is centralised. The dictatorship of the proletariat which comes in between the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of communism is the institutional fabric during the intermediate stage. It is clearly anti-democratic, for it is wedded to a "total and monistic creed" and rejects the democratic theory of free mobility of opinion.

Gandhi ji totally rejects the statist collectivist implications of Marxism. He advocates dispersal of power over wider area. In the intermediate stage Gandhi ji does not dream of withering away of the state, but of scattering away of it. Decentralisation of power is the core of Gandhian politics. He envisions a simple society where power is decentralised and pulverised and which is free from the blemish of what Lewis Mumford calls "Gianilism". Territorial decentralisation will be united with technological decentralisation.

Gandhi ji's plea for decentralisation of power and simplification of social and economic structure is in full keeping with the contemporary psychological and sociological study of the technological civilisation of our modern age. The 'giant' industrial system of the modern times has resulted in increasing isolation and powerlessness and helplessness of the individual. The growth

1. For an interesting discussion of the evils of big factorises and cities, see Mumford's Techniques and Civilisation and the Culture, apex of cities.
of a highly complex and massive economic structure and intricate state apparatus has baffled man's power of understanding, comprehension and judgment. The growth of centralised state superimposed on a 'giant' industrial system has resulted in bureaucratic distortion of the democratic stirrings of the individual. He can neither understand the intricacies of the socio-political processes, nor discover for himself a proper place in the society. In consequence freedom becomes a burden for modern man. 1 The remedy lies in the reduction of the state and economic system to a desirable size and in the dispersion of power over a wide area. Power must be pulverised and decentralised and small layers of authority should be set up. Man through his membership of such small bodies can become aware of his conscious role in the society. This will help him in recovering the lost prestige of freedom.

In addition to, in the Gandhian way there is a happy and harmonious blending of politics with ethics, the immediate with the ultimate. Any dichotomy between the nature of immediate politics and the ultimate picture of the society is sure to spell disaster. If our vision is a sane society founded on truth and non-violence, our methods and intermediate goals must conform to this pure vision. Ethical aims and political aims must grow together, to telescope is to tread a cruel way of utter disaster. In the contemporary world where man-killing weapons have been perfected with utter care and an amazing fineness, man must make the final choice. Either he will

1. See Erich Fromm - Fear of Freedom, Ch.IV.
accept the amoral tradition based on expediency and double standard
morality or he will select the path of truth and non-violence shown
by Gandhiji. The preference of the former may lead to total
extinction of mankind, while the preference for the latter will result
in the unification of humanity in a spirit of love, peace and
compassion.

(Contd.)
To-day, more than in any other period in the story of man, economics envelops most of human activities. Modern world has become a world dominated by economic forces and economic ideas. Aptly remarks Prof. Marshall that, "Man's character has been moulded by his everyday work, and the material resources which he thereby procures, more than by any other influence unless it be that of his religious ideals; and the two great forming agencies of the world's history have been the religion and economics. Here and there the order of the military or the artistic spirit has been for a while predominant; but religious and economic influences have no where been displaced from the front rank even for a time: and they have nearly always been more important than all others put together."¹

The motives that a modern man has in a modern society are becoming predominantly monetary or economic. "The basis on which good repute is in any highly organised industrial community ultimately rests is pecuniary strength; and the means of showing pecuniary strength."² "The economy of acquisition," said Lewis Mumford, "which had hitherto been practised by rare and fabulous creatures like Midas and Croesus, became once more the everyday mode; it tended to replace the direct 'economy of needs' and to substitute money values for life values."³

---

² Veblen, The Theory of Leisure Class, P.83.  
³ Lewis Mumford: Techniques and Civilization, P.23.
This motive leads to the multiplication of wants on the one hand and regarding labour as painful, on the other, and thus creates a situation in which the man finds himself lost. He is trying to fight a losing battle. "In the nature of the case the desire for wealth can scarcely be satiated in any individual instance and evidently a satiation of the average or general desire for wealth is out of the question. However widely or equally or 'fairly' it may be distributed, no general increase of the community's wealth can make any approach to satiating this need the ground of which is the desire of every one to excel everyone else in the accumulation of goods........ since the struggle is substantially a race for reputability on the basis of an invidious comparison, no approach of a definitive attainment possible." And "indeed, means have become ends. Material production was once supposed to be a means for a more dignified, happier life and the aim was clearly the fuller, more dignified and more human life. Today production and consumption have become ends in themselves. No body asks any longer, why and what for? We are happy discovering how we can produce more. Infact our economic system is based on ever increasing consumption and production. But why we want to produce more, why we want this, and the other........ is a question which is not asked." Industrialisation and the expansion of the machine brought in the dogma of increasing want. Industrialisation and mechanisation were responsible not merely for the multiplication of goods and an increase in their variety, but also for the increase of the desire for goods. "We passed from an economy of need to an economy of acquisition." 1

This set up of progressive use of mechanisation and technological advancements and an extreme division of work into as many small parts as possible, also has made possible the desire on the part of all to avoid direct productive work. Labour is considered painful and work is not regarded as a source of true satisfaction. "The normal satisfaction of work, the pleasure of physical activity, the opportunity of self-expression and the development of personality through work, the self-esteem and self-respect derived from useful work, and the social esteem won by recognition from others of the importance of one's work, are none of them properly realisable under industrial conditions...... and the more the division of labour is developed, the further is he (worker separated from the person his labour ultimately serves. This separation hinders the operation of the motive of service to others and thus reduces its strength, and at the same time the division of labour reduces the satisfaction to be obtained from work itself. Thus the satisfaction of work become divorced from each other, so that in the pursuit of personal gain the satisfaction of having given good service is no longer obtained, and the pursuit of good service no longer brings the satisfaction of the craftsmen, of social prestige or of personal gain. The motive of personal gain thus tends to become the dominating motive of the worker, for there remains little or nothing in work to make it worthwhile except the money that can be got out of it."^{1}

---

The consequence of this is the monetisation of the different aspects of life. This monetisation which has been of extreme type, and an essential element of a growing industrial economy, makes an individual increasingly helpless and his life insecure. The modern industrial society in which money economy predominates, is likely to diminish the status and importance of the individual even further. "A society in which all men have a money wage as their only source is a society of very great complexity and full of hazards to the working of the economy itself. It is also a society in which all men become subject to the threat of insecurity for which as individuals they have no remedy....."¹

These insecurities generated by a complete dependence upon money wage income for all make it very necessary for the stepping in of an agency which while providing for the security of all, is likely to become increasingly more and more powerful. "One thing is clear, a complete dependence upon money wage income for all, or even for the vast majority of men, can only end in tyranny by the state that provides the security it will not only tax the substance of the community savings, but also interfere in the operation of our industrial society to lessen the unemployment and friction that complexity makes possible and perhaps inevitable........."²

Thus "in a modern industrial society the road towards totalitarianism is unidirectional. .......Today our science and technology have placed in the hands of rulers of nations weapons an

¹ThaenBaum: The Philosophy of Labour, P. 148
²Ibid., P. 149.
tools of control, persuasion, and coercion of unprecedented po
we have reached the point where once totalitarian power is set
in a highly industrial society successful revolt becomes pract
impossible. Totalitarian power, once it is gained, can be p
petuated almost indefinitely in the absence of outside forces,
can lead to progressively more rapid robotization of the indiv

All these value patterns which have accompanied mechan
ation and increasing technical advancement have made our age "t
oppressive breath-taking age in which we live filled with hast
insecurity and discord" and our economy has been correctly de
as "that whole system of appetites and values with its deficit
of the life of snatching to hoard and hoarding snatch, which i
in the hour of its triumph, ...... seems sometimes to leave a
of as of ashes on the lips of civilisation which has brought a
conquest of the material environment resources unknown in ear
ages, but which has not learnt to master itself." And "t
is pretty such a civilisation without purpose except that the
is general agreement that the good life should be made availa
to all members of the community. But the problem of what is
good life receives little attention". "To-day, by the fact
everything seems possible to us, we have a feeling that the w
of all is possible", retrogression, barbarism, decadence." 

The modern economic structure needs urgently a radical

---
   (footnote)
5. Gasset Y. Ortega, The Revolt of the Masses, P. 32.
For Gandhiji, "the whole gamut of man's activities, today, constitutes one indivisible whole, and social, economic, political and purely religious work cannot be divided into water-tight compartments."¹ This synthetic view of life led him to think and express about the economics also. He formulated some principles on which the economic structure should be based. In fact, at times he even overemphasised the economic aspect. Replying to Gurudev, he said, "To a people famishing and idle, the only acceptable form in which God can dare appear is work and promise of food, as wages."² When Gurudev Tagore expressed doubts with regard to his economic policy, Gandhiji retorted by remarking and thus justifying his economic activities, "True to his poetical instinct, the poet lives for the morrow and would have us do likewise. He presents to our admiring gaze the beautiful picture of the birds early in the morning singing hymns of praise as they soar into the sky. These birds had their day's food and soared with rested wings in whose veins new blood had flowed during the previous night. But I have had the pain of watching the previous night. But I have had the pain of watching birds who for want of strength could not be coaxed even into a flutter of their wings. The human bird under the Indian sky gets up weaker than when he pretended to retire. For Millions it is an eternal vigil or an eternal trance.

¹ Young India, Vol. III, P. 350.
² Narijan, 24-12-1938.
It is an indescribably painful state which has to be experienced to be realised. I have found it impossible to soothe suffering patients with a song from Kabir. The hungry millions ask for invigorating food.  

It was the object poverty of Indian masses that made him active in public life. He called the poor "Davidranarayan" which means God in the form of the poor. He refused to recognise any God except the God that was to be found in the hearts of poor "and he prayed and worshipped "God that was nothing but in his opinion, through the service to "the half starved, half dumb millions." Gandhiji considered it very essential to raise the condition of the poor to a level at which they could have hope to obtain the necessities of life. He understood well "for the poor the economic is the spiritual". So he did put message of God before them. He asserted that he could give them only the message of sacred work. "To them God can only appear as bread and butter". Thus Gandhiji was fully convinced that as long as the basic needs of the poor were not satisfied, appeal to them was of no use. He opined that it was immoral to keep such vast numbers of the population under poor condition on starvation level. If he was asked about the cause of poverty, Gandhiji would unhesitatingly blame the rich for "it is the fundamental law of nature, without exception, that nature produces for our wants from day to day; and if only everybody took enc

1. Young India, October 13, 1921.
2. Ibid.
4. Ibid
for himself and nothing more, there would be no pauperism in this world, there would be no men dying of starvation. He declared that as long as the wide and deep gulf between the rich and the hungry masses persisted, there would be no possibility of the coming into vogue of the non-violent system of Government or society. So, he suggested the "levelling down or a few rich in whose hands is concentrated the bulk of the nation's wealth on the one hand and the levelling up of the semi-starved naked millions on the other."

This process should be accomplished by non-violent means.

It must be kept in mind that in all the activities of Gandhiji there is the moral consideration and thus fundamental ethical values dominate his economic ideas. He said, "that economics is untrue which ignores or disregards moral values. The extension of law of non-violence in the domain of economics means nothing less than the introduction of moral values as a factor to be considered in regulating international commerce." Again, "I do not confess I do not draw a sharp or any distinction between economics and ethics. Economics that hurts the moral well-being of an individual or a nation are immoral and therefore sinful."

"True economics never militates against the highest ethical standard." Also "The value of an industry should be gauged less by the dividends it pays to sleeping share-holders than by its effects on the bodies, souls and spirits of the people employed in:

3. Young India, 1924, p. 421.
4. Ibid., 13-10-1921.
5. Harijan, 2-10-1937.
Cloth is dear which saves a few annas to the buyer, while it costs the lives of the men, women and children who live in the Bombay chawls." Gandhi had proved that "while economic associations have for the most part, become entirely utilitarian, the idea of using the industrial unit as an organ for the enrichment of the spiritual sphere has never entirely died down". To remind people that the place of man's work should be a creative social centre is an uphill task—generally depending upon the vision of some outstanding personality. Mahatma Gandhi was such a remarkable personality who did not look upon the prevailing system with a dwarfed vision. "Gandhi ji, like Christ, lit beacons on distant hills, towards which posterity must grope its way in darkness.

In his interesting little booklet Sarvodaya Gandhi refutes "the idea that an advantageous code of social action is determined irrespective of the influence of social affections. We can find an elaboration of this idea in Ruskin's Unto This He remarks: "The social affections, says the economist, are accidental and disturbing elements in human nature; but the desire of progress are constant elements. Let us eliminate 'inconstants, and, considering the human being merely as a common machine, examine by what laws of labour, purchase and sale, the greatest accumulative result in wealth is obtained. Those are determined, it will be for each individual afterwards to deduce as much of the disturbing affectionate element as he can.

1. Young India: 6-4-1922.
4. M.K. Gandhi: Sarvodaya (Hindi) P.9, cf. Ruskin: Unto This I
and to determine for himself the result on the new conditions supposed."¹ This led the economist to treat man as a machine, the accumulation of wealth, his only concern being to find out means for the accumulation of wealth. With this end in view propounded the law of supply and demand which meant that the man should buy in the best and cheapest market and sell in the dearest.

Ruskin opposed vehemently this "commercial text." He argued, "so far as I know, there is no history record of anything disgraceful to the human intellect as the modern idea that commercial text 'buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest' represents, or under any circumstances could represent an aval principle of national economy. But in the cheapest market? but what made your market cheap? Charcoal may be cheap among roof timbers after a fire, and bricks may be cheap in your street after an earthquake, but fire and earthquake may not, therefore be national profits. Sell in the dearest? Yes, truly; but what made your market dear? You sold your bread well today, was it a dying man who gave his last coin for it and will never need bread more.² At another place he remarked that "it being the privilege of the fishes, as it is of rats and wolves, to live the laws of demand and supply but the distinction of humanity live by those of right."³

Gandhi too opined that "we cannot base a science on principle of demand and supply."⁴ He remarked, "it is one of

¹Ruskin: Unto This Last, P.2. ²Ibid., P.2. ³Ibid., P.80 (footnote) ⁴M.K. Gandhi: Sarvodaya, P.15.
most inhuman among the maxims laid down by modern economists. Nor do we always regulate human economists. Nor do we always regulate human relations by any such sordid considerations. The economists that disregard moral and sentimental considerations are like wax works that, being lifelike, still lacks the life of the living flesh.\textsuperscript{1}

Though Gandhiji gave supreme importance to moral considerations and considered moral progress as real progress, he did not imply that all kinds of material progress were bad or an indication of retrogression. "By economic progress, I take it," he said, "we mean material advancement without limit and by real progress we mean moral progress, which again is the same thing as progress of the permanent element in us.... It, therefore, material progress does not clash with moral progress, it must necessarily advance the latter."\textsuperscript{2} Only when material progress is morally justified does it become an indication of real progress. Material progress of the poor/adequate level is moral and therefore, comes under the category of real progress as visualized by Gandhiji. On the other hand, material progress of the rich is immoral as it increases the inequalities in the social order. But material retrogression of the rich through voluntary renunciation, charity, etc., upto a point might be regarded as real progress, whereas worsening of the material conditions of the poor in any form or to any extent is immoral and hence inimical to progress. Gandhiji's contention

\textsuperscript{1} Young India, 27-10-1921.
\textsuperscript{2} A lecture delivered by Gandhiji at a meeting of the Muir Central College Economics Society, Allahabad on 22-10-1916.
referred to the extremes of wealth and poverty. He believed that the occasion for moral degeneration is stronger in the former case and that the social optimum lies in complete economic equality of all the people.¹ This would also contribute for bringing the equilibrium condition of society, both morally and materially.

"Indeed, the test of orderliness in a country is not the number of millionaires it owns, but the absence of starvation among masses."² In short, Gandhi considered economic equality as a master key not only to the existence of a happy, harmonious society, but also to the attainment of equilibrium and real progress.

The measures Gandhiji suggested for bringing about economic equality can be grouped under two headings:

1. Equality by increasing wealth.
2. Equality by redistribution of wealth.

1. Although Gandhiji was interested in the entire world and its problems, he considered it his first duty to concentrate on Indian problems and strive hard to ameliorate the condition of the impoverished millions. To attain economic prosperity he wanted to revive and use indigenous methods well-suited to the conditions of India and did not favour the adoption of western methods. He believed that the solution lay in the reduction of wants, spinning wheel industry and the revival of handicrafts, decentralisation and

1. "I have no doubt that if India is to live an exemplary life of independence which would be the envy of the world, all the doctors, lawyers, teachers, merchants and others would get the same wages for an honest day's work." - Harljan, 16-3-1947.
2. A lecture delivered by Gandhiji at a meeting of the Muir College Economics Society, Allahabad, on 22-10-1916.
the rehabilitation of the village.

Gandhiji had realised that if economic motives would dominate as social aim, then social life would be dominated by violence and universal corruption as we witness in modern times. People in search of possession would inevitably consider economic advancement at any cost, even through military conquests as the Highest Good and this set up would end in producing war-mongers and tycoons. If indulgence were to be the predominant aim of the life it would bring in a social system based on pleasure in which people would be addicted to the joys of the flesh and luxurious living. Moral decay and social disintegration would follow. In either case moral vacuum would result and the people would have little opportunity to pursue the path of the Highest Good. The exclusive emphasis on pleasures and possessions makes the very idea of a society led by man devoted to high ideals and austere poverty absurd. A life of truth, dedication and self-mastery, appears to us as a painful struggle, a sacrifice of values, while the universal distress and frustration that modern life entails is ignored. "..... The science of economics does not stand on its own feet; it is derived from a way of the meaning and purpose of life - whether Economist himself knows this or not."

Gandhiji wanted individuals to believe in the deliberate curtailment of wants. "If by abundance you mean every one having

---

1 E.F. Schumacher, Quoted in J.P. Narain - Reconstruction of Indian Polity, P.87.
plenty to eat and drink and to clothe himself with, enough to keep
his mind trained and educated, I should be satisfied. But I should
not like to pack more stuffs to my belly than I can digest and more
things than I can ever usefully use. But neither do I want poverty,
penury, misery, dirt and dust in India.¹ In 1938 while discussing
the possibility of peace he remarked, "This again seems impossible
without great nations ceasing to believe in soul-destroying competition and to multiply wants and thereby increasing their material
possessions."² He made clear his views further, "I cannot
only imagine but am working for civilisation in which possession of
car will be considered no merit and railways will find no place.
It would not be for me an unhappy event if the world once more
became as large as it used to be at one time......... it is not an
attempt to go back to the so-called ignorant, dark ages. But it
is an attempt to see beauty in voluntary simplicity, poverty and
slowness....... the modern rage for variety, for flying through
the air, for multiplicity of wants, etc. have no fascination for me
They deaden the inner being in us."³

To Gandhi, the basic cause of all economic miseries is
the ever-increasing "go on and on" spirit of modern times. He
gives a warning, calling for a halt and as Louis Fischer remarked
"Stop and be" is the main characteristic of Gandhian economic thought
and therefore, the ideal of Gandhi is plain living and high thinking. Therefore he had vehemently opposed unnecessary multiplicat;

².Ibid., p.153.
³.Ibid., 1939, p.303.
of wants. He said, "High thinking is inconsistent with complicated material life based on high speed imposed on us by Mammon worship. All the graces of life are possible only when we learn the art of living nobly." 1 "Man falls", he remarked, "from the pursuit of the ideal of plain living and high thinking the moment he wants to multiply his daily wants. History gives ample proof of this. Man's happiness, really, lies in contentment. He who is discontent however, becomes a slave to his desires. All the sages have declared from the housetops that man can be his own worst enemy as well as his best friend. To be free or to be slave lies in his own hands." 2

Gandhiji was of the view that we should make efforts to satisfy such wants as are necessary for our proper existence. He considered this body as instrument entrusted to us by God for the service of his children and so thought it our duty to keep it fit. Nevertheless, there is no justification for the multiplication of wants. He said, "A certain degree of physical harmony and comfort is necessary, but above a certain level it becomes a hindrance instead of help. Therefore the ideal of creating an unlimited number of wants and satisfying them seems to be delusion and snare.

The satisfaction of one's physical needs, even the intellectual needs of one's narrow self, must meet at a certain point a dead stop, before it degenerates into physical and intellectual voluptuousness. A man must arrange his physical and cultural circumstances so that they do not hinder him in his service of

2. Ibid., 1-2-1942.
humanity on which all his energies should be concentrated."¹

"Our civilisation, our culture, our Swaraj depend not upon multiplying our wants - self-indulgence, but upon restricting our wants - self-denial."² Gandhiji believed in the upanishadic sayings and asked individuals to enjoy by renouncing. "The human body is meant", he said, "solely for service never for indulgence. The secret of happy life lies in renunciation. Renunciation is life. Indulgence spells death."³ This does not mean that Gandhiji wanted people to lead a life of recluse. On the contrary, he wanted them to enjoy all the amenities of life, which would make their life comfortable and their journey pleasurable and easy. He would have favoured electricity, ship-building, iron-works and machine-making and other similar things for the enjoyment and enrichment of life. He was not against these, but he wanted the people to keep two things before their minds: firstly, the greatest good of the whole society - we must be ever cautious and on our guard lest we may desire to multiply our wants at the expense of others - and secondly the ultimate aim of life - this means that we should not lose sight of the aim of our life in the mad rush for multiplying wants. Reconciling ourselves with these two conditions we may be able to discriminate between wants necessary and wants superfluous. Instead, as Louis Fischer observes, "Gandhism asks people to live better..... It does not ask them to live as saints in dispers. It asks them to be less-selfish, less greedy, less money-mad, less self-centred."⁴

¹ Harijan, 1936, P. 226.
² Young India, 1921.
³ Harijan, 24-2-1946.
⁴ Louis Fischer, Gandhi and Stalin, P. 146.
Gandhiji despised modern industrialisation. "To chance to industrialism is to court disaster. The present distress undoubtedly insufferable. Pauperism must go. But industrialism is no remedy." He was sceptical about machinery and technological advancement. He considered that the large-scale use of machinery "the chief symbol of modern civilisation", represented a great sin. He wrote: "The workers in the mills of Bombay have become slaves. The condition of the women working in the mills is shocking. If the machinery craze grows in our country it will become an unhappy land." Moreover, machines not only cause uneven accumulation of wealth, but even create rich, wealthy classes. Increasing mechanisation, said Gandhiji, would help the continuance of the alien rule rather than its termination. For example, though Gandhiji was not unaware of the beneficial effects of an improved system of transport and communication, he condemned railways in that they helped the consolidation of the British in India. He was also interested in pointing out their role accelerating the evils of industrialisation.

This should not mean that Gandhiji was against all machinery as such. "To say that is to caricature my views. I am not against machinery as such, but I am totally opposed to it when it enslaves us." He was practical enough to realise that machines could be discarded wholesale. He explained that "I am aiming not at the eradication of all machinery but limitation." To the question whether he was against all machinery his answer "is emphatical

1. Young India, 1926, P.348.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid. Pp.32-34.
5. Ibid.
7. Young India, 1924, P.378.
"No'. But I am against its indiscriminate multiplication. I refuse to be dazzled by the seeming triumph of machinery. I am uncompromisingly against all destructive machinery. But simple tools and instruments and such machinery as saves individual labour and lightens the burden of the millions of cottages, I should welcome." ¹ Thus he would not object to the use of machines which help the individual in his work and the limit should be set where they cease to help the individual and encroach upon his individuality. Again in 1924 he repeated, "I wish, too, you would dismiss from your minds the views attributed to me about machinery" and added, "what I do resent is the wanton and wicked destruction of one cottage industry of India that kept the wolf from doors of thousands of homes scattered over a surface, 1900 miles long, 1500 miles broad." ² To the argument that machinery would save time and provide leisure, he said, "Leisure is good and necessary up to a point only. God created man to eat his bread by the sweat of his brow, and I dread the prospect of our being able to produce all that we want, including our foodstuffs, out of a conjurer's hat." ³

Gandhiji was a confirmed opponent of large-scale industrialization and mechanization and mass production which displaced labour, thereby creating unemployment and caused the concentration of wealth in a few hands. He believed firmly that industrialization of the western type was not only unnecessary for India but even positively harmful. "I do not believe", he said, "that industrialization is necessary in any case for any country. It is much

¹.Young India, 17-6-1928.
³.Congress Presidential Address, Madras, P.738.
less so for India. Indeed I believe that Independent India can discharge her duty towards a groaning world by adopting a simple but ennobled life by developing her thousands of cottages and living at peace with the world, instead of adopting a complicated and complex material life based on high-speed production and large-scale manufacture brought in by the worship of Mammon, destroying human dignity and individuality and making man a mere cog in the machine and this would certainly be unfavourable to his ideal of making every individual "a full-blooded, fully-developed member of society."

As a practical idealist Gandhi would make exceptions, taking into account the motive for which the machine is used. If it become very necessary in the interest of the community as a whole to produce machines on a large scale, he would admit an exception provided their use would help to solve social problems and promote the welfare of all, and also their manufacture was nationalized and controlled by a non-violent state which would follow the principle of least coercion. "The heavy machinery for work of public utility which cannot be undertaken by human labour has its inevitable place, but all that would be owned by the state and used entirely for the benefit of the people. I can have no consideration for machinery which is meant either to enrich the few at the expense of many, or without cause to displace the useful labour of many." Again he said that he was socialist enough to say that

2. Harijan, 11-12-1937.
3. Ibid., 1935, P.146
factories should be nationalised; or state-controlled. "They ought only to be working under the most attractive and ideal conditions, not for profit, but for the benefit of humanity, love taking the place of greed as motive. It is an alternation in the conditions of labour that I want. This mad rush for wealth must cease, and the labour must be assured, not only of a living wage, but a daily task that is not mere drudgery."¹ In short, if the use of machines was motivated by "love and the good of humanity and did not lead to concentration of wealth in a few hands and inequality to centralisation of power, to urbanisation, to unemployment, to political, economic and social exploitation" then Gandhiji would have no objection at all.²

Gandhiji followed empirical and inductive method. As a true scientist he did not entertain a dogmatic objection to machines, or for that matter, to anything. He understood well the pathetic condition of India, analysed the causes and arrived at conclusions based on scientific method that British rule and western civilisation, industrialisation and mechanisation of the extreme type was injurious to India. He could see no reliable solution in the adoption of large-scale mechanisation, unlimited material expansion or creation of monopolies, to the manifold social problems of India, namely, an excessive rural population, idle labour, poor distribution of wealth, neglect of the welfare of the people, bad health, unwholesome food and the decay of art.³

¹.Young India, 1924, P.378.
³.Ibid.
Therefore he gave concrete suggestions for the solution of the various social problems. The measures he suggested for material improvement without resorting to an invitation of western civilisation were the spinning wheel – Khaddar, Decentralisation and village development.

It was the firm belief of Gardhiji that only in the re-introduction of hand-spinning and hand-weaving lay the proper solution for the problems of unemployment and poverty, for the economic and moral regeneration of India. In addition, it would prevent the economic 'drain' on India exercised by the

Gandhiji said that Charkha was not primarily to be used to compete with the mill industry. On the other hand, he wanted it to play the part of supplying raw material to the indigenous handloom industries and of providing supplementary employment to the agriculturists. Comparing the production statistics of the year 1922-23 Gandhiji proved that whereas at the most two and half million people could find their living by mill production, the spinning wheel could secure employment for "about half of the adult agricultural population of India deducting 61.4 million children under 10 from the total of 224 million." ¹

The other gains of the spinning wheel are, whereas for the mill industries an additional 400 to 500 millions of rupees...
As working capital are required, only an insignificant amount is required for the handloom industry and spinning, through the spinning wheel, the foreign exchange amounting to about 600 million rupees could be saved by curtailing imports. As a universal supplementary industry it alone could add 25% to the per capita national income with the "very figure of 40 rupees per year per head." And still another gain has been that the capital out of a loom costs Rs.15, whereas the small sum of Rs.3 could secure the spinning wheel.

Gandhiji started the Khadi movement in 1915 i.e., after his return from South Africa in the Sabarmati Ashram. Moves was started with the main object of enabling the inmates of the Ashram to use self-manufactured clothes and to discard mill-made clothing. But, later on, Gandhiji found that spinning could adopted as a national programme. He saw in the spinning wheel and khaddar not only a panacea for India’s growing pauperism, also the best means for industrialising the villages of India. The industrialisation of Gandhiji’s conception was an industrialisation not through large-scale mechanisation, but through cott industries and the restricted and controlled use of machinery. In his letter to Hakim Ajmal Khan, in 1922, Gandhiji wrote, "I can possibly unify and revivify India as the acceptance by all India of the spinning wheel as a daily sacrament and the Khadi wear as a privilege and a duty." Mere The music of the spin wheel was sweeter and “more profitable than the execrable harm

2. Young India, 11-11-1926.
3. Ibid., 11-11-1926.
concertina and accordion."¹ "For every revolution of the wheel spins peace, good-will and love. The loss of it brought about India's slavery, its voluntary revival with all its implications must mean India's freedom."²

In the context of India's economic development, the benefits and advantages of the spinning wheel, as put forward by Gandhiji, can be enumerated as follows³:

1. Very modest capital requirements.
2. Easy availability of raw materials at a low cost.
3. Simplicity in operation (lack of any need of great skill, and adaptable to the poor or ignorant, the young or old).
4. Unlimited and ready market in the vicinity of manufacture and, consequently, a source of steady income to agriculturists.
5. Independence of monsoon conditions.
6. In harmony with the religious and social susceptibilities of the people.
7. Ability to serve as a perfect means of fighting famine.⁴
8. Prevention of the disintegration of the family by carrying work to their home.
9. Ability to provide support to the agriculturist and handloom weaver.
10. Creation of facilities for many allied village occupations.
11. Promotion of the equitable distribution of wealth.
12. Solution of the problem of unemployment, of the partially employed agriculturists as well as the educated unemployed.

²K.K. Gandhi, India of My Dreams, P.51.
³Young India, 21-10-1926, 28-10-1926, and also 11-11-1926.
⁴See R.B. Gregg, Economics of Khadiyar, P.39.
Gandhiji was pained to see the decline of India's hand crafts and cottage industries. The "humble industries" such as stone-carving, stone-cutting, carpentry, brick-laying, building, cabinet-making and the manufacture of brass, iron and copper utensils, gold, silver and ivory work, dying and the spinning and weaving industries which provided the people of India with occupations that kindled their individuality and proved their art and ingenuity, were the means to be used in bringing about the economic renaissance of India.¹

Gandhiji felt very sorry to see the decline of home industries which not only "gave employment to millions" but helped millions of women to "eke out the family income."² He was convinced that the economic ruin of India was brought about by a deliberate policy of the British. It was with great pain that Gandhiji addressed the Rotarians in Bengal in 1925 - "Do you know how the industry has died? Well, it is a painful answer, but must give it. It was made to die."³ He again wrote in Young India - "The gradual extinction of all of India's principal famous industries, without any new ones arising to take their place, the steadily growing ruralisation of the country; the deterioration of the existing stock of cattle; scarcities and famines following in succession one year's failure of rain producing an acute famine where three years of deficient rainfall were necessary to bring about a famine; the progressive pauperisation of the agricultur

²Dutt, R: The Economic History of India under Early British Rule, 1950, p.256.
rendering him incapable of making any improvement in the little bits of his minutely subdivided holding, which are in their unfit for the application of new implements and improved methods of agriculture; the control over agriculture of the money-lending agencies driving the agriculturist to concentrate on cotton, aggravating the evil of high prices of foodstuffs; all these and many other factors have combined to make poverty and unemployment the stupendous problem of today. The middlemen of the town city, dumping manufactured cloth from Lancashire into the villages, deprived them of their life-giving handicrafts, and the mills, which the example of the west has taught us to erect on the rivers, the handicrafts have rendered the solution of that problem more acute by entangling it with the new one of excessively unequal distribution of wealth.

Because of these facts Gandhi became convinced that social and economic salvation lay in the termination of the domination and the revival of her indigenous industries. In this perspective his maxim that "without cottage-industry Indian peasant is dead" was full of vital importance. Of the industries Gandhi gave paramount importance to charkha which provided employment and livelihood to millions of Indians, men and women. The other village industries such as, hand-grinding, pounding, tanning, oil pressing, soap-making etc., were only khadi industry. Thus charkha became the pivot of Gandhi's ideas and the symbol of the Indian Independence Movement. In his own words, "khadi to me is the symbol of unity of Indian

1 Young India, 21-10-1926.
of its economic freedom and equality and therefore, ultimately in the poetic expression of Jawaharlal Nehru: "The livery of India's freedom". Thus "Gandhi's campaign for the development of home-made cloth industry is no mere fad of a romantic age reviving the past but a practical attempt to relieve the poor and uplift the standard of the village."¹

Although Gandhiji was not a professional economist, his economic thinking was full of significance. He opposed vehemently mass production or concentration of power in a few hands i.e. monopolies or cartels. He once said, "I hate privilege and monopoly. Whatever cannot be shared with the masses is taboo me"². Gandhiji had completely agreed the view of Marx that capital in private ownership was a menace for the society and therefore, instruments of production should be available to as air and water are or ought to be.³ But neither did he advocate violent appropriation of the capital by labour nor did he like to put all the means of production through the help of which the capitalists were supposed to create 'surplus values' and exploit the poor labourers, into the hands of centralised, totalitarian or bureaucratic state. He rather, wanted to put an end to capitalism at its very root, at production stage, by the method of decentralisation.

Gandhiji stated that concentration of production in particular areas had created troubles in regulating distribut

¹ Cole: Quoted by Nehru in The Discovery of India, 1946, P.34
³ Dantwala: Gandhism Reconsidered, P.9.
which has been one of the most tedious and complicated problems of modern economics. Therefore, the only solution he could suggest was to localise production and distribution in the area where things were required. This would regulate the economy and reduce its dependence on fraud and speculation. He said, "when production and consumption both become localised, the temptation to speed up production indefinitely and at any 

disappears. The endless difficulties and problems that our day economic system presents, would then come to an end."¹

"Granting for the moment that the machinery may supply all the needs of humanity, still it would concentrate production in particular areas, so that you would have to go in round about to regulate distribution; whereas, if there is production and distribution both in the respective areas where things are required, it is automatically regulated, and there is less chance for it none for speculation."²

Gandhiji categorically stated that capitalist production on a mass scale was responsible for the world crisis. He was in complete agreement with Karl Marx or Keynes, both of whom held that profits were bound to decline in the long run if production was to ignore any correlation with consumption. For instance in his conversation with an American journalist, he stated the problem in very simple terms: "There is a tremendous fallacy in Mr. Ford's reasoning. Without simultaneous distribution on equally mass scale, the production can result only in a great

²Cent Percent Swadeshi, P. 146.
tragedy. Take Ford's Cars. The saturation point is bound to
reach soon or late. Beyond that point, the production of th
cars cannot be pushed. That will happen then? Mass produc
takes no note of the real requirement of the consumer. If ma
production were in itself a virtue, it should then be capable
indefinite multiplication. But it can be shown that mass pro
carries with it its own limitations. If all countries adopte
the system of mass production, there would not be a big enough
market for their products. Mass production would then come t
stop듬

with regard to currency and Exchange Gandhiji wanted t
substitute labour for money as the medium of exchange. "He w
"under my system it is a labour which is the current coin, not
metal. Any person who can use his labour into cloth, he come
his labour into grain. If he wants paraffin oil, which he can
himself produce, he uses his surplus grain for getting the oil
It is exchange of labour on free, fair and equal terms -- hence
it is no robbery. You may object that this is a reversion to
primitive system of barter. But is not all international tra
based on the barter system?" To a modern economist, this a
appear something like an utopia, but there is no difficulty
appreciating the practicability of his idea if we can only und
stand that this is based on two conditions, viz., (1) that peo
have minimised their wants and (2) that there are self-sufici
families or village communities with the result that there wil

1,7endulkar, B. C. cit., Vol. III, pp. 166-170.
exchange rarely and, if at all, it will be easy to do through 
"currency" of labour in internal affairs and in form of barter 
paying the imports with the actual exports of articles.

Besides, decentralisation was very necessary for the 
non-violent state of Gandhiji's conception. He held that a non-violent 
state could not be based on a factory civilisation. "Central 
lisation", in his view, "cannot be sustained. Without adequate 
force," and, hence, "is inconsistent with the non-violent stru 
of society." 

These analysis of Gandhiji should not mean that he was 
a practical reformer or was unfavourable to every form of centr 
lisation. He did not object to the centralization of heavy 
industries, provided they were nationalized, for the benefit of 
and not permitted to hamper the growth of cottage industries an 
provided they formed only an insignificant part of national act 
He would even approve a state-managed, and state controlled ind 
that is, an economic order in which the resources were owned an 
exploited by the state in the interest of all, provided "it was 
based on force", and the production was to be effected through 
decentralised cottage industries. 

His scheme of decentralisation was primarily intended 
fit in with those industries which affect "the national activit
the Indian villages. In this context, Gandhiji had in his v.
khadi. He said that the very term khadi connoted decentrali-
He wanted every village to produce enough to meet its basic req-
ments and to have a little surplus as a contribution to the requ-
ments of the towns and cities. The production of khadi include-
cotton growing, picking, ginning, cleaning, carding, sliver-
ing, spinning, sizing, preparing the warp and the woof, weaving, wash-
and dyeing. He stated that all these processes should be carri-
on in villages, as he wanted decentralisation to start from the
beginning, even from the cotton-growing stage.

Finally, he declared that decentralisation was the best,
quickest and the most efficient way to build up the country from
bottom", and for this purpose he asked every educated Indian to
back to the villages and strive hard to build a prosperous Indi-
a firm basis.

For Gandhiji firmly believed and often repeated that the
real India was to be discovered not in her big cities and towns
in her "700, 000" villages. He was pained to see the pathetic
condition of Indian villages. He said that he agreed with Lio
Curtis's description of an Indian village as "a collection of
unsanitary dwellings constructed in a dunghill" and he added th
he could supply more details about the neglect of the villages.

stated that the deplorable condition of the Indian villages were

to the cruel alien rule and continuous neglect. He laid great emphasis on the supreme importance of the village in the Indian Social System, and in order to make crystal clear this truth, he even went to the extent of declaring that "if the villages perish, India will perish too." Throughout his life he strove hard for the reformation of the Indian villages where the majority of the Indian population lived under grave and appalling conditions. It was his deep-rooted conviction that prosperity of a permanent nature can be achieved through the proper development of the villages and their handicrafts and cottage industries, based on the principles of truth, love and non-violence.

He prescribed the following conditions for an ideal Indian village. —

1) There should be orderliness in the structure of the village.

2) The lanes and roads should be orderly and must be kept absolutely clean so that "in the land of barefooted pedestrain nobody need hesitate to walk or even sleep in the streets.

3) The lanes should be macadamised and have gutters for draining off water.

4) Temples and mosques must be kept beautifully clean so that visitors feel an air of tranquil holiness about them.

5) The villages should be filled with shade and fruit trees.

6) They should have aharma, and a small dispensary.

---

1. Harijan, 29-8-1936.
7) Washing and privy arrangements should be such as not to contaminate the air, water, and roads of the village.

8) Every village should be self-sufficient so far as its food and clothing requirements are concerned.

9) Every village should be capable of defending itself from robbers or wild animals.

10) It should have recreation facilities and a play-ground for adults and children and a reserve for its cattle.

11) If space is left over, the village should grow money crops except tobacco, opium, etc.

12) The village should maintain a village theatre, school and public hall.

13) It should have its own water-works, ensuring a clean water supply.

14) Education should be made compulsory up to the final basic course.

15) Caste, with its graded untouchability, should not be practised.

16) As far as possible, all activities should be conducted on a co-operative basis.

17) Non-violence, with its technique of Satyagraha and non-co-operation, should be the sanction of the village community.

18) There should be a compulsory service of village guards, to be selected by rotation from the register maintained by the village.

19) The Government of the village should be conducted by a Panchayat of five persons, annually elected by adult villagers possessing the minimum qualifications.
20) Since there should be no system of punishment in the accepted sense of the term, the village _panchayat_ would be the legislature, judiciary and executive combined.

21) Two _panchayats_ should jointly elect one leader, and should form a working party. Fifty such working parties should elect a second-grade leader. Parallel groups of 200 _panchayats_ should continue to be formed till they cover the whole of India, each succeeding group of _panchayats_ electing a second-grade leader. All second-grade leaders should jointly serve the whole India and severally for their respective areas. The second-grade leaders might elect a chief, whenever they deem necessary, to regulate and command all the groups.

In addition to these measures for increasing wealth and thereby ensuring economic equality, Gandhiji also suggested measures for a non-violent re-distribution of unevenly accumulated wealth. The measures he suggested for the improvement of the economic conditions of the poor were trusteeship, the superiority of love to capital and the real role the state had to play in the interest of all.

Trusteeship meant that "the rich man will be left in possession of his wealth of which he will use what he reasonably requires for his personal needs and will act as a trustee for the remainder to be used for the rest of the society." A violent and bloody revolution is a certainty one day unless there is

1. _Harijan_, 25-8-1940.
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voluntary abdication of riches and the power that riches give
and sharing them for the common good", 1 Gandhiji predicted. I
was in order to "avoid any such violent revolution and to crea
the possibility to maintain permanently the stability of equal
which is not possible if the means adopted to achieve the equa
were ignoble "2 that Gandhiji determined to propagate the doc
of trusteeship. He did not want to destroy the autocracy of
Indian princes and capitalists, but he demanded a conversion o
their autocracy into trusteeship. He did not want to dispose
the wealthy through force or compulsion which meant violence,
use of which would be violating his deep conviction and basic
teaching. So, the only way by which economic equality 3 could
secured was by the non-violent transformation of society throu
trusteeship. 4 Gandhiji himself explained the concept of tru
ship further and answered some of the criticisms levelled agai
it: "as soon as a man looks upon himself as a servant of soc
earns for its sake, spends for its benefit, then purity enters
into his earnings and there is ahimsa in his venture. Moreover
if k men's minds turn towards this way of life, there will com
about a peaceful revolution in society, and that without any
bitterness. It may be asked whether any time records such a
in human nature. Such things have certainly taken place in i
viduals. One may not perhaps be able to point to them in soc
as a whole. But this only means that up till now there has:

2. Ibid., P.9.
3. It was not equitable distribution that Gandhiji wanted but a
distribution of wealth, which can be secured only when one
possess anything more than one's neighbours.
been an experiment of non-violence on a large scale. Somehow other the wrong belief has taken possession of us that ahimsa is pre-eminently a weapon for individuals and its use should therefore be limited to that sphere. Infact this is not the case. Ahimsa is definitely an attribute to society. To convince p of this truth is at once my effort and experiment. ¹ It must noted that the concept of trusteeship as visualized by Gandhij was mainly intended to apply to a society where unequal accumulation had taken place. He certainly did not approve of the pm of "unnatural accumulation". But at the same time he did not to prevent the wealthy from making money, provided they realize necessity of giving away their surpluses after meeting the req
ments of a simple life, or of keeping them in trust for the p also if they adopted honest and noble means in the pursuit of wealth. Thus honesty was an essential condition for a trust.
Infact, the whole theory of Trusteeship was firmly based on th assumption of honesty on the part of the trustee.

Reformation of the individual and the rich and the poor or inner reform was another factor considered as necessary for successful trusteeship system. On the one hand, the wealthy mu reform themselves by adopting the necessary charges in their p life, reducing their wants to a minimum and observe all moral earning not dishonestly, always bearing in mind the poverty of and thereby developing a consciousness of the conditions of th

¹. Harijan, 25-8-1940.
society in which they live. The poor, on the other hand, must have faith in the good intentions of the wealthy and consider them as the trustees of the wealth of society. Thus through these non-violent means of the reformation of the have and have-nots alike, and of mutual trust and confidence, attainment of economic equality based on love and non-violence was a realisable goal. But if the transformation of the rich did not take place and if they did not become the guardians of wealth in the true sense of the term, then the measures to be adopted were, according to Gandhiji, non-violent non-co-operation and civil disobedience which would serve as the infallible means.1 "The rich", said Gandhiji, "cannot accumulate wealth without the co-operation of the poor. If this knowledge was to penetrate to and spread amongst the poor, they would become strong and would learn how to free themselves by means of non-violence from the crushing inequalities which have brought them to the verge of starvation."2

Gandhiji unequivocally stressed the importance of labour in modern society. He stated "capital should be labour's servant, not its masters".3 He also favoured the formation of unions by workers, for labour would be superior to capital only if it stood unified and was morally and intellectually trained.4 He also believed in strikes, but workers must perform their duties first; only if rights did not follow as a matter of course from the performance of their duties would Gandhiji vote for a labour strike.

1.Harijan, 23-8-1940.
2.Ibid. 3.Tendulkar, op.cit., Vol.VI, P.365.
But such a strike should be based on truth and non-violence.\(^1\) Gandhi had also favoured "profit-sharing" because it would reduce the eternal conflict between labour and capital and help society to a very great extent, in the realisation of the ideal of the trusteeship system\(^2\). He also advocated the fixation of a minimum wage which he preferred to call "a living wage" for the labour.

Gandhi thought it feasible to have trusteeship regulations imposed by the state. Complete independence meant both political and economic independence. The poor man ought to be assured of all the ordinary amenities of life that a rich man enjoys. Therefore the state had to strive to bring about economic independence. Gandhi would certainly welcome the increase in the expenditure of the state on various social services and the adoption of measures for the uplift of the poor through peaceful legislation and all other noble means, provided these measures were helpful in taking society a long way ahead towards the ideal of economic equality. The measures suggested by Gandhi should not lead one to interpret that Gandhi adopted a lenient attitude towards the lazy or those who encouraged poverty. On the contrary, he considered work as "divine" and no one who did not earn their bread by the sweat of their brow had no right to eat. The "drones of society" were committing a crime against mankind by refusing to work. While he wanted the rich to renounce their superfluous wealth in favour of the poor, he also emphatically exhorted the poor to work and respect their livelihood, and he held the society and the government, who alone could bring about real freedom and peace.

---

responsible if there were no opportunities for work.

Thus Gandhiji was not a mere idealist. He explored every possibility of adjusting his ideals to the practical conditions of life. Therefore he considered a minimum standard of living as necessary for social peace and happiness. Seeing the conditions of abject poverty in which his India lived he recommended an immediate improvement of their material position, which was far below even the minimum essential for a simple life. It was for this reason, for eliminating poverty through employment and manual labour, that he "resurrected" charkha on the Indian economic scene even in this age of scientific achievement and technological possibilities. As he was working for economic simplicity and equality, he did not favour multiplicity of wants. He pointed out that only when material wants were limited that an atmosphere could be created which would free the individual from external influences and enable him to discover his true purpose - the mission of human life.

Sorokin also almost echoes the Gandhian ideas on politics and economics. As for Gandhiji, so also for Sorokin, politics must be based on the bed-rock foundation of moral values. He also does not accept the cynical Machiavellian government of naked force, terror and fraud. Sorokin says, "during his own life time Machiavelli witnessed and conceded a complete repudiation of his supposedly bluntly realistic theories by the historical facts; Caesar's policy brought only a catastrophic destruction of many
cities and principalities of Italy; death of thousands of vict
of Cesare's aggressive wars; torture, suffering, and the de:
of dozens, possibly even of hundreds of Cesare's personal vict
including several of his closest relatives; his cynical violat
of all divine and human laws, perpetration of all the most hor
crimes; and, finally, the overthrow, imprisonment, and inglori
death of Cesare Borgia himself. These facts were a categoric
repudiation of Machiavelli's theories regarding the effectivity
of government by force and fraud.¹ He further explains the
similar policies of murder, fraud and force of Marius or sull:
Genghis Khan or Tamerlane, Hitler or Stalin, have caused main
destructive results. Therefore, he rightly concludes that ":
a general rule, the empires and organisations built mainly by
force, fraud, blood strife, and violation of the universal mo:
impervatives have been short-lived and disastrous " and " the l
existing organisations have been those animated by spiritual
altruistic forces for realization of the supreme values of God
Truth, Goodness, and Beauty."² This means that the really
ful and constructive policy of any government-builder, anxio
build a durable organisation, is that of scientifically-
competent and wise realization of the moral values of love, fi
ship, mutual help and compassion, and not the policy motivated
unlimited egoism, hate and nihilism and carried on by coercio
fraud, hypocrisy and other anti-moral and ugly means."³

¹P.A. Sorokin: Power and Morality, P. 176.
²Ibid., P. 177.
³Ibid.
Like Gandhiji Sorokin also condemns politics which gives importance to "a skill in machinations and manipulations of mainly low-grade human emotions and inter-relationships; the art of making money by all available means"; unscrupulous use of naked force"\(^1\) assisted by fraud. He calls such politics sensate politics. The state of the sensate culture, he says, "has been the most Machiavellian and cynical in its policy of raison d'etat, in its power politics, and in its application of the rule that might is right."\(^2\) Like Gandhiji Sorokin wants politics to be based not on brute force, but on true wisdom and moral values. So he wants to introduce a government not only of scientists who represent true knowledge, but also of sages and saints who represent the universal and moral imperatives without the guidance of which the government of science and scientific experts may turn out to be more dreadful and disastrous than that of politicians. In addition, "if unification of the truly creative scientific, wise, and moral forces in all the governments and in mankind at large is supplemented by inclusion into the governments of the foremost creative artists of the fine arts (literature, drama, music, architecture, painting, sculpture), and by the co-operation of the creators of Beauty with those of Truth and Goodness outside the governments, such a Union of the creators of the greatest values of Truth, Goodness, and Beauty on this planet would give to mankind the best possible government and social order."\(^3\)

---

2. Ibid., P.173.  
3. Ibid., P.172.
Like Gandhiji Sorokin also does not favour double standard of morality in politics. He points out that this puts the rulers over and above law and all moral values and ends in a complete 'moral nihilism.' The principle of double moral standard also means an extreme relativization of moral precepts and legal imperatives leading unavoidably to a universal progressive atomization of these values which, in turn, engenders conflict and strife producing hatred which leads to rude force and bloodshed. In this chaos might inevitably becomes right.

When Sorokin says that the state must function for the mental, moral and material benefit of the people rather than that of the few exploiting the many, he is echoing clearly the Gandhian ideas. Sorokin points out that in the modern sensate culture the state has been the egocistic, cynical, Machiavellian and power-drunk institution. Being a sovereign power, it is designed first of all for offensive and defensive warfare with all the groups whose interests are opposed to its own, and while it cannot overcome the lust for power, its policies are based on the naked power politics, uncontrolled by any of the ethical norms obligatory for private conduct. As long as the militant and power-drunk state which generates internal and international conflicts in their bloodiest and most inhuman forms remains, no durable peace is assured. So a remodelling of the state is urgently required. He suggests the lines on which the remodelling of the state should be carried on.

Sorokin says that only when the citizens and the officials
of a state become wiser, more capable and more altruistic, only when a genuine ennoblement of the state is possible and only then the state becomes the true servant of humanity, not its master. States, including the world state must be subjected to the same universal ethical and legal commandments applicable to private organisations and individuals. They should not be placed above these moral and legal imperatives. Instead, their cynical policy of the naked Machiavellian raison d'État must be put an end to.

Negatively this means that they should be stripped both of their sovereignty, especially of their right to wage war and of their power to coerce, suppress, punish and execute their citizens, particularly, of the misuse of firing squads and capital punishment. "All armed forces must be disbanded and reduced to a police force sufficient for the maintenance of domestic law and order. Within a few decades", writes Sorokin, "through such demobilisation and disarmament, a state could benefit its citizens economically to a far greater extent than it could through dozens of victorious military adventures. If the funds required merely for the maintenance of huge armed forces and armaments were used for a few decades for productive purposes, the profits would far exceed the dubious gains derived from military ventures. This disarmament would preclude the invention and manufacture of atomic bombs and similar satanic instruments of destruction."

These prohibitions also apply to the world state to be brought into vogue for the discharge of limited duties on behalf of humanity.

I.P.A. Sorokin: The Reconstruction of Humanity, P. 147.
humanity as a whole. Its legislative, executive and judicial bodies should consist of not only the representatives of the state but also of representatives of industry, science, religion, agriculture and the fine arts whose presence as full-fledged members will markedly heighten the competence, dignity, moral sense, impartiality and prestige of the world government. Like the individual state, it must be stripped of its power and privilege of inventing, manufacturing and using atomic bombs and other similar means of destruction and its enforcing apparatus must be restricted to the necessary minimum of police force. Likewise it should also be subjected to the universal moral and legal commandments and its pursuit of the power politics of the nihilistic raison d'etat must be terminated.

In order to ensure the mutual interdependence of the states (which should constitute mere territorial regions) a careful rearrangement of their boundaries by detaching a portion of a given state and exchanging it for a portion of an adjacent state, is necessary. In this way the "sacredness" of the territorial boundaries of the state along with their chauvinistic patriotism, will lose its prestige. Travelling, communication and circulation of ideas among the disarmed states must be made as free as possible.

As a positive measure, a universal bill of rights, inalienable and inviolable for every human being, which must embrace not only the "freedom" but also all the necessary conditions for decent material, educational and moral standards of life for all which the available resources permit, should be promulgated and
enforced as the fundamental principle of the constitution of every state, including the world state. Such rights naturally presuppose corresponding responsibilities and duties.

The government of the states should be composed not only of a combination of the elected representatives of the citizens of the electoral districts but a sufficient proportion of representatives of labour, industrial management, agriculture, science, religion, the fine arts and the professions, elected by their respective groups independently of the territorial electoral districts. The presence of these leaders will tend to mitigate the militancy of a given territorial district and weaken its vested interests and will immeasurably increase the competence, morality, impartiality and prestige of the government. Since the function of the government should be social service, its representatives as well as the experts it employs should be genuine social servants not interested in enjoying any special privileges or particularly high salaries, and competent and responsible managers of the functions entrusted to them rather than masters, potentates or dictators. Such conditions will perfectly satisfy persons who are eager to serve others, but conversely discourage greedy, selfish persons who look to government positions as a means for the realization of their rapacious ambition and lust for power.

Since the government must be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and since prevailing technical facilities make it possible quickly to obtain the opinion of the
citizens on any important matter, it should not pass any important law or measure without a preliminary determination of the opinion of the citizens through either the old-fashioned referendum or adequately organized polls. The legislative body should not be entitled to enact any legislation opposed to the majority vote of the citizens, no matter how large and forceful may be the majority vote of the legislature in favour of the measure. Thus direct democracy, or the town hall system of government, will be restored in lieu of indirect representation, with its many defects.

With regard to the field of government management and control, no rigid universal rule can be laid down. It depends upon the special conditions prevailing in the various states. As a general principle, the state should discharge only those functions which cannot be administered well by the non-state agencies or are not so administered. In this sense its sphere should be residual, taking care of the needs not satisfied completely by any other agencies, or satisfied by them more poorly than they could be fulfilled by the state. Serkin also does not favour the increase of state power. He points out that if the society is free from serious emergencies like wars, revolutions, famines, and major depressions, there is no need for any undue expansion of state control and regimentation. The more successfully the individuals and groups prevent or combat these emergencies, the less occasion does the state have to intervene.

Such reorganisation of the state will terminate its role as the principal breeding ground of sanguinary strife, corrupt politics
and lust for power. Thus remodelled, the state will become one of the most helpful, most beneficent of human institutions, a true social servant instead of a cruel, callous master.

Sorokin by proving the following points scientifically on the basis of historical facts, that politics is not an end, but a means for the benefit of humanity as a whole, that it should be based on universal moral and legal imperatives and that a double standard of morality in politics is disastrous, gives a rational support to Gandhian ideas on politics. When he says that a constructive realisation of human aspirations demands (a) replacement of these "governments of politicians" by "governments of scientists, saints and sages"; (b) an establishment of certain conditions, such as universal and total disarmament which can automatically prevent misuse and abuse of power by each and every government; (c) a substitution of the largely obsolescent political ideologies and current tattered values by new ones, better adapted to meet the gigantic challenge of this new era; and finally, (d) the spontaneous mobilisation and inspired cooperation of all the creative forces of humanity – its best minds, purest hearts, and highest conscience for building a nobler and better order in the human universe, he is almost echoing Gandhian ideas.

Like Gandhi Sorokin also is concerned with the problem of economic inequality in modern society. He says that experiment

Studies of young children between the ages of three and four, six to nine, and nine to twelve show that a conspicuous inequality in economic and other privileges generates enmity and conflicts among them even at an age when they are as yet hardly able to understand fully the significance of the ideas of equality and inequality. 1 This is still more true of adults. Even thinkers and observers in ancient times have emphasized this point. Plato says that with a sharp division between the haves and have-nots "a state is not one but two states, the one of poor men, the other of the rich; and they are.... always conspiring against one another.

Human history and present-day observation corroborate well the validity of this generalization. Where and when the contrast between wealth and poverty is most marked, where and when the wealth is acquired not through noble and meritorious efforts but through inheritance, luck, manipulation and various ignoble and devious means and when the rich misuse their wealth and power for anti-social purposes, there and then the antagonism and strife between the rich and the poor is especially sharp. In the contemporary world as the economic chasm between the rich and the poor strata is wide, the consequence is an ever-increasing class war between the multimillionaires and poverty-stricken strata. This gulf has generated strikes, riots, lockouts, revolts and revolutions which have made this century bloodiest and more turbulent than any of the preceding centuries.

Sorokin suggests the following measures to substantially mitigate this antagonism. The enmity can be terminated by:

1. Securing to every person a decent economic standard of living;
2. Limiting the amount of wealth possessed by any individual;
3. Reducing the chasm between the standards of living of the rich and the poor;
4. Making every rich person a trustee of the wealth entrusted to him rather than an arbitrary agent in its disposition.

Thus depriving parasitic, demoralized, irresponsible heirs and heiresses of the possibility of a scandalous misuse of their riches;
5. Responsible, socially constructive, and morally exemplary conduct on the part of the rich as genuine leaders,
6. Deflation of the value of pecuniary wealth in the total scale of human values by means of scientific, ethical, and religious demonstration that excessive riches do not make human life nobler or happier than a decent, moderate income sufficient to meet all the real physical, mental, moral, and cultural needs of man."

In addition, selfish and unrestrained competition in economic activities must be rigorously curtailed. This is possible, only when one is motivated not merely by selfish and egoistic considerations of economic advantages but also by enjoyment of one's work and a desire faithfully to discharge one's moral and social duties. All parasitic and antisocial occupations must be eliminated and the distribution of individuals among different occupations must conform as far as possible to their special tastes, aptitudes, abilities and preferences. In this respect the principle of equality of opportunity should be fully realized. Every
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child should be given maximum opportunity to discover and train his inherent abilities through a general and then specialized school education and through a period of apprenticeship with men, specialists, or handcraft masters. And all socially necessary and useful occupations must be regarded as true vocations as merely different ways of serving the needs of mankind. The existing sharp and unjust gradation of occupations into "superior" and "inferior" should go and likewise, the striking and often unjustifiable contrasts in the economic remuneration of different professions and various occupational pursuits should be mitigated or eliminated. In these measures suggested by Sorokin, one can find an echo of the measures suggested by Gandhi to secure economic equality.

Sorokin further points out that "these measures would only mitigate the enmity between the paupers and the millionaires but would exert a multitude of other influences beneficial to cultural life and creativity of humanity in general. Ethics from the standpoint of the natural law, not to mention the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount, such measures would be fully justified. Economically they would leave a sufficiently wide margin for the operation of economic incentives. Through equitable distribution, through economic security for all, through remuneration of the real creators of wealth and penalization of parasitic and irresponsible squanderers, through social stability and harmony, these measures would stimulate the process of wealth infinitely more than they would inhibit it through slight limitation of so-called "economic incentives".
and politically they would limit the autocratic, and therefore irresponsible and often selfish, misuse of the power of wealth for destructive and anti-social purposes. Likewise they would inhibit the degradation of the highest values to the level of marketable commodities worth so many dollars; the debasement of the arts and sciences, religion, and politics as mere merchandise bought and sold and obliged to adapt themselves to the whims and market demands of the rich. Finally, they would introduce peace and harmony into our interpersonal and intergroup relationships.¹

Condemning such economy which would turn persons into mere commodities in a competitive labour market forcing them to sell their labour and the same time be doomed to perpetual insecurity, Sorokin gives a scientific and rational support to Gandhian measures for achieving economic equality.

Thus one can find a remarkable consonance that exists between the views of Gandhiji and Sorokin with regard to the role of politics and economics in individual and social life.