CHAPTER 12

CONCLUSION

As the aim of the thesis is to evolve a critical and constructive exposition of the social and political thought of Anaji, the cluster of concepts available, pertaining to the subject, have been dissected and displayed, without mitigating the original characteristics of the concepts.

12.1 Individualism

Anaji remained a crusader of the rights of man, whenever the state intervened too much in the development of the personality of the individual. Anaji's claims for individualism are not like the cross-grained individual of Mill. Whether it was the imposition of collectivism at the economic level, or the untimely imposition of the official language by the Centre, Anaji raised his voice in favour of the individual. A thinker may argue for individualism from the points of view:

1) Individualism may be selfish and hedonistic.

ii) Individualism may be to legitimately defend the individual's rights when they are encroached upon by the State.

Anaji's case for individualism is not of the first type because, he opposed selfish activity and defended altruism, whenever it came to the question of educating and guiding the individual.

We can rightly classify his individualism as the one that can be brought under the second type, because he
did not hesitate to criticise the State or any group, which tried to exploit the individual.

An objection may be raised that Rajaji was against the authority of the State. This charge can be counted as follows: whenever Rajaji criticised the State, it was done more to defend the individual than to merely take an anti-authoritarian attitude. Otherwise Rajaji would not have defended, through State authority, the prohibition of the use of alcoholic liquors. What Rajaji was against, was the misuse of State authority and not the State. In fact he believed in encouraging the individual to respect and obey State authority, for a good life, through mutual co-operation (Oppurava).

12.3 The question of consistency:

Regarding the question of consistency in politics, we have to answer the following two questions:

1) Is it necessary to be consistent in politics?
2) Was Rajaji consistent?

Whether consistency is right or wrong, in general, is a question to be answered by the formal logician. But, for the question, whether it is necessary to be consistent in politics, we can answer it in the following two ways:

1) One can be inconsistent to defend his own dogma.
2) One can be inconsistent for the good of all.
The case of Bajaji cannot be brought under the first type, for he was crying hour by hour from house tops, that dogmatic assertions to benefit a few would not succeed. His campaign against political dogma, which support oligarchic rule, bears ample testimony to show that he did not support inconsistency for the sake of dogma.

We may perhaps fit Bajaji's thought under the second type of inconsistency. Even Gandhi declared that he preferred to be inconsistent when such an act would bring good to the society. Bajaji displayed much courage when, there was a chance of his being misunderstood as being inconsistent. Arguing for the sake of argument may show some inconsistencies, if we do not take all the variables into consideration. Regarding the language policy, Bajaji was blamed of being inconsistent. A careful examination of what he advocated would reveal that he was not against the study of Hindi as a language and that he was against forceful imposition of Hindi as the 'official' language, when a sizeable population of the country was not really prepared for it. Although he was not inconsistent regarding the language policy, he established his claim for the right to be inconsistent in his ex inconsistency.

13.3 Theme, the main principle of Bajaji's thought: belief in an Ultimate Power as the all-pervading
principle is a basic postulate of Anjali's thought. Attached to this are the concepts of the existence of the individual soul and the theory of dharma.

Dharma is the principle which binds the various concepts accepted by Anjali and already declared in the scriptures. Anjali's support or opposition to any policy depended upon how well such a policy could fit into the harmonious scheme of dharma. His thought, at all levels, bears the stamp of this principle, which he supported with boldness without fear of losing popularity. If Anjali believed in more political success, he would not have supported the concept of giving real education to the people, much against popular support. He displayed a similar boldness in criticizing the major power blocs when they chose to develop and accumulate nuclear armaments. It is also wrong to blame Anjali as a blind supporter of capitalism, for he considered that the Western form of capitalism was wedded to exploitation, as much as communism. Any system based on the maintenance of order by coercive authority, by mere majority did not appeal to him.

As a system of philosophy, we can classify Anjali's thought as Idealism. His leanings towards Jainskánta philosophy shows that his thought can be brought under the
personalistic type than the absolute type of Idealism. This tendency is consistently maintained in his views on politics. He pleaded for unity without losing the variations of the members of the society. Therefore, he supported a federal state with enough autonomy for the states and was not in favour of a 'monolithic' system which would reduce everything to uniformities in the name of preserving order and unity.

He fought tooth and nail against anything that was opposed to the principle of shama. It is more appropriate to classify his thought as the philosophy of shama than as any 'ism'. 'Ism' generally tend to become mere segmental and theoretical moving away from the concept of human welfare. The society can hope to achieve, through the philosophy of shama, unity without violence, individuality without licence and work without attachment to the fruits of action. This, then, is the burden of the song of Anaji's thought.