

INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF INDIA

Author

Dr.R. Selvaraju,

Associate Professor and Head

Department of History,

Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu.



DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

MANONMANIAM SUNDARANAR UNIVERSITY

**DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
TIRUNELVELI – TAMIL NADU -627 012.**

AUGUST-2024

Sl.No	Unit	Content	Page No
1.	I	Understanding Intellectual History and its impact – Indian Renaissance – Raja Rammohan Roy – DayanandaSaraswati – Syed Ahmed Khan – Vivekananda – Annie Besant	1-45
2.	II	Economic thought of Early Nationalists – DadabhaiNaoroji – R.C. Dutt – M.G. Ranade–J.C.Kumarappa	46-63
3.	III	BalaGangadharTilak – AurobindoGhosh – SubramanyaBharati– M.A. Jinnah	64-74
4.	IV	Social Thinkers: Jyothi RaoPhule -Periyar E.V. Ramasamy- B.R. Ambedkar , Ayothi Das Pandithar —— M.N. Roy	75-110
5	V	Mahatma Gandhi and Nationalism – Jawaharlal Nehru and Nation Building – Jaya Prakash Narayan and Total Revolution	111-154
6.	Annexure	References	155

UNIT I

Understanding Intellectual History and its impact – Indian Renaissance – Raja Rammohan Roy – DayanandaSaraswati – Syed Ahmed Khan – Vivekananda – Annie Besant

Objectives

- ❖ Understand the Raja Rammohan Roy to the Indian Renaissance, especially his efforts in social and religious reform.
- ❖ Understand the Dayananda Saraswati in the revival of Vedic traditions and the founding of the Arya Samaj.
- ❖ Highlight the contributions of Syed Ahmed Khan in promoting modern education and reform within the Muslim community.
- ❖ Understand the philosophy of Swami Vivekananda and how his teachings contributed to the global understanding of Indian spirituality

RAM MOHAN ROY

LIFE SKETCH

Ram mohan Roy was born on 22 May 1772 in an orthodox Brahman family at Radhanagar in Bengal, His father, Rama kanta Roy, was a revenue official and dependent land-holder under the Maharani of Burdwan.¹ Rammohan's early education included the study of Persian and Arabic at Patna, where he read the Koran, the works of the Sun mystic poets of Persia and the Arabic translations of the works of Plato and Aristotle. Then he went to Benares, to study Sanskrit and read the ancient Hindu scriptures, especially the Vedas and the Upanishads. Returning to his village at the age of sixteen, he wrote a rational critique of Hindu idol worship Which invited criticism from all

quarters Raja Ram Mohan had to leave his home even.

From there he went to different places including Tibet, from where he secured a firsthand knowledge of Buddhism, and to Benares, where he undertook further studies of the Sanskrit texts of the Advaita-Vedanta school. From 1805 to 1814, he worked for the East India Company as the personal Diwan first of Woodford and then of Digby. The association with English civil servants, especially Digby, was instrumental in Roy's study of modern Western thought. ² In 1814, he resigned from his job and moved to Calcutta in order to devote his life to religious, social and political reforms.

In November 1830, he sailed for England to be present there to counteract the possible nullification of the Act banning sati (widow-burning); powerful propaganda had been mounted by the orthodox Brahmans against the banning of sati in 1829 by William Bentinck, (the British Governor-General of India). Again Raja Ram Mohan was given the title of 'Raja' by the titular Mughal Emperor of Delhi, whose grievances the former was to present before the British king. In England, Raja Ram Mohan was well-received by the king and the Directors of the East India Company. Among his important activities in England was the presentation of a memorandum to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Revenue and Judicial Systems of India.

Raja Ram Mohan Roy inaugurated the age of enlightenment and liberal

reformist modernisation in India. To achieve all this he relied heavily on his wide knowledge of Persian-Arabic, Classical Greek, Vedantic and modern Western thought. He had learnt as many as ten languages— Persian, Arabic, Sanskrit, English, Urdu, Hindi, Hebrew, Greek, Latin and French—and was influenced by such contemporary events such as the French Revolution and the freedom movements in Naples, Spain, Ireland and Latin America. Hence, his concerns as a reformer and thinker were not confined to India. This has been acknowledged by, among others, Jeremy Bentham, C.F. Andrews, Brajendranath Seal and Rabindranath Tagore. Andrews called him the 'pioneer of the whole world movement,³ while Bentham, before he met Raja Ram Mohan during the latter's visit to England, addressed him in a letter as an 'intensely admired and dearly beloved collaborator in the service of mankind.

“There was a day when, all alone, Ram Mohan Roy took his stand on the common claim of humanity and tried to unite India with the rest of the world. His vision was not dimmed by obsolete conventions and customs”. Raja Raja Ram Mohan Roy inaugurated the age of enlightenment and liberal-reformist modernisation in India. He taught us that truth belongs to all men, that we Indians belong to the whole world. Ram Mohan extended India's consciousness in time and space.⁵ Raja Ram Mohan Roy's immediate problem was the religious and social degeneration of his native Bengal. Raja Ram Mohan adopted three approaches to socioreligious reform: (i) exposing and discrediting

those religious dogmas and practices which are irrational and/or contrary to social comfort; (ii) the promotion of modern Western education; and(iii) state action in support of both these programmes Several of the degenerate features of Bengal society were singled out scornfully in Raja Ram Mohan's first published work, Tuhfal-ul Muwahhiddin (A Gift to the monotheist),(published in 1803-4 at Murshidabad, where he was living at that time. It was written in Persian with a preface in Arabic). In it, he exposed such irrational religious beliefs and corrupt practices of the Hindus like belief in revelations, prophets and miracles, the seeking of salvation through bathing in a river and worshipping a tree or being a monk and purchasing forgiveness of their crime from the high priests' and the 'hundreds of useless hardships and privations regarding eating and drinking, purity and impurity, auspiciousness and inauspiciousness'

Raja Ram Mohan was particularly concerned with orthodox religious doctrine and practices. He noted that in the name of their separate religious orthodoxies, people develop discord among themselves by "giving peculiar attributes to that Being and ... [by] holding different creeds consisting of the doctrines of religion and precepts of Haram (the forbidden) and Halal (the legal).

Raja Ram Mohan was particularly concerned with orthodox religious doctrine and practices. He noted that in the name of their separate religious orthodoxies, people develop discord among themselves by "giving peculiar attributes to that Being and ... [by] holding different creeds consisting of the doctrines of religion and precepts of Haram (the forbidden) and Halal (the legal).

EMANCIPATION OF WOMEN

Raja Ram Mohan is well known for his pioneering thought and action on the emancipation of women and especially on the abolition of sati or widow-burning. He, to use the words of David Kopf, found Bengali Hindu women 'uneducated and illiterate, deprived of property rights, married before puberty, imprisoned in purdah, and murdered at widowhood by a barbaric custom of immolation known as sati

Unless women were freed from such inhumane forms of oppression, Raja Ram Mohan felt, Hindu society could not progress. He characterized sati as 'the violation of every humane and social feeling' and as symptomatic of 'the moral debasement of a race'. Just as he opposed the orthodox Christian doctrine of Atonement, so he rejected the theory that the wife can, or has to, atone for the sins of her husband. He also cited the Sacred Texts to show that they permitted the wife to continue her life after her husband's death. Ram Mohan Roy was

largely as a result of Raja Ram Mohan's campaign, sati was banned by Lord Bentinck in 1829. Raja Ram Mohan also advocated widow remarriage, female education and the right of women to property.

PIONEER OF MODERN WESTERN EDUCATION

Raja Ram Mohan was a pioneer of modern Western education, which, he believed, would enlighten the Indians against the superstitions and injustices of religious orthodoxies. The mere study of ancient, Sanskrit texts, he said, would only 'keep the country in darkness. In his famous letter on education to Lord Amherst, he wrote: If it had been intended to keep the British nation in ignorance of real knowledge, the Baconian philosophy would not have been allowed to displace the system of the school-men which was the best calculated to perpetuate ignorance. In the same manner the Sanskrit system of education would be the best calculated to keep this country in darkness if such had been the policy of the British legislature. But as the improvement of the native population is the object of the Government, it will consequently promote a more liberal and enlightened system of instruction, embracing Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Anatomy, with other useful sciences.

In 1816, Raja Ram Mohan founded an English school and some years later he lent support to the founding of the Hindu College. In 1825, he started the Vedant College, in which the study of Western knowledge was combined

with that of Indian learning

HIS POLITICAL THOUGHTS

In Raja Ram Mohan Roy's economic and political thought, there are some uncertainty between liberal-capitalist and feudal-aristocratic values as well as between colonial and postcolonial orientations.

The socio-historical changes that Raja Ram Mohan was responding to did not permit any neat and simple theoretical and philosophical treatment or paradigmatic encapsulation. In the face of the unprecedented socio-historical changes that were unfolding before him, he, in his writings, advocated the cause of what he felt were the liberating and growth-promoting forces and opposed what seemed to him to be the oppressive and growth-inhibiting features of the emerging political economy...

Initially, as he himself acknowledged, he had a 'great aversion' to British rule, but subsequently he' became its admirer and responsible critic. The basic ingredients of Rom Mohan Roy's political thought seem to have been from the anti-medievalist composition of his general philosophy of life.¹⁶ He derived a system of social ethics, in which individualistic ethics was tempered by the principle of communitarian ethics. In economics and politics, while he recognised the autonomy of the sphere of both, he also emphasised the role of

religion as a rational regulative principle of both economics and politics and as an instrument for creating an ideal state.

SOCIAL AUTHORITY WITH INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

Ram Mohan Roy's political thought can be understood correctly as great synthesizer. In the field of social ethics, he tried to harmonise social authority with individual freedom. According to him, individual progress is the criterion of social progress, but individual progress is impossible unless the conditions of social progress are created and sustained by social action. Like Locke, Grotius and Thomas Paine, he believed in the immutable sanctity of 'natural rights', including the right to life, the right to property, the right of free speech and the right of free association-the fundamental 'human rights' as understood in the modern world. Nevertheless, his ethical sheet-anchor was the Benthamite principle of the 'greatest happiness of the greatest number'. Moreover, he understood that 'natural rights' did not imply any possibility of the violation of the equal right of others.

REASONS FOR SUPPORT OF BRITISH RULE

Broadly speaking, there were two main reasons for Raja Ram Mohan's favorable attitude towards British rule in India. First, he was persuaded that British rule, unlike the despotic and tyrannical rule of the Mughals or the Rajputs, provided security and other civil liberties to the Indian people.

Secondly, he felt that the introduction of capitalist norms and principles by the British were contributing to India's economic development. In his political thinking he admired the British system of constitutional government for the civil liberties it gave to the people. He wanted to extend the benefits of that system of government to the Indian people. He wrote: 'I am impressed with the conviction that the greater our intercourse with European gentlemen, the greater will be our improvement in literary, social and political affairs.'

He sympathised with the freedom struggles of the Greeks and the Neapolitans. The French Revolution gladdened him. He rejoiced at the passage of the Reform Bill of 1832 by the English Parliament and the successful revolt by the Spanish colonies in South America. Yet he welcomed British rule over India. Commenting on his philosophy, B. Majumdar writes: "He was the first Indian who imbibed the spirit of the English constitution and demanded civil liberty with all its implications. Fully Aware as he was of the limitations of the Indians of his age he never thought of demanding political liberty for them. He was conscious of the ignorance and superstitions that enveloped the minds of his countrymen, who betrayed a deplorable lack of public spirit in their conduct. So he could not think them capable of exercising self-government. The great problem which confronted the well-wishers of India in the first half of the nineteenth century was not autonomy for India but the bare recognition of the principles of justice and security of life and property.

Raja Ram Mohan Roy attributed India's decline in the immediate pre-British period to the 'tyranny and oppression" of the Rajput rulers and the despotism of the Muslim rulers. In contrast, British rule appeared to him as providing to the Indians a God-sent opportunity of securing civil liberties. Raja Ram Mohan Roy believed that the British rulers, who enjoyed civil and political liberties in their country, could 'also interest themselves in promoting liberty and social happiness, as well as free inquiry into literary and religious subjects, among those nations to which their influence extends.

Ram Mohan Roy realised that India is as diverse as humanity itself – a sense of confluence of many languages, religions, customs and social practices, diverse sub-cultures and varieties of experience on many levels. He perceived that India must have a modern secular state and a modern economy. But this does not mean secularism in the sense of preoccupation of the state and the individual with materialistic self-interest unconcerned with religion. Ram Mohan Roy thought that in a country like India in which religion pervades diverse cultures and sub-culture in variety of subtle ways, what secularism required is a broadening of the base of religion as humane culture by ridding it of superstition, ritualism and blind conformity to scriptures and tradition and making it as a constructive and liberating social force. He wanted a theology liberation and freedom.

Raja Ram Mohan Roy believed that in his time, Indians could derive the advantages of the liberal spirit of British public or political life if the laws for India were made by the British Parliament rather than by an Indian Legislative Council located on Indian soil. If such a legislative council was set up, he feared that it would be controlled by the British GovernorGeneral of India and his Council. That would be in contravention of the principle of separation of powers, of which Raja Ram Mohan was an ardent supporter. 'In every civilised country,' he wrote, 'rules and codes are found proceeding from one authority, and their execution left to another. Experience shows that unchecked power often leads the best men wrong and produces general mischief' He maintained that if legislation for India was left to the British Parliament, it would benefit from the liberal public opinion in England. He was aware of the difficulties involved in making liberal legislation for a distant land. He, therefore, proposed three measures to ensure that the British Parliament makes good laws for the Indian people: (i) a free press; (ii) commissions of inquiry; and (iii) ascertaining the views of 'gentlemen of intelligence and respectability'.

Only these classes seemed to him to be able to exert any influence on the government in those times. Both through his writings and through his activities, Raja Ram Mohan Roy supported the movement for a free press in India- When press censorship was relaxed by Lord Hastings in 1819, Raja Ram Mohan founded three journals: The Brahmanical Magazine (1821); the Bengali weekly,

Samvad Kaumudi (1821); and the Persian weekly, Mirat-ul-Akbar (1822). John Adams, who succeeded Lord Hastings as Governor-General, re-imposed press censorship in March 1823. Against this a petition was made to the Supreme Court by Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Dwarkanath Tagore and several others. When the petition was rejected by the Court, Raja Ram Mohan submitted an appeal to the King-in-Council which too was rejected. The British colonial case against a free press in India was that India's was a colonial administration and not a representative constitutional government and that there was no effective public opinion in India. Raja Ram Mohan argued that a free press will help to generate such a public opinion. He also maintained that precisely because India was a colony, it stood in greater need of a free press if a revolutionary overthrow of the rulers was to be avoided.

NATURE AND FUNCTION OF STATE :

Ram Mohan has a definite understanding of the nature and function of the modern state. In his opinion, the chief function of the state is to protect the life, religion and property of the individuals. For this reason the sovereign in the state must have power to enforce law and order. He argued that since 1712 until the emergence of the Company as a political power there was no effective political force in India. Akbar II, the last but one representative of the imperial throne of Timur, enjoyed only the empty title of "King of Delhi" without royal

prerogative or power. Ranjit Singh's power was confined to north-western India only. The new middle classes were no doubt a significant social and economic force in Bengal, but they lacked cohesion to become an effective political force and had no influence outside the province.

The British were in those circumstances the only effective political force in the country and what was more important, had used that position to maintain orderly relations of exchange and to protect the lives, religion and property of the individuals. It was also in British India that the literary and political improvements were continuously going on. But he emphatically asserted that sovereignty must not be in the office of the Governor-General or his subordinate officers but in King-in-Parliament, who was the supreme legislative power in the country.

REFORMS IN JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION :

In order to introduce reforms in judicial administration, Ram Mohan recommended the codification of the criminal and civil law and the publication of the two codes in Indian languages to familiarize the community with the law of the country. In the Benthamite fashion he argued that the code of criminal law ought to be "simple in its principles, clear in its arrangement and precise in its definitions, so that it may be established as a standard of criminal justice in itself." Raja Ram Mohan Roy's focus, however, was not on any organisational

blue-print for a re-structured world order. His preoccupation rather was with synthesising a transnational, humanist culture. He appreciated the liberal, scientific, world-affirming attitude of modern Western thought. But he critique its foundation in the conflictual cosmology of the JudeoChristian tradition of thought which justifies the violence done unto one being or person in atonement for the sins of another. He appreciated the spiritual (inner self and self-purification) and communitarian values of Advaita-Vedanta. But he disapproved of its world-denying and self-denying assumptions. By such a critique of cultures and religions, he undermined the cultural arrogance of orthodox Brahmans, Christian missionaries and Macaulayan educationists. Thus, he, as noted by Brajendra nath Seal, paved the way for a synthesis between Eastern and Western social values and postulates against the common background of universal humanity." In other words, he pointed the way "to the solution of the larger problem of international culture and civilisation in human history, and became a precursor... a prophet of the coming Humanity."²² Hailing Raja Ram Mohan Roy as the herald of a world society, Rabindranath Tagore wrote :

“ Raja Ram Mohan Roy paved the way for a synthesis between eastern and western social value and postulated against the common background of universal humanity”

Thus it can be safely concluded that Raja Ram Mohan Roy was the only person in his time to realise completely the significance of the modern age. He

knew that the ideal of human civilisation does not lie in isolation of independence, but in the brotherhood of interdependence of individuals as well as nations. His attempt was to establish our peoples on the full consciousness of their own cultural personality, to make them comprehend the reality of all that was unique ... in their civilisations in the spirit of sympathetic cooperation.²³He was the pioneer of modern education and a socio religionist par excellence.

SWAMI DAYANAN

Swami Dayanand was a great educationist, social reformer and also a cultural nationalist. He was a great soldier of light, a warrior in God's world, a sculptor of men and institution. Dayanand Saraswati's greatest contribution was the foundation of Arya Samaj which brought a revolution the field of education and religion. Swami Dayananda Saraswati is one the most important reformers and spiritual forces India has known in recent times. The philosophy of Dayanand Saraswati can be known from his three famous contributions namely "Satyarth Prakash", "Veda Bhashya Bhumika" and and Veda Bhashya. Further the journal "Arya Patrika" edited by him also reflects his thought. Swami Dayanand the great founder of Arya Samaj, occupies a unique position in the history of political ideas of modern India. When the educated young men of India were slavishly copying the superficial aspects of European civilization and were making agitation for transplanting the political institutions of England

in Indian soil without paying any heed to the genius and culture of the Indian people, swami Dayanand boldly hurled India's defiance against the social, cultural and political domination of the west. Swami Dayanand, the greatest apostle of the indo-Aryan culture and civilization also proved to be greatest exponent of the most advanced ideas in politics in India. He was against idol worship, caste system, ritualism, fatalism, infanticide, sale of grooms etc. he also stood for the liberation of women and upliftment of depressed class. Keeping in mind the supremacy of Vedas and Hindus, he opposed Islam and Christianity and advocated for Suddhi movement to reconvert the other sects to Hindu order. Dayanand expressed political ideas too when described theory of state, forms of Governments, three- cameral legislation, functions of Government, rule of Law.

INTRODUCTION:

Swami Dayanand was a great educationist, social reformer and also a cultural nationalist. He was a great soldier of light, a warrior in God's world, a sculptor of men and institution. Dayananda Saraswati's greatest contribution was the foundation of Arya Samaj which brought a revolution in the field of education and religion. Swami Dayananda Saraswati is one the most important reformers and spiritual forces India has known in recent times. The dominant personality of 6 Dayananda Saraswati had found extraordinary reflection in the

virility of the Arya Samaj movement, and in almost every one of its adherents. The contribution of Arya Samaj in the field of education is commendable. According to Dr. S. Radhakrishna, “among the markers of modern India who had played an important role in the spiritual uplift of people and kindled the fire of patriotism, in me, among them Swami Dayananda has occupied the chief place.”

LIFE SKETCH :

Dayanand was born in an orthodox Brahman family at Tankara in the Morvi state in Kathiawar in 1824 to Karsamji Tiwari who served as a priest in a Shiva temple. The childhood name of Dayanand was Mulasankar. Under the loving care of his father Dayananda had acquired proficiency in Veda, Sanskrit grammar and Sanskrit language from childhood. Like Gautama became Buddha after witnessing four ordinary scenes of life, Dayanand’s life style changed after a single incident. When he was fourteen years of age he kept fast on the Shivaratri day with the other members of the family. At night other members of the family after worshipping Shiva began to sleep but Mulaji remained vigilant. He saw a rat eating the offering made to Shiva by the Devotees. This incident led him to think that the idol of Shiva could not be real God. When the idol could not protect the offering made to it, it could never protect the whole world. He became convinced about the futility of idol worship. This experience

aroused his conscience and Dayananda became a staunch crusader against the vices of Hinduism. His father tried to involve him in family life through marriage with a view to put restriction on his independent mind. Dayananda was not willing to enter into the bondage of family life therefore he fled from his home and reached Mathura. In 1861, at Mathura, Dayananda came in contact with Swami Brijananda. This contact is decisive point in his career. He became his disciple and studied the ancient religious literature, various mythological books and Sanskrit grammar text. The philosophical foundation of Dayananda took concrete shape at Mathura. He got knowledge and realization. Mulasankara became Dayananda Saraswati and by the instruction of his guru Vrijananda dedicated himself to spread the message of Veda and to fight against the conservative Hindu religion and wrong traditions. Dayananda though had contact with Brahma Samaj; they were not prepared to accept the supremacy of the Vedas and transmigration of soul. To fulfil the mission of his life, he founded Arya Samaj at Bombay on 10th April, 1875 and passed the rest of his life in establishing Arya Samaj branches at different places. The reformative zeal of Dayananda irritated the orthodox Hindus. Dayananda stood firm and resolute in the face of criticisms. He died of food poisoning on 30th October, 1883.

ON WOMEN, EDUCATION RELIGION AND DEMOCRACY

On the question of reforms in the women, Dayanand was opposed to the evil practices of child marriage and enforced widowhood, which

according to him did not have the sanction of vedas. The pitiable condition of child-widows in the society, which prohibited remarriage, evoked his deepest concern. He therefore, suggested 'nigopa' (a non-permanent co-habitation of widow:, and widowers) and later, even widow remarriage. For the 'prosperity of Aryavarta' (India), Dayanand's world view had a crucial place for education. An education based on moral and religious foundations and meant for all the four classes of men and women, was what Dayanand wanted. The burden of this education was, according to him, to be shouldered by the king or state. He stood for compulsory education. India's awakening he thought, hinged on this factor. He was in favour of an educational system which would emphasize on grammar; philosophy, Vedas, sciences, medicine, music and art. The political philosophy of Dayanand Saraswati has two central ideas-somewhat contradictory to each other. The first is the idea of an 'Enlightened Monarchy' -- a concept that he borrowed from Manusmriti-that is, a monarchy thoroughly rooted in obedience to Dharma. The second, somewhat contradictory notion is that of elective representation i.e. democracy, though, there really is no contradiction since, in the Vedas, there are references to assembly and the election of the king. Stressing the principle of election, he interprets the king as a president of the assembly. Moreover, politics, for him, was inseparable from morality and he therefore argued strongly for the guidance of political leaders by spiritual leaders. Dayanand extended his democratic elective principle into

the functioning and organizational structure of the Arya Samaj. He further visualized a polity which would be the embodiment of decentralization—a vast commonwealth with the village as the unit. The following are some of the principles out of the ten important principles of the Modern India : the Interface Arya Samaj (founded in 1875), which moulded a generation of freedom fighters, especially in northern India:

- 1) The source of pure knowledge is god.
- 2) The link between Vedas as guardians of true knowledge and an Arya Samajist is inseparable. He must assimilate its contents and make it popular among the people.
- 3) Ethical justifications of actions are a must.
- 4) The Arya Samaj is devoted to the idea of the emancipation of the world in all its aspects.
- 5) Rays of knowledge must dispel the darkness of ignorance.
- 6) One must leave enough for others. Man's well-being can only be identified with the collective development of his fellowmen.

Political Ideas:

The political ideas of Dayananda are as under: Swami Dayanand was an idealist in politics and he found his inspiration from the study of Vedas. His

method of interpreting the Vedas was quite different from the traditional method . He started with the age-long tradition that the Vedas contain truths which are universal in their application and which can stand the test of acute reason and searching science. The Indian tradition is that even sciences like medicine, mathematics, music, astronomy, politics and economics are based on Vedas.

Theory of state:

Swami Dayanand does not make any inquiry about the origin of the state. He concentrates his attention on the discussion of the character of a fully organized state with all its organs of administration. According to him, the state stands for the realization of the highest objects of life. The objective of state is not just to look to the secular and material welfare of the citizens but to promise the four fold objects of human life, namely religion, material prosperity, enjoyment and salvation. He wanted the state to direct its activities in such a way that these may be conducive to the securing of freedom from the bondage of the world.

The form of government: Swami Dayanand is dead against the rule by one man. In his Satyarth Prakash he says that absolute power should not be entrusted to one man. An autocratic king never allows others to be equal to him. His own personality may over shadow that of others. He declares that an autocrat is sure

to be partial in order to fulfil his own selfish ends. Swami Dayanand admitted the necessity of having a president for representing the unity of the state. The right of ruling the people is to be conferred by the people themselves. Dayanand fit in his theory of republicanism with the divine right of kingship theory, which is propounded by the dharma shastras.

The Three Assemblies:

Swami Dayanand states “let the three assemblies harmoniously work together, and make good laws, and let all abide by those laws. Let them all be of one mind in affairs that promote the happiness of all”. Swami Dayanand allows autonomy to educational and religious bodies. Normally the political or legislative assembly should not interfere with the decision arrived at the educational and religious assemblies. But the legislative assembly cannot hold itself totally aloof in educational and religious matters.

Rule of law:

Swami Dayanand held the law alone as the real king. He exhorts all to remember the teaching of the Vedic text which says “verily the just law alone is the true king, yes; the just law is the true religion.” He places the law above the king in a panegyric over the impersonal law he writes “ the law alone is the true governor that maintains order among the people. The law alone is their protector. The law keeps awake whilst all the people are fast asleep, the wise,

therefore, look upon the law alone as Dharma or Right. When rightly administrated the law makes all men happy but when administrated wrongly, without due consideration as to the requirements of justice it ruins the king. Rightly administrated law promotes the practice of virtue, acquisition of wealth and secures the attainment of the heart-felt desires of his people". Swami Dayanand does not like to provide even a separate set of judicial courts for the trials of king and other high officers. He upholds this dictum and elaborates it by stating that while the punishment inflicted on the king should be thousand times heavier than on an ordinary person.

Functions of government:

To swami Dayanand, government is the agent of the community. It has not only to provide security against internal and external dangers, but also to promote the highest aims of human life. He admits the need of allowing the citizens to hold private property. He believes in the inequality of division of wealth but at the same time apprehends that the rich might give trouble to the government.

He also laid great emphasis on the maintenance of a strong army. He describes that there is no other way of maintaining independence of the state than the raising up of a strong defensive force within the country. The government according to him is the guardian and protector of those who are not able to earn

their livelihood either because of old age and infirmity or because they are too young to take care of themselves, swami ji clearly mentions the case of the wife and minor children of the deceased officers who are entitled to the support of the government. If, however, any of them takes to vicious life, he or she should not receive any help. Dayanand Saraswati & Arya Samaj On 7 April, 1875 Dayanand Saraswati formed the Arya Samaj at Bombay. It was a Hindu reforms movement, meaning "society of the nobles". The purpose of the Samaj was to move the Hindu religion away from the fictitious beliefs. 'Krinvan to Vishvam Aryam" was the motto of the Samaj, which means, "Make this world noble".

Upliftment of women

The Arya Samaj not only sought spiritual reorganisation of the Indian psyche, it also worked towards abolishing various evil social practices. Primary among these were widow remarriage and women education. The Samaj launched programs to support widow remarriage in the 1880s. Maharishi Dayanand also underlined the importance of educating the girl child and opposed child marriage. He proclaimed that an educated man needs an educated wife for the overall benefit of the society.

Shuddhi Movement

The Shuddhi Movement was introduced by Maharishi Dayanand to bring

back the individuals to Hinduism who were either voluntarily or involuntarily converted to other religions like Islam or Christianity. Shuddhi or purification was imparted to those who sought their way back to Hinduism and the Samaj did an excellent work in penetrating the various strata of society, taking back the depressed classes into the folds of Hinduism.

Educational Reforms

Maharishi Dayanand was fully convinced that the lack of knowledge was the main culprit behind the adulteration of Hinduism. He set up a number of Gurukuls to teach his followers the knowledge of the Vedas and for them to spread the knowledge further. Inspired by his beliefs, teachings and ideas, his disciples established the Dayanand Anglo Vedic College Trust and Management Society, after his death in 1883. The first DAV High School was established at Lahore on June 1, 1886 with Lala Hans Raj as its headmaster.

Religious Reforms:

Although Dayanand immortalized the Vedas, however, he opposed idol worship. He raised voice against ritualistic religious practices. Those religious performances would lead to social, 12 economic, political and religious degeneration of India. He also rejected the ideas contained in Indian mythology. He denounced polytheism or worship of God in different forms. He emphasized that this polytheism had brought the division in Hindu society. Putting

emphasis on monotheism and to devote oneself to the formless God, he wrote in the 'Satyarth Prakash' — “ there is only one god with all those attributes generally ascribed to him by monotheists. He is the creator first of the Vedas, then of the world, hence the Vedas are eternal as compared with the world, but non-internal as compared with God.” Thus, Dayanand brought uncompromising revolution in the field of religion. He told that inner purity is essential for spiritual development. Religion, to a great extent, was to regulate the body, mind and spirit of a man. So, religion, truth, purity, emancipation, law, moral conduct were synonymous to him.

Opposition to Caste System and Untouchability:

Dayanand spearheaded his crusade against caste system and untouchability. He reinterpreted the system of Varna mentioned in the Veda. It was meant for occupational purpose in the society. As per the doctrines of guna, karma and swabhava, the society was divided into different varnas like the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudras with their respective occupation like worship, protecting the country, carrying on trade and commerce and to serve the other three castes. This occupation were inter-changeable. He emphasized the political need of this division of society. In his words, caste is— “a political institution made by the rulers for the common good of the society and not a natural or religious distinction. It is not a natural distinction,

for the four castes were not created by God as distinct species of men; but all men are of equal nature, of the same species, and brothers". In a similar vein, Dayanand denounced untouchability and labelled it as inhumane and unsocial. He cited the Vedas where the practice of untouchability was not at all present.

Status of Women: Upliftment of women The Arya Samaj not only sought spiritual reorganisation of the Indian psyche, it also worked towards abolishing various evil social practices. Primary among these were widow remarriage and women education. The Samaj launched programs to support widow remarriage in the 1880s. Maharishi Dayanand also underlined the importance of educating the girl child and opposed child marriage. He proclaimed that an educated man needs an educated wife for the overall benefit of the society Dayanand championed the cause of women. Child marriage and Purdah system were the orders of the Hindu society. Women education was restricted and widow remarriage was not allowed. Dayanand protested against all these evils. He cited the high position of women during Vedic period. So, he argued in favour of the equal rights of women with men. He explained that an illiterate woman will be a liability to her husband, children and for the whole family. He emphasized on women education and created provisions for them to read in DAV schools and colleges. He also asserted the right of women over property He opposed child marriage and argued in favour of legislation to stop this evil practice. He also condemned polygamy and polyandry. His reforms, gave a

moral boost to the women and helped in their upliftment. **Conclusion**

In order to understand the present, one needs to know the past. The seeds of religious fundamentalism which Dayananda sowed more than a century ago is bearing abundant fruit in contemporary India in the form of aggressive Hindutva against the religious minorities of India, especially the Muslims and Christians, as evidenced by the innumerable acts of atrocities committed against them in recent years. Thus, the true face of Dayananda, which has so far been hidden beneath the mask of his being a frontline Hindu social reformer, now emerges as that of a Hindu fundamentalist and nationalist. The ability of Dayananda's philosophy of religion to aliment Hindu chauvinism even after a century, once again tells us most eloquently that, ideologies rule the world, and that an ideological aggression if not resisted in time, can lead to lasting tragic consequences. Therefore, the popular conception of Dayananda as a benign Hindu social reformer is only a half-truth. The other half is that the roots of contemporary Hindu fundamentalism and militancy against the minority religions, to a great extent, lie deep in the 19th century, especially in the religious philosophy of persons like Dayananda Saraswati.

SYED AHMAD KHAN (1817-1898):

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan (October 17, 1817– 27 March 1898) was a teacher and a politician. He was a philosopher as well. He was also a social reformer. Furthermore, he founded the school that would later become Aligarh Muslim University.

In 1857, there was a rebellion in India. This is known as the First Indian War of Independence. During this time, **Sir Syed Ahmed Khan** kept loyal to the British; He also saved many European lives. After the rebellion, he wrote a book where he said the British were, in fact, those who caused the rebellion. To settle whether Sir Syed was a communitarian or a communalist, we need to assess the speeches and articles which he wrote. One such speech of Sir Syed, which he gave in Meerut in the year 1888, clearly shows that Sir Syed turned to arguments fielded by religious fanatics to develop a communal alliance between Indian Muslims and British Christians. He said,

Our Hindu brothers of these provinces are leaving us and are joining the Bengalis. Then we ought to unite with that nation with whom we can unite. No Mohammedan can say that the English are not “People of the Book” (Quranic term referring to Jews, Christians and Sabians). No Mohammedan can deny this: that God has said that no people of ‘other religions’ can be ‘friends’ of Mohammedans except ‘Christians’. He who had read the Quran and believes it, he can know that our nation (Muslims) cannot expect friendship and affection from

any other people. At this time our nation is in a bad state as regards education and wealth, but God has given us the light of religion, and the Quran is present for our guidance, which has ordained them (Christians) and us (Muslims) to be friends.

He was unhappy about the position of Muslims in India, as their social and economic status was declining. According to Sir Syed, Muslims had to bring a positive approach to the British and accept their ways of education. He wanted the Muslims to benefit from the British. To achieve this task, he had to bring about cooperation between the Muslims and the British. To accomplish this, he did the following things:

- ✓ Wrote the loyal Muslims of India to prove that their community was not disloyal to the British and to ask the British to end their hostility.
- ✓ Wrote a pamphlet “essay on the causes of the Indian Revolt” and pointed out the reasons for the outbreak of 1857. This pamphlet was circulated for free among the British officials.
- ✓ Wrote Tabyin-ul-kalam to point out similarities between Islam and Christianity.
- ✓ Established the British Indian Association.

Sir Syed played a vital role in the educational uplift of the Muslims in India. He did the following things to improve the educational standards:

- ✓ Set up a journal, Tahzib-ul-Akhlaq, which contained articles of influential Muslims who agreed with Sir Syed's approach towards education.
- ✓ Founded scientific society in Ghazipur in 1863.
- ✓ Opened school in Moradabad in 1859.
- ✓ Opened school in Ghazipur in 1864.
- ✓ Made a committee to raise funds for new schools.
- ✓ Set up a Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental school in Aligarh on 24 May 1875.
- ✓ Set up Muslim educational conferences in 1866 to raise the standards of education. Sir Syed also increased the political awareness of Muslims in the Sub-continent. At first, he believed in Hindu-Muslim unity, but later resolved to the two-nation theory. In 1885, the Indian National Congress was set up. It claimed to be the body of every Indian, regardless of religion. However, it later proved to be functioning only for the Hindus and tried to eradicate the Muslims. The Congress made three demands which were:
 1. Political representation according to the population. This obviously meant Hindu domination as they were a dominant majority in India and Sir Syed opposed it.

2. Appointment in government should be by competitive examinations. Sir Syed opposed this because he knew that the educational standards of the Hindus were much better than the Muslims.
3. The next official language should be Hindi, replacing Urdu. Urdu had a special place in the Muslim hearts, and Sir Syed opposed this. The British accepted this demand.

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan played a crucial role in improving the Muslim status. He worked tirelessly to restore relations between the Muslims and the British. He brought the Muslim revival through the Aligarh movement and showed the importance of education.

SWAMI VIVEKANANDA

Swami Vivekananda was born in 1863 and named after 'Vireshwara' who was revered by his mother. His name was later changed to Narendra Nath. In his short life span of 39 years, he contributed tremendously not only to the Indian society but also to the world at large due to his profound philosophy on spirituality and religion. His philosophy is relevant to and influences the political ideas of contemporary India as well. He tried to regenerate India through his philosophy of truth, love and tolerance which has influenced and constituted the Indian political thought over the years. His political ideas can be classified and studied under the following heads:

- Religious theory of nationalism
- Concept of internationalism
- Concept of freedom
- Concept of caste
- Concept of democracy
- Theory of resistance
- Theory of humanism

Religious Theory of Nationalism

Swami Vivekananda has propounded the political concept of nationalism with a religious interpretation which he defines as a form of spiritualism. Spiritualism according to him goes beyond religious rituals, social dogmas, ecclesiastical formulations and obsolete customs.

The pursuit of spiritualism has not only defined India's way of life but also can make her more dynamic at home as well as abroad. As an abode for spiritualism, India's spirituality has survived through the traditions of Vedas and Upanishads which has helped to strengthen the nation as well as retaining faith of its masses. That is also one of the reasons, why Swami Vivekananda stressed on the importance of the social and political institutions to be national as well as spiritual in character. His concept of nationalism is deeply intrinsic with his religious philosophy, because he was a spiritual man himself.

According to Swami Vivekananda, national unity can be achieved through

the acceptance of a common religion incorporating all the common principles of diverse religious sects. He wanted to strengthen the nation by imposing unity between 'brain of a Brahmin and heart of a Buddhist, the Islamic body and Vedanta brain and European society with India's religion'.

In other words, he conceived the idea of a universal religion based on the synthesis of virtues taught by different religions. Vivekananda attaches the highest importance to the unity as well as fusion of all religions into one universal entity of faith as religion constitutes the very nature of man and unites him to his fellowmen. The spirituality of a religion is the base which promotes the feeling of fraternity that leads to nationalism. The concept of nationalism that Vivekananda has propounded is an integral aspect of the common spirituality to emanate out of a common religion. Due to this reason, Vivekananda's concept of nationalism is called as a religious theory of nationalism. All the more so, since it has also influenced the Indian national movement.

Concept of Internationalism

Vivekananda's concept of nationalism goes beyond the concept of a common spirituality. That is why nationalism is complementary to universalism since he feels that the ultimate aim of spirituality is to embrace the whole of humanity in universal brotherhood.

Universalism according to Vivekananda is based on the fact that the whole universe exists as a single entity. Therefore, the diversities that are exhibited on

account of different nationalities would facilitate in exchanging knowledge as well as mutual contacts. As families grow into tribes, tribes into race, races into nation, nations into humanity and all parts of this humanity can form spiritual unity on the basis of their universal existence. It is in this scenario that India can play a role of spiritual leadership for the world.

The spiritual leadership can be achieved through spiritual unity of mankind. Vedanta which advocates universal outlook and can solve all national and international problems can bring about such spirituality. Vivekananda's universalism seeks to coordinate the identity of nations on the basis of spiritual unity without any subordination or precedence to nationalism. He was hopeful that the world would unite on scientific as well as the spiritual basis.

Concept of Freedom

Vivekananda made monumental contribution to the concept of freedom in political thought. He says that man is born free but life constrained his natural freedom which makes him to become atomized, isolated 'individual' whose sole interest unrestraint pursuit of desires and aims which bring into conflict the equivalent of freedom and they cancel each other. Although the virtues of individuality were essential for the development of their creative personalities but the essence of the spiritual self along with the social nature needs to be brought out. It is in this sense that Vivekananda classified different types of freedom as follows:

- Spiritual freedom
- Individual freedom
- Social freedom
- Economic freedom

Spiritual freedom is the inherent spiritual necessity for all forms of life to exist. It is a product of struggle between the internal life and external nature. Vivekananda considers freedom to be absolute and infinite, changeless and of poor quality, self-existent and immanent. He believes in the indispensability of freedom for the spiritual growth of the individual. However, the spiritualistic concept of freedom does not accept competitive freedom among individuals and stands instead for altruism.

Individual freedom is the natural possession of all individuals. He wanted each individual to cultivate a free body, mind and spirit. According to Vivekananda, individuals perfect themselves by acting freely and in turn the perfect individual perfects society. Due to this reason, he opposed any kind of restrictions on individual freedom born of any external pressure.

Social freedom is closely related to individual freedom. Vivekananda opposed any individual social barriers which would curb the individual initiative and hamper the social growth. He felt that social upliftment can be attained by coordinating social liberty with social equality. He considers liberty and equality complimentary to each other and therefore wanted the society to spend more on

education of the poor than on the rich and intelligent.

Economic freedom is necessary because economic poverty obstructs individual freedom. Vivekananda stressed on the interrelation between material freedom and individual happiness. According to him, the right to property is the natural right of the individual although his concept of economic freedom is not based on exploitative and acquisitive instinct of the individual.

Concept of Equality

Vivekananda's concept of freedom leads to his concept of equality as he emphasizes that equality is the sign of freedom. According to him, no man or nation can hope to attain freedom without physical and mental freedom that comes from equality. He was concerned with the process and not the different forms of equality. He stood for equal rights and opportunities and was opposed to any privileges or discrimination of any form. In fact, his concept of equality reflects his Vedanta philosophy which stresses on the gradual growth of the individual.

Concept of Socialism

Vivekananda was the first Indian to designate himself as a socialist. He found in socialism the key to social unity and economic justice. In fact, the Vedantic concept of unity postulates freedom and equality which induced him to expound the concept of socialism. The principle of justice - social, economic and

political has inspired him to call himself as a socialist. He described socialism as a movement for the liberation of masses and postulated socialism on the spiritual basis of society with commitments of freedom and equality. He was against any rigid social stratification like the caste system traditionally interpreted in the country. He advocates for social equality and creating equal chances for all the inhabitants in the country which can be compared with Laski's concept of equality. However, he did not sanction violence for the attainment of socialism.

Concept of Caste

According to Vivekananda, caste is a socialistic institution which forms the base of Indian society. He found in the caste system a clear translation of the principle of unity. It functioned on the principle of social and economic coordination and not on the rivalries among castes. His thoughts on the issue reconcile individual good with social good and individual liberty with social equality and harmony. So he described the caste system as individualistic in nature but socialistic in function. As an individualistic it encourages freedom of the group to maintain its own affairs and socialistic in the sense that each group thinks itself as a part of the community and cooperates with other groups to maintain social harmony and economic prosperity.

He compares the caste system with the class system of the West. Unlike the West, the caste system has degenerated into a hereditary caste which has bred social exclusiveness and has prevented social progress. Nevertheless, the caste

system is indispensable for ushering in prosperity, social equality and spiritual unity. He suggested abolishing the unjust customs within the caste system such as the practice of untouchability rather than abolishing caste in totality.

Concept of Democracy

According to Vivekananda, democracy facilitates peace as all individuals can have their voice heard irrespective of their social standing. He has categorized democracy into three components which have been mentioned as follows:

- As a way of life
- As a form of government
- As a decision-making process

As a way of life

According to Vivekananda, democracy is a way of life as it stands for freedom, equality and brotherhood and union. It also ensures individual dignity and rights as it facilitates individual growth and freedom. He denounced vested interests in society which deprived the masses of their legitimate rights.

As a form of government

For Vivekananda, democracy as a form of government could provide an opportunity for the people to uplift themselves and brighten their future as it is the government of the people and by the people.

As a decision-making process

The worth of the government depends on the worth of the people

according to Vivekananda. He wanted to improve the people through education which will contribute towards a qualitative change in the democracy. He wanted the individuals to perform the functions of the government so that the decision-making process can be transparent and accountable to the people whom they represent.

Theory of Resistance

Vivekananda contributed the theory of resistance. In the theory of resistance, he advocated to regenerate the nation through education and religiosity, which will strengthen the people. It will strengthen the weak from the oppression of the tyrant ruler and lead to full freedom in the true sense. So he did not advocate openly the cause of India's independence.

Theory of Humanism

Vivekananda's theory of humanism asserts that the individual is not only an end in himself but also divine by nature. He being a great humanist asserted that for the glory and purity of human nature, man should be treated as a manifestation of divinity. He advocated the concept of Humanistic Advaita which identifies humanity with divinity. He considered man as God, denounced social, economic and religious evils of society, and put an emphasis on inculcating faith and strength in the individual. So he said that each man should be treated not as what he manifests but as what he stands for.

Human nature is pure and divine and everything that is good, strong and

powerful emanates from divinity since all are free and equal in humanistic society. Although, there are impurities in human nature, which is not consistent with humanism, as man can also be selfish, exploitative that leads to inequality and bondage as a curse.

Vivekananda's humanism expounds that man who is an end in himself must also become a means to serve humanity. As an end, man illuminates his own divine light and as a means he helps others to find divinity in them and make them conscious of their divinity.

ANNIE BESANT

Annie Besant (née **Wood**; 1 October 1847 – 20 September 1933) was a British socialist, theosophist, freemason, women's rights and Home Rule activist, educationist, and campaigner for Indian nationalism. She was an ardent supporter of both Irish and Indian self-rule. She became the first female president of the Indian National Congress in 1917.

For fifteen years, Besant was a public proponent in England of atheism and scientific materialism. Besant's goal was to provide employment, better living conditions, and proper education for the poor. She became a prominent speaker for the National Secular Society (NSS), as well as a writer, and a close friend of Charles Bradlaugh. In 1877 they were prosecuted for publishing a book by birth control campaigner Charles Knowlton. Thereafter, she became involved

with union actions, including the Bloody Sunday demonstration and the London matchgirls strike of 1888. She was a leading speaker for both the Fabian Society and the Marxist Social Democratic Federation (SDF). She was also elected to the London School Board for Tower Hamlets, topping the poll, even though few women were qualified to vote at that time.

In 1890 Besant met Helena Blavatsky, and over the next few years her interest in theosophy grew, whilst her interest in secular matters waned. She became a member of the Theosophical Society and a prominent lecturer on the subject. As part of her theosophy-related work, she travelled to India. In 1898 she helped establish the Central Hindu School, and in 1922 she helped establish the Hyderabad (Sind) National Collegiate Board in Bombay (today's Mumbai), India. The Theosophical Society Auditorium in Hyderabad, Sindh (Sindh) is called Besant Hall in her honor. In 1902, she established the first overseas Lodge of the International Order of Co-Freemasonry, Le Droit Humain. Over the next few years, she established lodges in many parts of the British Empire. In 1907 she became president of the Theosophical Society, whose international headquarters were, by then, located in Adyar, Madras, (Chennai).

Besant also became involved in politics in India, joining the Indian National Congress. When World War I broke out in 1914, she helped launch the Home Rule League to campaign for democracy in India, and dominion status within the

British Empire. This led to her election as president of the Indian National Congress, in late 1917. In the late 1920s, Besant travelled to the United States with her protégé and adopted son Jiddu Krishnamurti, who she claimed was the new Messiah and incarnation of Buddha. Krishnamurti rejected these claims in 1929. After the war, she continued to campaign for Indian independence and for the causes of theosophy, until her death in 1933.

Early Life

Annie Wood was born on 1 October 1847 in London, the daughter of William Burton Persse Wood (1816–1852) and his wife Emily Roche Morris (died 1874). Her father was English, attended Trinity College Dublin, and attained a medical degree; her mother was an Irish Catholic. Her paternal grandfather Robert Wright Wood was a brother of Sir Matthew Wood, 1st Baronet.

Annie's father died when she was five years old, leaving a son, Henry Trueman Wood, and one daughter. Her mother supported Henry's education at Harrow School, by running a boarding house there. Annie was fostered by Ellen Marryat, sister of the author Frederick Marryat, who ran a school at Charmouth, until age 16. She returned to her mother at Harrow self-confident, aware of a sense of duty to society, and under the influence of the Tractarians.^[5] As a young woman, she was also able to travel in Europe.^{[6][7]}

In summer 1867, Annie and her mother stayed at Pendleton near Manchester with the radical solicitor William Prowting Roberts, who questioned Annie's political assumptions.^{[8][9]} In December of that year, at age 20, Annie married the cleric Frank Besant (1840–1917), younger brother of Walter Besant, an evangelical, serious Anglican.

Failure of the marriage

The Rev. Frank Besant was a graduate of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, ordained priest in 1866, but had no living: in 1866 he was teaching at Stockwell Grammar School as second master, and in 1867 he moved to teach at Cheltenham College as assistant master. In 1872, he became vicar of Sibsey in Lincolnshire, a benefice in the gift of the Lord Chancellor—who was Lord Hatherley, a Wood family connection, son of Sir Matthew Wood, 1st Baronet. The Besant family, with their two children, Arthur and Mabel, moved to Sibsey, but the marriage was already under strain. As Annie wrote in her *Autobiography*, "we were an ill-matched pair".

Self Assessment Questions.

1. What is Intellectual History, and why is it important in the context of India's development?
2. How did the Indian Renaissance contribute to India's socio-political awakening?
3. Describe the major reforms introduced by Raja Rammohan Roy and their impact on Indian society.
4. How did Dayananda Saraswati's philosophy shape the Indian socio-religious landscape?

UNIT II

Economic thought of Early Nationalists – Dadabhai Naoroji – R.C. Dutt – M.G.

Ranade –J.C.Kumarappa

Objectives

- ❖ Understand the economic ideas of early Indian nationalists and their impact on India's economic policies during British rule.
- ❖ Examine the contributions of Dadabhai Naoroji in exposing the economic drain of wealth from India under British rule.
- ❖ Analyze R.C. Dutt's critique of British economic policies and their effects on Indian agriculture and industry.
- ❖ Understand M.G. Ranade's economic thought and his efforts to promote industrialization and economic self-reliance in India.

Dadabhai Naoroji

Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917) Dadabhai Naoroji, the Grand Old Man of India, was born on September 4, 1825 in a Parsi family of Bombay. In life Naoroji had the distinction of being first in many things. He was the first Indian to be made a Professor at Elphinston College, Bombay, the first Indian to become a Member of Parliament, House of Commons (British Parliament), the first Indian to become a member of the Royal Commission and the first Indian to make the National Income Estimate. After teaching for a while at Elphinston College, he went to England in 1855 to look after business. There he took lively interest in politics and did many things to educate the British public opinion about the duties of England to India. Naoroji was an ardent nationalist. He was elected President of the Indian National Congress in 1886 and 1906. While at college, one of Naoroji's teachers called him 'the promise of India'. The teacher

was right. Naoroji became the Father of Indian Nationalism. Economic Ideas of Naoroji The Economic ideas of Naoroji are found in his monumental work "Poverty and UnBritish Rule in India." The Poverty of India was the theme of his book. He considered it the main economic problem of India. He made a survey of the per capita income in Bombay presidency for the years 1867-70. He noted that it was as low as Rs. 20 indicating the grinding poverty of the masses He thought that the per capita income should be at least Rs. 34 to meet the bare necessities of life. He attributed the poverty of India to the policy of continuous exploitation followed by the British Government. The Drain Theory Dadabhai Naoroji is famous as an economist for his 'Drain Theory'. He attributed the poverty of India to the British Rule. He felt that under the British rule, India had the "lordliest and costliest administration in the world.' The consequence of foreign domination was the drain of the wealth of India into England. He thought the extravagant cost of British administration had a disastrous effect on the Indian economy. Naoroji estimated that the drain which was to the tune of £3 million at the beginning of the 19th century increased to £30 million towards the end of the last century. According to Naoroji, this heavy drain of wealth from India into England was one of the main causes of the poverty of India. The drain of wealth took place in a number of ways. First large remittances were made by European officials of their savings in India. Second, large remittances were made in the form of salaries and pensions. Third, India often had to pay for government expenditure in England and of course in India too. Fourth, non-official Europeans made remittances from their business profits in India. The money which has gone out of India to England has once again come back as British Capital and foreigners have monopolized trade and industry. It has once again resulted in the drain of wealth. Thus the drain has become continuous and it has affected capital formation in India. Dadabhai Naoroji has collected a lot of statistical data to prove his drain theory.

He examined the figures of imports and exports between the years 1835 and 1872 and pointed out that the value of the exports exceeded that of imports by £500 million. The drain would have been greater, if interest had been calculated on the amount. No 2 country could bear such a drain upon its resources without sustaining very serious injury. The Naoroji pointed out that every war which the British fought after 1858 beyond the frontiers of India was clearly and mainly for safeguarding the imperial interests of Britain. He, therefore, argued that Britain should pay her proper share of the maintenance of the British Army in India. Further, when the Railways were built in India, India had to spend large sums on salaries and allowances to European staff were for all the top posts were manned by the Britishers. Indians employed largely on low paid jobs. Large sums of money also went out of India in the form of profits on railways to England. Thus the benefits of railways were enjoyed largely by the foreigners and the burden of foreign debt was borne by India. In the case of other countries, the English men merely sent their capital. But in the case of India, the English capitalists did not merely lend, but with their capital they themselves invaded the country. Dadabhai Naoroji felt that former rulers who plundered India's wealth by their invasions now and then were now better than the British rulers. He said. "The former rulers were like butchers hacking here and there, but the English with their scientific scalpel cut to the very heart....There is no wound to be seen, and soon plaster of the high talk of civilization, progress and what not covers up the wound." He felt that it was wrong to consider India as Nature's tragedy and the Indian agriculture, a gamble in the hands of the monsoon. He said that, "If India did not progress under the Englishmen there was no justification for their existence here." Naoroji suggested the following measures to remove India's poverty and to reduce the drain. 1. India and England should pay all salaries to their people within their boundaries. With regard to the Englishmen employed in India and the Indians

employed in England, there should be a fair and reasonable apportionment between the two countries. 2. As the Englishmen were paid reasonable salaries while they served in India, there was no need to pay pension to them. 3. As there was no danger of invasion of India by sea, and as all advantages from the Indian Navy went to England, India should not be charged any portion of the expenditure incurred on the maintenance of the Indian navy. Conclusion Though Naoroji's treatment of national income, as Dr. V.K.R.V. Rao pointed out, was based on "the Physiocratic concept of materiality of income" (Naoroji did not include 'services' in his calculation of per capita income), we should not forget the fact that Dadabhai Naoroji was the first Indian to calculate national income on per capita basis. His drain theory indicated broadly how there was perpetual exploitation of Indian wealth by the British administration. Above all, he explained the problem of poverty in India in a scientific manner based on statistical data.

POLITICAL IDEAS OF M.G.RAUADE

A BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF M.G. RANADE:

Mahadev Govind Ranade was born on 18th January, 1842 at Naxphad in Nasik district . He belonged to the famous Chitpawan Brahmin community, which has played a dominant role in the educational and political life of Maharashtra. Ranade's parents were orthodox and conservative and exerted influence on him to some extent. Ranade completed his early education at Kolhapur at the end of 1856. After this, his father sent him to Elphinstone High School at Bombay for further education. In 1859, he completed his Matriculation examination, and in 1862 B.A.examination, in First division 2 and Honours examination in second class. His examiner was impressed by the knowledge and his reading, because of which he collected money from his

friends and presented a gold medal and also books worth Rs.200/~ to him. He completed his M.A, in 1864 and LL.B.in 1865. In 1861, he become the fellow of Bombay University and rendered useful service to the University in that capacity. He began his career as a teacher. Later on he worked as an oriental translator and then as a subordinate Judge at various places. In 1868 he was given permanent appointment as a Professor of English and Marathi at Elphinstone College,Bombay.

In 1871, he was given permanent appointment in Judicial Department as a First Class Subordinate Judge by Bombay Government and he rose to be a Judge of Bombay High Court, 3 in 1881 . This office he retained till his death in 1901. As a Judge, Ranade was a great success, as his judgements bore marks of his considerable learning and a Judicious mind. Ranade throughout his life, had studied many books on various subjects. He had good command over Marathi, Sanskrit and English and had deep interest in History. He wrote his famous book on Maratha History, entitled 'Rise of Marathi Power'. His English knowledge gave access to new ideas. His studies of different subjects led him not only to take interest in subjects like politics and economics but also made him a great social reformer.

He began to work in social sphere from 1859, even during student days. In 1860, he read an essay on " Marathi Rajerajwade** in 'Dnyanprasarak Sabha' (1848). He was a guiding force of the 'Prarthana Samaj' and the 'Poona Sarvajanik Sabha*' which were established in 1867 and 1870 respectively. He also started to write in 'Indu-Prakash ' 4 (1862) on social evils . In 1873, when his wife died and the question of remarriage arose; he could not marry a widow and instead he was forced by his father to marry a virgin girl who was only eleven years. This was a life long stigma that got attached to him.

In 1885, the Government of Bombay nominated M.G.Ranade as the Law Member of the Bombay Legislative Council in place of a British Civilian. He was the Law Member of Council again in 1890 and 1893. In the field of education, he inspired his friends to establish Deccan Education Society which came into existence in 1884 . In 1887, he established Indian Social Conference with the help of Dewan Bahadur Raghunath Rao. He played an important role in the establishment of Indian National Congress in 1885. So much so the founder of the Congress A.O.Hume acknowledged him as his political guru. Through Indian Social Conference, he decided to discuss and to solve the Indian social problems . He was also appointed as a Member of the Finance Committee in 1886 . This distinguished jurist, economist, historian, social reformer and educationist died on 16th January, 1901 at Bombay.

It is true as C.Y.Chintamani has pointed out that, the gigantic intellect, saintly character, many sided activity, unflinching devotion to duty and passionate love to the ' Motherland ' of the late Justice Mahadev Govind Ranade ' were the wonder and inspiration of millions of his admiring countrymen* and that his whole life as * a noble record of glorious exertions and self-sacrificing labours for the regeneration of his teeming millions in all the departments of our activity in general and in the holy field of social Reform in particular.

MAIN FEATURES OF POLITICAL IDEAS OF M.G.RANADE:

Justice Ranade can be considered as the most important theoretician of Indian liberalism, because it was he who gave real thought content to liberal political ideas that were advocated by Ram Mohan Roy. Ranade was not only liberal, he was moderate also in the sense that he wanted the things to mature before they assume any definite form. Advocacy of social reform, role of

religion, moderation, commitment to economic development of the country and secular and liberal ideas of nationalism, can be considered as the main features of political ideas of M.G.Ranade. This he devocated through his writings.

RELIGIOUS IDEAS OF M.G.RANADE:

Ranade was a deeply religious soul and firm believer in existence of God, as a Supreme Reality on whom, both man and nature depend. In his 1 Theist's Confession of Faith 1 he explained that the intellectual capacity of a man is limited, therefore, a man cannot explain the things which are happening in the world. So also in many religious books ijp explained the origin and decay of the world. But all these books are written by men and not by the God? and hence if we were to believe in them naturally we would be called g superstitious . He accepted that by due devotion to God the chastening of conscience, the solid foundations of character are created. He had great belief in the purification of the human heart, in accordance with the dictates of conscience. The national mind of India cannot, in his view# be satisfied with agnosticism. Being a deep believer in the omnipotent majesty of God, he was persuaded of the truth that the divine force was active in history. History, thus is a manifestation of Divine Will. Even in the working of external nature, like the Stoic philosopher, Ranade found evidence of God's existence. According to him, the human soul is not identical with supreme Godhead and to this extent his position is different from that of Vedantism of the extreme monistic school. Thus, Ranade grants a measure of independence and free will to the human soul Ranade further said that, it is wrong to believe that 11 everything is happening according God's Will • He did not accept the view that man was free and he could do anything as he pleased. But he accepted the middle way of the development of man as it dependents upon his education, company, 12 and circumstances • Though he

believed in the existence of God he did not believe in the concept of ' Moksha ' or liberation. He argued that every man should believe in God, otherwise, he would not be in a position to perform virtuous acts and also a man should worship God. The worship of the God should not be done individually, it should be done collectively as due to it all people could come in close

IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL REFORMS:

M.G.Ranade is rightly counted as one of the greatest man who contributed to the building up of renascent India. The idea of social reform was very much in the air at the time when Ranade went to Bombay for his higher education. The ' Paramhansa Sabha ' (1849) had been established to eliminate social evils. During that period, in Maharashtra and also in India many a social evils were prevailing like caste astern, child marriage, untouchability, ban on foreign travel and prohibition of widow's remarriage. Generally, the people were ignorant and superstitious in every sphere of life. He realised that all these social evils were a hinderance to the development of society. Therefore, he had given first preference to social reforms. Ranade says, * You cannot have a good social system when you find yourself low in the scale of political rights, nor can you be fit to exercise political rights and privileges unless your social system is based reason and justice". Therefore, he took keen interest in the activities of social reform, such as the Widow marriage Association (1866), the Prarthana Samaj (1867),the Indian Social Conference (1887) etc.

From 1860, he began to take part in social activities by reading an essay on “ Marathi Rajerjawade “ in 'Dnyanaprakasha Sabha ' and advised, Maharashtrian nobles to acquire new OQ knowledge and to follow the part of Bengali nobles . @8hten the Indian National Congress was founded in 1885, some of the leaders thought that, side by side with political problems, they should also discuss social problems. But there was a controversy, therefore, the

Indian Social Conference met separately for the purpose of promotion of social reforms. M.G.Ranade, Dewan Bahadur Raghunath Rao were responsible for its establishment.

ECONOMIC IDEAS OF M.G.RANADE;

M.G.Ranade had deeply studied European economic thought and drawbacks of Indian economy. He suggested the measures to overcome it. Therefore, he was called as a father of Indian economics . He expressed his economic ideas through his various essays and lectures. In 1864 he read an essay on evils of over population and made it clear that in India the people thought that they were suffering due to their misfortune, but this type of thinking created laziness in the life of man. He further argued that in India it was believed that giving birth child was a sacred duty of man in his life. But increasing population was the cause of increase in diseases and famines, and Indians had no chance to establish their colonies as free nations' people for their livelihood. Therefore, customs like child marriage and A joint family system should be abolished to check the growth of over population.

In December, 1872, he delivered a lecture on ' Indian Commerce ' and pointed out to the people how Britishers were exploiting the Indians and destroying Indian arts and handicrafts. In India, imports were exceedingly larger than exports. Therefore, he argued that this condition should be reversed. But the commerce and also political power were two instruments that were in the hands of foreigners. Therefore, Indians should develop their own industries but for it, there should be our own capital i.e. money • To mobilise resources, he suggested some measures. He argued that from 1861 to 1870 one hundred and fifty crores rupees were given to Indians in the form of gold, but out of that one-half gold was used for ornaments and some was buried in soil,

remaining one-half was used to mint the coins. Instead of making ornaments of that gold, it should be used for the development of commerce and industries. This would create more employment.

CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE CONCEPT OF NATIONALISM EXPOUNDED BY RANADE;

Justice Mahadev Govind Ranade developed several important ideas in the field of religious, social, economic and political reforms. Therefore, he is rightly called as a father of modern Maharashtra. In those days the Indian society was rampant with superstition, poverty, bad manners and superstitious religious beliefs. Under those circumstances, even if Indians had got political freedom, they would not have been in a position to retain it and instead they would have remained the slaves of traditional customs. Therefore, whole society should be reformed. He established several organizations, to lay foundation of rich public life and initiated the organised activities of social reforms in Maharashtra and in India as well. And by means of various methods like applications, requests, meetings, speeches, magazines, he awakened the people in respect of religious, social, economic and political problems and thereby created nationalistic feelings. He exhorted the people to preserve the spirit of nationalism which we had lost due to our ignorance and social backwardness. Along with social reformation, Ranade gave importance to religious reforms, because he knew that religion had a very powerful hold on the Indian society and therefore, if social reforms were to succeed, the people should change their religious attitudes. He opposed fanatic and narrow minded religious attitudes and advocated equality, liberty and fraternity, among people as that existed in Varkari Sampradaya. Ranade adopted a moderate policy in respect of religious reformation, and instead of launching an all out attack on the religious and social evils, he advocated a gradual change, of course in

accordance with the main national stream of life. The reason for this softer line was the fear, that, if an all out attack was directed against the social and religious evils prevailing at this time, he might be isolated from the society and his reformist activities might fail. But in a country like India, where the social and religious evils had taken deep roots due to ignorance, the gradual change would be achieved only at a snail's pace. However, Ranade did not realise that a softer attitude to bring about change in age-old backwardness and ignorance if social and religious attitudes delayed our political freedom. As a result, Ranade's nationalist forces did not acquire the expected momentum. Ranade had drawn the attention of the educated and socially conscious people to his activities and thereby created social awareness. This truly helped in creating the political consciousness, but Ranade should have laid stress on political reforms along with social reforms. Had he been aware of the fact that, it was difficult for the people under an alien rule to come together to solve social problems as quickly as they would agree to come together for political problems, as it would have certainly added the vigour to nationalist movement. When the Extremists became dominant in the 'Sarvajanik Sabha' Ranade in 1896 established the 'Deccan Sabha', and even like wise after the foundation of the Indian National Congress (1885), just to consider social problems, he formed the Indian Social Conference in 1887. This helped to widen the gap between the moderates and extremists. Ranade, as a social reformer failed to practice what he preached as after the death of Ranade's first wife in 1873, his reformist friends expected that he would marry a widow to set an example but instead, he married a virgin, because of this, he was badly criticised. Only the educated people participated in his social reforms movements; uneducated masses remained aloof. Ranade explained in detail the role of 'Laissez Faire' policy of British government in impoverishing Indians and stressed the necessity of struggle, but when the Indian people began to

complain against excess tribute he said ** need not engage ourselves in that fruitless discussion, But people were of the view# that Ranade should have discussed these matters which was not of lesser importance. Ranade had faith in British sense of Justice. Therefore, he was of the opinion that the development of the Indians had to take place in connection with the Britishers, hence he did not want to sever the existing relations between India and England. He was of the opinion that the Indians must first achieve social reforms, and then they should demand political freedom. Ranade accepted the manifesto of Queen of 1858 as the Magna Charta on which he laid the foundation of his political 106 thoughts. But the history of Magna Charta is different . Ranade and his party had never realised that the political demands must get backed by some force as it was realised by the extremists. Therefore, they were more successful in their future political activities.

Romesh Chandra Dutt

Romesh Chandra Dutt is considered a national leader of the pre-Gandhian era and was a contemporary of Dadabhai Naoroji and Justice Ranade. Better known as **R.C Dutt**, he was a civil servant, a political and economic thinker and writer, a **Bengali Literature personality**, he is renowned for both his professional and literary careers. This article will **deal with the life, achievements, and contributions of Romesh Chandra Dutt**, with added stress to the socio-political facet of his life.

Romesh Chandra Dutt - Background

- Sir Romesh Chunder Dutt was born in Calcutta on **August 13, 1848**.

- He had his early education in Bengali schools in Calcutta and in the districts around. He was born into a family already famous for its academic and literary attainments.
- In 1866, Dutt completed the University of Calcutta's First Arts examination from Presidency College, coming second in order of merit and earning a scholarship.
- He traveled to England in 1868, accompanied by Surendranath Banerjea and Behari Lal Gupta, while still a B.A. student and qualified for the Indian Civil Service.
- Dutt began an illustrious career in the **Indian Civil Service** and in Indian politics in the year **1871**, as the **Assistant Magistrate of Alipore** to start off.
- Towards the end of his career, he was the Division Commissioner of Orissa, the highest position reached by any Indian ever.
- His service as a civil servant was praised by all levels of government, including Lieutenant Governors and Governors-General.
- While serving as the Commissioner of Orissa, he retired from the Indian Civil Service in 1897 at the relatively young age of 49.
- After his retirement, he was able to devote his time entirely to public activities and writing, which became a more fruitful portion of his career.

Romesh Chandra Dutt - Contribution & Achievements

Romesh Chandra Dutt did not engage in radical politics; instead, he used his authority and position to reap benefits for his country through diplomacy, writing, and constant public opinion creation.

Literary Career

- Dutt was an avid reader and a passionate writer. Even while busy with responsibilities at the civil services, he found time to engage with people through writing.
- Some of his famous works are '**Three Years In Europe**' (1872), a history of Bengali literature titled 'Bengali Literature' etc.
- He also penned four historical novels, '**Banga Bijeta**,' '**Madhabi Kankan**,' '**Rajput Jiban Sandha**,' and '**Maharashtra Prabhat**,' all of which were published in 1879. '**Samaj**' (1885) and '**Sangsar**' (1886) are two social novels he wrote.
- His political publications mainly dealt with the impoverished economic condition of India due to British rule.
- He wrote about the pathetic situation of agriculture, peasants, high revenue rates, deindustrialization, and the frequent occurrence of famines.
- His first book on the economic problems of the cultivators, '**Peasantry of Bengal**,' was published in 1875; the ideas developed in this book were expanded fully in '**Famines in India**,' published in 1900.
 - In it, he strongly argued against the over-assessment of land revenue and a plea for the Permanent Settlement to be extended to the Ryotwari area, as well as a permanent fixation of rents payable by the Ryots to the intermediaries.
- Even though he believed that British rule in India was beneficial to the country, his writings had enough influence to improve the situation.
- Few of his such works are '**England and India**' (1897), '**Famines in India**' (1900), and others. The most famous of his works in this series is '**The Economic History**'.

Political Career

- Dutt was appointed a lecturer in Indian History at the University of London shortly after his retirement from the Civil Service.
- **In 1899**, he was elected **President** of the **Indian National Congress**, and the expanding politically aware educated populace viewed him as one of their most effective spokespersons.
- R.C Dutt gained a reputation as an excellent orator and a man who was not hesitant to speak his own opinions even as a Civil Servant.
- His viewpoints on the reasons for poverty in India and administrative issues, such as the contentious Ilbert Bill, were not always in line with official thought.
- In 1904 he served as Revenue Minister for the State of Baroda for three years, while he was still with the University of London, and he returned again in 1908 as a member of the Decentralization Commission.

Conclusion

Conclusion

RC Dutt passed away in 1909, at the age of 61, just when a new period of productive labor appeared to be on the horizon. As a true Nationalist, Dutt believed that “there are two sides to every question, and it is absolutely necessary for the purposes of good government and of just administration that not only the official view but the people's view on every question should be represented and heard”. He was almost everything the emerging Indian intelligentsia hoped to be as a civil servant, a spokesman for the new generation of educated Indians, a liberal political leader, a perceptive student of economic concerns, a scholarly historian, and a creative writer.

J. C. Kumarappa

J. C. Kumarappa (born **Joseph Chelladurai Cornelius**) (4 January 1892 – 30 January 1960) was an Indian economist^[1] and a close associate of Mahatma Gandhi. A pioneer of rural economic development theories, Kumarappa is credited for developing economic theories based on Gandhism – a school of economic thought he coined "Gandhian economics."

Joseph Chelladurai Kumarappa was born on 4 January 1892 in Tanjore, present-day Tamil Nadu, into a Christian family. He was the sixth child of Solomon Doraisamy Cornelius, a Public Works officer, and Esther Rajanayagam. S.D. Cornelius, being one of the great old boys of William Miller, the famous Principal of Madras Christian College, sent his illustrious sons JC Cornelius and Benjamin Cornelius to Doveton School and later on to Madras Christian College. After becoming the followers of Gandhi, both these brothers adopt their grand father's name—Kumarappa—and hailed as Kumarappa brothers. (For biographical details see *The Gandhian Crusader: A Biography of Dr. J.C.Kumarappa*, Gandhigram Trust, 1956 (rev.1987).J C Kumarappa later on studied economics and chartered accountancy in Britain in 1919. In 1928 he travelled to the United States to obtain degrees in economics and business administration at Syracuse University and Columbia University, studying under Edwin Robert Anderson Seligman.

His older sister, Elizabeth Sornam Appasamy, became a notable educator and social worker in Madras.

Gandhian economics

On his return to India, Kumarappa published an article on the British tax policy and its exploitation of the Indian economy. He met Gandhi in 1929. At Gandhi's request he prepared an economic survey of rural Gujarat, which he published as *A Survey of Matar Taluka in the Kheda District* (1931). He strongly supported

Gandhi's notion of village industries and promoted Village Industries Associations.

Kumarappa worked to combine Christian and Gandhian values of "trusteeship", non-violence and a focus on human dignity and development in place of materialism as the basis of his economic theories. While rejecting socialism's emphasis on class war and force in implementation, he also rejected the emphasis on material development, competition and efficiency in free-market economics. Gandhi and Kumarappa envisioned an economy focused on satisfying human needs and challenges while rooting out socio-economic conflict, unemployment, poverty and deprivation. He was described by M. M. Thomas as one of the "Christians of the inner Gandhi circle" – which included non-Indians such as Charles Freer Andrews, Verrier Elwin and R. R. Keithahn, and Indians such as Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, S. K. George, Aryanayagam and B. Kumarappa, all of whom espoused the philosophy of non-violence.¹ J. C. Kumarappa responded positively to the Indian national renaissance, and he and George rejected the idea that British rule in India was ordained by divine providence

Kumarappa worked as a professor of economics at the Gujarat Vidyapith in Ahmedabad, while serving as the editor of *Young India* during the Salt Satyagraha, between May 1930 and February 1931. He helped found and organise the All India Village Industries Association in 1935; and was imprisoned for more than a year during the Quit India movement. He wrote during his imprisonment, *Economy of Permanence, The Practice and Precepts of Jesus* (1945) and *Christianity: Its Economy and Way of Life* (1945).

Later life

After India's independence in 1947, Kumarappa worked for the Planning Commission of India and the Indian National Congress to develop national

policies for agriculture and rural development. He also travelled to China, eastern Europe and Japan on diplomatic assignments and to study their rural economic systems. He spent some time in Sri Lanka, where he received Ayurvedic treatment. He settled near Madurai at the Gandhi Niketan Ashram, T.Kallupatti (a school based on Gandhian education system) constructed by freedom fighter and Gandhian follower K. Venkatachalapathi, where he continued his work in economics and writing.

He died on 30 January 1960, the 12th death anniversary of Mahatma Gandhi, aged 68. After his death the *Kumarappa Institute of Gram Swaraj* was founded in his honour. His elder brother Bharatan Kumarappa was also associated with Gandhi and the Sarvodaya movement.

Self Assessment Questions

1. What were the key economic ideas proposed by the early Indian nationalists, and how did they influence Indian economic thinking?
2. How did Dadabhai Naoroji's theory of the 'Drain of Wealth' shape the Indian nationalist movement?
3. What were the main arguments put forward by R.C. Dutt in his critique of British economic policies, particularly regarding Indian agriculture?

UNIT- III

BalaGangadharTilak – AurobindoGhosh – SubramanyaBharati – M.A.

Jinnah

Objectives

- ❖ Understand the role of Bala Gangadhar Tilak in India's freedom struggle and his advocacy for Swaraj (self-rule).
- ❖ Analyze the political and spiritual contributions of Aurobindo Ghosh to the Indian independence movement and his philosophical ideas.
- ❖ Understand the political journey of M.A. Jinnah from his early involvement in Indian nationalism to his role in the creation of Pakistan.

Bal Gangadhar Tilak

Bal Gangadhar Tilak was one of the most important leaders of the Indian Independence Movement. He is also known as 'Father of Indian Unrest.' This article shares details on the life history of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, his contributions in making India a free country and other related facts.

Bal Gangadhar Tilak's Personal Life

1. Born as Keshav Gangadhar Tilak in 1856 in Ratnagiri, modern-day Maharashtra.

2. Born into a middle-class Hindu family; got a bachelor's degree from Pune.
3. Initially worked as a Maths teacher. Later started working as a journalist and joined the freedom movement.
4. He was one of the founders of the Fergusson College in Pune.
5. He died in 1920 aged 64.

Bal Gangadhar Tilak's Political Life

1. Tilak joined the Congress in 1890.
2. He was opposed to moderate ways and views and had a more radical and aggressive stance against British rule.
3. He was one of the first advocates of Swaraj or self-rule. He gave the slogan, "Swaraj is my birthright and I shall have it." He believed that no progress was possible without self-rule.
4. He was part of the extremist faction of the INC and was a proponent of boycott and Swadeshi movements.
5. He published two papers – Kesari in Marathi and Mahratta in English. He was fearless in his criticism of the government in these papers.
6. He was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment on charges of "incitement to murder". He had written that killers of oppressors could not be blamed, quoting the Bhagavad Gita. After this, two British officials were killed by

two Indians in retaliation to the 'tyrannical' measures taken by the government during the bubonic plague episode in Bombay.

7. Along with Bipin Chandra Pal and Lala Lajpat Rai, he was called the 'Lal-Bal-Pal' trio of extremist leaders.
8. He was tried for sedition several times. He spent 6 years in Mandalay prison from 1908 to 1914 for writing articles defending Prafulla Chaki and Khudiram Bose. They were revolutionaries who had killed two English women, throwing bomb into the carriage carrying the women. Chaki and Bose had mistakenly assumed that Magistrate Douglas Kingsford was in it.
9. Tilak re-joined the INC in 1916, after having split earlier.
10. He was one of the founders of the All India Home Rule League, along with Annie Besant and G S Khaparde.
11. For his political ideals, Tilak drew heavily from the ancient Hindu scriptures.
12. He called for people to be proud of their heritage. He was against the blatant westernisation of society.
13. He transformed the simple Ganesh Puja performed at home into a social and public Ganesh festival.

14. He used the Ganesh Chaturthi and Shiv Jayanti (birth anniversary of Shivaji) festivals to create unity and a national spirit among the people. Unfortunately, this move alienated non-Hindus from him.
15. The Sarvajanik Ganeshotsav as popularised by him since 1894 is still one of the biggest festivals of Maharashtra.

Subramania Bharatiyar

Chinnaswami Subramania Bharatiyar (11 December 1882 – 11 September 1921) was an Indian writer, poet, journalist, Indian independence activist and social reformer from Tamil Nadu, India. Popularly known as "Mahakavi Bharatiyar", he is a pioneer of modern Tamil poetry and is considered one among the greatest of Tamil literary figures of all time. His numerous works were fiery songs kindling patriotism and nationalism during Indian Independence movement. Born in Ettayapuram of the then Tirunelveli district (presently Tuticorin district) in 1882, Subramania Bharati had his early education in Tirunelveli and Benares and worked as a journalist with many newspapers, notable among them being the Swadesamitran and India. Bharati was also an active member of the Indian National Congress. In 1908, an arrest warrant was issued against Bharati by the government of British India for his revolutionary activities forcing him to flee to Pondicherry where he lived until 1918. Bharati's works were on varied themes covering religious, political and social aspects. He was badly affected by the

imprisonments and by 1920, when a General Amnesty Order finally removed restrictions on his movements, Bharati was already struggling. He was struck by an elephant named Lavanya at Parthasarathy temple, Triplicane, Chennai, whom he used to feed regularly. Although he survived the incident, a few months later his health deteriorated and he died on 12 September 1921 early morning around 1 am. Though Bharati was considered a people's poet, a great nationalist, outstanding freedom fighter and social visionary, it was recorded that there were only 14 people to attend his funeral. He delivered his last speech at Karungalpalayam Library in Erode, which was about the topic of Man is Immortal. The last years of his life were spent in a house in Triplicane, Chennai. The house was bought and renovated by the Government of Tamil Nadu in 1993 and named Bharatiyar Illam (Home of Bharatiar). Songs penned by Bharati are widely used in Tamil films and Carnatic Music concerts.

Brief history of the person -personal

He was educated at a local high school called The M.D.T. Hindu College in Tirunelveli. From a very young age he learnt music and at eleven, he learnt poetry. It was during this time that he was conferred the title of "Bharati", the one blessed by Saraswati, the goddess of learning. Bharati lost his mother at the age of five and his father at the age of sixteen. He married Chellama who was seven years old when he was fourteen years old. He was brought up by his father who

wanted him to learn English, excel in arithmetic, and become an engineer. Through his great efforts he learnt 32 languages (29 Indian languages and 3 foreign languages). During his stay in Benaras (also known as Kashi and Varanasi), Bharati was exposed to Hindu spirituality and nationalism. This broadened his outlook and he learned Sanskrit, Hindi and English. In addition, he changed his outward appearance. He also grew a beard and wore a turban. Though he passed an entrance exam for a job, he returned to Ettayapuram during 1901 and started as the court poet of Raja of Ettayapuram for a couple of years. He was a Tamil teacher from August to November 1904 in Sethupathy High School in Madurai. During this period, Bharati understood the need to be well-informed of the world outside and took interest in the world of journalism and the print media of the West. Bharati joined as Assistant Editor of the Swadeshmitran, a Tamil daily in 1904. In December 1905, he attended the All India Congress session held in Benaras. On his journey back home, he met Sister Nivedita, Swami Vivekananda's spiritual heir. She inspired Bharati to recognise the privileges of women and the emancipation of women exercised Bharati's mind. He visualised the new woman as an emanation of Shakti, a willing helpmate of man to build a new earth through co-operative endeavour. He considered Nivedita as his Guru and penned a couple of lyrics praising her. He attended the Indian National Congress session in Calcutta under Dadabai Naoroji, which demanded Swaraj and boycott of British goods. By April 1907,

he started editing the Tamil weekly India and the English newspaper Bala Bharatham with M.P.T. Acharya. These newspapers were also a means of expressing Bharati's creativity, which began to peak during this period. Bharati started to publish his poems regularly in these editions. From hymns to nationalistic writings, from contemplations on the relationship between God and Man to songs on the Russian and French revolutions, Bharati's subjects were diverse. In 1908, Bharati gave evidence in the case which had been instituted by the British against V.O. Chidambaram Pillai. In the same year, the proprietor of the journal India was arrested in Madras. Faced with the prospect of arrest, Bharati escaped to Pondicherry which was under French rule. From there he edited and published the weekly journal India, Vijaya, a Tamil daily, Bala Bharatha, an English monthly, and Suryothayam, a local weekly in Pondicherry. The British tried to suppress Bharati's output by stopping remittances and letters to the papers. Both India and Vijaya were banned in British India in 1909. Bharati assisted Aurobindo in the Arya journal and later Karma Yogi in Pondicherry. This was also the period when he started learning Vedic literature. Three of his greatest works namely, Kuyil Pattu, Panchali Sabatham and Kannan Pattu were composed during 1912. He also translated Vedic hymns, Patanjali's Yoga Sutra and Bhagavat Gita to Tamil. He resumed editing Swadesimeitran from 1920 in Madras (modern day Chennai).

Career in political Bharati participated in the historic Surat Congress in 1907 along with V.O. Chidambaram Pillai and Mandayam Srinivachariar. During that time the divisions deepened within the Indian National Congress between the militant wing led by Tilak and Aurobindo and the moderate wing. Bharati supported Tilak and Aurobindo together with V. O. Chidambaram Pillai and Kanchi Varathaachariyar. Tilak openly supported armed resistance against the British. During Bharati's exile, he had the opportunity to meet many other leaders of the revolutionary wing of the Independence movement like Aurobindo, Lajpat Rai and V.V.S. Aiyar, who had also sought asylum under the French. When Bharati entered British India near Cuddalore in November 1918 and was promptly arrested. He was imprisoned in the Central prison in Cuddalore in custody for three weeks from 20 November to 14 December and was released after the intervention of Annie Besant and C.P. Ramaswamy Aiyar. He was stricken by poverty during this period, resulting in his ill health. The following year, 1919, Bharati met Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. Bharati and the Mahatma met once; it was an exceptional and memorable incident. Gandhiji visited Chennai and stayed in Rajaji's house to discuss the Rowlett Committee's Report.

Critical moments of independence, struggle,

. Though Bharathi died so young, he cannot be reckoned with Chatterton and Keats among the inheritors of 'unfulfilled renown'. His was a name to conjure with, at any rate in South India, while he was still alive. But his fame was not so

much as a poet as of a patriot and a writer of patriotic songs. His loudly expressed admiration for Tilak, his fiery denunciations in the Swadeshamitran, and the fact that he had to seek refuge in French territory to escape the probing attentions of the Government of Madras, made him a hero and a 'freedom fighter'. His lilting songs were on numerous lips, and no procession or public meeting in a Tamil district in the days of 'non-cooperation' could begin, carry on or end without singing a few of them... Bharathi's love of Tamil, both the language as it was in his own day and the rich literature left as a heritage, was no less than his love of India.

Principles & Practices Bharatiyar was considered the first to have advocated and campaigned for women's participation in politics. He advocated greater rights for women and their education. He visualised a modern Indian woman at the vanguard of society. He condemned the Shashtras, the procedures formulated by some orthodox Hindus and weren't held as holy by most Hindus, that suppressed women's rights. Most of his views are considered contemporary even in modern times. Bharathi was a Hindu. But his spirituality was not limited. He sang to the Hindu deities, and at the same time he wrote songs of devotion to Jesus Christ and Allah. Bharati also fought against the caste system in Hindu society. Although born into an orthodox Brahmin family, he gave up his own caste identity. He considered all living beings as equal and to illustrate this he even performed upanayanam to a young Harijan man and made him a Brahmin. He also scorned

the divisive tendencies being imparted into the younger generations by their elderly tutors during his time. He openly criticised the preachers for mixing their individual thoughts while teaching the Vedas and the Gita. He strongly advocated bringing the Harijans to the Hindu mainstream.

Awards and achievements

At the age of eleven he composed poems on lines given by various Tamil scholars in an assembly of learned men, he was then awarded the title of 'Bharati' by the admiring scholars. He contributed tremendously to the political emancipation of India, social reformation of the community and literary rejuvenation of Thamizh. Bharathiyar did appear to have had the vision of a prophet, the religious equanimity of a saint, the dreams of a patriot and the noble aspirations of a social reformer. Most of his predictions regarding his country and community and all his warnings regarding the malaise afflicting his society have materialized already. Bharati is considered the initiator of modern Tamil literature. Bharati used simple words and rhythms, unlike his previous century works in Tamil, which had complex vocabulary. He also employed novel ideas and techniques in his devotional poems. He used a metre called Nondi Chindu in most of his works, which was earlier used by Gopalakrishna Bharathiya. Bharati's poetry expressed a progressive, reformist ideal. His imagery and the vigour of his verse were a forerunner to modern Tamil poetry in different aspects. He was the forerunner of a forceful kind of poetry that combined classical and contemporary

elements. Under the guidance of Bharathiyar and others, Thamizh literature has served as a tool to mobilize our energy to achieve political freedom.

Literary Works

His insightful similies have been read by millions of Tamil readers. He was well-versed in various languages and translated speeches of Indian National reform leaders like Aurabindo, Bala Gangadar Tilak and Swami Vivekananda. He had a prodigious output penning thousands of verses on diverse topics like Indian Nationalism, love songs, children's songs, songs of nature, glory of the Tamil language, and odes to prominent freedom fighters of India like Tilak, Gandhi and Lajpat Rai. He even penned an ode to New Russia and Belgium. Bharathiyar's literary works include nationalistic poems, prayer songs, philosophical poems, didactic songs and minor poems related to social issues. His didactic poems are Murasu , Puthiya Atthichudi and Pappa Pattu . He was the originator of the short and crisp style of poems which has now become very popular.

Self Assessment Questions

1. How did Bala Gangadhar Tilak's concept of Swaraj shape the Indian freedom struggle, and what were his key contributions?
2. What were the major contributions of Aurobindo Ghosh to both the political and spiritual spheres of India's nationalist movement?
3. In what ways did Subramanya Bharati's poetry and writings inspire the masses and contribute to the growth of Indian nationalism?

UN

Social Thinkers: Jyothi Rao Phule -Periyar E.V. Ramasamy- B.R. Ambedkar ,
Ayothi Das Pandithar — M.N. Roy

Objectives

1. **Understand the contributions of Jyothi Rao Phule** to social reform, particularly his work for the upliftment of lower castes and women's education.
2. **Analyze the contributions of B.R. Ambedkar** to the fight for Dalit rights, social justice, and his role in drafting the Indian Constitution.
3. **Understand Ayothi Das Pandithar's efforts** in promoting the rights of the oppressed and his contributions to Tamil Buddhism and social equality.

Jyotirao Phule

Jyotirao Phule (born April 11, 1827, Bombay Presidency [now Maharashtra], India—died November 28, 1890, Pune) was an Indian social reformer, writer, and champion of equality for all people, including poor labourers and women. He was a strong critic of the Hindu caste system, a means by which people are differentiated and ranked according to the social group into which they are born.

Phule deplored the discrimination experienced by those placed at the bottom of the caste system, including the Shudras (artisans and labourers) and the groups today called Scheduled Castes, or Dalits. He led a movement in India that called for the creation of a new social order in which no one would be subordinate to the upper-caste Brahmans. Phule also fought for women's rights. Believing that education was essential to bringing about social change, he established schools for girls and for children of lower castes.

Early life

Jyotirao Govindrao Phule was born in what is now western Maharashtra state, though the exact place is not definitively known: it was either in or near Pune or in the nearby Satara district. His name is often rendered in Latin script in a variety of forms: Jyotibha Phule, Jotiba Phule, Jyotirao Phule, Jotirao Phule; Govindrao is also sometimes rendered as Govind. His family worked as fruit and vegetable farmers. They belonged to the Mali caste within the Shudra social class, which is the lowest of India's traditional social classes.

Phule was a talented student as a child, but it was uncommon for Mali children to pursue higher education. Like many other children from Mali families, he stopped his studies at an early age and began to work on the family's farm. One of Phule's neighbours helped persuade his father to send his son to school. In the 1840s Phule attended a secondary school run by Scottish Christian missionaries at Pune. Phule was inspired by historical movements and thinkers he learned about there, among them Thomas Paine and his *Rights of Man* (1791). He was also inspired by movements for independence and against slavery in America as well as the works and teachings of the Buddha and the mystic and poet Kabir.

Equality through education

In 1848 Phule was invited to attend the wedding of a friend from an upper-caste Brahman family. Relatives of the bridegroom reportedly mocked Phule for his lower-caste background, prompting him to leave the ceremony. This incident is said to have helped open his eyes to the injustices of the caste system, which he argued was an alien system introduced to India by foreign powers. He opened a pioneering school for lower-caste girls in Pune in 1848, a time when it was extremely rare for any girls in India to receive an education. He had educated his wife, Savitribai Phule, at home, and she became the teacher of the girls' school. Over the next few years, the Phules opened more schools for girls and a school for

people of lower castes, especially the Mahars and Mangs. The Phules' work met with significant hostility from orthodox Brahmins, who blamed them for disrupting the social status quo. Nevertheless, Phule and his wife continued their work toward socioeconomic and gender equality.

Phule opposed child marriage, and he supported the right of widows to remarry, which was rejected particularly by high-caste Hindus. He opened a home for widows, especially Brahmins, who had become pregnant as well as an orphanage for their children. Phule and his wife later adopted one of these children.

In 1873 Phule founded a reform society called Satyashodhak Samaj ("Society of Truth Seekers") to promote social equality, unite and uplift Shudras and other lower-caste people, and reverse the socioeconomic inequality caused by the caste system. The society also emphasized the importance of education and encouraged people to conduct weddings without Brahmin priests. Phule made clear that anyone was welcome to join Satyashodhak Samaj, regardless of social class. One of Phule's primary intentions was to unite people who had a shared experience of oppression within the Brahmin-dominated caste system. Satyashodhak Samaj predominantly consisted of people from non-Brahmin castes, but members did include Brahmins as well as people from various religious traditions. Phule also opened his personal water well for all people to use, which symbolized his welcoming attitude, and he invited people from all social classes into his home.

To publicize his ideas, Phule wrote books, essays, poems, and plays. His best-known work is the book *Gulamagiri (Slavery)*, published in 1873. An attack on India's caste system, it compares the position of members of the lower castes to that of enslaved people in the United States.

Death and legacy

In 1888 Phule was given the title Mahatma, which means “Great Soul” in Sanskrit. He suffered a stroke that same year that left him paralyzed. He died in 1890 in Pune.

Phule’s work and writings inspired later movements for caste reform in India, including that of Dalit leader Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar, and ongoing efforts to eliminate the discriminatory effects of the caste system in India represent his legacy today.

Periyar

Erode Venkatanaicker Ramasamy (1879–1973), better known as Periyar (The Great Man) has a complex legacy. He began as a nationalist, worked as a follower of Gandhi, but turned into a firebrand leader of the anti-Brahminism movement in Madras Presidency. He saw the salvation of the country in the destruction of the Congress, the Hindu religion, and Brahmin domination. He declared the goal of the Dravida Kazhaghham, the new avatar of the Justice Party in 1944 to be a ‘sovereign, independent Dravidian Republic’ and called upon his followers to observe Independence Day as a day of mourning representing the enslavement of the southerners’. Meanwhile, he saw himself as a social reformer and then as a Communist and again as a social reformer. Even in his call for social justice, we find a juxtaposition of race, varna, caste, class, gender, language, urban-rural divide and Tamil nationalism. On the one side of the divide of inequity, he places the Brahmins, the descendants of northern Aryans and, on the other, the Dravidian shudras. However, underlying his untiring campaigns spanning from 1917 to 1973 is a passionate advocacy of human dignity and in this lies his lasting contribution

Even in more concrete terms, Periyar's accomplishments are phenomenal. His movement indeed led to the end of Brahmin hegemony in Tamil politics and social life. His mission helped in spreading the message of egalitarianism and scientific temper. Elimination of caste-based social segregation and discriminations, improvement in the condition of women, right of temple entry and management to non-Brahmins, prevention of supremacy of Hindi over Tamil and obtaining Tamil as official language thereby enhancing its status and contributing to its growth, reservations for backward castes in government jobs, which entailed the first amendment in the Indian Constitution, and the emergence of a new leadership in Tamil Nadu from backward castes are solid instances of his revolutionary legacy which are too visible to be ignored.

Situating Periyar

Understanding Periyar must begin with understanding the person. He was born in a rich business family of the backward caste of Naickers in Erode, a town in the former Madras Presidency (Now Tamil Nadu). He studied only up to the fourth standard and as a young man left home to tour the nation. He even lived the life of an ascetic in Benares. It was here that he learnt the deceptions spread in the name of religion. Back home, he reflected his proficiency in business and became active in public activities. He was the Chairman of the Erode Municipality and an honorary magistrate. He held numerous positions of social importance. He joined the Indian National Congress in 1919 and became a staunch Gandhian. He held the positions of the Secretary and President of the Tamil Nadu Congress Committee. In each of his positions, he always strove for social justice, and 'service' was his sole motto. In 1924, he led the famous Vaikom Satyagraha in Kerala. The Ezhavas were not allowed to enter the streets around the Vaikom temple because of their 'low birth'. He faced imprisonment but he ultimately succeeded in his satyagraha and was declared the hero of Vaikom. Though he worked in the Congress in an important capacity, he faced caste prejudices within

the organisation. He tasted the prejudices in the party first-hand when he was elected the first non-Brahmin President of the Tamil Nadu Congress party. No sooner was the result declared, than a no-confidence motion was brought in on absurd grounds. It was nonetheless defeated. In 1925, when his resolution for the 'communal representation' at the Kancheepuram Congress, which he had been trying to get the party to accept for six years, was disallowed in the open session, he left the Congress once and for all, declaring it as the fortress of Brahmin imperialism.

Thereafter, he associated himself with the Justice Party which he headed in 1938. Six years later, he converted it into the non-political social outfit Dravidar Kazhagam. The original formation has now been sidelined and its offshoots—the DMK, AIADMK, and MDMK—dominate the politics of Tamil Nadu today. Meanwhile, he launched the Self-Respect Movement committed to social reform and social upliftment. The first Self-Respect Movement was held at Chengalpattu in February 1929. In 1932, Periyar travelled extensively within the Soviet Union and was very much impressed by the rationalistic anti-religious egalitarian social order and scientific, technological, and economic advancements therein. After his return from his prolonged exposure to Communism, he started the Self-Respect Communist Party as a political offshoot of the movement. He was imprisoned and the party was later banned. He was warned that if he did not stop working for the Communist Party, all his activities would be banned. He gave up his communist activities to be able to continue with the Self Respect Movement but his ideas carried their influence.

Periyar cannot be understood without referring to the colonial context. The colonization of India exposed her to the renascent spirit of Europe. For a civilization, ancient but moribund, the encounter was overwhelming. The vigour of their overseas rulers and their modern ways were eyeopeners for the enlightened Indians of the early colonial phase. The Indians who regarded

themselves as proud descendants of an ancient civilization were not to submit to the cultural supremacy of the West. Instead, they raised serious concerns about the state of their own culture and civilization. Many rose to the occasion to redeem what they considered as the lost glory of their ancient civilization. The great project endeavoured to entwine the essence of modernity with what they considered good in Indian traditions. In fact traditions were tested on the bases of rationalism and humanism—the twin interdependent fundamentals of modernity. Their endeavours and the accomplishments are known as the Indian Renaissance. The next stage was the propagation of Indian nationhood. The phenomenon of nation, like modernity and related to it, emerged in Europe. It was essentially an ethno-militaristic phenomenon which substituted religion to a great extent in the new rationalist world view of Europe. The phenomenon seeped into colonies too through the empires. In India, the concept of nationhood was also combined with the civilizational mission of self-redemption and with the passage of time a new nation was born but with an ancient spirit.

Renaissance and nation in the beginning were upper caste elitist projects. Nationalism which germinated in the course of the reformist spell of colonial India later subsumed the reform process and also spread to the emerging and expanding middle and lower middle classes. But its appeal was not universal. Civilizational redemption carried hardly any meaning to the vast majority of the population of this land. Imperial exploitation, oppression, humiliation and national pride mattered little to those, who led even otherwise, lives of gross degradation and deprivation. Nonetheless, the philosophical foundations of these projects, i.e., rationalism and humanism raised concerns which though not addressed by these projects did awaken people of even those sections who had suffered a dehumanised existence for centuries. The essence of this awakening was the worth and dignity of human beings as such. For many the struggle for

dignity and liberty became, and very legitimately so, more important as a social struggle than the anti-imperial struggle.

Periyar was certainly one of the greatest champions who raised the issue of this fundamental freedom. The problem of colonial subjugation was secondary for most Indians who were at the lower rung of the hierarchical caste order of India. The exploitation and oppression perpetrated by the ancient social regimen was immediate and an excruciatingly painful experience. Large numbers faced a scriptural or religious sort of apartheid. Periyar himself faced such caste prejudices despite being an influential Congress leader of the South. Despite the fact that he belonged to a wealthy family, he established himself as a great social and religious reformer and was a very important Congress leader. Yet, he could not avoid being treated as one whose presence or contact was considered polluting or defiling. And he found every move for the empowerment of the depressed castes blocked by a very active and powerful lobby of Brahmins.

In this mission, he did not appeal in the name of God, as has been the practice among most of the great leaders of the world, rather he dismissed the concept of God in the most forthright manner. Neither did he exhort the people in the name of some other lofty ideals. He relied mostly on the faculty of reason possessed by everyone and for this he indulged himself till his last in arguments with people, provoking them to come out of their stupor not only by his words but also with his deeds. He is rightfully addressed as the Socrates of East, as his ways bear a striking resemblance to Socrates.

He was also very impressed by the achievements of the West. He keenly observed that their advances in science and technology had made them the masters of the world and freed them of many of the miseries inflicted by nature. He found their rational orientation, instilled in them by their schooling system, the reason behind their advancement. The western philosophical traditions starting with Socrates and passing through Ingersoll, Broadlaw and Herbert Spencer had

strengthened his conviction and even Indian rationalist traditions propagated by such greats like Gautama Buddha and Thiruvalluvar had inspired him and he took on the mantle of completing their unfinished task. His contemporary, Jawaharlal Nehru, who was also an unwavering rationalist, also won his admiration.

Another very powerful phenomenon of his times, Communism, also affected his thinking profoundly. He was very impressed by the rationalistic and anti-religious approach of the movement and the economic development with egalitarianism achieved in the Soviet Union

Periyar's Theorization

Periyar was a rationalist with all his being and objectivity was his avowed means of analysis. Though his tools were scientific and universalistic, his concerns related to his milieu. He was deeply anguished by an imposed and historically institutionalised order of Brahminic hegemony in the name of religion, caste and spirituality which dehumanised the overwhelming majority of Dravidian peoples in the South. He took upon himself the mantle of undoing injustices and laying the foundation of a fair and egalitarian society. But it was a complicated mission. The fight was against something which was internalised and accepted by the suffering people as natural. The battle lines he drew and the wars he fought were more within the minds of the individuals and their collective consciousness. He was perturbed by the miserable existence of the Dravidians in southern India, particularly in Tamil Nadu. He fought for their emancipation but his ideas indeed have wider applications as well implications.

Rationalism, the very basis of Periyar's principles, was however not impersonal. His appeal for social justice was based on concrete rationalism but as it had to be a missionary campaign in order to defeat deep-rooted injustices perpetrated by a deeply entrenched caste which derived sanctity from a fossilised religion, his approach to the issue was very personal. The war he waged was not abstract. It was direct and very personal. He proclaimed:

E.V. Ramasamy, have taken upon myself the mission of making the Dravidian society acquire awareness and become a society of dignity like the societies elsewhere in the world.

I consider myself qualified enough to carry on the mission insofar as I am attached to nothing else, perceive concepts and devise schemes on the basis of rationalism. I consider that by itself it is enough for anyone who takes up a social mission.

He also personified the ideas he professed. For instance, he propagated atheism to be a great personal virtue. 'If one professes that there is no God, he should then have godly attributes about himself. ... he should be aware of the causes behind the phenomenal realities of the world? ..., to whom is there no God? There is no God to the truly enlightened. He should have the end of all philosophy. No one would be prejudiced against such an enlightened man. He would also not hate anyone. Anyone who hates him is an idiot.' And he demanded that a true atheist should not be hated; he is to be appreciated and followed.

Generally, normative theorizations seek an axiomatic proposition to be developed into a system of thought in a geometrical fashion. This fundamental proposition is either deductive or inductive. Related to this is another aspect of such theorization that is related to the position of the theorist. There are armchair theoreticians who construct societies in their imagination only, which have little to do with real societies and real peoples. Periyar was not an armchair theorist, who conjectured new worlds in his/ her (logical) imagination. He derived his ideas from practice. What he believed in he practiced and what he practiced he believed. He reached his rationalist worldview without taking any recourse to books or research. He derived his principles from observing life. At the other end, there are practitioner-theoreticians who are so obsessive about their immediate surroundings that their visions do not go beyond the immediate. Periyar's ideas were indeed derived from experiences - experiences of a very active and effective

political leader and social reformer. But his derivations were based on objectivity. He surmounted the follies of both science and activism with considerable success.

Many positivists were also prophets of utopia. Periyar was free from this predilection of scholarship too. He did not provide any visions of utopia. His message was hard-hitting and realistic. He did believe in Communism. But his notion of Communism was rooted solidly in the ground and deeply imbedded in the specificities of the Tamil land. What he wanted from people was very simple—redemption of their humanity. The idea was crystal clear. There was no intimidating philosophy, confusing mystical discourse, jargonised theory building or a goal of an unattainable utopia. The clarity of Periyar's objective made it sound very simple but its actualisation was a process of colossal magnitude. The mission had to confront millennia of misgivings, prejudices and practices. Nonetheless the magnitude of the mission was well matched by his untiring vigour, immense courage and unwavering conviction.

There are rare combinations of activism and scholarship which go beyond the ephemeral and the immediate. Periyar belonged to that genre of activist-philosophers. Besides, clarity of thought, commitment to objective and making rationality an article of faith and basis of his messianic appeal make him stand out even in that rare genre of activist-philosophers.

Abolition of Caste

The fundamental problem confronting Periyar was thus the denial of basic dignity to the large majority of humanity around him. And basic to his philosophy was the view that all men and women should live with dignity and have equal opportunities to develop their physical, mental and moral faculties. In order to achieve this, he wanted to put an end to all kinds of unjust discriminations and promote social justice and a rational outlook. The problem was not related to outright physical subjugation but to an order of oppression garbed in spirituality and religiosity. The order he sought to encounter was Brahminism. This holistic

order entailed a hierarchical social system, in which economic vocation, social relations and a number of privileges and restrictions were associated with castes located in that hierarchy. The worst aspect of this order was the practice of pollution and purity which were so extreme that even the sight and shadows of the outcastes, the lowest in the social order, were considered polluting. In this order, the Brahmins occupied the highest position, were considered the purest, and commanded a supreme position not only ritually but in every respect. Ironically all castes were graded superior or inferior in relation to each other except the Brahmin sitting at the top of the heap. And this order as such was sanctified as a divine creation.

Periyar himself, though a wealthy man, a man of influence as he worked for the Congress as a leader, suffered humiliation because of his caste even within the set up of that national organisation, the greatest platform of the national movement. He was treated as a being that defiled his surrounding by his presence and the articles he used. Casteism flourished not only in traditional social set-ups and upcoming political organisations but also in factories and trade unions. Even the progressive Marxists were not able to address this deeper malaise of Indian social relations. He fought these discriminations by exposing the conceptual hollowness and deception behind them and by making the fight his personal mission. He asked, ‘A sizable population today remains as untouchables, and another sizable population exists in the name of shudras and the serfs, coolies and menials. Who wants an independence that cannot help change these things? Who wants religion, scriptures and god, which cannot bring about a change in this sphere?’.

The fundamental problem had its ramifications — the moral and material backwardness, social schisms, and mutual hatred among people, which made society weak and caused untold miseries. He theorised that the main reason behind social malaises was casteism, which was imposed on the people of the

South by the Aryans for their own benefit. The people were naïve, did not realise the deception of the Aryans and became victims of their divisive designs and domination. The system was sanctified by the basic Aryan scriptures—the Vedas. The principle was the Varnashrama Dharma. According to this the society was divided into four Varnas, viz. Brahmins, Kshatriya, Vaishya, and Shudra and were assigned specific social functions. Brahmins, the offspring of the Aryans, became the self appointed legislators of Indian society. They wrote the Vedas, in fact, for their own benefit and declared them to be the words of God. This was a ploy to avoid comprehension of the truth based on reason, reality, experiences and experiments. They forbade inquiry, and spread the canard of sin and hell to frighten people into subjugation. The Brahmins assigned a superior position to themselves in this order; the other Varnas were extended a hierarchical division among themselves. There emerged castes within Varnas with the distinctions of superiority and inferiority. In this arrangement the society got irresolutely divided. The root of this division was Brahmin supremacy and Periyar decided to eliminate this supremacy.

Periyar made it sufficiently clear that he was against Brahminism and not the Brahmins. To him, Brahminism was the basis of the caste system which justified social inequality, untouchability and many other problems. His prime goal was the elimination of the caste system which he found against the principles of human civilization and self respect. It did all these things on the basis of divine ordination. He raised the fundamental issues of human dignity in a rational manner to counter these social evils. His exhortations were straight and hard-hitting.

A bunch of rascals have enslaved us. They have imposed upon us a certain system that brands us their slaves.

Your very birth is ignoble of course. The reason for that is ignoble about you is that you have accepted the status of the shudra. At least hereafter, you

should feel ashamed of it. It is not harmful to die for the sake of undoing the name of shudras instead of procreating in the name of the shudras.

How long hence are we going to remain shudras in this world? How long are we going to allow our children to be called the shudras? Aren't we supposed to do something to eradicate the dishonour and become human at least during this age of freedom and scientific temper?.

When stained with the excreta of a man or an animal we wash our hands with water. However, they insist upon taking a bath if they came into contact with the body of a person or even if the dress of a man brushes against them. Is there anything human about such human beings?.

They lead the cow; take dung and the urine of cows to sanctify the temple. But if a man enters the same temple, they consider the temple to have been defiled and arrange for sanctification. Are they reasonable men?.

We should eradicate casteism in the name of the Brahmin and the pariah getting rid of God, getting rid of all the scriptures.

He also attacked the caste distinctions among non-Brahmins using only logic to prove his point. 'Though each caste ascribes superiority to itself on solid bases, all their arguments only serve to show that all of them together are inferior to the Brahmins. Otherwise, all the evidences they cite do not serve any intended purpose. This is the picture of reality as such.' This, according to him, meant that people of castes other than the Brahmins belonged to inferior castes, and were untouchables. This deprived them of certain civil rights on par with the Brahmins and made them slaves to the Brahmins. According to Periyar, this discrimination meant that the birth of persons of other castes lacked honour since it may be the result of prostitution or cross-caste union. And he gave the clarion call to do or die.

The untouchable should not go within the sight of the Brahmins. He should not walk about the streets. He should not take water from the pond.

What social justice is there in such restrictions? If God does not bring destruction on such a society, how could he be merciful? For how long do you desire such oppressed, suppressed society to be patient, non-violent and passive? It is better to die fighting such social evils rather than live in a society that is the scene of such inhuman acts and attitudes.

His approach was to tackle the root of the social problems. For untouchability, the worst form of human degradation, he analysed the evil and traced its origin. Untouchability, he found, was based on religion and religion found its base in scriptures which again claimed to be the words of God. Attacking the very root of human degradation, he rejected the trio of God, scriptures and religion in totality. Periyar did not stand for cosmetic changes. For instance he did not advocate equality of castes in jobs or in social positions as the only solution to caste discrimination. He sought a complete normative and physical transformation to root out caste based discrimination.

Women's Liberation

Caste was not his sole concern. Among the many issues he touched upon, gender was a major one. For the subjugation of women, he said, they themselves were responsible as they did not feel that they deserved total freedom. And they did not suffer alone from their own bondage. Men lost their honesty and freedom too, since they had families dependent on them. They had to assume unnecessary responsibility and suffer needless anxieties. But men didn't see reason. They had enslaved women, devised concepts like chastity and categorised women who were 'unchaste' as prostitutes but they themselves did not observe such norms with respect to conjugal conduct. Whatever and wherever women were, they were monitored by men. Only when a woman was able to attend to the business of her life independent of a husband or a son could they attain the position they deserved.

In fact his approach towards women's issues was quite gendered as he viewed the problem as a separate one. His depiction of the state of women made it clear that women's liberation was independent of the larger plans of liberation.

The way man treats women is much worse than the way landlords treat servants and the high-caste treat the low-caste ... Women in India experience worse suffering, humiliation and slavery in all spheres than even the Untouchables ... A woman is for the male, a cook for himself; a maid for his house; a breeding farm for his family and beautifully decorated doll to satisfy his aesthetic sense. Do enquire whether they have been used for any other purpose. The slavery of women is only because of men. The belief of men that God created man with superior powers and woman to be slave for him, and woman's traditional acceptance of it as truth are alone responsible for the growth of women's slavery.

Women were denied education so that they did not have the ability and intelligence to question their slavery. However, the most important factor for women's subjugation, Periyar held, was that they lacked the right to property. In fact men treated women as their property. It was for this purpose that they devised the principle of chastity exclusively for women.

Qualities like freedom and courage were claimed as 'masculine' thus characterising male superiority as a natural phenomenon. Women would never be free unless they put an end to male domination and they could not depend on men for the same. 'The pretence of men that they respect women and that they strive for their freedom is only a ruse to deceive women. Have you ever seen anywhere a jackal freeing the hen and the lamb or the cat freeing the rats, or capitalists freeing the workers?.'

Women must get rid of their slavish mentality and they should realise that being civilised was not about dressing fashionably or looking good but living on equal terms with men. He sought rigorous education in rational thinking for

women, changes in the custom of marriage and birth control for the sake of women's liberation. He considered the terms, 'husband' and 'wife' inappropriate and called them companions and partners. He also rejected the words, 'wedding' or 'marriage' and termed it as a 'contract for companionship in life.'

Rural–Urban Divide

Periyar's propagation of social justice touched another inequity plaguing India—the urban-rural divide, or what is often today referred to as the divide between India and Bharat. The fact is that economic relations between town and country dwellers are based on unequal exchanges and while villagers do back-breaking labour and survive on the bare minimum, the city dwellers exploit their produce. Periyar equated the status of villagers to that of the Panchamas (untouchables) in the Varnasharama (caste) system, wherein the high castes flourished by exploiting the toiling low caste people. The notion that shudras (backward Dravidians) and the Panchamas were created to serve the high caste Brahmins was applicable to villagers too as it was believed that villages existed to serve towns. He in fact advocated that villages should be eliminated and even the word 'village' deleted from dictionaries. Villages, bereft of bare amenities like hospitals, school and parks where ninety per cent of people resided, were hardly places worth living. All the schemes for village development were mere hogwash.

The way out was complete urbanization. He sought newer methods in industry and reorganization of agriculture and total mechanization of all feasible agricultural activities. He wanted the farmers to be brought under co-operative bodies so that the produce could be shared equally by all of them. Villages must be linked together and developed as towns with schools, hospitals, parks, cinema theatres, drama halls, recreation centres, libraries etc. and there should be a magistrate and market for securing all commodities. He also stated that agriculture should be supplanted by smallscale industries located in the vicinity of such clusters.

Rationalism

The root cause of this human bondage and suffering, he found, was the lack of a rational outlook among the people. 'The reason for the present chaos and deterioration in our country is that we have been hindered from enquiry and repressed from the use of rationality.' The Tamilian outlook was largely based on their perceived ancient wisdom. They assumed that they should be what they were two thousand years before. They rationalised their actions on incomprehensible bases. They justified their acts in the name of Gods, writings in scriptures and sayings of sages. This was unlike the West where people were marching ahead, exploring new frontiers of knowledge, inventing new technologies. Their progress was based on their future-oriented rationalist approach. He differentiated scientific approach from the traditional belief systems. His one such illustration made his point clear. He said that Gods, religions, preachers and scriptures all for instance told people that an act of kindness to the poor guaranteed a place in heaven, whereas modern science would work for finding the causes of poverty and try to eliminate it. Here he found, that in the name of scholarship the same old ideas were reiterated. The mode of education was such that it forbade new thinking and forced the learner to accept the old uncritically. In the end this kind of education blunted the faculty of reasoning among people here.

Periyar asked people not to accept anything without ratiocination. One should not accept anything only because it is old, customary, habitual, generally accepted, based on hearsay, appeared mysterious, magical or divine, spoken by some saint, or claimed to be said by God. The distinctive aspect of a human being was reason and she/he must apply his/her this faculty in order to lead a life which could be called proper. In this process, he made rejection of God the fundamental application of rationalism. He said, 'I have examined thoughts fibre by fibre, maintaining the attitude of a dispassionate enquirer into Truth. I could not achieve any perspective of God.' He found that the concept of God drained energy out of

Indians. He was very particular about not accepting anything on hearsay without applying one's own reason, which, he maintained, resulted in disappointment and misery. He said, 'God has never revealed himself to anyone. God is only taught and projected to the uninitiated by those who claim enlightenment.' He conjectured that worship in the old human societies as well as the modern ones had its origin from fear and dread of the unknown natural phenomena. He believed that a rational approach was the key for social emancipation and crucial for development. He surmised that economic development was possible only through rationalistic thinking.

Periyar started the Self-Respect Movement with the objective of guiding people to redeem their deserved place in society. Periyar stated, 'The aim of a genuine Self-Respect Movement is to change whatever appears to be adverse to man's feelings of self-respect. That which enslaves you to customs of the world, to orthodoxy, to the rigours of religion, contrary to your rationality and awareness of truths of experience, is what I shall describe as antagonistic to self-respect. This all-important awareness of self respect based on feelings of dignity and indignity, may be deemed man's birth right, as the word 'man' is itself a word based on dignity. Therefore, he who is called 'man' embodies dignity in himself, and only through his right to this dignity, reveals his human qualities. That is why self-esteem is his birth-right. Man must cast aside his feelings of inferiority, the feeling that he is less important than other beings, and attain self-confidence and self-respect, it will automatically set right politics, nationalism and also theology.' The Self-Respect Movement was aimed at eradication of caste based discrimination. The objectives of the movement were the establishment of a casteless society based on complete equality of the masses, eradication of all social evils and freeing society from the shackles of superstition and blind faith in God and religion, promotion of educational and employment opportunities for women, popularization of self-respect marriages conducted without any Brahmin

priest and propagation of rationalism. Conceptually self-respect was the basis for ensuring equality in society. He wished every non-Brahmin to realise that they had their own self-respect to maintain in all their dealings with their fellow-beings. If a man realised that he was equal to all other men and that he had the right of equality with all other men, then he became a self-respecting person. He also wished women to have this self-respect.

Revolution and Communism

Another aspect of Periyar's thought was his belief in Communism. He exhorted people to be unafraid of revolution and ready themselves for the next change. He said that revolutionary changes in the affairs of men had been a continuous process since time immemorial. He cited numerous contemporary changes. He cited the abolition of a large number of kingships, which were treated as divine institutions earlier and people feared speaking ill of kings. Similarly in India some people were regarded as agents of God on earth and certain others not fit to be seen or even touched. The disappearance of untouchability indeed brought about a revolutionary change in society. Holy books also ordained girls to be married before puberty banning child marriage legally was also a social revolution. This was also a religious revolution in that the gods of the puranas (mythologies) had become the laughing stock of the people and so did the religion propagating them. He moved to exhort people for the final stage of change.

'Because of these revolutions in man's ideas and attitudes, we have come to question about the need for kings, priests, castes, religions and Gods as well. The present century has taken on a more revolutionary cry. People are now questioning the very existence of rich people, capitalists and tilted barons. Why should these people exist? We are trying to see how far these parasites are responsible for the misery of the proletariat - the poor of our land.

He, however, adapted the ideology to his own vision and mission. He merged the Self-Respect Movement with Communism and founded the Self

Respect Communist Party. The action plan of the Party included the nationalization of all industries, railway, banks, waterways, all agricultural lands, forests, botanical wealth, community farming, writing off all debts of peasants, limiting the working hours to eight hours, enhancing the wages and improving working conditions, and providing amenities like access to libraries. He later disbanded the party in favour of the Self-Respect Movement but his ideas remained influenced by Communism. He iterated that God, religion and law support the prevalence of the distinction between the rich and the poor, the existence of caste hierarchy and the cruelty of supremacy and servility. Periyar vowed to destroy the government, justice, morality and customs that permitted them. Periyar explained the Dravidar Kazhagam was an institution of the workers. Every Dravidian to him was a worker because they worked for the others and had been through the ages, servants as per the scriptures of Manu. All men, whether a cart man, scavenger, street cleaner, washer man, barber, potter, tiller, carpenter, cobbler, weaver or anyone who lived by the dint of manual labour were workers for him. The Brahmins and caste Hindus were not labourers as they did not do any manual labour. Only the shudras did and they were the Dravidians. The movement of the Dravidians was therefore the movement of the workers.

He offered an economic explanation for women's subjugation. It was with the advent of private property that the concept of marriage came into existence. Private property created the problem of its inheritance. Men would have thought of bequeathing his property to his own progeny alone which necessitated marriage.

Periyar believed that only if women, workers and agricultural labourers all joined in the revolution could there be communist government in India. He however sought the revolution by revolutionising the thinking habits of people. He said that the end of right to property would be the end of God. There would be no place for God, religion, or scriptures in a nation of socialism where property

rights did not exist. Intellectual ability assumed the position of prominence in such a nation. There was neither superior nor inferior and no professional hierarchy. All individuals were equal and paid the same wages. The nature of work done alone was different and whoever assumed a higher office assumed greater responsibilities.

He believed that Communism would hold the whole world in its grip ensuring international peace and prosperity. To him, Communism's objective was making a family, a fraternity of all people of all nations in the world. The wealth of the whole world would be the common property of all in the family. Every member of the family would be equal partner in the larger family.

Periyar also championed a socialist agenda. The resolution adopted in the Eighteenth State Conference of the Dravidar Kazhagam in December 1948 at Thuthukkuti called for the nationalization of all service industries like the generation of electricity, mines, transport, airways and waterways which were essential to the welfare of the common man; fixing ceilings on property holding in the form of lands, houses and cash as the first step in the process of promoting a socialist state and reducing the wages of the higher income group at the same time increasing the minimum wages to the workers in India.

The World of the Future

Periyar did have a vision for the future. He said that a rationalist deduced from the past, examined the present and constructed the future on a scientific basis. Nature had provisioned for people in plenty and in modern times mass production had resulted in a glut in markets and yet millions of people did not have the means to meet their basic needs. Periyar ruled that though many extraordinary men had claimed to have realised God and were even associated with godhood, none of them could find any solution for the miseries of the people. It was only because people were unable to dissociate themselves from God and religion and see the affairs of the world independently. With rationalist thought

and science, the future world would be reshaped. The future was a socialist world in which there would be no private property. In the future plutocrats would not be there to dominated the people; technology would free people from the drudgeries of hard labour and demeaning jobs (like scavenging), slavery would be unknown, one would not live on the mercy of another and women would not want special protection, safeguards and support. With only an hour or two of work, it would be possible for the people to produce the goods they need. The rest of the time would be available for leisure to indulge in fine arts or simple pleasures. Communal life would have reached such heights that the pains and trials of some citizens would be the pains and trials of the whole community. Co-operative effort and unitary feeling would have wiped out all differences and discriminations. Wars and armies would be unknown in the cooperative world state of the future.

Humanism

The common thread which joined Periyar's Self-Respect Movement, his advocacy of rationality and his championing of Communism was his essential humanism. To him humanity alone was the supreme value. He said, 'Forget God; think of man.' And the most human act to him was not to cause any suffering to anyone and help fellow beings. It was the very basis of community living. When man chose to live in communities giving up his barbaric way of living, he ought to have sought mutual support, through which each other's life could be bettered. He further thought that inequalities must be removed in order to ensure a humane society. The only means for achieving equality of all was to form a rational society where there was no place for any superstitions.

He opposed any sort of violence in human relations. He reasoned that it was in the nature of the tiger to growl and kill other animals. But violence was not natural to man. On the contrary to be human was to be aware of it. It is to the extent one lived without causing suffering to the other that one became a

rationalist creature. He advocated that one had to protect oneself from personal suffering but at the same time desist from causing suffering. 'If I were to encourage violent struggle, only the Dravidian would spring upon each other's throat. None of the Aryans who instigate violence would be touched in the least.' He was in favour of results achieved through peaceful rational and loving means even if they were delayed because of the very process. He firmly believed that only such revolutions without any violence involved would ensure real and permanent welfare to the people.

According to Periyar, humanism consisted of respecting the sentiments of the other. There were bound to be divergent opinions and it was not necessary to accept all but no one could be deprived of the right of the expression. He attached great importance to good human behaviour and conduct. He reiterated that one should behave or conduct himself in the same manner in which he expected others to conduct or behave themselves towards him.

Lastly Periyar's respect for all individuals and their reason was reflected in his statement, 'I have told you whatever I could perceive. I request you to accept whatever appears to be right to you and act accordingly. If there is anything wrong in whatever I have said. I request you to pity my ignorance.' Though he worked for the Dravidians, his concerns were universal. He clarified that he held no attachment towards any particular country, people or language and that all his activities were guided by his love of humanity and the need to serve it.

Periyar's Legacy: A Critique

Periyar aspired and worked for a new society where rationalism would rule the roost. Rationalism to him was freedom. He was very enthusiastic about science and technology which he felt made people's life easier. He talked of what fundamentally could be construed as self-empowerment. For this matter he was very particular about the prevailing notions and terminology. He never intended to

treat a social malaise symptomatically but worked for rooting out the problem and all other systems supporting that evil.

Despite his insistence on rationality and humanism, Periyar presented all the values he championed in his own life. He, in fact, personified rationality, atheism and the cause of justice. He tried but failed to separate his persona with his ideas and his towering persona indeed subsumed the values he imparted. This was perhaps necessary for the wider appeal of his ideas. However its implication in the long term was counterproductive. He was now viewed as a prophet. A prophet as an analogy reflected the personality cult and reduced rationalism to revelation. One author presented him as an avatar, 'The old saying is that whenever impropriety came to reign supreme, God will manifest himself in human form and restore propriety in the world. It is in a way thus that Periyar was born to defeat the impropriety of vested interests and to endow the illiterate and irrational common man with reason and self respect so that he can walk with a head held high.' The message was subtle and unintended but it had its repercussion. In this rationality was not an approach to be cultivated by each and every individual but a gospel to be told and believed. The Movement's fall from grace to become part of the personality cult of Tamil Nadu was perhaps the logical culmination of this approach.

At the second level, even for a rationalist movement, if the social bases of change and mobilization were a parochial or pre-modern collective identity, the mission itself stood negated. Though he proclaimed to attack brahminical practices alone, in reality it seemed to be against Brahmins as individuals. It was testified by the flight of a large number of Brahmins from the state. The caste system he sought to eliminate was in fact reinforced. Like the 'new class' of the Communist world, Tamil Nadu also saw the rise of the 'new caste' or 'neo-Brahmins' negating freedom in newer fashions. The personification of ideas and

primordialism in social mobilization went against the modern makeover of Tamil society and politics.

Social relations according to Marxism were based on the mode of production. Periyar's analysis of caste-oppression as an Aryan import does not fit the bill. Moreover tracing an ancient and unconfirmed causation and racial social base of an unjust order was not justified. The fact that displacing Brahmins from positions of power in Tamil Nadu simply did not result in a just society has proven the fallacy in Periyar's approach.

Godhood is a very high level of abstraction, and it is functional. It is not apparently comprehensible. It is the fulcrum of religiosity which has been a major tool of social organisation so far. For instance Mahatma Gandhi defined God as truth. It is such a high level of abstraction that it sounds almost superstitious and indeed for a layman it remains a superstition, because s/he believes in the concept without knowing its import and his/her conduct in this respect does not conform to the real meaning of Godhood. The fact remains that if Godhood has been used as a justification of statusquo so it has been employed as an inspiration for revolutions.

Nonetheless, Periyar raised issues which are equally relevant today. The problem of dignity is one such vital issue. The point to ponder, which Periyar raised so forcefully, is that the oppression is often self-inflicted. It is the result of ignorance, fear, greed and inaction. One is in fact down because of one's own vices. Domination and oppression is the product of the belief system rather than of actual social relations. Slavery which is the highest state of domination and oppression is more metaphysical than physical. His great contribution lies in fighting against oppression and for the sovereignty of individual human beings. He attacked the metaphysics of oppression with aplomb but he left his job half-done. He failed to provide a credible philosophy of freedom—a philosophy ensuring and sustaining freedom.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR

Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar was born on 14 April, 1891 in Mahar caste. The Mahar caste was one of the 'untouchable' castes. This created many difficulties in Ambedkar's higher education. With the help of a scholarship from Sayajirao Gaekwad, Maharaja of Baroda, he attended Columbia University, USA, and later on with hard work managed to study at the London School of Economics. In England he attained a doctorate and also became a barrister. On returning to India he virtually dedicated himself to the task of upliftment of the untouchable community. Soon he won the confidence of the- untouchables and became their supreme leader. To mobilise his followers he established organisations such as the Bahishkrit Hitkarni Sabha, Independent Labour Party and later All India Scheduled Caste Federation. He led a number of temple-entry Satyagrahas, organized the untouchables, established many educational institutions and propagated his views from newspapers like the 'Mooknayak', 'Bahishkrit Bharat' and 'Janata'. He participated in the Round Table Conference in order to protect the interests of the untouchables. He became the Chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly and played a very important role in framing The Indian Constitution. He was also the Law Minister of India up to 1951. Right from 1935 Ambedkar was thinking of renouncing Hinduism. Finally, in 1956 he adopted Buddhism and appealed to his followers to do the same. He felt that the removal of untouchability and the spiritual upliftment of the untouchables would not be possible by remaining a Hindu. Hence, he embraced Buddhism. Ambedkar was not only a political leader and social reformer but also a scholar and thinker. He has written extensively on various social and political matters. 'Annihilation of Castes', 'Who Were the Shudras', 'The Untouchables', 'Buddha and His Dharma' are his more important writings. Besides these, he had

also published many other books and booklets propagating his views. His thinking was based on a deep faith in the goals of equity and liberty. Liberalism and the philosophy of John Dewey also influenced his thinking. Jotirao Phule and Buddha have exercised a deep influence on Ambedkar's ideas on society, religion and morality. His political views were also influenced by his legal approach. Ambedkar's personal suffering, his scholarship and his constant attention to the problem of bringing about equality for the downtrodden untouchable community forms the basis of his thinking and writings.

AMBEDKAR'S VIEW ON THE BRITISH RULE IN INDIA

Ambedkar was aware of the drawbacks inherent in foreign rule. The British government had introduced some representative institutions in India. But full self-government could not have any alternative. Besides, Ambedkar always complained that the plight of the untouchables did not change under British rule. The British rulers were not interested in removing untouchability. Their policy had always been cautious in the matter of social reform. Reforms were likely to anger the upper castes and give them an opportunity to rally against British rule. Therefore, British rulers did not encourage rapid social reforms. In the field of education, Ambedkar felt that the government was not sincere in spreading education among the untouchables. All educational facilities were utilized by the upper castes only. Moreover, the interests of the upper castes and those of the untouchables were opposed to each other. Ambedkar wanted the British government to mediate on behalf of the untouchables. But the government neglected this responsibility. Because of this attitude of neglect, the untouchable community could not get any benefit from the British rule. Ambedkar was also not very happy about British administration. He was particularly critical of the administration on account of its over expensive character and general neglect of public welfare. But he knew that abrupt departure of the British would result into political domination of the upper castes. Therefore, a political settlement was

necessary clearly mentioning the powers of and safeguards for the untouchable ! I community. Without this, independence would be meaningless for the untouchables. In short, Ambedkar criticized the British rule for failing in its duty to uplift the untouchables. For this reason he supported the cause of self-government. But he insisted that in free India, the untouchable community must get a proper share in the power structure; otherwise independence would merely mean rule by the upper castes.

Political Strength

As a step in this direction, Ambedkar attaches much importance to political participation of the oppressed classes. He repeatedly emphasized that in the context of colonialism, it had become imperative that the untouchables gain political rights by organizing themselves politically. He claimed that by attaining political power, untouchables would be able to protect safeguards and a sizeable share in power, so that they can force certain policies on the legislature. This was so because during the last phase of British rule, negotiations had already begun for the settlement of the question of transfer of power. Ambedkar wanted the untouchables to assert their political rights and get an adequate share in power. Therefore, he formed political organizations of untouchables.

Conversion Throughout his life Ambedkar made efforts to reform the philosophical basis of Hinduism. But he was convinced that Hinduism will not modify its disposition towards the untouchables. So, he searched for an alternative to Hinduism. After careful consideration, he adopted Buddhism and asked his followers to do the same. His conversion to Buddhism meant reassertion of his faith in a religion based on humanism. Ambedkar argued that Buddhism was the least obscurantist religion. It appreciated the spirit of equality and liberty. Removal of injustice and exploitation was the goal of Buddhism. By adopting Buddhism, the untouchables would be able to carve out a new identity for themselves. Since Hinduism gave them nothing but sufferings, by renouncing

Hinduism, the untouchables would be renouncing the stigma of untouchability and bondage attached to them. To live a new material life, a new spiritual basis consistent with the liberal spirit was essential. Buddhism would provide this basis. Therefore, at the social level, education; at the material level, new means of livelihood; at the political level, political organization and at the spiritual level, self-assertion and conversion constituted Ambedkar's overall programme of the removal of untouchability.

Political Awakening among Untouchables

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar His writings and activity greatly contributed to the resurgence of the untouchable community. He created a sense of political awareness among the downtrodden. This resulted in the emergence of Dalit power in the Indian society. Ambedkar realized that the most oppressed section of the society was that of the untouchables. Therefore, he insisted upon the progress of this section as a condition for the development of Indian society. In order to create a spirit of self-assertion among the untouchables, they had to be given their own identity. This task of their mental liberation was fulfilled by Ambedkar's criticism of Hinduism. He touched upon the most basic feature of Hinduism: the authority of the Vedas and Shastras. He argued that Hindu religion was merely a set of meaningful rules and regulations. It was devoid of any philosophical basis. He demonstrated that Hinduism had come to be identified with Chaturvarna and Brahminism. By Brahminism he meant negation of the spirit of justice.

C. Iyothee Thass

C. Iyothee Thass (20 May 1845 – 1914) was an Indian anti-caste activist and a practitioner of Siddha medicine. He famously converted to Buddhism and called upon the Paraiyars to do the same, arguing that this was their original religion. He also founded the Panchamar Mahajana Sabha in 1891 along with Rettamalai Srinivasan. *Panchamas* are the ones who are outcastes.

"Iyothee Thass" is the most common Anglicized spelling of his name; other spellings include Pandit C. Ayodhya Dasa, C. Iyothee Doss, C. Iyodhi Doss, C. Iyothee Thoss, K. Ayōttitācar (avarkal), K. Ayōttitāsa (paṇṭitaravarkaḷ), or Ayothidas Pandithar.

Early life

Iyothee Thass possessed deep knowledge in Tamil, Siddha medicine and philosophy, and literary knowledge in languages such as English, Sanskrit and Pali. Iyothee Thass was born Kathavarayan on 20 May 1845 in Thousand Lights, a neighbourhood in Madras (now Chennai), and later migrated to the Nilgiris district. His family followed Vaishnavism and on that basis he named his children Madhavaram, Pattabhiraman, Janaki, Raman and Rasaram. His grandfather worked for George Harrington in Ootacamund (now Ooty) and little Kathavarayan profited immensely from this association.

Early Activism (1870 - 1900)

In 1870, Iyothee Thass founded Adhvaidhananda Sabha, considered one of his early institution-building activities. Later, in 1891, he established the Dravida Mahajana Sabha and organized its First Conference in Ooty. The conference addressed issues such as enacting criminal laws against the humiliation of untouchables and providing education and employment opportunities for them. Iyothee Thass actively engaged with the colonial census and sought recognition for the Depressed Classes as Adi-Tamilar, distinct from Hinduism.

In the 1870s, Iyothee Thass organized the Todas and other tribes of the Nilgiri Hills into a formidable force. In 1876, Thass established the Advaidananda Sabha

and launched a magazine called *Dravida Pandian* in collaboration with Rev. John Rathinam.

In 1886, Thass issued a revolutionary declaration that Scheduled caste people (Dalits) were not Hindus. Following this declaration, he established the "Dravida Mahajana Sabha" in 1891. During the 1891 census, he urged the members of Scheduled castes to register themselves as "Casteless Dravidians" instead of identifying themselves as Hindus. His activities served as an inspiration to Sri Lanka's Buddhist revivalist Anagarika Dharmapala.

Conversion to Buddhism

Iyothee Thass met Colonel H. S. Olcott with his followers and expressed a sincere desire to convert to Buddhism. According to Thass, the Paraiyars of Tamilakam were originally Buddhists and owned the land which had later been robbed from them by Aryan invaders.^[1] With Olcott's help, Thass was able to visit Ceylon and obtain *diksha* from the Sinhalese Buddhist monk Bikkhu Sumangala Nayake. On returning, Thass established the Sakya Buddhist Society in Madras with branches all over South India. The Sakya Buddhist Society was also known as the *Indian Buddhist Association* and was established in the year 1898.

Identifying the caste system's origin with the decline of Buddhism, Iyothee Thass urged Dalits to return to Buddhism for the annihilation of caste. In 1898, he embraced Buddhism during a visit to Sri Lanka and founded 'The Sakya Buddhist Society.' The society established branches in various locations, including South Africa and Sri Lanka. Iyothee Thass's efforts aimed at constructing a casteless identity for Dalits. He emphasized the need to record Buddhism as their religion in the census, challenging the established caste hierarchy.

Later life and work (1900 - 1914)

On 19 June 1907, Iyothee Thass launched a weekly Tamil newspaper called *Oru Paisa Tamizhan* or *One Paise Tamilian and Dravidia Pandian*,^[7] later known simply as *The Tamilan*, which he ran until his death in 1914. This newspaper became the main instrument of his criticism against caste power. In addition to hosting Iyothee Thass' editorials, the newspaper gave a voice to the public, including members of the Dalit community, who had the opportunity to publish articles on areas such as "religion, law, Tamil literature, economy, agriculture and a Ladies Column" The newspaper enjoyed a wide reach among marginalized communities and took an explicit anti-caste stance, also reflected in its refusal to use caste names

Iyothee Thass fought (unsuccessfully) with the Madras Mahajana Sabha for the right of Parayars to enter Vishnu and Shiva temples, traditionally denied to Dalit communities, and advocated with the British for free education up to the fourth grade and allocation of unused lands to oppressed Parayars.

Iyothee Thass died on 5 May 1914, just two weeks before his 69th birthday.

Brahmanisation of Thiruvalluvar

Iyothee Thass claimed that his grandfather Kandappan worked as a butler of George Harrington, a European Civil Servant possibly in Madurai district. During the same time, Francis Whyte Ellis, a British civil servant in the Madras Presidency and a scholar of Tamil and Sanskrit who had established a Tamil *sangam* (academy) in Madras in 1825 and asked Tamil enthusiasts to "bring to him ancient Tamil manuscripts for publication". Between 1825 and 1831, Kandappan discovered handwritten manuscripts of the *Thirukkural* as well as the *Tiruvalluva Maalai* (a hagiographic anthology of Valluvar and his work)

and the *Naaladi Naannurru* (also known as *Naalatiyaar*, a poetry collection from the Sangam period).^[11] According to popular sources, Kandappan preserved the works from destruction after finding the manuscripts written on palm leaves in a pile of leaves used for cooking. Kandappan had them delivered to Ellis.

The books were finally published in print for the first time in 1831 thanks to the collaboration between Ellis, his manager Muthusamy Pillai, and Tamil scholar Tandavaraya Mudaliar.^[11] The 1831 and 1834 editions published by Ellis did not mention Thiruvalluvar's parentage or specify his birth to a Brahmin father and a Pariah mother. However, differences were later identified in the 1835 edition of *Thiruvalluvar Malai* by Vishaka Perumal Iyer and the 1837 edition by his brother Saravana Perumal Iyer that suggested that both parents of Thiruvalluvar were Brahmins. Kandappan complained to Ellis that "four new verses had been added to the original version of *Thiruvalluvar Malai*". He also noted that Ellis' omissions about Valluvar's possible parentage as the son of a brahmin father and a pariah mother contributed to historical distortion and "co-opting Thiruvalluvar and his work into the brahminical Hindu value system".

Thass found the discrepancy between the 1831/1834 texts and the 1835/1837 texts notable, suggesting a deliberate intervention. Thass proposed that the publication of *Thirukkural* by Ellis likely alerted the brahmanas to the existence of an ethical text authored by a valluvan, a sub-sect of the pariahs. This awareness may have led them to reconcile their views on the social status of valluvans and pariahs with the newfound intellectual strength and achievements demonstrated in *Thirukkural*. To address this, Thass suggested that a new genealogy for Thiruvalluvar emerged, attempting to align him with noble birth. Different versions of these stories circulated, with the 1847 edition by Muthuveerapillai and Vedagiri Mudaliar linking Thiruvalluvar's birth to puranic myths. Thass argued that these stories,

often inconsistent and absurd, aimed to distance Thiruvalluvar from his Buddhist origins and integrate him into the brahminical Hindu value system.

Legacy

Iyothee Thass remains the first recognized anti-caste leader of the Madras Presidency. In many ways, Periyar, Dravidar Kazhagam, and B. R. Ambedkar are inheritors of his legacy. He was also the first notable Scheduled Caste leader to embrace Buddhism.

However, Iyothee Thass was largely forgotten until recent times when the Dalit Sahitya Academy, a publishing house owned by Dalit Ezhilmalai, published his writings. Ezhilmalai, then the Union Health Minister, also made a desired to name the planned National Center for Siddha Research after the leader. However, the proposal did not come into effect until 2005, when vehement protests by Se. Ku. Tamilarasan of the Republican Party of India (RPI) forced the Government to take serious note of the matter. The institute for Siddha Research (National Institute of Siddha) was subsequently inaugurated by Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Anbumani Ramadoss the then Union Health Minister on 3 September 2005 and named it after the anti-caste Buddhist leader. At its inauguration, the hospital had 120 beds. The patients were treated as per the traditional system of Siddha medicine.

Manabendra Nath Roy

Manabendra Nath Roy (born February 22?, 1887, Arbelia, India—died January 25, 1954, Dehra Dun) was a leader of India's communists until the independence of India in 1947. His interest in social and political issues eventually led to involvement with various Indian groups engaged in trying to overthrow British colonial rule by acts of terrorism. In 1915 he became involved

in a plot by Bengal revolutionaries to smuggle arms into India. The plot failed, and he vainly searched for the needed arms among various countries of East and Southeast Asia. In 1916 he reached San Francisco, Calif., where he changed his name to Manabendra Nath Roy.

Moving to Mexico, Roy helped found the Mexican Communist Party soon after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. In Moscow he made a favourable impression on Russian communist leader Vladimir Ilich Lenin and was put on the executive committee of the Communist International (Comintern). Breaking with the Comintern in 1929 over the policies of Soviet leader Joseph Stalin, Roy tried to return secretly to India but was arrested by the British and imprisoned. He was released a few years later and joined the Indian National Congress. Giving higher immediate priority to the defeat of fascism than to Indian independence, Roy opposed the Congress in its reluctance to aid the British in World War II. After India gained independence in 1947, Roy abandoned communism and became a founder of radical humanism, a mixture of socialist and liberal humanitarian ideas.

Self Assessment Questions

1. What were Jyothi Rao Phule's main contributions to social reform, and how did he address issues related to caste and gender inequality?
2. How did Periyar E.V. Ramasamy's Self-Respect Movement challenge traditional social hierarchies in India, and what were its key achievements?
3. What role did B.R. Ambedkar play in the struggle for Dalit rights, and how did his work influence the framing of the Indian Constitution?

UNIT V:

Mahatma Gandhi and Nationalism – Jawaharlal Nehru and Nation Building –
Jaya Prakash Narayan and Total Revolution

Objectives

- ❖ Understand Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy of nationalism and his role in leading India's struggle for independence through non-violence and civil disobedience.
- ❖ Examine Jawaharlal Nehru's vision for nation-building and his contributions to establishing a modern, democratic, and secular India.
- ❖ Analyze the concept of Total Revolution as proposed by Jayaprakash Narayan, focusing on its political and social dimensions.

Mahatma Gandhiji

Mahatma Gandhi is one of the greatest national leaders. He was born on 2nd October 1869 and was named as Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. He studied law in England and after returning from England, he started legal practice in India. In the early part of the 20th century, Gandhi went to South Africa, where the government subjected Indians to great discrimination and to the most humiliating treatment. He became renowned in South Africa as a champion of truth, non-violence and preserving the dignity of human beings. He returned to India in 1914, and dedicated the remaining years of his life to the cause of his motherland. In India, Mahatma Gandhi decided to fight against the British Raj. This period

marked by the freedom struggle came to be known as the Gandhian era (1920–1948). For the first time in the history of the world, a man was leading millions of people of a dependent country and teaching them the practical use of techniques like non-violence, non-cooperation and civil disobedience. In 1942, Gandhi called upon the British to quit India. Five years later the British left India, granting it complete independence (on 15th August 1947).

Gandhi's visit to South Africa in 1893 changed the course of his life. His experience in South Africa helped him to be a great leader. At Maritzburg, capital of Natal, he was thrown out of a railway compartment by a white policeman, and left to shiver in the cold on the railway platform. On this incident Gandhi wrote,

I began to think of my duty. Should I fight for my rights or go back to India or should I go on to Pretoria without minding the insult and return to India finishing the case? The hardship to which I was subjected was superficial, only a symptom of the deep disease of colour-prejudice. I should try if possible to root out the disease and suffer hardships in the process. Redress for wrongs, I should seek only to the extent that would be necessary for the removal of the colour prejudice.

This shock changed the course of his life. Gandhi decided to fight and remained in South Africa till 1914 to champion the cause of the coloured people. He organized the Natal Indian Congress and during the Boar War and Zulu Rebellion organized medical camps and helped the government. He published the

Indian Opinion in 1904 as a mouthpiece of coloured people. During his journey from Johannesburg to Durban, he read John Ruskin's *Unto This Last*, which had a deep impact on Gandhi's philosophy. He was greatly influenced by this work and started his Satyagraha against the discriminatory policy of the government of South Africa

Major Influences on Gandhi

The major influences on Gandhi's life may be summed up as the following:

- His mother's sense of self-sacrifice, spirit of service, religiousness and fasting
- His father's spirit of renunciation
- Influence of Jainism, Buddhism, Christianity, Vaishnavism and the Bhagavat Gita
- Plain living and high thinking of Raichand Bhai and works of Tolstoy and Ruskin had profound influence on Gandhi. In his autobiography, Gandhi wrote, 'Three moderns have left a deep impression on my life, and captivated me. Raichand Bhai by his living contact, Tolstoy by his book, *The Kingdom of God is Within You* and Ruskin by his *Unto This Last*
- The holy Quran and other books on Islam
- Thoreau's *Passive Resistance*

These major influences helped Gandhi achieve his ideals in life.

Political Ideas

The following are the basic ideas of Mahatma Gandhi:

(i) No political creed, but application of eternal truths

In 1936, Mahatma Gandhi said that there was no such thing as Gandhism, and he was not prepared to leave a sect after him. Gandhi said,

There is no such thing as Gandhism, and I do not want to leave any sect after me. I do not claim to have originated any new principle or doctrine. I have simply tried in my own way to apply the eternal truths to our daily life and problems. There is, therefore, no question of my leaving any code like 'Code of Manu'.

Gandhi's ideas were influenced by the writings of Ruskin, Thoreau and Tolstoy. He was also influenced by the Vedas, the Bhagavad Gita, the Bible, the Quran, and the other scriptures. It is essential to point out that Gandhi's political thought was mixed with religious principles.

(ii) Spiritualization of politics

Gandhi is said to be a saint amongst politicians and a politician among saints. He was not a politician in the ordinary sense of the term. He exhibited uncommon tact and intelligence in choosing the time as well as the methods and techniques to be used in launching his non-violence agitation. This made him the ideal for all political leaders, who were struggling for India's independence. A great contribution of Mahatma Gandhi to political theory and politics is political action guided by morality or spirituality. The leaders must be inspired by a sense

of sacrifice and service. Gandhi stressed on the importance of means and stated that right and just means should be adopted to achieve right and just ends. Thus, according to him ends and means are the same looked at from different angles.

(iii) The state a soulless machine destroying individuality

As an advocate of non-violence and philosophical anarchism, Gandhi was against the state. His anti-state attitude was justified on historical, moral and economic grounds. The state uses force, and its existence cannot be justified on moral grounds. By the use of force, the state deprives the moral value of the individual's action. The individual has a soul, but as the state is a soulless machine, 'it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence.' The state hinders progress by destroying individuality and it does great harm by its increasing reliance on force.

Gandhi's ideal is a stateless democracy, in which there is a federation of village communities, functioning on the basis of voluntary cooperation, and peaceful coexistence. Gandhi states, '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 even to the extent of defending itself against the whole world. Such a society is necessarily highly cultured in which every man or woman knows what he or she wants and knows that no one should want anything that others cannot have with equal labour.

(iv) Decentralization, labour and classless society

While in democracy there is a great deal of centralization and inequality. Gandhian philosophy puts emphasis on decentralization with equality, non-possession and labour being the ideals of this society. Gandhi writes,

If all laboured for their bread and no more, then there would be enough food and enough leisure for all. Then there would be no cry of over-population, no disease and no such misery as we see around . . . There will be no rich and no poor, none high and none low, no touchable and no untouchable.

While in the state, as it exists now, the growth of individuality is thwarted; in a stateless democracy every individual is given the maximum freedom to devote himself to the service of society, according to his calibre or capacity. According to a critic, ‘Gandhi was a firm believer in a classless, egalitarian society in which there would be no distinctions of rich and poor, high and low. In some respects, he went further even than the orthodox socialists, in as much as he would not exempt anyone from obligatory socially useful body-labour.’

Gandhi was against high-centralized production and pleaded for decentralized production. The idea is not to do away entirely with machinery as such, but to prevent the concentration of power in the hands of a few people. The salient features of Gandhian economy are as follows:

(i) Intensive, small-scale, and cooperative farming as opposed to mechanized, large-scale or

collective farming

- (ii) Development of cottage industries
 - (iii) Private ownership subject to the benefit of society
 - (iv) Proper balance of animal, human and plant life
 - (v) Provision for social justice and equally economic opportunities to all
 - (vi) Organization of economy through decentralization and village panchayats
- (v) State based on non-violence or ahimsa**

Mahatma Gandhi is against violence in thought, word and action. According to Gandhi Ahimsa is based on the principles of non-violence and love for all. Gandhi maintained, 'Ahimsa is not the crude thing it has been made to appear. Not to hurt any living thing is no doubt a part of Ahimsa. The principle of Ahimsa is hurt by every evil thought, by undue haste, by lying, by hatred, by wishing ill to anybody. It is also violated by our holding on to what the world needs.' He believed that the state is not an end but it is a means for the welfare of the people. He is opposed to the view that the state is above, nothing is outside the state and nothing is against the state. He is unwilling to accept the state as the highest group and an end in itself.

The ideal, however, is that the state functions on the principle of Ahimsa. It is possible when there is goodwill and crime is absent. Such a state where justice prevails represents the Ramrajya (kingdom of Lord Ram).

People in the Gandhian state have various rights and duties. As a thinker

who dislikes the absolute sovereignty of the state, Gandhi allows the citizen the right and duty of disobeying the laws of the state, where necessary. He is against the use of force by the state. Force should be used in minimum for the sake of maintenance of law and order. The police should think that it is to serve as the servants of the people and not their masters.

(vi) Property as trust and not as instrument of exploitation

Gandhi is against the use of property as an instrument of exploitation. Capitalism and exploitation should be removed through non-violent methods. Those who have property must regard it as trust and not as an instrument of exploitation. Gandhi's theory of trusteeship makes no distinction between private and non-private property. All property is held in trust, no matter who owns it, and what its nature or quantity is. It applies not only to tangible and transferable property, but also to places of power and position. It implies the transformation of the present capitalist system of society into an egalitarian system. Property is not to be a source of profit but a source of people's welfare. Gandhi said, 'No one should have property more than what one needs.'

(vii) Good end and good means

Gandhi was in favour of good end through good means. To him, the end can never justify the means. To realize the Gandhian state, only fair means are to be adopted. Non-violence and truth form the soul of Gandhi's technique. Regarding means and ends, Gandhi observed, 'The means may be linked to seed,

the end to a tree, and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and ends as there is between the seed and the tree.' Thus, the end and means should be invariably good.

(viii) Harmony between nationalism and internationalism

Gandhi put emphasis on the importance of nationalism in its noblest form. He was against nationalism based on violence and aggressive tactics. He was in favour of world peace, and wanted to bring about a harmony between nationalism and internationalism. People in a country should be patriotic, but they should be friendly towards the people of other countries. He said, 'My nationalism is intense internationalism.'

Satyagraha

Gandhi used the word Satyagraha in 1906 to express the nature of the non-violent action undertaken by the Indians in South Africa against the racist government. With his involvement in the Indian National Movement, he adopted it as a technique of love-force, soul-force, non-violence, aiming constantly at the search and pursuit of truth. To him, Satyagraha is the vindication of truth, not by infliction of suffering on the opponent but on one's own self. It is eternal insistence on truth. Satyagraha is based on non-violence and as such it does not permit violence in any form. Ahimsa and Satyagraha are synonymous for Gandhi. Satyagraha emphasizes always the purity of means as well as the purity of the

ends. It is a moral weapon in the hands of a morally strong person to fight injustice, tyranny or evil and can be applied in any sphere. Gandhi said, 'it is force that may be used by individuals as well as communities. It may be used as well in political as in domestic affairs. Its universal applicability is a demonstration of its permanence and invincibility'.

Evil should be resisted through the techniques of Satyagraha, a moral weapon based on soul force, which is superior to physical force. According to a critic, Satyagraha means 'clinging to truth', and as truth for Gandhi is God, Satyagraha in the general sense of the word means the ways of life of one who holds steadfastly to God and dedicates his life to him. The true Satyagrahi is accordingly a man of God.'

It is the weapon of the non-violent struggle. Mahatma Gandhi has explained the meaning of Satyagraha as follows:

The term Satyagraha was coined by me in South Africa to express the force that the Indians there used for full eight years and it was coined in order to distinguish it from the movement then going on in the United Kingdom and South Africa under the name of passive resistance. Its root meaning is holding on to truth, hence truth-force. I have also called it love-force or soul-force.

Satyagraha may assume the form of (a) non-cooperation, (b) fasting, (c) striking, (d) civil disobedience, (e) picketing and (f) Hijrat, i.e., voluntary exile. A

Satyagrahi, in order to fight the non-violent struggle, has to prepare himself for it by self-discipline, purity, courage and civility.

Before practicing Satyagraha in public life, a Satyagrahi must practice it in domestic or personal life. Like charity, Satyagraha must begin from home. An individual in search of truth, whether in domestic or public life, has a heavy burden of ethical code over his shoulders. He is a man of peace. The aim is self-realization through social service and sacrifice. Satyagraha is a weapon to counteract the evils and difficulties that come in the way of realization of truth. It is a weapon to be used for public good and never for personal gains. It is not to be resorted to defend immoral acts and wrongly earned gains. There is no place for ill-will and hatred in Satyagraha. A Satyagrahi does not think, in relation to his enemy in terms of victor and vanquished.

Satyagraha may not be confused with passive resistance. It is true that both are peaceful techniques of meeting aggression and bringing about social and political changes. However, there are differences between the two. Passive resistance as practiced is a political weapon of expediency but Satyagraha is a moral weapon based on the superiority of soul force over brute force. Passive resistance is the weapon of the weak but Satyagraha can be practiced only by the brave. The passive resistance aims at embarrassing the opponent into submission, but a Satyagrahi aims at winning the opponent from error by love and patient suffering. There is hardly any place for love for the enemy in the case of passive

resistance. In Satyagraha, there is no room for ill-will. Mahadeo Desai observed,

Satyagraha is dynamic, passive resistance is static. Passive resistance acts negatively and suffers reluctantly. Satyagrahi acts positively and suffers with cheerfulness because from love he makes the suffering fruitful. Passive resistance is not by its very nature universal in its application. It cannot be directed against one's nearest relations as Satyagraha can be. Passive resistance offered in a spirit of weakness and despair weakens the resister psychologically and morally. Satyagraha emphasizes all the time internal strength and actually develops the same. Satyagraha can offer more effective and determined opposition to injustice and tyranny than passive resistance.

Forms and Techniques of Satyagraha

The techniques of Satyagraha may take the form of non-cooperation and civil disobedience or fasting and strike. As regards non-cooperation, Gandhi pointed out that oppression and exploitation can be checked by non-cooperation of people. If people refuse to cooperate with the government, the latter cannot function. Gandhi said,

Even the most despotic government cannot stand except with the consent of the governed, which consent is often forcibly procured by the despot. As soon as the subject ceases to fear the despotic force, his power is gone.

Non-cooperation may manifest itself in the form of hartals, or picketing.

Hartal involves stopping of work as a measure of protest and its object to strike the imagination of the people and the government. Hartals to be effective are to be voluntary and no violence is to be used. Only persuasive methods are to be employed. Gandhi wrote,

Object of peaceful picketing is not to block the path of a person wanting to do a particular thing but to rely on the force of public opprobrium and to war and even shame the blacklegs. Picketing should avoid coercion, intimidation, discourtesy, burning or burying of effigies and hunger strike.

Another form of Satyagraha recommended by Gandhi is civil disobedience. This is regarded by him as ‘complete, effective and bloodless substitute of armed revolt.’ Bad laws are to be challenged and violated. Civil disobedience implies ‘the register’s outlawry in a civil, i.e., non-violent manner.’ Gandhi put the greatest emphasis on the word ‘civil’. He said,

Disobedience to be civil, must be sincere, respectful, restrained, never defiant, must be based upon some well-understood principle, must not be capricious and must have no ill-will or hatred behind it. Its use must be guarded by all conceivable restrictions. Every possible provision should be made against outbreak of violence or general lawlessness. The area as well as scope should also be limited to the barest necessity of the case.

The leaders, and not the Satyagrahis, are to decide which laws are to be violated. Another form of Satyagraha suggested by Gandhi is fasting. This is

considered by him as a strong weapon against oppression and Gandhi recommended the greatest caution in resorting to fasting. Fasting is not meant for all occasions but only on rare occasions. It can be undertaken for self-purification or for the purpose of resisting injustice and converting the evil-doer. Fasting is to be undertaken only by those who have spiritual fitness. It requires purity of mind, discipline, humility and faith. Gandhi's view is that fasting rouses conscience and fires the loving hearts to action.

Those who bring about radical changes in human conditions and surroundings cannot do it except by raising ferment in society. There are only two methods of doing this – violence and non-violence. Non-violent pressure exerted through self-suffering and by fasting touches and strengthens the moral fibre of those against whom it is directed.

The last method of Satyagraha is in the form of strike. However, Gandhi's view of strike is different from that advocated by Socialists and Communists. According to him, strike is a voluntary, purificatory suffering undertaken to convert the wrong doers. Gandhi does not believe in the theory of class war. His view is that industry is a joint enterprise of labour and capital and both of them are trustees. The strikers are required to put forward their demands in very clear terms. Those should not be unjust. Those should be within the reach of the capitalists to concede. The strikers are required to learn some manual craft so that during the strike period they do not have to depend upon the strike fund.

Gandhi recommended Satyagraha even in the case of foreign invasion. He explained his method in these words:

A non-violent man or society does not anticipate or provide for attacks from without. On the contrary, such a person or society firmly believes that nobody is going to disturb them. If the worst happens, there are two ways open to non violence. To yield possession but non-cooperate with the aggressor. Thus supposing that a modern edition of Nero descended upon India, the representatives of the States will let him in but tell him that he will get no assistance from the people. They will prefer death to submission. The second way will be the non-violent way. They would offer themselves unarmed as fodder for the aggressor's cannon. The underlying belief in either case is that even Nero is not devoid of a heart. The unexpected spectacle of endless rows upon rows of men and women simply dying rather than surrender to the will of an aggressor, must ultimately melt him and his soldiery.

When China was being conquered by Japan during the 1930s, Gandhi said, *If the Chinese had practiced non-violence of my conception, there would be no use left for the latest machinery of destruction which Japan possesses. The Chinese would say to Japan, 'Bring all your machinery. We present half of our population to you, but the remaining two hundred millions won't bend their knees to you.'* *If the Chinese did that, Japan would become China's slave.*

In 1916, Gandhi laid down certain principles to be observed in the Satyagraha Ashram at Sabarmati. Those principles of behaviour are truth, non-violence, non stealing, non-possession and celibacy. A true Satyagrahi is required to practice those ideals, in his day-to-day private and public life. In course of time, Gandhi favoured a few more virtues and qualities to be borne by a Satyagrahi. Those qualities are soul force, moral discipline, honesty, 'spiritual kinship with the opponent', implicit faith in human nature and goodness, self-inflicted suffering for truth and a will to crucify the flesh by fasting and humility. A Satyagrahi is not to harbour anger, suffer the anger of the opponent, retaliate or insult his opponent. If a Satyagrahi violated the rules prescribed by him, Gandhi preferred to stop the movement than to see the violation of those rules. Purity and non-violence of the persons engaged in a cause were always fundamental to him.

Satyagraha is based upon moral development of the Satyagrahi. He is to 'overcome evil by good, anger by love, untruth by truth, Himsa by Ahimsa.' He is to treat his opponent as a member of his own family and the family method was to be employed to iron out the differences. A Satyagrahi is to trust his opponent even if the latter plays him false. A Satyagrahi is required to have an open mind and whenever he realizes that his own opinion is wrong, he should confess his mistake and revise his judgement accordingly. Gandhi stated, 'Confession of error is like a broom that sweeps away dirt and leaves the surface cleaner than before.' A Satyagrahi is to meet his enemy, not to attack him but to compromise with him. A

Satyagrahi is to compromise on non-essentials and not fundamentals or the basic moral issues involved in the conflict.

A Satyagrahi has double responsibility. He is responsible to himself, i.e., to his own inner conscience and to the people. According to Gandhi, if there is a conflict between the two, a Satyagrahi should submit to the public opinion if the matter does not conflict with his moral conscience very often; he has to depend upon his conscience for guidance. There can be situations for a Satyagrahi when he should not surrender his personal moral intuitive judgment to mass opinion and follow the dictates of his conscience and leave free his followers to pursue their own course of action.

Satyagraha is related to the concept of love and non-violence. A Satyagrahi must have a sound basis for his love and affection. A Satyagrahi makes a distinction between the evil and the evil-doer. He wins the heart of the opponent through love and persuasion. He should not be obliged to accept things as they are. His aim is to secure social justice. The non-violence of a Satyagrahi has its impact. The wrong-doer gets tired of committing wrong in the absence of resistance. Gandhi states, All pressure is lost when the victim betrays no resistance. I seek entirely to blunt the edge of the tyrant's sword, not by disappointing the expectation that I would be offering physical resistance. The resistance of the soul would at first dazzle him and at last compel recognition from him which recognition would not humiliate but uplift him.

According to Gandhi, Satyagraha is non-violent coercion. The aim of the Satyagrahi is to move the heart of the enemy only by love and not by giving or causing any injury to him. Satyagraha is a weapon that only well-disciplined soldiers can use. He who leads the life of an honest and truthful man, can use it effectively. The user should be fearless. There are two other things viz., non-stealing and non possession, which are very important. Gandhi wrote,

Possession implies provision for the future. A seeker after truth, a follower of the Law of Love cannot hold anything tomorrow. God never stores for the morrow. He never creates more than what is strictly needed for the moment. If, therefore, we repose faith in His Providence, we should rest assured that He will give us every day our daily bread, meaning everything that we require.

Gandhi stated,

Theoretically, when there is perfect love, there must be perfect non-possession. The body is our last possession. So a man can only exercise perfect love and be completely dispossessed if he is prepared to embrace death and renounce his body for the sake of human service. But that is true in theory only. In actual life, we can hardly exercise perfect love, for the body as a possession will always remain with us. Man will ever remain imperfect and it will always be his part to try to be perfect.

According to Gandhi, humility and self-restraint must be practiced by the

Satyagrahi because they give him strength and force. At the time of the 1930 movement, Gandhi made the following rules for the Satyagrahis:

The Satyagrahi must harbour no anger, must suffer the anger of his opponent, putting up with assaults but refusing to retaliate; but he must not submit out of fear of punishment or the like to any order given in anger. He must refrain from insults and swearing; he must protect opponents from insults or attack, even at the risk of his life. He must not resist his arrest for the attachment of his property, but if he has got any property in his possession as a trustee, he must refuse to surrender it even though in defending it he might lose his life. As a prisoner he must behave in an exemplary manner; as a member of his unit in the struggle, he must obey the orders of his leaders although he may resign in the event of serious disagreement. He may not expect guarantee for maintenance of his dependants.

If Satyagraha is a way of life for an individual, it is also a means of group action by which through collective non-violent resistance, conflicts are settled and the cause of truth is vindicated. Gandhi has suggested various precautions and ethical codes to be followed while undertaking Satyagraha as a group action. For instance, it must be non-violent. The enemy should not be embarrassed. Gandhi put emphasis on 'open-dealing' in Satyagraha. Everything, including discussions or settlement of the dispute, should be done openly. The reason is that truth and secrecy cannot go together. Satyagraha is a struggle for righteousness and virtue.

It is a vindication of the right of opposition to coercive authority. No force in the world is as effective as Satyagraha. It is progressive in character. Gandhi's advocacy of the right of Satyagraha is a great contribution to political thought. As a moral technique for waging the battle of national freedom, Satyagraha gained dramatic and historic character. According to Stanley Jones, Satyagraha is the greatest contribution of Gandhi to the modern world. D.E. Smith describes Gandhi as a revolutionary leader on account of his developing the technique of Satyagraha.

The question arises whether the ideas of Gandhi are relevant for us today when we see ourselves surrounded in our day-to-day lives by so called Satyagrahas, Dharnas, fasts unto death and Gheraoes. Gandhi laid emphasis on means as well as on ends. It is suggested that if the Gandhian spirit is imbibed by the new generation, many problems can be solved without taking recourse to violence. Gandhi's technique can be employed successfully to fight the evils of corruption, black-marketing or injustices in economic, industrial or social life. Without bloodshed, Gandhism can be a complete revolution.

Concept of Society and Individual

Gandhi believed in the concept of the individual being the soul of the social system. The individual is the centre of the social system, but there is interdependence of the individual and the society. However, the individual is the root and the society is the fruit. He rejects unrestricted individualism that ignores

social obligations as well as the other extreme view, i.e., individual as a cog in the social machine. Gandhi said,

I value individual freedom but you must not forget that man is essentially a social being. He has risen to the 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 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.

Society must provide maximum opportunities to the individual for his development that consists of selfless service to society and willing fulfillment of social obligation. If the society fails in discharging its duty, resistance is justified.

According to Gandhi, individuals acquire the right of resistance or violation of the law of the state becomes a right and a duty when the laws are: (a) not of people's own making, (b) repugnant to public or private morals, (c) not promoting social good, (d) oppressive in nature and cause, all round harassment, hardship, humiliation, oppression and tyranny.

Thus, resistance becomes moral and just in the name of dictate of conscience, individual freedom, self-government and social good. Of course the manner of resistance must be of specific character and be in conformity with the

Gandhian general principle of purity of means. Gandhi's prescriptions are: (1) non-violent resistance, (2) civil resistance, and (3) civilized resistance. The resistances shall assume the form of: (1) non-cooperation and (2) civil disobedience, or Satyagraha. Those who resist the State in the name of morality, justice, dictate of conscience or freedom and self-government should adopt non-violent techniques or the techniques of Satyagraha and shall be prepared for suffering the consequences of such resistance. Gandhi wrote,

Government of the people is possible only so long as they consent either consciously or unconsciously to be governed. There is no government that can control an individual without his sanction. Voluntary obedience to the laws of the State and the society should be there so far as they are not repugnant to public or private morals. Willing obedience to social restraint for the sake of the well-being of the whole society enriches both the individual and society of which he is a member.

Gandhi is a philosophical anarchist for whom state was an unacceptable institution. Like Marx and the anarchists he thought that the state is an instrument of exploitation based on violence and sustained by violence. According to him by use of violence, the state suppresses the individuality of man. For Gandhi, the individual is the centre of the social system, and the political structure. The state is meant to promote the interest of the individual and to provide him adequate opportunities for the development of his personality which consists in rendering

selfless service to the society. Thus, according to Gandhi the state is a means to an end and the end being the all-round development of the individual.

Rights of the individual according to Gandhi are not created by the state. They are created by the individuals who by due performance of their duties qualify themselves for the enjoyment of their duties. The state only recognizes these rights. The individual has the right to resist the state for the vindication of his rights born out of due performance of one's duty. According to Gandhi, rights have their source in due performance of duties. If one performs his duties to the society, rights will automatically follow. Rights and duties are related as cause and effect, the latter being the cause and the former being the effect.

Gandhi was a philosophical anarchist who did not relish the idea of an organism like the state that is based on violence. His ideal condition of human existence is a condition of Statelessness. However, as a practical idealist he realized that due to the imperfections of the individuals the state is often felt as a necessary evil. Hence the individuals should obey the state and the principles of political obligation or what constitutes the basis of political obligation.

Gandhi as a philosophical anarchist was not only critical of the state but also of all governments extraneous to individuals. He understood Swaraj in the sense of self-government of the self by the superior self, or control of the individual behaviour, passion, greed and selfishness, by the dictates of conscience. Hence in his Hind Swaraj he observed 'Real home-rule is self-rule or

self-control.’ However, as a practical idealist he felt that since individuals are incapable of perfect self-control and their conduct does not become completely self-regulated, there is need for some form of government external to man. However, the government must be democratic in nature, i.e., democratic both in form and content. Such a government must be: (1) free from foreign control, (2) promote the welfare of all members of the society, (3) based on the equality of all members of the society irrespective of the religion, race, caste, sect or place of birth, (4) secular in nature, (5) free from domination by any section of the community, (6) based on the principle of democratic decentralization, (7) based on the principle of village self-government and (8) based on mutual toleration.

Gandhian Socialism

Gandhi was a critic of capitalism. He condemned the 19th century doctrine of laissez faire. To him accumulation of capital is an evil and immoral act.

Today the word ‘socialism’ has become a controversial one. Socialism is often compared with a hat, which has lost its shape because everybody wears it.

If socialism is defined as a political and economic theory according to which the means of production, distribution and exchange should be owned and controlled by the people, everyone should be given an equal opportunity to develop his talents and the wealth of the community should be fairly distributed, then Gandhi may be called a true socialist. Gandhi visualizes a social structure in which every attempt is made to ensure everybody’s rise. We shall now examine

the main tenets of Gandhian socialism.

Equitable Distribution of Wealth

Gandhi believed in the concept of economic equality and advocated, ‘a wise regulation of riches and absolute social justice.’ He once wrote,

Socialism is a beautiful word and so far as I am aware, in socialism all the members of the society are equal, none low, none high. In the individual body, the head is not high, because it is the top of the body, nor are the soles of the feet low because they touch the earth. Even as parts of the individual body are equal, so are the members of the society. This is socialism.

This statement clearly reveals the concept of equality as embodied in Gandhian socialism. On another occasion he wrote,

‘I am working for winning Swaraj for those toiling and unemployed millions, who do not get even a square meal a day and have to scratch along with a piece of stale ‘Roti’ and a pinch of salt.’

Gandhi was a practical man. He realized that complete equality is an improbability. Hence, he pleaded for equitable distribution. As he says, ‘My ideal is equal distribution but so far as I can see, it is not to be realized. I therefore work for equitable distribution of wealth.’

He felt that disparity of income should be reduced to a reasonable limit. In the ideal Constitution of India, which had his approval Gandhi pleaded, ‘Every

citizen shall have the right to obtain a minimum living wage through honest work or employment.’ No servant of the State shall be paid more than `500 per month. Inheritance taxes on a graduated scale shall be levied on property above a fixed minimum.

The following types of wealth that are now owned by the private capitalists shall become national property.

All the land shall belong to the State. Private landlords and Zamindari systems of land tenure will, therefore, cease to exist. The State shall grant long lease to those farmers who actually till the soil.

All key industries shall be owned by the nation.

Mines, rivers, forests, roads, railways, air transport, post and telegraph, shipping and other means to public transport shall be national property.

Gandhi was in favour of culmination of all forms of economic exploitation through non-coercive technique. He regarded accumulation of capital as immoral and a social crime. There should be no accumulation and no useless possession of wealth in society. The doctrine of equal distribution means that each man’s need should be fulfilled. Gandhi, in his later years, subscribed to the Marxian formula ‘to each according to his need.’

Theory of Trusteeship

Gandhi was not altogether in favour of abolition of private property. He believed in the principle of trusteeship under which the rich could possess all their

wealth in trust for the good of the people. He did not want to give unlimited power to property owners. They should become trustees of their surplus wealth for the good of the society.

The theory of trusteeship is a cardinal point of the economic policy that Gandhi had advocated for independent India. Gandhi strongly believed in the concept of 'Aparigraha' (non-possession) and contended that 'a thing not originally stolen must nevertheless be classified as stolen property if we possess without need for it.' When in 1929 Gandhi advocated his theory of trusteeship, he expected good response from the capitalists in India. But in actual practice when the response was very poor, he revised his view and accepted the idea of 'statutory trusteeship'. In the beginning he assumed that trusteeship would be inherited by the son but later on in 1938 he declared that a trustee has no heir but the public.

Gandhi never idealized private property. As K.G. Mashurwala aptly writes, He (Gandhi) would like to dispossess every person of all kinds of belongings. If he tolerates the institution of private property, it is not because he loves it or holds it to be necessary for the progress of humanity but because he had yet to discover a truthful and non-violent method of abolishing that institution.

Bread Labour

Gandhi's idea of bread labour is based on the principle of dignity and

sanctity of labour. According to Gandhi, the real wealth of the nation consists of labour. The idea that man should earn his bread by the sweat of his labour has greatly influenced him. The theory of bread labour postulates that every healthy individual must labour enough for his food, and his intellectual faculties must not be exercised in order to obtain a living or amass a fortune but only in the service of mankind.

Further Gandhi wrote, 'If all laboured for their bread and no more, then there would be enough food and enough leisure for all. There will then be no rich and no poor, none high, none low, no touchable and no untouchable.'

Gandhi rightly realized that labour has its unique place in any civilized nation. Although he did not blindly support the Ricardian or Marxian theories of labour, yet he adhered to the moral idea of the sanctification of labour. He not only preached it but also practiced it in South Africa. Every individual must work. 'Everyone should deem it a dishonour to eat a single meal without honest labour.'

Decentralized Order

Gandhi advocated decentralization both in the political and economic spheres. He was well aware of overcentralization. Centralization is a form of regimentation and authoritarianism and it 'makes the world so complex that the common man fails to understand the forces that are working in his life and society.'

In order to raise the common man into a high pedestal of glory, a large

measure of decentralization of both political and economic power is necessary. Gandhi wanted to evolve a decentralized structure of power and economy based on the effective reconstruction of self-reliant and self-sufficient village communities. The strength of the nation can be built only if the villagers lead a life of peace, harmony, goodwill and self-sufficiency. Hence, Gandhi advocated for powerful village panchayats and promotion of small-scale and cottage industries. As J.B. Karipalani writes, 'Decentralization in industry and devolution of power in politics are the only means by which humanity can hope to establish a social order based upon equality and justice and free from economic and political exploitation.'

Democratic Socialism

Gandhi was a socialist at heart. It is a political blasphemy to deny that Gandhi was a socialist. His socialism was not a blind imitation of the West. Hence, it had a few unique features. Gandhi wrote,

I have claimed that I was a socialist long before those I know in India avowed their creed. My socialism was natural to me and not adopted from a book. It came out of an unshakeable belief in non-violence. No man could be actively non violent and not rise against social injustice, no matter where it occurred, unfortunately. Western socialists have, so far as I know, believed in the necessity of violence for enforcing socialistic doctrines.

Gandhi believed in democratic socialism. He was not prepared to sacrifice the individual at the altar of the state and was opposed to dictatorship of any kind, either of the capitalists or of the proletariat. Gandhi's socialism is to be achieved through democratic means.

Non-violent Socialism

What makes Gandhian socialism practically different from communism is its faith in 'Ahimsa' or non-violence. That is why Gandhism is often called 'Marxism minus violence.' Gandhi had firm faith in non-violence. He was convinced that social justice can never be achieved by means of force. Nothing permanent can be built on violence. What is gained by violence may be lost before superior violence. Hence, he wanted to bring a social revolution through non-violent ways. He wanted to convert human nature by persuasion, not by coercion. He wrote, 'Some have called me the greatest revolutionary of my time. It may be false, but I believe myself to be a revolutionary— a non-violent revolutionary.'

Moral and Spiritual Socialism

Gandhian socialism is not only non-violent, but also moral and spiritual. Gandhi believed in the purification of means and ends. He was convinced that noble ends cannot be achieved by evil means and contended 'our progress towards the goal will be in exact proportion to the purity of our means.' 'This socialism', he wrote, 'is as pure as crystal. It requires crystal-like means to

achieve it.’

Gandhi believed in the fundamentals or ethics that love is better than hate, peace is better than war, cooperation is better than conflict, and persuasion is better than coercion. While Marx put emphasis on matter, Gandhi put emphasis on spirit or life.

To Marx religion is ‘the opium of the people’ but to Gandhi ‘the existence of the world in a broad sense depends on religion.’

Gandhi rejected the Marxist theory of class war, which preached permanent antagonism between the have and the have nots or between the capital and labour. He is not of the opinion that ‘capital and labour need to be antagonistic.’ Further, he wrote,

A labourer’s skill is his capital. Just as the capitalist cannot make his capital fructify without the cooperation of labour, even so the working man cannot make his labour fructify without the cooperation of capital . They would get to respect each other as equal partners in a common enterprise.

Agrarian Socialism

Gandhi developed his socialist ideas against the background of Indian economic life. India is essentially a land of villages where more than 85 percent of the population depends upon agriculture. Unless villages prosper and rise the true development of the country would not be possible. Hence, Gandhi wanted to

reconstruct and rejuvenate the villages through various schemes, particularly through small-scale and cottage industries. His ideal is a decentralized rural economy consisting of small, self-sufficient village communities. While Marx's socialism is urban and industrial, Gandhian socialism is rural and agrarian in character. Gandhi was not altogether opposed to machinery and industrialization. His object was 'not to destroy the machine but to impose limitations on it.' He wanted to save the toiling masses from the clutches of unemployment and starvation.

Indigenous Socialism

Gandhi developed his socialism against the background of Indian life. It is wrong to charge Gandhi of having diluted the meaning of socialism. His humanism inevitably leads him to be a socialist. He is a socialist because he wants to put an end to exploitation, injustice and inequality in society—a society in which the poorest of the poor should feel that it is his country, and in which people would be guided by devotion to social ends and social service instead of private gains and selfishness.

Gandhian socialist edifice was built, as far as possible, by the indigenous materials. Being influenced by the exalted life of abnegation of Buddha and the doctrine of sacrifice of Hindu philosophy, Gandhi put emphasis on non-accumulation, non-stealing and non-possession. Believing in the conception of Aparigraha, (i.e., non-possession), Gandhi contended that 'a thing not originally

stolen must nevertheless be classified as stolen property, if we possess it without need for it.' On another occasion he wrote, 'Real socialism has been handed down to Gopal, then where is the boundary line? Gopal literally means shepherd; it also means God. In modern language it means the State, i.e., the people.'

The first verse of the Ishopanishad, which contains the doctrine of 'renounce and enjoy' had also considerably influenced Gandhian socialism.

Hence, Gandhian socialism is essentially Indian in character. Gandhi had Indianized socialism. It is not a blind imitation of Western socialism or orthodox Marxism. We may brand it as an indigenous or 'Swadeshi' socialism. It is expected that the present-day socialists in India will give up all false pretensions of being called socialists and have a fresh look at Gandhian socialism that seems to be a good panacea to solve many ills of our society.

Evaluation of Gandhian Thought

The influence of Mahatma Gandhi on Indian politics has been tremendous. Every decision of Gandhi on the political situation in India was of great significance to all; to his admirers as well as critics. As a freedom fighter, Gandhi actually showed that the principles of truth and non-violence were not the mere theme of an idle talk, but the core of actual action. He became a dynamic force in the political and spiritual life of India. Indians could never have fought against the powerful British government by using force, because the latter could have suppressed them by using still greater force, which they commanded. The

symbolic use of the weapons of non-violence and Satyagraha were responsible for spreading patriotic fervour throughout the country. Decentralization of political power, democracy of village communities, decentralized production, bread labour, elimination of exploitation, prison reforms, private property to be held in trust, the state functioning as an agency of service on the basis of non-violence, etc., clearly show the strengths of the Gandhian thought. It is true that to vest absolute power in the state is risky. Decentralization of political power and decentralization of production, when introduced judiciously, will do immense benefit to a country. Gandhian thought lays great emphasis on service and cooperation and expresses itself strongly against power as a weapon.

The world cannot forget Gandhi, the apostle of truth and non-violence who lived the life of an ascetic. He said about himself, 'The law of complete love is the law of my being.' George Marshall remarked that 'Mahatma Gandhi is the spokesman for the conscience of all mankind.' Commenting upon Gandhi's assassination, George Bernard Shaw said, 'It is dangerous to be too good.' Gandhi was a great thinker, a great leader, a great reformer, a great philanthropist and a great revolutionary. Paying due homage to Gandhi, Sir Stafford Cripps observed, 'I know of no other man of any time or indeed recent history, who so forcefully and convincingly demonstrated the power of spirit over material things.'

Sarvodaya

The leaders who followed Mahatma Gandhi's constructive programmes

include Acharya Vinoba Bhave, Kaka Kalekar, late Jay Prakash Narayan and late K.G. Mashruwala. Regarding establishment of the Sarvodaya Society, a detailed plan was published on 20th January 1950. In such a society, there will be freedom for all and utmost equality; there will be no class and castes; no exploitation nor injustice; and equal opportunity for each for fullest development. Man will be the centre of such a society, but self-interest will not be the basis of social organization. Life in such a society will be an integrated whole, so that work, art and play will form a unified pattern making possible the growth of an integrated human personality. Further, there will be complete equality in a Sarvodaya society and no one would be oppressed under the tyranny of another person. It will be an ideal society and love and cooperation would be its bases. Truth and non-violence will dominate this society.

Sarvodaya is Gandhi's most significant socio political movement. Like Satyagraha, this also comprises two terms, Sarva- meaning one and all and Uday meaning wellbeing or upliftment. This combination thus indicates overall boost or development of all as the definition of Sarvodaya.

Gandhi first came across this righteous concept in the form of a book titled *Unto This Last*, by John Ruskin, which he read in South Africa in 1904. The effect of this book was so strong that it changed Gandhi's outlook towards life. He resolved to change his life according to the ethics of the book.

Three fundamental codes of belief formed the basis of Ruskin's ideology:

- An individual's benefit is in the benefit of everyone.
- A lawyer's work is as respectable as that of a barber; in as much as everyone has equal right to earn their living from their work.
- The life of labour, i.e., the life of one who tills soil and that of the handicraftsman are the lives that are worth living.

This system of belief made Gandhi feel obligated towards the society. He recalled these beliefs in his autobiography, 'The first of these I knew. The second, I had dimly realized. The third had never occurred to me. Unto This Last made it clear as daylight for me that the second and third were contained in the first. I arose with the dawn, ready to reduce these principles to practice'.

Despite Sarvodaya being a social philosophy in its basic form, India's pressing post-independence requirement demanded that it be changed into an urgent political set of guidelines. Its aim was to free the social classes from inequality and the best way to put it into practice was with the help of political resolve and state machinery. For Gandhi and for India, this was an indication of grassroots level boost which started in the villages with the most deprived classes, and then progressed to cover the higher social sections.

Nevertheless, to Gandhi, this was a physical expression of Sarvodaya. The more profound philosophies served as an inherent spiritual link for him. His quest for God guided him to the establishment of the most deprived and in the noble service of this lowest of the lowly man, Gandhi glimpsed God. This became his

worship and the soul of the deprived became his pilgrimage. Gandhi's exalted aspiration seemed to be getting fulfilled by service to the poorest of the poor. A justification to this perception is given by Gandhi himself, when he wrote in *Socialism of My Conception* in 1936: Man's ultimate aim is the realization of God, and all his activities, social, political, religious; have to be guided by the ultimate aim of the vision of God. The immediate service of all human beings becomes a necessary part of the endeavour, simply because the only way to find God is to see Him in His creation and be one with it. This can only be done by service of all. And this cannot be done except through one's country.

After 1948, Gandhi's associates carried forward this movement. The chief torchbearers of Sarvodaya were Acharya Vinoba Bhave, Jaiprakash Narayan and Dada Dharmadhikari. Their competent leadership and incessant striving propelled Sarvodaya from a mere initiative to a historic movement.

Sarvodaya puts emphasis on land. All wealth, including land, will be considered as common property to be used for common benefit. The class distinctions will vanish; everyone will work for society according to their capacity and receive from society in accordance to their needs. Production will be for consumption and mutual sharing, and not for profit. To put an end to bureaucratization of the economy, decentralization of production will be preferred in the new society. The economy will pre-eminently be based on small and cottage industries. There are two reasons ascribed for that. First, in a country like

India where capital is short and the size of labour supply too big, any attempt at industrialization through high technology is destined to fail. Second, the decentralization of production would prevent bureaucratization of the economic system and benefit the masses.

There will be no state in such a society. The state will not be abolished at once in such a society. The society will move gradually from a good government to a society without a government. The supporters of the Sarvodaya society are not in favour of indirect democracy, because in such a democracy there are political parties, which propagate wrong things. In a representative democracy all decisions are taken by majority and there is no regard for the minority. In such a government, all powers are concentrated in the hands of the government and its officials. Therefore, the Sarvodaya leaders are against this democracy and they suggest a government by the village. Acharya Vinoba Bhave has written that the village disputes should be solved in the villages. Then it would become a kingdom of God where there would be no conflicts and tensions. Vinobaji's Bhoodan movement aims at ushering in a new society on the basis of the Sarvodaya principles.

The Sarvodaya principles are highly commandable. They promote everything good that we strive for—selflessness, high morals and cooperation. If practised, it can only lead to betterment of the individual and mankind as a whole. However, it would not be wrong to state that the concept is more visionary than

applicable. Human beings fundamentally come with a lot of flaws and so does society. Non violent revolution, for one, cannot succeed without the backing of a party. Also, the fact that a society will exist that will have all its citizens live together in harmony is a pipe dream that will, as things stand, never be realized. Still, it would be a folly to dismiss the concept as too utopian and having no place in the real world. Even if humans achieve a portion of the principles advocated by the concept, much can be achieved.

Jaya Prakash Narayan

Jaya Prakash Narayan (1902–79) was a pioneer of the socialist movement and a renowned theoretician of socialist ideologies in India. In fact, he was the foremost leader, propagandist and spokesman of Indian socialism. He had played an important role in the struggle for India's independence as the acting General Secretary of the Indian National Congress in 1932 and had undergone imprisonment due to his nationalistic activities. He later organized the Congress Socialist Party in 1934 and became its general secretary.

Political Ideas of J.P. Narayan

J.P. Narayan was a high-ranking pioneer of the socialist movement in India and one of the most renowned theoreticians. His rationale for socialism was based on the fact that inequality leads to the social consequences, which threaten the stability of social relationships, such as exploitation of the poor by the rich and freedom, and freedom, which is the most fundamental of human

urges, becomes the domain of the prosperous few only. Hence socialism which has equality as the foundational value can ensure freedom for all and put an end to exploitation of man by man.

Democratic Socialism

The political philosophy of J.P. Narayan stands for Democratic Socialism. He felt that socialism needs to evolve through a democratic process. He felt that there is no need for dictatorship of the proletariat when the old ruling classes have been destroyed in India. He rejected the Soviet model of socialism and reinterpreted Marxism by referring to Marx at the Hague convention of the First International in 1872 where Marx did not consider a 'violent revolution' necessary for achieving socialism. That is why he felt that India needs to evolve its own picture of socialism, which is not possible without democracy. Therefore, it has to be a socialist state with democratic method.

Concept of Sarvodaya

J.P. Narayan along with Vinobha Bhave stood for a political revolution through the Sarvodaya society. The term *Sarvodaya* is composed of two words, '*Sarva*' and '*udaya*' which mean the 'rise of all' and 'upliftment of all'. This term was first used by Mahatma Gandhi as a translation of Ruskin's '*Unto the Last*' in 1904. The words 'Unto the Last' meant to uplift of the last or 'good of all' or 'service to all' or welfare service. Therefore, he wanted the society to be

organized on the lines of *Sarvodaya*.

The Sarvodaya Society was to be more or less a loose federation of a number of small self-governing villages with each of the unit self-sufficient and self-governing as far as possible. It is done so to attain the highest degree of decentralization in the political as well as economic spheres. There would not be any coercive or centralized authority such as a parliament which is elected on the basis of adult franchise and making laws with national administration on the principle of majority rule.

He wanted *rajniti*, i.e. politics to be replaced by *lokniti* which he defined as self-discipline or self-control while the former strengthen authoritarianism and there is ceaseless rivalry for power and a constant struggle for power. Since in a *sarvodaya* society, there is no place for government, therefore, it is free from oppressive rule of the foreign government.

The Sarvodaya Society will have two main principles, i.e. truth and non-violence. All the changes will occur peacefully. Peace would revolutionize the society in what J.P. Narayan called peaceful revolution or *sarvodaya*. There will not be any immorality or class hatred or gambling and no distinction between the rich and poor, privileged or under-privileged.

Self-control and self-suffering will be the basic requisites for realizing *sarvodaya*. The Sarvodaya Society should have the governor as the head of the state who should be living in a cottage which is accessible to all the citizens.

Being a citizen of India, he must also be a citizen of the world. In the Sarvodaya Society, the rights of the minority should be ensured and not exploited by the majority. It repudiates the concept of majoritarianism, i.e. the elements of superior virtue supposed to be present in the judgement of the majority. The minorities have the right to differ from the majority and all the decisions which should be carried out through majority should be carried out through consensus.

There will not be any class conflict in the society unlike that of Marx's class struggle. All the wealth, land, intellect and the property will be shared equally among the members of the society. Individual freedom should be ensured and each individual should learn the values of co-operation, mutual adjustment and self-sacrifice values which they should seek to preserve and value.

Concept of Democracy: Partyless Democracy

J.P. Narayan was a passionate patron of individual liberty. To him, democracy was both a creed as well as a way of life. He believed in the moral value of democracy and build up a new democratic setup in India according to the *sarvodaya* thought. As the institutions of democracy such as constitutions, systems of governments, parties and elections are futile unless the moral and spiritual qualities of the people appropriate the best constitutions and political systems. Although J.P. Narayan was an advocate of democracy, he was also a critic of Indian democracy in its present form and suggested ways to remove the

weaknesses that he felt.

The most serious drawback of Indian democracy was its highly centralized character of the Government. This prevented it from functioning as a direct democracy and the citizen was reduced to a vote-caster as a functionary of democracy. It also hampered the individual freedom as the bureaucracy did the major work which a citizen was supposed to perform. This was seen to lead to political apathy among the people.

Secondly, according to J.P. Narayan the democratic set up in the country has a narrow base. It is like an inverted pyramid that stands on its head and therefore it should stand on its base. He pointed that this defect in our legislative assemblies leads to the formation of a minority Government. He was critical of the fact that instead of the majority, the minority rules. Besides, the political parties also seek to come to power through their muscle as well as money power where the voters are bribed to cast their votes in their favour. The only solution out of this political mess is what J.P. Narayan advocates as a partyless democracy such as in the then Yugoslavia and Switzerland. Under such systems, democracy can function through a decentralized authority. He said that the concept of partyless democracy can be realized through the Bhoodan Movement:

- ✓ The people in each village should nominate through consensus and the techniques, which he called as *Bhoodan*, *Gramdan*, *Sampattidan*,

individuals whom they consider as their best servants. These individuals will form the *panchayat* or *mandal*. The members of the *Gram Mandal* will then form the *Thana Mandal* from which they will choose the members of the *District Panchayats*. In this way, the partyless democracy will start from the bottom. It will replace party politics and elections by community consensus as well as replacement of the principle of the majority by unanimity.

J.P. Narayan made an important contribution to political theory through his idea of participatory democracy. It is an extension of the Gandhian system of decentralization and Vinoba's idea of *Gram Swarajya*. He accepted the idea of a world community which could do justice to the suppressed sections of humanity. Although he is one of the most outstanding personalities in the field of Indian socialism but at times he is too idealistic and impractical to follow in a country like India. Nevertheless, he was great humanist revolutionary who pleaded for the maintenance of conditions which are necessary for the realization of equality of opportunities as the economic minimum is a pre-condition for the resplendence of the fruits of culture.

Self Assessment Questions

1. What were the core principles of Mahatma Gandhi's approach to nationalism, and how did they influence the Indian independence movement?
2. How did Jawaharlal Nehru's policies and vision contribute to the shaping of modern India after independence?
3. What is the concept of Total Revolution advocated by Jayaprakash Narayan, and how did it seek to address the political and social issues of India?

LEARNING RESOURCES

Recommended Books

Guha, Ramachandra, *Makers of Modern India*, Harvard University Press, Harvard, 2013.

Varma, V.P., *Indian Political Thought, Vol. II*, Laxmi Narayan Agarwal Educational Pub., Agra, 1959

Bhagwan, Vishnoo, *Indian Political Thinkers*, Atma Ram Pub., Lucknow, 1999

References

C.P.Andrews : The Renaissance in India

P.K.Gopalakrishnan : Development of Economic Ideas in India.

V.Brodovo : Indian Philosophy of Modern Times

Hanskohn : History of Nationalism in the East

C.Y.Chintamani : Indian Politics Since the Mutiny

Mujumdar.R.C. : History of Political Thought from Mohan to Dayananda.

Beniprasad : The Hindu – Muslim Questions

H.C.E.Zacharias : Renascent India

G.A.Natesan&Co : Ram Mohan Roy : Hist. Life, Writings and Speeches.