

MODERN INDIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

MA [Political Science]

First Semester

II (POLS 702C)

[ENGLISH EDITION]



Directorate of Distance Education
TRIPURA UNIVERSITY

Reviewer

Dr Aruna Kumar Malik

Assistant Professor, Gujarat National Law University

Authors:

Dr Jyoti Trehan Sharma and Ms. Lianboi Vaiphei (Units: 1.2-1.3, 1.4.3, 2.2, 2.4-2.5, 2.7, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5.1) © Dr Jyoti Trehan Sharma and Ms. Lianboi Vaiphei, 2015

Dr Biswaranjan Mohanty (Units: 2.3, 4.5, 4.6) © Dr Biswaranjan Mohanty, 2015

Vikas Publishing House (Units: 1.0-1.1, 1.4-1.4.2, 1.5-1.9, 2.0-2.1, 2.6, 2.8-2.12, 3.0-3.1, 3.3-3.10, 4.0-4.1, 4.3-4.4, 4.7-4.11)
© Reserved, 2015

Books are developed, printed and published on behalf of Directorate of Distance Education, Tripura University by Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication which is material, protected by this copyright notice may not be reproduced or transmitted or utilized or stored in any form of by any means now known or hereinafter invented, electronic, digital or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the DDE, Tripura University & Publisher.

Information contained in this book has been published by VIKAS® Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. and has been obtained by its Authors from sources believed to be reliable and are correct to the best of their knowledge. However, the Publisher and its Authors shall in no event be liable for any errors, omissions or damages arising out of use of this information and specifically disclaim any implied warranties or merchantability or fitness for any particular use.



VIKAS®

Vikas® is the registered trademark of Vikas® Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

VIKAS® PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT. LTD.

E-28, Sector-8, Noida - 201301 (UP)

Phone: 0120-4078900 • Fax: 0120-4078999

Regd. Office: 576, Masjid Road, Jangpura, New Delhi 110 014

• Website: www.vikaspublishing.com • Email: helpline@vikaspublishing.com

SYLLABI-BOOK MAPPING TABLE

Modern Indian Political Thought

| Syllabi | Mapping in Book |
|---|--|
| Unit: I Salient features of Modern Indian Political Thought Early Nationalist Responses: Rammohan to Jotiba Phule Socio-Political Thought: Naoroji, Ranade and Tilak | Unit 1: Features of Modern Indian Political Thought (Pages 3-36) |
| Unit: II Swami Vivekananda to Sri Aurobindo- A critical analysis of Indian Nationalism Gandhi, Subhas Bose , Neheru and Patel: An estimate of their views on national integration Rabindranath Tagore: Political Ideas, Nationalism | Unit 2: A Critical Analysis of Indian Nationalism (Pages 37-83) |
| Unit: III Keshab Baliram Hedgewar: Concept of State (Rastra) V.D. Savarkar: Cultural Nationalism M.S. Golwalker: Hindu Nationalism-A Critical Study Deendayal Upadhyaya: Integral Humanism | Unit 3: Political Thinkers – I (Pages 85-105) |
| Unit: IV Syed Ahmed Khan: Socio-Political Thoughts Mohammed Iqbal: Political Ideas Mohammed Ali Jinnah: Two Nation Theory Constitutionalism and Nationalism: Ambedkar and J.P. Narayan Ram Manohar Lohia: Political Thought | Unit 4: Political Thinkers – II (Pages 107-146) |

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|--------------|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| UNIT 1 FEATURES OF MODERN INDIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT | 3-36 |
| 1.0 Introduction | |
| 1.1 Unit Objectives | |
| 1.2 Modern Indian Political Thought: An Overview | |
| 1.3 Early Nationalist Responses | |
| 1.3.1 Ram Mohan Roy | |
| 1.3.2 Jotiba Phule | |
| 1.4 Socio-Political Thought | |
| 1.4.1 Dadabhai Naoroji | |
| 1.4.2 Ranade | |
| 1.4.3 Tilak | |
| 1.5 Summary | |
| 1.6 Key Terms | |
| 1.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress' | |
| 1.8 Questions and Exercises | |
| 1.9 Further Reading | |
| UNIT 2 A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF INDIAN NATIONALISM | 37-83 |
| 2.0 Introduction | |
| 2.1 Unit Objectives | |
| 2.2 Swami Vivekananda to Sri Aurobindo | |
| 2.2.1 Sri Aurobindo Ghose | |
| 2.3 Mahatma Gandhi | |
| 2.3.1 Major Influences on Gandhi | |
| 2.3.2 Political Ideas | |
| 2.3.3 Satyagraha | |
| 2.3.4 Concept of Society and Individual | |
| 2.3.5 Gandhian Socialism | |
| 2.4 Subhash Chandra Bose | |
| 2.4.1 Political Ideas | |
| 2.4.2 Socialist Ideology | |
| 2.4.3 The Concept of Samyavada | |
| 2.4.4 Nationalism | |
| 2.4.5 Concept of Freedom | |
| 2.4.6 Left Ideology | |
| 2.5 Jawaharlal Nehru | |
| 2.5.1 Political Ideas of Jawaharlal Nehru | |
| 2.5.2 Democratic Socialism | |
| 2.5.3 Concept of Democracy | |
| 2.5.4 Concept of Nationalism | |
| 2.5.5 Concept of Internationalism | |
| 2.5.6 Concept of Secularism | |
| 2.6 Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel | |
| 2.7 Rabindranath Tagore: Political Ideas, Nationalism | |
| 2.7.1 Concept of Democracy | |
| 2.7.2 Rights | |

- 2.7.3 Concept of Freedom
- 2.7.4 Views on Nation and Nationalism
- 2.7.5 Views on Internationalism and Universalism
- 2.8 Summary
- 2.9 Key Terms
- 2.10 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.11 Questions and Exercises
- 2.12 Further Reading

UNIT 3 POLITICAL THINKERS – I

85-105

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 Keshab Baliram Hedgewar: Concept of State
 - 3.2.1 Life and Works
- 3.3 V.D. Savarkar: Cultural Nationalism
- 3.4 M.S. Golwalker: Hindu Nationalism
- 3.5 Deendayal Upadhyaya: Integral Humanism
- 3.6 Summary
- 3.7 Key Terms
- 3.8 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.9 Questions and Exercises
- 3.10 Further Reading

UNIT 4 POLITICAL THINKERS – II

107-146

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 Syed Ahmed Khan: Socio-Political Thoughts
 - 4.2.1 Aligarh Movement: Social Reform and Education
 - 4.2.2 Concept of Nationalism
 - 4.2.3 Communalism
- 4.3 Mohammed Iqbal: Political Ideas
- 4.4 Mohammed Ali Jinnah
 - 4.4.1 Quaid-e-Azam's Fourteen Points
 - 4.4.2 Two-nation Theory
- 4.5 Constitutionalism and Nationalism: B.R. Ambedkar
 - 4.5.1 J.P. Narayan
- 4.6 Ram Manohar Lohia: Political Thought
 - 4.6.1 Goa and Nepal
 - 4.6.2 Lohia's Views on Capitalism and Marxism
 - 4.6.3 Revolutionary Thinker
 - 4.6.4 Lohia's Anti-English View
- 4.7 Summary
- 4.8 Key Terms
- 4.9 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.10 Questions and Exercises
- 4.11 Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

The period between 1707 and 1950 is extremely crucial in the history of India. The advent of the Europeans for the purpose of trading eventually led to the invasion of India by the British who ruled over India for a long time. The World War I and World War II played an important role in arousing the spirit of nationalism among people. Various freedom fighters fought for the independence of the country in their own way.

The Indian independence struggle included various political organizations, philosophies and movements. All of them aimed at ending the British rule in India. The Indian National Congress, along with Mahatma Gandhi, played a major role in the Indian national movement. Indian independence movement was fuelled by two ideologies—modernism and extremism. Both these ideologies strived for Poorna Swaraj but in different ways. Finally, India became independent on 15 August 1947 and became a republic on 26 January 1950 when the Constitution of India was enforced. During this period of struggle, India witnessed the arrival of several social and political thinkers. Early thinkers like Rammohan Roy, Dayanand Saraswati and Vivekananda show the path to new thoughts and acted as catalysts to a new awakening. They were followed by people, such as, Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak, V. D. Savarkar and Keshav Baliram Hedgewar, to mention a few.

This book discusses in detail the ideologies of thinkers mentioned above and many more. The book critically assesses the socio-political and economic factors that led to the rise of these thinkers.

This book, *Modern Indian Political Thought*, has been designed keeping in mind the self-instruction mode (SIM) format. It follows a simple pattern, wherein each unit of the book begins with the Introduction followed by the Unit Objectives for the topic. The content is then presented in a simple and easy-to-understand manner and is interspersed with Check Your Progress questions to reinforce the student's understanding of the topic. A list of Questions and Exercises is also provided at the end of each unit. The Summary, Key Terms and Activity further act as useful tools for students and are meant for effective recapitulation of the text.

NOTES

UNIT 1 FEATURES OF MODERN INDIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

NOTES

Structure

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Unit Objectives
- 1.2 Modern Indian Political Thought: An Overview
- 1.3 Early Nationalist Responses
 - 1.3.1 Ram Mohan Roy
 - 1.3.2 Jotiba Phule
- 1.4 Socio-Political Thought
 - 1.4.1 Dadabhai Naoroji
 - 1.4.2 Ranade
 - 1.4.3 Tilak
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 Key Terms
- 1.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.8 Questions and Exercises
- 1.9 Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The impact of modern Western culture gave birth to a new awakening in India. Western conquest exposed the weakness and decay of Indian society. Thoughtful Indians began to look for the defects in their society and for ways and means of removing them. While large number of Indians refused to come to terms with the West and still put their faith in traditional Indian ideas and institutions, others gradually came to hold that modern Western thought provided the key to the regeneration of their society. They were impressed in particular by modern science and the doctrines of reasons and humanism. Moreover, the new social groups—the capitalist class, the working class, the modern intelligentsia—demanded modernization since their own interests demanded it.

The arrival of this intellectual renaissance in India has been a great causal factor in the rise of modern Indian nationalism. It may also be regarded as an attempt on the part of scores of cultural factors to revive and reassert them: a sort of defence mechanism against the impact of an alien political power in the country.

In this unit, you will learn about some key features of modern Indian political thought, early nationalist responses and socio-political ideas of popular Indian thinkers.

NOTES

1.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Provide an overview of modern Indian political thought
- Explain the early nationalist responses, including those of Rammohan and Jotiba Phule
- Discuss Indian socio-political ideas of thinkers including Naoroji, Ranade and Tilak

1.2 MODERN INDIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT: AN OVERVIEW

A new humanist and cosmopolitan interpretation began to be put upon the old writing in the late nineteenth century. A radical trend thus arose with representatives like Anantaranga Pillai, Abutalib, Henry Vivian Derozio, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, and many more political pioneers.

Anantaranga Pillai kept notes for almost 25 years in which he faithfully expressed his feelings. He clearly stated that it was a blessing that the French came to India. He preferred the French rule to that of the Marathas' and the Muslims'. The reason being he believed that the French were the establishers of true law and order. Contradictorily enough, both Gandhi and Tilak asserted in the early 20th century that an efficient foreign rule is not a sufficient replacement for self-rule. Pillai did not regard Dupleix as a reformer. Also, he believed that the coming of foreigners was not disastrous. What was disastrous was the forgetfulness of the people towards *dharma*. Pillai's notes serve as a source of great information.

Abutalib belonged to an aristocratic Muslim family. As a thinker, he represented the Muslims. His small piece of literature in the form of a travelogue represented the differences of outlook between the British Muslims and the Indian Muslims. He was very much impressed by the British sense of perfection and their idea of material progress through the removal of all the impediments that hindered a comfortable living. He really liked their pursuit of knowledge in a scientific manner. All these social features were virtually absent among the Indian Muslims.

Henry Vivian Derozio possessed a dazzling intellect and followed the most radical views of the time drawing his inspiration from the French Revolution. He was also the leader of the Young Bengal Movement. He taught at the Hindu College (Presidency College, Calcutta) from 1826 to 1831. He encouraged and inspired his students to think rationally and freely, to question all authority, to love liberty, equality and freedom, and to worship truth. He and his followers attacked old and decadent customs, rites and traditions. However, their radicalism was not appreciated and accepted by many. They did not succeed in creating a movement because social conditions were not yet ripe for their ideas to flourish. In fact, to an extent their radicalism was bookish. They failed to come to grips with the Indian reality.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What, according to Pillai, was the real disaster for India?
2. Who was the leader of the Young Bengal movement?

NOTES

1.3 EARLY NATIONALIST RESPONSES

The central figure in the political awakening in India was Raja Ram Mohan Roy, who is rightly regarded as the first great leader of modern India or the Father of Modern India. Roy had a deep love for the Indian people. He really loved his country and worked hard all his life for their social, religious, intellectual and political regeneration. He was pained by the stagnation and corruption of contemporary Indian society which was at that time dominated by caste and conventions. Popular religion was full of superstition and was exploited by the selfish and corrupt priests. The upper classes were selfish and often sacrificed social interest to meet their own narrow interests. Roy possessed great love and respect for the traditional philosophical system of the East; but at the same time, he believed that Western culture alone could help regenerate Indian society. In particular, he wanted his countrymen to accept the scientific and rational approach, the principle of human dignity and social equality of all men and women. He also wanted the introduction of modern capitalism and industry in the country.

The outlook of Raja Ram Mohan Roy was based on an intellectual synthesis of the best thought of the Orient and the Occident. He was a learned scholar who knew over a dozen languages including Sanskrit, Persian, Arabic, English, Persian, Arabic, English, French, Latin, Greek and Hebrew. He was also well acquainted with Jainism and other religious movements and sects of India. Later he made an intensive study of the Western thought and culture. In 1809, he wrote in Persian his famous work '*Gift to Monotheists*'. In this work he put forward weighty arguments against belief in many Gods and argued for the worship of a single God. Roy vigorously criticized the worship of idols, rigidity of caste and pervasiveness of meaningless religious rituals.

He held that all the principal ancient texts of the Hindus preached monotheism or worship of one God. He published the Bengali translation of the Vedas and the five principles of Upanishads to prove his point. Roy believed in the power of human reason. He did not confine his appreciation of the rational approach to Indian religious beliefs and tradition alone. In this he disappointed his many missionary friends who had hoped that his rational critique of Hinduism would lead him to embrace Christianity.

Roy insisted on applying rationalism to Christianity too, particularly to the elements of blind faith in it. In 1820, he published his *Precepts of Jesus* in which he tried to separate the moral and philosophic message of the New Testament. He wanted the high moral message of Christ to be incorporated in Hinduism. This earned for him the hostility of the missionaries. Thus, as far as Roy was concerned, there was to be no blind reliance on India's own past or blind aping of the West. On

NOTES

the other hand, he put forward the idea that new India, guided by reason, should acquire and treasure all that was best in the East and the West. He stood for the reform of Hinduism and opposed its supersession by Christianity. He vigorously defended Hindu religion and philosophy from the ignorant attacks of the missionaries.

Roy's active social life coincided with the times of religious reform movements. These launched a crusade against medieval religion which sanctified such institutions as caste which was a powerful obstacle to the national unity of Indian people and a massive impediment to the development of a new economy in the country. The movements attacked polytheism, the practice of meaningless soul-deadening religious rites and religious dogmas which undermined the intellectual power of the people. They were national in content but religious in form. Brahmo Samaj was founded by Roy in 1828. Since the Hindu society was dominated and governed by religious conceptions of Hinduism, no religious reform movement could avoid a social reform programme in its scheme of things. According to Roy and other early religious reformers, religious renovation was the vital condition for revising the social structure from a decadent system to a healthy one.

The Brahmo Samaj, under the leadership of the Raja, launched an offensive against the caste system branding it as undemocratic, inhuman and anti-national. It crusaded against *sati pratha* and child marriage. It stood for the freedom of the widow to remarry and equal rights of men and women.

The Brahmo Samaj valued the modern Western culture and organized educational institutions in the country for spreading their message among the people. Roy was an admirer of the liberal democratic culture of the West.

Rammohan Roy therefore, considered the British rule in India as a good thing. He admired it for inaugurating progressive measures of social reform such as the abolition of *sati* and infanticide, for establishing modern educational institutions and a free press among others. This was natural since the British rule in India, during the first half of the 19th century, reflected a progressive aspect. Yet, in spite of his great admiration for the British, Roy organized a protest movement against the measure to restrict the freedom of the press. He also criticized the Britain government for excluding Indians from higher posts. Since the Brahmo Samaj was not merely religious movement but also included in its programme items of social and political reform, it was the precursor of the subsequent social reform movement started by Ranade and others. It also happened to be the harbinger of the political reform movement initiated during the early phase of Indian National Congress. The Brahmo Samaj inaugurated a new era for the Indian people by proclaiming the principles of individual freedom, national unity, solidarity and collaboration, and the democratization of all social institutions and social relations.

Raja Ram Mohan Roy inaugurated the Modern Age in India. From being a preserver of Indian tradition and customs, to a pioneer of Indian journalism, to the initiator of public agitation, to a firm believer in internationalism, Roy all his life fought against social injustice and inequality despite great personal loss and hardship. Roy had a very good understanding of history at a time when India's history was only a collection of images and impressions with no well-organized literature available.

He advocated a thesis explaining the cause of decline of Indian people through the ages. One of the causes was the lack of unity, and the other one was the absence of patriotism.

Roy also realized the problem of the drain of wealth from India. By and large, Raja Ram Mohan Roy did succeed in his mission. He represented the liberal spirit of his times. He was not an isolated thinker in an ivory tower. Roy, thus, was in the real sense 'Father of Modern India'.

Roy's political thought was a very interesting mixture of the liberal humanitarian approach of Europe and the religious and spiritual movements in India. As such, renaissance can be regarded as the product of these two forces. At times, Christianity was also involved, even leading to conflict between Christianity and Hinduism. Christian offenses, however, withdrew because of the new awakening and awareness among the Indian people. Brahmo Samaj was the earliest effort in renaissance, which attempted to blend the deepest experience of religion and spiritual life of ancient India with the message of social democracy of the French revolution.

The ideas and works of Brahmo Samaj appealed to the educated upper class of the society who wanted to bring about reform through rationality and reasoning. It was not very popular with lower classes. Yet, it did command influence. After Raja Ram Mohan Roy's death in 1833, the Brahmo Samaj did continue to exist but without much life till Debendranath Tagore, father of Rabindranath Tagore, revitalized it. He was a product of the best in the traditional Indian learning and the new thought of the West. Debendranath Tagore developed skepticism about the infallibility of the scriptures and finally repudiated it. He substituted intuition for the authority of the scriptures. By means of intuition he located sections of Upanishads which served as the religio-ideological basis of the doctrines and programmes of the Brahmo Samaj.

The young elements in the Samaj, who regarded themselves as radicals, resented this, and found their leader in Keshab Chander Sen (1838–84). Brahmo Samaj thus split into Brahmo Samaj of India under Keshab Chander Sen, and Adi Brahmo Samaj under Debendranath Tagore. Under Sen, the doctrine of the Brahmo Samaj was more and more adapted to the doctrine of pure Christianity. In later stages, he propounded the doctrine of 'Adesha' according to which God inspires knowledge in some individuals whose words must therefore be considered infallible and true. A section of Brahmos did not accept this doctrine, left the Samaj and started the Sadharan Brahmo Samaj with members like Surender Nath Bannerjee. This shows how an organization of cultural and religious reforms became a nursery for Indian nationalism. However, by 1922 the members of the Samaj dropped to just around 5000. Yet, the hypothesis stands that the cultural movement preceded political movement.

Another religious reform movement started in India under the impact of the new Indian and international conditions was the Theosophical Society, founded in the United States by Madam H.P. Blavastsky and Col. H.S. Olcott, who later came to India and founded the headquarters of the society at Adiyar near Madras in 1886. The theosophical movement soon grew in India as a result of the leadership given to it by Mrs. Annie Besant who had come to India in 1893. The uniqueness of this

NOTES

NOTES

movement consisted in the fact that it was inaugurated by a non-Indian who was a great admirer of Hinduism. It subscribed to the spiritual philosophy of ancient Hinduism and recognized its doctrine of the transmigration of soul. It preached universal brotherhood of men irrespective of distinctions of caste, creed, race or sex. Theosophists stood for making a comparative study of all the oriental religions.

However, it considered ancient Hinduism as the most profound spiritual religion in the world. It regarded men as the manifestations of God. However, the movement failed to strike deep roots in the country.

Rama Krishna Mission stands on the same platform of socio-religious reform movements. The national awakening of the Indian people found expression in the movement inspired by Ramakrishna, a great Hindu saint who sought religious salvation in the traditional ways of reincarnation, meditation and devotion (*bhakti*) in his search for religious truth or the realization of God. He lived with mystics of other faiths, including Muslims and Christians. He again and again emphasized that there were many roads to God and salvation and that the service of mankind was the service of God, for man was the embodiment of God.

It was his great disciple, Swami Vivekanand, an intellectual of a very high calibre, who after the death of the saint founded the Ramakrishna Mission (1897) to propagate his teachings. The Mission aimed at protecting Indians from materialistic influences of the Western civilization. It idealized Hinduism including its practice of idol worship and polytheism. It aimed at the spiritual conquest of the world through revived Hinduism.

Vivekanand stressed social action. He also gave the idea of religious socialism. Earlier in 1893, he attended the Parliament of Religions in Chicago, and was able to communicate with the learned people of the world. His speech impressed all because of his rationality and reasoning. He said that in the West the goal of individual was independence, his language was moneymaking, and his education was means to politics. As regards India, the goal was *mukti* or self-realization, the language was the Vedas, and the means were self-renunciation.

Vivekanand emphasized the indispensable oneness of all religions and harshly condemned any narrowness in religious matters. At the same time, he was convinced of the superior approach of the Indian philosophical tradition. He himself subscribed to Vedanta which he declared to be a fully rational system.

Vivekanand criticized Indians for having lost touch with the rest of the world and becoming stagnant and mummified. He realized that India was in real need of science. He even condemned the caste system and the current Hindu emphasis on ritual, ceremonies and superstitions. He urged the people to imbibe the spirit of liberty equality and free thinking. Vivekanand was also a great humanist. Touched by the poverty, misery and suffering of the masses of the country, he said: 'The only God in whom I believe, the sum total of all souls, and above all, my God the wicked my God the afflicted, my God the poor of all races.' To the educated Indians he said: 'So long as the millions live in hunger and ignorance, I hold every man a traitor, who having been educated at their expense, pays not the least need to them.'

The Mission had many branches in different parts of the country and carried on social service by opening schools, hospitals and dispensaries, orphanages, libraries, etc. The movement did not stress on personal salvation but on social good or social service.

The Arya Samaj was founded in Bombay in 1875 by Swami Dayanand Saraswati. It embodied the first upsurge of Indian nationalism and was a movement of quite a different nature. It had a more revivalist character. It declared the Vedas infallible and termed them as inexhaustible reservoir of all knowledge past, present and future. Since the Vedas were proclaimed infallible, the word of the Vedas and not the judgement of the individual was the final criterion. Thus, the Arya Samaj, while freeing the individual from the tyranny and tutelage of the Brahmin, demanded of him implicit faith in the divine nature of Vedas.

The repudiation of the authority of the Brahmin, the denouncing of the infinite number of meaningless rites and the worship of the images of different Gods and Goddesses which split the people into numerous belligerent sects, and the crusade against the scores of religious superstitious which kept, for many centuries, the Hindu mind in a state of mental befogging and spiritual degradation. These were the progressive elements in the programme of the Arya Samaj. Its slogan 'Back to Vedas' was inspired with the urge to bring about national unity and to inculcate national pride among the masses. However, since it retained its narrow Hindu basis, the national unity it proclaimed could not gather into it folds the non-Hindu communities such as the Muslims and the Christians. It became a semi-rationalized form of Hinduism.

The Arya Samaj had a programme of social reform also. Though opposed to the hereditary caste system, it stood for the four-fold caste division of society (to be determined by merit and not by birth). The Arya Samaj stood for equal rights to man and woman in social and educational matters. This was a distinct democratic conception. However, it opposed co-education. It also organized a network of schools and colleges in the country (DAV or Dayanand Anglo Vedic). The conservative section of the Samaj, however, started Gurukul in Haridwar where the education was Vedic in character in both content and method.

In all its activities, the Arya Samaj was generally inspired with the spirit of nationalism and democracy. It attempted to integrate the Hindus by destroying the sub-castes. It represented a form of the national awakening of the Indian people. Again, the Arya Samaj could not be a national or cosmopolitan religion since it demanded of its followers the recognition of the principle of the infallibility and the omniscience of the Vedas. However, the Arya Samaj played a progressive role in the earlier stages of Indian nationalism. However, when the national awakening broadened and deepened, and the national movement reached greater and greater secular heights, it became a hindrance to the growth of Indian nationalism by continuing, though unconsciously, to the creation of a belligerent religio-communal atmosphere.

The national awakening among the Indian Muslims took place at a slower rate than among the Hindus. There were historical and religious reasons for this.

NOTES

NOTES

Though a number of Hindu kingdoms had emerged during the period of the dissolution of the Mughal Empire after Aurangzeb, the Muslims always felt that they comprised the ruling community in India. They were particularly hostile to the British whom they accused of expropriating them of their political power. This made the Muslims avoid any contact with the new culture and education which the British introduced in India. They avoided coming under the influence of this system of education and stuck with greater tenacity to orthodox Islam. The impoverishment of the Muslims during the process of the British conquest of India took place at a rapid rate.

The Hindus availed themselves of the new education. They projected an educated class. A section of this class assimilated the principles of Liberalism, and studied other religions and organized several reform movements. On the other hand, the Muslims unfortunately got disoriented from the new education. It was predominantly from the Hindu community that the first section of the Indian intelligentsia and the bourgeoisie sprang out. It was only by the end of the 19th century that the Muslims began to take to modern education.

Some critics point out that another factor which restricted the growth of nationalism among the Indian Muslims was the basic character of Islam. Islam, they say, emphasizes more fanatically than any other religion the unity of its followers. It is a cosmopolitan union of the Muslims all over the world.

It resulted in greater resistance to the growth of nationalism which has a limited national territorial basis. It gives rise either to pan-Islamism or Humanism. Islam arose out of the democratic ferment of the people of Arabia against the privilege strata of society. As such, it has democratic undercurrents because Islam preaches the principles of social equality.

In spite of this relatively slow inertia of the Muslims, from the point of view of their development on nationalist lines, there sprang up, in course of time, a number of religious revivalist and reform movements among them. These movements were, however, not so powerful as their counterparts among the Hindus. The first signs of national awakening among Muslims found expression in a movement which aimed at making the Indian Muslims politically conscious and spreading modern education among them. Syed Ahmad Khan was the founder of this movement.

The liberal social reform and cultural movement founded by Syed Ahmed Khan is known as the Aligarh Movement, because it was at Aligarh that the Mohammedan Anglo Oriental College was established by it in 1875. This college developed into the Aligarh University in 1890. Along with it, an All India Muslim Educational Conference was also organized.

The Aligarh Movement aimed at spreading the Western education among the Muslims without weakening their allegiance to Islam. The religious education reinforced the secular education which was imparted through the educational institutions it started. The second task it undertook was to introduce social reform in the Muslim society.

The Aligarh Movement aimed at evolving a distinct social and cultural community among the Indian Muslims more or less on the modern lines. It condemned

polygamy and the social ban on widow remarriage which though permitted by Islam had crept in among some sections of the Muslims who were recent converts from Hinduism.

The Aligarh Movement was based on a liberal interpretation for the Quran. It tried to harmonize Islam with the modern liberal culture. Taking inspiration from the Aligarh Movement, several progressive movements sprang up in Bombay, Punjab, Hyderabad and other places.

Sir Muhammad Iqbal, the celebrated poet, played an important role in the history of Indian Muslims. Though he supported the Liberal movement, he asked the Muslim liberals to be on guard so that the broad human principles which Islam stood for were not thrown in the background by emphasis on the nation and the race. Iqbal described the European civilization as inhuman, rapacious, predatory and decadent. He was essentially a humanist and considered Islam as a religion of comprehensive humanism. In the later phase of his life, however, Iqbal exhibited a reactionary tendency. He opposed democracy as a system and became hostile to the Indian nationalist movement.

1.3.1 Ram Mohan Roy

Raja Ram Mohan Roy may be regarded as the founder of modern Indian political thought. Though his basic interest was in religion and philosophy, yet he was intensely concerned with the practical political problems of his times. He was not a systematic political thinker. His approach to politics was pragmatic and the method followed by him in political investigation was historical as well as empirical. His political thought has to be discussed through a diligent research of his writings which are quite extensive. Ram Mohan Roy was of the opinion that India had developed constitutional form of government during the several centuries preceding the Christian era. Raja had a profound knowledge of the Indian history.

Raja acquired the knowledge of the working of the British Indian administration including its judicial and revenue system. He was conscious of the effect of these institutions and pleaded for radical changes in their working. He demanded that the rule of law should be fully observed and the Indians should be given civil and political rights in conformity with their social status and capabilities.

Among the Western political thinkers, who influenced Roy's thinking on politics, the names of Bentham, Blackstone and Montesquieu need to be mentioned. From Montesquieu he borrowed the concept of the separation of powers as a necessary precondition of freedom. Ram Mohan Roy proposed that absolute separation of powers should become the basis of a reformed constitutional arrangement for India. Inspired by Blackstone's interpretation of the English constitution, Roy demanded the same guarantees of individual liberty for the Indian people as were available to the Englishmen. Political liberty would follow the grant of security of life and property. He agreed that India required a long period of tutelage before it could qualify for self-government and national freedom.

NOTES

NOTES

Roy's Concept of Freedom

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was a passionate believer in the ideal of freedom. His devotion to freedom of thoughts and expression had a lyrical quality about it. The Indian political tradition, despite its despotic aspects, had never interfered with the expression of heretical ideas in the realms of religion and philosophy. Roy emphasized this aspect of our cultural heritage and claimed that the concept of freedom of thought and worship was native to Indian soil.

His love for the ideal of liberty was further reinforced by his study of Western political thought and political movements. As a liberal thinker himself, Roy wanted to see the victory of the ideals of liberalism in every country. The concept of freedom could not be limited by narrow national boundaries. For Ram Mohan Roy the dimensions of liberty were universal and international. For historical reasons, freedom and constitutional government first arose in Europe, but Roy was confident that the Eastern world would sooner or later realize these ideals too.

Roy's Notion of Civil Liberty and Rule of Law

Citizens of a modern democratic state enjoy certain civil rights which are guaranteed by the rule of law or a written constitution. Ram Mohan Roy was of the view that civil rights cannot be claimed as the natural rights of men. They can exist only in a constitutional system of government where the laws of the state deliberately protect them. Roy argued that the Indians were placed under the protection of the whole British nation and that the British parliament was the supreme law-making authority for them and, consequently, the Indians were entitled to enjoy the same civil and religious rights which were given to Britons in Great Britain. The civil rights which the British subjects in India ought to enjoy are: right to life and liberty, right to property, freedom of thought and expression, and freedom of faith and religious worship. In his tract entitled *Final Appeal to the Christian Public*, Roy pointed out that the

Rajput and Muslim political rulers did not allow civil liberties to their subjects.

The protection of civil rights depended on certain constitutional and political reforms. Roy demanded for this purpose a written legal code, separation of legislative, judicial and executive functions, independent and efficient judiciary, introduction of the Habeas Corpus Act and the jury system, and the legal accountability of administrations. Roy wanted that the legal code should be self-sufficient and should preclude further references to any other books of authority, either Indian or European. He strongly criticized the fusion of administrative and judicial powers in the collector. He argued that the proceedings in the law courts should be made public so that the local Indian languages and English may replace Persian as the official language of the courts and administration. Revitalization of the Panchayat system and the inclusion of Indians as jurors and judges could be the devices to correct the abuses of the judicial system. Ram Mohan Roy firmly wanted to establish the legal accountability of every action of an official. To prevent corruption, he advised payment of higher salaries to Indian judges. Despite his adherence to the general principle of equality before law, he did not mind the creation of special courts for the trial of persons of high rank. Roy also emphasized the importance of the right to private property and considered it is inviolable.

Like Locke, Ram Mohan believed that the government should follow a policy of tolerance and must not interfere with the religious beliefs and rites of the subjects. He demanded that the British rulers should pay due respect to Indian religions and must not imitate policies of other conquerors of the past who ridiculed and persecuted the religion of the defeated races. He quoted the historical examples of the Greek, Roman and Muslim conquerors who had persecuted their Jewish and Christian subjects for their religious beliefs. He hoped that the English would not display religious intolerance in their treatment of Hindus and Muslims in India. Criticizing the attitude of the Christian missionaries, Roy declared:

To introduce a religion by means of abuse and insult, or by affording the hope of worldly gain, is inconsistent with reasons and justice. If by the force of argument they can prove the truth of their own religion and the falsity of that of Hindus many would of course embrace their doctrines, and in case they fail to prove this, they should not undergo such useless trouble, nor tease Hindus any longer by their attempt at conversion.

Roy and Freedom of Press

Ram Mohan Roy attached great importance to freedom of the press. He carried on a campaign against the Bengal Government's Regulation of 1823 aimed at restricting the freedom of Indian periodical press. He claimed that the Indian subjects had enjoyed freedom of the press since the beginning of the British rule. Roy criticized the arguments of the British officials in favour of the Bengal Regulation and made a spirited defence of the need for a free press in India in his petition to the King-in-Council. The British view was that a free press could be permitted only within a representative constitutional framework and India did not qualify for this privilege as it was a colony.

Ram Mohan argued that a free press was even more essential in India because the Indian government was not representative. A free press could prove an effective channel of communication between the people and the authorities. It can enable the rulers to redress the grievances of their subjects before they accumulate and bring about a revolutionary overthrow of the colonial regime. A free press would diffuse knowledge, improve the minds of the people and make them more loyal towards the British regime as this loyalty would be based on a critical understanding of the benefits of the British rule.

Roy on Separation of Powers

Like Montesquieu, Raja Ram Mohan Roy was a firm believer in the theory of separation of powers. While Montesquieu regarded it as a necessary precondition of constitutional liberty, Roy considered it as a cardinal principle of good government. In the case of district administration, Roy strongly protested against the fusion of executive and judicial functions in the person of the collector.

Before the renewal of the Charter in 1833, there were, broadly speaking, two schools of opinion regarding the creation of legislative authority for India. One school represented by John Sullivan and others held that India must have a legislative council on the Indian Territory to legislate for the country. The other school of opinion

NOTES

NOTES

wanted to preserve the status quo and wanted the British parliament to exercise legislative authority for India.

Ram Mohan Roy too opposed the plan of vesting legislative authority in the hands of legislative council in India because such a council was bound to be dominated by the executive wing of the Indian government. While he demanded that the British parliament should legislate for India, he was opposed to the transfer of executive power from the East India Company to the Crown as this would violate the principle of separation of powers and might lead to a despotic government.

The constitutional arrangement for India, according to Ram Mohan Roy, ought to have been based on the principle of separation of powers, checks and balances and limited government. While the British Parliament in England should be the law-making authority for India, the executive power should continue with the administrators of the East India Company stationed on Indian Territory. Moreover, there should be a complete delinking of the judicial function from the executive function and with both of these functions the educated and qualified Indians should be associated in larger number. The Indians ought to be entrusted with the highest judicial and administrative responsibilities. To a modern reader, Ram Mohan Roy's faith in the doctrine of separation of powers as the basis of institutional rearrangement for the British colonial system seems to be highly misplaced.

Roy and Colonial Rule

Speaking about the attitudes of various sections of the Indian population towards British colonial rule, Ram Mohan Roy said that the responses varied from extreme hostility through total apathy to sincere administration. The hostile elements generally belonged to the aristocratic class. He was much more impressed by the constitutional evolution of England where absolute monarchy had gradually been transformed into a constitutional form of government. He thought that the existing colonial rule of the British in India could also be transformed into constitutional rule by introducing the principle of separation of powers and through increasing association of the members of the Indian intelligentsia with administrative and judicial functions. Roy had made a deep and penetrating study of the British political system. He was deeply influenced by Blackstone's commentaries on the laws of England. Blackstone's interpretation of the English constitution was rigidly and narrowly legalistic which failed to take note of the emergence of the cabinet system. Following the analysis of Blackstone, Roy also thought that the essential merit of the British system was its reliance on the separation of powers. Consequently, he insisted on the implementation of the same principle in the reorganization of the Indian government. However, his advocacy of a legal code for India showed that on this question his views were more in harmony with those of Bentham than with those of Blackstone. Roy did not want that law-making authority should be vested in any institution controlled by the East India Company such as the Governor-General or his council. This function ought to be entrusted to the sovereign in the realm as the study of Bentham's works must have convinced him in this regard. He recommended three methods for ensuring good legislation for India. The first and the most important condition was the establishment of a free press in the country. Through a free press, the public can express its

opinion, the laws enacted by them could correspond to the opinion of the people and serve general interest. A free press allows the people to ventilate their grievances and prevent a revolution by enabling the British rulers to make laws in conformity with public opinion. The second method recommended by Ram Mohan Roy for securing good legislation for India was the appointment of inquiry by the British parliament whenever it decided to frame any new law about India. The third method proposed by Ram Mohan Roy to facilitate the task of suitable legislation for India was to ascertain the views of the aristocratic, wealthy and educated classes on any new piece of proposed legislation before it was finally enacted. However, some critics point out that this proposal seems to suggest his bias towards aristocracy and his 'contempt of the masses'. They say that for him, public opinion meant the opinion of the *zamindars*, merchants and the bureaucratic functionaries only.

NOTES

Roy's Ideal of Internationalism

Raja Ram Mohan Roy's love of liberty had no parochial or chauvinistic quality about it because it embraced the entire humanity irrespective of ethnic and national frontiers. In the spiritual sphere, he was the prophet of universal religion and preached the ideal of brotherhood of men. In the political sphere, he hoped for the victory of the liberal doctrines throughout the world. Roy did not recognize any basic contradiction or antagonism between nationalism and internationalism. He realized this truth at a time when the creed of nationalism was breeding so much intolerance and bitterness in Europe. He believed that Indian nationalism would gain strength from the achievement of national freedom by all European nationalities. The free nations of the world would then discover a bond of union in their common adherence to the principles of liberty and a liberal form of government.

Thus, Roy was one of the earliest exponents of the noble ideal of internationalism and cosmopolitan fraternity. In one of his hymns to the Almighty, Roy prayed: 'May God render religion destructive of differences and dislike between man and man, and conducive to the peace and union of mankind.' In the British connection with India, he visualized an instrument by which the nations of Asia could be elevated to the status of Europeans in material and cultural attainments. Without this process of leveling up of the economically and culturally backward peoples of the Orient, the great objective of universal brotherhood would remain a mere utopia.

The British Empire in India had given an opportunity to two great nations of the West and the East to come together and develop a synthesis of their divergent cultural traditions and make a successful experiment in international cooperation. As a worshipper at the shrine of universal fraternity, Ram Mohan suggested various means by which existing imperialist relationship between India and England based on force could be transformed into a voluntary union of nations based on mutually shared rights and benefits. He thought that the complete existence of a free press and deference to public opinion and finally appointment of the Indians to high offices according to merit would remove the isolation of the British regime and pave the way for a permanent association between the two great peoples could be a worthy example in international friendship to be emulated by other nations.

NOTES

However, Ram Mohan Roy was not dogmatic in his approach and did not like making political prophecies. During the last years of his life, he even suggested that India might become an independent nation within the next few decades. He hoped that this separation, when it came about, should be without violence and free India with the help of the free nations of Europe should participate in the task of spreading the message of liberalism and liberty to other nations of the East. Roy thought that the ideal of liberty was indivisible and could not be confined to just one part of the world.

1.3.2 Jotiba Phule

Another political pioneer of the times was Mahatma Jyotirao Govindrao Phule. Fondly known as Jotiba Phule, he occupies a unique position among the social reformers of Maharashtra of the nineteenth century. While other reformers concentrated mainly upon reforming the social institutions of marriage and family, with special emphasis on the status and rights of women, Jyotirao Phule revolted against the unjust caste system under which millions of people had suffered for centuries. Particularly noteworthy is that he courageously upheld the cause of the untouchables and took up the cudgels for them. He was a strong and committed advocate of their rights. The story of his life is an inspiring saga of a continuous struggle, which he waged relentlessly against the dominant forces of reaction.

Born in 1827, Jotiba lost his mother when he was only one year old. His father, Govindrao, was a vegetable vendor in Poona. Originally, Jyotirao's family was known as Gorhays and they came from Katgun, a village in Satara district of Maharashtra. His grandfather, Shetiba Gorhay, had settled down in Poona. Since Jyotirao's father and two uncles served as florists under the last of the Peshwas, they came to be known as Phule. After completing his primary education, Jyotiba had to leave the school and help his father by working on the family's farm. Jyotirao's marriage ceremony was held when he was not even thirteen.

Impressed by Jyotirao's intelligence and love for acquiring knowledge, two of his neighbours, one a Muslim teacher and another a Christian gentleman persuaded his father, Govindrao, to allow him to study in a secondary school. In 1841, Jotiba got admission in the Scottish Mission's High School at Poona. It was in this school that he met Sadashiv Ballal Govande, a Brahmin, who remained a close friend of Jyotiba throughout his life. Both Jyotirao and Govande were greatly influenced by Thomas Paine's ideas and they read with great interest Paine's famous book 'The Rights of Man'. Moro Vithal Valvekar and Sakharam Yashwant Paranjapye were two other Brahmin friends of Jyotirao who stood by him in all his activities. After completing his secondary education in 1847, Jyotirao decided not to accept a job with the Government.

An incident in 1848 made him aware about the inequalities of the caste system and the predominant position of the Brahmin in the social system. He was invited to attend a wedding of one of his Brahmin friends. As the bridegroom was being taken in a procession, Jyotirao accompanied him along with his (bridegroom's) relatives. Knowing that Jyotirao belonged to the Mali caste, which was considered to be inferior by the Brahmins, the relatives of the bridegroom insulted and abused him.

Jyotirao left the procession and returned home. With tears in his eyes, he narrated his experience to his father who tried to pacify him. After this incident, Jyotirao made up his mind to defy the caste-system and serve the Shudras and women who were deprived of all their rights as human beings under the draconian caste system.

He believed that education of women and the lower castes deserved priority. Hence, he began educating his wife Savitribai and opened a girls' school in August, 1848. The orthodox opponents of Jyotirao were furious and they started a vicious campaign against him. He refused to be unnerved by their malicious propaganda. As no teacher dared to work in a school in which untouchables were admitted as students, Jyotirao asked his wife to teach the girls in his school.

Stones were thrown at her when she was on her way to the school. The reactionaries threatened Jyotirao's father with dire consequences if he did not disassociate himself from his son's activities. Succumbing to the pressure, Jyotirao's father asked his son and daughter-in-law to leave his house as both of them refused to give up their noble endeavour. Though the school had to be closed for some time due to paucity of funds, Jyotirao re-opened it with the help of his Brahmin friends Govande and Valvekar.

In 1851, he founded a girls' school to which eight girls were admitted on the first day. The number of students increased gradually. Savitribai taught in this school also and had to suffer a lot because of the hostility of the high-caste people. Jyotirao opened two more girls' schools during 1851–52.

In the nineteenth century, widow remarriages were banned and child marriage was very common among the Brahmins and other upper castes. Many of the widows were young and not all of them could live in a manner in which they were expected to live. Some of the delinquent widows conceived, being unable to completely abstain from sexual relationships. To avoid the huge social stigma, they resorted to abortion or abandoned their illegitimate children on the streets or elsewhere. Out of pity for such abandoned orphans, Jyotirao established an orphanage. It was probably the first such institution founded by a Hindu. He gave protection to pregnant widows and assured them that the orphanage would take care of their children. It was in the orphanage run by him that a Brahmin widow gave birth to a baby boy in 1873 whom Jyotirao adopted as his son.

For a brief period, Jyotirao worked as a contractor for the Government and supplied building material required for the construction of a huge barrage at Khadakvasla near Poona. He gathered experience of working with the officials of the Public Works Department, which was notorious for its rampant corruption. With the exception of the British officers, who were holding very high positions in the department, all the clerks and other junior officers, who were invariably Brahmins, exploited the illiterate workers. Jyotirao felt it necessary to explain to the workers how they were being cheated by the Brahmin officials. He composed a ballad that described vividly the fraudulent practices resorted to by the Brahmin officials in the Public Works Department.

In his controversial book titled 'Slavery', published in June 1873, Jyotirao included a manifesto, which declared that he was willing to dine with all regardless

NOTES

NOTES

of their caste, creed or country of origin. Several newspapers refused to give publicity to the manifesto because of its contents. His book was severely criticized for its venomous propaganda against the Brahmins. Jyotirao dedicated his book to the 'good people of the United States as a token of admiration for their sublime, disinterested and self-sacrificing devotion towards the cause of abolition of Negro slavery'.

On 24th September 1873, Jyotirao convened a meeting of his supporters and it was decided to form the Satya Shodhak Samaj (Society of Seekers of Truth) with Jyotirao as its first President and Treasurer. Every member was required to take a pledge of loyalty to the British Empire. The main objectives of the organization were to liberate the Shudras and ati-Shudras and to stop their exploitation by the Brahmins. All the members of the Satya Shodhak Samaj were expected to treat all human beings as children of God and worship Him without the help of any mediator. Membership was open to all and there is evidence to suggest that some Jews were also admitted as members. This Samaj undertook the programme of arranging marriages without a priest, without dowry and at a minimum cost. Savitribai was the inspiration behind these revolutionary initiatives to reject centuries old religious traditions. This type of marriages, similar to a modern registered marriage, is still prevalent in many parts of India. Savitribai and Jyotirao had to face severe difficulties in introducing this type of marriage in the society, but that did not deter them from their path. In 1876, Jyotirao was nominated as a member of the Poona Municipality.

He tried to help the people in the famine-stricken areas of Maharashtra when a severe famine hit the state in 1877. The famine forced people in the rural areas to leave their villages in search of food and work. Some of them even had to leave their children behind. Jyotirao issued an appeal on 17 May 1877 that the Victoria Orphanage, founded under the auspices of the Satya Shodhak Samaj would look after these unfortunate children. From 1879 onwards, Krishnarao Bhalekar, one of his colleagues, edited a weekly called Deenbandhu, which was the mouthpiece of the Satya Shodhak Samaj. They weekly articulated the grievances of the peasants and workers. The Deenbandhu defended Jyotirao when Vishnushastri Chiplunkar, a powerful spokesman of the conservative nationalists, attacked Jyotirao's writings in the most vitriolic style.

It is noteworthy that just as Jyotirao did not mince words when he criticized the leaders of reformist movements, he was equally fearless in criticizing the decisions of the British Government, which did not contribute to the welfare of the masses. When the Government wanted to grant more licences for liquor shops, Jyotirao strongly condemned this move as he believed that addiction to liquor would ruin many poor families. On 30th November 1880, the President of the Poona Municipality requested the members to accord approval to his proposal of spending one thousand rupees on the occasion of the visit of Lord Lytton, the Governor-General of India. Lord Lytton had passed an Act that had resulted in gagging the press and this had been strongly criticized by Deenbandhu, as a violation of the right to freedom of the press. Therefore, Jyotirao did not at all like the idea of spending the money of the tax payers for honouring a guest like Lytton. He boldly suggested that the amount could

be very well spent on the education of the poor people of Poona. He was the only member out of the 32 nominated members of the Poona Municipality who voted against this official resolution.

Jyotirao alleged that the leaders of the Brahmo Samaj, the Prarthana Samaj and the Indian National Congress, despite their reform programmes, did very little in reality to improve the lot of the masses. He felt that these organizations were dominated by the Brahmins and were not truly representative in character. In his booklet called *Satsara (The Essence of Truth)*, published in June 1885, he criticized the Brahmo Samaj and the Prarthana Samaj. Addressing their leaders he declared, 'We do not need the help of your organizations. Do not worry about us.' In his book, *Sarvajanik Sabha or the Indian National Congress*, he warned that the persistent demand made by these organizations for Indianization of the administrative services would, if accepted, lead to Brahmanization of the services in India. He explained that it was difficult to create a sense of nationality so long as the restrictions on dining and marrying outside the caste continued to be observed by people belonging to different castes. He believed that education of the masses was the only way to promote the process of nation-building.

Jyotirao refused to accept the Vedas as sacrosanct. He opposed idol worship and denounced the caste system. In his book *Sarvajanik Satya Dharma Pustak (Book about the Common Dharma of Truth)*, published in 1891, a few months after his death, his views on religious and social issues are given in the form of a dialogue. According to him, both men and women were entitled to enjoy equal rights and it was a sin to discriminate on the basis of gender. He stressed the unity of man and envisaged a society based on liberty, equality and fraternity.

Throughout his life, Jyotirao Phule fought for the emancipation of the downtrodden people. His commitment to his cause and beliefs was phenomenal. The struggle which he launched at a tender age ended only with his death on 28th November 1890. He was a pioneer in many fields and stands out as one who never wavered in his quest for truth and justice. Though he was often accused of fomenting hatred between the Brahmins and non-Brahmins, very little effort was made to consider his scathing criticism in a broad perspective.

The future generations also took considerable time to understand and appreciate the profound significance of his unflinching espousal of the rights of man. Though some keen observers of the Maharashtrian society, like Narayan Mahadeo Parmananda, did acknowledge his greatness in his lifetime, it is only in recent decades that there is an increasing appreciation of his service and sacrifice in uplifting the masses. Today he is recognized as one of the most significant social reformers this country has ever had.

Jyotirao Phule's Educational Thought

Mahatma Jyotirao Phule was a visionary social reformer. The cornerstone of his reforms was education. His views, thoughts and actions in the realm of education in nineteenth century India was much ahead of his times and his single-minded dedication to his cause was amazing.

NOTES

NOTES

Jyotirao was aware that primary education among the masses in the Bombay Presidency was very much neglected. He argued that a good deal of the poverty of the masses, their want of self-reliance and their entire dependence upon the learned and intelligent classes could be attributed to the policy of the British Government of spending a large portion of the revenue on the education of the higher classes. According to him, this policy resulted in the virtual monopoly of the Brahmins over all the higher offices under the Government. Jyotirao boldly attacked the stranglehold of the Brahmins over the access to all the avenues of knowledge and learning. He denounced them as cheats and hypocrites. He asked the masses to resist the tyranny of the Brahmins. All his writings were variations of this basic theme. His critics made fun of his ignorance of grammar; his clumsy writing style and his far-fetched interpretation of Indian history and the ancient texts. They brushed aside his criticism by saying that he was merely echoing what the Christian missionaries had said about the Indian society in general and Brahmins in particular. The established scholars of his time did not take Phule's arguments seriously. His critics did not realize that Jyotirao's acrimonious criticism was basically a spontaneous outburst of a genuine concern for the equal rights of human beings.

Emotionally he was so deeply involved in his work that he could not make a dispassionate analysis and take a detached view of the social forces. Jyotirao's deep sense of commitment to basic human values made it difficult for him to restrain himself when he witnessed injustice and atrocities committed in the name of religion by those who were supposed to be its custodians.

Phule started his education mission when he was just 21 years old and his wife, Savitribai, who supported him in every way, was merely 18 years old. This couple, kindled by a passion, pursued their goal of educating the poor masses. They did not give-up despite the fact that they had to leave their home due to the strong opposition to their noble work. They opened a school for the masses in 1848. At that time, Jyotirao used to work part-time in a missionary school for his livelihood and he dedicated the rest of his time to the school set up by them. On the other hand, Savitribai worked full-time at the school set up by them and that too without any remuneration.

Jyotirao and Savitribai started two more institutions—a native female school in Poona and a society for promoting the education of Scheduled Castes. Through these two institutions, they then built a network of schools in the Poona region. Jyotirao and Savitribai focused on providing the girls and boys with vocational and trade-oriented education so as to make the students self-reliant, economically useful and capable of independent thinking. The issue of dropouts from schools was far more serious in those times. Jyotirao found a viable and practical solution to solve this problem. Both he and Savitribai found that the main reason for a high dropout rate in schools was poverty and disinterest in education. The couple made provisions to give salary to the students and planned a syllabus that was designed to serve the interests of girls and boys of the poorer sections of the society. They took up an awareness mission among the deprived and lower castes to introduce them to the advantages and joys of education. They also started literacy for parents and, through this, developed a holistic educational project. The strategies that Jyotirao adopted to

overcome issues like dropouts, caste panchayats, etc. continue to be a guiding force for our planners even today.

In 1882, he told the Hunter Education Commission that, 'there was no indigenous school for girls at that time in Poona. I, therefore, was induced in the year 1848 to establish such a school in which my wife and I worked together for many years. A year after the institution of the former school, I also established an indigenous mixed school for the lower classes, especially the 'Mahars' and 'Mangs'. Two more schools for these classes were subsequently added.' The couple's work in the arena of education was so commendable that the then Chairperson of the Education Board visited the girls' schools established by them and expressed satisfaction about this new movement in the field of education. Such was the force of the pioneering educational thoughts and deeds of Jyotirao and Savitribai.

Mahatma Jyotirao Phule was a multi-faceted personality. Since, he has made immense contribution as a social reformer; he is referred to as the path finder of a new social system. His educational thought was simple yet powerful. He understood that education of the marginalized groups, especially the girls of such families, would break the stranglehold that the Brahmins had in every sphere of life. He took the first big steps towards achieving his goal of social equality through educational empowerment by setting up the schools. His contribution towards the reforms in the Indian educational scene can hardly be overemphasized.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

3. Who is regarded as the Father of Modern India and why?
4. What was the name of the Persian work written by Ram Mohan Roy and what was it about?
5. What was the primary work done by Brahma Samaj?
6. Which were the two parts that Brahma Samaj was finally split into?
7. Who were the Western thinkers that Ram Mohan Roy was influenced by?
8. Who did Jyotiba Phule dedicate his book 'Slavery' to?
9. Who was criticized by Jyotiba Phule in Satsara?

1.4 SOCIO-POLITICAL THOUGHT

The effects of colonization on India were devastating. The colonizers not only exploited the resources of India but also treated the countrymen as second-grade citizens. They were subjected to economic, social and moral subjugation. Initially, the Indians remained oppressed and could not organize a revolt to fight back. However, the turn of the century saw organized movements since the Indians could not bear to be tortured anymore.

The national movement for Indian independence witnessed a number of factors that led to its growth and spreading across the country. This movement in

NOTES

India was one of the most successful freedom struggles the world had ever known and it went on to inspire similar revolutions all over the world like the struggle for freedom in South Africa. It was common for colonial administrators and ideologues to assert that India was not a nation but a geographical expression, a mere collection of hundreds of diverse races and creeds. What is perhaps even more important is that they denied that India was undergoing the process of nation-formation or was ever capable of doing so.

The founders of the Indian National movement accepted that India was not yet a nation despite common history and the elements of a common culture. Indeed, in many ways, India was not a nation until British had come and ruled us for centuries. The early British imperialist, before any sort of national fervour had made a beginning, were convinced that India was not one. In 1888, Sir John Strachey (quoted from the book *Philosophies of Education* by A. S. Seetharamu) said, 'There is not, and never was, an India ... this is the first and most essential thing to learn about India that there is not and never was an India or even in country of India possessing, according to European ideas, any sort of unity, physical, political, social or religious: no Indian nation, no 'people of India', which we hear so much...'. Frankly, it is not surprising that the British found it difficult to cope with the idea of a national India even as late as the 1930s when the Simon Commission's Report was published. Even as late as 1930s, the British were hard put to realise that a national consciousness has set in. However, nationalist leaders asserted that it had not entered the process of becoming a nation that it was now becoming a nation. India, they said, was a nation-in-the-making. India's becoming a nation was not to be seen as an event but a prolonged historical process, which had to be carefully promoted and nurtured. Many obstacles hindered and constantly challenged the process. It could not be taken for granted and had to be constantly developed and consolidated. Consequently, one of the major objectives they set out before the national movement was that of welding Indians into a nation and the promotion of the process of nation making through active ideological, political, economic and cultural efforts.

One reason why many of them favoured continuation of British rule was because under it, Indians were becoming a nation and they were afraid that this process might be interrupted if British rule disappeared prematurely. As soon as you see the making of the nation in India as a result of a concrete historical process, it becomes clear that the manner in which it was formed in India (or other colonies) was different from that of Europe's, for the two historical processes were very different. Basically, in India, the processes of nation and nationalism were the result not of ethnicity or the historical formation of the nation around language and culture, but of a movement against colonialism. The basic contradiction, which led to the national movement and nationhood in India, was also totally different from that in Europe. For one, it pitted not one section of the people, which formed into a nation, against another but the entire colonial people against colonialism and the colonial state, for the latter suppress not one class or section, but the entire colonial people. Similarly, unlike in Europe, where the bourgeoisie and/or the monarchy fought for a unified market and state or tried to unify the people around imperialism, chauvinism and jingoism in the era of imperialist rivalry, the colonial people fought primarily for national liberation from colonial economic and political domination.

In case of India, both the Indian nation and nationalism were products of history. To study their evolution is to study the economic, political and ideological development of the Indian people. In initial phase of national struggle, national leaders made the people of India conscious of the bond of common economic interests and of the existence of a common enemy and, thus, helped to weld them in a common nationalism. They made the people conscious of their economically precarious and degraded position and of the possibility of improvement. They gave a precise nationalist form to the incoherent economic aspirations of the people and spread ideas of economic development. They inculcated among the people the desire to increase the economic wealth of the country, showed them the ways of doing by putting forward a well-rounded programme of economic development and pointed out the obstacles, both economic and political, that needed to be overcome if the economic objectives were to be realized. In accomplishing these tasks, all the national leaders both moderates and extremists, contributed alike, displaying in the process, a high quality of the power of economic analysis and deep patriotism. Therefore, the accomplishments of the national leaders of this period that provided success is not measured in terms of immediate gains. In fact, in spite of their many failures, they laid strong and enduring foundations for the national movement to grow upon and deserve a high place among the makers of modern India.

The national movement in India included a range of political organizations, philosophies and movements, all of which had the common aim of getting rid of the British colonization of India. Both non-violent and militant methods were used in the course of this mass-based movement. Due to the involvement of almost all citizens of the nation, the movement also underwent a process of constant ideological evolution.

Initially, the movement began in an unorganized manner in parts of Bengal but later became a mainstream movement with the founding of the Indian National Congress (INC). The party demanded basic economic and social rights in the beginning but as it experienced mass involvement from all over the country, the approach turned more radical and the demands grew. Leaders like the triumvirate formed by Lala Lajpat Rai, Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Bipin Chandra Pal emerged as moderate leaders though the later part of their workings experienced radical workings such as the Swadeshi movements. However, the coming of the 1920s and the involvement of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi in the movement saw the rise of non-violence and civil resistance. However, revolutionaries such as Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose were present even then.

1.4.1 Dadabhai Naoroji

Dadabhai Naoroji was originally from Mumbai. He completed his education at the Elphinstone Institute School. He had the backing of the Maharaja of Baroda Sayajirao Gaekwad III and after completing his studies in 1874, became the Dewan (Minister) to the Maharaja. Since he was an Athornan or a formally ordained priest, Naoroji established the Rahnumae Mazdayasne Sabha (Guides on the Mazdayasne Path) on 1 August 1851. His aim was to bring back the original simplicity and purity of the Zoroastrian religion. A few years later, in 1854, he started a bi-monthly publication,

NOTES

NOTES

the *Rast Goftar* (or The Truth Teller), which aimed to educate people about basic Zoroastrian concepts. In 1855, he started work as Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at the Elphinstone College in Bombay, thus earning the unique honour of being the first Indian to do so. In 1855, he moved to London to take up partnership in a company called Cama & Co, to head their Liverpool office. This company was also the first Indian company to be started in Britain. But soon after, in 1858, he gave in his resignation due to ethical differences with company management. Next year, in 1859, he launched his own cotton trading company and named it Dadabhai Naoroji & Co. Some years later he took up the position of professor of Gujarati at University College, London.

Continuing his prolific career, in 1867, Naoroji became a major contributor to the establishment of the East India Association, an important organisation that ultimately led to the founding of the Indian National Congress. The East India Association was meant to put the Indian voice and opinion before the British public. The Association turned out to be the key to disproving the racist views of European supremacy over Asian natives, presented by the Ethnological Society of London in its 1866 session. Naoroji's Association quickly earned the backing of distinguished Englishmen and eventually exerted significant influence in the British Parliament.

He became the Prime Minister of Baroda in 1874, and later, in 1885, a member of the Legislative Council of Mumbai, until 1888. When Sir Surendranath Banerjee founded the Indian National Association in Calcutta a few years before the establishment of Indian National Congress in Mumbai, Naoroji was again chosen to be a member of the Association. The two entities were very similar in objectives and practices and later merged into the INC. Subsequently, Naoroji was elected President of the Congress in 1886 and in 1901, he published the very popular volume *Poverty and un-British Rule in India*.

Later, Naoroji shifted base to Britain again and carried on with his political work. He got elected for the Liberal Party in Finsbury Central at the 1892 general election, thereby becoming the first British Indian MP. During his swearing-in ceremony he refused to take his oath on the Bible and was eventually allowed to take his oath of office on his copy of *Khorddeh Avesta*. In the British Parliament sessions, he spoke on Irish Home Rule and conditions in India for the common man. In these endeavours, he was ably supported by Muhammed Ali Jinnah, the well-known Muslim nationalist and the future founder of Pakistan. In 1906, Naoroji was elected president of the Indian National Congress for the second time and was a rare moderate within the Congress which was being torn apart by the differences between moderates and extremists. Naoroji acted as mentor to Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Gopal Krishna Gokhale and Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi.

At the age of 91, he died in Bombay on 30 June 1917. A heritage road in Mumbai is named after him presently. There is also a similarly named road in Karachi, Pakistan and one in Finsbury area of London. A residential colony in Delhi is also named after him—Naoroji Nagar. Another member of his family who participated in the freedom struggle was his granddaughter, Khrushedben. She was one of the revolutionaries arrested in 1930 for trying to hoist the Indian flag in a Government College in Ahmedabad.

The focus of Dadabhai Naoroji's work was the alarming drain of wealth from India into England because of the colonial rule. He is considered the pioneer of the drain theory because it was he who started focusing on estimating the net profits being made by India as a country, and in turn, the impact colonization is having on these profits. Naoroji took it upon himself to prove that the English were draining the wealth of India into England. He listed six reasons for the external drain:

1. India is being ruled by a foreign power.
2. India is unable to draw immigrants, who in turn, bring labour and capital for economic growth.
3. India is forced to support Britain's administrative machinery and occupational army.
4. India is forced to bear the liability of empire building both within and outside its periphery.
5. By opening up free trade, the British were actually exploiting India by giving the well-paid jobs to foreign staff.
6. The people earning the highest salaries were British and so, were spending it all in England or taking it back to England as their savings, thus ensuring that none of it flowed back into the Indian economy.

He explained all these points in detail in his book 'Poverty' and came up with the alarming figure of 200–300 million pounds loss of revenue to Britain, which failed to ever flow back into India. He termed this phenomenon 'vampirism', indicating that like vampires suck the blood out of a person, so the British were sucking the wealth of the country out of it for their own interests. This was meant to ignite nationalist sentiments in the public which was largely unaware of this phenomenon.

At the same time, he was careful to give credit to the British where it was due and explained that British deserved tribute for bringing advanced services like the Railways to India. However, even with these services, the money being earned was sent back to Britain and not used for the betterment of the Indian society. Naoroji was very sure that India was being cheated out of a lot more than should have been and rather than paying off foreign investment like other nations did, India was paying double because its citizens also paid for the operations of the railways and the services that the railways provided, while the services were already a source of profit for Britain. The other ways that the Drain manifested was that British staff was paid much more than the services they rendered in their official positions, India's indigenous goods were undervalued in trade and the foreign goods were overvalued. A large number of Englishmen were brought into India and given undeservedly high salaries, part of which they were allowed to carry back to their countries when they were discharged from duty or retired. Besides this, the East India Company bought Indian goods with money taken from India and these goods were then sent to Britain, which was sheer exploitation in the name of free trade.

After he was elected to the Parliament by a very small margin, the first thing he did was give a speech questioning British role in India. He clarified that Indians fell into only two categories—British slaves or British subjects. He also said that the

NOTES

NOTES

institutions that the British had started in India should be run by Indians because when India would govern itself, its revenue would remain in India. Since Naoroji had outwardly portrayed himself as an Imperialist, he turned around the Indian viewpoint in such a way that his theory seemed to be of benefit to the British. He presented the idea of reduced financial liability for the British if Indians were able to rule themselves and poverty was reduced in India. He argued that if the British allowed Indian money to remain in India, Indian citizens would be more than happy to pay tributes because they would not be facing the dread of poverty. He advocated that Indian administrative jobs be given to Indians so that they would be able to justify the education that the British had provided for them. Naoroji was of the opinion that building Indian industry would solve the problem of the Drain to a large extent.

Naoroji also urged the British to revisit the unfair trade policy which promoted undervaluing of Indian goods. He said that if the Indian industries flourished they would be able to provide the British with due tribute through taxes and interests. However, with time, Naoroji lost patience with Britain and started to become more aggressive in his speeches. However, ultimately, it was Naoroji's efforts that led to the creation of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure in 1896, of which he also became a member. The Commission reviewed financial burdens on India and in some cases concluded that those burdens were misplaced.

1.4.2 Ranade

Justice Mahadev Govind Ranade (18 January 1842 – 16 January 1901) was a distinguished Indian scholar, social reformer and author. He was a founding member of the Indian National Congress and owned several designations as member of the Bombay legislative council, member of the finance committee at the centre, and the judge of Bombay High Court.

He was a popular public figure and mostly seen as a calm, patient and optimistic human being. This optimism also shone through in his dealings with British officials as well as his viewpoint regarding reform in India. He was instrumental in the establishment of the Vaktruttvottejak Sabha, the Poona Sarvajanic Sabha and the Prarthana Samaj. He was also the Chief Editor of a Bombay Anglo-Marathi daily paper, the Induprakash, which he founded based on his personal ideas regarding social and religious reform.

His birthplace was Niphad, a taluka town in Nashik district. However, his childhood was spent in Kolhapur where his father served as a minister. He studied at the Elphinstone College in Bombay, which he joined when he was 14 years old. Subsequently he went to Bombay University, which was one of the three new British universities, and was part of the first batches for both the B.A. (1862) and the L.L.B. (Government Law School, 1866) where he graduated at the top of his class. One of his classmates at the University was Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar. Later, Ranade got his postgraduate degree, again at the top of his class.

He secured the position of the Presidency magistrate, fourth judge of the Bombay Small Causes Court in 1871, first-class sub-judge at Pune in 1873, judge of the Poona Small Causes Court in 1884, and finally was appointed to the Bombay

High Court in 1893. From 1885 until 1893, he was also a member of the Bombay legislative council.

In 1897, Ranade was part of a committee which was entrusted to assess imperial and provincial expenditure and then make recommendations for financial cutbacks. His exceptional work in the Committee won him the decoration of Companion of the Order of the Indian Empire. He had earlier also served as a special judge under the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act in 1887.

One of the posts Ranade held during his prolific career was of syndic and dean of Arts at Bombay University. He had superb organizational skills and great understanding of the students' needs. He was a staunch supporter of Marathi language and literature and was always encouraging of the efforts made to translate well-known English works into Marathi. He also managed to introduce vernacular languages into the university syllabus.

He authored books on Economics in India and Maratha history. He had the vision to understand that for the growth of Indian economy, heavy industries will have to be established. He also believed that modern Western education would be instrumental in founding a strong and successful Indian nation. As per his mature thinking, both India and Britain could work together to achieve solutions to their respective problems, including reform and independence, which he felt was necessary for stability of a large nation like India. Reforming the rudimentary parts of Indian culture and adopting the progressive aspects of Western culture, in Ranade's view, would lead to "common interest;... and fusion of thoughts, amongst all men."

Religious Views

Along with his associates, Atmaram Pandurang, Dr. Bhandarkar and Vaman Abaji Modak, Ranade founded the Prarthana Samaj, a Hindu movement inspired by the Brahmo Samaj, which advocated principles of enlightened faith based on the ancient Vedas. Prarthana Samaj was started by Keshav Chandra Sen, a staunch Brahmo Samajist. The aim of the movement was to undertake religious reforms in Maharashtra. He presided at an event to honour his friend, Virchand Gandhi, who had defended Indian culture and Hinduism in 1893's world religion parliament in Chicago, USA.

Political Contributions

Ranade founded the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha and Ahmednagar Education Society and later was a founding member of the Indian National Congress. He has been seen as an early challenger of the politics of Bal Gangadhar Tilak and a mentor to Gopal Krishna Gokhale.

Ranade was a pioneer of the Social Conference movement, for which he stayed loyal and active until he died. He fought against societal ills like child marriage, the shaving of widows' heads, the heavy cost of marriages and other social functions, and the caste restrictions on traveling abroad. He was fiercely in favour of widow remarriage and women's education. As part of his continual efforts for these causes, he founded the Widow Marriage Association in 1861.

NOTES

NOTES

Although Ranade was fierce in his efforts to abolish harmful customs, he was very clear in his regard for Indian heritage and the social atmosphere that resulted from it. Ranade was respectful of India's history, especially inspiring moments like the Bhakti movement and Shivaji's reign, but he also gave due credit to the impact of British rule on India's progress as a nation. He had a balanced and holistic viewpoint wherein there was place for culture and tradition, but equal importance was given to changing with the times and accommodating the requirements of people and society. In his opinion, an overall sense of national regeneration was essential.

While Ranade was critical of superstitions and blind faith, he himself led a conservative existence. He chose to take prayaschitta (religious penance) in case of Panch-houd Mission Case rather than sticking to a strong stand against all odds.

When Ranade's first wife died, his friends, knowing his progressive ideas, expected him to marry a widow. However, he married a child bride as per his father's wishes. Her name was Ramabai Ranade. After marriage, he encouraged her to continue her education. After Ranade died, his wife carried on the social and educational reform work he had begun. The couple did not have any children. As per Ramabai's memoirs, when one similarly well-known Pune personality, Vishnupant Pandit, married a widow, Ranade invited him and his new bride to his home. Ranade's father did not approve of this move and threatened to leave home and move to Kolhapur, away from Ranade's place in Pune. When Ranade offered to resign from his government job, his father relented and stayed on with him in Pune. Ranade vowed to not go against his father ever again. However, his only condition was that Ramabai, his wife, would be allowed to participate in his social reform activities.

1.4.3 Tilak

Prof. T.L. Shay, in the preface to his book *The Legacy of the Lokmanya*, had said:

Lokmanya Tilak, one of India's greatest nationalist leaders, is also one of India's most misunderstood prophets. His life and his work constitute a great heritage, yet the meaning of this message has often been obscured. He has been called a disciple of expedience, meaning he was a political realist, while at the same time his philosophy was based on the highest idealism. He has been called a communalist, while actually he was the one who first taught the need for overcoming communal disagreements in the name of national unity. He has been called a provinciality, while actually he first retaught the meaning of love of the country. He has been accused of believing in violence, yet it was he who urged non-violence political action. He has been called a revolutionary, which is true, provided it is remembered he was a constructive revolutionary, far more interested in building than tearing down. He has been called an extremist, yet he was a moderating force. He has been censured for sacrificing everything for the cause, but he was always the first to sacrifice himself. And he was the first, and only, lokamanya of India.

Tilak has been described as the father of the Indian nationalism or the father of militant Indian nationalism. Chirol had described him as the 'father of Indian unrest'. One thing is quite clear that it was Tilak who covered the Indian National Congress into a mass organization.

'I regard India as my motherland,' said Tilak, 'and my goddess, the people in India my kith and kin, and loyal and steadfast work for their political and social emancipation my biggest religion and duty'. His concept of nationalism was neither narrow nor was it confined to religion. It is true that he used religion as a political tool, as a weapon in organizing our struggle for *Swaraj*. However, he did not use his politics for religious ends. In fact, he was against the mixing of religious questions with questions of purely political character. That was the reason why he did not approve Gandhi's *Khilafat* Movement as the main issue for launching the Non-cooperation Movement in India. He held that the *Khilafat* was a religious question and that it was a question which primarily involved Indian Muslims. He wanted the Indian Muslims to oppose this wrong committed against the Muslims and the Hindus to give their unhesitant support to them in their hour of difficulty. However, he believed that the *Khilafat* was not a political question and therefore advocated that it should not be mixed up with the political and national issues of India.

NOTES

By the celebrations of *Ganapati* and *Shivaji* festivals, Tilak did organize the Hindus. However, he considered that the work of the organization of the Hindus was not contrary to the work of the organization of the Indian nation as a whole. No doubt, the two works were not one and the same thing but they were not antithesis of each other as well. On the other hand, Tilak found them as supplementary. It is because of these considerations that Tilak was very eager and enthusiastic about Hindu-Muslim unity. It was in fact he who may be described as the father of the Congress-League scheme evolved at the Lucknow session of Indian National Congress. Therefore, Tilak cannot be dismissed as a Hindu nationalist or a Hindu communalist. It was he who, in fact, laid down the foundations of a broader and more integrating nationalism in India. In that sense he was the prophet of Indian nationalism. Tilak revived the religious traditions because he wanted to appeal not only to the English-educated Indians but also to the illiterate and orthodox masses. He wanted political awakening to grow out of the social and religious sentiments of the illiterates. He used the religious festivals for the cause of nationalism. On 8 September 1896 he wrote in the *Kesari* that 'the educated people can achieve results through these national festivals which it could be impossible for the congress to achieve. Why should you not give the shape of huge mass meetings to the bigger *jatras*? Will it not be possible for political activities to enter the humblest cottages of the villages through these festivals?' Tilak was quite conscious of the fact that Shivaji was a Hindu King who established a Hindu kingdom during the medieval times. In the words of Aurobindo Ghose:

The congress movement was for a long time purely occidental in its mind, character, and methods confined to English-educated few with no roots either in the past of the country or in the inner spirit of the nation...MR. Tilak was the first political leader to break through the routine of its somewhat academic methods, to bridge the gulf between the present and the past and to restore continuity to the political life of the nation. He developed a language and a spirit and he used methods which Indianized the movement and brought into it the masses. It was in order to teach us self-reliance and give us a sense of pride in the past history of India that he organized the *Ganapati* and *Shivaji* festivals.

NOTES

Rajni Palme Dutt has observed in his book *India Today* that Tilak, because of his identification of the national awakening with the revival of Hinduism alienated the Muslim masses from the national movement. It is true that Tilak's nationalism was revivalist in character because it aimed at cultural and religious revival of Hinduism. Tilak believed that only a religious instinct backed by pride in history could inspire us to self-reliance and national awakening.

Tilak was well aware of the Western theory of nationalism. At times he even approved of the Western concept of nationalism. In his trial speech of 1908, he quoted with approval Mill's definition of nationalism. In 1919 and 1920, he accepted the concept of self-determination and pleaded for its application to India. However, he was firmly of the view that religion and politics cannot be separated. He accepted that religion is an element in nationality. He observed that '*dharma*' means a tie—a tie to hold. *Dharma* connects the soul with God and hence man with man. Hindu religion is very old and it provides for moral as well as social ties. He argued that the study of the Gita, Ramayana and Mahabharata produced the same ideas throughout the country. He interpreted Gita as a gospel of action, and this had political implications.

M.N. Roy, in his book *India in Transition*, has described Tilak's concept of nationalism as orthodox nationalism or an integral nationalism. He criticized this concept of nationalism by saying that the same forces, which led to the military explosion of the mutiny of 1857, could be discovered behind the political theories of the orthodox nationalism of half a century later. He says that in social sense, orthodox nationalism was the resistance of the forces of reaction against the ominous radicalism of the denationalized intellectuals who led the congress. M.N. Roy does agree that Tilak's contribution to the growth of nationalism in India was his attack on the piecemeal policy of the Congress and his rallying around himself the discontented and rebellious lower middle class youths. Tilak in his programme of nationalism accepted that the nationhood of the Indian people was historically accomplished fact. According to M.N. Roy, the defect in Tilak's theory of nationalism was due to his belief that the right of the Indians to self-government was not conditional upon any preliminary political evolution, either social or economic. It is true that Tilak was not satisfied with the secular conception of nationalism because nationalism for Tilak was in the nature of a sentiment which must have its roots in the culture, tradition and history of the people. Tilak's contribution to the nationalist movement of India was that he Indianized the movement and brought the masses into its fold.

The spiritualization of the concept of nationalism was, however, not confined to Tilak. It was common to most of the extremist leaders of India. It had its own advantages because it brought the Hindu orthodoxy into the arena of Indian nationalism. It gave religious sanction to the nationalist movement. It gave us a sense of pride in our history and in our religion but as it stood it had also its drawbacks. It alienated the Muslims and more particularly the English-educated middle class among the Muslims, who were ready to co-operate on the basis of secular nationalism but not on the basis of religions nationalism. The spiritual character of Tilak's nationalism also ignored its economic aspect, and this may be treated as another drawback of his concept. There is no denying the fact that Tilak's concept of *Swaraj*

did provide religious foundations but without social and economic foundations it remained incomplete. It was Gandhi who later on provided all these foundations to the nationalist movement of India and, therefore, nationalism became more vigorous after 1920 than it was before.

It was only towards the year 1895 that Tilak lost his faith in British fair play and justice and in the common admiration for the British connection with India. By 1895, he had realized that the interests of India and England were not allied and that they were antagonistic. So conflict between the two, at some stage or the other, was inevitable. It was this change in attitude and the change in convictions that led him to talk disrespectfully of the Congress method of prayer and petitions. He dubbed it as mendicancy and demanded the use of other methods. Tilak criticized the method of constitutional agitation as preached and practiced by the moderates. It was because he had better understanding of the nature of the British rule in India. He did realize that the British rule was based on exploitation and it was a case of naked imperialism. He was fully conscious of the fact that the British connection with India was in the best interests of the British people, and that interests of India and England were not allied, but were antagonistic. He was against constitutional agitation because he clearly realized that we must have a constitution before we could talk of constitutional agitation. What the British had for us was not a constitution but the Indian penal code.

Tilak substituted the use of passive resistance in place of constitutional means, hitherto used by the modern leadership in India's struggle for *Swaraj*. Tilak's political method was the precursor of the non-cooperation movement started by Gandhi after 1920. However, *Gandhian* method was different from that of Tilak in so far as *satyagraha* is different from passive resistance. It is true that Tilak ruled out the use of force or violence in India's struggle for *Swaraj*. However, Tilak was not a votary of *ahimsa* or non-violence. For Tilak, non-violent resistance was at best a policy, a matter of convenience.

For Gandhi, Tilak's passive resistance was the *satyagraha* of the weak. Moreover, a *satyagrahi*, according to Gandhi, relies on the force of soul whereas Tilak relied on the militancy of the nation. Tilak believed in responsive co-operation; Gandhi believed either in co-operation or in non-cooperation, but not in conditional co-operation. *Gandhian satyagraha* was an extension of constitutional means. Tilak's passive resistance was a recommendation for the use of strong constitutional means based on the criticism of weak constitutional means. Tilak presented to the country the three-fold programme of boycott, *swadeshi* and national education. He justified the movement of boycott of British goods as practiced in Bengal in 1904–05, as a political weapon and as a measure of last resort. It was because of his political method that Tilak was described as an extremist. It is because of his political methods that he had his differences with the moderates. Tilak believed in the method of direct action but this does not mean that he accepted the method of violence. He ruled out the use of violence as irrelevant in India's struggle for *Swaraj*. Tilak had prepared for Gandhi the grounds and had created the conditions in which *Gandhian* method of non-violent direct action would operate. Tilak and other extremist leaders had already introduced to the masses the methods of passive resistance and non-

NOTES

NOTES

cooperation. Gandhi had merely to spiritualize these methods and make their use more extensive and intensive than ever before.

It is true that Tilak preached passive resistance and non-cooperation in addition to the methods of constitutional agitation. However, the framework in which Tilak operated was purely legal and constitutional. He always tried to prove that he was operating within the legal and constitutional framework. That was why he did not accept Chirol's description of himself as 'the father of Indian unrest'. He was so sure of the fact that he was operating within the legal framework that he went all the way to England to file a suit of defamation against Chirol.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

10. What was the national movement in India composed of?
11. Which was Dadabhai Naoroji's most popular work and when was it published?
12. When and why did Ranade win the Companion of the Order of the Indian Empire?
13. When did Tilak realize that British did not really care about the best interests of India?

1.5 SUMMARY

- A new humanist and cosmopolitan interpretation began to be put upon the old writing in the late nineteenth century. A radical trend thus arose with representatives like Anantaranga Pillai, Abutalib, Henry Vivian Derozio, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, and many more political pioneers.
- The central figure in the political awakening in India was Raja Ram Mohan Roy, who is rightly regarded as the first great leader of modern India or the Father of Modern India. Roy had a deep love for the Indian people. He really loved his country and worked hard all his life for their social, religious, intellectual and political regeneration.
- Brahma Samaj was founded by Roy 1828. Since the Hindu society was dominated and governed by religious conceptions of Hinduism, no religious reform movement could avoid a social reform programme in its scheme of things.
- Vivekanand stressed social action. He also gave the idea of religious socialism. Earlier in 1893, he attended the Parliament of Religions in Chicago, and was able to communicate with the learned people of the world. His speech impressed all because of his rationality and reasoning.

- The Arya Samaj was founded in Bombay in 1875 by Swami Dayanand Saraswati. It embodied the first upsurge of Indian nationalism and was a movement of quite a different nature. It had a more revivalist character. It declared the Vedas infallible and termed them as inexhaustible reservoir of all knowledge past, present and future.
- The Aligarh Movement aimed at spreading the Western education among the Muslims without weakening their allegiance to Islam. The religious education reinforced the secular education which was imparted through the educational institutions it started.
- While other reformers concentrated mainly upon reforming the social institutions of marriage and family, with special emphasis on the status and rights of women, Jyotirao Phule revolted against the unjust caste system under which millions of people had suffered for centuries.
- The national movement for Indian independence witnessed a number of factors that led to its growth and spreading across the country. This movement in India was one of the most successful freedom struggles the world had ever known and it went on to inspire similar revolutions all over the world like the struggle for freedom in South Africa.
- Dadabhai Naoroji was originally from Mumbai. He completed his education at the Elphinstone Institute School. He had the backing of the Maharaja of Baroda Sayajirao Gaekwad III and after completing his studies in 1874, became the Dewan (Minister) to the Maharaja.
- The focus of Dadabhai Naoroji's work was the alarming drain of wealth from India into England because of the colonial rule. He is considered the pioneer of the drain theory because it was he who started focusing on estimating the net profits being made by India as a country, and in turn, the impact colonization is having on these profits.
- Justice Mahadev Govind Ranade (18 January 1842 – 16 January 1901) was a distinguished Indian scholar, social reformer and author. He was a founding member of the Indian National Congress and owned several designations as member of the Bombay legislative council, member of the finance committee at the centre, and the judge of Bombay High Court.
- Ranade founded the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha and Ahmednagar Education Society and later was a founding member of the Indian National Congress. He has been seen as an early challenger of the politics of Bal Gangadhar Tilak and a mentor to Gopal Krishna Gokhale. Ranade was a pioneer of the Social Conference movement, for which he stayed loyal and active until he died.
- Tilak has been described as the father of the Indian nationalism or the father of militant Indian nationalism. Chitambar had described him as the 'father of Indian unrest'. One thing is quite clear that it was Tilak who covered the Indian National Congress into a mass organization.

NOTES

NOTES

1.6 KEY TERMS

- **Renaissance:** The humanistic revival of classical art, architecture, literature, and learning that originated in Italy in the 14th century and later spread throughout Europe.
- **Revivalist movement:** A movement, that seeks to reawaken traditional faith
- **Reformist movement:** A movement intended to bring about social and humanitarian reforms.
- **Social movement:** A group of people with a common ideology who try together to achieve certain general goals
- **Cultural nationalism:** It is a form of nationalism in which the nation is defined by a shared (inherited) culture, as opposed to, for instance, its ethnicity or its institutions.
- **Radicalism:** Political and social movements and ideologies that aim at fundamental change in the structure of society
- **Rationalism:** Philosophical view that regards reason as the chief source and test of knowledge.
- **Shudras:** The lowest caste in the Hindu caste system

1.7 ANSWERS TO ‘CHECK YOUR PROGRESS’

1. He believed that the coming of foreigners was not disastrous. What was disastrous was the forgetfulness of the people towards *dharma*.
2. Henry Vivian Derozio was also the leader of the Young Bengal Movement.
3. The central figure in the political awakening in India was Raja Ram Mohan Roy, who is rightly regarded as the first great leader of modern India or the Father of Modern India. Roy had a deep love for the Indian people. He really loved his country and worked hard all his life for their social, religious, intellectual and political regeneration.
4. He wrote in Persian his famous work ‘*Gift to Monotheists*’. In this work he put forward weighty arguments against belief in many Gods and argued for the worship of a single God.
5. The Brahma Samaj, under the leadership of the Raja, launched an offensive against the caste system branding it as undemocratic, inhuman and anti-national. It crusaded against *sati pratha* and child marriage. It stood for the freedom of the widow to remarry and equal right of man and women.
6. Brahma Samaj thus split into Brahma Samaj of India under Keshab Chander Sen, and Adi Brahma Samaj under Debendranath Tagore.

7. Among the Western political thinkers, who influenced Roy's thinking on politics, the names of Bentham, Blackstone and Montesquieu deserve special mention
8. Jyotirao dedicated his book to the 'good people of the United States as a token of admiration for their sublime, disinterested and self-sacrificing devotion towards the cause of abolition of Negro slavery'.
9. In his booklet called Satsara (The Essence of Truth), published in June 1885, he criticized the Brahmo Samaj and the Prarthana Samaj. Addressing their leaders he declared, 'We do not need the help of your organizations. Do not worry about us.'
10. The national movement in India included a range of political organizations, philosophies and movements, all of which had the common aim of getting rid of the British colonization of India. Both non-violent and militant methods were used in the course of this mass-based movement. Due to the involvement of almost all citizens of the nation, the movement also underwent a process of constant ideological evolution.
11. In 1901, he published the very popular volume *Poverty and un-British Rule in India*.
12. In 1897, Ranade was part of a committee which was entrusted to assess imperial and provincial expenditure and then make recommendations for financial cutbacks. His exceptional work in the Committee won him the decoration of Companion of the Order of the Indian Empire.
13. It was only towards the year 1895 that Tilak lost his faith in British fair play and justice and in the common admiration for the British connection with India. By 1895, he had realized that the interests of India and England were not allied and that they were antagonistic. So conflict between the two, at some stage or the other, was inevitable.

NOTES

1.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Write briefly about the writings of Abutalib and Henry Vivian Derozio.
2. Discuss briefly Roy's concept of freedom.
3. Highlight the incident which made Phule aware about the inequalities of the caste system.
4. How did the Indian National Movement start?
5. What were Ranade's religious views?

Long-Answer Questions

1. What was Roy's opinion regarding Western culture? Explain in detail.
2. Explain Ram Mohan Roy's ideal of internationalism.

NOTES

3. Write a biography of Jyotiba Phule.
4. How was Phule different from the reformers of his times? Elaborate.
5. Why was India not considered a nation and how did this opinion slowly change?
6. What was the focus of Naoroji's political ideas? Which were the six factors that according to him attributed to the Drain?
7. Explain Tilak's concept of nationalism in detail.

1.9 FURTHER READING

- Chand, Tara; *History of Freedom Movement in India*, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi, 2005.
- Chandra, Bipin; *Freedom Struggle*, National Book Trust, New Delhi, 1999.
- Chandra, Bipin; *Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India's Struggle for Independence*, Penguin Books, New Delhi, 1989.
- Choudhary, S. B.; *Civil Disturbances during the British Rule in India (1765 – 1857)*, World Press Limited, Calcutta, 1999.
- Desai, A. R.; *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, Popular Prakashan, New Delhi, 2008.
- Majumdar, R.C.; *The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857*, Calcutta Oriental Press Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1988.
- Sarkar, Sumit; *Modern India (1885 – 1947)*, Macmillan, New Delhi, 2000.
- Appadorai, A.; *Documents on Political Thought in Modern India*, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1973.
- Bali, D.R.; *Modern Political Thought (From Ram Mohan Roy to Jayaprakash Narayan)*, Sterling Publication, New Delhi, 1993.

UNIT 2 A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF INDIAN NATIONALISM

NOTES

Structure

- 2.0 Introduction
- 2.1 Unit Objectives
- 2.2 Swami Vivekananda to Sri Aurobindo
 - 2.2.1 Sri Aurobindo Ghose
- 2.3 Mahatma Gandhi
 - 2.3.1 Major Influences on Gandhi
 - 2.3.2 Political Ideas
 - 2.3.3 Satyagraha
 - 2.3.4 Concept of Society and Individual
 - 2.3.5 Gandhian Socialism
- 2.4 Subhash Chandra Bose
 - 2.4.1 Political Ideas
 - 2.4.2 Socialist Ideology
 - 2.4.3 The Concept of Samyavada
 - 2.4.4 Nationalism
 - 2.4.5 Concept of Freedom
 - 2.4.6 Left Ideology
- 2.5 Jawaharlal Nehru
 - 2.5.1 Political Ideas of Jawaharlal Nehru
 - 2.5.2 Democratic Socialism
 - 2.5.3 Concept of Democracy
 - 2.5.4 Concept of Nationalism
 - 2.5.5 Concept of Internationalism
 - 2.5.6 Concept of Secularism
- 2.6 Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel
- 2.7 Rabindranath Tagore: Political Ideas, Nationalism
 - 2.7.1 Concept of Democracy
 - 2.7.2 Rights
 - 2.7.3 Concept of Freedom
 - 2.7.4 Views on Nation and Nationalism
 - 2.7.5 Views on Internationalism and Universalism
- 2.8 Summary
- 2.9 Key Terms
- 2.10 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.11 Questions and Exercises
- 2.12 Further Reading

2.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will learn about the socialist ideas espoused by different thinkers in contemporary India. No single ideology of the contemporary ideologies has provoked as much thinking and adherents as socialism has done. The overall socialist ideas in

NOTES

India agree with the common socialism viewpoint that emphasizes on the social situation which emerges when the most universal of the interests dominate the social processes. Further, it is held that spirituality must serve as a motif for the objectification of socialism in India. However, not all socialist thinkers that have influenced and shaped the political ideas in contemporary India in their commitment to socialism did not call for adherence to spirituality. There developed different schools of socialism with each having its own programme of action for their realization.

2.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Analyse Indian nationalism from viewpoints of Swami Vivekananda and Sri Aurobindo
- Discuss the views of Mahatma Gandhi, Subhash Chandra Bose, Jawaharlal Nehru and Vallabhbhai Patel on national integration
- Explain the political ideas of Rabindranath Tagore

2.2 SWAMI VIVEKANANDA TO SRI AUROBINDO

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’s defined 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 religion. 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 is

NOTES

NOTES

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 facilitate individual growth and freedom. He denounced vested interests in society which deprived the masses of their legitimate rights.

NOTES

NOTES

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.

2.2.1 Sri Aurobindo Ghose

Sri Aurobindo Ghose (1872–1950) is regarded as the prophet of Indian nationalism. He is more famous for his contribution to the spiritual thought; nevertheless, his contribution to the modern Indian political thought is by no means insignificant. His career in active politics was, of course, very brief. He spent the early years of his life in England and returned to India in 1893 at the age of 21. He retired from politics in 1910 at the early age of 38 when he left for Pondicherry and devoted the rest of

his life to spiritual and *yogic* exercises. In his educational career he had so little contact with the Indian culture that he had to learn even his mother tongue—Bengali—at Baroda after his return from England. Still he developed such an intense love for India's culture and spiritual heritage that he raised it to the crowning glory in his social and political thought. In the words of Jawaharlal Nehru: 'It is extraordinary that a person who had spent fourteen years of his life, from the age of 7 to 21, cut off from India and steeped in the European classics and the England of his day, should have become, in later years, the brilliant champion of Indian nationalism based on the philosophic and spiritual background of Indian Thought.'

NOTES

It is significant that Sri Aurobindo lived till 1950, witnessing India's independence, but he never emerged from his retirement after 1910 to join the struggle for independence or to play an active role in the public life of Independent India. He produced several works in his usual brilliant style, chiefly dealing with philosophic and religious subjects. During his brief career in active politics Sri Aurobindo played an important role in the political awakening of India through his fiery articles and editorials in the English daily *Bande Mataram* between the years 1906–08 which shook not only Bengal but the entire India.

Systematic exposition of his political ideas can be found in several of his works dealing with Indian culture and spiritualism. Some of his important works are: *Essays on Gita*, *The Ideals of Karmayogi*, *Ideals and Progress*, *The Renaissance in India*, *The Foundation of Indian Culture*, *The Doctrine of Passive Resistance* and many others.

The liberal leaders, despite their glowing patriotism and extraordinary talents, could not galvanize and enthuse the vast masses of India because their approach to politics was marked with caution and it lacked necessary excitement. This gave rise to another group of national leaders, known as 'Radicals' who undertook to transform the national movement from an intellectual pastime of a few into an energetic mass movement. They included such stalwarts as Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, Bipin Chandra Pal and Sri Aurobindo Ghosh. The Radicals were also known as 'Extremist' though Sri Aurobindo was not in favour of this description. Describing his group as that of 'nationalists' he strongly repudiated the stand taken by the 'Moderates'. The nationalists were not prepared for any compromise as regards their demand for freedom. Thus the concept of Indian nationalism, originally introduced by Tilak and Bipin Chandra Pal, was developed by Aurobindo into a driving force for Indian struggle of independence.

Nationalism as a Religion

For Aurobindo, nationalism was not only a mission, a goal of life, but an end to be pursued as vigorously as religion. In one of his speeches in 1908, Aurobindo announced:

'Nationalism is not a mere political programme; is a religion that has come from God; Nationalism is a creed which you shall have to live. If you are going to be nationalist, if you are going to assent to this religion of Nationalism, you must do it in the religious spirit. You must remember that you are the instruments of God.'

NOTES

Thus, he not only awakened his countrymen to their sacred duty at that juncture, but also imparted a new moral tone to the national movement, ultimately preparing the mind of the country for the revolution which was ahead. The demand of *Swaraj* was, for Sri Aurobindo, a natural corollary of the ideal of *nationalism*. He believed that every nation on earth had a peculiar bent of its own, its individuality which could not be maintained, far less fostered, by external elements. The temper of Anglo-Saxon culture was an antithesis of the Indian culture. The Anglo-Saxon people paid greatest importance to the immediate, practical and material gains while India's chief characteristic was her spiritualism. He predicted that if India continued to remain a province of British Empire, sharing its institutions and governed by its policy, her fate would be no better than that of the ancient Greece with Roman domination.

Thus, Aurobindo was convinced that imitation of Europe was not at all conducive to India's regeneration. On the contrary, the test of the vitality of the nationalist movement was its non-imitative and non-artificial character. He, therefore, exhorted the Indian people to uphold the *Sanatan Dharma* which was the essence of their national personality. The *Sanatan Dharma* and the Indian nationalism were, therefore, co-terminus. In his own words:

'I say no longer that nationalism is a creed, a religion, a faith; I say that it is the *Sanatan Dharma*, with it moves and with it grows. When the *Sanatan Dharma* declines, then the nation declines and if the *Sanatan Dharma* were capable of perishing, with the *Sanatan Dharma* it would perish. The *Sanatan Dharma* that is nationalism.'

Aurobindo's concept of nationalism as religion opened wider horizons for the national movement. He felt that the task before us was not mechanical but moral; not political but spiritual. The aim of the nationalist movement was not confined to an alteration of the form of government—from a colonial rule to self-government—but it embraced a comprehensive programme of nation-building. Politics was a part of this programme, but only a part. The realization of the spirituality of India could alone make the nation free and great. The European ideal of 'mechanical' freedom, on the other hand, concentrated on outer social and political perfection, which was only half perfection; that too the lower half. The formula of European politics was, therefore, insufficient. Aurobindo, therefore, insisted that India's salvation did not lie in the enlargement of legislative councils, introduction of elective principle, colonial self-government or the like. His ideal of nationalism itself could not accommodate the moderates 'objectives of dominion status for India'. Aurobindo aimed at seizure of political power as a prelude to India's national regeneration. Once freedom from the foreign yoke was achieved, all other steps in the direction of national regeneration—moral improvement, industrial and social development and educational reconstruction—would be undertaken successfully. In fact, Aurobindo's concept of *Swaraj* was something more than mere political freedom.

Accordingly, Aurobindo envisaged two-fold task for nationalism in India: (a) winning *Swaraj* for India so as to cleanse her social and political life from the pollution of European origin and (b) return to 'our old national individuality', so that

India could play her great role in the redemption of the whole world. National regeneration of India was, for Aurobindo, not the final goal; it was a stepping stone to universal regeneration.

The Concept of Political Struggle

Aurobindo joined Bipin Chandra pal in demanding inalienable status of *Purna Swaraj* or complete sovereignty for the country. Like Bipin Chandra Pal, again, Aurobindo rejected the petitioning policy of the Congress and built up a comprehensive scheme of political action, known as the passive and defensive resistance. The doctrine of organized passive resistance was first articulated by Bipin Chandra Pal, but it was left to Aurobindo to develop it into a system through his editorials in *Bande Mataram*. Later Mahatma Gandhi further developed it into the doctrine of *Satyagraha*, and its practice won for him an immortal place in the history of Indian politics. The doctrine of passive resistance as conceived by Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo was based on certain well-defined principles. Its main objective was to make administration under the present conditions impossible by an organized refusal to do anything which would help British commerce in India's exploitation. This involved a larger programme of 'boycott'. Originally devised as an economic weapon to hit the British rulers at their most vital points, the concept of boycott was extended to wider dimensions involving four-fold non-cooperation with the alien government: (a) the economic boycott, (b) the educational boycott, (c) the judicial boycott and (d) the boycott of executive administration.

The idea of 'social boycott' was subsequently added in the programme. However, this all-round boycott was judiciously kept within the bounds of law unless defiance of law became an imperative duty for the nationalists. Aurobindo's programme of passive resistance eventually embraced the cult of revolution also, so as to pave the path to independence. Aurobindo was as much a passive resister as a revolutionary. The question of violence and non-violence did not trouble him so much as it did many others in the subsequent phases of India's freedom movement.

As a 'prophet of nationalism' Aurobindo recognized nation as the real instrument of human progress. The Western idea of state did not appeal to his mind. The state was, in his view, at best, an instrument of achieving mechanical freedom which was not the true freedom. According to Aurobindo, the idea of state in the modern times supports itself on two motives: (a) appeal to the external interest of race and (b) the appeal to its highest moral tendencies. It demands that individual egoism shall immolate itself to a collective interest; it claims that man shall live not for himself but for the whole, the group, the community. It asserts that the hope of the good and progress of humanity lies in the efficiency and organization of the state.

According to Aurobindo, the organized state of today neither represents the best mind of the nation nor even the sum of the communal energies: 'It is collective egoism much inferior to the best of which the community is capable.' Aurobindo was equally critical of the so-called welfare state. In his own words: 'The state now feels the necessity of justifying its existence by organizing the general economic and animal well-being of the community and even of the individuals.' This attempt of the

NOTES

NOTES

state to grow into an intellectual and moral being was one of the most interesting phenomena of the modern civilization. The demand of self-sacrifice from the individual for the sake of the good of the community and the need of a growing solidarity with his fellows is not disputed by Aurobindo. What he suggests is that the state is not qualified to make such a demand. The state was, of course, capable of providing conveniences and removing obstacles in the way of cooperative action of the individuals.

Aurobindo concluded: 'When the state attempts to take up control of the cooperative action of the community, it condemns itself to create monstrous machinery which will end by crushing out the freedom, initiative and serious growth of human being.' In short, Aurobindo was convinced that moral and spiritual energy, not physical force, was the key to social progress. Individual being endowed with this energy is essentially capable of such progress; and nation representing collective soul, manifested in the free cooperative action of the individuals, was also an effective instrument of progress. On the other hand, the state being largely based on physical force alone, was simply incapable to serve as the instrument of organic growth because 'the state was not an organism, it was a machinery, and it worked like a machine, without tact, taste, delicacy or intuition'. It was, therefore, quite improbable that a healthy unity of mankind can be brought about by state machinery, whether the men are organized into a federation of states or into a single world-state. In order to achieve a real unity of mankind, it was imperative to subordinate the mechanical means to our true development 'through a moralized and even spiritualized humanity united in its inner soul and not only in its outward life and body'.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What was spiritualism according to Swami Vivekananda?
2. Name the four types of freedom classified by Swami Vivekananda.
3. How could democracy be applied to a way of life, as per Vivekananda?
4. Name some important literary works of Aurobindo Ghose.
5. Aurobindo envisaged two-fold task for nationalism in India. What was it?

2.3 MAHATMA GANDHI

Mahatma Gandhi is one of the greatest national leaders. He was born on 2 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 15 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 Boer 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.

2.3.1 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.

NOTES

2.3.2 Political Ideas

The following are the basic ideas of Mahatma Gandhi:

NOTES

(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 is 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 *Ramarajya* (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

NOTES

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.

NOTES

(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.'

2.3.3 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.

NOTES

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.

NOTES

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

NOTES

NOTES

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.

2.3.4 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

NOTES

NOTES

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.

2.3.5 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.

NOTES

NOTES

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.

NOTES

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

NOTES

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 per cent 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

NOTES

NOTES

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 20 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

NOTES

NOTES

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.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

6. Name the period known as the Gandhian era.
7. How did Gandhi achieve spiritualization of politics?
8. What was Satyagraha according to Mahatma Gandhi?
9. According to Gandhi, individuals acquire the right of resistance or violation of the law of the state becomes a right and a duty. When?
10. What was Gandhi's opinion of private ownership?

2.4 SUBHASH CHANDRA BOSE

Subhash Chandra Bose was the symbol of India's firebrand patriotism and intense nationalism. As one of the most formidable leaders of India, he was born in a large middle class family as the sixth son among nine siblings in Cuttack, Orissa. He was born on 23 January 1897 to Janakinath Bose and Prabhavati Bose. It was the period of Renaissance and militant nationalism as the main currents in Indian political tradition.

At the age of 5, he was sent to an English elementary school in Cuttack, where he exhibited his talent and excelled with top honours but also grew conscious of the racial discrimination that was prevalent there. So he joined Ravenshaw

Collegiate School, where he came under the influence of Swami Vivekananda and his teachings. Later, he did his college from Presidency, Calcutta where he was introduced to politics and took part in a revolutionary protest against his professors. He finished his graduation in philosophy with first class honours from Scottish Church College, Calcutta. On the insistence of his father, he competed for the Indian Civil service exam in London and was successful and joined the service but disappointed his parents when he resigned from service on 22 April 1921 in response to the call of the motherland.

Bose joined the Indian National Congress but could not accept *Gandhism* as a philosophy. He was elected as the President of the Indian National Congress twice but he found Congress was adapting to Gandhi's philosophy and he could not follow it. He found it too passive and it didn't go well with his personality, being a man of action; although both shared the passion and the nationalistic zeal. He resigned from the post and started a separate political party called *All India Forward Bloc* and called for an immediate and full independence of India from the imperialistic rule of British rule.

He was aware of the international events and saw the Second World War as an opportune time to take advantage of the Britishers' vulnerability by organizing the *Azad Hind Fauj* or the Indian National Army (INA) with the assistance of Japanese and Indian prisoners-of-war and plantation workers from British Malaya, Singapore and other parts of Southeast Asia. He had even formed the Azad Hind Government in exile and led the INA for military campaigns against the allies in the north-eastern part of the country.

2.4.1 Political Ideas

Bose believed more in political action through his ideologies than in theorizing about them. His intense nationalism can be felt through his revolutionary words, 'Give me blood, I will give you freedom.' It led to armed attacks in destabilizing the foundation of British imperialism in India. He has often been misunderstood by his contemporary political *pundits* as well as the present galaxy of scholars. It is important to analyse the political ideas behind the actions of *Netaji* in order to have a comprehensive understanding of one of the greatest martyrs in the freedom struggle of India.

2.4.2 Socialist Ideology

Bose supported the socialist ideology as a means of transforming the Indian society from the clutches of feudalism and capitalism. The immediate cause of desiring freedom from the British imperial rule was to acquire a social reality of individual freedom through a socialist republic. He felt that socialist republic was the only model of 'complete all round undiluted freedom' for the people of India. Socialism was not merely a material necessity but also a spiritual compulsion.

Moreover, according to Bose, State being an agent of freedom, must work to the end of bringing freedom to each individual. It should act as an organ for the masses and accordingly address itself to the task of bringing an end of feudalism and capitalism while it strives to raise the material standard of life of the masses.

NOTES

For achieving such an end, all the agricultural and industrial system must be brought directly under its direct control. The state should continue to exist to ensure that the socialist order is maintained. He wanted to establish *Samyavad*, his doctrine of equality, which is discussed in the next section.

NOTES

2.4.3 The Concept of Samyavada

Samyavada is the political concept which *Netaji* had propounded as a political goal to establish socialism. He felt that in order to fight and win India's liberty it is necessary to give her full freedom to determine her own future with no interference and have a social order based on the eternal principles of justice, equality and fraternity. He had put forth his argument in the Haripura session of the Indian National Congress that the national problems of poverty, illiteracy, disease, scientific production and distribution can be effectively tackled only along socialistic lines. He emphasized that such problems need to be removed or else the future of Indian nationalism will be at stake. *Samyavada* is the synthesis of communism and fascism. He called it the doctrine of equality. There are certain traits of communism and fascism which he sought to synthesize in *Samyavada*. According to Bose, all matter is the manifestation of spirit forming the universe. The essential principal of human life is to love and this demands unlimited social involvement. Every social situation is not only independent of an individual but also his determinant. Hence a situation created by imperialism and feudalism would not create an atmosphere in which love would flow. The objective of politics is to create a social relationship which manifests in the form of love.

He denounced parliamentary democracy as it creates disunity and dissension, and emphasizes the need to accommodate even the dissenting minorities. However, he was against certain tenets of fascism such as imperialistic expansion, cult of racial supremacy, boosting of exploiting classes, belief in dominance of the will and intention of the leader, etc. He believed in the concept of equality and internationalism which were the main victims at the hands of the fascist dictators. He wanted to loosen the chains of British imperialism for which he did not hesitate to seek assistance from the Axis powers.

Strong government

For the implementation of socialistic principles, a strong government is necessary as he apprehended the loss of independence if the nation does not remove its socio-economic problems like unemployment, poverty and exploitation. A strong government is only possible if the government is committed to socialism.

Common culture

According to Bose, every nation must have its own history, own geographical area and culture. For India the common culture can be revived through its ancient culture. He had great pride in Indian culture and heritage and urged that every effort should be made to evolve a common culture in India and forget the primordial differences for the cause of the nation.

Self-reliance

Bose emphasized that every nation should be economically self-sufficient and self-reliant. It should not just depend on foreign aid and develop the agriculture and industry. He had also told the Japanese whatever aid they had given in building the Indian National Army will be given back as a loan once Independence was achieved.

Realist approach to politics

Mr. Bose was a staunch realist and therefore did not believe in the moral orientation of politics. He believed in the concept of political bargaining and diplomatic calculations as an important ingredient for the assertion of political power.

2.4.4 Nationalism

Bose was an arch nationalist and a staunch patriot. He endorsed Mazzini's concept of nationalism who had regarded the nation as a radiant and luminous mother. Although he did not theorize his concept of nationalism, being a practical man of action, still he popularized the ideal of supremacy of the nation in a country having inherited the legacy of feudalism, ecclesiasticism and despotic imperialism. He wanted to emancipate India from the clutches of the British Imperialism and suffered for the cause and all this earned him the status of a national hero.

He had taken great pride in Indian culture, religion and everything that constitutes the great heritage and civilization of India. He felt that India could have its rightful place only if it was freed from the clutches of British imperialism and this was possible only through Independence. Being a man of action, he did not theorize for the concept of freedom but had taken steps to organize an army from the surrendering enemy armies and organized the

Azad Hind Fauj or the Indian National Army to emancipate India from the British yoke.

Netaji was a great motivator for his soldiers in his armed struggle against British imperialism and the arch nationalist in him proved prophetic when he said that the darkest hour provides the dawn and India shall be free before long. He proved prophetic as India gained freedom after two years of his demise.

Characteristics of nationalism as propounded by Netaji

- **Deification of nation:** Bose being a religious man deified the nation. The nation has been deified to the status of a mother and the motherland is superior to heaven. The path to the worship of nation is through self-sacrifice. Therefore, mother India has been chained by the imperialist rule of the British and as a dutiful son he should be ready to make any sacrifices for her liberation, even if it means the path of an armed struggle.
- **Self-identity of nation:** According to Bose, every nation must establish its identity in the community of the nations. India will not have her due honour in the international community if it was not liberated from the British Rule.
- **Strong national army:** Bose emphasized the need for a strong, well-organized national army to fight for the liberation and maintenance of freedom. He

NOTES

NOTES

stressed the need for an Indian army under Indian leadership. He was very particular in the strategic location regarding where the INA had to fight while taking the help of the Japanese to oust the British in the north-eastern part of the country. It was meant to ensure that India's fate did not fall from one hand to other.

- **Self-sacrifice as the basis of nationalism:** Bose was highly influenced by Swami Vivekananda who had said that there could not be any realization without renunciation and for political freedom it was essential to undergo the highest suffering. He never promised a rosy picture for the freedom that he wanted for the country. His call for freedom echoes in the following words: 'Give me blood, I will give you freedom.'

2.4.5 Concept of Freedom

Netaji believed in the holistic concept of freedom. Freedom for him was not only the political freedom but also social as well as economic freedom. He had said the party that will win the political freedom for India will also be the party that will win the social and economic freedom for the masses.

2.4.6 Left Ideology

Netaji became notable votary of leftism, which is also reflected in his political approach. He professed leftism as a philosophy as well as an ideology. For Bose, leftism was the way to bring in socialism in India. Being a follower of Swami Vivekananda, he was committed to the spiritual way of life.

The *tantric* way of spiritual life prescribes two alternative means: Right and Left. The Right is the way of righteousness, but the pursuit of the righteous is slow while swiftness is the essence of the Left. The Left also stresses the independence of the spiritual goal of life and accordingly, it does not prohibit adoption of any means for attaining the former.

Bose pleaded for the leftism because he believed that it is in synchronism with India's traditional spirituality and also the course that has been compelled by the circumstances of life in India. He felt that India has to untangle herself from the social complexities and the un-spiritual forces such as imperialism, feudalism and capitalism. So Bose felt that the objective of freedom can be achieved by following the path of leftism and there is no alternative to it. To meet this end, a strong leader is needed such as Stalin or Hitler and a parliamentary form of government.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

11. What was Bose's opinion of Gandhism?
12. What was the need for Samyavada according to Netaji?

2.5 JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

Jawaharlal Nehru (1889–1964), a man with vision and dynamism, was one of the few Indians who could come out of the lap of luxury provided by his father Moti Lal Nehru and dedicate his life for political activism for the nation. It is through his role in the political activities that he contributed to the modern Indian political thought.

He was also a historian who recorded the British rule in India and the overview of the Indian nationalist movement. Prior to India's independence, he spoke and wrote on various problems facing India and the world at great length. He was influenced by Marxist thinking and had a good grasp of Marxist literature, which gave a new orientation to his thinking. He had acquired clarity in understanding the Indian society and felt that socialism suited Indian traditions because he saw the Indian society to be in the same state of pre-socialist Soviet Russia.

As the first Prime Minister of independent India, he continued to speak on problems facing free India and the nuclear world. He articulated his ideas and his views on political thought in general and on nationalism and social revolution in particular.

2.5.1 Political Ideas of Jawaharlal Nehru

Nehru was one of the founding fathers of socialism in India. He was one of the few Indians who went through many strains to establish a 'Socialist India' free from exploitation, degradation and subjection. He was instrumental in introducing socialist ideas into the socio-economic programme of the Indian National Congress and Indian Constitution.

Nehru was highly influenced by socialism which had taken different shapes in different periods. He was not a dogmatic socialist but was more influenced by the Fabian socialists like G.B. Shaw, Bernard Russell, etc. He had articulated his interest in socialism as he saw that it releases individuals from economic and cultural bondage. He advocated socialism in the Indian context due to the following reasons as mentioned below:

- Nehru was convinced that socialism is the only panacea to all our socio-economic evils.
- Socialism is more scientific as it is based on scientific methods of understanding the society and its history, the past events and laws of development, besides being useful in the economic sense.
- Socialism organizes to establish the society on social and economic justice.
- Socialism can help the problem of unemployment through the process of planning.

Nehru's political ideas are best articulated in his concept of socialism which can be called as democratic socialism or refined human materialism. Democratic socialism is characterized by a socialistic pattern of society with mixed economy as the base and planning as the main methodology that has to be imbibed like a philosophy of life.

NOTES

2.5.2 Democratic Socialism

NOTES

According to Nehru the model of democratic socialism suits Indian traditions and ethos. He felt that the parliamentary democracy can help in achieving socialism. Socialism is a set of beliefs or ideas that values equality, social justice, cooperation, progress, individual freedom and happiness in the society through the abolition of the private-enterprise economy and its replacement by 'public ownership', a system of social or state control over production and distribution. The presence of diverse social groups and ideologies in India provides the plurality that strengthens Indian democracy. The plurality is also the base for the ideological foundation of individual liberty. It also provides an alternative to the system of private enterprise and exploitation that the colonial rule of the British established in India.

Nehru was influenced by Fabian Socialism of Britain which was founded by Sidney Webb along with writers like H.G. Wells and George Bernard Shaw. Its intellectual elements include the utilitarian individualism of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. They seek to achieve socialism by parliamentary means and by appealing proactively to the middle class. It became a doctrine that sought to reconcile the values of liberty, democracy, economic progress and social justice. They envisaged socialism more as a form of society in which full democratic control would be exercised by the state and production would be done in the interests of the whole community.

Democratic socialism sees socialism as a long-term goal, which would evolve through the process and growth of economic efficiency through advanced technology, large-scale organization, planning and education with moral responsibility and the voluntary acceptance of equal shares in benefits and burdens. In short, socialism would lead to the inevitable outcome of liberalism and extend democracy from politics to industry.

Socialistic pattern of society

Nehru rejected both Marxian socialism as well as Gandhiji's concept of trusteeship. His concept of democratic socialism implies a socialistic pattern of society in which both human dignity as well as individual freedom go along with social and economic justice. It aims at the decentralization of economic and political power through peaceful democratic methods. In other words, democratic socialism envisages a polity where property rights will exist to a limited scale while the state will have control over the rest.

As a philosophy of life

Nehru wanted to develop socialism as a philosophy of life so that every man can develop a socialist outlook in which competition and conflict will be replaced by cooperation, equality and justice. It is not only the political and social structures which need to change but also the behaviour, attitude, instincts, habits and desires so that the feudal and capitalist exploitation, unemployment and starvation come to an end.

Mixed Economy as the base of Democratic Socialism

According to Nehru, Democratic Socialism is a model of development which is based on mixed economy, allowing both the public and private sector to co-exist. It aims at state control of the key industries and means of distribution such as Railways, Cooperatives, Banks, etc. It seeks to promote economic growth with social justice through adequate production and generation of employment, fair opportunities for growth.

Planning as a method of Democratic Socialism

Nehru was not in favour of violence due to class conflicts or the capitalist system. He felt that planning can be evolved as a method of change and would be the inevitable process of socialist economy in democratic structures. He expected that a planned development of economy will ensure the establishment of a classless society on cooperative basis.

2.5.3 Concept of Democracy

Nehru was influenced by the liberal democratic ideas and was one of the pioneers of parliamentary democracy in India. He emphasized equality of opportunity for all in the political and economic fields. He stood for the freedom of the individual to grow and develop to the best of his personality.

He also based his concept of democracy on his faith in individualism as he felt that everyone has the potentiality and opportunity to develop material opportunities as well as individual growth and identity of every individual. He emphasized equality and the integrated conception of political, economic and social freedom which could not be separated from one another.

For realizing equality, the society should be based on the egalitarian order and free from social discrimination as well as economic exploitation. To achieve this end, Nehru felt that parliamentary democracy is the best and most dynamic means which will ensure continuity as well as change. He sought to effectuate it through governmental institutions and principles such as popular sovereignty through representations, election through adult franchise, majority rule, responsible political parties and leadership, etc. Nehru believed the technique of democracy on non-violent pattern is the only way to achieve these social and political objectives. He stressed on democracy as a way of life which requires both education as well as self-discipline. In other words, Nehru's concept of democracy is political, socialistic, secular, humanitarian and educative.

2.5.4 Concept of Nationalism

Although Nehru was a great nationalist leader but he did not develop any theory of nationalism. Nevertheless, he defined the meaning and content of Indian nationalism on the collective memory of past achievements, traditions and experiences. He stressed on the cultural foundations for the unity of India which is based on three main principles, namely:

- The racial arrogance of the British rulers in India.

NOTES

- The ruthless exploitation of the British leading to abject poverty in India.
- The monopoly of the British in the political and administrative administration through following the rule of 'divide and rule'.

NOTES

So Nehru advocated for self-determination for the assertions of nationalism so that the social, political and economic nationalism can take place.

2.5.5 Concept of Internationalism

Nehru's progressive socialist nationalism was a mark of his love for internationalism. He viewed internationalism as the foundation of international peace and well-being of all nations. According to Nehru, the whole of humanity is one and the world is a stage on which he wanted India to play her part. He adhered to the concept of a world-state at the same time without undermining the concept of nation-state. He advocated the cause of disarmament for realizing the ideal of world peace and took great pride in being called as a citizen of the world.

So he promoted international outlook among the members of the Indian National Congress as well as his countrymen. No wonder, he was also one of the leading spokesmen of the Asian and African aspirations for political and economic freedom. He was instrumental in shaping India's foreign policy through groups such as NAM and principles like *Panchsheel*. The latter are the five cardinal tenets of international amity and accord based on the following principles:

1. Maintaining respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty
2. Non-aggression
3. Non-interference in each other's internal affairs
4. Peaceful coexistence
5. Equality and mutual benefits

NAM, the Non-Aligned Movement, stems from Nehru's belief that security can be obtained through the policy of friendship and cooperation and sustainable peace can be ensured. The policy of NAM led to the coalitions of the Afro-Asian countries that were newly independent after their fight against colonialism, economic exploitation and hegemonism.

2.5.6 Concept of Secularism

Nehru was a secularist in his thought and action and laid the foundation for Indian polity. He regarded secularism as a means to achieve the territorial integrity, political stability and national identity. Thus, he defined secularism in the dual sense to keep the state, politics and education separate from religion, i.e. making religion a private matter for the individual. It is this approach that prevented communalism to enter the domain of politics.

He advocated for a secular state in order to ensure socio-religious harmony among the different groups that exist in India so that a stable society could be established. It also implied equal opportunities for those who profess any faith without any religious discrimination. It stood against a theocratic state, where it created a class of citizens having more opportunities than the other.

So he envisaged secularism for national unity and integrity in the backdrop of a country having cleavages on the issues of religion, ethnicity, languages and tribes. He also dreamed of a society free from any dogmatism and obscurantism. The base or the foundation of a secular state lies in the socioeconomic justice. In the regard, planning provides a balanced economic growth of all religious and social groups.

NOTES

2.6 SARDAR VALLABHBHAI PATEL

The history of India would have been different had Sardar Patel not been the Deputy Prime Minister when India became independent in 1947. The triumvirate—Gandhiji, Nehru and Sardar Patel—were responsible for giving direction to the destiny of the country. Sardar Patel consolidated the country into one united whole in a unique manner.

Born on October 31, 1875 at Nadiad, in the Kaira district of Gujarat, Vallabh Bhai Patel was the son of Zaverbhai Galabhai Patel, a Leva Patidar. This class of cultivators was known for their simple character, industrious habits and straightforward dealings. Vallabh Bhai possessed an ingenious mind as a school boy. He was a rebel whose exceptional organisational abilities were recognised by his schoolmates and teachers. Patel passed the matriculation examination from the Nadiad High School in 1897.

Patel had two ambitions to fulfil, first to become a pleader and later a barrister. During those days a matriculate could become a lawyer by taking the pleaders examination. He became a pleader in 1900, and started practising in Godhra. In 1902 he shifted to Balsad, a taluka headquarter, where he practised as a criminal lawyer for nearly eight years, during which period he had built a name for himself as a most successful criminal lawyer. In 1910, he left for London and joined the Middle Temple, where he took an examination in Roman law and stood first. He returned to India in 1913 and started practising as a barrister in Ahmedabad, fulfilling his second ambition.

Gandhiji's Disciple

The impact of Gandhiji's personality on Vallabhbai was tremendous. It gave him a new mission in life. The Champaran struggle waged by Gandhiji had a sweeping effect on Patel's mind. In Gandhiji's Champaran victory Patel saw the beginning of a new agrarian revolution. His interest in politics had been kindled, as became abundantly clear in the Provincial Political Conference organised by the Gujarat Sabha and presided by Gandhiji at Godhara. The conference appointed a permanent committee with Gandhiji as the President and Patel as one of the secretaries. He became a staunch follower of Gandhiji. From then on there was no looking back. Blessed with rare qualities of fortitude, integrity and an iron determination, Patel played an important role in the freedom movement.

It was due to his sterling leadership and practical vision that the peasant movement in Gujarat became a success. It was in this struggle that the organisational capacity for which Sardar Patel was famous in the whole country became visible.

He took over as the nascent nation's Home Minister at a very crucial juncture in history and devoted himself whole heartedly to ensure that the country which was already partitioned, remained intact and united.

NOTES

Building a Union

On the eve of their departure, the British government announced that its paramountcy would lapse not only over the British territory but even over the native States. This meant that as many as 625 small and big native States would become independent like India and Pakistan. Consequently, the country would be divided into a number of small and big units.

Before embarking on this mammoth task, Sardar sought to ensure the stability of administration by forging a bridge of faith and confidence with the "Steel Frame". Most of the I.C.S. officers suspected that the Congress leaders, particularly Sardar in view of his past experiences with them, would have no faith in the I.C.S. But Sardar rose to the occasion and reposed total trust in their capability to serve the nation. He was, thus, able to win their unstinted support in the endeavour of nation building.

Attempts were afoot for finalising the standstill agreement with the States. It provided that the Central Government will be vested with powers of defence, foreign policy and communications even over the States. Travancore, Hyderabad and some other States declared themselves sovereign States and created hurdles in the agreement. On the other end, Jinnah with a view to tempt Jodhpur, Jaisalmer and other Border States made them an unconditional offer to align with Pakistan on their terms.

Political Sagacity

To find an amicable solution to this complicated situation, Sardar issued a statement to the princes wherein he appealed to their sense of patriotism and reiterated that the new States department in no way, desire to have supremacy over them. "If at all, any sense of supremacy is required, it would be with common understanding and for common good. We are at a momentous stage in the history of India. By common endeavour, we can raise the country to new greatness, while lack of unity will expose us to unexpected calamities. I hope the Indian States will realise fully that if we do not cooperate and work together in the general interest, anarchy and chaos will overwhelm us all great and small, and lead us to total ruin". The statement which amply reflected his statesmanship and political sagacity, removed whatever doubts lurked in the minds of the princes.

There was a popular agitation in Travancore and the State acceded to India. The Nawab of Bhopal could not take all this but when he realised that there was no alternative, he sent the instrument of accession duly signed to Sardar.

A man of iron will and absolute fearlessness, Sardar Patel tackled the question of 550 and odd State territories and principalities in such a strategic manner which left even his staunch critics in complete amazement. Almost within a year he redrew the map of India with every princely State joining the Indian union and thus, forming part of the political stream of life that was endowed with cultural unity and harmony.

The intricacy of the situation can perhaps be gauged by the fact that there were 26 small States in Orissa and 15 in the Chattisgarh area of present Madhya Pradesh. It required skilful diplomacy on the part of Sardar Patel to persuade them to merge into bigger, more viable units. Even more ticklish was the case of Saurashtra where there were 14 big States, 119 small States and other units under different administrations totalling 860.

The herculean task of merging all of them into the Saurashtra union was also accomplished by Sardar Patel. Soon, State after State started acceding to the Indian Union. One after the other, Gwalior, Indore, Dhar, Dewas all accepted the advice of Sardar. Rajputana States followed the same. The Sikhs of Punjab also cooperated with the merger.

Even by August 15, Hyderabad kept aloof. Hence, Lord Mountbatten himself started negotiations. At one stage, it appeared that there was a settlement but Nizam found himself helpless against the pressures of Razakars. The Razakars started harassing the local public. Thus, when the situation went out of control, Sardar with the consent of the Governor General initiated police action. In 108 hours, the Nizam surrendered and Hyderabad acceded and merged with India. The Nawab of Junagadh accepted an accession with Pakistan. Sardar solved this complex problem in his own inimitable way and the Nawab and his Diwan left Junagadh for Pakistan.

Thus, the 'Yagna' for establishment of a united India undertaken by Sardar was completed with the merger of Hyderabad. Politically, India became one and united. In the history of India stretched over ages, India became one and united for the first time and that too without shedding a drop of blood. That was the marvel of the personality of Sardar. The sterling qualities of leadership he had shown as leader of Satyagraha, flowered in greater way in the administration of the country, maintenance of law and order and ensuring stability of the country and making it invulnerable.

2.7 RABINDRANATH TAGORE: POLITICAL IDEAS, NATIONALISM

As a poet and litterateur, Rabindranath Tagore was one of the most distinguished personalities of Modern Asia. He was born on 7 May 1861 at Jorasanko in West Bengal. He is hailed as the Goethe of Bengali language and literature and has been described as the cultural ambassador of the spiritual East.

Although he was brought up in luxury, Rabindranath grew up to become a religious man. He was also highly sensitive to his surroundings which he expressed in his poems, which he started writing from the tender age of eight and published his first substantial poetry at the age of sixteen under the pseudonym *Bhanushingho*, which means ('Sun Lion') and wrote his first short stories and dramas in 1877. He denounced the British Raj and supported independence. His efforts endure in his vast canon and in the institution he founded, Vishwa-Bharati University.

His writings reveal that Rabindranath Tagore was an arch patriot and a staunch nationalist, which would in essence evoke political ideas that influenced the Indian

NOTES

political thought. However, his political ideas do not constitute him to be described as a politician as he stood for unity, harmony, cooperation and integral humanity. His political ideas can be analysed under the following heads as follows.

NOTES

2.7.1 Concept of Democracy

According to Tagore, democracy is the participation of the people in the exercise of sovereignty. It implies the political equality of all in the society and emphasizes on the economic and cultural equality as well. He did not agree with the concept of a farcical democracy because he believed that it has to abide by *Dharma* and is not divorced from ethics. He wanted the democracy to be self-reliant and resourceful.

The democracy that Tagore talks about also entrusts responsibility to the citizens to render their service in the interest of the community as a whole. In other words, whatever happens to the community should be done with the full participation of all the citizens. The people cannot be just expected to take part in politics only during the time of elections, to cast their votes; unfortunately, which is what democracy has come to mean today.

2.7.2 Rights

Tagore had always advocated for rights. He felt that a right should not be begged but must be created for the individuals, which is possible only through their consciousness. So he wanted the masses to cultivate moral force to regenerate and even stand before the arrogant despots, if required. He wanted the Indian villages to be reorganized so that they can develop initiative and cooperation to organize their own cottage industries and become self-reliant. He urged the individuals to cultivate their own moral force to develop resistance for any oppression of their rights. In other words, the people were responsible for the realization of their rights as no authority can quash their rights if the people are conscious as well as resist any oppression.

2.7.3 Concept of Freedom

The sensitive soul of Tagore rebelled against any concentration of power in the hands of a few people resulting in the oppression of individual freedom. He stood for autonomy of the human spirit as freedom served as an antidote to mechanical conventions, arbitrary and tyrannical laws, priestly prejudices and narrow social creeds. Freedom served as a counterpoise to death, shame and trammels. The state should exist to protect the interest of the individual and not its own interests.

In a way, Tagore sanctified the moral and spiritual freedom of the human spirit as freedom stands for illumination of the souls through the process of self-realization which is possible only through a universal approach. According to Tagore, sympathetic cooperation, compassion and trustworthy understanding of mankind brings them closer to the blessings of freedom. He has beautifully articulated this in *Gitanjali*:

Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high,

Where knowledge is free

Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic rules;

Where words come out from the depth of truth;

Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection;

Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habits;

Where the mind is led forward by this into ever widening thought and action

Into that heaven of freedom my Father let my country awake

NOTES

2.7.4 Views on Nation and Nationalism

Tagore made a clear distinction of nation and state as he felt that they had emanated from the European mind and certainly had not the Indian origins. According to Tagore, state was an organization of power and the concept of nation-state is the greatest evil for the nation as it trades on the 'febleness of the rest of the world'. It reduces individual to a mere cog and obstructs the growth of humanism. So the nation and nationalism are parochial concepts with a very narrow base.

Tagore considers nation antagonistic to the social interest of men as he said, 'The ideal of the social mean is selflessness but the ideal of the nation, like that of the professional is selflessness.' The advocates of nation-state and nationalism create barriers between the societies. This is where he distinguishes between Indian civilization and that of the European as the base of the former is society, while that of the latter is the state. Man can attain greatness either through the society as well as the state but if we think of building a state on the model of European pattern we shall be wrong as Indian civilization is based on its society.

Later, his concept of nationalism underwent a change and he started to conceive of an ideal society in India which is inhabited by people, embracing different religions and varied cultures who are living in perfect harmony. That is also the solution of Indian political and social problems in the international context.

2.7.5 Views on Internationalism and Universalism

Tagore was an internationalist, who stood for the world as an abode of men's spirit and not mere political power in his times when the world was supposed to stand for the assertion of rights of the individual states. So he forewarned the states against the dangers of racial prejudices which undermined the human unity. He portrayed the world as the abode of men's spirit and not a mere reservoir of political power. He, therefore, wanted the spirit of interdependence and brotherhood to pervade among the nations of the world.

Hence he aimed at the federation of mankind which would herald an era of international law and collective security. He wanted nations to shed suspicion, fear, distrust lustfulness and national egoism and instead opt for virtues of amity, national friendship and mingling of their respective cultures through mutual cooperation and co-existence.

It is in accordance with his ideals that the Viswa-Bharati University was initiated as an embodiment of the idea of cultural synthesis and cooperation of the East and the West. As an internationalist, he also emphasized for mutual cooperation, reciprocity and humanity as the basis for building relations among different countries.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

13. What was the biggest political achievement of Sardar Patel?
14. What was democracy according to Tagore?
15. What were Tagore's views on Internationalism?

2.8 SUMMARY

- Swami Vivekananda has propounded the political concept of nationalism with a religious interpretation which he's defined as a form of spiritualism. Spiritualism according to him goes beyond religious rituals, social dogmas, ecclesiastical formulations and obsolete customs.
- 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.
- It is significant that Sri Aurobindo lived till 1950, witnessing India's independence, but he never emerged from his retirement after 1910 to join the struggle for independence or to play an active role in the public life of Independent India. He produced several literary works though in his usual brilliant style, chiefly dealing with philosophic and religious subjects.
- Aurobindo joined Bipin Chandra pal in demanding inalienable status of *Purna Swaraj* or complete sovereignty for the country. Like Bipin Chandra Pal, again, Aurobindo rejected the petitioning policy of the Congress and built up a comprehensive scheme of political action, known as the passive and defensive resistance.
- 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.
- 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.

- 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.
- 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.
- Bose joined the Indian National Congress but could not accept *Gandhism* as a philosophy. He was elected as the President of the Indian National Congress twice but he found Congress was adapting to Gandhi's philosophy and he could not follow it. He found it too passive and it didn't go well with his personality, being a man of action.
- *Samyavada* is the political concept which *Netaji* had propounded as a political goal to establish socialism. He felt that in order to fight and win India's liberty it is necessary to give her full freedom to determine her own future with no interference and have a social order based on the eternal principles of justice, equality and fraternity.
- As the first Prime Minister of independent India, Nehru continued to speak on problems facing free India and the nuclear world. He articulated his ideas and his views on political thought in general and on nationalism and social revolution in particular.
- Nehru's political ideas are best articulated in his concept of socialism which can be called as democratic socialism or refined human materialism. Democratic socialism is characterized by a socialistic pattern of society with mixed economy as the base and planning as the main methodology that has to be imbibed like a philosophy of life.
- Patel had two ambitions to fulfil, first to become a pleader and later a barrister. During those days a matriculate could become a lawyer by taking the pleaders examination. He became a pleader in 1900, and started practising in Godhra.
- The impact of Gandhiji's personality on Vallabhbhai was tremendous. It gave him a new mission in life. The Champaran struggle waged by Gandhiji had a sweeping effect on Patel's mind. In Gandhiji's Champaran victory Patel saw the beginning of a new agrarian revolution.
- Although he was brought up in luxury, Rabindranath grew up to become a religious man. He was also highly sensitive to his surroundings which he expressed in his poems, which he started writing from the tender age of eight and published his first substantial poetry at the age of sixteen.
- According to Tagore, democracy is the participation of the people in the exercise of sovereignty. It implies the political equality of all in the society and emphasizes on the economic and cultural equality as well.

NOTES

NOTES

2.9 KEY TERMS

- **Spiritual freedom:** It 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.
- **Humanism:** The theory of humanism states that the individual is not only an end in himself but also divine by nature.
- **Satyagraha:** According to Mahatma Gandhi, it 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.
- **Democratic socialism:** It is characterized by a socialistic pattern of society with mixed economy as the base and planning as the main methodology that has to be imbibed like a philosophy of life.

2.10 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Spiritualism according to him goes beyond religious rituals, social dogmas, ecclesiastical formulations and obsolete customs. He feels that the ultimate aim of spirituality is to embrace the whole of humanity in universal brotherhood.
2. Vivekananda classified different types of freedom as follows:
 - Spiritual freedom
 - Individual freedom
 - Social freedom
 - Economic freedom
3. 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 facilitate individual growth and freedom.
4. Some of his important works are: *Essays on Gita, The Ideals of Karmayogi, Ideals and Progress, The Renaissance in India, The Foundation of Indian Culture, The Doctrine of Passive Resistance* and many others.
5. Aurobindo envisaged two-fold task for nationalism in India: (a) winning *Swaraj* for India so as to clean her social and political life from the pollution of European origin and (b) return to 'our old national individuality', so that India could play her great role in the redemption of the whole world.
6. 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).
7. 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.

8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. Bose joined the Indian National Congress but could not accept *Gandhism* as a philosophy. He was elected as the President of the Indian National Congress twice but he found Congress was adapting to Gandhi's philosophy and he could not follow it. He found it too passive and it didn't go well with his personality, being a man of action; although both shared the passion and the nationalistic zeal.
12. *Samyavada* is the political concept which *Netaji* had propounded as a political goal to establish socialism. He felt that in order to fight and win India's liberty it is necessary to give her full freedom to determine her own future with no interference and have a social order based on the eternal principles of justice, equality and fraternity.
13. The herculean task of merging 500 odd states into a united India was Patel's biggest achievement. The 'Yagna' for establishment of a united India undertaken by Sardar was completed with the merger of Hyderabad. Politically, India became one and united. In the history of India stretched over ages, India became one and united for the first time and that too without shedding a drop of blood. That was the marvel of the personality of Sardar. The sterling qualities of leadership he had shown as leader of Satyagraha, flowered in greater way in the administration of the country, maintenance of law and order and ensuring stability of the country and making it invulnerable.
14. According to Tagore, democracy is the participation of the people in the exercise of sovereignty. It implies the political equality of all in the society and emphasizes on the economic and cultural equality as well. He did not agree with the concept of a farcical democracy because he believed that it has to abide by *Dharma* and is not divorced from ethics. He wanted the democracy to be self-reliant and resourceful.

NOTES

NOTES

15. Tagore was an internationalist, who stood for the world as an abode of men's spirit and not mere political power in his times when the world was supposed to stand for the assertion of rights of the individual states. So he forewarned the states against the dangers of racial prejudices which undermined the human unity. He portrayed the world as the abode of men's spirit and not a mere reservoir of political power. He, therefore, wanted the spirit of interdependence and brotherhood to pervade among the nations of the world.

2.11 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. According to Swami Vivekananda, how could national unity be achieved?
2. What was caste according to Vivekananda?
3. Provide a brief biography of Aurobindo Ghose.
4. What were the major influences on Gandhi that shaped his political and nationalist ideas?
5. Briefly discuss Gandhian socialism as a concept.
6. What was Bose's socialist ideology?
7. What were Nehru's reasons for supporting socialism?
8. What was Gandhi's influence of Sardar Patel?
9. What was Tagore's concept of freedom?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Explain the concept of freedom as explained by Swami Vivekananda.
2. Discuss Ghose's beliefs regarding nationalism.
3. Highlight the basic political ideas of Mahatma Gandhi.
4. What were the various forms and techniques of Satyagraha employed by Mahatma Gandhi?
5. Explain the concept of Samyavada as propounded by Netaji.
6. What were the characteristics of nationalism according to Netaji?
7. How did Nehru envision the ideas of democracy, nationalism and internationalism?
8. How did Patel unify the Indian states? Describe in detail.
9. For Tagore, what were the differences between nation and State?

2.12 FURTHER READING

- Chand, Tara; *History of Freedom Movement in India*, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi, 2005.
- Chandra, Bipin; *Freedom Struggle*, National Book Trust, New Delhi, 1999.
- Chandra, Bipin; *Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India's Struggle for Independence*, Penguin Books, New Delhi, 1989.
- Choudhary, S. B.; *Civil Disturbances during the British Rule in India (1765 – 1857)*, World Press Limited, Calcutta, 1999.
- Desai, A. R.; *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, Popular Prakashan, New Delhi, 2008.
- Majumdar, R.C.; *The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857*, Calcutta Oriental Press Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1988.
- Sarkar, Sumit; *Modern India (1885 – 1947)*, Macmillan, New Delhi, 2000.
- Appadorai, A.; *Documents on Political Thought in Modern India*, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1973.
- Bali, D.R.; *Modern Political Thought (From Ram Mohan Roy to Jayaprakash Narayan)*, Sterling Publication, New Delhi, 1993.

NOTES

UNIT 3 POLITICAL THINKERS – I

Structure

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 Keshab Baliram Hedgewar: Concept of State
 - 3.2.1 Life and Works
- 3.3 V.D. Savarkar: Cultural Nationalism
- 3.4 M.S. Golwalker: Hindu Nationalism
- 3.5 Deendayal Upadhyaya: Integral Humanism
- 3.6 Summary
- 3.7 Key Terms
- 3.8 Answers to ‘Check Your Progress’
- 3.9 Questions and Exercises
- 3.10 Further Reading

NOTES

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The term resistance is generally used whenever we oppose or defend a particular issue. The modern usage of the term has originated from the self-designation of several movements during World War II, especially the French resistance.

A resistance movement is a group or collection of individual groups, dedicated to opposing an invader in an occupied country or the government of a sovereign state. It seeks to achieve its objects through either the use of non-violent resistance (sometimes referred to as civil resistance) or the use of armed force. Resistance movements may include any irregular armed force that rises up against an enforced or established authority.

Some resistance movements are underground organizations engaged in the struggle for national independence in a country under military occupation or totalitarian domination. Tactics of resistance movements against a constituted authority range from non-violent resistance and civil disobedience, to industrial sabotage and guerrilla warfare. For example, In India, Gandhiji adopted the techniques of civil disobedience in the early 1930s and passive resistance during the Quit India movement in 1942.

In this unit, you will learn about the strong and staunch nationalists who resisted not only the British government but also forces within the nation that were stopping them from achieving their personal ideals for the nation.

3.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Explain the concept of state as given by Keshab Baliram Hedgewar
- Discuss the cultural nationalism of V.D. Savarkar

- Examine Hindu nationalism from the perspective of M.S. Golwalkar
- Describe the concept of integral humanism as given by Deendayal Upadhyaya

NOTES

3.2 KESHAB BALIRAM HEDGEWAR: CONCEPT OF STATE

Dr. Keshav Baliram Hedgewar was a person with intense passion and selfless love for the Hindu community. He believed only Hindus were the sons of India and the existence and future of the nation was not independent to their existence in future. He worked towards this throughout his life and strived relentlessly to achieve his goal. He was the founder of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS).

3.2.1 Life and Works

Dr Hedgewar was born on 1st April 1889. While in Neel City High School of Nagpur, he was allegedly expelled for stridently singing *Vande Matram* and violating the conditions issued by British government. However, he did not stop here, intending to participate in the freedom struggle he went to Yeotmal for higher studies. After returning to Nagpur, he started participating in various revolts and movements, being an active member of Indian national Congress and got imprisoned on several occasions.

Revolutionary Preparations

During the First World War, all revolutionaries from across the country and abroad consented to utilize the opportunity of attacking the British who were involved in war with the Germans. Under the headship of Bhaoji Katre and Dr Hedgewar, the revolutionaries began to collect arms and money throughout the country for the proposed revolution. Dr Hedgewar had once put on a military uniform and took away the British stock of guns stored at Nagpur Railway Station to distribute the same to Gadar activists spread across the country. He also made an attempt to transport arms sent by revolutionaries abroad through a steamer, to be received at the Goa Port in 1912, with the help of his trusted colleague, Vaman Rao Dharmadhikari. However, the British came to know of it and the trans-shipment was seized before it could reach the terminus. The Germans were defeated badly, which also had resulted in demolition of the Indian revolution within the country.

National Movement

Dr Hedgewar recognized the indiscipline and disorganized coordination within revolutionary groups and the absence of political and national awareness in common masses, as the basic reasons of their failure in revolutionary upsurge. He realized that bravery and self-sacrifice of some daring and patriotic individuals will not yield to independence. Hence, was attracted towards the national movement started by the Indian National Congress.

In his association with the Indian National Congress, he participated in the freedom struggle and Non-cooperation Movement of 1921 and was sentenced. He

came out of jail on 12th of July 1922. His pure character, sacrificial and amiable nature, patriotism and devotion towards the noble cause of Indian freedom earned him lot of love from the leaders of nationalist movement in Central Province and he rose up to a higher rank in Congress. This was the time when all extremist leaders were apprehended for the all-out support by Mahatma Gandhi to the Khilafat Movement in an attempt to exploit the discontent amongst the Indian Muslims. Dr. Hedgewar felt it as a sort of appeasement of Muslim communalism and was sceptical that it would sow the seeds of separation in the long run and result in the country's disintegration.

Important Incidents

The AICC meeting was moved under the presidential heading of Sri Vijayaraghavachari, with a resolution for cow protection on 26 December 1920, which was not only opposed by Mahatma Gandhi in the name of Hindu-Muslim unity, but the meeting was abruptly ended and Sri Bade was forced to leave the session. The incident strongly affected Dr Hedgewar's sensibility making him fear for the ruinous outcome of the Hindu-Muslim unity and Muslim appeasement policy of Gandhi and the Congress.

Foundation of RSS

Dr. Hedgewar, for long had felt the lack of unity and patriotism amongst Hindus being the reason for movement failures and that without establishing national consciousness, discipline, self-less service and self-realization, freedom would be impossible to attain. Subsequent to his realization, he promised to remain bachelor throughout his life and decided to organize people under the banner of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh on Vijayadashami of 27 September 1925. He started the organization with a selected group of young boys who used to assemble in an open field every day for one hour. During an hour of daily meeting, the group used to be inculcated with patriotism, unity, discipline, love and respect for the country and selflessness through patriotic songs and stories of patriotic heroes.

On 7 April 1926, a *baithak* was organized wherein 26 people participated and proposed three names:

1. Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS)
2. Jaripataka Mandal
3. Bharatoddharak Mandal

Out of these names, RSS was selected unanimously.

Bharat Mata as common deity

Hedgewar realized the necessity of having a common deity to be worshipped by every member of Shakhya and also a common ideal. Consequently, he declared that regardless of the caste, religion or the language everybody is the son of Bharatmata hence, it would be the common deity and would strive for all-round progress, national development and to take the nation to the pinnacle of glory. Hence, incorporated the objective with their prarthana which started with *Namaste Sada Vatsale*

NOTES

NOTES

Matrubhume (Oh my beloved motherland, salutation to thee) in the first line and ends up in the last with *Param Vaibhavamnetu Metat Swarasthram* (Oh God, please give us strength and bless us to enable us to take our nation to the pinnacle of glory) and concludes the prayer with unifying slogan ‘Bharat Mata ki Jai’.

Idea behind starting the Shakha

Hedgewar’s idea behind starting shakhas was to inspire Swayamsevaks to dedicate themselves to the noble and generous task of nation building. He proposed the swayamsevaks to attain higher education and move out at different places for the purpose and spread the work of RSS across the country.

End of Legacy

Hedgewar was ill for a long time. His condition worsened on 21 June 1940 and his doctors decided to go for a lumbar puncture. Before lumbar puncture could be performed on him, he called Sri Guruji Golwalkar and other important workers of the Sangh and expressed his last wish for Guruji Golwalkar to take over the responsibilities of the Sarsanghchalak of the sangh. He took his last breath on 21st June 1940.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Why was Dr. Hedgewar expelled from school?
2. Why was Dr. Hedgewar attracted towards the Indian National Congress?
3. What was Hedgewar’s idea behind starting the Shakha?

3.3 V.D. SAVARKAR: CULTURAL NATIONALISM

Savarkar belonged to the illustrious caste of *Chitpavan* Brahmins that produced Nanasahib of 1857 fame. Also, Wasudeo Balwant and Lokmanya Tilak, who strove for Indian independence belonged to the same community.

The Savarkars originally hailed from the Konkan, a land symbolizing the great feat of reclamation performed by Parshuram, a mighty mythological figure. During the final days of Peshwa rule, the Savarkars were an important family. They were *Jagirdars* of a small village, Rahuri and enjoyed the honour of palanquin for their acknowledged eminence in Sanskrit scholarship. The blood, bones and brains of such ancestors carved out this grand figure of

Indian revolution, Vinayak Savarkar, who declared a war for the liberation of Hindustan.

Swatantryaveer Vinayak Damodar Savarakar was primarily a man of action, a nationalist who devoted all his energies to the realization of Hindu nationalism, whose fundamental dimensions were unity of the people, their modernization and their militarization. All these aspects are closely interlinked. Savarkar was the only all-India leader, apart from the Hindu Mahasabha, who launched an intense

propaganda for the militarization of the Hindus and for the industrialization of the country with pure patriotic and political objects during the Second World War. Savarkar stated that Britain's claim that she entered war to protect the vital principles affecting human freedom was a political stunt as long as she continued to hold India in political bondage. Savarkar discussed the war situation from the Indian viewpoint and its major issues in the context of international politics. Savarkar exhibited clear thinking and with unflagging energy. As regards foreign policy, he opined that it should be based on a very practical stand, on the principle of serving, safeguarding and promoting the national self-interest. He averred that it should not depend on 'isms'. The sound principle, he observed, in political arena is that that no form of government or political 'ism' was absolutely good or bad under all circumstances to all people alike. He propagated a policy of neutrality towards all nations in the world in respect of their internal affairs or mutual relations with each other.

According to Savarkar, all nations look first to ensure their own security and prosperity while dealing with international problems. They make or break pacts with this end alone in view. With the entry of Britain in the War, Savarkar declared that the Hindu Mahasabha felt itself concerned with the issues at stake in the War so far as they were likely to affect the safety and interest of the Hindu nation. So he appealed to the British Government to make an unmistakable declaration of granting Hindustan the status of a self-governing Dominion as an immediate step leading towards the final goal of complete independence and to introduce immediately a responsible Government at the Centre based on the democratic principle of one man one vote.

For Savarkar, the independence of India was 'the independence of our people, our race, and our nation'. Therefore, Indian *Swarajya*, as far as the Hindu nation is concerned, involves the political independence of the Hindu nation which would enable the people to grow to their full height. However, at the same time he declared at the 19th session of the Hindu Mahasabha held in Ahmadabad in 1937:

Let the Indian State be purely Indian. Let it not recognize any individual distinctions whatsoever as regards the franchise, public services, offices, taxation on the grounds of religion and race. Let no cognizance be taken whatsoever of man's being Hindu or Mohammedan, Christian or Jew. Let all citizens of that Indian State be treated according to their individual worth irrespective of their religious or racial percentage in the general population. Let that language and script be the national language and script of that Indian state which are understood by the overwhelming majority of the people as happens in every other state in the world, that is, in England or the United States of America and let no religious bias be allowed to tamper with that language and script with an enforced and perverse hybridism whatsoever. Let 'one man one vote' be the general rule irrespective of caste or creed, race or religion. If such an Indian State is kept in view the Hindu *Sanghatanits* will, in the interest of the Hindu *Sanghatan* itself, be the first to offer their whole hearted loyalty to it.

Many people criticized Savarkar for this repeated emphasis on an increase in military might. Some of them even went to the length of branding him a Fascist. In fact, Savarkar's weakest point remained in his inability to distinguish between

NOTES

NOTES

democracy and fascism. To him, the ideals of democracy and fascism made no difference. He measured the forces of liberty and freedom and the forces of Nazism and Fascism by the same standard. He had, it seems, no clear and deeper conception of a new state; nor had he faith or interest in a new world order. Savarkar's sole obsession was to make Hindus re-animated and re-born into a martial race. However, Savarkar never wanted to use violence without discrimination. He advised his compatriots to resort to violent means if and when other means fail to achieve the desired object. However, the winds of unending questions never seem to stop: How could a backward country like India stand up against or be compared with England? Where were the arms in Hindustan? Was it possible even to think of facing the British artillery? Indian soldiers in the British army were most loyal to their masters; then how could they be expected to rebel?

Nonetheless, Savarkar was ready with his answers: 'Whose arms are those that are in the hands of the Indian soldiers? They are ours! Our *Jawans* may be uneducated but I am sure that the love of freedom resides in their hearts. Just try to make that light of freedom a little more lustrous and it will work wonders. Very soon you will see the same arms turning against the British.' Savarkar was of the view that 'without the participation or cooperation of the army, it was impossible for any armed revolution to succeed in bringing freedom to Hindustan'. Savarkar used to stress that the 'Enemy's difficulty is our opportunity' and the 'Enemy's enemy is our friend'. This '*Mantra*' and '*Tantra*' (of involving the Army in the struggle) were like time bombs kept under the very throne of the British Empire. Further, during the days of Savarkar's tumultuous propaganda for Hindu militarization, military career was the monopoly of the Muslims, who formed three-fourths of the Indian Army.

Both the Muslims and the British Government knew well what Savarkar's militarization movement stood for. It aimed at carrying politics into the military ranks of the Indian Army, and winning over the Army to the side of revolution for the final overthrow of the British yoke. In fact, the ideal of Indian nationalism was a noble one. The Hindus did not find anything objectionable in the ideal of uniting whole of India into a consolidated political unit. Naturally, it suited well with the Hindu mentality with its synthetic trend, always prone to philosophies with a universal urge.

It is also true that the ideal of politics itself must be a Human state: all mankind for its citizens and the earth for its motherland. If all of India with one-fifth of the human race could be united irrespective of religious, racial and cultural diversities, merging them all into homogeneous whole, it would be but a gigantic stride taken by mankind towards the realization of that humanistic political ideal. The new concept of an Indian nationality was founded on the only common bond of a territorial unity of India. The Hindus for one found nothing revolting even in that assumption to their deepest religious or cultural or racial sentiment. It was because their national being had already been identified with that territorial unit, India, which to them was not only a land of sojourn but a home, their Fatherland, their Motherland, their Holy land and all in one! Indian patriotism was to them just a synonym of Hindu patriotism. The British also, while they favoured the Indian movement as an antidote to any possible revival of Hindu nationalism, took good care in catching the contagion of

this new Indian nationalist cult. They knew that if the Muslims also joined that cult whole-heartedly like the Hindus did, then there would really be united Indian nation—a contingency likely to prove perhaps more dangerous to British supremacy in India than a Hindu revival could single-handedly prove to be.

Thus, the policy of dividing Indians on communal lines (the notion of religion serving as the basis for the new political process based on popular participation) and giving support to the communalists became, from the end of the 19th century onwards, an important instrument or colonial policy in the efforts to thwart the rising national movement. Since the founding of the Indian National Congress, parallel with its growth through different stages, and as an accompaniment to the process of constitutional reforms, the official policy of active promotion of communalism was developed. This policy was also developed to meet the political exigencies back home in Britain where the growing democracy and labour movement were increasingly questioning imperialism in general and the policy of suppression of the popular national movements in colonies in particular.

The colonial administrators presented communalism as the problem of the defence of minorities. So the defence of minorities became an important part of the theory of imperialists' legitimization of its other components like welfare of the colonized people, civilizing the natives, white man's burden, etc. The imperialist statesmen, officials and ideologues at that stage said that Britain had to continue to rule India because it alone could protect the minorities from domination, exploitation and suppression by the majority.

The aim of the British policy of divide and rule was to check the politicization of the Indian people, to curb their consolidation and unification and to disrupt the process of the formation of Indian nation. Once the anti-imperialist nationalist movement arose, the policy was also directed towards checking its growth, dividing its actual or potential supporters and preventing Muslims (as also landlords' capitalists, etc.) from joining it.

However, the official British commitment was not to communalism in itself but its use for their own particular ends. It evolved gradually and changed to meet the changing times and the changing needs of colonial politics. It also differed from region to region. For example, it was not followed as one-sidedly in Punjab as in Bengal or U.P.; nor as actively between 1911–23 as before 1911 and after 1930. The commitment to Muslim communalism became total only after 1939. After 1937, the British had shifted from balanced to uncontrolled communalism, encouraged total communal division, gave virtually open support to the Muslim league especially in its anti-Congress role and tolerated its efforts to acquire a mass character.

As such, the first noticeable characteristic of Muslim political aggression, as Dr. Ambedkar pointed out in '*Pakistan or the Partition of India*', was their constantly increasing demands. The second thing was the spirit of exploiting the weakness of the Hindus, like the Muslim's insistence upon cow-slaughter and the stoppage of music before mosques. The third thing was the adoption by the Muslims of the 'gangster' method in politics. Dr. Ambedkar observed, 'The riots are a sufficient indication that *gangsterism* has become a settled part of their strategy in

NOTES

NOTES

politics.’ On the other hand, the Congress policy was ‘to tolerate and appease the Muslims by political and other concessions’. Here Ambedkar appears to be one with Savarkar in his analysis of the Hindu–Muslim problem and on the point of holding the Congress squarely responsible for it. Unquestionably, the Congress policy in power and politics was grossly pro-Muslim.

The rivalry of Hindu Mahasabha with the Congress had nothing to do with the issue of social reform versus political reform. Its quarrel with the Congress had its origin in the pro-Muslim policy of the Congress. Mahatama Gandhi never realized that this attitude on the issue was whetting Muslim appetite all the more. In 1931, he said, instead of bringing about *Swaraj* by force it would be preferable to wait till the Congress became equally popular with the non-Hindus. Critics point out that it meant linking the future of Hindus with the satisfaction of Muslims. This was the danger that Savarkar realized. He held that accepting any conditions of the Muslims for the sake of *Swaraj* was nothing less than slavery. To be honest, the Hindu–Muslim problem comprised two aspects. In the first aspect, the problem that presented itself was of two separate communities facing each other and seeking adjustment of their respective rights and privileges. In its other aspect, the problem was the problem of the reflex influences which that separation and conflict produced upon each of them. As Savarkar had said:

As it is, there are two antagonistic nations living side by side in India, several infantile politicians commit the serious mistake in supposing that India is already welded into a harmonious nation, or that it could be welded thus for the mere wish to do so. These our well-meaning but unthinking friends take their dreams for realities. But that solid fact is that the so-called communal questions are but a legacy handed down to us by centuries of cultural, religious and national antagonism between the Hindus and the Moslems. When time is ripe you can solve them; but you cannot suppress them by merely refusing recognition of them.

Savarkar also maintained that India could not be assumed to be a Unitarian homogenous nation. On the contrary there were two nations in the main: the Hindus and Muslims. He was of the opinion that the Hindus as a nation were willing to discharge their duty to a common Indian state on equal footing. However, if the Indian Muslims followed a policy of communal strife against the Hindus and cherished extra territorial designs of establishing a Mohammedan Rule or supremacy in India then the Hindus would look to themselves and stand on their own legs and fight single handed as best as they can for the liberation of India from any non-Hindu yoke, be it English or Muslim or otherwise.

Savarkar maintained that the Independence of India was in sight; however, he sensed the danger to the integrity of India from the vacillating, servile, deceptive and short-sighted leaders and the Congress policy in respect of the blank cheque offers like the communal award, the Simon Commission (with all non-Indian personnel to go into the question of constitutional reform), the census, the national script, the lingua franca and the national anthem. By the late 1930s and early 1940s, the Government began giving unequivocal recognition to Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League as the political powers which must be consulted on an equal footing

with the Congress in matters affecting Indian politics. Till then, the Congress and the League were looked upon by the Government as the only two representative bodies, whose opinion was tantamount to Indian opinion.

Referring to absolute non-violence, Savarkar demanded it to be ruled out not only on practical but also on moral grounds. Savarkar's meeting with Subhash Chandra Bose on 29 June 1940 shaped his militarization policy. One cannot deny that Savarkar was the main source of inspiration for the formation of the Indian National Army, whose founder Rasbehari Bose, an Indian revolutionary settled in Japan, was fully committed to Savarkar's mission of militarization and of armed revolution. It was Rasbehari who had informed Savarkar that Japan would enter the War before the end of the year 1940. Rasbehari even formed a unit of the Hindu Mahasabha in Japan after Savarkar became its President in 1937. That was the time when Savarkar once again emerged on the active political scenes after a lapse of 20 years.

Savarkar also made a four-fold contribution to the Hyderabad struggle, also known as Nizam Civil Resistance Movement, to make it the manifestation of Pan-Hinduism, to keep the Arya Samaj as its forefront to expose the anti-Hindu character of the Indian National Congress and to call off the struggle at the appropriate time. During this struggle, there was complete co-operation between the Hindu Mahasabha and the Arya Samaj (founded by Maharishi Dayanand in Punjab in 1876) in spite of the wily hindrances caused by topmost Congress leaders, callous misrepresentations made by the so-called nationalist-cum-Congress press, unsympathetic attitude of the Provincial Congress Ministries and the non-embarrassment policy of Gandhi.

This successful termination of the struggle for the civic, political, economic and religious rights of the Hindus and Sikhs, who were totally suppressed in the Hyderabad State, was a new feather in Savarkar's cap. It added prestige and power to his leadership skills. Hyderabad struggle was the first successful Civil Disobedience Movement in the history of modern India. It was the first successful political manifestation of Pan-Hinduism. It revealed the unique leadership qualities, organizational skills, political acumen and missionary zeal of Veer Savarkar.

Gandhi's Quit India Movement coincided with Savarkar's tendering his resignation from the presidentship of the Hindu Mahasabha on 31 July 1942. In his parting message, he asked to 'Hinduize all politics and militarize Hindudom'. However, the resignation sent waves of shocks throughout the Hindu *Sanghatanist* public in India. How could one afford to lose a personality that could energize the entire youth of the nation? He was a born leader. The role and responsibility which Gandhi and Nehru played and bore in the Congress, which arose over the talents and toils of Dadabhai Naoroji, Surenderanath Banerjee, Gokhale, Tilak and Das, was shouldered alone by Savarkar in the Hindu Mahasabha. It is worth quoting here that 'the Hindu Mahasabha would have joined the Congress in the 1942 movement if the Congress had solemnly guaranteed that it would irrevocably stand by the unity and integrity of India and that the Congress would not make any pact with the anti-national Muslim League'.

The annual session of the Hindu Mahasabha at Kanpur in December 1942 witnessed the return of Savarkar as the President once again. In the meanwhile,

NOTES

NOTES

Hindu Mahasabha along with Savarkar, Dr. Mookerjee, Dr. Moonje, N.C. Chatterjee, Raja Maheshwar Dayal, Rai Bahadur Meherchand Khanna and Prof. V.G. Deshpande framed national demands which included the immediate recognition of India by the British Parliament as an independent nation, national coalition government with full powers during the war period excepting the military portfolio, so far as the operative part was concerned, and holding of a constitution-framing assembly as soon as the war ceased.

On 10 February 1943, Gandhi began his 21-day fast in the Aga Khan Palace. In total confinement of his charitable attitude, Savarkar made appeals to Gandhi to break his fast. He said, 'His life, Gandhi himself may realize such a national appeal, is not so much his own as it is a national asset, a national property.' Savarkar opened a propaganda front to create a strong Hindu public opinion. He issued an appeal to the Hindus in general and Hindu *Sanghatanists* in particular to denounce this nefarious proposal for Pakistan uncompromisingly and fundamentally and asked the people to observe the first week of August 1944 as the United India and Anti-Pakistan Week.

Raising concerns for the fate of non-Muslims in the would-be Pakistan, he said, 'What were the thousands of Hindu Sikhs to do when faced by an imminent danger of being massacred in cold blood, looted, burnt alive, forcibly converted, in short, of being exterminated as racial and national being by the most barbarous attacks of an organized, dangerously armed and fanatically hostile foe and especially when the State as such was nowhere in evidence so effectively as to render any the least protection to them? Indian nationalism, secularism, Hindu-Muslim unity were fine words. However, at that particular moment, when the lives of millions of Hindus and Sikhs were in danger, these fine words were irrelevant. Instead of doing some introspection as to why the Congress policy failed, Nehru just blamed the Hindu *Sanghatansits*. Aggressively demanding a proactive role by the Hindu masses for establishing a Hindu *Rashtra*, Savarkar said: 'The choice therefore is not between two sets of personalities but between two ideologies, not between Indian Raj and Hindu Raj but between Muslim Raj and Hindu Raj, between *Akhand Hindustan* and *Akhand Pakistan*. The Hindu *Sanghatanist* ideology alone can, therefore, save our nation and re-establish an *Akhand Hindustan* from the Indus to the Seas.'

Then history took an unexpected and shocking turn! In the midst of an atmosphere of extreme gloom, confusion and disaster, Nathuram Vinayak Godse shot Gandhi with a revolver while Gandhi was going to the prayer ground in the compound of Birla House at Delhi in the evening at 5.30 on Friday, 30 January 1948, five minutes after the talks Gandhi had with Sardar Patel for settling the differences between Patel and Nehru on the question of 'Muslim loyalty' to India.

Naturally, this terrible act brought drastic and severe reaction against Hindu Mahasabha and the *Rashtriya Sawayam Sevak Sangh*. The latter was regarded as a militant storm-trooper offshoot of the Hindu Mahasabha. In his early youth, Godse was worker of the R.S.S. and later, he was a prominent member of the All-India Committee of the Hindu Mahasabha. Furious crowds pulled down and burnt Hindu Sabha flags, destroyed local and district Hindu

Sabha offices, burnt printing houses and studios belonging to the Hindu Sabha leaders, and attacked particularly people belonging to the caste of Godse. There

was trouble and tension in a few cities between the Hindu *Sabhaites* and the R.S.S. on the one side and the violent crowds of Gandhian persuasion on the other.

In the first week of February about 25,000 Hindu *Sanghatanists*, including great and small men, were arrested. The R.S.S. was outlawed. The Government accused Savarkar of complicity in the deed and put him behind bars. It was held officially that Nathuram Godse was the tool, Apte the brain and Savarkar was the Guru and guide behind the murder of Gandhi.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

4. What was unique about Savarkar's beliefs regarding nationalism?
5. What was the concept of independence of India for Savarkar?
6. What justification did the British give for their continued, oppressive rule of India?
7. When did Savarkar take up the position of president of Hindu Mahasabha again?

3.4 M.S. GOLWALKER: HINDU NATIONALISM

Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar was born on 19 February 1906. He was also fondly called Shri Guruji. He was an author and a political activist. The author of two highly controversial books—*Bunch of Thoughts*, and *We, or Our Nationhood Defined*—he also held the position of leader of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangha (RSS). His ideals and beliefs still live on, a century later, as is evident from the fact that the current Indian Prime Minister, Shri Narendra Modi has included a biographical profile of MS Golwalkar in his book, *Jyotipunj*, as one of the leaders who have inspired him. Golwalkar breathed his last on 5 June 1973.

Golwalkar was born in Ramtek near Nagpur, Maharashtra and turned out to be the only surviving son of the nine children born to his parents, Sadashivrao and Lakshmibai. Sadashivrao was a school teacher who was frequently transferred in his job to various parts of the country and as a result, Golwalkar completed his education across many institutions of India.

Golwalkar graduated from the Hislop College in Nagpur finally, with a Bachelor's degree in the sciences in 1926. After this, he joined Benaras Hindu University (BHU) in Varanasi to obtain a Master's degree in science. While he was still studying, he met Madan Mohan Malviya and was greatly impressed and influenced by his ideas. Malviya was a national leader at the time and also the founder of BHU.

He completed his Master's degree in 1928 and proceeded to pursue his Ph.D. in marine life at Madras. However, this part of his education was cut short prematurely due to shortage of money. Subsequently, he joined BHU as a professor of zoology and continued there for 3 years. It was during this time that he became

NOTES

the beloved ‘guruji’ for his students, because of his flowing beard, long hair and unpretentious style of dressing. This style was later adopted by his RSS followers to show reverence to him. After three years of teaching, Golwalkar went back to Nagpur and obtained his LLB degree in 1935.

While in Nagpur, Golwalkar happened to visit the Ramakrishna Mission and he was so deeply influenced that he was ready to renounce the world and take sanyas and also left for the Saragachi Ashram in Murshidabad district of West Bengal. At the ashram, he became a disciple of Swami Akhandananda, a direct disciple of Ramakrishna and *gurubandhu* of Vivekananda.

Finally, on 13 January 1937, he was initiated into the order of the Asmrama and also received his ‘diksha’. However, his guru was not ready to allow him to become a sanyasi. His guru asked him instead to carry on with his social service. His guru died in 1937 and that is when Golwalkar went back to Nagpur.

Leadership of RSS

During his years at BHU, Golwalkar came to know of Bhaiyaji Dani, a student of BHU, who had founded an RSS shakha in Varanasi. Golwalkar was immediately taken in by the ideology of RSS and decided to join the Sangh. Thereafter he met Hedgewar and also went for training to Nagpur at the RSS Officers Training Camp.

After meeting Golwalkar, Hedgewar was so impressed that he decided to invite Golwalkar to join RSS upon his return from the Ramakrishna Mission. Golwalkar was in agreement and said about this new opportunity: “Like spirituality, organization of the Nation has also been my inclination from early days. I believe that I would be in a better position to achieve it successfully being a part of the Sangh.” Once in, it took him little time to climb through the ranks of the Sangh and was given the position of General Secretary of the RSS in 1939. When Hedgewar passed away in 1940, Golwalkar was chosen to be the next RSS Sarsanghachalak.

As soon as he took up his new responsibility as the Sarsanghachalak, Golwalkar started a series of cross-country tours where he met the Sangh workers and propagated the RSS ideology. Due to this and many other initiatives, the Sangh activities flourished under his leadership and there was a considerable increase in the number of *shakhas* countrywide. To him goes the credit for creating the network of various socio-cultural organisations all over the country, which eventually came to be known as the Sangh Parivar. Organizations like the Bharatiya Jana Sangh (political party), Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh (trade union), Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad (students union), Vanavasi Kalyan Ashram (tribal welfare) and many more such were established by Swayamsevaks who ventured into different fields of public life.

In 1940, RSS opened its branches in Kashmir and Jammu. At this time, Balraj Madhok was appointed as a *pracharak* for Jammu, and Prem Nath Dogra was appointed the *sanghchalak* (Director). When a *shakha* was established in Srinagar in 1944, Golwalkar visited there in 1946. On 18 October 1947, owing to a request made by Sardar Patel (India’s then Home Minister), Golwalkar met the Maharaja Hari Singh, to persuade the Maharaja to accede his empire to India. Golwalkar took along Vasantryao Oak, the RSS *pracharak* for Delhi, and Narendrajit

Singh, the RSS *sanghchalak* for United Provinces. Historians believe that the Maharaja was successfully persuaded but formal accession papers were signed much later, on the 26 October, after Pakistanis invaded.

Pogrom of Muslims

Rajeshwar Dayal, Chief Secretary to the United Provinces Government in 1947-1948, wrote a book named *A Life of Our Times*. In this book, he recounts his shock when he discovered Golwalkar's plan for a pogrom of Muslims:

'I must record an episode of a very grave nature when the procrastination and indecision of the U.P. Cabinet led to dire consequences. When communal tension was still at fever-pitch, the Deputy Inspector-General of Police of the Western Range, a very seasoned and capable officer, B.B.L. Jaitley, arrived at my house in great secrecy. He was accompanied by two of his officers who brought with them two large steel trunks securely locked. When the trunks were opened, they revealed incontrovertible evidence of a dastardly conspiracy to create a communal holocaust throughout the western districts of the province. The trunks were crammed with blueprints of great accuracy and professionalism of every town and village in that vast area, prominently marking out the Muslim localities and habitations. There were also detailed instructions regarding access to the various locations, and other matters which amply revealed their sinister purport.

Greatly alarmed by these revelations, I immediately took the police party to the Premier's house. There, in a closed room, Jaitley gave a full report of his discovery, backed by all the evidence contained in the steel trunks. Timely raids conducted on the premises of the RSS (Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh) had brought the massive conspiracy to light. The whole plot had been concerted under the direction and supervision of the Supremo of the organization [Golwalkar] himself. Both Jaitley and I pressed for the immediate arrest of the prime accused, Shri Golwalkar, who was still in the area.'

Dayal further recounts that the Chief Minister was reluctant to place Golwalkar under arrest, as he himself would have wanted. However, the Chief Minister promised to initiate discussion of this issue in the Cabinet:

'At the Cabinet meeting there was the usual procrastination and much irrelevant talk. The fact that the police had unearthed a conspiracy which would have set the whole province in flames and that the officers concerned deserved warm commendation hardly seemed to figure in the discussion.'

After the discussion, the Cabinet decided to send a letter to Golwalkar demanding an explanation for the evidence that had been gathered against him. Dayal claims to have drafted the letter, which was dispatched for delivery through two police officers immediately. However, the letter remained undelivered because:

'Golwalkar, however, had been tipped off and he was nowhere to be found in the area. He was tracked down southwards but he managed to elude the couriers in pursuit. This infructuous chase continued from place to place and weeks passed. Came January 30, 1948, when the Mahatma, that supreme apostle of peace, fell to a bullet fired by an RSS fanatic. The whole tragic episode left me sick at the heart.'

NOTES

NOTES

Arrest and RSS ban

After Mahatma Gandhi's assassination in January 1948 by Nathuram Godse, a Sangh member, it was widely believed that RSS was a part of the plot, even though Golwalkar had strongly condemned the murder publicly. Golwalkar was placed under arrest on Feb 4 along with 20,000 swayamsevak. Besides this, the Sangh was banned for allegedly promoting "violence" and "subversion."

After the arrests, Godse announced publicly that he had acted independently of the Sangh and of his own will, thereby vindicating the Sangh of any responsibility for Gandhi's murder. However, his brother Gopal Godse—who was also an accused in the Gandhi assassination—claimed that Nathuram was still very much a member of the RSS and was only trying to protect the organization and Golwalkar by taking the complete blame. Finally, Golwalkar was released on 5 August after the statutory six months came to an end.

The government did not lift the ban on RSS even after Golwalkar was released despite Golwalkar's best efforts. Golwalkar negotiated endlessly with the then Home Minister Vallabhbhai Patel. Owing to the ban, the violence and mass arrests that followed against the Sangh shocked the RSS members, who had heretofore considered themselves to be a part of a patriotic organization.

During his negotiations with Golwalkar, Patel offered that RSS merge with the Congress, but Golwalkar's was not ready for this step. At Golwalkar's refusal, Patel made it mandatory for the Sangh to have a written constitution and made it a pre-condition for any further step. In response to this, Golwalkar launched a *satyagraha* on 9 December 1948. Again, Golwalkar was placed under arrest, together with 60,000 RSS volunteers. The RSS leaders Eknath Ranade, Bhaiyaji Dani and Balasaheb Deoras gave up on the *satyagraha* in January 1949 and, in collaboration with Liberal leader T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, created a constitution for the RSS which was as per Patel's demand. The ban was finally lifted on 11 July 1949.

3.5 DEENDAYAL UPADHYAYA: INTEGRAL HUMANISM

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya was born on 25 September. He was an eminent philosopher, economist, sociologist, historian, journalist, and political scientist. He led the Bharatiya Jan Sangha, the predecessor of the modern-day Bharatiya Janta Party. He is also the formulator of the Integral Humanism theory. His thinking was different and the theory served as an alternative framework for politics and governance.

His birthplace was a small village in Uttar Pradesh, called Chandrabhan. It is around 25 kms away from the town of Mathura. Chandrabhan has now been renamed as Deendayal Dham. His father was Bhagwati Prasad, a popular astrologer of his time and his mother was Shrimati rampyari who was also a pious lady. However, both his parents passed away when he was a young boy and he was raised by his maternal uncle and his wife. He was an exceptional student and topped his batch in

the board exam for matriculation, in his school in Sikar. For this, he received a gold medal from Maharaja Kalyan Singh of Sikar, besides a monthly scholarship of Rs. 10 and Rs 250 more for books. He completed intermediate level from the Birla College in Pilani, which is now the prestigious Birla Institute of Technology and Science. In 1939, he completed his graduation with first division from the Sanatan Dharma College in Kanpur. He wanted to study further and get his Master's degree in English Literature and for this he joined St. John's College, Agra. However, he could not give his first year final exams because his cousin fell gravely ill. Thereafter, on his uncle's persuasion, he sat for the Provincial Services Exam. He qualified but refused to join the Services because he was more inclined towards working with the common man. To this end, he obtained a B. T. degree at Prayag and entered public service.

When he was studying at the Sanatan College in Kanpur, one of his classmates was Baluji Mahashabde, through whom he found out about the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and eventually met the founder, K.B. Hedgewar. At the shakha where he met Hedgewar, he engaged in an intellectual discussion with the leader and impressed everyone around. This gave a boost to his public persona and RSS provided him a medium to fulfil his ambition of public service. And from 1942, he became a full-time member of the RSS after completing his Sangh training at a 40 day camp in Nagpur. He didn't stop there and also completed a second-year training of the RSS, thereby qualifying for becoming a lifelong RSS *pracharak*. He started work at Lakhmipur as a *pracharak* and eventually in 1955, became the joint *prant pracharak* (regional organiser) for Uttar Pradesh.

Deendayal Upadhyaya was a man with lofty ideals and was a brilliant organizer, besides having the capacity to think in turn like a social thinker, economist, educationalist, politician, writer, journalist, speaker, organiser etc., as the situation required. His Sangh leaders considered him to be the ideal RSS *swayamsevak* because 'his discourse reflected the pure thought-current of the Sangh'.

In the 1940s, he launched a monthly publication called *Rashtra Dharma*, from Lucknow, which aimed to spread the ideology of nationalism. He never let his name appear in the publication as the Chief Editor but in each edition there would be a long, impressive and thought-provoking piece of writing by him which left an indelible mark on the mind of his readers. Subsequently, he also started a weekly magazine called *Panchjanya* and a daily publication called *Swadesh*.

After the Bharatiya Jan Sangh was founded in 1951 by Syama Prasad Mookerjee, RSS leaders felt that Deendayal was ready to be in command for merging the Jan Sangh smoothly into RSS. He was appointed as General Secretary of its Uttar Pradesh branch, and later the all-India General Secretary. He was so good at this position and so meticulous in his work that he impressed Syama Prasad Mookerjee enough for him to say:

'If I had two Deendayals, I could transform the political face of India.'

When Mookerjee passed away suddenly in 1953, Deendayal had to shoulder the entire responsibility of building up the orphaned organisation and nurturing it into a countrywide movement. For the next decade and a half, he remained the

NOTES

NOTES

organization's general secretary and in his own meticulous way, built it up slowly but surely. He gathered a group of dedicated, young, loyal workers and inspired in them the idealism which he felt himself and these young workers ultimately formed the backbone of the organization. However, when he stood for Lok Sabha elections from UP, he lost.

Upadhyaya was the proponent of the political philosophy known as Integral Humanism. It eventually became the guiding philosophy of the Bharatiya Janata Party. The philosophy advocates the synchronized and combined program of the body, mind and intellect and soul of each human being. As per Upadhyaya, the main focus in India must be to build a unique economic model which puts the human being at centerstage.

The theory is in opposition to western capitalist individualism as well as Marxist socialism. However, it shows the relevance of western science. It is actually attempting to establish a middle path between capitalism and socialism, while recognizing the merits of both and criticizing the excesses of both.

Four objectives of humankind

As per Upadhyaya, humankind had four hierarchically organized attributes—body, mind, intellect and soul—which correspond to four universal objectives, kama (desire or satisfaction), artha (wealth), dharma (moral duties) and moksha (total liberation or 'salvation'). None of these can be discounted or ignored but even so, the most basic one is Dharma and the ultimate objective is Moksha, for everyone. He observed that socialist and capitalist ideologies focussed only on the bodily and mind needs and ignored the spiritual ones, thus were incomplete. These theories were only based on human desires for wealth and material things.

Rejection of individualism

Upadhyaya was vehemently against social systems wherein individualism 'reigned supreme'. He was also distrustful of communism wherein individualism was 'crushed' as part of a 'large heartless machine'. Society, as per Upadhyaya, rather than being an outcome of a social contract between individuals, was an entire, natural living organism which had an absolute 'national soul' or 'ethos' and its social organism needs were similar to those of the individual.

Deendayal Upadhyay urged Indians of the free India to not get carried away by Western concepts such as individualism, democracy, socialism, communism, capitalism etc. However, he feared that the political basis of free India had been these superficial concepts and not the timeless concepts found in the ancient Indian heritage. According to him, the original Bharatiya thought process was getting corrupted by Western theories and ideologies and thereby leading to India's true progress. He believed that infusion of fresh energy and enthusiasm was essential for public upliftment.

He was modern enough to realize the value of advances in technology but did not want Indians to blindly follow suit. Deendayal's approach in most things was largely constructive. So, he urged his young followers to speak up against the

government if they felt that there was an error in judgement and conversely, support it wholeheartedly when it did good work. He was a firm believer in Swaraj (self-governance), which was also the motto of the Bharatiya Janata Party till end of 20th century. He was a nationalist before anything else. He was found dead on 11 February 1968 at Mughal Sarai Railway yard under mysterious circumstances. His speech had roused thousands of delegates in the Calicut session. Given below is an excerpt:

‘We are pledged to the service not of any particular community or section but of the entire nation. Every countryman is blood of our blood and flesh of our flesh. We shall not rest till we are able to give to every one of them a sense of pride that they are children of Bharatmata. We shall make Mother India Sujala, Suphala (overflowing with water and laden with fruits) in the real sense of these words. As Dashapraharana Dharini Durga (Goddess Durga with her 10 weapons) she would be able to vanquish evil; as Lakshmi she would be able to disburse prosperity all over and as Saraswati she would dispel the gloom of ignorance and spread the radiance of knowledge all around her. With faith in ultimate victory, let us dedicate ourselves to this task.’

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

8. Name the two controversial books written by MS Golwalkar.
9. How did Golwalkar strengthen RSS from his leadership?
10. How did Deendayal Upadhyay happen to join the RSS?
11. Name the publications launched by Upadhyay.
12. Name the four objectives of mankind as given by Upadhyay in his Integral Humanism theory.

3.6 SUMMARY

- Dr Keshav Baliram Hedgewar was a person with intense passion and selfless love for the Hindu community. He believed only Hindus were the sons of India and the existence and future of the nation was not independent to their existence in future. He worked towards this throughout his life and strived relentlessly to achieve his goal. He was the founder of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS).
- During the First World War, all revolutionaries from across the country and abroad consented to utilize the opportunity of attacking the British who were involved in war with the Germans. Under the headship of Bhaoji Katre and Dr Hedgewar, the revolutionaries began to collect arms and money throughout the country for the proposed revolution.
- Dr Hedgewar recognized the indiscipline and disorganized coordination within revolutionary groups and the absence of political and national awareness in common masses, as the basic reasons of their failure in revolutionary upsurge.

NOTES

- Hedgewar realized the necessity of having a common deity to be worshiped by every member of Shakhya and also a common ideal. Consequently, he declared that regardless of the caste, religion or the language everybody is the son of Bharatmata hence, it would be the common deity and would strive for all-round progress, national development and to take the nation to the pinnacle of glory.
- The Savarkars originally hailed from the Konkan, a land symbolizing the great feat of reclamation performed by Parshuram, a mighty mythological figure. During the final days of Peshwa rule, the Savarkars were an important family. They were *Jagirdars* of a small village, Rahuri and enjoyed the honour of palanquin for their acknowledged eminence in Sanskrit scholarship.
- According to Savarkar, all nations look first to ensure their own security and prosperity while dealing with international problems. They make or break pacts with this end alone in view. With the entry of Britain in the War, Savarkar declared that the Hindu Mahasabha felt itself concerned with the issues at stake in the War so far as they were likely to affect the safety and interest of the Hindu nation.
- Savarkar maintained that the Independence of India was in sight; however, he sensed the danger to the integrity of India from the vacillating, servile, deceptive and short-sighted leaders and the Congress policy in respect of the blank cheque offers like the communal award, the Simon Commission (with all non-Indian personnel to go into the question of constitutional reform), the census, the national script, the lingua franca and the national anthem.
- In the first week of February about 25,000 Hindu *Sanghatanists*, including great and small men, were arrested. The R.S.S. was outlawed. The Government accused Savarkar of complicity in the deed and put him behind the bars. It was held officially that Nathuram Godse was the tool, Apte the brain and Savarkar was the Guru and guide behind the murder of Gandhi.

3.7 KEY TERMS

- **Liberty:** A person's freedom from control by fate or necessity
- **Hindutva:** A strong or aggressive sense of Hindu identity, seeking the creation of a Hindu state
- **Utilitarianism:** The doctrine that actions are right if they are useful or for the benefit of a majority
- **Rationalism:** A belief or theory that opinions and actions should be based on reason and knowledge rather than on religious belief or emotional response
- **Integral Humanism:** It is a doctrine developed by Deendayal Upadhyaya and adopted by the Jana Sangh in 1965 as its official doctrine. It is also the official philosophy of the Bharatiya Janata Party. It aims to appeal to broad sections of Indian society by presenting an indigenous economic model that puts the human being at centerstage.

3.8 ANSWERS TO ‘CHECK YOUR PROGRESS’

1. He was allegedly expelled for stridently singing Vande Matram and violating the conditions issued by British government. However, he did not stop here, intending to participate in the freedom struggle he went to Yeotmal for higher studies.
2. Dr Hedgewar recognized the indiscipline and disorganized coordination within revolutionary groups and the absence of political and national awareness in common masses, as the basic reasons of their failure in revolutionary upsurge. He realized that bravery and self-sacrifice of some daring and patriotic individuals will not yield to independence. Hence, was attracted towards the national movement started by the Indian National Congress.
3. Hedgewar’s idea behind starting shakhas was to inspire Swayamsevaks to dedicate themselves to the noble and generous task of nation building. He proposed the swayamsevaks to attain higher education and move out at different places for the purpose and spread the work of RSS across country.
4. Savarkar was the only all-India leader, apart from the Hindu Mahasabha, who launched an intense propaganda for the militarization of the Hindus and for the industrialization of the country with pure patriotic and political objects during the Second World War.
5. For Savarkar, the independence of India was ‘the independence of our people, our race, and our nation’. Therefore, Indian *Swarajya*, as far as the Hindu nation is concerned, involves the political independence of the Hindu nation which would enable the people to grow to their full height.
6. The colonial administrators presented communalism as the problem of the defence of minorities. So the defence of minorities became an important part of the theory of imperialists’ legitimization of its other components like welfare of the colonized people, civilizing the natives, white man’s burden, etc. The imperialist statesmen, officials and ideologues at that stage said that Britain had to continue to rule India because it alone could protect the minorities from domination, exploitation and suppression by the majority.
7. The annual session of the Hindu Mahasabha at Kanpur in December 1942 witnessed the return of Savarkar as the President once again.
8. The two books were *Bunch of Thoughts*, and *We, or Our Nationhood Defined*.
9. As soon as he took up his new responsibility as the Sarsanghachalak, Golwalkar started a series of cross-country tours where he met the Sangh workers and propagated the RSS ideology. Due to this and many other initiatives, the Sangh activities flourished under his leadership and there was a considerable increase in the number of *shakhas* countrywide.
10. When he was studying at the Sanatan College in Kanpur, one of his classmates was Baluji Mahashabde, through whom he found out about the Rashtriya

NOTES

NOTES

Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and eventually met the founder, K.B. Hedgewar. At the shakha where he met Hedgewar, he engaged in an intellectual discussion with the leader and impressed everyone around. Thereafter, he was invited to join RSS by Hedgewar.

11. In the 1940s, he launched a monthly publication called *Rashtra Dharma*. Subsequently, he also started a weekly magazine called *Panchjanya* and a daily publication called *Swadesh*.
12. As per Upadhyaya, humankind had four hierarchically organized attributes—body, mind, intellect and soul—which correspond to four universal objectives, kama (desire or satisfaction), artha (wealth), dharma (moral duties) and moksha (total liberation or ‘salvation’).

3.9 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. How did Hedgewar deify India and what purpose did this serve?
2. What was the equation between the Hindu Mahasabha and the Indian National Congress?
3. How was Savarkar instrumental in the first successful instance of civil disobedience?
4. What were the changes brought about by Golwalkar in the RSS?
5. Briefly discuss the highlights of Deendayal Upadhyay’s career with the RSS.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Discuss the foundation of RSS by Baliram Hedgewar and the role played by RSS in the national movement for freedom.
2. Examine Savarkar’s views on India’s participation in the First World War.
3. What were the consequences of Mahatma Gandhi’s assassination on Savarkar and Hindu Mahasabha?
4. Provide a biography of MS Golwalkar.
5. Examine the Integral Humanism theory provided by Deendayal Upadhyay.

3.10 FURTHER READING

Chand, Tara; *History of Freedom Movement in India*, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi, 2005.

Chandra, Bipin; *Freedom Struggle*, National Book Trust, New Delhi, 1999.

Chandra, Bipin; *Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India’s Struggle for Independence*, Penguin Books, New Delhi, 1989.

Choudhary, S. B.; *Civil Disturbances during the British Rule in India (1765 – 1857)*, World Press Limited, Calcutta, 1999.

Desai, A. R.; *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, Popular Prakashan, New Delhi, 2008.

Majumdar, R.C.; *The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857*, Calcutta Oriental Press Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1988.

Sarkar, Sumit; *Modern India (1885 – 1947)*, Macmillan, New Delhi, 2000.

Appadorai, A.; *Documents on Political Thought in Modern India*, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1973.

Bali, D.R.; *Modern Political Thought (From Ram Mohan Roy to Jayaprakash Narayan)*, Sterling Publication, New Delhi, 1993.

NOTES

UNIT 4 POLITICAL THINKERS – II

Structure

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 Syed Ahmed Khan: Socio-Political Thoughts
 - 4.2.1 Aligarh Movement: Social Reform and Education
 - 4.2.2 Concept of Nationalism
 - 4.2.3 Communalism
- 4.3 Mohammed Iqbal: Political Ideas
- 4.4 Mohammed Ali Jinnah
 - 4.4.1 Quaid-e-Azam's Fourteen Points
 - 4.4.2 Two-nation Theory
- 4.5 Constitutionalism and Nationalism: B.R. Ambedkar
 - 4.5.1 J.P. Narayan
- 4.6 Ram Manohar Lohia: Political Thought
 - 4.6.1 Goa and Nepal
 - 4.6.2 Lohia's Views on Capitalism and Marxism
 - 4.6.3 Revolutionary Thinker
 - 4.6.4 Lohia's Anti-English View
- 4.7 Summary
- 4.8 Key Terms
- 4.9 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.10 Questions and Exercises
- 4.11 Further Reading

NOTES

4.0 INTRODUCTION

The last three decades have seen a spectacular disintegration of the old political patterns and parties which had ruled the politics of the Nehruvian period.

Integration of religion and politics is a risky thing because religious approach is diametrically different to democratic outlook. Religion is a personal matter and if it is permitted to feature in public associations, it will distort politics.

So, if we want to strengthen democracy and provide a concrete base for it and make its functioning successful, it is essential that people do not mix their religion with politics. It is not right to think that legal ruling will help separate politics from religion. Until the outlook of the public undergoes changes and people rise higher than their trivial beliefs and differences, it is impossible to keep religion and politics away from each other. However, only by keeping them away from each other, will it be possible to keep a democratic system intact.

In this unit, we will learn about popular thinkers such as Jinnah, Syed Ahmed Khan, Mohammed Iqbal, B.R. Ambedkar, Ram Manohar Lohia and J.P. Narayan.

NOTES

4.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Examine the socio-political thoughts of Syed Ahmed Khan
- Discuss the political ideas of Mohammad Iqbal
- Explain the two-nation theory propounded by Mohammed Ali Jinnah
- Describe the thoughts of B.R. Ambedkar and J.P. Narayan on constitutionalism and nationalism
- Analyse the political thought of Ram Manohar Lohia

4.2 SYED AHMED KHAN: SOCIO-POLITICAL THOUGHTS

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan (17 October 1817–27 March 1898) was born into Mughal nobility. He was an educationist and politician who pioneered modern education for the Muslim community in India. He had also earned a reputation as a distinguished scholar while working as a jurist for the British East India Company.

He was a nationalist who was personally affected by the turmoil of the Indian rebellion of 1857, so he penned the booklet *Asbab-e-Bhaghawath-e-Hind (The Causes of the Indian Mutiny)*—a daring critique of the British policies that led to the revolt.

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan had a dynamic personality as he was influenced by different political events that had taken place in India. The political ideology and his thought differed with the change in the political process and can be divided into two phases. The first phase spans up to 1887, while the second phase started after 1887. In both these phases, the political ideas evolved from nationalism to communalism.

4.2.1 Aligarh Movement: Social Reform and Education

Sir Syed started the Aligarh Movement to spread modern education as well as social reform. Aligarh was the centre of the movement due to which it is known as the Aligarh Movement. He realized the need to reform the society so that modern education could take place especially among the Muslim community. The Muslims, in his opinion, were bereft of the scientific outlook and the progress which would result with the spread of modern education system. He believed that the future of Muslims lay in re-interpreting the traditional principles of Islam through the modern and scientific approach or else the community will regress to the old ages.

The Muslim community suffered more than other communities in India due to the policy that the British had taken up after the War of Independence in 1857. They were seen as their adversaries for their role played in the rebellion. The British introduced a new educational policy which drastically differed from the existing one, where they made English as the only medium of instruction as well as the official language in 1835. The British were introducing the new policy with a vengeance to

liquidate the Mughal rule as the subcontinent was brought directly under the British Crown. They made an effort to suppress by banning Arabic, Persian and religious education in schools.

This move led to a negative reaction amongst the Muslims most of whom were pessimistic towards everything modern and Western in outlook and nature. They were apprehensive about using the opportunities available under the new regime. This tendency, had it continued for long, would have proven disastrous for the Muslim community. The biggest stumbling block that Syed Ahmed Khan found was about the attitude among the Muslim community regarding the traditional interpretations of Islam.

It was in this atmosphere of despair and despondency that Sir Syed started the Aligarh Movement with social reforms and education as the two key areas. He promoted Western-style scientific education by founding modern schools and journals and organizing Muslim intellectuals. Inspired by the functioning of British colleges, he founded the Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College in 1875 with the aim of promoting social and economic development of Indian Muslims.

The College later developed into the Aligarh Muslim University. His work gave rise to a new generation of Muslim intellectuals and politicians who further consolidated the Aligarh movement to secure the political future of Indian Muslims.

The Aligarh Movement had two objectives. The first objective was to regenerate the Muslims community and revive the spirit of progress by introducing modern education so that they are not left bereft of the new opportunities available under the new regime. Secondly, it aimed to create social progress without deviating from the fundamentals of their faith. He also felt that this step would help in removing the state of misunderstanding and tension between the Muslims and the new British Government. Thus, he started the Mohammedan Anglo Oriental College, which is now called as Aligarh Muslim University.

The Aligarh Movement had the aim of bringing social and cultural reforms by persuading the Muslims to learn English education and abstaining from the politics of agitation. This would create a cordial atmosphere of mutual understanding between the British Government and the Muslims. In the long term, it would also produce an intellectual class amongst the Muslim community, who would have an important role to play in the political as well as in the economy of the country even under foreign rule. Thus, Syed Ahmad Khan's Aligarh Movement played a significant role in bringing about an intellectual revolution among the Indian Muslims which has succeeded in achieving the major objectives, i.e. educational progress and social reform. It is his efforts that have earned Sir Syed the title 'Prophet of Education'.

4.2.2 Concept of Nationalism

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan's concept of nationalism was conceived as Hindu-Muslim unity, which was reflected till the year 1887. He considered the Hindus and the Muslims as a single nation and never demanded a separate homeland for the Indian Muslims. He was clear that religion should not be seen as an obstacle for nationalism. He had advocated for the separation between religious and political matters because

NOTES

NOTES

the religious and spiritual matters were not linked with mundane affairs. Therefore, he felt that both Muslims and Hindus can live united for national integrity.

He practiced his concept of nationalism in his policies as well as practice. As a member of the Viceroy's legislative council he strove for the welfare of both Hindus and Muslims. He was not a religious bigot or an unwarranted critic of Hindus. He worked closely with the Hindus in the scientific society and the Aligarh British India Association. He sought donations from the Hindu Rajas and *Zamindars* for Mohammedan Aligarh Oriental College and was also well-represented in the management and the teaching community. In the initial years of the college, the Hindu students outnumbered the Muslims. Cow slaughter was banned in the college. Along with Surendra Nath Banerjee he demanded restoration of the age for civil services examination from 18 to 21 years. He revived the British Association at Aligarh for his purpose.

He defined the word *qaum* to mean a community of both Hindus and Muslims. He expressed the need for Hindu-Muslim unity while explaining the meaning of *qaum* in his speech that he made on 27 January 1884. He said that 'whether Hindus or Muslims, they lie on one soil and are governed by the one and the same ruler, have the same sources of benefit which equally shares the hardships of a famine'. In other words, Sir Syed stood for Indian nationalism as a federation of the *qaums*, which means communities.

4.2.3 Communalism

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan changed his views during the second phase from December 1887. It was during this phase that he started stressing more on nationalism based on community, i.e. changed his approach towards communalism.

Communalism as a political philosophy was first coined by the well-known libertarian socialist author and activist Murray Bookchin as a political system to complement his environmental philosophy of social ecology. It has been defined as a theory of a society that is divided into several small, independent communes and the state is just a confederation of these communes.

He started opposing the application of the principles of representative and parliamentary government as he felt that the Western form of democracy and nationalism would not operate in India. For a country like India which is full of diversities of castes, religions and races, it is too complex for the system of representative form of government and it would not satisfy the principles of equality. As long as the religious, casteist and racial differences exist in India, the Western model of democracy will not be established.

Since democracy believes in the rule of the majority, he felt that such a system would totally override the interests of the smaller community and lead to the domination of the more educated and more numerous Hindus over the less educated and less numerous Muslims. In a way, the Congress demand for a representative form of government would hurt the Muslims most.

This argument forms the crux of the two-nation theory. According to this theory, Hindus and Muslims were two separate nations which had separate economic,

political and social interests and different cultural as well as historical background, and therefore could not form a single nation.

The first principal of the Mohammedan Aligarh Oriental College, Theodore Beck influenced him that only Anglo-Muslim alliance could ameliorate the Muslim community and having a sincerity to uplift the Muslim community, he felt that was the only way to achieve his goals. Besides, the Congress was also antagonizing him, as he was not given his due importance. Coming from an aristocratic class, it was not usual to be kept away from the major decision-making processes in politics. He was convinced that Muslims' marginalization under the leadership of the Congress party would result in the creation of such nationhood as would make the Muslims subservient to the majority community, i.e. the Hindus. Therefore, it was only justified to conceive of a nationhood based along the religious lines of the community.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Name the book written by Syed Ahmed Khan on the 1857 mutiny.
2. What was the objective of the Aligarh National Movement?
3. What did the word '*qaum*' mean to Syed Ahmed Khan?

4.3 MOHAMMED IQBAL: POLITICAL IDEAS

Sir Muhammad Iqbal (also known as Allama Iqbal), the celebrated poet, played a very significant role in the history of Indian Muslims. Though he supported the Liberal movement, he asked the Muslim liberals to defend the broad principles of humanity, which Islam stood for. Iqbal also revealed the inhuman, rapacious, predatory and decadent characteristics of the European civilization. He was essentially a humanist and a follower of Islam and its comprehensive humanism.

Iqbal was born to Kashmiri parents in Sialkot on 9 November 1877. Sialkot is now in Pakistan but at the time, it fell within the Punjab Province of British India. His grandparents had also been Kashmiri Pandits, Brahmins of the Sapru clan from Kashmir who had converted to Islam. When Sikhs took over Kashmir in the early 19th century, his grandparents had fled to Punjab. His pride in his Kashmiri lineage often reflected in his literary works.

Iqbal's father was Sheikh Noor Muhammad, and he was a tailor. He was a deeply religious man, who was not formally educated. Iqbal's mother Imam Bibi was a compassionate lady who was always ready to help others and had strong problem-solving abilities. She died on 9 November 1914 in Sialkot. Iqbal had been close to his mother, and after she passed away, he wrote an elegy expressing his pain for the loss.

He was professionally a lawyer who wrote poetry as a hobby. Besides these occupations, he was an active member of the Muslim League. He was strongly against the involvement of Indians in World War I and communicated this regularly

NOTES

to prominent Muslim political leaders such as Mohammad Ali Jinnah and Muhammad Ali Jouhar. He criticised the religiously mainstream Indian National Congress, for having largely only Hindu members. He was also disappointed and dismayed when the League was torn apart from within in the 1920s between the pro-British group led by Sir Muhammad Shafi and the centrist group led by Jinnah.

In November 1926, spurred on by friends and supporters, Iqbal fought the election for a seat in the Punjab Legislative Assembly from the largely Muslim district of Lahore, and won by a considerable 3,177 votes. His key focus was to support those constitutional proposals put forward by Jinnah which attempted to ensure voting and ruling rights to Muslims and a say in a coalition with the Congress. He also collaborated closely with the Aga Khan and other well-known Muslim leaders to restore the unity that factional divisions had torn apart in the Muslim League.

Iqbal, Jinnah and concept of Pakistan

After the ideological conflict that took place in the Muslim League in the 1920s, Iqbal had also been disillusioned with the politicians of the Muslim League, especially Sir Muhammad Shafi and Sir Fazl-ur-Rahman. With time, Iqbal started to put all his hopes in the leadership of Mohammed Ali Jinnah because he saw Jinnah as the only person who could keep the League united and fulfil the League's objectives of Muslim empowerment someday. Due to his faith in Jinnah, he established a strong, personal correspondence with Jinnah, and also proved instrumental subsequently in persuading Jinnah to end his self-imposed exile in London and come back to India take over the helms of the League. Iqbal's firm beliefs in Jinnah and his leadership abilities are reflected in the following words he wrote:

'I know you are a busy man but I do hope you won't mind my writing to you often, as you are the only Muslim in India today to whom the community has right to look up for safe guidance through the storm which is coming to North-West India and, perhaps, to the whole of India.'

Iqbal was the first to harbour the dream of a Muslim majority state—during the 1930s. However, Jinnah was still involved in talks with the Congress through the 1930s and only in 1940 announced officially his intentions to fight for an independent Muslim state. In the opinion of some historians, Jinnah had been only looking for an agreement with the Congress rather than the partition of India. However, it was Iqbal's constant push in that direction which made Jinnah get convinced about the idea. Iqbal expressed his own vision of an independent Muslim state to Jinnah in the following letter dated 21 June 1937:

'A separate federation of Muslim Provinces, reformed on the lines I have suggested above, is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of Non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are.'

When Iqbal held the position of president of Punjab Muslim League, he was extremely critical of Jinnah's political stances, especially an official agreement with a Punjabi leader Sir Sikandar Hyat Khan. Iqbal considered Sikandar Hyat Khan to

be just a political leader who represented the feudal class rather than having as his focus the propagation of Islam as a political philosophy. However, for Iqbal, the single minded focus was to encourage the Muslim people to support Jinnah and the Muslim League in achieving their objective. On the political future of Muslims in India, Iqbal expressed his views thus:

‘There is only one way out. Muslims should strengthen Jinnah’s hands. They should join the Muslim League. Indian question, as is now being solved, can be countered by our united front against both the Hindus and the English. Without it, our demands are not going to be accepted. People say our demands smack of communalism. This is sheer propaganda. These demands relate to the defence of our national existence.... The united front can be formed under the leadership of the Muslim League. And the Muslim League can succeed only on account of Jinnah. Now none but Jinnah is capable of leading the Muslims.’

NOTES

4.4 MOHAMMED ALI JINNAH

Mohammad Ali Jinnah submitted a proposition of 14 points as a constitutional reform plan to protect the political rights of Muslims in independent India, wherein he tried to get more rights for Muslims. The Nehru report (1928) in contrast had political gaps between Hindus and Muslims. Jinnah presented his 14 points which covered the interests of Muslims and stated that it was ‘parting the ways’ and expressed his inability to work with Indian National Congress in future. Leaders of the league prompted him to revive the Muslim League and give it a direction. Consequent to this, these points became their demand, ultimately paving way for the creation of Pakistan as a separate country.

Background

Muslim leaders, Aga Khan and Mohammad Shafi were critical about the Nehru Report claiming it to be a death warrant due to the manner in which some of its points were formulated. After Jinnah’s return from England, in March 1929, the Muslim League organized a session under his presidential leadership. While addressing the members of the group he amalgamated Muslim perspectives under 14 items which later became known as Jinnah’s 14 points.

4.4.1 Quaid-e-Azam’s Fourteen Points

1. The form of the past constitution should be federal with the residuary powers vested in the provinces.
2. All cabinets at central or local level should have at least 1/3 Muslim representation.
3. All legislatures in the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the definite principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every province without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or even equality.

NOTES

4. In the Central Legislature, Muslim representation shall not be less than one third.
5. Representation of communal groups shall continue to be by means of separate electorate as at present, provided it shall be open to any community at any time to abandon its separate electorate in favour of a joint electorate.
6. Any territorial distribution that might at any time be necessary shall not in any way affect the Muslim majority.
7. Full religious freedom, i.e., freedom of belief, worship and observance, propaganda, association and education shall be guaranteed to all communities.
8. No bill or resolution or any part, thereof, shall be passed in any legislature or any other elected body if three fourths of the members of any community or in the alternative, such other method is devised as may be found feasible and practicable to deal with such cases.
9. Sindh should be separated from the Bombay Presidency.
10. Reforms should be introduced in the North West Frontier Province (NWFP) and Balochistan on equal footing as in the other provinces.
11. Provision should be made in the constitution giving Muslims an adequate share along with the other Indians in all the services of the state and in local self-governing bodies, having due regard to the requirements of efficiency.
12. The constitution should embody adequate safeguards for the protection of Muslim culture and for the protection and promotion of Muslim education, language, religion, personal laws and Muslim charitable institution and for their due share in the grants-in-aid, given by the state and by local self-governing bodies.
13. No cabinet, either central or provincial, should be formed without there being a proportion of at least one-third Muslim ministers.
14. No change shall be made in the constitution by the Central Legislature except with the concurrence of the state's contribution of the Indian Federation.

Reactions

Jinnah's fourteen points evoked mixed reactions throughout the nation. Hindus unanimously disregarded his suggestion while Jawaharlal Nehru referred to it as 'Jinnah's ridiculous 14 points' and Congress party rejected the demands made in it. As these points were brought to the notice of common mass, he was invited to attend the round table conference where he represented the Muslim's standpoint. Jinnah's 14 points played a significant role in the freedom struggle for Pakistan. In these points he not only brought out the Muslim rights but also suggested to protect the rights of all religious groups. He gained a great recognition from the former P. M. of Pakistan Chaudhry Muhammad Ali in his book *The Emergence of Pakistan*.

4.4.2 Two-nation Theory

The separatist and loyalist tendencies among a section of the Muslim intelligentsia and the big Muslim nawabs and landlords reached a climax on 30 December 1906,

when the All India Muslim League was founded under the leadership of the Aga Khan, the Nawab of Dhaka and Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk. Founded as a loyalist, communal and conservative political organization, the League made no critique of colonialism, supported the partition of Bengal, raised the slogan of separate Muslim interests, demanded separate electorates and safeguards for Muslims in government services, and reiterated all the major themes of communal politics and ideology enunciated earlier by Sir Ahmad and his followers. The aims of the League were as follows:

- (i) To promote among Indian Muslims feelings of loyalty towards the British Government and to remove any misconception, that may arise, as to the intentions of the Government with regard to any of its measures.
- (ii) To protect the political and other rights of the Indian Muslims and to place their needs and aspirations before the Government in temperate language, and
- (iii) So far as possible without prejudice to the objects mentioned under (i) and (ii) to promote friendly relations between Muslim and other communities of India.

Thus, from its very inception the Muslim League was a communal body established to look after the political rights and interests of the Muslim community alone. Its political activities were directed not against the foreign rulers but against the Hindus and the National Congress.

It, thus, played into the hands of the British who announced that they would protect 'special interests' of the Muslims. To increase its usefulness, the British also encouraged the Muslim League to approach the Muslim masses and to assume their leadership. It is true that the nationalist movement was as also dominated at this time by the educated town-dwellers but in its anti-imperialism, it was representing the interests of all Indians—rich or poor, Hindu or Muslim. On the other hand, the Muslim League and its upper class leaders had little in common with the interests of the Muslim masses, who were suffering as much as the Hindu masses at the hands of foreign imperialism.

This basic weakness of the League came to be increasingly recognized by the patriotic Muslims. The educated Muslim young men were, in particular, attracted by radical nationalist ideas. The militantly nationalist 'Ahrar Movement' was founded at this time under the leadership of Maulana Mohammed Ali, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Hasan Imam, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan and Mazhar-ul-Haq. These young men disliked the loyalist politics of the Aligarh School and the big nawabs and zamindars.

Similar nationalist sentiments were arising among a section of the traditional Muslim scholars led by the Deoband School. The young Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, who propagated his rationalist and nationalist ideas in his newspaper *Al Hilal*, which he brought out in 1912 at the age of 24, was also a prominent Muslim scholar. In 1911, war broke out between the Ottoman Empire (Turkey) and Italy and during 1912 and 1913, Turkey had to fight the Balkan powers. The Turkish ruler claimed at this time to be also the Caliph or religious head of all Muslims; moreover, nearly all of the Muslim holy places were situated within the Turkish Empire. A wave of sympathy for Turkey swept India.

NOTES

NOTES

A medical mission, headed by Dr. M. A. Ansari, was sent to help Turkey. Since Britain's policy during the Balkan War and after was not sympathetic to Turkey, the pro-Turkey and pro-Caliph or Khilafat sentiments tended to become anti-imperialist. In fact, for several years (from 1912 to 1924), the loyalists among the Muslims Leaguers were completely overshadowed by nationalist young men.

Unfortunately, with the exception of a few persons like Azad who were rationalists in their thinking, most of the militant nationalists among Muslim young men also did not fully accept the modern secular approach to politics. The result was that instead of understanding and opposing the economic and political consequences of imperialism, they fought imperialism on the grounds that it threatened the Caliph and the holy places. Even their sympathy for

Turkey was on religious grounds. Moreover, the heroes and myths and cultural traditions they appealed, belonged not to ancient or medieval Indian history but to West Asian history. It is true that this approach did not immediately clash with Indian nationalism. Rather, it made its adherents and supporters anti-imperialist and encouraged the nationalist trend among urban Muslims. But in the long run, this approach too proved harmful, as it encouraged the habit of looking at political questions from a religious point of view. In any case, such political activity did not promote among the Muslim masses a modern, secular approach towards political and economic questions.

The election's results were a great disappointment to the Muslim League and Jinnah. It could not gain a majority even in the Muslim-majority provinces of the Punjab and Bengal. Jinnah who had parted company with the Congress in 1928, settled down in London in 1932 to practice law. He returned to India in 1935 and led the Muslim League to the polls. The poor election results convinced Jinnah that the only way to counteract the Congress was to inflame communal feelings among the Muslims.

In Uttar Pradesh, the Congress rejected a demand for a coalition with the Muslim League, which fanned the fires of Muslim frustration. Some of the Congress leaders in Uttar Pradesh feared that if the Muslim League was brought into the ministry the Congress agrarian programme would suffer. The Uttar Pradesh legislature during the years 1937–46 justified the apprehensions of the Congress leaders. The Congress stood for democracy, socialism and a common Indian nationality, the League tried to promote the interests of only the Muslims in India.

Jinnah proclaimed that Muslims could not expect any justice or fair play at the hands of the Congress. Throughout the twenty-seven months of the Congress rule in the provinces, the

League kept up intense propaganda climaxed by the Pirpur Report in the late 1938, the Shareef Report on Bihar in March 1939 and Fazul Haq's Muslim Sufferings under Congress Rule in December 1939. The charges included failure to prevent encouragement of Hindi at the cost of Urdu and the Wardha Scheme of Basic Education, which was ironically enough devised largely by two eminent Muslim educationists, Zakir Husain and K. G. Saiyidin. The Congress suggested an enquiry

by Sir Maurice Gwyer, the Chief Justice of the Federal Court, but the Muslim League turned down the proposal. Jinnah asserted that India was not one nation, and that the Muslims of India constituted a separate nation, and therefore, were entitled to a separate homeland of their own.

The Muslim League propaganda gained by the existence of such communal bodies among the Hindus as the Hindu Mahasabha, They too accepted the two-nation theory. They actively opposed the policy of giving adequate safeguards to the minorities so as to renovate their fears of domination by the minorities. Interestingly enough, the communal groups—Hindu as well as Muslims—did not hesitate to join hands against the Congress.

Another characteristic feature the various communal groups shared was their tendency to adopt pro-government political attitudes. It is to be noted that none of the communal groups and parties, which talked of Hindu and Muslim nationalism, took active part in the struggle against foreign rule. They saw the people belonging to other religions and the nationalist leaders as the real enemies. The communal groups and parties also shied away from social and economic demands of the common people, which as we have seen above, were being increasingly taken up by the nationalist movement. In this respect, they increasingly came to represent the upper class vested interests.

Communalism also became, after 1937, the only political recourse of colonial authorities and their policy of 'divide and rule'. This was because, by this time, nearly all the other divisions, antagonism and divisive devices promoted and fostered earlier by the colonial authorities had been overcome by the national movement, and had become politically nonviable from the colonial point of view, The Non-Brahmin challenge in Maharashtra and South India had fizzled out. The Scheduled Castes and other backward classes could no longer be mobilized against the Congress except in stray pockets. The Right and Left wings of the Congress also refused to split. Inter-provincial and inter-lingual rivalries had exhausted themselves much earlier, after the Congress accepted the validity of linguistic states and the cultural diversity of the Indian people. The effort to pit the zamindars and landlords against the national movement had also completely failed. The elections of 1937 showed that nearly all the major social and political props of colonialism lay shattered. The communal card alone was available for playing against the national movement and the rulers decided to use it to the limit, to stake all on it. They threw all the weight of the colonial state behind Muslim communalism, even though it was headed by a man, M. A. Jinnah, whom they disliked and feared for his sturdy independence and outspoken anti-colonialism. The outbreak of World War II in September 1939 further strengthened the reliance on the communal card.

The British Government stuck to 'the issue of minorities' and even brought up the unbridgeable gulf between the Congress and the Muslim League. Mahatma Gandhi held that it was a domestic problem, which would disappear if the British withdrew from India. At the Ramgarh session of the Congress, held in March 1940, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the President, emphasised the heritage of a common nationality between the Hindus and the Muslims in India and significantly remarked,

NOTES

NOTES

‘Whether we like it or not, we have now become an Indian nation, united and indivisible’. Various factors fanned communal bitterness and at its annual session, held at Lahore in March 1940, the Muslim League enunciated the theory that the Muslims are not a minority but a ‘nation’ and they must have their separate homeland. It was of the view that ‘the areas in which the Muslims were numerically in a majority, as in the north-western and eastern zones of India, should be grouped to constitute independent states in which the constituent units would be autonomous and sovereign’. Indeed, the influence of the Muslim League over the Muslims had increased much by that time. Gandhi’s reaction to the Lahore resolution was prophetic, ‘I can never be a willing party to the vivisection. I would employ every non-violent means to prevent it. For it means the undoing of centuries of work done by numberless Hindus and Muslims to live together as one nation. Partition means a patent untruth.’

The two-nation theory stated that India consisted of two separate nations, on the basis of religion: Hindus and Muslims. The ‘two-nation theory’ was considered false in the history of India. During medieval times, a common culture was shared by both, Hindus and Muslims. Both of them had fought for freedom together during and after the Revolt of 1857. Hindus and Muslims together were equally repressed during the national struggle for independence.

In 1940, Pakistan was demanded as an independent state at the Lahore session of the Muslim League. The basis of this demand was the two-nation theory. Many Muslims in India did not support this demand.

The ‘Khudai Khidmatgar’, a well-known Muslim organization in the North-West Frontier Province was set up by the veteran leader, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan. He was better known as ‘Frontier Gandhi’. The League was supported by the British government to demand an independent state for Muslims. The withdrawal of the Congress from provincial governments was termed by the Muslim League as ‘Deliverance Day’. The Congress had withdrawn to protest against the British reaction to the demand for independence. The Muslim League celebrated the ‘Deliverance Day’.

C.R. Formula (1944)

C. Rajagopalachari realized the necessity of a settlement between the Congress and the Muslim League for the attainment of independence. In 1944, he came up with a formula, called the C. R. Formula. Its main contents were as follows:

- After the war, a commission shall be appointed to demarcate the boundaries of Muslim-dominated districts in the north-west and east of India.
- The people of these districts shall decide, by plebiscite, the issue of separation from India.
- The Muslim League should agree to the provisional interim government, formed by the Congress for the transitional period.
- In the event of separation, a mutual agreement shall be entered into by the two governments for combined defence, commerce, communication and other essential sectors, etc.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

4. Why is Iqbal considered the pioneer of the idea of a separate Muslim state?
5. What were the reactions that Jinnah's 14-points evoked in India?
6. What were the aims of the Muslim League?

NOTES

4.5 CONSTITUTIONALISM AND NATIONALISM: B.R. AMBEDKAR

B.R. Ambedkar was born on 14 April 1891 (*Vaiasakha Purnima*) at a place called Mhow, near Indore in Madhya Pradesh, where his father was serving as the headmaster in the Army School. He was the fourteenth child of his parents (of whom only five (three sons and two daughters) had survived), Ramji Sakpal and Bhima Bhai. His mother died early when he was only five and he was brought up by his father's sister Mira Bai. Bhim Rao came from the *Mahar* group of untouchables which was the largest group of untouchables in Maharashtra. In the view of some scholars, *mahars*, who were the original settlers in Maharashtra were pushed aside by the invading Aryans. It is also claimed that the very name of the state Maharashtra (literally, great nation) was originally '*Mahar-rashtra*', the land of *the mahars*.

Bhim Rao's family had a military background. His father Ramji Sakpal and grandfather Maloji Sakpal had rendered military service to the British. His mother also had a military background, his father was a Subedar Major from the village of Murad in the Thane district of Maharashtra. Mhow, which is on the border of Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh, had itself been a military centre, a cantonment area. Suffering from all the possible disabilities, segregation and discrimination, Bhimrao's family was kept out of the mainstream of the Maharashtra social and political setup. It thus came to belong to the humanistic *Bhakti* tradition of the *Kabir panth*.

As a young boy, Bhim Rao was sent to the local Marathi school, where his official name was registered as Bhima Ramji Ambavadekar. The family preferred the ancestral village rather than the caste as his surname. Later on, Bhima started his high school education in the government high school of Satara. At School, he became a victim of segregation like every other untouchable boy. He was asked to sit away from them and was forbidden to mix and play with them. His Sanskrit teacher refused to teach him as Sanskrit was regarded as the divine language and the untouchables were not considered eligible for learning it. Hence, though Bhima wanted to study Sanskrit, he was forced to study Persian instead.

Ramji Sakpal shifted to Bombay on termination of his services in 1904. Initially, the family had to live in a *chawl* in Parel. At this stage, Bhima was transferred to a high school in Parel and subsequently to the famous Elphinstone High School, from

NOTES

where he passed his matriculation in 1907. Bhima was the first *mahar* boy who had passed his matriculation with distinction.

Here, it may be noted that as per the tradition of his time, Bhima was married when he was just in the fifth standard at the age of fourteen. His bride Rama Bai, daughter of Bhiku Valangkear, was just nine year old at the time of her marriage.

Bhim Rao continued his college education at Elphinstonic College with the help of a monthly scholarship of Rupees 25 per month offered by the ruler of Baroda, *Maharaja Sayaji Rao Gaikwad* who was well-known as a reform-minded king. The great Professor Max Muller supplemented Bhim Rao's education with the gift of books and clothes. He was still in college when he became a father. His first son was Yashwant. He passed his B.A. in 1913 with English and Persian as his main subjects.

After his graduation, he took up service in the princely state of Baroda. Here he suffered humiliation even at the hands of his lowest subordinates. He had no option but to resign his job, as he could not suffer injustice and indignity.

In 1913, he had an opportunity to go abroad for his higher education. He joined Columbia University in New York, U.S.A., as a *Gayakwad* scholar and was the very first *Mahar* to undertake foreign studies. In 1915, he received his M.A. from Columbia for his dissertation *Ancient Indian Commerce*. In June 1916, he registered for his Ph.D. based on the thesis *National Dividend for India: A Historical and Analytical Study*, which was finally accepted by Columbia University for the award of Ph.D. in June 1917.

In October 1916 he moved from Columbia to the London School of Economics and Political Science where he joined M.Sc. (Economics) and D.Sc. (Economics). He also joined the *Gray's Inn* for the degree of Bar-at-Law. His admission into these prestigious institutions in London was greatly facilitated by the introductory letters written by his Columbian Professor R.A. Selegman.

However, he was called back by the *Maharaja* of Baroda and was appointed his military secretary. He had to leave his job in utter disgust in view of the continued harassment and ill-treatment at the hands of the caste-ridden society. On his return to Bombay, he was appointed professor of political economy in the Sydenham College of Commerce and Economics at the attractive salary of Rupees 450 per month. Even here, he was treated as a pariah by his caste-Hindu colleagues, which led to his resignation in March 1920. Thereafter he returned to London to resume his higher studies. However, before he left for London he had started a weekly paper called *Mooknayak* (Leader of the dumb) to champion the cause of the depressed classes in India.

He was awarded the degree M.Sc. (Economics) by the University of London in 1921 for his thesis 'Provincial Decentralization of Imperial finance in British India'. Next year, he was called to the Bar. At the same time, he also submitted his thesis entitled 'The problem of the Rupee' for his D. Sc in 1923. Upon completion of studies in London, Bhim Rao moved to Germany to study Economics for three months at the University of Bonn.

In June 1923, he finally returned to India to start his career as a lawyer in Bombay High Court. However, as an untouchable barrister, he did not have a good practice and had to supplement his income by working as a part-time Professor of law at the Batliboi's Institute of Accountancy.

It was in July 1924 that Ambedkar started his political career by establishing the *Bahishkrit Hitkarini Sabha* (The excluded-classes welfare association) to raise the educational level and the economic status of the depressed classes as well as to ventilate the hardships of these classes. He established this institution in collaboration with Sir Chimanlal Setalvad in 1927. He started his paper *Bahishkrit Bharat* to articulate grievances and voice the interests of the depressed classes.

In 1927, he was nominated as a member of Bombay legislative council. Next year, he was appointed Professor of Law in the government Law College, Bombay. He represented the untouchables in the Second Round Table Conference held in London. In 1932, the Ramsay MacDonald Award conceded the demand for separate electorates for Untouchables. Ambedkar was also to present at the Third Round Table conference held in London in 1932-33.

On his return to India, he founded the *Independent Labour Party* which contested elections held under the Government of India Act of 1935. His party had fielded seventeen candidates of whom 15 were returned to the House. In June, 1935, he became the Principal and Perry Professor of Jurisprudence in Bombay's Government Law College. In 1942, the British Indian Government picked him up as a member of the Executive Council of the Governor General of India and was given the charge of Labour. He held this post until July 1946.

In 1946, he published his scholarly work *Who were the Shudras?* He dedicated this work quite appropriately to Jyotiba Phule whom he described as 'the greatest *Shudra* of modern India', who made the lower classes of the Hindus conscious of their slavery and to the highest classes who had preached the gospel that 'for India, social democracy was more vital than Independence from foreign rule.'

In November 1946, he was elected to the Constituent Assembly of India first from Bengal (and later from his home state of Maharashtra). Thereafter, he was elected by the Constituent Assembly as the Chairman of its prestigious Drafting Committee. The Chairmanship of the Drafting Committee involved the very onerous task of finalizing and presenting to the Constituent Assembly the final Draft of the Constitution of India and to clarify and defend its controversial provisions. On account of the role he played in this capacity, he was universally acclaimed as the 'Architect of the Indian Constitution.'

When India attained her freedom from the alien British Rule on the midnight of 15 August 1947, he was appointed by Nehru as the Minister for Law in his cabinet. After over a year, he had to resign from his job owing to his serious differences with Nehru on the issue of Government's policy towards the Hindu Code Bill. However, in 1952, he was elected to the Rajya Sabha, a status which he enjoyed until his death in December 1956.

NOTES

It was in 1948 that, after the death of his first wife, Dr Ambedkar married Dr Sharda Kabir, a Maharashtra Brahmin. She lived with him until the last moment of his life.

NOTES

In June 1952, his old *alma mater*, the Columbia University honoured him with the Degree of L.L.D. (*Honoris Causa*) in recognition of the work done by him in connection with the drafting of India's Constitution. The University lauded him as 'one of India's leading citizens, a great social reformer and a valiant upholder of human rights.'

Since 1949, he started participating actively in the World Buddhist Conferences held in Kathmandu and Rangoon. In September, of the same year, he published the Buddhist prayer book called the *Buddha Upasna Pantha*. In 1955, he formed the Bhratiya Buddha Mahasabha. It was in 14 October 1956 that he left Hinduism to become a Buddhist in Nagpur. Next month, he participated in the annual session of the World Buddhist Conference held in Kathmandu where he was praised as *Nav Buddha*.

He passed away on 6 December 1956, when his second wife, Dr Sharda Kabir went to his bedroom to wake him up but found him dead. He died after prolonged illness.

As a great scholar of his times Dr Ambedkar authored the following most notable books and brochures:

- (1) *The Problem of the Rupee: Its Origin and its Solution*, 1923;
- (2) *The Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India*, 1925;
- (3) *Annihilation of Caste*, 1936;
- (4) *Thoughts of Pakistan*, 1946;
- (5) *Ronade Gandhi and Jinanh*, 1943;
- (6) *What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables*, 1945;
- (7) *Who were the Shudras*, 1946;
- (8) *State and Minorities*, 1947;
- (9) *The Untouchables*, 1948;
- (10) *Maharashtra as a Linguistic State*, 1948;
- (11) *Thoughts on Linguistic States*, 1945 and
- (12) *Buddha and his Dhamma*, 1957

Besides these monumental works, the following works were published after his demise in 1956:

1. *The Rise and Fall of Indian Women*, 1965;
2. *Dr Ambedkar on Buddhism*, 1982; and
3. The unpublished works of Babasaheb Ambedkar appearing in 8 volumes under the title *Dr Babasaheb Ambekar: The Writing and Speeches*, 1979.

He also published two newspapers, one after another. The first news paper launched by him was a *Marathi* fortnightly called *Mook Nayak* which was renamed as *Bahishkrit Bharat* in 1927.

He was also responsible for establishing a number of educational institutions for the benefit of all, including the scheduled castes, the depressed and the oppressed people of India, for instance:

1. Siddhartha Collage of Arts and Science, 1946;
2. Milind Maha Vidalaya, 1951;
3. Sidhartha College of Commerce and Economics, 1953; and Siddhartha College of Law, 1956.

Finally, he was instrumental in establishing the following associations, institutions and political parties:

1. Bahishkrit Hitkari Sabha, 1924;
2. Samta Sainik Dal, 1928;
3. Independence Labour Party, 1936;
4. People's Education Society, 1945;
5. Mumbai Rajya Kanistha Gaokamagal Association, 1955;
6. Bhartiya Baudh Mahasabha, 1955; and
7. Republican Party 1956.

The most sacred spots relating to Dr Ambedkar's life work are:

- (i) *Janma Bhoomi - Mhow Cantonment, M.P.*;
- (ii) *Kranti Bhoomi - Mahad*;
- (iii) *Deeksha Bhoomi - Nagpur*;
- (iv) *Chaitya Bhoomi - Chupati, near Shivaji Park in Dadar, Bombay.*

Phases of His Public Life

The three-and-a-half decade long public career of Dr Ambedkar can be studied under the following five major phases:

1. **1918-1928:** During which he established himself as a lawyer and launched a series of *Satyagrahas* to safeguard the interest of the depressed classes
2. **1929-1936:** During which he clamoured for separate electorate for the *Dalits*
3. **1937-1946:** In which he held a number of public offices and used them for the benefit of the depressed classes
4. **1946-1950:** In which he prepared the draft of the Constitution of India which earned him the title of *modern Manu*; and
5. **1950-1956:** In which he relinquished Hinduism and adopted Buddhism

Thus, Dr Ambedkar was a renowned professor, barrister, legislator, constitution-framer, cabinet minister, social reformer and the uncrowned leader of the *Dalits*,

NOTES

the depressed and oppressed classes of India for whose emancipation, welfare and upliftment he lived and died. The multi-faceted work of Dr. Ambedkar made him the most eminent *Mahar*, architect of Indian Constitution, and posthumously earned him the highest state decoration of Bharat Ratna.

NOTES

Social Ideas

As a *Mahar*, Dr Ambedkar had himself suffered a lot of indignities and discrimination at the hands of the so-called upper castes, and was, thus, always eager to bring revolutionary changes in the traditional social system of India. He wanted to rescue the oppressed and the suppressed classes from the yoke of Brahminism and casteism. This, he thought, could be possible only through the efforts of the oppressed and the suppressed people themselves, as he knew that the rights are never given in charity or donation. Like Tilak, he maintained that one has to fight for them, clamour for them and, struggle against the prevalent social structure, tradition, practices and belief.

Problem of Hindu Order

To Ambedkar, the very first problem of Hindu social system was the one relating to the origin of the *Shudras*. In his famous book entitled *Who were the Shudras?* Ambedkar mentions that the principle of graded inequality was the basis for determining the term ‘associated life’ as amongst the four *Varnas*. In his opinion, the *Arya Samajis* believed that the four *Varnas* of the Indo-Aryan society had been in existence from the very beginning. They believed that the *Vedas* were ‘eternal and sacrosanct’. Ambedkar thought that the certain portions of the *Vedas*, especially the *Purusha Sukuta*, were fabricated by the Brahmins to serve their own purpose. In his view, the *Aryasmajists* had done a great mischief by preaching that the *Vedas* were ‘eternal, without beginning, without end and infallible’. Such observations resulted in making the Hindu society a static society.

The Purushasukata made the *Chatur-varna* as a sacred and divine institution. It originally described the *Brahmins* as the mouth, the *Kshatriyas* as the arms, the *Vaishyas* as the thighs and the *Shudras* as the feet of the *purush*. The great Hindu law-maker, Manu, also enunciated afresh the ideal of *Purushasukata*. He also emphasized that the ‘Veda is the only and the ultimate sanction for dharma’. He invested the social idea of *chaturvarna* contained in *purushasukata* with the degree of divinity and infallibility which Ambedkar thought, it did not have there-before.

Original Three-Varna System

Ambedkar also put forth his prepositions about the *shudras*. According to him:

- (i) The *Shudras* were one of the Aryan communities of the solar race;
- (ii) There was a time when Indo-Aryan society recognized only three *Varnas*. The *Shudras* were not a separate *Varna*, but a part of the *Kshyatriya Varna*.
- (iii) Then, at some point of time, there started an unending struggle between the *shudra* kings and the *Brahmins* in which the *shudras* were subjected to

various tyrannies and indignities and were excluded from the *Kshatriya* classes;

- (iv) *Brahmins* hated the *shudras*, inflicted tyrannies and indignities on them and refused to invest the *shudras* with the sacred thread; and (v) Due to loss of sacred threads *shudras* became socially degraded, fell below the rank even of the *vaishyas* and came to form the fourth *varna*. They were, thus, downgraded from the second to the fourth *varna* which was created especially for them.

NOTES

Status of the Shudras

Ambedkar has summarized the status of a *shudra* as follows:

1. He was to take the last place in the social order;
2. He was considered impure and therefore no sacred act could be done within his sight and within his hearing;
3. He was not to be respected like the other classes;
4. His life had no value and anybody could kill him, without having to pay any compensation and even if some compensation had to be paid, it had to be of a smaller value as compared with that of the *Brahmin*, the *Kshatriya* and the *Vaishya*;
5. He could not acquire knowledge and it was a sin and a crime to give him education;
6. He could not acquire property and the *Brahmin* could take his property at his pleasure;
7. He could not hold any office under the State;
8. His duty and salvation lay in his serving the so-called higher classes;
9. The higher classes were not to marry a *shudra*, they could, however, keep a *shudra* woman as a concubine; but if a *shudra* touched the women of a higher class, he was to be severely punished; and
10. He was born in servility and was to be kept in servility forever.

Untouchability and Ambedkar

Untouchability meant ‘pollution by the touch of certain persons by reason of their birth in a particular caste or family. This practice of untouchability is peculiar to the Hindu social system. Ambedkar devoted his book ‘*The Untouchables: Who are They*’ to discuss the origin of untouchability. He did not regard Hindu civilization as a civilization because it had continued to suppress and censor a large section of humanity. They were not only suppressed and enslaved; they were also not allowed to live inside the village along with the other castes, the so-called higher-castes. As a matter of fact, from the very beginning they lived outside the village.

Unlike the *shudras*, the untouchables were outside the four-fold *Varna* system. The *shudra* was a *Savarana*, i.e., the one possessing a *Varna*. As against him, the untouchable was the *avarna*, i.e., outside the *Varna* system. Since the *avarnas*

NOTES

were outside the *Varna* system, they were also made to live on the outskirts of the village and not inside the village. The system of separate and distinct quarter became a perpetual and permanent feature of Indian village system. As far as the *mahars* of the Maharashtra were concerned they always lived outside the village, because they belonged to a tribe different from the one to which the settled tribes belonged. They were known as the ‘broken men’ who belonged to a different tribe, different blood who were as such given quarters outside the village.

Evils of Caste System

Ambedkar had provided a fairly long list of the evils which had polluted the Hindu caste system:

- (i) The membership of caste was confined to those who were born in it and it was therefore an exclusive membership;
- (ii) Its members were forbidden to marry outside the caste;
- (iii) They were prevented from possessing arms, so that they may not revolt against their oppressors and exploiters;
- (iv) They were denied the right of education;
- (v) They were denied the right to property;
- (vi) They were assigned the jobs, not on the basis of their capacities, but on that of the social status of their parents. There was no readjustment of occupations and therefore the caste became a direct cause of much of unemployment.
- (vii) The caste system embodied the arrogance and selfishness of a perverse section of Hindus who considered themselves superior enough in social status to set a fashion who had authority to force in on their so-called inferiors;
- (viii) The self styled high caste people also claimed the right of excommunication which often meant death.

At the hands of these people, virtue had become cast-ridden and morality had become cast bound.

Ambedkar had ventured to explain as to why there was no social revolution in India, despite the highly discriminatory and oppressive social system. He finds the answer in the conspiracy of the people of the higher caste to reduce the lower classes to a system of total disability. They were deliberately denied the means to escape and were made to become reconciled to their eternal servitude. They were denied military service, their suffrage, their political weapon, and education. The system of *Chaturvarna* denied these weapons to the masses of these people and paralysed and crippled them completely. They, thus, were left with no option but to accept their servitude.

Ambedkar also thought of certain ways to help these classes to overcome their servitude. The most important of these were:

- (i) The dignity behind the caste, and the *shastras* which sanctioned it, should be destroyed;

- (ii) The system of scaling the caste in a graded order should be abolished;
- (iii) Inter-caste marriages should be encouraged as it would disturb the caste spirit;
- (iv) The monopoly of the *Brahmins* over education should be abolished and education be made universal;
- (v) The monopoly of the *Kshatriyas* over armaments and their exclusive right to constitute the nation's army should be abolished and recruitment to army should be by open, fair and equal competition;
- (vi) They should be given the right to vote and to contest elections, *at par* with all other classes so that they too have equal opportunity to participate in their governance.

According to Ambedkar, the *Brahmins* enslaved the mind and *Baniyas* enslaved the body and having done it, they divided the spoils which belong to the governing classes. He also thought that *Brahminism* was opposed to democracy and the values for which it stood, especially the values of Justice, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity and the Rule of Law.

In order to purge the Hindu religion of inhumanities, Dr. Ambedkar made the following suggestions:

1. There should be one and only one standard book of Hindu religion acceptable to all Hindus. On the other hand, preaching of any doctrine, religious or social, contained in the *Vedas*, the *Shastras*, or the *Purnans*, should be penalized;
2. The priesthood should be abolished. It must at least cease to be hereditary. There must be a State examination for priesthood;
3. It should be made penal for a person who has no *Sanad* (certificate or degree) to officiate as a priest;
4. A priest should be the servant of the State and like any other civil servant should be paid by the State and should be subject to the disciplinary action by the State in the matter of his morals, beliefs and forms of worship, in addition to his being subject along with other citizens to the ordinary law of the land;
5. The number of priests should be limited by law according to the requirements of the State, like other civil services. This would be the only effective way to kill the spread of *Brahminism*. He was of the view that '*Brahminism* is the poison which has spoiled Hinduism. If Hinduism is to be saved it can be saved only by killing *Brahminism*.'

The Question of Reservation

Dr Ambedkar was of the view that there is no link between the Hindus and the depressed classes just as there was practically nothing in common between the Hindu and the Muslims. And, if the then British Government had agreed, in principal, to create a separate electorate for the Muslims, there should also be a separate

NOTES

NOTES

electorate for the depressed classes. Just as the Muslims and the Sikhs had emerged as distinct communities, the depressed classes should likewise be treated as a separate community. Hence, separate electorates and the separate constituencies should be created under the Government of India Act to give adequate representation to the depressed and the backward classes. The matter was considered at length at the Round Table Conferences and given shape under the *Poona Pact*.

Ambedkar had asked for the reservation of twenty-two seats out of one hundred and forty in elections to the then Bombay Legislative Council.

Since the separatist demands of both Jinnah and Ambedkar were in line with the traditional imperial policy of ‘divide and rule’; the British accepted their demand for equal but separate identities. It was later on sanctified by the Government of India Act 1935. When in 1946, the Constituent Assembly started functioning and Dr Ambedkar was elected as the Chairman of its Drafting committee, he insisted not only on continuing the system of reservation but also extending it further. He was able to have his demand accepted and incorporated in the Constitution of India which gives the so-called Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes reservations to the extent of 15 and 7.5 per cent respectively. For this purpose a separate State-wise schedule was annexed to the Constitution. This reservation was provided in respect of the Parliament, the state legislature, public-services and educational institutions.

Dr Ambedkar was probably the only non-Muslim who had supported Jinnah’s demand for Pakistan, as it was in consonance with his own demand for separate electorates. At this point, his major argument was that the so-called higher classes of Hindus had separated them for the *Kshatriya* class (the second class) and downgraded them lower than even the *Vaisya* class by creating a fourth category for them. Their social ranking was, thus, lowered from the second to the fourth. Moreover, the people who came from various migrating tribes were deliberately kept out of the *Varna* system and were treated even lower than this fourth class and by keeping them outside the four-fold *Varna* system they were called the *Avarnas*, the outsiders and therefore the untouchables.

Ambedkar’s argument was that since these classes have been suppressed, oppressed and exploited and have been treated as the neglected classes and since Hinduism has never accepted them as one of its part, they should politically, electorally and administratively be kept separate. No section of high class Hindus had accepted them as their own integral part. Therefore, to think of integrating them socially and emotionally in future would also remain a dream. This was the main premise on which he had totally disagreed with Gandhi. Gandhi thought it would be possible for the Hindu society to amalgamate and integrate socially and emotionally not only the religious minorities but also the variety of socially, educationally and economically weaker castes in the mainstream of the Indian society and state. However by maintaining this, Gandhi was simply giving vent to his idealism, forgetting his own recurrent measures in the direction of restoration of communal unity, including his Hindu-Muslim unity fasts had, at best received only a temporary success, and despite devoting a major part of his life to the amelioration of this castes, he had miserably failed to bring about communal unity on a durable basis, the most horrible aftermath

of whose failure had resulted into the partition of India on communal lines and the bloody events that followed thereafter.

One of Gandhi's closest *sabarmati ashramite*, G. Rama Chandra Rao (Gora), went on to observe in his book entitled *An Atheist with Gandhi* that if Gandhi was not assassinated in 1948 and was allowed to live for a few months or years more, he himself might have become an atheist.

Ambedkar was probably more realistic than Gandhi in thinking that those who have been kept separated for centuries would ever remain separated. They would never be able to get assimilated either in the mainstream of Hinduism or in the mainstream of Indian society, in view of the inflexible attitude of the so-called high class Hindus, especially its militant section.

Hence, the only way to bring up the so-called Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes on an equal footing was to keep them as a distinct and separate class or entity. Hence, as a champion of the depressed classes, Ambedkar stood for the philosophy of 'Equal but Separate'. This he thought was the only way to ensure to them the benefits of the high ideals of justice, liberty, equality, fraternity and the rule of law which are basic values on which the very edifice of our Constitution is created.

Unfortunately, once these classes emerged as separate entities, the political parties competed with one another to treat them as their vote-banks, rather than working for their all-round welfare and solving their problems.

Subsequently, this question not only got politicized, but was also taken to the courts. The Supreme Court, in its historical verdict, declared that it is the prerogative of the State to make reservations for any class or classes of citizens, but justice demands that the total number of reservations should not exceed 50 per cent. When V.P. Singh became the Prime Minister, he sought to extend the reservation to an extent which was far in excess of the Supreme Court's upper limit of 50 per cent. Not only did the politicians and political parties vie with each other to increase the quota of the reservation, but some states wanted to increase the actual population proportion of this class and consequently asked for raising it to the extent of even 70 per cent or more. Yet, these steps temporarily resulted in unprecedented acts of violence, including acts of self-immolation by students who rightly believed that 'merit' was being downgraded and subordinated to the 'caste' factor. This instance was an unforceable consequence of V.P. Singh's attempt to extend the benefits of reservation to the other backward classes as well, i.e., the socially and economically backward classes and other Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

Hindu Code

Ambedkar was of the view that in India, there is a Uniform Civil Code of Laws covering almost every aspect of human relationship except marriage and succession. The Hindu Code Bill drafted by him introduced only four new factors in the existing law. These were:

1. Abolition of the doctrine of rights by birth;
2. Absolute right over property to women;

NOTES

NOTES

3. Equitable share to daughter;
4. Provision for divorce not only to men, but equally to women as well.

If the Hindu Code Bill, with these provisions, could be adopted it would be consistent with the provisions of article 15 of our Constitution which directs the State not to discriminate against any citizen on ground of 'birth', it would also be in accordance with the Article 13 of the UN Charter which lays down 'Encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification.'

Dr Ambedkar along with sixteen other members of the Select Committee of the Constituent Assembly, which was entrusted with the job of amending and codifying certain branches of the Hindu law, presented to the Constituent Assembly its report on 12 August 1948. The report contained nine points: preliminary; marriage and divorce; adoption; minority and guardianship; joint family property; women and property; succession, maintenance and miscellaneous.

Later on, he drafted the Hindu Code Bill along with these subjects. It was aimed at removing the legal obstacles in the social advancement of women. However, it was opposed by the orthodox section of the members of the Parliament, including a number of Congressmen. The Congress Party did not support the Hindu Code Bill. Prime Minister Nehru permitted the Congress members to vote on the Bill according to their conscience. This resulted in the dropping of the Hindu Code Bill and that marked the occasion for Ambedkar's resignation from the Nehru Cabinet.

Conversion to Buddhism

To Ambedkar, Buddhism was important not only because he agreed with its tenets and institutions, but also because it enabled him to reconstruct more scientifically and satisfactorily the history of ancient India, says K. Raghavendra Rao, the author of *Makers of Indian Literature: Babasaheb Ambedkar*. According to Ambedkar, 'Ancient Indian History must be exhumed. Fortunately, with the help of the Buddhist literature, ancient Indian History can be dug out of the debris which *Brahmin* writers have heaped upon it in a fit of madness.' He characterized Buddhism as a revolution almost as great as 'The French Revolution'. Starting off as a religious revolution, Buddhism grew into a multi-pronged revolution: social, cultural and political. He suggested that the distinctiveness and profundity of the Buddhist revolution could be seen from an examination of the pre-revolutionary system, the ancient regime of India.

Ambedkar paints a sketch of the degraded condition to which the Aryan civilization had sunk, prior to the advent of the revolution. It was, in short, a society riddled with social evils such as gambling, drinking and sexual immorality of all varieties. Buddha was the first and perhaps the greatest of the social reformers India had produced. His religion spread everywhere, spilling beyond the borders of India. It succeeded not only because of the content of its teachings but also because of the charismatic personality of its founder, who himself lived by his teachings. Through his own example, he showed what a pure life was, what was right conduct, and by implication exposed the impurity and the immorality of the Aryan *Brahmanical* life of his time.

There are five principle of Buddhism, known as *panch shila*. These are:

1. Not to kill
2. Not to steal, lie, be unchaste
3. Neither to drink intoxicant liquor nor to eat at forbidden times
4. Not to dance, sing or attend theatrical or other spectacles, use garlands, scents and ornaments
5. Neither to receive money, nor to use high or broad beds

These apparently negative virtues stemmed from the cardinal virtues of love and wisdom. These Buddhist precepts constituted a direct challenge to the caste system which had defiled the essence of Aryan *Brahmanical* order. Buddha preached against the caste order and freely admitted *Shudras* to his *Bhiku order*. He also opposed the lower status accorded to women in the ancient regime and admitted to the highest ranks in his order. Buddhism opened up its educational system to both, the *shudras* and women.

It was in this context and due to these compelling reasons that Dr. Ambedkar embraced Buddhism and advocated it as an ideal not only for India but for the whole strife-ridden world. His acceptance of Buddhism was not merely a negative gesture of leaving Hinduism, but was a positive act of commitment to a superior religious way of life. This is why he was hailed '*Nav Buddha*'.

Political Ideas

Though Ambedkar was not primarily a political theorist, he did work with a fairly definite political and legal thinking, which is widely reflected in the views he expressed on a variety of subjects, especially on the floor of the Constituent Assembly of India. Ambedkar regarded the State as a necessary institution which he thought exists for the performance of the following three sets of goals:

- (i) In the first place, it has individualistic functions as its goals. He subscribed to the view that 'The right of every subject to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness and to free speech and free exercise of religion' is sacred.
- (ii) In the second place, he also expected the State to perform judicial functions and maintained social, political and economic justice within the society, by eliminating or at least reducing inequalities of class, caste and religion. It must ensure the maintenance of law and order functions.
- (iii) In the third place, the State is required to see that every individual citizen enjoys 'freedom from want and freedom from fear.'

By performing these functions, the State would act as a servant and an instrument of public welfare and would thus, essentially be democratic.

Ambedkar had a marked preference for democracy not only because it gives largest possible participation to the people in the governance but also it ensures immense opportunities of challenge and change, without necessarily shedding unnecessary blood. It is a system which is neither hereditary, nor does it allow political power to be vested in or to be identified with a particular person. People elected through the system of Universal Adult Franchise hold the reins of power.

NOTES

NOTES

Ambedkar was generally in favour of the parliamentary form of democracy because he thought it to be the best available system. However, in view of the then prevailing extraordinary and highly abnormal circumstances in India, he personally preferred a presidential form of government as that would protect and promote India's security, unity, integrity and sovereignty. It would be a highly centrifugal system as it would not only divide powers between the Centre and states but would also effectively ensure political stability. Hence, in his view a presidential form of government, unlike the parliamentary system, would imply a kind of federal system ensuring not only division of powers, but also encourage the strengthening of democratic federalism. He had come to this conclusion by studying the views of the thinkers and writers like Alexander Pope, who had publically expressed his view that 'Power corrupts its possessor and absolute power corrupts absolutely.' Hence, ideally speaking, the State would be good or viable which is based on the division, decentralization and maximum diffusion of power. Such a system would protect not only a strong central government but also the rights and freedom, of the minorities who would generally be treated at par with others.

Citizens' Rights and Freedoms

Ambedkar was of the view that a democratic federal framework would ensure that every citizen has minimum set of equal rights and freedoms and would not deprive them of the benefits of their profession. He also believed that the guarantee of minimum freedom and rights alone would not make any state an ideal state. In his view, each and every citizen should be able to enjoy all the freedoms and rights in consonance with similar freedoms and rights available to all others in the State. He believed that however rich a state may be, it will have to provide these basic rights equally to one and all.

The rights and freedoms which Dr. Ambedkar wanted the citizens of every liberal democracy to possess and enjoy are the rights which he succeeded to include in the list of Fundamental Rights and the Directive Principles of State Policy enshrined in our Constitution. These are, in fact, the rights which are intended to improve the quality of democracy and also help people in improving the quality of their own. However, the most important of these rights, which he was able to think of and provide, was the right to constitutional remedies which enables every citizen to have his violated rights restored by approaching the Courts to issue appropriate writs. He believed that if this right is not ensured to the citizens, all other rights would lose their importance as the State would go on delimiting and restricting these rights and these would, one day, virtually disappear. He regarded fundamental rights as the very soul of democracy, the fountain of democracy and the fragrance of democracy.

Reservation for Backward Sections of Society

Ambedkar was eager that not only elaborate sets of rights be available to all citizens, without discrimination, but that, by itself, would not meet the ends of justice. This is because in India there are a number of classes and sections of people that have been historically, socially, educationally and economically backward. These include the *shudras*, the scheduled castes, the scheduled tribes and the other socially,

economically and sexually backward citizens of India. These have always been kept apart and away from the society and have never been allowed to get themselves assimilated in the mainstream of the Indian society. Therefore, the state will have to make special efforts to ensure these rights to them on the basis of priority, so that they are also able to come up to a normal level to enjoy the rights and freedoms which others would ordinarily be enjoying in any case.

Linguistic Reorganization of the State

In order to promote the cause of unity of India on the one hand and reduce social tensions on the other, he was eager to reorganize the Indian Provinces on a national linguistic basis. Such a reorganization would curb *casteism, communalism, regionalism and fundamentalism*. He was not willing to allow the State to reorganize itself on any other basis, as that would seriously threaten the unity and integrity of India. Here, it may be recorded that Ambedkar was also eager to encourage the various scripts and languages, whether regional, provincial or sectional. The scripts may vary, but in the interest of the Unity of India, the language should be one, so that it may serve as a cementing force, and not a divisive force. That is why; of all the languages spoken in India he wanted Hindi to be the official language not only of the Central government but also of all the provinces, so that it becomes a strong denominator of India's unity and integrity.

Views Regarding India's Partition

As stated earlier, Ambedkar was probably the only non-Muslim leader of India's struggle for freedom who openly defended the Partition of India into India and Pakistan on communal grounds. He was of the view that every community should have the right and the autonomy to preserve, protect and enrich its culture and religion, and to that end, every community which has all the essential elements of a nation should have the right to secede and declare itself as an independent sovereign state. Therefore, he not only supports Jinnah's demand for Pakistan, but also asked the creation of an independent sovereign *Dalitistan*. He declared that those who have deliberately been kept separate for decades and centuries should have the right to live separately so that they are no longer oppressed, suppressed and exploited.

Religion and Politics

Ambedkar was strongly in favour of a secular state, i.e., a state which does not accord to any religion the status of a State religion. This view of Ambedkar was in contravention of his defence of Pakistan which, in any case, was to be an Islamic state. This is indicative of a clear contradiction in his views.

However, apart from his defence of Pakistan, we find him asking the state to accord to every religion the status of equality and would not like it to interfere with any religion. He also did not want the State to impose or levy a religious tax, nor would he like the State to force people's conversion to others religions, because otherwise a citizen would lose the freedom of voluntary conversion. Hence, he wanted every province, having a distinct majority—religion of its own, to protect, preserve and enrich its religion, as that would be in accordance with, and not opposed to, the spirit of federalism.

NOTES

NOTES

Critical Evaluation

During his lifetime, Dr Ambedkar ventured to bring about a total change in the social, economic and political transformation in India's social and political structure and in this effort, he succeeded to a very large extent. He dedicated his life towards the eradication of untouchability and related issues. Like the Indian liberal moderates of World War I era of our freedom struggle, that is, in line with Naoraji, Ranade and Gokhale, he would give precedence to social reform and consider the task of political independence only as a second priority. His position was reforms first, freedom afterwards. Similarly, he dedicated his life as much to improve the condition of Indian women as he had done for raising the status of the *dalits*. The oppression, suppression and exploitation which the *dalits* and the women had to suffer at the hands of the male and *Brahmin* dominated society was, in fact, a blot on the face of India. Just as he wanted reservation for the *dalits*, he was equally eager to bring about the Hindu Code Bill to improve the condition of women. And, when he thought he would not be able to reform Hinduism during his lifetime, he got disgusted and left Hinduism as un-curable and un-reformable religion. He adopted Buddhism not only himself, but also encouraged his followers to adopt Buddhism. Dr Ambedkar would be remembered by the generations to come as a great social reformer, a jurist and one of the most prominent framers, rather the guiding spirit, of the Constitution of India. It was a belated recognition of his unprecedented contribution and his services not only to *dalits* and the women, but to the nation as a whole, that he was posthumously decorated with the highest civilian award of India, the Bharat Ratna.

4.5.1 J.P. 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.

NOTES

NOTES

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.
- A Sarvodaya Society will be established so that it remains free from party politics and the workers will not contest any elections but dedicate themselves to the service of the movement.
- All the political members should cooperate in the *sarvodaya* work such as in the Bhoodan movement, which is acceptable to all.
- All the political parties should be neutralized in the legislatures. All members should vote not on part lines but on the basis of highest preference that the member obtains.

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.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

7. Who was considered the architect of the Indian Constitution?
8. Who were the *mahars* of Maharashtra?
9. What was the Hindu Code bill drafted by Ambedkar?
10. What were the two main principles envisioned for the Sarvodaya society?
11. What was considered the biggest drawback of the Indian form of democracy?

4.6 RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: POLITICAL THOUGHT

Ram Manohar Lohia was born in Akbarpur village in Ambedkar Nagar district, Uttar Pradesh. He was influenced and initiated into the freedom struggle by his father Hira Lal, with whom Lohia attended numerous protest assemblies during his formative years. At the age of 10, Lohia contributed in his own way to the freedom struggle – on the death of Lokmanya Tilak, he organized and led a strike comprising his school mates.

Lohia's father was an ardent follower of Mahatma Gandhi, which contributed to his son's inclination towards Swaraj. Gandhi's spiritual maturity and self-control influenced Lohia to follow in his footsteps. As a 10-year-old, he had already proved his allegiance to Gandhi and the independence movement by participating in a Satyagraha march. In 1921, Lohia met Jawaharlal Nehru and over the years, both Gandhi and Nehru contributed immensely to the development of Lohia's personality and political ideas. What began as only an acquaintanceship with Nehru transformed into close friendship. However, even as a young man, Lohia never minced his words. He admired Nehru and at the same time, disagreed with him over many key ideological issues.

In 1928, as a student leader, Lohia organized a protest against the Simon Commission which had been sent by the British government to prepare a report on granting dominion status to India without considering the opinion of its citizens. Lohia studied for his Ph.D. in Berlin, Germany. Once, in Europe, Lohia attended the League of Nations Assembly in Geneva where India was represented by the Maharaja of

NOTES

Bikaner, an ally of the British Raj. Lohia took a strong exception to this and launched an immediate protest from the visitor's gallery. As a result, Lohia became popular in India overnight. In Berlin, he helped in the formation of the Association of European Indians and became the secretary of this club. The organization's focus was on preserving and expanding Indian nationalism abroad.

After receiving his doctorate, Lohia returned to India and joined the Indian National Congress. Lohia was inclined towards socialism and played an important role in the formation of the Congress Socialist Party in 1934. He wrote extensively on the possibility of a socialist India for the party's journal, *Congress Socialist*. In 1936, upon his election to the All India Congress Committee, Lohia revived the party's near-defunct foreign affairs department. Nehru himself appointed Lohia as the secretary of this department. During his tenure of two years, Lohia helped concretize India's foreign policy.

In the Second World War, Lohia saw an opportunity to topple the British Rule in India. He travelled across the country, instigating the citizens through his speeches to boycott all government institutions. Resultantly, Lohia was arrested on May 24, 1939. However, the British authorities feared his arrest could cause a youth uprising and, thus released him from prison just a day later.

A determined Lohia then wrote an article titled *Satyagraha Now* in Gandhiji's newspaper *Harijan* on June 1, 1940. Six days later, he was re-arrested and imprisoned for two years. While passing the judgment, the magistrate had observed: 'He (Lohia) is a top-class scholar, civilized gentleman, and has liberal ideology and high moral character.' In a meeting of the Congress Working Committee following Lohia's imprisonment, Gandhi had said, 'I cannot sit quiet as long as Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia is in prison. I do not yet know a person braver and simpler than him. He never propagated violence. Whatever he has done has increased his esteem and his honor.' In prison, Lohia was severely tortured and harassed by the jailors. In December 1941, all imprisoned Congress leaders, including Lohia, were released in a desperate attempt by the British authorities to stabilize the country which was reverberating with the demands for independence. In 1942, the Indian National Congress launched the Quit India Movement under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi. Prominent leaders, including Gandhi, Sardar Vallabhai Patel, Jawaharlal Nehru and Maulana Azad, were put behind bars to muzzle nationalistic voices. The responsibility to guide and lead the struggle of the nation towards independence fell on the shoulders of the Socialist cadre, which included senior leaders like Lohia. He went underground to escape arrest and from there, published posters and documents to awaken the people's spirit of 'do or die'.

Along with freedom fighter Usha Mehta, Lohia started a secret radio station called Congress Radio from Bombay to inspire people towards revolution. He also edited *Inquilab* (Revolution), a monthly publication of the Congress. Other senior leaders like Aruna Asaf Ali, Abdan Shaikh and Madiha also took active part in the Quit India Movement. While remaining underground, Lohia visited Calcutta to revive the movement in the state. He changed his name to escape arrest even as the police was closing in on him. Lohia then fled to Nepal's dense jungles. There, Lohia met

many Nepalese revolutionaries, including the Koirala brothers, who remained his allies for the rest of their lives.

Lohia was finally captured in May 1944 from Bombay and was taken to the notorious Lahore prison, which was known to perpetrate torture on prisoners. Lohia too was subjected to inhuman treatment by jail authorities to extract information from him. He was released in 1946 under the pressure put on the British authorities by Mahatma Gandhi.

As India's tryst with freedom approached, the antagonism and clashes between the Hindus and Muslims increased. Lohia vehemently opposed Partition and wrote extensively against it. He appealed to the two communities in the regions affected by riots to stay united, ignore the divisive forces and adhere to Gandhi's ideals of nonviolence. On August 15, 1947, as political leaders hovered in Delhi to take over the reign of the country, Lohia stayed by Gandhi's side who was lamenting the consequences and killings brought about by Partition.

4.6.1 Goa and Nepal

In 1946, soon after his release from prison by the British authorities, Lohia went to Goa for rest. He was accompanied by his communist friend Juliao Menezes, the author of the anti-Catholic and anti-Portuguese work *Contra Roma e além de Benares* (Against Rome and Returning to Benares). Menezes had later revealed he had invited Lohia to Goa to disturb peace and encourage revolution in the state which was under the Portuguese rule. On the other hand, Nehru had publicly stated that Goa was a foreign territory and Indian politicians would not intervene in its internal affairs. He had said: 'Eighteen years ago, a Congress committee was started in Goa by Mr. Tristao Braganza Cunha and for some years he was a member of the All-India Congress Committee. Later, under the constitution of the Congress, such foreign committees were not affiliated.'

Thus, despite being a tourist and clearly an outsider as far as the Congress leadership was concerned, Lohia inspired struggle and launched satyagraha in Goa. He began intervening in the local political affairs, influenced the small Goan Communist movement and fostered sedition. He was arrested by the Portuguese administration, while delivering a public speech, was imprisoned and later sent to British India. Gandhi supported Lohia and responded to his arrest stating: 'the little Portuguese settlement, which merely exists on the sufferance of the British government, can ill-afford to ape its bad manners. In free India, Goa cannot be allowed to exist as a separate entity in opposition to the laws of the Free State. Without a shot being fired, the people of Goa will be able to claim and receive the rights of citizenship of the Free State. The present Portuguese government will no longer be able to rely upon the protection of the British arms to isolate and keep under subjection the inhabitants of Goa against their will. I would venture to advise the Portuguese government of Goa to recognize the signs of the times and come to honorable terms with the inhabitants, rather than function on any treaty that might exist between them and the British government.'

NOTES

NOTES

Gandhi added: 'It is ridiculous to write of Portugal as the Motherland of the Indians of Goa. Their mother country is as much India as is mine. Goa is outside British India, but it is within geographical India as a whole. And there is very little, if anything, in common between the Portuguese and the Indians in Goa.' Amid growing support, Lohia tried to re-enter Goa on September 28, 1946, but was arrested at the Colem Railway Station, put into solitary confinement. He was banned from entering Goa for the next five years. Lohia desisted from entering Goa for the third time on the advice of Gandhi and Nehru.

In Nepal, with support of his socialist and communist friends, Lohia initiated a struggle to bring the country within the Indian domain and free them from the clutches of monarchy. However, contradictions failed his attempts; while on one hand, the Koiralas supported him, the Nepalese citizens were not keen on merger with India. Lohia was not only influenced by socialism but also practiced it. He deeply favoured the use of Hindi as the official language of India. Lohia argued that the use of English hindered people's thoughts, 'was a progenitor of inferiority feelings and deepened the gap between the educated and uneducated public'. He called upon the people: 'Come, let us unite to restore Hindi to its original glory.' He also recognized the importance of a nation's economic strength and encouraged the citizens to join the post-freedom reconstruction activities. Lohia urged people to construct canals, wells and roads voluntarily in their neighbourhood. He volunteered to build a dam on river Paniyari, which stands strong till date and is also known as the 'Lohia Sagar Dam'. Lohia said: 'Satyagraha without constructive work is like a sentence without a verb.' He felt that public work could unite and bring a sense of awareness in the community. Lohia felt that as a democracy, the Parliament was obliged to listen to the citizens who elected them. He, thus helped create a day called 'Janavani Day' on which people from around the country could assemble and express their grievances to the members of Parliament. The tradition still persists.

In 1963, when Lohia entered the Parliament for the first time, the country had evolved a one-party government through three general elections. He wrote a pamphlet titled '25000 Rupees a Day', the amount spent on Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's daily activities. Lohia felt this was an obscene sum spent on a leader in a country whose majority population lived on 3 annas (less than one-quarter of a rupee) a day. Lohia called it an important issue, one which required a special debate in Parliament.

The controversy is still remembered as the *Teen Anna Pandrah Anna* (3 annas 15 annas) controversy. Lohia was neither a Marxist nor an anti-Marxist. Unlike Marxist theorists, Lohia argued that caste, more than class, was the prime deterrent to India's progress. Caste, according to Lohia, was a form of class in the Indian context. He said that class was a mobile caste since the country was anyways dominated by ideas of the upper castes constituted by the brahmins and the *baniyas*. Lohia said caste restricted one's social and economic opportunities, which in turn constricted people's ability. This, he argued, further restricted opportunity. Where caste prevails, Lohia said, opportunity and ability were restricted to ever-narrowing circles of people. In his own party, the Samyukta (United) Socialist Party, Lohia promoted lower caste candidates by giving them electoral tickets and senior party

positions. With this, Lohia aimed to ensure people accepted and voted for his party's candidates, irrespective of their caste.

4.6.2 Lohia's Views on Capitalism and Marxism

Lohia argued early that Marxism and Capitalism were similar in as far as their views on industrialization were concerned. He stated that industry was no solution for the Third World. In fact, in 1951, Lohia had warned the Americans that their lives would soon be taken over by big industries. He called Marxism the 'last weapon of Europe against Asia' and propounded the 'Principle of Equal Irrelevance', declining both Marxism as well as Capitalism. He perceived Capitalism as the doctrine of 'people living upward of 40 degrees north of the equator'. Lohia preferred search for an appropriate technology, which could reduce hard work but at the same time, not put the common man at the mercy of machines. He considered capitalism to be 'the doctrine of individual, free enterprise, mass production and balance of power based peace'. Lohia rejected capitalism and believed it encouraged only poverty and war.

According to Lohia, capitalism could destroy national freedom. He further perceived communism as part of capitalism and said that 'it only seems to smash the capitalist relations of production'. According to him, both capitalism and communism were 'part of a single civilization as both are driven by continuous application of science to economy and rising standard of living'.

4.6.3 Revolutionary Thinker

Lohia was always concerned with the welfare of the masses. Besides his revolutionary ways during the civil disobedience movement, his concern to bridge the divide between the rich and the poor, and the elimination of caste and irrelevant industry, Lohia also sought to promote equality between sexes, discourage discrimination on the basis of colour and preservation of individual privacy. Lohia also believed in joint action. He supported overthrow of a government which misused its power, even if it had to be done before the completion of its official term. Lohia gave action to his words. He was the first parliamentarian to move a no-confidence motion against the Nehru government, which had by then been in office for 16 years.

Lohia is popularly known as a maverick socialist. He often surprised his supporters as well as opponents through his words and actions. In one instance, he astounded everyone by calling on the Indian government to produce the bomb, after the Sino-Indian War of 1962.

4.6.4 Lohia's Anti-English View

Lohia was in favour of abolishing private schools and establishing better municipal (government) schools, which would be open to students from all castes. He saw this approach as a means to abolish caste system.

At the annual convention of the Socialist Party, Lohia formulated a plan to decentralize the power of the government and give more powers in the hands of the

NOTES

NOTES

people. He also set up the Hind Kisan Panchayat to give an ear to the problem of the farmers.

As a socialist, Lohia sought to unite socialist from across the world to form a potent global platform. He died on 12 October 1967 in New Delhi and left behind no property or bank balance.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- 12. What were Lohia's views on capitalism?
- 13. When did Ram Manohar Lohia pass away?

4.7 SUMMARY

- Sir Syed started the Aligarh Movement to spread modern education as well as social reform. Aligarh was the centre of the movement due to which it is known as the Aligarh Movement. He realized the need to reform the society so that modern education could take place especially among the Muslim community.
- The Aligarh Movement had the aim of bringing social and cultural reforms by persuading the Muslims to learn English education and abstaining from the politics of agitation. This would create a cordial atmosphere of mutual understanding between the British Government and the Muslims.
- Sir Syed Ahmed Khan's concept of nationalism was conceived as Hindu-Muslim unity, which was reflected till the year 1887. He considered the Hindus and the Muslims as a single nation and never demanded a separate homeland for the Indian Muslims.
- In November 1926, spurred on by friends and supporters, Iqbal fought the election for a seat in the Punjab Legislative Assembly from the largely Muslim district of Lahore, and won by a considerable 3,177 votes. His key focus was to support those constitutional proposals put forward by Jinnah which attempted to ensure voting and ruling rights to Muslims and a say in a coalition with the Congress.
- Mohammad Ali Jinnah submitted a proposition of 14 points as a constitutional reform plan to protect the political rights of Muslims in independent India, wherein he tried to get more rights for Muslims.
- The separatist and loyalist tendencies among a section of the Muslim intelligentsia and the big Muslim nawabs and landlords reached a climax on 30 December 1906, when the All India Muslim League was founded under the leadership of the Aga Khan, the Nawab of Dhaka and Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk.
- As a *Mahar*, Dr Ambedkar had himself suffered a lot of indignities and discrimination at the hands of the so-called upper castes, and was, thus, always

eager to bring revolutionary changes in the traditional social system of India. He wanted to rescue the oppressed and the suppressed classes from the yoke of Brahminism and casteism.

- According to Ambedkar, the *Brahmins* enslaved the mind and *Banias* enslaved the body and having done it, they divided the spoils which belong to the governing classes. He also thought that *Brahminism* was opposed to democracy and the values for which it stood, specially the values of Justice, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity and the Rule of Law.
- To Ambedkar, Buddhism was important not only because he agreed with its tenets and institutions, but also because it enabled him to reconstruct more scientifically and satisfactorily the history of ancient India.
- During his lifetime, Dr Ambedkar ventured to bring about a total change in the social, economic and political transformation in India's social and political structure and in this effort, he succeeded to a very large extent. He dedicated his life towards the eradication of untouchability and related issues.
- 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.
- 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'.
- As India's tryst with freedom approached, the antagonism and clashes between the Hindus and Muslims increased. Lohia vehemently opposed Partition and wrote extensively against it. He appealed to the two communities in the regions affected by riots to stay united, ignore the divisive forces and adhere to Gandhi's ideals of nonviolence.
- According to Lohia, capitalism could destroy national freedom. He further perceived communism as part of capitalism and said that 'it only seems to smash the capitalist relations of production'. According to him, both capitalism and communism were 'part of a single civilization as both are driven by continuous application of science to economy and rising standard of living'.

NOTES

4.8 KEY TERMS

- **Communalism:** A theory of a society that is divided into several small, independent communes and the state is just a confederation of these communes.
- **Jinnah's 14 points:** Mohammad Ali Jinnah submitted a proposition of 14 points as a constitutional reform plan to protect the political rights of Muslims in independent India, wherein he tried to get more rights for Muslims.

NOTES

- **Two-nation theory:** The two-nation theory stated that India consisted of two separate nations, on the basis of religion: Hindus and Muslims.
- **Sarvodaya:** The term *Sarvodaya* is composed of two words, ‘*Sarva*’ and ‘*udaya*’ which mean the ‘rise of all’ and ‘upliftment of all’.

4.9 ANSWERS TO ‘CHECK YOUR PROGRESS’

1. He was a nationalist who was personally affected by the turmoil of the Indian rebellion of 1857, so he penned the booklet *Asbab-e-Bhaghawath-e-Hind (The Causes of the Indian Mutiny)*—a daring critique of the British policies that led to the revolt.
2. The Aligarh Movement had two objectives. The first objective was to regenerate the Muslims community and revive the spirit of progress by introducing modern education so that they are not left bereft of the new opportunities available under the new regime. Secondly, it aimed to create social progress without deviating from the fundamentals of their faith.
3. He defined the word *qaum* to mean a community of both Hindus and Muslims. He expressed the need for Hindu–Muslim unity while explaining the meaning of *qaum* in his speech that he made on 27 January 1884. He said that ‘whether Hindus or Muslims, they lie on one soil and are governed by the one and the same ruler, have the same sources of benefit which equally shares the hardships of a famine’.
4. Iqbal was the first to harbour the dream of a Muslim majority state—during the 1930s. However, Jinnah was still involved in talks with the Congress through the 1930s and only in 1940 announced officially his intentions to fight for an independent Muslim state. In the opinion of some historians, Jinnah had been only looking for an agreement with the Congress rather than the partition of India. However, it was Iqbal’s constant push in that direction which made Jinnah get convinced about the idea.
5. Jinnah’s fourteen points evoked mixed reactions throughout the nation. Hindus unanimously disregarded his suggestion while Jawaharlal Nehru referred to it as ‘Jinnah’s ridiculous 14 points’ and Congress party rejected the demands made in it.
6. The aims of the League were as follows:
 - (i) To promote among Indian Muslims feelings of loyalty towards the British Government and to remove any misconception, that may arise, as to the intentions of the Government with regard to any of its measures.
 - (ii) To protect the political and other rights of the Indian Muslims and to place their needs and aspirations before the Government in temperate language, and
 - (iii) So far as possible without prejudice to the objects mentioned under (i) and (ii) to promote friendly relations between Muslim and other communities of India.

7. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar was considered the architect of the Indian Constitution.
8. As far as the *mahars* of the Maharashtra were concerned they always lived outside the village, because they belonged to a tribe different from the one to which the settled tribes belonged. They were known as the ‘broken men’ who belonged to a different tribe, different blood who were as such given quarters outside the village.
9. The Hindu Code Bill drafted by him introduced only four new factors in the existing law. These were:
 - Abolition of the doctrine of rights by birth;
 - Absolute right over property to women;
 - Equitable share to daughter;
 - Provision for divorce not only to men, but equally to women as well.
10. The Sarvodaya Society would have two main principles, i.e. truth and non-violence. All the changes would occur peacefully. Peace would revolutionize the society in what J.P. Narayana 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.
11. 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.
12. According to Lohia, capitalism could destroy national freedom. He further perceived communism as part of capitalism and said that ‘it only seems to smash the capitalist relations of production’. According to him, both capitalism and communism were ‘part of a single civilization as both are driven by continuous application of science to economy and rising standard of living’.
13. He died on 12 October 1967 in New Delhi.

NOTES

4.10 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Briefly discuss the change in Syed Ahmed Khan’s views regarding communalism before and after 1887.
2. Write a brief note about Mohammed Iqbal’s family background.
3. What role did Jinnah play in the Muslim League?
4. What were the main points of the CR Formula?
5. How did Ambedkar envision helping the lower classes to realize their potential?
6. Highlight some of the steps taken by Lohia to support India’s fight for freedom.

NOTES

Long-Answer Questions

1. Give a detailed background of the Aligarh National Movement and Sir Syed Ahmed Khan's role in it.
2. Highlight Mohammad Iqbal's views regarding the creation of a separate Muslim state.
3. Discuss the gist of Jinnah's 14 points and interpret his political ideology from these points.
4. Explain in detail Ambedkar's opinion and views about the class system in India and untouchability.
5. What were Ambedkar's views regarding Buddhism?
6. Explain the concept of Sarvodaya as envisioned by JP Narayan.
7. Examine Mahatma Gandhi's influence on Ram Manohar Lohia's political views.

4.11 FURTHER READING

- Chand, Tara; *History of Freedom Movement in India*, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi, 2005.
- Chandra, Bipin; *Freedom Struggle*, National Book Trust, New Delhi, 1999.
- Chandra, Bipin; *Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India's Struggle for Independence*, Penguin Books, New Delhi, 1989.
- Choudhary, S. B.; *Civil Disturbances during the British Rule in India (1765 – 1857)*, World Press Limited, Calcutta, 1999.
- Desai, A. R.; *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, Popular Prakashan, New Delhi, 2008.
- Majumdar, R.C.; *The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857*, Calcutta Oriental Press Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1988.
- Sarkar, Sumit; *Modern India (1885 – 1947)*, Macmillan, New Delhi, 2000.
- Appadorai, A.; *Documents on Political Thought in Modern India*, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1973.
- Bali, D.R.; *Modern Political Thought (From Ram Mohan Roy to Jayaprakash Narayan)*, Sterling Publication, New Delhi, 1993.