



Jnanadeepa

Pune Journal of Religious Studies

ISSN 2249-1503

www.punejournal.in

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4255705

Gandhian Social Vision for the Twenty-First Century

George Pattery, SJ

Abstract: Millennial thinking was not particularly Gandhi's cup of tea. To his rational mind, any time, any place and anyone could be equally significant. To reflect on the coming century in Gandhian terms may not be quite Gandhian. However, even those, who attribute all the ills of modern India to Gandhi and his failed experiment, would like to add a volume on Gandhi, at least to prove that Gandhi was not relevant to modern society, let alone for the 21st century. Such is his hold on post-modern mind.

Keywords: Gandhi, Gandhian vision, Modern society, India of the future

Cited as:

Pattery, George. (1999) Gandhian Social Vision for the Twenty-First Century. <i>Jnanadeepa: Pune Journal of Religious Studies</i> , Jan 1998 Vol 2/1 19-35 https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4255705
--

1999-01-07

Updated on Nov 10, 2020

Gandhian Social Vision for the Twenty-First Century

George Pattery, SJ

Dept. of Philosophy, Visva-Bharati, Calcutta

Millennial thinking was not particularly Gandhi's cup of tea. To his rational mind, any time, any place and anyone could be equally significant. To reflect on the coming century in Gandhian terms may not be quite Gandhian. However, even those, who attribute all the ills of modern India to Gandhi and his failed experiment, would like to add a volume on Gandhi, at least to prove that Gandhi was not relevant to modern society, let alone for the 21st century. Such is his hold on post-modern mind.

Indeed, Gandhi had a vision. He visioned, not because he was close to another century, nor because he was called upon to do it. At a time when colonial expansion was the 'vision' of the day and anti-colonialism was the immediate task ahead, Gandhi dared to envision a way of life and a model of society that was relevant both to the colonizers and the colonized, and that remains a challenge for us today, even if in a de-constructive way. That we need a vision in order to engage the immediate and the most practical has been amply substantiated from the conceptual, pedagogical, and psychological points of view.¹ Leaving aside the epistemological function of 'vision' in the reconstruction of societies, we shall for a while attempt a hermeneutic of Gandhi's 'envisioning'. We shall dwell

on the features of his social vision only in so far as they are relevant for an interpretation of the pedagogy of 'Gandhian envisioning' of the future.

1. The Encircling Visions

In order to enter upon such a hermeneutic, we need to locate Gandhi within his time and place. What is particularly disconcerting is the fact that he envisioned a way of life and social model amidst so many conflicting social theories and national ideologies of his time. The Indian intellectual renaissance, and later the independent struggle, prompted the birth of 'indigenous social visions' and national discourses. Movements such as the *Brahmo Samaj* (founded in 1830) in Bengal, the *Prarthana Samaj* (1867) in Maharashtra, the *Arya Samaj* (1875) in Punjab, the Theosophical Society (1875), the *Ramkrishna* Movement, and dynamic leaders such as Rammohun Roy (1772-1833), Swami Dayananda (1824-1883), Mahadeva Govinda Ranade (1842-1901), Swami Vivekananda (1863-1902), Madame Blavatsky (1831-1891), and Annie Besant (1847-1933) articulated the Indian social concerns against the background of the political institutions of the day. Echoing the social, moral and spiritual vigour of the renaissance, most of

them strongly 'believed in India's power in delivering an important message to the West and even to the whole of humanity'.²

With the establishment of Indian National Congress in 1855, there emerged another set of socio-political visions for India. Both the 'moderates' and the 'extremists,' such as Vishnu Krishna Chiploonkar (1850-1882), Bankim Chandra Chatterjee (1838-1898), Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917), Surendranath Banerjee (1845-1925), Gopal Krishna Gokhale (1866-1915), Bal Gangadhar Tilak (1856-1920), Bipin Chandra Pal (1858-1932), Lala Lajpat Rai (1865-1928) and Aurobindo Ghosh (1872-1950), resonated with the indigenous thinking and nationalistic sentiments of different types.³ They varied from 'nation-building' to *Swadesim*, all sharing the genius of Indian social organization and at the same time partaking of the western concept of nation-state. A variant note is heard in the Nehruvian vision of society (1889-1964), where a more definite 'economic and social content' is added to nationalism, whereby 'the backward, orthodox and divided society could be transformed into an industrialized, secular, liberal democracy'.

The marxists in India sought to build up a classless society in line with the Marxian-Leninist analysis and found Gandhian experiment and Indian independent struggle reactionary. Much of the early marxist analysis held that Gandhi and his independent struggle were bourgeois and transitory in nature, and underrated the role of colonialism (a wrong perception indeed as was

proved by later events and is acknowledged by Indian marxists today), and worked for an international classless society as per the rules of marxist analysis.

At the international level, industrial economics and colonial politics was the fashion of the day. More industry, greater production and consumption, and rapid expansion of technology were the dictates of the day. The industrial vision dominated the day. The colonial politics of the time insisted on few industries, low production and low consumption and backward agriculture in the colonies as 'protectionist methods'. Colonies supplied 'raw material for industry' and provided markets for industrial countries. This mainstream economic and political thinking was already opposed by Tolstoy, Ruskin, Saint-Simon, Proudhon, Edward Carpenter and others

2. The Gandhian Envisioning

It is interesting and significant to note that Gandhi dared to envision amidst these numerous ideologies and visions; and he was original in his thinking, challenging the existing visions. We shall briefly dwell on the distinguishing features of the Gandhian vision in order to spell out the hermeneutical principles that could be significant for envisioning society for the coming century.

Prompted by the exposure in England and challenged by the enthusiasm of his English friends, Gandhi took to learning the *Gita* and the Hindu traditions more seriously while he was in England. Through his struggles and

questions of 'self-identity' as an Indian, Gandhi discovered that 'tradition' has much to do with one's way of life. Later in S. Africa, while searching for a methodology of struggle against the racial discrimination and injustice, he looked into 'traditional' (Indian) methods and ways of resolving conflicts. In both cases he learned the resilience of 'tradition' in creating a way of life and as a method of conflict resolution. Early in 1909, in the seminal tract *Hind Swaraj*, he articulated a social vision taking fully into account 'tradition' as the bed-rock of his vision. His was an attempt to reconstruct India's past for our times because he too felt that India had a 'civilizational role' to play to the modern world. In this he was of one mind with the religio-social movements that we mentioned earlier. He edged them out in that attempt because he unearthed the traditional, cultural and human values that were the strength of India's ancient culture. Culture and tradition constituted important categories in Gandhi's social vision.

Gandhi definitely shared the nationalist sentiments of his time, and was unambiguous in his opposition to colonial rule, and rejected it 'lock, stock and barrel'. However, he defined nationalism not in terms of nation-state, or territory, or rulers but in terms of 'the people,' the masses, the illiterate, rural and rough selves; the people rich in 'humanity' and abounding in a sense of 'the beyond'. He converted the Indian National Congress into a people's party, and the national struggle into a mass movement. His vision of India cannot be divorced from his perception of and identification with the Indian masses.

Envisioning a future social order derived its rationale from a people's perspective.

The Nehruvian socialism and Marxian classless society worked to a plan. Gandhi was opposed to and differed from both. They analyzed and worked out a theory that would definitely determine the future. Gandhi went back to the rural structures based on the wisdom of the ages and helped them to evolve into a national and global vision. His was not the logical conclusion of an analysis, but the result of a synthesis that has been happening through the wisdom of people from time immemorial. This wisdom sought 'swaraj' (total liberation), beginning with individual selves, villages and society at large, in an ever-widening circle. The wisdom of the people became in his hands a scientific instrument in evolving a system or vision.

Economics and other social sciences were coming of age, forming themselves into independent sciences with 'data-based objective analysis'. Emotion-free, value-free, and objective analysis claimed to produce 'scientific' results. However, Gandhian pedagogy and vision questioned the veracity of these methods taken in themselves. He introduced 'human affections' into economic thinking, not for emotional reasons, but for economic reasons. Human affections need not be non-productive; on the contrary, human affections in economic calculations can contribute to greater productivity, provided such products contributed to 'healthy human living'. Value-free science is not necessarily scientific. Gandhian vision edged out of 'this-worldly concerns'.

The nationalists wanted to create a social vision independent of the colonialists, and the colonialists attempted to create a world-order marginalizing the colonized. Gandhi spoke of a society of interdependence. Such 'interdependence' was a more comprehensive term (beyond the immediate agencies of Britain and India); he referred to the very nature of the interdependence of all creation; of an inter-relatedness of all and sundry on 'free status'. He was not interested in creating a society based on equality; rather people of his society were committed seekers after 'Truth'. They had 'multiple identities' in relation to nature, family, nation, society, and to the ultimate. Gandhian vision embraced these multiple identities of peoples.

At this stage let us stay for a while with two critical dimensions of Gandhian social philosophy that have far reaching hermeneutical implications: first, Gandhi introduced a sort of urban-village polarity in social thinking; secondly, he was a social anarchist placing the individual in contrast to the society. Gandhi's fascination for villages and village style of life has invited much criticism, probably rightly so. Much of the criticism is provoked by his pronouncements. Gandhi did not elaborate his philosophy in a systematic and logical way, though he was quite rational in his thinking and acting. However, his statements were often cryptic and needed much explanation. He did explain himself when asked but not otherwise. A creative and intuitive thinker that he was, he saw more, and ahead of his time, and his statements represent such a visionary out-

look. One could not expect the crowds to understand the implications of his intuitions, nor could one expect a full explanation from Gandhi as he was engaged full-time in national struggle.

Why this fascination for villages? Positively it was the practical aspect of *Swadeshi*, and negatively it meant to check the menace of technology that centralizes and overpowers the human. These are inter-related. Villages were being impoverished and cities were thriving. Villages are impoverished for the sake of city life. The city-centred life in turn is dependent on technology. Technology centralizes. Unlike Marx, Gandhi did not believe that exploitation is due principally to the capitalistic system. In the so-called post-communist era, we might probably understand better how and why Gandhi was right in his perception. The globalization and the multi-nationalization of economies are possible due to 'technology's centralizing tendencies'. For Gandhi competitiveness, consumerist greed and standardization were all basically due to a technology centred way of life. Technologization implied 'indefinite multiplication of wants, and endless gratification of these wants by material means'. Gandhi was not opposed to technology, science or towns. In fact Gandhi was very 'experimental' in life; he wanted to test and verify everything. He was, however, opposed to the 'alienating aspects' of technology that brings dichotomy between villages and cities, between the ancient and the modern, between *swadeshi* and *videshi*. He envisaged an interdependent way of life. He himself was experimenting with all kinds of technology that would suit the

villages and help maintain the traditional and healthy way of life of the villages. He wanted rural industries that would be non-polluting, non-alienating and non-centralizing. In today's idiom, we would call it 'appropriate technology'. Interrelatedness, cooperation and inter-dependence were the vocabulary of his philosophy. The key word was *Swadeshi*, 'where one is rooted in one's immediacy of time, place and traditions'. Gandhi's was an 'encompassing vision,' (to use a Jasperian term). It envelops all aspects of life: material, spiritual, personal, social, immanent and transcendent. The ecological thinking of our time helps us to understand some of the 'Gandhian idiosyncracies'.⁴ There are thinkers today who would argue that modern technology will find other sources of energy if the present source of energy reaches an optimal point; that technology will find non-polluting technologies, and that science is capable of solving the problems that it creates. The debate continues. However, it is generally accepted today that scientific rationality remains scientific when it includes intuitive, interrelated thinking in its fold.⁵

Gandhi was a 'social anarchist'. He envisaged a minimum role for the state. 'That Government is the best which governs the least'.⁶ He distrusted both centralized socialistic states and 'mobocracied' democracies. Both systems centralize and homogenize, and replace human autonomy. Gandhi wanted to safeguard the 'autonomous spirit of the humans'. In this he belonged to the best of Indian traditions, which treat the human as the embodiment of the Ultimate, as the self in the

Self. All systems, governments and laws, and above all the State tend to be bound by rules and regulations that are man-made, where the soul is lost. He introduced the soul-force by which conscientious individuals, fired by the spirit of satyagraha, strive after truth relentlessly. Concerning the individual's freedom and autonomy, Gandhi was an absolutist. The quest for Truth would dictate all, and the individual's well-informed conscience would be the ultimate arbiter. 'Individual freedom alone can make a man surrender himself completely to the service of the society. If it is wrested from him, he becomes an automation and society is ruined.' True freedom on the individual's part involves selflessness. In the final analysis it is the individual himself who will protect his freedom. The State is incapable of protecting the individual's freedom. Gandhi thus introduced a non-academic term 'soul-force' into the discussion about society. The vision of building up a society depends not only on economics, politics and science but also, perhaps primarily, on the soul-force. Gandhi preferred the 'enlightened anarchy' of the truth seeker to the established order of a 'conformist'.

The concept of the nation-State did not occupy a priority in his thinking. Neither did he believe that the parliamentary form of Government was devoid of defects. His remarks on the British parliament were harsh. He said: 'That which you consider to be the Mother of Parliaments is like a sterile woman and a prostitute'. One of the insightful readings into this remark is found in Amlan Datta. It is like a prostitute because it allows itself to be ruled

over by any party, not due to its selfless service, but because of victory in power struggle; it is like a sterile woman because no lasting improvement is possible simply by legislative enactment. Parliament operates on paper legislation, and it is ineffective unless the conscience of the people is prepared.⁷

The primacy given to the individual and his conscience is the most radical statement made on the role of the institutions. In a memorial lecture on Ranade delivered at Pune in 1943, Ambedkar argued that 'rights are protected not by law but by the social and moral conscience of society'.⁸

The Gandhian critique of the nation-state concept, of democracies of his time, and his insistence on the moral conscience of the people highlight the fact that he brings 'ethics' into political discourse, and politics into ethical vocabulary. The moral question cannot be left out of politics or out of the consideration of any social vision. It is to the credit of Gandhi that he brought ethics and politics onto the same platform. The two terms of '*swadeshi* and *swaraj*' provide the hermeneutical keys. In these two concepts, the prefix - *swa* - is vital. It refers to the self, to being at-home with oneself and one's immediate surrounding, to the 'Self' that rules and decides. In Gandhi's vision, 'self (SWA)' is capable of ruling, and feeling at home, when it is the self in the Self. This self is the Self in search for Truth. Truth is *Sat-ya*: the whole of existence. The self is in pursuit of Truth; the selves are in pursuit of Truth, and it is in that search and it is on that path they meet, relate and are inter-depend-

ent. For Gandhi this quest for and experiment with Truth brings peoples together, a kind of 'UR-Religion' in the Gandhian scheme. In this primordial religiosity all can be brought together, irrespective of religions and cultures. From his own life-journey, we learn that Gandhi came to social commitment and vision as a result of and in pursuit of the Truth that began when he was a boy refusing to oblige the teacher in the classroom. To understand Gandhian social vision, we need to grasp his religiosity, his search for truth. It is *Satyagraha*, 'holding onto Truth at all costs,' that brings about *swadeshi* and *swaraj*.⁹

3. Hermeneutical Significance of Gandhian Social Vision

Tradition, *Swadeshi* and *Swaraj* constitute the three components of Gandhian social vision. All three are tied up with the hermeneutical key of *Satyagraha* religiosity.¹⁰

3.1. Tradition as the Unfolding of Truth

What is the role of TRADITION in envisaging society for the 21st century?

Modern western history until now was defined by the spirit of enlightenment with a definite trust in rationality, abounding confidence in the success of science in solving human problems and above all asserting rational logic. Christianity has claimed these factors for itself, saying that it is Christianity's influence that gave the West these factors, even if the claim is made in an apologetics against liberation theology. However, today there is an evident de-

cline of the old Kantian, Cartesian and Hegelian rational certainties, manifested in the continuing malaise of the political and social institutions that are products of enlightenment rationality. The Marxian crisis is also the crisis of the spirit of enlightenment. The post-modernity responds to this malaise by deconstructing the enlightenment edifice, and building on the role of 'Tradition' in constituting the meaning of the present. Heidegger, G.Gadamer and P. Ricoeur broadly represent this trend by their interpretation of the text, the present, in reference to the tradition. Heidegger spoke of tradition as '*uberlieferung*' understood as the active inheritance of the past as an open possibility, not as a rigidly determined and determining schema.¹¹ Truth is seen here not as a proposition that corresponds, but as an endless network of references constituted by the multiple voices of the *uber-lieferung*. Such multiplicity resists all attempts at unity or rigid system, but discovers multiplicity of cultural universes that are inherited.¹²

Taking the discussion further, Gadamer speaks of the operativeness of the past in the present. 'The present is seen and understood only through the intentions, ways of seeing, and preconceptions bequeathed from the past'. Gadamer's hermeneutics and his critique of historical consciousness assert that the past is not like a pile of facts which can be made an object of consciousness, but rather is a stream in which we move and participate in every act of understanding. Tradition, then, is not over against us but something in which we stand and through which we

exist: for the most part it is so transparent a medium that it is invisible to us 'as invisible as water to fish'.¹³ In envisioning a society for the future, one need to attend to tradition, not as thing of the past but as stream flowing into the present and taking us to the future. This stream or this *parambara* goes back to the roots of our existence. Gandhi called our attention to this factor. His attempt to reconstruct India's ancient social institutions could be better understood in the light of post-modernist critique of the present social institutions.

3.2 Swadeshi as Cosmic Relationship

Gandhi has been maligned for being 'parochial' in his thinking and outlook because he advocated 'indigenous' thinking, acting and seeing. *Swadeshi* that he advocated is not an anti-west nor anti-modern stance. *Swadeshi* as a hermeneutical principle implies that we adopt a 'cosmic outlook on life'. It believes that reality is inter-related, and that there is wonder and beauty in the 'here and now'. It is a kind of mystical perspective that lets us glory in 'small things and in the immediate neighbourhood'. It finds wisdom in one's own culture, people and place. There is enough wisdom given by nature to each people and culture. We need to explore this wisdom of the 'local' in solving our problems and in becoming fully human and holistic. *Swadeshi* is eco-pedagogy; it is a way of being at home with one's own. It is the theology of the microcosm. It believes in dependency on one's self for one's immediate needs, and self-sufficiency in the neighbourhood. It believes that the wisdom of the

cosmos is given in the 'here and now', and *swadeshi* tries to unearth this wisdom. As Gabriel Marcel once said: 'The true function of the sage is surely the function of linking together, of bringing into harmony ... the sage is truly linked with the universe'.¹⁴ *Swadeshism* is a world view that goes beyond ego-logical thinking to the eco-logical way of being.

This cosmic consciousness invites one to engage the present and the immediate because the whole cosmos is contained in it. Our social vision for the future, therefore, should mean a way of life that enables us to be rooted in the here and now. The temptation is to take off. Modern communication and transportation facilities can place many more on wheels, always going somewhere but reaching no-where. It is interesting to note that in one of the studies done on communal conflicts in India it was said that communal riots were the creation of 'urban people,' and that they were mostly instigated by 'rootless people looking for identity' in an alienated city life.¹⁵ The challenge of the 21st century society is to be 'rooted in'.

A new organization is surfacing on the horizon. The indications of that development are already present. People have started discovering that they prefer to live in small cottages in dispersed settlements rather than in multistoried buildings in the middle of a huge metropolis. Kitchen gardens attached to cottages can supply much of the domestic needs and more should be possible with experiments in scientific gardening. Despite Gandhi, spinning will not perhaps become a household industry.

But it will be possible to weave on hobby looms and make gifts to our friends of what we weave, and receive similar gifts in return. It will be possible to produce in the basements of our cottages most of the furniture we need. Houses can be built with prefabricated materials, depending on little else but our own designs and family labour, almost in the same spirit that children make toy houses. It is possible today, and will become more so tomorrow, to practise self-help in all these and other ways. Some of these indications are clearer among the richer countries and communities than among the poorer. But this only shows what people will do when they are free to choose.¹⁶

Jonathan Porrit has emphasized it from the perspective of the Greens:

To avoid writing the earth's obituary we must cease to see the future simply as an extension of the present, and we must think as much about what should be, as about what actually is. We must think again of the links between ourselves and the earth, and of the way the earth speaks to us through an ideal of life. We must seek ways creatively to disintegrate the economic and industrial constraints that are turning our world and our lives into a wasteland. Above all, we must learn to blend our concern for people with our respect for the earth through the post-industrial politics of peace, liberation and ecology: the politics of life.¹⁷

A new earth and a new heaven is shaping up from the small peoples of the localities. The task of envisioning the 21st century includes quickening the pace of this logic of the God of 'small

things,' and hasten the formation of micro-cosmic living and mutually supporting family circles.

3.3. Swaraj as the Power of Self-giving

Soul-force was the non-academic concept that Gandhi introduced into political discourse and into social visioning. Starting with the British war-hero Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, almost everybody felt uneasy with this most 'common and readily available weapon,' introduced by the naked fakir. The indomitable nature of the human formed the basis of Gandhi's political struggles. What is real power? Who wields power, and how and when is power exercised? In any vision of society, one has to define the nature of power and the means to deal with it. When power is defined in terms of 'soul-force,' it is assumed that such power is available to all humans. Every human being has the resources of power within him/her. This power consists in reaching out, transcending oneself to realize oneself. It implies the prophetic power to act, to resist injustice, to struggle against the demons; it includes the mystical power to see, to behold and 'listen to Being,' as Heidegger would say.

In this paradigm, politics and spirituality are about power and empowerment. It interferes with power structures, power ideologies and power toxins residing in the souls of each of us. Soul-force is about power structure of a different kind: it consists in the power of letting go, of self-sacrificing love, of simple living, of harmonious dwelling within the universe, of resisting evil to

the point of death, of a sharing and caring that embodies a mother's love, of being fully alive and present to the here and now. This power is not foreign to any but the mighty and the rich. This power is available to anyone who is ready to wrestle with the self within. It implies that 'political economy' derives its power not from a competitive edge, but from human affections; it means that real political power is not the result of a power struggle but an outcome of service to the community. There is a paradigm shift here. Does the progress of post-modern society indicate a trend towards such a paradigm shift? The scene is ambiguous. There is on the one hand the menacing grip of the multinationals on the life and philosophy of every society, where their economic terms dictate and alienate relationships at the inter-national, national and domestic levels. There is the tendency towards a 'standardization of cultures' dictated by the globalizing agents. There is the consumerist discourse dictated by 'greed' and marketed by the liberals. On the other hand, the opposite trend is also visible. There is today a shift towards a new consciousness-culture where 'energy' is defined and found in the relationship marked by original blessings; there is a move towards life that is simply and authentically lived in communities of peoples; there is a search to grow towards a greater consciousness that touches upon the transcendent; there is a search for an appropriate technology that harmonizes. Who will advance this pace? Where do we find such communities of new power-relationships? These are the real religious questions of the day. But

the traditional religions are engaged in the same power struggle of economics and politics where success, status and statistics count.

4. Encompassing Vision and Christian Pedagogy

In Gandhian hermeneutics, traditional-cosmic-self-giving ways are effected by an encompassing vision which is also at the same time a pedagogy. In Gandhian terminology *satyagraha*, holding onto Truth at any cost, provided such a vision and a pedagogy. The end and the means are intrinsically related. Truth refers to *sat* = existence. It is commitment to existence, to the whole of it, to the entire spectrum of life. In pedagogical terms a commitment to existence (*Sat*) is at the same time an invitation to be rooted in and to stand beyond, to *EK-SIST* - in Heideggerian terms. Any existence (*sat*) that does not have an *ek-sistent* dimension (*Sat*), cannot be authentic. This ability to 'stand-out' (*ek-stasis*) means to transcend our own situations, to get outside of ourselves in time and space. This enables us to function as moral agents, allowing us to see ourselves in the guise of those upon whom we act.¹⁸ Such *ek-stasis* was traditionally confined to the fields of art and religion; Gandhi brought that into public and political discourse.

Post-modern society calls for an encompassing vision and pedagogy. The strength of traditional religions and societies was that they provided, or at least claimed to provide, an encompassing vision and pedagogy, however faulty. Today religion ceases to be the sole agency to provide such an encompassing vision; science and technology

are trying to occupy that place by means of technological arms which have the capacity to reach every corner of the world with a uniform style of living. However, an encompassing vision should be distinguished from a 'homogenizing ideology'. An encompassing vision will have room for alternate models of living.

Christian faith is a pedagogy and a movement of 'ultimate concern'. The Church is an *ecclesia*, a gathering of peoples who can provide space for 'alternate, counter-cultural and creative models' of living. 'Tradition' is an important component in Christian pedagogy as well. Tradition is translated as 'memory'. Christianity is a memorial celebration, feasting on memories and creating new memories; tying up different memories and building up peoples. Memory brings peoples together, enables them to break bread together and to form communities of sharing and caring that grows into cosmic compassion.

It is the memory of 'the Incarnated One'; an incarnated memory is a localized memory, a *swadeshi* memory that resonates with the earth and the water around; memories of the sages, *rishis*, prophets and saints, the rulers and the ruled of the local; not a pyramidal memory, but memory in an ever-widening circle; it is the memory of the '*adivasi*,' the one who named the mountains, rivers and the fields; memory of the 'lilies of the fields and birds of the air'.

It is the memory of the 'crucified' - the one who attained *swaraj* through total self-giving, against the logic of

greed, of 'power, pleasure and plenty'. The memory of the crucified, of *swaraj*, does not enslave; does not bind up. It is a liberated memory that liberates others. Memory does not bind us to a piece

of land, to an object of worship, or to an agent of power. The incarnated, crucified memory lives on in the memory of all *satyagahis* who dare 'an encompassing vision'.

Notes

1. Manheim Karl, *Ideology and Utopia*, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966; Cf. The section on "Faith, Utopia and Political Action", in Gutierrez Gustavo, *A Theology of Liberation*, London: SCM Press, 1988, pp.135-139; Freire Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, NY: Herder & Herder, 1970; Redfield James, *The Celestine Prophecy*, Hoover, Ala: Satori Press, 1993.
2. S.P.Udayakumar, "Mapping the 'Hindu Re-making of India'", in *Gandhi Marg* (Jan-March, 1998), pp. 443-444.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 444.
4. Jonathan Porrit, *Seeing Green*, Oxord: Basil Blackwell, 1984, pp. 25-90.
5. Cf. Calude Alvares, *Science, Development and Violence*, Ashis Nandy, *Traditions, Tyranny and Utopia*, Delhi: University Press, 1987, pp. 130-131; I. Illich, *Deschooling Society*, NY: Harper & Row, 1971.
6. *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, VII, N.Delhi: The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Govt of India, 1958-1990, p. 305. Henceforth cited as CW. H.Thoreau, whom Gandhi admired, said: 'That Government is best which governs not all'. Cf. *Life without Principle*, Palo Alto: Stanford University, 1946, p. 1.
7. Amlan Datta, *The Gandhian Way*, Shillong: NEHU Publications, 1986, pp. 34-35.
8. *Ibid.*, p.35.
9. CW. VII, pp.72-73, 148, 220-1, XIV, p.272. Cf. Also G. Pattery, *Gandhi the Believer*, Delhi: ISPCK, 1996, pp. 15-17.
10. CW. VII. pp.72-73, 148, 220-1, XIV, p.272. Cf. Also *Gandhi the Believer*, *op.cit.*, pp. 15-17.
11. See specially ch.5 in M. Bobnola, *Verita e Interpretatione nello Heidegger di 'essere' e tempo'*, Editione di Filosofia, Turin, 1983.
12. R.E. Palmer, *Hermeneutics*, Evanston: Northwestern University, 1969, pp. 176-177.
13. Cf. Vattimo Gianni, *Beyond Interpretation*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 90-91.
14. Marcel Gabriel, *The Decline of Wisdom*, NY: Philosophical Library, 1955, p. 42.
15. Kakar Sudhir, "Reflections on religious Group Identity", in *Seminar*, (Feb. 1993), pp. 50f.
16. A. Datta, *op.cit.*, pp. 18-19; cf. Also. F.E Schumacher, *Small is Beautiful*, London: Abacus, 1974.
17. J. Porrit, *op.cit.*, p. 235.
18. Cf. Allan Megill, *Prophets of Extremity*, California: University of California Press, 1987, pp. 341-342.