



Rai Technology University

ENGINEERING MINDS

Modern Indian Political Thought



SYLLABUS

Background of Social and Political Thought, Colonial Intervention in Society, Economy and Polity, Modern Indian Political Thought : Issues and Approaches, Socio-Political Reform in the 19th Century India: Introduction, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Justice M.G. Ranade, Gopal Krishna Gokhale

Militant Nationalism: Introduction, B.G. Tilak, Sri Aurobindo, Bhagat Singh, Colonialism, Caste Order and the Tribal Societies, Jyotiba Phule (1827-1890), E. V. Ramaswami Naicker, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Anti-Colonial Tribal Movements In India

Politics and Religion in Modern India: The Interface, Introduction, Swami Dayanand Saraswati, Swami Vivekananda and V.D. Savarkar, Sir Syed and Ahmed Khan, Mohammad Iqbal, M.A. Jinnah and Abdul Kalam Azad

Gandhism: Evolution and Character, Concept of Swaraj, Satyagraha and Critique of Western Civilization, Sarvodaya and the Gandhian Alternative, Gandhian Social Reform, Bhudan Movement

Nationalism and Social Revolution-I (Socialism), Introduction, Jawaharlal Nehru, Subhash Chandra Bose, Political Thought of JP and Narendra Dev, Rammanohar Lohia

Nationalism and Social Revolution II (Communists): Introduction, Communists and the Indian National Movement (1925-47), M.N. Roy - Marxism and Radical Humanism, Contemporary Marxist Thinking (Indian), Nationalism and Social Revolution - An Overview

Suggested Readings:

1. Shruti Kapila, Faisal Devji, Political Thought in Action: The Bhagavad Gita and Modern India, Cambridge University Press
2. Thomas Pantham, Kenneth L Deutsch, Political Thought In Modern India, Sage Publications (CA)
3. Bipin Chandra, Ideology and politics in modern India, Har-Anand Publications
4. Anupama Rao, A. Rao, The Caste Question: Dalits and the Politics of Modern India, University of California Press

CHAPTER 1

Background of Social and Political Thought

● **STRUCTURE**

- Learning objectives
- Colonial intervention in economy, society and polity
- Modern Indian political thought: issues & approaches
- Review questions

● **LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this chapter you should be able to:

- The meaning and nature of colonialism.
- Colonialism development in its various stages at the world level.
- Explain the issues facing modern India.
- Have an idea regarding the main currents of the history of political ideas in India during 19th and 20th centuries.

● **COLONIAL INTERVENTION IN ECONOMY, SOCIETY AND POLITY**

Levels of Colonialism

Concerning the levels of colonialism, a few points necessity be remembered.

- Appropriation of the surplus of the colony by the metropolis was the central characteristic of colonialism. Each level was characterised by a new way of surplus appropriation. As colonialism grew and matured from one level to another, it evolved new methods of surplus appropriation.

- There was no sharp break flanked by one level and the other. As one level evolved and grew into the other level, characteristics of the earlier level sustained into the later level as well. At the similar time some more characteristics entered the later levels to distinguish them from the previous level.
- Some shapes of surplus appropriation might be very marked in one colony but totally absent in some other colony because of separate historical factors. In other languages, all the levels of colonialism need not happen in all the colonies. Therefore, the third level was atrophied in India; the second in Indonesia and the first and the second in Egypt.

The First Level: The Era of Monopoly Deal and Revenue Appropriation

Throughout the first level of colonialism, the vital objectives of colonialism were:

- Monopoly of deal with the colony vis-à-vis other European merchants and the colony's traders and producers. Though, whenever handicraft men or other producers were employed on explanation of the colonial state, their surplus was directly seized not in the manner of industrial capitalists, but in that of merchant-usurers.
- The direct appropriation of revenue or surplus by the use of the state power. The colonial state required big financial possessions to wage wars in the colony and on the seas and to uphold naval forces, forts, armies and trading posts. Direct appropriation of the colony's surplus was also needed to finance purchase of colonial products. Directly appropriated surplus was also to serve as a source of profit to the merchants, corporations and the exchequer of the metropolis. The big number of Europeans employed in the colony also appropriated a big section of the colony's surplus directly by extortion and corruption or high salaries.

It is to be noted that:

- The unit of plunder and direct seizure of surplus is very strong throughout this level of colonialism; and
- There is no important import of metropolitan manufactures into the colony.

A vital characteristic of colonial rule throughout this era was that no vital changes were introduced in the colony as regards management, judicial system, transport and communication, ways of agricultural or industrial manufacture, shapes of business management or economic organization, education or intellectual meadows, society, and social organization. The only changes made were in military organization and technology, which modern self-governing chieftains and rulers in the colonies were also trying to introduce, and in management at the top of the structure of revenue collection so as to create it more efficient.

Why was this so? Because the colonial mode of surplus appropriation via purchase of colony's urban handicrafts and plantation and other products by a buyer's monopoly and by manage in excess of its revenues, did not requite vital socioeconomic and administrative changes in the colony. It could be superimposed in excess of its existing economic, social, cultural, ideological and political structures. Also the colonial power did not feel the need to penetrate the village deeper than their indigenous precursors had done as extensive as their economic surplus was successfully sucked out.

The Second Level: Use by Deal-The Period of Foreign Investment and International Competition for Colonies

The newly developing industrial and commercial interests in the metropolis and their ideologies began to attack the existing mode of use of the colony with a view to creation it serves their interests. Moreover, as it became clear that colonial manage was to be an extensive-term phenomenon, the metropolitan capitalist class as a whole demanded shapes of surplus appropriation which would not destroy the golden goose. It realized that the

plundering shape is less capable than others of reproducing circumstances for its advantage.

Industrial bourgeoisie's interest in the colony place in satisfying the need for outlets for their ever-rising output of manufactured goods. Connected with this was the need to promote the colony's exports. This was for many reasons:

- The colony could buy more imports only if it increased its exports, which could only be of agricultural and mineral products, to pay for them. Colony's exports had also to pay for the 'drain' or to earn foreign swap to give for the export of business profits and the savings and pensions of Europeans working there;
- The metropolis desired to lessen dependence on non-empire sources of raw materials and foodstuffs. Hence, the need to promote the manufacture of raw materials in the colony. The colonial rulers' necessity enables the colony to do so. The colony had to be urbanized as a reproductive colony in the agricultural and mineral spheres and
- As the subordinated complement of a capitalist economy, the use of the colony both as a market for goods and as a supplier of raw materials necessity occur within the perspective of extended reproduction.

Therefore, the essence of the second level of colonialism was the creation of the colony into a subordinate trading partner which would export raw materials and import manufactures. The colony's social surplus was to be appropriated by deal on the basis of selling dear and buying cheap. This level of colonialism could even embrace countries which retained political freedom. The colony could not be exploited in the new method within its existing economic, political, administrative, social, cultural and ideological setting; this setting had to be shattered and transformed all beside the row.

The transformation was actively undertaken under the slogan of development and modernization. In the economic field, this meant integrating the colonial economy with the world capitalist economy and above all, the

metropolitan economy. The chief instrument of this integration was the freeing of foreign trade of all restrictions and tariffs, 'especially in as far as its deal with the metropolis was concerned. For mainly of this era, the colony was to be distant more of a free trading country than the metropolis itself. Free entry was now given to the capitalists of the metropolis to develop plantations, trade, transport, and mining and in some cases industries in the colony. The colonial state gave active financial and other help to these capitalists, even when the doctrine of laissez faire reigned supreme at home. The agrarian structure of the colony was sought to be transformed with the purpose of creating the colony a reproductive one by initiating capitalist agriculture. Likewise, a major effort to improve the system of transport and communication was made.

Major changes occurred in the administrative field. Colonial management now had to be more extensive and comprehensive, if metropolitan products were to penetrate the interior cities and villages and the agricultural produce was to be drawn out of them. The legal structure in the colony had to be overhauled. Sanctity of contract and its enforcement became essential, if transactions needed to promote imports and exports were to become viable. It was throughout this level that the Western capitalist legal and judicial system was introduced in the colonies and semi-colonies. The changes, though, often related only to criminal law, law of contract, and civil law procedure; personal law, including that of marriage and inheritance, was often left untouched. Contemporary education was now introduced basically with a view to man the new vastly expanded administrative machinery, but also with a view to change the colony's society and society.

The second level of colonialism generated liberal imperialist political ideology and parts of imperialist statesmen and officers who talked of training the colonial people in the arts of democracy and self-government. It was whispered that if the colonial people 'learnt' the virtues of law and order, sanctity of business contract, free trade, and economic development, the economic interest of colonialism could be perpetuated even if the metropolitan power was to withdraw direct political and administrative management. One point

needs to be stressed in this connection: The colonial authorities did not deliberately set out to under develop the colony. On the contrary, their whole effort was to develop it so that it could complement, however in a subordinate location, the metropolitan economy.

The earlier shapes of surplus extraction sustained throughout this level and became a drag on its full working. Moreover, since the colony had also to pay the costs of its transformation, the burden on the colonial peasant rose steeply.

The Third Level: The Period of Foreign Investment and International Competition for Colonies

A new level of colonialism was ushered in as a result of many major changes in the world economy:

- Spread of industrialization to many countries of Europe, North America, and Japan;
- Intensification of industrialization as a result of the application of scientific knowledge to industry, and
- Further unification of the world market due to a revolution in the means of international transport. There now occurred an intense thrash about for new, secure, and exclusive markets and sources of agricultural and mineral raw materials and foodstuffs. Moreover, expanded reproduction at home and extended use of colonies and semi-colonies produced big accumulations of capital in the urbanized capitalist countries. There occurred simultaneously concentration of capital and merger of banking capital with industrial capital in many countries. This led to big-level export of capital and search for monopolized markets and regions where it could be invested. All the three features, namely, markets, sources of raw material, and capital export, were interlinked. As thrash about for the division and redivision of the world in the middle of the imperialist countries was intensified, fresh use was established for the older colonies. Their social surpluses and manpower could be used as counters in this thrash about.

Colonialism at this level also served significant political and ideological purpose in the metropolis. Nationalism or Chauvinism, adventure, and glorification of empire could be used to tone down the rising social divisions at home by stressing the general interests in the empire. More specifically, empire and glory were used to counter the growth of popular democracy and the introduction of adult franchise, which could have posed a danger to the political power of the capitalist class and which increased the importance of the ideological instruments of hegemony in excess of society. In this hegemony, the thoughts of empire played an increasingly significant role.

Where colonies had been acquired in the earlier levels, vigorous efforts were made to consolidate metropolitan manage. Reactionary imperialist policies now replaced liberal imperialist policies of the earlier level. To preserve direct colonial rule on a permanent basis was now seen essential on all counts, but especially, to draw metropolitan capital to the colony and to give it security. Once again the earlier shapes of surplus appropriation sustained into this level. In information, in some of the colonies, for instance, India, the earlier two shapes of surplus extraction remained more significant than the third one.

Politically and administratively the third level of colonialism meant more rigorous manage in excess of the colony. Moreover, it was now even more significant that colonial management should permeate every pore of colonial society and that every port, city, and village be connected with world economy. The management also now became more bureaucratic, detailed and efficient.

A major change now occurred in the ideology of colonialism. The talk of training the colonial people for independence died out and was revived later only under the pressure of anti-imperialist movements. Instead came the talk of benevolent despotism, of the colonial people being a permanently immature or 'child' people in excess of whom permanent trusteeship would have to be exercised. Geography, 'race', climate, history, social organization, society and

religion of the colonial people were cited as factors which made them permanently unfit for self-government. This was in stark contrast to the second level belief that colonial people were capable of being educated and trained into becoming carbon copies of the advanced European people and so, into self-governing nations.

Efforts at the transformation of the colony's economy, society, and society sustained throughout this level also however once again with paltry results. Though, the tendency urbanized to abandon social and cultural modernization, especially as the anti-imperialist forces began to take up the task. Colonial management increasingly assumed a neutral stance on social and cultural questions and then began to support social and cultural reaction in the name of preserving indigenous organizations.

Colonial Intervention in Indian Society

We would now focus on the impact that colonialism produced on several regions of Indian life and people. Indian economy slowly got connected to British economy in scrupulous and world capitalist economy in common. The British colonialism, in turn, penetrated into every region of Indian society.

Intervention in Social and Cultural Meadows

Beside with British rule also came a link with the West; and thoughts which were urbanized in Western Europe made their entry into India. By deal and travel, India had for centuries get in touch with not only with the countries of Asia but also with Europe. By these sources news of measures and happenings in Europe and elsewhere and details of the new thinking taking lay in the West were already reaching India in the 18th century. British rule not only hastened their arrival in India but the very nature of the foreign power quickened these powers with a regional meaning charged with immediacy and relevance. The intellectual life of the Indian people was influenced by such thoughts as democracy and sovereignty of the people, rationalism and humanism. These thoughts helped Indians not only to take a critical seem at

their own society, economy, and government, but also to understand the true nature of British imperialism in India.

These thoughts spread by several channels: education, the press, pamphlets and the public platforms. The spread of contemporary education, though, was very limited. If the foreign government initially neglected primary and secondary education, it turned hostile to higher education soon after 1858. As several of the educated Indians began to use their recently acquired modern knowledge to examine and criticize the imperialist and exploitative character of British rule and to organize an anti-imperialist political movement, the British officers began to press continuously for the curtailment of higher education. The structure and pattern aims, ways, curricula and content of education were all intended to serve colonialism.

A few other features of Indian education arising out of its colonial character should be noted. One was the complete neglect of modern technological education which was a vital necessity for the rise and development of contemporary industry. Another was the emphasis on English as the medium of instruction in lay of the Indian languages. This not only prevented the spread *of* education to the masses but also created a wide linguistic and cultural gulf flanked by the educated and the masses. Government's refusal to allocate adequate funds of education slowly reduced the educational standards to a very low stage. And because the students had to pay fees in schools and colleges, education became a virtual monopoly of the middle and upper classes and the municipality and city dwellers.

New thoughts, a new economic and political life, and British rule produced a deep impact on the social life of the Indian people that was first felt in the urban regions and which later penetrated to the villages. Contemporary industries, new means of transport, rising urbanization and rising employment of women in factories, offices, hospital and schools promoted social change. Social exclusiveness and caste rigidities were eroded; the total disruption of old land and rural relationships upset the caste balance in the countryside. However several of the evils persisted, the penetration of capitalism made social status dependent mainly on money and profit creation became the mainly desirable social action.

In the beginning the policies of the colonial state also encouraged social reform. Efforts were made to modernize Indian society in order to enable the economic penetration of the country and the consolidation of British rule. To some extent, the humanitarian instincts of some of the officials aroused by the glaring social Injustices enshrined in the Indian caste system and the low status of women in society also played a role. The Christian missionaries also contributed towards the reform of Indian society at this level. But very soon the vital conservative character and extensive-term interest of colonialism asserted themselves and colonial policies towards social reform were changed. The British, so, withdrew their support from the reformers and slowly came to face with the socially orthodox and conservative units of society.

Intervention in Economy

The exact nature of the colonial intervention in the indigenous Indian economy can be grasped by learning its power separately in dissimilar elements of the economy like agriculture, deal and industry.

Impact on Agriculture

The British brought in relation to the significant transformation in India's agricultural economy but this was not with a view to improving Indian agriculture but rather to obtain for themselves in the shape of land revenue, all surplus accessible in agriculture and to force Indian agriculture to play its assigned role in a colonial economy. Old relationships and organizations were destroyed and new ones were born. But these new characteristics did not symbolize a change towards modernization or its movement in the right direction. The British introduced two major land revenue and tenurial systems. One was the Zamindari system. The other was the Ryotwari system.

Whatever the name of the system, it was the peasant cultivators who suffered. They were forced to pay very high rents and for all practical purposes functioned as 'tenants-at-will'. They were compelled to pay several illegal dues and cesses and were often required to perform forced labour or begar. What is more significant, whatever the name or nature of the revenue system, in effect the Government came to inhabit the location of the landlord? Much later, especially after 1901, revenue rates were slowly reduced but then the agrarian economy had been ruined to such an extent and the landlords, moneylenders, and merchants had made such deep inroads into the village that it was of no practical use to the peasant cultivators themselves.

The greatest evil that arose out the British policies with regard to Indian agricultural economy was the emergence of the moneylender as an influential economic and political force in the country. Because of the high revenue rates demanded and the rigid manner of collection, the peasant cultivator had often to borrow money to pay taxes. In addition to paying exorbitant interest, when his crops were ready he was invariably forced to sell his produce cheap. The money-lender, on the other hand could manipulate the new judicial system and the administrative machinery to his advantage. In this regard the Government, in information, actually helped him, because without him the land revenue could not be composed in time, nor could the agricultural produce be brought to the ports for export. Even to get the commercial crops for export produced in the first example, the Government depended on the moneylender to persuade the cultivator by offering to finance him by loans. It is not surprising, so; that in course of time the moneylender began to inhabit a dominant location in the rural economy. In both the Zamindari and the Ryotwari regions, there occurred a big-level transfer of land from the hands of the actual cultivators of the hands of money-lenders, merchants, official and rich peasant. This led to landlordism becoming the dominant characteristic of land relationships all in excess of the country.

Intermediate rent receivers also grew. This procedure is referred to as 'Sub-infatuation'. The new landlords and zamindars had even less of a link

with land than the old zamindars. Instead of taking the trouble to organize machinery for rent collection, they merely sublet their rights to intermediate rent receivers. The impact of British rule therefore led to the development of a new structure of agrarian dealings that was very regressive. The new system did not at all permit the development of agriculture. New social classes appeared at the top as well as at the bottom of the social level. There arose landlords, intermediaries and moneylenders at the top and tenants-at-will, share-croppers and agricultural labourers at the bottom. The new pattern was neither capitalism nor feudalism, nor was it a continuation of the old Mughal arrangement. It was a new structure that colonialism evolved. It was semi-feudal and semi-colonial in character.

The mainly unfortunate result of all this was that absolutely no effort was made either to improve agricultural practices or develop them beside contemporary rows for increased manufacture. Agricultural practices remained unchanged. Better kinds of implements, good seeds and several kinds of manures and fertilizers were not introduced at all. The poverty-stricken peasant cultivators did not have the possessions to improve agriculture; the landlords had no incentive to do so, and the colonial Government, behaved like a typical landlord; it was interested only in extracting high revenues and did not take any steps to modernize and improve and develop Indian agriculture. The result was prolonged stagnation in agricultural manufacture. Agricultural statistics as accessible only for the 20th century; and here the picture was quite dismal. While overall agricultural manufacture per head fell by 14 per cent flanked by 1901 and 1939, the fall in the per capita manufacture of food granules was in excess of 24 per cent. Mainly of this decline occurred after 1918.

Impact on Deal and Industry

As with agriculture, the British Indian Government controlled deal and industry purely with a view to foster British interests. India, no doubt, underwent a commercial revolution, which integrated it with the world market,

but she was forced to inhabit a subordinate location. Foreign trade took big strides forward especially after 1858 and Rs. 213 crores in 1899. It reached a peak of Rs. 758 crores in 1924. But this growth did not symbolize a positive characteristic in Indian economy nor did it contribute to the welfare of the Indian people, because it was used as the chief instrument by which the Indian economy was made colonial and dependent on world capitalism. The growth of the Indian foreign trade was neither natural nor normal; it was artificially fostered to serve imperialism. The composition and character of the foreign trade was unbalanced. The country was flooded with manufactured goods from Britain and forced to produce and export the raw materials Britain and other foreign countries needed. Last but not least, the foreign trade affected the internal sharing of Income adversely. The British policy only helped to transfer possessions from peasants and craftsmen to merchants, moneylenders and foreign capitalists.

An important characteristic of India's foreign trade throughout this era was the constant excess of exports in excess of imports. We should not, though, imagine that it was to India's advantage. These exports did not symbolize the future claims of India on foreign countries, but the drain of India's wealth and possessions. We necessarily also keep in mind that the bulk of foreign trade was in foreign hands and that approximately all of it was accepted on by foreign ships. One of the mainly significant consequences of British rule was the progressive decline and destruction of urban and rural handicraft industries. Not only did India lose its foreign markets in Asia and Europe, but even the Indian market was flooded with cheap machine-made goods produced on a mass level. The collapse of indigenous handicrafts followed.

The ruin of the indigenous industries and the absence of other avenue of employment forced millions of craftsmen to crowd into agriculture. Therefore, the pressure of population on land increased. Therefore, it will be seen that industrial development in India till 1947 was slow and stunted and did not at all present in industrial revolution or even the initiation of one. What was more significant, even the limited development was not self-governing

but was under manage of foreign capital. Secondly, the structure of industry was such as to create its further development dependent on Britain. There was approximately a complete absence of heavy capital goods and chemical industrial without which rapid and autonomous industrial development could hardly happen. Machine-tool, engineering and metallurgical industries were virtually non-existent. Moreover, India was entirely dependent on the imperialist world in the field of technology. No technological research was accepted out in the country.

Intervention in Polity

Besides economy and social structure, British also sought to change the existing polity. The main objectives behind the intervention of this factor were to augment the profitability of the Indian possessions and to uphold and strengthen the British hold in excess of India. The administrative machinery of the Government of India was intended and urbanized to these ends. The main emphasis in this respect was placed on the maintenance of law and order so that deal with India and the use of its possessions could be accepted out without disturbance.

Civil Service

The Civil Service was brought into subsistence by Lord Cornwallis. The East India Company had from the beginning accepted on its deal in the East by servants who were paid low wages but who were permitted to deal privately. Later, when the Company became a territorial power, the similar servants assumed administrative functions. They now became very corrupt. By oppressing regional weavers and artisans, merchants, and zamindars, by extorting bribes and 'gifts' from rajas and nawabs, and by indulging in illegal private trades, they amassed untold wealth with which they retired to England. Clive and Warren Hastings made attempts to put an end to their corruption, but were only partially successful.

Cornwallis, who came to India as Governor-General in 1786, was determined to purify the management, but he realized that the Company's servants would not provide honest and efficient service as extensive as they were not given adequate salaries. He so enforced the rules against private deal and acceptance of presents and bribes by officials with strictness. At the similar time, he raised the salaries of the Company's servants. For instance, the Collector of a district was to be paid Rs. 1500 a month and one per cent commission the revenue collection of his district. In information, the Company, Civil Service became the highest paid service in the world. Cornwallis also laid down that promotion in the Civil Service would be by seniority so that its members would remain self-governing of outside power.

In 1800, Lord Wellesley pointed out that even however civil servants often ruled vast regions; they came to India at the immature age of 18 or so and were given no regular training before starting on their jobs. They usually lacked knowledge of Indian languages. Wellesley so recognized the College of Fort William at Calcutta for the education of young recruits to the Civil Service. The Directors of the Company disapproved of his action and in 1806 replaced it by their own East India College at Haileybury in England. Till 1853 all appointments to the Civil Services were made by the Directors of the East India Company, who placated the members of the Board of Management by letting them create some of the nominations. The Directors fought hard to retain this lucrative and prized privilege and refused to surrender it even when their other economic and political privileges were taken away by Parliament. They lost it finally in 1853 when the Charter Act decreed that all recruits to the Civil Service were to be selected by a competitive examination.

A special characteristic of the Indian Civil Service since the days of Cornwallis was the rigid and complete exclusion of Indians from it. It was laid down officially in 1793 that all higher posts in management worth more than \$500 a year in salary were to be held by Englishmen. This policy was also applied to other branches of Government, such as the army, police, judiciary, and engineering. In the language of John Shore, who succeeded Cornwallis:

- The fundamental principal of the English had been to create the whole Indian nation subservient, in every possible method, to the interest and benefits of ourselves. The Indians have been excluded from every honor, dignity, or office, which the lowest Englishmen could be prevailed to accept.

Why did the British follow such a policy? Several factors combined to produce it. For one, they were influenced that a management based on British thoughts, organizations, and practices could be firmly recognized only by English personnel. And, then, they did not trust the skill and integrity of the Indians. For instance, Charle Grant, Chairman of the Court of Directors, condemned the people of India as "a race of men lamentably degenerate and base; retaining but a feeble sense of moral obligation;....., and sunk in misery by their vices." Likewise, Cornwallis whispered that "Every native of Hindustan is corrupt." It may be noted that this criticism did apply to some extent to a small class of Indian officials and zamindars of the time. But, then, it was equally if not more true of British officials in India. In information, Cornwallis had proposed to provide them high salaries in order to help them resist temptations and to become honest and obedient. But he never thought of applying the similar adequate salaries to eradicate corruption in the middle of Indian officials.

In reality, the exclusion of Indians from higher grades of services was a deliberate policy. These services were required at the time to set up and consolidate British rule in India. Obviously the task could not be left to Indians who did not possess the similar instinctive sympathy for, and understanding of, British interests as Englishmen. Moreover, the influential classes of British society were keen to preserve the monopoly of lucrative appointments in the Indian Civil Service and other services for their sons. In information, they fought tooth and nail in the middle of themselves in excess of these appointments. The right to create appointment was a perpetual bone of contention flanked by the Directors of the Company and the members of the

British Cabinet, How could the English then agree to let Indians inhabit these posts? Indians were, though, recruited in big numbers to fill subordinate posts as they were cheaper and much more readily accessible than Englishmen.

The Indian Civil Service slowly urbanized into one of the mainly efficient and powerful civil services in the world. Its members exercised vast power and often participated in the creation of policy. They urbanized sure traditions of independence, integrity, and hard job, however these qualities obviously served British and not Indian interests. At the similar time they slowly came to shape a rigid and exclusive and proud 'caste' with a very conservative and narrow outlook. They came to consider that they had an approximately Divine right to rule India. The Indian Civil Service has often been described the 'steel frame' which reared and sustained British rule in India. In course of time, it became the chief opponent of all that was progressive and advanced in Indian life and one of the main targets of attack by the rising Indian national movement.

Army

The second significant pillar of the British regime in India was the army. It fulfilled three significant functions. It was the instrument by which the Indian powers were conquered; it defended the British Empire in India from foreign rivals; and it safeguarded British supremacy from the ever-present threat of internal revolt.

The bulk of the Company's army consisted of Indian soldiers, recruited chiefly from the region at present incorporated in U.P. and Bihar. For example, in 1857, the strength of the army in India was 31 1,400 of whom 265,900 were Indians. Its officers were, though, exclusively British, at least since the days of Cornwallis. In 1856, only three Indians in the army received a salary of Rs. 300 per month and the highest Indian officer was a subedar. A big number of Indian troops had to be employed as British troops were distant too expensive. Moreover, the population of Britain was perhaps too small to

give the big soldiery needed for the conquest of India. As a counterweight, the army was officered entirely by British officials and a sure number of British troops were maintained to stay the Indian soldiers under manage. Even so, it seems surprising today that a handful of foreigners could conquer and manage India with a predominantly Indian army. This was possible because of two factors. First, there was absence of nationalism in the country at the time. A soldier from Bihar or Avadh did not think, and could not have thought, that in helping the Company defeat the Marathas or the Punjabis he was being anti-India. Secondly, the Indian soldier had an extensive custom of loyally serving those who paid his salary. This was popularly recognized as loyalty to the salt. In other languages, the Indian soldier was a good mercenary, and the Company on its section was a good paymaster. It paid its soldiers regularly and well, something that the Indian rulers and chieftains were no longer doing.

Police

The third pillar of British rule was the police whose creator was once again Cornwallis. He relieved the zamindars of their police functions and recognized a regular police force to uphold law and order. In this respect he went back to, and modernized, the old Indian system of thanas. Interestingly, this put India ahead of Britain where a system of police had not urbanized yet. Cornwallis recognized a system of circles or thanas headed by a daroga, who was an Indian. Later, the post of the District Superintendent of Police was created to head the police organization in a district. Once again, Indians were excluded from all superior posts. In the villages, the duties of the police sustained to be performed by village-watchmen who were maintained by the villagers. The police slowly succeeded in reducing major crimes such as dacoity. One of its major achievements was the suppression of thugs who robbed and killed travelers on the highways, particularly in Central India. The police also prevented the organization of a big-level conspiracy against foreign manage, and when the national movement arose, the police was used to suppress it. In its dealings with the people, the police adopted an

unsympathetic attitude. A Committee of Parliament accounted in 1813 that the police committed "depredations on the peaceable inhabitants, of the similar nature as those practiced by the dacoits whom they were employed to suppress." And William Bentinck, the Governor-Common, wrote in 1832:

- As for the police so distant from being a protection to the people, I cannot better illustrate the public feeling concerning it, than by the following act, that nothing can exceed the popularity of a recent regulation by which, if a robbery has been committed, the police are prevented from creation any enquiry into it, except upon the requisition of the persons robbed: that is to say, the shepherd is a more ravenous beast of prey than the wolf.

Judicial Organisation

The British laid the foundations of a new system of dispensing justice by a hierarchy of civil and criminal courts. However given a start by Warren Hastings, system was recognized by Cornwallis in 1793. In each district was recognized a Diwani Adalat, or civil court, presided in excess of by the District Judge who belonged to the Civil Service. Cornwallis therefore separated the posts of the Civil Judge and the collector. Appeal from the District Court place first to four Provincial Courts of Civil Appeal and then, finally, to the Sadar Diwani Adalat. Below the District Courts were Registrars' Courts, headed by Europeans, and a number of subordinate courts headed by Indian judges recognized as Munsifs and Amins. To deal with criminal cases, Cornwallis divided the Presidency of Bengal into four Divisions, in each of which a court of Route presided in excess of by the civil servants was recognized. Below these courts came a big number of Indian magistrates to attempt petty cases. Appeals from the Courts of Route place with the Sadar Nizamat Adalat. The criminal courts applied Muslim Criminal Law in a customized and less harsh shape so that the tearing separately of limbs and such other punishment were prohibited. The civil courts applied the customary law that had prevailed in any region or in the middle of a part of the people since time immemorial. In 1831, William Bentinck abolished the Provincial

Courts of Appeal and Route. Their job was assigned first to Commissions and later to District Judges and District Collectors. Bentinck also raised the status and powers of Indians in the judicial service and appointed them as Deputy Magistrates, Subordinate Judges and Principal Sadar Amins. In 1865, High Courts were recognized at Calcutta, Madras and Bombay to replace the Sadar Courts of Diwani and Nizamat.

The British also recognized a new system of laws by the procedures of enactment and codification of old laws. The traditional system of justice in India had been mainly based on customary law which arose from extensive custom and practice, however several laws were based on the shastras and shariat as well as on imperial power. However they sustained to observe customary law in common, the British slowly evolved a new system of laws. They introduced regulations, codified the existing laws, and often systematized and modernized them by judicial interpretation. Their Charter Act of 1833 conferred all law-creation power on the Governor-Common-in-Council. All this meant that Indians were now to live increasingly under man-made laws, which might be good or bad but which were openly the products of human cause, and not under laws which had to be obeyed blindly and which could not be questioned as they were supposed to be divine and so sacred.

In 1833, the Government appointed a Law Commission headed by Lord Macaulay to codify Indian laws. Its labours eventually resulted in the Indian Penal Code, the Western-derived Codes of Civil and Criminal Procedure and other codes of laws. The similar laws now prevailed all in excess of the country and they were enforced by a uniform system of courts. Therefore it may be said that India was judicially unified.

The Rule of Law

The British introduced the concept of the rule of law. This meant that management was to be accepted out, at least in theory, in obedience to laws, which clearly defined the rights, privileges, and obligations of the subjects and

not just as to the caprice or personal discretion of the ruler. In practice, of course, the bureaucracy and the police enjoyed arbitrary powers and interfered with the rights and liberties of the people. One significant characteristic of the concept of the rule of law was that any official could be brought before a court of law for breaches of 'official duty or for acts done in excess of his official power. The rule of law was to some extent a guarantee of the personal liberty of a person. It is true that previous rulers of India had been in common bound by custom and custom. But they always had the legal right to take any administrative steps they wanted and there lived no other power before which their acts could be questioned. The Indian rulers and chiefs sometimes exercised this power to do as they wanted. Under British rule, on the other hand, management was mainly accepted on just as to laws as interpreted by the courts however the laws themselves were often defective, were made not by the people by a democratic procedure but autocratically by the foreign rulers, and left a great deal of power in the hands of the civil servants and the police. But that was perhaps inevitable in a foreign regime that could not in the very nature of things be democratic or libertarian.

Equality Before Law

The Indian legal system under the British was based on the concept of equality before law. This meant that in the eyes of law all men were equal. The similar law applied to all persons irrespective of their caste, religion, or class. Previously, the judicial system had paid heed to caste distinctions and had differentiated flanked by the so-described high-born and low-born. For the similar crime lighter punishment was awarded to a Brahmin than to a non-Brahmin. Likewise, in practice zamindars and nobles were not judged as harshly as the commoner. In information, very often they could not be brought to justice at all for their actions. Now the humble could also move the machinery of justice.

There was, though, one exception to this excellent principle of equality before law. The European and their descendants had separate courts and even

laws. In criminal cases they could be tried only by European judges. Several English officials, military officers, planters, and merchants behaved with Indians in a haughty, harsh, and even brutal manner. When efforts were made to bring them to justice, they were given indirect and undue protection and consequently light or no punishment by several of the European judges before whom alone they could be tried. Consequently, miscarriage of justice occurred regularly.

In practice, there appeared another kind of legal inequality. Justice became quite expensive as court fees had to be paid, lawyers occupied, and the expenses of witnesses met. Courts were often situated in distant cities. Law suits dragged on for years. The complicated laws were beyond the grasp of the illiterate and ignorant peasants. Invariably, the rich could turn and twist the laws and courts to operate in their own favor. The mere threat to take poor persons by the extensive procedure of justice from the lower court to the highest court of appeal and therefore to face him with complete ruin often sufficed to bring him to heel. Moreover, the widespread prevalence of corruption in the ranks of the police and the rest of the administrative machinery led to the denial of justice. Officials often favored the rich. The zamindars oppressed the ryots without fear of official action. In contrast, the system of justice that had prevailed in pre-British times was comparatively informal, speedy, and inexpensive. Therefore, while the new judicial system marked a great step forward in so distant as it was based on the laudable principles of the rule of law and equality before law and on rational and humane man-made laws, it was a retrograde step in some other compliments: it was now costlier and involved extensive delays.

- **MODERN INDIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT: ISSUES & APPROACHES**

The Colonial Context and Conception of Colonial Rule

The beginning of the 19th century, the procedure of colonization of India was complete. Henceforth, the foremost concern of colonial rulers was the consolidation of the gains, i.e., the maintenance of colonial rule. For this they needed supporters from in the middle of the subjected which could be achieved only by cultural and ideological hegemony. The making of a class of landlords and the educated urban middle class, mainly of who were absorbed by colonial administrative system and other colonial organizations, were steps to meet the needs of British Colonialism. The colonial education and other cultural undertakings geared towards the establishment of ideological hegemony. This was the social and ideological context in which the political thought throughout the early colonial rule urbanized. A dissimilar conception of colonial rule also urbanized throughout the course of the nineteenth century. It was based on an appreciation of the traditional organizations and practices.

Rammohan Roy sharp critique of several degrading features of Indian society was almost certainly what made him appreciate the advantages of being ruled by and associated with an enlightened nation like the British. Keshab Chandra Sen too held that British rule which appeared at a time of grave social and moral crisis was a divine dispensation and not a mere accident. God willed it so. He even held that the temporal sovereign was God's representative and sedition, so, was not only a political offence but a sin against God.

Rabindranath Tagore, Dada Bhai Nauroji, G.K. Gokhale, M.G. Ranade, as well as CR Das and Moti Lal Nehru-all spoke, in varying degrees of the benefits that British rule had brought to India. Said Gokhale in 1905: "The country enjoys now uninterrupted peace and order....". Nauroji noted that no educated native will prefer any other rule to English rule.

In the face of colonial repression and use, this conception of colonial rule i.e. of the British rule being beneficial, could not last for extensive. The

colonial rule was looked upon as an unnecessary evil and by the beginning of 20th century, anti-colonialism became integral to political thinking. Here we shall present the broad outlines of dissimilar streams in the anti-colonial thought in 20th century. Despite the appreciation for sure English values and organizations, all the stream of anti-colonial nationalist thought commonly held that colonial rule was dehumanizing and exploitative. In information, the roots of nationalist conception of colonial rule could be traced in the liberal custom of 19th century. Nauroji had laid the blame of 'material treatment it received at the hands of British rulers.' Gokhale blamed the British rule for 'steady dwarfing of a race in consequence of it's exclusion from power' which he measured an 'enormous evil.' The 20th century liberals, without refuting the 'civilizing' role of colonial rule, pleaded for the transfer of power.

The agenda for future nationalist conceptions of colonial rule was set by Tilak. The decade of 1920s was the decade of radicalization of anti-colonial thinking. A part of the educated youth, critical of Gandhi's thoughts and ways, sought to advance the understanding of British and to evolve new ways of political thrash about. The revolutionary nationalists appeared out of this trend.

Another trend was represented by the Socialist and Communists. The Communist Party of India came into subsistence with the inspiration and help of Communist International. Its conception of colonial rule has based on Lenin's theory of imperialism as the highest level of capitalism and Marx's articles on India in New York Tribue (1853). M.N. Roy's India in Transition and Rajni Palme Dutt's India Today, both stressed the integration of Indian possessions and economy with the British colonial economy to use India's raw materials. M.N. Roy, official ideologue of the Indian Communists in 1920s, accentuated the linking of anti-colonialism with the campaign against world capitalism. The procedure of radicalization of Congress led to the emergence of radical nationalism in the shape of Congress Socialist Party in 1934. The Congress socialist thinkers, particularly Jaya Prakash Narayan and Acharya Narendra Dev, made an effort to synthesize socialism with nationalism and to

press socialism in the service of nationalism, i.e. in the anti-colonial thrash about.

Renaissance and Social Reform

The Indian Renaissance and Social Reform movement challenged age-old traditions and customs which bound the Indian people in chains of servitude and bondage. The burning questions of caste-oppression, child marriage, Sati and so on became the focal point of several a reform movements. Attacks on idolatry and superstition were also a significant characteristic of these reforms.

Rational Critique of Religion and Society

We have seen above that the early thinkers of contemporary India were pre-occupied mainly with social and religious issues. The political questions were paid little or no attention. Rammohan Roy's first published job, Tuffat-ul-Muwahihhidin is a rational critique of religious systems in common and the role of vested interests in religion. Rammohan in his later writings exposed the irrationality of Hindu religious rituals and dogmas, and social evils such as sati, child marriage etc. He measured religious reform mainly essential for both social reform and political modernization. Therefore, the beginning of contemporary Indian thinking is marked by a critique of the existing social order. This critique was accepted forward by successors with a view to create a 'contemporary' society.

Rammohan Roy's first published job Tuffat-ul-Muwahihhidin was a relative revise of religion and a rational critique of religion and society, He attacked the belief in revolution, prophets, miracle and all types of superstitions like seeking salvation by bathing in a river and worshipping a tree etc., and pleaded for rational explanation and empirical verification as the only basis for truth.' Radh Kanta Deb, Henry Derozio of Hindu College, despite their criticism of Rammohan for his pro-British attitude, agreed with

him on the question of rational explanations. Akshay Kumar Dutt rejected religion supernaturalism and maintained that everything could be explained on the basis of cause and rationality. Naturally, so Brahmo Samaj and other streams of the reform movement in Bengal fought for widespread reforms in Hindu Society. Syed Ahmed Khan, Ranade and 'other thinkers too stood for a rational critique of Indian society. Jyotiba Phule challenged the legitimacy of the Hindu Social order based on caste-hierarchy and pleaded for social transformation on egalitarian grounds.

Rammohan's Tuhft not only forwarded the rational explanation and cause as the basis of truth but being a revise of relative religion, also contributed to the development of the thought of religious universalism and a universal outlook based on the element of Godhead and monotheism. Rammohan explained dissimilar religions in conditions of national embodiments of one universal theism. In Keshub Chandra Sen's view all the recognized religions were true and all the prophets having the similar Dir Keshub's notion of "Fatherhood of God" implied brotherhood of man".

Religious Revivalism

Religious revivalism was a trend within the reform movements which sought to reform religion, but differed in one significant respect. It sought to reform by an appeal to the past-the Golden Age, as it were. It sought to restore the glory of ancient religion. Mainly emerging from within the womb of Hindu Society, they tried to dexterously combine pristine religious purity with several contemporary values like individual liberty and democracy.

In the middle of the major religious reform movements of 19th century India, like Brahmo Samaj, Prarthana Samaj, Arya Samaj and Ramakrishna Mission, it was the latter two that really represented this appeal to the past. The Arya Samaj with its slogan of 'Hack to the Vedas' and the Ramakrishna Mission with its effort to resurrect vedantic Hinduism, however considerably dissimilar in their approaches to religion had the similar essential purpose of

reforming religion in conditions with changing times. They sought to set up to some degree, the freedom of individual, break the stranglehold of Brahminism and reform the caste system which had birth as its solid determinant of status. Therefore, Arya Samaj and its chief architect Swami Dayanand Saraswati, repudiated the power of the Brahmins and fought against the very thought of intermediaries flanked by God and his devotees. To that extent, they freed the individual from the tyranny of Brahmin priesthood. It opposed polytheism and associated meaningless rituals and superstitions which split the people into innumerable sects.

The Ramakrishna Mission which drew inspiration from saints like Chandidas and Chaitanya and was initiated by the rustic saint Ramakrishna, on the other hand idealized Hinduism, its polytheism and idol worship. Swami Vivekananda, its chief propagandist, was chiefly concerned that Indian nationalism which he said necessity fight the corrupting 'materialist powers' of the west. Unification and reform of Hindu society were a prerequisite to this end. There was therefore an essential unity in the religious revivalist movements, in conditions of the objectives. The Arya Samaj fought against the rigid, hereditary caste system and argued for the inclusion of guna character, Karma (action) and Swabhava (nature) as criteria for the basis of caste. Even Shudras, just as to it, could revise the vedas. It was this appeal of religious revivalism that drew hundreds of nationalist towards it and it therefore signaled a component of India's national awakening.

Liberalism: Dissimilar Strands

Liberalism is a political philosophy or worldview founded on thoughts of liberty and equality. Liberals espouse a wide array of views depending on their understanding of these principles, but usually they support thoughts such as free and fair elections, civil rights, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, free deal, and private property.

Liberalism first became a separate political movement throughout the Age of Enlightenment, when it became popular in the middle of philosophers and economists in the Western world. Liberalism rejected the notions, general

at the time, of hereditary privilege, state religion, absolute monarchy, and the Divine Right of Kings. The early liberal thinker John Locke is often credited with founding liberalism as a separate philosophical custom. Locke argued that each man has a natural right to life, liberty and property and just as to the social contract, governments necessity not violate these rights. Liberals opposed traditional conservatism and sought to replace absolutism in government with democracy and/or republicanism and the rule of law.

The revolutionaries in the American Revolution, the French Revolution and other liberal revolutions from that time used liberal philosophy to justify the armed overthrow of what they saw as tyrannical rule. The nineteenth century saw liberal governments recognized in nations crossways Europe, Spanish America, and North America. In this era, the dominant ideological opponent of liberalism was classical conservatism.

Throughout the twentieth century, liberal thoughts spread even further, as liberal democracies establish themselves on the winning face in both world wars. Liberalism also survived major ideological challenges from new opponents, such as fascism and communism. In Europe and North America, classical liberalism became less popular and gave method to social democracy and social liberalism. The meaning of the word "liberalism" also began to diverge in dissimilar sections of the world. Just as to the Encyclopedia Britannica, "In the United States liberalism is associated with the welfare-state policies of the New Deal program of the Democratic management of Pres. Franklin D. Roosevelt, whereas in Europe it is more commonly associated with a commitment to limited government and laissez-faire economic policies."

Today, liberal political parties remain a political force with varying degrees of power and power on all major continents.

M.G. Ranade

Ranade, a representative of the dominant liberal thinkers, articulated the interests of the rising Indian capitalist class. The central section of his argument was that the Indian economy should follow a capitalist path of development, if it is to solve her troubles. He argued that the state necessity

play an active role in economic development. He disagreed with the laissez-faire concept of state. He whispered that India could get rid of its phenomenal poverty and dependence on agriculture by industrialization and commercialization of agriculture, and the state necessity play an active role in such transformative procedure.

Ranade pointed out the immense progress of agriculture in France, Germany and Russia after the liquidation of feudal agriculture and introduction of capitalist dealings and peasant proprietorship.

Though, Ranade's advocacy of state intervention in economic behaviors did not provide the state unlimited sanctions, for he was a believer of individual freedom. Unlike the western liberal philosophers, though, Ranade's individual liberty was a concept that derived from his metaphysical thoughts which based themselves on the Upanishads. In his view God resides in everything in this universe, and so, in each human being. Therefore the freedom of conscience is the real freedom and the rights of conscience necessity take precedence in excess of all other thoughts. Man should then submit to the voice of his inner conscience alone and not to any outside force or power-religious or political. Though, this also means that individual freedom of action is to be used in a method that is does not impose restraints on the equally free rights of other people. Ranade was also a critic of the caste system which imposes external restrictions on human behavior. He supported the Bhakti movement because he thought the saints asserted the dignity of the human soul irrespective of birth.

The agency of social change and reform in Ranade's view was the elite stratum. In his opinion, ".....there is always only a minority of people who monopolize all the units of strength. They are socially and religiously in the front ranks, they possess intelligence, wealth, thrifty habits, knowledge and power. This elite group was composed of Brahmins, Baniyas, Zamindars and the educated middle-class." So, true to the aspirations of the capitalist class, he whispered that "power necessity gravitate where there is intelligence and wealth." His scheme for representation to Indians contained provisions for giving political power to the rich and educated. At the municipal stage, for instance, the elected seats were to be divided in the ratio of two to one flanked

by property holders and the intelligent class... However he did not consider such representation democratic, he nevertheless whispered that it was necessary as the masses were still incapable of electing 'worthy men as representatives. Generations of training and education were required before they could be made capable of it.'

Jyotiba Phule and B.R. Ambedkar

In contrast, Jyotiba Phule (1827-90) and B.R. Ambedkar (1891-1956) presented the other pole of liberal thought. The predominant power of Phule was the revolutionary liberalism of Thomas Paine. He maintained that all men and women are born free and equal. God had made them so and no one should suppress anybody else. They should so, have equality before law and equality of opportunity for entry into the civil service or municipal management.

In the light of this, naturally, the high caste politics of the Ranade School did not create sense to him, nor did the strategy of developing capitalism. Phule's main preoccupation on the other hand was liberating the downtrodden castes-the Shudras and Adi-Shudras from the grip of caste-slavery. He rejected the whole system of Hindu/ Brahminical mythologies and the cruel and inhuman caste laws that went with them. Whatever improvement was apparent in the circumstances of these people was the result of British rule. Unlike Ranade, Phule so, was a votary of mass education and criticized the British for diverting funds to higher education which was to him of secondary importance.

Fundamental to Ambedkar's approach for the upliftment of the 'untouchables' was their education. Education, for him, meant not only literacy but higher education. 'Untouchables' necessarily possesses self-respect and dissociates from traditional bonds of untouchability and refuse to do traditional untouchables' job. 'Untouchables' necessity is represented at all stages of government by their representatives. He was always firm on the question of 'untouchables' leading themselves, i.e.; producing their own leaders.

Further, for ensuring that the downtrodden castes got their due, he insisted that the government take responsibility for the welfare of its entire

people, create special rights for those who had been denied education and occupational opportunities. To this end, he visualized a strong central government with a clear-cut commitment for the welfare of its entire people. Phule's and Ambedkar's liberalism therefore despite a chronological gap, provided a counterpoint to the elite liberalism.

Nationalism

Nationalism is a belief system, creed or political ideology that involves a strong identification of a group of individuals with a nation. There are two major perspectives on the origins and basis of nationalism, one is the primordialist perspective that describes nationalism as a reflection of the ancient and perceived evolutionary tendency of humans to organize into separate grouping based on an affinity of birth; the other is the modernist perspective that describes nationalism as a recent phenomenon that requires the structural circumstances of contemporary society, in order to exist. There are several definitions for what constitutes a nation, though, which leads to many dissimilar strands of nationalism. It can be a belief that citizenship in a state should be limited to one ethnic, cultural, religious, or identity group, or that multi-nationality in a single state should necessarily comprise the right to express and exercise national identity even by minorities.

The adoption of national identity in conditions of historical development, has commonly been the result of a response by an influential group or groups that is unsatisfied with traditional identities due to inconsistency flanked by their defined social order and the experience of that social order by its members, resulting in a situation of anomie that nationalists seek to resolve. This anomie results in a society or societys reinterpreting identity, retaining units that are deemed acceptable and removing units deemed unacceptable, in order to create a unified society. This development may be the result of internal structural issues or the result of resentment by an existing group or groups towards other societies, especially foreign powers that are or are deemed to be controlling them.

National flags, national anthems, and other symbols of national identity are commonly measured highly significant symbols of the national society. Deep emotions are aroused.

Socialism

Socialism is an economic system characterized by social ownership of the means of manufacture and co-operative management of the economy. "Social ownership" may refer to cooperative enterprises, general ownership, state ownership, or citizen ownership of equity. There are several diversities of socialism and there is no single definition encapsulating all of them. They differ in the kind of social ownership they advocate, the degree to which they rely on markets or scheduling, how management is to be organized within productive organizations, and the role of the state in constructing socialism.

A socialist economic system would consist of a system of manufacture and sharing organized to directly satisfy economic demands and human needs, so that goods and services would be produced directly for use instead of for private profit driven by the accumulation of capital. Accounting would be based on physical quantities, a general physical magnitude, or a direct measure of labour-time in lay of financial calculation. Sharing would be based on the principle *to each just as to his contribution*.

As a political movement, socialism comprises a diverse array of political philosophies, ranging from reformism to revolutionary socialism. Proponents of state socialism advocate the nationalization of the means of manufacture, sharing and swap as a strategy for implementing socialism. In contrast, libertarian socialism proposes the traditional view of direct worker's manage of the means of manufacture and opposes the use of state power to achieve such an arrangement, opposing both parliamentary politics and state ownership. Democratic socialism seeks to set up socialism by democratic procedures and propagate its ideals within the context of a democratic political system.

Contemporary socialism originated from an 18th-century intellectual and working class political movement that criticized the effects of industrialization and private property on society. In the early 19th-century,

"socialism" referred to any concern for the social troubles of capitalism irrespective of the solutions to those troubles. Though, by the late 19th-century, "socialism" had approach to signify opposition to capitalism and advocacy for an alternative system based on some shape of social ownership. Marxists expanded further on this, attributing scientific assessment and democratic scheduling as critical units of socialism.

Revolutionary Socialism

The term revolutionary socialism refers to socialist tendencies that subscribe to the doctrine that a social revolution is necessary in order to effect structural changes to society. More specifically, it is the view that revolution is necessary to achieve a transition from capitalism to socialism. Revolution is not necessarily defined as a violent insurrection; it is defined as seizure of political power by mass movements of the working class so that the state is directly controlled by the working class as opposed to the capitalist class and its interests as a precondition for transitioning toward or establishing socialism.

Revolutionary socialism comprises a diverse range of social movements that sometimes describe "revolution" differently from one other. It comprises Orthodox Marxist tendencies such as Luxemburgism and Impossibilism, as well as Leninism and Marxism-Leninism - which are based on the theory of Vanguardist-led revolution; as well as revolutionary Syndicalism; revolutionary democratic socialism and anarchism.

It is used in contrast to the reformism of social democracy, which is not anti-capitalist, and is opposed to movements that seek to slowly ameliorate the economic and social troubles of capitalism by political reform.

Revolutionary socialism also exists in contrast to the concept of small revolutionary groups seizing power without first achieving mass support, termed Blanquism.

Origins

In the Communist Manifesto, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote:

- All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, self-governing movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air. However not in substance, yet in shape, the thrash about of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national thrash about. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie. In depicting the mainly common phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the basis for the sway of the proletariat.— Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels

Scholars have pointed out that the term "revolution" as used by Marx, Engels and their followers tends to refer to complete change of a social and economic nature by a mass movement of the "immense majority". In addition, if this revolutionary change was not opposed by the existing ruling elite, Marx and Engels contended, it could be accepted out peacefully. By contrast, the Blanquist view accentuated the overthrow by force of the ruling elite in government by an active minority of revolutionaries, who then proceed to implement socialist change, disregarding the state of readiness of society as a whole and the mass of the population in scrupulous for revolutionary change.

The reformist viewpoint was introduced into Marxist thought by Eduard Bernstein, one of the leaders of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD). From 1896 to 1898, Bernstein published a series of articles entitled "Probleme des Sozialismus" ("Troubles of Socialism"). These articles led to a debate on revisionism in the SPD, and can be seen as the origins of a reformist trend within Marxism.

In 1900, Rosa Luxemburg wrote *Social Reform or Revolution*, a polemic against Bernstein's location. The job of reforms, Luxemburg argued,

could only be accepted on, "in the framework of the social shape created by the last revolution". In order to advance society to socialism from the capitalist 'social shape', a social revolution will be necessary:

- Bernstein, thundering against the conquest of political power as a theory of Blanquist violence, has the misfortune of labeling as a Blanquist error that which has always been the pivot and the motive force of human history. From the first appearance of class societies, having class thrash about as the essential content of their history, the conquest of political power has been the aim of all rising classes. Here is the starting point and end of every historic era...In contemporary times, we see it in the thrash about of the bourgeoisie against feudalism.—Rosa Luxemburg, *Social Reform or Revolution*

Vladimir Lenin attacked Bernstein's location in his *What is to be Done*. When Bernstein first put forward his thoughts the majority of the SPD rejected them. The 1899 Congress of the SPD reaffirmed the Erfurt programme, as did the 1901 congress. The 1903 congress denounced "revisionist efforts".

The First World War and Zimmerwald

Vladimir Lenin, Leon Trotsky, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, jointly with a small number of other Marxists opposed to the war, came jointly in the Zimmerwald Conference in September 1915. This conference saw the beginning of the end of the uneasy coexistence of revolutionary socialists and reformist socialists in the Second International. The conference adopted a proposal by Trotsky to avoid an immediate split with the Second International. At first opposed to it, in the end Lenin voted for Trotsky's resolution to avoid a split in the middle of anti-war socialists.

In December, 1915 and March, 1916, eighteen Social Democratic representatives, the Haase-Ledebour Group, voted against war credits, and were expelled from the Social Democratic Party. Liebknecht wrote *Revolutionary Socialism in Germany* in 1916, arguing that this group was not a revolutionary socialist group, despite their refusal to vote for war credits, further defining, in his view, what was meant by a revolutionary socialist.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 and after

Several revolutionary socialists argue that the Russian revolution of October 1917 led by Lenin and Leon Trotsky follows the revolutionary socialist model of a revolutionary movement of the immense majority. By contrast, the October revolution is popularly portrayed as a putsch or coup d'état beside the rows of Blanquism.

Revolutionary socialists, particularly Trotskyists, argue that the Bolsheviks only seized power as the expression of the mass of workers and peasants, whose desires are brought into being by an organized force - the revolutionary party. Marxists such as Trotskyists argue that Lenin did not advocate seizing of power until he felt that the majority of the population, represented in the soviets, demanded revolutionary change and no longer supported the reformist government of Alexander Kerensky recognized in the earlier revolution of February 1917:

- "Lenin, after the experience of reconnoiter, withdrew the slogan of the immediate overthrow of the Provisional Government. But he did not withdraw it for any set era of time, for so several weeks or months, but strictly in dependence upon how quickly the revolt of the masses against the conciliations would grow."—Leon Trotsky

For these Marxists, the information that the Bolsheviks won a majority (in alliance with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries) in the second all-Russian congress of Soviets - democratically elected bodies - which convened at the time of the October revolution, shows that they had popular support of the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, the vast majority of Russian society.

In his pamphlet, *The Lessons of October*, published in 1923, Trotsky argued that military power place in the hands of the Bolsheviks before the October revolution was accepted out but this power was not used against the government until the Bolsheviks gained mass support.

The mass of the soldiers began to be led by the Bolshevik party after the 'July days' of 1917, and followed only the orders of the Military Revolutionary Committee under the leadership of Trotsky in October (also termed the 'Revolutionary Military Committee' in Lenin's composed works).

Yet Trotsky only mobilized the Military Revolutionary Committee to seize power on the advent of the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which began on 25 October 1917.

Following the Russian Revolution of 1917 the Third International was founded. This International became widely recognized with Communism, but also defined itself in conditions of revolutionary socialism. Though, in 1938, Trotskyists shaped the Fourth International because they thought that the Third International was lost to Stalinism; this latter International became recognized with revolutionary socialism.

Emerging from the Communist International, but critical of the post-1924 Soviet Union, the Trotskyist custom in Western Europe and elsewhere uses the term 'revolutionary socialism'. For example, in 1932, the first issue of the first Canadian Trotskyist newspaper, *The Vanguard*, published an editorial, "Revolutionary Socialism vs. Reformism". Today, several Trotskyist groups advocate "revolutionary socialism" as opposed to reformism, and are measured, and consider themselves, "revolutionary socialists". Luxemburgism is another revolutionary socialist custom.

Marxist Socialism

In Marxist theory, socialism, lower-level communism or the socialist mode of manufacture refers to a specific historical stage of economic development and its corresponding set of social dealings that eventually supersede capitalism in the schema of historical materialism. In this definition, socialism is defined as a mode of manufacture where the criterion for manufacture is use-value, where manufacture for use is coordinated by *conscious* economic scheduling and the law of value no longer directs economic action. Socialism would be based on the principle of *To each just as to his contribution*. The social dealings of socialism are characterized by the working-class effectively controlling and owning the means of manufacture and the means of their livelihood either by cooperative enterprises or public ownership and self management, so that the social surplus would accrue to the working class or society as a whole.

This view is constant with, and helped to inform, early conceptions of socialism where the law of value no longer directs economic action, and therefore monetary dealings in the shape of swap-value, profit, and interest and wage labor would not operate and apply to socialism.

The Marxian conception of socialism stood in contrast to other early conceptions of socialism, mainly notably early shapes of market socialism based on classical economics including Mutualism and Ricardian socialism, which unlike the Marxian conception, retained commodity swap and markets for labor and the means of manufacture. The Marxian conception was also heavily opposed to Utopian socialism.

Although Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels wrote very little on socialism and neglected to give any details on how it might be organized, numerous Marxists and neoclassical economists used Marx's theory as a basis for developing their own models and proposals for socialist economic systems and served as a point of reference for the socialist calculation debate.

Mode of Manufacture

Socialism is a post-commodity economic system, meaning that manufacture is accepted out to directly produce use-value as opposed to being produced with a view to generating a profit. The level in which the accumulation of capital was viable and effective is rendered insufficient at the socialist level of social and economic development, leading to a situation where manufacture is accepted out independently of capital accumulation in a supposedly *planned* fashion. Although Karl Marx and Frederick Engels understood *scheduling* to involve the input and decisions of the individuals involved at localized stages of manufacture and consumption, scheduling has been interpreted to mean centralized scheduling by Marxist-Leninists throughout the 20th century. Though, there have been other conceptions of economic scheduling, including decentralized-scheduling and participatory scheduling.

In contrast to capitalism, which relies upon on the coercive market forces to compel capitalists to produce use-values as a byproduct of the pursuit of profit, socialist manufacture is to be based on the rational scheduling of use-

values and coordinated investment decisions to attain economic goals. As a result, the cyclical fluctuations that happen in a capitalist market economy will not be present in a socialist economy. The value of a good in socialism is its physical utility rather than its embodied labor, cost of manufacture and swap value as in a capitalist system.

Socialism would create use of incentive-based systems, and inequality would still exist but to a diminishing extent as all members of society would be worker-owners. This eliminates the severity of previous tendencies towards inequality and conflicts arising ownership of the means of manufacture and property income accruing to a small class of owners. The way of compensation and reward in a socialist society would be based on an authentic meritocracy, beside the principle of "from each just as to his skill, to each just as to his contribution".

The advanced level of socialism, referred to as "upper-level communism" in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, is based on the socialist mode of manufacture but is differentiated from lower-level socialism in a few fundamental methods. While socialism implies public ownership (by a state tools) or cooperative ownership (by a worker cooperative enterprise), communism would be based on general ownership of the means of manufacture. Class distinctions based on ownership of capital cease to exist, beside with the need for a state. A superabundance of goods and services are made possible by automated manufacture that allow for goods to be distributed based on need rather than merit.

Intermediate Phases

The era in which capitalism becomes increasingly insufficient as an economic system and immediately after the proletarian conquest of the state, an economic system that characteristics units of both socialism and capitalism will almost certainly exist until both the productive forces of the economy and the cultural and social attitudes develop to a point where they satisfy the necessities for a full socialist society (one that has lost the need for monetary value, wage labor and capital accumulation). Specifically, market dealings will still exist but economic elements are either nationalized or re-organized into

cooperatives. This middle stage is sometimes described as "state capitalism" or "market socialism".

Social Dealings

The fundamental goal of socialism from the view of Marx and Engels was the realization of human freedom and individual autonomy. Specifically, this refers to freedom from the alienation imposed upon individuals in the shape of coercive social relationships as well as material scarcity, whereby the individual is compelled to engage in behaviors merely to survive (to reproduce his or herself). The aim of socialism is to give an environment whereby individuals are free to express their genuine interests, creative freedom, and desires unhindered by shapes of social manage that force individuals to job for a class of owners who expropriate and live off the surplus product.

As a set of social relationships, socialism is defined by the degree to which economic action in society is planned by the associated producers, so that the surplus product produced by socialized assets is controlled by a majority of the population by democratic procedures. The sale of labor power would be abolished so that every individual participates in running their institution as stakeholders or members with no one having coercive power in excess of anyone else in a vertical social division of labor (which is to be distinguished from a non-social, technological division of labor which would still exist in socialism). The incentive structure changes in a socialist society given the change in the social environment, so that an individual laborers' job becomes increasingly autonomous and creative, creating a sense of responsibility for his or her institution as a stakeholder. The individual is no longer alienated from his or her job: job becomes a means by which the individual fulfills his or her humanity (pursues his or her interests).

Role of the State

In Marxist theory, the state is "the institution of organized violence which is used by the ruling class of a country to uphold the circumstances of its rule. Therefore, it is only in a society which is divided flanked by hostile social classes that the state exists." The state is therefore seen as a mechanism

that is dominated by the interests of the ruling class and utilized to subjugate other classes in order to protect and legitimize the existing economic system.

After a workers' revolution, the state would initially become the instrument of the working class. Conquest of the state tools by the working class necessity take lay to set up a socialist system. As socialism is built, the role and scope of the state changes as class distinctions (based on ownership of the means of manufacture) slowly deteriorate due to the concentration of means of manufacture in state hands. From the point where all means of manufacture become state property, the nature and primary function of the state would change from one of political rule (via coercion) in excess of men by the making and enforcement of laws into a scientific management of things and a direction of procedures of manufacture; that is the state would become a coordinating economic entity rather than a mechanism of class or political manage, and would no longer be a state in the Marxian sense.

Sarvodaya and Anarchism

The political philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi as it urbanized throughout the course of his political behaviors maintained an essential stability with earlier strands of thought. The essentially Indian spiritual approach to politics, urbanized by Vivekananda and Aurobindo Ghosh establish its sustained expression in Gandhi. In 1909, in *Hind Swaraj*, he accepted the vital distinctions made flanked by society and state and India and the west. He extolled the spirituality of India and juxtaposed it to the violent, politically corrupt nature of the European state. His comments were reserved for the English parliamentary system; he described all western political power as brute force. His participation in politics was so apologetic. "If I appear to take section in politics, it is only because politics encircles us today like the coil of a snake..... I wish, so, to wrestle with the snake."

This being the attitude to politics, logically to Gandhi, the state was by definition abhorrent. It is in this sense, that from a totally dissimilar perspective, Gandhism and his Sarvodaya shared its mainly essential political trait with anarchist ideology. Gandhi, like Vivekananda whispered that if individuals are allowed freedom to express and pursue their interests, then as

section of their spiritual unity, they will slowly discover their identity of interests. This he whispered gave rise to a human nature that was essentially accommodative and compromising. To this end, he saw like his anarchist counterparts-Kropotkin and Tolstoy-the state as a major obstacle in the realization of individual freedom and social harmony. "The state symbolizes violence in a concentrated shape." He saw it as a soulless machine that can never be weaned absent from violence. In his ideal society, so, there is no state-political power. Since he saw in the state an essential centralizing tendency that curbs individuality he held that, "if-India is to evolve beside non-violent rows, it will have to decentralize."

Following Gandhi, Vinobha Bhave articulated this location as a leading exponent of Sarvodaya ideology. Vinobha visualized a total revolution transforming all features of life. The goal for him was to mould a new man.... to change human life and create a new world. The departure of the British had not brought Indian society any closer to Sarvodaya, the main obstacle to which was the centralized government. "Sarvodaya", just as to him, "does not mean good government or majority rule, it means freedom from government, it means decentralization of power." Central to Vinoba's conceptualization of politics and power is his distinction flanked by rajniti, the politics of power, and lok-niti, and the ethics of democracy. Lokniti strives to use the "potential powers of the citizen" and would abandon political parties and elections, arrive at decisions by consensus, and forge an identity of interest that would ensure continuing social harmony."

Subsequently, Jayaprakash Narayan accepted forward the Gandhian-Sarvodaya conception of politics. J.P. as a national leader remained primarily concerned with the abuse of political power in India, and therefore establishes himself perpetually in opposition to the Congress. He, too, was a strong advocate of decentralization of power and expanded and propagated the concept of party-less democracy.

- **REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Briefly discuss the impact of colonial intervention on agriculture.
- Briefly discuss Cornwallis' role vis-à-vis the Indian Civil Service.
- Briefly discuss the various contexts in which political thought developed during the early phase of colonialism.
- What did the thinkers of early 19th century India have to say by way of critique of the then society and religion?
- Write a brief note on the liberal strand of Indian nationalism.

CHAPTER 2

Socio-Political Reform in the 19th Century India

- **STRUCTURE**

- Learning objectives
- Introduction
- Raja Ram Mohan Roy
- Justice M.G. Ranade
- Gopal Krishna Gokhale
- Review questions

-

- **LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- The theme of socio-political reform in 19th century India and to acquaint you with the broad contours of the ideology underlying the socio-political reform movement and its legacy to modern India.
- Appreciate the role of, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, socio-religious reform movements in the making of modern India.
- Understand the Ranade's concepts of liberalism and nationalism.
- The development of Gokhale's political career and the formative intellectual influences that shaped his political thinking.

-

- **INTRODUCTION**

Circumstances Leading to the Social Reform Movement

The Indian Social Reform Movement was mainly, however not exclusively a product of the Western impact on Indian civilization. The Indian Civilization in the 18th century was under the power of many caste practices. Taboo on inter-dining and marriage and notion of pollution were some of them. The lot of the lower castes was the worst. They were treated as untouchables and required to stay in segregated localities since even their

shadow was deemed to pollute a high caste Hindu. They were not allowed to use village wells and were denied education. The orthodox measured these caste rigidities and taboos as divinely ordained and denigrated or condemned all attempts at change or progress.

After that to the lot of the lower castes, the location of women was particularly hard in 18th century India. Child marriage was widely prevalent and it was customary to marry young boys flanked by 10 and 16 to young girls flanked by 6 and 10. Since child mortality was high in those days, several young girls became widows even before reaching the age of physical maturity. These young widows were not allowed to marry and their plight was indeed mainly miserable. On the other hand, there was no bar on a widower and he was even allowed to have several wives. Polygamy was widespread in the middle of the high caste Hindus (the Kulin Brahmins of Bengal in scrupulous) as well as Muslims. Purdah was a method of life with both Hindu and Muslim women. They were usually never allowed to approach outside their chambers and could not illustrate their uncovered faces to the outside world. In short, Indian civilization was groaning under the tyranny of inhuman customs and traditions. The people had lost all feelings of humanity and justice. What was worse, the creative spirit of the people was being undermined.

The social reform movement of the 19th century was partly a response to the Western impact on a traditional civilization and to approach to conditions with the colonial challenge posed by the colonial attendance. Since the Western impact was first felt in Bengal, the western educated Bengalis were the first to raise the banner of reform. At in relation to the similar time the Indian civilization was also exposed to the behaviors of Christian missionaries. The missionaries like Alexander Duff, William Carey and Wilson propagated their religion by educated organizations they had started and spared neither money nor power to spread the faith. The missionaries presented Hinduism as a mass of superstitions and cruel practices and projected Christianity as the ideal faith.

Although the missionaries failed to achieve mass conversions, their zeal to propagate the faith bore a very dissimilar type of result. It aroused a new spirit of inquiry in the middle of the thoughtful Indians concerning their

own faith. It made them go back to the Vedas to discover out what was true Hinduism. Consequently, they refused to accept the prevailing ceremonies, rituals and taboos, in short popular Hinduism, as the true faith.

In England itself the 19th century was a period of great change and vitality. It was the age of the Reform Bill, of the abolition of slavery and the emancipation of women; of great prime ministers like Peel, William Gladstone, and Benjamin Disraeli and social workers like Florence Nightingale and Elizabeth Fry. The English educated Indian was highly influenced by the developments in England. A new social conscience awakened in the middle of the English educated intelligentsia of India. Raja Ram Mohan Roy initiated a social reform movement in Bengal, recognized as Brahmo Samaj which opposed the existing customs and practices of the Hindus. Akshay Kumar Dutt, Ishwar Chandra Vidya Sagar, Debendernath Tagore, Michael Madhusudan Dutt, Girish Chandra Ghose, Harish Chandra Mukherji, Raj Narain Bose and K.M. Banherjee were some of the earliest in Bengal recognized for their pioneering job in the direction of fighting superstition, cruelty and injustice practiced in the name of Hinduism.

The urge for reform also establishes expression in other sections of the country. Gopal Hari Deshmukh, Mahadev Govind Ranade and Jhotiba Phule in Western India, Kandukuri Veeresalingam and Narayana Guru Swami in South India, Dayananda Saraswati and Syed Ahmed Khan in North India were some of the prominent reformers in these regions. The combined efforts of these reformers and the movements they had initiated brought in relation to the important awakening in Indian civilization.

Broad Contours of the Social Reform Ideology

Revival versus Reform

It is often debated whether the reformers were or were not revivalists. They were, in a sense, both reformers and revivalists. They wanted to revive the best in our past and at the similar time discard or reform the prevailing inhuman and irrational customs. Ridiculing those who wanted to blindly return to the past, Ranade queried, —When we want to revive our organizations and

customs... what scrupulous era of history is to be taken as old?" Ranade correctly pointed out how customs and usages are constantly or ceaselessly changing. Secondly, to drive home the point that a mere blind revival of all past practices was neither wise nor practical, Ranade asked: Shall we require our Brahmins to turn into beggars and dependents upon the king as in old days? "The men and gods of those days ate and drank forbidden things to excess in a method no revivalist will now venture to recommend", said Ranade.

The reformers did not altogether discard the past and did not mind involving some of the traditions from the past. But they were not revivalists in the sense that they glorified everything that lived in an imaginary golden age. They were for a critical acceptance of the past. The reformers were careful men who had realized that if a return to the past was neither feasible nor welcome, then equally a complete severance from the past was impossible and undesirable. The reformist ideology stood for adjustment of the old to the new circumstances in a slow and careful manner. In the languages of Justice Telang, a reformer of Western India, "It was the duty of everyone to understand and appreciate the past and selecting all that was possible from it, apply it to the altered circumstances of today. All this was to be done with moderation, wisdom and right direction."

The Thought of Change and Progress

The reformers whispered in the law of development, of change and progress. They were critical of the Hindu doctrine of Karma or re-birth, just as to which our present plight was attributed to our past lives or deeds (Karma), and the notion of "maya" or illusoriness of the material world, because such beliefs caused the people to passively accept life and destroyed creativity. The reformers instead whispered that man could determine his own progress and was a responsible agent of change. To consider that our present was determined by our past and hence we should accept it with calm resignation was to consider in an uninspiring ideal which only perpetuated the status quo. The reformers whispered in progress. In information, Gopal Krishna Gokhale measured progress to be one of the revolutionary thoughts that had approach

to us from the West. A system that refused to change and adapt to new situations was destined to become a drag on civilization rather than serve to protect it or serve it.

The reformers sought to change those sectors of Indian civilization where the status quo had become not only a drag on civilization but also led to its political subjection and economic backwardness. To the reformers progress and change was a sign of life vitality and creativity. Ranade summed up this aspect of the social reform ideology when he observed, "The change which we should all seek is therefore a change from constraint to freedom, from credulity to faith, from status to contract, from power to cause, from unorganized to organized life, from bigotry to toleration from blind fatalism to a sense of human dignity. This is what I understand by social development, both for individuals and civilizations in this Country."

Individual as the Centre of All Things

The social reform ideology measured the individual as the centre of all human endeavors. Civilization moves round the axis of its individuals. The welfare and comfort of the individual in this world was the main source of inspiration for all the social reforms. The reformers refused to accept the argument of the Sanatanis that sati brought benefits to the women in future births. They argued for its abolition on the ground that it brought pain and suffering were very much influenced by the Western philosophy of individualism and the Benthamite doctrine of utility interpreted as the greatest good of the greatest number. The aim of social reform was to rediscover the individuals, to liberate his intellect and to create him or her once again free, creative and happy. The sense of human dignity necessity reasserts itself. The reformers rejected the notion that a thing had to be done basically because a power (priests or Shastras) had enjoined it. A thing should be done only if our cause told us it was conducive to mankind's present well-being and comfort. In other languages, they rejected the principle of medieval organization based on power and instead pleaded for a reformed organization based on cause.

This does not mean that the reformers were against religion or religious power as such. They were only protesting against blind acceptance of

whatever was said by men who spoke in the name of religion. For example, Ranade preached that we are the children of God, not of men, and the voice of God is the only voice we are bound to hear. We may so revere all human power and pay compliments to prophets and revelations, he argued, but should never let this reverence and respect approach in the method of the dictates of conscience, the Inner voice of cause within us, which he described as "the divine command in us."

Necessity Social Reform Precede Political Reform

One question that was persistently raised throughout the period of reform and is being raised to this day was: Necessity social reform necessarily precedes other (political and economic) reforms? One school, best represented by the Parsi reformer from Bombay, Malbari, was of the view that social reform necessity precedes political reform. The state, it was argued, is based on the family and hence before trying to reform the state. attempts necessity is made to reform or improve the family. A people with their houses debased, their women ignorant and superstitious, a people trammelled with all the old world prejudices and subject to cruel and inhuman customs, can never hope to enjoy or exercise high political privileges. This school whispered that all endeavors to achieve political reform (self-government) without fulfilling the preliminary circumstances of moral and social reform were bound to end in disappointment if not in disaster. This does not mean that the social reformers were against political freedom or driving the British out of India. They were all for ultimate self rule but felt that genuine political freedom or self-government would be possible only after the civilization had changed morally, become egalitarian and rid itself of caste disabilities and superstitions. As Raja Ram Mohan Roy argued, sure administrative events of British rule may deserve censure; but the social circumstances of the people, characterized by senseless and inhuman customs which undermine their vitality and debase their ideals, were infinitely worse. Hence he welcomed and even pleaded for the British connection as a necessary short time curative measure. Gokhale even measured British rule as "providential", a section of the divine plan to help Indians improve their lot.

At the similar time, it would be wrong to say that the social reformers did not realize the interconnection flanked by dissimilar features of civilization. That they were fully aware of this information becomes clear from Ranade's well-known languages, "You cannot have a good social system when you discover yourself low in the level of political rights, nor can you be fit to exercise political rights unless your social system is based on cause and justice. You cannot have a good economic system when your social arrangements are imperfect. If your religious ideals are low or groveling, you cannot succeed in the social, economic or political spheres. The interdependence is not an accident but the law of our nature". Though, their broad approach was to follow the row of least resistance. K.T. Telang explained this strategy therefore: "Secure first the reforms which you can secure with the least difficulty and then turn your energies in the direction of those reforms where more difficulty has to be encountered. You will therefore obtain all that vigor which the spirit of reforms necessity derive from success and therefore carry out the whole job of progress with greater promptitude than if you go to job the other method."

Another great figure of this period, Dadabhai Naoroji popularly recognized as the Grand Old Man of India took the stand that we should job for both political and social reform, but separately. Dadabhai took the stand that the Indian National Congress should consider only troubles in which all were equally interested rather than those which tended to create conflicts. Dadabhai said this while reacting to Malbari's aggressive campaign, both in India and in England, for the Age of Consent Bill which sought to prescribe a minimum age for marriage for Indian girls. In his well-known presidential address to the Indian National Congress, Dadabhai expressed the view that the National Congress should confine itself only to question in which the whole nation can directly participate like political reform or demand for self-government and leave the adjustment of social reforms and other class questions to class Congresses.

Ways of Social Reform

The 19th century reformers looked towards the state for help in achieving social reform however it would be wrong to say that the reformers were in excess of enthusiastic in relation to the legislation or measured it the sole way of reform. As the great reformer of the age, Sayaji Rao, the Gaekwad of Baroda, put it, "There seem to be two great ways of reform, legislation and persuasion. Of these the simpler and swifter is legislation, but on the other hand, it can only deal with scrupulous evils and its effects are less permanent and thorough. Moreover, in some compliments it seems more suited to our national temperament, which like that of some continental peoples in Europe prefers government action to popular initiative. But legislation cannot deal with great barriers which have their roots deep in social organization. This only education can deal with".

One thing is sure. The reformers were not prepared to accept the argument of militant nationalists like Tilak who insisted on political autonomy or self-rule preceding any effort at social reform and criticized the reformers for weakening and destroying national pride by their perpetual criticism of their heritage and their own past organizations and practices. Telang for example, maintained that the state had every right to interfere for the sake of justice and humanity, even if the Shastras were against the proposed measure of reform. The British Indian Government may have pledged itself to a policy of neutrality in religion by the Proclamation of 1858, Telang argued, but this did not provide the sovereign the right to abandon his paramount duty which was to protect the subjects from unjust harm. Ranade was more sophisticated in his support of state legislation. He pleaded with Tilak to see the variation flanked by the alleged interference due to foreign initiative and the so-described interference due to Indian initiative. He made it clear that in matters of reform, the initiative should be chiefly Indian, based upon its custom and dictated by the wisdom of the mainly representative and enlightened men in the society.

It is clear that the 19th century reformers were men of great caution. They were neither blind imitators of the western method of life nor reckless radicals. They stood for gradual; evolutionary and constructive change. This is

why we discover all of them emphasizing the role of education in enlightening the people and changing their hearts. They prized contemporary or western education mainly because they clearly perceived its emancipatory role. While in Eastern India the Brahmo Samaj started schools, in Western India the Prarthana Samaj did likewise. The Maharaja of Baroda made primary education free and compulsory in his state because, as he himself put it, without education "no solid progress can be made and without it no lasting progress can be maintained".

In a letter to Malbari who seemed too eager to have the British legislate reforms regardless of whether the people had been educated or not Telang wrote, "My faith in the education of public opinion as a great social force is approximately unlimited. And I consider that in the extensive run the results of education are not only more enduring, but what might appear paradoxical, more rapid than the results of such artificial remedies as are proposed in your note". The reformers put faith in human conscience. They whispered there was a universal conscience implicit in the individual conscience and this conscience was capable of being trained and perfected. It was to awaken the individual conscience, the individual's sense of right and wrong, that all the social reformers put such great emphasis on education.

Religious Reforms

The 19th century effort at religious reform had two features. The first sought to remove idolatory and religious superstitions and the second, to present a theistic ideal.

The Attack on Idolatory and Superstitions

The early social reformers adopted approximately an iconoclastic attitude towards idol worship and polytheism. The endeavor of the Brahmo Samaj, for example, was to remove from Hinduism all idolatrous practices. They measured the proliferation of gods and goddesses as later development, strange to Vedic age. The polytheism was sought to be justified on the ground that the spirit behind it was of pure monotheism. Raja Ram Mohan Roy refused to accept this argument, as the orthodox Hindu had a separate

conception of the individuality of every deity he worships. "Neither do they (the Hindus)", Roy contended, "regard the images of these gods merely in the light of instruments for elevating the mind... they are basically in themselves made objects of worship."

The apologists of image worship argued that idolatry were a harmless practice, "calculated to do much good and no harm". The reformers in reply pointed to the quarrels in the middle of the worshippers of dissimilar gods and sure practices associated with sure shapes of idol worship. Concerning the first point this is what Raja Ram Mohan Roy had to say, "So tenacious are these devotees in respect of the honor due to their chosen divinities that when they meet in such holy spaces as Hardwar, the adjustment of the points of precedence not only become occasions of warmest verbal altercations, but sometimes even physical blows and violence." Concerning the latter point, the Bengali reformers cited the cult of Krishna and Kali worship which were often accompanied by human and animal sacrifices and marked by 'use of wine and sexual license.

Some critics charged the early 19th century reformers and the Brahmo Samaj in scrupulous of being heavily influenced by Christianity and of trying to Christianizes Hinduism. This is not a fair charge. All that the early Bengali reformers were trying to do was to liberate and rationalize Hinduism and put it on a rational basis so that it may give a incentive to all-round progress without cutting the Hindus off totally from their past. These reformers can be compared to men like Bacon, Disraeli and Luther who struck hard at the roots of medieval European civilization. Like their European counterparts, the early Bengali reformers sought to raise their voice against blind acceptance of religious power and against the tyranny of priests and religious dogma.

The New Theistic Ideal

The 19th century religious reform movement not only repudiated polytheism, but more importantly, stressed the theistic tendencies in Hinduism. Raja Ram Mohan Roy made general cause with Christian and Muslim *Unirarianism*. He therefore opposed the Christian doctrine of Trinity, arguing that it was erroneous to conceive of God and his son and the Holy

Spirit as if they were three separate entities. The Brahmo Samaj claimed that only God defined as "the Eternal, Unsearchable and Immutable Being who is the author and preserver of the Universe can claim the unqualified and enthusiastic worship of all men without distinctions of caste, color, creed or race". The Brahmo Samaj claimed that such a conception was propounded in the Upanishads written by the ancient Hindu seers and sages. It wanted to reestablish Hinduism in this pristine, pure shape, freed from all superstitions and prevailing inhuman practices. It attacked the idolatrous tendency in all creeds and asked followers of all religions to return to one God.

Social Reforms

Although the reformers tried to rid civilization of all its blind beliefs and inhuman practices, there were two broad regions which appeared to be of the utmost concern to them. One was the pernicious caste system and the other was the plight of Indian womanhood.

Attack on the Caste System

The reformers' attack was against all custom-bound morality: but since caste typified this mentality at its worst, the reformers made it their prime target of attack. To fight caste the reformers resorted to a two-fold strategy. They firstly argued that caste was not section of the pristine and pure religion but a subsequent unhealthy development. Raja Ram Mohan Roy for example, quoted from the Mahanirwana Tantra to illustrate that caste was neither a barrier to marriage nor essential to the organization of civilization. He said "there is no discrimination of age or caste or race in the Saiva marriage as enjoyed by Siva, one should marry a woman who has no husband and who is not *__sapinda*‘, that is, who is not within prohibited degree of marriage." Roy measured the priests as the main culprits responsible for perpetuating the myth of the sacred origins of caste. He sceptically observes that men can be truly divided into four classes: "those who deceive, those who are deceived, those who both deceive and are deceived and those who neither deceive nor are deceived ".

Secondly, the reformers used rational arguments to illustrate that caste was doing more harm than good and that caste was not promoting the political interest of the Hindus. The division into numerous castes had destroyed all feelings of oneness and patriotism, in the middle of the Hindus separately from disqualifying them from undertaking any hard enterprise which required sustained and unified effort.

In the opinion of the reformers, caste set up a tyranny greater than that of any state or foreign ruler. Expounding the Brahmo philosophy, Sittanath Tattwabhusan in his book on the Philosophy of Brahmonism observes, "Whatever may have been our differences in the past, a general system of education is now happily leveling up these differences and raising us o a moral platform from which love, sympathy, cooperation and unity seem to be things higher and more valuable than all other things, When will the pernicious distinctions which are sapping the very life blood -of our nation be at an end, and India rise as a strong, united nation fit to fulfill the high destiny which Providence has ordained for her. There cannot be a surer truth than this that high destiny cannot be fulfilled without the utter destruction of the supreme root of all our social evils, the caste system."

The reformers not only criticized and preached, they also in their own method sought to put into practice their reforms, at times in rather extreme fashion. Debendra Nath Tagore, for example, went to the extent of discarding his sacred thread and appointed a non-Brahmin to the ministry of the Samaj and dismissed all Brahmins from the ministry who insisted on wearing their threads. Keshub Chandra Sen openly encouraged inter-caste manage and had his own daughter married outside his caste. The Brahmos started the practice of inter-caste dining. They opposed hereditary caste professions and gave recognition only to talent.

Education and Uplift of Women

The 19th century western educated reformers were profoundly moved by the plight of Indian women. We have briefly described the plight of Indian women in the 18th century, how the young girls were married off at the age flanked by Qand 10 years, how they were forced to live in purdah etc. Though,

the mainly pernicious custom of that century was sati and the Bengali reformers naturally concentrated on its abolition. Officially the British management was hesitant to interfere particularly after the annexation of Peshwa's kingdom. It was only in 1812 and 1817 that the British management sent positive instructions enjoining preventive events such as no woman should be forcibly dragged to the pyre against her will or be forced to commit sati when pregnant or minor. It was when some citizens made petitions to the Governor Common against these progressive orders of 1812 and 1817 that Raja Ram Mohan Roy came out powerfully to the rescue of Indian women and made a counter petition in 1818 narrating the gruesome practices associated with Sati and condemning it as murder.

In his petition the Raja narrated how women were persuaded by their after that heirs to commit Sati; how some women who in their first moments of grief rashly expressed the desire to perform Sati, were later forced upon the pyre and "bound down with ropes and pressed with green bamboos until consumed by the flames." In their fight against Sati, the reformers did not hesitate to use the scriptures against their opponents. Raja Ram Mohan Roy cited Manu, Yajnavalkya and others to illustrate that Sati was never compulsory. The very information that Manu enjoins a women to live "voluntarily on pure flowers, roots and fruits... and not pronouncing the name of another man", meant that she was not obliged to commit Sati, he argued.

Ram Mohan Roy brought out many tracts and pamphlets in Bengali condemning Sati. The Bengali reformers refuted all the arguments forwarded by orthodox in favor of Sati, viz., a) failure to perform Sati would mean re-birth as an animal, b) its observance meant enjoyment with husband for eternity, c) it expiated the sins of her husband's maternal and paternal ancestors up to three generations. The reformers dismissed these arguments as metaphysical and not provable since one really did not know with certainty anything that legislation necessity seek to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number on this earth. The women's happiness when alive was more significant than any promise of happiness hereafter or in the after that life. The reformers also condemned several other inhuman practices such as the sale of daughters to prospective husbands and polygamy. They also sought

to restore to women the rights of inheritance-bestowed on her by the ancient law givers like Vajnavalkya, Narad and Vyas.

Political Liberalism

The 19th century reformers were liberals. The essential thoughts of their political liberalism may be summed up as: individual freedom, constitutionalism and representative government.

Freedom, Law and Cause

Mainly of the reformers were influenced by Western learning. Western philosophers like Kant and Mill particularly influenced them. Ranade who was much influenced by Kantian ethics understood freedom or liberty as essentially implying the freedom of the moral will. Man alone in the middle of all animals possesses the capability to distinguish flanked by right and wrong and hence he necessity have the liberty to choose flanked by right and wrong. To quote Ranade, "Freedom means being responsible Co the voice of God in us." Liberals did not understand liberty to mean freedom to seek any substance of desire; rather they understood it as the freedom to follow out higher nature (moral self) by willingly discarding passions and desires of the lower order. They regarded state and civilization as meaningful only because they contributed to the development of such moral freedom. A liberal civilization allows citizens to live just as to the dictates of their conscience while a liberal state gives the legal and political atmosphere conducive to such a life. Freedom therefore understood was not in contradiction to either cause or law.

Constitutionalism and Representative Government

Indian liberal reformers looked to the state for doing several things. But at the similar time, they were aware that absolute power corrupts and degrades the rulers. This is why they also opposed centralization and pleaded for a constitutional structure which made government responsible to the people and ensured their participation on public affairs. Government should be by laws and not arbitrary. It should be decentralized. The view of the reformers stemmed from their revise of the philosophy of John Stuart Mill

who wanted Government itself to assume responsibility for exploring avenues for increased participation of the people as a means to their political education. Gokhale testified before the Royal Commission on Decentralization therefore: "The car of-management should not merely roll in excess of (people's) bodies... them necessity themselves be permitted to pull at the ropes."

The liberals also urged the bureaucracy to abandon its self-imposed unhealthy seclusion, its attitude of high caste, of super-Brahmins. Bureaucracy necessity become sensitive to Indian public opinion and shed its veil of secrecy. Speaking on the Official Secrets Act (1903), Gokhale urged Government not to issue too several confidential circulars since official secrecy encourages rumors which can only damage the people's image of Government. Time and again the Liberals urged the bureaucracy to become more responsive and mix and interact with the people.

The liberals advocated political and administrative reforms which would create for increased people's participation. They pleaded for strengthening municipal government. They urged the establishment of District Advisory Councils. Men like Surendranath Bannerjee and Dadabhai Naoroji concentrated on the question of employment of Indians in higher services and connected the issue of holding free and equal competitive examinations for recruitment to the Indian Civil Service with association of Indians with management. The argument for the Indianization of services was made on economic, political and moral grounds. The exclusion of Indians not only meant a drain of wealth from India by method of payment of salaries and pensions to foreign bureaucrats, it also resulted as Dadabhai pointed out, in the "Dwarfing of the race," The abilities of the people were becoming less by disuse and the people were beginning to lose confidence in the government and British rule.

To rouse political consciousness and augment political participation, the liberals recognized several associations. In Bengal there were the British India Association and the Indian Association. In Bombay we had the Bombay Association started by Jagannath Shanker Seth and Dadabhai Naoroji. In Poona there was the Sarvajanic Sabha under Chiplunkar and others. In 1882, Alan Octavian Hume, an Englishman and a retired Secretary to the

Government, took the lead in forming the National Congress. In an open letter to the graduates of the Calcutta University, he said, "Constituting as you do, a big body of the mainly highly educated Indians, you should in the natural order of things, constitute also the mainly significant source of all mental, social and political progress in India." The Congress from its very inception attracted Indian liberals and several great names were associated with it. Dadabhai Naoroji was its dominating figure till 1906. Gokhale, Phirozeshaw Mehta, W.C. Bonnerjie, Surendranath Bannerji, Badruddin Tyabji, K.T. Telang, R.C. Dutt and Rash Behari Ghosh were other great stalwarts associated with the Congress flanked by 1885 and 1905. All these liberals were unanimous on two counts; One, there necessity be a definite however slow movement towards the ideal of self-rule; and two, the highest political development India should aspire to, should be self-rule within the framework of the British empire.

It was the political aspiration of the liberals to see the several Indian societies like the Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, and Parsis, join jointly in political organizations from regional Boards and Municipalities to the very top in the Imperial Legislative Council. The liberal were sure of one thing: If the Indian people were not treated as equal participants in government, they would become more critics of the government and as Gokhale pointed out, once the limits of fair criticism are reached, there can be only unfair criticism.

Economic Nationalism and the Welfare State Thought

The 19th century Liberals had also urbanized a powerful critique of British economic policy and drew up plans for economic reconstruction based on state intervention. Critics like Romesh Dutt clearly perceived how the British policy of developing Indian markets for the advancement of her own industries was proving disastrous for the country. The British policy resulted not only in destroying Indian urban handicrafts but also forced the urban unemployed artisans to go back to villages, which, in turn, increased the pressure on Indian agriculture, resulting in further subdivision of land, growth of unproductive debt (due to improvident borrowing and unscrupulous lending), often leading to the transfer of land to the non-agriculturists.

Dadabhai Naoroji, the Grand Old Man of India, propounded his well-known "Drain theory" to indicate how the British were draining absent the wealth of India. Comparing British rule with the earlier regimes, Dadabhai admits that the Mughals and the Marathas may have plundered and looted but their wealth remained within India. Individual subjects may have suffered but not the country as a whole. Again Dadabhai admits that under native rulers, the taxes may have been heavy but the proceeds stayed within the country. With the British, not only was the tax burden high, but the proceeds too were sent out of the country. Dadabhai accused the British of perpetually draining absent India's wealth in the shape of a diversity of payments viz. interest, pensions, furlough allowances of the British army, House charges, etc. This "drain" prevented India, Dadabhai argued, from accumulating capital with which Indians could start industries or deal.

Gokhale studied the causes of rural indebtedness and opined that the remedy to reduce indebtedness place in providing credit to agriculturists by starting Agricultural Banks and Credit Co-operative Civilizations. Ranade wanted state farms to be set up as model farms and to develop undeveloped land. In short, we can say that the Indian liberals stood (unlike the laissez faire Liberals of the West) for a welfare state. We may even provide them the credit for evolving the concept of a welfare state, if not in conditions of theoretical constructs, at least empirically in conditions of the needs of a backward economy. The welfare schemes they proposed related mainly to three regions: agriculture and industrial development, public health, and sanitation and public education.

●

● **RAJA RAM MOHAN ROY**

Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Ram Mohun also spelled Rammohun, Rammohan, or Ram Mohan (22 May 1772 – 27 September 1833), was an Indian religious, social, and educational reformer who challenged traditional Hindu civilization and indicated the rows of progress for Indian civilization under British rule. He is also described the "Maker of Contemporary India" and "Father of Contemporary India". He, beside with Dwarkanath Tagore and other Bengalis, founded the *Brahmo Sabha* in 1828, which engendered the

Brahmo Samaj, an influential Indian socio-religious reform movement throughout the Bengal Renaissance. His power was apparent in the meadows of politics, public management, and education, as well as religion. He is recognized for his efforts to abolish sati, the Hindu funeral practice in which the widow immolated herself on her husband's funeral pyre, and child marriage.

Biography

Early Life and Education (1772–1792)

Roy was born in a Bengali Hindu family in Radhanagore, Hooghly, Bengal (now West Bengal), in 22 May 1772, into the Rarhi Brahmin caste of Sandilya Gotra (family name Bandyopadhyay). His family backdrop displayed religious diversity; his father Ramkanto Roy was a Vaishnavite, while his mother Tarinidevi was from a Shaivite family. This was unusual for Vaishnavites did not commonly marry Shaivites at that time. Therefore, one parent wanted him to be a scholar, a *sastrin*, while the other wanted him to have a career dedicated to the *laukik*, which was secular public management. He wandered approximately the Himalayas and went to Tibet.

Early Political and Religious Career (1792–1820)

Raja Rammohan Roy's impact on contemporary Indian history concerned a revival of the ethics principles of the Vedanta school of philosophy as establish in the Upanishads. He preached in relation to the unity of God, made early translations of Vedic scriptures into English, co-founded the Calcutta Unitarian Civilization, founded the Brahmo Samaj, and campaigned against sati. He sought to integrate Western civilization with characteristics of his own country's traditions. He recognized schools to modernize a system of education in India.

Throughout these overlapping eras, Ram Mohan Roy acted as a political agitator and agent, while being employed by the East India Company and simultaneously pursuing his vocation as a Pandit.

In 1792, the British Baptist shoemaker William Carey published his missionary tract *An Enquiry of the Obligations of Christians to Use Means for*

the Conversion of Heathens. In the following year, William Carey landed in India to settle. His objective was to translate, publish and distribute the Bible in Indian languages and propagate Christianity to the Indian peoples. He whispered the "mobile" (i.e. service classes) Brahmins and Pundits were mainly able to help him in this endeavour, and he began gathering them. He learned the Buddhist and Jain religious works as a means to improve his argument in promotion for Christianity in the cultural context. In 1795, Carey made get in touch with a Sanskrit scholar, the Tantric Hariharananda Vidyabagish, who later introduced him to Ram Mohan Roy; Roy wished to learn English.

Flanked by 1796 and 1797 the trio of Carey, Vidyavagish and Roy fabricated a spurious religious job recognized as the *Maha Nirvana Tantra* (or "Book of the Great Liberation") and attempted to portray it as an ancient religious text to "the One True God". The document's judicial parts were used in the law courts of the English Resolution in Bengal as Hindu Law for adjudicating upon property disputes of the zamindari. Though, British magistrates and collectors began to suspect it as a forgery; its usage, as well as the reliance on pundits as sources of Hindu Law, was quickly deprecated. Vidyavagish has a brief falling out with Carey and separated from the group but maintained ties with Ram Mohan Roy.

In 1799, Carey was joined by missionary Joshua Marshman and the printer William Ward at the Danish resolution of Serampore.

From 1803 to 1815, Rammohan served the East India Company's "Writing Service", commencing as private clerk "munshi" to Thomas Woodforde, Registrar of the Appellate Court at Murshidabad, whose distant nephew, also a Magistrate, later made a livelihood off the spurious *Maha Nirvana Tantra* under the pseudonym Arthur Avalon. In 1815, Raja Ram Mohan Roy shaped "Atmiya Sabhan", and spent several years at Rangpur and elsewhere with Digby, where he renewed his contacts with Hariharananda. William Carey had, by this time, settled at Serampore and the trio renewed their association with one another. William Carey was also aligned with the English Company, then headquartered at Fort William, and his religious and political ambitions were increasingly intertwined.

The East India Company was taking money from India at a rate of three million pounds a year in 1838. Ram Mohan Roy estimated how much money was being driven out of India and where it was headed towards. He predicted that approximately half of the total revenue composed in India was sent out to England, leaving India to fill taxes with the remaining money.

At the turn of the 19th century, the Muslims, although considerably decreased after the battles of Plassey and Buxar, still posed a political threat to the Company. Rammohan was now chosen by Carey to be the agitator in the middle of them.

Under Carey's secret tutelage in the after that two decades, Rammohan launched his attack against the bastions of Hinduism of Bengal, namely his own Kulin Brahmin priestly clan (then in manage of the several temples of Bengal) and their priestly excesses. The social and theological issues Carey chose for Rammohan were calculated to weaken the hold of the dominant Kulin class, especially their younger disinherited sons forced into service that constituted the mobile gentry or "bhadralok" of Bengal, from the Mughal zamindari system and align them to their new overlords of Company. The Kulin excesses targeted incorporated child marriage and dowry. In information, Carey tried to convert Raja to Christianity and appointed a religious priest to attempt to convert Raja, although the priest later accepted Hinduism.

Middle "Brahmo" Era (1820–1830)

Commenting on his published works, Sivanath Sastri wrote that Roy was section of a second appeal to the Christian Public. Brahmanical Magazine Sections I, II and III, with Bengali translation and a new Bengali newspaper described Sambad Kaumudi, was processed in 1821. In 1822, A Persian paper described *Mirat-ul-Akbar* contained a tract entitled "Brief Remarks on Ancient Female Rights"; a book in Bengali described Answers to Four Questions was released the similar year. The third and final appeal to the Christian public took lay in 1823. Roy wrote a letter to Rev. H. Ware on the "Prospects of Christianity in India" and an "Appeal for Famine-Smitten Natives in Southern India" in 1824. A Bengali tract on the qualifications of a God-loving

householder, a tract in Bengali on a controversy with a Kayastha, and a Grammar of the Bengali language in English were written in 1826. A Sanskrit tract on "Divine Worship by Gayatri" with an English translation, the edition of a Sanskrit treatise against caste, and the previously noticed tract described "Answer of a Hindu to the Question" was released in 1827. A shape of divine worship and a collection of hymns were composed by Roy and his friends in 1828. In 1829, "Religious Instructions founded on Sacred Authorities" was published in English and Sanskrit; a Bengali tract described "Anusthan" was also published that year. A petition against Suttee also took lay in 1829. In 1830, Roy was in charge of a Bengali tract, a Bengali book concerning the Bengali language, the trust deed of the Brahmo Samaj, an address to Lord William Bentinck congratulating him for the abolition of Sati, a document in English of the arguments concerning the burning of widows, and a tract in English on the disposal of ancestral property by Hindus.

Life in England and Death (1830–1833)

In 1830, Ram Mohan Roy traveled to the United Kingdom from the Khejuri Port, which was then the sea port of Bengal and is currently in East Midnapore, West Bengal. He was the first person amongst the educated Indians, to sail to England in 1830. At the time, Roy was an ambassador of the Mughal emperor Akbar II, who conferred on him the title of Raja to convince the British government for welfare of India and to ensure that the Lord Bentick's regulation banning the practice of Sati was not overturned. Roy also visited France.

Roy died in Britain at Stapleton, Bristol, on 27 September 1833. The cause of his death was meningitis; he was buried in Arnos Vale Cemetery in southern Bristol.

Personal

Ram Mohan Roy was married thrice. His third wife, Devi Uma, outlived him.

Roy's political backdrop influenced his social and religious to reforms of Hinduism. He wrote: "The present system of Hindus is not well calculated

to promote their political interests.... It is necessary that some change should take lay in their religion, at least for the sake of their political advantage and social comfort."

Rammohan Roy's experience working with the British government taught him that Hindu traditions were often not respected or thought as credible by Western standards; this affected his religious reforms. He wanted to legitimize Hindu traditions to his European acquaintances by proving that "superstitious practices which deform the Hindu religion have nothing to do with the pure spirit of its dictates! " The "superstitious practices" Rammohan Roy objected incorporated sati, caste rigidity, polygamy and child marriages.

Religious Reforms

The religious reforms of Roy contained in beliefs of the Brahmo Samaj expounded by Rajnarayan Basu are: Brahmos consider that the fundamental doctrines of Brahmoism are at the basis of every religion, followed by man; Brahmos consider in the subsistence of One Supreme God, and worship Him alone. Brahmos consider that worship of Him needs no fixed lay or time.

Social Reforms of Raja Ram Mohan Roy

Roy demanded property inheritance rights for women and, in 1828, set up the *Brahmo Sabha*, which was a movement of reformist Bengali's shaped to fight against social evils.

Roy's political backdrop influenced his social and religious to reforms of Hinduism. He wrote: "The present system of Hindus is not well calculated to promote their political interests.... It is necessary that some change should take lay in their religion, at least for the sake of their political advantage and social comfort."

Rammohan Roy's experience working with the British government taught him that Hindu traditions were often not respected or thought as credible by Western standards; this affected his religious reforms. He wanted to legitimize Hindu traditions to his European acquaintances by proving that "superstitious practices which deform the Hindu religion have nothing to do with the pure spirit of its dictates! " The "superstitious practices" Rammohan

Roy objected incorporated sati, caste rigidity, polygamy and child marriages. These practices were often the reasons British officials claimed moral superiority in excess of the Indian nation. Ram Mohan Roy's thoughts of religion sought to create a fair and present civilization by implementing humanitarian practices alike to Christian ideals and therefore legitimize Hinduism in the contemporary world.

Educationist

Roy whispered education to be an implement for social reform. In 1817, in collaboration with David Hare, he set up the Hindu College at Calcutta. In 1822, Roy founded the Anglo-Hindu school, followed four years later by the Vedanta College, where he insisted that his teachings of monotheistic doctrines be incorporated with "contemporary, western curriculum"; Vedanta College offered courses as a synthesis of Western and Indian learning. In 1830, he helped Alexander Duff in establishing the Common Assembly's Institution, by providing him the venue vacated by *Brahma Sabha* and getting the first batch of students. Roy supported induction of western learning into Indian education. He advocated the revise of English, science, western medicine and technology. He spent his money on a college to promote these studies.

Journalist

Roy published magazines in English, Hindi, Persian, and Bengali. He published Brahmonical Magazine in English in 1821. One notable magazine of his was the *Sambad Kaumudi*, published in 1821. In 1822, Ram Mohan published Mirat-ul-Akbar in Persian language.

Brahmonical Magazine ceased to exist after publication of few issues. But Sambad Kaumudi, news weekly, sheltered topics such as freedom of press, induction of Indians into high ranks of service and separation of the executive and judiciary. Sambad Kaumudi became bi-weekly in January 1830 and sustained for 33 years.

He published newspaper to register his protest against the introduction of Press Ordinance of 1823. The ordinance stated that a license from the

Governor Common in council would be mandatory to publish any newspaper. When the English Company censored the press, Rammohan composed two memorials against this in 1829 and 1830 respectively. Being an activist, he steadily opposed social atrocities like Sati and child marriage.

Cenotaph

The tomb was built by Dwarkanath Tagore in 1843, 10 years after Rammohan Roy's death in Bristol on 27 Sep 1833; it is situated in the Arnos Vale Cemetery on the outskirts of Bristol. In 1845 Dwarkanath Tagore arranged for Rammohan's remnants to be returned to India by Roy's nephew, who had accompanied Dwarkanath for this purpose to Britain. Rammohan's leftovers were cremated close to Kolkata on 28 February 1846 by his family.

In September 2006 representatives of the Indian High Commission and the mayor of Kolkata came to Bristol to spot the anniversary of Ram Mohan Roy's death. Throughout the ceremony Hindu, Muslim and Sikh women sang Sanskrit prayers of thanks. Following this visit the Mayor of Kolkata, Bikash Ranjan Bhattacharya, decided to raise funds to restore the cenotaph, and in June 2007 businessman Aditya Poddar donated £50,000 towards the restoration. In June 2008 the Arnos Vale restorers confirmed that they could not locate Roy's remnants at the location after searching for it by digging. Thebrahmosamaj.net stated, "To everyone's surprise the coffin was not to be seen under the chattri."

Roy's Political Liberalism

Roy can be described as the earliest advocate of liberalism and the precursor of the liberal movement in India. Liberalism had appeared as the mainly valuable product of renaissance and reformation in Europe. It captured some of the best brains in the 19th century Europe and America. It became the dominant ideology of the first stage of religious and social reform in India. Liberalism, in brief, stands for the value and dignity of the individual personality; the central location of Man in the historical development; and the faith that people are the ultimate source of all power. Quite naturally

liberalism insists on the inviolability of sure rights of the individual without which no human development can be thought of; it insists on human equality and also on the tenet that the individual should not be sacrificed for the sake of civilization. In liberalism, there is no scope for arbitrary and despotic use of power in any field whether it is religious, social, political or economic.

Roy advocated liberal principles in all walks of life. In the religious field Roy stood for tolerance, a non-collective approach to all troubles and secularism. He valued the freedom of the individual to follow the dictates of his conscience and even to defy the commands of the priestly class. Politically, Roy was a supporter of the impersonal power of law and opposed all types of arbitrary and despotic power. He was influenced that the subsistence of constitutional government is the best guarantee of human freedom. He insisted on the use of constitutional means as when required to safeguard the rights. He preferred the gradual improvements of the condition of this country because, to him, such improvements were more lasting and profound.

True to the liberal principles in the economic sphere, Roy whispered in the sanctity of right to property. Likewise, he whispered that a strong middle class had a significant role to play in socio-political dynamics. He was for the emancipation of poor peasants who were exposed to the use of zamindars. He wanted the government to reduce its demands of landlords. He wanted to preserve the ryotwari system and rural basis of Indian civilization and also set up modern scientific industry. He though differed from the other western liberal thinkers in one significant respect, viz. role of state and sphere of state behaviors. In his scheme of things, the state is expected to bring in relation to the social reform, in protecting the rights of the tenants against the landlords etc.

On Liberty

Liberty was a pivot approximately which the whole religion-socio-political thought of Roy revolved. His protest against idolatry, his agitation against Sati, his demand for contemporary western education and his insistence on freedom of press, right of women, and his demands for "separation for powers" and for the codification of laws were all expressions

of his intense love for liberty. For him, liberty was a priceless possession of mankind. He was the first to deliver the message of political freedom to India. Although Roy recognized the positive gains India would get from British rule, he was never in favor of an unending foreign rule in India. He measured the British connection necessary for India's social emancipation. Political freedom was bound to follow. His love for liberty though was not limited to one nation or society. It was universal. He supported all struggles which aimed at human freedom. Freedom for him was indivisible. He celebrated the establishment of constitutional governments in Spain and Portugal and was pained when such a government collapsed in Naples in 1821.

Freedom was the strongest passion of Roy's mind. He whispered equally in the freedom of body and mind, so also the freedom of action and thought. He shunned all restrictions imposed by consideration of race, religion and customs on human freedoms.

On Rights of the Individual

Roy was the first to create awareness for civil rights amongst the Indians. He was grateful to the Britishers because they made accessible to Indians all those civil rights which were enjoyed by the Queen's subjects in England. However Roy did not specifically enlist the civil rights, he appears to contain in it the following rights. Right to life and liberty, right to have opinions and freedom of expression, Right to property, Right to religion etc.

Roy gave the greatest importance to the right to freedom of opinion and expression. To him it incorporated the freedom of creativity of mind and intellect, as well as the freedom of expressing one's opinions and thoughts by dissimilar media. Just as to Roy, freedom of expression was equally useful to the rulers and the ruled. Ignorant people were more likely to revolt against all that the rulers did, they could turn against power itself. In contrast an enlightened public would be opposed only to the abuse of power by power and not to the subsistence of power itself. The free press, the Raja argued, had never caused a revolution in any section of the world. But several examples could be cited where, in the absence of a free press, since the grievances of the people remained unrepresented and underdressed, the situation had become

ripe for a violent 'revolutionary' change. A free and self-governing press alone could-bring forth the best in the government as well as the people.

Roy, though, was not against the reasonable restrictions on the freedom of press. He even accepted some additional restrictions on the Indian Press, which were not imposed on the press in England. Such restrictions, he whispered, might be necessary here as some Indians were likely to encourage hatred in the minds of the natives towards the British rulers. Roy also justified the restrictions imposed with a view to check the seditious attempts of creating hostilities with neighboring friendly states. He, though, strongly objected to the restrictions imposed by the bureaucracy in India. These restrictions, in his opinion, were arbitrary and uncalled for by the circumstances in this country.

On Law and Judicial Management

Law, Roy claimed, was the making of passionless cause. It was the command of the sovereign. Hence, even the highest officer in the East India Company did not possess the competence for enacting the laws for India. The king-in-Parliament alone could have that power. What is more, Roy argued that the English parliament, before finalizing every piece of legislation relating to India should take into explanation the views of the economic and intellectual elites in this country. Another significant Thought that Roy has contributed in the context of law relates to the codification of law He thinks that such codification was in the interest of both the rulers and ruled. He suggested that the codification should be done on the basis of the principles general and agreeable to all groups and factions in the civilization. In the course of codification, the extensive-standing customs of this country should not be overlooked. Of course, only those customs which are reasonable and conducive to common welfare of the people should be picked up. Codified law should be easy, clear and exact. Codification would create the interpretations of laws more impersonal and its application more uniform.

Roy had a clear perception of the distinction flanked by law, custom and morality. He accepted that evolving customs were a significant source of law, but the two could not be recognized. He also made a distinction flanked by law and morality. Some laws, just as to Roy, might be legally valid, but

morally indefensible. Conversely, some practices might be morally sound but could not be given legal force. Principles of morality are relative to the social realities and any law to be effective necessarily take into explanation these ethical principles prevalent in a given civilization. In his book entitled 'An Exposition of Revenue and Judicial System in India' Roy presented a profound discussion on urgent reforms in administrative and judicial matters. He stressed the point that the management could not be efficient and effective unless there was official speaking in the language of the masses. There should also be many channels of communication flanked by the management and the people.

Roy's suggestions of reform in the judicial field are more numerous because for him an efficient, impartial and a self-governing judiciary was the supreme guarantee of liberty. Roy whispered that the association of the natives in the judicial procedure had to be an essential characteristic of judicial management. Other events advocated by him incorporated: constant supervision of the judicial proceedings by a vigilant public opinion, substitution of English for Persian as the official language to be used in the courts of law, appointment of Indian assessors in civil suits, trial by jury, separation of judicial from executive functions, and the constant consultation of the native interests before the enactment of any law that concerned them. He also suggested the revival of the age-old Panchayat system of adjudication. Roy therefore urged many reforms and corrections in the Indian Judicial system in keeping with political liberalism.

On International Co-subsistence

Thoughts of Ram Mohan Roy on this subject are the expressions of his future oriented imagination and insight. He has portrayed a beautiful picture of international coexistence. He was perhaps the first thinker of the 18th century who had a clear vision of internationalism. This vision might have occurred to him in the course of his search for universal religion. Roy, the prophet of universalism, argued that all nations of the world necessarily be placed on an equal footing in order to achieve global unity and a sense of broad fraternity. It

is only then that the contradiction flanked by nationalism and internationalism can be ended.

Roy held that the dissimilar tribes and nations were merely the branches of the similar family and hence, there necessity be frequent swap of views and frequent provide and take in all matters in the middle of the enlightened nations of the world. This, just as to Roy, was the only method to create the human race happy and contented. Differences in political perspectives could be eliminated by thrashing out the differences on the general platforms composed of equal number of delegates from each of the contestant countries. Such a general forum could also be useful for the resolution of all international issues, which would enable mankind to live in peace for generations jointly. Roy's thoughts in this respect proved prophetic, the League of Nations and the UNO are in sense institutional expressions of these thoughts.

-

- **JUSTICE M.G. 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 many designations as member of the Bombay legislative council, member of the finance committee at the centre, and the judge of Bombay High Court. A book written by Madhav Srinivas Vidwans 'Srimati Ramabai Ranade Vyakti ani Karya' (sahayak Sarojini Vaidya), also throws light on the life and achievements of M. G. Ranade.

A well recognized public figure, his personality as a calm and patient optimist would power his attitude towards dealings with Britain as well as reform in India. Throughout his life he helped set up the Poona *Sarvajanik Sabha* and the *Prarthana Samaj*, and would edit a Bombay Anglo-Marathi daily paper, the *Induprakash*, founded on his ideology of social and religious reform.

Biography

Ranade belonged to a Chitpavan Brahman family. He was born in Niphad, a small city in Nasik district, and spent much of his childhood in Kolhapur where his father was a minister. He began studies at the Elphinstone College in Bombay (now recognized as Mumbai), at the age of fourteen. He belonged to Bombay University, one of the three new British universities, and was section of the first batches for both the B.A. (1862) and the LL.B. (Government Law School, 1866) where he graduated at the top of his class. The scholar and later founder of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar was his classmate. Ranade later got his MA degree at the top of his class.

He was appointed 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 to the Bombay High Court in 1893. From 1885 until he joined the High Court, he belonged to the Bombay legislative council.

In 1897, Ranade served on a committee charged with the task of enumerating imperial and provincial expenditure and creation recommendations for financial retrenchment. This service won him the decoration of Companion of the Order of the Indian Empire. Ranade also served as a special judge under the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act from 1887.

Ranade held the offices of syndic and dean in arts at Bombay University, where he displayed much organizing power and great intimacy with the needs of the student class. A thorough Marathi scholar, he encouraged the translation of average English works and tried, with some success, to introduce vernacular languages into the university curriculum.

He published books on Indian economics and on Maratha history. He saw the need for heavy industry for economic progress and whispered in Western education as a vital unit to the basis of an Indian nation. He felt that by understanding the mutual troubles of India and Britain both reform and independence could be achieved to the benefit of all and insisted that a self-

governing India could only be stable after such reforms were made. Reform of Indian civilization and use of a version of Western civilization, in Ranade's view, would bring in relation to the –general interest... and fusion of thoughts, amongst all men.”

Activism

Religious

With his friends Dr Atmaram Pandurang, Bal Mangesh Wagle and Vaman Abaji Modak, Ranade founded the Prarthana Samaj, a Hindu movement inspired by the Brahmo Samaj, espousing principles of enlightened theism based on the ancient Vedas. Prarthana Samaj was started by Keshav Chandra Sen, a staunch Brahma Samajist, with the objective of carrying out religious reforms in Maharashtra. He presided a function to honor his friend Virchand Gandhi, who had defended Indian civilization and Hinduism in 1893's world religion parliament in Chicago, USA.

Political

Ranade founded the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha and later was one of the originators of the Indian National Congress. He has been portrayed as an early adversary of the politics of Bal Gangadhar Tilak and a mentor to Gopal Krishna Gokhale.

The 1911 *Encyclopedia Britannica* stated that the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha "regularly helped the government with sound advice". Not everyone agreed. In a letter to Henry Fawcett, Florence Nightingale wrote:

- [T]he Poona Sarvajanik Sabha (National Association) [...] again pretends to symbolize the people and merely symbolizes the money lenders, officials, and a few effete Mahratta landlords.

Social

Ranade was a founder of the Social Conference movement, which he supported till his death, directing his social reform efforts against child marriage, the shaving of widows' heads, the heavy cost of marriages and other social functions, and the caste restrictions on traveling abroad, and he

strenuously advocated widow remarriage and female education. He was one of the founders of the Widow Marriage Association in 1861. Ranade attempted to job with the structure of weakened traditions, reforming, but not destroying the social atmosphere that was India's heritage. Ranade valued India's history, having had a great interest in Shivaji and the Bhakti movement, but he also recognized the power that British rule in excess of India had on its development. Ranade encouraged the acceptance of change, believing traditional social structures, like the caste system, should accommodate change, thereby preserving India's ancient heritage. An overall sense of national regeneration was what Ranade desired.

However Ranade criticized superstitions and blind faith, he was conservative in his own life. He chose to take *prayaschitta* (religious penance) in case of *Panch-houd Mission Case* rather than taking a strong face of his opinions.

Upon the death of his first wife, his reform-minded friends expected him to marry (and thereby rescue) a widow. Though, he adhered to his family's wishes and married a child bride, Ramabai Ranade, whom he subsequently provided with an education. After his death, she sustained his social and educational reform job. He had no children. Ramabai Ranade in her memoirs has stated that when one equally prominent Pune personality, Vishnupant Pandit, married a widow, Ranade entertained him and a few guests at his house. This was not liked by his orthodox father who decided to leave Ranade's house in Pune and go to Kolhapur. It was only after he, Mahadev G. Ranade, told the father that he would resign from his government job that the father relented and canceled his plans to go to Kolhapur. Ranade decided never to do any such thing in the future. He though was insistent that his young wife, Ramabai Ranade, should do his bidding in the matters of social reforms. This has been confirmed in her memoirs.

Political Thoughts of Ranade

Ranade is measured a prophet of contemporary India because he visualized the future course of development in India. Ranade sought to enlighten the Indian masses in relation to the benefits of material progress

which could be used as a means to ethical and desirable lives. So, he expounded a political philosophy that aimed at spiritualization of politics but opposed the use of religion or spiritual power in politics. He whispered in liberalism but revised its vital tenets. In the present part, we shall talk about:

- Ranade's thoughts on liberalism,
- On nature and functions of the state,
- On Indian politics and
- Concept of Indian nationalism.

Ranade's Thoughts on Liberalism

Ranade's concept of liberalism was based upon his overall theory of morality which drew up on the belief that the purpose of all human action was the development of man and his capacities in all spheres of life. The purpose of our life just as to Ranade was essentially moral. "The end" he wrote, "is to renovate, to purify and also to perfect the whole man by liberating his intellect elevating his average of duty and perfecting all his powers." He held political elevation, social emancipation and spiritual enlightenment as three significant goals that should be pursued.

Ranade was a moderate. He did not consider in revolutionary ways. His political way was essentially constitutional. In this way the purity of means was accentuated. Secondly, the change was sought by the constituted power and not by breaking it. Thirdly, the agitators were expected to exhaust all the legal means accessible and attempt to change the heart of rulers. In this way, submission of petitions and symbols played a significant role because he thought that in the case of regional grievances, such ways would prove to be successful. Even if these petitions failed, Ranade upheld their utility as being essential for training in democracy and politics.

While defining liberalism, he said that moderation would be its watchword. Belief in the dignity of human beings and individual liberties, duty to obey the laws of the state and striving ceaselessly for reforms were the goals he set for the Liberals. Ranade advocated change by constitutional means. He whispered that, advancement, if had to be permanent, had to be illustrate. Therefore Ranade's liberalism was essentially progressive.

Ranade on the Nature and Functions of the State

Ranade differed from the British individualists concerning the role of the state in the field of political economy. He maintained that the state represented the power, wisdom, mercy and charity of its best citizens; so, it had to play a more positive role in human life. It was the duty of the state to protect the lives of the people and to create it nobler, happier and richer. The purpose of the state was essentially moral. It was a means to attain higher grades of civilized life.

Just as to Ranade, in contemporary times the state could not rest with its police functions. Now it had to seem after the social welfare and social progress. Just as to Ranade, the state necessarily performs regulative, productive and distributive functions. The state should regulate and manage public life. The force of the state necessarily is used to prevent social malpractices and use of man by man. Secondly, the state should get involved in productive behaviors. The classical liberals held that the state should not interfere in economic matters, but Ranade argued that the state could perform productive functions by establishing industries in key regions of the economy. He did not want to substitute the state action for individual initiative but to create individual initiative more broad based and to encourage the spirit of creativity and self-help in the middle of members of the civilization. When individuals became capable of managing their own affairs, the state should withdraw because ultimately the state protection and manage were but crutches to teach the nation to walk. Therefore, he wanted to strike a right balance flanked by individual initiative and state intervention.

However Ranade was not a socialist, he realized the importance of the distributive functions of the state. He maintained that it was the duty of the state to give the minimum means of betterment to the people. Ranade upheld the right to property and free individual initiative. He though, advocated some limitations on the rights of the rich people. He suggested state intervention to reduce the gulf flanked by the wealthy and the poor and to assure a minimum average of livelihood to all the citizens. Ranade argued that in a poor and backward country like India, the state had to play a positive role in the productive and distributive procedures.

Ranade's Thoughts on Indian Management

Ranade was a keen student of Indian management and suggested several reforms in its working. The establishment of a democratic government in India was his goal: He requested the British government to grant fundamental rights to the people. He held that the Indian government should be urbanized approximately the following six principles:

- Supremacy of law,
- Representative government with representation to princes in the upper house of parliament,
- General constitution for states.
- Parliamentary government,
- Representation of India in the imperial parliament pending full development of Indian constitution and
- Decentralization of judiciary.

He was of the opinion that the guiding principles of the central government should be national co-ordination, regional execution and collective action. There necessarily exist linkages at all stages of the government so that proper co-ordination was achieved. Regional autonomy had to be balanced with the demands of the national government. Ranade supported decentralization of power and he was very happy when Lord Ripon decided to introduce regional administrative bodies in India in 1882-83. He opined that due to the centralization of power, the germs of progress had been nipped in the bud and regional initiative destroyed. He wanted regional functions to be delegated to the regional authorities. He favored the development of a widespread scheme of regional government with village bodies as the foundations of the system. He claimed that once upon a time, the Panchayati system in India was very strong and effective. He wanted the government to provide wide ranging powers to regional bodies so that they could become strong and responsible.

Ranade sought to introduce some reforms in the princely states because he wanted the government in these states to be accountable and operate on the

basis of time tested practices. He suggested that the laws of the state should be written. The regional bodies should be given more powers. The arbitrary powers of the ruler should be curbed by appointing Council of Elders etc.

Ranade-the Prophet of Indian Nationalism

Ranade was the prophet of Indian nationalism. He was the first Indian thinker to insist that national development necessity be based on the principles of democracy, secularism and liberalism. He accentuated the importance of religious tolerance and Hindu-Muslim unity because he whispered that the Indian people were the chosen people of God and India was the true land of promise. It was their historic duty to illustrate the patch to the world. Ranade made it clear that Hindu or Muslim civilization could not become the basis of Indian nationalism. The composite Indian civilization which had been developing since the past 3000 years was the basis of Indian nationalism. Just as to Ranade, the chief excellence of the Indian people was their skill to absorb the best from other cultures and to provide a new form and shape to their civilization. Ranade expected that interaction with the British would also enrich Indian civilization. "There has been no revolution, and yet old condition of things has been tending to reform itself by the slow procedure of assimilation. The great religions of the world took birth here and now they meet again as brothers prepared to higher dispensation, which will unite all and vivify all; India alone in the middle of all nations of the world has been so favored."

Ranade wanted to promote the fusion of the best units in dissimilar societies in order to develop a general Indian nationality. His ideal was national unification and for that purpose, he wanted to job in as several meadows and at as several stages as possible. This would be a slow growth but he whispered that short cuts to unity were dangerous. Ranade maintained that all the major societies in India should approach jointly to attain general objectives and fight against poverty and backwardness. Freedom and prosperity were not possible without unity. He made it clear that it was the general tenet of Indian nationalism that progress for India meant progress of all its sections and societies. He recognized the information that by united

action and progress, Indians could gather enough strength to create the transfer of power from the British to Indians inevitable. While pointing out the main features of Indian nationalism, he wrote "The inner spring, the hidden purpose not consciously realized in several cases, is the sense of human dignity and freedom which is slowly asserting its supremacy in excess of national mind. It is not confined to one sphere of family life. It invades the whole man and creates him feel that individual purity and social justice have paramount claim in excess of us all which we can ignore extensive without being dragged to a lower stage of subsistence."

Therefore in political matters Ranade advocated the cause of freedom and progress and wanted to develop such state structures that would strike the right balance flanked by individual rights and public good. In his economic thoughts, he maintained the similar theoretical balance.

-

- **GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE**

Gopal Krishna Gokhale, (9 May 1866 – 19 February 1915) was one of the founding social and political leaders throughout the Indian Independence Movement against the British Empire in India. Gokhale was a senior leader of the Indian National Congress and founder of the Servants of India Civilization. By the Civilization as well as the Congress and other legislative bodies he served in, Gokhale promoted not only primarily independence from the British Empire but also social reform. To achieve his goals, Gokhale followed two overarching principles: non-violence and reform within existing government organizations.

Backdrop and Education

Gopal Krishna Gokhale was born on May 09, 1866 in Ratnagiri, Maharashtra, and a state on the western coast of India that was then section of the Bombay Presidency. Although they were Chitpavan Brahmins, Gokhale's family was relatively poor. Even so, they ensured that Gokhale received an English education, which would lay Gokhale in a location to obtain employment as a clerk or minor official in the British Raj. Being one of the

first generations of Indians to receive a university education, Gokhale graduated from Elphinstone College in 1884. Gokhale's education tremendously influenced the course of his future career – in addition to learning English, he was exposed to western political thought and became a great admirer of theorists such as John Stuart Mill and Edmund Burke. Although he would approach to criticize unhesitatingly several features of the English colonial regime, the respect for English political theory and organizations that Gokhale acquired in his college years would remain with him for the rest of his life. Gopal Krishna Gokhale, was one of the founding social and political leaders throughout the Indian Independence Movement against the British Empire in India. Gokhale was a senior leader of the Indian National Congress and founder of the Servants of India Civilization. By the Civilization as well as the Congress and other legislative bodies he served in, Gokhale promoted not only primarily independence from the British Empire but also social reform. To achieve his goals, Gokhale followed two overarching principles: non-violence and reform within existing government organizations.

Indian National Congress and Rivalry with Bal Gangadhar Tilak

Gokhale became a member of the Indian National Congress in 1889, as a protégé of social reformer Mahadev Govind Ranade. Beside with other modern leaders like Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Dadabhai Naoroji, Bipin Chandra Pal, Lala Lajpat Rai and Annie Besant, Gokhale fought for decades to obtain greater political representation and power in excess of public affairs for general Indians. He was moderate in his views and attitudes, and sought to petition the British authorities by cultivating a procedure of dialogue and discussion which would yield greater British respect for Indian rights. Gokhale had visited Ireland and had arranged for an Irish nationalist, Alfred Webb, to serve as President of the Indian National Congress in 1894. The following year, Gokhale became the Congress's joint secretary beside with Tilak. In several methods, Tilak and Gokhale's early careers paralleled – both were Chitpavan Brahmin, both attended Elphinstone College, both became

mathematics professors, and both were significant members of the Deccan Education Civilization.

Gokhale's first major confrontation with Tilak centered approximately one of his pet projects, the Age of Consent Bill introduced by the British Imperial Government, in 1891-92. Gokhale and his fellow liberal reformers, wishing to purge what they saw as superstitions and abuses from their native Hinduism, wished by the Consent Bill to curb child marriage abuses. However the Bill was not extreme, only raising the age of consent from ten to twelve, Tilak took issue with it; he did not substance per se to the thought of moving towards the elimination of child marriage, but rather to the thought of British interference with Hindu custom. For Tilak, such reform movements were not to be sought after under imperial rule when they would be enforced by the British, but rather after independence was achieved when Indians would enforce it on themselves. The bill though became law in the Bombay Presidency. In 1905, Gokhale became president of the Indian National Congress. Gokhale used his now considerable power to undermine his longtime rival, Tilak, refusing to support Tilak as candidate for president of the Congress in 1906. By now, Congress was split: Gokhale and Tilak were the respective leaders of the moderates and the "extremists" in the Congress. Tilak was an advocate of civil agitation and direct revolution to overthrow the British Empire, whereas Gokhale was a moderate reformist. As a result, the Congress Party split into two wings and was mainly robbed of its effectiveness for a decade. The two sides would later patch up in 1916 after Gokhale died.

Servants of India Civilization

In 1905, when Gokhale was elected president of the Indian National Congress and was at the height of his political power, he founded the Servants of India Civilization to specifically further one of the causes dearest to his heart: the expansion of Indian education. For Gokhale, true political change in India would only be possible when a new generation of Indians became educated as to their civil and patriotic duty to their country and to each other. Believing existing educational organizations and the Indian Civil Service did not do enough to give Indians with opportunities to gain this political

education, Gokhale hoped the Servants of India Civilization would fill this need. In his preamble to the SIS's constitution, Gokhale wrote that "The Servants of India Civilization will train men prepared to devote their lives to the cause of country in a religious spirit, and will seek to promote, by all constitutional means, the national interests of the Indian people." The Civilization took up the cause of promoting Indian education in earnest, and in the middle of its several projects organized mobile libraries, founded schools, and provided night classes for factory workers. Although the Civilization lost much of its vigor following Gokhale's death, it still exists to this day, however its membership is small.

Involvement with British Imperial Government

Gokhale, however an earlier leader of the Indian nationalist movement, was not primarily concerned with independence but rather with social reform; he whispered such reform would be best achieved by working within existing British government organizations, a location which earned him the enmity of more aggressive nationalists such as Tilak. Undeterred by such opposition, Gokhale would job directly with the British during his political career in order to further his reform goals.

In 1899, Gokhale was elected to the Bombay Legislative Council. He was elected to the Council of India of Governor-General of India on 22 May 1903 as non-officiating member on behalf of Bombay Province. He later served to Imperial Legislative Council after its expansion in 1909. He there obtained a reputation as very knowledgeable and contributed significantly to the annual budget debates. Gokhale urbanized so great a reputation in the middle of the British that he was invited to London to meet with secretary of state Lord John Morley, with whom he recognized a rapport. Gokhale would help throughout his visit to form the Morley-Mentons Reforms introduced in 1909. Gokhale was appointed a CIE (Companion of the Order of the Indian Empire) in the 1904 New Year's Honours List, a formal recognition by the Empire of his service.

Mentor to both Jinnah and Gandhi

Gokhale was famously a mentor to Mahatma Gandhi in his formative years. In 1912, Gokhale visited South Africa at Gandhi's invitation. As a young barrister, Gandhi returned from his struggles against the Empire in South Africa and received personal guidance from Gokhale, including a knowledge and understanding of India and the issues confronting general Indians. By 1920, Gandhi appeared as the leader of the Indian Independence Movement. In his autobiography, Gandhi calls Gokhale his mentor and guide. Gandhi also recognized Gokhale as an admirable leader and master politician, describing him as 'pure as crystal, gentle as a lamb, brave as a lion and chivalrous to a fault and the mainly perfect man in the political field'. Despite his deep respect for Gokhale, though, Gandhi would reject Gokhale's faith in western organizations as a means of achieving political reform and ultimately chose not to become a member of Gokhale's Servants of India Civilization. Gokhale was also the role model and mentor of Mohammed Ali Jinnah, the future founder of Pakistan, who in 1912, aspired to become the "Muslim Gokhale". Even the Aga Khan has stated in his autobiography that Gokhale's power on his thinking was almost certainly considerable.

Impact on Indian Nationalist Movement

Gokhale's impact on the course of the Indian nationalist movement was considerable. By his secure connection with the highest stages of British imperial government, Gokhale forced India's colonial masters to recognize the capabilities of a new generation of educated Indians and to contain them more than ever before in the governing procedure. Gokhale's firm belief in the need for universal education deeply inspired the after that great man on the Indian political level, Mohandas K. Gandhi; his faith in western political organizations however rejected by Gandhi, was adopted by a self-governing India in 1950.

Sources Of Gokhale's Political Thought

Gokhale was not a political thinker in the strict sense of the term. He did not produce any political treatise like that of Hobbes or Locke. Neither did he write a political commentary like Tilak's 'Geeta Rahasya' or Gandhi's 'Hind-Swarajya' which could be referred to in order to explain his political tenets. But we do have a number of articles written by him on several occasions that reflect his political thinking. Likewise the many speeches he made on significant socio-economic issues and his correspondence with his contemporaries, now accessible in the shape of composed works, enable us to explore his political thoughts. There are some excellent biographies and scholarly works on Gokhale that also constitute a significant source for the revise of his political thought. Therefore with the help of all these sources it is possible for us to delineate the political thinking of Gokhale.

Political Thought

Gokhale's political thought revolves more approximately the socio-political issues of his times rather than any vital political concept like that of the state or nation or sovereignty. Hence in order to understand his political doctrines we have to refer to the vital political issues of his time and method' he responded to these. Now the issues being several in number and intricate in nature, the thoughts that appeared as responses to these issues reflect the rich diversity of Gokhale's political thinking. Though, we shall concern ourselves mainly with discussing Gokhale's political thought under three major headings viz. Gokhale's responses to British rule in India, his liberalism and the political programme that he devised and worked for.

Responses to British Rule in India

Like mainly of the liberal Indian thinkers of his time Gokhale appreciated and welcomed the British rule in India. His appreciation of the British rule and particularly his insistence on the continuation of the British rule in India were based on two premises. In the first example, like all the moderates, Gokhale was influenced that it was because of British rule that the

procedure of modernization of the Indian civilization had set in. The British upheld the concept of equality before law, they introduced the principle of representative government they guaranteed the freedom of speech and press. All these things were certainly new. It was again the British who set in the procedure of political integration in India. There was much for Indians to learn from the British and hence, Gokhale pleaded that we should bear with them for some time and create progress in the field of industry, commerce, education and politics. Gokhale was influenced that if British rule sustained for some time, India would be modernized totally and eventually join the society of nations like any other self-governing state in Europe.

Gokhale whispered that in keeping with their liberal traditions, the British would fulfill their pledges and bestow on India self-government once Indians qualified themselves for the similar. This concept of 'England's pledges to India' was built upon the declarations of Thomas Munro, Macaulay, Henri Lawrence and above all Queen Victoria's Proclamation. In spite of the information that from the end of Ripon's viceroyalty in 1884 to the August-Declaration of 1917 successive Viceroys and Secretaries of India emphatically repudiated the feasibility of introducing English political organizations to India, Gokhale still whispered that by appealing to the British sense of liberalism, by convincing them of India's genuine capabilities the British would ultimately be influenced and would introduce to India western political organizations. It was this faith in British liberalism that made Gokhale plead for the continuance of the British rule in India.

His justification for the continuance of the British rule in India did not mean that he was totally satisfied with the British management in India. For example, he was a bitter critic of the high handedness of the Curzonian management. He also argued on several occasions that the British raj was more raj and less British in the sense that it was reluctant to introduce English parliamentary organizations to India, yet he whispered that British rule was destined to accomplish its providential mission in India.

Gokhale sincerely felt that the history of India had nothing to offer as distant as the development of democratic political organizations was concerned. In a paper read before the Universal Races Congress, London,

July, 1911, Gokhale admitted, "India did not develop the national thought of political freedom as urbanized in the west." He was influenced that the social and political organizations of the country necessity be reformed in the image of the west. To him the European history presented a well-marked development of the democratic thought and was so useful in shaping our thoughts of liberty and democracy. The British connection would definitely serve this purpose and hence he welcomed the British rule in India. In one of his letters to his friend Gokhale wrote: "You necessity all realize that whatever be the shortcomings of bureaucracy... though the insolence of individual Englishman, they alone stand today in the country for order; and without sustained order no real progress is possible for our people." Therefore to Gokhale British rule in India stood for social order which was the pre-condition of progress and hence he justified the continuance of British rule in India.

Liberalism

As noted at the outset Gokhale was essentially a liberal thinker. But his liberalism was slightly dissimilar from the classical liberalism that lived in the eighteenth and nineteenth century Europe. In order to understand the separate character of Gokhale's liberalism it is essential to get ourselves acquainted with the liberal ideology in common. Liberalism as an ideology may be defined as an thought committed to individual freedom, as a way and policy in government, as an organizing principle in civilization, and a method of life for the individual and society. Liberty is the core doctrine of liberalism and it stands against coercive interference of any type in any walk of life. In the *social sphere* liberalism stands for secularism. It advocates man's freedom from the shackles of religious orthodoxy and believes in freedom of conscience. In the sphere of economy it appreciates the ideal of free deal coupled with internal freedom of manufacture and external freedom of exportation. It stands for free competition implying no curb on import and export of goods. For this cause it stands for the use of natural possessions and sharing of economic dividends at the hands of the individuals. In the *sphere of politics* liberalism and instead of restricting the role of the state in economic

life of the nation, he wanted the state to play a positive role in promoting industrial development and deal.

But to him, liberty did not imply the total absence of restraint; on the contrary, he felt that individual liberty could be usefully allowed only when the individuals behave with a sense of self-restraint and self organization. He knew that the ideal of liberty could not be realized unless the citizens are guaranteed sure rights to freedom. To him the right of free expression and the freedom of press were essential to... realize the ideal of individual liberty. He, so, opposed the Official Secret Bill in 1904 on the grounds that it was proposed to arm the government with a greater power to manage the press. Gokhale also favored the right to private property and the freedom of contract. Commenting on the Land Revenue Code Amendment Bill Gokhale said that "the ordinary citizen is as tenaciously attached to his proprietary rights in excess of his holdings... that there is nothing he will not do if it is in his power to ward off what he regards as a direct or indirect attack on these rights. And it is not hard to understand that a proposal to take absent from his power of alienating, when necessary, his holding should seem to him to be a mainly serious encroachment on his rights. Therefore Gokhale defended the right to private property, individual liberty and freedom of contract which essentially constituted the core of liberal doctrine.

En order to uphold individual liberty and essential civil rights, Gokhale proposed the establishment of representative organizations in the country. Just as to him the first prerequisite for the improvement of dealings flanked by Britain and India was unequivocal declaration in England to put her resolve to help forward the growth on representative organizations in India and a determination to stand by this policy.' Though, Gokhale did not demand universal franchise. He proposed property qualification for enfranchisement. For instance, for the village Panchayat elections Gokhale wanted that only such persons should be enfranchised who paid a minimum land revenue.

Gokhale also preferred the representation of interests beside with the representation of people in the legislature. In his last testament and will be suggested that the legislative Council in each province should constitute of 75 to 100 members. Taking Bombay as an illustration he pleaded for one seat

each in the legislature for the Karachi Chamber, the Ahmadabad Mill Owners and the Deccan Sardars. He also suggested the principle of special representation for the religious minority. Therefore, as a liberal, Gokhale on the one hand defended the concept of individual liberty and on the other hand supported the establishment of representative institution in a limited sense.

Gokhale's thoughts concerning the role of state extraordinarily differed from that of classical liberalism. Classical liberalism pleads for a laissez-faire state. The only functions that classical liberalism grants to the state are police functions. They consider that a government which governs the least is the best. But Gokhale, following the footsteps of Justice M.G. Ranade pleaded for state-intervention to regulate the economic and social life of the country. Here Gokhale differed extraordinarily from J.S. Mill. Gokhale wanted the Government to intervene in the economic life for the sake of industrial development and agricultural prosperity. He wanted the government to intervene not only in the procedures of sharing but also in the procedure of manufacture. Just as to Gokhale the purpose of government was to further the moral and material interests of the people. In order to realize this purpose the government cannot remain unconcerned towards the unnatural restrictions in the path of development. Just as to Gokhale the government should remove these 'unnatural restrictions' and accelerate the pace of development. Gokhale said: "Indians needed a government which subordinates all other thoughts to the welfare of the Indian people, which presents the indignities offered to Indians abroad as however they were offered to Englishmen and, which endeavors by all means in its power to further the moral and material interests of the people in and outside India." Therefore to Gokhale the state should not be a 'police state'-only, but it should embark upon welfare behaviors and intervene in the economic life of the country whenever necessary. We can conclude that Gokhale's liberalism was no doubt inspired by the liberalism of Mill but it significantly differed from the classical liberalism in two compliments. On the one hand it did not advocate the extreme individualism, emphasizing the negative meaning of liberty and on the other hand it pleaded for necessary state intervention in the economic and social life of the country.

Death

Gokhale sustained to be politically active by the last years of his life. This incorporated extensive traveling abroad: in addition to his 1908 trip to England, he also visited South Africa in 1912, where his protégé Gandhi was working to improve circumstances for the Indian minority livelihood there. Meanwhile, he sustained to be involved in the Servants of India Civilization, the Congress, and the Legislative Council while constantly advocating the advancement of Indian education. All these stresses took their toll, though, and Gokhale died on Feb 19, 1915 at an early age of forty-nine. Bal Gangadhar Tilak, his lifelong political opponent, said at his funeral: "This diamond of India, this jewel of Maharashtra, this prince of workers is taking eternal rest on funeral ground. Seem at him and attempt to emulate him".

●

● REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Explain how the social reform movement of the 19th century was the Indian response to the Western impact.
- Explain the 19th century reformers' understanding of the interdependent nature of all (social, political and economic) reform.
- Identify the influences that shaped Roy as a reformer.
- What were the grounds on which Roy objected to idolatry?
- What was the main criticism of Ranade against the popular practice of the Hindu religion?
- What were the evil effects of the caste system on the Hindu society according to Ranade?
- What was the role of the state as envisaged by Gokhale?

CHAPTER 3

Militant Nationalism

● **STRUCTURE**

- Learning objectives
- Introduction
- Bal Gangadhar Tilak
- Sri Aurobindo's political thought
- Bhagat Singh: the martyr and his ideology
- Review questions

● **LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Discuss the main features of Militant Nationalism.
- Tilak's views on social reform and contribution to the Indian national movement .
- Analyze the philosophical foundations of Sir Aurobindo thought
- Evaluate Sir Aurobindo role as a thinker and activist in the freedom movement
- Explain Bhagat Singh role as a thinker and activist in the freedom movement.

● **INTRODUCTION**

The main objective of this element is to acquaint you with the common features of Militant Nationalism. The militant nationalist brought in relation to the a departure in the national movement by adopting more radical ways of agitation than those followed by the earlier moderates. The prominent leaders of this stage of the national movement were Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh, Bipan Chandra Pal and the Late Lajpat Rai. Militant nationalism represented a separate stage in the anti-colonial thrash about. It introduced new ways of political agitation, involved popular symbols for mobilization and therefore tried to broad base the movement. Militant Nationalism was a stage of Nationalism in India. It had all the characteristics of Nationalism,

besides sure distinctive characteristics of its own. Let us take note of these common and specific characteristics in turn.

The Units of Nationalism

The essential units of a Nation are territory, population and a sovereign state. For the growth of a nation the population necessity has sure features which provide it unity and separateness. These are a general language, a general race, a general religion and a general cultural custom. However none of these features are totally present in every nation, they are usually present in a big degree. A nation may not have a single language. There may be several languages within it but it may still have a sense of national unity. There may be a general literary custom however the languages may be several. It is the similar with race religion and cultural custom. There can be differences in all these compliments *within* a broadly *unified civilization*.

General historical and cultural traditions can unite people very firmly. The sense of nationality is usually promoted by the memory of a people's shared experience of the past. This memory of the past is rekindled when a country is subjected to foreign rule and use. A foreign rule always adversely affects the civilization of a subject people. An significant aspect of the anti-colonial movements is to recover the self-respect of the people and re-deal indigenous civilization. History confirms the truth that subjection to foreign rule, misgovernment and use is the mainly powerful factor in creating the sense of nationalism. Despite all these constitutive units, nationalism is an abstraction. It is ultimately a *state* of mind of a group of people.

Distinctive Features of Militant Nationalism

The adjective 'militant' provides a fair thought of its distinctive nature. While nationalism is itself a very strong feeling and sentiment, militant nationalism is an even more vehement, assertive and aggressive feeling. There can be two methods of winning freedom for a subject country. One is to impress upon the rulers that freedom is the birthright of the people and should be granted to them gracefully. This presumes that the alien rulers are open to cause and will quit of their own accord without being forced to do so by the subjects. The other method is to attack the rulers and the government and

bring their power to an end, as it is futile to expect that colonial rulers will listen to cause and agree to surrender the gains and advantages of an empire.

The first may be described as the liberal or moderate way and the second as the militant way. Liberals or moderates may well be aware of the evils of foreign rule, but they do not consider it a total or unmitigated evil. The evils can be removed by gradual levels by convincing the rulers by symbols and petitions and the normal procedure of argument. The benefits of a contemporary and civilized government ought not to be lost by impatience in excess of temporary and curable complaints. The moderates regarded the British connection as section of a divine plan for the advance of India into the contemporary age.

The militant nationalists' attitude was entirely dissimilar. To them, the alien government was a total evil. It was the cause of political, economic, cultural and spiritual ruin of the country. The foreign ruler could never be trusted to vacate the country that he has gained by conquest. Persuasion, so, was futile; more forceful ways necessity be used and the moderates, just as to them, were lacking in will and a sense of urgency. The variation flanked by the moderates and the militant nationalist was radical, just as to Lala Lajpat Rai. It was not one of speed, nor of way, but of fundamental principles. He pronounced that India would never evolve into a self-governing state, if it were to follow the ways of the moderates. He also said that unless the Congress took steps to change its nature and adopt direct ways of political action, some other movement might start with this substance. The result would then be that the Congress would sink into insignificance. It was prophetic of him indeed to have said this in 1905, two years before the stormy session of the Congress at Surat in 1907.

Militant Nationalism and Terrorist Revolutionary Anarchism

We may note that however militant nationalism differed radically from liberal nationalism, it necessity be distinguished from revolutionary and terrorist anarchism. Political murder and assassination were not approved by the militant nationalists, however the extremists drew their inspiration from the creed of the militant nationalists. The connection flanked by the two was at

the mainly, indirect. The militant nationalists were able to understand the extremists with greater sympathy. The extremists were, just as to them misguided and reckless but it was all due to the harsh and repressive policies of the government. It was a natural reaction on the section of the sensitive minds of the younger generation. B.C. Pal went to the extent of saying that what ultimately prevails in politics is force rather than right and so, one necessity not fail to use force when it is necessary. But like Tilak and Sri Aurobindo, he came to regard these ways as obsolete and inapplicable under Indian circumstances, especially under the changed circumstances towards the end of the first decade of the present century. These ways were bound to be ineffective, as the government had gained immensely in its power to crush extremist action. In Lala Lajpat Rai's languages, "Violence for political purposes by unarmed people is madness. To talk of violent ways is also in my judgment criminal folly.... It will be nothing short of madness to rely, on violence or even think of it under the present circumstances of life in India."

Militant Nationalism: A Highly Emotional, Religious Feeling

In militant nationalism, each one of the factors of nationalism named earlier territory, population, religion, race, etc. acquire an added emotional emphasis. For instance, the territory of a nation is much more than geographical entity. It is a sacred land. The motherland is measured as greater than heaven. It is a divinity in physical shape and the embodiment of its philosophy of life and dharma. The mountains and rivers of the country are also more than physical objects. They are objects of worship. Sri Aurobindo wrote, "Whereas others regard the country as an inert mass and know it in conditions of plains, meadows, mountains and rivers, I seem upon the country as the mother; I worship and adore her as the mother."

The Mission of the Nation: Swami Vivekananda and Swami Dayananda Saraswati

Every nation state believes, at least implicitly, that it is separate from other nations and has a mission to carry out. Militant nationalism believes this

more openly and emphatically. It holds that the people of a nation should become a free and sovereign nation state in order to lie just as to its own spirit and genius and contribute to the progress of mankind. India and the East, as compared with the West, have just as to this view, a pronouncedly religious and spiritual character. National freedom and independence are necessary, as Sri Aurobindo said, because India has first of all to live for herself and then to live for the world. He wrote, "God has set separately India as the eternal fountain-head of holy spirituality, and he will never suffer that fountain to run arid." "India is the 'guru' of the human soul in its profounder maladies, she is destined once more to new-mould the life of the world and to restore the peace of the human spirit."

Sri Aurobindo spoke of Hindu religion as 'Sanatana Dharma', *Sanatana* meaning eternal and *Dharma* meaning that which holds jointly and unites civilization in the universal sense. It is more than a creed and a religion. These have a restricted meaning and can unite people jointly, but also divide them from other peoples. Sanatana Dharma is eternal as well as universal and transcends national distinctions and differences of creed. India is its house and it is India's mission to uphold it and convey it to the world. B.C. Pal expressed the meaning of Sanatana Dharma in same conditions. "The ideal (of Nationalism) is that of humanity in God, of God in humanity the ancient ideal of *Sanatana Dharma*, but applied as it has never been applied before to the problem of politics and the job of national revival. To realize that ideal, to impart it to the world is the mission of India."

Religious Faith Behind Militant Nationalism Manly and Assertive Religion

The militant nationalists recognized secure relation flanked by custom and national consciousness. They appealed to glory and greatness of the Indians' past. They were inspired by the teachings of Ramakrishna and Vivekananda, in which service to fellow human beings was recognized with service to God. The elimination of ignorance and poverty, the extension of freedom and equality to women, universal understanding and tolerance of dissimilar religions as dissimilar roads leading to the similar goal, love of

country and love of mankind, were accentuated as essential units in the making of contemporary India. Vivekananda inspired people to follow a virile and manly religion. He exhorted to people to accept this world as real and not seem upon it as a 'Maya' or illusian. Just as to him, the true aim of religion was the liberation of the promotion of the freedom of the spirit. He also vehemently condemned the physical and-moral backwardness of the country. He said, "What we want is vigor in the blood, strength in the nerves, iron muscles and nerves of steel." "First of all our young men necessity be strong." "Your will be nearer to Heaven by football than by a revise of the Gita. You will understand the Gita better with your biceps, your muscles, a little stronger."

Dayananda Saraswati's teachings also had a same impact. He advocated that for the making of a manlier and energetic nation, it was necessary to return to the faith of the Veda-If the spirit and power of the past could be restored, the attainment of freedom for the country would be easy and sure. It will be noted that Dayanand's message was; on the face of it, a call for the revival of the past but in the context of the time, it was a call for the positive as section of the ancient spirit. This could be the only road to the attainment of freedom for the country. As B.C. Pal has written in his 'My Life and Times', "...it cannot be denied that the movement of Dayananda Saraswati, as organized in the Arya Samaj, has contributed more than the rational movement of the Raja's Brahmo Samaj to the development of a new national consciousness in the contemporary Hindu, particularly in the Punjab... This was really the beginning of that religious and social revival in the middle of Hindus of India to which we owe so mainly the birth of our present national consciousness."

The Bhagavad Gita

Militant nationalists were also profoundly influenced by the *Bhagavadgita*. They drew from it the lesson of duty. The performance of duty was to be selfless and free from egoism. Personal thoughts and sentiments of love, attachment, and dislike or hatred necessity are set aside. Our duty is to be performed as an offering to God without expecting fruit or reward in return.

Krishna's call to Arjuna was that he should fight the enemy, whoever the enemy may be. His arrows may hit and kill his own dealings and teachers, but he necessity do his duty and fight. In this connection, B.G. Tilak's interpretation of the Gita needs special mention. He derived a philosophy of 'activism' which essentially implied the carrying out of one's duty with devotion instead of abandoning it out of laziness and sloth. In the context of British power in excess of India, this meant performing the duty of in excess of throwing the foreign government and the conquest of freedom for the country.

Both militant nationalism and revolutionaries had special reverence for the *Bhagavadgita*. The Maharashtrian revolutionary, Damodar Hari Chapekar, accepted with him a copy of the Gita even when he was to be hanged. Sri Aurobindo has narrated how under trials in the Alipore Bomb Case were reading Gita in the Court room, totally of oblivious of the court proceedings or the noise and disturbance approximately them.

The Relation Flanked by Means and Ends: Comparison of Militant Nationalism and Gandhian Views

The discussion underlines an significant point in relation to the militant nationalism's conception in relation to the connection flanked by means and ends. Two views are possible on this question:

- Any means may be used to achieve a desirable end; for instance, the freedom of the country and
- The means necessity is ethically right; that is, as good as the end; if not, the end itself loses its value. The first view is that of the militant nationalist.

The second is the Gandhian view. The militant nationalist was concerned with the best and the quickest means of achieving the end. He would not be inclined to waste time in moral debate for fear that the end itself several be lost. As Lajpat Rai said, "We necessity do what is best, practical and possible under the circumstances." This attitude may be described as

'Ethical Relativism', in contrast to 'Ethical Absolutism,' of which Gandhi may be taken as the perfect instance.

The Religion of Nationalism

We have already referred to the distinctive outlook of the militant nationalists on nationalism. They attached an especially emotional meaning to the nation. The nation was not presently a geographical term but a psychological and spiritual concept as well. The militant nationalists were inspired by the vision of the nation as the sacred house of the Divine Mother. Bankim Chandra Chatterjee was looked upon as a rishi or seer because he gave the country the inspiring sacred formula, the mantra of Vande Mataram—"I bow to the Mother". In this mantra was combined love of divinity as well as love of the country. The country itself was transformed into a deity.

●

● **BAL GANGADHAR TILAK**

Lokmanya Tilak, born as Keshav Gangadhar Tilak (23 July 1856 – 1 August 1920), was an Indian nationalist, journalist, teacher, social reformer, lawyer and independence activist who was the first popular leader of the Indian Independence Movement. The British colonial authorities derogatorily described him "Father of the Indian unrest". He was also conferred with the honorary title of "*Lokmanya*", which literally means "Accepted by the people".

Tilak was one of the first and strongest advocates of "Swaraj" (self-rule) and a strong radical in Indian consciousness. His well-known quote, "*Swaraj is my birthright, and I shall have it!*" is well-remembered in India even today.

Early Life

Tilak was born in Ratnagiri, Maharashtra. His father, Shri Gangadhar Tilak was a school teacher and a Sanskrit scholar who died when Tilak was sixteen. Young Keshav graduated from Deccan College, Pune in 1877. Tilak

was amongst one of the first generation of Indians to receive a college education.

Tilak was expected, as was the custom then, to actively participate in public affairs. He stated:

- "Religion and practical life are not dissimilar. To take Sanyasa is not to abandon life. The real spirit is to create the country your family job jointly instead of working only for your own. The step beyond is to serve humanity and the after that step is to serve God." This dedication to humanity would be a fundamental unit in the Indian nationalist movement.

After graduating, Tilak began teaching mathematics at a private school in Pune. Later due to ideological differences with the colleagues in the New School, he decided to withdraw from that action. In relation to the that time, he became a journalist.

He organized the Deccan Education Civilization with a few of his college friends, including Gopal Ganesh Agarkar, Mahadev Ballal Namjoshi and Vishnushastri Chiplunkar whose goal was to improve the excellence of education for India's youth. The Deccan Education Civilization was set up to create a new system that taught young Indians nationalist thoughts by an emphasis on Indian civilization.

The Civilization recognized the New English School for secondary education and Fergusson College for post-secondary studies. Tilak taught mathematics at Fergusson College. He began a mass movement towards independence that was camouflaged by an emphasis on a religious and cultural revival.

Political Career

Indian National Congress

Tilak joined the Indian National Congress in 1890. He opposed its moderate attitude, especially towards the fight for self-government. He was one of the mainly-eminent radicals at the time.

Despite being personally opposed to early marriage, Tilak opposed the 1891 Age of Consent bill, seeing it as interference with Hinduism and a dangerous precedent. The act raised the age at which a girl could get married from 10 to 12 years.

A plague epidemic spread from Bombay to Pune in late 1896, and by January 1897, it reached epidemic proportions. In order to suppress the epidemic and prevent its spread, it was decided to take drastic action, accordingly a Special Plague Committee, with jurisdiction in excess of Pune municipality, its suburbs and Pune cantonment was appointed under the Chairmanship of W. C. Rand, I.C.S., and Assistant Collector of Pune by method of a government order dated 8 March 1897. Troops were brought in to deal with the emergency. The events employed incorporated forced entry into private homes, examination of occupants, evacuation to hospitals and segregation camps, removing and destroying personal possessions, and preventing plague cases from entering or leaving the municipality. By the end of May, the epidemic was under manage.

Even if the British authorities' events were well-meant, they were widely regarded as acts of tyranny and oppression. Tilak took up this issue by publishing inflammatory articles in his paper *Kesari* quoting the Hindu scripture, the Bhagavad Gita, to say that no blame could be attached to anyone who killed an oppressor without any thought of reward. Following this, on 22 June 1897, Rand and another British officer, Lt. Ayerst were shot and killed by the Chapekar brothers and their other associates.

Tilak was charged with incitement to murder and sentenced to 18 months imprisonment. When he appeared from prison, he was revered as a martyr and a national hero. He adopted a new slogan, "Swaraj (self-rule) is my birthright and I shall have it."

Following the 1905 Partition of Bengal, which was a strategy set out by Lord Curzon to weaken the nationalist movement, Tilak encouraged the Swadeshi movement and the Boycott movement. The Boycott movement consisted of the boycott of foreign goods and also the social boycott of any Indian who used foreign goods. The Swadeshi movement consisted of the usage of goods produced by oneself or in India. Once foreign goods were

boycotted, there was a gap which had to be filled by the manufacture of those goods in India itself. Tilak, so, rightly said that the Swadeshi and Boycott movements are two sides of the similar coin.

Tilak opposed the moderate views of Gopal Krishna Gokhale, and was supported by fellow Indian nationalists Bipin Chandra Pal in Bengal and Lala Lajpat Rai in Punjab. They were referred to as the Lal-Bal-Pal triumvirate. In 1907, the annual session of the Congress Party was held at Surat, Gujarat. Trouble broke out flanked by the moderate and the radical factions of the party in excess of the selection of the new president of the Congress. The party split into the "Jahal matavadi" ("Hot Faction" or radicals), led by Tilak, Pal and Lajpat Rai, and the "Maval matavadi" ("Soft Faction" or moderates). Nationalists like Aurobindo Ghose, V. O. Chidambaram Pillai were Tilak supporters.

Imprisonment in Mandalay

On 30 April 1908, two Bengali youths, Prafulla Chaki and Khudiram Bose, threw a bomb on a carriage at Muzzafarpur, in order to kill the Chief Presidency Magistrate Douglas Kingsford of Calcutta fame, but erroneously killed two women traveling in it. While Chaki committed suicide when caught, Bose was hanged. Tilak, in his paper *Kesari*, defended the revolutionaries and described for immediate Swaraj or self-rule. The Government swiftly arrested him for sedition. But a special jury convicted him, and the Parsi judge Dinshaw D. Davar gave him the controversial sentence of six years' transportation and a fine of Rs 1,000. The jury by a majority of 7:2 convicted him. On being asked by the judge whether he had anything to say, Tilak uttered these memorable languages "All that I wish to say is that, in spite of the verdict of the jury, I still uphold that I am innocent. There are higher powers that rule the destinies of men and nations; and I think, it may be the will of Providence that the cause I symbolize may be benefited more by my suffering than by my pen and tongue". The judge sentenced Tilak to six years' transportation and a fine of Rs. 1,000. In passing sentence, the judge indulged in some scathing strictures against Tilak's conduct. He threw off the judicial restraint which, to some extent, was observable in his charge to

the jury. He condemned the articles as "seething with sedition", as preaching violence, speaking of murders with approval. "You hail the advent of the bomb in India as if something had approach to India for its good. I say, such journalism is a curse to the country". Tilak was sent to Mandalay, Burma from 1908 to 1914. While imprisoned, he sustained to read and write, further developing his thoughts on the Indian nationalist movement. While in the prison he wrote the mainly-well-known *Gita Rahasya*. Several copies of which were sold, and the money was donated for the freedom fighting.

Life after Prison

Tilak had mellowed after his release in June 1914, more because of the diabetes and hardship in Mandalay prison. When World War I started in August, Tilak cabled the King-Emperor in Britain of his support and turned his oratory to discover new recruits for war efforts. He welcomed The Indian Councils Act, popularly recognized as Minto-Morley Reforms, which had been passed by British Parliament in May 1909, terming it as "a marked augment of confidence flanked by the Rulers and the Ruled". Acts of violence actually retarded, than hastened, the pace of political reforms, he felt. He was eager for reconciliation with Congress and had abandoned his demand for direct action and settled for agitations "strictly by constitutional means" - a row advocated by his rival Gopal Krishna Gokhale. Tilak saw the spark in Mohandas Gandhi and tried his best to convince Gandhi to leave the thought of "Total Ahinsa" and attempt to get "Swarajya" by all means. Gandhi, however looked upon him as his guru, did not change his mind.

All India House Rule League

Later, Tilak re-united with his fellow nationalists and re-joined the Indian National Congress in 1916. He also helped establish the All India House Rule League in 1916–18, with G. S. Khaparde and Muhammad Ali Jinnah and Annie Besant. After years of trying to reunite the moderate and radical factions, he gave up and focused on the House Rule League, which sought self-rule. Tilak traveled from village to village trying to conjure up support from farmers and locals to join the movement towards self-rule. Tilak

was impressed by the Russian Revolution, and expressed his admiration for Vladimir Lenin.

Tilak, who started his political life as a *Maratha* propagandist, progressed into a prominent nationalist after his secure association with Indian nationalists following the partition of Bengal. When asked in Calcutta whether he envisioned a Maratha-kind of government for Free India, Tilak replied that the Maratha-dominated governments of 17th and 18th centuries were outmoded in the 20th century, and he wanted a genuine federal system for Free India where every religion and race was an equal partner. He added that only such a shape of government would be able to safeguard India's freedom. He was the first Congress leader to suggest that Hindi written in the Devanagari writing be accepted as the sole national language of India.

Social Contributions

In 1894, Tilak transformed the household worshipping of Ganesha into a public event (Sarvajanik Ganeshotsav).

In 1895, Tilak founded the Shri Shivaji Finance Committee for celebration of "Shiv Punya Tithi" or the death anniversary of Shivaji Maharaj, the founder of 17th century Maratha Empire. The project also had the objective of funding the reconstruction of the tomb (Samadhi) of Shivaji Maharaj at Fort Raigad. For this second objective, Tilak recognized the Shri Shivaji Raigad Smarak Mandal beside with Senapati Khanderao Dabhade II of Talegaon Dabhade, who became the Founder President of the Mandal.

Tilak started the Marathi weekly, *Kesari* in 1880-81 with Gopal Ganesh Agarkar as the first editor. *Kesari* later became a daily and continues publication to this day.

Tilak said, "I regard India as my Motherland and my Goddess, the people in India are my kith and kin, and loyal and steadfast job for their political and social emancipation is my highest religion and duty".

Legacy

- Tilak Smarak Ranga Mandir, a theatre auditorium in Pune was dedicated to him.

- In 2007, the Government of India released a coin to commemorate the 150th birth anniversary of Bal Gangadhar Tilak.
- The Kesari is still published as a daily newspaper in Marathi.
- The Deccan Education Civilization that Tilak founded with others in the 1880s still runs much respected Organizations in Pune like the Fergusson College.
- The Public Ganesh festival (Ganeshotsav) has become an essential section of the civilization of Marathi Hindu societies during the world. Increasingly, other Hindu societies are also adopting the practice.
- Because of Tilak's efforts, Shivaji, the founder of Maratha Empire is the only figure from that period revered by modern Marathi masses and Hindu nationalist parties like the Shivsena.
- The Swadeshi movement started by Tilak at the beginning of the 20th century became section of the Independence movement until that goal was achieved in 1947. One can even say Swadeshi remained section of Indian Government policy until the 1990s when the Congress Government liberalized the economy.

● **SRI AUROBINDO'S POLITICAL THOUGHT**

Sri Aurobindo: His Life and Job

Sri Aurobindo (15 August 1872 – 5 December 1950), born Aurobindo Ghosh or Ghose was an Indian nationalist, freedom fighter, philosopher, yogi, guru and poet. He joined the Indian movement for freedom from British rule, for a while became one of its influential leaders and then turned into a spiritual reformer, introducing his visions on human progress and spiritual development.

Aurobindo studied for the Indian civil service at King's College, Cambridge. After returning to India he took up several civil service works under the Maharaja of Baroda and started to involve himself in politics. While in politics he was imprisoned by British India for writing articles against British rule. He was released when no proof was provided. Throughout his

stay in the jail he reputedly had mystical and spiritual experiences, after which he moved to Pondicherry, leaving politics for spiritual job.

Throughout his stay in Pondicherry, Aurobindo evolved a new way of spiritual practice, which he described Integral Yoga. The central theme of his vision was the development of human life into a life divine. He whispered in a spiritual realization that not only liberated man but also transformed his nature, enabling a divine life on earth. In 1926, with the help of his spiritual collaborator, Mirra Alfassa ("The Mother"), he founded the Sri Aurobindo Ashram. He took *Mahasamadhi* on 5 December 1950. He was the first Indian to create a major literary corpus in English.

His main literary works are *The Life Divine*, which deals with theoretical features of Integral Yoga; *Synthesis of Yoga*, which deals with practical guidance to Integral Yoga; and *Savitri*, an epic poem which refers to a lay in the *Mahabharatha*, where its characters actualise integral yoga in their lives. His works also contain philosophy, poetry, translations and commentaries on the *Vedas*, *Upanishads* and the *Gita*.

Biography

Early Life

Aurobindo Ghosh was born in a Bengali Hindu family in Calcutta (now Kolkata), West Bengal, India on 15 August 1872. His father, Krishna Dhan Ghosh, was District Surgeon of Rangapur, Bengal. His mother, Swarnalata Devi, was the daughter of Brahmo religious and social reformer, Rajnarayan Basu. In 1877, Aurobindo and two elder siblings - Manmohan Ghose and Benoybhusan Ghose were send to the Loreto Convent school in Darjeeling. His father was posted at several positions at the Government hospitals in Bengal throughout this time. His father was whispered to be an atheist just as to Aurobindo and wanted his sons to revise for Indian civil service in England.

England (1872–1893)

In 1879, Aurobindo and his two elder brothers were taken to Manchester, England for a European education. The brothers were placed in

the care of the Reverend W.H. Drewett and his wife in London. Drewett was an Anglican priest whom Ghose knew by his British friends at Rangapur. The Drewetts tutored the Ghose brothers privately; they were asked to stay the tuition totally secular and to create no mention of India or its civilization.

Flanked by 1880 and 1884, while his brothers were learning at Manchester Grammar School, Drewett coached Aurobindo in Latin and his wife coached him in French, geography and arithmetic until he joined St Paul's School. Here he learnt Greek, spending the last three years reading literature and English poetry. He also acquired some familiarity with German and Italian. K.D. Ghosh wanted his sons to pass the prestigious Indian Civil Service examination, but in 1889 it appeared that of the three brothers, only young Aurobindo had a chance of fulfilling his father's aspirations, his brothers having already decided their future careers. To become an ICS official, students were required to pass the competitive examination, as well as to revise at an English university for two years under probation. Aurobindo secured a scholarship at King's College, Cambridge, coming first in the examination. He also passed the written examination of the Indian Civil Service after a few months, where he was ranked 11th out of 250 competitors. He spent the after that two years at King's College.

A blue plaque unveiled in 2007 commemorates Aurobindo's residence at 49 St Stephen's Avenue in Shepherd's Bush, London, from 1884 to 1887.

By the end of two years of probation, Aurobindo had no interest in ICS exam and came late to the horse riding exam purposefully to get him disqualified for the service.

At this time, the Maharaja of Baroda, Sayajirao Gaekwad III, was traveling in England. James Cotton, brother of Sir Henry Cotton, for some time Lieutenant Governor of Bengal and Secretary of the South Kensington Liberal Club, knew Aurobindo and his father secured for him a lay in Baroda State Service and arranged for him to meet the prince. He left England for India, arriving there in February, 1893. In India Aurobindo's father who was waiting to receive his son was misinformed by his mediators from Bombay (now Mumbai) that the ship on which Aurobindo had been traveling had sunk

off the coast of Portugal. Ghose who was by this time frail due to ill-health could not bear this shock and died.

Baroda (1893–1906)

In Baroda, Aurobindo joined the state service, working first in the Survey and Settlements department, later moving to the Department of Revenue and then to the Secretariat, and several miscellaneous works like teaching grammar and assisted in writing speeches for the maharaja of Gaekwad. Throughout his job in Baroda he started working as a section-time French teacher at Baroda college, he was later promoted to the post of Vice-Principal. At Baroda, Aurobindo self studied Sanskrit and Bengali.

Throughout his stay at Baroda he contributed to several articles to *Indu prakash* and spoke as a chairman of the Baroda college board. He published the first of his collections of poetry, *The Rishi* from Baroda. He also started taking active interest in the politics of India's freedom thrash about against British rule, working behind the scenes as his location at the Baroda State barred him from overt political action. He connected up with resistance groups in Bengal and Madhya Pradesh, while traveling to these states. He recognized get in touch with Lokmanya Tilak and Sister Nivedita. He also arranged for the military training of Jatindra Nath Banerjee (Niralamba Swami) in the Baroda army and then dispatched him to organize the resistance groups in Bengal.

Calcutta

Aurobindo repeatedly visited Bengal, at first in a bid to re-set up links with his parents' families and his other Bengali relatives, including his cousin Sarojini and brother Barin, and later increasingly in a bid to set up resistance group's crossways Bengal. But he formally shifted to Calcutta (now Kolkata) only in 1906 after the announcement of Partition of Bengal. Throughout his visit to Calcutta in 1901 he married Mrinalini, daughter of Bhupal Chandra Bose, a senior official in Government service. Aurobindo Ghose was then 28; the bride Mrinalini, 14. Marrying off daughters at a young age was general in 19th century Bengali families.

Aurobindo was influenced by his studies on rebellion and revolutions against England in medieval France and the revolts in America and Italy. In his public action he took up non-cooperation and passive resistance in front but also took up secret revolutionary action as a preparation for open revolt, in case if the passive revolt failed.

In Bengal with Barin's help he recognized contacts with revolutionaries, inspiring radicals like Bagha Jatin, Jatin Banerjee, and Surendranath Tagore. He helped set up a series of youth clubs. He helped establish the Anushilan Samiti of Calcutta in 1902.

Aurobindo attended Congress meeting in 1906 and participated as a councilor in forming the fourfold objectives of "Swaraj, Swadesh, Boycott and national education". In 1907 at Surat session of Congress where moderates and hardliners had a major showdown, he led the hardliners beside with Bal Gangadhar Tilak. The Congress split after this session. In 1907–1908 Aurobindo traveled extensively to Pune, Bombay and Baroda to firm up support for the nationalist cause, giving speeches and meeting several groups. He was arrested again in May 1908 in connection with the Alipore Bomb Case. He was acquitted in the ensuing trial and released after a year of in accessible incarceration. Once out of the prison he started two new publications, *Karmayogin* in English and *Dharma* in Bengali. He also delivered the Uttarpara Speech hinting at the transformation of his focus to spiritual matters. The British persecution sustained because of his writings in his new journals and in April 1910 Aurobindo, obeying an inner Adesh which he had shaped he habit of unquestioningly heeding, moved to Pondicherry, where Britain's secret police monitored his behaviors.

Conversion from Politics to Spirituality

The trial ("Alipore Bomb Case, 1908") lasted for one full year, but eventually Aurobindo was acquitted. His Defence Counsel was Chiitranjan Das. On acquittal, Sri Aurobindo was invited to deliver a speech at Uttarpara where he first spoke of some of his experiences in jail. Afterwards Aurobindo started two new weekly papers: the *Karmayogin* in English and the *Dharma* in Bengali.

Aurobindo said he was visited by Vivekananda in the Alipore Jail. In his languages, "It is a information that I was hearing constantly the voice of Vivekananda speaking to me for a fortnight in the jail in my solitary meditation and felt his attendance. The voice spoke only on a special and limited but very significant field of spiritual experience and it ceased as soon as it had finished saying all that it had to say on that subject."

Aurobindo had several experiences from the time he had landed in India but had not recognized in relation to the any yoga or what yoga was. Later, when Aurobindo became involved with Congress and *Bande Mataram*, Barin had sustained to meet patriotic youngsters for recruitment for such a plan. In 1907, Barin introduced Aurobindo to Vishnu Bhaskar Lele, a Maharashtrian yogi. Aurobindo was greatly influenced by the guidance he got from him, he had instructed Aurobindo to depend on an inner guide and any type of external guru or guidance would not be required.

In 1910 Aurobindo withdrew himself from all political behaviors and secretly stayed at Chandarnagore, where he was being searched for one of the articles which were under his name in karmayogin. Later when the warrant against him was dropped he moved to Pondicherry, then a French colony.

Pondicherry

In Pondicherry, Aurobindo totally dedicated himself to his spiritual and philosophical pursuits. A series of works *The Life Divine*, *The Synthesis of Yoga*, *Essays on The Gita*, *The Secret of The Veda*, *Hymns to the Mystic Fire*, *The Upanishads*, *The Renaissance in India*, *War and Self-determination*, *The Human Cycle*, *The Ideal of Human Unity* and *The Future Poetry* were published in this magazine. Arya stopped its publication in 1921. Several years later, Aurobindo revised some of these works before they were published in book shape.

At the beginning of his stay at Pondicherry, there were few followers, but with time their numbers grew, resulting in the formation of the Sri Aurobindo Ashram in 1926. In 1926 he first signed his name as "Sri Aurobindo."

For some time afterwards, Sri Aurobindo's main literary output was his voluminous correspondence with his disciples. His letters, mainly of which were written in the 1930s, numbered in the many thousands. Several were brief comments made in the margins of his disciple's notebooks in answer to their questions and reports of their spiritual practice—others extended too many pages of cautiously composed explanations of practical features of his teachings. These were later composed and published in book shape in three volumes of *Letters on Yoga*. In the late 1930s, Sri Aurobindo resumed job on a poem he had started earlier—he sustained to expand and revise this poem for the rest of his life. It became perhaps his greatest literary attainment, *Savitri*, an epic spiritual poem in blank verse of almost 24,000 rows. Aurobindo died on 5 December 1950.

Philosophical Basis of Aurobindo's Political Thought

Aurobindo's writings reflect diverse powers. Of these, the Indian custom of idealism in philosophy appears to have impressed him the mainly. The great European philosophers from Homer to Goethe influenced him the maximum throughout his formative era and the revise of Geeta, Upanishads and Vedanta had a deep impact on his political thinking. As Romain Rolland said, Sri Aurobindo was "the highest synthesis of the genius of Asia and the genius of Europe". He tried to integrate the materialist trend in western philosophy with the idealist custom in Indian philosophy. Vedantic philosophy as propounded by Ramakrishna and Vivekanand also influenced Aurobindo's thinking.

He was also inspired by the extra ordinary vitality and diversity of the Indian intellectual custom. He whispered that the writings of the Vedantic sages and the Buddha reflect the genius of the Indian mind. Though, at a later level, just as to Aurobindo, the Indian philosophical custom became narrow in outlook and lost its dynamism and vitality. As against this, western philosophy supervised to retain its dynamism and sustained to grow. Aurobindo wanted to combine the best units of the Indian and western philosophical custom.

He explained the origin, nature and destiny of this world in his theory of development. Just as to his theory of making, matter passes by several

levels of development; from the plant and animal levels to that of the mind and the super mind. In his view, matter is spirit in a hidden shape, rising progressively towards the revelation of the spirit which is the supreme, unconditioned and absolute reality. In this procedure of development, in the transformation from the mind to the super mind, the technique of 'yoga' helps human beings to hasten the procedure. Sri Aurobindo urbanized his own technique described 'Integral Yoga' or 'Purna Yoga' which incorporates the techniques of four yoga i.e. Karma yoga, Bhakti yoga, Jnana yoga and Raja yoga—as well as the Tantrik philosophy. By this integral Yoga, a Yogi can rise to the super mental stage, which will bring him joy (Ananda). The attainment of Ananda helps in self-realization and assists in the service of humanity.

Just as to him, since 'matter' is not dissimilar from 'spirit' 'gradual development of matter will convert it into pure spirit. Despite the obstacles in the method which may slow down the procedure, the advancement of humanity in the direction of spiritual perfection will continue. In this procedure, a few urbanized souls will job as pathfinders and will thrash about hard to discover the path for others. Aurobindo whispered that India's custom of spiritual thought and practice was very advanced and the whole of humanity could benefit from this in its spiritual journey. He wanted India to take the lead and for this cause, thought that India ought to be free, to play her true role in the spiritual regeneration of the world.

Political Thought: Early Stage

A secure scrutiny of Aurobindo's writings illustrate that he wrote extensively on problem of current political importance in the early stage of his political action. His political thought at that time consisted of:

- His views on the Indian National Congress and the British rule in India.
- The Concept of Nation and the Theory of Spiritual Nationalism.
- His programme of action — Theory of Passive Resistance etc.,

His writings in this era necessity are seen against the political backdrop of our country in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. His objective was to rally the masses for the fight against the foreign rulers and his ultimate goal was full freedom for the country. Aurobindo's thoughts in the later stage, i.e. from 1910 onwards reflect clearly the need for humanity to return to the spiritual motivations of life. As suggested, concentrate on his political thought, which he expressed in the earlier stage of his life (1883-1905) and the first stage of his political action (1905 to 1910). Later, as suggested, proceed to revise his views on human unity.

His Views on the Indian National Congress

When Aurobindo returned from England, he observed the political scene and expressed his views by his writings in journals like 'Bande Mataram'. He was critical of the Congress organization and its leadership at that time. He criticized the Congress on four counts—viz.

- Its aims and objectives,
- Its composition,
- The motives of the leaders and
- The ways adopted by them for the realization of their aims and objectives.

This does not mean that he was basically against the national Congress. On the contrary, he declared that "The Congress was to us, all that is to man mainly dear, mainly high and mainly sacred." But at the similar time, he did not hesitate to express his disillusionment and dissatisfaction in relation to the it's working. About the aims and objectives of the organization, he thought that the Congress did not have a clear-cut goal of national freedom. The leaders of the Congress were wasting time on trifles like sure administrative reforms, which were totally inadequate to meet the need of the time. Their demands, he delivered were 'shamefully modest.'

In relation to the composition of the Congress, he thought that the Congress was a middle class organization and so, did not symbolize the Indian masses. The newly educated middle class leadership was only interested in

gaining power and a lay in the Indian polity. He accentuated the need for converting the national movement into a mass movement by including in it the vast numbers of the proletariat. He whispered that the emergence of the Indian 'proletariat' on the horizon of the national movement would be an significant key to the solution of the problem of transforming the Congress into a truly national and popular body. Thirdly, concerning the motives of the Congress leaders, his observation was that they were not sincere leaders. They were timid and afraid of displeasing their rulers. He whispered that these defects in the organization had adversely affected the national movement in the country.

He felt that the Congress leadership had not perceived the British rule correctly and so, instead of boldly asserting their goal, the leaders relied on the sense of justice and benevolence of the British rulers. They resorted to futile petitions and requests in the annual sessions of the Congress. He so stressed the need for a broad based organization that could channelize the whole power of the country to free it from foreign rule. Therefore, his insistence on enthusing the masses with the spirit of independence was one of the first efforts to provide a mass character to the freedom movement.

Nature of the British Rule

Aurobindo's first political writings in 'Indu-Prakash'— an Anglo—Marathi paper - was a direct attack on British rule. Of course, some leaders participating in the national movement were also criticizing British rule at that time, but their criticism was quite indirect. His writing was a departure from this approach of expression. He created such a sensation in the country that justice M.G. Ranade had to warn the editor of Indu-Prakash to be careful, and subsequently the editor had to request Aurobindo to vary his tone, which he did rather reluctantly. The purpose of Aurobindo's criticism of the British rule was two fold. In the first example, he wanted to strengthen the anti-British sentiments in the country and secondly, to break the myth of British superiority.

He expressed the view that the British political system was in no method the best as was widely whispered by Indian intelligentsia. He was also critical of the absence of social freedom and equality. Hence, he whispered

that copying British model was not in the interest of our country. Concerning the nature of the British rule in India he expressed the view that, "It is mercantile in basis and exploitative in character". It necessarily be, so, weakened from its base itself, in order to achieve freedom and independence of the country. Aurobindo described the behavior of the British officials as rude and arrogant. He whispered that the system of management set up by the British in India was thoroughly unsuitable to the Indian people, their socio-economic system, their mind and genius. He was also critical of the anglicized Indians who regarded the British method of life and civilization worth emulating. He, though, did not substance to learning from the experience of the British, however he was against the thoughtless aping of European thoughts and ideals. He objected to the rising tendency in the middle of Indians to ignore the past and of having no clear vision for the future.

Concept of Nation and Theory of Spiritual Nationalism

Aurobindo's concept of nation was deeply influenced by Bankimchandra—a great Bengali novelist. He whispered that the nation is not presently a piece of neither land nor a mass of human beings. It is neither a figure of speech nor the making of mind. It is something more than a geographical element or a figment of peoples' imagination. Therefore, his concept of nation is profound and very dissimilar from the commonly held patriotic notions in relation to the nation. To him, India was like his mother and hence he was highly devoted to her. He glorified India as a Mother Goddess, and advised the young patriots to job for their nation which is their mother. He whispered that the liberation of the motherland is the mainly urgent duty of her children for which they necessarily be ready to sacrifice even their lives.

Just as to Aurobindo's understanding, the 'nation' is a mighty 'shakti' composed of all the shaktis of all the millions of elements that create up the nation. It is therefore a livelihood entity. He expressed his deep feelings of love and dedication to the motherland in numerous articles and poems. Such patriotism he whispered could job miracles. Therefore, Aurobindo's definition of nationalism had a spiritual dimension, unlike the ordinary patriotic

understanding of the conditions nationalism. Nationalism in his opinion is not merely a political movement. It is neither a political programme nor an intellectual past time. In his opinion, nationalism is akin to religion. It is a faith and a creed which one has to live. It is a religion which has approach from God. Hence, it cannot be crushed. Even if attempts are made by external forces to suppress it, it reemerges and survives due to the strength of God in it. Nationalism is immortal. It can not die, because it is not a making of human beings but is created by God. If one wants to be a nationalist, one necessarily works for his nation. Nationalism in his opinion was a deep and fervent 'religious sadhana'. Here in lies the variation flanked by Aurobindo's concept of nationalism and nationalism as perceived by other thinkers and political activists of his time.

Nationalist movement sparked off by the partition of Bengal was in the opinion of Aurobindo a divinely inspired and guided movement. In his opinion, this movement was not guided by any political self interest, but it was a religious mission which the people were trying to fulfill. Therefore for him, "nationalism is a religion by which people attempt to realize God in their nation, and their fellow country men".

The Second Level: From 1910 Onwards

We have already noted that Aurobindo dramatically withdrew from politics in 1910 and moved to Pondicherry, following the persistent calls from his inner self by mystic experiences. His writings throughout this stage are mainly philosophical in nature, in which we discover extension of his earlier political thoughts now expressed in the wider context of humanity and its spiritual future.

Development of Human Civilization

Aurobindo argues that, in the course of its development human civilization has to pass by three levels. The first is the level of spontaneity. At this level the shapes and behaviors of society formation, its traditions and customs and institutional setup are the result of natural organic growth. Natural instincts and environmental needs play an significant section in its

formation. The people consider in sure symbol which are imaginative and instinctive in nature. The people belonging to the similar race or kinship follow identical symbols which become a religion for them. Therefore, in this level of development, natural instincts and religious symbols go jointly. The second level is the level of consciousness in which people become intellectually self conscious and start thinking in relation to the this life and its troubles with the help of intelligence and creative power. This level, is predominantly psychological and ethical in nature. In this level intellectuals get importance and approach forward as the initiators of the age of cause and revolt or progress and freedom.

The third level is the level that symbolizes both the triumph and failure of cause. In this level., human beings in collectivity begin to live more deeply and purposively. Life of human beings at this level will be governed by a sense of unity, sympathy, spontaneous liberty and the spirit of individual and collective subsistence. From here humankind has to advance towards the realization of spiritualized civilization. This is the ideal towards which the procedure of development of civilization points out. In this spiritual civilization, 'nation' as a regulating mechanism will have no lay. It will not be worshipped by people as their God or their superior self. There would be no clashes or conflicts on the basis of separate identities as nations. There would be unity within the nations as group but there would also be ultimate unity and oneness of the humankind. The primary responsibility of achieving this unity was entrusted by Aurobindo to India.

Nature of Human Unity

It will not be a mechanical unity recognized under the iron law of the state or any organization because such type of mechanical unity will negate the diversity of several groups, and individuals. There would be no suppression of individual or the life of smaller society. All individuals and communities will get the fullest opportunity for the full development of their potentialities and the full expression of their multi-faced diversity. The future civilization will be a civilization of intricate oneness, a world civilization in which present nations will be intrinsic sections of the whole. The national

civilizations would continue to function as cultural elements but their physical boundaries will have no relevance as they would seem beyond them to realize the vision of the unity of mankind.

Aurobindo was aware of the troubles and hurdles in the method of the emergence of such spiritual civilization at that time, but he was optimistic in relation to the its advent in the close to future. He was not only hopeful but sure in relation to the attainment of world unity and peace. Mankind's aspiration for peace and unity had become a reality to some extent in the shape of the establishment of the League of Nations in 1920 and the United Nations in 1945. He was also aware of the practical limitations of such organizations in the face of the realities of international politics, but firmly whispered in the emergence of united world. It was his belief that this was sure because it was essential for the very continuance of humanity and failure in this respect meant the failure of the human race itself. This could never be, for humanity would not, whatever be its occasional lapses, job for its own extinction.

- **BHAGAT SINGH: THE MARTYR AND HIS IDEOLOGY**

Bhagat Singh (28 September 1907 – 23 March 1931) was an Indian nationalist measured to be one of the mainly influential revolutionaries of the Indian independence movement. He is often referred to as Shaheed Bhagat Singh, the word "Shaheed" meaning "martyr" in a number of Indian languages. Born into a Sikh family which had earlier been involved in revolutionary behaviors against the British Raj, as a teenager Singh studied European revolutionary movements and was attracted to anarchist and Marxist ideologies. He became involved in numerous revolutionary organizations, and quickly rose by the ranks of the Hindustan Republican Association (HRA) to become one of its main leaders, eventually changing its name to the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association (HSRA) in 1928.

Seeking revenge for the death of Lala Lajpat Rai at the hands of the police, Singh was involved in the assassination of British police officer John Saunders. He eluded efforts by the police to capture him. Jointly with Batukeshwar Dutt, he undertook a successful effort to throw two bombs and leaflets inside the Central Legislative Assembly while shouting slogans of Inquilab Zindabad. Subsequently they volunteered to surrender and be

arrested. Held on this charge, he gained widespread national support when he underwent a 116 day fast in jail, demanding equal rights for British and Indian political prisoners. Throughout this time, enough proof was brought against him for a conviction in the Saunders case, after trial by a Special Tribunal and appeal at the Privy Council in England. He was convicted and subsequently hanged for his participation in the murder, aged 23. His legacy prompted youth in India to begin fighting for Indian independence and he continues to be a youth idol in contemporary India, as well as the inspiration for many films. He is commemorated with a big bronze statue in the Parliament of India, as well as a range of other memorials.

Early Life

Bhagat Singh, a Sandhu Jat, was born on 28 September 1907 to Kishan Singh and Vidyavati at Chak No. 105, GB, Banga village, Jaranwala Tehsil in the Lyallpur district of the Punjab Province of British India. His birth coincided with the release from jail of his father and two uncles, Ajit Singh and Swaran Singh. His family was Sikhs, some of whom had been active in Indian independence movements, and others having served in Maharaja Ranjit Singh's army. His ancestral village was Khatkar Kalan, close to the city of Banga in Nawanshahr district (now renamed Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar) of Punjab.

His grandfather, Arjun Singh, was a follower of Swami Dayananda Saraswati's Hindu reformist movement, Arya Samaj, which had a considerable power on the young Bhagat. His father and uncles were members of the Ghadar Party, led by Kartar Singh Sarabha and Har Dayal. Ajit Singh was forced to flee to Persia due to pending court cases against him, while Swaran Singh died at house in 1910 following his release from Borstal Jail in Lahore.

Unlike several Sikhs of his age, Singh did not attend the Khalsa High School in Lahore. His grandfather did not approve of the school officials' loyalism to the British authorities. Instead, he was enrolled in the Dayanand Anglo Vedic High School, an Arya Samaji institution.

In 1919, at the age of 12, Bhagat Singh visited the location of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, where unarmed people gathered at a public

meeting had been fired upon without warning a few days earlier, killing thousands. Bhagat Singh participated ardently in Mahatma Gandhi's Non-Cooperation Movement in 1920 and openly defied the British by following Gandhi's wishes of burning his government school books and any imported British clothing he could discover. At the age of 14, he welcomed in his village, protestors against the Gurudwara Nankana Sahib firing of 20 February 1921 which killed a big number of unarmed protesters. Disillusioned with Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence, after Gandhi described off the non-cooperation movement, following the violent murders of policemen by villagers, which were a reaction to the police's killing of three villagers by firing at Chauri Chaura in the United Provinces in 1922, he joined the Young Revolutionary Movement. Henceforth, he began advocating the violent overthrow of the British in India.

In 1923, Singh joined the National College in Lahore, where he not only excelled academically but was also involved in extra-curricular behaviors such as the dramatics civilization. By this time, he was fluent in five languages. In 1923, Singh won an essay competition set by the Punjab Hindi Sahitya Sammelan. In his essay on *Punjab's Language and Writing*, he quoted Punjabi literature and showed a deep understanding of the troubles of afflicting Punjab. He founded the Indian nationalist youth organization Naujawan Bharat Sabha in March 1926. He also joined the Hindustan Republican Association, which had prominent leaders, such as Ram Prasad Bismil, Chandrashekhar Azad and Ashfaqulla Khan. The name of the organisation was changed to Hindustan Socialist Republican Association at Singh's insistence. A year later, to avoid getting married by his family, Singh ran absent from his home to Cawnpore. In a letter he left behind, he stated:

- My life has been dedicated to the noblest cause, that of the freedom of the country. So, there is no rest or worldly desire that can lure me now...

It is also whispered that he went to Cawnpore to effort to free the Kakori train robbery convicts from jail, but returned to Lahore for strange reasons. On the day of *Dussehra* in October 1926, a bomb exploded in Lahore.

Singh was arrested for his alleged involvement in this Dussehra bomb case on 29 May 1927, but was released for exhibiting good behavior against a steep fine of Rs. 60,000, in relation to the five weeks after his arrest. He wrote for and edited Urdu and Punjabi newspapers, published from Amritsar, as well as briefly for the *Veer Arjun* newspaper published in Delhi. He also contributed to *Kirti*, the journal of the Kirti Kisan Party ("Workers and Peasants Party"), and in September 1928, that party organized an all-India meeting of revolutionaries in Delhi with Singh as its secretary. He later rose to become this association's leader.

Later Revolutionary Behaviors

Lala Lajpat Rai's Death and Murder of Saunders

In 1928, the British government set up the Commission, headed by Sir John Simon, to statement on the political situation in India. The Indian political parties boycotted the Commission, because it did not contain a single Indian in its membership, and it met with country-wide protests. When the Commission visited Lahore on 30 October 1928, Lala Lajpat Rai led a non-violent protest against the Commission in a silent march, but the police responded with violence. The superintendent of police, James A. Scott, ordered the police to *lathi* charge the protesters and personally assaulted Rai, who was grievously injured, later on Rai could not recover from the injury and died on 17 November 1928. It was obviously recognized that Scott's blows had hastened his demise. Though, when the matter was raised in the British Parliament, the British Government denied any role in Rai's death. Although Singh did not witness the event, he vowed to take revenge, and joined other revolutionaries, Shivaram Rajguru, Sukhdev Thapar and Chandrashekhar Azad, in a plot to kill Scott. Though, in a case of mistaken identity, Singh received a signal to shoot on the appearance of John P. Saunders, an Assistant Superintendent of Police. He was shot by Rajguru and Singh while leaving the District Police Headquarters in Lahore at in relation to the 4:15 pm on 17 December 1928.

Although the murder of Saunders was condemned as a retrograde action by Mahatma Gandhi, the Congress leader, others were more understanding of the motivation. Jawaharlal Nehru wrote that

- Bhaghat Singh did not become popular because of his act of terrorism but because he seemed to vindicate, for the moment, the honor of Lala Lajpat Rai, and by him of the nation. He became a symbol, the act was forgotten, the symbol remained, and within a few months each city and village of the Punjab, and to a lesser extent in the rest of northern India, resounded with his name. Innumerable songs grew in relation to the him and the popularity that the man achieved was something amazing.

Escape

After killing Saunders, the group escaped by the D.A.V. College entrance, crossways the road. Chanan Singh, a Head Constable who was chasing them, was fatally injured by Chandrashekhar Azad's covering fire. They then fled on bicycles to pre-arranged spaces of safety. The police launched a huge search operation to catch the culprits and blocked all exits and entrances from the municipality; the CID kept a watch on all young men leaving Lahore. They hid for the after that two days. On 19 December 1928, Sukhdev described on Durga Devi Vohra, their friend Bhagwati Charan Vohra's wife, for help, which she agreed to do. They decided to catch the train departing from Lahore for Howrah early the after that morning. To avoid recognition, Singh shaved off his beard and cut his hair short.

Singh and Rajguru left the home early the after that morning, with both men carrying loaded revolvers. Dressed in Western attire and carrying Vohra's sleeping child, Singh and Vohra passed off as a young couple, while Rajguru accepted their luggage as their servant. At the station, Singh supervised to conceal his identity while buying tickets and the three boarded the train heading to Cawnpore. At Cawnpore, they boarded a train for Lucknow since the CID at Howrah railway station usually scrutinized passengers on the direct train from Lahore. At Lucknow, Rajguru left separately for Benares while

Singh, Vohra and the infant went to Howrah, with all except Singh returning to Lahore a few days later.

1929 Assembly Bomb Throwing Incident

To subdue the rise of revolutionaries like Bhagat Singh in the country, the British government decided to implement the Defense of India Act 1915, which gave the police a free hand. Influenced by a French anarchist who bombed the French Chamber of Deputies, Singh proposed to the HSRA his plan to explode a bomb inside the Central Legislative Assembly, which was agreed to. Initially it was decided that Batukeshwar Dutt and Sukhdev would plant the bomb while Bhagat Singh would travel to the USSR. Though later the plan was changed. He entrusted Dutt to plant the bomb. On 8 April 1929, Singh and Dutt threw two bombs inside the assembly rushing from Visitor's Gallery. The smoke from the bomb filled the Hall and they shouted slogans of "*Inquilab Zindabad!*" and showered leaflets. The leaflet claimed that the act was done to oppose the Deal Disputes and the Public Safety Bill being presented in the Central Assembly and the death of Lala Lajapath Rai. Few sustained injuries in the explosion but there were no deaths. Singh and Dutt claimed that the act was intentional and they were arrested. Gandhi, once again, issued strong languages of disapproval for their deed.

Assembly Bomb Case Trial

Singh and Dutt were charged with effort to murder, and the trial began on 7 May 1929. Doubts have been raised in relation to the accuracy of testimony offered at the trial. One key discrepancy related to the automatic pistol that Singh had been carrying prior to his arrest. One witness, Sobha Singh, told the court that Singh had been firing the pistol two or three times before it jammed, and some policemen stated that Singh was pointing the gun when they arrived. Later Sobha Singh was knighted as a reward for his testimony. Sergeant Terry, who had confronted and arrested Singh, testified that the gun was pointed downward when he took it from Singh and that Singh "was playing with it." Just as to the *India Law Journal*, though, this was incorrect, as Singh had turned in excess of the pistol himself. Just as to

Kooner, Singh "committed one great blunder" by taking his pistol on that day "when it was clear not to harm anybody and offer for police arrest without any protest." Kooner further states that the police linked "the shell of the gun fire establish from the (Saunders') murder location and the pistol." The two were sent to the Sessions Court of Judge Leonard Middleton, who ruled that Singh and Dutt's actions had undoubtedly been 'deliberate' as the bombs had shattered the one and a half-inch deep wooden floor in the Hall. Dutt was defended by Asaf Ali, while Singh defended himself. Their appeal was turned down and they were sentenced to 14 years life imprisonment.

Further Trial and Execution

On 15 April 1929, the 'Lahore bomb factory' was exposed by the police, leading to the arrest of other members of HSRA, out of which seven turned informants, helping the police to connect Singh with the murder of Saunders. Singh, Rajguru, and Sukhdev were charged with the murder of Saunders. Singh decided to use the court as a tool to publicize his cause—the independence of India.

Hunger Strike and Lahore Conspiracy Case

Singh was re-arrested for murdering Saunders and Chanan Singh based on substantial proof against him, including the statements of his associates, Hans Raj Vohra and Jai Gopal. His life sentence in the Assembly Bomb case was deferred till the Saunders' case was decided. Singh was sent to the Mianwali jail from the Delhi jail, where he witnessed discrimination flanked by European and Indian prisoners, and led other prisoners in a hunger strike to protest this illegal discrimination.

They demanded equality in standards of food, clothing, toiletries and other hygienic necessities, as well as availability of books and a daily newspaper for the political prisoners, who they demanded should not be forced to do manual labour or any undignified job in the jail, as detailed in their letter to the House Member on 24 June 1929.

Muhammad Ali Jinnah spoke in the Assembly supporting Singh, and sympathized with the prisoners on hunger strike. He declared on the floor of the Assembly:

- The man who goes on hunger strike has a soul. He is moved by that soul, and he believes in the justice of his cause... though much you deplore them and though much you say they are misguided, it is the system, this damnable system of governance, which is resented by the people.

Jawaharlal Nehru met Singh and the other strikers in Mianwali jail. After the meeting, he stated:

- I was very much pained to see the distress of the heroes. They have staked their lives in this thrash about. They want that political prisoners should be treated as political prisoners. I am quite hopeful that their sacrifice would be crowned with success.

The Government tried to break the strike by placing dissimilar food things in the prison cells to test the hungry prisoners' resolve. Water pitchers were filled with milk so that either the prisoners remained thirsty or broke their strike but nobody faltered or the impasse sustained. The authorities then attempted forcing food by feeding tubes into the prisoners, but were resisted. With the matter still unresolved, the Indian Viceroy, Lord Irwin, broke his vacation in Simla to talk about the situation with the jail authorities. Since the behaviors of the hunger strikers had gained popularity and attention amongst the people nationwide, the government decided to advance the start of the Saunders murder trial, which was henceforth described the Lahore Conspiracy Case. Singh was transported to Borstal Jail, Lahore, and the trial of this case began there on 10 July 1929. In addition to charging them for the murder of Saunders, Singh and 27 other prisoners were charged with plotting a conspiracy to murder Scott and waging a war against the King. Singh, still on hunger strike, had to be accepted to the court handcuffed on a stretcher: he had lost 14 pounds (6.4 kg) weight from 133 pounds (60 kg) before the strike.

By now, the condition of another hunger striker, Jatindra Nath Das, lodged in the similar jail had deteriorated considerably. The Jail committee recommended his unconditional release, but the government rejected the suggestion and offered to release him on bail. On 13 September 1929, Das died after a 63-day hunger strike. After his death, Lord Irwin informed the British prime minister Ramsay MacDonald:

- Jatin Das of the Conspiracy Case, who was on hunger strike, died this afternoon at 1 pm Last night, five of the hunger strikers gave up their hunger strike. So there are only Bhagat Singh and Dutt who are on strike...

Approximately all the nationalist leaders in the country paid tribute to Das' death, and Mohammad Alam and Gopi Chand Bhargava resigned from the Punjab Legislative Council in protest. Motilal Nehru moved a successful adjournment motion in the Central Assembly as a censure against the "inhumane treatment" of the Lahore prisoners. Singh finally heeded a resolution of the Congress party and the request of his father, ending his 116-day hunger strike on 5 October 1929. Throughout this era, Singh's popularity in the middle of general Indians extended beyond Punjab. Singh's attention now turned to his trial, where he was to face a British team on behalf of the Crown and comprising C. H. Carden-Noad, Kalandar Ali Khan, Gopal Lal and the prosecuting inspector, Bakshi Dina Nath. The defence was composed of eight lawyers. When Jai Gopal turned into a prosecution witness, Prem Dutt, the youngest amongst the 28 accused, threw his slipper at Gopal in court. The magistrate ordered that all the accused should be handcuffed, despite all other revolutionaries having dissociated themselves from the act. Singh and others refused to be handcuffed and were so subjected to brutal beating. The revolutionaries refused to attend the court and Singh wrote a letter to the magistrate citing several reasons why they had done so. The trial was henceforth ordered to be accepted out in the absence of the accused or members of the HSRA. This was a setback for Singh as he could no longer use the trial as a forum to publicize his views.

Special Tribunal

To speed up the slow trial, the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, declared an emergency on 1 May 1930, and promulgated an ordinance setting up a special tribunal composed of three high court judges for this case. The ordinance cut short the normal procedure of justice as the only appeal after the tribunal was at the Privy Council situated in England. The Tribunal was authorized to function without the attendance of any of the accused in court, and to accept death of the persons giving proof as a concession to the defence. Consequent to *Lahore Conspiracy Case Ordinance No.3 of 1930*, the trial was transferred from Rai Sahib Pandit Sri Kishan's court to the tribunal composed of Justice J. Coldstream (president), Justice G. C. Hilton and Justice Agha Hyder (members).

The case commenced on 5 May 1930 in Poonch Home, Lahore against 18 accused. On 20 June 1930, the constitution of the Special Tribunal was changed to Justice G.C. Hilton (president), Justice J.K. Tapp and Justice Sir Abdul Qadir. On 2 July 1930, a *habeas corpus* petition was filed in the High Court demanding the ordinance and said that it was *ultra vires* and so illegal, stating that the Viceroy had no powers to shorten the customary procedure of determining justice. The petition argued that the Act, allowed the Viceroy to introduce an ordinance and set up such a tribunal only under circumstances of break down of law-and-order, whereas there had been no such breakdown. Though, the petition was dismissed as 'premature'. Carden-Noad presented the government's grievous charges of conducting dacoities, bank-robbery, and illegal acquisition of arms and ammunition amongst others. The proof of G.T.H. Hamilton Harding, the Lahore superintendent of police, shocked the court, when he stated that he had filed the First Information Statement against the accused under specific orders from the chief secretary (D.J. Boyd) to the governor of Punjab and that he was unaware of the details of the case. The prosecution mainly depended upon the proof of P.N. Ghosh, Hans Raj Vohra and Jai Gopal who had been Singh's associates in the HRSA. On 10 July 1930, the tribunal decided to press charges against only 15 of the 18 accused, and allowed their petitions to be taken up for hearing the after that day. The three

accused against whom the case was withdrawn incorporated Dutt, who had already been awarded a life sentence in the Assembly bomb case.

The ordinance (and the tribunal) would lapse on 31 October 1930 as it had not been passed in the Central Assembly or the British Parliament. On 7 October 1930, the tribunal delivered its 300-page judgment based on all the proof and concluded that participation of Singh, Sukhdev and Rajguru was proved beyond reasonable doubt in Saunders' murder, and sentenced them to death by hanging. The remaining 12 accused were all sentenced to rigorous life imprisonment.

Appeal to the Privy Council

In Punjab, a defence committee drew up a plan to appeal to the Privy Council. Singh was initially against the appeal, but later agreed to it in the hope that the appeal would popularize the HSRA in Britain. The appellants claimed that the ordinance which created the tribunal was invalid, while the government countered that the Viceroy was totally empowered to create such a tribunal. The appeal was dismissed by Judge Viscount Dunedin.

Reactions to the Judgment

After the rejection of the appeal to the Privy Council, Congress party president Madan Mohan Malviya filed a mercy appeal before Lord Irwin on 14 February 1931. An appeal was sent to Mahatma Gandhi by prisoners to intervene. In his notes dated 19 March 1931, the Viceroy recorded:

- While returning Gandhiji asked me if he could talk in relation to the case of Bhagat Singh, because newspapers had approach out with the news of his slated hanging on March 24th. It would be a very unfortunate day because on that day the new president of the Congress had to reach Karachi and there would be a lot of hot discussion. I explained to him that I had given a very careful thought to it but I did not discover any basis to convince myself to commute the sentence. It appeared he establish my reasoning weighty.

The Communist Party of Great Britain expressed its reaction to the case:

- The history of this case, of which we do not approach crossways any instance in relation to the political cases, reflects the symptoms of callousness and cruelty which is the outcome of bloated desire of the imperialist government of Britain so that fear can be instilled in the hearts of the repressed people.

An abortive plan had been made to rescue Singh and fellow inmates of HSRA from the jail. HSRA member Bhagwati Charan Vohra made bombs for the purpose, but died creation them when they exploded accidentally.

Ideals and Opinions

Powers

Singh was attracted to anarchism and communism. He was an avid reader of the teachings of Bakunin and also read Marx, Lenin and Trotsky. Singh did not consider in the Gandhian ideology—which advocated *Satyagraha* and other shapes of non-violent resistance, and felt that the politics of Gandhism would replace one set of exploiters with another. Some of his writings like *Blood Sprinkled on the Day of Holi Babbar Akalis on the Crucifix* were influenced by the thrash about of Dharam Singh Hayatpur.

Anarchism

From May to September 1928, Singh published a series of articles on anarchism in a Punjabi periodical *Kirti*. He expressed concern in excess of misunderstanding of the concept of anarchism in the middle of the public and tried to eradicate its misconception in the middle of people, writing "The people are scared of the word anarchism. The word anarchism has been abused so much that even in India revolutionaries have been described anarchist to create them unpopular." As anarchism means absence of ruler and abolition of state, not absence of order, Singh explained, "I think in India the thought of universal brotherhood, the Sanskrit sentence *vasudhaiva*

kutumbakam etc., has the similar meaning." He wrote in relation to the growth of anarchism:

- "The first man to explicitly propagate the theory of Anarchism was Proudhon and that is why he is described the founder of Anarchism. After him a Russian, Bakunin, worked hard to spread the doctrine. He was followed by Prince Kropotkin etc."

Singh explained anarchism in the article:

- "The ultimate goal of Anarchism is not, not complete independence, just as to which no one will be obsessed with God or religion, nor will anybody be crazy for money or other worldly desires. There will be no chains on the body or manage by the state. This means that they want to eliminate: the Church, God and Religion; the state; Private property."

Marxism

Singh was profoundly influenced by Marxism, saying that the ideal for him and his comrades was "the social reconstruction on Marxist basis". Indian historian K. N. Panikkar described Singh as one of the early Marxists in India. From 1926 onwards, he studied the history of the revolutionary movement in India and abroad. In his prison notebooks, he quoted Vladimir Lenin in reference to imperialism and capitalism and also the revolutionary thoughts of Trotsky. When asked what his last wish was, Singh replied that he was learning the life of Lenin and he wanted to finish it before his death. In spite of his belief in Marxist ideals though, Singh never joined the Communist Party of India.

Atheism

Singh began to question religious ideologies after witnessing the Hindu–Muslim riots that broke out after Gandhi disbanded the Non-Cooperation Movement. He did not understand how members of these two groups, initially united in fighting against the British, and could be at each

other's throats because of their religious differences. At this point, Singh dropped his religious beliefs, since he whispered religion hindered the revolutionaries' thrash about for independence, and began learning the works of Bakunin, Lenin, Trotsky—all atheist revolutionaries. He also took an interest in Soham Swami's book *General Sense* (Singh incorrectly referred to Niralamba Swami, though Niralamba had only written the introduction), which advocated a shape of "mystic atheism". While in his prison cell in 1931, he wrote a pamphlet entitled *Why I am an Atheist* in which he discussed and advocated the philosophy of atheism. This pamphlet was a result of some criticism by fellow revolutionaries on his failure to acknowledge religion and God in jail; the accusation of vanity was also dealt with in this pamphlet. He supported his own beliefs and claimed that he used to be a firm believer in The Almighty, but could not bring himself to consider the myths and beliefs that others held secure to their hearts. In this pamphlet, he acknowledged the information that religion made death easier, but also said that unproved philosophy is a sign of human weakness. In this context, he noted:

- As regard the origin of God, my thought is that man created God in his imagination when he realized his weaknesses, limitations and shortcomings. In this method he got the courage to face all the trying circumstances and to meet all dangers that might happen in his life and also to restrain his outbursts in prosperity and affluence. God, with his whimsical laws and parental generosity was painted with variegated colors of imagination. He was used as a deterrent factor when his fury and his laws were repeatedly propagated so that man might not become a danger to civilization. He was the cry of the distressed soul for he was whispered to stand as father and mother, sister and brother, brother and friend when in time of distress a man was left alone and helpless. He was Almighty and could do anything. The thought of God is helpful to a man in distress.

Martyrdom

His mentor as a young boy was Kartar Singh Sarabha, whose photo he always accepted in his pocket. Singh is himself measured a martyr for acting to avenge the death of Lala Lajpat Rai. In the leaflet he threw in the Central Assembly on 9 April 1929, he stated: "It is easy to kill individuals but you cannot kill the thoughts. Great empires crumbled, while the thoughts survived." After learning the Russian Revolution, he wanted to die so that his death would inspire the youth of India which in turn will unite them to fight the British Empire. Prannath Mehta, Singh's friend, visited him in the jail on 20 March, four days before his execution, with a draft letter for clemency, but he declined to sign it.

●

● **REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- What do you understand by Militant Nationalism?
- How does militant nationalism compare with Revolutionary and anarchism?
- What is the significance of Militant nationalism in contemporary politics?
- What was Tilak's Theory of Social Reform?
- Why did Tilak oppose the idea of reform through legislation?
- What are the major factors which influenced Aurobindo's political thinking?
- Explain in brief Aurobindo's concept of nation.
- Which two qualities were considered by Bhagat Singh to be the most important ones for revolutionary?

CHAPTER 4

Colonialism, Caste Order and the Tribal Societies

● **STRUCTURE**

- Learning objectives
- Colonialism, caste order and tribal movements
- Jyotiba Phule (1827-1890)
- E.V. Ramaswami Naicker
- Dr. B. R. Ambedkar
- Anti-colonial tribal movements in India
- Review questions

● **LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Explain the nature of the anti-caste movements that arose in the aftermath of British Colonialism.
- Discuss the genesis and evolution of Tribal movements in colonial India.
- Discuss the nature and evolution of Jyotiba Phule's thinking.
- Discuss the context in which E.V. Ramaswami Naicker emerged.
- Discuss the relevance of E.V. Ramaswami Naicker life and work in contemporary India.
- Understand the significance of Dr. Ambedkar's social and political thought.
- the socio-economic conditions of the Tribal during the colonial period.

● **COLONIALISM, CASTE ORDER AND TRIBAL MOVEMENTS**

Colonialism and its Impact in the Cultural and Social Fields

The integration of Indian economy with the world capitalist system was followed by changes in the social and cultural meadows. Colonialism facilitated India's get in touch with the momentous changes that the western world was undergoing and introduced Indian intellectuals to the radical and liberal ideals of democracy, popular sovereignty and rationalism. The industrial revolution, the breath-taking advance of science and technology and the great revolutionary upheavals of the 18th and 19th centuries in the west were transforming the whole face of the world - it was never to be the similar again. The profound impact that this beside with the introduction of contemporary education had on the parts of Indian middle classes led to intense questioning and critical appraisal of the backward and degrading socio-religious practices prevalent in Indian civilization.

The mcio-cultural milieu of pre-colonial India was primarily shaped by the family and kinship organizations which conditioned the mind with a religious and caste identity. All the traditional practices were by these organizations; passed on from generation to generation. Initially, modem education did not touch more than the frills of Indian civilization. The lack of enough cultural possessions and ideological tools at the command of the colonial state eventually led the British, in the person of Lord Macaulay, to direct their efforts at producing a class from in the middle of the Indians who would be carriers of colonial civilization and ideology - Indians by the color of their skin but British in their tastes and thought. Though, whatever be the case, under this power of contemporary thoughts there urbanized in India, a whole series of socio-religious reform movements.

Reformist Movements

These movements took the shape of a 'thrash about against the backward units of traditional civilization', an significant dimension of which was opposition to caste., The movements like Brahmo Samaj and Prarthana Samaj advocated the removal of caste distinction.

Following the reform movements of the early nineteenth century which were explicitly influenced by liberal thoughts, there were religious reform movements like the Arya Samaj and Ramakrishna Mission. Arya Samaj drew its inspiration from Vedic Hinduism, rejected polytheism and idolatry, and sought to provide greater role to individuality. 'Swami Dayananda Saraswati, the architect of Arya Samaj accepted that all persons including Shudras could read the Vedas. This was a extra ordinary innovation in traditional Hinduism, where something like Shudras having access to scriptures was measured blasphemous. Dayanand Saraswati measured caste as having had a useful function in the past. Though, in his conception he introduced much greater flexibility by asserting that birth should not be the sole criterion. Guna (character), Karma (action) and Swabhav (nature), just as to him necessity be the criteria. The Ramakrishna mission, on the other hand, preached Vedantic Hinduism and advocated universal brotherhood. Initiated by a easy village Saint Ramakrishna, this powerful revivalist movement in Bengal was subsequently accepted forward by Swami Vivekananda. Vivekananda did not want to discard the caste system altogether, but attacked its rigidity. He too wanted to change it from a system based solely on birth to one based on merit. He vigorously attacked the practice of untouchability.

Anti-Caste Movements: Some Details

One of the mainly significant features of these reform movements was their opposition to caste and its accompanying rigidity. The 6utspokenly anti-caste movements led by Ramaswami Naicker, Jyotiba Phule and Sri Narayana Guru bear testimony to this. As you shall see later in this block, the chief inspiration for Ambedkar's crusade came from the ideals of liberty, fraternity and equality - the slogans of the Western revolutions. The socially progressive stance of these movements on questions of sati, dowry, widow remarriage, etc. beside with intense questioning of the rigidities of the caste system illustrate that Western thoughts of liberalism had a powerful impact.

Colonialism and its Impact on the Economy

Here we shall deal primarily with the impact on the agrarian economy. In the middle of the major changes introduced by the British in Indian economy, the distant-reaching changes in agriculture were almost certainly the mainly significant. These changes introduced with a view to cornering the surplus in the shape of land revenue and to create Indian agriculture an appendage of the British economy, greatly transformed the face of the countryside. It was precisely with this purpose that, as you have read earlier, the colonial authorities introduced two major tenurial and land revenue systems - the Zamindari and Ryotwari systems, whereby the location of peasant cultivators became quite precarious. They were forced to pay very high rents and were made to pay illegal dues and cesses and often had to perform forced labour.

High rates of revenue forced these peasant cultivators to take recourse to borrowing money - at equally high rates of interest - often forcing the peasant to resort to distress sales. Floods and famines aggravated the situation and made them more and more susceptible to the money-lenders grip, who in any case was being helped by the Government. This rising grip of the money-lenders in excess of the agrarian economy eventually enabled them to acquire the land of the distressed peasants whose pauperization was becoming a rising characteristic of rural life.

The British made conscious efforts to incorporate the Indian agricultural and tribal economy into the ever-expanding market of British colonialism. To this end, Indian agriculture was forced to cater to the needs of British Capital. So, there was huge forced manufacture of cash crops like cotton, indigo, sugar, tea and coffee. This spread of crops intended for export to Indian and foreign markets were one of the main forces which created a more homogeneous agrarian civilization in the early 19th century. Not only were tribal people and nomads being settled and subordinated to the discipline of producing an exportable surplus, but several of the gradations in status and function flanked by people of the settled agricultural tracts which had obtained

under indigenous rule were disappearing, giving method to easy distinctions of wealth and landholding.

In the middle of the changes that the whole gamut of British policies brought in the agrarian set-up was a change in the social relationships too. Slow penetration of capital and of consumption into the forests was a very important change. The partnership flanked by the Company and the money-lender - trader which had facilitated the subjugation of India now proceeded in the conquest of India's internal frontiers. Monied 'settlers from the plains trickled into the central Indian tribal zone establishing landlordism and indebtedness alien to the domestic economy of the indigenous tribal systems. As late as the 18th century, there still lived an extensive rustic and itinerant economy which had changed in a big method by mid-nineteenth century. Everywhere they (British) sought to settle and discipline groups such as the Gujars, Bhathis, Ranjar, Rajputs and Mewatis who moved approximately, extracting protection rent. The assessment of waste land and making of more rigid property rights enforceable by court order restricted the nomads' mobility. Several of the herdsmen carrier people of the Deccan for example, had already become subordinate agricultural 'Castes' before 1870. The changes in the rustic and agrarian economy however they were a cause for much discontent and rebellions, though, affected changes in the caste structure too.

Caste Order and Colonialism

You necessity have read in relation to the caste-system in Indian civilization in the course on Indian Government and Politics. In this element we shall introduce you to the impact of colonialism on the caste order. Though, before we go on to see what changes colonialism brought in its wake, let us briefly enumerate sure vital characteristics of the caste system. G.S. Ghurye, in his authoritative job on Caste has enumerated six such characteristics:

- Segmental division of civilization, i.e., the "quasi-sovereignty of caste" and its governing body, as a result of which members of a caste ceased to be members of a society as a whole, insofar as such caste was a

group with a separate arrangement for meeting out justice to its members. Therefore, it implied a situation where citizens owned moral allegiance to their caste first, rather than to the society as a whole.

- Hierarchy or rigid ordering of civilization from top to bottom on the basis of ritual status and equally rigid definition of roles and functions that each group necessarily performs.
- Restrictions in inter-dining and social intercourse just as to the detailed rules which prescribe what sort of food or drink can be accepted by a person and from what castes.
- Civil and religious disabilities and privileges of dissimilar parts: mainly expressed by separated livelihood and some castes not having access to sure regions, streets, temples, practices like untouchability and SO on.
- Lack of unrestricted choice of job
- Endogamy or restriction of marriage

Impact of British Judicial and Administrative Practices

The judicial and administrative practices introduced by the British based on the principle of equality before law, obviously made no distinction flanked by castes. Further, introduction by the British of a uniform criminal law "removed from the purview of caste, several matters that used to be adjudicated by it earlier." No longer were caste-governing bodies to decide on matters of assault, adultery, rape and so on. Slowly, even in sure matters of civil law, like marriage and divorce, the power of caste started getting eroded. The second aspect was the enactment of sure laws which practically eroded the power of castes in several compliments however practically, often the impact was marginal. Despite this, legislations like the Widow Remarriage Act of 1856 or the Castes Disabilities Removal Act of 1850 did have considerable impact on the power of caste. Concerning marriage, usually the British legal system tried to adhere to the practices laid down by regional customs.

British management also took up the question of civil equality for lower castes. The Govt. in Bombay Presidency, for instance, issued a resolution in 1923 threatening to withhold grants to any school/educational institution that refused to admit students from lower castes. Also the practice of segregating students from lower castes in classes was slowly abandoned and they were made to sit with co-pupils from in the middle of the caste Hindus. The Madras Govt. in 1923 empowered Magistrates to punish offenders of lower castes and in 1925 by a special legislation threw open all public roads and streets giving access to any public office, well, tank or lay of public resort to all classes of people including the depressed. The Govt. of Madras Presidency was in information, the first to introduce protective discrimination in jobs for the lower castes, as early as in 1873.

Impact of Economic Changes

You have seen how this changing economic structure led to integration of sure itinerant people into the caste structure with the expansion of agricultural behaviors. It also led to a change in the status of sure caste groups within the caste hierarchy with land becoming a commodity that could be sold to anyone who could pay for it, even a 'low caste' member, provided an opportunity to several to acquire an economic status whereby they could slowly strive for upward mobility. Availability of new economic opportunities in port municipalities and capitals and access to new trading and employment opportunities for the lower castes resulted in relative prosperity for them. For example, the improved communications brought in relation to the enlargement of market for oil and pressed oilseeds, from which Telis (Oilmen) all in excess of eastern India benefited. The Noniyas of eastern UP, Kolis of Surat coast and many other groups benefited from the new employment opportunities resulting from railway, road and canal construction. In such cases, just as to M.N. Srinivas, the wealthier families or parts became possessed of a desire to move up in caste hierarchy by acquiring the symbols and rituals of higher castes, This upward mobility is recognized as 'Sanskritization'. The changes from an agricultural economy to an industrial

economy also brought in its wake procedures like westernization which involved a change in status based on adoption of western values.

Anti-Caste Movements under the Power of Liberal Philosophy

The third major method in which the caste structure was affected was by powerful anti-caste and social reform movements under the Arya Samaj in Northern India, Raja Ram Mohan Roy in Bengal, Jyotiba Phule in Maharashtra, Sri Narayana Guru in Kerala, Ramaswami Naicker in Madras and so on. The major themes taken up by these movements were reform in regard to the location of women, equality for oppressed castes, common reform in religion and rituals. So, for example, social reformers had exerted enough pressure for the enactment of the Special Marriage Act in 1872 that made inter-caste marriage possible.

Questions of widow remarriage, Sati, women's education etc. was significant issues of thrash about waged by the social reformers, particularly in Bengal. The mobility of a few low castes had in Srinivas' languages, a 'demonstration effect' on all others in the area. The latter felt that they were no longer condemned to a life of poverty and oppression. Provided they made the effort, they could also rise up the ladder. Perhaps this feeling significantly contributed to lending a strength to the movement of lower and backward castes. What has approach to be recognized as the 'Backward Classes Movement' acquired a widespread character and was particularly strong in Southern sections of India. These movements, passed by two levels: in the first, the lower castes tried to acquire the symbols and rituals of high status, while in the second aspirations moved towards acquisition of political power, education and share in the new economic opportunities.

The emergence of caste sabhas or associations gave organizational impetus to the movement of backward castes. Initial action of these sabhas were directed at trying 'to reform caste customs and undertake welfare behaviors of the benefit of their caste brethren, in the shape of structure hostels, homes on a co-operative basis, setting up colleges and hospitals, and give scholarships. An overview of the mainly significant anti-caste movements suggests that, despite widely differing approaches and ways they had a general

stand, in that they were motivated by same issues which became the total point of reform. While the social reformers of Bengal explicitly challenged the very basis of caste oppression by advocating nationalism, the Arya Samaj and or the Ramakrishna Mission sought to vary the caste system by efforts in the direction of removal of untouchability. Phule and Naicker organized the 'lower castes' to lead an assault on the upper caste power in all spheres of social life. Though, it has been pointed out that such movements which organized the lower castes against upper caste power, in due course got transformed into a movement of caste solidarity themselves.

Tribal Movements

The tribal movements in colonial India, it necessity be understood, were born out of deep dissatisfaction and often discontent against socio-economic policies of the British Government, which adversely affected their lives. Whether it be the question of encroachment of tribal lands by money-lenders backed by the Govt., the acquisition of tribal forest, high taxation or enhancement of rent, everyone of these policies created in the middle of the tribes and itinerant societies extreme distrust of the authorities and turned them against the rulers - often against outsiders in common, since that was how the tribal mind perceived the situation to be.

The situation was further worsened by the information that famines in the latter half of the 19th century forced the tribal into destitution. Dr. Verrier Elwin remarks that the chief cause of the decline of tribal societies' '...was the loss of land and forests" which just as to him, "had the effect of enervating tribal organism that it had no interior resistance against infection by a score of other evils..." If we seem back in excess of the extensive series of tribal rebellions against power in other sections of tribal India, we see that the majority of them arose in excess of this one point. Therefore, the Kol insurrection of 1833 was caused by encroachment on tribal land. The Tamar rebellions repeated seven times flanked by 1789 and 1832 were primarily due to the illegal deprivation of their rights in land, which the Hos, Mundas and Oraons suffered. The Santhal Rebellion (1855) was primarily a revolt against oppression of landlords, village money-lenders etc. The Birsa Munda Revolt

(1895-1901) too was directed against the 'outsider'-namely landlords, traders and government officers. As apparent, the movements were spread in excess of big section of the country.

A noteworthy characteristic of these tribal movements, separated in legroom and time from one another, was that they occurred not in one or two pockets but were spread out crossways the country and had at the root, general or alike issues. Important tribal movements took lay in the beginning of the twentieth century. Mainly significant in the middle of these was in the present Andhra Pradesh, where the tribals' forest agitation merged with Gandhi's non-cooperation movement and subsequent to its withdrawal was accepted further under the leadership of Sitarama Raju. Just as to Prof. Summit Sarkar the spread of the movement was distant beyond Andhra. "On 10 July 1921, Reading accounted to the Secy. of State that 2,50,000 out of 4,00,000 acres of forest in Kumaon Division of U.P. had been burnt down. Cavalry had to be sent to Muzaffarpur in North Bihar in Dec. 1921 to tackle an agitation in excess of grazing rights. From Bengal, too, came reports of Santhals reasserting their lost forest rights in the Jhargram area of Midnapur and widespread looting of woodlands in Banskhali land Cox's Bazar regions of Chittagong."

A revise of these innumerable tribal movements reveals motivating features which have parallels in alike agrarian movements elsewhere in the world. Mainly of these have been characterized by what has been described a negative consciousness by Ranajit Guha wherein, more than their own consciousness as a class or social group, a consciousness based on an identification of the enemy has played a vital role. Often enemies of the people have been recognized as enemies of the faithful, oppressed and disenfranchised and have been mingled with religious calls for thrash about against such enemies.

Teachings of Judaism, Christianity and Shia'ite Islam often had, as integral section of their teachings the promise of a paradise on earth for a thousand years by divine intervention. This has been variously described as Messianism, Millenarianism or Mahdism. Such millenarian units can be seen in the dissimilar Mahdist movements in the Babism of mid 19th century Iran

or in the vision of a Heavenly Kingdom in the Taiping Rebellion in China or in the several variants of Brazilian Cultic protest movements. Kathleen Gough, on the basis of a revise of 77 agrarian revolts has roughly classified them into five kinds in conditions of their goals, ideology and ways of organization:

- Restorative rebellions to drive out the British and to restore earlier rulers and social dealings,
- Religious movements for the liberation of a area or an ethnic group under a new shape of govt.,
- What had been referred to as 'Social banditry' by E. J. Hobsbawm,
- Terrorist vengeance, with thoughts of meeting out collective justice and
- Mass insurrections for the redress of scrupulous grievances.

However Eric Hobsbawm, Norman Cohn and Peter Worsely have suggested that millenarian movements were unusual or absent in India, Gough holds a dissimilar opinion. Just as to her, it is almost certainly true in the 'strict sense of a belief in a thousand year era in which the evil one will be chained, in a wider sense it is not true. The belief and expectation that the present evil world will be transformed by divine intervention and bliss shall reign on earth, has permeated several a tribal movement in India. "Birsa Munda received teaching both from Lutheran missionaries and Hindu ascetics but then reverted to his Munda religion, bringing with him beliefs and images from both major faiths. He taught the Mundas first that he was divinity - appointed messenger approach to deliver them from foreign rule, and later that he was an incarnation of God himself. His mission was to save the faithful from destruction in imminent flood, fire and brimstone, by leading them to the top of a mountain. Beneath them, "all the British, Hindus and Muslims would perish, after which a Munda Kingdom would be ushered in."

Some of these movements subsequently got integrated with the national movement. Particularly throughout the non-cooperation movement the 'forest Satyagrahas' played an significant role. Slowly, they also got imbued with anti-imperialist ideology. Sumit Sarkar notes in the case of Sitarama Raju's movement that sure striking new characteristics were visible.

Sitarama Raju was not a regional village muttadar unlike previous leaders but "a man without family or interest, an outsider coming from a group which claimed Kshatriya status and often some proficiency in Telugu and Sanskrit scholarship...."

Anti-imperialist ideology was still rudimentary. Raju's anti-imperialist feeling was reflected, for example in his statement that he was unable to shoot Europeans as they were always bounded by Indians whom he did not want to kill. This ideology was accompanied by primitive messianic units. He had been wandering in the middle of the tribals since 1915 as a Sanyasi claiming astrological and medicinal powers and coming under Non-Cooperation power in 1921. "Raju hints he is bullet-evidence" accounted the Malkangiri Deputy Tehsildar, while a rebel proclamation in April 1924 claimed that "God Sri Jagannadhaswami would incarnate very shortly as kalkiavatar and seem before us." Essentially all these tribal movements were the outcome of deep resentment and discontent against the policies of British imperialists that affected them adversely.

JYOTIBA PHULE (1827-1890)

Mahatma Jyotirao Govindrao Phule (11 April 1827 – 28 November 1890), also recognized as Mahatma Jyotiba Phule was an activist, thinker, social reformer, writer, philosopher, theologian, scholar, editor and revolutionary from Maharashtra, India in the nineteenth century. Jotiba Phule and his wife Savitribai Phule were pioneers of women's education in India. His extraordinary power was apparent in meadows like education, agriculture, caste system, women and widow upliftment and removal of untouchability. He is mainly recognized for his efforts to educate women and the lower castes as well as the masses. He, after educating his wife, opened first a school for girls in India in August 1848. In September 1873, Jotirao, beside with his followers, shaped the Satya Shodhak Samaj (Civilization of Seekers of Truth) with the main objective of liberating the Bahujans, Shudras and Ati-Shudras and protecting them from use and atrocities. For his fight to attain equal rights for peasants and the lower caste and his contributions to the field of education, he is regarded as one of the mainly significant figures of the Social Reform

Movement in Maharashtra. Dhananjay Keer, his biographer, notes him as "the father of Indian social revolution".

Attitude Towards Colonial Government

Welcoming the British Rule

British rule had brought to an end the tyranny and chaos of the regime of the last Peshwa in Maharashtra. The colonial rulers had not only recognized law and order but also the principle of equality before law. The earlier regime of Brahmin Peshwas had imposed strict limitations on education, job and livelihood standards of the lower castes and women. The new rulers opened the 1 opportunities in education and mobility in job for the members of all castes. Missionary schools and government colleges were ready to admit any student irrespective of caste origins. New thoughts of equality and liberty could reach the moderately educated parts of the lower caste. Phule was almost certainly the best product of this procedure. High caste reformers and leaders also had welcomed the colonial rule. It is not surprising that Phule who was concerned with the slavery of the lower castes also favored the British ~rule. He hoped that the new government which believes in equality flanked by man and man would emancipate lower castes, from the power of the Brahmins.

The British rule opened up new employment opportunities in the management. The political power at regional stage was also being given to the Indians. Phule who had worked as a member of the Poona Municipality could visualize how lower castes would be able to acquire power at regional stage throughout the era of British rule and also enter the colonial bureaucracy. He whispered in the benevolent attitude of the British rulers towards the lower castes and so asked for a number of things from them. He was not sure how extensive the British rule would continue. So, he wanted lower castes to use the opportunity and get rid of the tyranny of Brahmins. Brahmin rulers used to collect vast wealth out of taxes levied on poor lower castes population, but never used to spend even a paisa for their welfare. On the contrary, the new regime was showing the signs of doing good things for the deprived people.

Phule assured the colonial rulers that if the Shudras were made happy and contented, they need not worry in relation to the loyalty of the subjects. He wanted the British government to abolish Brahmin Kulkarni's location, and a post of village headman (Patil) filled on the basis of merit. In information, Phule would have liked the Qritish government to put an end to the balutedary system which was linked with caste specific occupations in the villages. He asked the government to create laws prohibiting customs and practices which gave subordinate status to women and untouchables. Phule wanted Brahmin bureaucracy to be replaced by non-Brahmin bureaucracy. But if the non-Brahmins were not accessible, the government should appoint, he thought, the British men to these posts. He whispered that the British officers would take impartial view and were likely to face with lower castes.

Phule knew that education had not yet percolated to the lower castes. The masses had not yet become politically conscious. The high caste elites were claiming that they were the true representatives of the people and so wee demanding political rights. This procedure, Phule thought, would reestablish the political supremacy of the high castes. Phule advised his followers from the lower castes not to participate the-movement for political rights. He argued that the Indian National Congress or other political associations were not national in the true sense of the term because they represented only high castes. Phule warned his followers against the selfish and cunning motives of the Brahmins in forming these associations and advised them to stay themselves absent from such associations. In his Satya Shodhak Samaj, he had made it a rule not to talk about politics. In information, we discover that he had expressed more than once a complete and total loyalty towards the new government. He firmly whispered that the almighty God had dethroned the tyrannical rulers and had recognized in their lay a presently, enlightened and peaceful British rule for the welfare of the masses. It does not mean that Phule did not understand the significance of politics. Infect, he has said at one lay that the circumstances of lower castes had deteriorated because they were deprived of political power. His efforts to organize lower castes under the banner of Satya Shodhak Samaj should be seen as a political action. It is true that he gave preference to social reform rather than political reform in the 19th

century. But that does not suggest that he would have sustained to hold the educated, they would become conscious of their political rights vis-à-vis similar views in the changed circumstances. He knew that if the lower castes were Brahmins and not only demand a share in political power, but would dethrone the Brahmins and set up their own supremacy. His writings were directed towards that.

Criticism of the British Rule

However Phule preferred British rule to the regime of the Brahmins, he was aware of the shortcomings of the former and he never hesitated to point them out openly. Since his mission was to bring in relation to the an egalitarian civilization where all men and women would enjoy liberty, Phule criticized the modern rulers if he felt that their policies went against this thought. He was mainly interested in destroying forever the supremacy of Brahmins in social, economic and political meadows. So, he used to attack the British government whenever its policies favored the Brahmins even indirectly.

It was the educational policy of the British government which came under severe attack from Phule. He complained that the government was providing more funds and greater facilities to higher education and neglecting that of the masses. He brought it to the notice of the government that the greater portion of the revenue of the Government was derived from the labour of masses. The higher and rich classes contribute very little to State's exchequer. The government, so, should spend a big portion of its income on the education of the masses and not of the higher classes.

Due to the educational policy favoring the upper classes, the higher offices were virtually monopolized by them, If the government wished the welfare of the lower castes, it was its duty to reduce the proportion of high castes in the management and augment that of the lower castes. Phule's substance in writing a book on slavery was to open the eyes of the government to the pernicious system of high class education. This system, Phule said, was keeping the masses in ignorance and poverty. The government used to collect a special cess for educational purposes but the funds so derived were not spent

for education of the masses. He criticized the primary schools run by the government by saying that the education imparted in these schools was not satisfactory. It did not prove practical or useful in the future career of the students. He also criticized on same rows the higher secondary schools, colleges and system of scholarships. The scholarship system, he observed was unduly favorable to literary castes while there was a need to encourage the lower castes children.

Moderate nationalists had always held high the liberal principles on which the British government was founded and criticized the colonial bureaucracy for departure from them. Phule agreed with them on this point. Though, he made a distinction flanked by British officers and the Brahmin officers and preferred the former. But he observed that the British officers were concerned in relation to the their own comfort and salaries. They did not discover enough time to know in relation to the real circumstances of the peasants. They did not understand the language of the peasants. The Brahmin officers thereby used to get an opportunity to mislead the British officers and use the poor and illiterate peasants. Phule almost certainly did not realize that the colonial rule depended upon the elites of the colony to uphold its dominance and so recruited them to the bureaucracy.

His biographers tell us that when he was a member of the Poona Municipality he showed unusual courage in opposing a move to spend one thousand rupees on Viceroy's visit. In 1888 a dinner was organized in honor of the Duke of Connaught at Poona. Phule went there in the typical dress of a poor peasant and delivered a moving speech after the dinner. He told the audience that the people of the country were to be establish in the villages. He had intentionally approach in that dress so that the British guests would approach to know how a general peasant existed: He also told them that it was the duty of the government to formulate policies for the welfare of these peasants. In his writings also we approach crossways a criticism of government's policies which went against the peasants. As suggested, take note of it while discussing his views on economic issues.

Critique of the Indian Social Order

Philosophical Foundations of the Critique of Social Order

Phule's criticism of the British government emanated out of his concern for the welfare and the status of the lower castes in modern civilization. Just as to Phule, the Indian civilization was based on inequality flanked by man and man and use of ignorant masses by the cunning Brahmins. Phule whispered that God who is the creator of the Universe has created all men and women free and capable of enjoying their rights. The creator has created all men and women as the custodians of all human rights so that a man or a group of men should not suppress an individual. The Maker has bestowed upon all men and women religious and political liberty. So, no one should seem down upon anyone's religious faith or political opinion. Every individual has a right to property. The Maker, Phule thought, has given all human beings the liberty of thought and expression. But the thought or opinion one is expressing should not be harmful to anybody. The creator has made all men and women capable of claiming a location in civil service or municipal management just as to their skill. No one should encroach upon the equal liberty of other human beings. Phule whispered that all men and women are entitled to enjoy all the things the Maker has created. All men and women are equal before law. Phule held that the magistrates and judges of the court of law should be impartial in their judgments. Phule urbanized a critique of Indian civilization in the light of these fundamental principles.

Attack on Varna and Caste System

Indian civilization was founded on the Varna system. Phule challenged the view that it was god-ordained. He held that this claim was made to deceive the lower Varnas. Since this claim was made by the religious texts of the Hindus, he decided, to expose the falsehood of these texts.

Phule depended upon the modern theories and his own creativity to interpret these texts. Accordingly, he whispered that Brahmins who were recognized as Aryans descended upon the plains of North India few thousand years back, perhaps from Iran. They came as conquerors and defeated the

original inhabitants of this land. Under the direction of the leaders such as Brahma and Parshuram, Brahmins fought protracted wars against the original inhabitants. They initially settled on the banks of the Ganges and later on spread-out in excess of the other sections of the country. In order to stay a better hold in excess of the masses, they devised the mythology, the Varna and caste system and also the code of cruel and inhuman laws. They founded a system of priest craft which gave the Brahmin a prominence in all rituals. The caste system was a making of cunning Brahmins. The highest rights and privileges were given to the Brahmins whereas Shudras and Atishudras (untouchables) were regarded with hatred and contempt. Even the commonest rights of humanity were denied to them. Their touch or even their shadow was measured as pollution. Phule reinterpreted the religious text of the Hindus to illustrate how Aryans had conquered the original inhabitants. The nine avatars of Vishnu were seen by him as several levels of Aryan conquest. From those days, the Brahmins have enslaved the Shudras and Atishudras. For generations they have accepted the chains of slavery of bondage. A number of Brahmin writers like Manu have added from time to time to the existing legends which enslave the minds of the masses. Phule compared the system of slavery fabricated by the Brahmins with slavery in America and pointed out that Shudras had to suffer greater hardships and oppression than the blacks. He thought that this system of selfish superstition and bigotry was responsible for the stagnation and all the evils from which India was suffering for centuries.

After narrating the story of Brahmin power in the past. Phule tells us how in his times things had not changed much except for advent of the enlightened rule of Britain. The Brahmin sustained to use the Shudra from his birth to death. Under the guise of religion, the Brahmin intervened and meddled in each and everything the Shudra did. A Brahmin tried to use him not only in his capability as a priest, but did so in a number of other methods also. Due to his higher education, he had monopolized all the positions in the management, judiciary, social, religious and political organisations. In a city or village, the Brahmin was all in all. He was the master and the ruler. The Patel of the village had become a nonentity. Instead the Brahmin village accountant recognized as Kulkarni had acquired power in the village. He was

the temporal and spiritual adviser of the people, a money-lender and a common referee in all matters. Similar was the case at tehsil stage where a tehsildar used to harass to illiterate masses. Phule tells us that the story holds good at all stages of management and in judiciary, as well as several departments of the government. The Brahmin bureaucrats used to use the poor and ignorant masses in each and every case by misguiding the British superiors.

It is essential at this level to note that Phule who belonged to the gardner caste - Shudra caste - was concerned in relation to the not only Shudras but also Atishudras, i.e. the untouchables also. He advocated that these lower castes and untouchables should organise against the dominance of the Brahmins and strive for an egalitarian civilization. It is not, so, surprising that Dr. Ambedkar whose thoughts you are going to revise of later regarded Phule as his Guru.

Equality flanked by Man and Woman

Another oppressed group in the Indian civilization was that of women. Phule always mentions women beside with men. He did not assume that when men are mentioned, women are automatically incorporated into that category. He creates a special reference to women when he discusses human rights. Presently as Shudras were deprived of rights by the Brahmins by keeping them ignorant, Phule thought that selfish men had prohibited women from taking to education in order to continue male power. The Hindu religious texts had given a number of concessions to men but had imposed severe restrictions on women. Phule was mainly concerned in relation to the marriage system of those days. He attacked the customs and practices such as child marriage, marriage flanked by young girl and old man, polygamy, objection to remarriage of women, prostitution, harassment of widows, etc, He advised Shudra peasants not to have more than one wife and not to marry their young children. He had given serious thought to the institution of marriage and had devised a easy and contemporary contract kind ritual for the marriage ceremony of the members of Satya Shodhak Samaj (Truth Seeking Civilization). It is motivating to note that Phule did not stop at visualizing

equal status to women in marriage, family education and religion but claimed that woman was superior to man in several compliments.

-

- **E.V. RAMASWAMI NAICKER**

Erode Venkata Ramasamy (17 September 1879 – 24 December 1973), affectionately described by his followers as Periyar, Thanthai Periyar or E. V. R., was a businessman, politician, Indian independence and social activist, who started the Self-Respect Movement or the Dravidian Movement and proposed the making of an self-governing state described Dravida Nadu, comprising the states of South India. He is also the founder of the socio-cultural organisation, Dravidar Kazhagam.

Periyar was born in Erode, Madras Presidency to a wealthy family of Kannada speaking Balijas. At a young age, he witnessed numerous incidents of racial, caste and gender discrimination. Periyar married when he was 19, and had a daughter who existed for only 5 months. His first wife, Nagammai, died in 1933. Periyar married for a second time in July 1948. His second wife, Maniammai, sustained Periyar's social job after his death in 1973, but still his thoughts and thoughts were being spread by Dravidar Kazhagam.

Periyar joined the Indian National Congress in 1919, but resigned in 1925 when he felt that the party was only serving the interests of the Brahmins. In 1924, Periyar led a non-violent agitation (satyagraha) in Vaikom, Kerala. From 1929 to 1932 toured Malaysia, Europe, and Russia, which had an power on him. In 1939, Periyar became the head of the Justice Party, and in 1944, he changed its name to *Dravidar Kazhagam*. The party later split and one group led by C. N. Annadurai shaped the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) in 1949. While continuing the *Self-Respect Movement*, he advocated for an self-governing Dravida Nadu (*Dravidistan*).

Periyar propagated the principles of rationalism, self-respect, women's rights and eradication of caste. He opposed the use and marginalization of the non-Brahmin indigenous Dravidian peoples of South India and the imposition of, what he measured, Indo-Aryan India. His job has greatly revolutionized Tamil civilization and has significantly removed caste-based discrimination. He is also responsible for bringing new changes to the Tamil alphabet.

Though, at the similar time, Periyar is also held responsible for creation controversial statements on the Tamil language, Dalits and Brahmins and for endorsing violence against Brahmins.

Biography

Early Years

Periyar was born as Erode Venkata Ramasami Naicker on 17 September 1879, in the city of Erode, then a section of the Coimbatore District of the Madras Presidency. Periyar's father, a rich businessman, was Venkatappa Naicker (or Venkata), and his mother was Chinna Thayammal, alias Muthammal. He had one elder brother named Krishnaswamy and two sisters named Kannamma and Ponnuthoy. He later came to be recognized as "Periyar" meaning 'respected one' or 'elder' in Tamil.

In 1929, Periyar announced the deletion of his caste surname *Naicker* from his name at the First Provincial Self-Respect Conference of Chenggalpattu. He could speak three Dravidian languages: Kannada, Tamil and Telugu. His mother tongue was Kannada. Periyar attended school for five years after which he joined his father's deal at the age of 12. He used to listen to Tamil Vaishnavite gurus who gave discourses in his home enjoying his father's hospitality. At a young age, he began questioning the apparent contradictions in the Hindu mythological stories which he opined to be lies spread by the Indo-Aryan race. As Periyar grew, he felt that people used religion only as a mask to deceive innocent people and so took it as one of his duties in life to warn people against superstitions and priests.

Periyar's father arranged for his wedding when he was nineteen. The bride, Nagammai, was only thirteen. It was not, altogether, an arranged marriage because Periyar and Nagammai had recognized each other and were already in love with each other. Nagammai actively supported her husband in his later public behaviors and agitations. Two years after their marriage, a girl child was born to them. Though, this child existed only for five months. The couple had no more children.

Kasi Pilgrimage Incident

In 1904, Periyar went on a pilgrimage to Kasi to worship in the revered Siva temple of Kashi Vishwanath. However regarded as one of the holiest locations of Hinduism, he witnessed immoral behaviors, begging, and floating dead bodies. His frustrations extended to functional Hinduism in common when he experienced what he described Brahmanic use.

Though, one scrupulous incident in Kasi had a profound impact on Periyar's ideology and future job. At the worship location there were free meals offered to guests. Due to extreme hunger, Periyar felt compelled to enter one of the choultries disguised as a Brahmin with a sacred thread on his bare chest, but was betrayed by his moustache. The gatekeeper at the temple concluded that Periyar was not a Brahmin, as Brahmins were not permitted by the Hindu *shastras* to have moustaches. He not only prevented Periyar's entry but also pushed him rudely into the street.

As his hunger became intolerable, Periyar was forced to feed on leftovers from the streets. Approximately this time, he realized that the choultry which had refused him entry was built by a wealthy non-Brahmin from South India. This discriminatory attitude dealt a blow to Periyar's regard for Hinduism, for the measures he had witnessed at Kasi were totally dissimilar from the picture of Kasi he had in mind, as a holy lay which welcomed all. Ramasami was a theist till his visit to Kasi, after which his views changed and he became an atheist.

Member of Congress Party (1919–1925)

Periyar Ramaswamy joined the Indian National Congress in 1919 after quitting his business and resigning from public posts. He held the chairmanship of Erode Municipality and wholeheartedly undertook constructive programs spreading the use of Khadi, picketing toddy shops, boycotting shops selling foreign cloth, and eradicating untouchability. In 1921, Periyar courted imprisonment for picketing toddy shops in Erode. When his wife as well as his sister joined the agitation, it gained momentum, and the management was forced to approach to a compromise. He was again arrested throughout the Non-Cooperation movement and the Temperance movement.

In 1922, Periyar was elected the President of the Madras Presidency Congress Committee throughout the Tirupur session, where he advocated strongly for reservation in government jobs and education. His attempts were defeated in the Congress party due to a strong attendance of discrimination and indifference, which led to him leaving the party in 1925.

Vaikom Satyagraha (1924–1925)

In Vaikom, a small city in Kerala state, then Travancore, there were strict laws of untouchability in and approximately the temple region. *Dalits*, also recognized as Harijans were not allowed into the secure streets approximately and leading to the temple, let alone inside it. Anti-caste feelings were rising and in 1924 Vaikom was chosen as a appropriate lay for an organized *Satyagraha*, passive resistance campaign as practiced by Gandhi. Under his guidance a movement had already begun with the aim of giving all castes the right to enter the temples. Therefore, agitations and demonstrations took lay. On April 14, Periyar and his wife Nagamma arrived in Vaikom. They were arrested and imprisoned for participation. In spite of Gandhi's objection to non-Keralites and non-Hindus taking section, Periyar and his followers sustained to provide support to the movement till it was withdrawn. He received the title *Vikkom Veeran*, mostly given by his Tamil followers who participated in the Satyagraha. Though, a considerable part of intellectuals feel that Periyar's participation in the Indian independence movement and his contributions in the Vaikom Satyagraha have been highly exaggerated.

The method in which the *Vaikom Satyagraha* measures have been recorded gives a clue to the image of the respective organizers. In an article entitle *Gandhi and Ambedkar, A Revise in Leadership*, Eleanor Zelliott relates the 'Vaikom Satyagraha' including Gandhi's negotiations with the temple authorities in relation to the event. Furthermore, the editor of Periyar's *Thoughts* states that Brahmins purposely suppressed news in relation to the Periyar's participation. A leading Congress magazine *Young India* in its extensive reports on Vaikom never mentions Periyar.

Self-Respect Movement

Periyar and his followers campaigned constantly to power and pressure the government to take events to remove social inequality, even while other nationalist precursors focused on the thrash about for political independence. The Self-Respect Movement was described from the beginning as "dedicated to the goal of giving non-Brahmins a sense of pride based on their Dravidian past".

In 1952, the Periyar *Self-Respect Movement Institution* was registered with a list of objectives of the institution from which may be quoted as

- for the diffusion of useful knowledge of political education; to allow people to live a life of freedom from slavery to anything against cause and self respect; to do absent with needless customs, meaningless ceremonies, and blind superstitious beliefs in civilization; to put an end to the present social system in which caste, religion, society and traditional occupations based on the accident of birth, have chained the mass of the people and created "superior" and "inferior" classes... and to provide people equal rights; to totally eradicate untouchability and to set up a united civilization based on brother/sisterhood; to provide equal rights to women; to prevent child marriages and marriages based on law favorable to one sect, to conduct and encourage love marriages, widow marriages, inter caste and inter-religious marriages and to have the marriages registered under the Civil Law; and to set up and uphold houses for orphans and widows and to run educational organizations.

Propagation of the philosophy of *self respect* became the full-time action of Periyar since 1925. A Tamil weekly *Kudi Arasu* started in 1925, while the English journal *Revolt* started in 1928 accepted on the propaganda in the middle of the English educated people. The *Self-Respect Movement* began to grow fast and received the sympathy of the heads of the Justice Party from the beginning. In May 1929, a conference of Self-Respect Volunteers was held at Pattukkotai under the presidency of S. Guruswami. K.V. Alagiriswami took charge as the head of the volunteer group. Conferences followed in succession during the Tamil districts of the former Madras Presidency. A training school

in Self-Respect was opened at Erode, the house city of Periyar. The substance was not presently to introduce social reform but to bring in relation to the a social revolution to foster a new spirit and build a new civilization.

International Travel (1929–1932)

Flanked by 1929 and 1935, under the strain of World Depression, political thinking worldwide received a jolt from the spread of international communism. Indian political parties, movements and considerable parts of leadership were also affected by inter-continental ideologies. The Self-Respect Movement also came under the power of the leftist philosophies and organizations. Periyar, after establishing the *Self-Respect Movement* as an self-governing institution, began to seem for methods to strengthen it politically and socially. To accomplish this, he studied the history and politics of dissimilar countries, and personally observed these systems at job.

Periyar toured Malaysia for a month, from December 1929 to January 1930, to propagate the *self-respect* philosophy. Embarking on his journey from Nagapattinam with his wife Nagammal and his followers, Periyar was received by 50,000 Tamil Malaysians in Penang. Throughout the similar month, he inaugurated the Tamils Conference, convened by the Tamils Reformatory Sangam in Ipoh, and then went to Singapore. In December 1931 he undertook a tour of Europe, accompanied by S. Ramanathan and Erode Ramu, to personally acquaint himself with their political systems, social movements, method of life, economic and social progress and management of public bodies. He visited Egypt, Greece, Turkey, Russia, Germany, England, Spain, France and Portugal, waiting in Russia for three months. On his return journey he halted at Ceylon and returned to India in November 1932.

The tour shaped the political ideology of Periyar to achieve the social concept of Self-Respect. The communist system obtained in Russia appealed to him as appropriately suited to deal with the social ills of the country. Therefore, on socio-economic issues Periyar was Marxist, but he did not advocate for abolishing private ownership. Immediately after his return, Periyar, in alliance with the enthusiastic communist M. Singaravelu Chettiar, began to job out a socio-political scheme incorporating socialist and self-

respect ideals. This marked a crucial level of development in the *Self-Respect Movement* which got politicized and establish its compatibility in Tamil Nadu.

Opposition to Hindi

In 1937, when Chakravarthi Rajagopalachari became the Chief Minister of Madras state, he introduced Hindi as a compulsory language of revise in schools, thereby igniting a series of anti-Hindi agitations. Tamil nationalists, the Justice Party under Sir A. T. Panneerselvam, and Periyar organized anti-Hindi protests in 1938 which ended with numerous arrests by the Rajaji government.

Throughout the similar year, the slogan "Tamil Nadu for Tamilians" was first raised by Periyar in protest against the introduction of Hindi in schools. He explained that the introduction of Hindi was a dangerous mechanism used by the Ayrans to infiltrate Dravidian civilization. He reasoned that the adoption of Hindi would create Tamils subordinate to Hindi-speaking North Indians. Periyar explained that Hindi would not only halt the progress of Tamilians, but would totally destroy their civilization and nullify the progressive thoughts that had been successfully inculcated by Tamil in the recent decades.

Cutting crossways party rows, South Indian politicians rallied jointly in their opposition to Hindi. There were recurrent anti-Hindi agitations in 1948, 1952 and 1965.

As President of the Justice Party (1938–1944)

A political party recognized as the *South Indian Libertarian Federation* (commonly referred to as *Justice Party*) was founded in 1916, principally to oppose the economic and political power of the Brahmin jati groups. The party's goal was to render social justice to non-Brahmin groups. In order to gain the support of the masses, non-Brahmin politicians began propagating an ideology of equality in the middle of non-Brahmin *jati* groups. Brahmanical priesthood and Sanskritic social class-value hierarchy were blamed for the subsistence of inequalities in the middle of non-Brahmin *jati* groups.

In 1937, when the government required that Hindi be taught in the school system, Periyar organized opposition by the *Justice Party* to this policy. After 1937, the Dravidian movement derived considerable support from the student society. In later years, opposition to Hindi played a big role in the politics of Tamil Nadu. The fear of the Hindi language had its origin in the disagreement flanked by Brahmins and non-Brahmins. To the Tamils, acceptance of Hindi in the school system was a shape of bondage. When the *Justice Party* weakened in the absence of mass support, Periyar took in excess of the leadership of the party after being jailed for opposing Hindi in 1939. Under his tutelage the party prospered, but the party's conservative members, mainly of who were rich and educated, withdrew from active participation.

Dravidar Kazhagam (1944–onwards)

Formation of the Dravidar Kazhagam

At a rally in 1944, Periyar, in his capability as the leader of the Justice Party, declared that the party would henceforth be recognized as the *Dravidar Kazhagam*, or "Dravidian Association". Though, a few who disagreed with Periyar started a splinter group, claiming to be the original Justice Party. This party was led by veteran Justice Party leader P. T. Rajan and survived till 1957.

The *Dravidar Kazhagam* came to be well recognized amongst the urban societies and students. Villages were influenced by its message. Hindi, and ceremonies that had become associated with Brahmanical priesthood, were recognized as alien symbols that should be eliminated from Tamil civilization. Brahmins, who were regarded as the guardians of such symbols, came under verbal attack. From 1949 onwards, the *Dravidar Kazhagam* intensified social reformist job and put forward the information that superstitions were the cause for the degeneration of Dravidians. The *Dravidar Kazhagam* vehemently fought for the abolition of untouchability amongst the *Dalits*. It also focused its attention on the liberation of women, women's education, willing marriage, widow marriage, orphanages and mercy houses.

Split with Annadurai

In 1949, Periyar's chief lieutenant, Conjeevaram Natarajan Annadurai, recognized a separate association described the *Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam* (DMK), or Dravidian Advancement Association. This was due to differences flanked by the two, where Periyar advocated a separate self-governing Dravidian or Tamil state, while Annadurai compromised with the Delhi government combined with claims of increased state independence. Periyar was influenced that individuals and movements that undertake the task of eradicating the social evils in the Indian sub-continent have to pursue the goal with devotion and dedication without deviating from the path and with uncompromising zeal. Therefore, if they contest elections aiming to assume political power, they would lose vigor and sense of purpose. But amongst his followers, there were those who had a dissimilar view, wanting to enter into politics and have a share in running the government. They were looking for an opportunity to section with Periyar. Therefore, when Periyar married Maniammai on 9 July 1948, they quit the *Dravidar Kazhagam*, stating that Periyar set a bad instance by marrying a young woman in his old age - he was 70 and she 30. Those who parted company with Periyar joined the DMK. However the DMK split from the *Dravidar Kazhagam*, the organisation made efforts to carry on Periyar's Self-Respect Movement to villagers and urban students. The DMK advocated the thesis that the Tamil language was much richer than Sanskrit and Hindi in content, and therefore was a key which opened the door to subjects to be learned. The *Dravidar Kazhagam* sustained to counter Brahminism, Indo-Aryan propaganda, and uphold the Dravidians' right of self-determination.

Later Years

In 1956, despite warnings from P. Kakkan, the President of the Tamil Nadu Congress Committee, Periyar organised a procession to the Marina in order to burn pictures of the Hindu God Rama. Periyar was subsequently arrested and confined to prison.

The behaviors of Periyar sustained when he went to Bangalore in 1958 to participate in the All India Official Language Conference. There he stressed

the need to retain English as the Union Official Language instead of Hindi. Five years later, Periyar traveled to North India to advocate the eradication of the caste system. Nearing Periyar's last years, an award was given to him by the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and it was presented to him by the Union Education Minister, Triguna Sen in Madras (Chennai), on 27 June 1970. In his last meeting at Thiagaraya Nagar, Chennai on 19 December 1973, Periyar declared a call for action to gain social equality and a dignified method of life. On 24 December 1973, Periyar died at the age of 94.

Principles and Legacy

Periyar spent in excess of fifty years giving speeches, propagating the realization that everyone is an equal citizen and the differences on basis of caste and creeds were man-made to stay the innocent and ignorant as underdogs in the civilization. Although Periyar's speeches were targeted towards the illiterate and more mundane mass, scores of educated people were also swayed. Periyar viewed reasoning as a special tool. Just as to him, all were blessed with his tool but very few used it. Therefore Periyar used reasoning, with respect to subjects of social interest, in his presentations to his audience. Collective differences in Tamil civilization were measured by several to be deep-rooted characteristics until Periyar came to the scene. Cho Ramaswamy remarked in *India Today*:

- "Periyar was accepted and acclaimed as the leader by a important part of the Tamil population in spite of all his contempt for Tamil and disdain for Tamils only because he was perceived to be a genuine individual, a rarity in the middle of those in public life. There was no shade of hypocrisy in him and he never attempted sophistry while propounding his social philosophy."

Rationalism

The bedrock of Periyar's principles and the movements that he started was rationalism. He thought that an insignificant minority in civilization was

exploiting the majority and trying to stay it in a subordinate location forever. He wanted the exploited to sit up and think in relation to their location, and use their cause to realize that they were being exploited by a handful of people. If they started thinking, they would realize that they were human beings like the rest, that birth did not and should not endow superiority in excess of others and that they necessarily awaken themselves and do everything possible to improve their own lot.

Likewise, Periyar explained that wisdom lies in thinking and that the spear-head of thinking is rationalism. On caste, he stated that no other livelihood being harms or degrades its own class. But man, said to be a rational livelihood being, does these evils. The differences, hatred, enmity, degradation, poverty, and wickedness, now prevalent in the civilization are due to lack of wisdom and rationalism and not due to God or the cruelty of time.

Periyar also blamed the capitalists for their manage of machineries, creating difficulties to the workers. Just as to his philosophy, rationalism, which has to lead the method for peaceful life to all, had resulted in causing poverty and worries to the people because of dominating forces. He stated that there is no use of basically acquiring titles or amassing wealth if one has no self-respect and scientific knowledge. An instance he gave was the West sending messages to the planets, while the Tamil civilization in India was sending rice and cereals to their dead forefathers by the Brahmins.

In a message to the Brahmin society, Periyar stated, "in the name of god, religion, and sastras you have duped us. We were the ruling people. Stop this life of cheating us from this year. Provide room for rationalism and humanism". He added that "any opposition not based on rationalism, science, or experience will one day or another, reveal the fraud, selfishness, lies and conspiracies".

Self-Respect

Periyar's philosophy of self-respect was based on his image of an ideal world and a universally accepted one. His philosophy preaches that human actions should be based on rational thinking. Further, the outcome of the

natural instinct of human beings is to look at every substance and every action and even nature with a spirit of inquiry, and to refuse to submit to anything irrational as equivalent to slavery. Therefore, the philosophy of self-respect taught that human actions should be guided by cause, right and wrong should follow from rational thinking and conclusions drawn from cause should be respected under circumstances. Freedom means respect to thoughts and actions measured 'right' by human beings on the basis of 'cause'. There is not much variation flanked by 'freedom' and 'self-respect'.

Periyar's foremost appeal to people was to develop self-respect. He preached that the Brahmins had monopolized and cheated other societies for decades and deprived them of self-respect. He stated that mainly Brahmins claimed to belong to a "superior" society with the reserved privilege of being in charge of temples and performing archanas. He felt that they were trying to reassert their manage in excess of religion by their superior caste status to claim the exclusive privilege to touch idols or enter the sanctum sanctorum.

Women's Rights

As a rationalist and ardent social reformer, Periyar advocated forcefully during his life that women should be given their legitimate location in civilization as the equals of men and that they should be given good education and have the right to property. He was keen that women should realize their rights and be worthy citizens of their country.

Periyar fought against the orthodox traditions of marriage as suppression of women in Tamil Nadu and during the Indian sub-continent. However arranged marriages were meant to enable a couple to live jointly during life, it was manipulated to enslave women. Much worse was the practice of child marriages practiced during India at the time. It was whispered that it would be a sin to marry after puberty. Another practice, which is prevalent today, is the dowry system where the bride's family is supposed to provide the husband a vast payment for the bride. The purpose of this was to assist the newly wedded couple financially, but in several instances dowries were misused by bridegrooms. The outcome of this abuse turned to the use of the bride's parents wealth, and in sure circumstances, lead to dowry deaths.

There have been hundreds of thousands of cases where wives have been murdered, mutilated, and burned alive because the father of the bride was unable to create the dowry payment to the husband. Periyar fiercely stood up against this abuse meted out against women.

Women in India also did not have rights to their families' or husbands' property. Periyar fought fiercely for this and also advocated for the women to have the right to separate or divorce their husbands under reasonable circumstances. While birth manage remained taboo in civilization of Periyar's time, he advocated for it not only for the health of women and population manage, but for the liberation of women.

He criticized the hypocrisy of chastity for women and argued that it should also either belong to men, or not at all for both individuals. While fighting against this, Periyar advocated to get rid of the Devadasi system. In his view it was an instance of a list of degradations of women attaching them to temples for the entertainment of others, and as temple prostitutes. As a further liberation of women, Periyar pushed for the right of women to have an education and to join the armed services and the police force.

Just as to biographer M.D. Gopalakrishnan, Periyar and his movement achieved a better status for women in Tamil civilization. Periyar held that in matters of education and employment there should be no variation flanked by men and women. Gopalakrishnan states that Periyar's power in the State departments and even the Center made it possible for women to join police departments and the army. Periyar also spoke out against child marriage.

Social Reform and Eradication of Caste

Periyar wanted thinking people to see their civilization as distant from perfect and in urgent need of reform. He wanted the government, the political parties and social workers to identify the evils in civilization and boldly adopt events to remove them. Periyar's philosophy did not differentiate social and political service. Just as to him, the first duty of a government is to run the social organisation efficiently, and the philosophy of religion was to organise the social system. Periyar stated that while Christian and Islamic religions were fulfilling this role, the Hindu religion remained totally unsuitable for

social progress. He argued that the government was not for the people, but, in a "topsy-turvy" manner, the people were for the government. He attributed this situation to the state of the social system contrived for the advantage of a small group of people.

One of the regions of Periyar's focus was on the upliftment of rural societies. In a booklet described *Village Uplift*, Periyar pled for rural reform. At that time rural India still shaped the main section of the Indian subcontinent, in spite of the ongoing procedure of urbanization. Therefore, the distinction flanked by rural and urban had meant an economic and social degradation for rural inhabitants. Periyar wanted to eradicate the concept of "village" as a discrimination word in the middle of spaces, presently as the concept of "outcast" in the middle of social groups. Periyar advocated for a site where neither the name nor the situation or its circumstances imply differences in the middle of people. He further advocated for the modernization of villages by providing public facilities such as schools, libraries, radio stations, roads, bus transport, and police stations.

Periyar felt that a small number of cunning people created caste distinctions in order to control in excess of civilization, so he accentuated that individuals necessity first develop self-respect and learn to examine propositions rationally. Just as to Periyar, a self-respecting rationalist would readily realize that caste system had been stifling self-respect and so he or she would strive to get rid of this menace.

Periyar stated that the caste system in south India is, due to Indo-Aryan power, connected with the arrival of Brahmins from the north. Ancient Tamil Nadu (section of Tamilakkam) had a dissimilar stratification of civilization in four or five areas (*Tinai*), determined by natural surroundings and adequate means of livelihood. Periyar also argued that birds, animals, and worms, which are measured to be devoid of rationalism do not create castes, or differences of high and low in their own species. But man, measured to be a rational being, was suffering from these because of religion and discrimination.

Ideals and Criticisms

Periyar's political ideal was to nullify the effect of perceived Brahmin power in favor of a Shudra power. The basis of this strategy was the assumed truth of the Aryan Invasion Theory, which viewed the Indian demography beside racial dimensions—the Aryan North and the Dravidian South. Therefore, the political ideal was a mix of castes and racism.

Periyar's opponents accused him of attacking Hinduism and the Brahmin society. But his was targeted against Brahminism and not Brahmins, and the manipulation of Hinduism and not Hinduism as a faith. But, there are no statements attributed to Periyar on any manipulations by other religions such as Buddhism, Christianity, or Islam.

Periyar was listed amongst the *top 100 mainly influential people* amongst Tamil civilization of the 20th century.

Tamil Language and Writing

Periyar claimed that Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam, and Kannada came from the similar mother language of Old Tamil. He explained that the Tamil language is described by four dissimilar names since it is spoken in four dissimilar Dravidian states. Nevertheless, current understanding of Dravidian languages contains statements contradicting such claims. For instance, the currently recognized classification of Dravidian languages gives the following separate classes:

- Southern (including Tamil–Kannada (Malayalam) and Tulu);
- Central (including Telugu–Kui and Kolami–Parji); and,
- Northern (including Kurukh–Malto and Brahui).

Additionally, statements on the attendance of proof for linking Dravidian languages and Indo-European languages are accessible. With relation to writing, Periyar stated that by the Tamil writing in relation to the arts, which are useful to the people in their life and foster knowledge, talent and courage, and propagating them in the middle of the masses, will enlighten the people. Further, he explained that it will enrich the language, and therefore it can be regarded as a zeal for Tamil. Periyar also stated that if languages of

North Indian origin (Sanskrit) are removed from Telugu, Kannada, and Malayalam, only Tamil will be left. On the Brahmin usage of Tamil, he stated how the Tamil spoken by the Andhras and the Malayalee peoples was distant better than the Tamil spoken by the Brahmins. Periyar whispered that Tamil language will create the Dravidian people unite under the banner of Tamil civilization, and that it will create the Kannadigas, Andhras and the Malayalees be vigilant. With regards to a Dravidian alliance under a general umbrella language, Periyar stated that "a time will approach for unity. This will go on till there is an end to the North Indian power. We shall reclaim an self-governing sovereign state for us".

At the similar time, Periyar was also recognized to have made controversial remarks on the Tamil language and people from time to time. On one occasion, he referred to the Tamil people as "barbarians" and the Tamil language as the "language of barbarians". Though, Anita Diehl explains that Periyar made these remarks on Tamil because it had no respective feminine verbal shapes.

In stone inscriptions from 400 or 500 years ago, several Tamil letters are establish in other forms. As a matter of necessity and advantage to cope with printing technology, Periyar thought that it was sensible to change a few letters, reduce the number of letters, and alter a few signs. He further explained that the older and the more divine a language and its letters were said to be, the more they needed reform. Because of changes brought in relation to the by means of contemporary transport and international get in touch with, and happenings that have attracted languages and products from several countries, foreign languages and their pronunciations have been assimilated into Tamil quite easily. Further, changing the form of letters, creating new symbols and adding new letters and likewise, dropping those that are redundant, were quite essential just as to Periyar. Therefore, the glory and excellence of a language and its writing depend on how easily they can be understood or learned and on nothing else"

Thoughts on Thirukkural

Periyar hailed the *Thirukkural* as a valuable scripture which contained several scientific and philosophical truths. He also praised the secular nature of the job. Periyar praised Thiruvalluvar for his account of God as a formless entity with only positive attributes. He also suggested that one who reads the *Thirukkural* will become a Self-respecter, absorbing knowledge in politics, civilization, and economics. Just as to him, however sure things in this ancient book of ethics may not relate to today, it permitted such changes for contemporary civilization.

On caste, he whispered that the *Kural* illustrates how Vedic laws of Manu were against the Sudras and other societies of the Dravidian race. On the other hand, Periyar opined that the ethics from the *Kural* was comparable to the Christian Bible. The Dravidar Kazhagam adopted the *Thirukkural* and advocated that Thiruvalluvar's *Kural* alone was enough to educate the people of the country. One of Periyar's quotes on the *Thirukkural* from Veeramani's *Composed Works of Periyar* was "when Dravida Nadu (Dravidistan) was a victim to Indo-Aryan deceit, *Thirukkural* was written by a great Dravidian Thiruvalluvar to free the Dravidians".

Self-Determination of Dravidistan

The Dravidian-Aryan disagreement was whispered to be a continuous historical phenomenon that started when the Aryans first set their foot in the Dravidian lands. Even a decade before the thought of separation appeared, Periyar stated that, "as extensive as Aryan religion, Indo-Aryan power, propagation of Aryan Vedas and Aryan "Varnashrama" lived, there was need for a "Dravidian Progressive Movement" and a "Self-Respect Movement". Periyar became very concerned in relation to the rising north Indian power in excess of the south which appeared to him no dissimilar from foreign power. He wanted to secure the fruits of labour of the Dravidians to the Dravidians, and lamented that meadows such as political, economic, industrial, social, art, and spiritual were dominated by the north for the benefit of the north Indians. Therefore, with the approach of independence from Britain, this fear that

North India would take the lay of Britain to control south India became more and more intense.

Periyar was clear in relation to the concept of a separate multi-linguistic nation, comprising Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kannada regions, that is roughly corresponding to the then existing Madras Presidency with adjoining regions into a federation guaranteeing protection of minorities, including religious, linguistic, and cultural freedom of the people. A separatist conference was held in June 1940 at Kanchipuram when Periyar released the map of the proposed *Dravida Nadu*, but failed to get British approval. On the contrary, Periyar received sympathy and support from people such as Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar and Muhammad Ali Jinnah for his views on the Congress, and for his opposition to Hindi. They then decided to convene a movement to resist the Congress.

The concept of *Dravida Nadu* was later customized down to Tamil Nadu. This led to a proposal of a union of the Tamil people of not only South India but including those of Ceylon as well. In 1953, Periyar helped to preserve Madras as the capital of Tamil Nadu, which later was the name he substituted for the more common Dravida Nadu. In 1955 Periyar threatened to burn the national flag, but on Chief Minister Kamaraj's pledge that Hindi should not be compulsory he postponed the action. In his speech of 1957 described *Suthantara Tamil Nadu En?* (Why an self-governing Tamil Nadu?), he criticised the Central Government of India inducing thousands of Tamilians to burn the constitution of India. The cause for this action was that Periyar held the Government responsible for maintaining the caste system. After stating reasons for separation and turning down opinions against it he closed his speech with a "war cry" to join and burn the map of India on June 5. Periyar was sentenced to six months imprisonment for burning the Indian constitution.

Advocacy of such a nation became illegal when separatist demands were banned by law in 1957. Regardless of these events, a *Dravida Nadu Separation Day* was observed on September 17, 1960 resulting in numerous arrests. Though, Periyar resumed his campaign in 1968. He wrote an editorial on 'Tamil Nadu for Tamilians' in which he stated, that by nationalism only

Brahmins had prospered and nationalism had been urbanized to abolish the rights of Tamils. He advocated that there was need to set up a *Tamil Nadu Freedom Organization* and that it was necessary to job towards it.

Anti-Brahmanism vs. Anti-Brahmin

Periyar was a radical advocate of anti-Brahmanism. His *anti-brahmanism* was apparent from his comments to his followers that if they encountered a Brahmin and a snake on the road they should kill the Brahmin first. He also used violent and vulgar language in his writings against Hindu gods.

In 1920 when the Justice Party came to power, Brahmins occupied in relation to the 70 percent of the high stage posts in government. After reservation was introduced by the Justice Party, it reversed this trend, allowing non-Brahmins to rise in the government of the Madras Presidency. Periyar, by the Justice Party, advocated against the imbalance of the power of Brahmins who constituted only 3 percent of the Population in excess of Government jobs, judiciary and the Madras University. His Self-Respect Movement espoused rationalism and atheism and the movement had currents of anti-Brahminism. Furthermore, Periyar stated that:

- "Our Dravidian movement does not exist against the Brahmins or the Banias. If anyone thinks so, I would only pity him. But as suggested, not tolerate the methods in which Brahminism is degrading Dravidanadu. Whatever support they may have from the government, neither myself nor my movement will be of cowardice".

Though, at the similar time, Periyar has also advocated the destruction of Brahmins.

- "Only if the Brahmin is destroyed, caste will be destroyed. The Brahmin is a snake entangled in our feet. He will bite. If you take off your leg, that's all. Don't leave. Brahmin is not able to control because power is in the hands of the Tamilian

Periyar also criticised Subramanya Bharathi in the journal *Ticutar* for portraying Mother Tamil as a sister of Sanskrit in his poems:

- "They say Bharati is an immortal poet....Even if a rat dies in an akrakāram, they would declare it to be immortal....All of Tamilnadu praises him. Why should this be so? Supposedly because he sang fulsome praises of Tamil and Tamilnadu. What else could he sing? His own mother tongue, Sanskrit, has been dead for years. What other language did he know? He cannot sing in Sanskrit....He says Tamilnadu is the land of Aryas."

Comparisons with Gandhi

In the Vaikom Satyagraha of 1924, Periyar and Gandhi both cooperated and confronted each other in socio-political action. Periyar and his followers accentuated the variation in point of view flanked by Gandhi and himself on the social issues, such as fighting the Untouchability Laws and eradication of the caste system.

Just as to the booklet *Gandhi and Periyar* Periyar wrote in his paper *Kudi Arasu*, in 1925, reporting on the information that Gandhi was ousted from the Mahasabha, because he opposed resolutions for the maintaining of caste and Untouchability Laws which would spoil his efforts to bring in relation to the Hindu-Muslim unity. From this Gandhi learned the need of pleasing the Brahmins if anything was to be achieved.

Periyar in his references to Gandhi used opportunities to present Gandhi as on principle serving the interests of the Brahmins. In 1927, Periyar and Gandhi met at Bangalore to talk about this matter. The main variation flanked by them came out when Periyar stood for the total eradication of Hinduism to which Gandhi objected saying that Hinduism is not fixed in doctrines but can be changed. In the *Kudi Arasu*, Periyar explained that:

- "With all his good qualities, Gandhi did not bring the people forward from foolish and evil methods. His murderer was an educated man. So nobody can say this is a time of high civilization. If you eat poison you will die. If electricity hits the body you will die. If you oppose the Brahmin you will die. Gandhi did not advocate the eradication of

Varnasrama *Dharma* structure but sees in it a task for the humanization of civilization and social change possible within its structure. The consequence of this would be sustained high-caste leadership. Gandhi adapted Brahmins to social change without depriving them of their leadership".

Therefore, Gandhi did not advocate the eradication of the Varnasrama Dharma structure but saw in it a task for the humanization of civilization and social change possible within its structure. The consequence of this would be sustained high-caste leadership. Gandhi accepted *karma* in the sense that "the *Untouchables* reap the reward of their *karma*, but was against discrimination against them by the revaluing term *Harijans*. As shown in the negotiations at Vaikom his ways of abolishing discrimination were: to stress on the orthodox inhumane treatment of *Untouchables*; to secure voluntary lifting of the ban by changing the hearts of caste Hindus; and to job within a Hindu framework of thoughts.

On the Temple Entry issue Gandhi never advocated the opening of *Garbha Griha* to *Harijans* in consequence of his Hindu belief. These sources which can be labelled "pro-Periyar" with the exception of M. Mahar and D.S. Sharma, clearly illustrate that Periyar and his followers accentuated that Periyar was the real fighter for the removal of Untouchability and the true uplift of Hairjans, whereas Gandhi was not. This did not prevent Periyar from having faith in Gandhi on sure matters.

Religion and Atheism

Periyar was usually regarded as a pragmatic propagandist who attacked the evils of religious power on civilization, mainly what he regarded as Brahmin power. At a young age, he felt that some people used religion only as a mask to deceive innocent people and measured it as his life's mission to warn people against superstitions and priests. Anita Diehl explains that Periyar cannot be described an atheist philosopher. Periyar, though, qualified for the definition of what the term 'atheist' implies in his address on philosophy. He repudiated the term as without real sense: "...the talk of the atheist should be

measured thoughtless and erroneous. The thing I call god... that creates all people equal and free, the god that does not stop free thinking and research, the god that does not inquire for money, flattery and temples can certainly be an substance of worship. For saying this much I have been described an atheist, a term that has no meaning".

Anita Diehl explains that Periyar was against incompatibility of faith with social equality and not religion itself. In a book on revolution published in 1961, Periyar stated, "be of help to people. Do not use treachery or deceit. Speak the truth and do not cheat. That indeed is service to God".

On Hinduism, Periyar whispered that it was a religion with no distinctive sacred book (bhawad gita), or origins, but to be an imaginary faith preaching the "superiority" of the Brahmins, the inferiority of the Shudras, and the untouchability of the Dalits (Panchamas). Maria Misra, a lecturer at Oxford University, compares him to the philosophes, by stating, "his contemptuous attitude to the baleful power of Hinduism in Indian public life is strikingly akin to the anti-Catholic diatribes of the enlightenment philosophes". In 1955, Periyar was arrested for his public agitation of burning the pictures of Rama at public spaces, as a symbolic protest against the Indo-Aryan power and degradation of the Dravidian leadership just as to the Ramayana epic. Periyar also shoed the images of Krishna and Rama, stating that they were Aryan gods that measured the Dravidian Shudras to be "sons of prostitutes".

Periyar openly suggested to those who were marginalized within the Hindu societies to consider converting to other faiths such as Islam, Christianity, or Buddhism. On Islam, he stated how it was good for abolishing the disgrace in human connection, based on one of his speeches to railway employees at Tiruchirapalli in 1947. Periyar also commended Islam for its belief in one invisible and formless God; proclamation of equal rights for men and women; and advocating of social unity.

At the rally in Tiruchi, Periyar said:

- "Muslims are following the ancient philosophies of the Dravidians. The Arabic word for Dravidian religion is Islam. When Brahmanism was imposed in this country, it was Mohammad Nabi who opposed it,

by instilling the Dravidian religion's policies as Islam in the minds of the people"

Periyar viewed Christianity alike to the monotheistic faith of Islam. He explained that their faith says that there can be only one God which has no name or form. Periyar took an interest in Rev. Martin Luther, where both he and his followers wanted to liken him and his role to that of the European reformer. Therefore, Christian views such as that of Ram Mohan Roy's *The Precepts of Jesus* has had at least an indirect power on Periyar.

Separately from Islam and Christianity, Periyar also establish in Buddhism a basis for his philosophy however he did not accept that religion. It was again an alternative in the search for self-respect and the substance was to get liberation from the discrimination of Hinduism. By Periyar's movement *Temple Entry Acts* of 1924, 1931, and up to 1950 were created for the non-Brahmins. Another accomplishment took lay throughout the 1970s when Tamil replaced Sanskrit as the Temple language in Tamil Nadu, while Dalits were finally eligible for priesthood.

Controversies

Comments on Brahmins, Dalits and Religious Minorities

Dalit intellectual Ravikumar states that Periyar was not much of a supporter of the minorities. He cites Periyar's sayings from the book "Periyar E V R Sinthanaigal" by Anaimuthu in support of this claim:

- We feared the Brahmin, and acquiesced extra legroom to Muslims. We are facing the consequences today. It's like that proverb: Fearing the dung, we have stepped on shit. If sahibs (meaning Muslims) get proportionate representation and the Scheduled Castes get representation in jobs and education and if the rest of the slots are monopolized by Brahmins, O Shudra, what will be your future

These comments, beside with other controversial comments allegedly made by Periyar, were also perceived as anti-Dalit by a part of the intelligentsia and were the subject of a book "E V Ramasamy Naickarin

Marupakkam" or "The other face of E V Ramasamy Naicker" written by M. Venkatesan. Though, Dalit leader and founder of Puthiya Tamizhagam K. Krishnasamy praises Periyar and credits him for administering justice to Dalits throughout the 1957 Ramnad riots. His views are echoed by Punitha Pandian of *Dalit Murasu*. In 1954, Periyar controversially referred to Tamil Nadu's Christians and Muslims as non-Tamils.

Factionism in the Justice Party

When B. Munuswamy Naidu became the Chief Minister of Madras Presidency in 1930, he endorsed the inclusion of Brahmins in the Justice Party, saying:

- So extensive as we exclude one society, we cannot as a political speak on behalf of or claim to symbolize all the people of our presidency. If, as we hope, provincial autonomy is given to the provinces as a result of the reforms that may be granted, it should be essential that our Federation should be in a location to claim to be a truly representative body of all societies. What objection can there be to admit such Brahmins as are willing to subscribe to the aims and objects of our Federation? It may be that the Brahmins may not join even if the ban is removed. But surely our Federation will not thereafter be open to objection on the ground that it is an exclusive organisation.

However sure members supported the resolution, a faction in the Justice Party recognized as the "Ginger Group" opposed the resolution and eventually voted it down. Periyar, who was then an observer in the Justice Party, criticised Munuswamy Naidu, saying:

- At a time when non-Brahmins in other parties were slowly coming in excess of to the Justice Party, being fed up with the Brahmin's ways and methods of dealing with political questions, it was nothing short of folly to think of admitting him into the ranks of the Justice Party.

This factionism sustained till 1932 when Munuswamy Naidu stepped down as the Chief Minister of Madras and the Raja of Bobbili became the chief minister.

Violence by Periyar's Followers

In response to Hindu processions throughout Ganesha Chaturthi and Ram Navami, Periyar led processions which skippered and broke idols of Rama, Lakshmana and Pillaiyar. However Periyar claimed to follow peaceful means of protest, nevertheless, these processions often caused violent clashes flanked by Periyar's followers and theists, represented in contemporary times by right-wing organisations as Hindu Munnani and Hindu Makkal Katchi. From time to time, activists of the Dravidar Kazhagam have also launched physical attacks on Brahmins. Tempers reached a boiling point when a member of the Dravidar Kazhagam tried to assassinate Rajagopalachari. The attack was, though, unsuccessful and was severely condemned by Periyar who prohibited the usage of violence.

On 7 December 2006, a statue of Periyar opposite the Ranganathaswamy temple at Srirangam was defaced by activists of the Hindu Makkal Katchi. Supporters of Periyar retaliated with violence against Hindu mutts and temples. Petrol bombs were allegedly hurled and devotees attacked at Ayodhya Mandapam, a Hindu religious congregational centre in West Mambalam, by members of Thanthai Periyar Dravidar Kazhagam, a splinter group of the Dravidar Kazhagam.

Followers and Power

After the death of Periyar in 1973, conferences were held during Tamil Nadu for a week in January 1974. The similar year Periyar's wife, Maniyammai, the new head of the *Dravidar Kazhagam*, set fire to the effigies of 'Rama', 'Sita' and 'Lakshmana' at Periyar Thidal, Madras. This was a retaliation to the *Ramaleela* celebrations where effigies of 'Ravana', 'Kumbakarna' and 'Indrajit' were burnt in New Delhi. For this act she was imprisoned. Throughout the 1974 May Day meetings held at dissimilar spaces in Tamil Nadu, a resolution urging the Government to preserve 80 percent of

jobs for Tamils was passed. Soon after this, a camp was held at Periyar Mansion in Tiruchirapalli to train young men and women to spread the ideals of the *Dravidar Kazhagam* in rural regions.

On Periyar's Birthday of 17 September 1974, Periyar's *Rationalist Library and Research Library and Research Institute* was opened by Tamil Nadu Chief Minister M. Karunanidhi. This library contained Periyar's rationalist works, the manuscripts of Periyar and his recorded speeches. Also throughout the similar year Periyar's ancestral house in Erode, was dedicated as a commemoration structure. On February 20, 1977, the opening function of *Periyar Structure* in Madras was held. At the meeting which the Managing Committee of the *Dravidar Kazhagam* held, there on that day, it was decided to support the candidates belonging to the *Janata Party*, the *Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam* (DMK), and the *Marxist Party* throughout the Common Elections.

On 16 March 1978, Maniyammai died. The *Managing Committee of the Dravidar Kazhagam* elected K. Veeramani as Common Secretary of the *Dravidar Kazhagam* on March 17, 1978. From then on, the *Periyar-Maniyammai Educational and Charitable Civilization* started the *Periyar Centenary Women's Polytechnic* at Thanjavur on September 21, 1980. On May 8, 1982, the *College for Correspondence Education* was started under the auspices of the *Periyar Rationalist Propaganda Organization*.

In excess of the years, Periyar's power had an impact on Tamil Nadus political party heads such as:

- C.N. Annadurai and M. Karunanidhi of the *Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam'* (DMK),
- V. Gopalswamy founder of the Marumalarchi Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (MDMK),
- S. Ramadoss founder of the Pattali Makkal Katchi (PMK),
- Thol. Thirumavalavan, founder of the Dalit Panthers of India (DPI), and
- *Dravidar Kazhagam's* K. Veeramani.

Other political figures influenced by Periyar were former Congress minister K. Kamaraj, former Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh Mayawati. Periyar's life and teachings have also influenced writers and poets such as Kavignar Inkulab, and Bharathidasan including actors such as Kamal Hassan and Sathyaraj. Noted Tamil Comedian N. S. Krishnan was a secure friend and follower of Periyar. W. P. A. Soundarapandian Nadar was a secure confidant of Periyar and encouraged Nadars to be a section of the Self-Respect Movement.

●

● **DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR**

Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar (14 April 1891 – 6 December 1956), popularly also recognized as *Babasaheb*, was an Indian jurist, political leader, philosopher, anthropologist, historian, orator, economist, teacher, editor, prolific writer, revolutionary and a revivalist for Buddhism in India. He was also the chief architect of the Indian Constitution. In 2012 he was chosen greatest Indian in a nationwide poll held by History TV and CNN-IBN.

Born into a poor Mahar (measured an Untouchable caste) family, Ambedkar campaigned against social discrimination, the system of *Chaturvarna* – the categorization of Hindu civilization into four *varnas* – and the Hindu caste system. He converted to Buddhism and is also credited with providing a spark for the transformation of hundreds of thousands of Dalits or untouchables to Theravada Buddhism. Ambedkar was posthumously awarded the Bharat Ratna, India's highest civilian award, in 1990.

Overcoming numerous social and financial obstacles, Ambedkar became one of the first Dalit (untouchables) to obtain a college education in India. Eventually earning a law degree and doctorates for his revise and research in law, economics and political science from Columbia University and the London School of Economics, Ambedkar gained a reputation as a scholar and practiced law for a few years, later campaigning by publishing journals advocating political rights and social freedom for India's untouchables.

He is regarded as a Bodhisattva by some Indian Buddhists, however he never claimed himself to be a Bodhisattva. Ambedkar said at a public function

in 1956, while he was converting, that, "accepting Buddhism does not only mean getting into new religion it means entering into new shape of life where everybody has responsibility to cultivate wisdom, compassion and morality in this life moments, Buddha's dhamma is here to guide and protect humanity, what we have to do is to strive for creating a moral order"

Ambedkar's View on the British Rule in India

Ambedkar was aware of the drawbacks inherent 'in foreign rule. The British government had introduced some representative organizations in India. But full self-government could not have any alternative. Besides, Ambedkar always complained that the plight of the untouchables did not change under British rule. The British rulers were not interested in removing untouchability. Their policy had always been careful in the matter of social reform. Reforms were likely to anger the upper castes and provide them an opportunity to rally against' British rule. So, British rulers did not encourage rapid social reforms. Even in the field of education, Ambedkar felt that the government was not sincere in spreading education in the middle of the untouchables. All educational facilities were utilized by the upper. castes only. Moreover, the interests of the upper castes and those of the untouchables were opposed to each other. Ambedkar' wanted the British government to mediate on behalf of the untouchables. But the government neglected this responsibility. Because of this attitude of neglect, the untouchable society could not get any benefit from the British rule. He was also not very happy in relation to the British management. He was particularly critical of the management on explanation of its in excess of expensive character and common neglect of public welfare.

But he knew that abrupt departure of the British would result into political power of the upper castes. So, a political resolution was necessary clearly mentioning the powers of and safeguards for the untouchable society. Without this, independence would be meaningless for the untouchables. In short, Ambedkar criticized the British rule for failing in its duty to uplift the untouchables. For this cause he supported the cause of self-government. But he insisted that in free India, the untouchable society necessity get a proper

share in the power structure; otherwise independence would merely mean rule by the upper castes.

Ambedkar on Democracy

Like several other national leaders Ambedkar had complete faith in democracy. Dictatorship may be able to produce results quickly; it may be effective in maintaining discipline but cannot be one's choice as a permanent shape of government. Democracy is superior because it enhances liberty. People have manage in excess of the rulers. In the middle of the dissimilar shapes of democratic government, Ambedkar's choice fell on the parliamentary shape. In this case also he was in agreement with several other national leaders.

Meaning: Social and Economic Democracy

Ambedkar viewed democracy as an instrument of bringing in relation to the change peacefully. Democracy does not merely mean rule by the majority or government by the representatives of the people. This is a formalistic and limited notion of democracy. We would understand the meaning of democracy in a better fashion if we view it as a method of realizing drastic changes in the social and economic spheres of civilization. Ambedkar's thought of democracy is much more than presently a scheme of government. He emphasizes the need for bringing in relation to the an all-round democracy. A scheme of government does not exist in vacuum; it operates within the civilization. Its usefulness depends upon its connection with the other spheres of civilization. Elections, parties and parliaments are, after all, formal organizations of democracy. They cannot be effective in an undemocratic atmosphere. Political democracy means the principle of 'one man one vote' which designates political equality. But if oppression and injustice exist, the spirit of political democracy would be missing. Democratic government, so, should be an extension of a democratic civilization. In the Indian civilization, for example, so extensive as caste barriers and caste-based inequalities exist, real democracy cannot operate. In this sense, democracy means a spirit of fraternity and equality and not merely a political

arrangement. Success of democracy in India can be ensured only by establishing a truly democratic civilization.

Beside with the social foundations of democracy, Ambedkar takes into consideration the economic features also. It is true that he was greatly influenced by liberal thought. Still, he appreciated the limitations of liberalism. Parliamentary democracy, in which he had great faith, was also critically examined by him. He argued that parliamentary democracy was based on liberalism. It ignored economic inequalities and never concentrated upon the troubles of the downtrodden. Besides, the common tendency of the western kind of parliamentary democracies has been to ignore the issues of social and economic equality. In other languages, parliamentary democracy accentuated only liberty whereas true democracy implies both liberty and equality. This analysis becomes very significant in the Indian context. Indian civilization was demanding freedom from the British. But Ambedkar was afraid that freedom of the nation would not ensure real freedom for all the people. Social and economic inequalities have dehumanized the Indian civilization. Establishing democracy in such a civilization would be nothing short of a revolution. This would be a revolution in the social structure and attitudes of the people. In the face of hereditary inequality, the principles of brotherhood and equality necessarily are recognized. So, Ambedkar supported the thought of all-round democracy.

Factors Necessary for the Successful Operation of Democracy

We have already seen that Ambedkar favored the parliamentary shape of government. For the successful functioning of this shape of government, it is necessary that some other circumstances necessarily be fulfilled. To begin with, political parties are necessary for the effective working of parliamentary democracy. This will ensure subsistence of the opposition which is very significant.

Parliamentary government is recognized as responsible government mainly because the executive is constantly watched and controlled by the opposition. Respect and official status for the opposition means absence of absolute power for the executive. The other condition is a neutral and non-

political civil service. A neutral civil service means that officers would be permanent - not dependent on the fortunes of the political parties - and that they would not take sides with political parties. This will be possible only when appointments of civil servants are not made on the basis of political consideration. Success of democracy depends on several ethical and moral factors also. A country may have a constitution. But it is only a set of rules. These rules become meaningful only when people in the country develop conventions and traditions constant with the constitution. People and politicians necessarily follow sure norms in public life. Likewise, there necessarily also exist a sense of morality and conscientiousness in the civilization. Law and legal remedies can never replace a voluntary sense of responsibility. No amount of law can enforce morality. Norms of honest and responsible behaviour necessarily develop in the civilization. Democracy can be successful only when every citizen feels duty bound to fight injustice even if that injustice does not put him into any difficulty personally. This will happen when equality and brotherhood exist in the civilization.

To create democracy successful in India, Ambedkar suggested a few other precautions also. Democracy means rule of the majority. But this should not result into tyranny of the majority. Majority necessarily always respects the views of the minority. In India there is a possibility that the minority society will always be a political minority also. So, it is very essential that the minority necessarily feel free, safe and secure. Otherwise, it will be very easy to convert democracy into a permanent rule against the minority. Caste system could therefore become the mainly hard obstacle in the successful functioning of democracy. The castes which are supposed to be of low status will never get their proper share in power. Caste will create barriers in the development of healthy democratic traditions. This means that unless we achieve the task of establishing democracy in the social field, mere political democracy cannot survive.

On State Socialism

From this discussion, you will realize that Ambedkar was not only a scholar with a firm intellectual grip on concepts, but he was also aware of the

practical social difficulties in the method of democratic functioning. So, he emphasizes that mere liberty cannot be an adequate goal. Liberty is meaningful when accompanied by equality. We want a democratic government which will uphold the thought of equality also. The western thoughts of liberal democracy and parliamentary shape of government do not ensure equality. So Ambedkar turned to socialism.

Inclination to Socialism

In those days, two diversities of socialism were prominent. One was Marxist Socialism. Ambedkar studied several features of Marxism and favored some Marxist principles. He usually subscribed to the material view of history and agreed to the need for a total change for bringing in relation to the equality. He also accepted the thought of public ownership of property. Though, he did not become a Marxist. The other significant diversity of socialism was Democratic Socialism. Ambedkar's firm belief in democracy attracted him to this ideology. He felt that socialism necessity function within a democratic framework. Democracy and socialism need not be opposed to each other. Therefore, in 1947, Ambedkar propounded the thought of 'State socialism'. Even earlier, when he recognized the Self-governing Labour Party in 1937, he had adopted a broadly socialist programme. The name of the party itself designates that it was to be a party of all depressed classes. Its programme incorporated state management of significant industries and bringing in relation to the a presently economic system. The party wanted to ensure minimum average of livelihood for agricultural and industrial workers.

Meaning of State Socialism

In 1947, Ambedkar suggested that the Constitution of India should incorporate the principle of State Socialism. State socialism means that the state would implement a socialist programme by controlling the industrial and agricultural sectors. There are two major features of Ambedkar's State socialism. (a) Key industries and vital industries will be owned by the state. There will be no private ownership of such industries. This will help in rapid industrialization and at the similar time, benefits of industrialization will be

distributed in the middle of all the parts of the civilization by the state. Insurance will also be entirely under state manage; (b) Agriculture will be treated as a state industry. This means that the state will initiate collective farming. Farmers will be allowed to enjoy section of the agricultural produce and the state will get some share in the shape of levy. Food granules procured by method of levy will be used for sharing at fare prices. In other languages, the state will actively manage both the industry and the agriculture. This will ensure equitable sharing of wealth and protect the needy and the poor. Rapid industrial progress and welfare of all the parts of the civilization will be the responsibility of the state. Though, the democratic organizations such as the parliament will also remain intact.

In the parliamentary shape of government, the similar party may not remain in power permanently. Dissimilar parties with dissimilar programmes may approach to power. So, Ambedkar suggested that the programme of State Socialism should be made an unalterable section of the constitution', so that any party which comes to power will have to implement that programme. This thought of State Socialism shows that Ambedkar was aware of the troubles of poverty and economic inequality. He laid great emphasis on industrialization. He whispered that India needed rapid industrial growth. This will help to ease out the burden on agriculture. But merely of wealth, the menace of capitalism had to be avoided.

Role of Government

This was possible only if the state functioned as a major partner in the field of industry. Ambedkar whispered that the state operating by government will be a neutral agency looking after the interests of the whole society. So, he attached much importance to the role of the government. Government, just as to him, has to perform the role of a welfare agency. It has to ensure rapid progress and presently sharing of the fruits of that progress. The role of the government was not restricted to industry only. It was expected to be active in the region of banking and insurance. Moreover, the government necessity also manages the agriculture. By owning major industries and controlling agriculture, the government will curb economic injustice. In other languages,

changes of a revolutionary nature are to be brought in relation to the by the efforts of the government.

Ambedkar and Drafting of the Indian Constitution

In 1947, Ambedkar became Chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly of India. His contribution in this role has become immemorable. Ambedkar's legal expertise and knowledge of constitutional laws of dissimilar countries was very helpful in framing the Indian Constitution. His deep regard for a democratic constitution and insistence upon constitutional morality also helped in this procedure. In this sense, he is rightly regarded as the architect of the Indian Constitution. There are several administrative details in the Indian Constitution (e.g. provisions concerning the Public Service Commission, Attorney Common, Comptroller and Auditor Common, etc.) which have made the constitution a very lengthy document. But Ambedkar defended inclusion of such details. He argued that we have created a democratic political structure in a traditional civilization. If all details are not incorporated, unscrupulous rulers in the future' may misuse the constitution without technically violating it. Therefore, formally the constitution may remain in operation but its real purpose may be defeated. To avoid this, the best safeguard is to write down all necessary details and to bind future rulers to these details. In a civilization where the democratic custom is weak, such safeguards become essential. This shows that Ambedkar was a staunch constitutionalist. He whispered that a government necessity be constitutional and that constitution necessity be treated as a vital and sacred document. There was no room for extra-parliamentary action in constitutional politics. He also attached much significance to the development of constitutional norms and public practices constant with the constitution.

Dr. Ambedkar's necessity significant contribution to the Indian Constitution may be seen in the regions of fundamental rights, strong central government and protection of minorities. As a liberal. Ambedkar whispered that fundamental rights constitute the mainly significant section of the constitution. But mere listing of these rights is not enough. What creates fundamental rights really fundamental is the guarantee of constitutional

protection to these rights. Ambedkar was proud of Article 32 of the Indian Constitution which guarantees judicial protection to fundamental rights. Such protection creates the rights real and meaningful. There was common agreement in the constituent assembly that India needed a strong central government. Ambedkar shared this view. But his chief cause for advocating a strong central government was slightly dissimilar from that of the others. He was aware that India was a caste-ridden civilization in which lower castes have always received unjust treatment from the higher castes. He was afraid that casteism would be all the more powerful at regional and provincial stages. Government at these stages would be easily subject to casteist pressures and it would fail to protect the lower castes from higher caste oppression. The national government would be less influenced by these pressures. It would be more liberal in its approach than the regional governments. 'Only a strong central government, so, will ensure some protection to the lower castes. This was Ambedkar's mainly significant cause for creating a strong central government. He knew that the minority societies in India were in the mainly vulnerable location. In India, there was a tendency of a collective or caste majority becoming a political majority also. Therefore, a minority will be both a caste minority and political minority. It will be subject to political as well as social harassment. The democratic rule of 'one-man-one-vote' will not be enough in such a situation. What we need in India is some guarantee of a share in power for the minorities. Minority societies should get an opportunity to elect their representatives. The views of these representatives necessarily are fully respected.

Ambedkar attempted to incorporate several safeguards for the minorities, including definite representation in the executive. He was successful in creating provisions concerning political reservations in legislatures and the appointment of a special officer for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Commissioner) under Article 338 etc. He would have liked to create several more safeguards but for the unwillingness of the majority in the constituent assembly. What is important here is Dr. Ambedkar's view that democracy is not merely majority rule and that caste-collective minorities

necessity be fully protected to create democracy meaningful. He 'was, in other languages, against the 'Majoritarianism Syndrome'.

On Social Change

Ambedkar made ceaseless efforts for the removal of untouchability and the material progress of untouchables. From 1924 onwards, he led the movement of untouchables till the end of his life. He firmly whispered that the progress of the nation could not be realized without first removing untouchability. Ambedkar held the view that the removal of untouchability was connected to the abolition of the caste system and that it could be only by discarding the religious notions from the basis of the caste system. So, in the course of his analysis of the caste system, he examined the Hindu religious philosophy and criticized it. He did this boldly, often facing strong resentment from the orthodox Hindus.

Priority to Social Reform

Social reform was always the first priority of Dr. Ambedkar. He whispered that the economic and political issues should be resolved only after achieving the goal of social justice. If priority is given to the issue of political emancipation, it would mean transfer of power from foreign rules to the upper caste Hindus, who are equally distant from the lower castes. Therefore, injustice against the untouchables would still continue. Likewise, the thought that economic progress would resolve all social troubles was also ill-founded, just as to Ambedkar. Casteism is an expression of mental slavery of the Hindus. It made them insensitive. So, no real change could take lay without doing absent with the evil of casteism. Social reform was the precondition of revolutionary changes in our civilization.

Social reform consisted of reform of the family system and religious reform. Family reform incorporated abolition of practices like child-marriage etc. This was significant mainly because it involved upliftment of women. Reforms concerning marriage and divorce laws for example, would benefit women who were as oppressed as the untouchables. Ambedkar strongly criticized the degradation of women in the Indian civilization. He whispered

that women were entitled to an equal status with men and that they necessarily have the right to education. He lamented that the Hindu religion had deprived women of the right to property. In the Hindu Code Bill which he prepared, he took care that women should get a share the property. While he organized the untouchables, he always described upon women of the untouchable society to approach forward and participate in social and political movements.

Attack on the Caste

Ambedkar's main battle was against the caste system. Caste had made Hindu civilization stagnant. Due to the caste system, Hindu civilization is unable to accommodate outsiders. This drawback poses permanent troubles for integration. Even internally, the Hindu civilization fails to satisfy the test of a homogeneous civilization. It is only a conglomerate of dissimilar castes. Caste is an obstacle in the growth of national spirit. Mainly importantly, caste system perpetrates injustice on the lower castes. It does not allow progress of the lower castes. Lower castes receive nothing but contempt. This has resulted in moral degradation and demoralization of the lower castes. The untouchables, in scrupulous, are the constant substance of injustice. They are denied education, good livelihood and human dignity. The caste system has dehumanized them thoroughly. The very thought that the mere touch of one human being pollutes another shows the gross stage of inequality and brutality to which the caste system had sunk. So, the battle for the removal of untouchability becomes the battle for human rights and justice.

Removal of Untouchability

How can untouchability be removed? Untouchability is the indication of slavery of the whole Hindu civilization. If the untouchables discover themselves chained by the caste Hindus. the caste Hindus themselves live under the slavery of religious scriptures. So, emancipation of the untouchables automatically involved emancipation of the Hindu civilization as a whole. Ambedkar warns that nothing worthwhile can be created on the basis of caste. We can build neither a nation nor morality on this basis. So, a casteless civilization necessity is created. Inter caste marriages can effectively destroy

the caste but the difficulty is that people will not be prepared to marry outside their caste so extensive as casteism dominates their thinking. Ambedkar describes such ways as inter-caste dining or marriage as 'forced feeding'. What is required is a more drastic change: liberating people from the clutches of religious scriptures and traditions. Every Hindu is a slave of the Vedas and Shastras. He necessarily be told that these scriptures perpetrate wrong and so, need to be discarded. Abolition of castes is dependent upon destroying the glory of these scriptures. Till the scriptures control the Hindus, they will not be free to act just as to their conscience. In lay of the unjust principle of hereditary hierarchy. We necessarily set up the principles of equality, liberty and fraternity. These should be the foundations of any religion.

Self-respect in the Middle of Untouchables

Though, Ambedkar knew that all this involved a total change in Hinduism which would take a very extensive time. So, beside with this suggestion for vital change, he also insisted on several other methods for the uplift of the untouchables. Under the power of custom the untouchables had totally surrendered to the power of the upper castes. They had lost all spirit to fight and assert themselves. The myth of inherent pollution also considerably influenced the minds of untouchables. So, it was necessary to arouse their self-respect. Untouchables should realize that they are the equals of caste Hindus. They necessarily throw absent their bondage.

Education

Ambedkar whispered that education would greatly contribute to the improvement of the untouchables. He always exhorted his followers to reach excellence in the field of knowledge. Knowledge is a liberating force. Education creates man enlightened, creates him aware of this self-respect and also helps him to lead a better life materially. One of the causes of the degradation of the untouchables was that they were denied the right to education. Ambedkar criticized the British policy on education for not adequately encouraging education in the middle of the lower castes. He felt that even under the British rule education sustained mainly to be an upper

caste monopoly. While a labour member in the executive council of the Governor-common, he was instrumental in extending scholarships for education abroad to the untouchable students. Ambedkar wanted the untouchables to undergo both liberal education and technological education. He was particularly opposed to education under religious auspices. He warned that only secular education could instill the values of liberty and equality in the middle of the students.

Economic Progress

Another very significant remedy which Ambedkar upheld was that the untouchables should free themselves of the village society and its economic bondage. In the traditional set up, the untouchables were bound to specific occupations. They were dependent upon the caste Hindus for their sustenance. Even for meager returns they had to submit themselves to the power of caste Hindus. Ambedkar was aware of the economic dimension of their servitude. So, he always insisted that the untouchables should stop doing their traditional job. Instead, they should acquire new skills and start new professions. Education would enable them to get employment. There was no point in remaining dependent upon the village economy. With rising industrialization, there were greater opportunities in the municipalities. Untouchables should quit villages, if necessary and discover new jobs or engage themselves in new professions. Once their dependence on caste Hindus is in excess of, they can easily throw absent the psychological burden of being untouchables. In a realistic evaluation of the villages, Ambedkar graphically describes them as 'a sink of localism, a den of ignorance, narrow-mindedness and communalism'. So, the earlier the untouchables become free of village-bondage, the better. Even if the untouchables had to live in the villages, they should stop doing their traditional job and seek new means of livelihood. This would ensure their economic emancipation to a considerable extent.

'The mainstay of Ambedkar's argument was that the oppressed class's necessity generates self-respect in the middle of themselves. The best policy for their uplift was the policy of self-help. Only by working hard and casting off mental servitude, they can attain an equal status with the remaining Hindu

civilization. He did not consider in social reform on the basis of humanitarianism, sympathy, philanthropy etc. Equal status and presently treatment was a matter of right and not pity. The downtrodden should assert and win their rights by disagreement. There was no short cut to the attainment of rights.

Political Strength

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

Conversion

During his life Ambedkar made efforts to reform the philosophical basis of Hinduism. But he was influenced that Hinduism will not vary its disposition towards the untouchables. So, he searched for an alternative to Hinduism. After careful consideration, he adopted Buddhism and asked his followers to do the similar. His conversion to Buddhism meant reassertion of his faith in a religion based on humanism. Ambedkar argued that Buddhism was the least obscurantist religion. It appreciated the spirit of equality and liberty. Removal of injustice and use was the goal of Buddhism. By adopting Buddhism, the untouchables would be able to carve out a new identity for themselves. Since Hinduism gave them nothing but sufferings, by renouncing Hinduism, the untouchables would be renouncing the stigma of untouchability and bondage attached to them. To live a new material life, a new spiritual basis constant with the liberal spirit was essential. Buddhism would give this

basis. So, at the social stage, education; at the material stage, new means of livelihood; at the political stage, political organization and at the spiritual stage, self-assertion and conversion constituted Ambedkar's overall programme of the removal of untouchability.

-

- **ANTI-COLONIAL TRIBAL MOVEMENTS IN INDIA**

Socio-Economic Profile of the Tribals throughout the Colonial Era

Rural India had been inhabited by the tribal population from the beginning. The tribal societies existed in relative seclusion and separation for centuries and in varying states of economy. In spite of their contacts with the non-tribals, they maintained their separate identity. Each tribal society maintained its own socio-religious and cultural life and its political and economic organisations. Until the arrival of the British in the tribal regions, the main means of manufacture and survival for the tribals were land and forests. The forests were of great significance for the tribal all in excess of India. They had customary rights to use the minor forest products. Firewood, flowers, fruits, leaves, honey, housing material, edible nuts, medical herbs etc. shaped the essential things of the daily necessities of tribals. They used forest products for food, constructing homes and shifting farming. They grazed their cattle in the forests. The forests provided them with security. In relation to the significance of the forests for the tribals Kr. Suresh Singh says: "They (Tribal societies) can, so, subsist on circumstances in which members of these more civilized race could not exist. When the crop fails, jungle fruits and vegetables of all types (sag) are valuable reserve. With the help of these they succeed in teething in excess of the era of stress which could play havoc. "

In addition, the tribals practiced weaving, basket creation, fishing, hunting and food gathering. Their instruments of labour and livelihood were not very urbanized. Bows and arrows were the main instruments of self-protection and hunting. The tribal societies had their respective chiefs and clan councils (panchayat) to seem after them and manage their social, religious, economic and political affairs. Each tribal paid some amount of land produce

to his respective chief. But it. was not a legal right; it was a moral requirement. The chiefs were given voluntary contribution in type and a few days of free labour every year by the people.

●

● **REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- What was the impact of British Colonialism in social and cultural fields?
- Briefly discuss the impact of British rule on the Indian economy
- Discuss the Tribal Movements that arose in Colonial India.
- Why did Phule initially welcome the British rule? What was his later criticism?
- Examine Naicker's views on the Varnashrama Dharma.
- What role did Naicker play in the anti-Hindi agitation that waged in the South in the early part of 20th century?
- Briefly discuss Ambedkar's views on the British Rule in India.
- Discuss Ambedkar's concept of State Socialism.
- What changes were brought about by the British policies in the economy of the tribals?

CHAPTER 5

Politics and Religion in Modern India: The Interface

- **STRUCTURE**

- Learning objectives
- Introduction
- Swami Dayanand Saraswati, Swami Vivekananda and V.D. Savarkar
- Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, Mohammad Iqbal, M.A. Jinnah and Abul Kalam Azad
- Review questions

Learning Objectives

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Discuss the Indians' response to British colonialism.
- Discuss the main features of revivalist nationalist politics.
- Explain the development of Hindu thought from mid-nineteenth century onwards.
- Relationships between Islam and Politics, and democracy.

-

- **INTRODUCTION**

Indian Response to British Rule

British colonial rule and the impact of western civilization and civilization brought forward many categories of response in the middle of educated and concerned Indians. These responses were in proof from 1860 onwards when British policy in India began to undergo drastic changes. Suspicion, repression, systematic use of existing social aloofness in the middle of societies to foster divisive tendencies for political ends and strict surveillance quickly replaced pre-1858 laxity in these matters. For our purpose, though, we take up these strands of responses from 1885 when the Indian National Congress was formally recognized for the easy cause that

some shape of organized politics appeared in support of one or the other category of response.

Several Responses

These responses may be stated as follows:

- Modernization of politics and social reform on the basis of rational principles of the west and by a procedure of gradual version; loyalist, peaceful and constitutionalist in approach;
- Radicalization/Spiritualization of politics, its goals and ways; mobilization by Hindu religious symbols and emotive appeals to the virtues of self-reliance and past glory; opposition to British rule; traditional approach to social reform;
- Loyalist, constitutionalist in political approach; mobilization based on appeal to Muslim religion and protection of Muslim interests;
- A political outlook in which preference for western principles of government was combined with innovative, peaceful and active ways of protest; mobilization and action; freedom as a primary goal.

In addition, there were attempts by *Scheduled Castes* and *Tribes* to share seats and power in the emerging political order. The Marxian left forces, mainly prominent in the thirties, also represented an significant trend of opinion and action in response to colonial subjection; a important power on Indian politics.

Indian Response as Reflected in Organizations and Movements

These trends establish early expression in organizations and movements associated with the Brahmo Samaj, Prarthana Samaj, Arya Samaj, the Aligarh College and Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, the Ramakrishna Mission, the Theosophical Civilization, and Social ' Reform Congress. These organizations and corresponding movements stood for *I* reform and regeneration of civilization or a scrupulous society by religious or rationalist thoughts. The movements were limited in level, and were not overtly political in character. But they did underline directly or indirectly, the crucial role of religion and

custom in generating popular enthusiasm approximately a cause. Religion was the subject of discourse or a means of social mobilization. The lesson was not lost on the militant nationalists and the 'extremists' as they were described in Congress parlance; they represented the second strand of political response of western impact.

Moderates' Response

As extensive as liberal moderate leaders were in charge of the Congress (1885-1906) the effective emphasis was on western liberal principles of cause, rights, loyalty, freedom from prejudice and discrimination, national unity, gradualism and an unit of elitism. Religion was measured a matter of personal concern. The liberals were democratic in their principles, but their politics never came down to the stage of the people nor did they ever feel the necessity to deliberately blend religion and politics to advance political causes. As some of the Congress leaders (Tilak in Maharashtra and Aurobindo Ghosh, Surendranath Banerjee, Bipin Pal in Bengal and Lala Lajpat Rai in Punjab) entered the period of mass politics, however on a limited level, and virtually without the approval of the liberal leadership, soon after the government proposed to partition the province of Bengal on grounds of administrative convenience in 1903, the politics of extremists and the militant nationalists could be said to have arrived on the scene.

Militant Nationalists

It was a new brand of politics-active and impatient-rising out of accumulated grievances, new developments in India, as well as a sense of disgust with the existing state of affairs. There was a new establish confidence in the middle of India's industrial entrepreneurs which prompted them to demand more room for expansion. Rising volume of educated unemployment, the economic distress of the people, the combined effect of Dadabhai Naoroji's 'Poverty and the British Rule in India', R.C.Dutt's 'Economic History of British India', and William Digby's 'Wealthy British India' all contributed to rising militancy.

Mainly of the militants of Bengal could be divided into strands: There were believer; in the mother cult; that is, those who extolled shakti which just as to them symbolized India of the past, present and future. The other group was described Vedantists who followed the preaching of Swami Vivekananda and the message of Lord Krishna. Both groups whispered in the use of force or violence however it cannot be said that that was their only programme of action. An motivating comment on both these groups comes from Lajpat Rai.

●

● **SWAMI DAYANAND SARASWATI, SWAMI
VIVEKANANDA AND V.D. SAVARKAR**

Dayananda Saraswati

Dayanand Saraswati (12 February 1824 – 30 October 1883) was an significant Hindu religious leader of his time. He is well recognized as the founder of the Arya Samaj, a Hindu reform movement of the Vedic custom. He was a profound scholar of the Vedic lore and Sanskrit language. He was the first to provide the call for Swarajya' "India for Indians" – in 1876, later taken up by Lokmanya Tilak. Denouncing the idolatry and ritualistic worship prevalent in Hinduism at the time, he worked towards reviving Vedic ideologies. Subsequently the philosopher and President of India, S. Radhakrishnan, described him one of the "makers of Contemporary India," as did Sri Aurobindo.

One of his notable disciples was Shyamji Krishna Varma, who founded India Home in Sindh, Pakistan and guided other revolutionaries. Others who were influenced by and followed him incorporated Madam Cama, Pandit Guru Dutt Vidyarthi, Pran Sukh Yadav, Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, Lala Hardayal, Madan Lal Dhingra, Ram Prasad Bismil, Bhagat Singh, Mahadev Govind Ranade Swami Shraddhanand. Mahatma Hansraj and Lala Lajpat Rai. One of his mainly influential works is the book Satyarth Prakash, which contributed to the Indian independence movement. He was a sanyasi (ascetic) from boyhood, and a scholar, who whispered in the infallible power of the Vedas.

Maharshi Dayananda advocated the doctrine of Karma (Karmasiddhanta in Hinduism) and Reincarnation (Punarjanma in Hinduism). He accentuated the Vedic ideals of brahmacharya (celibacy) and devotion to God. The Theosophical Civilization and the Arya Samaj were united from 1878 to 1882, becoming the Theosophical Civilization of the Arya Samaj. In the middle of Maharshi Dayananda's contributions are his promoting of the equal rights for women, such as the right to education and reading of Indian scriptures, and his intuitive commentary on the Vedas from Vedic Sanskrit in Sanskrit as well as Hindi so that the general man might be able to read them. Dayanand was the first to provide the word of Swadeshi extensive before Mahatma Gandhi

Early Life

Dayanand Saraswati was born on 12, February, 1824 in Tankara, close to Morbi in Kathiyawad area (Rajkot district) of Gujarat. His original name was Mool Shankar. His father's name was Karshanji Lalji Tiwari and mother's name was Yashodabai. Theirs was a Brahmin family with his father being a tax collector and was a rich, wealthy and influential person. He was the head of an eminent Brahmin family of the village. When Mool Shankar was eight years old, Yajnopavita Sanskara, or the investiture with thread of the "twice-born" were performed. His father was a follower of Shiva and taught Dayanand Saraswati the methods to impress the Lord. Dayanand was also told the importance of keeping fasts. On the occasion of Shivaratri, Dayanand had to sit awake the whole night in obedience to Lord Shiva. One such night, he saw a mouse eating the offerings to the God and running in excess of the idol's body. After seeing this, he questioned himself, if the God could not defend himself against a little mouse then how could he be the savior of the huge world.

Since he was born under Mul Nakshatra, he was named "Moolshankar", and led a comfortable early life, learning Sanskrit, the Vedas and other religious texts to prepare himself for a future as a Hindu priest.

The deaths of his younger sister and his uncle from cholera caused Dayananda to ponder the meaning of life and death and he started asking

questions which worried his parents. He was to be married in his early teens, as was general in nineteenth-century India, but he decided marriage was not for him and in 1846 ran absent from house.

Dayananda Sarasvati spent almost twenty-five years, from 1845 to 1869, as a wandering ascetic, searching for religious truth. An ascetic is someone who provides up material goods and lives a life of self-denial, devoted to spiritual matters. He existed in jungles, in retreats in the Himalayan Mountains, and at a number of pilgrimage locations in northern India. Throughout these years Dayananda Sarasvati practiced several shapes of yoga. He became a disciple, or follower, of a well-recognized religious teacher, Virajananda Dandeesha (sometimes spelled Birajananda). Birajananda whispered that Hinduism had strayed from its historical roots and that several of its practices had become impure. Dayananda Sarasvati promised Birajananda that he would devote his life to restoring the rightful lay of the Vedas in the Hindu faith.

Dayanand's Mission

Dayananda mission was not to start or set up any new religion but to tell the humankind for Universal Brotherhood by nobility as spelt out in Vedas. For that mission he founded Arya Samaj enunciating the Ten Universal Principles as a code for Universalism *Krinvento Vishwaryam* meaning the whole world be an abode for Nobles (Aryas). His after that step was to take up the hard task of reforming Hinduism with dedication despite multiple repeated attempts on his personal life. He traveled the country demanding religious scholars and priests to discussions and won repeatedly on the strength of his arguments based on his knowledge of Sanskrit and Vedas. He whispered that Hinduism had been corrupted by divergence from the founding principles of the Vedas and that Hindus had been misled by the priesthood for the priests' self-aggrandizement. Hindu priests discouraged the laity from reading Vedic scriptures and encouraged rituals, such as bathing in the Ganges River and feeding of priests on anniversaries, which Dayananda pronounced as superstitions or self-serving practices. By exhorting the nation to reject such superstitious notions, his aim was to educate the nation to Go back to the

Vedas. He wanted the people who followed Hinduism to go back to its roots and to follow the Vedic life, which he pointed out. He exhorted the Hindu nation to accept social reforms like the abolition of untouchability, sati, and dowry, Education of women, Swadeshi and importance of Cows for national prosperity as well as the adoption of Hindi as the national language for national integration. By his daily life and practice of yoga and asanas, teachings, preachings, sermons and writings, he inspired the Hindu nation to aspire to *Swarajya* (self governance), nationalism, and spiritualism. He advocated the equal rights and compliments to women and advocated the education of a girl child like the males.

Swami Dayanand did logical, scientific and critical analyses of all faiths i.e. Christianity & Islam as well as of other Indian faiths like Jainism, Buddhism and Sikhism. In addition to denouncing idolatry in Hinduism, as may be seen in his book *Satyarth Prakash*. He was against what he measured to be the corruption of the true and pure faith in his own country. Unlike several other reform movements of his times within Hinduism, the Arya Samaj's appeal was addressed not only to the educated few in India, but to the world as a whole as evidenced in the sixth principle of the Arya Samaj. In information his teachings professed universalism for the all livelihood beings and not for any scrupulous sect, faith, society or nation.

Dayananda's Vedic message was to emphasize respect and reverence for other human beings, supported by the Vedic notion of the divine nature of the individual–divine because the body was the temple where the human essence (soul or "atma") had the possibility to interface with the creator ("Paramatma"). In the ten principles of the Arya Samaj, he enshrined the thought that "All actions should be performed with the prime objective of benefiting mankind", as opposed to following dogmatic rituals or revering idols and symbols. The first five principles speak of Truth and the other five of a civilization with nobility, civics, co-livelihood and disciplined life. In his own life, he interpreted moksha to be a lower calling (due to its benefit to one individual) than the calling to emancipate others.

Dayananda's "back to the Vedas" message influenced several thinkers and philosophers the world in excess of.

Arya Samaj

Swami Dayananda's creations, the Arya Samaj, unequivocally condemns idol worship, animal sacrifice, ancestor worship, pilgrimages, priest craft, offerings made in temples, the caste system, untouchability, child marriages and discrimination against women on the grounds that all these lacked Vedic sanction. The Arya Samaj discourages dogma and symbolism and encourages skepticism in beliefs that run contrary to general sense and logic. To several people, the Arya Samaj aims to be a "universal civilization" based on the power of the Vedas.

Though, Swami Dayananand showed extreme rationalism and paradoxically made several assumptions while interpreting the Veda. Therefore, he posited that Brahman could be the only God, and denied the subsistence of the lower gods. He also partially accepted the power of the Shastras, the commentaries of Sayana. It is a matter of surprise that he denied the power of the shastras, while accepting section of them to be true therefore accepting the upanayana and disallowing the Shraddha and Ashvamedha (The spirits, when summoned, just as to him were a bad omen and ashva did not mean 'horse'). In order to get approximately the shastras, he wrote a treatise on Sanskaras.

The shastras, much like the vedas just as to the Sanatana dharma, are correct because of the yogaja pramana of the rishis. The gods cannot either be exposed by the senses or by cause.

Death

Dayananda was subjected to several unsuccessful attempts on his life because of his efforts to reform the Hindu civilization such as killing dangerous snakes worshiped in temples crossways India. In 1883 Dayananda was invited by the Maharaja of Jodhpur to stay at his palace. The Maharaja was eager to become his disciple and learn his teachings. One day Dayananda went to the Maharaja's rest room and saw him with a dance girl named Nanhi Jan. Dayananda boldly asked the Maharaja to forsake the girl and all unethical acts and follow dharma like a true Aryan. Dayananda's suggestion offended the dance girl and she decided to take revenge. She bribed Dayananda's cook

to poison him. At bedtime, the cook brought him a glass of milk containing poison and powdered glass. Dayananda drank the milk and went to sleep only to wake up later with a burning sensation. He immediately realized that he had been poisoned and attempted to purge his digestive system of the poisonous substance, but it was too late. The poison had already entered his bloodstream. Dayananda was bedridden and suffered excruciating pain. Several doctors came to treat him but all was in vain. His body was sheltered all in excess of with big bleeding sores. On seeing Dayananda's suffering the cook was overcome with unbearable guilt and remorse. He confessed his crime to Dayananda. On his deathbed, Dayananda forgave him and gave him a bag of money and told him to flee the kingdom lest he be established out and executed by the Maharaja's men.

Works

Dayananda Saraswati wrote more than 60 works in all, including a 16 volume explanation of the six Vedangas, an partial commentary on the Ashtadhyayi (Panini's grammar), many small tracts on ethics and morality, Vedic rituals and sacraments and on criticism of rival doctrines (such as Advaita Vedanta, Islam and Christianity). Some of his major works are Satyarth Prakash, Sanskarvidhi, Rigvedadi Bhashya Bhumika, Rigved Bhashyam (up to 7/61/2) and Yajurved Bhashyam. The Paropakarini Sabha situated in the Indian municipality of Ajmer was founded by the Swami himself to publish and preach his works and Vedic texts.

Swami Vivekananda

Swami Vivekananda (12 January 1863–4 July 1902), born Narendra Nath Datta was an Indian Hindu monk. He was a key figure in the introduction of Indian philosophies of *Vedanta* and *Yoga* to the western world and was credited with raising interfaith awareness, bringing Hinduism to the status of a major world religion in the late 19th century. He was a major force in the revival of Hinduism in India and contributed to the notion of nationalism in colonial India. He was the chief disciple of the 19th century saint Ramakrishna and the founder of the Ramakrishna Math and the Ramakrishna Mission. He is

perhaps best recognized for his inspiring speech beginning with "Sisters and Brothers of America," by which he introduced Hinduism at the Parliament of the World's Religions in Chicago in 1893.

Born into an aristocratic Bengali family of Calcutta, Vivekananda showed an inclination towards spirituality. He was influenced by his guru Ramakrishna from whom he learnt that all livelihood beings were an embodiment of the divine self and hence, service to God could be rendered by service to mankind. After the death of his guru, Vivekananda toured the Indian subcontinent extensively and acquired a first-hand knowledge of the circumstances that prevailed in British India. He later traveled to the United States to symbolize India as a delegate in the 1893 Parliament of World Religions. He delivered hundreds of public and private lectures and classes, disseminating tenets of Hindu philosophy in the United States, England and Europe. In India, Vivekananda is regarded as a patriotic saint and his birthday is celebrated as the National Youth Day.

Early Life (1863–1888)

Birth and Childhood

Vivekananda was born as Narendranath in Calcutta, the capital of British India, on 12 January 1863 throughout the Makar Sankranti festival. He belonged to a traditional Bengali *Kayastha* (a caste of Hindus) family and was one of the nine siblings. Narendra's father Vishwanath Datta was an attorney of Calcutta High Court. Narendra's mother was a pious woman and a housewife. The progressive rational approach of his father and the religious temperament of his mother helped form his thinking and personality. Young Narendranath was fascinated by the wandering ascetics and monks.

Narendra was an average student, but a voracious reader. He was interested in a wide range of subjects such as philosophy, religion, history, the social sciences, arts, and literature. He evinced interest in the Hindu scriptures such as the *Vedas*, the *Upanishads*, the *Bhagavad Gita*, the *Ramayana*, the *Mahabharata* and the *Puranas*. He trained in Indian classical music, and participated in physical exercise, sports, and organizational behaviors. Narendra joined the Metropolitan Institution of Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar in

1871 and studied there until 1877 when his family moved to Raipur. The family returned to Calcutta two years later.

College and Brahmo Samaj

In 1879 after his family moved back to Calcutta, Narendra passed the entrance examination from the Presidency College. He subsequently studied western logic, western philosophy and history of European nations in the Common Assembly's Institution (now recognized as the Scottish Church College). In 1881 he passed the Fine Arts examination and in 1884 he completed a Bachelor of Arts degree.

Narendra studied the works of David Hume, Immanuel Kant, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Baruch Spinoza, Georg W. F. Hegel, Arthur Schopenhauer, Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill, and Charles Darwin. Narendra became fascinated with the evolutionism of Herbert Spencer and had correspondence with him; he translated Spencer's book *Education* (1861) into Bengali. Alongside his revise of Western philosophers, he was thoroughly acquainted with Indian Sanskrit scriptures and several Bengali works. Dr. William Hastie, principal of Common Assembly's Institution, wrote, "Narendra is really a genius. I have traveled distant and wide but I have never approach crossways a lad of his talents and possibilities, even in German universities, in the middle of philosophical students." Some accounts regard Narendra as a *srutidhara*—a man with prodigious memory.

Narendra became the member of a Freemason's lodge and of a breakaway faction of the Brahmo Samaj led by Keshub Chandra Sen. His initial beliefs were shaped by Brahmo concepts, which incorporated belief in a formless God and deprecation of the worship of idols. Not satisfied with his knowledge of philosophy, he wondered if God and religion could be made a section of one's rising experiences and deeply internalized. Narendra went in relation to the asking prominent residents of modern Calcutta whether they had approach "face to face with God" but could not get answers which satisfied him. His first introduction to the saint Ramakrishna occurred in a literature class in Common Assembly's Institution, when he heard Hastie lecturing on William Wordsworth's poem *The Excursion*. While explaining the

word "trance" in the poem, Hastie suggested his students to visit Ramakrishna of Dakshineswar to know the real meaning of trance. This prompted some of his students, including Narendra, to visit Ramakrishna.

With Ramakrishna

Narendra's meeting with Ramakrishna in November 1881 proved to be a turning point in Narendra's life. Narendra said in relation to the this first meeting that

- "Ramakrishna looked presently like an ordinary man, with nothing extra ordinary in relation to the him. He used the mainly easy language and I thought 'Can this man be a great teacher?'. I crept close to him and asked him the question which I had been asking others all my life: 'Do you consider in God, Sir?' 'Yes', he replied. 'Can you prove it, Sir?' 'Yes'. 'How?' 'Because I see Him presently as I see you here, only in a much intense sense.' That impressed me at once. I began to go to that man, day after day, and I actually saw that religion could be given. One touch, one glance, can change a whole life."

However Narendra did not accept Ramakrishna as his teacher initially and revolted against his thoughts, he was attracted by his personality and started visiting him at Dakshineswar regularly. He initially looked upon Ramakrishna's ecstasies and visions as "mere figments of imagination", and "hallucinations". As a member of Brahmo Samaj, he was against idol worship and polytheism, and Ramakrishna's worship of Kali. He even rejected the *Advaitist Vedantism* of "identity with absolute" as blasphemy and madness, and often made fun of the concept. However at first Narendra could not accept Ramakrishna and his visions, he did not neglect him. Instead, he tested Ramakrishna, who faced all of his arguments and examinations with patience—"Attempt to see the truth from all angles" was his reply. His father's untimely death in 1884 left Narendra's family bankrupt. Unable to discover employment and facing poverty, Narendra questioned God's subsistence. Throughout this time, Narendra establish solace in Ramakrishna, and his visits to Dakshineswar increased. Narendra slowly became ready to renounce

everything for the sake of realizing God. In time, Narendra accepted Ramakrishna as his guru.

In 1885, Ramakrishna urbanized throat cancer and he was transferred to Calcutta and later to Cossipore. Narendra and Ramakrishna's other disciples took care of him throughout his final days. Narendra's spiritual education under Ramakrishna sustained. At Cossipore, Narendra reportedly experienced *Nirvikalpa Samadhi*. Throughout Ramakrishna's last days, Narendra and some of the other disciples received the ochre monastic robes from Ramakrishna, forming the first monastic order of Ramakrishna. Narendra was taught that service to men was the mainly effective worship of God. Throughout his final days, Ramakrishna asked Narendra Nath to take care of other monastic disciples and in turn asked them to seem upon Narendra as their leader. Ramakrishna died in the early morning hours of 16 August 1886 at his garden home in Cossipore.

Founding of the Ramakrishna Math

After the death of Ramakrishna, his devotees and admirers stopped funding the Cossipore math. The unpaid rents soon piled up and Narendra and other disciples of Ramakrishna had to discover a new lay to live. Several of his disciples returned home and became inclined towards a *Grihastha* (family-oriented) life. Narendra decided to create a dilapidated home at Baranagar the new *math* (monastery) for remaining disciples. The rent of the *Baranagar Math* was cheap and it was funded by "holy begging". In his book *Swami Vivekananda: A Reassessment*, Narasingha Prosad Sil writes, "the Math was an adult male haven, a counter-civilization society of freedom-seeking youths on the fringe of civilization and the municipality". The math became the first structure of the *Ramakrishna Math*—the monastery of the first monastic order of Ramakrishna. Narendra later reminisced in relation to the early days in the monastery:

- We underwent a lot of religious practice at the *Baranagar Math*. We used to get up at 3:00 am and become absorbed in *japa* and meditation. What a strong spirit of detachment we had in those days! We had no thought even as to whether the world lived or not.

In January 1887, Narendra and eight other disciples took formal monastic vows. Narendra took the name of *Swami Bibidishananda*. Later he was given the name *Vivekananda* by Ajit Singh, the Maharaja of Khetri. In January 1899 the *Baranagar Math* was transferred to Belur in the Howrah district, now recognized as the Belur Math.

As a Monk Wandering in India (1888–1893)

In 1888, Vivekananda left the monastery as a *Parivrājaka*— the Hindu religious life of a wandering monk, "without fixed abode, without ties, self-governing and strangers wherever they go." His sole possessions were a *kamandalu* (water pot), staff, and his two favourite books—*Bhagavad Gita* and *The Imitation of Christ*. Vivekananda traveled extensively in India for five years, visiting centers of learning, acquainting himself with the diverse religious traditions and dissimilar patterns of social life. He urbanized a sympathy for the suffering and poverty of the masses and resolved to uplift the nation. Livelihood mainly on *bhiksha* (alms), Vivekananda traveled on foot and railway tickets bought by his admirers whom he met throughout the travels. Throughout these travels he made acquaintance and stayed with Indians from all walks of life and religions—scholars, *dewans*, rajas, Hindus, Muslims, Christians, *pariahs* (low caste workers) and government officials.

Northern India (1888–1890)

In 1888, Vivekananda's first destination was Varanasi, where he met the Bengali writer, Bhudev Mukhopadhyay and the saint Trailanga Swami. He also met Babu Pramadas Mitra, the noted Sanskrit scholar, with whom he corresponded on the interpretation of the Hindu scriptures. After Varanasi he visited Ayodhya, Lucknow, Agra, Vrindavan, Hathras and Rishikesh. At Hathras, he met Sharat Chandra Gupta, a railway station master who later became one of his earliest disciples as *Sadananda*. Flanked by 1888 and 1890, he visited Vaidyanath and Allahabad. From Allahabad, he went on to Ghazipur, where he met Pavhari Baba, an *Advaita Vedanta* ascetic who used to spend mainly of his time in meditation. Throughout this era, Vivekananda

returned to Baranagar *math* a few times, because of ill health and to arrange for monetary funds for the *math*.

The Himalayas (1890–1891)

In July 1890, accompanied by the fellow monk Swami Akhandananda (also a disciple of Ramakrishna), Vivekananda visited the Himalayas. This constituted the first stage of his journey that would encompass the West. He visited Nainital, Almora, Srinagar, Dehradun, Rishikesh and Haridwar. Throughout these travels, he met Swami Brahmananda, Saradananda, Turiyananda and Advaitananda. They stayed at Meerut for some days occupied in meditation, prayer and revise of scriptures. At the end of January 1891, Vivekananda left his fellows and journeyed to Delhi.

Rajputana (1891)

After visiting historical locations at Delhi, Vivekananda journeyed towards Alwar in Rajputana. Later Vivekananda journeyed to Jaipur, where he studied Panini's *Ashtadhyayi* with a Sanskrit scholar. He after that traveled to Ajmer, where he visited the palace of Akbar and the Dargah Sharif. At Mount Abu, he met Raja Ajit Singh of Khetri, who became his ardent devotee and supporter. Swami Tathagatananda, a senior monk of the Ramakrishna Order wrote of the connection:

- Swami Vivekananda's friendship with Maharaja Ajit Singh of Khetri was enacted against the backdrop of Khetri, a sanctified city in Northern Rajasthan, characterized by its extensive heroic history and self-governing spirit. Destiny brought Swamiji and Ajit Singh jointly on 4 June 1891 at Mount Abu, where their friendship slowly urbanized by their mutual interest in important spiritual and secular topics. The friendship intensified when they traveled to Khetri and it became clear that theirs was the mainly sacred friendship, that of a Guru and his disciple.

At Khetri, he delivered discourses to the Raja, became acquainted with the *pandit* Ajjada Adibhatla Narayana Dasu, and studied *Mahābhāṣya* on

sutras of Panini. After two and a half months there, in October 1891, he proceeded towards Maharashtra.

Western India (1891–1892)

Vivekananda visited Ahmedabad, Wadhwan and Limbdi. At Ahmedabad, he completed his studies of Islamic and Jain civilization. At Limbdi, he met Thakur Saheb Jaswant Singh, who had himself been to England and America. From Thakur Saheb, he first got the thought of going to the West to preach Vedanta. He later visited Junagadh, where he was the guest of Haridas Viharidas Desai, the Dewan of the State. The Diwan was so charmed with his company that every evening he, with all the State officials, used to meet Vivekananda and converse with him until late at night. Vivekananda also visited Girnar, Kutch, Porbander, Dwaraka, Palitana, Nadiad, Nadiad ni haveli and Baroda. At Porbander, he stayed three quarters of a year, furthering his philosophical and Sanskrit studies with learned *pandits*.

Vivekananda's after that destinations incorporated Mahabaleshwar, Pune, Khandwa and Indore. At Kathiawar, he heard of the Parliament of the World's Religions and was urged by his followers there to attend it. After a brief stay in Bombay in July 1892, he met Bal Gangadhar Tilak throughout a train journey. After waiting with Tilak for a few days in Pune, Vivekananda traveled to Belgaum in October 1892 and to Panaji and Margao in Goa. He spent three days in the Rachol Seminary, the oldest convent of Goa, where unusual religious manuscripts and printed works in Latin were preserved. There, he studied Christian theological works.

Southern India (1892–1893)

Later Vivekananda traveled to Bangalore, where he became acquainted with K. Seshadri Iyer, the Dewan of the Mysore state, and stayed at the palace as a guest of the Maharaja of Mysore, Chamaraja Wodeyar. Iyer described Vivekananda as "a magnetic personality and a divine force which were destined to leave their spot on the history of his country." The Maharaja

provided the Swami a letter of introduction to the Dewan of Cochin and got him a railway ticket.

From Bangalore, he visited Trichur, Kodungalloor, and Ernakulam. At Ernakulam, he met Chattampi Swamikal, modern of Narayana Guru, in early December 1892. From Ernakulam, he traveled to Trivandrum, Nagercoil and reached Kanyakumari on foot throughout the Christmas Eve of 1892. At Kanyakumari, Vivekananda meditated on the "last bit of Indian rock", recognized later as the Vivekananda Rock Memorial. At Kanyakumari, Vivekananda had the "Vision of one India", also commonly described "The Kanyakumari resolve of 1892". He wrote,

- "At Cape Camorin sitting in Mother Kumari's temple, sitting on the last bit of Indian rock—I hit upon a plan: We are so several sanyasis wandering in relation to the, and teaching the people metaphysics—it is all madness. Did not our *Gurudeva* use to say, 'An empty stomach is no good for religion?' We as a nation have lost our individuality and that is the cause of all mischief in India. We have to raise the masses."

From Kanyakumari he visited Madurai, where he met the Raja of Ramnad, Bhaskara Sethupathi, to whom he had a letter of introduction. The Raja became his disciple and urged him to go to the Parliament of Religions at Chicago. From Madurai, he visited Rameswaram, Pondicherry and Madras and there he met some of his mainly devoted disciples, who played significant roles in collecting funds for his voyage to America and later in establishing the Ramakrishna Mission in Madras. With the aid of funds composed by his Madras disciples and Rajas of Mysore, Ramnad, Khetri, Dewans and other followers, Vivekananda left for Chicago on 31 May 1893 from Bombay assuming the name *Vivekananda*—the name suggested by the Maharaja of Khetri, Ajit Singh.

First Visit to the West (1893–1897)

Vivekananda visited many municipalities in Japan such as Nagasaki, Kobe, Yokohama, Osaka, Kyoto and Tokyo, and some spaces in China and Canada en route the United States. He arrived at Chicago in July 1893.

Though, to his disappointment he learnt that no one without credentials from a *bona fide* organisation would be accepted as a delegate. He came in get in touch with Professor John Henry Wright of Harvard University who invited him to speak at the university. On learning that Vivekananda lacked credential to speak at the Chicago Parliament, Wright is quoted as having said, "To inquire for your credentials is like asking the sun to state its right to shine in the heavens." On the Professor, Vivekananda himself writes "He urged upon me the necessity of going to the Parliament of Religions, which he thought would provide an introduction to the nation."

Parliament of the World's Religions

Parliament of the World's Religions opened on 11 September 1893 at the Art Institute of Chicago as section of the World's Columbian Exposition. On this day Vivekananda gave his first brief speech. He represented India and Hinduism. He was initially nervous, bowed to *Saraswati*, the Hindu goddess of learning and began his speech with, "Sisters and brothers of America!". To these languages he got a standing ovation from a crowd of seven thousand, which lasted for two minutes. When silence was restored he began his address. He greeted the youngest of the nations on behalf of "the mainly ancient order of monks in the world, the Vedic order of sannyasins, a religion which has taught the world both tolerance and universal acceptance." He quoted two illustrative passages from the *Shiva mahimna stotram*—"As the dissimilar streams having their sources in dissimilar spaces all mingle their water in the sea, so, O Lord, the dissimilar paths which men take, by dissimilar tendencies, several however they seem, crooked or straight, all lead to Thee!" and "Whosoever comes to Me, by whatsoever shape, I reach him; all men are struggling by paths that in the end lead to Me." Despite being a short speech, it voiced the spirit of the Parliament and its sense of universality.

Dr. Barrows, the president of the Parliament said, "India, the Mother of religions was represented by Swami Vivekananda, the Orange-monk who exercised the mainly wonderful power in excess of his auditors." He attracted widespread attention in the press, which dubbed him as the "Cyclonic monk from India". The *New York Critique* wrote, "He is an orator by divine right,

and his strong, intelligent face in its picturesque setting of yellow and orange was hardly less motivating than those earnest languages, and the rich, rhythmical utterance he gave them." The *New York Herald* wrote, "Vivekananda is undoubtedly the greatest figure in the Parliament of Religions. After hearing him we feel how foolish it is to send missionaries to this learned nation." The American newspapers accounted Vivekananda as "the greatest figure in the parliament of religions" and "the mainly popular and influential man in the parliament". The *Boston Evening Transcript* accounted that Vivekananda was "a great favourite at the parliament...if he merely crosses the platform, he is applauded". He spoke many more times at the Parliament on topics related to Hinduism, Buddhism and harmony of religions. The parliament ended on 27 September 1893. All his speeches at the Parliament had the general theme of universality, and accentuated religious tolerance.

Lecturing Tours in America and England

Following the Parliament of Religions, Vivekananda spent almost two years lecturing in several sections of eastern and central United States, mostly in Chicago, Detroit, Boston, and New York. He founded the "Vedanta Civilization of New York" in 1894. By the spring of 1895, his busy and tiring schedule led to poor health. He stopped lecturing tours, and started giving free and private classes on *Vedanta* and *Yoga*. Starting in June 1895, he mannered private lectures to a dozen of his disciples at the Thousand Island Park in New York for two months.

Throughout his first visit to the West, he traveled to England twice—in 1895 and 1896. His lectures were successful there. There in November 1895, he met Margaret Elizabeth Noble, an Irish lady, who would later become Sister Nivedita. Throughout his second visit to England in May 1896, Vivekananda met Max Müller, a noted Indologist from Oxford University who wrote Ramakrishna's first biography in the West. From England, he also visited other European countries. In Germany he met Paul Deussen, another Indologist. Vivekananda was offered academic positions in two American universities—one for the chair of Eastern Philosophy at Harvard University

and another alike location at Columbia University—which he declined since such duties would disagree with his commitment as a monk.

Vivekananda attracted many followers and admirers in the US and Europe, such as Josephine MacLeod, William James, Josiah Royce, Robert G. Ingersoll, Nikola Tesla, Lord Kelvin, Harriet Monroe, Ella Wheeler Wilcox, Sarah Bernhardt, Emma Calvé, and Professor Hermann Ludwig Ferdinand von Helmholtz. He initiated many followers into his mission; Marie Louise, a French woman, became Swami Abhayananda, and Mr. Leon Landsberg, became Swami Kripananda.

From West, Vivekananda also set his job back in India in motion. He was in regular correspondence with his followers and brother monks, offering advice and monetary funds. His letters in this era reflect motives of his campaign for social service, and often contained strong languages. He wrote to Swami Akhandananda, "Go from door to door amongst the poor and lower classes of the city of Khetri and teach them religion. Also, let them have oral lessons on geography and such other subjects. No good will approach of sitting idle and having princely dishes, and saying "Ramakrishna, O Lord!"—unless you can do some good to the poor." Eventually in 1895, money sent by Vivekananda was used to start the periodical *Brahmavadin*, for the purpose of teaching the Vedanta. Later, Vivekananda's translation of first six chapters of *The Imitation of Christ* was published in *Brahmavadin* (1889). Vivekananda left for India on 16 December 1896 from England with his disciples, Captain and Mrs. Sevier, and J.J. Goodwin. On the method they visited France and Italy, and set sail for India from the Port of Naples on 30 December 1896. He was later followed to India by Sister Nivedita. Nivedita devoted the rest of her life to the education of Indian women and the cause of India's independence.

Back in India (1897–1899)

Colombo to Almora

The ship from Europe arrived in Colombo, Sri Lanka on 15 January 1897. Vivekananda received an ecstatic welcome. In Colombo, he gave what constitutes his first public speech in the East, *India, the Holy Land*. From there on, his journey to Calcutta was a triumphal progress. He traveled from

Colombo to Pamban, Rameswaram, Ramnad, Madurai, Kumbakonam and Madras delivering lectures. People and Rajas gave him enthusiastic reception. Throughout his train journeys, people often squatted on the rails to enforce stopping of the train to hear him. From Madras, he sustained his journey to Calcutta and then to Almora. While in the West he talked of India's great spiritual heritage; on return to India he repeatedly addressed social issues—uplift of the population, getting rid of the caste system, promotion of science, industrialization of the country, addressing the widespread poverty, and the end of the colonial rule. These lectures, published as *Lectures from Colombo to Almora*, illustrate his nationalistic fervor and spiritual ideology. His speeches had power on the contemporaneous and subsequent Indian leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi, Bipin Chandra Pal, Balgangadhar Tilak and Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose.

Founding of the Ramakrishna Mission

On 1 May 1897 at Calcutta, Vivekananda founded the Ramakrishna Mission—the organ for social service. The ideals of the Ramakrishna Mission are based on *Karma Yoga*. Its governing body consists of the trustees of the Ramakrishna Math—the organ to carry out religious works. Both Ramakrishna Math and Ramakrishna Mission have their headquarters at Belur Math. He founded two other monasteries—one at Mayavati on the Himalayas, close to Almora, described the *Advaita Ashrama* and another at Madras. Two journals were started, *Prabuddha Bharata* in English and *Udbhodan* in Bengali. The similar year, the famine relief job was started by Swami Akhandananda at Murshidabad district.

Vivekananda had earlier inspired Jamsetji Tata to set up a research and educational institution when they had traveled jointly from Yokohama to Chicago on Vivekananda's first visit to the West in 1893. Now Tata requested him to head the Research Institute of Science that Tata had recognized; he declined the offer citing disagreement with his "spiritual interests". Vivekananda visited Punjab where he tried to mediate ideological disagreement flanked by *Arya Samaj* (a reformist movement of Hinduism) and *Sanatans* (orthodox Hindus). After brief visits to Lahore, Delhi and Khetri, he

returned to Calcutta in January 1898. He consolidated the works of *math* and trained disciples in excess of the after that many months. He composed *Khandana Bhava Bandhana*, a prayer song dedicated to Ramakrishna in 1898.

Second Visit to the West and Last Years (1899–1902)

Vivekananda left for the West for the second time in June 1899 despite his declining health. He was accompanied by Sister Nivedita and Swami Turiyananda. He spent a short time in England, and went on to the United States. Throughout this visit, he recognized the Vedanta civilizations at San Francisco and New York. He also founded "*Shanti Ashrama*" (peace retreat) at California. He attended the Congress of Religions in Paris in 1900. From the US, he went to Paris. His lectures in Paris dwelt on worship of *Linga* and authenticity of the *Gita*. From Paris he visited Brittany, Vienna, Istanbul, Athens and Egypt. The French philosopher Jules Bois was his host for mainly of this era. He returned to Calcutta on 9 December 1900.

Following a brief visit to Advaita Ashrama, Mayavati, he settled at Belur Math from where he sustained to coordinate the works of Ramakrishna Mission and *Math*, and also the works in England and America. Several visitors came to him in these days, including royalties and politicians. He was unable to join the Congress of Religions in 1901 in Japan due to deteriorating health. He, though, went for pilgrimages to Bodhgaya and Varanasi. Declining health and ailments such as asthma, diabetes and chronic insomnia restricted his behaviors.

Death

On 4 July 1902, the day of his death, Vivekananda woke up very early in the morning, went to chapel and meditated for three hours. He taught *Shukla-Yajur-Veda*, Sanskrit grammar, and yoga philosophy to pupils in the morning at Belur Math. He discussed with colleagues a plan to start a Vedic college in the Ramakrishna *Math*, and accepted out usual conversation. At seven p.m. he went into his room and asked not to be disturbed. Vivekananda died at ten minutes past nine p.m. while he was meditating. Just as to his disciples, Vivekananda attained *Mahasamadhi*. Rupture of blood vessels in the

brain was accounted as a possible cause of the death. His disciples whispered that rupture was an explanation of *Brahmarandhra*—the aperture in the crown of the head—being pierced when he attained *Mahasamadhi*. Vivekananda had fulfilled his own prophecy of not livelihood to be forty years old. He was cremated on sandalwood funeral pyre on the bank of Ganga in Belur. On the other bank of the river, Ramakrishna had been cremated sixteen years before.

Teachings and Philosophy

- Vivekananda whispered a country's future depends on its people; his teachings focused on the development of the mass. He wanted ~~to~~ set in motion a machinery which will bring noblest thoughts to the doorstep of even the poorest and the meanest.” Vivekananda whispered that the essence of Hinduism was best expressed in the Vedanta philosophy, based on the interpretation of Adi Shankara. He summarised the Vedanta's teachings as follows: Each soul is potentially divine. The goal is to manifest this Divinity within by controlling nature, external and internal.
- Do this either by job, or worship, or mental discipline, or philosophy—by one, or more, or all of these—and be free. This is the whole of religion. Doctrines, or dogmas, or rituals, or books, or temples, or shapes, are but secondary details.

Vivekananda connected morality with the manage of mind. He saw truth, purity and unselfishness as traits which strengthened the mind. He advised his followers to be holy, unselfish and have *Shraddha* (faith). He supported practice of *Brahmacharya* (celibacy), and whispered that such practice was the source of his physical and mental stamina, as well as eloquence. Vivekananda accentuated that success was an outcome of focused thought and action. In his lectures on Raja Yoga, he said, "Take up one thought. Create that one thought your life – think of it, dream of it, live on that thought. Let the brain, muscles, nerves, every section of your body, be full of

that thought, and presently leave every other thought alone. This is the method to success that is method great spiritual giants are produced."

Vinayak Damodar Savarkar

Vināyak Dāmodar Sāvarkar (28 May 1883 – 26 February 1966) was an Indian revolutionary and politician. He was the proponent of liberty as the ultimate ideal. Savarkar was a poet, writer and playwright. He launched a movement for religious reform advocating dismantling the system of caste in Hindu civilization, and reconversion of the converted Hindus back to Hindu religion. Savarkar created the term *Hindutva*, and accentuated its distinctiveness from Hinduism which he associated with social and political disunity. Savarkar's Hindutva sought to create an inclusive collective identity. The five units of Savarkar's philosophy were Utilitarianism, Rationalism and Positivism, Humanism and Universalism, Pragmatism and Realism.

Savarkar's revolutionary behaviors began when learning in India and England, where he was associated with the India Home and founded student civilizations including Abhinav Bharat Civilization and the Free India Civilization, as well as publications espousing the cause of complete Indian independence by revolutionary means. Savarkar published *The Indian War of Independence* in relation to the Indian rebellion of 1857 that was banned by British authorities. He was arrested in 1910 for his connections with the revolutionary group India Home. Following a failed effort to escape while being transported from Marseilles, Savarkar was sentenced to two life conditions amounting to 50 years' imprisonment and moved to the Cellular Jail in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

While in jail, Savarkar wrote the job describing *Hindutva*, openly espousing Hindu nationalism. He was released in 1921 under restrictions after signing a plea for clemency in which he renounced revolutionary behaviors. Traveling widely, Savarkar became a forceful orator and writer, advocating Hindu political and social unity. Serving as the president of the Hindu Mahasabha, Savarkar endorsed the ideal of India as a *Hindu Rashtra* and opposed the *Quit India* thrash about in 1942, calling it a "Quit India but stay your army" movement. He became a fierce critic of the Indian National

Congress and its acceptance of India's partition, and was one of those accused in the assassination of Indian leader Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. He was acquitted as the charges could not be proven.

The airport at Port Blair, Andaman and Nicobar's capital, has been named Veer Savarkar International Airport. The commemorative blue plaque on India House fixed by the Historic Structure and Monuments Commission for England reads "Vinayak Damodar Savarkar 1883-1966 Indian patriot and philosopher existed here".

Early Life

Vinayak was born in the family of Damodar and Radhabai Savarkar in the village of Bhagur, close to the municipality of Nasik, Maharashtra. He had three other siblings namely Ganesh, Narayan, and a sister named Mainabai.

After death of parents the eldest sibling Ganesh, recognized as Babarao, took responsibility of the family. Babarao played a supportive and influential role in Vinayak's teenage life. Throughout this era, Vinayak organised a youth group described *Mitra Mela (Group of Friends)* and encouraged revolutionary and nationalist views of passion by this group. In 1901, Vinayak Savarkar married Yamunabai, daughter of Ramchandra Triambak Chiplunkar, who supported his university education. Subsequently in 1902, he enrolled in Fergusson College, in Pune. As a young man, he was inspired by the new generation of radical political leaders namely Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal and Lala Lajpat Rai beside with the political thrash about against the partition of Bengal and the rising Swadeshi campaign. He was involved in several nationalist behaviors at several stages. In 1905, throughout Dussehra festivities Vinayak organised setting up of a bonfire of foreign goods and clothes. Beside with his fellow students and friends he shaped a political outfit described *Abhinav Bharat*. Vinayak was soon expelled from college due to his behaviors but was still permitted to take his Bachelor of Arts degree examinations. After completing his degree, nationalist activist Shyam Krishnavarma helped Vinayak to go to England to revise law, on a scholarship. It was throughout this era that Garam Dal, (literally translated as *Hot Faction*) was shaped under the leadership of Tilak,

due to the split of Indian National Congress. The members of Garam Dal, did not acknowledge the moderate Indian National Congress leadership agenda which advocated dialogue and reconciliation with the British Raj. Tilak advocated the philosophy of Swaraj and was soon imprisoned for his support of revolutionary behaviors.

Behaviors at India Home

After his joining Gray's Inn law college in London Vinayak took accommodation at Bharat Bhawan India Home. Organised by expatriate social and political activist Pandit Shyamji, India Home was a thriving centre for student political behaviors. Savarkar soon founded the Free India Civilization to help organise fellow Indian students with the goal of fighting for complete independence by a revolution, declaring,

- We necessity stop complaining in relation to the this British officer or that officer, this law or that law. There would be no end to that. Our movement necessity not be limited to being against any scrupulous law, but it necessity be for acquiring the power to create laws itself. In other languages, we want absolute independence

Savarkar envisioned a guerrilla war for independence beside the rows of the well-known armed uprising of 1857. Learning the history of the revolt, from English as well as Indian sources, Savarkar wrote the book, *The History of the War of Indian Independence*. He analyzed the circumstances of 1857 uprising and assailed British rule in India as unjust and oppressive. It was via this book that Savarkar became one of the first writers to allude the uprising as India's "First War for Independence." The book was banned from publication during the British Empire. Madame Bhikaji Cama, and expatriate Indian revolutionary obtained its publication in the Netherlands, France and Germany. Widely smuggled and circulated, the book attained great popularity and influenced rising young Indians, Savarkar was learning revolutionary ways and he came into get in touch with a veteran of the Russian Revolution of 1905, who imparted him the knowledge of bomb-creation. Savarkar had printed and circulated a manual amongst his friends, on bomb-creation and

other ways of guerrilla warfare. In 1909, Madan Lal Dhingra, a keen follower and friend of Savarkar, assassinated British MP Sir Curzon Wylie in a public meeting. Dhingra's action provoked controversy crossways Britain and India, evoking enthusiastic admiration as well as condemnation. Savarkar published an article in which he all but endorsed the murder and worked to organise support, both political and for Dhingra's legal defence. At a meeting of Indians described for a condemnation of Dhingra's deed, Savarkar protested the intention of condemnation and was drawn into a hot debate and angry scuffle with other attendants. A secretive and restricted trial and a sentence awarding the death penalty to Dhingra provoked an outcry and protest crossways the Indian student and political society. Strongly protesting the verdict, Savarkar struggled with British authorities in laying claim to Dhingra's remnants following his execution. Savarkar hailed Dhingra as a hero and martyr, and began encouraging revolution with greater intensity.

Arrest in London and in Marseilles

In India, Ganesh Savarkar had organised an armed revolt against the Morley-Minto reforms of 1909. The British police implicated Savarkar in the investigation for allegedly plotting the crime. Hoping to evade arrest, Savarkar moved to Madame Cama's house in Paris. He was nevertheless arrested by police on March 13, 1910. In the final days of freedom, Savarkar wrote letters to a secure friend scheduling his escape. Knowing that he would mainly likely be shipped to India, Savarkar asked his friend to stay track of which ship and route he would be taken by. When the ship *S.S. Morea* reached the port of Marseilles on July 8, 1910, Savarkar escaped from his cell by a porthole and dived into the water, swimming to the shore in the hope that his friend would be there to receive him in a car. But his friend was late in arriving, and the alarm having been raised, Savarkar was re-arrested.

Savarkar Case before the Permanent Court of Arbitration

Savarkar's arrest at Marseilles caused the French government to protest to the British, which argued that the British could only recover Savarkar if they took appropriate legal proceedings for his rendition. This dispute came

before the Permanent Court of International Arbitration in 1910, and it gave its decision in 1911. The case excited much controversy as was accounted by the New York Times, and it measured it involved an motivating international question of the right of asylum. The Court held, firstly, that since there was a pattern of collaboration flanked by the two countries concerning the possibility of Savarkar's escape in Marseilles and since there was neither force nor fraud in inducing the French authorities to return Savarkar to them, the British authorities did not have to hand him back to the French in order for the latter to hold rendition proceedings. On the other hand, the tribunal also observed that there had been an "irregularity" in Savarkar's arrest and delivery in excess of to the Indian Army Military Police guard.

Trial and Andaman

Arriving in Bombay (colonial name of Mumbai), he was taken to the Yervada Central Jail in Pune. Following a trial, Savarkar was sentenced to 50 years imprisonment and transported on July 4, 1911 to the infamous Cellular Jail in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

His fellow captives incorporated several political prisoners, who were forced to perform hard labour for several years. Reunited with his brother Ganesh, the Savarkars nevertheless struggled in the harsh environment. Forced to arise at 5 am, tasks including cutting trees and chopping wood, and working at the oil mill under regimental strictness, with talking amidst prisoners strictly prohibited throughout mealtime. Prisoners were subject to frequent mistreatment and torture. Get in touch with the outside world and house was restricted to the writing and mailing of one letter a year. In these years, Savarkar withdrew within himself and performed his routine tasks mechanically. Obtaining permission to start a rudimentary jail library, Savarkar would also teach some fellow convicts to read and write.

Savarkar appealed for clemency in 1911 and again throughout Sir Reginald Craddock's visit in 1913, citing poor health in the oppressive circumstances. In 1920, the Indian National Congress and leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi, Vithalbhai Patel and Bal Gangadhar Tilak demanded his

unconditional release. Savarkar tactically signed a statement endorsing the trial, verdict and British law, and renouncing violence, a bargain for freedom.

- I hereby acknowledge that I had a fair trial and presently sentence. I heartily abhor ways of violence resorted to in days gone by and I feel myself duty bound to uphold law and constitution to the best of my powers and I am willing to create the a success in so distant as I may be allowed to do so in future

Savarkar appealed for clemency within a year of his reaching the Andamans. In one of his communications, he says,

- ...if the government in their manifold beneficence and mercy release me, I for one cannot but be the staunchest advocate of constitutional progress and loyalty to the English government which is the foremost condition of that progress.... Moreover, my conversion to the constitutional row would bring back all those misled young men in India and abroad who were once looking up to me as their guide.

On May 2, 1921, the Savarkar brothers were moved to a jail in Ratnagiri, and later to the Yeravda Central Jail. He was finally released on January 6, 1924 under stringent restrictions – he was not to leave Ratnagiri District and was to refrain from political behaviors for the after that five years. Though, police restrictions on his behaviors would not be dropped until provincial autonomy was granted in 1937.

Joglekar considers Savarkar's appeal for clemency a tactical ploy, like Shivaji's letter to Aurangzeb, throughout his arrest at Agra, Vladimir Lenin's travel by sealed train by Germany as a section of a deal with Germany and Joseph Stalin's pact with Adolf Hitler.

Hindutva

- Throughout his incarceration, Savarkar's views began turning increasingly towards Hindu cultural and political nationalism, and the after that stage of his life remained dedicated to this cause. In the brief era he spent at the Ratnagiri jail, Savarkar wrote his ideological treatise

– *Hindutva: Who is a Hindu?*. Smuggled out of the prison, it was published by Savarkar's supporters under his alias "Maharatta." In this job, Savarkar promotes a radical new vision of Hindu social and political consciousness. Savarkar began describing a "Hindu" as a patriotic inhabitant of Bharatavarsha, venturing beyond a religious identity. While emphasising the need for patriotic and social unity of all Hindu societies, he described Hinduism, Jainism, Sikhism and Buddhism as one and similar. He outlined his vision of a "Hindu Rashtra" (*Hindu Nation*) as "Akhand Bharat" (*United India*), purportedly stretching crossways the whole Indian subcontinent. He defined the Hindu race as neither Aryan, Kolarian or Dravidian but as that People who live as children of a general motherland, adoring a general holy land

Scholars, historians and Indian politicians have been divided in their interpretation of Savarkar's thoughts. A self-described atheist, Savarkar regards being Hindu as a cultural and political identity. While often stressing social and society unity flanked by Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists and Jains, Savarkar's notions of loyalty to the fatherland are seen as an implicit criticism of Muslims and Christians who regard Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem as their holiest spaces. Savarkar openly assailed what he saw as Muslim political separatism, arguing that the loyalty of several Muslims was conflicted. After his release, from jail on 6 January 1924 Savarkar help establish the Ratnagiri Hindu Sabha, aiming to job for the social and cultural preservation of Hindu heritage and civilization. Becoming a frequent and forceful orator, Sarvakar agitated for the use of Hindi as a general national language and against caste discrimination and untouchability. Focusing his energies on writing, Savarkar authored the *Hindu Pad-pada-shahi* – a book documenting and extolling the Maratha empire – and *My Transportation for Life* – an explanation of his early revolutionary days, arrest, trial and incarceration. He also wrote and published a collection of poems, plays and novels. Another action he started was to reconvert to Hinduism those who had converted to other faiths. He also wrote

a book named 'Majhi Janmathep'(Meaning My Lifeterm) in relation to the his experience in Andaman prison.

Leader of the Hindu Mahasabha

In the wake of the rising popularity of the Muslim League led by Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Savarkar and his party began gaining attraction in the national political environment. Savarkar moved to Mumbai and was elected president of the Hindu Mahasabha in 1937, and would serve until 1943. The Congress swept the polls in 1937 but conflicts flanked by the Congress and Jinnah would exacerbate Hindu-Muslim political divisions. Jinnah derided Congress rule as a "Hindu Raj", and hailed December 22, 1939 as a "Day of Deliverance" for Muslims when the Congress resigned en masse in protest of India's arbitrary inclusion into World War II. Savarkar's message of Hindu unity and empowerment gained rising popularity amidst the worsening collective climate.

Savarkar as president of the Hindu Mahasabha, throughout the Second World War, advanced the slogan "Hinduize all Politics and Militarize Hindudom", he decided to support the British war effort in India seeking military training for the Hindus. When the Congress launched the *Quit India* movement in 1942, Savarkar criticised it and asked Hindus to stay active in the war effort and not disobey the government, he urged the Hindus to enlist in the armed forces in order to learn the "arts of war". Under his leadership, the Mahasabha won many seats in the central and provincial legislatures, but its overall popularity and power remained politicians. Hindu Mahasabha activists protested Gandhi's initiative to hold talks with Jinnah in 1944, which Savarkar denounced as "appeasement." He assailed the British proposals for transfer of power, attacking both the Congress and the British for creation concessions to Muslim separatists. Soon after Independence, Dr Shyama Prasad Mookerjee resigned as Vice-President of the Hindu Mahasabha dissociating himself from its *Akhand Hindustan* plank, which implied undoing partition.

Opposition to the Partition of India

The Muslim League adopted the Lahore Resolution in 1940, calling for a separate Muslim state based on the *Two-Nation Theory*, Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar summaries Savarkar's location, in his *Pakistan or The Partition of India* as follows,

- Mr. Savarkar... insists that, although there are two nations in India, India shall not be divided into two sections, one for Muslims and the other for the Hindus; that the two nations shall dwell in one country and shall live under the mantle of one single constitution;... In the thrash about for political power flanked by the two nations the rule of the game which Mr. Savarkar prescribes is to be one man one vote, be the man Hindu or Muslim. In his scheme a Muslim is to have no advantage which a Hindu does not have. Minority is to be no justification for privilege and majority is to be no ground for penalty. The State will guarantee the Muslims any defined measure of political power in the shape of Muslim religion and Muslim civilization. But the State will not guarantee secured seats in the Legislature or in the Management and, if such guarantee is insisted upon by the Muslims, such guaranteed quota is not to exceed their proportion to the common population.

Support for Jewish State in Palestine

Savarkar in a statement issued on 19 December 1947, expressed joy at the recognition of the claim of Jewish people to set up an self-governing Jewish state, and likened the event to the glorious day on which Moses led them out of Egyptian bondage. He measured that justice demanded restoration of whole Palestine to the Jews, their historical holy land and Fatherland. He regretted India's vote at the United Nations Organisation against the making of the Jewish state terming the vote a policy of appeasement of Muslims.

Works

Veer Savarkar wrote more than 10,000 pages in the Marathi language. His literary works in Marathi contain "*Kamala*", "*Mazi Janmathep*" (My Life

Sentence), and mainly famously "1857 - The First War of Independence", in relation to the what the British referred to as the Sepoy Mutiny. Savarkar popularised the term 'First War of Independence'. Another noted book was "*Kale Pani*" (alike to Life Sentence, but on the island prison on the Andamans), which reflected the treatment of Indian freedom fighters by the British. In order to counter the then accepted view that India's history was a saga of continuous defeat, he wrote an inspirational historical job, "*Saha Soneri Pane*" (Six Golden Pages), recounting some of the Golden eras of Indian history. At the similar time, religious divisions in India were beginning to fissure. He described what he saw as the atrocities of British and Muslims on Hindu residents in Kerala, in the book, "*Mopalyanche Group*" (Muslims' Strike) and also "*Gandhi Gondhal*" (Gandhi's Confusion), a political critique of Gandhi's politics. Savarkar, by now, had become a committed and persuasive critic of the Gandhi-an vision of India's future.

He is also the author of poems like "*Sagara pran talmalala*" (*O Great Sea, my heart aches for the motherland*), and "*Jayostute*" (written in praise of freedom), one of the mainly moving, inspiring and patriotic works in Marathi literature. When in the Cellular jail, Savarkar was denied pen and paper. He composed and wrote his poems on the prison walls with thorns and pebbles, memorized thousands rows of his poetry for years till other prisoners returning house brought them to India. Savarkar is credited with many popular neologisms in Marathi and Hindi, like:

- "Hutatma"(Martyr),
- "Mahapaur" (Mayor),
- *Digdarshak* (leader or director, one who points in the right direction),
- *Shatkar* (a score of six runs in cricket),
- *Saptahik* (weekly),
- *Sansad* (*Parliament*),
- "doordhwani" ("telephone"),
- "tanglekhan" ("typewriting") in the middle of others.

He chaired Marathi Sahitya Sammelan in 1938. Books by Savarkar:

- Saha Soneri Paane

- *1857 che Svatantrya Samar*
- *Hindupadpaatshahi*
- *Hindutva*
- *Jatyochhedak Nibandha*
- *Moplyanche Banda*
- *Maazi Janmathep*
- *Kale Pani*
- *Shatruchya Shibirat*
- *Londonchi batamipatre*
- *Andamanchya Andheritun*
- *Vidnyan nishtha Nibandha*
- Joseph Mazzini
- *Hindurashtra Darshan*
- *Hindutvache Panchapran*
- *Kamala*
- *Savarkaranchya Kavita*
- *Sanyasta Khadg*

Arrest and Acquittal in Gandhi's Assassination

Following the assassination of Gandhi on January 30, 1948, police arrested the assassin Nathuram Godse and his alleged accomplices and conspirators. He was a member of the Hindu Mahasabha and RSS's Swayansevak an organisation started by in the middle of others Pundit Madan Mohan Malviya and Lala Lajpat Rai. Godse was the editor of Agrani - Hindu Rashtra a Marathi daily from Pune which was run by a company "The Hindu Rashtra Prakashan Ltd." This company had contributions from such eminent persons as Gulabchand Hirachand, Bhalji Pendharkar and Jugalkishore Birla. Savarkar had invested ₹15000 in the company. Savarkar a former president of the Hindu Mahasabha, was arrested on 5 February 1948, from his home in Shivaji Park, and kept under detention in the Arthur Road Prison, Mumbai. He was charged with murder, conspiracy to murder and abetment to murder. A day before his arrest, Savarkar in a public written statement, as accounted in

The Times of India", Mumbai dated 7 February 1948, termed Gandhi's assassination a fratricidal crime, endangering India's subsistence as a nascent nation.

The Approver's Testimony

Godse claimed full responsibility for scheduling and carrying out the attack. Though just as to Badge the approver, on 17 January 1948, Nathuram Godse went to have a last *darshan* of Savarkar in Bombay before the assassination. While Badge and Shankar waited outside, Nathuram and Apte went in. On coming out Apte told Badge that Savarkar blessed them "*Yashasvi houn ya*". Apte also said that Savarkar predicted that Gandhi's 100 years were in excess of and there was no doubt that the task would be successfully finished. Though Badge's testimony was not accepted as the approver's proof lacked self-governing corroboration and hence Savarkar was acquitted.

Kapur Commission

On November 12, 1964, a religious programme was organised in Pune, to celebrate the release of the Gopal Godse, Madanlal Pahwa, Vishnu Karkare from jail after the expiry of their sentences. Dr. G. V. Ketkar, grandson of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, former editor of Kesari and then editor of Tarun Bharat, who presided in excess of the function, gave information of a conspiracy to kill Gandhi, in relation to the which he professed knowledge, six months before the act. Ketkar was arrested. A public furor ensued both outside and inside the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly and both homes of the Indian parliament. Under pressure of 29 members of parliament and public opinion the then Union house minister Gulzarilal Nanda, appointed Gopal Swarup Pathak, M. P. and a senior advocate of the Supreme Court of India, in charge of inquiry of conspiracy to murder Gandhi. The central government planned on conducting a thorough inquiry with the help of old records in consultation with the government of Maharashtra, Pathak was given three months to conduct his inquiry, subsequently Jevanlal Kapur a retired judge of the Supreme Court of India was appointed to conduct the inquiry. The Kapur Commission was provided with proof not produced in the court; especially the testimony of two

of Savarkar's secure aides - Appa Ramachandra Kasar, his bodyguard, and Gajanan Vishnu Damle, his secretary, Kasar told the Kapur Commission that Godse and Apte visited Savarkar on or in relation to the January 23 or 24, which was when they returned from Delhi after the bomb incident. Damle deposed that Godse and Apte saw Savarkar in the middle of January and sat with him (Savarkar) in his garden. Justice Kapur concluded: "All these facts taken jointly were destructive of any theory other than the conspiracy to murder by Savarkar and his group."

Later Life and Death

After Gandhi's assassination Savarkar's house in Mumbai was stoned by angry mobs. After he was acquitted of the allegations related to Gandhi's assassination and released from jail, Savarkar was arrested by the Congress government, for creation "militant Hindu nationalist speeches", he was released after agreeing to provide up political behaviors. He sustained addressing social and cultural units of Hindutva. He resumed political activism after the ban on it was lifted, it was though limited until his death in 1966 because of ill health. His followers bestowed upon him honours and financial awards when he was alive. His body was visited by in excess of a hundred thousand people, when it place in repose. Two thousand RSS workers gave his funeral procession a guard of honor. Just as to McKean, there was public antipathy flanked by Savarkar and the Congress for mainly of his political career, yet after independence Patel and Deshmukh unsuccessfully sought partnership with the Hindu Mahasabha and Savarkar. It was forbidden for Congress party members to participate in public functions honoring Savarkar. Nehru refused to share the level throughout the centenary celebrations of the India's First War of Independence held in Delhi. After the death of Nehru, the Congress government, under Prime Minister Shastri, started to pay him a monthly pension.

On November 8, 1963 Savarkar's wife Yamuna passed absent. On February 1, 1966 Savarkar renounced medicines, food and water which he termed as 'atmaarpan'. Before his death he had written an article titled 'atmahatya nahi atmaarpan' in which he argued that when one's life mission is

in excess of and skill to serve the civilization is left no more, it is better to end the life at will rather than waiting for death. He died on February 26, 1966 at the age of 83. He was mourned by big crowds that attended his cremation. He left behind a son Vishwas and a daughter Prabha Chiplunkar. His first son, Prabhakar, had died in infancy. His house, possessions and other personal leftovers have been preserved for public display.

After his death, since Savarkar was championing militarization, some thought that it would be fitting if his mortal remnants were to be accepted on a gun-carriage. A request to that effect was made to the then Defence Minister, Y.B. Chavan, who later on became Deputy Prime Minister of India. But Chavan turned down the proposal and not a single minister from the Maharashtra Cabinet showed up in the cremation ground to pay homage to Savarkar. In New Delhi, the Speaker of the Parliament turned down a request that it pay homage to Savarkar. In information, after the independence of India, Jawaharlal Nehru had put forward a proposal to demolish the Cellular Jail in the Andamans and build a hospital in its lay. When Y.B. Chavan, as the House Minister of India, went to the Andamans, he was asked whether he would like to visit Savarkar's jail but he was not interested. Also when Morarji Desai went as Prime Minister to the Andamans, he too refused to visit Savarkar's cell.

-

- **SIR SYED AHMED KHAN, MOHAMMAD IQBAL, M.A.
JINNAH AND ABUL KALAM AZAD**

Syed Ahmad Khan

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, KCSI (17 October 1817 – 27 March 1898), born Syed Ahmad Taqvi commonly recognized as Sir Syed, was a Muslim philosopher and social activist in British India

In 1842, Emperor Bahadur Shah Zafar II conferred upon Sir Syed the title of *Javad-ud Daulah*, conferred upon Sir Syed's grandfather Syed Hadi by Emperor Shah Alam II approximately the middle of the 18th century. In

addition, the Emperor added the title of *Arif Jang*. The conferment of these titles was symbolic of Sir Syed's incorporation into the nobility of Delhi.

Born into Muslim nobility, Sir Syed earned a reputation as a distinguished scholar while working as a jurist for the British East India Company. Throughout the Indian Rebellion of 1857, he remained loyal to the British and was noted for his actions in saving European lives. After the rebellion, he penned the booklet *Asbab-e-Baghawat-e-Hind (The Causes of the Indian Mutiny)* – a daring critique, at the time, of British policies that he blamed for causing the revolt. Believing that the future of Muslims was threatened by the rigidity of their orthodox outlook, Sir Syed began promoting Western-approach scientific education by founding contemporary schools and journals and organising Muslim entrepreneurs. Towards this goal, Sir Syed founded the Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College in 1875 with the aim of promoting social and economic development of Indian Muslims.

One of the mainly influential Muslim politicians of his time, Sir Syed was suspicious of the Indian independence movement and described upon Muslims to loyally serve the British Raj. He denounced nationalist organisations such as the Indian National Congress, instead forming organisations to promote Muslim unity and pro-British attitudes and behaviors. Sir Syed promoted the adoption of Urdu as the *lingua franca* of all Indian Muslims, and mentored a rising generation of Muslim politicians and entrepreneurs. Prior to the Hindi–Urdu controversy, he was interested in the education of Muslims and Hindus both and this was the era in which Sir Syed visualized India as a "beautiful bride, whose one eye was Hindu and, the other, Muslim". Due to this view, he was regarded as a reformer and nationalist leader.

There was a sudden change in Sir Syed's views after the Hindi–Urdu controversy. His education and reformist policies became Muslim-specific and he fought for the status of Urdu. Maulana Hali writes, in his book, *Hayat-e-Javed*, "One day as Sir Syed was discussing educational affairs of Muslims with Mr. Shakespeare, the then Commissioner of Banaras, Mr. Shakespeare looked surprised and asked him, 'This is the first time when I have heard you talking specifically in relation to the Muslims. Before this you used to talk in

relation to the welfare of the general Indians." Sir Syed then told him, "Now I am influenced that the two societies will not put their hearts in any venture jointly. This is nothing, in the coming times an ever rising hatred and animosity seems on the horizon basically because of those who are regarded as educated. Those who will be approximately will witness it." Sir Syed is hailed as the father of the Two Nation Theory and one of the founding fathers of Pakistan, beside with Allama Iqbal and Muhammad Ali Jinnah.

Aligarh Movement

Aligarh Movement was the movement led by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, to educate the Muslims of the South Asia after the defeat of the rebels in the Indian rebellion of 1857. Its mainly important attainment was the establishment of Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh, which later became Aligarh Muslim University. Activists in the Aligarh Movement became leaders of the Pakistan Movement and Indian Independence Movement, demanding a greater voice for Muslims in the British Raj.

Backdrop

The Mutiny of 1857 soured dealings flanked by the British and the Muslim society. The British Raj implemented a new educational policy that banned Arabic, Persian and religious education in schools and made English not only the medium of instruction but also the official language. This spawned a negative attitude amongst the Muslims towards everything contemporary and western, and a disinclination to create use of the opportunities accessible under the new regime.

Syed Ahmad Khan (1817–98) was primarily responsible for the educational proposals and political activism that inspired Muslim elites. Ahmad Khan originally founded the All India Muhammadan Educational Conference in 1886 in order to promote contemporary Western education, especially science and literature, in the middle of India's Muslims. The conference, in addition to generating funds for Ahmad Khan's Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College, motivated Muslim elites to propose expansion of educational uplift elsewhere, recognized as the Aligarh Movement. In turn this

new awareness of Muslim needs helped stimulate a political consciousness in the middle of Muslim elites who helped shape the All-India Muslim League (AIML).

Seeing this atmosphere of despair and despondency, Sir Syed launched his attempts to revive the spirit of progress within the Muslim society of India. He was influenced that the Muslims in their effort to regenerate themselves, had failed to realize the information that mankind had entered a very significant stage of its subsistence, i.e., an period of science and learning. He knew that the realization of the very information was the source of progress and prosperity for the British. So, contemporary education became the pivot of his movement for regeneration of the Indian Muslims. He tried to change the Muslim outlook from a medieval one to a contemporary one.

Sir Syed's first and foremost objective was to acquaint the British with the Indian mind; his after that goal was to open the minds of his countrymen to European literature, science and technology.

So, in order to attain these goals, Sir Syed launched the Aligarh Movement of which Aligarh was the center. He had two immediate objectives in mind: to remove the state of misunderstanding and tension flanked by the Muslims and the new British government, and to induce them to go after the opportunities accessible under the new regime without deviating in any method from the fundamentals of their faith. Keeping education and social reform as the two planks of his program, he launched the Aligarh Movement with the following objectives:

Efforts made by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan

Fortunately, Syed Ahmad Khan was able to draw into his orbit a number of sincere friends who shared his views and helped him. In the middle of them were well-recognized figures like Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk, Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk, Hali, Shibli, Maulvi Nazir Ahmad, Chiragh Ali, Mohammad Hayat, and Zakaullah. His gifted son Syed Mahmood, a renowned scholar, jurist and educationist, was a great source of help to him.

Syed Ahmad also succeeded in enlisting the services of a number of distinguished English professors like Bech, Morison, Raleigh and Arnold who gave their best in structure up the Aligarh College into a first-rate institution.

A brief chronology of Syed Ahmad's efforts is given below:

- 1859: Built Gulshan School in Muradabad.
- 1863: Set up Victoria School in Ghazipur.
- 1864: Set up the Scientific Civilization in Aligarh. This civilization was involved in the translation of English works into the native language.
- 1866: Aligarh Institute Gazette. This imparted information on history; ancient and contemporary science of agriculture, natural and physical sciences and advanced mathematics. This journal was published until 1926.
- 1870: Committee Striving for the Educational Progress of Muslims.
- 1875: Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental School (M. A. O.), Aligarh, setup on the pattern of English public schools. Later raised to the stage of college in 1877 and university in 1920.
- 1886: Muhammadan Educational Conference. This conference met every year to take stock of the educational troubles of the Muslims and to persuade them to get contemporary education and abstain from politics. It later became the political mouthpiece of the Indian Muslims and was the forerunner of the Muslim League.

Writings of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan

Besides his prominent role in the educational uplift of the Muslims, Syed Ahmad Khan's writings played an significant role in popularizing the ideals for which the Aligarh stood. His essay on "The Causes of Indian Revolt in 1858", and other writings such as "Loyal Muhammadans of India", Tabyin-ul-Kalam and "A Series of Essays on the Life of Muhammad and Subjects Subsidiary Therein" helped to create cordial dealings flanked by the British Government and the Indian Muslims. They also helped to remove misunderstandings in relation to the Islam and Christianity. It was from this platform that Syed Ahmad Khan strongly advised the Muslims against joining

the Hindu dominated Congress. He was in favor of reserved seats for Muslims and also promoted the thought that Hindus and Muslims are two separate nations. This thought led to the Two-Nation Theory.

Syed Ahmad Khan's Aligarh Movement played a important role in bringing in relation to the an intellectual revolution in the middle of the Indian Muslims. Therefore it succeeded in achieving its major objectives, i.e. educational progress and social reform. His efforts earned Sir Syed the title "Prophet of Education".

Education

Sir Syed held the view that acquisition of contemporary education would help in the progress and development of Muslim so he set up a scientific revise at Ghazipur in 1862 which recognized several educational institution at dissimilar spaces. Due to this, application of contemporary scientific knowledge became easy. They helped the development of the Urdu language because contemporary subjects were translated into it.

MOHAMMAD IOBAL

Mohammad Iqbal attempted to give a systematic basis for the political thoughts of Indian Muslims. He provided a critique of the political thoughts of liberal democracy in relation to the Islamic political thoughts. For understanding his political thoughts, it is necessary to understand his views on Islam and ego.

Islam and Ego

Iqbal whispered that Islam has been rendered useless for the contemporary man because of its medieval spirit. It was so not because of the weakness of Islam per se but because of the information that people did not understand the cue spirit of Islam. He blamed the orthodox and self-seeking sufis for providing a harrow interpretation of Islam. Iqbal whispered that medieval mysticism deprives the followers of Islam of healthy instincts and puts forth only the obscure thoughts. He believed that revival of true Islam was a necessity for the cure of the world. A careful revise of Islam was necessary

which could provide "a type of insight into its significance as a world information". Islam had potential of becoming a "livelihood force". Iqbal's vision of civilization, state and politics was based on his view of Islam. Just as to Iqbal the ideal civilization on earth will be recognized by the Muslims-chosen people of God, the deputies of God in the East. A Muslim is not an extraordinary person (titan) but a general man and an "embodiment of good to all the world". He possesses the qualities of "justice and benevolence". Iqbal whispered that only by "self affirmation, self-expression, and self-development "can the Muslims become more strong and free". These are the three levels by which the uniqueness of ego can be achieved.

The philosophy of "egoism" or "self" of Iqbal is important from the point of view of his political thoughts. Iqbal was dissatisfied with the economic and political system in civilization. The Civilization has created organizations which have enslaved the individual. It undermines the religion and ethical principles. Iqbal, so, offers a higher ideal worth emulating. The "ego" necessity is kept within proper limits. And this can be done by only obedience and discipline. It will ultimately lead to the vice regency of God. Iqbal whispered that those Muslims who are guided by the Quran or the Book of Wisdom will fulfill this mission.

Cardinal Principles of Iqbal's Political Thought

The disagreement flanked by east and west or flanked by love and cause shape the cardinal principle of Iqbal's political thought. Iqbal had shown strong distrust of west and western civilization. To him the West symbolized values of materialism and it was in contravention of the high values of spiritualism and religiosity characterizing the, East. The bases of west are cause, while that of the eastern civilization is love.

Iqbal felt the need for making of an ideal civilization. He was critical of the western conceptions of several political thoughts, i.e. the nation-state, nationalism, equality, liberty, democracy, interpretation of history, the socialist movement in the west etc. He opined that western political thought appeared beside with the emergence of capitalism. The capitalist civilization is product of material civilization. To Iqbal the purpose of civilization should be

to create the life of its members happy and good. Every member should discover opportunities for the development of his "ego" and personality. The capitalist society cannot secure, Iqbal whispered, good life of the people. Its basis is the profit of a few. Science, philosophy, democracy, constitution and fundamental rights of equality and liberty are all subservient to the exploiting classes.

Nationalism

In Iqbal's opinion 'Rationalism gives a psychological and political justification for the nation-state. The capitalist system was responsible for its emergence. It is based on the consideration of territory. Nationalism merely attaches an individual to a territory. Patriotism, just as to Iqbal is dissimilar from nationalism. Patriotism is "a perfectly natural virtue and has a lay in the moral life of a man". But nationalism just as to Iqbal, is a political concept and is not in consonance with the spirit of Islam. He whispered that if nationalism was accepted in its ideal shape, Islam would no more remain a livelihood factor. Nationalism "comes into disagreement with Islam when it begins to play the role of the political concept.... demanding that Islam should recede to the backdrop of a more private opinion and cease to be a livelihood factor in the national life." Iqbal, though, was not opposed to the concept of nationalism which had potentialities of uniting people of a scrupulous country for the achievement of freedom. Such a concept of nationalism, just as to Iqbal, was not inconsistent with the spirit of Islam. But religion could be a more uniting factor of people than nationalism. He whispered that the Westerners wanted to use nationalism "to shatter the religious unity of Islam to pieces". Iqbal was not opposed to the national movement but viewed nationalism as a disturbing unit in politics. Iqbal felt that the contemporary-world had become a danger aiming at 'de-Islamization' of the Muslims. Nationalism was one such danger. Iqbal was afraid of the possible growth of nationalism in India. He started with the assumption that India was not a nation. Muslims and nationalism are not identical just as to him because they were a minority. Muslims in India constitute a cultural entity.

Do Muslims shape a separate nation? Just as to Prof. Moin Shakir, Iqbal has no clear-cut answer to this question. He whispered that Muslims were "bound jointly not by racial, linguistic, or geographical ties, but their collective brotherhood". He concluded that India was not a single nation. The thought of nationalism would be an obliteration of diversity, which would be mainly undesirable just as to Iqbal. But it does not mean that Iqbal was not in favor of a United India. He felt that fusion of the societies was not possible in India. Instead, mutual 'harmony and cooperation of dissimilar societies should be sought. To him the talk of one nation was "futile". Iqbal's insistence on the maintenance of separate societies by recognizing them as separate entities gave rise to Muslim Nationalism. This has made him the father of the Thought of Pakistan.

Just as to Moin Shakir the feeling that the Muslim League accepted Iqbal's concept of Muslim Nationalism to its logical end is not valid. He never thought of partitioning India. Instead he suggested the thought of a separate Muslim state in the North in his presidential address to the Muslim League in 1928. He demanded only "a state within a state", and not a separate state. Moin Shakir says "Therefore, Iqbal's scheme appears to have no relation to the league demand for partition. But the league leadership exploited Iqbal's name to provide strength and sanctity to the demand for Pakistan". Even Jinnah's and other Muslim leaders' attempts to rally the anti-Hindu forces in the parties under the guise of the two-nation theory was more profoundly inspired by Rahmat Ali than Iqbal. Iqbal had great respect for non-Muslim societies. He was opposed to the narrow and sectarian nationalism inside and outside India as the basis of polity. He had great passion for India's freedom.

Democracy

To Iqbal democracy was one of the significant characteristics of the contemporary western system. This democracy is dissimilar from and opposed to the Islamic democracy. This concept of democracy is the invention of the west. It believes in the sovereignty of the people and in the concept of liberty and equality. Western democracy is the result of a reaction to the past dominated by the feudal structure of Europe. Iqbal thought that these

characteristics of democracy are inconsistent with the tenets of Islam. Unlike in western democracy, the sovereignty in Islamic democracy does not lie with the people. Sovereignty, just as to Islam, is vested in God; not in the people. To Iqbal the western concept of democracy will be meaningful for a few in the civilization. This concept is based on the principles of use. The concept of majority of the western democracy may not be always wise. Just as to Iqbal, equality and liberty of western democracy are not real. Democracy is a comparison of imperialism and buttresses the interests of the exploiters. So, as a rule of the people, it cannot be realized. Just as to Iqbal, in the garb of democracy, operates "the demon of autocracy". Liberty and other so-described rights are merely a cover in capitalism. Democracy is the continuation of the authoritarian rule of the past.

Socialism

Iqbal was impressed by the concept of socialism as propounded by Karl Marx in the sense that it rejects capitalism, democracy and nationalism. He discovers several points of parallel flanked by Islam and Marxian ideology. He opined that both Islam and Marxism "aim at destruction of autocracy in the world, but view capitalism with disfavor, both disapprove of priesthood and church as organized organizations". He whispered that Islam is a shape of socialism which is not used by the Muslims. He, though, did not agree with all features of the principles of socialism. Just as to him, Marxism is concerned only with matter and ignores the soul and spirit. He also rejected the materialist interpretation of history. It was a product of Western intellectualism just as to him. He whispered that the great defect of Marxism is its denial of God and spiritual values. This, just as to Iqbal, is the unhealthy and dark face of Marxism. Iqbal did not agree with the Marxian concept of state and government as well. He felt that a classless civilization would not be achieved and the state would not whither absent.

M.A. JINNAH

Muhammad Ali Jinnah born Mahomedali Jinnahbhai; (25 December 1876 – 11 September 1948) was a lawyer, politician and statesman, and the

founder of Pakistan. Jinnah served as leader of the All-India Muslim League from 1913 until Pakistan's independence on 14 August 1947, and as Pakistan's first Governor-General from independence until his death. He is revered in Pakistan as *Quaid-i-Azam* (Great Leader) and *Baba-i-Qaum* (Father of the Nation) and his birthday is observed as a national holiday.

Born in Karachi and trained as a barrister at Lincoln's Inn in London, Jinnah rose to prominence in the Indian National Congress in the first two decades of the 20th century. In these early years of his political career, Jinnah advocated Hindu-Muslim unity, helping to form the 1916 Lucknow Pact flanked by the Congress and the All-India Muslim League, a party in which Jinnah had also become prominent. Jinnah became a key leader in the All India Home Rule League, and proposed a fourteen-point constitutional reform plan to safeguard the political rights of Muslims should a united British India become self-governing. In 1920, though, Jinnah resigned from the Congress when it agreed to follow a campaign of *satyagraha*, or non-violent resistance, advocated by the influential leader, Mohandas Gandhi.

By 1940, Jinnah had approached to consider that Indian Muslims should have their own state. In that year, the Muslim League, led by Jinnah, passed the Lahore Resolution, demanding a separate nation. Throughout the Second World War, the League gained strength while leaders of the Congress were imprisoned, and in the elections held shortly after the war, it won mainly of the seats reserved for Muslims. Ultimately, the Congress and the Muslim League could not reach a power-sharing formula for a united India, leading all parties to agree to separate independence for a predominately Hindu India, and for a Muslim-majority state, to be described Pakistan.

As the first Governor-General of Pakistan, Jinnah worked to set up the new nation's government and policies, and to aid the millions of Muslim refugees who had emigrated from the new nation of India after the separation, personally supervising the establishment of refugee camps. Jinnah died at age 71 in September 1948, presently in excess of a year after Pakistan gained independence from the British Raj. He left a deep and respected legacy in Pakistan, however he is less well thought of in India. Just as to his biographer, Stanley Wolpert, he remains Pakistan's greatest leader.

Liberalism and Jinnah

Jinnah was initially 'influenced by British liberalism. He was associated with the leading Indian liberals i.e. Dadabhai Naoroji, G.K. Gokhale, S.N. Banerjee and R.C. Das. His early liberalism was a product of his English education and the power of Indian liberals. He had uncompromising faith in the concept of nationalism, democracy, secularism and the unity of the country. He told Dr. Ashraf "I happened to meet many significant English liberals.... I grasped that liberalism, which became section of my life, thrilled me very much". The core of his liberalism consisted of liberty-civil, fiscal, personal, social, economic, political and international; moral worth and spiritual equality of each individual, dignity of human personality, impartial judiciary, cheap legal procedure and accessible courts, abolition of class privileges and abolition of power of money. His liberalism, to sum up, stood for: freedom, constitutionalism, absence of any kind of fanaticism in social and political life, co-operation with the British government, constitutional shape of agitation for the right cause, rule of law and the unity of country. He did not support the extra-constitutional way in an agitation. He felt that even the non-cooperation movement was a non-liberal movement.

He acknowledged the positive contribution of the British rule. He whispered that developments such as the growth of feelings of patriotism and nationalism were the result of attitudes and policies of the British government. He expressed belief in the democratic organizations of regional self-government. Just as to him a government should not be public criticism. A civilized government is recognized for the respect it has for public opinion. undemocratic functioning of the government leads to revolution. But he did not grant people the right to revolt. He stood for the establishment of democracy. But he felt that it should not be given to them as a gift but as a right. Jinnah adheres to liberalism as a spokesman of the liberal middle class. Just as to him the middle class could not fit in with a movement of the masses. Jinnah felt that with the emergence of Gandhi and Mohammad Ali masses started taking section in national movement. He felt that the involvement of the masses affected the liberal character of the Indian National Congress. So,

he left the Indian National Congress, and started contradicting whatever he had said earlier. 1920 was the dividing year in the political understanding of Jinnah.

His approach to politics throughout the liberal stage was secular. He accentuated that the people should forget religious differences. Religion should be separated from politics. He said the co-operation of all the societies was necessary for the cause of the motherland. Only if the Indians forgot their religious differences, would they be deserving "real political franchise, freedom and self-government". He did not agree with the Aligarh movement that if the British left India, Hindu Raj would be recognized. He disagreed with Gandhi on the issue of mixing religion with politics. He did not even support the Khilafat movement because it blended religion with politics.

Nationalism

Just as to Jinnah the emergence of nationalism in India was the result of colonial policies-integration of India into a political and social element and spread of English education. Initially he whispered in the one-nation theory. He accentuated the unity flanked by the Hindus and the Muslims. India had a single nationality. This nationalism was a liberal and secular nationalism. He did not locate patriotism in religion. He did not consider pan-Islamism as a sound ideology for the Muslims of India. In the initial stage of his career, Jinnah strived for Hindu-Muslim harmony. He labelled the "supposed rivalry" flanked by the Hindus and Muslims as nothing more than an effort to divert the attention from the troubles and to defer reforms. Jinnah was also impressed by Gopal Krishna Gokhale when he met him in Bombay in 1904. He was so impressed by Gokhale that he stated his ambition of becoming the "Muslim Gokhale".

Just as to Sarojini Naidu Jinnah appeared as the "ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity" at this meeting. He rejected the separate electorate proposed by the Morley- Minto reforms of 1909. But paradoxically, he became the Calcutta Council's Muslim member from Bombay. However not the formal member of the Muslim League, Jinnah supported the resolution of the Muslim League that strove to attain a "system of self-government appropriate to India" to be

brought in relation to the "by constitutional means, a steady reform of the existing system of management, by promoting national unity and fostering public spirit in the middle of the people of India, and by co-operating with other societies for the said purposes". But after Jinnah was appointed as the permanent president of the Muslim League, his views on Hindu-Muslim unity underwent important changes. He supported the resolution of the Muslim League which resolved to job for Swaraj, "full religious liberty" and "separate electorates".

On the eve of the Simon Commission, Jinnah rejected the Nehru statement which was opposed to the system of "separate electorates". He described the Nehru statement as nothing more than a statement of the "Hindu location". He had sensed even before 1923 that the Hindu Mahasabha was influencing the Congress. Jinnah made three amendments on March 27, 1927 in a conference chaired by him

- Those were separate electorates should remain,
- There should be reservation for Muslims to the extent of one third of the seats in the central legislature and
- Residuary powers should be vested in the provinces.

This proposal was rejected by the Congress in 1928. Agha Khan, the founder president of the Muslim League, who presided in excess of the All Parties Muslim Conference in 1929, wrote that "For him (Jinnah) there was no future in Congress or in any camp-allegedly on all India basis-which was in information Hindu dominated. We had at last won him in excess of to our view". At this conference Jinnah declared that the Simon Commission Statement was "dead". But he spelt out what was later to become his strategy for the promotion of Pakistan.

Two-Nation Theory

The two-nation theory is the ideology that the primary identity of Muslims on the Indian subcontinent is their religion, rather than their language or ethnicity, and so Indian Hindus and Muslims are two separate nationalities, regardless of ethnic or other commonalities. The two-nation theory was a

founding principle of the Pakistan Movement and the partition of India in 1947. The ideology that religion is the determining factor in defining the nationality of Indian Muslims is also a source of inspiration to many Hindu nationalist organizations, with causes as varied as the redefinition of Indian Muslims as non-Indian foreigners in India, the expulsion of all Muslims from India, establishment of a legally Hindu state in India, prohibition of conversions to Islam, and the promotion of conversions or reconversions of Indian Muslims to Hinduism.

There are varying interpretations of the two-nation theory, based on whether the two postulated nationalities can coexist in one territory or not, with radically dissimilar implications. One interpretation argued for sovereign autonomy, including the right to secede, for Muslim-majority regions of the Indian subcontinent, but without any transfer of populations. A dissimilar interpretation contends that Hindus and Muslims constitute "two separate, and regularly antagonistic methods of life, and that so they cannot coexist in one nation." In this version, a transfer of populations is a desirable step towards a complete separation of two incompatible nations that "cannot coexist in a harmonious connection".

Opposition to the theory has approach from two sources. The first is the concept of a single Indian nation, of which Hindus and Muslims are two intertwined societies. This is a founding principle of the contemporary, officially secular, Republic of India. Even after the formation of Pakistan, debates on whether Muslims and Hindus are separate nationalities or not sustained in that country as well. The second source of opposition is the concept that while Indians are not one nation, neither are the Muslims or Hindus of the subcontinent, and it is instead the relatively homogeneous former provincial elements of the subcontinent which are true nations and deserving of sovereignty, this view has been presented by the Baloch, Sindhi, and the Pashtun sub-nationalities of Pakistan.

History

In common, the British-run government and British commentators made "it a point of speaking of Indians as the people of India and avoid

speaking of an Indian nation." This was cited as a key cause for British manage of the country: since Indians were not a nation, they were not capable of national self-government. While some Indian leaders insisted that Indians were one nation, others agreed that Indians were not yet a nation but there was "no cause why in the course of time they should not grow into a nation." Alike debates on national identity lived within India at the linguistic, provincial and religious stages. While some argued that Indian Muslims were one nation, others argued they were not. Some, such as Liaquat Ali Khan argued that Indian Muslims were not yet a nation, but could be forged into one.

Just as to Pakistan Studies curriculum, Muhammad bin Qasim is often referred to as the first Pakistani. Muhammad Ali Jinnah also acclaimed the Pakistan movement to have started when the first Muslim put a foot in the Gateway of Islam.

The movement for Muslim self-awakening and identity was started by the Muslim modernist and reformer Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (1817–1898). The poet philosopher Muhammad Iqbal (1877–1938), (the *poet of East*), provided the philosophical exposition and Barrister Muhammad Ali Jinnah (1871–1948) translated it into the political reality of a nation-state. Allama Iqbal's presidential address to the Muslim League on December 29, 1930 is seen by some as the first exposition of the two-nation theory in support of what would ultimately become Pakistan. The scholar Al-Biruni (973-1048) had observed, at the beginning of the eleventh century that Hindus and Muslims differed in all matters and habits. On March 22, 1940, Jinnah made a speech in Lahore which was very alike to Al-Biruni's thesis in theme and tone. Jinnah stated that Hindus and Muslims belonged to two dissimilar religious philosophies, with dissimilar social customs and literature, with no intermarriage and based on conflicting thoughts and concepts. Their outlook on life and of life was dissimilar and despite 1,000 years of history, the dealings flanked by the Hindus and Muslims could not attain the stage of cordiality. The All-India Muslim League, in attempting to symbolize Indian Muslims, felt that the Muslims of the subcontinent were a separate and separate nation from the Hindus. At first they demanded separate electorates, but when they came to the conclusion that Muslims would not be safe in a Hindu-dominated India,

they began to demand a separate state. The League demanded self-determination for Muslim-majority regions in the shape of a sovereign state promising minorities equal rights and safeguards in these Muslim majority regions.

The theory asserted that India was not a nation. It also asserted that Indian Hindus and Indian Muslims were each a nation, despite great variations in language, civilization and ethnicity within each of those groups. To counter critics who said that a society of radically varying ethnicities and languages who were territorially intertwined with other societies could not be a nation, the theory said that the concept of nation in the East was dissimilar from that in the West. In the East, religion was "a complete social order which affects all the behaviors in life" and "where the allegiance of people is divided on the basis of religion, the thought of territorial nationalism has never succeeded." It asserted that "a Muslim of one country has distant more sympathies with a Muslim livelihood in another country than with a non-Muslim livelihood in the similar country." So, "the conception of Indian Muslims as a nation may not be ethnically correct, but socially it is correct." Iqbal had also championed the notion of pan-Islamic nationhood and strongly condemned the concept of a territory-based nation as anti-Islamic: "*In taza khudaon mein bada sabsay watan hai; Jo pairahan iska hai, voh mazhab ka kafan hai.*" He had stated the dissolution of ethnic nationalities into a unified Muslim civilization (or *millat*) as the ultimate goal: *Butaanay rang-o-khoon ko toad kar millat mein gum ho ja; Na Turani rahe baqi, na Irani, na Afghani* (Destroy the idols of color and blood ties, and merge into the Muslim civilization; Let no Turanians remain, no Iranians, no Afghans).

In his book *Pakistan, or The Partition of India*, Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar wrote a sub-chapter titled *If Muslims truly and deeply desire Pakistan, their choice ought to be accepted*. He asserted that, if the Muslims were bent on the making of Pakistan, the demand should be conceded in the interest of the safety of India. He asks whether Muslims in the army could be trusted to defend India in the event of Muslims invading India or in the case of a Muslim rebellion. "[W]hom would the Indian Muslims in the army face with?" he questioned. Just as to him, the assumption that Hindus and Muslims

could live under one state if they were separate nations was but "*an empty sermon, a mad project, to which no sane man would agree.*"

Justifications by Muslim Leaders

Muhammad Iqbal's statement explaining the attitude of Muslim delegates to the London's round-table conference issued in December 1933 was a rejoinder to Jawahar Lal Nehru's statement. Nehru had said that the attitude of the Muslim delegation was based on ~~reactionarism~~"reactionarism". Iqbal concluded his rejoinder with:

- In conclusion, I necessity put a straight question to Pandit Jawahar Lal, how is India's problem to be solved if the majority society will neither concede the minimum safeguards necessary for the protection of a minority of 80 million people, nor accept the award of a third party; but continue to talk of a type of nationalism which works out only to its own benefit? This location can admit of only two alternatives. Either the Indian majority society will have to accept for itself the permanent location of an agent of British imperialism in the East, or the country will have to be redistributed on a basis of religious, historical and cultural affinities so as to do absent with the question of electorates and the collective problem in its present shape.

In Muhammad Ali Jinnah's All India Muslim League presidential address delivered in Lahore, on March 22, 1940, he explained:

- It is very hard to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in information, dissimilar and separate social orders, and it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a general nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and Muslims belong to two dissimilar religious philosophies, social customs, litterateurs. They neither intermarry nor interline jointly and, indeed, they belong to two dissimilar civilizations which are based mainly on conflicting thoughts and conceptions. Their aspect on life and of life is dissimilar. It is quite

clear that Hindus and Mussalmans derive their inspiration from dissimilar sources of history. They have dissimilar epics, dissimilar heroes, and dissimilar episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and, likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke jointly two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, necessity lead to rising discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built for the government of such a state.

Savarkar's Opposition to the Formation of Pakistan

The Hindu Maha Sabha under the presidentship of Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, presented a stand of complete opposition to the formation of Pakistan. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar summaries Savarkar's location, in his *Pakistan or The Partition of India* as follows,

- Mr. Savarkar... insists that, although there are two nations in India, India shall not be divided into two sections, one for Muslims and the other for the Hindus; that the two nations shall dwell in one country and shall live under the mantle of one single constitution;... In the thrash about for political power flanked by the two nations the rule of the game which Mr. Savarkar prescribes is to be one man one vote, be the man Hindu or Muslim. In his scheme a Muslim is to have no advantage which a Hindu does not have. Minority is to be no justification for privilege and majority is to be no ground for penalty. The State will guarantee the Muslims any defined measure of political power in the shape of Muslim religion and Muslim civilization. But the State will not guarantee secured seats in the Legislature or in the Management and, if such guarantee is insisted upon by the Muslims, such guaranteed quota is not to exceed their proportion to the common population.

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan's Opposition to the Partition of India

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan who is also recognized as "Boundary Gandhi" or "Sarhadi Gandhi" was not influenced by the two-nation theory and

wanted a single united India as house for both Hindus and Muslims. He was from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, in present-day Pakistan. He whispered that the partition would be harmful to the Muslims of the subcontinent. Post partition, Ghaffar Khan was a strong advocate of the Pashtunistan movement.

ABUL KALAM AZAD

Abul Kalam Muhiyuddin Ahmed Azad (11 November 1888 – 22 February 1958) was an Indian Muslim scholar and a senior political leader of the Indian independence movement. One of the mainly prominent Muslim leaders, he opposed the partition of India because he thought Muslims would be more powerful and dominant in a united India. Following India's independence, he became the first Minister of Education in the Indian government. In 1992 he was posthumously awarded India's highest civilian award, the Bharat Ratna. He is commonly remembered as Maulana Azad; he had adopted *Azad* (*Free*) as his pen name. His contribution to establishing the education basis in India is recognized by celebrating his birthday as "National Education Day" crossways India.

As a young man, Azad composed poetry in Urdu, as well as treatises on religion and philosophy. He rose to prominence by his job as a journalist, publishing works critical of the British Raj and espousing the causes of Indian nationalism. Azad became the leader of the Khilafat Movement, throughout which he came into secure get in touch with the Indian leader Mahatma Gandhi. Azad became an enthusiastic supporter of Gandhi's thoughts of non-violent civil disobedience, and worked to organise the non-cooperation movement in protest of the 1919 Rowlatt Acts. Azad committed himself to Gandhi's ideals, including promoting *Swadeshi* (indigenous) products and the cause of *Swaraj* (*Self-rule*) for India. In 1923, at an age of 35, he became the youngest person to serve as the President of the Indian National Congress.

Azad was one of the main organizers of the Dharasana Satyagraha in 1931, and appeared as one of the mainly significant national leaders of the time, prominently leading the causes of Hindu-Muslim unity as well as espousing secularism and socialism. He served as Congress president from 1940 to 1945, throughout which the *Quit India* rebellion was launched. Azad

was imprisoned, jointly with the whole Congress leadership, for three years. Azad became the mainly prominent Muslim opponent of the demand for a separate Muslim state of Pakistan and served in the interim national government.

Amidst collective turmoil following the partition of India, he worked for religious harmony. As India's Education Minister, Azad oversaw the establishment of a national education system with free primary education and contemporary organizations of higher education. He is also credited with the establishment of the Indian Institutes of Technology and the basis of the University Grants Commission, an significant institution to supervise and advance the higher education in the nation.

Romantic Stage of his Thoughts

Azad opined that an understanding of Quran would help in political, social and cultural reconstruction of life. He expressed his political views in 'Al-Hilas', which sheltered "romantic" stage of his thoughts. He expressed profound belief in the sovereignty of God, establishment of the divine kingdom, order and good government and in the supremacy of truth. He analyzed Indian politics in conditions of religion. To him the believers are "friends of God" and non-believers are "friends of devil". The "friends of God" are ready to die for the truth. They are not afraid of anything in this or after that birth. The "friends of devil" take recourse to force and do not love truth.

He felt that politics in India needed drastic overhauling. For achieving this it was necessary that the "friends of God" organised themselves into a party of God. He whispered that Islam ensured complete equality, liberty, tolerance, freedom of conscience and expression, fraternity and brotherhood. In 1914 he attempted to organise the ulema to take up the cause\of Islam. He tried to develop a systematic Islamic theory of politics beside the rows of his romanticism. Perhaps he was the only Muslim intellectual to do so. Till the end of the First World War Azad cherished and pursued this aim. After the First World War he realized that "romantic approach to politics would not yield desirable results. He became an uncompromising anti-imperialist. He

advocated unity in the middle of the countrymen. He said that nationalism was constant with the spirit of Islam. He described Pan-Islamism as a misnomer. He wanted the Muslims to join Congress. He said if Muslims joined the Congress, it would not be an unislamic act. This realization of Azad marked the end of romantic stage of his thoughts. The Jalianwalabagh tragedy and the end of the Khilafat movement eroded his faith in romanticism.

●

● **REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- What were the main features of Indian response to British Colonialism?
- Briefly discuss the main features of Muslim separatist thought.
- Mention the main features of Hindu Revivalism.
- Briefly discuss Dayanand Saraswati's political ideas.
- Briefly mention some of the principles on which the Arya Samaj was founded.
- What did nationalism mean to Vivekananda?
- Explain Savarkar's political ideas.
- Explain the views of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan regarding the applicability of concept of democracy.
- Discuss Iqbal's views on nationalism?
- Explain briefly Jinnah's views on the two-nation theory.
- Discuss Azad's views on Nationalism.

CHAPTER 6

Gandhism: Evolution and Character

- **STRUCTURE**

- Learning objectives
- Concept of Swaraj, satyagraha and critique of western civilization
- Sarvodaya and the Gandhian alternative
- Gandhian social reform: Bhoodan movement
- Review questions

- **LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Discuss Gandhi's views on modern civilization
- Explain his concepts of Swaraj and Satyagraha
- Discuss his critique of the West and
- Comment on his relevance in present day India
- Explain his concepts of Sarvodaya.
- Understand the Bhoodan Movement.

- **CONCEPT OF SWARAJ, SATYAGRAHA AND CRITIQUE OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION**

The Civilization Justification And British Rule

Sir Jayson-Hicks, the British House Secretary said in 1924;

- "We did not conquer India for the benefit of Indians..... We conquered India as an outlet for the good of Great Britain. We conquered India by the sword. We should hold it.... We hold it as the finest outlet for British goods in common and for Lancashire cotton goods in scrupulous."

Some other British theorists and statesmen, though, maintained that they were in India not for their own benefit but for India's good. They claimed that they came as trustees or bearers of the "White Man's Burden" of enlightening, civilizing or modernizing India. Such a view was held, for example, by Lord Curzon, the Viceroy of India from 1898 to 1905. In his convocation address to Calcutta University in 1905, he said that "truth took a high lay in the moral codes of the West before it had been likewise honored in the East, where craftiness and diplomatic vile have always been held in much repute." On a later occasion, Curzon maintained that India's Swaraj would have to approach either from the British Parliament or by violence.

Mahatma Gandhi vehemently opposed both Curzon's civilization justification of British colonialism and his prognosis that India's Swaraj would have to approach either from the British or by violence. Gandhi argued that dharma or satya had a central lay in Indian custom and that it was wrong for the British to claim any monopoly, or superiority in matters of truth or morality. Against Curzon, Gandhi also maintained that Indian Swaraj would approach neither from the British Parliament nor by violence but by the-non-violent direct action of the people of India.

Gandhi, Moderates and Extremists on the Legitimacy of British Rule

Before going on to examine the characteristics of Gandhi's unique standpoint, we necessarily pause to note that it differed not only from Curzon's views but also from the views of the moderates and the extremists within the Indian national movement. The moderates were opposed to the "economic drain" of India by British colonialism but they whispered in the cultural superiority of contemporary Western civilization. They sought to bring in relation to the India's modernization and eventual independence by conventional political ways, e.g. petitions and legislative actions. By contrast the extremists relied on terrorist or violent ways. The revivalists in the middle of them upheld the cultural superiority of Indian custom.

Gandhi's Hind Swaraj

Hind Swaraj or Indian House Rule is a book written by Mohandas K. Gandhi in 1909. It is a book in which he expresses his views on Swaraj, Contemporary Civilization, Mechanization etc.

Backdrop

Mohandas Gandhi wrote this book while traveling from London to South Africa onboard SS *Kildonan Castle* flanked by November 13 and November 22, 1909. In the book Gandhi provides a diagnosis for the troubles of humanity in contemporary times, the causes, and his remedy.

Key Arguments

Gandhi's Hind Swaraj takes the shape of a dialogue flanked by two characters, *The Reader* and *The Editor*. The Reader essentially serves as the typical Indian countryman whom Gandhi would have been addressing with Hind Swaraj. The Reader voices the general beliefs and arguments of the time concerning Indian Independence. Gandhi, The Editor, explains why those arguments are flawed and interject his own arguments. As *The Editor* Gandhi puts it, "it is my duty patiently to attempt to remove your prejudice."

In the dialogue which follows, Gandhi outlines four themes which structure his arguments.

- First, Gandhi argues that 'House Rule is Self Rule'. He argues that it is not enough for the British to leave only for Indians to adopt a British-styled civilization. As he puts it, some "want English rule without the Englishman... that is to say, [they] would create India English. And when it becomes English, it will be described not Hindustan but Englishtan. This is not the Swaraj I want."
- Gandhi also argues that Indian independence is only possible by passive resistance. In information, more than denouncing violence, Gandhi argues that it is counter-productive; instead, he believes, "The force of love and pity is infinitely greater than the force of arms. There is harm in the exercise of brute force, never in that of pity." This is essential during *Hind Swaraj*.

- In order to exert passive resistance, Gandhi reasons that Swadeshi be exercised by Indians, meaning the refusal of all deal and dealings with the British. He addresses the English when he states, "If you do not concede our demand, we shall be no longer your petitioners. You can govern us only so extensive as we remain the governed; we shall no longer have any dealings with you." Gandhi creates an intriguing argument here; if the British want India for deal, remove deal from the equation.
- Finally, Gandhi argues that India will never be free unless it rejects Western civilization itself. In the text he is deeply critical of western civilization, claiming, "India is being ground down, not under the English heel, but under that of contemporary civilization." He speaks in relation to the civilization not presently in relation to India, however. He argues that "Western civilization is such that one has only to be patient and it will be self destroyed." It is a profound repudiation. Not only is western civilization unhealthy for India, but western civilization is by its own virtue unhealthy.

Swaraj

Swaraj can mean usually self-governance or "self-rule", and was used synonymously with "house-rule" by Gandhi but the word usually refers to Gandhi's concept for Indian independence from foreign power. Swaraj lays stress on governance not by a hierarchical government, but self governance by individuals and society structure. The focus is on political decentralization. Since this is against the political and social systems followed by Britain, Gandhi's concept of Swaraj laid stress on India discarding British political, economic, bureaucratic, legal, military, and educational organizations.

Although Gandhi's aim of totally implementing the concepts of Swaraj in India was not achieved, the voluntary job organizations which he founded for this purpose did serve as precursors and role models for people's movements, voluntary organisations and some of the non-governmental organisations that were subsequently launched in several sections of India.

The Bhoodan movement which presaged land reform legislation action during India, ultimately leading to India discarding the Zamindari system, was also inspired by the thoughts of Swaraj.

Key concepts

Swaraj warrants a stateless civilization; just as to Gandhi, the overall impact of the state on the people is harmful. He described the state a "soulless machine" which, ultimately, does the greatest harm to mankind. The raison d'être of the state is that it is an instrument of serving the people. But Gandhi feared that in the name of molding the state into an appropriate instrument of serving people, the state would abrogate the rights of the citizens and arrogate to itself the role of grand protector and demand abject acquiescence from them. This would create a paradoxical situation where the citizens would be alienated from the state and at the same time enslaved to it which just as to Gandhi was demoralizing and dangerous. If Gandhi's secure acquaintance with the working of the state tools in South Africa and in India strengthened his suspicion of a centralized, monolithic state, his intimate association with the Congress and its leaders confirmed his fears in relation to the corrupting power of political power and his skepticism in relation to the efficacy of the party systems of power politics and his revise of the British parliamentary systems influenced him that representative democracy was incapable of meting out justice to people. So he thought it necessary to evolve a mechanism to achieve the twin objectives of empowering the people and 'empowering' the state. It was for this that he urbanized the two pronged strategy of resistance and reconstruction.

Although the word Swaraj means self-rule, Gandhi gave it the content of an integral revolution that encompasses all spheres of life. "At the individual stage Swaraj is vitally linked with the capability for dispassionate self-assessment, ceaseless self-purification and rising self-reliance". Politically swaraj is self-government and not good government and it means a continuous effort to be self-governing of government manages, whether it is foreign government or whether it is national. In other languages, it is sovereignty of the people based on pure moral power. Economically, Swaraj means full

economic freedom for the toiling millions. And in its fullest sense, Swaraj is much more than freedom from all restraints, it is self-rule, self-restraint and could be equated with *moksha* or salvation.

Adopting Swaraj means implementing a system whereby the state machinery is virtually nil, and the real power directly resides in the hands of people. Gandhi said, "Power resides in the people, they can use it at any time." This philosophy rests inside an individual who has to learn to be master of his own self and spreads upwards to the stage of his society which necessity is dependent only on itself. Gandhi said, "In such a state everyone is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbor"; and also "It is Swaraj when we learn to rule ourselves."

Gandhi explained his vision in 1946:

- "Independence begins at the bottom... A civilization necessity is built in which every village has to be self sustained and capable of managing its own affairs... It will be trained and prepared to perish in the effort to defend itself against any onslaught from without... This does not exclude dependence on and willing help from neighbors or from the world. It will be a free and voluntary play of mutual forces... In this structure composed of innumerable villages, there will be ever widening, never ascending circles. Growth will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose center will be the individual. So the outermost circumference will not wield power to crush the inner circle but will provide strength to all within and derive its own strength from it."

Gandhi was undaunted by the task of implementing such a utopian vision in India. He whispered that by transforming enough individuals and societies civilization at big would change. He said, "It may be taunted with the retort that this is all Utopian and, so not worth a single thought... Let India live for the true picture, however never realizable in its completeness. We necessity have a proper picture of what we want before we can have something approaching it."

Efforts for Implementation

In 1917, Gandhi asked Indians nationwide to sign a petition demanding Swaraj. This petition was supported by, in the middle of others, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Ram Manohar Lohia. Critics contain Muhammad Ali Jinnah and Rabindranath Tagore.

In 1919, the Navajivan Trust, a publishing home, was founded by Gandhi to educate by publications general Indians in relation to the principles of Swaraj, in their native tongue. The trust is still in subsistence today and just as to its initial promises is totally self reliant having accepted absolutely no donation or grant during its subsistence.

Since achieving Swaraj could not be possible without the elimination of all shapes of power, Gandhi decided to undertake a number of constructive behaviors aimed at reducing the dependence of Indians from the British and simultaneously also creation them self-reliant. So, he founded several voluntary organisations during his life to carry out such social welfare programs. The All India Spinners Association, the All India Village Industries Association, the Harijan Sewak Sangh and the Leprosy Basis were some of the organizations he shaped. The thrust of all these behaviors was social and not political. Gandhi also decided to popularize the spinning wheel in India to create hand-spun cloth out of khadi. The intention was to reduce India's dependence on foreign made cloth. This movement, described the Khadi Movement, later gained fame by the term *Swadeshi*. Gandhi himself spun and weaved cloth from spinning wheels and handlooms in his *ashram*. The spinning wheel or the *Charkha* became a symbol of the Indian freedom thrash about, and was incorporated into several flags.

At the Indian National Congress annual session in September 1920, delegates supported Swaraj, and in the similar year they agreed with Khilafat leaders to job and fight jointly for both causes. This can be regarded as the official launching of the Swaraj movement by the Congress. Though, the Congress thought of Swaraj was significantly dissimilar from that of Gandhi. The Gandhian thought of Swaraj outlined in his book *Hind Swaraj* was not acceptable to several Congress leaders. Jawaharlal Nehru later dismissed it as "totally unreal" and declared that neither he nor the Congress had ever

measured the picture presented in it. The Congress treated Swaraj more as a politically inclined goal demanding complete political independence from the British.

Current Implementation

Currently Swaraj has been implemented in a village described Hiware Bazar. The village being highly deplete with water, education and vital needs for life at one point, is now self enough with a high per capita income.

After Gandhi

After Gandhi's assassination Vinoba Bhave shaped the Sarva Seva Sangh at the national stage and Sarvodaya Mandals at the local stage to carry on integrated village service - with the end purpose of achieving the goal of Swaraj. Two major nonviolent movements for socio-economic and political revolution in India: the Bhoodan movement led by Vinoba Bhave and the Total Revolution movement led by Jayaprakash Narayan were actually held under the aegis of the thoughts of Swaraj. These movements had some success, but due to the socialist tendencies of Nehruvian India were not able to unleash the type of revolution that was aimed at.

Gandhi's model of Swaraj was strongly opposed and entirely discarded by the Nehruvian government. He had wanted a system of a classless, stateless direct democracy. On January 29, 1948, in what is recognized as his *Last Will and Testament*, Gandhi suggested disbanding of the Congress as a political forum. On the after that day he was killed.

In that message in relation to the dismantling Congress, he said, "Its task is done. The after that task is to move into villages and revitalize life there to build a new socio-economic structure from the bottom upwards." He wanted the Congress party to change into a constructive job organisation - Lok Sewak Sangh was the name he proposed - to conscientise and mobilise the people to job and thrash about for Swaraj. Though none of these objectives were achieved when India became self-governing. India, although a federation, got a strong central government. Representative democracy, rather than direct democracy was adopted. The Congress Party was not disbanded.

Rather it went on to become one of the frontrunners in running the government of India.

Additionally, contemporary India has kept in lay several features of British power, including widespread use of the English language, General-law, industrialization, liberal democracy, military organisation, and the bureaucracy.

Arvind Kejriwal, the national conveyor of Aam Aadmi Party is trying to introduce the concept of participatory budgeting (swaraj) in the whole country. The party will be fighting Delhi elections in 2013 and Common elections in 2014.

Satyagraha

Satyagraha loosely translated as "insistence on truth"- satya (truth); agraha (insistence) "soul force" or "truth force" is a scrupulous philosophy and practice within the broader overall category usually recognized as nonviolent resistance or civil resistance. The term "satyagraha" was coined and urbanized by Mahatma Gandhi. He deployed satyagraha in the Indian independence movement and also throughout his earlier struggles in South Africa for Indian rights. Satyagraha theory influenced Nelson Mandela's thrash about in South Africa under apartheid, Martin Luther King, Jr.'s campaigns throughout the civil rights movement in the United States, and several other social justice and alike movements. Someone who practices satyagraha is a satyagrahi.

Satyagraha Theory

Defining Success

Assessing the extent to which Gandhi's thoughts of satyagraha were or were not successful in the Indian independence thrash about is a intricate task. Judith Brown has suggested that "this is a political strategy and technique which, for its outcomes, depends of historical specificities." The view taken by Gandhi differs from the thought that the goal in any disagreement is necessarily to defeat the opponent or frustrate the opponent's objectives, or to meet one's own objectives despite the efforts of the opponent to obstruct

these. In satyagraha, by contrast, these are not the goals. —The Satyagrahi's substance is to convert, not to coerce, the wrong-doer.” Success is defined as cooperating with the opponent to meet a presently end that the opponent is unwittingly obstructing. The opponent necessity be converted, at least as distant as to stop obstructing the presently end, for this cooperation to take lay.

Means and Ends

The theory of satyagraha sees means and ends as inseparable. The means used to obtain an end are wrapped up in and attached to that end. So, it is contradictory to attempt to use unjust means to obtain justice or to attempt to use violence to obtain peace. As Gandhi wrote: —They say, 'means are, after all, means'. I would say, 'means are, after all, everything'. As the means so the end...”

Gandhi used an instance to explain this:

- If I want to deprive you of your watch, I shall certainly have to fight for it; if I want to buy your watch, I shall have to pay for it; and if I want a gift, I shall have to plead for it; and, just as to the means I employ, the watch is stolen property, my own property, or a donation.

Gandhi rejected the thought that injustice should, or even could, be fought against —by any means necessary” — if you use violent, coercive, unjust means, whatever ends you produce will necessarily embed that injustice. To those who preached violence and described nonviolent actionists cowards, he replied: —I do consider that, where there is only a choice flanked by cowardice and violence, I would advise violence....I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honor than that she should, in a cowardly manner, become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonor....But I consider that nonviolence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment.”

Satyagraha versus Duragraha

The essence of Satyagraha is that it seeks to eliminate antagonisms without harming the antagonists themselves, as opposed to violent resistance,

which is meant to cause harm to the antagonist. A Satyagrahi so does not seek to end or destroy the connection with the antagonist, but instead seeks to change or “purify” it to a higher stage. A euphemism sometimes used for Satyagraha is that it is a “silent force” or a “soul force”. It arms the individual with moral power rather than physical power. Satyagraha is also termed a “universal force,” as it essentially “creates no distinction flanked by kinsmen and strangers, young and old, man and woman, friend and foe.”

Gandhi contrasted satyagraha (holding on to truth) with “duragraha” (holding on by force), as in protest meant more to harass than enlighten opponents. He wrote: “There necessity is no impatience, no barbarity, no insolence, no undue pressure. If we want to cultivate a true spirit of democracy, we cannot afford to be intolerant. Intolerance betrays want of faith in one's cause.”

Civil disobedience and non-cooperation as practiced under Satyagraha are based on the “law of suffering”, a doctrine that the endurance of suffering is a means to an end. This end usually implies a moral upliftment or progress of an individual or civilization. So, non-cooperation in Satyagraha is in information a means to secure the cooperation of the opponent uniformly with truth and justice.

Satyagraha in Big-Level Disagreement

When by satyagraha in a big-level political disagreement involving civil disobedience, Gandhi whispered that the satyagrahis necessity undergo training to ensure discipline. He wrote that it is “only when people have proved their active loyalty by obeying the several laws of the State that they acquire the right of Civil Disobedience.”

He so made section of the discipline that satyagrahis:

- Appreciate the other laws of the State and obey them voluntarily
- Tolerate these laws, even when they are inconvenient
- Be willing to undergo suffering, loss of property, and to endure the suffering that might be inflicted on family and friends

This obedience has to be not merely grudging, but extraordinary:

- ...an honest, respectable man will not suddenly take to stealing whether there is a law against stealing or not, but this very man will not feel any remorse for failure to observe the rule in relation to the carrying headlights on bicycles after dark.... But he would observe any obligatory rule of this type, if only to escape the inconvenience of facing a prosecution for a breach of the rule. Such compliance is not, though, the willing and spontaneous obedience that is required of a Satyagrahi.

Principles for Satyagrahis

Gandhi envisioned satyagraha as not only a tactic to be used in acute political thrash about, but as a universal solvent for injustice and harm. He felt that it was equally applicable to big-level political thrash about and to one-on-one interpersonal conflicts and that it should be taught to everyone.

He founded the Sabarmati Ashram to teach satyagraha. He asked satyagrahis to follow the following principles (Yamas described in Yoga Sutra):

- Nonviolence (ahimsa)
- Truth — this comprises honesty, but goes beyond it to mean livelihood fully in accord with and in devotion to that which is true
- Non-stealing
- Chastity (brahmacharya) — this comprises sexual chastity, but also the subordination of other sensual desires to the primary devotion to truth
- Non-possession (not the similar as poverty)
- Body-labor or bread-labor
- Manage of the palate
- Fearlessness
- Equal respect for all religions
- Economic strategy such as boycotts (swadeshi)
- Freedom from untouchability

On another occasion, he listed seven rules as “essential for every Satyagrahi in India”:

- necessity have a livelihood faith in God

- necessity consider in truth and non-violence and have faith in the inherent goodness of human nature which he expects to evoke by suffering in the satyagraha effort
- necessity be leading a chaste life, and be willing to die or lose all his possessions
- necessity be a habitual *khadi* wearer and spinner
- necessity abstain from alcohol and other intoxicants
- necessity willingly carry out all the rules of discipline that are issued
- necessity obey the jail rules unless they are specially devised to hurt his self-respect

Rules for Satyagraha Campaigns

Gandhi proposed a series of rules for satyagrahis to follow in a resistance campaign:

- harbor no anger
- suffer the anger of the opponent
- never retaliate to assaults or punishment; but do not submit, out of fear of punishment or assault, to an order given in anger
- voluntarily submit to arrest or confiscation of your own property
- if you are a trustee of property, defend that property (non-violently) from confiscation with your life
- do not curse or swear
- do not insult the opponent
- neither salute nor insult the flag of your opponent or your opponent's leaders
- if anyone attempts to insult or assault your opponent, defend your opponent (non-violently) with your life
- as a prisoner, behave courteously and obey prison regulations (except any that are contrary to self-respect)
- as a prisoner, do not inquire for special favorable treatment
- as a prisoner, do not fast in an effort to gain conveniences whose deprivation does not involve any injury to your self-respect

- joyfully obey the orders of the leaders of the civil disobedience action
- do not pick and choose amongst the orders you obey; if you discover the action as a whole improper or immoral, sever your connection with the action entirely
- do not create your participation conditional on your comrades taking care of your dependents while you are engaging in the campaign or are in prison; do not expect them to give such support
- do not become a cause of collective quarrels
- do not take sides in such quarrels, but assist only that party which is demonstrably in the right; in the case of inter-religious disagreement, provide your life to protect (non-violently) those in danger on either face
- avoid occasions that may provide rise to collective quarrels
- do not take section in processions that would wound the religious sensibilities of any society

Gandhi's Critique of Contemporary Civilization

Western civilization began in Ancient Greece. There and in the Roman civilization it urbanized until the start of the middle Ages when it mainly vanished from Europe. Throughout the middle Ages, Western civilization resided, instead, in the Arab/Persian world to a modest degree. Mahatma Gandhi knew western civilization very well because he had taken his education in London. He had a several English friends. He compared always flanked by western civilization and Indian civilization. By his experience he suggested his associates and Indian people follow always Indian civilization. Mahatma Gandhi described, "While the mission schools of other denominations very often enable the Natives to contract all the terrible vices of the Western civilization, and very rarely produce any moral effect on them, the Natives of the Trappist mission are patterns of simplicity, virtue and gentleness. It was a treat to see those saluting passers-by in a humble yet dignified manner."

Then the rediscovery of Western civilization in Europe in the Late Middle Ages prompted the Renaissance. Western civilization's continuing development then led to the Scientific Revolution, the Enlightenment, the American Revolution, the Industrial Revolution and to what is measured today as contemporary civilization. Mahatma Gandhi described, "No one with a sense of justice will fail to endorse Mr. Kallenbach letter on the subject of Indians. Will the Transvaal go to pieces if a few Indians quietly live and deal in it? It does not behoove us to treat as criminals the descendants of a people enlightened extensive before western civilization blossomed forth."

Mahatma Gandhi described, "I dismiss with utter contempt the allegation that any threat was held out to the deceased member of my society. But what is the moral of this, to us, tremendous tragedy? I necessarily call a spade a spade. This is not an occasion when I can perhaps use soft languages: and I do deliberately charge the Transvaal Government with the murder of an innocent man, and this only because he was an Asiatic. The Asiatic Act has placed us in a hard situation. It has now exacted blood. Will the humanity of the whites of the Transvaal tolerate an Act which has necessitated the tragedy I have described? Or will the public still continue to consider that the Asiatic Act is all for the best, that it is necessary for the protection of the white men of the Transvaal, and that, so, if the Asiatic, stupidly in their opinion, take to heart the insult that is offered by the Act, it is not their concern? Such is not the lesson that we would learn from Western civilization."

Better than others. They do so because they view a civilization's stage of development as a product of race. As a result, they view any claim of cultural superiority as a claim of racial superiority and, accordingly, condemn the thought of cultural superiority as racist. Though, as we have seen, a civilization's stage of development is not a product of race. Mahatma Gandhi described, "We, on our section, ought to resist the fascination that western civilization has for us in view of these characteristics that we observe. At the similar time we should keep in mind that eastern peoples have not been free from comparable cruelty. In information, we discover in the East examples of greater cruelty than in the West. The only lesson to be learnt is that East and West are no more than names. Human beings are the similar everywhere.¹ He

who wants to will conduct himself with decency. There is no person to whom the moral life is a special mission. Everything depends on the individual himself. One can pursue the principles of morality at any lay, in any environment or condition of life.

Mahatma Gandhi described, –But from the present civilization, or, rather, from western civilization, there flow two propositions which have approximately become maxims to live by I call them fallacious maxims. They are might is right and survival of the fittest. Those who have propounded these two maxims have given a meaning to them. I am not going into the meaning that might be attached in our minds to them, but they have said undoubtedly, by saying –might is right”, that physical might is right, that physical strength is right and supreme. Some of them have also combined intellectual strength with physical strength, but I would replace both these with heart-strength, and I say that nobody with merely physical might and intellectual might can ever enjoy that strength that can proceed from the heart. It never can be that mere intellectual or mere physical strength can ever supersede the heart-strength or, as Ruskin would say, social affections. A quickening and quickened soul responds only to the springs of the heart. That1 is the variation flanked by western and eastern civilization? I know that I am treading on very dangerous and delicate ground. We had the distinction given to us by so great an power as Lord Selborne only a short time ago, and I have very humbly and very respectfully to differ from His Excellency’s views. It seems that western civilization is destructive, eastern civilization is constructive. Western civilization is centrifugal, eastern civilization is centripetal. Western civilization, so, is naturally disruptive, whereas eastern civilization combines. I consider also that western civilization is without a goal, eastern civilization has always had the goal before it.

I do not mix up or confuse western civilization with Christian progress. I decline to consider that it is a symbol of Christian progress that we have sheltered a big section of the globe with the telegraph system, that we have got telephones and ocean greyhounds, and that we have trains running at a velocity of 50 or even 60 miles per hour. I refuse to consider that all this action connotes Christian progress, but it does connote western civilization. I

think western civilization also symbolizes tremendous action, eastern civilization symbolizes contemplativeness, but it also sometimes symbolizes lethargy. The people in India, the people in China I leave Japan for the time being having been sunk in their contemplative mood, have forgotten the essence of the thing, they have forgotten that, in transferring their action from one sphere of life to another sphere of life, they had not to be idle, they had not to be lazy. The result is that immediately they discover an obstacle in their method, they basically sit down. It is necessary that that civilization should approach in get in touch with that of the West, it is necessary that that civilization should be quickened with the western spirit. Immediately that information is accomplished, I have no doubt also that the eastern civilization will become predominant, because it has a goal. I think you will see easily that a civilization or a condition in which all the forces fly absent from the centre necessarily be without a goal, whereas those which converge to a point have always a goal. It is then necessary for these two civilizations to meet and we shall have a dissimilar force altogether, by no means a menacing force, by no means a force that disunites, but a force that unites. The two forces are undoubtedly opposing forces, but perhaps in the economy of nature both are necessary. Only we, as intelligent human beings with heart and soul, have to see what those forces are, and have to use them, not blindly but intelligently, not anyhow and haphazard, but with a goal in view. Immediately that is done, there is no difficulty whatsoever in the two civilizations meeting and meeting for a good purpose.”

Civilizations do meet and even merge but never has such an impact been witnessed as the impact of the west on India. A Birdseye view of the Indian scenario would depict a miniature or a distorted West in India. Mahatma Gandhi described, —Let it be remembered that western civilization is only a hundred years old, or to be more precise, fifty. Within this short span the western people seem to have been reduced to a state of cultural anarchy. We pray that India may never be reduced to the similar state as Europe. The western nations are impatient to fall upon one another, and are restrained only by the accumulation of armaments all round. When the situation flares up, as suggested, witness a veritable hell let loose in Europe. All white nations seem

upon the black races as their legitimate prey. This is inevitable when money is the only thing that matters. Wherever they discover any territory, they swoop down on it like crows upon carrion. There are reasons to suggest that this is the outcome of their big industrial undertakings.”

Mahatma Gandhi described, —There has been quite a line in the Home of Commons in relation to the budget proposals recently introduced. The sessions continue right by the night, with the result that half the number of members stretches themselves out for a nap right in the midst of all, wake up when it is time for voting and resume the nap as soon as the voting is in excess of. Such is the condition of the greatest Parliament in the world. How, in these circumstances, they attend to the nation’s business—readers may imagine for themselves. We discover that mainly people are selfish. It will not be wrong to say that the sun of pure justice has set. Relatively, the British people behave somewhat better and that is why they outshine the other nations. Though, it does not appear likely that Western civilization will survive much longer.”

Mahatma Gandhi described, —If you now have planes flying in the air, take it that people will be done to death. Looking at this land, I at any rate have grown disillusioned with Western civilization. The people whom you meet on the method appear half-crazy. They spend their days in luxury or in creation a bare livelihood and retire at night thoroughly exhausted. In this state of affairs, I cannot understand when they can devote themselves to prayers. Suppose Dr. Cook has, in information, been to the North Pole, what then? People will not, on that explanation, get the slightest relief from their sufferings. While Western civilization is still young, we discover things have approach to such a pass that, unless its whole machinery is thrown in excess of-board, people will destroy themselves like so several moths. Even today we can see that there are more and more cases of suicide every day. There are reasons why it may be advisable for people to approach to England on some business or for education, but, usually speaking, I am definitely of the view that it is altogether undesirable for anyone to approach or live here. We shall consider this point at greater length some other time.”

The impact has been so great and so deep that, wherever we go, and, as distant as the eye can see, we notice only western manners and we are for a

moment set to wonder if we are in India or in some western country. Mahatma Gandhi described, –While Western civilization is still young, we discover things have approach to such a pass that, unless its whole machinery is thrown in excess of-board, people will destroy themselves like so several moths. Even today we can see that there are more and more cases of suicide every day. There are reasons why it may be advisable for people to approach to England on some business or for education, but, usually speaking, I am definitely of the view that it is altogether undesirable for anyone to approach or live here. We shall consider this point at greater length some other time.”

Mahatma Gandhi described, –He had the spirit of patriotism in him from childhood. He was born in 1841. From the earliest time that he began to understand things, he had thoughts of working for Japan’s uplift. He braved several hardships in pursuit of his thought. In the war against Russia, he displayed great courage. He was therefore an expert in war; also in mathematics, education, management, in short, in everything. He must, therefore, be admitted to be a brave man. In subjugating Korea, he used his courage to a wrong end. But those who fall under the spell of the Western civilization cannot help doing so. If Japan is to rule, defend and expand herself by force, she has no option but to conquer the neighboring lands. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that those who have the real welfare of the people at heart necessity lead them only beside the path of Satyagraha.”

Mahatma Gandhi described, –The tendency of the Indian civilization is to elevate the moral being that of the Western civilization is to propagate immorality. The latter is godless; the former is based on a belief in God. So understanding and so believing, it behaves every lover of India to cling to the old Indian civilization even as a child clings to the mother’s breast.”

Mahatma Gandhi described, –This civilization is unquestionably the best, but it is to be observed that all civilizations have been on their trial. That civilization which is permanent outlives it. Because the sons of India were establish wanting, its civilization has been placed in jeopardy. But its strength is to be seen in its skill to survive the shock. Moreover, the whole of India is not touched. Those alone who have been affected by Western civilization have become enslaved. We measure the universe by our own miserable foot-rule.

When we are slaves, we think that the whole universe is enslaved. Because we are in an abject condition, we think that the whole of India is in that condition. As a matter of information, it is not so, yet it is as well to impute our slavery to the whole of India. But if we bear in mind the above information, we can see that if we become free, India is free.”

Mahatma Gandhi described, —We saw in Hind Swaraj that it is not so much from British rule that we have to save ourselves as from Western civilization. Clearly, if Englishmen settle down in India as Indians, they will cease to be foreigners. If they cannot bring themselves to do so, it will be our duty to create circumstances in which it will be impossible for them to stay on. The writings of Englishmen themselves often tell us how wicked Western civilization is. There was a storm of protest in England against the alleged high-handedness of the Spanish authorities when Ferrer was put to death. The letter in the Daily News of October 22 which the well-known author, Mr. G. K. Chesterton, wrote, pointing out that this was sheer hypocrisy on their section, will bear summarizing even today. Mr. Chesterton says: We have been hysterically protesting against what Spain has done, but that is so much hypocrisy and nothing else. It is out of our pride that we take up such an attitude. In information, we are presently as bad as Spain, in sure compliments much worse. We have no political executions in England because we have no political rebellions in our country and not because we are a religious people. Wherever we do have rebellions, there we do have executions, much more mean, reckless and savage than the execution of Ferrer. The hanging of the Fenians at Manchester has been admitted by all lawyers to have been in contempt of logic and law. The killing of Scheepers in South Africa is a thing of which even the Imperialists are now ashamed. A few harmless peasants at Denshawail objected to the looting of their property; they were tortured and hanged. When our rulers react with such brutality and baseness to small and ineffectual regional risings, how would they behave if confronted with a rising in London itself alike to the one in Spain? We are at peace, not because we do not use religion but because we have sunk silently under the power of our rulers.² If we have no rebellions, we are guilty of crimes worse than the death of Ferrer.³ A private soldier the other day committed⁴ suicide in order to

avoid a flogging. This suicide is more hideous than the execution of Ferrer under the pressure of strong emotions in a time of excitement. Yet the incident attracted no attention in England, because we are the one people in Europe who are successfully oppressed. In view of such shortcomings in the civilization of this people which dazzles us so much, we had better consider whether we should tolerate it in India or banish it while we have still time to do so. It is a civilization which grinds down the masses and in which a few men capture power in the name of the people and abuse it. The people are deceived because it is under cover of their name that these men act.”

Mahatma Gandhi described, –On reflection, we cannot help feeling that Western civilization is as cruel as, perhaps more cruel than, the terrible expression on the face of the man in the cartoon. The sight which fills one with the utmost indignation is that of the cross in the midst of weapons dripping with blood. Here the hypocrisy of the new civilization reaches its climax. In former times, too, there used to be bloody wars, but they were free from the hypocrisy of contemporary civilization.” Mahatma Gandhi described, –Self-interest will create them fight in the middle of themselves; too even today they are fighting. That is a feature aspect of Western civilization. If we imitate the Western people, we may succeed for a time in mixing with them but subsequently we would also be blinded by selfishness and fight with them and fight in the middle of ourselves, too.”

–This glamorous illustrate is the product of Western civilization. We can deem ourselves successful if we are not led absent by it. I do not mean to say that Chhaganlal has succumbed to the temptation. He is, though, greatly affected by it and anyone would be so affected at first sight.”

●

● **SARVODAYA AND THE GANDHIAN ALTERNATIVE**

Concept of Sarvodaya

Sarvodaya is a term meaning 'universal uplift' or 'progress of all'. The term was first coined by Mahatma Gandhi as the title of his 1908 translation of John Ruskin's tract on political economy, *Unto This Last*, and Gandhi came to

use the term for the ideal of his own political philosophy. Later Gandhians, like the Indian nonviolence activist Vinoba Bhave, embraced the term as a name for the social movement in post-independence India which strove to ensure that self-determination and equality reached all strata of Indian civilization.

Origins and Gandhi's Political Ideal

Gandhi received a copy of Ruskin's *Unto This Last* from a British friend, Mr. Henry Polak, while working as a lawyer in South Africa in 1904. In his *Autobiography*, Gandhi remembers the twenty-four hour train ride to Durban (from when he first read the book), being so in the grip of Ruskin's thoughts that he could not sleep at all: "I determined to change my life in accordance with the ideals of the book." As Gandhi construed it, Ruskin's outlook on political-economic life extended from three central tenets:

- That the good of the individual is contained in the good of all.
- That a lawyer's job has the similar value as the barber's in as much as all have the similar right of earning their livelihood from their job.
- That a life of labour, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman is the life worth livelihood.

Four years later, in 1908, Gandhi rendered a paraphrased translation of Ruskin's book into his native tongue of Gujarati. He entitled the book *Sarvodaya*, a compound he invented from two Sanskrit roots: *sarva* (all) and *udaya* (uplift) -- "the uplift of all" (or as Gandhi glossed it in his autobiography, "the welfare of all").

Although inspired by Ruskin, the term would for Gandhi approach to stand for a political ideal of his own stamp. The ideal which Gandhi strove to put into practice in his ashrams was, he hoped, one that he could persuade the whole of India to embrace, becoming a light to the other nations of the world. The Gandhian social ideal encompassed the dignity of labor, an equitable sharing of wealth, collective self-sufficiency and individual freedom.

Sarvodaya Movement

Gandhi's ideals have lasted well beyond the attainment of one of his chief projects, Indian independence. His followers in India sustained working to promote the type of civilization that he envisioned, and their efforts have approach to be recognized as the Sarvodaya Movement. Anima Bose has referred to the movement's philosophy as "a fuller and richer concept of people's democracy than any we have yet recognized." Sarvodaya workers associated with Vinoba, J. P. Narayan, Dada Dharmadhikari, Dharendra Mazumdaar, Shankarrao Deo, K. G. Mashruwala undertook several projects aimed at encouraging popular self-organisation throughout the 1950s and 1960s, including *Bhoodan* and *Gramdan* movements. Several groups descended from these networks continue to function in the vicinity in India today.

Beginning on the one year anniversary of the immersion of Gandhi's ashes, an annual Sarvodaya mela or festival has been held at Srirangapatna and at Tirunavaya. At the latter location, it was instituted by K. Kelappan.

●

● **GANDHIAN SOCIAL REFORM: BHOODAN MOVEMENT**

Concept of Constructive Programme

Gandhi experimented with his constructive program at the time of the non-cooperation movement in 1921. Gandhi wanted that the Congress accept his programme and only then was he inclined to launch the mass movement. Involvement in the social reconstruction programme would help an ordinary Congress worker to stay in touch with ground reality. The Congress Party accepted Gandhi's social reconstruction Programme as their programme. Non-cooperation movement was launched at the time when Indian Civilization was confronted with a lot of social turmoil. In reality, the non-cooperation movement combined multiple social and political movements within it. It was infect the first mass movement organised on an all India stage. Gandhi appeared as the leader of mass politics in India, where people of all castes and

all classes participated. Participation in the mass movement became an educative experience for a Congress worker.

Non-cooperation movement sustained for a era of in relation to the one year which threw up several political leaders from dissimilar areas. Gandhi encouraged the Congress workers in the social-reconstruction programme when there was no mass politics. This kept the Congress workers with in the fold of social reconstruction programme. Participation in the great social experiment kept the Congress workers busy. Gandhi was described by some regional Congress leaders at Bardoli to lead another peasant movement on the issue of rent. The no rent campaign sustained under the personal supervision of Gandhi, although he did not actively lead the movement. Moreover, Bardoli was a section of raiyatwari area where there was no middleman flanked by the state and tenants. It was easier on the section of the raiyats (tenants) to lead the movement against the Government. The leadership of the movement remained in the hands of the Patidar Society, but Gandhi succeeded in motivating them to involve themselves in his social reconstruction programme. Upper caste people went to the Harijan Bastis and worked for the abolition of untouchability. In the beginning, they showed a lot of inhibitions in mixing with the Harijans, but slowly made it a section of their everyday lives.

Gandhi personally felt satisfied with the result of the Bardoli movement, although the movement perhaps succeeded only in an economic sense. It was followed by the Civil Disobedience movement which is the second mass movement on an all India plane. This movement drew rural masses to politics. The Civil Disobedience movement comprised a big number of no-tax movements. Mainly prominent of those were in UP and Andhra, where the leaders of the movement followed Gandhian rows by combining social and economic issues jointly.

Bhoodan Movement

The Bhoodan Movement or Land Gift Movement was a voluntary land reform movement in India started by Acharya Vinoba Bhave in 1951 started at Pochampally village now recognized as Bhoodan Pochampally.

Way

The mission of the movement was to persuade wealthy landowners to voluntarily provide a percentage of their land to lower castes. Vinoba Bhave walked crossways India on foot, to persuade landowners to provide up a piece of their land. He was followed by crowds almost everywhere he went. Philosophically, Vinoba Bhave was directly influenced by the Sarvodaya movement of Gandhi of whose he was the spiritual heir. The movement was started on 18th April 1951 at Pochampalli village in Nalgonda district when Telangana peasant movement on the land issue reached the peak. It was a violent thrash about launched by poor peasants against the regional landlords. Bhave said that rural rich necessity participate in voluntary sharing of land.

First Donation: Vedre Ramachandra Reddy Bhoodan

Vedre Ramachandra Reddy got his title " Bhoodan " as he was the first donor and imitator of the great land donation movement in early 1950s(18 April 1951) in Andhra Pradesh at a village described Pochampally in the Nalgonda district of Andhra Pradesh. He was a great social worker and noble man. Acharya Vinoba Bhave started the land donation movement in Pochampally village in April 1951 with initiation of donation of 100 acres, of land from Vedre Ramachandra Reddy, which led to a total of 1 million acres of land donation and sharing in the middle of the poor in post independence Period in India.

Vedre Ramachandra Reddy was born on July 17, 1905 into a very prominent family throughout the Nizam Rule in Deccan and died on December 9, 1986. He completed his law/Barrister training in Ferguson Law College in Pune. After practicing for a few years, he resigned as he was fed up with British system and joined social reform and helped initiate Land Donation movement in Pochampally of Andhra Pradesh (formerly Hyderabad State). After him, the land donation movement is maintained under a bhoodan trust movement till date with the help of his sons.

—Perhaps none of Gandhi's followers, have created so several worshippers of Truth & Non-violence, so several genuine workers as has

Vinoba Bhave. In Vinoba, as in very others, thought, speech & action job in harmony, so that Vinoba's life is like a melodious song".

Vinoba Bhave was one of the great spiritual leaders & reformers of contemporary India, whose job & personal instance moved the hearts of countless Indians. Born in 1895, at the age of ten, Vinoba took a vow lifelong celibacy & selfless service to others searching for a method of life that would synthesize both spiritual Truth & practical action. Vinoba exposed Gandhi, & joined in Gandhi's job for the regeneration & freedom of India. As Vinoba himself put it: "I experienced with Gandhi the peace of the Himalayas the revolutionary spirit. Peaceful revolution, revolutionary peace, the two streams united in Gandhi in a method that was altogether new." Gandhi also wrote to Vinoba's father, "At a tender age, Vinoba has acquired a degree of spirituality & ascetics that took me years of patient labour."

In 1940 Gandhi chose Vinoba to be the first Satyagrahi i.e. non-violent resister, to offer non-violent resistance to the British regime. Vinoba's social activism was founded on a lifetime's revise of the other major world religions. Vinoba's life, reveals the harmony of the inner & outer life of a great man, who had an unwavering commitment to the practice of non-violence, to an occupied spirituality, & to the universal power of love.

After India had independence, Vinoba started out on his extraordinary & unprecedented in recorded history, the Bhoodan (Land-Gift) Movement. In excess of a era of twenty years, Vinoba walked by the length & breadth of India persuading land-owners & land-lords to provide their poor & downtrodden neighbors a total of 4 million acres (16,000 km) of land.

The Bhoodan-Gramdan movement initiated inspired by Vinoba brought Vinoba to the international scene.

In 1951, the Third Annual Sarvodaya Conference was held at Shivarampali, a village a few miles south of the municipality of Hyderabad in South India. Vinoba was persuaded to leave his society center (Ashram) at Pavnar, close to Nagpur & attend the meetings. Telangana had been the scene of violent communist rebellion which was still smoldering in April 1951. For Vinoba the future of India was essentially a contest flanked by the fundamental creeds of Gandhi & Marx. In coming to Hyderabad, Vinoba &

other Gandhians were confronting a challenge & testing their faith in non-violence.

On April 11, 1951, the final day of conference, Vinoba announced that on his walk house to Pavanar he & a few companions would tour the Communist infested regions of Telangana to spread the message of Peace i.e. Non-violence. Once in Telangana, Vinoba quickly showed his sensitivity to the new situation. On April 17, at his second stop, Vinoba learned at first hand that village people were afraid of the police as well as the Communists & that the village was torn beside class-rows.

On April 18, 1951, the historic day of the very genesis of the Bhoodan movement, Vinoba entered Nalgonda district, the centre of Communist action. The organizers had arranged Vinoba's stay at Pochampalli, a big village with in relation to the 700 families, of whom two-thirds were landless. Pochampalli gave Vinoba a warm welcome. Vinoba went to visit the Harijan (the Untouchables) colony. By early afternoon villagers began to gather approximately Vinoba at Vinoba's cottage. Vinobaji asked the harijans why they have taken arms, and supporting the communists, for which the harijans have said that they were promised land vinobaji asked them if they get land they will shun violence for which they replied in positive vinobaji asked them how several families are there and how much land they want, the harijans replied that there are in relation to the 40 families and they want 80 acres of land vinobaji asked them if they get land they will do cooperative farming, for which they agreed vinobaji said that he will write to the government and will see that they are allotted the land, for which the harijans replied that the donor have faith on that and requested vinobaji to inquire the regional zamindar sri vedere rama chandra reddy, who was a very good man vinobaji did not have faith in this and gave instance of mahabaratha, where if pandavas were given five villages the mahabaratha battle wouldn't have taken lay, and also cited examples of feuds taking lay for boundaries but the villagers insisted that he inquire Mr. Reddy vinobaji arranged a prayer meeting in the evening and placed the harijans request in front of the villagers and elders who came there. To everyone's surprise, Ram Chandra Reddy, the regional landlord, got up & said in a rather excited voice: "I will provide you 100 acres for these people."

This incident was neither planned nor imagined was the very genesis of the Bhoodan movement & it made Vinoba think that therein place the potentiality of solving the land problem of India. This movement later on urbanized into a village gift or Gramdan movement. This movement was a section of a comprehensive movement for the establishment of a Sarvodaya Civilization, both in India & outside India later on Mr. Vedre Rama chandra reddy gave another 800 acres on dissimilar occasions. he was awarded several positions in the government, whom he has refused, as he want to be absent from politics.

The movement passed by many levels in regard to both momentum & allied programmes. In October 1951, Vinoba was led to demand 50 million acres (200,000 km) of land for the landless from the whole of India by 1957. Therefore a personal initiative assumed the shape of a mass movement, reminding the people of Gandhi's mass movements. This was indeed a very extra ordinary attainment for a constructive job movement. The enthusiasm for the movement lasted till 1957 & thereafter it began to wane.

Meanwhile the Bhoodan Movement had been transformed from a land-gift movement to a village-gift or Gramdan movement, in which the whole or a major section of a village land was to be donated by not less than 75% of the villagers who were required to relinquish their right of owner-ship in excess of their lands in favor of the whole village, with power to equitably redistribute the total land in the middle of village's families with a proviso for revision after some intervals. The Programme of individual land-gifts was still there, but henceforth became a neglected action.

The Gramdan thought did not prove popular in the non-tribal regions & this partly accounted for the decline of the movement at the end of the 1950s. All this sustained till 1974. from the view-point of its ups & downs. But there was another aspect as well & it related to allied programmes unfolded from time to time. Those programmes were:

- Sampattidan (Wealth-gift),
- Shramdan (Labour-gift),
- Jeevandan (Lifelong commitment to the movement by co-workers),
- Shanti-Sena (Peace-army),
- Sadhandan (gift of implements for agricultural operations).

As regards attitudinal transformation, the propagation of thoughts combined with the material achievements, could not but affect the mind of the thinking people. The movement directly influenced the life-approach of the co-workers, especially the lifelong co-workers & by them several workers & associates or fellow-seekers. By adopting Gandhi's thoughts to the solution of the vital economic problem of land collection & equitable redistribution in the middle of the landless, the Movement kept Gandhi's thoughts of socioeconomic reconstruction alive at a era when the tendency of the educated elite was to overlook, if not to reject Gandhi's thoughts as irrelevant. The Movement kindled interest in the individuals to revise Gandhi's thoughts & to assess their relevance. Jayaprakash Narayan, a renowned Marxist, and a Socialist, & one of the fore-mainly leaders in politics, before & after India's Independence, came to be more & more intimately associated with the movement & realized that it was a superb endeavor to bring in relation to the revolution in human dealings founded on the Gandhian philosophy of non-violence. Ultimately Jayaprakash devoted his whole life to the construction of a Sarvodaya civilization.

The Movement spontaneously attracted the attention of several fellow-seekers & thinkers from outside India. Louis Fischer, the well-known American correspondent said: "Gramdan is the mainly creative thought coming from the East in recent times". Hallam Tennyson, the grandson of the well-known English poet, Alfred Tennyson, wrote a book, "The Saint on the march". He narrated his memorable experiences as he moved with Vinoba into rural India. Chester Bowles, the American ambassador to India, observed in his book, "The dimensions of peace": "We experienced in 1955, the Bhoodan Movement is giving the message of Renaissance in India. It offers a revolutionary alternative to communism, as it is founded on human dignity". The British Industrialist, Earnest Bader was deeply impressed by the Bhoodan movement & implemented the Gandhian concept of Trusteeship by allotting 90% share in the company to his industrial workers. The British quaker, Donald Groom, trekked with Bhoodan Sarvodaya co-workers for six months in the central India covering a aloofness of 1,400 miles (2,300 km).

The American friend Rev. Kaithan turned himself into a Sarvodaya co-worker & recognized a society centre in South India. David Graham, an English journalist of Sunday Average, incorporated Vinoba as one of the creative rebels. Arthur Koestler, in 1959 wrote in London Observer, that the Bhoodan Movement presented an Indian alternative to the Nehruvian model of Western development. In Italy too, in the early 1970s, Giovanni Ermiglia beside with his friend Giorgio Ceragioli recognized *Assefa* with the aim of supporting Bhoodan movement in the action for a voluntary land reform.

To conclude taking an overall view it cannot be gainsaid that the Bhoodan-Gramdan Movement, despite all its real & apparent limitations, it would ever be deemed as a glorious effort for a peaceful & non-violent solution of the vital land problem of Indian civilization & by it for a non-violent reconstruction of the Sarvodaya socio-economic-politico order of universal relevance & significance. Below is a small article from the speech of then Prime Minister of India Shri. P. V. Narasimha Rao... "So it was, that genius of the great Vinoba Bhave said, "O.K., let us inquire for land". If the land is accessible, let us distribute it. Then what? If you get the land, you don't have to provide the gun for a land. O.K. One section of it is solved. So Mr. Ramachandra Reddy of this scrupulous village came forward and said, "I have got 100 or there was a number of acres of land. I am going to provide it free". After that several of us followed suit. But he was the first donor. And at Pochampally a vast, huge and magnificent movement described Bhoodan Movement was born".

Raja Bahadur GIRIWAR NARAYAN SINGH C.B.E., Raja of Ranka also donated 111,101 acres of land to the Vinoba Bhave Bhoodan Initiative highest acre of land given by any landlord or estate in India

History of Bhoodan Movement

On April 18, 1951, the historic day of the very genesis of the Bhoodan movement, Vinoba entered Nalgonda district, the centre of Communist action. The organizers had arranged Vinoba's stay at Pochampally, a big village with in relation to the 700 families, of whom two-thirds were landless. Pochampally villagers gave Vinoba a warm welcome. Vinoba went to visit the

Harijan (the Untouchables) colony. By early afternoon villagers began to gather approximately Vinoba at Vinoba's cottage. The Harijans asked for eighty acres of land, forty wet, forty arid for forty families that would be enough. Then Vinoba asked, "If it is not possible to get land from the government, is there not something villagers themselves could do?" To everyone's surprise, Ram Chandra Reddy, the regional landlord got up & said in a rather excited voice: "I will provide you 250 acres for these people." At his evening prayer meeting, he repeated his promise to offer 250 acres of land to the villagers. This incident neither planned nor imagined was the very genesis of the Bhoodan movement & it made Vinoba think that therein place the potentiality of solving the land problem of India. This movement later on urbanized into a village gift or Gramdan movement. This movement was a section of a comprehensive movement for the establishment of a Sarvodaya Civilization, both in India & outside India.

As an experiment in voluntary social justice, Bhoodan has attracted admiration during the world. There is little question that it created a social atmosphere in India that presaged land reform legislation action during the country. It also had a tangible effect on the lives of several people: in excess of 5 million acres (20,000 km²) were donated. Though, it failed to meet the more ambitious goal of 50 million acres (200,000 km²) that had been set for it.

The initial objective of the movement was to secure voluntary donations of land and distribute it to the landless, but the movement soon came out with a demand of 1/6 share of land from all land owners. In 1952, the movement had widened the concept of gramdan (village in gift) and had started advocating commercial ownership of land. The first village to approach under gramdan was Mangroth in Hamirpur Dist of U.P. It took more than three years to get another village in gift. The second and third gramdans took lay in Orissa and the movement started spreading with emphasis on securing villages in gift.

Raja Bahadur GIRIWAR PRASAD SINGH C.B.E., Raja of Ranka 1911/1969 donated highest acre of land to the villagers in Palamau region.

●

● **REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Briefly describe Gandhi's conception of Swaraj.
- Discuss Gandhi's critique of modern civilization.
- What do you understand by Purna Swaraj?
- How did Gandhi define Satyagraha? And what are the principles on which Satyagraha is based?
- What is Sarvodaya?
- Discuss Gandhi's concept of Satyagraha.
- How did the Bhoodan movement come about?

CHAPTER 7

Socialism: Nationalism and Social Revolution

● **STRUCTURE**

- Learning objectives
- Introduction
- Jawaharlal Nehru
- Subhash Chandra Bose
- Rammanohar Lohia
- Political thought of JP and Narendra Dev
- Review questions

● **LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Discuss the different types of socialism.
- Discuss the objective conditions of socialist movement in India.
- Understand the role of Bose in nation building.
- State Rammanohar Lohia's analysis of capitalism and communism.
- Discuss the basic philosophy of Jayaprakash Narayan and Acharya Narendra Dev.

● **INTRODUCTION**

Kinds of Socialism

Evolutionary Socialism

There are basically two kinds of socialism—the Marxian or Revolutionary socialism and Evolutionary socialism. Evolutionary socialism has got dissimilar brands— utopian socialism, democratic socialism, parliamentary socialism, revisionism, fabianism, social democracy, welfare socialism and Euro-communism. Marxian socialism holds that socialism can be brought in relation to the only by a violent revolution. The new civilization

created would be socialist; by abolishing private property, establishing dictatorship of the proletariat and by bringing in relation to the monopoly of the Communist Party. Evolutionary socialism, as the very term suggests, believes in the evolutionary way of establishing socialism. It implies that there is no need of overthrowing the system (State) existing before. Instead, the social forces wishing to bring in relation to the socialism should do it by the organs of the State i.e. legislature. They should help shape the policies which are socialistic and should get them implemented. It is against the concepts of dictatorship of the proletariat and single party monopoly. Evolutionary socialism is, in information, a synthesis of the Marxist and liberal views of democracy. Like Marxism it believes in the establishment of a civilization which is free from use and inequality, and like liberal democracy, it favors multiparty system, periodic elections and free expression of views.

Philosophy of Socialism

Philosophy of socialism urbanized in the 19th century, although the thoughts concerning socialism were propounded even before. For example, the thoughts of philosophers such as Rousseau, Morelly and Babeuf propounded before the French Revolution, shaped significant characteristics of socialism, as it came in relation to the later. Mention can be made of thoughts such as the abolition of private property and faith in equality.

Utopian Socialists

After the industrial revolution (1760-1830) the condition of the workers worsened in European countries. The workers suffered from the dissimilar crises of capitalism—their diving circumstances were miserable, there was huge unemployment, inflation etc. Several humanist and social reformers reacted to this. The trio of Saint-Simon (1760-1825), Charles Fourier (1772-1873) and Robert Owen (1771-1858) attacked the capitalist socio-economic order. They supported the establishment of a socialist civilization. They accentuated the need for equal sharing of wealth and gave support to the union movement. They were mainly utopian socialists. They whispered that if the capitalist's changes their attitudes, the circumstances of

the workers would be improved within the given capitalist system. They did not examine the capitalist mode of manufacture. They also failed to provide a scientific theory for removing the use of the capitalist civilization.

Power of Utopian Socialism

Utopian socialism, though, influenced the French and German socialists on the one hand and Marx and Engels on the other. Blanc (1813-1882), a reformer and a scholar gave the economic principle "from each just as to his skill, and to each just as to his job." He is regarded as the chief precursor of the welfare state. He influenced both the Social Democrats and the revisionists. Proudhon (1809-1865) attacked private property. He associated the economic system with political system. He pleaded for the overthrow of the capitalist system. Pre-Marxian socialism, except Proudhon, based itself upon the humanitarian hope that people will treat each other better if manufacture increased. But they failed to examine scientifically the functioning of the capitalist economic system and the use inherent in it.

German Social Democracy

In the 1860s the phenomenon of German Social Democracy assumed considerable significance. Lassalle (1825-1864) was one of the early German Social Democrats. He urged that the working class necessarily have a separate party, which can symbolize their interests in the legislature. He was a supporter of the producers' cooperative. The socialists and the Marxists reached a compromise in Germany and proposed the well-known Gotha Programme (1875). This programme was moderate and it supported the evolutionary way of bringing in relation to the socialism. Marxists and Karl Marx himself criticised this programme and drafted another programme on Marxist lines recognized as Erfurt Programme. This programme accentuated the importance of the interrelationship flanked by history and revolutionary programme. In reaction to the Erfurt Programme appeared revisionism. The main advocate of revisionism was Bernstein (1850-1932). He said that the Marxists emphasize only the economic factor but the non-economic factors are equally significant. The Marxian theory of value, just as to him, is not

applicable always. His theory provided substantive basis to evolutionary socialism.

Bernstein's revisionism influenced British Parliamentary Socialism and Fabianism. To propagate these views the British Labour Party was founded in 1906. It urbanized the deal union movement. It said that socialism could be recognized, by the participation of the labour parties in the government. The party whispered that the state could introduce pro-working class policies and this would provide birth to socialism. It sought to combine the economic principles of socialism with the principle of parliamentary democracy and welfare liberalism. Ramsay MacDonald, Harold Laski and Clement Attlee were the significant leaders of the British Labour Party. The British parliamentary democracy whispered in scheduling, reform, gradual change, progressive taxation and faith in the parliamentary ways as against the revolutionary ways of overthrowing capitalism. It did not consider in the theory of class thrash about, dictatorship of the proletariat and in the capability of the state to bring in relation to the change.

Euro-communism which urbanized mainly in France, Italy and Germany also believes in the principles of evolutionary socialism. On June 4, 1884, the Fabian Civilization was set up in England by some arm chair intellectuals. It aimed at establishing a socialist civilization in England by democratic, gradual and peaceful means. The civilization was named after a Roman Common Fabius, who adopted a policy of "wait and hit hard at the right moment." C.D.H. Cole and H.J. Laski were in the middle of its main advocates. The Fabian Civilization maintained that socialism and democracy are supplementary and complementary to each other. Socialism can be brought in relation to the by the gradual method by democratic means.

Objective Circumstances for the Socialist Movement in India

The growth of socialist thought took lay in India mainly in the twentieth century, unlike in the west where it had flourished in the nineteenth century. Socialism as a philosophy of social and economic reconstruction in India urbanized as a result of the impact of Western thought. The growth of socialist thought took lay at a time when colonial use had reached intolerable

proportions. The land structure was marked by the attendance of innumerable intermediaries, mainly landlords who were woven into a hierarchical structure. Below these intermediaries lived the hopeless tenants and poor peasants. The landlords exploited them by charging exorbitant rents, charging forced allowances, inflicting physical injuries on them and by evicting them from their land. The peasantry was heavily indebted to the money-lenders. The money-lenders, landlords and the British governments colluded with each to use the Indian peasantry. The working class did not shape a very big part of the population in comparison to the peasantry. Though, they too shaped an exploited part of the civilization. The intelligentsia and the middle classes played an important role in mobilizing people against British India. They generated feelings of nationalism. The peasantry also revolted against landlords and colonialism usually even without the intelligentsia's leadership.

Growth of Socialist Thoughts

The leaders of the Indian national movement were not only against the continuation of the British rule, they also wanted to reconstruct the social, political and economic structure of India after the attainment of Independence. The socialist thoughts constituted a very significant characteristic of this proposed reconstruction. Although the systematic development of socialist thoughts took lay in India from the 1920s, even before some leaders had strongly desired the socio-economic reconstruction of Indian civilization on radical rows. Therefore, in 1893 Aurobindo contributed seven articles to Indu Prakash under the title "New Lamps for Old". In these articles he criticised the middle class orientation of the Indian National Congress and pleaded for the betterment of the circumstances of the "proletariat". Tilak mentioned in relation to the Russian Nihilts, in the articles he wrote in 'Kesari'— a Marathi paper founded by him. Lala Lajpat Rai was almost certainly the first Indian writer to talk in relation to the socialism and Bolshevism. He presided in excess of the first Indian Deal Union Congress in 1920. But M.N. Roy's comment on Lala Lajpat Rai was that he was "a bourgeois politician with no sympathy for socialism." M.N. Roy criticised the bourgeois power of the

Congress throughout 1921-23. This was mainly because he & is interested in the establishment of Communism in India.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 inspired the Socialist and Marxist thinking in India to a great extent. Although C.R. Das did not sympathize with the Russian revolution, he mentioned it in the Gaya Congress of 1917. He helped in structure the deal union movement in India. Motilal Nehru visited Soviet Union in 1926. Jawaharlal Nehru, the Hindustan Socialist Republican Army (HSRA) were also impressed by the measures in Soviet Union. Jawaharlal Nehru, Subash Chandra Bose, Acharya Narendra Dev, Jayaprakash Narayan, Rammanohar Lohia, Achyut Patwardhan, Yusuf Mehrallp and Ashok Mehta were some of the significant thinkers of the socialist stream in India. The socialists were influenced by the Russian revolution, but they had serious differences with the Communists on the application of Marxism in its original shape in India. The Communist Party of India (CPI) which was shaped in 1924 whispered in the theory of class thrash about and the establishment of a socialist civilization by revolution. The socialists wanted its establishment by state initiative.

The Congress Socialist Party (CSP)

The formation of the CSP was preceded by the repression of the working class organisation by the government in the 1920s. The leaders of the working class were implicated in and tried under the Peshawar Conspiracy case (1922-23), Kanpur Conspiracy case (1924) and Meerut Conspiracy case (1929).

The socialist thoughts assumed organizational shape in May 1934. The socialists shaped the Congress Socialist Party (CSP). The failure of the Civil Disobedience movement and accompanying depression unleashed a chain of measures eventually that led to the formation of the CSP within the Congress. The Congress Socialist Party shaped a group of socialists within the Congress. It aimed at achieving complete Independence of India from imperialism and the establishment of a socialist civilization. The blueprint adopted at one of its conferences strived for "All power to the toiling masses, nationalization of key industries, abolition of feudalism and landlordism without compensation,

sharing of land and co-operative and collective farming." The first all-India conference of the socialists was held on May 17, 1934 at Patna under the presidentship of Acharya Narendra Dev. Jayaprakash Narayan, Achyut Patwardhan, Yusuf Mehraly and Ashok Mehta assisted Acharya Narendra Dev in the formation of the CSP. Although Jawaharlal Nehru was a socialist, he did not join the CSP. The socialists played an significant role in the 1942 Quit India Movement. In March 1948 at the Nasik convention the socialists decided to leave the Congress. They shaped a separate party which came to be recognized as the Socialist Party of India. At the Patna convention in 1949, the socialist party announced its allegiance to the democratic ways and a constructive approach to the social and economic troubles. The Socialist Party decided to merge with the Krishak Mazdoor Praja Party (KMPP) led by J.B. Kriplani after the 1952 common-elections. The merger took place in Bombay on September 26 and 27, 1952.

Jawaharlal Nehru and Socialism

The relevance of Jawaharlal Nehru remains undiminished today. In information, his thoughts and approach to political, economic and social issues are more relevant now than even in his life-time.

It is necessary to state this vital truth and assess the continuing validity and vitality of his approach, because some who unabashedly use his name seek to project him as a pragmatist rather than as the firmly committed socialist that he was.

It is the fashion these days to say that socialism is a vague term, that it is a slogan, that there is no precise definition of what it means. This is essentially the argument of the believers in the status quo, of those who are afraid of radical change that will either hurt their own interests or destroy their pet theories.

It is no doubt true despite his huge personal popularity and the power at his disposal in the government and in the party, Jawaharlal Nehru could not put into practice several of the thoughts he spelt out concerning the radical changes, social and economic, that our civilization required. But this necessity be seen in the backdrop of the dilemma he faced as an honest

politician committed to socialism on the one hand and to democracy on the other. Rightly, he saw no contradiction flanked by the two, for, who can deny that true democracy is the only viable basis for genuine socialism and that without advance towards the goal of socialism democracy will be bereft of meaning? Nehru would not discard the democratic procedures or bypass the democratic organizations in order to put his thoughts into practice. In our context, with an extensive history of feudalism, caste hierarchy, religious divergence, multiplicity of languages and customs, in information of stratification of civilization in a diversity of methods, it has not been easy to correlate custom and change, to job out a viable compromise flanked by the best of cherished values and the urgency of eliminating social and economic inequalities. Jawaharlal Nehru realized that revolution in our situation had to be by consent and could not be by imposition. He admired the Soviet achievements and accepted the ultimate ideals of Marxism, but he did not create a secret of his reservations in relation to the applying the similar ways in the case of our country.

In an underdeveloped nation with several layers of development within itself, both vertical and horizontal, and with a diversity of vested interests wielding tremendous power and very articulate, the difficulties involved in bringing in relation to the radical changes by consent were obvious enough. Yet the alternatives to the democratic system are so risky and unpredictable that he would not lightly discard his faith, even if this meant a visible, often frustrating, slowing down of the procedure of change.

Nehru's acceptance of political democracy was not unqualified. "I am perfectly prepared to accept political democracy," he said, "only in the hope that this will lead to social democracy." He was clear in his mind that political democracy is only the method to the goal and is not the final objective". He saw clearly that if profound economic changes did not take place fast enough, the political structure would be rendered unstable.

If political or social organizations stand in the method of such change, they have to be removed.

Socialism, whose essence is the removal of poverty and establishment of equal opportunities if not of equality in the strictest sense, has necessarily to

suit the circumstances of each country, and Nehru's constant effort was to bring in relation to the changes without destroying the fabric of Indian civilization, even if sure sections of that fabric were to be replaced.

Nehru saw the socialist civilization as some type of a cooperative civilization, in which each individual would provide of his best and would discover full scope for his own development. The very first step had to be the ending of the profit motive of the acquisitive civilization to which we are accustomed. The dilemma he faced was the result of his desire to avoid a violent upheaval that could have disastrous consequences for future generations of our people and to take the maximum number of people beside with him on the new path. This was no easy task, for the vested interests in the acquisitive civilization which he wanted to end were entrenched in the party and in the administrative tools which had necessarily to be his major instruments. Also, it was these interests who were active throughout the freedom thrash about, and even more in the years of freedom, and they were able to create the illusion of democratic functioning without active participation by the masses of our population who were to gain by the changes Nehru envisaged.

Once Nehru said that two contradictory and conflicting procedures could not go on face by face. That unluckily is what has been happening. The Directive Principles contain a broad outline of the type of socialist civilization envisaged, but the several amendments to other chapters of the Constitution that have been necessitate have brought out the dichotomy in thinking that characterized the Constitution-creation body. On another plane, the formulation of the concept of ~~mixed~~ "mixed economy" represent Ted on the one hand the ~~half-method home~~ "Nehru thought of and on the other the skill of the vested interests to stay ~~two~~ contradictory and conflicting procedures" going on face by face, a situation Nehru did not desire. It is no coincidence that the ~~mixed~~ "mixed economy" in operation has resulted in a strengthening of the monopoly and big business homes, and a consequent tightening of their hold on the administrative tools. If corruption has increased and the public sector has not been enlarged and strengthened to the extent it should have been, this

is because of acceptance of the “mixed economy” as something of a “half-method home”.

It necessity be said that Jawaharlal Nehru fully realized the difficulties inherent in seeking radical change by democratic procedures.

I think it is possible to set up socialism by democratic means provided, of course, the full democratic procedure is available.

There has been mass awakening as never before in our history, and despite huge illiteracy our people have demonstrated their capability to reject what is against their interests. But the real problem is that the democratic procedure is not yet fully urbanized, and the people have only limited choice. The limitations imposed by our circumstances, both historical and man-made, have helped both the urban and rural vested interests to twist the democratic procedure to suit their own ends which are diametrically opposed to the interests of the masses.

In thinking of a shape of socialism suited to our national needs and national genius, Nehru envisaged a limited lay for the private sector, but he was quite clear in relation to the framework.

In all that counts, in a material sense, nationalization of the instruments of manufacture and sharing appears to be inevitable. The question is whether there can be a step-by-step approach in this matter. Our experience with the takeover of the wholesale deal in food grains shows that partial events in dealing with manufacture and sharing of essential commodities can defeat the very objective. The fate of the land reform events has shown that an administrative machinery that is not geared to the task can job havoc. The continuing importance and power of the big business homes necessity be appear as the direct result of the failure to involve the people at the grassroots stage more and more in the procedures of scheduling, manufacture and sharing.

It is possible to discover fault with Jawaharlal Nehru for not having made the maximum use of his popularity to force the pace of change, but to do so is to overlook the historical forces that had shaped him and the historical circumstances in which he had to function, separately from his own commitment to the democratic procedures as well as to the instruments at his

disposal. It is debatable how much more he could have achieved in his lifetime, but it is indisputable that he laid firm foundations for the type of civilization we want to build in this country. It is for us and for future generations to build on these foundations.

Nehru was conscious that the Indian Revolution would be extensive and arduous, for he said: "Leaders and individuals may approach and go; they may get tired and slacken off; they may compromise and betray; but the exploited and suffering masses necessity carry on the thrash about, for their drill sergeant is hunger." If the social and economic burdens of the masses "continue and are actually added to, the fight necessity not only continue but grow more intense". The masses would ultimately assert themselves, and of this he had not the least doubt. It was his hope that the political parties and the administrative tools would help the masses to assert themselves and secure their rights. He was quite clear in his mind that a leadership that failed to take the masses nearer the goal of socialism would be thrown aside, and the mass upsurge in 1969 following the elimination of the Syndicate from the Congress would seem to bear this out, even if only in a very limited sense.

Nehru said: We have to plan at both ends. We have to stop the cumulative forces that create the rich richer and we have to start the cumulative forces which enable the poor to get in excess of the barrier of poverty.

The scheduling procedure unluckily has not gone on the method he had planned it to, and this is where the two main instruments on which he had to depend approach in.

Nehru wanted the services to "cease to think of themselves as some select coterie separately from the rest of the people", and he rejected people with the "coat and necktie" mentality. In other languages, he wanted a new kind of administrator to emerge, who could identify himself with the general people without effort and who would not become either a tool in the hands of vested interests or a self-seeker without a conscience. Unluckily this type of change has not approach in relation to the; on the other hand, the expanded administrative structure has careerists and self-seekers in several key positions. This has to change.

As for the other instrument, the Congress, it may now be in better form than in Nehru's time, but what he said in relation to the Congressmen remains relevant. Congressmen should create the organisation strong and effective. Use of money for boosting individuals in the organisations is very undesirable. Bogus members should be weeded out. Those in the organisation for whom the Congress is not an instrument for serving the country, who serve themselves and use it for their own ends...should be turned out.

He wanted the party to be a mass party, constantly in touch with the people and reflecting their aspirations, constantly struggling to end social and economic injustice. Some changes have taken place in the party in recent times, but it is still distant from being the type of instrument for change that Jawaharlal Nehru wanted it to be. It is to be hoped that the new forces at work within the Congress and the mass consciousness that has urbanized in the country will create it so.

Our aim and our troubles were succinctly summed up when Jawaharlal Nehru said:

- Socialism is the inevitable outcome of democracy. Political democracy has no meaning if it does not embrace economic democracy. And economic democracy is nothing but socialism. Monopoly is the enemy of socialism. To that extent it has grown throughout the last few years, we have drifted absent from the goal of socialism.

Subhash Chandra Bose and Socialism

He was a section of left-wing opposition to the Gandhian right-wing within the Indian National Congress. He was influenced by Lenin, Kamal Pasha, Mussolini, Aurobindo and Vivekananda.

Dissimilar Behaviors of Bose

His leftism had three phases. In the late 1920s, it was marked by his opposition to the Dominion States. In the thirties he wanted the end of imperialism and after independence, he wanted the socialist stage of movement to begin. He said, "I am an extremist, all or nothing." He began his public life as a non-cooperator in 1921. He was dissatisfied with Gandhian

ways. In 1923, he joined the Swarajist Party of C.R. Das because he was not in agreement with Gandhi. From a Swarajist he became a member of the Independence League. He beside with Srinivasa Iyenger shaped the Congress Democratic Party at the Lahore Congress of 1929. He refused to sign a declaration of the then Viceroy Irwin. He became the president of the Congress in 1938 and 1939. As a president he wanted to provide ultimatum to the government for complete independence, but he had to resign from presidentship under Gandhi's pressure. He wanted to organise the leftist forces and so shaped the Forward bloc in 1939. This was preceded by some developments. In the 1930s the peasantry and the working class were getting restive, under the leadership of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, Prof. Ranga and Indulal Yagnik. The peasant organisations demanded abolition of landlordism, reduction in land tax and debt. The Congress leadership could not take up these issues to the satisfaction of Subhash Chandra Bose. Bose wanted complete independence and establishment of socialism in India after freedom from British rule. He could, though, not succeed in structure a strong left consolidation committee, unlike the one which was shaped in Bombay in June 1940 comprising the Socialists, the Radical League of M.N. Roy and the Communists.

Rammanohar Lohia and Socialism

Rammanohar Lohia became the mainly prominent socialist leader in the post-independence era. He was active in bringing in relation to the Asian Socialist Conference of 1953. He stood for combining the principles of socialism with those of Gandhism. He laid emphasis on adapting socialism to the specifics of the Indian civilization. In 1952, he pleaded for greater incorporation of Gandhian thoughts in socialist thought. He advocated decentralization of the economy based on the revival of the cottage industries. He preferred small machines to big machines in the economy of the country. He was opposed to any type of co-operation with the Congress. He laid basis of anti-Congressism in India. He was equally opposed to the communists: He supported the principle of "equidistance" vis-à-vis the Congress and the Communists. He broke from the Praja Socialist Party in 1955 on the issue of

supporting the Congress. Lohia, in information, gave a theory of mobilization of the backward classes. He said that the socialists could capture power by mobilizing the backward classes. He held caste to be one of the mainly powerful exploiting organizations in India. The backward classes, just as to him, should shape the government to introduce the policies based on the principles of socialism. He accepted the Marxian principle of dialectical materialism, but whispered that consciousness played a more determining role than the economy. He whispered that in history there was constant disagreement flanked by the well-organised castes and the loosely organised classes. Caste represented conservative forces in the civilization, just as to him.

-

- **JAWAHARLAL NEHRU**

Jawaharlal Nehru (14 November 1889 – 27 May 1964) was the first Prime Minister of India and a central figure in Indian politics for much of the 20th century. He appeared as the paramount leader of the Indian Independence Movement under the tutelage of Mahatma Gandhi and ruled India from its establishment as an self-governing nation in 1947 until his death in office in 1964. Nehru is measured to be the architect of the contemporary Indian nation-state; a sovereign, socialist, secular, and democratic republic. He was the father of Indira Gandhi and the maternal grandfather of Rajiv Gandhi, who were to later serve as the third and sixth Prime Ministers of India, respectively.

The son of a prominent lawyer and nationalist statesman, Nehru was a graduate of Cambridge University and the Inner Temple, where he trained to be a barrister. Upon his return to India, he enrolled at the Allahabad High Court while taking an interest in national politics. Nehru's involvement in politics would slowly replace his legal practice. A committed nationalist since his teenage years, Nehru became a rising figure in Indian politics throughout the upheavals of the 1910s. He became the preeminent leader of the left-wing factions of the Indian National Congress throughout the 1920s, and eventually of the whole Congress, with the tacit approval of his mentor, Gandhi. As Congress President, Nehru described for complete independence from Britain,

and initiated a decisive shift towards the left in Indian politics. He was the principal author of the Indian Declaration of Independence (1929).

Nehru and the Congress dominated Indian politics throughout the 1930s as the country moved towards independence. His thought of a secular nation state was seemingly validated when the Congress under his leadership swept the provincial elections in 1937 while the separatist Muslim League failed to shape a government in any of the Indian provinces. But, these achievements were seriously compromised in the aftermath of the Quit India Movement in 1942 which saw the British effectively crush the Congress as a political organisation. Nehru, who had reluctantly heeded Gandhi's call for immediate independence, for he had desired to support the Allied war effort throughout the World War II, came out of a lengthy prison term to a much altered political landscape. The Muslim League under his old Congress colleague and now *bête noire*, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, had approach to control Muslim politics in India. Negotiations flanked by Nehru and Jinnah for power sharing failed and gave method to the independence and bloody partition of India in 1947.

Nehru was elected by the Congress to assume office as self-governing India's first Prime Minister although the question of leadership had been settled as distant back in 1941, when Gandhi acknowledged Nehru as his political heir and successor. As Prime Minister, Nehru set out to realize his vision of India. The Constitution of India was enacted in 1950, after which he embarked on an ambitious program of economic, social and political reforms. Chiefly, he oversaw India's transition from a monarchy to a republic, while nurturing a plural, multi-party democracy. In foreign policy, Nehru took a leading role in Non-Alignment while projecting India as a local hegemony in South Asia.

Under Nehru's leadership, the Congress appeared as a catch-all party, dominating national politics and winning consecutive elections in 1951, 1957, and 1962. He remained popular with the people of India in spite of political troubles in his final years as exemplified by the defeat in the Sino-Indian War. Guha writes, "[had] Nehru retired in 1958 he would be remembered as not presently India's best prime minister, but as one of the great statesmen of the

contemporary world." Nehru, therefore, left behind a disputed legacy, being "either adored or reviled for India's progress or lack of it." What is not disputed, though, is his impact on India, with it being observed "that if Nehru had been a dissimilar type of man, India would have been a dissimilar type of country."

Vital Characteristics of Nehru's Political Thought

Nehru wanted the model of Democratic Socialism which suits Indian traditions and ethos. He was influenced by Fabian Socialism of Britain. Several of the active members were his friends. He was of the opinion, that Parliamentary politics is the means of achieving socialism. Multiple social groups and ideological groups will strengthen Indian democracy. Pluralism will become the ideological basis of individual liberty and societal demands necessity has a beautiful reconciliation.

Nehru's Legacy to the Indian Nationalist Movement

Throughout the last stage of the Indian national movement, Gandhi was its mainly prominent leader. After that to him was Jawaharlal Nehru. He made a distinctive and specific contribution to it and to Indian nationalism. The first was the international outlook urbanized by Indians under Nehru's guidance. Approximately all the significant resolutions of the Congress working committee on world affairs were drafted by him.

Nehru made visits to the Brussels Conference on anti-imperialism. He conceived India's thrash about for freedom as a section of the thrash about of other dependent peoples against imperialism. He attracted the socialists, the communists, the representatives of deal unions and the peasants to the nationalist movement by creation repeated statements that the national thrash about for freedom was not only for political freedom from foreign power, but for social equality and freedom from p6verty as well. In other languages, he gave an economic content to it.

Nation-Structure after 1947

The tasks before a leader, who was the head of the government, were dissimilar from that of a leader of the nationalist movement, which had the objective of achieving freedom for the country. Until freedom was achieved the single objective of achieving independence kept dissimilar political forces united and the mainly dominant political force eclipsed all others. In India these dissimilar political forces before 1947 were: the liberals, the Hindu militants, the communalist Muslims, the Gandhians, the Congress socialists, the communists and local political forces based on linguistic forces.

Nehru was historically described upon to unite these forces or fight against the secessionists and promote Indian nationalism. After the making of Pakistan, the Muslim separatists were not a major force. Gandhi's martyrdom at the hands of a Hindu fanatic weakened the Hindu fanatics after 1948. But it was the relentless ideological fight against them led by Nehru which made them politically and administratively weak. If India remained as a modern

state and civil civilization and the information that a superior number of Muslims were livelihood in freedom and security in India than in Pakistan, it was because of Nehru's continuous preaching of secularism in India. Nehru made it clear that religion has no function in public life, particularly in politics. Nehru's secular thinking shaped under the power of liberal western education. As a liberal, he separated politics and religion. Religion has no function in politics, when religious 'forces get active in politics, they become collective. Nehru differentiated majority communalism from minority communalism. He thinks that majority communalism can grow into fascism. In creation the Indian constitution secular and in providing equal rights to all religious groups Nehru's contribution is important. The Indian state remnants a secular and democratic state without any allegiance towards any religion.

Views on Socialism and Social Revolution

Nehru whispered in planned economy for maximum utilization of possessions. He did not- favor nationalization of private capital. In his scheme of economic development, mixed economy should play a prominent role. Both public sector and private sector necessity help each other in removing poverty and the other vital troubles of Indian Civilization. The above was based on the socialist thought that the market economy and the unregulated capitalism, based on profit-creation basis, alone, should not determine the character of economy. Nehru wanted the public sector to have commanding heights in the economy. That is why he wanted the public sector to play a vital section in regard to the development of heavy industries like steel and the exploration of oil possessions in India.

Industrialization necessity aim in creating an equalitarian civilization. In Nehru's scheme, big industries with advance technology have a major role. As Nehru states that "I am all for tractors and big machinery. I am influenced that rapid industrialization of India is essential to reduce the pressure on land to combat poverty and raise average of livelihood, for protection and a diversity of other purpose. But I am equally influenced that the mainly careful scheduling and

adjustment are necessary if we are to reap the full benefits of industrialization and avoid any of its dangers.”

-

- **SUBHASH CHANDRA BOSE**

Subhas Chandra Bose (23 January 1897 – strange) also recognized as Netaji was one of the mainly prominent Indian nationalist leaders who attempted to gain India's independence from British rule by force throughout the waning years of World War II with the help of the Axis powers.

Bose, who had been ousted from the Indian National Congress in 1939 following differences with the more conservative high command, and subsequently placed under home arrest by the British, escaped from India in early 1941. He turned to the Axis powers for help in gaining India's independence by force. With Japanese support, he organised the Indian National Army (INA), composed mainly of Indian soldiers of the British Indian army who had been captured in the Battle of Singapore by the Japanese. As the war turned against them, the Japanese came to support a number of countries to shape provisional governments in the captured areas, including those in Burma, the Philippines and Vietnam, and in addition, the Provisional Government of Azad Hind, presided by Bose. Bose's effort, though, was short existed; in 1945 the British army first halted and then reversed the Japanese U Go offensive, beginning the successful section of the Burma Campaign. The INA was driven down the Malay Peninsula, and surrendered with the recapture of Singapore. It was accounted that Bose died soon thereafter from third degree burns received after attempting to escape in an overloaded Japanese plane which crashed in Taiwan, which is disputed. The trials of the INA soldiers at Red Fort, Delhi, in late 1945 caused vast public response in India.

Clement Attlee, the British Prime Minister throughout whose rule India became self-governing, mentioned that INA behaviors of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose (which weakened the Indian Army – the very basis of the British Empire in India) and the Royal Indian Navy mutiny in 1946 were major reasons that made the British realize that they were no longer in a location to rule India.

Early Life

Subhas Chandra Bose was born in a Bengali Hindu, Kayastha family on 23 January 1897 in Cuttack, Odisha, then a section of Bengal Presidency, to Janakinath Bose, an advocate and Prabhavati Devi. His parents' ancestral home was at Kodalia village (close to Baruipur; now recognized as Shubhashgram, South 24 Parganas, West Bengal). He was the ninth child of a total of fourteen siblings. He studied at Stewart School, Cuttack, an Anglo school, until the seventh average and then shifted to Ravenshaw Collegiate School. After securing the second location in the matriculation examination of Calcutta province in 1911, he got admitted to the Presidency College where he studied briefly. His nationalistic temperament came to light when he was expelled for assaulting Professor Oaten for the latter's anti-India comments. He later joined Scottish Church College under University of Calcutta and passed his B.A. in 1918 in philosophy. Subhas Chandra Bose left India in 1919 for Great Britain with a promise to his fathers that he would seem in the Indian Civil Services Examination (ICS). He went to revise in Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge, and matriculated on 19 November 1919. He came fourth in the ICS examination and was selected but he did not want to job under an alien government which would mean serving the British. He resigned from the civil service job and returned to India. He started the newspaper *Swaraj* and took charge of publicity for the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee. His mentor was Chittaranjan Das who was a spokesman for aggressive nationalism in Bengal. In the year 1923, Bose was elected the President of All India Youth Congress and also the Secretary of Bengal State Congress. He was also editor of the newspaper "Forward", founded by Chittaranjan Das. Bose worked as the CEO of the Calcutta Municipal Corporation for Das when the latter was elected mayor of Calcutta in 1924. In a roundup of nationalists in 1925, Bose was arrested and sent to prison in Mandalay, where he contracted tuberculosis.

National Politics

Indian National Congress

In 1927, after being released from prison, Bose became common secretary of the Congress party and worked with Jawaharlal Nehru for independence. Again Bose was arrested and jailed for civil disobedience; this time he appeared to become Mayor of Calcutta in 1930. Throughout the mid-1930s Bose travel-led in Europe, visiting Indian students and European politicians, including Benito Mussolini. He observed party organisation and saw communism and fascism in action. By 1938 Bose had become a leader of national stature and agreed to accept nomination as Congress president.

He stood for unqualified Swaraj (self-governance), including the use of force against the British. This meant a confrontation with Mohandas Gandhi, who in information opposed Bose's presidency, splitting the Indian National Congress party. Bose attempted to uphold unity, but Gandhi advised Bose to shape his own cabinet. The rift also divided Bose and Nehru. Bose appeared at the 1939 Congress meeting on a stretcher. He was elected president again in excess of Gandhi's preferred candidate Pattabhi Sitaramayya. U. Muthuramalingam Thevar strongly supported Bose in the intra-Congress dispute. Thevar mobilized all south India votes for Bose. Though, due to the maneuverings of the Gandhi-led clique in the Congress Working Committee, Bose establish himself forced to resign from the Congress presidency.

All India Forward Bloc

On 22 June 1939 Bose organised the Forward Bloc, aimed at consolidating the political left, but its main strength was in his house state, Bengal. U Muthuramalingam Thevar, who was disillusioned by the official Congress leadership which had not revoked the Criminal Tribes Act (CTA), joined the Forward Bloc. When Bose visited Madurai on 6 September, Thevar organised a huge rally as his reception.

Bose advocated the approach that the political instability of war-time Britain should be taken advantage of—rather than basically wait for the British to grant independence after the end of the war (which was the view of

Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and a part of the Congress leadership at the time). In this, he was influenced by the examples of Italian statesmen Giuseppe Garibaldi and Giuseppe Mazzini.

His correspondence reveals that despite his clear dislike for British subjugation, he was deeply impressed by their methodical and systematic approach and their steadfastly disciplinarian outlook towards life. In England, he exchanged thoughts on the future of India with British Labour Party leaders and political thinkers like Lord Halifax, George Lansbury, Clement Attlee, Arthur Greenwood, Harold Laski, J.B.S. Haldane, Ivor Jennings, G.D.H. Cole, Gilbert Murray and Sir Stafford Cripps. He came to consider that a free India needed socialist authoritarianism, on the rows of Turkey's Kemal Atatürk, for at least two decades. Bose was refused permission by the British authorities to meet Atatürk at Ankara for political reasons. Throughout his sojourn in England, only the Labour Party and Liberal politicians agreed to meet with Bose when he tried to schedule appointments. Conservative Party officials refused to meet Bose or illustrate him courtesy because he was a politician coming from a colony. In the 1930s leading figures in the Conservative Party had opposed even Dominion status for India. It was throughout the Labour Party government of 1945–1951, with Attlee as the Prime Minister, that India gained independence. On the outbreak of war, Bose advocated a campaign of mass civil disobedience to protest against Viceroy Lord Linlithgow's decision to declare war on India's behalf without consulting the Congress leadership. Having failed to persuade Gandhi of the necessity of this, Bose organised mass protests in Calcutta calling for the 'Holwell Monument' commemorating the Black Hole of Calcutta, which then stood at the corner of Dalhousie Square, to be removed. He was thrown in jail by the British, but was released following a seven-day hunger strike. Bose's home in Calcutta was kept under surveillance by the CID.

Escape from British India to Nazi Germany & Japan

Bose's arrest and subsequent release set the scene for his escape to Germany, via Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. A few days before his escape, he sought solitude and on this pretext avoided meeting British guards

and grew a beard on the night of his escape, he dressed as a Pathan to avoid being recognized. Bose escaped from under British surveillance at his home in Calcutta. On 19 January 1941, accompanied by his nephew Sisir K. Bose in a car that is now on display at his Calcutta house.

He journeyed to Peshawar with the help of the Abwehr, where he was met by Akbar Shah, Mohammed Shah and Bhagat Ram Talwar. Bose was taken to the house of Abad Khan, a trusted friend of Akbar Shah's. On 26 January 1941, Bose began his journey to reach Russia by British India's North West boundary with Afghanistan. For this cause, he enlisted the help of Mian Akbar Shah, then a Forward Bloc leader in the North-West Boundary Province. Shah had been out of India en route to the Soviet Union, and suggested a novel disguise for Bose to assume. Since Bose could not speak one word of Pashto, it would create him an easy target of Pashto speakers working for the British. For this cause, Shah suggested that Bose act deaf and dumb, and let his beard grow to mimic those of the tribesmen. Bose's guide Bhagat Ram Talwar, strange to him, was a Soviet agent.

Supporters of the Aga Khan III helped him crossways the border into Afghanistan where he was met by an Abwehr element posing as a party of road construction engineers from the Organization Todt who then aided his passage crossways Afghanistan via Kabul to the border with Soviet Russia. After assuming the guise of a Pashtun insurance agent ("Ziaudddin") to reach Afghanistan, Bose changed his guise and traveled to Moscow on the Italian passport of an Italian nobleman "Count Orlando Mazzotta". From Moscow, he reached Rome, and from there he traveled to Germany. Once in Russia the NKVD transported Bose to Moscow where he hoped that Russia's traditional enmity to British rule in India would result in support for his plans for a popular rising in India. Though, Bose establish the Soviets' response disappointing and was rapidly passed in excess of to the German Ambassador in Moscow, Count von der Schulenburg. He had Bose flown on to Berlin in a special courier aircraft at the beginning of April where he was to receive a more favorable hearing from Joachim von Ribbentrop and the Foreign Ministry officials at the Wilhelmstrasse.

In Germany, he instituted the Special Bureau for India under Adam von Trott zu Solz, broadcasting on the German-sponsored Azad Hind Radio. He founded the Free India Center in Berlin, and created the Indian Legion (consisting of some 4500 soldiers) out of Indian prisoners of war who had previously fought for the British in North Africa prior to their capture by Axis forces. The Indian Legion was attached to the Wehrmacht, and later transferred to the Waffen SS. Its members swore the following allegiance to Hitler and Bose: "I swear by God this holy oath that I will obey the leader of the German race and state, Adolf Hitler, as the commander of the German armed forces in the fight for India, whose leader is Subhas Chandra Bose". This oath clearly abrogates manage of the Indian legion to the German armed forces whilst stating Bose's overall leadership of India. He was also, though, prepared to envisage an invasion of India via the USSR by Nazi troops, spearheaded by the Azad Hind Legion; several have questioned his judgment here, as it appears unlikely that the Germans could have been easily persuaded to leave after such an invasion, which might also have resulted in an Axis victory in the War.

In all 3,000 Indian prisoners of war signed up for the Free India Legion. But instead of being delighted, Bose was worried. A left-wing admirer of Russia, he was devastated when Hitler's tanks rolled crossways the Soviet border. Matters were worsened by the information that the now-retreating German army would be in no location to offer him help in driving the British from India. When he met Hitler in May 1942 his suspicions were confirmed, and he came to consider that the Nazi leader was more interested in by his men to win propaganda victories than military ones. So, in February 1943, Bose turned his back on his legionnaires and slipped secretly absent aboard a submarine bound for Japan. This left the men he had recruited leaderless and demoralized in Germany.

Bose spent approximately three years in Berlin, Germany from 1941 until 1943. Throughout his earlier visit to Germany in 1934 he had met Emilie Schenkl, the daughter of an Austrian veterinarian whom he married in 1937. They had a daughter, Anita Bose Pfaff, who was born to them in 1942.

After being disillusioned that Germany could be of any help in liberating India, in 1943 he left for Japan. He traveled by the German submarine U-180 approximately the Cape of Good Hope to southeast of Madagascar, where he was transferred to the Japanese submarine *I-29* for the rest of the journey to Imperial Japan. This was the only civilian transfer flanked by two submarines of two dissimilar navies in World War II.

Leadership of Azad Hind Fauj and later Measures

The Indian National Army (INA) was originally founded by Captain Common Mohan Singh in Singapore on 1 September 1942 with Japan's Indian POWs in the Distant East. This was beside the concept of—and with support of—what was then recognized as the Indian Independence League, headed by expatriate nationalist leader Rash Behari Bose. The first INA was though disbanded in December after disagreements flanked by the Hikari Kikan and Mohan Singh, who came to consider that the Japanese High Command was by the INA as a mere pawn and propaganda tool. Mohan Singh was taken into custody and the troops returned to the prisoner-of-war camp. Though, the thought of a liberation army was revived with the arrival of Subhas Chandra Bose in the Distant East in 1943. In July, at a meeting in Singapore, Rash Behari Bose handed in excess of manages of the organisation to Subhas Chandra Bose. Bose was able to reorganize the fledgling army and organise huge support in the middle of the expatriate Indian population in south-east Asia, who lent their support by both enlisting in the Indian National Army, as well as financially in response to Bose's calls for sacrifice for the national cause. INA had a separate women's element, the Rani of Jhansi Regiment (named after Rani Lakshmi Bai) headed by Capt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, which is seen as a first of its type in Asia. Even when faced with military reverses, Bose was able to uphold support for the Azad Hind movement. Spoken as a section of a motivational speech for the Indian National Army at a rally of Indians in Burma on 4 July 1944, Bose's mainly well-known quote was "Provide me blood, and I shall provide you freedom!" In this, he urged the people of India to join him in his fight against the British Raj. Spoken in Hindi, Bose's languages are highly evocative. The troops of the INA were

under the aegis of a provisional government, the Azad Hind Government, which came to produce its own currency, postage stamps, court and civil code, and was recognized by nine Axis states—Germany, Japan, Italy, the Self-governing State of Croatia, Wang Jingwei regime in Nanjing, China, a provisional government of Burma, Manchukuo and Japanese-controlled Philippines. Recent researches have shown that the USSR too had recognized the "Provisional Government of Free India". Of those countries, five were authorities recognized under Axis job. This government participated in the so-described Greater East Asia Conference as an observer in November 1943.

The INA's first commitment was in the Japanese thrust towards Eastern Indian frontiers of Manipur. INA's special forces, the Bahadur Group, were extensively involved in operations behind enemy rows both throughout the diversionary attacks in Arakan, as well as the Japanese thrust towards Imphal and Kohima, beside with the Burmese National Army led by Ba Maw and Aung San.

Japanese also took possession of Andaman and Nicobar Islands in 1942 and a year later, the Provisional Government and the INA were recognized in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands with Lt Col. A.D. Loganathan appointed its Governor Common. The islands were renamed *Shaheed* (Martyr) and *Swaraj* (Independence). Though, the Japanese Navy remained in essential manage of the island's management. Throughout Bose's only visit to the islands in early 1944, when he was cautiously screened, by the Japanese authorities, from the regional population who at that time were torturing the leader of the Indian Independence League on the Islands, Dr. Diwan Singh, who later died of his injuries, in the Cellular Jail. The islanders made many attempts to alert Bose to their plight, but apparently without success. Enraged with the lack of administrative manage, Lt. Col Loganathan later relinquished his power and returned to the Government's headquarters in Rangoon.

On the Indian mainland, an Indian Tricolour, modelled after that of the Indian National Congress, was raised for the first time in the city in Moirang, in Manipur, in north-eastern India. The cities of Kohima and Imphal were placed under siege by divisions of the Japanese, Burmese and the Gandhi and Nehru Brigades of INA throughout the attempted invasion of India, also

recognized as Operation U-GO. Though, Commonwealth forces held both positions and then counter-attacked, in the procedure inflicting serious losses on the besieging forces, which were then forced to retreat back into Burma.

When Japanese funding for the army diminished, Bose was forced to raise taxes on the Indian populations of Malaysia and Singapore. When the Japanese were defeated at the battles of Kohima and Imphal, the Provisional Government's aim of establishing a base in mainland India was lost forever. The INA was forced to pull back, beside with the retreating Japanese army, and fought in key battles against the British Indian Army in its Burma campaign, notable in Meiktilla, Mandalay, Pegu, Nyangyu and Mount Popa. Though, with the fall of Rangoon, Bose's government ceased to be an effective political entity. A big proportion of the INA troops surrendered under Lt Col Loganathan. The remaining troops retreated with Bose towards Malaya or made for Thailand. Japan's surrender at the end of the war also led to the eventual surrender of the Indian National Army, when the troops of the British Indian Army were repatriated to India and some tried for treason.

On 6 July 1944, in a speech broadcast by the Azad Hind Radio from Singapore, Bose addressed Mahatma Gandhi as the "Father of the Nation" and asked for his blessings and good wishes for the war he was fighting. This was the first time that Gandhi was referred to by this appellation.

His mainly well-known quote/slogan was *Provide me blood and I will provide you freedom*. Another well-known quote was *Dilli Chalo* ("On to Delhi!") This was the call he used to provide the INA armies to motivate them. *Jai Hind*, or, "Glory to India!" was another slogan used by him and later adopted by the Government of India and the Indian Armed Forces. Other slogan coined by him was Ittefaq, Etemad, Qurbani. INA also used the slogan Inquilab Zindabad, which was coined by Maulana Hasrat Mohani.

Disappearance and Alleged Death

Bose is alleged to have died in a plane crash at Taihoku (Taipei), Taiwan, on 18 August 1945 while en route to Tokyo and perhaps then the Soviet Union. The Imperial Japanese Army Air Force Mitsubishi Ki-21 bomber he was traveling on had engine trouble and when it crashed Bose was

badly burned, dying in a regional hospital four hours later. His body was then cremated, and a Buddhist memorial service was held at Nishi Honganji Temple in Taihoku. His ashes were taken to Japan and interred at the Renkōji Temple in Tokyo. This version of measures is supported by the testimonies of a Captain Yoshida Taneyoshi, and a British spy recognized as "Agent 1189."

The absence of his body has led to several theories being put forward concerning his possible survival. One such claim is that Bose actually died later in Siberia, while in Soviet captivity. Many committees have been set up by the government of India to probe into this matter.

In May 1956, a four-man Indian team recognized as the Shah Nawaz Committee visited Japan to probe the circumstances of Bose's alleged death. Though, the Indian government did not then request assistance from the government of Taiwan in the matter, citing their lack of diplomatic dealings with Taiwan.

Though, the Inquiry Commission under Justice Mukherjee, which investigated the Bose disappearance mystery in the era 1999–2005, did approach the Taiwanese government, and obtained information from the Taiwan government that no plane carrying Bose had ever crashed in Taipei, and there was, in information, no plane crash in Taiwan on 18 August 1945 as alleged. The Mukherjee Commission also received a statement originating from the U.S. Department of State supporting the claim of the Taiwan Government that no such air crash took lay throughout that time frame.

The Justice Mukherjee Commission of Inquiry submitted its statement to the Indian government on 8 November 2005. The statement was tabled in Parliament on 17 May 2006. The probe said in its statement that Bose did not die in the plane crash, and that the ashes at the Renkoji Temple (said to be of Bose's) are not his. Though, the Indian Government rejected the findings of the Commission, however no reasons were cited.

Recently Netaji's grand nephew Sugata Bose in his book *His Majesty's Opponent* claimed that the founder of the Indian Independence League in Tokyo, Rama Murti had hidden a portion of alleged cremated remnants of Bose as "extra precaution" in his home and secondly, this portion has been brought to India in 2006 and the Prime Minister was informed in relation to

the development. But the Prime Minister's Office refused this claim in a statement issued in response to an RTI application, as "*As per records, no such information exists.*"

On the other hand in February 2012 Dr Purabi Roy, an expert on Russia and research scholar who also held a Chair in St Petersburg University, claimed that Bose was in USSR throughout Second World War. Roy claims to have establish "a unique photograph of Subhas Chandra Bose taken throughout Second World War" that might have been taken in Siberia.

Mystery in excess of Netaji's disappearance was first revealed by Satyendra Narain Sinha, who went to Japan, Taipei and China to follow the missing links. His article was published in a national daily in 1960s. But, Dr. Roy is the first who is claiming that Bose was in Russia. Reportedly Khrushchev had told an interpreter throughout his New Delhi visit that Bose can be produced within 45 days if Nehru wishes. But, that never happened. the Third Enquiry Commission on Netaji Disappearance, led by Justice Mukherjee, categorically announced Bose did not die at the Taihoku plane crash in 1945 as there was no plane crash throughout that era in an approximately the air strip, now in Taipei. Therefore the Commission had quashed the so-described urn of Netaji at Renkoji Temple in Tokyo, Japan.

In 1992, Bose was posthumously awarded the Bharat Ratna, India's highest civilian award, but it was later withdrawn in response to a Supreme Court directive following a Public Interest Litigation filed in the Court against the "posthumous" nature of the award. The Award Committee could not provide conclusive proof on Bose's death and therefore the "posthumous" award was invalidated. No headway was made on this issue though. Bose's portrait hangs in the Indian Parliament, and a statue of him has been erected in front of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly.

Bose Mystery in Modern India

Mission Netaji is a Delhi-based Indian non-profit trust that conducts research on Subhas Chandra Bose's disappearance. Some documents the organisation has dug out have information linked to Bose's disappearance. This led to more documents that remain classified. Many Indian ministries,

including the Indian Prime Minister's Office, have refused to create public the documents under the Right to Information Act campaign launched by Mission Netaji, on the ground that their disclosure will affect India's dealings with foreign countries.

Books on the Mystery

Several books have been published in self-governing India, dealing with the subject of Bose death mystery. This comprises books such as *Netaji: Dead or Alive?* by Samar Guha and *Back from Dead: Inside the Subhas Bose Mystery* by Anuj Dhar. Dhar's *India's Major Cover-up* contains several allegations and uses several "top secret" documents and photographs to argue that Bose was alive at least until 1985. The book accuses Pranab Mukherjee and the Indian Intelligence Bureau of foul play to prevent the truth from being revealed.

Ideology and Philosophy

Bose advocated complete unconditional independence for India, whereas the All-India Congress Committee wanted it in phases, by Dominion status. Finally at the historic Lahore Congress convention, the Congress adopted Purna Swaraj (complete independence) as its motto. Gandhi was given rousing receptions wherever he went after Gandhi-Irwin pact. Subhas Chandra Bose, traveling with Gandhi in these travels, later wrote that the great enthusiasm he saw in the middle of the people enthused him tremendously and that he doubted if any other leader anywhere in the world received such a reception as Gandhi did throughout these travels crossways the country. He was imprisoned and expelled from India. Defying the ban, he came back to India and was imprisoned again.

Bose was elected president of the Indian National Congress for two consecutive conditions, but had to resign from the post following ideological conflicts with Mohandas K. Gandhi and after openly attacking the Congress' foreign and internal policies. Bose whispered that Gandhi's tactics of non-violence would never be enough to secure India's independence, and advocated violent resistance. He recognized a separate political party, the All

India Forward Bloc and sustained to call for the full and immediate independence of India from British rule. He was imprisoned by the British authorities eleven times. His well-known motto was: "*Provide me blood and I will provide you freedom*".

His stance did not change with the outbreak of the Second World War, which he saw as an opportunity to take advantage of British weakness. At the outset of the war, he left India, traveling to the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan, seeking an alliance with each of them to attack the British government in India. With Imperial Japanese assistance, he re-organised and later led the Azad Hind Fauj or Indian National Army (INA), shaped with Indian prisoners-of-war and plantation workers from British Malaya, Singapore, and other sections of Southeast Asia, against British forces. With Japanese monetary, political, diplomatic and military assistance, he shaped the Azad Hind Government in exile, and regrouped and led the Indian National Army in failed military campaigns against the allies at Imphal and in Burma.

His political views and the alliances he made with Nazi and other militarist regimes at war with Britain have been the cause of arguments in the middle of historians and politicians, with some accusing him of fascist sympathies, while others in India have been more sympathetic towards the real politic that guided his social and political choices. It is also whispered in the middle of a part of people in India that if Subhas Ch. Bose could win the freedom of India himself the face of today's Indian sub-continent would have been dissimilar.

Political Philosophy

Subhas Chandra Bose whispered that the Bhagavad Gita was a great source of inspiration for the thrash about against the British. Swami Vivekananda's teachings on universalism, his nationalist thoughts and his emphasis on social service and reform had all inspired Subhas Chandra Bose from his very young days. The fresh interpretation of the India's ancient scriptures had appealed immensely to him. Several scholars consider that Hindu spirituality shaped the essential section of his political and social thought during his adult life, although there was no sense of bigotry or

orthodoxy in it. Subhas who described himself a socialist, whispered that socialism in India owed its origins to Swami Vivekananda. As historian Leonard Gordon explains "Inner religious explorations sustained to be a section of his adult life. This set him separately from the slowly rising number of atheistic socialists and communists who dotted the Indian landscape."

Bose's correspondence (prior to 1939) reflects his deep disapproval of the racist practices of, and annulment of democratic organizations in Nazi Germany. Though, he expressed admiration for the authoritarian ways (however not the racial ideologies) which he saw in Italy and Germany throughout the 1930s, and thought they could be used in structure an self-governing India.

Bose had clearly expressed his belief that democracy was the best option for India. The pro-Bose thinkers consider that his authoritarian manage of the Azad Hind was based on political pragmatism and a post-colonial recovery doctrine rather than any anti-democratic belief. Though, throughout the war (and perhaps as early as the 1930s) Bose appears to have decided that no democratic system could be adequate to overcome India's poverty and social inequalities, and he wrote that a socialist state alike to that of Soviet Russia (which he had also seen and admired) would be needed for the procedure of national re-structure. Accordingly some suggest that Bose's alliance with the Axis throughout the war was based on more than presently pragmatism, and that Bose was a militant nationalist, however not a Nazi nor a Fascist, for he supported empowerment of women, secularism and other liberal thoughts; alternatively, others consider he might have been by populist ways of mobilization general to several post-colonial leaders. Bose never liked the Nazis but when he failed to get in touch with the Russians for help in Afghanistan he approached the Germans and Italians for help. His comment was that if he had to shake hands with the devil for India's independence he would do that.

On 23 August 2007, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe visited the Subhas Chandra Bose memorial hall in Kolkata. Abe said to Bose's family "The Japanese are deeply moved by Bose's strong will to have led the Indian independence movement from British rule. Netaji is a much respected name in

Japan." Though in India several consider that Netaji was not given the due respect that he deserved. Infosys Technologies founder-chairman N. R. Narayana Murthy told– "We have not paid him due respect. It is time this is corrected," he said delivering the annual Netaji oration– "If only Netaji had participated in post-independence nation structure"

Desh Prem Divas

The West Bengal government decided in 2011 to observe Bose's birth anniversary (23 January) as *Desh Prem Divas* which means *Day of Patriotism*. However the Forward Bloc requested the Indian government to declare Bose's birth anniversary as Desh Prem Divas at a national stage, the government did not approve of it, citing that– "Several eminent personalities took section in the freedom thrash about of India and the immense contribution made by them cannot be judged relatively. If at all a day is to be declared as Desh Prem Divas, it does not seem to be appropriate to be so declared on the birth anniversary of any scrupulous personality. Even the birth anniversary of Mahatma Gandhi has not been declared as any special day relating to the freedom movement of India."

-

- **RAMMANOHAR LOHIA**

Ram Manohar Lohia (23 March 1910 – 12 October 1967) was an activist for the Indian independence movement and a Nationalist political leader.

Early Life

Lohia was born in a village Akbarpur in Ambedkar Nagar district, Uttar Pradesh, in India to Hira Lal, a nationalist and Chanda, a teacher. He was born to Marwari Maheshwari family. His mother died when he was very young. Ram was introduced to the Indian Independence Movement at an early age by his father by the several protest assemblies Hira Lal took his son to. Ram made his first contribution to the freedom thrash about by organizing a small hartal on the death of Lokmanya Tilak.

Hari Lal, an ardent follower of Mahatma Gandhi, took his son beside on a meeting with the Mahatma. This meeting deeply influenced Lohia and sustained him throughout trying circumstances and helped seed his thoughts, actions and love for swaraj. Ram was so impressed by Gandhiji's spiritual power and radiant self-manage that he pledged to follow the Mahatma's footsteps. He proved his allegiance to Gandhi, and more importantly to the movement as a whole, by joining a *satyagraha* march at the age of ten.

Lohia met Jawaharlal Nehru in 1921. In excess of the years they urbanized a secure friendship. Lohia, though, never hesitated to censure Nehru on his political beliefs and openly expressed disagreement with Nehru on several key issues. Lohia organized a student protest in 1928 to protest the all-white Simon Commission which was to consider the possibility of granting India dominion status without requiring consultation of the Indian people.

Lohia attended the Banaras Hindu University to complete his intermediate course job after standing first in his school's matric examinations. In 1929, Lohia completed his B.A. from Calcutta University. He decided to attend Berlin University, Germany in excess of all prestigious educational institutes in Britain to convey his dim view of British philosophy. He soon learned German and received financial assistance based on his outstanding academic performance.

Freedom Fighter

While in Europe, Lohia attended the League of Nations assembly in Geneva. India was represented by the Maharaja of Bikaner, an ally of the British Raj. Lohia took exception to this and launched a protest then and there from the visitor's gallery. He fired many letters to editors of newspapers and magazines to clarify the reasons for his protest. The whole incident made Lohia a recognized figure in India overnight. Lohia helped organize the Association of European Indians and became secretary of the club. The main focus of the organization was to preserve and expand Indian nationalism outside of India. Lohia wrote his PhD thesis paper on the topic of *Salt Satyagraha*, focusing on Gandhiji's socio-economic theory.

Return to India

Lohia joined the Indian National Congress as soon as he returned to India. Lohia was attracted to socialism and helped place the basis of Congress Socialist Party, founded 1934, by writing several impressive articles on the feasibility of a socialist India, especially for its journal, the *Congress Socialist*. When elected to the All India Congress Committee in 1936, Lohia shaped a foreign affairs department for the first time. Nehru appointed Lohia as the first secretary of the committee. Throughout the two years that he served he helped describe what would be India's foreign policy.

In the onset of the Second World War, Lohia saw an opportunity to collapse the British Raj in India. He made a series of caustic speeches urging Indians to boycott all government organizations. He was arrested on 24 May 1939, but released by authorities the very after that day in fear of a youth uprising.

Soon after his release, Lohia wrote an article described "Satyagraha Now" in Gandhiji's newspaper, Harijan, on 1 June 1940. Within six days of the publication of the article, he was arrested and sentenced to two years of jail. Throughout his sentencing the Magistrate said, "*He (Lohia) is a top-class scholar, civilized gentleman, has liberal ideology and high moral character.*" In a meeting of the Congress Working Committee Gandhi said, "*I cannot sit quiet as extensive 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.*" Lohia was mentally tortured and interrogated by his jailers. In December 1941, all the arrested Congress leaders, including Lohia, were released in a desperate effort by the government to stabilize India internally.

He vigorously wrote articles to spread the message of toppling the British imperialist governments from countries in Asia and Africa. He also came up with a hypothetical blueprint for new Indian municipalities that could self-administer themselves so well that there would not be need for the police or army.

Quit India

Gandhi and the Indian National Congress launched the Quit India movement in 1942. Prominent leaders, including Gandhi, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Jawaharlal Nehru and Maulana Azad, were jailed. The "secondary cadre" stepped-up to the challenge to continue the thrash about and to stay the flame for swaraj burning within the people's hearts. Leaders who were still free accepted out their operations from underground. Lohia printed and distributed several posters, pamphlets and bulletins on the theme of "*Do or Die*" on his secret printing-press. Lohia, beside with freedom fighter Usha Mehta, broadcast messages in Bombay from a secret radio station described Congress Radio for three months before detection, as a measure to provide the disarrayed Indian population a sense of hope and spirit in absence of their leaders. He also edited *Inquilab* (Revolution), a Congress Party monthly beside with Aruna Asaf Ali, Abdul Shaikh and Madiha took section in the Quit India Movement.

Lohia then went to Calcutta to revive the movement there. He changed his name to hide from the police who were closing in on him. Lohia fled to Nepal's thick jungles to evade the British. There he met, in the middle of other Nepalese revolutionaries, the Koirala brothers, who remained Lohia's allies for the rest of their lives.

Lohia was captured in May 1944, in Bombay. Lohia was taken to a notorious prison in Lahore, where it is alleged that he underwent extreme torture. His health was destroyed but even however he was never as fit his courage and willpower strengthened by the ordeal. Under Gandhiji's pressure, the Government released Lohia and his comrade Jayaprakash Narayan.

As India's tryst with freedom neared, Hindu-Muslim strife increased. Lohia strongly opposed partitioning India in his speeches and writings. He appealed to societies in riot torn areas to stay united, ignore the violence nearby them and stick to Gandhiji's ideals of non-violence. On 15 August 1947, as the rest of India's leadership gathered in Delhi for the handover of power, Lohia stayed by Gandhiji's face as he mourned the effects of Partition.

Goa and Nepal

Following his release by the British at Gandhi's intervention, Lohia decided to vacation with a communist friend in Goa, Juliao Menezes^{12 & 3}, author of the anti-Catholic and anti-Portuguese job "Contra Roma e além de Benares" ("Against Rome And Returning To Benares"), 1939 *Contra Roma e além de Benares*.

Juliao Menezes has admitted that his intention in inviting Lohia to Goa was to "disturb the peace in Goa". Moreover, Jawaharlal Nehru publicly admitted that Goa was foreign territory where Indian politicians had no business.

Once there, despite being an outsider and a tourist, Lohia began to meddle in regional political affairs, assisting the minuscule Goan Communist movement and fostering sedition. He decided to deliver a public speech but was arrested, briefly imprisoned, then expelled to British India. Gandhi wrote to vehemently protest the Goan Government's actions, affirming Indian irredentism vis-à-vis Goa, stating that Goa would not be allowed to remain separate from India. Gandhi said in response to the Goan Government's arrest & expulsion of Lohia:

- "The little Portuguese resolution which merely exists on the sufferance of the British Government can ill afford to ape its bad modes. 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 British arms to isolate and stay 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 approach to honorable conditions with the inhabitants, rather than function on any treaty that might exist flanked by them and the British Government"

Gandhi also said:

- "...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 general flanked by the Portuguese and the Indians in Goa."

Lohia attempted to re-enter Goa again on 28 September 1946 but was arrested at the Colem Railway Station at Colem, jailed with solitary confinement and then once again expelled with a ban on his re-entry for the after that five years. In alliance with his socialist and communist friends in Nepal, Lohia then began a parallel movement to bring Nepal within the ambit of the Indian state, Indian and Congress politics. While his friends, the Koiralas and their Nepal Congress, remained personally popular, the masses of the Nepalese people reacted negatively and with hostility at this effort to extend Indian irredentism against them, aggressively forcing Lohia on the back foot and to proximately abandon the notion.

Post Independence

Dr. Lohia favored Hindi as the official language of India, arguing

- "The use of English is a hindrance to original thinking, progenitor of inferiority feelings and a gap flanked by the educated and uneducated public. Approach, let us unite to restore Hindi to its original glory."

Lohia decided to create the mass public realize the importance of economic robustness for the nation's future. He encouraged public involvement in post-freedom reconstruction. He pressed people to construct canals, wells and roads voluntarily in their neighborhood. He volunteered himself to build a dam on river Paniyari which is standing till this day and is described "Lohia Sagar Dam." Lohia said "*satyagraha without constructive job is like a sentence without a verb.*" He felt that public job would bring unity and a sense of awareness in the society. He also was instrumental in having 60 percent of the seats in the legislature reserved for minorities, lower classes, and women.

As a democracy, the Parliament of India was obliged to listen to citizens' complaints. Lohia helped create a day described "Janavani Day" on which people from approximately the nation would approach and present their grievances to members of Parliament. The custom continues even today.

When he arrived in Parliament in 1963, the country had a one-party government by three common elections. Lohia shook things up. He had written a pamphlet, "25000 Rupees a Day", the amount spent on Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, an obscene sum in a country where the vast majority existed on 3 annas (less than one-quarter of a rupee) a day. Nehru demurred, saying that India's Scheduling Commission statistics showed that the daily average income was more like 15 annas (a little under a rupee) per day. Lohia demanded that this was a significant issue, one that cried out for a special debate. The controversy, still remembered in India as the "Teen Anna Pandrah Anna (3 annas –15 annas)" controversy. Member after member gave up his time to Lohia as he built his case, demolishing the Scheduling Commission statistics as fanciful. Not that the Commission was attempting to mislead, but the reality was that a small number of rich people were pulling up the average to present a wholly unrealistic picture. At that time, Lohia's figure was true for in excess of 70% of the population.

Unlike the Marxist theories which became fashionable in the third world in the 1950s and 1960s, Lohia recognized that caste, more than class, was the vast stumbling block to India's progress. It was Lohia's thesis that India had suffered reverses during her history because people had viewed themselves as members of a caste rather than citizens of a country.

Caste, as Lohia put it, was congealed class. Class was mobile caste. As such, the country was deprived of fresh thoughts, because of the narrowness and stultification of thought at the top, which was composed mainly of the upper castes, Brahmins and Baniyas, and tight compartmentalization even there, the former dominant in the intellectual arena and the latter in the business. A proponent of affirmative action, he compared it to turning the earth to foster a better crop, urging the upper castes, as he put it, "to voluntarily serve as the soil for lower castes to flourish and grow", so that the country would profit from a broader spectrum of talent and thoughts.

In Lohia's languages, *"Caste restricts opportunity. Restricted opportunity constricts skill. Constricted skill further restricts opportunity. Where caste prevails, opportunity and skill are restricted to ever-narrowing circles of the people"*. In his own party, the Samyukta (United) Socialist Party, Lohia promoted lower caste candidates both by giving electoral tickets and high party positions. However he talked in relation to the caste incessantly, he was not a casteist—his aim was to create sure people voted for the Socialist party candidate, no matter what his or her caste. His point was that in order to create the country strong, everyone needed to have a stake in it. To eliminate caste, his aphoristic prescription was, *"Roti and Beti"*, that is, people would have to break caste barriers to eat jointly (*Roti*) and be willing to provide their girls in marriage to boys from other castes (*Beti*).

Lohia's views on Capitalism and Marxism

Lohia was early to recognize that Marxism and Capitalism were alike in that both were proponents of the Big Machine. It was his belief that Big Industry was no solution for the third world (he even warned Americans, back in 1951, in relation to the their lives being taken in excess of by big corporations). He described Marxism the "last weapon of Europe against Asia". Propounding the "Principle of Equal Irrelevance", he rejected both Marxism and Capitalism, which were often presented as the only alternatives for third world nations. Nehru too had a alike view, at least insofar as he observed to Andre Malraux that his challenge was to *"build a presently civilization by presently means"*. Lohia had a strong preference for appropriate technology, which would reduce drudgery but not put the general man at the mercy of distant absent forces. As early as 1951, he foresaw a time of the 'monotonic mind', with nothing much to do because the troubles of livelihood had been all addressed by technology.

Lohia viewed capitalism as the doctrine of ~~people~~ livelihood upward of 40 degrees north of the equator'. He establish capitalism as being the doctrine of individual, free enterprise, mass manufacture and balance of power based- peace. *'Capitalism imposed the peace of death on Asia and elsewhere, caused their population to grow and their economic tools to decay,* Lohia

stated. He establishes how population and manufacture proceeded simultaneously in the middle of the white or pink people, but the colored people suffered crisis in civilization and crafts beside with the rampant population growth. He rejected the capitalist integration of Asia as capitalism bred poverty and war. He held a staunch view that capitalism will destroy the precarious national freedom.

His view on communism was as strong. Marxism and Soviet system was a fad in the middle of the first generation political elite of self-governing nations of Asia. Lohia was never enamored by these prevailing trends. He establishes a crisis inherent at the centre of the communist system. Communism necessitates a centralized party and subsequently a centralized state to develop the forces of manufacture. A dictatorial party and state is immoral and cannot uphold the morality of a utopia.

Dr. Lohia viewed that *communism inherits from capitalism its technique of manufacture, it only appears to smash the capitalist dealings of manufacture*. He viewed both as section of a single civilization as both are driven by continuous application of science to economy and rising average of livelihood. An individual may be either in US or in the Soviet Russia, is impelled by identical aims of rising output by mass manufacture.” Lohiaji stated that the contemporary civilization has split up into these two warring camps to renew itself.

Revolutionary Thinker

Aside from the procedural revolution of non-violent civil disobedience, bridging the rich-poor divide, the elimination of caste and the revolution against incursions of the big-machine, other revolutions in Lohia's list incorporated tackling Man-Woman inequality, banishing inequality based on color, and that of preserving individual privacy against encroachment of the collective.

Several of Lohia's revolutions have advanced in India, some with greater degrees of success than others. In some instances the revolutions have led to perverse results which he would have establish distasteful. Though, Lohia was not one to shy absent from either controversy or thrash about. Lohia

whispered that a party grew by taking up causes. He was a strong believer in popular action. In India's parliamentary system, where elections could be described even before the term was in excess of, he once said that *"Live societies don't wait for five years (the term of the parliament)"*, meaning that a government which misruled should be thrown out by the people. He accepted out this thought by moving the first no-confidence motion against the Nehru government, which had by then been in office for 16 years!

Lohia is often described a maverick socialist, a clichéd but nevertheless apt account. He gave that impression not to be controversial, but because he was always evolving his thoughts, and like his mentor, Gandhi, did not hesitate to speak the truth as he saw it. He often surprised both supporters and opponents. He astounded everyone by calling for India to produce the bomb, after the Sino-Indian War of 1962.

Lohia's Anti-English Views

He was anti-English, saying that the British ruled India with bullet and language (*bandhook ki goli aur angrezi ki boli*). Full of unforgettable phrases which would characterize a point of view, he captured who was a member of India's ruling class in with close to-mathematical precision that have not been bettered in three decades – *"high-caste, wealth, and knowledge of English are the three requisites, with anyone possessing two of these belonging to the ruling class"*. The definition still holds.

Lohia wanted to abolish private schools and set up upgraded municipal (government) schools which would provide equal academic opportunity to students of all castes. This he hoped would help eradicate the divisions created by the caste system.

At the Socialist Party's Annual Convention, Lohia set up a plan to decentralize the government's power so that the common public would have more power in Indian politics. He also shaped *"Hind Kisan Panchayat to resolve farmers everyday troubles"*.

Experiment with Non-Congressism

In 1963, he propounded the strategy of Non-Congressism. He was of the opinion that in the past three common elections the Congress won with a thumping majority and there was a feeling in the middle of the masses that the Congress cannot be defeated and it has approach to stay in power for ever. Lohia invited all the Opposition parties to field a single candidate against Congress nominees so that this illusion can be removed from the masses. This formula of Dr Lohia got vast success in the 1967 common elections and in nine States, the Congress party was defeated and Samyuktha Vidhayak Dal Governments were shaped by the Opposition parties of that time

Lohia was a socialist and wanted to unite all the socialists in the world to shape a potent platform. He was the Common Secretary of Praja Socialist Party. He recognized the World Development Council and eventually the World Government to uphold peace in the world. Throughout his last few years, besides politics, he spent hours talking to thousands of young adults on topics ranging from Indian literature to politics and art. Lohia, who was unmarried, died on 12 October 1967 in New Delhi. He left behind no property or bank balance.

Anecdotes

- While in school reading the prescribed history book, Lohia noted that the British author of the textbook referred to the great Hindu king Shivaji as a "bandit leader". Lohia researched the facts, and proved that the label "bandit leader" was an unjust account of the Maharaj. Lohia launched a campaign to have the account stricken from the textbook.
- When Lohia returned to India in 1933 from abroad, a comical situation arose. He had no money to reach his hometown from the airport. He quickly wrote a nationalistic article for *The Hindu*, one of the mainly popular and widely read newspapers, and got money to pay for the fare house.
- In the midst of the 1967 Lok Sabha elections, Ram Manohar Lohia was being desperately sought by a lady from Europe. Lohia was contesting from Kannauj, but he was mostly in Phulpur, Jawaharlal Nehru's

pocket borough, campaigning for the late Janeshwar Mishra, who was pitted against the formidable Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Nehru's sister. It was a watershed election in the sense that the results would finally illustrate that the Congress was not totally invincible, that dents could be made in its armour. So Lohia was leaving nothing to chance. But the messages from his aides in relation to the persistent European lady presently would not end. Finally, Lohia relented, put his election job aside. A meeting was fixed at Allahabad. The woman turned out to be Stalin's daughter Svetlana, desperately seeking extension of her visa to build a memorial for her late husband Brajesh Singh of the Kalkanker royal family. Since the erstwhile USSR was opposed to India entertaining Svetlana, even the information that Singh's nephew, Dinesh Singh, was in Indira Gandhi's inner circle did not help. Lohia, the stormy petrel of Indian politics, was her last hope. As expected, he advised Svetlana to fight it out, not leave India and he promised to raise her case in Parliament. At the similar time, Lohia, the fountainhead of anti-Congressism and an ardent opponent of the Nehru-Gandhi family, did all he could to capitalize on Svetlana's personal tragedy in political conditions. After the Allahabad meeting, Lohia turned to his colleagues and said, *"This is the variation flanked by Europe and Asia. The daughter of Stalin is running approximately in circles to extend her visa while the daughter of Nehru is India's Prime Minister."*

-

- **POLITICAL THOUGHT OF JP AND NARENDRA DEV**

Jay Prakash and Narendra Dev

A section of the middle class leaders turned radical and started talking the language of classes. Nehru and Acharya Narendra Dev rose to be the two prominent leaders of the nationalist politics and got recognition as radical progressive leaders. This stream snowballed into force in 1930s. JP, who had a Marxist orientation while he was studying in the USA, came back and joined

this rank. He came in close contact with Nehru and Narendra Dev and worked with them in the Congress organisation at Allahabad. JP's radical consciousness helped him to be a close confidant of Nehru. Interestingly, JP had good relations with Gandhi because his wife Prabhvati was working in Gandhi's Ashram while he was abroad. JP's personality turned out to be interesting and complex and he acquires a unique position in the history of national movement.

Basic Philosophy of JP and Narendra Dev

Both JP and Narendra Dev wanted to work within the national congress and create political platform for socialists and other left wingers. They realized that the congress was a platform which needed a new orientation. There was no point in creating another political party. According to them the Congress party offered enough space for accommodating different ideological groups. It was also the class character of the Indian national movement that helped in maintaining such a complex ideological framework. Acharya Narendra Dev said "for a subject, colonial state political independence is the first step on the road to socialism. In a middle class revolutionary movement, for socialism to stay away from the nationalist movement would be fatal. It is also essential, for the success of the national movement, to base itself on the support of the people together with middle class. The economic well-being of the common people must, however, find a central place in the programme of the movement. The Congress Socialist Party must not divorce the national movement from the revolutionary aspirations of workers, peasants and the middle class." This was the famous speech given by Acharya Narendra Dev at the CSP's first conference at Patna in 1934, Both JP and Narendra Dev recognized the importance of the congress party as the leader of the anti-imperialist struggle; Secondly, they recognized the importance of class politics in the congress. Thirdly, the fact that the ideology of socialism was going to play a significant role in the national movement. Fourthly, the CSP was going to function as a pressure group in the congress It would be neither a political party nor an alternative to the congress.

JP and the Formation of the Congress Socialist Party (CSP)

The Congress socialist party was formed in the Nasik Jail when JP, Lohia, Ashok Mehta, Achyut Patwardhan and Minoo Masani decided to float an organisation. Left wing intellectuals because of their political conviction floated a forum. At the same time, mass politics in the civil disobedience movement got radicalized. Kisan Sabha and All India Trade Union Congress became two powerful class fronts. Combination of social forces with intellectuals created a powerful socialist movement in India. JP, as a Marxist intellectual wrote a book—'Why Socialism', which helped the Left wing people all over India to clarify their doubts regarding the concept of socialism. This book was published on behalf of the congress socialist party. In this work, he developed four important theses:

- The foundations of socialism
- What the congress socialist stands for
- Alternatives
- Methods and techniques

Socialist Programme and Narendra Dev

The Socialist Party brought out a socialist programme which clearly indicates their viewpoint. First, for nationalization big capital was necessary, but not abolition of private property. Secondly, their main emphasis was on the abolition of the Zamindaries in rural India. Land reforms should be implemented which would bring land to the tiller. In other words, they pleaded for the growth of the peasant proprietor and small industrial capital. Narendra Dev was much more clear in the concept of democratic socialism. Democracy cannot survive without socialism and vice versa. Human Freedom is the basis of acquiring a socialistic pattern of society.

Socialism and Democracy

He said socialism for which we stand is democratic because:

- It is opposed to hierarchical conception of society;

- It is opposed to the control of social power, political or economic by a single person or a privileged class in any form of despotism, dictatorship, feudalism or capitalism;
- It is opposed to imperialism and foreign domination in all forms and recognizes the entire right of democratic freedom;
- It favors democratization of social relations and behaviours;
- It establishes the control of the working people over social, economic and political powers;
- It provides for self govt. in all social, political and economic affairs;
- It evolves order on the basis of liberty, i.e. free participation of all concerns;
- It provides for democratic decentralization of power and responsibility;
- It assures social equality and justice by attaching priority to the needs as claims for fun physical, mental as moral development of all;
- It provides social happiness, of which individual happiness is a constituent;
- It regards the people as a source of authority and recognizes their right to revolt in case a single person or a minority group or class attempts to seize or retain control over government, institutions or social power and
- It favors a democratic organisation for peace and international relations.

Opposition to the Third International

Narendra Dev stoutly opposed the policy of the Third International which split and weakened the anti-imperialist forces and sought to discredit Indian nationalism and its leaders. He said that nation:tlisn was a potent social force and it was not meant to create a head-on-clash between nations or class struggles.

Socialism not a Borrowed Ideology

Socialism was not a borrowed ideology for Narendra Dev. He never abused Gandhi's constructive programme. He only felt that it must be

supplemented by a class organisation for the abolition of vested property rights. He was prepared to accept Satyagraha as an instrument of class conflict in India. But he felt that it would be unrealistic to believe that feudal landlords who levied unlawful exactions upon their tenants and capitalists who cared more for profits than for protection could become dependable trustees of national resources.

The failure of the civil disobedience movement could not be explained in terms of the moral inadequacy of the Satyagrahis. The freedom movement was only an expression of the educated middle class. If it had to gain strength, it must evoke new response from the people working in fields and factories. Political freedom must be translated in terms of long delayed relief of economic and social leaderships.

Socialists in the Largely Post-independence Period

Socialists committed the biggest mistake by not participating in the 1946 elections which were the basis of formation of the constituent Assembly. Later JP lamented over the matter. He admitted that it was the biggest blunder they had committed. After independence, the congress high command gave a call that no other ideological group had any place in their organisation. That is why the socialists decided to leave the congress party in 1950 and to oppose it as well. They decided to strengthen the democratic system by creating a strong opposition. Socialist party contested the 1952 general elections and was virtually routed. 1952 became the historical moment in the history of Indian Socialist Politics. JP and Acharya Narendra Dev both got disillusioned with electoral politics. Narendra Dev remained as the leader of Praja Socialist Party till his death whereas IP joined the Bhoodan Movement under the leadership of Vinobha Bhave. IP remained next to Vinobha in the Bhoodan movement. IP played a very active role in making the Bhoodan movement a success.

●

● REVIEW QUESTIONS

- What do you understand by evolutionary socialism?

- Discuss the various conditions for the rise of the socialist movement in India.
- Briefly comment on Rammanohar Lohia's contribution to socialism in India.
- Explain the main features of Nehru's views on nationalism and social revolution.
- What were the basic features of Nehru's thought?
- Briefly discuss Nehru's legacy to the national movement.
- Explain in brief the historical foundation of Subhash Bose's political philosophy.
- Discuss Bose's views on Nationalism. What arguments did he give in support of Swadeshi?
- What is the basic philosophy of JP and Narendra Dev?
- How did JP interpret Marxism?
- Briefly discuss Acharya Narendra Dev's views on socialism.

CHAPTER 8

Communists: Nationalism and Social Revolution

● **STRUCTURE**

- Learning objectives
- Introduction
- Communists and the Indian National Movement 1925-47
- M.N. Roy—Marxism and Radical Humanism
- Contemporary Marxist thinking
- Nationalism and social revolution
- Review questions

● **LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Explain the economic and political developments in the twentieth century.
- Describe and discuss the origins of the left wing in India.
- Comment on M.N. Roy's views on the Indian social reality.
- Understand the contribution of M.N. Roy towards the development of communism in India and to critically assess the Marxist analyses of Indian society.
- The uniqueness of Indian Marxists' thinking.
- The implications of these contrasting viewpoints for the future of India's independence.

●

● **INTRODUCTION**

Economic and Political Background

Though inspired by the Russian Revolution, communism in India did not develop as a result of exogenous factors only. On the contrary, internal

economic and political situation since the outbreak of the First World War slowly but steadily created the ground congenial for the emergence of communist ideas on the Indian soil. Unfortunately, however, in their over-enthusiasm for internationalism the Indian communists could not always remain true to their own selves as the sons of the soil. This often resulted in the confusion between national and international tasks. But in order to comprehend the root cause of this confusion we should first know about the politico-economic situation prevailing in the country at the time of the inception of communism in India.

Economic Background

Growth of national capitalism provided the economic background of the emergence of Marxist groups in India. However, it was not until the First World War that conditions were ripe for the growth of capitalism in India. Before 1914 the industrial sector was dominated by the cotton and jute industries. During the war there was, on the one hand, a sharp fall in the volume of raw jute exports and, on the other, a fall in the imports of cotton piece goods. As a result there was substantial growth in both the industries. Cotton textiles, which were dominated by the Indian capitalists, experienced a growth in investment from a pre-war figure of Rs. 395 crores to Rs. 726 crores in 1922. Jute industry, which was mainly controlled by the British manufacturers, also experienced similar growth. Not only that, the total number of registered companies also increased from a pre-war figure of 356 to 1039 in 1920-21. Besides, the European businessmen increasingly found it hard to maintain their grip on the Indian economy so much so that many Indian manufacturers entered into such fields as engineering, iron and steel, paper, cement etc. Thus by the Twenties new Indian industrial groups had begun to emerge.

The setting up of the Industrial Commission in 1916 or the policy of differential protection advocated by the Fiscal Commission in 1922 no doubt paved the way for Indian Industrialization. But, in fact, the colonial government had no general policy of industrialization at that time. This is evident from the hardening of attitude of the imperialist government

immediately after the contingency of the war was over. Hence the growth in demand of certain goods and a change in India's commercial relations with the external world were the real stimulants for India's industrial growth.

Political Background

Growth in Indian capitalism also manifested itself in greater political mobilization both on the part of the national bourgeoisie and the working class. Hence most of the strikes during this period were defensive in character launched to fight wage cuts and retrenchment. Yet the working class was also getting more and more class conscious. The All-India Trade Union Congress was formed in 1920. Though the AITUC and its affiliated unions mainly fought economic battles, there was a distinct tendency for localized disputes to spread rapidly to other sections of industry. The working class also took active part in the non-cooperation movement as well as the Simon Commission boycott. This proved increasing political awareness among the nascent Indian proletariat.

The national bourgeoisie, too, got restive during this period. Refusal of the imperialist government to grant self-government after the war, the continuance of the anti-people Rowlatt Act, the Jallianwala Bagh atrocities, and the insufficiency of the Montague Chelmsford Reforms all these, accompanied by the imperialist stranglehold on the economy, inspired the national bourgeoisie to launch mass movements in support of its demands. It was during this period that the Indian National Congress, the chief spokesman of the Indian capitalist class, for the first time changed its political character from a small liberal constitutional body to a mass political party, led by an active petty bourgeoisie cadre and involving sections of the peasantry. The Congress, under the supreme leadership of Gandhi, began to consolidate the political and economic position of the Indian bourgeoisie by forcing a series of concessions from the colonial state through the periodic mobilization of mass pressure. Despite the presence of left Congressites like Nehru and Bose, Gandhi was the linchpin of the national movement. Gandhi, with the help of his creed of non-violence, not only put pressure on the colonial government but also effectively checked the emergence of national revolutionary

movements for social revolution. Thus the Congress combined in itself the narrow class demands of the national bourgeoisie with the broad demands of the masses.

-

- **COMMUNISTS AND THE INDIAN NATIONAL
MOVEMENT 1925-47**

Left-wing Politics

In politics, left-wing describes an outlook or specific location that accepts or supports social equality, often in opposition to social hierarchy and social inequality. It usually involves a concern for those in civilization who are disadvantaged relative to others and an assumption that there are unjustified inequalities (which right-wing politics views as natural or traditional) that need to be reduced or abolished.

The political conditions *Left* and *Right* were coined throughout the French Revolution (1789–1799), referring to the seating arrangement in the Estates Common: those who sat on the left usually opposed the monarchy and supported the revolution, including the making of a republic and secularization, while those on the right were supportive of the traditional organizations of the Old Regime. Use of the term "Left" became more prominent after the restoration of the French monarchy in 1815 when it was applied to the "Independents".

The term was later applied to a number of movements, especially republicanism throughout the French Revolution, socialism, communism, and anarchism. Beginning in the last half of the Twentieth Century, the phrase left-wing has been used to describe an ever widening family of movements, including the civil rights movement, anti-war movements, and environmental movements, and finally being extended to whole parties, including the Democratic Party in the United States and the Labour Party in the United Kingdom. In two party systems, the conditions "left" and "right" are now sometimes used as labels for the two parties, with one party designated as the

"left" and the other "right", even when neither party is "left-wing" in the original sense of being opposed to the ruling class.

History

In politics, the term *left wing* derives from the French Revolution, as radical Montagnard and Jacobin deputies from the Third Estate usually sat to the left of the president's chair in parliament, a habit which began in the Estates Common of 1789. During the 19th century in France, the main row dividing left and right was flanked by supporters of the French Republic and those of the Monarchy. The June Days Uprising throughout the Second Republic was an effort by the left to assert itself after the 1848 Revolution, but only a small portion of the population supported this.

In the mid-19th century, nationalism, socialism, democracy, and anti-clericalism became characteristics of the French Left. After Napoleon III's 1851 coup and the subsequent establishment of the Second Empire, Marxism began to rival radical republicanism and utopian socialism as a force within left-wing politics. The influential *Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, published in 1848, asserted that all human history is the history of class thrash about. They predicted that a proletarian revolution would eventually overthrow bourgeois capitalism and create a classless, stateless, post-monetary civilization.

In the United States, several leftists, social liberals, progressives and deal unionists were influenced by the works of Thomas Paine, who introduced the concept of asset-based egalitarianism, which theorizes that social equality is possible by a redistribution of possessions.

The International Workingmen's Association (1864–76), sometimes described the First International, brought jointly delegates from several dissimilar countries, with several dissimilar views in relation to the how to reach a classless and stateless civilization. Following a split flanked by supporters of Marx and Mikhail Bakunin, anarchists shaped the International Workers' Association. The Second International (1888–1916) became divided in excess of the issue of World War I. Those who opposed the war, such as Vladimir Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg, saw themselves as further to the left.

In the United States after Reconstruction, the phrase "the Left" was used to describe those who supported deal unions, the civil rights movement and the anti-war movement. More recently in the United States, *left-wing* and *right-wing* have often been used as synonyms for Democratic and Republican, or as synonyms for *liberalism* and *conservatism* respectively.

Positions

The following positions are typically associated with left-wing politics.

Economics

Leftist economic beliefs range from Keynesian economics and the welfare state by industrial democracy and the social market to nationalization of the economy and central scheduling. Throughout the industrial revolution, left-wingers supported deal unions. In the early twentieth century, the Left was associated with policies advocating extensive government intervention in the economy. Leftists continue to criticize what they perceive as the exploitative nature of globalization, the *race to the bottom* and unjust place-offs. In the last quarter of the Twentieth Century the belief that government (ruling in accordance with the interests of the people) ought to directly involve itself in the day to day workings of an economy declined in popularity amongst the center left, especially social-democrats who became influenced by 'third method' ideology.

Other leftists consider in Marxian economics, which are based on the economic theories of Karl Marx. Some distinguish Marx's economic theories from his political philosophy, arguing that Marx's approach to understanding the economy is self-governing of his advocacy of revolutionary socialism or his belief in the inevitability of proletarian revolution. Marxian economics does not exclusively rely upon Marx, it draws from a range of Marxist and non-Marxist sources. The dictatorship of the proletariat or workers' state is conditions used by Marxists to describe what they see as a temporary state flanked by the capitalist and communist civilization. Marx defined the proletariat as salaried workers, in contrast to the proletariat, who he defined as outcasts of civilization, such as beggars, tricksters, entertainers, buskers,

criminals and prostitutes. The political relevance of farmers has divided the left. In *Das Kapital*, Marx scarcely mentioned the subject. Mao Zedong whispered that it would be rural peasant's not urban workers who would bring in relation to the proletariat revolution.

Left-libertarians, Libertarian socialists and left-wing anarchists consider in a decentralized economy run by deal unions, workers' councils, cooperatives, municipalities and communes, and oppose both government and private manage of the economy, preferring *regional manage*, in which a nation of decentralized areas are united in a confederation.

Just as to Barry Clark:

- Leftists... claim that human development flourishes when individuals engage in cooperative, mutually respectful dealings that can thrive only when excessive differences in status, power, and wealth are eliminated. Just as to leftists, a civilization without substantial equality will distort the development of not only deprived persons, but also those whose privileges undermine their motivation and sense of social responsibility. This suppression of human development, jointly with the resentment and disagreement engendered by sharp class distinctions, will ultimately reduce the efficiency of the economy.

The global justice movement, also recognized as the anti-globalization movement or alter-globalization movement, protests against corporate economic globalization, due to its alleged negative consequences for the poor, workers, the environment and small businesses.

The Environment

Both Karl Marx and the early socialist William Morris arguably had a deep concern for environmental matters. Just as to Marx, “Even an whole civilization, a nation, or all simultaneously existing civilizations taken jointly... are not owners of the earth. They are basically its possessors, its beneficiaries, and have to bequeath it in an improved state to succeeding generations.” Following the Russian Revolution, environmental scientists such as revolutionary Aleksandr Bogdanov and the Proletkul't organisation made efforts to incorporate environmentalism into Bolshevism, and "integrate

manufacture with natural laws and limits" in the first decade of Soviet rule, before Joseph Stalin attacked ecologists and the science of ecology, purged environmentalists and promoted the pseudo-science of Trofim Lysenko. Likewise, Mao Zedong rejected environmentalism and whispered that, based on the laws of historical materialism, all of nature necessity be put into the service of revolution.

From the 1970s onwards, environmentalism became an rising concern of the left, with social movements and some unions campaigning in excess of environmental issues. For instance, the left-wing Builders Labourers Federation in Australia, led by the communist Jack Mundy, united with environmentalists to lay Green Bans on environmentally destructive development projects. Some segments of the socialist and Marxist left consciously merged environmentalism and anti-capitalism into an eco-socialist ideology. Barry Commoner articulated a left-wing response to The Limits to Growth model that predicted catastrophic resource depletion and spurred environmentalism, postulating that capitalist technologies were chiefly responsible for environmental degradation, as opposed to population pressures. Environmental degradation can be seen as a class or equity issue, as environmental destruction disproportionately affects poorer societies and countries.

Many left-wing or socialist groupings have an overt environmental concern, whereas many green parties contain a strong socialist attendance. For instance, the Green Party of England and Wales characteristics an eco-socialist group, Green Left, that was founded in June 2005 and whose members held a number of influential positions within the party, including both the former Principal Speakers Siân Berry and Dr. Derek Wall, himself an eco-socialist and Marxist academic. In Europe, some 'Green-Left' political parties combine traditional social-democratic values such as a desire for greater economic equality and workers rights with demands for environmental protection, such as the Nordic Green Left.

Well-recognized socialist Bolivian President Evo Morales has traced environmental degradation to consumerism. He has said "The Earth does not have enough for the North to live better and better, but it does have enough for

all of us to live well." James Hansen, Noam Chomsky, Raj Patel, Naomi Klein, The Yes Men, and Dennis Kucinich have had alike views.

In the 21st Century, questions in relation to the environment have become increasingly politicized, with the Left usually accepting the findings of environmental scientists in relation to the global warming, and several on the Right disputing or rejecting those findings. The left is though divided in excess of how to effectively and equitably reduce carbon emissions- the center-left often advocates a reliance on market events such as emissions trading or a carbon tax, whilst those further to the left tend to support direct government regulation and intervention either alongside or instead of market mechanisms.

Nationalism and Anti-nationalism

The question of nationality and nationalism has been a central characteristic of political debates on the Left. Throughout the French Revolution, nationalism was a policy of the Republican Left. The Republican Left advocated civic nationalism, and argued that the nation is a "daily plebiscite" shaped by the subjective "will to live jointly." Related to "revanchism", the belligerent will to take revenge against Germany and retake manage of Alsace-Lorraine, nationalism was sometimes opposed to imperialism. In the 1880s, there was a debate flanked by those, such as Georges Clemenceau (Radical), Jean Jaurès (Socialist) and Maurice Barrès (nationalist), who argued that colonialism diverted France from the "blue row of the Vosges" (referring to Alsace-Lorraine), and the "colonial lobby", such as Jules Ferry (moderate republican), Léon Gambetta (republican) and Eugène Etienne, the president of the parliamentary colonial group. After the Dreyfus Affair though nationalism became increasingly associated with the distant right.

The Marxist social class theory of proletarian internationalism asserts that members of the working class should act in solidarity with working people in other countries in pursuit of a general class interest, rather than focusing on their own countries. Proletarian internationalism is summed up in the slogan, "Workers of all countries, unite!", the last row of *The Communist*

Manifesto. Union members had learned that more members meant more bargaining power. Taken to an international stage, leftists argued that workers ought to act in solidarity to further augment the power of the working class.

Proletarian internationalism saw itself as a deterrent against war, because people with a general interest are less likely to take up arms against one another, instead focusing on fighting the ruling class. Just as to Marxist theory, the antonym of proletarian internationalism is bourgeois nationalism. Some Marxists, jointly with others on the left, view nationalism, racism, and religion, as divide and conquer strategies used by the ruling classes to prevent the working class from uniting against them. Left-wing movements so have often taken up anti-imperialist positions. Anarchism has urbanized a critique of nationalism that focuses on nationalism's role in justifying and consolidating state power and power. By its unifying goal, nationalism strives for centralization, both in specific territories and in a ruling elite of individuals, while it prepares a population for capitalist use. Within anarchism, this subject has been treated extensively by Rudolf Rocker in *Nationalism and Civilization* and by the works of Fredy Perlman, such as *Against His-Story*, *Against Leviathan* and "The Continuing Appeal of Nationalism".

The failure of revolutions in Germany and Hungary ended Bolshevik hopes for an imminent world revolution and led to promotion of "Socialism in One Country" by Joseph Stalin. In the first edition of the book *Osnovy Leninizma*, Stalin argued that revolution in one country is insufficient. But by the end of that year, in the second edition of the book, he argued that the "proletariat can and necessity build the socialist civilization in one country". In April 1925 Nikolai Bukharin elaborated the issue in his brochure *Can We Build Socialism in One Country in the Absence of the Victory of the West-European Proletariat?* The location was adopted as State policy after Stalin's January 1926 article *On the Issues of Leninism*. This thought was opposed by Leon Trotsky and his followers who declared the need for an international "permanent revolution". Several Fourth Internationalist groups approximately the world who describe themselves as Trotskyist see themselves as standing in this custom, while Maoist China supported Socialism in One Country.

Some link left-wing nationalism to the pressure generated by economic integration with other countries encouraged by free-trade agreements. This view is sometimes used to justify hostility towards supranational organizations such as the European Union. Left-wing nationalism can also refer to any nationalism which emphasizes a working-class populist agenda which seeks to overcome perceived use or oppression by other nations. Several Third World anti-colonial movements adopted left-wing and socialist thoughts.

Third-Worldism is a tendency within leftist thought that regards the division flanked by First World urbanized countries and Third World developing countries as being of high political importance. This tendency supports national liberation movements against what it considers imperialism by capitalists. Third-Worldism is closely linked with African socialism, Latin American socialism, Maoism, Pan-Africanism and Pan-Arabism. Some left-wing groups in the developing world — such as the Zapatista Army of National Liberation in Mexico, the Abahlali base Mjondolo in South Africa and the Naxalites in India — argue that the First World Left takes a racist and paternalistic attitude towards liberation movements in the Third World.

Religion

The original French left-wing was anti-clerical, opposing the power of the Roman Catholic Church and supporting the separation of church and state. Karl Marx asserted that "Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless circumstances. It is the opium of the people." In Soviet Russia the Bolsheviks originally embraced "an ideological creed which professed that all religion would atrophy" and "resolved to eradicate Christianity as such." In 1918 "ten Orthodox hierarchs were summarily shot" and "children were deprived of any religious education outside the house." Today in the Western world, those on the Left usually support secularization and the separation of church and state.

Religious beliefs, though, have also been associated with some left-wing movements, such as the American abolitionist movement and the anti-capital punishment movement. Early socialist thinkers such as Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, and the Comte de Saint-Simon based their theories of

socialism upon Christian principles. From St. Augustine of Hippo's *Municipality of God* by St. Thomas More's *Utopia* major Christian writers defended thoughts that socialists establish agreeable. Other general leftist concerns such as pacifism, social justice, racial equality, human rights, and the rejection of excessive wealth can be establish in the Bible. In the late 19th century, the Social Gospel movement arose which attempted to integrate progressive and socialist thought with Christianity in faith-based social activism, promoted by movements such as Christian Socialism. In the 20th century, the theology of liberation and Making Spirituality was championed by such writers as Gustavo Gutierrez and Matthew Fox.

There are also left-wing movements such as Islamic socialism and Buddhist socialism. There have been alliances flanked by the Left and anti-war Muslims, such as the Respect Party and the Stop the War Coalition in Britain. In France, the Left has been divided in excess of moves to ban the hijab from schools, with some supporting a ban based on separation of church and state, and others opposing the ban based on personal freedom.

Social Progressivism and Counterculture

Social progressivism is another general characteristic of the contemporary Left, particularly in the United States, where social progressives played an significant role in the abolition of slavery, women's suffrage, civil rights, and multiculturalism. Progressives have both advocated prohibition legislation and worked towards its repeal. Current positions associated with social progressivism in the West contain opposition to the death penalty, and support for legal recognition of similar-sex marriage, sharing of contraceptives, public funding of embryonic stem-cell research, and the right of women to choose abortion. Public education was a subject of great interest to groundbreaking social progressives such as Lester Frank Ward and John Dewey who whispered that a democratic system of government was impossible without a universal and comprehensive system of education.

Several counterculture movements in the 1960s and 1970s were associated with the "New Left". Unlike the earlier leftist focus on union activism, the "New Left" instead adopted a broader definition of political

activism commonly described social activism. U.S. "New Left" is associated with the Hippie movement, college campus mass protest movements and a broadening of focus from protesting class-based oppression to contain issues such as gender, race, and sexual orientation. The British "New Left" was an intellectually driven movement which attempted to correct the perceived errors of "Old Left".

The New Left opposed prevailing power structures in civilization, which it termed "The Establishment", and became recognized as "anti-Establishment." The New Left did not seek to recruit industrial workers, but rather concentrated on a social activist approach to organization, influenced that they could be the source for a better type of social revolution. This view has been criticised by some Marxists (especially Trotskyists) who characterized this approach as 'substitutionism'- or what they saw as the misguided and apparently non-Marxist belief that other groups in civilization could 'substitute' for the revolutionary agency of the working class.

Several early feminists and advocates of women's rights were measured left-wing by their contemporaries. Feminist pioneer Mary Wollstonecraft was influenced by the radical thinker Thomas Paine. Several notable leftists have been strong supporters of gender equality, such as: the Marxists Rosa Luxemburg, Clara Zetkin and Alexandra Kollontai, the anarchist Emma Goldman, and the socialists Helen Keller and Annie Besant. Marxists such as Clara Zetkin and Alexandra Kollontai though, however supporters of radical social equality for women, opposed feminism on the grounds that it was a bourgeois ideology. Marxists were responsible for organizing the first International Women's Day measures.

In more recent times the women's liberation movement is closely linked to the New Left and other new social movements that challenged the orthodoxies of the Old Left. Socialist feminism and Marxist feminism saw themselves as a section of the left that challenged what they perceive to be male-dominated and sexist structures within the left. Liberal feminism is closely linked with left-liberalism, and the left-wing of mainstream American politics.

Diversities

The spectrum of left-wing politics ranges from centre-left to distant left. The term *centre left* describes a location within the political mainstream. The conditions *distant left* and *ultra-left* refer to positions that are more radical. The centre-left comprises social democrats, social liberals, progressives and also some democratic socialists and greens. Centre-left supporters accept market allocation of possessions in a mixed economy with a important public sector and a thriving private sector. Centre-left policies tend to favor limited state intervention in matters pertaining to the public interest.

In many countries, the conditions *distant left* and *radical left* have been associated with diversities of communism, Autonomist and anarchism. They have been used to describe groups that advocate anti-capitalist, identity politics or eco-terrorism. In France, a distinction is made flanked by the *left* and the *distant left*. The US Department of Homeland Security defines left-wing extremism as groups who want "to bring in relation to the change by violent revolution rather than by recognized political procedures."

In China, the term *Chinese New Left* denotes those who oppose the current economic reforms and favor the restoration of more socialist policies. In the Western world, the term *New Left* refers to cultural politics. In the United Kingdom in the 1980s, the term *hard left* was applied to supporters of Tony Benn, such as the Campaign Group and Labour Briefing, as well as Trotskyist groups such as the Militant Tendency and Socialist Organizer. In the similar era, the term *soft left* was applied to supporters of the British Labour Party who were perceived to be more moderate. Under the leadership of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown the British Labour Party re-branded itself as New Labour in order to promote the notion that it was less left-wing than it had been in the past. One of the first actions though of the Labour Party leader who succeeded them, Ed Miliband, was the rejection of the "New Labour" label.

Left-wing post-modernism opposes attempts to supply universal explanatory theories, including Marxism, deriding them as grand narratives. It views civilization as a contested legroom, and via deconstruction seeks to undermine all pretensions to absolute truth. Left-wing critics of post-

modernism assert that cultural studies inflate the importance of civilization by denying the subsistence of an self-governing reality.

In 1996, physicist Alan Sokal wrote a nonsensical article entitled "Transgressing the Boundaries: Toward a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity". The journal *Social Text* published the paper in its Spring/Summer 1996 issue, whereupon Sokal publicly revealed his hoax. While this action was interpreted as an attack upon leftism, Sokal, who was a committed supporter of the Sandinista movement in Nicaragua throughout the 1980s, planned it as a critique from within the Left. He said he was concerned in relation to the what he saw as the rising prevalence on the left of "a scrupulous type of nonsense and sloppy thinking... that denies the subsistence of objective realities". He described into question the usefulness of such theories to the wider left movement saying he "never understood how deconstruction was meant to help the working class."

Workers and Peasants Party

The Workers and Peasants Party (WPP) was a political party in India, which worked inside the Indian National Congress 1925-1929. It became an significant front organisation for the Communist Party of India and an influential force in the Bombay labour movement. The party was able to muster some success in creation alliances with other left units inside the Congress Party, amongst them Jawaharlal Nehru. Though, as the Communist International entered its 'Third Era' stage, the communists deserted the WPP project. The WPP was wound up, as its leadership was arrested by the British authorities in March 1929.

Founding of the Party

The party was founded in Bengal on November 1, 1925, as the Labour Swaraj Party of the Indian National Congress. The founding leaders of the party were Kazi Nazrul Islam, Hemanta Kumar Sarkar, Qutubuddin Ahmad and Shamsuddin Hussain. The founding manifesto was signed by Kazi Nazrul Islam. Throughout the first three month of subsistence, the party organisation was very provisional.

At the All Bengal Praja Conference, held at Krishnagar on February 6, 1926, a resolution was moved by Faizuddin Hussian Sahib of Mymensingh for the making of a workers-peasants party. The move was seconded by Braja Nath Das of Bogra. The resolution was passed by the conference, and in accordance with this decision the name of the party was changed to 'Workers and Peasants Party of Bengal'. Dr. Naresh Chandra Sengupta was elected party president and Hemanta Kumar Sarkar and Qutubuddin Ahmad were elected as joint secretaries.

Build-up of the WPPs of Bengal and Bombay

As of 1926, the WPP of Bengal had only 40 members, and its growth in membership was very slow. A two-room party office was set up at 37, Harrison Road, Calcutta. British intelligence perceived that the Bengal Jute Workers Association, the Mymensingh Workers and Peasants Party (with branch in Atia), the Dhakeswari Mill Workers Union, the Bengal Glass Workers Union, the Scavengers' Union of Bengal and the Workers Protection League were led by the party.

Soon after the 1926 conference of the WPP of Bengal, the underground Communist Party of India directed its members to join the provincial Workers and Peasants Parties. All open communist behaviors were accepted out by Workers and Peasants Parties. The Comintern organizer M.N. Roy took section in the build-up of the WPP.

A WPP was shaped in Bombay in January 1927. D.R. Thengdi was elected president and S.S. Mirajkar common secretary. The WPPs gained power within the Bombay and Bengal Pradesh Congress Committees. From the WPP of Bombay, K.N. Joglekar, R.S. Nimbkar and D.R. Tengdi were elected to the All India Congress Committee. From the WPP of Bengal, two party representatives were elected to the AICC. The WPP representatives jointly with Nehru were able to convince the AICC to create the Indian National Congress an associate member of the League against Imperialism.

Madras Congress

At the 1927 annual Congress session in Madras a leader of the WPP of Bombay, K.N. Joglekar presented a proposal for a resolution in the Subjects Committee, that the Indian National Congress should demand full independence for India. The proposal was seconded by Jawaharlal Nehru. At the open session of the Madras Congress, Nehru moved the resolution and Joglekar seconded it. The resolution was passed unanimously. This was the first time in history that the Indian National Congress officially demanded full independence from British rule. Throughout the Madras session, the WPP functioned as a fraction. Directly after the Madras Congress, the WPP took section in a 'Republican Congress' meeting jointly with other left units of the Congress Party and radical deal unionists. Nehru chaired the meeting.

Deal Union Struggles

Particularly the WPP of Bombay was successful in mobilizing deal union job. It built unions amongst printing press, municipal and dock workers. It gained power amongst the workers of the Great Indian Peninsular Railway. Throughout 1928 the WPP led a common strike in Bombay, which lasted for months. At the time of the strike, the Girni Kamgar Union was founded.

Anti-Simon thrash about

Throughout the protests against the Simon Commission, the WPP played a major role in organising manifestations in Calcutta and Bombay. In Bombay it also mobilized 'hartal' (common strike) in protest against the Simon Commission.

1928 Bengal Party Conference

The WPP of Bengal held its third conference in Bhatpara, in March 1928. After the conference the executive of the party published the conference documents in a book titled *A Call for Action*. In the book an argument is presented that national independence was not possible as extensive as capitalists dominated the freedom thrash about. British intelligence sources claimed that Philip Spratt had been the author of the book.

Formation of WPPs in Punjab and UP

At a conference in Lyallpur in September 1928 the Punjab Kirti Kisan Party (Workers and Peasants Party of Punjab) was shaped by the *Kirti* group. Chabil Das, a Lahore propagandist of the Naujawan Bharat Sabha, was elected president of the party. In October 1928 two WPPs were shaped in the United Provinces. One of them was the Bundelkhand Workers and Peasants Party, with N.L. Kadam as its secretary and headquartered in Jhansi. The party held its founding conference in Jhansi on October 28-October 29, 1928. Jhavwala from Bombay presided in excess of the conference. The other was the U.P. Peasants and Workers Party which was founded at a conference in Meerut. P.C. Joshi was elected president and Dharamvir Singh was elected common secretary. The Meerut conference was attended by Philip Spratt, Muzaffar Ahmed and Kedar Nath Sahgol.

All India WPP Conference

In late November 1928 the WPP of Bengal executive committee met with Philip Spratt and Muzaffar Ahmed. They decided to appoint Sohan Singh Josh of the Punjab Kirti Kisan Party to chair the All India Workers and Peasants Conference, to be held in Calcutta in December. The provincial WPPs attended All India Workers and Peasants Conference in Calcutta on December 22-December 24, 1928, at which the All India Workers and Peasants Party was shaped. A 16-member national executive was elected. The Bengal, Bombay, Punjab and United Provinces were allocated four seats each in the national executive. Out of these 16, ten were either recognized as CPI members or as 'communists'. R.S. Nimbkar was the common secretary of the party. The conference discussed an affiliation of the party with the League against Imperialism. Spratt and Ahmed urged the conference to approve the affiliation of the party to the League. The conference decision to postpone a decision on the issue to a later occasion.

Comintern Turns against the WPP

The political fortunes of the WPP were to be terminated by changes in policy of the Communist International. The July 1928 sixth congress of the

Communist International declared that 'The Union of all communist groups and individuals scattered during the country into a single, illegal, self-governing and centralized party symbolize the first task for Indian communists.' This was a statement made in opposition to the structure of the 'multi-class' WPP. The new row was promoted at the congress by the Finnish communist Otto Kuusinen. In his statement, he stated that it was 'necessary to reject the formation of any type of bloc flanked by the Communist Party and the national-reformist opposition' in the colonies. Moreover, he claimed that parties like WPP could develop into petty bourgeois parties. Leon Trotsky concurred with this view. In June 1928, he had submitted a document which described WPP an invention of Joseph Stalin and that the party was a 'thoroughly anti-Marxist formation'. Abani Mukherji, a founding member of CPI, had described WPP as a 'Kuomintang Party' and that WPP 'is accumulating by itself the units of future Indian Fascism.'. S.N. Tagore and the delegates of the Communist Party of Great Britain argued for retaining the WPP. This declaration created confusion amongst the communist ranks in India. On December 2, 1928, the Executive Committee of the Communist International had drafted a letter to the WPP, which singled out the WPP as consisting '...mainly of petit-bourgeois intellectuals, and they were tied up with either the system of landlordism and usury or straight absent capitalist interests.' The letter did though take extensive time to reach the WPP. The Tenth Plenum of the ECCI, July 3-July 19, 1929, directed the Indian communists to break with WPP. When the communists deserted it, the WPP fell separately.

Policies

The founding manifesto of the Labour Swaraj Party stressed that the party was organised on the basis of class thrash about, for the liberation of the masses. The party combined demand for full independence with socio-economic demands. In 1927, the WPP of Bombay presented a programme of action to the All India Congress Committee. The programme proposed thrash about for full independence combined with active socio-economic policies for the toiling classes. The WPP of Bengal had submitted a manifesto the Madras

Congress session, which sought that the Congress should engage in mass struggles for full independence and that a Constituent Assembly should determine the constitution of an self-governing India. The party also worked for the abolishment of 'zamindari' system in agriculture.

●

● **M.N. ROY—MARXISM AND RADICAL HUMANISM**

Manabendra Nath Roy (1887–1954), born Narendra Nath Bhattacharya and popularly recognized as M. N. Roy, was an Indian nationalist revolutionary and an internationally recognized radical activist and political theorist. Roy was a founder of the Communist Parties in both Mexico and India and was a delegate to congresses of the Communist International. Following the rise of Joseph Stalin, Roy left the mainline communist movement to pursue an self-governing radical politics. In 1940 Roy was instrumental in the formation of the Radical Democratic Party, an organization in which he played a leading role for much of the decade of the 1940s. Roy later moved absent from Marxism to become an exponent of the philosophy of Radical Humanism.

Early Years

Just as to Dr. Bhaskar Bhole the birth year of M. N. Roy is 1893. Dr. Bhole claims that just as to one of Roy's colleagues, Mr. Avinash Bhattacharya, Roy was born in Bengali year 1293 (i.e. 1886–87 AD). V. B. Karnik, one of Roy's biographers, quotes his birth date in the Marathi Vishwakosh as 21 March 1887. Just as to Police records 1888 is his birth year. But 1893 necessity is his correct birth year, as the Radical Humanist in its February 1953 issue mentions that Roy has completed 60 years.

Narendra Nath "Naren" Bhattacharya, later recognized as M. N. Roy, was born on 21 March 1887 at Arbelia, situated in the 24 Parganas of West Bengal, close to Calcutta (Kolkata).

The Bhattacharyas were Sakta brahmins — a family of hereditary priests. Naren's paternal grandfather was the head priest of the goddess Kshepateswari in the village of Ksheput, situated in the Midnapore district of

West Bengal. Naren's father also served for a time in priestly capability there, although the big size of his family — he being one of 11 siblings — forced a relocation to the village of Arbelia and a change of job.

Following the death of his first wife, the elder Bhattacharya married Basantakumari Devi, the niece of Dwarkanath Vidyabhusan and was appointed as a teacher of Sanskrit in the nearby Arbelia English school. The couple had a total of eight children, including the fourth-born Naren.

Naren Bhattacharya's early schooling took lay at Arbelia. In 1898 the family moved to Kotalia. Bhattacharya sustained his studies at the Harinavi Anglo-Sanskrit School, at which his father taught, until 1905.

Bhattacharya later enrolled at the National College under Sri Aurobindo, before moving to the Bengal Technological Institute, where he studied Engineering and Chemistry. Much of Bhattacharya's knowledge was gained by self-revision, though.

Nationalist Revolutionary

Towards the end of the 19th Century militant nationalism began to spread in the middle of the educated middle classes of Bengal, inspired by the writings of Bankim and Vivekananda. Naren Bhattacharya was swept up in this movement, reading both of these leading luminaries extensively.

Just as to one biographer, Roy gained an appreciation from Bankim that true religion required one not to be cloistered from the world, but to job actively for the public good; Vivekananda reinforced this notion of social service and further advanced the thought that Hinduism and Indian civilization was superior to anything the western world could offer.

With his cousin and childhood friend Hari Kumar Chakravarti (1882–1963), he shaped a group of free-thinkers including Satcowri Banerjee and the brothers, Saileshvar and Shyamsundar Bose. Two other cousins of Bhattacharya and Chakravarti — Phani and Narendra Chakravarti — often came from Deoghar, where they went to school with Barin Ghosh. A mysterious Vedic scholar, Mokshadacharan Samadhyayi, active organizer of secret branches of the Anushilan Samiti in Chinsura started frequenting Bhattacharya group.

In July 1905 a partition of Bengal was announced, scheduled to take effect in October. A spontaneous mass movement aimed at annulment of the partition appeared, giving radical nationalists like Naren Bhattacharya and his co-thinkers an opportunity to build broader support for their thoughts. Following his expulsion from high school for organizing a meeting and a march against the partition, Bhattacharya and Chakravarti moved to Kolkata and joined in the active job of the Anushilan.

Under Mokshada's leadership, on 6 December 1907 Bhattacharya successfully committed the first act of political banditry in order to raise money for the secret civilization. When arrested, he was carrying two seditious books by Barin Ghosh. Defended by the Barrister J.N. Roy (secure friend of Jatindranath Mukherjee or Bagha Jatin) and the pleader Promothonath Mukherjee, he got released on bail, thanks to his reputation as a student and social worker.

Unhappy with Barin's highly centralized and authoritative method of leadership, Bhattacharya and his group had been looking for something more constructive than creation bombs at the Maniktala garden. Two incidents sharpened their interest in an alternative leadership. Barin had sent Prafulla Chaki with Charuchandra Datta to see Bagha Jatin at Darjeeling who was posted there on official duty, and do absent with the Lt. Governor; on explaining to Prafulla that the time was not yet ripe, Jatin promised to get in touch with him later. However Prafulla was much impressed by this hero, Barin cynically commented that it would be too much of an effort for a Government officer to serve a patriotic cause. Shortly after, Phani returned from Darjeeling, after a short holiday: fascinated by Jatin's charisma, he informed his friends in relation to the unusual man. On hearing Barin censuring Phani for disloyalty, Bhattacharya decided to see that exceptional Dada and got caught for good.

The Howrah-Shibpur Trial (1910–11) brought Bhattacharya closer to Jatindra Mukherjee.

The Indo-German Conspiracy

Several Indian nationalists, including Roy, became influenced that only an armed thrash about against the occupying forces of Great Britain would be enough to separate India from the British empire. To the furtherance of this end, revolutionary nationalists looked to a rival imperial power, that of Kaiser Wilhelm's Germany, as a potential source of funds and armaments.

In August 1914 a huge European war erupted flanked by Britain and Germany. Expatriate Indian nationalists organized as the Indian Revolutionary Committee in Berlin made an informal approach to the German government in support of aid to the cause of anti-British armed thrash about in their native land. These contacts were favorable and towards the end of the year word reached India that the Germans had agreed to give the money and material necessary for the launch of an Indian war of independence from British rule. Revolution seemed close to.

The task of obtaining funds and armaments for the coming thrash about was entrusted to Naren Bhattacharya. Bhattacharya was dispatched first to Java, where in excess of the after that two months he was able to obtain some limited funds, albeit no armaments.

Early in 1915, Bhattacharya set out again, leaving India in search of vaguely promised German armaments which were whispered to be en route, somewhere on the Pacific. Roy would not see his homeland again for 16 years.

The actual plan seemed fantastic, as Bhattacharya-Roy later recounted in his posthumously published memoirs:

- "The plan was to use German ships interned in a port at the northern tip of Sumatra, to storm the Andaman Islands and free and arm the prisoners there, and land the army of liberation on the Orissa coast. The ships were armored, as several big German vessels were, ready for wartime use. they also accepted many guns each. The crew was composed of naval ratings. They had to escape from the internment camp, seize the ships, and sail.... Many hundred rifles and other small arms with an adequate supply of ammunition could be acquired by Chinese smugglers who would get then on board the ships."

At the last minute, money for the conduct of the operation failed to materialize and "the German Consul Common mysteriously disappeared on the day when he was to issue orders for the execution of the plan," Bhattacharya recalled.

Disgusted but still holding out hope, Bhattacharya left Indonesia for Japan, hoping to win Japanese support for the liberation of Asia from European imperialism, despite Japan's nominal alliance with Great Britain. There he met with Chinese nationalist leader Sun Yat-sen, who had escaped to Japan following the failure of a July 1913 uprising in Nanking.

Sun Yat-sen refused to assist Bhattacharya in his task of organizing anti-British revolution in India, expressing instead faith in the ultimate liberating mission of Japan and his own powerlessness owing to British manage of Hong Kong, Sun's base of operations in South China. Efforts to raise money from the German Ambassador to China were likewise unsuccessful.

Bhattacharya's behaviors soon drew the attention of the Japanese secret police, who were concerned in relation to the Bhattacharya's efforts at fomenting revolution. Upon learning that he was in relation to the to be served formal notice to leave Japan within 24 hours and not wishing to be deported to Shanghai, Bhattacharya immediately set in relation to the leaving the country overland by Korea. He tried to create his method from there to Peking (Beijing), but by this time he was spotted and recognized by the British secret police, who detained him. Only by a stroke of good fortune was Bhattacharya able to win his release from the police, due to the British Consul Common's ill ease with holding a British subject indefinitely without having formal charges first been preferred.

Further efforts to raise funds for armaments from the German consulate at Hankow resulted in a further tentative agreement. Though, this plan also came to naught owing to the size of the commitment, which had to be approved in Berlin, just as to German Ambassador to China Admiral Paul von Hintze. Bhattacharya determined to take his plan for German funding after that to the German Ambassador in the United States, before heading to Germany itself. Employees of the German embassy were able to assist

Bhattacharya in obtaining a lay as a stowaway aboard an American ship with a German crew, bound for San Francisco.

Although they knew he was on board the ship, British authorities stopping the vessel in international waters were unable to locate Bhattacharya in the secret compartment in which he was hurriedly hidden. In an effort to throw the British off his trail — and in an effort to obtain more appropriate accommodations for the extensive trans-Pacific voyage, Bhattacharya stealthily disembarked at Kobe, Japan.

In Kobe Bhattacharya made use of a false French-Indian passport previously obtained for him by the Germans in China. Posing as a seminary student bound for Paris, Bhattacharya obtained an American passport visa, bought a ticket, and sailed for San Francisco.

International Revolutionary

Throughout his stay in Palo Alto, a era of in relation to the two months, Roy met his future wife, a young Stanford University graduate named Evelyn Trent. The pair fell in love and journeyed jointly crossways the country to New York Municipality.

It was in the New York Municipality public library that Roy began to develop his interest in Marxism. His socialist transition under Lala owed much to Bankim Chandra Chatterjee's essays on communism and Vivekananda's message of serving the proletariat. Bothered by British spies, Roy fled to Mexico in July 1917 with Evelyn. German military authorities, on the spot, gave him big amounts of money.

The Mexican president Venustiano Carranza and other liberal thinkers appreciated Roy's writings for *El Pueblo*. The Socialist Party he founded (December 1917), was converted into the Communist Party of Mexico, the first Communist Party outside Russia. The Roys lodged a penniless Mikhail Borodin, the Bolshevik leader, under special circumstances. On the basis of a grateful Borodin's reports on Roy's behaviors, Moscow was to invite Roy to the 2nd World Congress of the Communist International, held in Moscow throughout the summer of 1920.

A few weeks before the Congress, Vladimir Lenin personally received Roy with great warmth. At Lenin's behest, Roy formulated his own thoughts as a supplement to Lenin's *Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions*.

Material from Roy's pen was published by *International Press Correspondence* (Inprecor), the weekly bulletin of the Communist International. Roy served as a member of the Comintern's Presidium for eight years and at one level was a member of the Presidium, the Political Secretariat, the Executive Committee, and the World Congress.

Commissioned by Lenin to prepare the East — especially India — for revolution, Roy founded military and political schools in Tashkent. In October 1920, as he shaped the Communist Party of India, he contacted his erstwhile revolutionary colleagues who, at this juncture, were hesitating flanked by Radicalism (*Jugantar*) and Mohandas K. Gandhi's novel programme. Secure to the *Jugantar* in spirit and action, C. R. Das inspired Roy's confidence. From Moscow, Roy published his major reflections, *India in Transition*, approximately simultaneously translated into other languages. In 1922 appeared Roy's own journal, the *Vanguard*, organ of the emigre Communist Party of India. These were followed by *The Future of Indian Politics* (1926) and *Revolution and Counter-revolution in China* (1930), while he had been tossing flanked by Germany and France.

Leading a Comintern delegation appointed by Joseph Stalin to develop agrarian revolution in China, Roy reached Canton in February 1927. Despite fulfilling his mission with ability, a disagreement with the CCP leaders and Borodin led to a fiasco. Roy returned to Moscow where factions supporting Leon Trotsky and Grigory Zinoviev were busy fighting with Stalin's.

Stalin refused to meet Roy and provide him a hearing at the plenum in February 1928. Denied a decent treatment for an infected ear, Roy escaped with Nikolai Bukharin's help, sparing himself Stalin's anger. Shortly after Trotsky's deportation, on 22 May 1928, Roy received the permission to go abroad for medical treatment on board a Berlin-bound plane of the Russo-German Airline Deruluft. In December 1929, the *Inprecor* announced Roy's

expulsion from the Comintern, approximately simultaneously with Bukharin's fall from grace.

Imprisonment

Roy returned to India for the first time in December 1930. Upon reaching Bombay, Roy met leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Bose, the former of whom recalled that despite important political differences, "I was attracted to him by his extra ordinary intellectual capability."

Roy's political action in India proved to be brief, on 21 July 1931 he was arrested in Bombay on an arrest warrant issued in 1924. Roy was taken to Kanpur to face charges under Part 121-A of the Indian Penal Code, "conspiring to deprive the King Emperor of his sovereignty in India."

No trial was held in open court; rather, the proceedings were mannered inside the jail in which Roy was held. Proceedings were mannered from 3 November 1931 until 9 January 1932, at which time Roy was sentenced to 12 years of rigorous imprisonment.

Roy was taken immediately under armed guard to the Central Jail at Bareilly for completion of his sentence managing, though, to smuggle out the defence statement which he was not allowed to present in court. This disallowed declaration was published in full by Roy's supporters in India as *My Defence*, and in abridged shape in New York as *I Accuse*.

Roy was unapologetic for his advocacy of the use of armed thrash about against British colonialism, in his own defence declaring

- The oppressed people and exploited classes are not obliged to respect the moral philosophy of the ruling power.... *A despotic power is always overthrown by force*. The force employed in this procedure is not criminal. On the contrary, precisely the guns accepted by the army of the British government in India are instruments of crime. They become instruments of virtue when they are turned against the imperialist state.

Roy filed an appeal in his case to the Allahabad High Court, but this was dismissed on 2 May 1933 — although Roy's sentence was at the similar time reduced from 12 years to 6 by the court. Roy ultimately served 5 years

and 4 months of this term, sitting in five dissimilar jails. Dismal prison circumstances took a severe toll on Roy's health, and he suffered lasting damage to his heart, kidneys, lungs, and digestive tract as a result of his time behind bars. Roy also lost many teeth, was regularly feverish, and suffered constant pain from a chronically infected inner ear.

Despite his imprisonment, Roy still supervised to contribute to the Indian national liberation movement. A steady stream of letters and articles were smuggled out of jail. He also wrote a 3000-page draft manuscript provisionally titled *The Philosophical Consequence of Contemporary Science*.

Released in November 1936 in broken health, Roy went to Allahabad for recovery, invited by Nehru. Defying the Comintern order to boycott the Indian National Congress, Roy urged Indian Communists to join this Party to radicalize it. Nehru, in his presidential address at Faizpur session in December 1936, greeted the attendance of Roy, as

- ...one who, however young, is an old and well-tried soldier in India's fight for freedom. Comrade M.N. Roy has presently approach to us after a extensive and mainly distressing era in prison, but however shaken up in body, he comes with a fresh mind and heart, eager to take section in that old thrash about that knows no end till it ends in success.

From the podium Roy in his speech recommended the capture of power by *Constituent Assembly*. Unable to collaborate with Gandhi, though, Roy was to stick to his own conviction. In April 1937, his weekly *Self-governing India* appeared and was welcomed by progressive leaders like Bose and Nehru, unlike Gandhi, and the staunch Communists who accused Roy of deviation.

Radical Humanist

In marrying Ellen Gottschalk, his second wife, ~~Roy~~ establishes not only a loving wife but also an intelligent helper and secure collaborator." They settled in Dehra Dun. Roy proposed an alternative leadership, seized the crisis following Bose's re-election as the Congress President, in 1938: in Pune, in

June, he shaped his *League of Radical Congressmen*. Disillusioned with both bourgeois democracy and communism, he devoted the last years of his life to the formulation of an alternative philosophy which he described *Radical Humanism* and of which he wrote a detailed exposition in *Cause, Romanticism and Revolution*.

In his monumental biography, *In Freedom's Quest*, Sibnarayan Ray writes:

- If Nehru had his troubles, so had Roy. From early life his sharp intellect was matched by a strong will and extra-ordinary self-confidence. It would appear that in his extensive political career there were only two persons and a half who, in his estimate, qualified to be his mentors. The first was Jatin Mukherji (or Bagha Jatin) from his revolutionary nationalist era; the second was Lenin. The half was Josef Stalin....

With the declaration of World War II, Roy (in a location secure to that of Sri Aurobindo) condemned the rising totalitarian regimes in Germany and Italy, instead supporting England and France in the fight against fascism. He severed connections with the Congress Party and created the Radical Democratic Party in 1940. Gandhi proceeded to foment *Quit India* in August 1942. In response The British imprisoned without trial approximately the whole Indian National Congress leadership within hours. Roy's row was clearly dissimilar from that of the mainstream of the national liberation movement. Just as to Roy, a victory for Germany and the Axis powers would have resulted in the end of democracy worldwide and India would never be self-governing. In his view India could win her freedom only in a free world. Subhas Chandra Bose took the pro-active stance that *The enemy of my enemy is my friend*; escaping home-arrest and India he shaped the *Azad Hind Provisional Indian Government in Exile* and allied with the Japanese brought the Indian National Army to India's doorstep.

Sensing India's freedom to be a post-war reality following the defeat of the Axis powers and the weakening of British imperialism, Roy wrote a series of articles in *Self-governing India* on the economic and political

structures of new India, even presenting a concrete ten-year plan, and drafting a *Constitution of Free India* (1944).

Roy in his philosophy devised means to ensure human freedom and progress. Remembering Bagha Jatin who “personified the best of mankind”, Roy worked “for the ideal of establishing a social order in which the best in man could be manifest.” In 1947, he elaborated his theses into a manifesto, *New Humanism*, expected to be as significant as the *Communist Manifesto* by Marx a century earlier.

Death and Legacy

A lecture tour to the USA was to be suspended, as Roy died on 25 January 1954. Beginning in 1987, Oxford University Press began the publication of the *Selected Works of M.N. Roy*. A total of 4 volumes were published by 1997, gathering Roy's writings by his prison years. Project editor Sibnarayan Ray died in 2008, though, and the Roy works publishing project was so prematurely terminated.

-

- **CONTEMPORARY MARXIST THINKING**

Uniqueness of Indian Marxist Thinking

Marxist thinking in India is not as urbanized as in the West. In India, Marxism is the product of Western intellectual custom. Logic of intellectual development in West had reached a scrupulous level of culmination. Renaissance, reformation and enlightenment led to a creative stage in Western intellectual history which is recognized as the Marxist stage. The basis of this new thinking was laid by Marx and Engels. In India we do not have such a rich intellectual custom. Our intellectual custom allows very little legroom for original thinking. It is a hard task on the section of a Marxist to be very original and creative. Despite this the Indian Marxist custom is not so bad as compared to several other States in third world countries. It has a history of half a century. Marxist intellectuals in India basically remain with in the

Communist Parties. Some of them however, are establish outside the fold of these parties.

Marxists and Historical Materialism

Communists in India have always been busy in trying to seem for answers to troubles in a Marxist framework. They have had very little time to do philosophical thinking. Their concern has been basically in the application of historical materialism to Indian situations. Mainly Indian Marxists have a dialogue with Marx's own writings on Indian civilization. In constructing Indian history, Marx has made two significant points. First, Indian civilization before the British rule was a stagnant civilization. Village society and caste civilization created a social framework for creation Indian economy a unchanging economy. Secondly, British rule was a blessing in disguise which helped in destroying this aspect of Indian civilization and created circumstances for regeneration. Marx's own statement is given below: "The historic pages of their rule in India statement hardly anything beyond that destruction. The job of regeneration hardly transpires by a heap of ruins. Nevertheless it has begun."

The British rule cannot stop the changes introduced by it. Changes would bring national unity. Moreover, introduction of freedom of press and English education have brought in relation to the a radical change in Indian civilization. An educated class with new thoughts would be playing an significant role in the political transformation of a civilization. Marxists have a historical scheme for understanding any history. There are sure levels in history like primitive communism, slavery, feudalism and capitalism. Historical development of each civilization experiences these levels. Some of the prominent communists themselves applied the historical scheme in a mechanical manner. S.A. Dange, *India: From Primitive Communism to Slavery* accepted the level of slavery in Indian history. But mainly of the Indian communists reject this point and attempt to understand Indian history in a creative manner. All of them agree to a point that Indian history does not have a level of slavery. Primitive tribal civilization gets transformed into a caste civilization without experiencing the level of slavery. Indian feudalism

integrated caste system into it. It has similarities with European feudalism because it does not have serfdom which is an integral section of European feudalism.

Indian Marxists on Colonial Rule

All Indian Marxists agree to a point that India experienced capitalism under colonial rule. British rule brought sure radical transformation in the Indian civilization. It destroyed sure social organizations like the village society which had become an obstacle to social progress. Colonial capitalism created troubles for Indian progress. Colonial policy affected the artisan society. They were reduced to being paupers by the deindustrialization policy of colonial rule. One has to recognize the positive features of British rule which created sure circumstances in bringing contemporary industries. When railway was introduced in India, Marx was hopeful that India would experience a level of industrialization even however British rule did not intend to do so. Marx observed, "But when you have once introduced machinery into the locomotion of a country, which possesses iron and coal, you are unable to withhold it from its fabrication. You cannot uphold a net of railways, all those industrial procedures necessary to meet the immediate and current wants of railway locomotion, and out of which there necessity grow the application of machinery to those branches of industry not immediately linked with railways. The railway system will so, become in India, truly, the forerunner of contemporary industries.... Contemporary industry resulting from the railway system "will dissolve the hereditary divisions of labor, upon which rest the Indian castes, those decisive impediments to Indian progress and Indian power."

British rule could not stop the wheel of economic progress in India. India experienced the level of capitalism. Big level industrialization took lay flanked by two world wars. This gave an economic strength to Indian capitalist class for supporting the demand for independence.

Indian Marxists and Character of Indian Independence

Once India achieved independence what is the character of Indian independence became a debatable point in the middle of Marxists. Controversy in excess of the issue brought differences within communists to the surface. There are basically three opinions on the issue of independence. A part of the communists declared Indian independence as fake. India was a colony under the British rule and after independence turned into a neo-colony of British and American imperialism. Second group is of the opinion that India has acquired true independence by the path of self-governing economic development and such a India is going to be totally self-governing of the imperialist world. Third group remnants in flanked by the first and second. They accept the independence of India but there is always a threat from imperialism which cannot be washed absent.

Indian Marxists on Indian State and Ruling Class

Split in the Indian Communist Movement

This led to variation of opinion in the middle of Indian communists on the question of Indian State and ruling class. The function of the Congress party in the post-independence history remnants a debatable point. Each group remained as a political trend within the party. The Communist party functioned as a platform till 1964. Split in the international communist movement accentuated the differences further. Formal split in the Communist party took place in 1964. This did not stop there. Split within split occurred in the year of 1967. At present there are several splintered groups in India. But there are three major groups in communist politics whose differences of opinion on the issue of state, scheduling and ruling class need a serious discussion.

Indian Marxists and Instrumental Approach to the State

Indian communists have an instrumental approach to the question of the state. That state is an instrument of the ruling classes and it works in safeguarding and furthering their interests. Otherwise each Communist Party

has a political theory of Indian state. Understanding of ruling class helps in characterizing Indian state. There are three Communist Parties: CPI, CPI(M) and CPI(ML). We have to understand each party's viewpoint on the character of Indian State. The location of the CPI is as follows: "The State in India is the organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole, in which the big bourgeoisie holds powerful power. This class rule has links with the landlords. These factors provide rise to the reactionary pulls in the State Power."

This statement has two sections. First, the big bourgeoisie holds the state power which is the national bourgeoisie. At the similar time they have not snapped their dealings with the landlords in rural India. This helps in the rise of reactionary forces in Indian politics. They recognize the progressive character of the national bourgeoisie. The ruling Congress Party is the party of this class, that is why it can function as the instrument of social progress. Basically, the congress party can fight feudal interests in rural India. The location of CPI(M) is as follows: "The present Indian state is the organ of the class rule of the bourgeoisie and the landlords led by big bourgeoisie who are increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital in the pursuit of capitalist path of development. This class character essentially determines the role and function of State in the life of the country. "

For CPI(M), the ruling class is composed of the capitalists and landlords. They both share power in Indian state. Moreover, Indian capitalists are collaborating with foreign capitalists. State is an instrument of capitalists and landlords. The Congress Party is a party of these classes. It has a very little capability to play a progressive role in Indian politics. There is no question of social, economic and political progress unless this state is undermined and destroyed and replaced by a state of People's Democracy.

CPI(ML) is not a homogeneous political grouping. There are several groups working in the platform. Dominant viewpoint in the party is as follows. "India under Congress rule is only nominally self-governing, in information it is nothing more than a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. The Congress Party Management symbolizes the interests of the Indian feudal princes, big landlords, and bureaucrat-comprador capitalists." In other languages, Indian ruling class has a comprador character. They are subordinated to the American

and Russian imperialism. Capitalists are very friendly with the landlords. Indian state is an instrument of these classes which do not job in the interests of Indian people. It is a reactionary state. Indian state and the Congress Party cannot become instruments of social change.

Both CPI and CPI(M) provide sure autonomy to the Indian state. Within the present class configuration, state can play a decisive role in the development of a civilization. Both recognize the importance of scheduling. That scheduling in Indian economy supplements the strength of Indian capitalist class. Indian capitalist class because of its belated growth does not have enough capital and technology for taking a self-governing path. State sector or public sector can give them a helping hand in their development. Public Sector in Indian economy has gone for capital rigorous industries. That helps the Indian capitalist class not to be so much dependent on foreign capital. It provides them sure maneuvering capability in the international economy.

Indian Marxists and Foreign Policy

In the arena of foreign policy, both CPJ and CPI(M) support the non-alignment policy. India is not a member of any bloc, neither Western Soviet. India after independence takes a self-governing path in international politics. That helps them to protect national interest in a better manner. It is another matter that it receives economic aid from Soviet Union and America.

Indian Marxists and the Congress

As the Congress Party under the leadership of Nehru took a forthright and self-governing stand on the role of scheduling and foreign policy, it created confusion in the minds of the communist parties. CPI believes that Congress under the leadership of Nehru represented the interests of the national bourgeoisie. The row sustained till the Indira Gandhi era. The Congress Party pursued the policy of non-alignment. It gave priority to public sector in Indian economy. Here the perception of CPI(M) differs slightly from CPL. That non-aligned policy is the result of the character of Indian capitalist

class which is a reasonably urbanized class in all the third world countries. They pursued the policy of scheduling to stay India autonomous of international capital. There is a possibility that Indian capitalist class goes deeper into economic crisis. It will depend more and more on foreign capital like World Bank and IMF.

CPI and CPI(M) agree that the Congress Party is a secular party but very often compromises with collective forces. Power of single personalities like Nehru, Indira Gandhi in Congress politics creates the party more authoritarian. Congress Party under the leadership of Indira Gandhi has never faced any organizational election. That is why CPI(M) characterizes the Congress Party as an authoritarian party, although CPI does not agree with this characterization.

Both CPI and CPI(M) do not have any political theory of communalism and caste system. Most of the leaders throughout the national movement acquired sure understanding out of their experience. On both these issues, their understanding does not differ from liberal traditions. India is a multi-society civilization. Inter-collective harmony is a necessity for practicing class politics. With radicalization of mass politics, collective politics will retreat.

Indian Marxists and the Caste System

On the issue of caste system, their perception has a historical dimension. In the procedure of transformation from a tribal to a peasant civilization, India has integrated into caste systems. Castes are basically occupational groups based on the division of labor" Capitalism would change the caste system. Class politics will be able to check caste politics. Caste politics is a section of the ruling class politics. As B. T. Ranadive provides his observation, "The stability of religiosity, communalism and casteism was embedded in the compromise that permitted the continuation of antiquated land dealings."

Progressively their understanding on the caste question is changing. Caste system has to be fought on the plane of ideological and Political stage.

Caste legitimacy allows upper castes to oppress the lower castes. Ideological hegemony of caste system necessity is fought. Both CPI and CPI(M) support the reservation policy on the caste basis to destroy the iniquitous caste system.

Indian Marxists and Nationality

CPI, CPI(M) and CPI(ML) all support the freedom of nationalities. Indian nation is a collection of dissimilar nationalities. Each nationality is based on a linguistic row supported by cultural traditions_ That is why all communists agree to a point that Indian state should be a federal state for helping in allowing the cultural groups to flower. Ethnicity is a question which has approach to Indian politics in the 1980s. Tribal societies because of their ethnic backdrop have been demanding a tribal state like Jharkhand in Central India. Communist Parties agree to a point that all ethnic groups' necessity be allowed to function In an autonomous area, which is guaranteed by the Constitution. There is no such clear thinking on the question of ethnicity in communist circles

Indian Marxists on the Strategy of Mobilization

On the plane of political mobilization, CPI and CPI(M) have adopted a single strategy whereas the CPI(ML) has a confused opinion. Some groups in CPI(ML) do not like to adopt the parliamentary path while some others, specifically IPF (Indian People's Front) accept it. All the parties face a problem of reconciling flanked by the parliamentary row and revolutionary mass row. CPI has taken to electoral politics without any hesitation whereas CPI(M) has tried to reconcile flanked by electoral politics and mass politics, but progressively ha., become a victim of electoral politics CPI(ML) has been confused in excess of the issue. But CPI(ML) has been able to take low castes and lower classes jointly for political mobilization. In the case of Bihar, exercising their franchise becomes a radical slogan because poor from low castes are usually not allowed to vote. In a intricate caste ridden civilization, a strategy of class politics is not an easy task. In the procedure of political thrash about, a clearer strategy can emerge.

-

- **NATIONALISM AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION**

The Nationalists, Socialism and Social Revolution: An Overview

The trend represented by the socialists in the national movement was broadly represented in the thoughts of Jawaharlal Nehru, Subhas Chandra Bose, Jayaprakash Narayan, Narendra Dev and their associates in the Congress Socialist Party. Despite differences in the middle of them, they were attracted towards the ethical ideal of socialism emphasizing abolition of inequality, use and injustice; they were simultaneously ardent nationalists and were opposed to the ways of disagreement and violence by which the socialist revolution had been accomplished in the USSR. In other languages, they aimed at a socialist restructuring of India on the basis of Indian nationalism. At the similar time, they also distanced themselves from the trend represented by Hindu revivalism. Broadly, they accentuated the secular basis of Indian nationalism and it was with in this framework that they projected their vision of socialism.

Jawaharlal Nehru

Nehru's understanding of the problem of social transformation of India was primarily guided by his secular and scientific outlook, which aimed at the modernization of Indian civilization. In this venture Nehru had before him two major alternatives: One, the model of free market economy in the West, based on unrestricted capitalism; the other was the model of planned economy as pursued in the USSR. Nehru had reservations against both of these approaches. He could not accept the first one, since this would eventually lead to gross inequality and use, in violation of the vital norms of humanism.

As regards the Marxian model of socialism which was being practiced in Soviet Russia, Nehru was deeply impressed by its achievements and he quite openly proclaimed that socialism was the only option for India, if a civilization free from the clutches of use, injustice and inequality was to be built. His socialist sympathy was mainly strongly apparent in his Presidential address at the Lucknow Session of the AI CC in 1936. He could at the similar

time never reconcile himself to the ways. Therefore, he could not accept the thought of the cult of one centralized party, restrictions on rights and freedoms of individuals and above all, Soviet socialism's emphasis on class thrash about and the forcible overthrow of an exploitative social order. Nehru's socialism was broadly based on limited public manage of private enterprise, planned economy etc. on the one hand, and pluralism, freedom of the individual etc. on the other. In developing this perspective, he was deeply influenced by the Fabian thought of democratic socialism in a nationalist framework. While this nationalism was sharply dissimilar from the thought of Hindu revivalism with which Nehru never compromised, he accentuated that India's road to socialism would have its foundations based on traditional Indian ideals like cooperation, peaceful development, humanism and accommodation of all religious. beliefs, i.e. secularism.

It becomes quite strongly apparent that Nehru was projecting a vision which was bound to unleash tensions and difficulties, since it was an effort to reconcile things which were contradictory. While Nehru's goal was to seek a civilization based on justice and free from use, he attempted to do it in a framework of thought where rights and freedoms of individuals placed in unequal circumstances would not be restricted. This was a type of humanism which was unworkable in practice, since the privileged and the underprivileged were advised to job in a spirit of cooperation. Effectively speaking, Nehru's nationalistic vision blurred his perspective of socialism and dissipated the possibility of any real social revolution, since his radical outlook contradicted his path of compromise.

Subhas Chandra Bose

Subhas Chandra Bose's thought of social transformation of India was guided primarily by a spirit of intense nationalism and the thoughts of practical politics. While he quite strongly accentuated that political freedom was meaningless without social and economic emancipation of the masses and that in free India it was not the vested interests (i.e., the landlords, money-lenders and capitalists) but the interests of the peasants and workers which would be protected, the ideological framework which he envisaged for

realizing these goals contradicted his objectives. In fighting vested interests, since he stood for the abolition of landlordism, an uniform land-tenure system and sound Scheduling, he distanced himself from the capitalist path of free-market economy and came certainly closer to the radical ideology of socialism. But his spiritual backdrop, particularly the power of Vivekananda, his militant nationalism and his primary consideration being practical politics, led Bose to reject the Marxist model of socialism with emphasis on class thrash about and materialism. Therefore, while he was certainly attracted towards socialism's crusade against injustice and use and its advocacy of the cause of equality, he could not endorse the political strategy of Marxism for realization of these objectives.

His ideological vision became particularly clouded because, guided primarily by militant nationalist sentiments he aimed at realizing his goal by adopting a path which would provide him quick, immediate and effective results. This inclination towards pragmatism being a major characteristic of Bose's political outlook, he looked towards fascism with its emphasis on centralized state manage and militarism. He felt that the quickest road to social transformation was possible by combining the ideological goal of Marxism, socialism with emphasis on equality and the fascist ways of discipline, militant nationalism and rigid state manage. In this regard, the views of Bose sharply differed from those of Nehru, who was uncompromisingly opposed to fascism for its in human character.

Bose, though, could not convincingly explain as to how this odd mixture was really possible in practice, since fascism was basically a protection of the vested interests of capitalism, while Marxian socialism was uncompromisingly opposed to capitalism. The result was that Subhas Chandra Bose's nationalist ideological vision did not enable him to develop any real and effective understanding of the problem of social revolution in India.

The Marxists, Socialism and Social Revolution: An Overview

The freedom thrash about witnessed another trend represented broadly by the Marxists who distanced themselves from the socialist minded nationalists on a number of questions. Their thought of social revolution was

broadly guided by the vital tenets of Marxism and the experience of the Russian Revolution that had taken lay in 1917. On the one hand, they were skeptical in relation to the very ideology of nationalism and the solutions provided by people like Nehru, Subhas Chandra Bose, Narendra Dev and others, since in their opinion the nationalist framework of thought would perpetuate the vital problem of inequality, use and injustice in India; on the other hand, they stood for a social order where the interests of the workers and poor peasants would be primarily safeguarded and real power would vest in their hands. This meant an alternative understanding of the problem of social revolution in the framework of a radical variant of socialism, i.e., Marxism. This trend was reflected collectively in the viewpoint of the communists associated broadly with the Communist Party of India, the Workers' and Peasants' Party and other radical groups which broadly swore in the name of Marxism. Individually, the Marxist location was best represented in the thought of M.N. Roy in his early years when he was associated with the communist movement. Later, though, there took lay a major shift in his outlook when he provided a reinterpretation of Marxism and distanced himself from the Communists.

The Communists

The alternative strategy of social revolution proposed by the communists was primarily a product of their critique of the nationalist brand of socialism. While they also were genuine patriots and stood for secularism, opposition to Hindu revivalism and obscurantist practices like untouchability, their vital argument was that the objectives of socialism, i.e. equality, justice and freedom from use could not be realized without a radical restructuring of civilization. In their vision, this was impossible by adopting the nationalist solution which accentuated primarily the thought of accomplishment of national freedom under the leadership of the middle-Class oriented parties and groups as represented by Nehru, Sub has Bose and Congress Socialists. The Communists also could not agree with their perspective of social transformation which mainly justified the values of harmony and co-operation in the middle of the contending groups and classes in a civilization where

discrimination flanked by the privileged and underprivileged was very acute. In other languages, their main objection against nationalism was that it was virtually a protection of the vested interest" and real social transformation was impossible by adopting the framework of nationalism.

Motivated by this thought the communists, who professed their adherence to Marxism, urbanized an alternative approach towards the understanding of the question of social revolution. They followed what is usually recognized as the *class approach* and therein place their fundamental variation with the nationalist approach. They argued that if the ordinary man was to be the real beneficiary of social transformation, then it would have to be the alliance of the working class and peasantry which would be the guiding force of revolution.. This, they argued, could riot be done by adopting the ways of cooperation and preaching harmony-of contending groups and classes in civilization; to achieve this objective, the communists therefore preached the thought of violent, forcible overthrow of the propertied classes which incorporated the nationalists, i.e., the middle classes also. In proclaiming this goal, they were mainly inspired by the experience of the Russian Revolution.

This approach, though, despite its strongly radical thrust, proved unworkable for a number of reasons. One, despite the criticism of the nationalists, it could *pot* be appreciated by the communists that nationalist sentiments and appeals were too strongly embedded in the minds of the masses, which could not be presently brushed aside. Rather, this virulent attack on nationalism and the castigation of the nationalist leaders like Gandhi, Nehru and Subhas Bose as mediators of capitalists quite often in accessible the communists from the mainstream of the freedom thrash about. Two, the model of the Russian Resolution was virtually unworkable in India, because the material circumstances were fundamentally dissimilar. Three, the communists overestimated the potential and organizational strength of the working class was somewhat mechanical and to a big extent unreal, with the consequence that their vision of social revolution eventually remained unreal and unworkable.

M.N. Roy

M.N. Roy quite often regarded as one of the founders of communist 'movement in India, was one of the those early Marxists who attempted a radical understanding of the issue of social transformation of Indian civilization as separate from the framework of nationalism. In his early stage (extending up to the late 20s) Roy's understanding suggested that the social emancipation of the Indian masses was possible only by effecting a socialist revolution in the country under the leadership of the working class, since he whispered that in India nationalism was a spent force and that the nationalist movement was virtually aimed at ultimate consolidation of the interests of the middle class which spearheaded it. This hostility towards and cynicism in relation to the nationalism made Roy an uncompromising critic of the leaders of the Indian National Congress like Gandhi and Nehru. Moreover, Roy's optimism in relation to the prospects of a socialist revolution in India was mainly guided by his understanding that industrialization had proceeded quite rapidly in the country with the result that a strong working class had appeared with the potentiality to unleash a revolution. Subsequent research has proved that this understanding was totally at variance with reality, since the British were not at all interested in any real and effective industrialization of India.

M.N. Roy, as we know, later returned to India following his dissociation with the Communist movement and this second stage, broadly recognized as the era of 'radical humanism', witnessed Roy's reinterpretation of Marxism in a new perspective. Throughout this era, while he maintained his earlier critique of nationalism and thereby sustained to aloofness himself from the Congress Party, his views underwent a change in regard to the earlier understanding of Marxism as presently a political instrument for violent overthrow of the exploiter class. Roy now came round to the location that for a real social revolution in India what was primarily necessary was the assertion of a new type of ethical consciousness with which the people would have to be imbued. The emphasis now shifted in his thought from political confrontation to a type of abstract humanism which, though, was of little practical use. As a transition took lay in his writings from focusing on the masses to that on the

individual and from political action to abstract humanism, his perspective of social revolution became blurred and virtually unworkable.

-

- **REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- How did the Indian working class react to changing political situation in the country after the First World War?
- How did the left wing emerge in India?
- Discuss M. N. Roy's concept of Radical Humanism.
- What were the negative and positive inputs of the British rule as regards the Indian Society?
- How did the socialists interpret the problem of social revolution in India?

"The lesson content has been compiled from various sources in public domain including but not limited to the internet for the convenience of the users. The university has no proprietary right on the same."



Rai Technology University

ENGINEERING MINDS

Rai Technology University Campus

Dhodballapur Nelmangala Road, SH -74, Off Highway 207, Dhodballapur Taluk, Bangalore - 561204

E-mail: info@raitechuniversity.in | Web: www.raitechuniversity.in