

SELECT POLITICAL THINKERS-II

MA [Political Science]

Second Semester

Paper IX

1310316109



UTKAL UNIVERSITY

Directorate of Distance & Continuing Education

Bhubaneswar

Authors

Madhusmita Giri: Units (1, 2.2, 3.2) © Reserved, 2015

Dr Biswaranjan Mohanty: Units (2.3-2.4) © Dr Biswaranjan Mohanty, 2015

Dr. Syamala K. & Dr. P.I. Devaraj: Unit (4) © Dr. Syamala K. & Dr. P.I. Devaraj, 2015

Vikas Publishing House: Units (2.0-2.1, 2.5-2.9, 3.0-3.1, 3.3-3.8) © Reserved, 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication which is material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or transmitted or utilized or stored in any form or by any means now known or hereinafter invented, electronic, digital or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the Publisher.

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



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

VIKAS® PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD

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

Phone: 0120-4078900 • Fax: 0120-4078999

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

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



D. D. C. E.
Education for All

ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY

Founded in 1943, Utkal University is the 17th University of the country and the first of Orissa. It is the result of the efforts of Pandit Nilakantha Dash, Maharaja Krushna Chandra Gajapati, Pandit Godavarish Mishra and many others who envisioned a progressive education system for modern Orissa.

The University started functioning on 27 November 1943, at Ravenshaw College, Cuttack. It originated as an affiliating and examining body but shifted to its present campus spread over 400 acres of land at Vanivihar in Bhubaneswar, in 1962.

A number of Postgraduate Departments and other centres were established in the University campus. There are presently more than two hundred general affiliated colleges under the University. It has eleven autonomous colleges under its jurisdiction, twenty-eight constituent postgraduate departments, 2 constituent law colleges and a Directorate of Distance & Continuing Education. It boasts of a centre for Population Studies, a School of Women's Studies, an Academic Staff College, a pre-school and a high school. The University also offers a number of self-financing courses.

NAAC accredited since 2003, with B++ status and a score little over 80%, Utkal University is recognized by the UGC. It is a member of the Indian Association of Universities and the Commonwealth Association of Universities.

**DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE & CONTINUING EDUCATION
UTKAL UNIVERSITY : VANI VIHAR
BHUBANESWAR:-751007.**

From the Director's Desk

The Directorate of Distance & Continuing Education, originally established as the University Evening College way back in 1962 has travelled a long way in the last 52 years. **'EDUCATION FOR ALL'** is our motto. Increasingly the Open and Distance Learning institutions are aspiring to provide education for anyone, anytime and anywhere. DDCE, Utkal University has been constantly striving to rise up to the challenges of Open Distance Learning system. Nearly ninety thousand students have passed through the portals of this great temple of learning. We may not have numerous great tales of outstanding academic achievements but we have great tales of success in life, of recovering lost opportunities, tremendous satisfaction in life, turning points in career and those who feel that without us they would not be where they are today. There are also flashes when our students figure in best ten in their honours subjects. In 2014 we have as many as fifteen students within top ten of honours merit list of Education, Sanskrit, English and Public Administration, Accounting and Management Honours. Our students must be free from despair and negative attitude. They must be enthusiastic, full of energy and confident of their future. To meet the needs of quality enhancement and to address the quality concerns of our stake holders over the years, we are switching over to self instructional material printed courseware. Now we have entered into public private partnership to bring out quality SIM pattern courseware. Leading publishers have come forward to share their expertise with us. A number of reputed authors have now prepared the course ware. Self Instructional Material in printed book format continues to be the core learning material for distance learners. We are sure that students would go beyond the course ware provided by us. We are aware that most of you are working and have also family responsibility. Please remember that only a busy person has time for everything and a lazy person has none. We are sure you will be able to chalk out a well planned programme to study the courseware. By choosing to pursue a course in distance mode, you have made a commitment for self improvement and acquiring higher educational qualification. You should rise up to your commitment. Every student must go beyond the standard books and self instructional course material. You should read number of books and use ICT learning resources like the internet, television and radio programmes etc. As only limited number of classes will be held, a student should come to the personal contact programme well prepared. The PCP should be used for clarification of doubt and counseling. This can only happen if you read the course material before PCP. You can always mail your feedback on the course ware to us. It is very important that you discuss the contents of the course materials with other fellow learners.

We wish you happy reading.

(S.P. Pani)
DIRECTOR

SYLLABI-BOOK MAPPING TABLE

Select Political Thinkers-II

Syllabi	Mapping in Book
UNIT I Hegel & T.H Green	Unit-1: Hegel and T. H. Green (Pages 3-32)
UNIT II Karl Marx & Lenin	Unit-2: Marx, Lenin and Mao (Pages 33-80)
UNIT III Gramsci & Nozick	Unit-3: Gramsci and Nozick (Pages 81-109)
UNIT IV Gandhi & Mao	Unit-4: Gandhian Thought (Pages 111-156)

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
UNIT 1 HEGEL AND T. H. GREEN	3-32
1.0 Introduction	
1.1 Unit Objectives	
1.2 G. W. F. Hegel	
1.2.1 Idealism	
1.2.2 Dialectical Method	
1.2.3 Theory of State and Freedom of Individual	
1.3 T. H. Green	
1.3.1 The State	
1.3.2 Punishment	
1.3.3 Political Obligation	
1.4 Summary	
1.5 Key Terms	
1.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'	
1.7 Questions and Exercises	
1.8 Further Reading	
UNIT 2 MARX, LENIN AND MAO	33-80
2.0 Introduction	
2.1 Unit Objectives	
2.2 Karl Marx	
2.2.1 Theory of Alienation	
2.2.2 Dialectics	
2.2.3 State and Revolution	
2.2.4 Criticism	
2.3 Lenin	
2.3.1 Lenin's Theory of Imperialism	
2.3.2 Theory of Party	
2.3.3 Tactics of Revolution	
2.4 Mao	
2.4.1 Background of History: Struggle for Socialism	
2.4.2 Establishment of Socialism in China	
2.4.3 Economy of New Democracy or New Socialism	
2.4.4 Mao's Hundred Flowers Policy	
2.5 Summary	
2.6 Key Terms	
2.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'	
2.8 Questions and Exercises	
2.9 Further Reading	
UNIT 3 GRAMSCI AND NOZICK	81-109
3.0 Introduction	
3.1 Unit Objectives	
3.2 Antonio Gramsci	
3.2.1 Gramsci and Civil Society	
3.2.2 Gramsci on Hegemony	
3.2.3 Gramsci on Revolution	
3.3 Robert Nozick	
3.3.1 <i>Anarchy, State and Utopia</i>	
3.3.2 <i>Philosophical Explanations</i>	

- 3.4 Summary
- 3.5 Key Terms
- 3.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.7 Questions and Exercises
- 3.8 Further Reading

UNIT 4 GANDHIAN THOUGHT

111-156

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 Influences of Various Religious Traditions on Gandhian Thought
 - 4.2.1 Influences of Some Great Thinkers on Gandhi
 - 4.2.2 Gandhian Concept of a Universal Religion
- 4.3 Gandhian Socialism
 - 4.3.1 Sarvodaya
 - 4.3.2 Concept of *Varnadharma* or the Natural Classes in Gandhian Thought
 - 4.3.3 Untouchability: A Crime Against God and Man
 - 4.3.4 Gandhi's Views on the Status of Women in Society
 - 4.3.5 Nai Talim: Gandhian Scheme of Education
 - 4.3.6 Environmental Protection and Ecological Way of Living
- 4.4 Political Thoughts of Gandhi: Satyagraha
 - 4.4.1 Techniques of *Satyagraha*
 - 4.4.2 Constructive Programme
 - 4.4.3 *Gram Swaraj* or Village Republics: Gandhian Views on Democracy
 - 4.4.4 *Ramrajya*: Gandhian Concept of True Democracy
 - 4.4.5 Nationalism and Internationalism
- 4.5 Economic Thoughts of Gandhi
 - 4.5.1 Bread Labour
 - 4.5.2 Trusteeship
 - 4.5.3 Gandhi's Attitude Towards Industrialization and Modernization
 - 4.5.4 Concept of Swadeshi
 - 4.5.5 *Hind Swaraj*
- 4.6 Summary
- 4.7 Key Terms
- 4.8 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.9 Questions and Exercises
- 4.10 Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

Political thinking or thoughts pertaining to politics are as old as the field of politics itself. These thoughts have a range of different styles and approaches. Different eras have witnessed political thinkers who have always taken initiatives to openly speak about conventions, provide advice to those who exercised the power to rule, defend traditions and principles, or be critical about the world according to their viewpoint. Their focus has always been sharp on governmental agencies, judiciaries, exercise of coercive power, and so on. They have been more inclined towards the nature of the society or the common man. In more generic terms, through centuries, political thought has grown in such a direction that it blends with whatever is considered as ethical, moral, philosophical, and social.

There are two main streams of thought in political science. One looks for stability and order with justice. The other, seeks justice the opposite way because it believes the existing society is incapable of providing for justice. The issues became acute in the wake of Industrial Revolution when the workers were subjected to inhuman exploitation. In this system Marx advocated revolution and his followers, namely, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Zedong, Antonio Gramsci and Robert Nozick elaborated his views and tried to apply them in the social affairs. Gandhi also wanted justice for the underlings. But his strategy was different. He did not believe in violent revolution. He believed it is possible to change the exploiters hard by suffering and love. Instead of class contradiction Gandhi worked for class collaboration. His target was abolition of imperial rule of India, and he achieved it.

This book, *Select Political Thinkers II*, elaborates on the socio-political and economic views of the thinkers mentioned above and a few more like Hegel and T. H. Green. The book follows the self-instructional mode wherein each unit begins with **Introduction** and **Unit Objectives** before going onto the presentation of detailed content in a simple and structured format. The **Summary** gives you a brief outline of the topics discussed in the unit. **Key Terms** hold the pulse of the main diagnostic principles forming the basis of the discussion. **Check Your Progress** questions are provided at regular intervals to test the student's understanding of the topics. **Questions and Exercises** are provided at the end of each unit. The **Further Reading** section holds the prospects for advance learning and understanding in the field.

Structure

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Unit Objectives
- 1.2 G. W. F. Hegel
 - 1.2.1 Idealism
 - 1.2.2 Dialectical Method
 - 1.2.3 Theory of State and Freedom of Individual
- 1.3 T. H. Green
 - 1.3.1 The State
 - 1.3.2 Punishment
 - 1.3.3 Political Obligation
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 Key Terms
- 1.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.7 Questions and Exercises
- 1.8 Further Reading

NOTES**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

German philosopher George Willhelm Friedrich Hegel was a well known figure of German idealism who introduced the dialectic method in the study of Western philosophy. Hegel believed his system of philosophy was a culmination of all philosophical thoughts. His thoughts were systematically divided into the science of logic, philosophy of Nature, and the philosophy of spirit. Some of the basic ideas which can be said to be at the core of Hegel's philosophy are idea of freedom, self-consciousness, reason, and recognition.

In this unit, you will learn about the idealism as enunciated by Hegel. You will also be made familiar with the concepts and elements of idealism. This unit also deals with Hegel's narration of the idea of the theory of state and freedom of individual. This unit also talks about ideas of the state as enunciated by T. H. Green. You will be introduced to the linkages between the development of the positive liberalism and functions of state. This unit also describes various facets of Green's conception of punishment.

1.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Analyze the idea of dialectical method propounded by Hegel
- Identify Hegelian idealism
- Comprehend Hegel's idea of state and freedom of an individual
- Interpret punishment as explained by Green
- Discuss the concept of political obligation
- Analyze Green's idea of state

1.2 G. W. F. HEGEL

George Willhelm Friedrich Hegel was born in Stuttgart, Germany on August 27, 1770. He passed his youth in the intoxicating days of the French revolution. He was nineteen when the French revolution broke out. His father was a civil servant in the department of finance of the state of Wurtemberg. Most of his relatives were either teachers or liberal ministers. He grew up with patient and methodical habits of

NOTES

those civil servants whose modest efficiency has given Germany the best governed cities in the world. Hegel entered the German School when he was just three years old. At the age of five, when he went to the Latin school, he was already aware of the first declension, taught to him by his mother.

He as a student was highly industrious and hard working and he made full analysis of all the important books he read. He was sent to the grammar school at Stuttgart for his education. Hegel got into Stuttgart's *Gymnasium illustre* in 1776.

Hegel was a voracious reader in his adolescence, with a habit of copying excerpts and extracts in his diary as he read. During his adolescence, some of the writers that he read included German poet Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, and writers of Enlightenment, for instance Christian Grave and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. The *Abiturrede* (graduation speech) which concluded his studies at the Gymnasium was entitled "The abortive state of art and scholarship in Turkey."

He was a brilliant student, at school he excelled and won a scholarship to a reputed seminary at Tubingen in 1788, where he studied philosophy and theology. Here he devoted himself thoroughly to theological studies in preparation for the Lutheran ministry. Later, he felt disgusted with the orthodox tenets of Christianity and abandoned the career which his parents wanted him to pursue.

Hegel entered the Tubinger Stift at the young age of eighteen. It is here he met the future poet Friedrich Holderlin and the future philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, both of whom were to be the crucial in Hegel's development as philosopher and thinker. All the three did not like the overall atmosphere of the seminary and thought it to be restrictive. Their mutual friendship grew and soon they became very close friends and had a mutual influence on each other thoughts and ideas. Together they saw French Revolution unfold with a feeling of excitement and exuberance. Theoretical debates on the philosophy and ideas of Kant became a common occurrence between Schelling and Holderlin, but Hegel maintained his distance from such engagements. During this time Hegel saw himself as a future popular philosophe, i.e. a man of letters who makes the recondite ideas of philosophy understandable to the ordinary public. It is not that Hegel did not engage with the ideas of Kantian philosophy, but his need for this engagement did not arise until the end of the century.

After completing his studies, he accepted the position of a family tutor with a wealthy family in Switzerland from 1793–1796. This was followed by similar positions at Berne and Frankfurt from 1797–1800. His philosophical speculation began at this time.

It was during this period he wrote what is known as the 'Life of Jesus'. Another book that he wrote during this period was 'The Positivity of the Christian Religion'. His relationship with his employers became strained, and when Holderlin brought to him a similar offer with a wine merchant in Frankfurt, Hegel did not think twice before accepting it. He moved to Frankfurt in 1797. In Frankfurt, Holderlin's influence of Hegel's ideas and thought became much more forced and apparent. In Frankfurt, Hegel wrote an essay called 'Fragments on Religion and Love'. He wrote another essay called 'The Spirit of Christianity and Its Fate' in the year 1799. It remained unpublished during his lifetime. In 1812, Hegel's brother George Ludwig died as an officer in Napoleon's Russian campaign.

Hegel's inheritance was modest. He gave up tutoring and took to writing. He published a book differentiating the philosophy of Fichte and Schelling. In collaboration with Schelling, he edited the *Journal fur Philosophie*. His well known work 'Phenomenology of Mind' appeared in 1807. He was a university lecturer at Jena

NOTES

from 1801 to 1807. After working for a year as a newspaper editor in Bamberg, he moved to Nuremberg as headmaster of a high school in 1808, and continued there till 1816. His long work, *Science of Logic* in three volumes, appeared in 1812, 1813 and 1816. By this time, he became quite well known, and in 1816 he was invited to take up a post at the University of Heidelberg as a professor of Philosophy.

Schelling, Hegel's old friend, who was a professor at a university in Jena, encouraged him to come to the city in 1801. In Jena, Hegel wrote a dissertation on the orbits of the planet, which helped him get a position of lecturer at the University, although the job was unpaid. Later that year, Hegel published a book entitled *The Difference between Fichte's and Schelling's Systems of Philosophy*. He gave lectures on Logic and Metaphysics, and together with his friend Schelling he lectured on topics like 'Introduction to the Idea and Limits of true Philosophy' and conducted a 'Philosophical Disputorium'. It was the year 1802, when Hegel and Schelling brought out the journal called 'Critical Journal of Philosophy'. For almost a year both of them wrote a piece for the journal, but their collaboration came to an end in 1803, for Schelling had to depart for Wurzburg. Hegel was promoted to the post of extraordinary Professor at the university, though he was still not getting paid. The promotion was the result of a letter that Hegel wrote to then minister of culture, the poet and playwright Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, expressing his dissent on the promotion of Jakob Friedrich Fries, his philosophical opponent, before him. Hegel tried to secure a position at the resurgent University of Heidelberg with the help of Johann Heinrich, a German classicist and poet, known mainly for his translation of Home's *Odyssey*, but failed to do so. Later in the same year, to Hegel's embarrassment, Fries was given a salaried position of an Ordinary professor at the university.

Hegel moved to Bamberg in March 1807, at the age of 37, where he became the editor of a newspaper, *Bamberger Zeitung*. The offer was first made to Niethammer, but he rejected the offer and passed it to Hegel, which he reluctantly accepted, for he was unable to find any other employment of his liking. Ludwig Fischer, Hegel's illegitimate son, and his mother, did not move to Bamberg with Hegel. In 1808, Hegel, once again through the help of Niethammer, was able to secure a position of headmaster of a Gymnasium in Nuremberg. He worked as the headmaster of the Gymnasium till 1816. In the Gymnasium at Nuremberg, Hegel began using his book *Phenomenology of Mind* in classroom for teaching. Hegel developed the idea of an encyclopedia of the philosophical sciences as a part of his teaching the class called 'Introduction to knowledge of the Universal Coherence of the Sciences'. His encyclopedia was categorized into three parts – logic, philosophy of spirit, and philosophy of nature. In 1811, Hegel married the eldest daughter of senator, Marie Helena Sisanna von Tucher. From her, he had two sons- Karl Friedrich Wilhelm and Immanuel Thomas Christian. This period also saw the publication of Hegel's second major work, *Science of Logic*. Hegel received an offer from two universities, University of Erlangen, Berlin, and University of Heidelberg. He declined the offer of the University of Erlangen and chose to move to Heidelberg in 1816. Soon after, Ludwig Fischer, Hegel's illegitimate son who had been living in an orphanage, joined his household in April 1817.

In the same year, Hegel published his *The Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Outline*. This work was an attempt to summarize his entire philosophy for the students who would come to attend his lectures in Heidelberg. Next year, in 1818, Hegel received a renewed offer of the chair of philosophy at the University of Berlin, which had been vacant since the death of Fichte in 1814. Hegel accepted the offer and moved to Berlin. While working in Berlin, Hegel published his *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. In Berlin, Hegel completely devoted himself to his lectures.

NOTES

He lectured on various subjects like aesthetics, the philosophy of religion, the philosophy of history, and the history of philosophy. His lectures on subjects were published posthumously based on notes taken by his students during his lectures. His lectures soon became famous, and students from all over Germany, and sometimes abroad, began to attend them. At the age of 60, in the year 1830, Hegel was appointed the rector of the University. The year 1830 was also the year of riots for reform in Berlin. Hegel was deeply stirred up and agitated by the riots. Next year, in 1831, he was decorated for his service to the Prussian state by Frederick William III. Hegel left Berlin in 1831, because of the spread of a cholera epidemic in Berlin, and took refuge in Kreuzberg. Hegel's health began to deteriorate, and he preferred to remain inside the house. In October, Hegel came back to Berlin, as the new semester at the University began, thinking that the epidemic was under control. But he did not see the end of that year and died on 14th November, the same year. It is said that the last words that Hegel uttered were: "And he didn't understand me". Hegel was buried in the Dororheenstadt cemetery next to Fichte and Solger, as per his wishes, on 16th November 1831. Hegel was never able to hear of the death of his son Ludwig Fischer who had died while serving the Dutch army in Batavia some days before his own death.

His principal works are *The Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807), *Science of Logic* (1812–1816) which captivated Germany and won him the chair of philosophy at Heidelberg. In 1817, he wrote his *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, so that he could get a position at the University of Berlin. In 1821, he published his *Philosophy of Right*, and his *Philosophy of History* was published posthumously in 1837. In all these works, Hegel commented on and analyzed various areas of political theory. He is also considered to be the founder of what we now call modern idealism. In the first half of the eighteenth century, he was the greatest figure in the realm of philosophy in Germany, for during this time Germany was divided in three categories based on the Hegelian idealism – the Hegelians, the left Hegelians, and the right Hegelians. He introduced the idea of dialectic and the theory concerning the concept of self-realization. He gave a new theory of history, which according to him was the human spirit writ large, the 'march of reason in the world'. He was critical of purely reflective knowledge. His famous work *Philosophy of Right* deals with key issues of law, politics and morality, and makes an important distinction between the civil society and the state. Towards the end of his life, Hegel started attracting large audiences from the entire German speaking world and many became his disciples. His other works were *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, *Lecture on aesthetics*, *Lecture on the Philosophy of Religion* and *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*. In recognition of his work, in 1830, Hegel was elected rector of the University.

Hegel's works are usually considered difficult and are known for the vastness of topics they cover. Hegel's system of philosophy included an understanding of not only the history of philosophy but the world itself. It is usually described as a "progression in which each successive movement emerges as a resolution to the contradictions inherent in the preceding movement." For instance, Hegel thought of French Revolution as the emergence of something entirely new in the European societies in the entire history. He saw this something new as the authentic individual political freedom. And because it is new in the sense that something like this never happened before, it is infinite in regards to all that preceded it. On the one hand the sudden rush of violence that feeds the revolution cannot stop being itself, while on the other hand, it has already exhausted its enemy. And that is why the revolution has nowhere else to go but to its own end, its own outcome – the freedom is won, but not without the brutal reign of terror consuming this freedom. But history learns from its own mistakes and progresses

by eradicating those mistakes, and precisely because of this the idea of a constitutional state is possible, a state which represents not only the idea of rational government, but also ideas which changed the history forever – the ideas of freedom and equality. It was Hegel’s analysis of French revolution that made German poet Heinrich Heine call him “The Orleans of German Philosophy.”

Hegel is credited with being one of the few who created German idealism. His ideas concerning historicism and idealist version of reality not only had a revolutionizing impact on the Western philosophy, but also played an important role in the development of Marxism and the rest of the continental philosophy. Hegel’s philosophical system is comprehensive in its explanation or description of the relationship between the mind and nature, the subject and the object of knowledge, and psychology, the state, history, art, religion, and philosophy. Specifically, he is credited with the creation of a system in which the idea of spirit or mind manifests itself in set of oppositions and contradictions in such a way that ultimately it integrates and unites without terminating or cancelling out either of the poles or diluting one to the other. For instance, the contradictions between freedom and nature, and transcendence and immanence. Hegel’s influence was not limited to his admirers or his followers. He influenced a whole range of intellectuals and thinkers, including those who were his disparagers. Some of his ideas or concepts which proved to be more influential than others are ‘dialectic’ or ‘speculative logic’, ‘absolute idealism’, ‘negativity’, ‘spirit’, ‘negativity’, ‘sublation’, ‘the master/slave dialectic’, ‘ethical life’, and the importance of history.

1.2.1 Idealism

Hegel is considered an idealist thinker. He started with the assumption that the universe is a coherent whole. In this organic unity, what he variously called the idea, or spirit or reason, or the divine mind, is the only reality. Everything, including matter or the external world, is the creation of this idea or spirit or reason or the divine mind, and this is the only reality. Therefore, one can conclude that the reason is what governs the world.

In Germany, it was considered that if the contemporary reality was not based on reason, then the reality had to be altered. This general framework of general political theory was given a highly sophisticated personal touch by Hegel with his two-fold argument that, first, history was not merely a chronological table but had a meaning which was both profound and purposeful, particularly the important thing for him being to recreate Greek harmony within the context of modern society based on individualism and reason. Second, as Scottish philosopher A.C. MacIntyre observed, it was Hegel, who was the first thinker to have understood very clearly that questions concerning morality change from one particular place and time to another, and there was nothing called a permanent moral question. This led to the important assertion of Hegel that the history of philosophy was the core of philosophy. What logically followed was the important conclusion that all history represented particular levels of development, and had to be judged on the basis of advancement towards the realization of reason. He was convinced that reason, truth and freedom were identifiable, that the process of reaching the final stage and even a blueprint of the final stage was conceivable, as history as a quest of development had a definite beginning and a certain end.

Hegel’s philosophical system has the idea of a definite political philosophy with a definite political order at its core. The concept of dialectic between the civil society and the restoration of state is neither something that lurks on the fringes of his system, nor it is merely a minor section of his philosophy of right, instead it is something that makes up the very core around which his entire system of philosophy is structured.

NOTES

NOTES

Hegel's ideas and concepts are the apogee of the tradition of western philosophical thought, and therefore to decipher and understand them, one must interpret them within the tradition of the western philosophical thought.

The German Romantic Movement influenced Hegel considerably, though he rejected the ideas of the movement. Among all the philosophers of the German Romantic Movement it was Emanuel Kant who influenced Hegel the most. Kant's famous work *Critic of Pure Reason* (1781) made a synthesis of the two different ideals of enlightenment- Newtonian Physics and Helvetian Empiricism. Newton offered definite and unalterable laws for all occasions and places, on the other hand Helvetious and Hume argued that rational belief emanated from our own sensual encounters. Kant's important contribution emerged with his assertion that these two different perceptions would be reconciled by the fact that all our experience ended in a Newtonian certainty, by the nature of the concepts and categories with which we understand the world. This interrelationship was crucial, as 'concepts without perceptions are empty, perceptions without concept are mind'. Kant was the exponent of practical reason, which was based on belief in god, freedom and immortality. Within this framework, any meaningful moral category had to have a universalistic basis, for instance, when all nations became republic there need not be any war. This was similar to a popular assertion in the late 20th century that democracies do not fight with one another. The condensation of history and the rejection of the past as essentially incomplete resonated in the writings of Hegel, and subsequently in those of Marx. Marx's assertion, 'one hundred years of capitalism did more wonders then all the preceding history taken together', echoed the optimism and confidence that Kant and Hegel excluded. Hegel criticized Kant's handling of reason while dealing with the challenge of empiricism that if the reason is not able to the scrutinize the things in themselves, then it means that reason is merely subjective and therefore has no control over the objective reality of the world, which then leads to an unacceptable division of the world between subjectivity and objectivity. The relation between subject and object was a complex but interrelated one, with unity of the opposite subjects or matters both in theory and practice leading to a 'praxis'. This conflict was of crucial importance to Hegel, as his seminal contribution of alienation originated with this formulation. The alienation of mind originated when the objective factors which were originally produced by human labour and knowledge became detached and unrecognizable to man. In such a situation, theory did not reflect reality, and truth had no meaning in the real world. As a result, human frustration and helplessness increased. To end this separateness in all its manifestations, the entire framework of inquiry was brought within the ambit of reason. Separateness had to be ended by a theory of unity of totality in philosophy. This utmost emphasis on reason was of tremendous importance to Hegel, as human emancipation—a distinct possibility in the modern period could only be realized on the basis of reason. He emphasized the human capacity to cherish freedom, and in that sense had the capacity to transcend the imperfections of contemporary nature and society by the process of mediation. Reason and human action led to mediation by new concepts and category replacing old ones, which at one time looked stable. This was the driving force of the Hegelian dialectic which made his philosophy a negative one.

Usually the idealism of Hegelian system is considered as an absolute idealism because it provides us with a set of categories in terms of which all human experiences of the past and the present can be understood. There is another dimension of Hegelian idealism. This may be called idealist interpretation of history. According to this theory, it is the ideas that constitute the true motor of history, what gives momentum to history is the development of ideas. All changes in society, economy, polity and culture take

place because of development of ideas. Hegel's Idealism which is often called Absolute Idealism sees a certain relationship between the subject and the object. It is a relationship between a knowing subject and the objective world, which is known as the relationship between the mind and the world.

1.2.2 Dialectical Method

The dialectical method is the most distinguishing feature of the Hegelian philosophical system. The dialectical method is as old as Socrates but in the hands of Hegel it is given a universal validity and application that is more moral and profound. According to him, the movement of thought is dialectical. The dialectical method that Hegel prefers is that of an argument, which has been one of the most crucial ways of explaining philosophy in both European and Indic philosophical traditions. The origin of the word 'dialectic' can be traced back to time of Plato in Ancient Greece, who made the term popular through Socratic dialogues. The entire concept of dialectic is based on the idea of discussion between two or more people with different or opposing viewpoints, but with the eagerness to find the truth of the subject at hand through the use of reason while exchanging their different perspectives. Thus, dialectical method is essentially different from the very idea of debate in which the participants' focus remains on proving their point of view as the right one, and persuading their opponents to come to terms with their ideas, and this is why a judge or a jury is often required to decide the winner in case of a debate, whereas in the dialectical method no such thing is needed. The dialectical method is also different from rhetoric, which is simply an act of oration with an appeal to ethos, logos, or pathos. In other words rhetoric can be simply defined to be a kind of communication with the purpose of convincing the audience to agree with a specific perspective, argument or action.

Hegel's dialectical method uses the idea of thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis, by the application of which he sought to resolve the entire problem of contradiction. Hegel with his dialectical method tried to resolve the various issues of contradiction in the western philosophical thoughts. Hegel's dialectical method also tried to reconcile the numerous different traits that emerged in the history of philosophy in the past.

He never claimed to be its inventor, and even acknowledged that the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates used it. For Hegel every truth was the synthesis of two contradictory elements. Affirmation leads to dogmatism, negation to skepticism, and only through the systematic mediation of mysticism can the real truth emerge. According to Hegel, human progress does not take place in a positive straight line. It is always a zigzag movement. It is just like 'a ship tackling against an unfavorable wind'. World according to him is not static, but is dynamic. The true concept of this world must be an active, moving process, a process of evolution. In evolution, something that is underdeveloped, undifferentiated or homogenous, develops by differentiating of, assuming many different and opposing or contradictory forms. It then unites again in a new concrete object and becomes unity in diversity. The lower is denied in the higher. It does not remain what it was, but it is preserved in the higher form. This whole process was given the name of dialectic by Hegel. There are four basic ideas at the core of Hegelian dialectics: first, everything is finite and transient and exists within the limits of time; second, everything consists of opposing forces; third, gradual changes occur which lead to the point where one force is overcome by the other; and fourth, change happens not in circular motion but in spiral.

The history of dialectics is rich and varied within this broad categorization. Many say that the history of dialectic resembles the history of entire philosophy. The basic idea of dialectics is apparent in the theories of Heraclitus of Ephesus, who maintained

NOTES

NOTES

that everything is always in a constant change, which is the result of inner discord and resistance. The dialectical method aims to resolve this inner discord through the reasoned discussion and arguments as a way to the search for the ultimate truth. One way to approach the dialectical method is through Socratic method, in which a given hypothesis is proven to lead to the opposing ideas or contradictory concepts, thus making that hypothesis prone to improvement and therefore its withdrawal as a candidate for arriving at the truth.

Another way to go with the dialectical method is to negate some of the presuppositions of both the thesis and anti-thesis, thus arriving at what we call synthesis of the two, or what Hegel calls 'sublation'. However, it is possible that the denial of the presuppositions of both the thesis and anti-thesis is opposed by the candidates who proposed them. In such a case, there might be a second-order controversy.

Though Hegel used the dialectical model of thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis, but in a very different way. He termed the components of his three-valued logical model as abstract-negative-concrete. There are instances when Hegel used the terms – immediate-meditated-concrete. Hegel makes the use of these terms on numerous occasion throughout his work.

Hegel developed his version of dialectical method as a response to his identification with the Kantian system of philosophy, which prefers the scientific approach towards the study of nature over the Enlightenment philosophical methods.

Crucial to this method was a belief that accuracy came out of a method of reduction, which meant that knowledge emerged out of the detailed study and analysis of parts. Hegel's dialectical method presupposed that ideas and beliefs were to be related to their institutions and social structures, i.e. the spheres of the subjective mind and the objective mind had to converge. The categories of subject and object were to go together as a theory and practice. What apparently looked contradictory were actually dialectical terms, interdependent. This method was to be internally, linked to the subject matter. It did not just record and observed but attempted to build an edifice of a well-connected discourse, which one may accept or reject. It accepted dialogue and conversations and the very basis of the dialectical method is a 'constant endeavor to convert every occasions of non-agreement into an occasion of agreement'. In *Phenomenology*, Hegel illustrated the dialectical method at work in the human consciousness, but it is in the *Philosophy of Right* that one finds a more elaborate and comprehensive political use of dialectical method, which is reflected in the Hegel's explanation of the evolution of the world from Ancient Greece to the present time (Hegel's time).

He proposed that history exhibits a dialectical pattern in the way it evolves. He posited that the different contradictory and opposing forces of different levels of social life culminates in the State by the process of synthesis, which, according to Hegel, was the ultimate body. However, the relation that exists between the contradictions of the thesis and anti-thesis and the synthesis remains within the limits of the ideas of the social practices.

Marx too discerned a dialectical pattern in history, but then understood contradictions between the means and relations of production and different stages of history. Every being, as Hegel expressed it, is to be understood, not only by what it is but what it is not. The opposite of being is not being, and being and not being are alike summed up and carried further towards reality in becoming. Each stage, or thesis reached by the ideal until it has arrived at its goals, must fall sort of perfection. Its imperfections will call into being a movement to remove them or anti thesis. There will

be a struggle between thesis and anti-thesis until such time as a synthesis is found which will preserve what is true in both thesis and anti thesis, the synthesis, in its turn, becoming a new thesis, and so on until the idea is at last enthroned in perfection.

Hegel claimed that the only way in which the human mind can arrive at the truth regarding anything is through the dialectical method of reasoning. As human beings we formulate a doctrine about something. That doctrine will contain elements of truth but also since all human beings are passionate, self centered, fallible and limited by their particular historical perspective, elements of error, other individuals perceiving the error in that doctrine, will formulate a doctrine which is precisely the opposite. Their doctrine will contain elements both on truth and error. A third doctrine is necessary in order to preserve what is true in both, only a synthesis can reconcile the thesis and its anti-thesis. The third doctrine again becomes a new thesis subject to self contradiction and we are faced with the problem again of constructing a new synthesis out of this third doctrine and its anti thesis. This process presumably continues indefinitely although each synthesis is thought to be closer to the absolute truth than each preceding synthesis.

All finite things, according to Hegel are contradictory in themselves. Moreover, it is not men who remove these contradictions but reason itself. If not us, but the very force, within the thesis and antithesis, which is the reason that promotes development. Thus, it can be concluded that dialectic or the state of opposition is a process which is self-generating, the very principle which moves or puts the world in action. Or in other words, the world exists because of the process of contradictions. The process of dialectic then offers a theory to explain the history as a story of the development of the spirit. Because all the former steps of the spirit are preserved in the new ones it emphasizes, the continuity of that story of the increasing revelation of the spirit remains. Thus, history can be defined as a process which makes the spirit transform from the state of knowing nothing to the state where it has the complete knowledge of itself. It is the increasing revelation of the purposes of the rational mind. Hegel used this dialectical theory to offer an explanation for the way in which the society and its institutions progress. The purpose of the dialectics is to display what he called 'necessity in history'. The historical necessity which he saw in history was a physical and moral compulsion. He had before his eyes the picture of Germany after the Battle of Jena, which was hopelessly miserable. He wanted Germany to stand and arise and become a world spirit. In other words, it should have its domination all over the world. When he said that Germany must become a state he meant that it ought to do so and the highest interest of civilization and national life required it to advance in that direction. Germany must become a state, not because the Germans wished it but because the growth of Germany into a world-state was in line with the whole direction of moral and scientific development, as it was the present bearer of the world spirit. The disunion and feebleness of Germany, he said, were not the marks of her decay but rather the travel of the German spirit about to give birth to a new social and political order. It is in this way that Hegel made an appeal to the fidelity of German nation and idealized and exalted the state to its mystical height. Thus, dialectic was not only a logical method of arriving at truth, it was also a moral instrument for bringing about the unification of Germany and its emergence as a great nation. The first and the harshest criticism of Hegel's methodology is that the dialectic is very vague and ambiguous. George H. Sabine, Professor of philosophy contended that the most obvious error in Hegel's dialectic was the extreme vagueness, not to say the ambiguity, of his use of terms and the extreme generality that he attributed to words which are notoriously hard to define. He used the words like 'thought', 'contradiction', 'absolute idea', 'civil society', 'march of God on earth' to mean what he wanted them to mean. His use of

NOTES

NOTES

these and so many other words was unconventional, vague and ambiguous. His theory of dialectic was full of over simplification and over generalization. Secondly, as a synthetic logic, which he wanted to replace supplement and supersede the logic of the understanding, it was neither convincing nor effective. Thirdly, according to his dialectical and historical method, the course of history is determined. In the words of Professor Lancaster, 'It is a necessary result of following the dialectical method that individual wishes and preferences are reduced to the level of mere caprice. The actors in human history are not but vast in personal forces'. Fourthly, it was criticized that a double-edged sword which was used by Hegel as an instrument of conservatism, while in the hands of Marx and Engels it was a tool for bringing about revolutionary communism. Fifth, Sabine has pointed out that theory which Hegel proposed regarding the logical emergence of German national state through the dialectical process was incorrect. Hegel's theory of nationality was not the outcome of the dialectic but was occasioned by the revolutionary upsurge of contemporary France. Sixth, it was also criticized that logic as such cannot be the only basis of all human activities. Idealist metaphysician McTaggart has pointed out three difficulties in Hegel's dialectics. The first difficulty is that the thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis cannot be recognized except in relation to one another. The second difficulty is that in religion, liberty, history, law and philosophy, the dialectical process is affected by external influences. The third difficulty is that in the application of the dialectical method to the field of natural and social sciences, we will deal with a subject matter which is highly intricate and not sufficiently systematized.

For instance, Hegel, in the logic, offers a dialectical explanation of existence: Existence is what we understand as pure being, but when examined it appears the state of pure being cannot be distinguished from the state of nothingness. Therefore what seems to be coming into being is also simultaneously dissolving into nothingness, for instance, living means stepping towards dying, and thus both nothing and being combine together in the form of 'becoming'. Hegel followed the Socratic method in the sense that he made the contradictions which were implicit-explicit, and therefore every stage of Hegelian dialectical process is the result of the implicit contradictions of the previous stage. Hegel thought of the entire history as one enormous dialectic, major stages of which detail an advancement from self-alienation as slavery to self-unification and identification with the idea of the rational, constitutional state of free and equal citizens. It is not possible to use Hegelian dialectic in a mechanical way for any given thesis. Many critics hold that except the logical denial of thesis, the selection of any anti-thesis is subjective. And if we use the logical denial of thesis as an anti-thesis, then it is impossible to arrive at a synthesis. In the practical application of the dialectical method, when the user uses his subjective view to choose the anti-thesis in order to serve his purpose, then the contradictions between the thesis and anti-thesis cannot be said to be the logical but rhetorical, and thus arrived synthesis cannot be strictly defended against a number of other possible synthesis. The problem inherent in the concept of Fitchian 'Thesis-Anti-thesis-Synthesis' model is the very idea that negations or denials are not inherent in things but are brought from outside. But Hegel argues that the contradictions do not come from outside of things, but are inherent. The origin of this version of dialectic, as noted earlier, can be seen in the ideas of Heraclitus. Hegel states that the motive or the purpose of dialectics is 'to study things in their own being and movement and thus to demonstrate the finitude of the partial categories of understanding.'

Hegel considers the transition from quantity to quality as one of the most important principles of dialectics. He terms this principle as 'the measure'. In other words, one

can define the ‘measure’ as the qualitative quantum, and define quantum as the phenomenon of the existence of quantity. Hegel describes this relationship between the two, while elaborating on the idea of the measure, in the following words:

“The identity between quantity and quality, which is found in measure, is at first only implicit, and not yet explicitly realized. In other words, these two categories, which unite in measure, claim an independent authority. On the one hand, the quantitative features of existence may be altered, without affecting its quality. On the other hand, this increase and diminution, immaterial though it be, has its limit, by exceeding which the quality suffers change. [. . .] But if the quantity present in measure exceeds a certain limit, the quality corresponding to it is also put in abeyance. This however is not a negation of quality altogether, but only of this definite quality, the place of which is at once occupied by another. This process of measure, which appears alternately as a mere change in quantity, and then as a sudden revulsion of quantity into quality, may be envisaged under the figure of a nodal (knotted) line.”

To illustrate his point, Hegel illustrates the states of accumulation of water in the following words:

‘Thus the temperature of water is, in the first place, a point of no consequence in respect of its liquidity, still with the increase or diminution of the temperature of the liquid water, there comes a point where this state of cohesion suffers a qualitative change, and the water is converted into steam or ice’.

The other examples that Hegel mentions in order to illustrate his point further include the arrival at the point when heap of wheat is formed just by the addition of a single grain, and the continuous act of plucking out single hair leading to the bald head.

Another important principle of dialectic, for Hegel, is the negation of the negation. He calls this ‘sublation’ or *Aufhebung*. There are things, the existence of which can only be explained by their relation to other, but through the process of sublation, i.e. through the negation of the negation, these things integrate the other in themselves. Thus what we have is the requirement of two opposing moments for the occurrence of the dialectical movement, which would be a somewhat and an other. And through the process of sublation or *Aufhebung*, writes Hegel, “something becomes an other’ this other is itself somewhat; therefore it likewise becomes an other, and so on *ad infinitum*”. The process of sublation or the negation of negation simply means that something transforms into an other, but this newly other is also something which has an other, and the process again leads to this new something becoming the other and so on, the process goes to *ad infinitum*. Thus, we can concluded that during the transformation into the other, the something connects with itself, it becomes self-related. According to Hegel, the process of becoming therefore has two moments – coming-to-be and ceasing-to-be. Through the process of sublation the being that exist transforms into nothing, i.e. it ceases to exist, and as it happens something new comes up, i.e. it comes to exist. Thus, what has been sublated ceases to exist, but at the same time it is also preserved and maintained. In dialectics, a totality transforms itself, it is self-related.

1.2.3 Theory of State and Freedom of Individual

Theory of State

Hegel thought of the state as the representation of the universal mind or *geist*. For him, the state was the embodiment of the divine purpose or the divine idea. As such, he regarded it as essentially divine in origin. The state must be looked upon with great reverence. Since he regarded the state as the product of the divine will, he rejected the idea of the social contract theory as the origin of state altogether. The social

NOTES

NOTES

contract theory makes the state an artificial institution – a position which he was not prepared to accept. The idea that men in natural state were equal and free appeared to be absorbed and ridiculous to Hegel. Life of people in the natural state, as per him, was marked by injustice and violence and it was mostly dominated by natural impulses and feelings. He regarded the state not as a play writ of the individuals but as a product of a long process of evolution. It marked the advancement from lower group life to higher and more perfect institutional life. It grew from the family which was replaced by civil society, and the civil society was replaced by the state. At every stage of this development, Hegel saw the working of universal mind or the hand of the spirit which was God. This is the Hegelian concept of the state as the embodiment of God on earth. Through his logic he amply proved that the state is God in human history. It is a unity between particularity and universality and, therefore, it constitutes perfect rationality. To Hegel, what was rational was real and what was real was rational. The state was perfectly rational and, therefore, it was perfectly real. Since perfect reality is God, the state is, therefore, God in the phenomenal existence.

According to Hegel, the state represented universal altruism. It synthesized dialectically the elements with in the family and civil society. As in the case of the family, the state functions in a manner that the interests of everyone were furthered and enhanced. It represented the universal tendencies within civil society, thus giving rise to the notion of civil society. The state had ‘its reality in the particular self-consciousness raised to the place of the universal’. The state was ‘absolutely rational’ and had substantive will for realizing itself through history, and was therefore, internal. For Hegel, the state was an end in itself. He described it like a mind realizing thorough the process of history its own self. Hegel, as stated earlier, was an idealist, which meant that he perceived the state as a living organism with the highest order of right over the individual self. And he thought of an individual as someone whose highest duty was to function as a part of the state. He emphasized the public nature of the state, yet he did not distinguish between the private and the public spheres. He examined the different components of the state, for instance the law, the bureaucracy, and the monarchy.

According to Hegel, the state is not only the highest expression, the spirit has yetattained, it is the final embodiment of spirit on earth. Thus, there can be no spiritual evolution beyond the state anymore, than there can be any physical evolution beyond man. The state too is a whole which is far greater than the parts which compose it and which have significance only in it. The state is unchecked by any moral law, for it itself is the creator of morality. This can be seen clearly in its internal affairs and in its external relations. Firstly, it laid down what shall be the standard of morality for its individual citizens. It went without saying that they can never plead conscience or the moral law against it. Kant had believed that they could, that the individual conscience or the practical reason of the individual was the guide of guides to cling to. Hegel going beyond Kant to J.J. Rousseau maintained that conscience can only tell us to do what is right. It cannot tell us what is right. Conscience itself must be informed by the traditions of the community. According to him the wisest man of antiquity have led it down that wisdom and virtue consist in leaving conformably to the customs of one’s people, which are indeed the collective reason of the past. And the state is the truest interpreter of the tradition of the community. Only it can tell us what is good, and conformity with its decrease, or social ethics, is thus the highest morality. The state can recognize no obligation other than its own safety in its relations with other states. Its own welfare is its highest law. The idea that the specific interest of the state is the most important consideration is generally well accepted and acknowledged principle. Against this no plea based on hypothetic morality can be allowed. In the Ethics Hegel wrote categorically: ‘the state is the self-certain, absolute mind which acknowledges

no abstract rules of good and bad, shameful and mean, craft and deceptions'. International relations, therefore, are relations between sovereign states who believe that what is in their own interest is right and that the only sin is to act knowingly against those interests. He further wrote that the fundamental propositions of international law remain a good intention. States are independent in their relations with one another and think of the conditions that they form with one another as tentative. Hence, when the specific wills of states fail to come to an agreement, the only way to settle the controversy thus arrived at is war. Moreover, war must not be considered as something which is pure evil. The universal love of mankind is an insipid invention. War is itself virtuous activity. For Hegel peace corrupts and everlasting peace would corrupt everlastingly. Hegel defined war as the state of affairs which in an earnest way deals with conceit of temporal goods and concerns, which at other times is a common theme for enlightening sermonizing. He wrote that wars have been successful in preventing the occurrence of civil broils and thus have helped in the strengthening of the state internally.

According to Hegel, the state is an individual in history. It is to history what an individual is to biography. The state was the achievement of freedom because it was the embodiment of freedom. The real individual freedom consists in obeying the rules and laws of the state and cultivating the everyday habit of looking on the commonwealth as our substantive purpose and the foundation of our lives. From the point of view of will it is the incarnation of the general will or real will. The state represents the best in the individual will. It has a will and a personality of its own, apart from and superior to the will and personality of its members. The individual can attain his true freedom only as a member of the state. It is the state from which the individual rights are derived, and therefore no individual right can go against the welfare of the state. The end of the state is the glorification of the state itself. According to the liberal political theorist L.T. Hobhouse, the Hegelian concept of state calls for the idea of a state as a superior being, a spirit, a super-personal entity, a divine will, in which all the individuals are merely subsidiary elements, with all their rights and conscience, and happiness and misery. The state is the embodiment of the highest order of morality, which sets forth the standard of morality to be followed by the members of the state. Hegel considered the state as something of mystical entity, a mysterious amalgamation of every social institution. He morally and rationally exalted the authority of the state. He completely subordinated the individual to the authority of the state. His personality has been reduced to a zero. Philosopher C.E.M. Joad has drawn the following paradoxical conclusions from Hegel's theory of the state: (i) the state can never act unrepresentatively. The policeman who arrests the burglar and hands him over to the magistrate, and the magistrate who sends him to the jail expresses the will (real will) of the burglar to be arrested and to be locked up, (ii) the bond which binds the individual to other individuals in the community and to the state as a whole forms an integral part of his personality. He cannot act as an isolated unit but only as an integral part of the state. The will with which he acts is not purely individual will but a part of the will of the state, (iii) the state contains within itself and represents the social morality of all its citizens. It is a supreme moral community, a guardian of the entire moral world and not just a factor within an organized moral world.

The state is the very existence of the idea of ethics. It is ethical consciousness in the sense that substantial will manifests and reveals to itself, knowing itself, and thinking itself, achieving what it is aware of and in so far as it is aware of it. The existence of the state is in its customs, the self-consciousness of the individuals, the knowledge and the activities. The individual self-consciousness, on the other hand, finds its essential freedom in the state as its very essence or the outcome of its action. As long as the state

NOTES

NOTES

represents the existence of the substantial will it possesses, it remains to be absolutely rational. There is no end beyond this substantial unity, for it is absolute and unmoved. It is in this unity the essence of freedom materializes and exists in its greatest right. This absolute end, the unmoved unity, has the right of highest order against the individual member, whose highest obligation is to function as a member of the state.

In Hegelian theory, the state does not merely represent freedom, rather it is the very existence of the real, concrete freedom. What does the real, concrete freedom mean? For Hegel, the real freedom is not mere development of individual interests and rights recognized by the state, but also the transformation of individual interests and rights into the universal interests. The real freedom is achieved when the individual begins to consider the universal as essentially its own, and make it its own aim and end and gets active in its pursuit. The result of this realization is that the universal interests are not achieved unless the personal and specific interests and aims are achieved through the individual co-operation. And also the existence of individuals cease to be merely for the purpose of their personal gain and achievements, rather it becomes a quest for the universal fulfilment, for in the act of realization of universal as their own, in the act of willing, every action of every individual works in the direction of achieving the universal end. The idea of modern state, thus, exhibits tremendous strength, for it offers the development of subjective aims and interest in the extreme of individual peculiarities, but at the same time it also brings the subjectivity back to the idea of essential unity, and hence manages to preserve the notion of unity in the very idea of subjectivity. Political sentiments, such as patriotism, is usually considered to be the willingness to sacrifice oneself for the sake of the state or country. But, verily it is the sentiment which under the normal situations and in regards to everyday life illustrates that the state is an end in itself. Hegel maintains that sentiments like patriotism are often considered as the subjective opinion because they are often stripped of their true reality, which in essence is objective.

Freedom of the Individual

Hegel's idea of freedom comes from the idea formulated by the political philosophers of ancient Greece, which maintains that it is only through the state that an individual can find its freedom, its true self. According to Sabine, Hegel swung back in the direction of Greek political theory towards the view that individual good implies the performance of a socially valuable task. According to Hegel, freedom is the very essence of man. It is man's distinctive quality to renounce freedom is to renounce one's status as a man. It is however, not the freedom of any and every casual will of which he talks. His notion of freedom comprises of being compliant with the real will. The influence of Rousseau and Kant on Hegel's notion of freedom is apparent here. Both Hegel and Kant developed their ideas of freedom while taking Rousseau's idea of moral freedom as their starting point. Rousseau's notion of moral freedom considers it to be a very specific and peculiar characteristic of man, and both Kant and Hegel envisioned the idea of state in regards to this very freedom of Rousseau. But the Kantian concept of freedom was negative, limited and subjective in meaning, which made his attitude to the state somewhat grudgingly individualistic. Kant had understood the freedom as an individual right to will, a self-imposed imperative of duty, and he asserted that all individuals who possess such a will, existed, and ought to be treated, always as an end in himself and never as merely a means. To Hegel, freedom of this kind is negative because it wears the face of beauty, and it is limited because it isolates each man as an end in himself. Such freedom is, again subjective because it resides in the inner world of intention and conscience, and does not find a free issue outwards into objective life.

NOTES

Hegel, in opposition to Kant sketches a more positive and objective conception of freedom and a less individualistic conception of the state. Freedom he holds must be positive. According to Kant, the notion of freedom is the obedience to any moral will, while Hegel thought of freedom as the obedience to prescriptions of social morality, to the moral will of the society. His notion of freedom consists of obedience to the dictates of universal reason but he would identify the dictates of universal reason with social morality rather than with the isolated moral will of the individual. The state, for him, was the crystallization of this social morality, it is the embodiment of the community.

According to Hegel, freedom consists of the will to make one's natural self (composed of one's particular interest and passion) conform to one's thinking self (reason). One realizes one's freedom when one submits to the law, to the rules of social morality and to the institutions of the national state. The state is the highest and absolute embodiment of social morality, it both sustains by personality as a being with freedom of will transcends by compelling me to contemplate a good beyond by own personal interest.

Hegel equates liberty with law. Law may guarantee and safeguard liberty but sometimes it may also go against liberty. In order to justify his equation of liberty with law Hegel said that, only that authority has the power to make laws or thus guarantee liberty which can represent the spirit of the nation. The spirit of the nation cannot be represented by the majority of the people or by an assemblage of men. It can only be represented by one actual decreeing individual i.e. the monarch. In other words, he identified the will of the monarch with the liberty of the individual. According to him, each and every element in the society can reach its free resistance only in an absolute monarchy like the one prevailing in the then Prussia.

Hegel claimed to have proved through his dialectical logic that Prussia was the highest peak and the very stronghold of freedom, that its absolutist constitution is the goal towards which humanity must move and that its government preserves and keeps, as it were, the purest spirit of freedom. As Prof. Wayper points out, Hegel turned the entire notion of freedom upside down by identifying freedom with obedience, equality with discipline, and personality with the by-product of the state. Hegel emphasized that freedom is the manifestation of the complete obedience to the state laws. He argued that the state is the embodiment of reason. The laws of the state are the outward expressions of reason. According to German idealist, freedom lies in obedience to reason. Another argument put forward by Hegel is that the essence of spirit which seeks to know itself is freedom. The history of mankind is the history of the evolution of spirit and therefore of freedom. When the freedom is represented by the state, all the individuals enjoy freedom.

The individual realizes freedom to the extent to which he identifies himself with the spirit or the essence of spirit. There are two wills existing side by side in the individual mind – real will and actual will. Real will represents the rational will and takes care of the interest of the community as a whole while the actual will looks after the personal and private interests of the individual alone. According to Hegel, freedom for the individual consists in subordinating the actual will to rational will. By serving the interest of the community alone, the individual can get the fulfillment of his personality. The impulsive will being very powerful, the individual himself cannot subjugate it without the help of the state. The only way to be free is the voluntary submission of the impulsive will to reason which is expressed in the state. According to Hegel, the individual is free only if he identifies voluntarily, willingly, and consciously with the laws of the state. If the individual obeys the state due to fear or punishment he is no longer free. He did not conceive freedom as the rights of the individuals. The

NOTES

state according to him was omnipotent. The individuals do not possess any rights against the state. He did not give any rights of speech, or expression or association to the individual in conflict with the state. Whatever, rights the individual may seem to be exercising, can be exercised only in the silence of law or with in the four corners of law. An individual has no right against the state, but within the state. In the state alone, man can find freedom, while without it, he is completely in subjugation.

Hegel's idea of freedom is both objective and creative, and it expresses itself in a series of outward manifestations: first the law, then the rules of inward morality, and finally the whole system of institutions and influences that make for righteousness in the national state. The whole system of institutions and influences were called as social ethics. The state must be envisaged in terms neither of law nor of the morality of individual conscience, but in terms of social ethics. The social morality is the product of a free will seeking to realize itself in a positive and objective form and the state, as the highest expression and organ of social morality. Thus, the notion of freedom of an individual was a social phenomenon. It existed in the involvement in the social morality. For Hegel, the meaning of freedom was willingness to do what is rational, the desire of the spirit, and the strength to act towards it. To him, freedom was a complete and absolute surrender to the laws of state.

According to Sabine, 'His theory of freedom was apart of the wide spread reaction against the violence of the French revolution which Burk began'. There was a sound reason why the case against the revolution should have appealed to a German philosopher. The theory of natural rights, while of course fully known to educated German's, had never made itself part of the popular consciousness in Germany. In England and France, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have seen the theory made into a defense of revolution and Germany was a country in which there was no revolution. Hegel's view on freedom implies two things. Firstly, he continually implied that no genuine conflict of interest can even arise between individuals and the society they belong to, and secondly, the state is the representation of the highest possible ethical value, or in other words no institution can possibly claim to represent the higher ethical and moral value than the state. These two phases of Hegel's philosophy, though they are perfectly comprehensible when viewed in the light of the circumstances in which he wrote, are nevertheless the causes of very great confusion in his thought. Hegel in his famous discussion of freedom talks about the three stages of evolution of freedom in the history of the world: "In the world of the ancient Orient, people do not yet know that the human spirit is free. Because they do not know this, they are not free. They know only that, one person is free, but for this very reason such freedom is mere arbitrariness, savagery, stupefied passion." It is interesting to note in the above passage Hegel relates freedom with knowledge. He continues: "This one person is therefore only a despot, not a free man." He further writes, "It was among the Greeks that the consciousness of freedom first arose, and thanks to that consciousness they were free. But they, and the Romans as well, knew only that some persons are free, not the human as such." Roman considered the citizens of their state as free, but they did not consider the slaves as citizens and therefore not free. "It was first the Germanic people, through Christianity, who came to the awareness that every human is free by virtue of being human, and that the freedom of spirit comprises our most human nature." That is why, "world history is the progress in the consciousness of freedom—a progress that we must come to know in its necessity." Hegel also talks about the idea of freedom of human will. He says, "The will is free, so that freedom is both the substance of right and its goal, while the system of right is the realm of freedom made actual."

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What does Hegel's Philosophy of Right deals with?
2. Name the two ideals of enlightenment given by Kant in his work Critic of Pure Reason.
3. Why Hegelian idealism is also referred to as absolute idealism?
4. What is Hegel's dialectic method?
5. State the aim of dialectic method given by Hegel.
6. Define history.

NOTES**1.3 T. H. GREEN**

Thomas Hill Green was an English Philosopher, a political radical, and a temperance reformer. He was also an active member of the British idealist movement. Born in Yorkshire, England, in 1836, he was, like other British idealists, greatly under the influence of the Hegel's metaphysical historicism. He was one of the most prominent thinkers who devised the idea of social liberalism. His father was a clergy man in the Church of England. From his father's side, he was a descendant of Oliver Cromwell. Till the age of fourteen, he was educated at home, after which he entered the Rugby school, where he received his education for five years. In 1855, he entered Balliol College, Oxford. He did take much interest in the regular studies, but continued to read in various different areas of knowledge, from which he profited greatly. While still at Balliol, he came under the influence of the great Benjamin Jowett and by this inspiring contact, was fired to more definite and purposeful intellectual endeavors. In 1860, Green became a fellow of Balliol, and continued to be so till 1878. In 1878, he was elected as the Whyte Professor of Moral Philosophy. He married Miss Charlotte Symonds, a sister of John Addington Symonds in 1871. While teaching at the University of Oxford, he covered a wide range of topics, which include history, logic, ethics, metaphysics, education, and the history of philosophy. Green was not merely a clustered pedagogue. He took an active part in public affairs and was a member of the Oxford Town Council for many years. He often spoke as a campaigner of the liberal party, and also was a member of its various committees and commissions. He also served as a prominent worker in the Temperance Movement. He died in 1882, at an early age of forty six, because the blood poisoning.

In his political philosophy Green was highly influenced by his studies of the Greek classics. According to political scientist Ernest Barker, 'The influence of Plato and Aristotle has been particularly deep in England'. The curriculum of the oldest and most important branch of studies in Oxford finds in the 'Republic' of Plato and the 'Ethics' of Aristotle its central texts, and truths drawn from Greek thought have been learned in Oxford and enforced in the world, not only by the thinkers, but also by the men of action who have been trained in this curriculum. Green himself was a product of the University of Oxford and there he had also served as a professor of moral philosophy. The core of his philosophy can be seen in the ideas of Greek classical philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle. In his political ideas, Green was also heavily influenced by the ideas of German Philosophy, especially the writings of Kant and Hegel. Among the philosophers of the continent who exercised a tremendous influence on the writings of Green, the author of the *Social Contract* i.e. Rousseau was the most important. What he found permanently valuable in Rousseau was the idea of state as something that represents a general will, and therefore is entitled to absolute obedience.

NOTES

For many years, Green remained involved in the local political affairs, either through the university, or through the temperance societies, or through the local Oxford Liberal association. When the Second Reform Act was enacted, he campaigned in favor of the franchise being extended to every man living in boroughs, even though there is no ownership of real property. Thus, it is fair to say that Green was more radical than most of the liberals of the age, including William Ewart Gladstone. In the year 1881, Green gave a lecture on the Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract, which became his most well-known and admired statement on the liberal political philosophy. During this time, green was also actively lecturing on various topics such as epistemology, religion, political philosophy, and ethics. He was and continues to remain one of the most important forces behind the idea of social liberalism. During his lifetime, he was influential and well known as a teacher. Most his works were published posthumously. He delivered his Lectures on the Principle of Political Obligation while he was still holding the chair of moral philosophy at Oxford, during the winter of 1879-80. These lectures were first published in 1882. Similarly, his *Prolegomena to Ethics* was also published posthumously.

His major works include his sermons on *Faith and Witness of God*, the essay *On the Different Senses of 'Freedom' as Applied to Will and the Moral Progress of Man*, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation*, and the *Lectures on Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract*.

1.3.1 The State

Green did not approve the social contract theory of the origin of government. He considered it as a confused way of stating this truth. He rejected the social contract theory on the basis of the fact that it considers the state as voluntary associations. Similarly, he dismissed the force theory as an explanation of the state, for according to this theory the force becomes the basis of the state. According to Green, the basis of state is neither consent, nor force. The basis of state is will. It is not the existence of supreme coercive power that makes a state, but the exercise of the supreme coercive power in specific ways, and particular ends, for instance, when it is exercised in accordance with the law of the state, and for the sustenance of the rights. The state maintains through a system of law, the possibility of freedom that otherwise would not exist. Green himself says that the state is justified in using force to repeal a force which opposes freedom. Hence, it can be said that apart from the state the individual can have no existence as a person. According to Green, state is both natural and essential. For him, it is an ethical establishment imperative for the moral growth and maturation of man. The primary purpose of the state, according to Green, is to enforce rights, even by compulsion if necessary. Although natural and necessary but the state authority is neither omnipotent, nor absolute. It has its limitations both from within and without. From within because the state laws are only capable of dealing with the manifestations of intentions and actuality of actions. It fails to deal with the intentions or motives. The state cannot promote morality directly. It can simply remove obstacles to good life. It is also limited by the individuals, who have the right to resist in those situations wherein the state fails to work for the common good and turns tyrannical. Green says that in such situations, resistance of an individual is not merely the exercise of his rights, but also his duty.

Green maintained that many permanent groups within the society follow their own system of rights and that the right of the state over them is one of adjustment. Barker states that internally the state adjusts each of these groups in regards to its own system of rights, and externally it adjusts each system of right in regards to the

state. And since the power of the state is that of adjustment, it therefore, had ultimate authority. Green mentioned of the existence of group in society contains the germs of the theory of pluralism. But Green has not taken up the pluralistic position at all.

The limitation of the authority of a state is reflected in its adherence to the international law. Unlike Hegel and like Kant, Green believed in the authoritative role of international law and international organization. The right of every man to free life involves the conception of a common humanity and of a common social organism. According to T. H. Green the function of the state is negative. Good life for the most part is self-earned. The state cannot promote it directly. Its business is simply removing the impediments in the achievement of freedom. According to Green, the three most important impediments to freedom are ignorance, drunkenness and poverty. It is the function of the state to remove such obstacles. He felt that the problem with classical liberalism was that it considered freedom in entirely negative light, while he thought of freedom as something positive. Therefore, it is fair assertion that Green led the intellectual basis for the formation of modern social welfare state, for old age pensions, unemployment, insurance, health insurance, and all the other legislative schemes which aim to offer a sense of self-security. Commenting upon Green's theory of state actions G. H. Sabine said 'Green's general principle that a liberal government ought to legislate in any case where the law can remove an obstacle to the highest moral development of its citizens, provided at least the framework for a wholly different conception of government form that was held by the older liberalism'. In place of laissez-faire and freedom of contract it opened the way, in the name of positive freedom, for any degree of social legislation that could be justified as particularly effective in improving the standard of living. What Green added to liberal theory was his conception of collective well being as a pre-condition of individual freedom and responsibility thus, in principle Green's revision of liberalism closed up the gap which laissez-faire has placed between politics and economics and put on government the duty of regulating the economic system and it fails to produce satisfying results. The state, Green insists is the only source of actual rights. He says ideal rights may be conceived which are not in the state, only when they are in it do they become rights. Green's state like Hegel's, is a community of communities, but again like Hegel's there is no questions but that it is supreme over all the communities it contains. The members of the state derived the rights, which they have as members of other associations from the state and have no rights against it. Like Hegel, Green's state differs from all the associations within wherein the general will is fully realized.

For all his belief that the state represents the divine spirit itself, he never regarded the state as an end in itself. For Green, the state was always a means to a specific end, and that end comprises of the complete moral evolution of the individuals of the state. He believed in the existence with the general will. Indeed he is convinced that this general will is the real basis of the state. Legal sovereignty, he agrees with Austin, must reside in the supreme authority within the state, in that body which recognizes no power above itself. But behind this legal sovereign is the general will, and this general will, not force or fear, is what really determines the habitual obedience of people. Men are in the habit of obeying only those institutions which they think, perhaps, unconsciously, represent the general will. This is true irrespective of the form of government the state may possess, since even an absolute monarchy must inspire loyalty and voluntary submission in its subject. According to Green, general will is the true sovereign of the community.

According to Green, the role of a state is to nurture and defend the social, political, and economic atmosphere which can offer the individuals of the state a better opportunity

NOTES

NOTES

of acting in harmony with their conscience. He also stated that the state should be cautious in making decisions regarding both the curtailment of the liberties of the individuals and the ways of curtailing those liberties. It is possible for both over-enthusiast and clumsy state to smother the moral and ethical growth of individuals by intervening inappropriately and thus shutting down chances for the scrupulous actions. The intervention of the state is justifiable only when there is a danger of individual enslavement. And even in such cases, Green thought that it would be more appropriate if the action is taken by the affected community rather than the state. He thought that the local councils and municipal authorities are able to come up with imaginative and appropriate solutions for the problems of everyday social life than the state. And therefore, he preferred the option of solution of problems which are local in nature.

Green's idea was not to offer a general solution to every problem, but to formulate particular solutions to cater to the particular problems. He asserted that there is no such thing as universal solutions, and that the division of responsibilities between national and local governmental units is bound by the limits of time, or in other words these divisions are not eternal, they must change with time. The distribution of responsibilities between the two units should be based on the idea that it is important and crucial to encourage people to exercise their scrupulous will in specific situations, for it is the only way in which individual self-realization can be encouraged and nurtured. He considered the distribution of the responsibilities as something associated with the practical aspect of politics, rather than ethical and philosophical aspect of politics. There may be times when the local and municipal organizations or institutions fail to control the hazardous effects of something like liquor industry, and it is only in such circumstances the state should take control.

Green asserted the idea that in the case of making decisions regarding the allotment of such tasks, the ultimate power must reside with the state. For Green, the legitimization of a nation state remains as far as it is able to maintain a system of rights and duties, which can help individuals in self-realization. And yet, it is neither the political calculation nor the philosophical speculation that shapes the most suitable structure of the system. What shapes it is the fundamental concept and prescriptive structure of a particular society.

1.3.2 Punishment

Green's views on punishment are essentially related to his theory of state action. In order to maintain conditions and remove obstacles, the state must positively interfere with everything tending to violate conditions or impose obstacles. It must use force to repeal a force opposing freedom. According to Barker punishment is not inflicted with any direct reference to the moral guilt of the offender in the past, or to his moral reformation in the future. If it were imposed with reference to moral guilt, it would have to be graded according to the degree of moral guilt, and here we are at once made by the insuperable difficulty that moral guilt cannot be measured by degrees, because we cannot enter into the recesses of the will to discover its intensity or quality. If again punishments were imposed with reference to moral reformation in the future it would not only loss its power as a deterrent, but it would deprive the criminal of the possibility, let us rather say, the fundamental duty of regenerating his own will.

The criminals' will, which is anti-social, constitutes a force opposed to freedom. Punishment in such a case is a force directed against that force. Punishment is not inflicted with any direct reference to the moral guilt of the offender in the past, nor to his moral reformation in the future. Actually punishment is adjusted to maintaining the external conditions necessary for the free action of will, it is not adjusted to the inner

will itself. It is in fact directed to secure the external conditions necessary for the moral action. Punishment therefore, like all state action, has a moral purpose. It is moral in the sense that its ultimate aim is to secure freedom of action for the moral will of every member of the community.

According to Green, the primary object of punishment is not to make the criminal feel the pain just for the sake of it, and also not for the sake of discouraging him from committing the crime again. The primary object of punishment is to associate the pain with the very idea of crime in the minds of those who might commit it in future. The future prevention of crime is the chief object of punishment. Green said that for the state what matters is not the idea of virtue and vice, but the idea of right and wrong. The state punishes the wrong done in the form of the crime, but the idea is not to avenge the crime, but to associate the sense of terror with the very notion of crime so as to create a future deterrence, and thus ensure the preservation of rights. Its ultimate aim is to secure freedom of action for the moral will of every member of the community. It implies that punishment should be given according to the importance of the right violated.

In the case of T. H. Green, punishment has both direct and indirect defects. Directly, it is a force preventive of a force opposed to rights. Indirectly, punishment is, and in order to be effectively preventive must be a reformation of the will, or rather a shock which makes possible the criminal's reformations of his own will. Even in this later aspect punishment is still a removal of obstacle, for the obstacle, which the criminal opposes is not only a force, but a will.

According to Green, "it is commonly asked whether punishment according to its proper nature is retributive or preventive or reformatory. The true answer is that it is and should be all three". Philosopher Cesare Beccaria made a similar attempt earlier with the idea of creating deterrence and retributivism, but the problem that he faced was that of consistency, i.e. he could not keep his theory consistent. Before we understand ideas of crime and punishment as proposed by Green, it is crucial for us to understand the notion of retributivism and deterrence, for in formulating his theory of crime and punishment Green attempted to unite these two very ideas. A brief encounter with these two ideas will be sufficient to show the difficulty that lies in bringing them together.

The concept of retributivism was recommended by Kant. According to this concept, the state retains the right to punish the crime. The right to punish in retributivism comes from the social contract theory. In recommendation of retributivism, Kant formulated what he called the categorical imperative: 'act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law'. According to Kant, when the crime is being punished the injustice done by the crime in breaking the moral code or the law is restored. The person responsible for breaking the moral code or the law is also responsible for the punishment, for if he had not transgressed the law, there wouldn't be any need for the punishment. Kant suggests that the punishment for a given crime must be fixed, and the intensity of the punishment must be of the same value as the intensity of the crime. Therefore, a murderer must be punished by execution. Every crime should have a fixed physical punishment, and once the punishment is fixed for a specific crime, there must not be any room for discretion. In the Kantian universe there is no place for things like reform and deterrence, and therefore there is no point in using them as the elements of mitigation. And if we take reform as a mitigating factor out of the equation, then a reformed person also needs to be punished equally as an unreformed person. This, however, does not mean that the notion of retributivism rejects the idea of reformation, or that

NOTES

NOTES

this notion can never ever lead to reformation. Deterrence and reform may be side products of punishment under the ‘lex talionis’ model, but nothing more. And such an effect may even be something to desire. The idea of retributivism is not based on the achievement of greater good, but on fixing personal accountability. There are various flaws in the idea of retributivism, some are explicitly apparent, for instance, not always one can find a physical punishment equal to every crime that can be committed. This idea also refuses to consider the circumstances in which the crime is committed or even the idea of crime rate. It may seem that the idea of retributivism lacks in compassion, however one should keep in mind that the basic principle on which it is based is that of the individual responsibility, dignity and worth, something which one does not find in the concept of utilitarianism. The theory of deterrence is something which is absolutely opposite to the idea of retributivism. The theory of deterrence is a utilitarian concept, the main advocate of which was Jeremy Bentham, a British Utilitarian philosopher. In this theory, the right to punish comes from the basic principle of Utilitarianism, which is the ‘the greatest happiness of the greatest number’. The notion of deterrence suggests that the basic principle is the happiness of the greatest number of people, and anything that is a threat to this basic principle must be deterred. This clearly means that the theory of deterrence actually incorporates the idea of reform. Punishment is also a form of unhappiness, and therefore punishment must not be used unless it becomes the cause of more happiness than harm or unhappiness. Thus the major aim becomes the deterrence of the harm. And therefore, there is no need for a correlation between the crime committed and punishment imposed. For the very act of punishment is to cause deterrence in similar acts of crime. The theory of deterrence gives permission to make an individual an example for the rest, if a deterrence is created in such a way; it also permits the punishment of an innocent individual if the act of punishment causes more happiness than harm. However, it should be noted that such a condition is not considered as desirable, but is acceptable if it leads to the happiness of a greater number of people. When examined closely, it is “clear [sic], when it is a question of the amount of the penalty, the virtue of one theory is the vice of the other”.

Green, while formulating his theory of crime and punishment, attempted to combine both the ideas together. He began by asking himself: “When does the state have the right to punish?” As mentioned above, both the theories offer a different justification for the right to punish. Green formulated his theory, which unlike the two theories, offered the justification for the punishment in the concept of individual rights. He said: “The right . . . of free life in every man rests on the assumed capacity in every man of free action contributory to social good’. He argued that it is impossible for men to have natural rights in the natural state, i.e. the state of nature. The existence of rights depends on the existence of a society, for it is the society which formulates and controls these rights in order to achieve a common goal or interest. He further argued that the idea of natural rights is relative to the moral result to which the perfect law is relative. A good law is so not because it is capable of implementing natural rights, but because it is capable of working towards the realization of a common goal. The only way to understand what rights are natural is by considering the powers that must be used for the achievement of this goal. A good law will secure these powers to their full extent. Thus the idea of a common good become the very basis for not only the existence of society, but also the individual morality. Green agreed with the Kantian concept of ‘categorical imperative’ and thought that this is what comprises the content of morality. But Green did not stop here, he extended the Kantian idea and argued that the possession of natural rights include non-interference of the other members of the society and a recognition by the individual of other’s rights. This suggests that one’s moral agency

is valid only till it is not an impediment in the achievement of common good. Green thus asserts that the 'associated men' have right to prevent "actions as interfere with the possibility of free action contributory to social good. This constitutes the right of punishment, the right to use force ... as may be necessary to save others from this interference". Thus the motive behind the punishment is not that of imposing penalty for the intensity of crime, but is the "protection of rights, and the association of terror with their violations." Thus, we can conclude that the model of right comes with the model which helps in the enforcement of these rights, and we call this latter model, punishment. Thus the function of state is to preserve and maintain the rights of the individuals and the notion of common good that is associated with it. In the light of this a punishment becomes unjustifiable if the crime does not violate a known right or fulfilment of a "known obligation of a kind."

So far we have seen the basic framework of punishment that Green proposes. The only idea that keeps the framework of punishment in its proper place is that of the association of rights with the idea of punishment. In order to accomplish punishment, says Green, it is important to incorporate the following aspects into the theory of crime and punishment:

"Punishment of crime is preventive in its object, not, however, preventive of any or every evil or by any and every means, but . . . justly preventive of injustice, preventive of interference with those powers of action and acquisition which it is for the general well-being that individuals should possess, and according to laws which allow those powers equally to all men. But in order to effectually attain its preventive object and to attain it justly, it should be reformatory."

What Green is attempting to do must be understood and in order to do so we must scrutinize every aspect of his theory. He emphasizes that even though punishment must be just and retributive, it should not be based on the idea of vengeance. The right to impose punishment must be reserved with the state agencies, and individuals should not be given any such right. The only exception is the case of self-defense. The right to punish remains with the state with a fair understanding that the state will not abuse this right and will use it only to prevent the harm caused by the crime. Green says that the intensity of punishment must only be what is required to prevent the occurrence of such crimes in the future, which means that the intensity of punishment does not depend on the intensity of crime, on the assurance of future protection. In this way, Green is trying to escape from the extremities of both Kantian and Utilitarian perspective of punishment. "Kantianism and Utilitarianism are defective theories which must be rejected as they stand, but which can be exploited for their special insights". So the question now remains is that how Green combines the two theories of retributivism and deterrence? As stated earlier, according to Green, a crime is a violation of a known right. He says that "Crime should be punished according to the importance of the right which it violates, and to the degree of terror which in a well-organized society needs to be associated with crime in order to protection of the right". It is true that for Green the object of punishment is to cause deterrence, but it is also true that he believes in the retributive and reformatory aspects of punishment. He agrees with both Hegel and Kant in that in its own right, punishment is an "act returning on himself, in the sense that it is the necessary outcome of his act in a society governed by the conception of rights, a conception which the offender appreciates and to which he does involuntary reverence". The retributivism states that a just punishment must inflict the physical harm which is equal to the one caused by the crime, thus restoring the injustice done by the crime. Here Green agrees that retribution if required when a right is violated by a crime, and that the offender must "have his due, and [sic] should be punished justly". At this point we see a difference growing between the perspective

NOTES

NOTES

of Green and the perspective of Kant. For Kant a just punishment is the punishment equal to the physical harm of the crime, but for Green it is not so. Green believes that it is impossible to calculate the suffering or the harm caused by the crime. And if the harm cannot be calculated, it is impossible to inflict a punishment equaling that harm or suffering. And even if it were possible, then also it will be impossible to 'reconstruct' the harm caused by the crime, for the harm or the suffering also depends on the situation. Green uses this complexity to justify his idea of punishment. He says that the idea of retribution is a part of just punishment. And maintains that one must not make the already complex job of inflicting just punishment more complex by including the idea of inflicting the punishment which must be equal in its severity to the evilness of the crime. He maintains that such an equality is impossible to achieve.

Having established the idea that the equality in the severity and intensity of punishment and crime is impossible to achieve, Green states that the law must determine the category for each possible crime and must associate a fixed punishment with each crime. For, the punishment inflicted for each crime must not be disproportionate to the rights violated by each crime. This is how Green proposes to determine the severity of the punishment. This means that the more severe punishment for the violation of more central right. Green writes that "It amounts to this, that the crime which requires most terror to be associated with it in order to its prevention should have most terror thus associated with it". According to Green, the proper nature of a just punishment is its retentiveness, which does not in any way suggest that Green advocates that retributive elements should not be incorporated in the punishment. It simply means that even though the punishment may not be equal to the crime committed by the offender, he nevertheless deserves to be punished. It also means that the offender can be punished by the state only for the crime he has committed, and not for anything else. Punishment "looks back at the wrong done in the crime which it punishes in order to the consideration of sort of the terror which needs to be associated with such wrong-doing in order to the future maintenance of the rights."

Green's assertion that without the violation of real and known right, the punishment cannot be justified, leads to the conclusion that Green, unlike Bentham, does not recommend the punishment of an innocent even if it means the deterrence in the future crimes. In order for the crime to be punishable there must be an intentional violation of the rights. Once such violation occurs, the punishment is justified. It is impossible to deter an innocent man from doing something which he has not done yet. The idea is that one cannot judge a man for doing something that he has not done yet. In Green's opinion, such an idea can be easily abused. Till now, it so appears that Green's idea of punishment rests primarily on the idea of deterrence than on the notion of retribution. To support this, one must be reminded of what has already been mentioned earlier that for Green the primary objective of punishment is to create a deterrence in the future occurrence of the similar crimes. Green's view differs from the Utilitarian perspective in the sense that the objective of the latter is to deter people from causing harm so that the greatest happiness of the greatest number can be achieved. Though Green makes it clear that deterrence is the primary principle behind his theory of punishment, he offers some examples which seem contradictory to this claim. He says that death penalty for stealing a sheep is not considered as a just punishment, even if the rate of crime sees a rapid increase. As per the Utilitarian theory of deterrence, death penalty might be accepted if such a punishment is capable of causing deterrence in the future stealing of sheep. But for Green, such a crime does not require the harshness of death penalty. Green makes his point that "a society where there was any decent reconciliation of rights no such terror as is caused by the punishment would be required for the punishment of death." This clearly

demonstrates that in spite of having deterrence as the primary principle, Green's theory of punishment also relies on the nature of right that has been violated by the crime for the infliction of the punishment. A crime can only be punished by associating the most efficient of terrors with the violation of the particular right. Thus, apart from the principle of deterrence, Green's theory of punishment also rests on the principle of the justice of general system of rights.

In the determination of the justness or the unjustness of a punishment the crucial aspect is the amount or the severity of the punishment. The flaw in the Kantian idea of retribution is the measurement of the physical harm or suffering caused by the crime then punishing the offender with the equal amount of physical pain. When transferred to the Green's theory, this flaw becomes more prominent, for it becomes impossible to measure the physical equivalent of the violation of a right. Green says that "The amount of pain which is any kind of punishment causes to the particular person depends on his temperament and the circumstances, which neither the state nor its agent the judge, can ascertain." The extreme form of retributive approach would also be equally unjust. So the question then becomes what according to Green is a just punishment? For Green, a just punishment must have three aspects – retributivism, deterrence, and reform. We have already discussed in detail the role that retributivism plays. As far as the deterrence is concerned the major question that remains unanswered is that who is to be deterred? Green says that the punishments is not so much for the man who has committed the crime, as it is for the others who might get tempted to commit the crime. In Green's theory, the crime violates the right. No punishment can undo the violation, and therefore the idea of punishment is prevent the future violation of the right by the similar crimes. On the reformatory aspect of the punishment, Green said that in order to be preventive and just, a punishments must also be reformative. Green stated that reformatory aspect of a punishment is a byproduct of a preventive aspect of punishment, for if a punishment prevents a crime by compelling the criminal to give up their criminality, then the punishment is not just preventive but also reformative. Once a punishment has been inflicted on a criminal, he has to give up certain rights, and it is only desirable that he should reform and regains his rights. Green believed that when the criminals will be dealt in such manner, the infliction of punishment will make them aware of the anti-social nature of their acts, and will thus offer them an opportunity to reform.

To conclude, we can say that Green's theory of crime and punishment rests primarily on the idea of deterrence and prevention. But at the same time, it also advocates the justness of the punishment, unlike Bentham's Utilitarian view.

1.3.3 Political Obligation

The problem of political obligation is one of the most important issues of political philosophy. Green belongs to the idealist school of political obligation. It was T. H. Green in the idealist edition who declared that government cannot claim an unconditional obedience of its citizens. He argued that an individual owes his allegiance to society, not to the state or government. Accordingly, the organized power of society should be recognized as political authority for the purpose of determining political obligation. Green's concept of political obligation is based on his concept of the 'common good'. Green writes:

"To ask why I am to submit to the power of the state, is to ask why I am to allow my life to be regulated by that complex of institutions without which I literally should not have a life to call my own, nor should be able to ask for a justification of what I am called on to do. For that I may have a life which I can call my own, I must not

NOTES

NOTES

only be conscious of myself and of ends which I present to myself as mine, I must be able to reckon on a certain freedom of action and acquisition for the attainment of those ends, and this can only be secured through common recognition of this freedom on the part of each other by members of a society, as being for a common good”.

Thus, the law of our being demands civic or political obligations. It is not possible to limit the idea of moral goodness to the mere cultivation of self-regarding virtues. Moral goodness then is an attempt to achieve the moral ideal that has been revealed to us by self-analysis as something which is ideal to us. The idea of political obligation emerges from this very fact, for all the political or civic institutions are representation of moral ideas. But, because the existence of a society is only for the growth and evolution of the individuals, one can test the political institution by asking a simple question – whether or not these institutions help in the moral development of individuals of the state or society? It is clear that the final moral idea is not realized in any existing political or civic institutions, but it is also clear from the same analysis that there is a scope for the true development. Thus, we arrive at the ideas of rights and obligations which should be protected and maintained by the law of the state, as opposed to those actually maintained, with the further consequence that sometimes it may become morally necessary for the individuals to rebel or resist the authority of the state, for the sake of the benefits of the state itself. A state represents the general will, which is the shared desire for common good. The foundation of state is not based on the coercive authority imposed in its citizens from without, but on the realization of the citizens of that which comprises their true nature.

Green maintains that it is society, not the state which is the pivot of the common good. Green is quite different from utilitarian view so far as the notion of human nature is concerned. Whereas utilitarians treat the human beings as a pleasure-seeking animal, Green holds that human beings do not seek pleasure as such. In his opinion, the rational basis of human activity is will or reason, not desire or passion. As self-conscious beings, man and women wish to realize the good which they grasp along with other members of the community. He further says human beings do not identify their self-interest as distinctly as they identified the common good. Common good not only comprehends the good of all members of the community, but their conceptions of the common good are also identical.

In his lectures on the principles of political obligations, Green argued that the state itself is obliged to promote the common good as conceived by its citizens, and that individual is obliged to obey only those laws which will promote the common good. If individuals think that they will serve the cause of the common good by defying any command of the state, their political obligation does not prevent them from such defiance. In Green's view, it is the consciousness of the common good which prompts human beings to accept their duties. They tend to sacrifice their self-interest for the sake of the common good for they realize that they can attain self-realization only as members of the community, not as separate individuals. The question of priority between the individual and the community is irrelevant because individuals have no existence outside the community, and no community can exist without its constituent individuals. The true basis of the community lies in each individual treating every other individual as an end in itself, because each member of the community is recognized as capable of pursuing the ideal object. The true object of politics as well as of morality is to improve the moral character of the individuals. This should be the criterion of evaluation of any institutional law. In other words, each institutional law should enable the citizens to exercise their goodwill and reason in the conduct of their affairs. It is the moral nature of human being which postulates his freedom. Freedom requires all members

of the community to have equal opportunity of self-development. It is the duty of the state to create such conditions that are conducive to human freedom. Green points out that law can force the individual to perform certain acts, but this would be external acts only. No law can make them moral because morality is dependent on something freely willed. Will, not force, is the very basis of the state, Green writes. Green thus, emphasizes on the moral nature and capacity of human beings. The principal function of the state is to secure the common good as conceived and defined by its citizens. By recognizing the organized power of the community rather than the state as the object of political obligation, Green rules out the claim of any government to demand unconditional obedience from its citizens.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

7. State whether the following are true or false:
 - (i) Green regards the state as natural and necessary.
 - (ii) According to Green punishment should be given according to the importance of the right violated.
 - (iii) Green's concept of political obligation is based on his concept of the individual good.
8. According to Green, what were the three greatest obstacles to freedom?
9. What is the primary objective of punishment, as explained by Green?

1.4 SUMMARY

- George Willhelm Friedrich Hegel was born in Stuttgart, Germany on 27 August 1770.
- His principal works were *The Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807), *Science of Logic* (1812–1816) which captivated Germany by its unintelligibility and won him the chair of philosophy at Heidelberg.
- Hegel was the founder of modern idealism and the greatest influence in the first half of the 18 century when the entire academic community in Germany was divided between Hegelians, the left Hegelians and the right Hegelians.
- Hegel's works have a reputation for their difficulty and for the breadth of the topics they attempt to cover. Hegel introduced a system for understanding the history of philosophy and the world itself, often described as a 'progression in which each successive movement emerges as a resolution to the contradictions inherent in the preceding movement.
- Hegel criticized Kant's handling of reason while dealing with the challenge of empiricism if things in themselves were beyond the scrutiny of reason, then reason remained merely subjective, without control over objective reality, leading to an unacceptable division of the world between subjectivity and objectivity.
- Hegelian idealism is often referred to as Absolute Idealism because it provides us with a set of categories in terms of which all human experiences of the past and the present can be understood.
- The dialectical method is as old as Socrates but in the hands of Hegel it is given a universal validity and application that is more moral and profound.
- By applying the categories of a thesis, and anti thesis and a synthesis, Hegel's major thrust was to solve the problem of contradiction.
- The aim of the dialectical method is resolution of the disagreement through rational discussion, and ultimately the search for truth.

NOTES

- Hegel's own use of the dialectical method originated with his identification of Kantian critical theory, which means rejection of the Enlightenment philosophical method based on the scientific approach of studying nature.
- According to Hegel the dialectic is the only way in which the human mind can arrive at the truth about anything.
- The first and the most tracking criticism of Hegel's methodology is that the dialectic is very vague and ambiguous.
- Hegel regarded the state as the embodiment of the Geist or the universal mind. The state, according to him, was the representative of the divine idea or divine purpose.
- According to Hegel, the state represented universal altruism. It synthesized dialectically the elements within the family and civil society.
- Hegel's concept of freedom was based on the old Greek idea of an individual finding his true self, freedom and personality in and through the state.
- According to Kant, freedom consists in obedience to any moral will, but according to Hegel, freedom consists in obedience to the dictates of social morality, to the moral will of the community.
- Hegel equates liberty with law. Law may guarantee and safeguard liberty but sometimes it may also go against liberty.
- Hegel's ideas of freedom is both objective and creative, and it outwardly express itself in a series of outward manifestations – first the law, then the rules of inward morality; and finally the whole system of institutions and influences that make for righteousness in the national state.
- Thomas Hill Green was an English philosopher, political radical and temperance reformer, and a member of the British idealism movement.
- Green was involved in local politics for many years, through the University, temperance societies and the local Oxford Liberal association.
- Green did not approve the social contract theory of the origin of government. He considered it as a confused way of stating this truth.
- Green further recognized that the various permanent groups within society have their own inner system of rights and that the right of the state over them is one of adjustment.
- Green believed that the state should foster and protect the social, political and economic environments in which individuals will have the best chance of acting according to their consciences.
- Green tended to favour action by the affected community itself rather than national state action itself—local councils and municipal authorities tended to produce measures that were more imaginative and better suited to the daily reality of a social problem.
- Green stressed that there are no eternal solutions, no timeless division of responsibilities between national and local governmental units.
- Green's views on punishment are essentially related to his theory of state action. In order to maintain conditions and remove obstacles, the state must positively interfere with everything tending to violate conditions or impose obstacles.
- According to Green, the primary object of punishment is not to cause pain to the criminal for the sake of causing it nor chiefly for the sake of preventing him

from committing the crime again, but to associate terror with the contemplation of the crime in the minds of others who might be tempted to commit it.

- Retributivism, a concept advocated by Kant, obtains its right to punish from the social contract theory.
- Punishment of crime is preventive in its object.
- Green insisted that a punishment, in order to be effectively preventive and just, also needed to be reformatory.
- The problem of political obligation is one of the most important issues of political philosophy.
- It was T. H. Green in the idealist edition who declared that government cannot claim an unconditional obedience of its citizens.
- In Green's view, it is the consciousness of the common good which prompts human beings to accept their duties.
- Green thus, emphasizes on the moral nature and capacity of human beings. The principal function of the state is to secure the common good as conceived and defined by its citizens.

NOTES

1.5 KEY TERMS

- **Idealism:** It is a philosophical theory that maintains that experience is ultimately based on mental activities.
- **Hegelian idealism:** Also known as 'absolute idealism', it is a concept that provides a set of categories in terms of which all human experiences of the past and the present can be understood.
- **State:** The state maintains, through a system of law, the possibility of freedom that otherwise would not exist
- **Political obligation:** It is the fundamental or central problem of political philosophy.

1.6 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Hegel's famous work *Philosophy of Right* deals with key issues of law, politics and morality, and made an important distinction between the state and civil society.
2. Kant's famous work *Critic of Pure Reason* (1781) made a synthesis of the two different ideals of the enlightenment—Newtonian physics and Helvetian empiricism.
3. Hegelian idealism is often referred to as absolute idealism because it provides us with a set of categories in terms of which all human experiences of the past and the present can be understood.
4. Hegel's dialectic method is based on a dialogue between two or more people who may hold differing views, yet wish to seek the truth of the matter through the exchange of their viewpoints while applying reason.
5. The aim of the dialectical method is resolution of the disagreement through rational discussion, and ultimately the search for truth.
6. History is a process by which the spirit passes from knowing nothing to the full knowledge of itself.

NOTES

7. (i) True
(ii) True
(iii) False
8. According to Green, the three greatest obstacles to freedom were ignorance, drunkenness and poverty.
9. According to Green, the primary objective of punishment is not to cause pain to the criminal for the sake of causing it nor chiefly for the sake of preventing him from committing the crime again, but to associate terror with the contemplation of the crime in the minds of others who might be tempted to commit it.

1.7 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short Answer Questions

1. Write a short note on Hegel's idea of freedom of individual.
2. State the basic concepts of Hegelian dialectic method.
3. What are the difficulties in Hegel's dialectic as given by McTaggart?
4. Write a short note on E. M. Joad's conclusion on Hegel's theory of state.
5. What is political obligation as given by Green?
6. Differentiate between Green's and utilitarian idea of human being.

Long Answer Questions

1. Hegel's dialectic method is the crux of his philosophy. Elucidate.
2. Critically analyze Hegel's idea of state.
3. Describe the various criticisms of Hegel's dialectic method.
4. State and examine Green's idea of punishment.
5. 'Will, not force is the basis of the state'. Discuss.
6. Discuss Green's idea of state.

1.8 FURTHER READING

- Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wolff, Jonathan. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Strauss, Leo, & Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, David, Janet Coleman, William Connolly (et.al.) 1991. *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Grube, G. M. A, C. D. C. Reeve. 1992. *Plato: Republic*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub Co.
- Grube, G. M. A. 1980. *Plato's Thought*. Cambridge: Hackett Pub Co Inc.
- Balme, D. M. Aristotle. 2002. *Historia Animalium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shields, Christopher. 2007. *Aristotle*. New York: Routledge.

UNIT-2 MARX, LENIN AND MAO

Structure

- 2.0 Introduction
- 2.1 Unit Objectives
- 2.2 Karl Marx
 - 2.2.1 Theory of Alienation
 - 2.2.2 Dialectics
 - 2.2.3 State and Revolution
 - 2.2.4 Criticism
- 2.3 Lenin
 - 2.3.1 Lenin's Theory of Imperialism
 - 2.3.2 Theory of Party
 - 2.3.3 Tactics of Revolution
- 2.4 Mao
 - 2.4.1 Background of History: Struggle for Socialism
 - 2.4.2 Establishment of Socialism in China
 - 2.4.3 Economy of New Democracy or New Socialism
 - 2.4.4 Mao's Hundred Flowers Policy
- 2.5 Summary
- 2.6 Key Terms
- 2.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.8 Questions and Exercises
- 2.9 Further Reading

NOTES

2.0 INTRODUCTION

For over 150 years the world has been challenged by a system of thought that is known as Marxism. It has questioned the basis of class society in general and capitalist society in particular, and it was the foundation of a new kind of state that survived seventy years on earth, namely, a socialist state. The three outstanding proponents of this system of thought were Karl Marx of Germany, V. I. Lenin of Russia and Mao Zedong of China. Marx discovered the law of class contradiction and declared that, without a revolution of the proletariat, there cannot be an end of exploitation of the working people. Lenin gave an organizational shape to this doctrine by setting up a revolutionary party that captured power in Tzarist Russia and transformed it into a socialist state. Mao Zedong slightly moved away from the classical Marxist doctrine of relying on the industrial workers and organized the Chinese peasants to capture power in 1949 and move towards people's democracy. In this unit, you will be introduced to revolutionary socialists like Marx, Lenin and Mao.

2.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Explain Karl Marx's tenets of Marxism
- Describe the political philosophies and economic theories of Lenin
- Define modern communism according to Mao Zedong

2.2 KARL MARX

Karl Marx was a German philosopher, historian, sociologist, political theorist, political economist, and radical socialist, who developed social and political theory which is now known as Marxism. His ideas of Marxism and a scientific analysis of history of capitalism not only helped significantly in the evolution of social and political sciences as we know them today, but also revolutionized the socio-political movements all over

NOTES

the world. He also influenced other areas like arts, literature, philosophy, and so on. During his lifetime, many of his works were published, the most notable of which are the *Communist Manifesto* (1848) and *Das Capital* (1867-1894). Marx wrote many of his works in collaboration with Friedrich Engels, his revolutionary socialist friend.

Marx was born in a Jewish family on the 5th March 1818 in the Catholic city Trier, in the Rhineland province of Prussia. His father was a moderately well-to-do lawyer. His parents were descendent of a long line of Jewish rabbis. His father Heinrich, a son of Marx Levi, was a rabbi in Trier.

In the summer of 1836, Marx reflected on his life and his studies and decided to take them seriously. He got engaged with an educated baroness of the Prussian ruling class, Jenny von Westphalen, who had known Marx since childhood and had broken her engagement with a young aristocrat to get engaged with Marx. Because of their ethnic and class differences the engagement between the two was controversial. Marx got acquainted with her father, Ludwig von Westphalen, and befriended him. He was later to dedicate his doctoral thesis to Ludwig Westphalen. He came to Berlin in the October of the year 1836. He took a keen interest in philosophy in spite of the fact that his field of study was law. He believed that without the study of philosophy it is impossible to accomplish anything. He began to take interest in the works of G.W.F Hegel, an influential German philosopher who had recently deceased, and whose ideas were the topic of discussion in the European philosophical communities. He got associated with a student group, Doctor's Club (*Doktorclub*), which discussed the ideas of Hegel, and later in 1837 through the group became associated with the group of radical thinkers, who called themselves Young Hegelians. With the Young Hegelian, Marx shared his critical thoughts regarding the metaphysical assumptions of Hegel, but adopted the dialectical method of Hegel to criticize and analyze the social, political, and religious norms of the time from the perspective of Left. The death of his father in 1838 was both emotional and financial blow to Marx, with whom he had come very close emotionally.

During this time in his life, Marx was writing both fiction and non-fiction. He wrote love poems dedicated to his fiancé, a short novel called *Scorpion and Felix* and a play, *Oulanem*. During his lifetime none of his early writings were published. Marx abandoned the idea of writing fictions, and engaged himself in the study of English and Italian, art history, translation of Latin classics, among other things. In the year 1841 he completed his doctoral thesis, *The Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature*, which was seen as controversial by the conservative professors of the University, but was also described as 'a daring and original piece of work in which Marx set out to show that theology must yield to the superior wisdom of philosophy.' Because of the controversial aspect of his thesis, Marx chose to submit his thesis to University of Jena, which was considered to be more liberal in attitude. In April 1841, Marx was awarded Ph.D. by the University of Jena.

After completing his studies, Marx became a journalist in Cologne, where he wrote for a newspaper called *Rheinische Zeitung*, which was famous for its radical journalism. It was while working as a journalist, Marx under the influence of Hegel's idea of dialectical materialism began to shape up his ideas of socialism. In the year of 1843, Marx moved to Paris, France. In Paris he wrote for newspapers like *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* and *Vorwärts!*. It was in Paris Marx met Friederich Engels, another German immigrant. He collaborated with Friedrich Engels in the writing of a series of books on the ideas of socialism. He published *The Holy Father* in which he criticized Bauer's Young Hegelian philosophy. The same year he was exiled to Brussels, Belgium. In Brussels, he became a prominent figure in the Communist League. In

1847, Marx and Engels were asked to draft the manifesto by the newly formed Communist League in London. Marx and Engels worked on the manifesto, and next year it was published as the famous 'The Communist Manifesto'. In the manifesto, Marx and Engels looked at history as a series of class struggle, and proclaimed that soon capitalism will be swept aside by the rise of the proletariat revolution. Marx wrote the manifesto while anticipating the 1848 Revolution. In the midst of revolutionary uprising Marx left Belgium, before being expelled by the government, for Paris. But his stay in Paris was very brief. He then travelled to Germany to encourage and fuel the revolutionary uprising. After the failure of revolution, Marx settled down in London, where he lived for the rest of his life.

During the winter of 1849-1850, a faction of the Communist League began to demand an immediate revolution, under the belief that with the revolutionary uprising the entire working class of the Europe will join it. Both Marx and Engels condemned such an uprising, and said that it would be a suicidal move for the party, for the government will be able to crush the uprising very easily thus causing an end to the revolution and by extension the party. Marx said that it is not possible to achieve social change just by the will power a handful of people. Marx felt, in the wake of the failure of the 1848 Uprising, that the Communist League should spend its energy in uniting the proletariat and urging them to collaborate with the progressive section of the bourgeois so that they can overthrow the feudal aristocracy. In turn, he was ridiculed by the aggressive faction of the party for being limited to the lectures on the political economy. As a result of these events Marx ceased his appearance in communists meetings of London. In the year 1852, Marx fought vigorously for the defense of the eleven communists who were arrested in Cologne. He also wrote pamphlets in their favour. In the same year, he published an essay entitled 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' in an American-German periodical. In this essay he presented an acute analysis of the formation of a bureaucratic absolutist state with the help of the proletariat class. Next twelve years of his life were marked by isolation, and it was almost the same for Engels as well.

Marx lived in the state of both material and spiritual misery from 1850 to 1864. He was financially bankrupt, and could not find a paid employment, with one exception. In the March of 1850, he was forced out from his house along with his wife and four small children. All his belongings were seized. Many of his children died, including his son Guido and daughter Franziska, for whom, it is said that Marx's wife ran out in order to borrow money for her daughter's coffin. Marx and his family lived in small apartment of two rooms for six long years in Soho, often hiding from his creditors. Once he had to flee to Manchester to escape the creditors. During this period Marx's wife had several breakdowns.

During the period of Marx's hardship, Engels proved to be a true and loyal friend, for he financially supported him throughout. Engels worked as clerk and, therefore, initially his contribution to Marx was not very substantial, but when in 1864, he was promoted to become the partner in the firm of Ermen and Engels at Manchester, he began generously supporting Marx. Marx considered his friendship with Engels with great pride, and was extremely intolerant of any sort of criticism of Engels. Other factors like bequests from Marx's wife's relatives and from his friend Wilhelm Wloff also contributed in the alleviation of their financial condition.

In 1851, Marx became the European correspondent of *The New York Tribune*. The editor of the newspaper saw Fourierism, a socialist system of Charles Fourier, a French Theorist, in favourable light. In eleven years, i.e. from 1851 to 1862, Marx wrote some five hundred articles and pieces for the newspaper. Some of them were contributed

NOTES

NOTES

by Engels. Marx published *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, his first book on economic theory in the year 1859. The preface of the work contained the summary of Marx's materialist view of the history. During this period, Marx focused primarily on his studies of economic and social history. He also became busy writing the drafts of what would later become his most celebrated work, *Das Kapital* or *Capital*. Some of the drafts written by Marx, like the *Outlines* and the *Theories of Surplus Value*, are significant in themselves and were published posthumously.

The establishment of the International Working Men's Association in the year 1864 ended Marx's political and social isolation. In spite of the fact that Marx was neither its head nor the founding member, he soon rose to become the leading force of the association. The first public meeting of the Association was called on the 28th September, 1864. Marx was called in the meeting as a representative of the German workers. He did not speak anything at the meeting and maintained his silence throughout. While in the subcommittee, Marx wrote 'Address and the Provisional Rules of the International Working Men's Association', which became his first step towards being a leading spirit of the party. Marx became involved in the party assiduously. He attended almost all the meetings, sometimes several times in a week. The International became famous and began to be considered as prestigious. In 1869, it is said that its membership grew to some 800, 000 members.

Though Marx was successful in the International, he still was not known in Europe as a political personality. But it changed with the Paris Commune that transformed him into an international personality, 'The best calumniated and most menaced man of London,' he once wrote. In 1870, Marx and Engels were in the favour of Franco-German war, considered the German terms after the defeat of French army as the elevation of German power and prestige and wealth at the expense of French public. Marx and Engels completely supported the Paris Commune, when it was proclaimed during the insurrection in Paris. After the crushing of the Commune, Marx said in his address, *Civil War in France*:

'History has no comparable example of such greatness....Its martyrs are enshrined forever in the great heart of the working class.'

Engels called Paris Commune the first example of the proletariat dictatorship. Marx became famous throughout Europe as the writer of *Civil War* and the leader of the International. His name became associated with the very spirit of revolution, which the Paris Commune symbolized.

Marx had published the first volume of *Capital* in 1867, in which he explained in detail his labour theory of value. He also talked about his ideas of surplus value and exploitation, which according to him would finally lead to the collapse of capitalism. The book was a success. Some 3,000 copies were printed in Russian languages in 1872 because of the demand of the book in Russia. By the 1871, the German translation of the book had exhausted its entire first edition, which led to the publication of the second edition of the book. Marx never published the second and the third volumes of the *Capital*, though continued working on them throughout his life. They were published posthumously by Engels.

In the last decade of his life, there was a decline in Marx's creative energy. He became depressed, and became more focused towards his family. In this period of his life, he did not complete any substantial work, but he continued to be an avid reader and took lessons in Russian.

Marx critiqued the formation of German Social Democratic Party by the collaboration of his own followers and Ferdinand Lassalle, claiming that they have

made many compromises with the establishment. The German leader did not heed his criticism, and tried to convince him of their perspective.

Many revolutionary leaders of Russia tried to seek help from him in his last years, because of his fame and stature as a leader of the International. He tried helping them as best as he could, but he did not get involved in any political movement. Though Marx had withdrawn himself from active participation in politics, he still had what Engels' called a 'peculiar influence' over the workers and the leaders of socialist movements throughout Europe. The death of his wife on 2nd December 1881 followed by the death of his daughter broke him down, both physically and mentally. He died on 14 March 1883 in London. Some nine to eleven mourners attended his funeral. Engels in his speech at the funeral said:

'On the 14th of March, at a quarter to three in the afternoon, the greatest living thinker ceased to think. He had been left alone for scarcely two minutes, and when we came back we found him in his armchair, peacefully gone to sleep—but forever.'

2.2.1 Theory of Alienation

Marx's theory of alienation can simply be defined as the detachment of two or more things that belong together naturally, or in other words to create feeling of antagonism between things which are in perfect harmony. In Marx's theory of socialism, this concept is used to refer to the detachment of people from their human nature. Marx viewed alienation as a consequence of capitalism. The theory of alienation is one of the most original contributions of Marx to the political philosophy. It is the work of young Marx which remained unpublished during his lifetime. It was discovered from the archives of German Social Democrats as late as 1927, and later published as *Economic and Philosophic Manuscript of 1844*. It is distinguished from Marx's later work, which is characterized by scientific rigor. Marx's early work contains his humanist thought of communism, and focuses on the concepts of alienation and freedom. It exposes the dehumanizing effect of capitalist mode of production. Marx claimed that within this mode of production, the workers are constantly deprived of the right to consider themselves as the master of their actions, to determine their actions, to shape their relationships with others, and to be the owner of the production of their actions, and because of this deprivation the workers invariably lose determination of their lives. Capitalism never allows the workers to be independent and self-realized, rather it makes them an instrument or a tool or a means in the hands of the bourgeoisie to achieve specific goals or ends. The bourgeoisie owns the means of production, and uses the workers to get the maximum surplus value possible within existing state of market competition. Every worker, who engages in the production, contributes to the social wealth of the society. The reason of the feeling of alienation in the capitalist societies is that the only way a worker has to express the social aspect of his individual self is through the process of production, which remains to be owned privately and not socially or collectively. And as stated earlier, to this privately owned means of production, a worker is a social being but simply a tool or an instrument to be used for production:

'Let us suppose that we had carried out production as human beings. Each of us would have in two ways affirmed himself and the other person. (1) In my production I would have objectified my individuality, its specific character, and therefore enjoyed not only an individual manifestation of my life during the activity, but also when looking at the object I would have the individual pleasure of knowing my personality to be objective, visible to the senses and hence a power beyond all doubt. (2) In your enjoyment or use of my product I would have the direct enjoyment both of being conscious of having satisfied a human need by my work, that is, of having objectified man's essential nature, and of having thus created an object corresponding to the need of another man's essential nature . . . Our products would be so many mirrors in which we saw reflected our essential nature.' (Comment on James Mill)

NOTES

NOTES

Marx's theory of alienation was derived directly from Hegel, though its roots may be found in works of earlier philosophers. Alienation, for Hegel, consisted in man's failure to realize that the world was not external to spirit. When man saw this, they would become free and this freedom has been realized in history. Marx's main criticism of Hegel was that man's alienation would not end with the hypothetical abolition of the external world. The external world was, in fact, part of man's nature and only the establishment of right relationship between man and his environment could put an end to the condition of alienation. Marx thus rejected the idealist notion of spirit and substituted its supposed antithesis to the external world by the real antithesis between man engaged in alienated labour and his social-self eager to achieve fulfillment through creative work under conditions of freedom.

In his early writings Marx discussed several forms of alienation starting like young Hegelians, from religious alienation to philosophical, political and economic categories of alienation. As labour was man's most significant activity, economic aspects of alienation were regarded by Marx as more important than its ideological and political aspects. Religion serves the dual purpose of a compensation for suffering and a projection of man's hopes and desires. Marx viewed religion as illusion of happiness, and claimed that a demand for the abolition of this illusion is the demand for the real happiness of the people. Philosophy too could constitute a form of alienation. Speculative philosophy reduced history and man to a mental process, and replacing God by the absolute was no better than a secularized theology. Marx analyzed the form of political alienation in a similar manner. The state, he said, contained a true description of human nature, but at the same time it deprived man of the opportunity of achieving it. Political life in the modern state is thus scholasticism of the people's life. Monarchy is the preferred expression of this alienation. Republicanism is its negative insight in its own sphere.

In *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, Marx analyzed the economic aspects of alienation. Starting from the concept of alienated labour, Marx highlighted four related aspects of human alienation under capitalism. The economic form of alienation has been dealt in detail in the following pages. Members of the proletariat were obviously the most alienated section of capitalist society. Marx, however, applied the concept of alienation to all social cases, including capitalist.

Marx defined human freedom as absence of man's alienated condition. For him alienation and freedom were historical negations. Man expresses his humanity through productive labour which can be of economic, social, artistic, literary or scientific nature. Man as a subject transforms the material objects around him to express his creative capacities. In capitalist society, man's productive activity is deformed in such a way as to cause his alienation and estrangement. In *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, Marx mentioned four aspects of estrangement: (i) alienation from the product of work, (ii) from work itself, (iii) from one's fellow beings and (iv) from human species or life. Estrangement or alienation is a radical loss of freedom because it is the negation of free genuinely human creative activity.

According to Marx, in the first place, the worker in the capitalist mode of production does not own and control the products of his own labour. The proletariat does not use the wealth which he creates. Thus, he is alienated from his own product. The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien force. The labourer himself becomes a commodity whose value is equal to the bare means of his subsistence. The capitalist on the other hand who purchases the labour power of the proletarian is the real owner of the wealth which he creates. Secondly, Marx affirms that a worker's detached relation to the products of his labour is only a manifestation of the alienated

nature of the productive activity itself. The labourer who sells his labour-power for a wage, produces commodities under orders from the capitalist. His work is, therefore, neither free nor voluntary because he does not satisfy any creative urge of his own by working in a factory and is managed by his bourgeois employer. The bourgeois institutions of private property reduce him to the status of a wage-slave. Human beings lost the ability to see their own products for what they were, and were willing to be enslaved by them. This was what Marx meant by commodity fetishism. Thirdly, alienated labour results in the estrangement of the proletarian from his fellow-beings. It results in the hostility between the employed and unemployed workers who look upon each other as alien force. The workers similarly see in the manager and the proprietor alien forces profiting from their alienated work. The basis of genuine social relation is thus totally destroyed in capitalism. Fourthly, the above three aspects of man's alienation produce his alienation from his actions, and thus from his own being. The egoistic, self-centered existence of the estranged proletarian alienates him from man's entire cultural heritage. As Marx points out, the oppressed members of the working-class are scarcely aware of the artistic, scientific, literary and other cultural achievements of the human race. They lack the capacity to understand and enjoy these beautiful and valuable gifts of human creativity. Man is thus, cut off from the life history of his own species. By dehumanizing his existence, man becomes a slave to his own alienated activity. What is true of the worker is equally applicable to those who live parasitically on appropriations of the product of estranged labour. The capitalist, who rides on the back of the proletariats, also leads an alienated life because he is also not personally engaged in any creative work and is a victim of fetishism of commodities. In a society not characterized by freedom, both the slave and his enslaver are equally unfree.

Thus, the factors which help create the condition that Marx calls alienations are: the division of labours, private ownership of both means of production and products of labour, fetishism of commodities, the power of money, state, church, and other institutions that confront an individual as an alien force. Man, with the exception of a few individuals engaged in creative activity, cannot recognize themselves in their own works. In a world dominated by private property, alienation is generalized. Not only does the worker who sells his labour but also the capitalist who appropriates the product of his work and the merchant who sells the commodity in the market, the 'haves' and 'have-nots', the rulers and the ruled, are in such a system, alienated from their work, from themselves, from others and from nature. In a society of alienation the relationship of a man with other men is not that of a human being to his fellow human beings but that of a servant to his master, of a subordinate to his boss, and so forth. The workers alienation is the most extreme form of alienation because it is the very nature of his activity. For the non-workers, the master, the owner, the idler, the priest, the philosopher, the general or the ruler, alienation is not activity but a condition. All this criticism rested in the implicit utopian premise that the individuals were fully human only when they developed and expressed their potential through satisfying labour. Linked with this premise was the second remarkable assumption that the modern industrial system afforded opportunities for all to engage in a rewarding labour. In the socialist utopia, division of labour would be abolished ending alienation and monotony.

Alienation as condition of capitalist society is the basic assertion of Marxism. Hegel in his philosophy talked about the various stages through which the spirit moves away from the ignorance and towards the understanding of the self. Marx in his materialist explanation of the society and nature of human history replaces the metaphysical categories with the materialistic ones. In his hand, alienation takes place of Hegel's spiritual ignorance, and man's realization of his species-being, along with

NOTES

NOTES

overcoming of alienation and an objective establishment of a better society replaces the transcendent end of history. Such a teleological reading of Marx, especially by French philosopher Alexandre Kojève in the first half of the twentieth century, has been subjected to severe criticism by another French philosopher, Louis Althusser, in his work on random materialism. According to Althusser, such a reading of Marx has several defects: it projects the proletariat as a subject of history, it is clouded by the idealism of Hegel, the philosophy of the subject, something which dominated the philosophical scene of Europe for five centuries, and something which has been condemned as the 'bourgeois ideology of philosophy'. Marx in the *German Ideology* writes that 'things have now come to such a pass that the individuals must appropriate the existing totality of productive forces, not only to achieve self-activity, but, also, merely to safeguard their very existence.' Marx seems to be saying is that there is no doubt that the human have a requirement for self-activity, but that requirement is of secondary historical relevance. Why? Because according to Marx, the capitalist mode of production will fuel the economic immiseration so quickly that the only way proletariat would survive is by engaging in the social revolution, and therefore, they will hardly have any time to think about self-activity. This, however, does not in any way suggest that leaning against, what we call, alienation arise only when the other needs are satisfied, it simply means that these leaning do not gain primary importance. Many works in the Marxist tradition done by people like Raya Dunayevskaya and other reveal the sense of desire for self-activities even in those workers who struggle to achieve the basic goals of human life. Marx, in his book *The Holy Family* says that proletariat are not the only class of society to experience alienation, the capitalists experience it as well, but the difference between the two is in the ways in which they experience alienation. He writes:

'The propertied class and the class of the proletariat present the same human self-estrangement. But the former class feels at ease and strengthened in this self-estrangement, it recognizes estrangement, as its own power and has in it the semblance of a human existence. The class of the proletariat feels annihilated, this means that they cease to exist in estrangement, it sees in it its own powerlessness and the reality of an inhuman existence. It is, to use an expression of Hegel, in its abasement the indignation at that abasement, an indignation to which it is necessarily driven by the contradiction between its human nature and its condition of life, which is the outright, resolute and comprehensive negation of that nature. Within this antithesis the private property-owner is therefore the conservative side, the proletarian the destructive side. From the former arises the action of preserving the antithesis, from the latter the action of annihilating it.'

Let us try to understand the manifestation of alienation in capitalism, but for that we must go back a bit and understand what changed in the society with the arrival of capitalism. The pre-capitalist feudal society was marked by lack of technology and means to control the natural resources and processes; the production was less even to meet the requirements of the people, thus causing famines, and diseases were not under control as they are today. The social relations in such a society were shaped and determined 'by a low stage of development of the productive powers of labour and correspondingly limited relations between men within the process of creating and reproducing their material life, hence also limited relations between man and nature.' The major, or perhaps, the only source of production was land, and therefore, it dominated feudal society to such an extent that people saw and perceived themselves in relation to the land. In his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, Marx talks about this. He writes: 'In feudal landownership we already find the domination of the earth as of an alien power over men. The serf is an appurtenance of the land. Similarly the heir through primogeniture, the first born son, belongs to the land. It inherits him.

NOTES

The rule of private property begins with property in land which is its basis.' Inheritance and bloodlines determined the ownership of land, or in other words, it was the birth of a person, and not the actions, that determined his destiny. In one of his early works, Marx talks about the way in which 'the aristocracy's pride in their blood, their descent, in short the genealogy of the body...has its appropriate science in heraldry. The secret of the aristocracy is zoology.'

The zoology to which Marx refers to was something that determined the life and relationships of people in the feudal societies. Because of the low level of productivity, the peasants were forced to be under constant labour, but without any satisfaction of tasting the fruits of their own labour, for the feudal lords and the Church would take what they desired of the production from the peasants often by force. Therefore, in the feudal societies we see three factors that caused the sense of alienation: first, the low level of productivity; second, the human subordination to the land; and the third, the domination of the aristocracy and the Church over the peasants. Though the sense of alienation was there in the feudal societies, it was limited, for the peasants laboured on their own lands and produced almost everything that they required in their individual family units. 'If a person was tied to the land, then the land was also tied to the people... The peasant, and even the serf of the middle ages, remained in possession of at least 50 per cent, sometimes 60 and 70 percent, of the output of their labour.'

It is true that the social relations of the feudal society was marked and characterized by subordination and domination, but it is also true that in midst of domination and subordination, there also existed real human relationship between people. In his magnum opus *Capital*, Marx explains the way in which 'the social relations between individuals in the performance of their labour appear at all events as their own mutual personal relations, and are not disguised under the shape of social relations between the products of labour'. However, there is a difference between the constraints of feudalism and dynamics of capitalism. There was a demand by the bourgeoisie of a society in which everything had a price, which is to say that everything could be bought and sold. Here it would be important to keep in mind that selling is essentially associated with alienation. And the only way such society could possibly be formed was through the massive enclosures of the common land. The enclosures of common land created a situation which arose in the history of mankind for the very first time: for the first time a majority of people in society did not have direct access to the means of production, which in this case was land, and thus was created a section of landless peasants who for their survival had to submit to a different and new kind of exploitation, i.e. wage labour.

The arrival of capitalism necessitated 'a fundamental change in the relations between men, instruments of production and the materials of productions.' These basic and fundamental changes put certain forces in motion which transformed almost every aspect of human life. Capitalism even changed the notion and perception of time in such way that watches, which in the 17th century were simply considered as toys, became a means to measure the time of labour or quantifying the time of idleness, because of the 'importance of an abstract measure of minutes and hours to the work ethic and to the habit of punctuality required by the industrial discipline.' And suddenly men did not have the right to deal with their own production, for their being wage labours detached them from the product to of their own labours. Peter Linebaugh in *The Landon Hanged*, which is his account of the history of 18th century London, says that in the early phase of capitalist economy the worker who worked for the capitalist establishments considered themselves to be the owner of what they produced, and it was a 'judicial onslaught' in the latter half of the eighteenth century to convince

NOTES

them that the product of their labour did not belong to them but to the owners of the factory, the capitalists. In the eighteenth century most of the workers were not paid exclusively in money, and it was 'true of Russian serf labour, America slave labour, Irish agricultural labour and the metropolitan labour in London trades.' But, with the arrival of nineteenth century all other forms of labour were replaced by the wage labours, which meant that labour was now looked at as a commodity which can be bought and sold in the market place. On the surface, both capitalist and labourers did not share any formal relations or connections, but in real sense they were inextricably connected. The act of production shifted from the familial atmosphere of home to the disciplined atmosphere of the factory. The labourers' relationship with machine, which became the new means of production, were determined by the automation of the labours in the factories. Machines, which were the remarkable achievement of human begins 'became a source of tyranny against the worker.'

While comparing the works of craftsman and artisan to that of the workers of the factory, Marx in *Capital* wrote: 'In handicrafts and manufacture, the workman makes use of a tool, in the factory, the machine makes use of him. There the movements of the instrument of labour proceed from him, here it is the movements of the machines that he must follow. In manufacture the workmen are parts of a living mechanism. In the factory we have a lifeless mechanism independent of the workman, who becomes a mere living appendage.'

The division of labour was not only one of the most important aspects of factory production, but also one of the most devastating. In the pre-capitalist societies the division of labour did happen, but it was a social division of labour which means that different people were involved in the production of different things, or were engaged in the different crafts. But, in capitalism the division of labour was a new kind – it was a detailed division of labour within the single branch of production. Labour was divided for every worker, i.e. each worker was supposed to perform specific tasks. Such an arrangement of the division of labour required the workers to specialize in specific tasks, in a series of mechanical activities, which engaged only some of their capacities as human being at the expense of the other abilities. While talking about the consequences that such a division of labour caused, Harry Braverman, an American Marxist, writes: 'While the social division of labour subdivides society, the detailed division of labour subdivided humans, and while the subdivision of society may enhance the individual and the species, the subdivision of the individual, when carried on the without regard to human capabilities and needs, is a crime against the person and humanity.'

A similar point was made by the nineteenth century critic of industrialization, John Ruskin, who claimed that in the division of labour, it is not the labour which is divided but the men themselves, and therefore, the term 'division of labour' is false. According to H. Braverman, the workers in the capitalist mode of production become excessively dependent on the owners of the means of production. He writes that as the worker 'is depressed, therefore, both intellectually and physically, to the level of machine, and from being a man becomes an abstract activity and a stomach, so he also becomes more and more dependent on every fluctuation in the market price, in the investment of capital and on the whims of the wealthy'. As the dependency of the workers increased, it became almost impossible for them to conceive their lives independently of the capitalist machinery. Working, for them, meant their reduction to the level of human machine, and to be deprived from the work meant death while being alive. Marx argued that importance of capital for a worker vital, and the lack of it threatens the very existence of the workers. He writes: 'The existence of capital is

his existence, his life for it determines the content of his life a manner indifferent to him'. Workers do not have choice, for in order to survive the only option they have is to work. In this sense, the labour of the workers became a forced labour, for the workers did not have freedom to choose not to work, neither did they have the freedom to choose what they produced and in the manner which they produced. Everything was determined for them. Marx writes: 'The fact that labour is external to the worker, does not belong to his essential being, that he, therefore, does not confirm himself in his work, but denies himself, feels miserable and not happy, does not confirm himself in his work, but denies himself, feels miserable and not happy, does not develop free mental and physical energy, but mortifies his flesh and ruins his mind. Hence, the worker feels himself only when he is not working, when he is working he does not feel himself. He is at home when he is not working, and not at home when he is working. His labour is, therefore, not voluntary but forced, it is forced labour. It is, therefore, not the satisfaction of a need, but a mere means to satisfy need outside itself. Its alien character is clearly demonstrated by the fact that as soon as no physical or other compulsion exists it is shunned like the plague'.

Another aspect to the division of labour in the factory was the emergence of the collective value producing class, i.e. in the wake of the fact that each worker was supposed to perform certain specific tasks, no worker was the producer of the entire commodity. A commodity was then produced by a number of workers, each of whom performed certain tasks for the production of this commodity. This emergence of collective force of workers found itself in a constant struggle with the capitalist forces who owned the machines and means of production. The workers collectively began to assert their rights of controlling the machines rather than being controlled by them. One famous example of such a struggle is Luddite Rebellion in the early nineteenth century. The revolution became so widespread, strong and forceful, that in order to crush the rebellion the government had to deploy more troops than it deployed during the battle of Waterloo.

Commodities have come to dominate capitalist society to such an extent that it is no longer considered an oddity, and is seen as something natural. Everything that is produced and achieved in today's society become commodities. Marx rightly noted that 'the wealth of societies, in which the capitalist mode of production prevails, appears as an immense collection of commodities.' Capitalist mode of production is the first system of generalized commodity production in which commodity becomes 'a universal category of society as a whole.' When the society is dominated by the production of commodity, it shapes and affects the way in which we experience our world, the external reality, and our relation to it. Every society has one thing in common that people work towards the production of objects so that they can fulfill their needs and requirements. And that is why Marx begins his analysis of commodities in the capitalist mode of production by maintaining that 'a commodity is an external object, a thing which through its qualities satisfies human needs of whatever kind,' irrespective of whether the need is for luxury or survival. Commodities possess two kinds of values—use value and exchange value. The societies dominated by the capitalist mode of production, the only way to fulfil one's needs and requirements is through engaging in the exchange of commodities, i.e. buying and selling of commodities. To survive, we must buy food as commodities; to travel we must buy means of transportations or permission to board a means of transportation, in case of public transports, as a commodity; and to acquire knowledge, we must buy books, and other commodities to gain access to knowledge. These commodities are overwhelmed by the exchange value that they have to such an extent that the needs of human beings becomes

NOTES

NOTES

indistinguishable from the mechanisms of market. The way commodities are circulated and exchanged in the market is more mysterious and enigmatic than the production of the commodities, for while the commodities are produced, the worker, to some extent, have a direct relationship with the products they produce. But as soon as the products are sent to the market, they become commodities, and this relationship is lost completely. In the market, the commodities are exchanged for the money, which again is exchanged for other commodities. Marx writes that ‘the actual process of production, as a unity of the direct production process and the circulation process, gives rise to new formations, in which the vein of internal connections is increasingly lost, the production relations are rendered independent of one another, and the component values become ossified into forms independent of one another.’

Marx demystifies the mechanics involved in the process of circulation and exchange of commodities and explains the way this exchange of commodities affects the relationships shared by the individual producers by transforming it into the relationships between the commodities produced by these individual producers. They become detached from each other, but still remain dependent on the commodities produced by the other. The producers of the commodities realize that the division of labour under the working conditions of the factory which has transformed them into independent private producers has also made the social process of production and the relationship shared by the individual produces within that process independent of the producers themselves. They also realize that the detachment of the individuals from each other helps create a system of material dependence, of which they all become a part. In a capitalist society, it becomes critical for the individuals to possess certain things, for instance, labour power, or the means of productions, if they desire to engage into the relationships of production within the society. As a result it appears that it is not the man, but the things in themselves have the ability to create and maintain the production relations in the societies.

The reason that the commodities come to possess social characteristics is because the individuals who enter into the process of production, enter as the owner of commodities. This process is explained by Marx in the following words: ‘To the producers, therefore, the social relations between their private labours...do not appear as direct social relations between persons in their work but rather as material relations between persons and social relations between persons and social relations between things.’ Thus, it seems that it is market that works independently of the individuals to control the price fluctuation, and forces the workers into one section of production and out of another. It is through the social form of things that the society impacts the individual. This adds to the sense of alienation that is so prevalent in the capitalist society. Marx indicated that ‘the characters who appear on the economic stage are merely personification of economic relations, it is as the bearers of these economic relations that they come into contact with each other.’

While analyzing the idea of alienation in the capitalism, Marx explained the way human relationships are reified, the way in which human powers are attributed to the inanimate objects, and the process through which the social organization appears as if it were as independent of the individual will as commodity fetishism. It is true that there has been a tremendous increase in the commodity fetishism with the growth of capitalism, in which ‘the capitalist mode of production takes over the totality of individual, family, and social needs and, in subordinating them to the market, also reshapes them to serve the needs of capital.’ As is apparent in the society today that everything in the world finds a market for itself. In this context, Ernst Fischer writes: ‘We have become so accustomed to living in a world of commodities, where nature is perhaps only a

NOTES

poster for a holiday resort and man only an advertisement for new product, we exist in such a turmoil of alienated objects offered cheaply for sale, that we hardly ask ourselves any longer what it is that magically transforms objects of necessity (or fashion) into commodities, and what is the true nature of the witches' Sabbath, ablaze with neon moons and synthetic constellations, that has become our day to day reality.' It is important for the circulation of commodities and creation of exchange value of the commodities that there be a commodity which can be compared with all other commodities, a commodity which can be the representative of all commodities. Marx called this universal commodity.

Marx in his analysis of alienation capitalism explained the way in which emergence of capitalism brought a problem with itself, the problem of evaluating various different commodities. And in order to solve this problem, it came with the solution of the universal commodity – the money. Physical objects such as silver and gold became the 'direct incarnation of all human labour.' As the idea of money materialized in the society, the relationships that people shared with their production assumed material dimension while remaining free from their control or action. Marx says that 'This situation is manifested first by the fact that the products of men's labour universally take on the form of commodities. The riddle of the money fetish is, therefore, the riddle of the commodity fetish, now become visible and dazzling to our eyes.'

The term that Marx used for the money is 'universal pimp', for according to him, it acts as a mediator between the people and the desires they have. The value that the money used to have in terms of metals such as gold and silver became somewhere lost in time, and its place was taken by the worthless alloy metal coins and paper notes. In spite of the loss of the intrinsic value, the money emerged as the most powerful commodity which can buy anything and everything: 'Money is all other commodities divested of their shape, the product of their universal alienation.' The role that money plays in the circulation and exchange of commodities determines the consciousness of people who are involved in the process of the circulation and exchange of the commodities. Meszaros explains this in the following words: 'Money is taken to possess these colossal powers as natural attributes. People's attitude towards money is, undoubtedly, the outstanding instance of capitalist fetishism, reaching its height in interest bearing capital. Here, people think they see money creating more money, self-expanding value ... workers, machines, raw materials – all the factors of production – are downgraded to mere aids, and money itself is made the producer of wealth.' What we see here is that in the capitalist society money come to acquire great powers and status, but at the same time, according to Marx, all the human abilities and desires are compressed into a sense of having: 'Private property has made us so stupid and one-sided that an object is only ours when we have it, when it exists for us as capital or when we directly possess, eat, drink, inhabit it, etc., in short, when we use it.' Marx also talks about the way in which the human desire for possessing things is both denied and stimulated. He says: 'The worker is only permitted to have enough for him to live, and he is only permitted to live in order to have. In a descriptive and perceptive paragraph, Marx explains that way in which money devours the individual personalities of people. This paragraph can also be seen as a brilliant counter to the argument that capitalism promotes the individuality of people. Marx writes: 'That which exists for me through the medium of money, that which I can pay for, i.e. which money can buy, that am I, the possessor of the money. The stronger the power of my money, the stronger I am. The properties of money are my, the possessors', properties and essential powers. Therefore what I am and what I can do is by no means determined by my individuality. I am ugly, but I can buy the most beautiful women. Which means

NOTES

to say that I am not ugly, for the effect of ugliness, its repelling power, is destroyed by money. As an individual I am lame, but money procures me 24 legs. Consequently, I am not lame. I am a wicked, dishonest, unscrupulous individual, but money is respected, and so also is its owner . . . through money I can have anything the human heart desires. Do I not, therefore, possess all human abilities? Does not money therefore transform all my incapacities into their opposite?’

Commodity Fetishism and Class

Commodity fetishism together with the sense of alienation determines and shape of social relationships. The possessors of wealth inhabit a world which remains beyond their active control, and in which happens the reification of human relationships. The rules and laws of capitalism devours the individuality of such people. Marx argues that the fundamental instinct to enrich oneself, which ‘in a miser is a mere idiosyncrasy, is, in the capitalist, the effect of the social mechanism, of which he is but one of the wheels.’ It is possible the ruling capitalist class, through the productive forces that they own, can become wealthy enough, but it is impossible for them to either control the vast economic forces of the system, or even design or program any of its section in an accurate way. The capitalist appear to be caught in contradiction, that ‘capital is a social force, but it is privately, rather than collectively, owned so its movements are determined by individual owners necessarily indifferent to all the social implications of their activities.’ In order to compete with the competitors, a capitalist is required to constantly be in the mode of action, and while these actions may benefit his individual firm, they affect the society by causing economic recessions, thus affecting many other firms and companies in a negative way. Such economic crisis prove the supremacy of the system over any individual capitalist. This offers a satisfactory explanation of why the ruling class considers such crises a huge dent in their ideology and confidence.

A capitalist often believes that he creates wealth because of his daring entrepreneurial spirit, but the reality is that he ‘rides the wave another has created.’ The dependency of the ruling capitalist class on the proletariat is brought to the fore by the idea of class struggle, which, like economic crises, is a lethal blow to the perceptive ideologies of the capitalists. But the problem with the capitalist class is that in spite of the fact that they are also the victim of alienation, they will constantly and always try to defend the system that makes them the victim in the first place by offering them the power and wealth dictated by the material position they hold in that system. Lukacs argues that it is impossible for the capitalist class to transcend the limits of commodity fetishism of the capitalist society. He says that the bourgeoisie will never be able to realize the true spirit or nature of capitalism, unless they confront their role as the exploiters of the proletariat and upholders of the capitalism. And that is the reason that the capitalists distance themselves from the realization of the real social relationships that underlie the structure of capitalism. They force themselves to believe that relations of production under the capitalist mode of production is something that is natural and cannot be tampered with.

Lukacs argues that the workers differ from the capitalist, even though they too are conditioned by what we call commodity fetishism, in the sense that they do not remain permanently blinded to the reality of the capitalist system. He father argues that the position of the working class is unique in the sense that it possesses the ability to rip apart the veil of reification form the capitalist system, for sooner or later, the struggle of working class against the capitalism reveals their real role that the working class play in the production of wealth in the society. The idea of class struggle suggests

the cessation on the part of the working class to perceive themselves as isolated individuals. It also suggests that possibility of their awareness regarding the social character of labour. According to Lukacs, the realization of the working class regarding the reality behind the commodity fetishism also causes the possibility of their realization of necessity of revolutionary transformation of society. He says: 'This enables us to understand why it is only in the proletariat that the process by which a man's achievement is split off from his total personality and becomes a commodity leads to a revolutionary consciousness.'

The early liberals were confident that economic inequality could be prevented with constant growth, which would percolate downwards and raise the standard of living. However, Marx pointed out that the gulf between rich and poor forever widened. Capitalism encouraged inequality and consumerism. Commodities assumed personalities of their own. To Marx, exploitation and alienation made possible the revolutionary transformation of capitalism. It was the individual as a producer who rebelled against society to free himself from exploitation and oppression. The basis of change was, therefore, moral. Unless private property was abolished the worker could not be truly free. But once this was achieved, human nature would undergo a transformation, for a true communist society was one of socialized humanity. Capitalism divided society into two hostile camps. The proletariat grew larger and larger, with their miseries and pauperization attenuated, while the bourgeoisie would become numerically small, prosperous and well up. With wages pushed low, small entrepreneurs were forced to join the working class or merge with giant monopolies. The ever-increasing appetite of the capitalist class led to an ever increasing demand for markets, raw materials and profits representing a crisis within capitalism. Marx argued that the increase in productivity did not benefit the worker, who only received exchange, and not use value. The surplus value was appropriated by the capitalist. With polarization of society, class struggles became sharper, making a revolution on a world scale inevitable. He conceived of a worldwide transformation, for capitalism was truly international and global in impact. He asserted that the seeds of destruction of capitalism is contained within the capitalism itself.

He rallied the working class under the call 'workers of all countries unite'. Thus, Marx believed that the conditions of man's alienation can be overcome under communism which abolishes commodity production. In communism, there will be no private property and, therefore, no alienated labour. Economic planning will reverse the existing domination of the product over the worker and distribution according to need will remove the workers existing concern for his physical survival. The division of labour existing under capitalism will be replaced by a new system of assigning work through which an individual can engage himself in several types of productive and creative activity according to his own aptitude and choice. In capitalist society, the working-class cannot hope to achieve its freedom because it cannot put an end to the phenomenon to alienation without abolishing capitalist method of production itself.

Contemporary Marxist thought, better known as neo-Marxism, has developed in two directions: humanist and scientific. The humanist strain of neo-Marxism draws particularly on the early works of Marx and constitutes the main stream of critical theory. Its dominant themes are the problems of alienation and wage to human emancipation. Sociologist Herbert Marcuse has brilliantly portrayed the conditions of alienation in bourgeois societies which have reduced the human being to 'one-dimensional man'. He has stated that capitalism has cunningly anaesthetized the discontent of the oppressed by manipulating the means of communication so as to stimulate trivial material desires which are easily satisfied. Marcus has argued that

NOTES

NOTES

human beings should first be made aware of their condition of on freedom. Where after they will easily find their way to freedom. The scientific strain of neo-Marxism mainly occupies with its explanatory and scientific aspects. It was particularly interested in structures as well as relative importance of cultural, ideological and social factors.

Thus, Louis Althusser, a French communist and philosopher, challenged the humanist themes of Marxist thinking in the early 1960s and stressed the need of analyzing the deep structure of human society, specially the mode of production.

Brief history of Marxism in the twentieth century

There is no doubt that the notion of alienation is one of the most fundamental aspect of Marxism, but at the same time it is also controversial. It was in year 1932 that Marx's most important work on alienation, *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscript*, was finally published. The publication of this book dramatically transformed the tradition called 'Western Marxism', which had writers like Herbert Marcuse and John Paul Sartre. The writers of this tradition made extensive use of the idea of alienation, but in their hands the concept of alienation intermingled with idealism and was explained not in terms of the social organization but in terms of human psychology. In the late 1950s, the New Left emerged as a reaction against the ideas, both theoretical and practical, of Stalinism. Unfortunately, the writers of the New Left along with Stalinism also discarded the Marxism, in the sense that they abandoned some of the most fundamental principles of Marxism, such as the role economic structure plays in the structuring of the society, and the notion of objective class antagonism that resides at center of capitalism. Perry Anderson writes that 'The most striking trait of Western Marxism as a common tradition is, thus perhaps the constant presence and influence on it of successive types of European idealism.' These writers began using the idea of alienation to offer explanation of crisis of modern life which was characterized by misery and isolation, the notion of 'lonely crowd,' and 'those aggregations of atomized city dwellers who feel crushed and benumbed by the weight of a social system in which they have neither significant purpose nor decision-making power.' Because of the writings under the tradition of Western Marxism, the idea of alienation was detached from its Marxist meaning of the way in which social organization affects people, and became something associated with the state of mind. One of the typical books that deals with the idea of alienation in non-Marxist ways, which was also to some extent fashionable during this period in the twentieth century, is *Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society*, edited by Eric and Mary Josephson, published in 1962. According to Josephsons, the notion of alienation means the 'the untold lives of quiet desperation that marks our age,' and the group of people who suffer from alienation include, artists, women, sexual deviants, immigrants, drug addicts, and young generation. It is interesting to note here that the editors of the book understood the notion of alienation purely as a psychological state of mind, 'referring to an extraordinary variety of psycho-social disorders, including loss of field, anxiety states, anomie, despair, depersonalization, rootlessness, apathy, social disorganization, loneliness, atomization, powerlessness, meaninglessness, pessimism, isolation, and the loss of belief and values.' But if alienation was a purely a manifestation of a human consciousness then the solution to alienation must also reside in the human consciousness, which means that in order to solve the problem of alienation one does not need to change the social organization.

Eric Fromm suggests on the similar lines that alienation in its different forms is chain of illusion, and it is possible to break that chain within the confines of the capitalism, as for Fromm the point of inception of sense of alienation is the 'stereotyped alternatives of thinking.' But Marx differed from such a take on alienation. For him, as it is clear

from his writings, alienation was not simply a state of mind, it had its root in the fundamental principles of capitalist society. He maintained that the human consciousness was a construction of society and the way it is organized. And, therefore, the root of alienation must be in the society. One Marxist thinker once said that ‘the life activity of the alienated individual is qualitatively of a kind. His actions in religion, family affairs, politics and so on, are distorted and brutalized as his productive activity... There is no sphere of human activity that lies outside these prison walls.’ Marx’s ideas helps us acquire an in-depth understanding of the way in which the process of production shapes and conditions the entire society. There are two controversial areas of activity as far as alienation is concerned. The first area of activity is the mental or intellectual labour, or creativity in the production of commodities which is marked by the sense of alienation.

The division of labour under the capitalist work environment causes a very prominent demarcation between the work and creativity. Work, by which we mean physical work, is divided into several different tasks, and creativity required in every process of the production is dispersed into million fragments. Under capitalism, the labour itself becomes a commodity and its value is determined by the labour time, i.e. the amount of time invested in the creation of the labour. For instance, the time invested in training or educating a worker for a specific task. And that is why a skilled or educated engineer is paid much more in than an unskilled labourer. Baverman writes that ‘In this way a structure is given to all labour process that at its extremes polarises those whose time is infinitely valuable and those whose time is worth almost nothing’. This, however, does not suggests that the educated and skilled engineer does not fall into the trap of alienation. The skilled and educated intellectual also become the victim of alienation because of the commercialization of knowledge, which is one of the characteristics of modern form of capitalism. For a capitalist an intellectual work like a work of literature, or a design of a microchip is as much a property as any other product in the market, like a car or a washing machine. It is a characteristic of capitalists to enrich themselves through the incorporation of mental or intellectual labour as they do in case of material or physical labour.

According to H. Braverman (1974), the way labour is divided in the society does not allow the intellectuals to harness their true capacity and discover new aspects of the society. Franz Jakubowski writes: ‘The social division of labour creates a series of sub-spheres, not only in the economy but in the whole of social life and thought. These develop their own autonomous sets of laws. As a result of specialization, each individual sphere develops according to the logic of its own specific object’. It is within the confines of these limitations and in isolation that these intellectual activities take place. The result is that the science fails to ‘understand either the method of the principle of even their own concrete substratum of reality’. The competition of market suppresses the human potential of creating new ideas and methods and techniques. The machinery of the capitalism does not allow the intellectual growth of the society. This, however, does not mean that nothing new or useful is developed or created in capitalism. It simply means that in the capitalist society the research takes place with the limits of confinements which limits the potential of possible development.

Almost similar processes are involved in the creation and consumption of art in the society dominated by the ideas of capitalism. In his brilliant work, *Marxism and Modernism*, Eugene Lunn explains the way in which the capitalist society claims to offer artistic freedom on one hand, but on the other it takes that freedom back. He writes: ‘Bourgeois society — with all its progressive advance over ‘feudal’ constrictions — is also inimical to many forms of art, for example, because of division of labour,

NOTES

NOTES

the mechanization of many forms of human activity, and the predominance of quantitative over qualitative concerns'. Marx said that like intellectuals and scientists, artists also fail to escape from the conversion of their creativity into commodities. One reason for this is that, like every worker, the artists also depend on their capacity to earn money: 'The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyers, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage labourers'. Another reason is, as Lunn mentions, the way in which the production of commodity determines and conditions art. The simple fact that artistic production is sold in the market conditions and determines each and every level of the artistic production and conception. An example of this can be seen in Marx's critic of Eugene Sue's novels, in which Marx asserts that the author was under the influence of the political and ethical assumptions of the target audience of the novel. Art also cannot escape another important capitalist manifestation, commodity fetishism. 'If one form of spiritualizing mystification has been eroded by expansion of commerce — the romantic apotheosis of the arts as soaring above material reality — a new fetishism has replaced it, the fetishism of commodities'. This directs our attention to the ways of the rapid inclusion of radical cultural development in the system as a form of commodity. But this also does not imply that an artistic production in the capitalist society is reduced to the value of tin of jam or soup. Art has the capacity to stimulate the imagination and emotions of the people. And therefore it is possible that it can help enrich the understanding of the individuals of the society and expose the contradictions inherent in what visible appearances. Lunn writes that 'We cannot reduce art to exchange rates reflecting the pervasive alienation. Even with its halo removed, art was capable of diagnosing, and pointing beyond alienating social and economic conditions . . . All art has the capacity to create a need for aesthetic enjoyment and education which capitalism cannot satisfy. Although coming increasingly under the influence of the marketplace, art is produced and consumed in relative autonomy and is not identical to factory work or to a pure commodity.'

H. Braverman maintains that the second controversial area of Marx's idea of alienation is the way he analyses the activities outside the work circle, which is undertaken not because it is necessary but because of choice. The more people are confronted with the misery and hostility of the work, more they try to indulge in the life outside the work. And this why the system constantly keep coming with new ways to cater the needs of the individuals outside the work environment. This gives rise to what Marxists call 'leisure industry'. The very existence of leisure industry points to the fact that the detachment of work from the leisure has created a void in our free time. 'Thus, filling time away from the job also becomes dependent upon the market, which develops to an enormous degree those passive amusements, entertainments, and spectacles that suit the restricted circumstances of the city and are offered as substitutes for life itself'. But what is important to notice that everything that is supposed to make us feel better in our free time and promote family value is designed to make us consume more as a family unite. 'As the advances of modern household and service industries lighten the family labour, they increase the futility of family life, as they remove the burden of personal relations, they strip away its affections, as they create an intricate social life, they rob it of every vestige of community and leave in its place the cash nexus'.

Meszaros explains the ways in which the indulgence of people in their free time or what we call private life encourages the power that capitalism has over us. He writes: 'The cult of privacy and of individual autonomy thus fulfils the dual function of

NOTES

objectively protecting the established order against challenge by the rabble, and subjectively providing a spurious fulfilment in an escapist withdrawal to the isolated and powerless individual who is mystified by the mechanisms of capitalist society which manipulates him'. He also says that in the capitalist society alienation ceases the human ability to form real relationships, and people deprived of this ability try to compensate the loss by indulging in their private space, which again reinforces the sense of alienation more than ever. 'To seek the remedy in autonomy is to be on the wrong track. Our troubles are not due to a lack of autonomy but, on the contrary, to a social structure — a mode of production — that forces on men a cult of it, isolating them from each other'. Sense of alienation cannot be eradicated by seeking pleasure in some isolated activity, rather it would require a complete reorganization of society, for indulgence in the private life deprive the people of the opportunity to collectively shape the society. Therefore leisure and lifestyle are incapable transcending us from the chains of alienation. The only way to do so is the engage in a collective struggle against the capitalist society, for the roots of alienation lies in the capitalism.

In *Capital*, Marx writes: 'The veil is not removed from the countenance of the social life process, i.e., the process of material production, until it becomes production by freely associated men and stands under their conscious and planned control'.

2.2.2 Dialectics

In the Theses on Feuerbach, written in 1845 but first published as an appendix to the 1888 edition of Engels' *Ludwig Feurbach*, Marx led the foundation for what he called dialectical materialism. Engels claimed that dialectical materialism is the science of the general laws of motion and growth of thought, human society, and nature. Though it was a natural process, acting upon and being acted upon by the natural environment in which it takes place. It is impossible to transcend the natural process. Marx borrowed his dialectical method from German philosopher, G. W. H. Hegel and sought to combine it with his materialism. Hegel has postulated that 'idea' or 'consciousness' was the essence of universe, and that all social institutions were the manifestation of changing forms of idea. Idea evolved into new forms because of its inherent tension, exemplified in the clash between thesis (partial truth) and anti-thesis (opposite of thesis — again a partial truth) resulting in synthesis (which is nearer the truth) as long as synthesis itself contains partial truth, it takes the role of thesis and undergoes the same process until this process reaches absolute truth, exemplified in 'absolute idea' or 'absolute consciousness'.

In Hegelian philosophy, dialectics applied to the process, evolutions and development of history. He viewed history as the progressive manifestation of human reason, and the development of a historical spirit. History recorded increasing awareness and greater rationality as exhibited in human affairs. Human consciousness and freedom expanded as a result of conflicting intellectual forces, which were constantly under tension. Hegel believed in a movement from a rudimentary state of affairs to a perfect form. The process of history, for Hegel was marked by two kinds of causation: (i) the individual spirit which desired happiness and provided energy and (ii) the world spirit which strived for higher freedom that came with the knowledge of the self. However, though Marx agreed with Hegel that there was a constant movement in the dialectical process he believed that 'matter' and not the 'idea' as the essence of universe, and the social institutions were the manifestation of changing material conditions. Matter underwent the dialectical process because of its inherent tensions, until perfect material conditions, exemplified by a 'rational mode of production' come into existence.

NOTES

Marx emphasized the real rather than the ideal, the social rather than the intellectual, matter rather than mind. For Marx, the key idea was not the history of philosophy, but the history of economic production and the social relation that accompanied it. Marx acknowledged Hegel's great contributions, which was to recognize world history as a process, as constant motion, change, transformation, and development, and to understand the internal connection between the movement and its development. From Hegel, he also learned that various angles of the developmental process could not be studied in isolation, but in their relations with one another and with the process as a whole. Hegel applied dialectics to the realm ideas. However, Marx as a materialist believed that consciousness was determined by life, and not the other way around. Unlike the latent conservatism and idealism of Hegelian philosophy, Marxism rejected the status quo, capitalism as intolerable. Social circumstances changed, with no social system lasting forever. Capitalism arose under certain historical circumstances, which would disappear in due course time. Thus, Marx, like Hegel, continued to believe that dialectics was a powerful tool. It offered a law of social development, in that sense Marx's social philosophy was a philosophy of history like Hegel's.

Engels in his book *Anti-Duhring* published in 1878, postulated three laws of material dialectics or dialectical materialism: (i) the transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa; (ii) the interpretation of opposites; (iii) the negation of negations. These principles signify the process of resolving contradictions of material conditions of human life which paves the way for social progress. Class conflict is also a manifestation of this process. Karl Marx does not systematically explain anywhere in his works his theory of dialectical materialism. But he makes it clear that his materialism is dialectical not mechanical. In mechanical materialism evolution is the path taken by material things under the pressure of their environment. In dialectical materialism evolution is considered as growth of matter from the very within, environment helping or hindering, but neither originating the evolutionary process, nor capable of preventing it from reaching its inevitable goal.

Motion, to the dialectical materialism, is the mode of existence of matter. The ultimate reality in matter is motion. Moreover, this is a dialectical process, the reconciliation of opposing movements in an endless effort to achieve a more perfect harmony. Matter to the dialectical materialist is active not passive and moves by an inner necessity of its nature.

It contains within itself the energy necessary to transform it. Matter is self-moving or self-determining. The universe is self sufficient, self-creating, self-perpetuating. Hegel explained the dialectical process as the activity of God in the world, Marx borrowed the 'energy' from Hegel's immanent God in the world, dissociates it from God and locates it in matter itself. The interest of dialectical materialism lies more in motion than in matter, in a vital energy within matter invariably deriving it towards perfect society just as Hegel's demi-urge drove forward to the perfect realization of spirit. As Engel said, 'the dialectical method grasps things and their images, ideas, essentially in their sequence, their movement, their birth and death'. Dialectical materialism represents the philosophical bases of Marxism, historical materialism represent its scientific basis. It implies that in any given epoch the economic relations of society—the means whereby man and women undertake production, distribution and exchange of material goods for the satisfaction of their needs play important role, in shaping their social, political, intellectual and ethical relationships. Marx applied dialectics to the material or social world consisting of economic production and exchange.

NOTES

A study of the productive process explained all other historical phenomena. Marx noted that each generation inherited a mass of productive forces, an accumulation of capital, and a set of social relations which reflected these productive forces. The new generation modified these forces, but at the same time these forces prescribed certain forms of life, and shaped human character and thought in distinct ways. The mode of production and exchange was the final cause of all social changes and political revolutions. Marx considered matter as being active, capable of changing from within. It was not passive, needing an external stimulus for change, a conception found in Hobbes. The theory begins with the 'simple truth, which is the clue to the meaning of history. Marxism demands revolution. The dignity of man can only be reclaimed when the common wealth society is distributed equality. The survival of man depends upon his success of producing what he needs from the nature. And that is why production is considered to be the most important human activity. And men who remain isolated produce less than those who remain associated. And thus, the society is the result of man's attempt to produce what he thinks is necessary to his survival.

But society has never accomplished that to the satisfaction of all its members, and in consequence, has always been subject to internal stresses and strains. The Marxian interpretation of human history is economic. Marx saw evolutionary changes in the ethical, religious, social, economic, and political ideas and institutions of mankind. According to him, the ideas and social institutions, which determine the actions of individual, can be changed endlessly. And the primary reason for this change is the material condition of the society and not the Hegelian idealism. Human history, therefore, has a material basis. Marxist perspective postulates that the structure of society may be understood in terms of its base (the foundation) and superstructure (the external build-up). Base consists of the mode of production while superstructure is represented by its legal and political structure, religion, morals, social practices, literature, art and culture and so on. Mode of production has two components: forces of production and relations of production. Forces of production cannot remain static, they have an inherent tendency of development in the direction of achieving the perfect society. Forces of production have two components: means of production (tools and equipment) and labour power (human knowledge and skills). Men and women constantly endeavour to devise better ways of production. Improvement in the means of production is manifested in the development of technology. This is matched by development of human knowledge and skills as required to operate the new technology. Hence, there is the corresponding development of labour power. On the other hand, relations of production in any given epoch are given by the pattern of ownership of means of social production. These give rise to two containing classes—haves and have nots. Marx talked about four stages of human history, such as ancient times, medieval times, modern times and future society based on communism. In earlier stages of historical development, development of the forces of production fails to make any dent in the pattern of ownership. In other words, changes in the mode of production bring about changes in the nature of contending classes but they do not bring about an end of the class conflict. Change in the nature of contending classes is itself brought about by a social revolution. When material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, these relations turn into their fetters. The new social class which comes to own new means of production, feels constrained by these fetters and overthrows the old dominant class in a revolution. As a result of social revolution, an old social formation is replaced by a new social formation. In this process world contending classes are replaced by new contending classes but class conflict continues on a new plan. This has been the case till the rise of capitalism,

NOTES

which will be overthrown by a socialist revolution leading to the eventual emergence of classless society.

Marx, in his analysis of history mentioned the important role of ideology in perpetuating false consciousness among people, and demarcated the stages which were necessary for reaching the goal of communism. In that sense both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat were performing their historically destined roles. In spite of the deterministic interpretation of history, the individual had to play a very important role within the historical limits of his time, and actively hasten the process. Marx had a very powerful moral content in his analysis, and asserted that the progress was not merely inevitable, but would usher in a perfect society free of alienation, exploitation and deprivation. His materialistic conception of history emphasises the practical side of human activity, rather than speculative thought as the moving force of history. In the famous funeral oration speech, Engels claimed that Marx made two major discoveries—the law of development of human history and the law of capitalist development.

2.2.3 State and Revolution

Marx critically dissected the Hegelian theory of the modern state and its institutions in his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (1843). According to Marx, Hegel's separation of civil society and the state was only relevant in his perception of a particular historical context. The state was not eternal. It would eventually disappear. Marx contended that the state was not a march of God on Earth as Hegel described, but an instrument of the dominant economic class exploiting and oppressing the other sections of society. Marx rejected the dichotomy between civil society and the state in Hegelian philosophy, and concluded that the state and bureaucracy did not represent universal interests. Marxism advocates a perspective of state based on class. His theory of state differs from both the organic theory and mechanistic theory of the state. Marx's idea of state does not consider state as an 'ethical institution' or a 'natural institution', as proposed by the organic theory of state. Like mechanistic theory, Marxist theory of state considers state as an artificial device, but it differs with the former in the fact that it does not consider the state either as a manifestation of the will of the people or as a tool for reconciliation of conflicting interests.

According to the class theory, the state comes into existence when society is divided into two antagonistic classes, one owning the means of social production and the other being constrained to live on its labour. In other words, it is the emergence of 'private property' that divides society into two conflicting classes. Those owning the means of production acquire the power to dominate the other classes not only in the economic sphere but in all spheres of life. When there is an antagonism amongst the classes in a society, the state becomes a political instrument, 'a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over another. The economic class domination results in the suppression of the less privileged class. The class character of a state becomes clearly defined. Being the principal component of the super-structure founded on the economic basis of society, the state takes every measure to strengthen and protect this basis. With the emergence of 'private property', society is divided into 'dominant' and 'dependent' classes. The dominant class, in order to maintain its stronghold on economic power, invents a new form of power i.e., political power. The state is the embodiment of political power. It is, therefore, essentially subservient to economic power. Thus, according to the class theory, the state neither originates in the will of the people, nor does it stand for the benefit of all society, but is an instrument devised by a dominant class for its own benefit. It is imposed on society from above to serve the interest of a particular class. The state has not existed from eternity. It came into

existence at a particular stage of historical development. It is a product of the conscious effort of the dominant class which first acquired the means of production and there after political power. The state is, therefore, by no means a natural institution as the organic theory has maintained.

According to Marxism, unlike the organic theory, the class theory makes a clear distinction between state and society. Society and the state do not come into existence together. The class theory treats society as a natural institution, and the state as an artificial device. In other words, man is by nature a 'social animal', but not a 'political animal' as Aristotle had assumed. Society is a natural institution because it is an essential condition for the production of material goods which are indispensable for the survival of man. Production is the most important of all human activities. Since men in association produce more than men in isolation, society is a natural means of securing the necessities of life. The form of production at any given stage of social development determines the pattern of social relations. Under 'primitive communism', when the state has not yet made its appearance, the means of production are meager and communally owned. At this earlier stage, there is no private property, hence, society is not divided into antagonistic classes.

Marx further observes that at a later stage, when the means of production are somewhat developed, that is, when the hunting, fishing and food-gathering economy is replaced by an economy based on animal husbandry, domestic agriculture and small industry. There is 'surplus production' which is cornered by a class owning the means of production. As a result, 'dominant' and 'dependent' classes came into existence. The structure of society is always determined by the prevalent form of production. The hand mill gives you society with the feudal lord, the steam-mill gives you society with the industrial capitalist. The attitudes and outlook of society, the legal, political and intellectual relations as well as the religious and social systems are also determined by the material conditions of life. Whatever the form of the state, it is invariably an instrument of the dominant class.

Bourgeois ideologists, since the very beginning, has pictured the state as an entity which the providence has offered to mankind. And, therefore, it has not class characters, therefore, is simply an instrument used to settle disputes between the people irrespective of their class affiliation. Such an idea of state justifies the privileged position of the bourgeois and the exploitation of the proletariat. Marx opposed such a concept of state, and claimed that state is not something introduced from without but is something that develops from within the society. The primary reason for the development of state was the change in the material condition of production. When one mode of production was succeeded by another, a change occurred in the system of state. Marx claimed that the existence of state is not from time immemorial. The lack of class and private property in the primitive societies also contributed in the lack of state. This is not to say that in the primitive societies there were no social functions. The social functions of these societies were carried by men who were chosen by the society, which also reserved the right to dismiss these chosen men anytime it wanted. The relationships between people, in those times, were determined and shaped by the opinion of the society. However, the growth of productive force caused the disintegration of such societies. As the privately owned property appeared, classes began to materialize. And the need for the protection of private property and the owners of these properties were felt, and thus came the state into being. The birth of state was followed by its development which was accompanied by the class struggle. It thus becomes clear that the state is the manifestation of the class society. The state came into being because of the emergence of class, and it will dissolve with the disappearance

NOTES

NOTES

of class. But such a thing is possible only under the communism. The alternative that Marx envisaged was a classless, stateless society of true democracy and full of communism, in which the political state disappeared.

The privileged class dominates the dependent class of the society by using the state machinery to serve its own purposes and interests. Thus, from this perspective the state simply becomes a tool in the hand of the dominant class which helps them to oppress and exploit the not so privileged class. Such a reading of state makes it clear that the state is an embodiment of not only exploitation and oppression, but also injustice. It does not rest on moral foundations as the organic theory believes. It is not even a tool of harmonizing the interest of different individuals or groups as the mechanistic theory claims. State is an instrument for the resolution of conflict, according to the class theory of the state, it simply is a means of oppression of the class struggle. The reason that the state maintains or tries to maintain order in the social structure is not because of its ability to secure the willing obedience of the people of the society, but because of its use of coercive power to get the people to comply to it, and at same time citing it as the moral and ethical justification for its existence.

It has been made clear by the pioneers of the class theory—Marx, Engels, and Lenin—that the state works as an instrument in the hands of the dominant class for ensuring its supremacy and exploiting the dependent class. In the *Communist Manifesto* (1848), Marx and Engels observed that ‘political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another’. In *Socialism, utopian and Scientific* (1880), Engels maintained that ‘the state is an organization of the particular class which was pro-tempore the exploding class’. In *The Origin of the family Private Property and the State* (1884), Engels once again made it clear that ‘the state of antiquity was above all the state of the slave-owners for the purpose of holding down the slaves as the feudal state was the organ of the nobility for holding down the peasant serfs and bondsmen, and the modern representative state is an instrument of exploitation of wage labour by capital’. Lenin in *The State and Revolution* said that the state is an instrument of class dominance and also an instrument for the exploitation of one class by another, according to Marx. He continued by saying that the state is created by the ‘order’, which not only legalizes but also perpetuates this exploitation and oppression by playing a role of moderate between the classes.

According to the Marxist perspective, the primary feature of the state is that the public authority claims to represent that interest of all the people and classes of the society, but verily, it only represents the interests of the economically dominant class. The state uses the machinery of armed forces, police and the army to enforce its authority. In the stateless society everyone was armed, but in the society which gets divided along the lines of class and economic privileges, the armed force and police are used to serve the privileged class and suppress the people in general by making subjecting them to the exploitations of the ruling class. Representative bodies (parliaments), the huge bureaucratic machine with a whole army of official, intelligence agency, the courts, procurators offices and prisons, all are used for the same purpose. All of them combined, make the political authority of the exploiting state.

With the deepening of contradiction between the classes and intensification of class struggle, the machinery of the state expands. This process has taken a very intense form in the present capitalist society, wherein the machinery of state and the armed force and other kinds of authoritative tools of the state have become enormous. The burden of the maintenance of these state machineries fall on the people, which they find difficult to deal with. The state of any society with class difference is designed

NOTES

in such a way that it will always protect the interests of the ruling class both inside the country and outside in the country – inside the country in respect with other classes, and outside the country in respect with the other states. The state, therefore, with such a character ‘an executive committee’ serving the interest of the capitalist class will have no reason for existence in a classless society. A classless society based upon the doctrine ‘from everyone according to his ability and to everyone according to his needs would come into existence’.

According to Marx the state, regardless of the forms of government, is an evil, because it was a product of a society saddled with irreconcilable class struggles. It belonged to the realm of the super-structure, as it was conditioned and determined by its economic base. In the course of history, each mode of production would give rise to its specific political organization, which would further the interest of the economically dominant class. In *Communist Manifesto*, Marx defined the state in a capitalist society, as the ‘executive committee of the bourgeoisie’.

In his book *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1852), Marx denounced the bureaucratic and all powerful state advising the proletariat to destroy it. His views on the state were determined largely by his perception and analyses of the French state, the Revolution of 1848 and the *coup d’etat* of Napoleon III. As a result, Marx advocated a violent revolutionary seizure of power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, in countries with democratic institutions, the transition from capitalism to socialism could be peaceful.

Marx and Engels provided a blueprint of a future state which will be based on communism. They elaborated that communist society will eliminate all forms of alienation for the human individual from nature, from society and from humanity. It does not merely mean consumer satisfaction, but abolition of all forms of estrangement, the liberation of human forces and enhancement of personal creativity. The institution of private property and division of labour identified as the source of alienation would be destroyed as a prerequisite for the new and truly human phase in history. They viewed that proletariat as an agent and not as a tool in history, and with the liberation of the proletariat comes the liberation of the society.

The transitional phase, the phase between the annihilation of the bourgeois state and the inauguration of a communist state or society, symbolized by the dictatorship of the proletariat, generated a great deal of controversy in Marxist political theory. Interestingly, one of the well-known utopias was the least delineated. Marx’s cautious productions were imposed by his own epistemological premises. It is important to understand that the idea of violent seizure of power by the proletariat and establishment of a proletariat dictatorship is crucial for the understanding of Marx’s ideas on the functioning and nature of the society where communism prevails and proletariats enjoy the freedom and authority. While talking about the political rule of the proletariat, Marx and Engels advised to the workers to capture the state, destroy all privileges of the old class, and prepare for the eventual disappearance of the state.

Marx and Engels strongly believed that the state in its existing form, whether as an instrument of dominating the proletariat or as an instrument of enforcing the authority on the society by the use of various machinery, will only develop and become stronger, and even in its strongest form it will continue to serve the interest of the of the small section of the ruling and dominant class. The only way a state can become majoritarian and truly democratic is by seizure of the state by the proletariat. Whatever form that state might assume, it was important that the proletariat should contend with this powerful machinery while creating its revolution. In the later part of his life, Marx

NOTES

became truly convinced by the need for the destruction and annihilation of the state and establishment of the proletariat dictatorship. In the early periods of his life, while keeping the example of French Revolution in mind, he had anticipated that soon the state machinery will be seized by the proletariat revolution, for he was convinced that the revolutionary process will be fueled by the political centralization. Marx argued that for the communists the only implication of the destruction of the state would be that the domination of class over another would cease to exist.

In the *German Ideology* and the *Paris Manuscripts*, Marx projected an image of future state/society from the internal tension of existing capitalist state/society, implying that, at the outset, communist society would be perfect, universalizing those elements of bourgeois society that could be universalized.

Marxist Theory of Revolution

On the basis of scientific analysis of the system of capitalism, Marx had declared that a social revolution was inevitable. Revolution was certain to come, because the forces of discontent would eventually accumulate and break through all obstacles. Revolution would come. Marx had no doubt about it. But how would it come and what would follow? For these questions Marx had definite answers. The proletariat must organize for political action and make revolution. *Communist Manifesto* declared that every preceding class that enjoys the privilege tried to strengthen their power and position by subjecting the society to their terms of appropriation. The only way the proletariat can enjoy the authority over the productive forces of the society is by discarding and abandoning the prevalent mode of appropriation. And since the proletariats do not have the anything of their own which needs strengthening or security, the only motive they must have is to do away will all the existing securities, for instance, the private property. All the historical movements that took place have been the movements for the interests and benefits for the minorities, the ruling class or the privileged class, but the proletariat movement is the self-conscious and independent movement of immense majority. It is impossible for the proletariats, who are presently the lowest strata of the society, to rise without the springing up of the entire superincumbent strata of the official society. Therefore, the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.

According to Marx, social progress would have to come about through a violent struggle between classes. By progress Marx meant the expansion of the productive capacity of both society and individual human beings. This would ultimately lead to greater freedom and equalities and to the realization of man's capacity. Marx observes the dramatic conflict of classes intensified during a period of social upheaval reached its climax in a political revolution. The fundamental cause of any revolution was the desire and endeavour of a subject class to capture the state power from the ruling class by force and to reorganize the state apparatus to suit its own specific needs. The final struggle takes place in the political realm by the social and economic objective which divide the warring class formation which are really the true cause of revolution. A successful revolution will remove those social, economic and political institutions which obstruct the development of the class for whose benefit the revolution has been carried out. Marx has developed this general prognosis of class conflict and general and specific causes of revolution in such works as *The German Ideology*, *The Communist Manifesto* and *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. When Marx discussed specific revolution, he enriched his general theory with empirical facts. In his *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Marx produced a masterpiece of contemporary French revolutionary history taking account of the

complexities of the revolutionary events, wherein a multitude of classes interacted changing continuously their alignments. Moreover, Marx clearly recognized the crucial role played by individuals in promoting or thwarting the course of revolution.

The Marxist theory of revolution is the consequence and the concentrated expression of Marx's view of historical development, which is to say of the sequence of social formation in history. He saw the driving force of social development in the historical tendency towards establishing property relations which corresponded to the level of development and character of the technique used of production at particular period. Marx found the key to understand the sequence of the various modes of production in the law of motion, which was activated by social classes whose interest coincided with the developing tendency. For Marx, social revolution is an ongoing process in which causes and effect are dialectically related. The old social order includes in its womb certain elements which contradicts its dominant features. Marx said:

'In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution.'

When in history, the fetters of the relations of production were broken by the developing forces of production, the resulting revolutions were partial in nature. The transition from feudal relation of production to bourgeois relations of production accompanied by social and political constitution adapted to it represented a partial revolution only. Marx observed:

'What is the basis of a partial, purely political revolution? It is that a part of civil society emancipates itself and attains to universal domination, that a particular class undertakes the general emancipation of the society from its particular situations. This class frees the whole of society but only under the pre-supposition that the whole of society is in the same situation as this class, that it possesses, or can equally acquire for example, money and education.'

It is necessary to remember that Marx emphasized the human causes of revolution. He was at pains to point out that he conceives of revolution as a mechanical result of the conflict of economic forces, it was something that has also to be accomplished by human beings. He said that 'of all the instrument of production, the greatest productive force is the revolutionary class itself. The organization of the revolutionary elements as a class presupposes the existence of all the productive forces that could be endangered in the womb of old society.' But the proletariat had to undergo a massive transformation through its own education in the school of class struggle before it could become a fit agent of revolution. In making the revolution, the proletariat will acquire the capacity of undertaking the task of socialist reconstruction.

The name that Marx gave to this activity was 'revolutionary praxis'. It embodies through a dialectical unity of theory and practices the subjective and objective causes

NOTES

NOTES

of revolution. He summed this up in the following words, 'in revolutionary activity the changing of oneself coincides with the changing of circumstances.'

It implied that the proletariat must become a class 'for itself' by developing class consciousness which is necessary cause and precondition of a successful revolution. Marx did not believe in revolutionary prophecy. He did not go into detail concerning the exact nature, strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution he thought to be imminent. Concerning the possibility of a successful revolution, Marx adopted his view according to the historical situation in which he found himself. He was very optimistic during the European revolution in 1848 but his hopes faded gradually thereafter except for a brief revival during the Paris Commune of 1871.

By 1851 Marx had become convinced of the primacy of economic factors in determining the possibilities of revolution. His considered view about revolution now was that only a severe economic crisis caused by a falling rate of capitalist profits in a slump could precipitate it. The effective cause of revolution has to be located in economic situation and nowhere else and new revolution is possible only as a consequence of a worsening trade cycle leading to increasing misery of the proletariat. It is just as certain as this crisis. Marx became so convinced of economic determinism of the revolutionary process at this stage that he was prepared to dissolve to Communist League when it appeared to be falling under the control of leaders who believed in attempting a revolution irrespective of the economic situation. During the next decade, he expected the capitalist crisis to breakout that would provoke a socialist revolution.

Marx's materialist view of history would indicate that it was most likely to breakout in the most advanced industrial countries like Britain, France or the United States. In a letter to Engels in 1859, Marx mentioned that 'revolution is imminent on the continent and will immediately assume a socialist character. Can it avoid being crushed in the small corner, because the moment of bourgeois society is in the ascendant over much larger areas of the earth?' But Marx also believed that in some underdeveloped countries such as Germany a bourgeois revolution could spark off a subsequent socialist revolution. Later in his life, he came to believe that backward Russia might prove the starting point of a new European revolution, initially bourgeois but ultimately proletarian in character. Lenin implemented this Marx's theory of two-stage revolution in his own way in the Russian Revolution in 1917 and Mao did the same in his own characteristic way in bringing about the Chinese revolution. While Marx generally regarded force as the midwife of the revolution, he conceded that socialism could come about as a culmination of a peaceful mass movement in some of the capitalist democracies.

Marx was opposed to the use of revolutionary terror as it weakened the cause of revolution. He strongly criticizes the use of terror by the Jacobins in the French revolution. Physical force, however, as opposed to terror, was to Marx a perfectly acceptable revolutionary weapon provided the economic, social and political conditions were such as to make its use successful. It was also Marx's view that a successful revolution in one country could not be stabilized if it remained confined to the borders of a single country.

2.2.4 Criticism

The Marxist views on state and revolution have been criticized on the following grounds: Critics argued that there is no rigid class division in society. They pointed out that classes are not fixed and rigidly maintained blocks within society as Marx assumes. Liberal thinkers have pointed to the constant forces of social mobility — changing

status of men and women by their efforts and other social circumstances. The supporter of capitalism argued that twentieth century capitalism was different from 19th century capitalism when Marxism emerged. These thinkers claimed that capitalism transferred itself by adopting the model of 'welfare state', and had itself become an instrument of social justice. Thus, the present day capitalism is the capitalism with a human face. Critics argue that there is no science of classless society in the socialist countries as Marx had assumed. In the former USSR and the Peoples Republic of China, where socialist revolutions along Marxist line had taken place, there were no indications of emergence of a classless and stateless society. On the contrary the state-apparatus in socialist countries proved to be much more repressive than that in liberal democracies, and their social set-off was characterized by a pyramid of power, instead of moving towards classlessness. In fact, the class theory of the state and revolution is now being revised by its champions. It is now being increasingly realized that instead of looking for a rigid class division in the present-day society, it would be more fruitful to look for the different 'structures of domination' and 'forms of domination' and launch a systematic attack on such structure and forms in order to restore freedom, equality and justice in society.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Who was known as the father of scientific socialism?
2. What does Marx's theory of alienation refer to?
3. Which two directions did contemporary Marxism develop into?

2.3 LENIN

Lenin was the architect of the first communist state in the world. Along with Marx, he also became a saint, a philosopher, and a guide for communists all over the world. According to Maxey, 'Lenin, now the beatified saint of Bolshevism was not only a revolutionary leader of great sagacity and practical ability, but was also a writer and thinker of exceptional penetration and power.' Lenin was no mere opportunist. Long before the Russian Revolution, he had a positive and coherent political philosophy, and this philosophy after he became head of the Russian state, governed all his public decisions and acts. It became and has remained to a very large degree of the political road map of Russian communism'. Truth is that he brought Marxism up-to-date and adapted it in Russian culture. In a way, he rehabilitated true revolutionary Marxism which was placed in cold storage or rather buried by the opportunists and revisionists of the Second International. In this context, we have to discuss the concept of socialism which has been developed by Lenin at length.

Imperialist Capitalism: Way to Socialism

Lenin said that with the concepts of the party and of imperialist capitalism the theory of communism as a logical structure was complete, yet it lacked what proved to be its main driving force as a political system. This was the concept of socialism in one country added by Stalin and his sole venture into theory. In a sense this was a normal capstone to Leninism—at least to the concept of Leninism developed in this way. For Lenin's achievement as it has been described here, was to produce a version of Marxism applicable to an industrially underdeveloped society with an agrarian peasant economy. Socialism in the country, therefore, completed the divergence between Lenin's Marxism and the Marxism of Western Europe, which had been conceived by Marx and Marxists as a theory to transform a highly industrial economy from a capitalist to a socialist society. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that from the standpoint of Marxian

NOTES

theory, all this was commonly understood, Stalin's concept of socialism in one country was logically weak. He tried to meet the arguments that made the concept seem a paradox. In origin it was hardly more than an incident in the scramble for the succession that followed Lenin's death, and Stalin's purpose when he put the theory forward, 'was to eliminate Trotsky's relations with Lenin. It included an unfair, even a mendacious, representation of the theory of permanent revolution and of Trotsky's relations with Lenin. This phase of the theory needs no further exposition here.

Industrial and military power

In spite of this, socialism in the country became the operative factor in Leninism. Under this slogan, communist Russia emerged as a great industrial and military power, initiated in 1928, the first of the five-year plans which began a revolution with far greater long-term political and social consequences than Lenin's revolution of 1917. By harnessing communism to the tremendous driving force of Russian nationalism, the five-year plans became the first great experiment with a totally planned economy. And by its success Russian communism became a model likely to be followed by peasant societies with national aspirations all over the world. In 1924, Stalin put forward very abruptly the thesis that Russia 'can and must build up a socialist society.' Only a few months before he had repeated the conventional opinion, current since 1917 and before, that the permanence of socialism in Russia depended on Socialist Revolutions in Western Europe. Stalin argued that the only obstacle to a complete socialist society in Russia was the risk created by 'capitalist encirclement' (the intrigues), the 'espionage nets,' or the intervention of the capitalist enemies. There was nothing new, of course, in the belief that communist and capitalist states could not permanently coexist.

High-level of production

Lenin held this opinion, but this was not the obstacle, from the standpoint of Marxism, for completing socialism in Russia. Marxists had supposed that socialism required an economy with a high level of production and hence, an industrial society, which Russia was not. Stalin did not meet this argument but argued instead that socialism could be built in a country of great extent with large natural resources. In effect, he neglected the economic argument normal to Marxism and substituted a political argument. Stalin assumed that, given adequate resources, an adequate labour force, and a government with unlimited power, a socialist economy could be constructed as a political policy. This of course is what socialism in one country became, and in theory it is quite different from the supposed dependence of politics on the economy which had been a principle of Marxism. On the other hand, Stalin's assumption fitted rather easily with some elements of Leninism. It was not at all clear that Lenin was proposing a different policy from that which the party had long been following, for no one in 1924 denied that it ought to move toward socialism as fast and as far as it could. For practical purposes 'this had been settled when Lenin persuaded the party to abandon projects for carrying communism into Western Europe and to accept the German terms at Brest-Litovsk. As was then said, Lenin traded space for time when he acceded to the loss of territory that the Germans demanded. But there was no point in gaining time except on the supposition that communism had a future in Russia. 'From the moment of the victory of socialism in one country,' Lenin had then said, the only important question is 'the best conditions for the development and strengthening the Socialist Revolution that has already started.'

Struggle against world imperialism

As far as tactics were concerned, Lenin was banking on the possibility provided by his theory of imperialism that a significant period of coexistence might be possible. In developing the idea that capitalism develops unevenly, he had said, 'the victory of socialism is possible first in a few or even in one single capitalist country.' He was then thinking of countries already industrialized but less ingenuity than Lenin's would have sufficed to apply the idea to Russia. Finally, in some of his latest writings he seemed to be saying that through its own cultural and industrial development Russia could go a long way towards socialism. There was perhaps even a suggestion of Russian nationalism when Trotsky told the Communist International, 'The struggle for Soviet Russia has merged with the struggle against world imperialism'. The fact is that Stalin's theory was more remarkable because of its dialectical awkwardness than because it made any important change in Leninism. If, then, Lenin was proposing no change of policy, it seemed as if nothing were left of his theory except the academic question whether socialism in Russia could be completed. There were, of course, other important questions, notably of rate, but Stalin had said nothing about this. Should industrialization be rapid with correspondingly rapid changes in agriculture? Or should it be slow with a correspondingly long toleration of the peasant agriculture permitted in 1917. On these questions there were sharp differences of opinion in 1924, and socialism in one country then seemed to be more acceptable to the gradualists than to their opponents, perhaps because it seemed to acknowledge the magnitude of the task. Stalin performed one of his devious political manoeuvres, he sided with the gradualists to eliminate the opposition, and having established his power, he started in his five-year plan a far more rapid rate of industrialization than anyone had ever considered possible. In view of his political methods one might suppose that the whole proceeding, including the studious vagueness of his theory, was an example of deliberate guile, but it is really not possible to say how much of the end Stalin foresaw from the beginning. In view of the feebleness of the theory, it can hardly be supposed that the party's acceptance of socialism in one country was due to logic. The truth seems to be that the party was heartily tired, after seven years of governing against heavy odds, of being told that it held power on the sufferance of a revolution that looked less and less likely to happen. With success its confidence had grown in its ability not only to hold on but to go ahead, and its inherited theory of revolution had become a frustrating socialism in one country seems to be that Stalin told the party what it wanted to hear, a form of political argument more persuasive than dialectic.

Agricultural production

Though the party saw little of what it was committing itself to, its acceptance of socialism in the country meant adoption of forced-draft industrialization that Lenin began in 1928 and his forced collectivization of agriculture began the year following. The second was entailed by the first, not as Lenin sought to increase agricultural production but to get a ready source of labour for expanding industry and to simplify the administration of the forced levies on the peasants' hoarded grain. The practical success of the policy is one of the miracles of recent history, a miracle controlled directed throughout by the party.

In little more than a decade the party created in Russia a military force able, with Western support, to withstand the German onslaught of World War II. It created an industrial system with a greatly expanded productive capacity and was capable of indefinite or further expansion at an extraordinarily rapid rate of annual increase. It created a government stable enough' to remain master of its military force and

NOTES

NOTES

resourceful enough to initiate and in some fashion to manage the industrial system, while the party retained its control over the government. It worked on Russian society the necessary corresponding changes. It created the literacy needed to turn peasants into an industrial working force, and it trained the managers, technicians, engineers, and scientists without whom a modern industrial society is impossible. This was a third revolution imposed, as Stalin said, 'from above' and by an utterly totalitarian dictatorship. It also imposed on Russia, in little more than a decade, the hardship and barbarism that Marx, in his historical account of the 'primitive accumulation' of capital, had described has spread through more than two centuries of English history. Of this he had said, 'Capital comes into the world soiled with mire from top to toe, and oozing blood from every pore.' In Russia this was literally true.

Imperatives of industrialization

The story of Lenin's revolution belongs to general history. What is relevant here are its implications for the political theory of Russian Marxism. Its effect was to make Lenin's Russia, socialist in name, into the greatest of European national powers. No fiction could make the Russian state appear to be a super-structure on the Russian economy, for the superstructure was visibly creating its economic base. Socialism in one country cut the last tie with the conventional meaning of economic determinism, already made tenuous by Trotsky's theory or of imperialism. The motive to which Lenin appealed was Russian patriotism, for there was no more than a verbal difference between building up the socialist homeland and building up the Russian homeland. The regime was socialist only because the nation owned the means of production, its realities were political absolutism, and the imperatives of industrialization. It claimed indeed to have abolished exploitation, but the claim rested on a semantic argument, the workers' own the factories and cannot exploit themselves. It claimed also that it had conquered the class struggle, and that the relations between the industrial workers-and the peasants were friendly, but the accumulation of capital was effected by forced saving, which came mostly out of the peasants' standard of living.

Advertising socialist 'emulation'

The party still called itself proletarian, but it tended more and more to consist of the executives that industrialization required, and when in 1931 Lenin enumerated the duties of managers, they differed from the duties of managers' in capitalist industry chiefly in not including advertising socialist 'emulation'. It introduced wage differentials between classes' of labour similar to those in capitalist industry, though in deference to its socialist claims the regime provided a considerable range of fringe benefits like socialized medicine and paid rest periods. It is true that industrial expansion opened a wide range of opportunity, especially to able and energetic young people who could benefit from publicly supported education, and this no doubt contributed greatly to the stability of the regime. It is also true that its harshness was gradually 'mitigated as its goals were realized'. The fact remains that the whole process was one of extraordinary hardship even allowing for the terrible hardship caused by World War II. Not the least of the hardship was the chronic insecurity caused by Lenin's habitual use of terrorism and forced labour exercised through the secret police, which fell on the party as well as on the population at large. The determination to create a collective industry and a collective agriculture is a trace of Marxism that chiefly distinguished Lenin's methods from those that might have been used by a Tsar bent on building up Russia's national power.

Concept of a national state

The concept, of a national state, which is also socialist, was, from the standpoint of Marxian social philosophy, a logical monstrosity, for Marxism had no positive concept either of, a state or a nation, and it had always conceived socialism to be merely incompatible with either. Nationalism was conceived by Marx and by Marxists generally to be merely a relic of feudalism and national patriotism to be a vestigial sentiment which like religion, belonged to the false ideological consciousness that laid the working class open to exploitation by the more rational bourgeoisie.

The *Communist Manifesto* had laid down the principle that ‘the working men have no country,’ and it had been regarded as a major strength of Marxism that it emancipated the workers from a, crippling illusion. Marxism had always counted itself internationalist, but its internationalism had been negative in the sense that it expected national distinctions simply to disappear as the working class became enlightened enough to pursue its real class interests. Lacking any positive concept of a nation or any recognition that, nationalism might represent a real cultural value, Marxism lacked also any concept of an international organization of national states. Its internationalism was a relic of early nineteenth century individualism, which had been engrossed in abolishing institutions felt to be obsolete and oppressive, and which had, therefore assumed that some ideal form of collectivism would be left merely by the removal of obstacles and obstructions. This assumption was responsible for the vein of utopianism that underlay the essentially realistic temper of Marx’s thought. The attitude of Marxism toward the state was substantially similar.’

The state too, in Marxian mythology was expected, in the phrase that Engels made famous, to ‘wither away’ after a successful socialist, revolution. Marxism, in its own understanding of itself, had always been a class movement and its revolution was conceived as a proletarian revolt against a middle-class dictatorship. The concept of the class struggle, which the *Communist Manifesto* had asserted to describe ‘the history of all hitherto existing society, left no room for any concept of a general national or state interest, nor was any considered to be dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, with the negative mandate to repress counter revolution and with a positive mandate to create communism, which for all practical purposes was almost undefined. When the success of socialism in one country turned Stalin’s Russia into a very powerful national state, it was a state as nearly as possible without a political philosophy. Or more accurately, it had an elaborate philosophy but one which had no clear cut positive application to what it was doing.

The consequence was that its policies had little perceptible relationship to the theories that it professed, which often seemed a mere façade for conventionally nationalist and imperialist behaviour. The government which Lenin founded and which Stalin inherited, according to its own conception of itself, was an alliance between an urban industrial proletariat and the peasants. Both Lenin and Trotsky expected that this alliance would be temporary, for neither supposed that the peasants would voluntarily follow the workers in either the collectivism or the internationalism that they supposed would be the policy of a working-class minority either could or would coerce the overwhelming majority of peasants. In this they were mistaken, as Lenin was mistaken in supposing that at some point the alliance with the peasants would be replaced by an alliance with the Western proletariat.

Problem of peasantry

The problem of the peasantry was solved not in the light of any social philosophy, either socialist or nationalist, but by the savage coercion of Stalin’s programme of

NOTES

NOTES

collectivization at the end of the 1920's, which reduced the peasantry to a state of misery that Tsarist Russia never matched. This policy did indeed succeed in the sense that it made possible the rapid development of industry, but it also left a chronic imbalance between industry and agriculture which, by the end of Stalin's life, put the whole regime in jeopardy. Stalin's agricultural policy exemplified the recklessness of an irresponsible despot, covered by the hollow pretense that relations between industrial workers and peasants were 'friendly.' It represented no rational concept of national interest, which the regime's philosophy lacked. In a similar way the regime's concept of itself as a working-class government obstructed its own policy of industrialization. Almost the only positive remnant of the philosophy was Stalin's constant pretense that any opposition to his totalitarian despotism was counter-revolutionary, hence, the wild charges of treason and conspiracy by which he liquidated men with a lifelong record as dedicated revolutionists. Both the party and the government 'discarded any valid claim to represent the working class, which was, in fact, impossible if the purpose were effectively to construct a large-scale industrial system. 'The regime coerced workers as impartially as it coerced every other group, and if it was in truth the exponent of any social class, its favorite seemed to be the new class of managers and technicians which it was creating, as disappointed Marxists like Milovan Djilas freely predicted. Its industrial policy created another imbalance between the production of capital goods and the production of consumers' goods for which its socialist professions provided no justification, but which might represent a militarism that belied its professed peaceful intentions.

National ownership of the means of production

Socialism in the country provided Russia with no cues for its relations to other states different from those of conventional nationalist imperialism. Communism is represented as itself an ideological tie that provides communist countries with a common interest, but there is no perceptible reason why this should be so. The national ownership of the means of production does not affect any advantage that the Russian industrial system might gain from controlling, for example, the output of Silesian steel or make her more charitable in dealing with Poland.

By and large Russian policy toward her ring of satellite states in Eastern Europe has been one of using them to enhance her own economic and military power. The only one of these states that retained much independence of action was Yugoslavia, which was also the one not included in Russia's area of occupation at the end of the war. The crucial test of a community of interest between communist states will, no doubt be provided by the long-term relations between Russia and China, since neither will be able to treat the other as a satellite. It may well be true, however, that socialism in one country has made an important change in Russia's international orientation. The adoption of Stalin's policy, meant in substance, abandoning the theory that communism depended on the support of the working class in Western Europe.

There were, in fact, substantial reasons why support from this quarter should not have been forthcoming, though the concept of communism as a working-class movement prevented these reasons from being acknowledged. Except perhaps in a few special cases, there was no reason why the western European worker, with a higher standard, of living his own independent labour unions and generally liberal political institutions should be attracted by communism. The political role of communism in the West has on the whole been one of subversion, effective, only where grievances existed that made subversions a tempting form of political activity.

NOTES

The state of affairs was different in countries with a social and 'economic structure' closer to that of Russia when Lenin launched his theory. A country with an agrarian economy and a largely peasant population, subject to the pressure of rapidly growing population, is almost under an imperative to industrialize even to keep the low standard of living it has. The problem of industrialization in such a society like that of Russia, is accumulation of capital, and short of the ability to borrow on very favourable terms, capital can be accumulated only by methods of forced saving similar to those followed by Russia. As a rule, also, countries of this sort lack a political structure able to oppose any obstacle to a dictatorship.

International Effect of Communism

The attraction exerted by the success of Lenin's rapid industrialization is, therefore, obvious, and in consequence the international effect of communism in one country was to face Russia towards the East. As early as 1923, Lenin foresaw this possibility when he said that his theory of imperialism implied the division of the world into 'two camps.' He attributed this to 'the imperialists' and regarded it as a disadvantage, because he assumed that greater power lay on the side of the highly industrialized European bloc. After the temporary alliance of World War II, 'Lenin revived the idea of the two camps but possibly he no longer thought it a disadvantage. In any case, the international effect of communism in one country has been a division between two power blocs, variously described as capitalist-communist, imperialist-peace-loving, or simply West-East. The future of each depends, apparently, on its success in attracting the uncommitted nations. The spread of liberal political institutions probably depends on providing an alternative to violent methods of forced saving.

In Russia, the rigours imposed by socialism in one country, were lightened by the prospect held out by the Marxian tradition that they were temporary. Their purpose was first described as the building of socialism, which Lenin proclaimed to have been accomplished about 1936, and second by the transition to communism, the higher stage mentioned by both Marx and Lenin and said by Stalin also to be possible in one country. Beyond this, repression would no longer be required and the state might wither away.' This prospect, so deeply rooted in the Marxist tradition, was a kind of promissory note that the regime might sometime have to meet, or it might be a focus for criticism and discontent. Why, it might be asked, since there are no longer exploiting classes, should the state not begin to wither away? In 1939, Stalin said that this question was indeed 'sometimes asked.' His answer was the usual one given by a Marxian theorist, when his predictions fail. The questioners, he said, have 'conscientiously memorized' the words but 'have failed to understand the essential meaning.' They have overlooked the espionage nets spread by encircling capitalist powers. He concluded that the state would remain in the communist stage, until the capitalist encirclement vanished by the whole world becomes communist.

Lenin approached the question again, rather circuitously, in one of the latest writings. In 1950, he wrote several articles on Marxism and language, the purpose of which was to show that neither logic nor language depended on the class struggle, since language was a medium of communication between people of all social classes. This somewhat esoteric question seems an improbable subject of interest, but his purpose apparently was revealed when he reproved those comrades 'who have an infatuation for explosions' as the method for any, kind of important social change. In Soviet society there are no 'hostile classes' he gave an instance of the 'revolution from above' that brought about collective agriculture and hence no need for 'explosions.' In other words, the transition to communism will take place under 'the direction and

NOTES

control of the party. Khrushchev (a Russian politician), too, has occasionally taken pains to strip the transition of its utopian connotations. At the Twenty-first Party Congress (1959), he described his seven-year plan as ‘the building of communism’ and at the same time warned that a communist society would not be ‘formless and unorganized.’ Yet he also spoke of a possibility that would have horrified Lenin, the growth of ‘public organizations or voluntary associations that might take over. Many functions hitherto carried out by state organs’ — of course, under the direction of the Party. It seems a fair presumption that what is left of the withering away of the state’ ‘at least as far as concerns the party’s intentions, is a regime with the services’ usually attached to the concept of a welfare state, a level of ‘production, that will permit more consumers goods without reducing the production of capital goods below whatever level the party deems necessary, a corresponding increase in living standards with a reduction of the working day, and some lightening or decentralization of administrative regulations.

In order to make socialism more effective, Lenin has developed different techniques and philosophy in great detail. These are outlined below.

2.3.1 Lenin’s Theory of Imperialism

This theory is found in his book *Imperialism, the Highest State of Capitalism*. Lenin regards imperialism as the highest form of capitalism. He argues that with the development of capitalism, the industrial unites also develop and become bigger and then they collaborate with trusts and cartels to create what is known as monopoly capitalism. In the financial world a similar process takes place. When the bank combines and become the master of capital, they assist the industrialists with the capital, thus encouraging the transformation of monopoly capitalism into the finance capitalism. The monopoly and finance capitalisms have a great tendency of expanding very rapidly and aggressively. The primary export of finance capitalism is money or capital, and the consequences of its enforcement are the exploitation of colonial people, whom it oppresses and subjects to the law of the capitalist society thus increasing misery amongst the people and destroying their liberty and freedom. According to Lenin, ‘Imperialism is capitalism in that stage of development in which the domination of monopoly and finance capital has taken shape, in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance in which the division of the world by international trusts has begun, and in which the portion of all the territory of the earth by the great capitalist countries has been completed.’ Lenin claimed that imperialism in spite of being the highest stage of capitalism also contains various contradictions within itself, which shall destroy capitalism and bring socialism. The first contradiction is that of the antagonism between the labour and capital. The labour is exploited by the capital, thus feeling the revolution of the exploited workers. If it will be materialized, the spirit of socialism will start.

2.3.2 Theory of Party

The greatest contribution of Lenin to Socialism is his theory of the party. While Marx laid too much emphasis on the development of class consciousness among the workers, Lenin laid emphasis on the party organization. According to him, ‘The proletariat has no other weapon in the struggle for power except organization.’

Constantly pushed out of depths of complete poverty, the proletariat can and will inevitably become the unconquerable. The party is needed not only before the revolution to arouse the revolutionary spirit in the proletariat but also after the revolution to annihilate the capitalist state so that the dictatorship of proletariat can be established.

Workers do not become socialists automatically. They become trade unionists. Socialism has to be brought to them from outside and this is done by the party which is in reality the 'vanguard of the proletariat'. It must be able to lead the proletariat to elevate them to the level where they can understand their class interests and purpose with will great vigour and determination. The party must act as the General Staff of the Proletariat. Lenin wrote thus, 'The Communist Party is a part of the working class, the most advanced most class conscious and hence the communist party has no other interests other than the interests of the working class as a whole. The Communist Party is differentiated from the working class in its totality. The Communist Party is the organizational and political lever which the most advanced sections of the working class use to direct the entire mass of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat along the right road.'

NOTES

Dictatorship of the Proletariat

Lenin described the proletariat dictatorship as the stage which would come during the transitional period of the state, i.e. when the state would transform into socialism from capitalism. Lenin accepted Marx's doctrine of proletariat dictatorship in full but he succeeded in converting it to the dictatorships of the communist or socialist ideological party.

2.3.3 Tactics of Revolution

According to Sabine, 'No principle of Marxian strategy was better settled than the rule that it's impossible to make a revolution by force of conspiracy before the time is ripe, that is, before the contradictions in a society have produced a revolutionary situation.' It was this principle which distinguished Marx's scientific socialism from Utopianism or mere adventurism. This view led to the emergence of two views in Russia, one held by the Mensheviks and the other by the Bolsheviks, regarding the tactics socialist industry and the slow growth of the proletariat into a majority. The other group was led by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. According to Trotsky it is easier for the proletariat to take over the ruling class in a economically backward country than in a country where capitalism has reached the advanced stage.

Lenin thought in terms of the tactics. According to him, insurrection is an art which something can be taught and so it is a matter for the artist in revolution who is the professional revolutionary master. It came to have certain maxims such as (i) never play at uprising but once it is begun remember firmly that you have to go to the very end (ii) one must strive to take the enemy by surprise to take advantage of a moment when his troops are scattered'. Lenin was opposed to a large diffused party and he wanted the party to consist of professional revolutionaries and it must be organized as secretly as possible. There is no room for democracy here. According to Lenin, the communists must be always prepared to enter it. According to Lenin, a revolution becomes possible only when the lower classes do not want the old way and the upper classes cannot continue with the old way.

Strategy of world revolution

The Third International was founded in March 1919. It was formed to organize world revolution. It was held that without the world revolution, Russian Revolution would also collapse. The new organization, according to Watson, issued a manifesto to the proletarians of the whole world which extolled the Soviet from government and the dictatorship of the proletariat and emphasized the need to support the non-communist labour movement.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

4. Who was the architect of the first communist state in the world?
5. What became an operative factor in Leninism?
6. Which motive did Lenin appeal to?

2.4 MAO

Mao Zedong, the father of modern communist China, was not only an important political leader who molded the destiny of the Chinese people and made China as one of the most powerful nations of the world, but also an important Marxian philosopher who gave Marxism its Asiatic form.

Mao Zedong was born in 1893 in the Huan province in the family of a poor peasant. As a child he was required to work hard on the fields and consequently forced to give up his education at the age of 13. As Mao Zedong was keen to become educated, he worked on the fields during the day-time and read books at night. He took special delight in the books dealing with heroes of the world, and was greatly impressed by heroes like George Washington, Rousseau, Gladstone and Napoleon. He also studied the histories of various countries. One thing which really surprised him was that all these books on history dealt with the character and achievements of rulers, feudal lords, and nobility and hardly made any reference to the hardships and sacrifices made by the peasants. The actual sufferings of the peasants also left a deep impact on his mind. He was pained to see that the rulers and nobles maltreated the peasants and even chopped off their heads. To define the concept of socialism which has been developed by Mao Zedong, first we have to discuss the trend of socio-economic problem of China.

2.4.1 Background of History: Struggle for Socialism

Since the beginning of the war of resistance, a general feeling of liveliness prevailed all over the country. In later times compromise and anti-communism again became dominant, which threw people in to the state of bewilderment once again. This affected the intellectuals and young students first. The question that became pertinent at that time was regarding the fate of China. What was to happen to China? And, therefore it was important to clarify the trends of socialism in the country. But even if the observations are not true, it is impossible for them not to have some truth, and therefore, they might encourage the cultural workers to rise and come forward with their own contribution to the country.

One hopes that they will be part of the discussion to correctly identify the needs of the nation. A scientific approach is needed for the quest of the truth and to tackle the problems faced by the country. A responsible bent of mind is required to lead the country on the road to socialistic liberation. The facts can be measured with the help of the revolutionary practice of millions of people. This is the kind of attitude the Chinese culture had.

2.4.2 Establishment of Socialism in China

Since a long time, Mao struggled to bring about a cultural, economic and political revolution. His goal was to create a new society and state by establishing the tenets of socialism for China. His definition of a new society and state were designed to have a new political structure and a new economy, along with a new culture. He wanted China to come out of political oppression and economic exploitation and gain political freedom and economical prosperity. He also wanted that China should come out of

the ignorance and backwardness of the old culture, and transform to become enlightened and progressive. The aim of Mao Zedong was to create a novel cultural sphere for China.

China's Historical Characteristics

Ideologically, every culture reflects the way the economy and politics of the society functions. But it is true that both politics and economics go hand-in-hand. They both play an important role in the determination of culture. Marx said, 'It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary their social being that determines their consciousness.' He further added, 'The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways, the point, however, is to change it.' In the history of mankind, for the first time, these scientific formulations have proved accurate in resolving the problematic aspects of the relations between the existence and the human consciousness. And these formulations are the fundamental ideas and concepts that underline the dynamic and radical theory of knowledge, as something that reflects the material reality of the world, which so vigorously explained and elaborated by Lenin.

It is important to keep these fundamental concepts in mind while discussing the problems pertaining to China's culture. Thus, it is evident that Mao wanted to remove those elements from the old national politics, which reacted to the tenets of the old national culture. On the other hand, the new national culture which he had in mind was interlinked with the new national politics and economics. The old culture was based on the ideas of old politics and economy of the China. Similarly, the new politics that Mao had in mind was based on the new kind of economic and political models, which was to become the foundation a new culture in China.

China's Old Politics, Economics and Culture

Since the rule of the Chou and Chin, the society of China was feudal, just like its politics, economy and dominant culture. There have been various changes of colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal nature in the Chinese society, ever since it was invaded by the foreign capitalism. China in the first half of the twentieth century was both feudal and semi-feudal in the areas which were occupied by Japan. He said that the political and economic characteristics of the Chinese society were prevalently colonial, semi-colonial, and semi-feudal, and also the reverent culture, which was the reflection of political and economic image, was also feudal and colonial in nature. The revolution specifically focuses on the eradication of these prevalent economic, political, and cultural forms.

Mao wanted to create a new kind of politics and economy, which then would give rise to a new kind of culture. According to Mao, in the course of its history, there were two stages through which it was important for the Chinese revolution to go through: the first stage was that of democratic revolution, and the second stage was the socialist revolution. It is important to understand that both the stages are different from each other. In this case, the first category does not include the democracy. It can be said that the new politics, the new economy, and the new culture of China emerged from the new democracy. It is not possible for any political group, party or individual, who has no understanding of the theme, to direct the revolution to victory.

Chinese Revolution: A Part of the World Revolution

According to Mao, historically, the Chinese revolution is divided into democracy and socialism. Democracy here does not mean the general democracy, but it refers to the

NOTES

NOTES

Chinese form of democracy. After studying both the historical development of the world and China, it is evident that the said characteristic was not an abrupt development as the result of the Opium War, rather it was shaped after the WWI and the October Revolution of Russia. Thus, we can divide the Chinese revolution into two stages: the first stage was the transformation of the colonial and feudal aspect of the society into a democratic form of society, and the second stage was the continuation of the revolution for the establishment of socialist form of society. This can be called the trend in the development of the socialism.

The first stage of this revolution began to shape up after the Opium War of 1840, i.e. when feudalism of China began to undergo transformations. It began to change, into a partially colonial and a partially feudal society. This was followed by the various movements of Taiping Heavenly Kingdom, the Sino-French War, the Sino-Japanese War, the Reform movement of 1898, the Revolution of 1911, the May 4th Movement, the Northern Expedition, the War of the Agrarian Revolution and the War of Resistance against Japan. In combination, all these movements consumed an entire century by representing the struggles of the people of China on various occasions and in different degrees against both the imperialist and the feudal forces in order to create a free and democratic state, and thereby completing the first stage of the revolution. Socially, the nature of this first stage of revolution is not that of proletariat-socialist, but bourgeois-democratic. But still, it requires continued efforts, since it is still confronted with strong resistance. When the first president of the Republic of China, Sun Yat-Sen said, 'The revolution is not yet completed, all my comrades must struggle on,' he referred to the bourgeois Democratic Revolution. Changes in the China's democratic revolution began to take place after the outbreak of the WWI, and the establishment of socialism in Russia, as the result of the October Revolution of Russia in 1917. Prior to these happenings, the bourgeois-democratic revolution of China was part of the bourgeois democratic world revolution. This revolution has undergone changes after these happenings. It fell in the new class of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and as far as the alignment of revolutionary forces was concerned, it belonged to the proletarian-socialist world revolution.

In this era, no revolution in a colony or semi-colony directed against imperialism, i.e., against the international bourgeoisie or international capitalism, falls in the old category of the bourgeois-democratic world revolution, but within the new category. This is part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution. Such revolutionary colonies and semi-colonies cannot be regarded as allies of the counter-revolutionary front of world capitalism, they have become allies of the revolutionary front of world socialism. In countries which are colonies and semi-colonies, these types of revolutions are socially and fundamentally bourgeois-democratic in their social character, during the first stage or first step. Though the objective of such a revolution is targeted at developing capitalism, it is not a primitive revolution (with the bourgeoisie leadership, aimed at establishing a capitalist society and a state under bourgeois dictatorship) anymore. This revolution itself is revolutionary, being led by the proletariat. Its main objective is to establish a new democratic society in the first stage and a state which is governed by the combined forces of all the revolutionary classes. Thus, in reality this revolution paves a still wider path for socialism to develop. While in progress, this may further be divided into sub-stages. These sub-stages emerge due to changes on the enemy's side and within the ranks of our allies. However, the basic nature of the revolution does not change. This type of a revolution weakens the base of imperialism. Hence, imperialism opposes it. However, socialism favours it and the land of socialism supports it along with the socialist international proletariat. Hence, it is unavoidable for

NOTES

this type of revolution to become part of the proletarian- socialist world revolution. The correct thesis, 'the Chinese revolution is part of the world revolution' emerged earlier in the period of 1924–27. This was the period of China's First Great Revolution. The Chinese Communists framed it and it was endorsed by everyone who participated in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle of the time. Nevertheless, the significance of the thesis was not very clear during those days. Thus, a large number of the people misunderstood the crux of the thesis. According to Mao Tse Tung the thesis made by the Chinese communists is based on Stalin's theory of socialism.

The great worldwide consequence of the October Revolution can be stated as follows:

- (a) It broadened the scope of the national question and converted it from the activity of combating national oppression in Europe to the general activity of emancipating those who were victims of imperialism's oppression.
- (b) A large number of possibilities have been introduced for implementation. Due to this the cause of the emancipation of the oppressed people of the West and the East and has drawn them together for the victorious struggle against imperialism.
- (c) Hence, it has bridged the socialist West with the enslaved East. This helped in creating a new front of revolutions against world imperialism. It begins from the proletarians of the West through the Russian Revolution and extends to the oppressed people of the East.

2.4.3 Economy of New Democracy or New Socialism

A new democracy in China should be novel in its approach to both politics and economy. A new democratic policy must control the banking sector along with the industrial and commercial sectors. The enterprises in these sector will include banks, railways, and airlines, both foreign owned and Chinese owned, which either are monopolistic in nature or to be managed privately. The state shall administer and operate these enterprises. Thus, the private capital will not be able to dominate the economy. This is the prime motive for regulating the capital. This was solemnly declared by the Kuomintang's First National Congress's manifesto, which can be seen as the right step towards the economic structure of the new kind of democratic republic. In the new-democratic republic, led by the proletariat, the state enterprises will have socialist characteristics. The whole national economy will be led by them. However, the republic will not seize the privately owned properties in general, and it will also not prohibit the growth and the development of capitalist ventures and productions, for the economy of China was still not very developed.

The republic, however, will take the lands from the landlords and will disperse them amongst the farmers who have meagre or no land. This is in synchronization with Dr. Sun Yat-Sen's slogan of 'land to the tiller. It promotes abolishment of the relationship feudal in nature and the private ownership of land by the farmers and peasants. It also allows the development of a peasant based economy in the rural areas. This is the policy of 'equalization of land ownership'. The slogan, 'Land to the tiller' suits this policy just right. Generally, socialist agriculture will not be established at this stage, although various types of cooperative enterprises have been developed on the basis of 'land to the tiller'. Mao believed that they would contain the elements of socialism.

Regulation of Capital

Mao thought that it would be best if the economy of China follow the path of capital regulation and landownership equalization. It advocated that economy must never be

NOTES

owned by few individuals, and that a few capitalists and landlords should never be allowed to dominate the livelihood of the people. He also called for either the establishment of a capitalist kind of society similar to that of European and American models, or the permission for the survival of the old semi-feudal society. This economy of new democracy is otherwise known as New Socialism of Mao Zedong, in China. Its politics are concentrated expressions of the economy of New Democracy.'

Opposition to Capitalism

Like Marx, Lenin and Stalin, Mao was also against capitalism. He emphasized on the inability of true peace or accommodation to exist, along with capitalism. This was because the two systems contradicted each other. A dynamic tussle struggle between these two antagonistic systems was unavoidable, though it was likely to be averted for the time being through mutual restraint. However, Mao was flexible in his belief pertaining to the inevitability of conflict between the capitalists and the socialists.

People's War

Another significant characteristic of Mao's belief was his concept of people's war to achieve socialism. Mao wanted the simultaneous execution of two revolutions, one against imperialism and the colonial rule and the other against the feudal landlords. He was sure that it was not possible for the rule of the feudal landlords to end until the rule of imperialism was overthrown. On the other hand, it was not possible to form a powerful contingent to overthrow imperialism, unless the farmers were assisted in overthrowing the feudal landless class. It was emphasized by Mao that these two front wars were to be fought by the masses that were politically structured, rather than by representing the masses. He considered people to be more important than the weapons and wrote that 'Weapons are an important factor in war but not the decisive factor, it is people, not things, that are decisive.' Thus he stressed on the theory of total revolution by the totality of the masses.

Denial of 'Left' Phrase-Mongering

If it is not possible to follow the capitalist road of bourgeois dictatorship, Mao suggested, then it is possible that one can follow the road that leads to the socialist-proletarian dictatorship. He said that the ongoing relationship is the first step, which soon will pave way for the second stage of the revolution, which will be the arrival of socialism. The people of China can only be happy when they enter the socialist era. However, in the present scenario, it was not right to impose socialism in society. The first important task was to combat the imperialist forces and establish a democratic society. Only after this task is accomplished, socialism can prevail. There can be no Chinese revolution without both, new democracy and socialism. New democracy will take much time and is not an easily achievable task. Mao said that 'we are not utopians and cannot divorce ourselves from the actual conditions confronting us.' There are some propagandists who confuse the two stages of the revolution, which are very different from each other. Such propagandist propose the idea of a single stage revolution so that they prove the applicability of the Three People's Principle to every revolution and that communism, therefore, loses its basic objective. They use this theory to fervently oppose communism and the Communist Party. Their basic motive was to weaken and eradicate every revolution, to oppose a thorough going bourgeois-Democratic Revolution and thorough-going resistance to Japan.

They also direct their efforts to influence public opinion to capitulate to the Japanese aggressors. This is purposely being fostered by Japanese imperialists. Since their

occupation of Wuhan, they have realized that only military force cannot subdue China and hence, they have begun to launch political attacks and economic blandishments. Politically, their attacks comprise tempting wavering elements in the anti-Japanese camp, creating divisions in the united front and undermining Kuomintang-Communist cooperation. Their economic blandishments assume the image of the so-called joint industrial enterprises. In central and southern part of China the Japanese aggressors allow Chinese capitalists to invest 51 per cent of the capital in such enterprises, with the Japanese investing the remaining percentage of the capital. On the other hand, in northern China, the Japanese are allowing Chinese capitalists to invest 49 per cent of the capital, with Japanese capital contributing the remaining 51 per cent of it. The Japanese invaders have also promised that they will restore the former assets of the Chinese capitalist to them in the form of capital shares in the investment. One section, represented by Wang Ching-wei, has already capitulated. Another section lurking in the anti-Japanese camp would also like to cross over. But, with the cowardice of thieves they fear that the Communists will block their exit and, what is more, that the common people will brand them as traitors. So, they have combined forces and decided to prepare the ground in cultural circles and through the press. Having determined on their policy, they have lost no time in hiring a few 'metaphysics-mongers'. They have a destructive approach which is detrimental since it confuses the steps to be taken in the revolution and weakens the effort directed towards the current task.

According to the Marxist view of the development of the revolution, the two stages are consecutive without any intervention of the dictatorship of the bourgeois. Mao considered this is a utopian ideal, which the true revolutionary cannot accept.

2.4.4 Mao's Hundred Flowers Policy

This feature of Mao's thought forms the part of the new ideology which Mao advocated during the period of Cultural Revolution. He asserted that it would be wrong to think that in any society there should be only one ideology or only one state. He held that each thinking was a flower and let such hundred schools of thought contend.' Earlier in February, 1957 Mao had also asserted that 'all classes and social groups that approve, support and work for the cause of socialist construction belong to the category of the people.'

Through his theory of Hundred Flowers he once again asserted that the society shall find out the rotten and outdated ideas and get rid of the same only if all the ideas were permitted free expression. In short this policy emphasized that coercion shall not be used in ideological matters.

Three People's Principles: Old and New

Mao held the opinion that the communists must recognize 'the three people's principles' as the political means to begin anti-Japanese National United Front. He acknowledged that 'the three people's principles being what China needs today,' and said that 'our party is ready to fight for their complete realization.' There is no doubt about the basic coordination between the political aspects of three people's principle and the communist minimum programme. But the question that he asked was regarding the nature of the three people's principles. He said that China should adopt the three people's principles which Sun Yat-Sen reinterpreted in his manifesto, which according to Mao was the true interpretation. He declared all the other interpretation of the principles as false interpretations. Mao opined that the manifesto of Sun Yat-Sen highlights two eras in the history of this principle — the Three People's Principles of the old bourgeois-Democratic Revolution in a semi-colony, the Three People's Principles of old

NOTES

NOTES

democracy and the old Three People's Principles. Later, they got aligned in the new category, they became the Three People's Principles of the new bourgeois — Democratic Revolution' in a semi-colony, the Three People's Principles of New Democracy and the new Three People's Principles. Both the revolutionary Three People's Principles of the new period and the new or genuine Three People's Principles, embody the three great policies of alliance with Russia, cooperation with the Communist party and the peasants and workers. Without any of these Three Great Policies, the three people's principles would either not hold true, or not be complete in the new period. Primarily, the revolutionary, new or genuine Three People's Principles have to have an alliance with Russia. In the present global scenario, it is amply clear that unless there is the policy of alliance with Russia, there will inevitably be a policy of alliance with imperialism, with the imperialist powers.

Secondly, the revolutionary, new and genuine Three People's Principles should cooperate with the Communist party. Thirdly, the revolutionary, new and genuine Three People's Principles should have a policy of assisting farmers and workers.

Culture of New Socialism or Democracy

Culture reflects the ideology of the political and economic state of a given society. China has an imperialist culture which reflects the imperialist or the partial rule, in the political and economic fields. Cultural organizations foster this culture. The imperialists directly run these organizations in China. This category also comprises of the culture of slavery. The culture of China also comprises of semi-feudal characteristics. These characteristics are a reflection of its semi-feudal politics and economy. Its exponents encompass everyone who advocates the beliefs of Confucius, the study, of the Confucian canon, the old ethical code and the old ideas in opposition to the new culture and new ideas. Imperialist culture and semi-feudal culture are interlinked and formed a reactionary cultural alliance against China's new culture. This form of reactionary culture offers its services to the imperialists and the feudal class and should be swept away. Unless this is eradicated, it is not possible to build a new culture of any kind. It is not possible to construct without destructing. The new culture reflects the ideology of the new politics and the new economy, which it sets out to serve.

Mao said that the Chinese society has gradually changed in character since the emergence of a capitalist economy in China, it is no longer an entirely feudal but a semi-feudal society, although the feudal economy still predominates. The capitalist economy is new in comparison to the feudal economy. The political forces of the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat are the new political forces which have emerged and grown simultaneously with this new capitalist economy. The new culture is a reflection of the new economic and political forces in the field of ideology and it also serves them. In the absence of the capitalist economy, the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat and without the political forces of these classes, it would not have been possible for the new ideology or new culture to emerge. These new political, economic and cultural forces are all forces of revolution which oppose the old politics, the old economy and the old culture. The old edition has two parts, one being China's own semi-feudal politics, economy and culture and the other, the politics, economy and culture of imperialism, with the latter heading the alliance. Both are bad and should be eradicated. The struggle between the new and the old in Chinese society, is a struggle between the new forces of the people (different revolutionary classes and the old forces of imperialism) and the feudal class. This struggle lasted a full hundred years since the Opium War and nearly thirty years, if dated since the revolution

of 1911. However, revolutions too, can be classified into old and new. Those that are new in one historical period become old in the other.

The century of the Chinese bourgeoisie democratic revolution can be divided into two main stages, the first stage of eight years (belonging to the old category) and the last twenty years. This is because the international and domestic political situation has changed. It falls in the new category. Old democracies are the characteristic of the first eight years. New democracy is a feature of the last twenty years. Mao believed this distinction to hold well in culture as well as in politics.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

7. What was the purpose of Mao's struggle?
8. How was the Chinese revolution divided, according to Mao?

2.5 SUMMARY

- Karl Marx was a German philosopher, sociologist, historian, political economist, political theorist and revolutionary socialist, who developed the socio-political theory of Marxism.
- His ideas play a significant role in both the development of modern social sciences and also in the socialist political movement.
- While Marx remained a relatively obscure figure in his own lifetime, his ideas and the ideology of Marxism began to exert a major influence on socialist movements shortly after his death.
- Marx's theory of alienation refers to the separation of things that naturally belong together, or to put antagonism between things that are properly in harmony.
- Marx's theory of alienation is founded upon his observation that, within the Capitalist Mode of Production, workers invariably lose determination of their lives and destinies by being deprived of the right to conceive of themselves as the director of their actions, to determine the character of their actions, to define their relationship to other actors, to use or own the value of what is produced by their actions.
- According to Marx, in the first place, the worker in the capitalist mode of production does not own and control the products of his own labour.
- It is the division of labour with all its effects, private ownership of the means of production and the products of labour, fetishism of commodities, the power of money, state, church and other institutions confronting the individual as alien forces, which produce the condition Marx described as alienation.
- The workers alienation is the most extreme form of alienation because it is the very nature of his activity.
- Alienation is a foundational claim in Marxist theory.
- *The German Ideology* Marx writes that 'things have now come to such a pass that the individuals must appropriate the existing totality of productive forces, not only to achieve self-activity, but, also, merely to safeguard their very existence'.
- One of the most important, and devastating, features of factory production was the division of labour.

NOTES

NOTES

- The division of labour meant that workers had to specialize in particular tasks, a series of atomized activities, which realized only one or two aspects of their human powers at the expense of all the others.
- In the capitalist system individuals have to possess certain things — labour power, or materials of production, for example — in order to enter into productive relationships with each other.
- The creation of exchange values and the circulation of commodities requires a commodity which can represent all other commodities, through which all other commodities can be compared.
- Marx described how the development of capitalism brought with it the problem of how to evaluate different commodities and simultaneously created the solution in the form of money, the universal commodity.
- Lenin was the architect of the first communist state in the world.
- Lenin said that with the concepts of the party and of imperialist capitalism the theory of communism as a logical structure was complete, yet it lacked what proved to be its main driving force as a political system.
- The motive to which Lenin appealed was Russian patriotism, for there was no more than a verbal difference between building up the socialist homeland and building up the Russian homeland.
- The problem of the peasantry was solved not in the light of any social philosophy, either socialist or nationalist, but by the savage coercion of Stalin's program of collectivization at the end of the 1920's.
- The attraction exerted by the success of Lenin's rapid industrialization is therefore obvious, and in consequence the international effect of communism in one country was to face Russia toward the East.
- The greatest contribution of Lenin to Socialism is his theory of the party. While Marx laid too much emphasis on the development of class consciousness among the workers, Lenin laid emphasis on the party organization.
- Lenin thought in terms of tactics. According to him, insurrection is an art which is something that can be taught and so it is a matter for the artist in revolution who is the professional revolutionary to master.
- Mao Tse Tung, the father of modern communist China, was not only an important political leader who moulded the destiny of the Chinese people and made China as one of the most powerful nations of the world, but also an important Marxian philosopher who gave Marxism its Asiatic form.
- Mao's definition of a new society and state were designed to have a new political structure and a new economy, along with a new culture.
- According to Mao, historically, the Chinese revolution is divided into democracy and socialism.
- The new historical characteristic of the Chinese revolution is its division into two stages, the first being the new Democratic Revolution.
- The so-called democratic system in modern states is usually monopolized by the bourgeoisie and is being used to oppress the common people.
- Like Marx, Lenin and Stalin, Mao was also against capitalism. He emphasized on the inability of true peace or accommodation to exist, along with capitalism.

2.6 KEY TERMS

- **Marxism:** A world view and method of societal analysis that focuses on class relations and societal conflict is known as Marxism.
- **Leftism:** It is the ideology of the political left.

2.7 ANSWERS TO ‘CHECK YOUR PROGRESS’

1. Karl Marx was the father of scientific socialism.
2. Marx’s theory of alienation, refers to the separation of things that naturally belong together, or to put antagonism between things that are properly in harmony.
3. Contemporary Marxist thought better known as neo-Marxism has developed in two directions: humanist and scientific.
4. Lenin was the architect of the first communist state in the world.
5. Socialism in the country became the operative factor in Leninism.
6. Lenin appealed to Russian patriotism.
7. Mao struggled for bringing about a cultural, economic and political revolution.
8. According to Mao, historically, the Chinese revolution is divided into democracy and socialism.

2.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What is commodity fetishism?
2. What did the *Communist Manifesto* of Lenin state?
3. What did Marx’s theory of alienation state?
4. Why, according to Marx, was a social revolution inevitable?
5. What is the role of the state, according to Lenin?
6. How did Lenin define imperialist capitalism?
7. What is Mao’s hundred flower policy?
8. According to Mao, how could China become a socialist country?

Long-Answer Questions

1. How were Marx’s thoughts similar to those of G. W. H. Hegel?
2. What was Marx’s main thesis?
3. What do you understand by dialectical materialism of Marx?
4. Explain the concept of historical materialism.
5. Describe the concept of socialism according to Lenin.
6. Mao was regarded as the father of modern Communist China. Discuss.
7. Describe the political philosophies and economic theories of Lenin.

2.9 FURTHER READING

Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.
Wolff, Jonathan. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

NOTES

NOTES

Strauss, Leo, & Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, David, Janet Coleman, William Connolly (et.al.) 1991. *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grube, G. M. A, C. D. C. Reeve. 1992. *Plato: Republic*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub Co.

Grube, G. M. A. 1980. *Plato's Thought*. Cambridge: Hackett Pub Co Inc.

Balme, D. M. Aristotle. 2002. *Historia Animalium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shields, Christopher. 2007. *Aristotle*. New York: Routledge.

UNIT-3 GRAMSCI AND NOZICK

Structure

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 Antonio Gramsci
 - 3.2.1 Gramsci and Civil Society
 - 3.2.2 Gramsci on Hegemony
 - 3.2.3 Gramsci on Revolution
- 3.3 Robert Nozick
 - 3.3.1 *Anarchy, State and Utopia*
 - 3.3.2 *Philosophical Explanations*
- 3.4 Summary
- 3.5 Key Terms
- 3.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.7 Questions and Exercises
- 3.8 Further Reading

NOTES**3.0 INTRODUCTION**

Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci was a socialist theorist who is credited with making the term 'hegemony' famous amongst the Marxist philosophers and intellectuals, which he used to refer to the phenomenon of one class dominating the other. Such a domination does not restrict itself to the political and economic aspects, but extends to the ideological aspects, i.e. the dominant class manipulates the dependent class into seeing from their perspectives and convince them to accept the said perspective as something natural or commonsensical.

In this unit, we will look at the life and political philosophy and ideas of Antonio Gramsci. We will also study the life and the ideas of Robert Nozick, a prominent intellectual figure of twentieth century, whose presence was strongly felt and registered in the political world. He is remembered for his famous engaging style and broad understanding, both as a writer and a teacher. His philosophy has influenced generations of readers, and will continue to do so.

3.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Discuss the life and times of Antonio Gramsci
- Explain Gramsci's views on state and civil society
- Analyze Gramsci's views on hegemony and how he used the term to refer to the dominance of one class over the other
- Describe the life of Robert Nozick
- Discuss the philosophical explanations of Robert Nozick's ideologies

3.2 ANTONIO GRAMSCI

Gramsci was born on 22 January, 1891, in the town of Ales, Sardinia, which was one of the poorest of regions of Italy, to Francesco Gramsci and Giuseppina Marcias. He was the fourth child of his parent, who in total had seven children. He shared a strong and affectionate relationship with his mother, but never was able to develop a close relationship with his father. His mother's pungent humor, her gift telling stories and her resilience made a great impression on young Gramsci. Gramsci, along with his younger sister Teresina, was very fond of literature. He was also very close, spiritually and intellectually, with his eldest brother Gennaro, and his youngest brother Carlo.

NOTES

Gramsci's political development was greatly shaped by Gennaro's early decision to become a socialist.

Gramsci's father was associated with politics but was unsuccessful in the parliamentary election held in 1897. In that period, Sardinian politics was marked and characterized by corruption and local disputes, which led to Gramsci's father arrest and sentencing for five years, when Gramsci was still a small child. The charge on his father was that of embezzlement. His imprisonment changed the life of his family significantly. Gramsci and his family had to face a lot of problems. Due to financial problems, Gramsci was withdrawn from the school when he was eleven. After some elementary education Gramsci started working in an office. He worked as a tax officer in Ghilarza to help his family. After that he engaged in various casual jobs and continued doing so until his father's release from the prison in the year 1904. During this period of hardship, Gramsci did not abandon his studies altogether, and continued it privately. When his father was not at home the family lived in utter poverty. During this time Gramsci suffered physical deformity and developed a hunchback. Because of ill health, Gramsci became a host to various internal disorders, which continued throughout his life. Later in his life, he wrote that the doctors had given up on him and that his mother would keep a small coffin and a small dress, until about 1914, to be used in the circumstance of his death. His life in the village became very harsh in the wake of his suddenly reduced class status, and was fueled by his ill health, and his physical deformity. Because of this harshness of the life in the village, he drew back from the life itself. This aspect of his personality would often come to dominate him throughout his life. Later in his life, Gramsci said that he was like 'worm inside a cocoon, unable to unwind himself.'

After his father was released from prison their financial conditions improved and he rejoined school for completing his education. When he was 17, Gramsci moved along with his elder brother to Cagliari, the capital of the island. The intention behind this was to get admission in the grammar school. After completing his secondary school in Cagliari, he went on to win a scholarship to the University of Turin, and in the year of 1911, he enrolled in the Modern Philosophy course.

During Gramsci's stay in Turin, it was called the red capital of Italy and was the place that housed the most advanced industry of the country.

Gramsci completed his secondary school in Cagliari. Gramsci was in Turin at the time when it was called the red capital of Italy. During the period of the First World War, almost 30 per cent of the population of the city comprised of the industrial workers. There was a surge against the capitalism in the city in 1919, and a movement began with the aim to occupy the factories and set up factory councils. Lots of problems were taking place in Cagliari relating to working class movement and many people lost their lives due to this unrest. In the midst of this unrest Gramsci arrived in the village. His elder brother Gennaro was a local socialist party secretary. In Cagliari, Gramsci became friends with a teacher, named Raffa Garzia, who would commission articles for a newspaper called *Sardinian Nationalist*. Here Gramsci came under the influence of Gaetano Salvemini, who condemned the exploitation of the Mezzogiorno at the hands of the North, and asked for the right to vote for the peasants of South (it should be noted that during that time in Italy an illiterate did not have right to vote, and most of the peasant of the South were illiterate. Women gained the right to vote only in 1945). Thus, Gramsci moved for Turin as a young intellectual divided between the international ideas of socialism, and Sardist expansionism.

Gramsci encountered all these upheavals when he went to Turin for his higher studies which invariably affected his intellectual development as a thinker and a

NOTES

philosopher. During his stay in the University of Turin he came in contact with the thoughts of famous people like Antoni Labriola, Giovanni Gentile, Rodolfo Mondolfo and Benedetto Croce. Benedetto Croce was the most famous and a highly respectable intellectual in Italy of his time. These thinkers promoted the idea of a type of Hegelian Marxism, which Antoni Labriola called the philosophy of praxis. Gramsci's relationship with this philosophy remained ambiguous throughout his whole life, and in spite of this he used this term to escape from censors during his prison life. In the year 1913, Gramsci joined the Italian Socialist Party.

Gramsci suffered from poor health and financial problem, though he was particularly good in his studies. His interest in the politics along with his financial and health difficulties led him to leave his studies in the year 1915. His knowledge of history and philosophy had become extensive by this time.

Gramsci's writings became famous from his study period and in 1914 onwards he started writing for the socialist newspaper *Grido del Popolo*. His writings made him famous and he gained his position as a notable journalist. He was an articulate and a prolific writer, who wrote primarily on the topic of political philosophy. Gramsci soon emerged as a formidable commentator. As his reputation grew as a successful journalist, he was appointed as the co-editor of the Piedmont edition of *Avant!*, which was an official organ of the Socialist Party. He wrote extensively on various aspects of the social and political life in Turin.

Gramsci also worked during this period of his life towards educating and organizing the workers of Turin. In the year 1916, he spoke for the first time in public, on topics like women emancipation, French Revolution, Romain Rolland, and Paris Commune. Gramsci became one of the most prominent socialist of Turin after various Socialist Party leaders were arrested causing the August 1817 riots. After the incident, Gramsci was appointed the editor of *Il Grido del Popolo* and a member of the party's Provisional committee.

Gramsci established a weekly newspaper called *L'Ordine Nuovo (The New Order)* in collaboration with Togliatti, Umberto Terracini, and Angelo Tasca. A new development happened in the Socialist Party in the month of October of the same year. In spite of the fact that the party was divided between different factions that were hostile to each other, a large majority of the members of the party voted for the party to join the Third International. Vladimir Lenin saw the *L'Ordine Nuovo* group as the closest to the Bolsheviks in its orientation, and therefore he backed the group against the Amadeo Bordiga's, and extreme leftists', anti-parliamentarian plan.

Gramsci's group advocated for the worker's council within the party, which was one thing that distinguished his group from the other voices of the party. Worker's council was established during the strikes of 1919 and 1920 in Turin. Gramsci considered these councils important and thought that they can become the proper means through which the workers of the factories can take control over the organization of the production. Even though Gramsci believed that his stance on the subject was in sync with the Lenin's idea of 'all power to the Soviets,' he was criticized by Bordiga for being influenced by the thoughts of Georges Sorel and Daniel DeLeon and portraying an anarchist tendency. With the defeat of the workers of Turin in 1920, Gramsci was left alone in the party in his advocacy for the councils.

Gramsci, for the next few years, worked mainly on the growth and strengthening of the factory council movement. He also practiced what is called militant journalism. This, in the year 1921, prompted his alliance with the communist minority inside the PSI (Partito Socialista Italiano [Italian Socialist Party]) at the Party's Livorno Congress. Though, he was appointed as the member of the central committee of the PSI, he

NOTES

hardly played any significant role in the party until after many years. He was one of the most describing individuals of the Italian socialism, who at the beginning of the fascist movement of Mussolini's warned that if Mussolini's movement is not curbed right at the beginning through the unified actions of all, it would create a serious threat for both Italian democracy and Italian socialism.

Gramsci called the years from 1921 to 1926 the years 'of iron and fire', for these years were both eventful and productive for him. Some of the important events that mark his life during these years are: his life in Moscow for around a year and a half as an Italian delegate to the Communist International, election to the Chamber of Deputies in 1924, and his positioning as a general secretary of PCI. He also felt a significant change in his personal life during these years, for he met Julka Schucht, his future wife, in Russia who was both a violinist and a member of the Communist Party of Russia, this marriage with Julka brought him two sons Antonio and Delio.

Towards the end of the year 1926, the Fascist government of Italy imposed a new set of emergency laws, under the guise of the supposed attempt to kill Mussolini, which was made many days before the imposition of the emergency laws. In spite of the fact that Gramsci had parliamentary immunity, he was arrested by the fascist government of Italy and was sent to the Roman prison Regina Coeli.

During his trial the prosecutor infamously made the statement that 'for twenty years we must stop this brain from functioning'. He was sentenced to prison for five years on Ustica island. Next year his sentence was increased to twenty years of prison in Turi. His life in prison was difficult, which made his already not so good health deteriorate even further. There was an attempt to exchange prisoners, Gramsci amongst them, between Italy and Russia in 1932, but it resulted in failure. He was granted conditional freedom in the year 1934 on the grounds of his fallen health, after he visited hospitals in Civitavecchia, Formia, and Rome. At the age of 46, in a hospital in Rome, Gramsci was declared dead. It is certain that what killed Gramsci was the hardship of prison life and his falling health, which was never given proper attention in the prison.

And in spite of this it is a common knowledge that the prison years of Gramsci were also the most productive years of his intellectual life. He recorded all his intellectual meditation in notebooks that he kept with him the prison, and which were finally published after the Second World War. The richness of his intellectual productivity during the prison years is also reflected in the letter that he wrote to friends and family from the prison. Interestingly, the most important person to him during his prison years was not his wife, but his sister-in-law, Tania Schucht. During his prison life, she became increasing and intimately involved with Gramsci. It was because she had been living in Rome for several years, and therefore, was in the position of helping Gramsci with not only by fulfilling his requirement for medicine, food, and clothes, but also with regular exchange of ideas and emotions through letters.

Gramsci was sent to the prison in Turi, in the Bari province after he was sentenced to prison for twenty years, four months and five days along with various other Italian Communist leaders on 4th June 1928. This place proved to be the one place where he was kept under detention for the longest period of time (from June 1928 till November 1933). After that he was sent under the guard of the police to a clinic in Formia. In August 1935, he was once again transferred under the police guard, but this time in the Quisisana Hospital in Rome. He spent the final two years of his life in the hospital of Rome. Apart from Tania, his sister-in-law, there were other people who wrote to him or visited him, and among them was his mother Giuseppina, who died in 1933, his sisters Teresina and Grazietta, his brother Carlo, and his friend Piero Sraffa, the

economist, who proved to be a very good and loyal friend during Gramsci's term in the prison by offering him services which were both crucial and indispensable. In order to get Gramsci the books and journals that he required in the prison, Sraffa used both his personal funds and his professional contacts. Gramsci possessed an exceptional memory, but still it would not be unjustified to say that without the moral and emotion support of Tania and material and professional support of Sraffa, the *Prison Notebooks* that we have today never would have materialized.

Gramsci's writings during his prison time did not become public for many years. In fact, it was not until many years after the Second World War that PC started to bring some sections of prison notebooks and some five hundred Gramsci's letter that were written from the prison to print. It was in the first decade of second half of the twentieth century that Gramsci's writings began to generate interest and critical comments from various intellectuals of different countries, interestingly these intellectuals were not only from the west but also from the third world nations. Many of the terms that Gramsci used in his prison works became assimilated in the regular vocabulary of the leftist thinkers and intellectuals, the most famous of which, and complex as well, is 'hegemony'. He used the term in two ways. He used it to understand the reason that prompted both success and failure of socialism around the world. He also used it to elaborate a practical agenda so that the socialist ideas and vision can be realized within the prevailing conditions of the world. These conditions included the rise and triumph of fascism, and the lack of clarity of ideas and vision in the left, which, to a great extent, fueled and resulted in the said triumph of fascism. Some of the other terms that were both practically and theoretically pertinent in his writings, include 'organic intellectual,' 'national popular,' and 'historical bloc'. Even though these terms were not coined by Gramsci, they in his writing assumed great novel and radical implications and continued with great effect in the formulation of a new kind of political philosophy.

3.2.1 Gramsci and Civil Society

In the history of political thought the concept of civil society is quite old. However, over a period of time this concept has undergone a considerable change. Originally the terms civil society and political society were used as conterminous. Thus, the term civil society was applied synonymously with state. But under the complex conditions of present day society it is necessary to recognize the distinctive feature of civil society. Antonio Gramsci was an Italian Marxist who sought to distinguish civil society from political society in the context of his analysis of capitalist society. Conventional Marxist theory had held that the base of any society comprises of economic mode of production, while the superstructure of the society is comprised of legal and political systems, along with various manifestations of social and cultural consciousness, which includes religion, social customs, morals, and cultural practices. Marxist theory also held that it is the dominant character of base which determines and conditions the character of a society's superstructure. And when the social development takes place, the change in the character of base translates into the changes in the superstructure.

Marxist theory focuses primarily on the changes in the base, and the superstructure is not regarded to deserve an independent analysis. Gramsci did not accept this position. He suggested that there is some degree of independence in the superstructure of the western society of his time, and therefore it was necessary to engage in an independent analysis of the superstructure as well.

Gramsci particularly focused on the structures of domination in the culture of the capitalist society. He identified two levels of this superstructure. Political society or state resorts to coercion to maintain its domination. The whole organization of

NOTES

NOTES

government, including police, judiciary, and prison comes within its purview. The structures associated with this part of superstructure are called structure of coercion. Civil society resorts to obtaining consent of the citizens to maintain its domination. This part of superstructure is closer to the base and is relatively autonomous. The structures associated with this part are called structures of legitimation. Gramsci pays special importance to this part of the superstructure. According to Gramsci, the institutions of civil society, family, school and church makes the citizens of a society familiar with rules of ruling class and condition them to regard these rules as the natural authority of the privileged class. The conditioning of the people through these institution makes them believe in the legitimacy of the ruling capitalist class to such an extent that even the injustice of the ruling class appears to the people as an act of natural justice. That is why these are called structures of legitimation. They enable the capitalist society to function in such a manner that the ruling classes seem to be ruling with the consent of the people. When power is apparently exercised with the consent of its subject, it is called hegemony. Gramsci points out that the structures of legitimation within the capitalist society tend to prevent any challenge to its authority. Capitalist society largely depends on the efficiency of these structures for its stability. It is only when civil society fails to prevent dissent that political society is required to make use of its structures of coercion including police, courts and prisons. This analysis leads us to the conclusion that the strategy of communist movement should not be confined to the overthrow of the capitalist class but it should make a dent in the value system that sustains the capitalist rule. This value system is likely to persist through the institutions of civil society even under socialist mode of production. Fresh efforts will have to be made to transform the culture of that society by inculcating socialist values in the mind of the people.

According to Gramsci, it would be futile to hope that true socialism would automatically grow from the ashes of capitalism. Gramsci tried to convince the Marxist that they should come out from the spell of economics and continue their ideological warfare in the field of culture, art, literature and philosophical debates. The revolutionaries must infiltrate the autonomous institutions of civil society and create a new mass consciousness informed by the socialist value system. Gramsci was primarily a humanist. He was opposed to any type of tyranny. He did not want to use revolution in order to set up a coercive state, but wanted to democratize all institutions. In fact, he sought to replace the state by regulated society where all decisions would be made through consensus and not by means of coercion.

Gramsci followed Marx and tried to develop his own ideas and concepts of a nation state, while considering the reality of the civil society. Gramsci argues that it is impossible to understand the idea of state without having a proper understanding of the civil society. He further says that one must not understand the state simply as a government's apparatus, but also as the private apparatus of civil society or hegemony. Basing his ideas on the Marxist concept of state, Gramsci categorizes states into two categories — state as a government, and state as political organization. He distinguishes these two categories, and says that through the activities of the everyday civil society the integral state continuously reproduces itself. The activities and practices of a civil society gains the moral and intellectual guidance in the form of hegemony. For Gramsci, hegemony functions for the dominant, as well as the subaltern class of a society. According to Gramsci, every class of the society must hegemonize social relations in society before seizing power. Gramsci enriched the concept of civil society to a great extent. Retaining Marx's idea of class war, he focused as much on war as on class. He understood politics as a kind of war and used metaphors from military warfare to explain its processes. But unlike in military warfare, in politics the battles

are not limited to the use of sheer force. Although force is used the battle in the field of ideas is most important. Civil society for Gramsci is a space where this battle for the control of ideas takes place. According to him, the dominance of the ruling classes is not maintained solely on the basis of their control of the coercive apparatus of the state, namely the police and the army. They also need to acquire a dominant intellectual and moral leadership in civil society. In Gramsci's view, exploitative class relations of capitalist society have to be made to appear right and proper in order to establish legitimacy of the ruling exploitative class. In other words, the ruling classes need to create a false perception among the working classes of their own social situation. Since human beings define themselves in terms of ideals and values, the ruling classes need to control those institutions where ideas, ideals and values are formed. This function according to Gramsci's conception is performed by the various institutions of civil society. These civil society institutions are churches, parties, trade unions, universities, the press, publishing houses and voluntary associations of all kinds. By disseminating the ideology of the dominant class the institutions ensure its cultural and moral supremacy over the subordinate classes. In this way the ruling class obtains the consent of the latter of their own subordination. The theory of hegemony given by Gramsci has a deep-rooted relation to his idea of a capitalist state. He refuses to consider the idea of a state in a narrow sense of term, by conceiving it simply as a government. He offers a division between the state and economy. The political society was the arena of the political institutions and also legal constitutional control. The civil societies commonly seen as the private or non-state sphere mediates between the state and the economy. But Gramsci stressed that the division between the two is not very practical, for in reality there is a severe overlap between the two. What rules the capitalist state, according to Gramsci, is the amalgamation of force and consent. He considered political society as the area of force and the civil society as area of consent.

Gramsci proposes that the bourgeoisie under a modern capitalist state maintains the economic dominance by making sure that some of the demands that are made by the trade unions and the political parties that work for the interests of the masses are fulfilled by the state. It is in this way, the bourgeoisie takes part in a form of a passive revolution by resisting its own economic concerns and therefore allowing some changes in the form of its hegemony. He considers movements like fascism and scientific management, along with the methods of Frederick Taylor and Henry Ford as pivotal example of such practice.

Gramsci uses the ideas of Italian political philosopher Machiavelli, and claim that the only way that the working-class will be able to develop a different and alternative hegemony in the society and what he calls organic intellectuals is by the help of the forces of the revolutionary party, he calls it 'the modern prince'. Gramsci stresses, given the complexity of the modern civil society, the importance of a simultaneous existence of both 'war of position' and 'war of manoeuvre'. By former he means that revolutionary activities like agitations and protests of trade unions and an advancement of the culture of the working class, along with the other means which can help in the establishment of an alternate and opposing civil society; and by the 'war of maneuver' he means a direct revolution without any threat of a counter revolution.

In spite of his claim regarding the blurred lines between the two, he refuses to give any importance to the idea of state adulation which results from realized unity of civil and political society, something which both Fascists and Jacobins did. He is convinced that the historical project of the proletariat is to establish what he calls a 'regulated society'. For him the complete growth of the civil society's ability to regulate itself will manifests in the form of the 'withering away of the state.'

NOTES

NOTES

Gramsci defines civil society as the vast range of institutions which were also super structural in nature. Gramsci states that the state offers crucial mechanism so that the connection between the civil society and economy can be established, but there are times when the idea of civil society becomes much more boarder that this analysis allows it to be. Gramsci defines it in the broadest sense as ‘the ensemble of organisms commonly called ‘private’’. And that is why it is a matter of both the individual characteristics and the regulated institutions of social and cultural nature. It is apparent that the Gramsci’s idea of superstructure is very different from the Marx’s concept that claims it to be the combination of institutions for perpetuation of the monolithic bourgeoisie ideology.

The civil society has many definitions as it includes the legal apparatus, it also includes other things such as children parties, shopping trips and going on holidays. As everyone knows that the civil society is involved with the everyday life so it’s very difficult to recognize and also have some connection with the operations of power. Thus, we can say that the notion of civil society has much in common with what Gramsci categorizes as common sense. For example, gardening clearly has a relationship with the ideas of, among other things, nationality, consumerism, and family, and that is why it has certain ideas regarding the material world which functional to the capitalism in the modern society. But it would not be fair to express it in terms of these categories. The best way to express the idea of civil society is to express it in terms of other kinds of social categorizations like gender, age, or in terms of completely different categories like pleasure. And yet, the ideals and values of the ruling class appears to be most authentic and natural and therefore permanent in this realm of private life. One practical consequence of this is both the durability and successfulness of the transformative politics capable of penetrating this realm. Therefore the civil society realizes about the other issue which are prevalent than the issue of class. Some earlier forms of the concept suggest that the only result of a civil society is the establishment of an unequal society. Gramsci, however, did not agree with such idea and argued that even after a successful and major social and political upheaval, there would be a need of a complex and well-pronounced civil society.

3.2.2 Gramsci on Hegemony

Hegemony is in its simplest sense refers to the dominance of class over the other class or classes in a given society. In Marxist theory the term is used in a more technical and specific sense. In the writings of Antonio Gramsci, hegemony refers to the ability of a dominant class to exercise power by winning the consent of those it subjugates as an alternative to the use of coercion. As a non-coercive form of class rule, hegemony is typically understood as a cultural or ideological process that operates through the dissemination of bourgeois values and beliefs throughout the society.

However, it also has a political and economic dimension, consent can be manipulated by pay increases or by political or social reform. The most influential twentieth century exponent of this view was Antonio Gramsci. Gramsci made it clear in his writings that existence of class system in a society is not simply the consequence of the unequal economic and political distribution but also of what he called bourgeois hegemony. Hegemony comprises the intellectual and cultural dominance of the ruling or the privileged class, which is the result of the pervasion of the values and beliefs of the ruling class amongst the masses through the use of institutions like civil society, media, religion, youth mobilization, trade unions, and so on. What makes this process so insidious is that it extends beyond formal learning and education into the very common sense of the age. The significance of Gramsci’s analysis is that, in order to achieve

socialism, a battle of ideas has to be waged through which proletarian principles, values and theories displace or, at least, challenge bourgeois ideas.

Gramsci used the term hegemony to describe all the process, through which the dominant class attained intellectual and moral leadership. Through the concept of hegemony he also emphasized that the ruling classes rely more on the institutions and civil society than those of the state for obtaining the consent of the subordinated. The coercive apparatus of the state is used only where spontaneous consent has failed. The concept of hegemony has a strategic importance in Gramsci's own political practice. He argued that in order to properly fight the revolutionary battle for the working classes and peasantry, communist parties in different countries need to contest the hegemony of the ruling classes in civil society. Gramsci admired the Bolshevik Revolution of Russia as a victory of the will power over economic conditions. He also warned that this strategy would not be suitable under the conditions prevailing in the western society where the working class had come to accept the existing arrangements. He set aside certain assumptions of classical Marxism and produced a new analysis of the bourgeois state. Previously, the term hegemony was described and also used by the famous Marxists such as Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. He used this term to symbolize the political leadership of the working class for the purpose of initiating a democratic revolution. After that Gramsci greatly expanded this concept for developing a sharp analysis for the ruling capitalist class and also for the bourgeoisie which lays down and preserve its control in the society. The orthodox Marxism always predicted that the socialist revolution was inevitable result of the capitalist mode of production.

This type of revolution was not famous in the developed nations by early twentieth century. The concept capitalism seemed even more fixed than ever. So, according to Gramsci, capitalism was suggested and maintained through ideology and not just through violence, political and economic coercion. At that time there was development of a hegemonic culture within the bourgeoisie that helped in the propagation of its ideas and values. This was mainly done so that the bourgeoisie become the common sense of values for all. The people who were a part of the working class saw their benefit in the interest of the bourgeoisie, which discouraged them to revolt against them and instead encouraged them to help maintain the status quo. Gramsci was on the view that the norms and values of bourgeoisie eventually becomes the natural values and ideals of the entire society, and therefore, it was important for the working class that they develop their own ideals and values and culture.

Lenin, the famous leftist intellectual and political revolutionary, maintained that culture functions as an accessory for the achievement of political objective, but Gramsci believed that culture was the fundamental necessity for attaining power. In his view, it is not possible for a class in a society to impose its domination on the modern conditions without working towards the fulfilment of its own economic ambitions. This was neither dominated through force nor coercion. So, this can be said that it should have intellectual and moral leadership and also make compromises and alliances through variety of forces. Gramsci calls this union of social forces 'historic blocs' a term taken from the famous philosopher Georges Sorel. This bloc forms mainly on the basis of consent for making a certain social order which produces and also reproduces the hegemony of the dominant class.

This is mainly done with the help of institutions, social relations, and their ideas. Gramsci proposed a theory that asserted the importance that political and ideological superstructure possess, the primary function of which is to maintain and fracture the relationships within the economic base of the society. Gramsci believed that cultural values of the bourgeois were related to the dominant and popular culture and religion

NOTES

NOTES

of the society, and therefore, he deemed it necessary to analyse the concept of hegemonic culture.

It becomes apparent from the writings of Gramsci that to some extent he was impressed by the way Roman Catholic Church exerted its influence, by making sure to bridge the gap that was becoming apparent between the religion of those who were learned and those who were not so. Gramsci considered Marxism to be a union between the pure intellectual critique of religion that one can find in the concept of Renaissance humanism and the aspects of idea of reformations that has so charmed and attracted the masses. Gramsci believed that the only way in which Marxism can replace religion is if offers to satisfy the spiritual needs of the people, and to do so it was crucial that people should begin thinking it as a manifestation of their own experience.

Gramsci argued that it is on the consented form of coercion that the dominance of hegemony rests.

The term hegemony is more sensitive and a critical term and, therefore, this was more useful than the term domination. The term domination fails to acknowledge active role during the operation of power for the lower class people. Gramsci had defined the term hegemony by talking about the difference between the various moments within the process of hegemony.

As Gramsci thought to define the term in various ways, it isolated his earlier notes mainly on coercion and consent, domination and leadership, common sense and good sense and also limited and expansive. So, the term hegemony can show how these details which were given by Gramsci could be built into a nuanced conception mainly for political and cultural authority. The term hegemony has been very prominent and also applicable in Gramsci's writings which were vastly used by many political philosophers in the humanities and social sciences.

Roots of Hegemony

Gramsci's development as an intellectual happened in the midst of the defeat of the working class revolution, which Gramsci attributed to the lack of ability of the working class to form association with the other subordinate groups of the society. He proposed that if such association could be formed, it would mean the cessation of the differences between the various subordinate groups of the society, which he claimed would be of great use in the formation of national organization, which can both defeat fascism and transform the society in true sense. However, he did not mean by such an association simply a federation of faction with equal weight. What he meant was that the working class of the society can lead the other subordinate groups, thus forming a center of a progressive revolutionary movement. This is what he means by the term 'hegemony' in its simplest version.

It should be noted that Gramsci did not coin the term 'hegemony'. The term was famous from the Russian socialist movement and also a fresh description about this term was given by Lenin. Lenin never used the term hegemony openly in a society but Gramsci claimed that Lenin was the philosopher who described the concept of the term hegemon, even though Lenin rarely used the term 'hegemony'. By saying this Gramsci mainly thought about three things which are:

- (a) Firstly, Lenin realized that it was impossible to initiate revolution just on the basis of the growing differences within the economy. And, therefore, he gave proper thought 'to the front of cultural struggle'.
- (b) Secondly, Lenin began to formulate the idea that the bourgeoisie was devoted to fight for hegemony, because of the fact that the opponents of the bourgeoisie were committed to lead the working class through its dominance of ideas and

values. Lenin said that ‘the working class spontaneously gravitates towards socialism; nevertheless, bourgeois ideology, which is the most widespread (and continuously revived in the most diverse form), is the one which, most of all spontaneously imposes itself upon the working class – this despite the fact that Russia lacked the western democracies, developed civil societies, through which such notions could be disseminated and embedded’.

- (c) And finally, Lenin asserted it is important for the revolutionary party to associate itself with the struggles of each and every group or class which is oppressed or suppressed in the society, and not just with the struggle of the working class of the industries and factories. He also stated that the only to understand the suppression of the industrial working class is through the realization of the ‘relationships between all the classes and strata and the state and the government, the sphere of the interrelations between all the classes.’

There is hardly any doubt that to some extent Gramsci was influenced by the ideas of Lenin. One thing that he liked most of Lenin’s idea that the revolutionary political party must play an important and crucial role in both educating the various subordinate groups of the society and strengthening the relationship between them and thus, establishing its leadership of the working class. Lenin said that in certain instances the revolutionary party functions as an intermediary between their own group and the other oppressed groups, and thereby ‘securing the development of the group which they represent with the consent and assistance of the allied groups’.

Gramsci, however, did not simply follow the concept of hegemony as Lenin developed it. Gramsci also drew from the idea of the Vincenzo Gioberty, a moderate Catholic philosopher, who linked the idea of hegemony with the idea of alliance between the masses and the bourgeois intellectuals, and called it national-popular culture. Thus, the works of Gramsci, though continue to remain a powerful political tool, also become an instrument for an acute analysis of historical and cultural aspects of the society, which can be used to understand, analyze, and evaluate the ways in which the various groups tried to establish hegemonic blocs in the past.

Ideological Hegemony

Gramsci in his book *Prison Notebooks*, written 1929-35, emphasized the degree to which capitalism was maintained not merely by economic domination, but also by political and cultural factors, and he called this ideological hegemony. He acknowledged the description of capitalism as stated by Marx earlier and also accepted that the struggle between the ruling class and the subordinate working class was the main driving force which moved the society at that time. But Gramsci refused to accept the conventional view of Marxist regarding the way in which the ruling class ruled. And in refusing the traditional ideas, Gramsci put forward the importance and significance of the role that ideology plays, which is certainly one of the most original contributions to the modern social and political analysis. Usually the term ‘ideology’ is used in the sense of the set of ideas or beliefs that one possesses. But what is usually missed in such a use of the word is its close relation to the idea of power. In the simplest definition, which is easier to comprehend, comes from Anthony Giddens. According to Giddens, ideology is ‘shared ideas or beliefs which serve to justify the interests of dominant groups’. This definition makes it clear the relationship that ideology share with the power is that of legitimization of the idea and values of the dominant class or group, which allows it to continue its domination on the subordinate class, and also of distortion of the real situation that people of a society are in.

NOTES

NOTES

The conventional idea of Marxism regarding the concept of power was based entirely on the role that force and coercion play in establishing the domination of ruling class over the subordinate class. More or less similar ideas were also advocated by Lenin, who became a famous and the most influential socialist thinker of the time after the success of the Revolution of 1917 in Russia. But Gramsci did not agree with the idea of coercion and use of force. He felt that every repressive structure of the society employs a more subtle but at the same time pervasive means of ideological control to establish and maintain itself. He was convinced that this use of subtle ideological control was missing from the traditional Marxist idea of power in the repressive societies based on class distinction. Gramsci proposed two different forms of political control — the first is the domination, which simply means the use of force and coercion by state machinery like police and armed forces; and the second is hegemony, by which Gramsci meant the ideological control and more importantly submission through consent and acceptance. He asserted that it is impossible for a regime or a state to maintain its control mainly through the organized state machineries like armed forces and police, irrespective of the extent to which it is authoritarian. And therefore, in the long run, the regime or the state would require the popular approval and the sense of legitimacy amongst the people if it wants to maintain stability.

For Gramsci, hegemony was a term that referred to the pervasion of the set of values, beliefs, morals, and attitudes in the society, through which the status quo in the social power relation is maintained. In this sense, hegemony can be defined as an ‘organizing principle’ which is infused into every part of daily life through the help of the process of socialization. This prevailing set of ideas and attitudes and values are internalized by the public to such an extent that they gradually become what is referred as ‘common sense’, and therefore, the morality, culture and ideas of the ruling class becomes something natural, something unchangeable, and something which must not be changed.

Marx divided society into base and superstructure, where the former is represented by the economic structure, and the latter comprises institutions and beliefs and values systems prevalent in the society. Most of the Marxists accepted this division of the society. But Gramsci did not stop here, he went further to divide the superstructure into those institutions which are openly coercive and those which are not so. In the category of the coercive institutions, Gramsci included state institutions such as police, armed forces, government, and the legal system. In the category of the institution, which according to him were not coercive, he included religious institutions, schools, universities, trade union, political parties, cultural associations, clubs, the family, and so on. To an extent, the school can be included in both the above mentioned categories, for some part of school life is apparently coercive, such as compulsory education, the national curriculum, national standards and qualifications.

Thus, according to Gramsci the society comprised the relations of production, which is the relationship between labour and the capital, and that of state, which is the coercive institutions, and civil society, i.e. non-coercive institutions.

Gramsci offered an acute analysis which was much deeper than any of the previous Marxist analysis of the failure of the working class of Europe in their uprising against the bourgeois after the WWI, and then their move towards the idea of reformism, which meant that instead of working towards overthrowing ruling elite, they would tinker with the system. His theory offered a far more subtle explanations of the way power works than any of his contemporary Marxists, and explained that how the ruling class uses this power to establish and maintain its rule over the society.

Now, the big question that confronts us is that is Gramsci was right in his analysis that the ruling class establish and maintain its dominance only by the consent of the people, and use the coercive institutions like armed force and legal system only as a last option, then what does it mean to the Marxists who wished to do away with the ruling class on the basis that they use force and violence to establish and maintain their dominance? What should be the strategy of the revolutionary parties, if the ruling elite's hegemony is the result of an ideological association between the ruler and the ruled? The answer to these question is to establish what is called the 'counter hegemony' against the ruling elite by the ruled, if they wish to break from the dominance of the former. And that the ruled must look at structural changes and the ideological changes as part of the larger struggle against the ruling capitalism, unlike traditional Marxism which thought that the changes in the economic structure would automatically bring the changes in the ideological structure. Having established the basic premise of the struggle, let us now look at the practical aspect of it. Since, the traditional Marxism had already promoted the economic struggle, it was already there at the center of the class struggle. What was missing from the class struggle was the ideological struggle, which Gramsci thought was important to incorporate in the class struggle, if people were to be aware of their domination. Moreover, it was also to give them power to question the ideals and values of their rulers and their right to dominate. What needed to be challenged was the popular ideals and values and attitudes which were accepted by the civil society, and here the role of informal education becomes important.

The idea of challenging what has been accepted by the masses, however, is not an easy task. The term 'ideological hegemony' simply meant that most of the people of the society accepted the prevailing norms as right, as natural, and commonsense and thought that there cannot be any other way to run a society. There might have been few complaints about the functioning of the society here and there, causing people to demand for the improvements and reform, but more or less people accepted the basic ideas and values prevalent in the society as something natural and neutral, thus aiding the existing class structure of the society. It was like people were asking for a bigger piece of bread, when the issue at hand was the very ownership of the bakery that produced the bread.

Hegemony: A Tool for Historical and Political Analysis.

In the following paragraphs we will look at the way Gramsci used the term 'hegemony' as an instrument for analyzing history and politics. It is true that over time the way Gramsci used the term 'hegemony' in relation to the subject he was writing about changed, but what helps is his piece of work that he wrote before arrest, 'Some aspects of the Southern Question,' for it makes his use and understanding of the term hegemony unambiguous. He says in this work that the only way working class can 'become the leading and dominant [i.e. hegemonic] class to the extent that it succeeds in creating a system of class alliances which allows it to mobilize the majority of the working population against capitalism and bourgeois state'. The historical development of Italian society was such that it did not allow the struggle to be posed entirely as a struggle against economic inequality. If the working class movement wanted to include other groups, especially the Italian peasants, into the movement then it was important for it to understand the importance of issues which were culturally close to the other groups, and address them. Gramsci identified two such issues — the Southern Question and the role played by the Catholic Church. The Italian peasantry felt oppressed most within these matters, and therefore, the industrial working class needed to address the issue of inequality concerning these matters and incorporate the demands for the Italian peasants in its agenda. Such an approach would have made the industrial working

NOTES

NOTES

class avoid dominating the other suppressed group, and recreate successfully a hegemonic group. The idea was not just to speak for the other groups to win their vote or to address certain issue to broaden the base of the movement, rather the idea was to create a true hegemonic group that could successfully incorporate a prominent chunk of its subaltern's perspective its own. Gramsci argued that in the process of the making of this hegemonic group, there will occur a change in the leading group because of the broadening of its factionalism, which earlier was quite narrow. Gramsci called this 'corporatism'. He said that to be successful leaders, the workers must stop thinking of themselves in terms of their occupations, for instance as a blacksmith or carpenter. He instead proposed that, 'They must think as workers who are members of a class which aims to lead the peasants and intellectuals. Of a class which can win and build socialism only if it is aided and followed by the great majority of these social strata.'

The idea of leadership in this hegemonic group brings a lot of issue at the fore. First, it allows the leading group to possess the power to make decisions for the other groups which are no leading, something which is called *agency*. Those who are the part of the leading group have the clarity to situation as it exists and not get influenced or manipulated by the effects of ideology. Second, when the leading group decides to engage with the practices and values of the subaltern groups it means that the group must consider these values and practices with utmost seriousness, even if they are not necessarily progressive. As already mentioned, Gramsci mentions Catholic Church as one of the forces that influences greatly the lives of the Italian peasantry. Though Gramsci himself was an atheist, still he did not consider the Church as reactionary. Quite early in his career as a socialist, Gramsci refused to follow the path of mindless anti-clericalism and tried to mend and promote his links with the Church activists, for he knew that a majority of the Italians were believers and their mobilization was not possible if this important aspect of their lives was not addressed. As far as his identification of the issue of the 'Southern Question' is concerned, Gramsci realized that the Italian Church was divided along the lines of region. In the southern part of Italy, the Church often played the role feudal oppression, for most of the priests in the south were landlords themselves, but this was not case in the north, where the church played the role of a democratic and spiritual-ethical opposition to the state.

A question that becomes important here at this point is what happens when the subaltern group develops their own counter-hegemony and challenge the authority of the leading group. Gramsci did not have any concrete answer to this question of how the leading group can keep the hegemonic activities of the subaltern group under limit, thereby restricting the expansion of its hegemony. Gramsci was somehow not able to completely theorize this problem, and this apparent from his resort of economism. He writes that nothing that 'accounts [must] be taken of the interest of the groups over which hegemony is to be exercised,' and that 'the leading group should make sacrifices of an economic-corporate kind,' Gramsci concludes that 'such sacrifices and sic a compromise cannot touch the essential,' which is 'the function exercised by the leading group in the decisive nucleus of economic activity'.

What causes the sense of optimism in spite of this irregular reductive tendency is the ability of the hegemonic bloc to incorporate the demands and issues of the other groups in their operations. It is not possible for the ruling power to survive which though one hand asks the ruled to give it consent, but on the other hand it refuses to voice the issues and aspirations and ambitions of those who gave it the consent to rule. Gramsci argues that the hegemonic processes allows the subaltern to transition from being 'a thing' to being 'a historical person, a protagonist', and this transition in itself is a forceful rejoinder to the idea that the subaltern remain under the dominance of the their leader's ideology. Gramsci's democratic tendencies is apparent in his argument

wherein he asks the hegemonizing group to accept challenges to its leadership. He writes: 'Active and direct consent' means 'the participation of all, even if it produces a disintegration or an apparent tumult.'

The issue concerning the aspirations of the subaltern people brings another point regarding the process of hegemony: hegemony is an unending process. If a leading group wants to continue to be in power, then it must be alert and cautious regarding the demands of the subaltern which are volatile in nature, and also regarding the context within which it exercises its authority, for this context has a tendency to shift constantly. Gramsci says that a social group even before coming to the power has to exercise its leadership, but even when it comes to power, it must continue to lead.

Another point that can be made concerning hegemony is psychological. One might ask – why do people accept their dominance under the leadership of someone else? Why the subaltern adopt the ideas and values of the hegemonic bloc as its own? One answer to this question can be that the hegemony is much more than just values and ideas, for it also takes other forms such as material, economic, legal, and political. In many instances the ruling power goes extra mile to ensure that its rules population have enough food to eat, jobs to earn money, and have access to facilities like healthcare. In the democratic societies, people are given certain rights and freedoms, while allow them autonomy to certain extent. Terry Eagleton says, 'What uniquely distinguishes the political form of such societies is that people are supposed to believe they govern themselves.' It can be argued that such an illusion of autonomy and self-government is also promoted and furthered by other forms of society, but Eagleton draws our attention to the institutional and organizational aspect of hegemony. For organizations play a crucial role in the propagation of ideas and attitudes and values for the 'ideological' functioning of hegemony. Gramsci is of the view that the civil society plays an important role in maintaining the authority of the dominant group. He argued that the civil society performs this task effectively by making dissolving the demarcation between the political and everyday life. Gramsci refuses to believe that the indulgence of people in their leisure activities or their exhibition of semi-unconsciousness collective behavior as the evidence of their being controlled by the dominant capitalism. While Theodor Adorno and Mac Horkheimer strongly believed that mass culture is a strong evidence of both capitalism's control and of people's unconscious consent to that control. Gramsci, however refuses to believe this. He argues that everyone is a part of the mass. He writes: 'We are all conformists if some conformism or other, always man in the-mass or collective man.'

Gramsci engages himself with the tasks of understanding the various currents and aspects of thought that are at the center of each historical form of conformism. For instance, the use of car in the modern society. Everyone is aware that the excessive use of car is not good for the environment, and soon the consequences of the use of automates is going to be apparent, in fact have started becoming apparent. And in spite of this knowledge people continue to use cars, in fact, the automobile market is expanding and increasing every year. According to Gramsci, this is not because of the false ideas enforced on the people by the capitalist car industries, it is also not the evidence of how selfish people are. Various currents of ideas and aspects of thought are at the center of this. For instance, car is one of the technologies, which puts the people in connection with the other institutions of the civil society, like schools, hospitals, etc. From the Gramscian point of view the use of car is a free choice, and what makes this tie between the user and the use of car stronger is the way it is related with the human relationships, emotions such as love, and notions such as care.

NOTES

NOTES

Gramsci's idea of hegemony also includes the issue of force. What should be the move of the hegemonic group in regards to those groups which are beyond their assimilation in the cultural and political operations the hegemonic group? Gramsci says that although the leading of the hegemonic group is like leading a coalition, it nonetheless 'dominates antagonistic groups, which it tends to 'liquidate', or to subjugate perhaps even by armed force.'

3.2.3 Gramsci on Revolution

Gramsci came in contact with the labour movement in Turin, where he had gone to pursue his study in university of Turin in 1911, at the center of which was the Fiat car and related industries. It was in Turin that he joined the Socialist Party of Italy (PSI) in the year 1913.

Gradually, Gramsci became more involved with the activities of the party and in the November of the 1915 he gave up his studies to become a member of the editorial board of the *Il Grido del Popolo*, a paper of the Socialist Party. During this period, until the Russian Revolution of 1917, Gramsci's idea of politics was very distant from that of Lenin and Bolsheviks, in spite of the fact that both Russia and Italy were similar in terms of tactical and strategic actions. By year 1915, which also saw the emergence of Gramsci as a self-aware revolutionary, the Bolsheviks has both undergone a revolution and a counter-revolution, the result of which was that they now had a clear formulation of on the agrarian issue and their own position on the question of revolutionary party. The consequences of these clear formulations were to elude the lefts in the Psi till 1921. By the year 1915, Lenin had realized the basic reason behind the failure of the Second International, and also the necessity to initiate a complete break from it. Both the left in the PSI and Gramsci were not aware of the development in the attitudes of Lenin towards these events.

Gramsci's intellectual and political development was very different from that of Lenin's. He was not the influence of the traditional Marxism as represented by Kautsky and Plekhanov, rather he was influenced by an Italianized version of Marxism which he found in the works of Labriola, Gentile, and Corce. It was to this version of Marxism that Gramsci turned towards for the answers to the question that he felt in the activities and concepts of the rights in both the PSI and the Second International. Gramsci thought that the submissive and fatalist attitude of these were not separate form what he considered flaws in the historical materialism as proposed by Marx and Engels. He felt that the critique that Marx offered of the political economy in his much celebrated work *Capital* was verily mechanical material, which chose to ignore the importance of the role of working class in the process of becoming conscious of its suppressed position and a subsequent rise to bring down the system, irrespective of the economic situation. Therefore, he considered Marx's historical material lacking and agreed with Corce, who advocated a return to Hegel, so that to incorporate his idealism and offer an acute understanding to the role of subjective political factor in the revolution.

The approach that Lenin and Trotsky took towards the issue of Russian Revolution differed markedly from the approach of Gramsci. Quite early in 1899, Lenin had argued against the mechanistic interpretation of Marx's materialism, which led the proponents of such an interpretation conclude that the only way to stop capitalism in Russia is to encourage backwardness in the Russia's internal market. In the year 1905, Trotsky has argued in this theory of 'permanent revolution' that the only way to understand the rise of capitalism in Russia was to put it in the context of development of capitalism in the entire world.

Lenin, however, agreed with the Marxist view, that led them to conclude that because of the capitalist expansion, the leadership of the revolution against Tsar came

to the bourgeoisie of Russia. Lenin and Trotsky concluded, writes Steven J. Jones, 'that the weakness of an indigenous Russian bourgeoisie and the social weight of the Russian proletariat combined to guarantee that the former would bloc with reaction against the working class when faced with a real fight through bourgeois democratic demands.'

Gramsci believed that in order to initiate revolution in backward Italy, no matter what the social relations were, it is important to have the will to initiate the revolution, whereas Lenin and Trotsky believed that the revolution is be initiated in the backward Russia because of the very contradictions that exist within the social relations of the Russian society. Gramsci's weak or flawed understanding of the historical materialism was the result the flaws his methodological grasp of Marxism. During 1920s, the consequence of these flaws in Gramsci's ideas become very blurred, for during this time he was more focused towards the position Communist International or Comintern. But the complete significance of these weaknesses become apparent in his writings during his prison time, which was later published as *Prison Notebooks*.

With such an idea of Marxism and understanding of historical materialism, Gramsci welcomed the advent of Russian Revolution in the year 1917. He considered it as a 'proletariat act ...[which] must naturally result in a socialist regime', and thought of it as an substantiation of his understanding of Marxism. He thought of the Russian Revolution as a 'Revolution against Das Kapital', and in the Bolshevik's work, he saw 'the continuation of Italian and German idealist thought, and which in Marx was contaminated by positivistic and naturalistic incrustations.' In spite of this scathing criticism of Marx, he believed in the Menshevik strategy that there exists a:

'... fatal necessity for a bourgeoisie to be formed in Russia, for a capitalist era to open, before the proletariat might even think of rising up, of their own class demands, of their revolution.' He saw Lenin as a revolutionary reader who could use his will to initiate a revolution thus forcing the stride of history, and not as someone who could merely express the inherent contradictions of the Russian society. With the deepening of the revolutionary fervor in Italy, Gramsci reflected further on the things that could be understood and incorporated from Lenin as a revolutionary. The year 1917 was year of great political and revolutionary tumult. Workers in Turin revolted against the local state, which was supported by the strikes throughout the region of Piedmont. But the revolution was not a success. The defeat came at the cost of five hundred lives and some two thousand casualties. But the revolutionary feeling was not over. The workers of Turin refused to be suppressed in spite of this brutal defeat. They rose again, in a manner unprecedented in 1919-20. The strength of the Italian Socialist Party was no rise. The number of member grew from 81,000 in the year 1919 to 216,000 in 1920. Under the direction of PSI, the Trade Union Federation was able to spread enormously between 1914 and 1920 from 320,000 to 2.3 million. These numbers show that people in general were connecting with the general idea of revolution and socialist ideals.

A year before the end of the second decade of the twentieth century, Gramsci along with some other members established a paper called *L'Ordine Nuovo*. Initially the paper was a sort propagandist weapon for the socialist party, but soon Gramsci directed it away from the abstract form of propaganda towards a serious reflection on the cultural issues, the aim of which was to capture the energy of the growing revolution by giving it a shape of something like the revolution in Russia. He wrote to of the workers' state in June of 1919:

'This state does not pop up by magic: the Bolsheviks worked for eight months to spread and make their slogans concrete: all power to the Soviets, and the Soviets were already known to the Russian workers in 1905. Italian communists must treasure the Russian experience and save on time and labour.'

NOTES

NOTES

After the affiliation of PSI to the Comintern in October 1919, it went ahead and contested in a general election with agenda of establishing proletariat dictatorship. The result was astonishing. The PSI emerged as a winner of the single largest bloc of seat — 156 seats out of the total 568. Next year in 1920, over half of the municipal councils was won by the PSI. The rapid growth of the Socialist Party is the evidence that the workers of Italy during the early twentieth century were following the path of revolution with all energy and enthusiasm.

The struggle inside the factories reached a new stage in the spring of 1920 as the newly found Internal Commission had given the workers right to control whole aspects of the factory. Some half a million workers got engaged with the councils and commissions in the summer of 1920. Gramsci understood what really was stake. He writes:

‘Under the capitalism the factory was a miniature state, ruled over by a despotic board. Today after the workers occupations, this despotic power in the factories has been smashed; the right to choose passed into the hands of the working class. Every factory that has industrial executives has become an illegal state, a proletarian republic living from day to day, awaiting the outcome of events.’

The main question was how to influences the ‘outcome of events’? Gramsci wanted to find a way to transform he dual power in the factories into a challenge for the state. And it is here that Gramsci’s weaknesses as far as the matter of party was concerned stood brutally exposed. Why? Because Gramsci was never able to bring himself to endeavor for the revolutionary communist party. Even when the PSI was affiliated to the Comintern, Gramsci was not very enthusiastic about fighting against the Turati reformist wing to exclude it. He did not even agree with Bordiga’s view that there is a need to organize in order to fight for one’s factional perspectives within the PSI on national scale.

It is notable that Harman, while talking about the failings of Gramsci and the Party, wrote that in regards to the accessing of the role of Marxist intervention in the class struggle, Gramsci’s ‘own activity in 1919-1920 and 1924-26 was a shining (although not, of course, perfect) example of such intervention.’ What is striking here is some sense of reservation on Harman’s part on mentioning the failures of Gramsci in the said issue. However, Gramsci, while writing in retrospect, was prepared to be much harsher of his earlier actions than Harman was ever willing to be. Gramsci writes:

‘In 1919/20 we made extremely serious mistakes which ultimately we are paying for today/ For fear of being called upstarts and careerists we did not form a faction and organize this throughout Italy. We were no ready to give the Turin councils an autonomous directive centre, which could have exercised an immense influence throughout the country for fear of a split in the unions and of being prematurely expelled from the Socialist Party.’

Lenin and Trotsky also shared this feeling of harshness regarding the failings of every section in the PSI. Trotsky writes of PSI:

‘The Party carried on agitation in favour of the soviet power, in favour of the hammer and sickle, in favour of Soviet Russia, etc. The Italian working class en masse took this seriously and entered the road of open revolutionary struggle, But precisely at the moment when the party should have drawn all the practical and political conclusions from its agitation it became scared of its responsibility and shied away, leaving the rear of the proletariat unprotected.’

Lenin shared this harshness of Trotsky. He writes:

‘Did a single communist show his mettle when the workers seized the factories in Italy? No. At the time there was yet no communism in Italy.’

Gramsci's ability of self-criticism, irrespective of his role in the events taking place and irrespective of the price that was paid, was an ability which was common to all the great revolutionists, is what made Gramsci move towards Comintern.

Gramsci differentiates between the nature of revolution that occurred in Russia and the nature of revolutions that were in countries other than Russia. He analyzes and explains the need for this difference. Russia had a superstructure which was what he calls 'primordial and gelatinous', and there was not much in the way of mediators between the revolutionaries and the Tsarist authorities. The task that Bolsheviks had in front of them did not include winning over the mediators and, therefore, they were free to focus all their energy in overpowering the state. Gramsci calls this kind of attack and consequent victory by the Russian 'war of manoeuvre', but in the light of the situation of the Western Front during the WWI, he states that such an abrupt transformations and consequent victories seldom happens. Another form of revolution, which according to him, is the reality that most of the societies have to go through, and which happens over a period of time through a continuous struggle in the superstructure, where in ideas and values and attitudes are incorporated in the struggle. Gramsci calls this a 'war of position'. He states that the developed capitalist nations of the West have anticipated some serious struggle and uprising against them and, therefore, they have accordingly organized and transformed themselves. But the nations which were not so developed did not have the presence of intermediaries, and this absence of intermediaries helped the capitalist regimes to grow into a complex network of institutions and practices, which not only defends them from the threat of internal disintegration, but at the same time also makes the idea of revolution both politically and psychologically impossible.

Gramsci's distinction between the 'war of manoeuvre' and 'war of position' gives way to some interesting points. The first and the most prominent point that emerges out of this distinction is that of the relationship between the two kinds of struggles — ideological and armed. To some extent the distinction that Gramsci makes is contradictory. First, Gramsci says that war of position must prepare the appropriate ground so that an attack can be made on capitalism, but then he says that the war of position has decisively replaced the war of manoeuvre. To those revolutionary movements which do not accept the ways of violence, Gramsci's second use of war of position may be of value, but it is not in sync with the fact that Gramsci was a barricades militant. Another problem is that it poses the danger of aligning the war of position with notions such as reformism, something that caused Gramsci to break away from PSI. Therefore, it has been suggested by scholars and intellectuals that we must try to think of these two categories in relation with each other. There are moments when the grounds need to be prepared in the superstructure before the real decisive action can take place. For instance, the case of a political party establishing a cordial relationship with the media just prior to the elections. At other moments, however, the head-on war precedes the war of position.

Gramsci argues that it is possible to resolve the crisis for the ruling group and that to in its favor by the use of either coercive or ideological means. But, he also says that such a resolution is most unlikely to be a resolution of permanence. Gramsci's one axiom, which is taken from Marx, says that a 'social formation' is most unlikely to dissolve while its forces of production 'still find room for further forward movement.' The declining ruling group tries to reassert its authority after its failed attempt to bring the subaltern groups into its hegemony, and tries to cause hindrance in the path of these productive forces. Gramsci calls this failure a 'passive revolution'.

Risorgimento (Italian unification), for Gramsci, was the most appropriate example of passive revolution. After the unification, the bourgeoisie of Italy had the chance to

NOTES

NOTES

establish a proper national popular so that they can lead the popular classes, while responding to their ambitions and aspirations, but instead they, based on the Moderate Party, formed a minority political class, which slowly and gradually changed the leadership of the radical Action Party. Gramsci writes that this bourgeois elite was ‘characterized by its aversion to any intervention of the popular masses in state life, to any organic reform which would substitute a ‘hegemony’ for its crude, dictatorial ‘dominance’’. It, therefore, lacked the popular mandate, and without it the Italian bourgeoisie became prone to various crises, which ultimately resulted in the emergence of fascism. For Gramsci there is a basic relation between the rise of Mussolini and *transformismo*, for both of them were ‘revolutions from above’, instead of being hegemonic projects. In both the cases there was a high level of intervention in the state, which had no connection, whatsoever, with the consent of the people of Italy. Therefore, it would not be impossible to achieve a socialist revolution, as Gramsci points out in his reference to Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal as another expression of the same phenomenon. But this is not completely devoid of the suspicion of coercion by the state. Gramsci was convinced that if there is no participation of people in the radical changes in the society, then such as change will most certainly lead to the authoritarian for leadership which will seek to oppress and exploit the people.

In 1848, the Paris Commune ushered in a qualitatively new phase of the historical development, despite the defeat of both the sides. The previous fragile equilibrium of the class forces and their superstructures were thrown into crisis which was progressive expansivity of the bourgeois project which had encountered its organic crisis. The crisis was organic by nature in the sense that it placed the very foundations of the bourgeois hegemony. According to traditional Marxist, it was the moment when bourgeoisie’s claims about the universality were revealed to be in the service of the particularistic interests. This was defined as the accumulation of capital in the hands of the ruling class. The working classes mainly revolted and their refusal was subsumed pacifically into the expensive state of the bourgeoisie. Their demands were always different and instead of the political forms which were adequate to their own emergent class project, sought to elevate and also educate, but whatever they did was always on their own terms.

This is the Gramsci’s version of the communist manifesto which was the thesis of the bourgeoisie where they brought forward their own gravedigger, though once again Gramsci said that the stresses alongside is traditionally emphasized on the economic dimensions and also the political determinants of this process. It was the crisis of the entire social formation as both were based on the economic content and political form. So, in certain sense, the logic of historical development of the previous period went into the reverse and that was a traumatic return to a primal scene. Gramsci argued that this process comes to a halt and also the conception of the State was a pure forced return towards the state. The bourgeois class is saturated and also it not only expands but also starts to disintegrate. It not only does not assimilate the new elements but it loses part of itself.

Then after that they began a period of passive revolution. In the early 1930, Gramsci appropriated the concept of Passive Revolution from Italian writer Vincenzo Cuoco. The political context of this appropriation is significant and for this it is the same period when he polemicized against the implicit economism of the Comintern. These types of revolutionary fantasies of those years were particularly related to the struggle against fascism in Italy. During a discussion in the prison with his other inmates or the party members, Gramsci insisted that it was always necessary to be more political to understand the historical foundations of fascism and also to outline a realistic

political programme that could be the mass forces against the regime. Gramsci's proposal was mainly for a constituent assembly which could help to provide the Communist Party with the political space that was necessary to rebuild its forces for an assault on the bourgeois state. The seeming pessimism of this proposal can lead to his isolation among the other political prisoners amid acrimonious accusation. Gramsci said that judging the balance of forces that conducted a tactical retreat to his famous book *Prison Notebooks* in order to furnish his position with the political arguments was necessary to justify his untimely meditations. Therefore, the concept of passive revolution was originally used by Cuoco to describe the Neapolitan revolution which happened in 1799. From this Gramsci transformed the concept in the first instance mainly to provide an analysis of the distinctive features of the Italian Revolution. Later on, it soon became clear that Gramsci used the concept which could have had a more general significance and could be used to indicate the modernity. This was also taken by other States such as the Jacobin Moment, which distinguished the experience of the French Revolution. In the third moment, he also extended the concept to signify pacifying and incorporating nature that was assumed by the bourgeois hegemony in the Revolution of the imperialism. This happened particularly in the Western European nations but with the determinant effects that was upon the colonial periphery.

The passive revolution, thus, came to denote the hegemonic project for an entire historical period of that era. At that period according to Italian philosopher Domenico Losurdo, in 1848 and till 1871 a phase of passive revolution began with the failure of the workers and also the popular classes were identifiable neither with the counter revolution nor with the political and ideological fall of the dominant class. So, the category of passive revolution is a section which was used in the famous book written by Gramsci, the *Prison Notebooks*, in order to denote the persistent capacity of the initiative of the bourgeoisie which succeeded even during the historical phase in which it ceased to be a properly revolutionary class.

This class was mainly to produce the socio-political transformations which were sometime significant for conserving the power properly in its own hands, the initiative and the hegemony and also leaving the working classes in their conditions. If the bourgeois project was able to continue then it was to deliver real progress. At the same time, it tried very hard to deny the opportunities to the other class the initiative for producing the stagnation and widespread loss of faith.

Modernity was caught in an Arnoldian twilight where it was mentioned that the wandering between two worlds, one was dead and the other was powerless to be born. Thus, we see that the Gramsci's idea of passive revolution in its entirety not only shows the ability of Marxist tradition to engage with the non-Marxist thoughts, but also shows its ability of critical self-renewal. Gramsci's dialectical analysis offers a sense of both of them. At first he developed his notion of passive revolution outside the Marxism, and then used it to analyse historical instances, while modifying and updating it in accordance with his findings. His third step was to assess his newly formed idea in respect to the concepts of the critique of the political economy, which are the base of the materialistic interpretation of the history, and his fourth and final step was to supplement the concepts of the critique of political economy with the idea of praxis, which allowed the critique of political economy to be read in a new political light. Gramsci's return to the concept of praxis, allows him to propose Marxism as something that is capable of offering an explanation of the historical emergence of all the ideologies, including itself, rather than a simple synthesis of different contending ideologies or merely a theory that stood against the others.

NOTES

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Which period was known as the year of 'iron and fire'?
2. Define hegemony.
3. What is civil society according to Gramsci?
4. State the significance of Gramsci's analysis regarding achieving socialism.

3.3 ROBERT NOZICK

Robert Nozick (1938-2002) was a prominent American political philosopher, who was most active in the 70s and 80s of the twentieth century. He studied at Columbia University and then went on to become a professor at Harvard University. His most famous book is *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, which was published in 1974. It was a libertarian answer to John Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* published in 1971. His other works involved decision theory and epistemology.

Nozick was a thinker with exceptional mind, who rose to fame while he was still in his graduation at Princeton in the early 1960s. His dissertation thesis was on decision theory, which he wrote under the guidance of Carl Hempel, a German philosopher.

Like other intellectuals of that age, he too got influenced by the new politics of the Left, but after reading about the defense of personal liberty and capitalism in the works of writers such as F.A. Hayek, Ludwig von Mises, Murray Rothbard and Ayn Rand, he gave up the leftist politics and devoted his focus and concentration to the study of political theory, instead of being concerned with the technicalities of analytical philosophy. This break up from the leftist poetics culminated in his most celebrated work *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, published in 1974. Nozick's *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* along with Rawls' *A theory of Justice*, aroused the interest in the political philosophy within the circles of traditions of analytical philosophy in America. Till the publication of these books, the analytical philosophy had almost neglected the subject of political philosophy. Both the books were received with great enthusiasm and initiated philosophical discourse and discussion to such an extent that political philosophy became one of the most central subject in the American philosophical circles in 70s and 80s. Given the success of his book, Rawls kept working on political philosophy, but Nozick soon changed the course and engaged with some other issues and concerns.

In 1981 Nozick came his *Philosophical Explanations*, which too was well received and earned him numerous awards, in which Nozick offers new accounts of free will, nature of value, knowledge, meaning of life, and personal identity. He also proposed an epistemological system which attempts to engage with Edmund Gettier-style problems, as wells as problems put forward by skeptics. His system claimed that justification was not an essential necessity for knowledge. Nozick was famous for his curious, exploratory style and methodological ecumenism.

3.3.1 *Anarchy, State and Utopia*

Anarchy, State, and Utopia, earned Nozick many honours and awards including the National Book Award in 1975, one year after the book was published. In this book, Nozick defends the idea of liberalism, minimal state intervention, and private property.

Nozick opens his book with the idea of rights of an individual. In the very first sentence of the book, he writes: 'Individuals have rights, and there are things no person or group may do to them (without violating their rights).'

According to Nozick, the very existence of the individual rights poses the questions regarding the responsibility and works of the state and its various institutions and

officials. He asks if individual rights leave any room for the state. The central issue that Nozick is concerned with, in his book, is reading the moral and ethical nature of the state.

Though Nozick proposed minimal intervention of state, he was not an anarchist, for he did not outrightly do away with state's existence. He did support its existence, and allowed some coercive powers to it, in some cases. His idea of a state is sometimes known as the 'night watchman theory', which mimics the idea of a night watchman whose only job is to protect the theft and illegal intrusion into the private property.

In first part of his book, Nozick offers a justification for the minimal intervention by the state. In the second part of his book, he argues that no justification can be offered for extensive states. In the third and last part of book, which is also least famous, he deals with the issue of distributive justice. He offers a strong defense of what he calls 'the entitlement theory'. The entitlement theory can be summarized in the following three points:

1. A person is entitled to the holding that he acquires as per the principle of justice in acquisition.
2. A person who acquires a holding as per the principle of justice in transfer, from someone else entitle to the holding, is entitled to the holding.
3. Except by the application of the above points, no one else is entitled to the holding.

The most significant point amongst the above points is the last one, for it does not allow any kind of socialism or welfarism and thus, prohibits the state or powerful agency from compelling someone to give up his holding so that it can benefit someone else. But if someone voluntarily wants to give up his holding to someone else, the second point allows it. What is important here is that Nozick's principle does not allow the state to forcefully coerce someone into giving up his holding for the advantages of someone else. Thus, according to Nozick, the just distribution of goods means the free exchange of goods amongst the consenting adults, even if it promotes inequality in the society.

In fact, Nozick explicitly announced that, starting from any initial position that anyone thinks is just, application of his view would result in the inequality because some people's product or service would inevitably be in greater demand than that of others. So other people would voluntarily pay them more or buy more of their product or service, and they would thus acquire greater holdings (become richer) than other people. Nozick argues that the only way to prevent inequalities in the society is the forbidding of the 'capitalist acts between consenting adults' by the socialist state. He adopted the Kantian notion that people should not only be treated as means, but also as ends.

3.3.2 Philosophical Explanations

Philosophical Explanation is another celebrated work of Robert Nozick, which was first published in the year 1981. It a vast philosophical treaty which cover a broad range of subjects like metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics.

The Parthenon Model and Non-coercive Philosophy

Nozick advocates the Parthenon model of philosophy and disapproves of the tottering tower model. And between the explanatory or non-coercive mode and argumentative or coercive mode, he chooses the former, i.e. the explanatory or non-coercive mode. Parthenon model of philosophy is capable of pursuing various projects of philosophical nature, while the tottering tower model functions in such a way that every philosophical

NOTES

NOTES

project becomes dependent on something more fundamental, something like Descartes' *cogito ergo sum*. And unlike the argumentative or coercive mode of philosophy, the explanatory mode of philosophy tries to look for wide range of possibilities, and not just trying to offer proofs.

Reflexivity

In his work Nozick concludes that the closest-continuer schema focuses on a general structure of identity through time, and not on personal identity. He also talks about the special characteristics of self, especially its ability of reflexive self-awareness, which begins at the level of language, and which is different in case of the proper names. His explanation of the reflexive self-reference concludes that all the sentences which have pronouns like 'I', 'my', 'me', or 'mine', what we call I-statements, can possibly be derived from the non-I-statements. Nozick proposes a hypothesis (it follows not from the points made by him concerning language the term 'I') that selves are essentially selves, which means 'that anything which is self could not have existed yet been otherwise.' In order to explore this hypothesis further he questions the possibility of reflexive self-knowledge, and offers the answer that reflexive self-knowledge is a special mode in which we relate to our won selves as objects, or a dispositional account, or a brute-fact account, or an account in which the self puts itself into its reflexive self-referring.

Inegalitarian Theories

An inegalitarian theory categorizes state into two classes — those which need an explanation, and those which neither need nor admit of explanation. In the inegalitarian theory the nature state is nothingness, and questions like 'why is there something rather than nothing?'. Nozick hypothesized that it is possible for nothingness to contain a very powerful force that could produce something. He uses the verb 'to nothing' to refer to things that the force of nothingness does to other things so that they can remain in the state of nonexistence. It is possible then the force of nothingness might lead to 'nothing' itself. He writes that 'nothingness, hoisted by its own powerful petard, produces something.' Alternatively, it is also possible for the inegalitarian theory to take existence as a natural state, so that the real state departs from fullness because of the working of special forces.

Egalitarian Theories

In order to understand and analyses the egalitarian theories, Nozick divides the world into a state which comprise of nothingness, and several states which can conceived as means for something to be there. Assuming that each state is equally probable and random, it become very likely that something is there. Nozick, however, moves on from this, for the application of the principle of indifference form the theory of probability considers nonrealization to be the natural state for a possibility, and that special factors are necessary for being realized. One of the ways in which we can reach a complete egalitarian theory is by maintaining principle of fecundity that it is possible that all possibilities are realized.

Limiting the Universe

Nozick realizes and acknowledge reasons for restricting the full fecundity in a principle 'LF' which restricts the world to a sort 'S'. Which means that LF states that the real external world of our everyday experience is of sort S, and the possibility of sort S is states by LF itself. And also the sort S offers specification for some explanatory unity of high degree, for instance the entire universe is governed by the laws of nature. If

LF satisfies the invariance principle I, then it will not be arbitrary. And because of the self-subsumption by the theory of quantification, LF cannot be a brute fact. And because of the invariant principle I, LF will not be arbitrary. If LF has to be egalitarian, then it is necessary that LF should be realized as self-reflexive.

Self-subsumption and Reflexive Self-reference

In order to offer a credible explanation of why one version of LF sticks instead others, Nozick links reflexive self-reference to the explanatory self-subsumption. The holding of LF in virtue of its holding is apparently insufficient, and it is this that characterizes the basic principle as reflexive. A basic reflexive principle will hold merely in virtue of its holding, for it holds true 'from the inside.'

Knowledge of Necessary Truths

Nozick does not need in order to make the tracking work to establish a distinction between what is necessary truths and what is empirical truths. He simply assumes that the mathematical truths and necessarily true. With this assumption the variation condition falls out and tracking gets reduced to 4: 'If p were true and S were to use method M to arrive at a belief whether (or not) p, then S would believe, via M, that p.' Most of the time majority of people put accept mathematical conclusions and statement based on authority of the book or the mathematician, or simply the mathematics. In such cases the people's tracking of truth reduces to whether the means through which they encounter the statement has preserved the tracking or not. Due to lack of the precise specification of the theory of subjunctives and methods, there exists some ways to deal with cases which are hard, for instance, the case in which a person's beliefs regarding the process through which he has come to acquire the belief regarding P is false — he realizes not that his beliefs have been induced by damages to his brain, or something of that sort.

The Skeptic

Nozick's fundamental, and yet crucial to his system, idea that philosophy must be explanatory and non-coercive is reflected in the relationship that he creates with philosophy's perennial skeptic. He is not unlike those who always attempt to prove that skepticism is not productive and always false or wrong. He attempts to explain the useful role of skepticism, by illustrating that knowledge is possible even when one is floating or dreaming in a tank. This is done by the truth tracking account through the assertion that its subjunctive conditionals are different from that of the entailments, or in simple words by marinating that knowledge does not reach a dead end under logical implication.

Assigning Weight and Indeterminism

Nozick indeterministically construes the life long process of self-definition. The weighting is 'up to us' in the sense that it is undetermined by basic causal factors, even though later action is fully caused by the reasons one has acknowledged. He equates allotting weights in this deterministic sense to the currently orthodox interpretation of quantum mechanics', following von Neumann in understanding a quantum mechanical system as in a super position or probability mixture of states, which changes endlessly as per the quantum mechanical equations of motion and discontinuously via measurement or observation that collapses the wave packet from a superposition to a particular state. Analogously, a person before decision has reasons without fixed weights: he is in a super position of weights. The process of decision reduces the superposition to a particular state that causes action.

NOTES

NOTES

Ethical Pull

It is necessary for the theory of ethical pull to illustrate the basic moral principle based on which someone exerts a moral claim on us. It must also be able to show how this basic fundamental principle restricts the behaviour of the people towards the person who possess this principle. This fundamental basis of morality must be something of immense value. Nozick writes: 'being an I—the self as reflexively self-conscious, adding that the self should be a value seeker. What is wanted is a self seeking value. This leads to a basic fundamental principle of the moral pull, 'Treat someone (who is a value-seeking I) as a value- seeking I.' A treatment such as this needs the outlining of one's attitudes and behaviours to other people, quite similarly as an artisan modifies his actions based on the characteristics and details of his materials.

Responsiveness

It is the ethical responsiveness that deems the fundamental moral principle as something of great value. Ethical or moral responsiveness does not only requires the following rules. What it demands can be understood from some of the basic moral principles against heinous acts such as murder, manipulation, cheating, robbery, and so on. However, there is a general principle which calls for reaction to the very idea of values, with 'intricate implications for animals, trees, ecological systems, and so on.' Moral progress comprises features that call for the ethical response.

According to Nozick responsiveness to value and knowledge belongs to the general group of responsive relation to the reality. The value inherent in responsiveness is not something of special nature, but instead this value for responsiveness comes from value as a degree of the organic unity.

Development and Transformation of the Self

When the development of a hierarchical structure is harmonious, then there is a development of the lower in the hierarchy by the higher, quite similar to the pleasure that an altruist receives in doing good deeds. But because of its connection with the more elemental, the higher becomes less desiccated and less ethereal. Such development becomes an immediate cause for the diminishing of the difference between morality and self-interest. Here Nozick adopts Aristotelian idea that people are most valuable when they attempt to bring out their most valuable attributes and characteristics and cherish them. Those who see values are the reagents of value, and they have a role to realize value, which in itself is 'inert', by bringing it and incorporating it into the human material reality.

Basis of Value

According to Nozick there are five possibilities for one's relation to value:

- (a) **Nihilism:** It means that the world has no inherent value or statements which are true in itself.
- (b) **Realism or platonism:** It says that the existence of values are true, and that their characters do not depend on the subjective choices and behaviours.
- (c) **Idealism or creationism:** It agrees with realism partially, for it too believes that values exist, but it also differs from realism in the fact that it believes that subjective choices and behaviours and attitude affects the character of values.
- (d) **Formationism or romanticism:** It maintains that though the existence and character of value do not depend on subjective choices, the initial stage of the values subjectivity does shape them.

- (e) **Realizationism:** The existence of value is determined by the people, but the character of value remains independent of people's subjectivity.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

5. Fill in the blanks:
- (i) Nozick's notion of state is also known as the _____.
- (ii) Nozick was famous for his curious, exploratory style and _____ ecumenism.
6. What was the aim of the explanatory mode given by Nozick?

NOTES

3.4 SUMMARY

- Antonio Gramsci was the famous philosopher of Italy.
- Gramsci made the distinction between the state and civil society which must be maintained in order to prevent authoritarianism.
- Gramsci also provided the basis for a historical materialist that was described as interdisciplinary research programme.
- Gramsci provides the fertile tools and also the concepts for research into the macro or meta-narratives of modernity and modernization.
- He proposes that the particular interpretation of the foundational concepts of historical materialism breaks with various determinists of deformations of Marx's thought. At the same time Marx's thought was only insisting upon the integrity of his theory which was a tradition of thought that was capable of the renewal through self-criticism.
- Gramsci also said that the hegemony is moral and also intellectual in its leadership nature which treats the aspirations and also views of subaltern class people as an active element within the political and cultural programme of the hegemonic bloc.
- Gramsci's conception of hegemony always revolves around the maintenance of the fundamental groups and also around the mechanism by which the subaltern groups accepts the leadership of another group.
- The idea of power described as hegemony was also influenced by many debates about the civil society.
- Many philosophers have criticized the civil society that was described by Gramsci but the way civil society was narrowly conceived in liberal democratic thought was reduced to an associational domain.
- The goal of civil society was for strengthening the development of policy that can be pursued either in the neoliberal sense for building the civic institutions to complement the states and also the markets. This can also be seen in the Gramscian description about building the civic capacities to think differently and also challenge the assumptions and the norms that can be articulated in the new ideas and visions.
- Gramsci's writings about education were not always easy to understand. In fact that was described as quite confusing during that period. Many times

NOTES

these writings were used by the philosophers in a wrong way or were misinterpreted.

- Robert Nozick was an American political philosopher who was most prominent in the 1970s and 1980s.
- The most famous book of Robert Nozick is *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, which was published in 1974. It was a libertarian answer to John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* published in 1971.
- Part I of Nozick's book justifies a minimalist state, and Part II argues that no more extensive state can be justified. The most important or at least best known section of Part II is Nozick's discussion of the issue of distributive justice.
- *Philosophical Explanations* is a wide-ranging metaphysical, epistemological and ethical treatise written by Robert Nozick. It was published in 1981.
- In *Philosophical Explanations* (1981), which received many awards, Nozick gave novel accounts of knowledge, free will, personal identity and the nature of value and the meaning of life.

3.5 KEY TERMS

- **Political society:** Gramsci described the term political society as the arena of the political institutions and legal constitutional control.
- **Hegemony:** Hegemony is in its simplest sense the ascendancy or domination of one element of a system over others.
- **Anarchy:** It is a political state characterized by the absence of a publicly recognized government or enforced political authority.

3.6 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The period between 1921 and 1926 was known as the Year of iron and fire.
2. When the power is apparently exercised with the consent of its subject, it is called hegemony.
3. Civil society for Gramsci, is a space where the battle for the control of ideas takes place.
4. The significance of Gramsci's analysis is that, in order to achieve socialism, a battle of ideas has to be waged through which proletarian principles, values and theories displace or at least challenge bourgeois ideas.
5. (i) Night watchman theory
(ii) Methodological
6. The explanatory mode aims at exploring possibilities rather than establishing proofs, gathering and ranking a basketful of more or less illuminating theories.

3.7 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. How has Gramsci differentiated between civil society and political society?
2. State Gramsci's views on revolution.
3. What is Gramsci's criticism regarding the subaltern classes?
4. What were the basic aspects on which informal education was based, as given by Gramsci?
5. Differentiate between the terms hegemony and domination.
6. What do you mean by free will?
7. Write a short note on Nozick's book *Anarchy, State and Utopia*.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Discuss Gramsci's views on civil society. Why did he give more importance to civil society in that period?
2. Describe the term hegemony and economism.
3. Discuss the concept of the entitlement theory.
4. Critically examine Gramsci's views on hegemony.
5. Analyze the concept of ideological hegemony as given by Gramsci.
6. Explain the inegalitarian and egalitarian theories.
7. Discuss Nozick's philosophical explanations.

3.8 FURTHER READING

Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wolff, Jonathan. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Strauss, Leo, & Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, David, Janet Coleman, William Connolly (et.al.) 1991. *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grube, G. M. A, C. D. C. Reeve. 1992. *Plato: Republic*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub Co.

Grube, G. M. A. 1980. *Plato's Thought*. Cambridge: Hackett Pub Co Inc.

Balme, D. M. Aristotle. 2002. *Historia Animalium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shields, Christopher. 2007. *Aristotle*. New York: Routledge.

NOTES

UNIT-4 GANDHIAN THOUGHT

Structure

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 Influences of Various Religious Traditions on Gandhian Thought
 - 4.2.1 Influences of Some Great Thinkers on Gandhi
 - 4.2.2 Gandhian Concept of a Universal Religion
- 4.3 Gandhian Socialism
 - 4.3.1 Sarvodaya
 - 4.3.2 Concept of *Varnadharma* or the Natural Classes in Gandhian Thought
 - 4.3.3 Untouchability: A Crime Against God and Man
 - 4.3.4 Gandhi's Views on the Status of Women in Society
 - 4.3.5 Nai Talim: Gandhian Scheme of Education
 - 4.3.6 Environmental Protection and Ecological Way of Living
- 4.4 Political Thoughts of Gandhi: Satyagraha
 - 4.4.1 Techniques of *Satyagraha*
 - 4.4.2 Constructive Programme
 - 4.4.3 *Gram Swaraj* or Village Republics: Gandhian Views on Democracy
 - 4.4.4 *Ramrajya*: Gandhian Concept of True Democracy
 - 4.4.5 Nationalism and Internationalism
- 4.5 Economic Thoughts of Gandhi
 - 4.5.1 Bread Labour
 - 4.5.2 Trusteeship
 - 4.5.3 Gandhi's Attitude Towards Industrialization and Modernization
 - 4.5.4 Concept of Swadeshi
 - 4.5.5 *Hind Swaraj*
- 4.6 Summary
- 4.7 Key Terms
- 4.8 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.9 Questions and Exercises
- 4.10 Further Reading

4.0 INTRODUCTION

Mahatma Gandhi was not an academic philosopher in the accepted sense of the term. His aim in life was realizing truth and non-violence in thought, word and deed and this was reflected in his writings, speeches, plans and schemes.

According to Gandhi, true religion and true morality are inseparable as morality represents the essence of religion. God can be discovered by loving all his creations. This is morality in Gandhi's opinion and clarified by D.M. Dutta when he wrote, 'the path to the realization of the True self or God, therefore, lies through the love of others and the performance of duties towards others as love demands. Morality thus becomes the essence of religion'. Just as water causes the seed to sprout and grow, religion causes moral sense to grow and develop.

Gandhi maintained that morality does not consist of living blindly, but consists of living with the full consciousness and knowledge of love. According to him, morality is obeying the voice of the conscience with the full knowledge of the repercussions. Gandhi believed observances of some cardinal virtues are essential for the strength of morality. He held that following and developing these basic virtues would enable an individual to walk on the right path. He asserted that these virtues are to be practiced in thought, word and deed because the aim of ethical activities is to attain complete purity.

In this unit we shall look into the influences which shaped his thoughts.

NOTES

NOTES

4.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Assess the impact that various Indic and semitic religions had on the life and thoughts of Gandhi
- Discuss the influence of thinkers like John Ruskin, Leo Tolstoy and Swami Vivekananda on the socio-political thoughts of Gandhi
- Discuss the ethical and religious concepts in the socio-political thinking of Mahatma Gandhi
- Identify the cardinal virtues from the Gandhian perspective
- Explain why truth and non-violence were considered the basic principles of the Gandhian thought
- Describe the Gandhian philosophy of end and means
- Explain the concept of God as per the views of Gandhi

4.2 INFLUENCES OF VARIOUS RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS ON GANDHIAN THOUGHT

One of the earliest influences that shaped the life and thought of Mahatma Gandhi is the ancient Indian tradition and he represents all that is best in Indian thought from the early Vedic age to the age of modern Indian Renaissance. The first and foremost influence on Gandhi was that of his mother and it was a religious-minded mother who made Gandhi a deeply religious man. Born and brought up in the Vaishnava tradition, he was also influenced by the ancient Hindu tradition.

God is Truth

A close look into the Gandhian thought reveals that much of his thoughts is based on humanism. Some authors have even suggested that Gandhi's entire beliefs were based on the teachings of the *Upanishads* and the concept of non-violence or love preached by Jainism. As a staunch humanist, Gandhi sought to see God in his fellow beings and he saw God in truth.

Vaishnavism

Another strong influence on Gandhian religious thought can be traced to his affiliation to the traditional Vaishnava heritage of his family. He derived his moral and religious ideas essentially from Hinduism. His first lessons in truth, religion, morality and toleration of other faiths were derived from the Vaishnava religion. The sense of surrendering oneself to God was the basis of Gandhi's philosophy of religion and ethics and is rooted in Vaishnavism. As a staunch Vaishnavite, Gandhi believed that salvation can be attained by devotion to God and service to humanity.

Bhagavad Gita

Gandhi almost always carried the Gita with him. The Gita is the most influential work of Indian philosophy. It tells us how we can attain the final goal of *moksa* or spiritual freedom through *jnana*, *karma*, *bhakti* and *margas*. It speaks of the philosophy of *karma* (action) being based on *gyan* (knowledge) and supported by *bhakti* (devotion). The sole aim of the Gita is to suppress unrighteousness and establish *dharma*. It stands for the universal brotherhood of all beings and highlights the importance of selfless service to benefit the entire cosmos. It instructs people to perform their duty without caring about rewards. When each one does his duty, without selfish desires,

the well-being and the solidarity of the world is preserved. The Gita, thus, is the essence of the teachings of the Upanishads and preaches the message of *Lokasamgraha* or welfare for all.

Gandhi learnt about *karmayoga* or path of action from the Gita. He also expounded the Gita's message of *anasakti* or selfless action and the means of practicing it. According to him, *anasakti* or detachment was a golden means between action and inaction or *karma* and *akarma*. So action without attachment to its fruits was the ideal to be attained. One must be unaffected by pleasure or pain, success or failure and not hanker after any compensation or reward for one's actions.

The spirit of renunciation found in the Gita was what appealed most to Gandhi and the spirit of absolute self-control took possession of his mind from the very first time he read the book. He undertook to become an ideal *sthitaprajna*, a man of renunciation. Renunciation for Gandhi didn't just mean abandoning the world and retiring to the forest. It meant to continue doing one's duty without caring about recompense. Thus, *anasakti*, yoga and *ahimsa* taken from the standpoint of the Gita were the inspiring ideals behind the multifarious activities of Gandhi.

According to Gandhi, one should read Gita to appreciate the excellent union of duty, religion and politics. It was from the Gita that Gandhi built up a basis to the concept of non-cooperation with evil and this formed the foundation of *satyagraha*. He called the Gita his spiritual dictionary for it never failed him in times of distress and he found it free from sectarianism, dogma and it had a universal appeal. Thus, we can see how Gandhi derived almost all concepts of his moral, religious, social and political philosophy from the Bhagavad Gita and it was a source of inspiration for him till the end of his life.

Ramayana

The Ramayana left a deep impression on Gandhi. He was very fascinated by the concept of *Ramrajya* as described in the Ramayana. It was his dream for an independent India to be governed according to *Ramrajya* (divine raj) or perfect democracy, where equal rights are ensured to prince and pauper alike. The Ramayana conveys the message that if any system or order gives priority to the spiritual or human values, then everything in the cosmos falls into its right place. Society would then look like a vast family based on the great concept of '*Vasudaiva Kudumbakam*,' as the whole world would become one family.

The influence of Ramayana on Gandhi was so great, that the last two words uttered by him just before his last breath were '*Hey Ram*'.

Jainism

Jainism's profound influence on the life and thought of Mahatma Gandhi originated from early in his life in Kathiawad, a place where Jain traditions were strongly preserved. In his autobiography, we find him taking a vow before his mother in the presence of Jain monk, Becharji Swami, to keep away from meat, liquor and women in England. Dr. Devanesan says, 'Gandhi could not escape the influence of Jainism since the atmosphere of Kathiawad was impregnated with its teaching and spirit'. He acquired a good deal of knowledge of Jainism from a deeply religious Jain jeweller in Bombay, Raichand. He maintained regular correspondence with Raichand who was a staunch follower of Jainism.

The practice of *ahimsa* was the outcome of his firm conviction in the dignity of all lives and this conviction was the influence of Jainism and Buddhism. For Gandhi,

NOTES

NOTES

Jainism with its doctrine of *syadvada* or *anekantavada* was the most logical of all faiths. A concrete exemplification of *anekantavada* could be found in Gandhi as seen in his respect for other religions. Absolute truth is the final aim of man and we cannot transcend this relative truth.

The influence of Jainism is clearly visible in the Gandhian concept of *satyagraha*, which is a practical form of non-violence. The ideal of the welfare of all, forms the cornerstone of Jain thought and this influenced the Gandhian ideal of *sarvodaya*. Thus, Jainism's three ideas influenced Gandhi the most, *ahimsa* from the religious aspect, *syadvada* from the philosophical aspect and the institution of vows on the ethical side.

Buddhism

Certain aspects of Gandhi's teachings resemble those of Buddha. Gandhi agreed with the wisdom of the eightfold path and four noble truths of Lord Buddha to help the salvation of the human race. The futility of caste distinctions, rites, rituals and dogmas were recognized both by Buddha and Gandhi. Gandhi drew inspiration from Buddha's relentless war against the priestly class which tried to perpetuate unholy discriminations among human beings. Buddha stressed on purity of means which in turn influenced Gandhi who constantly maintained that there is an indissoluble relationship between pure means and noble end. Gandhi became aware of the philosophical basis of *ahimsa* through the teachings of Buddha. He was impressed by the message of compassion communicated by Buddha. By protesting non-violently against the evils in individuals and society, Gandhi was following the footsteps of these great teachers.

Christianity

Christianity and Islam were two important semitic religions, which left a deep impression in the life and teachings of Gandhi. He said that Jesus Christ and Muhammad are world teachers and included Christian and Islamic worship in his Ashram's prayers.

Gandhi finds his concept of *ahimsa* coinciding with the Christian concept of Agape in the New Testament, which meant active unselfish love. Both Christ and Gandhi were concerned with an individual's inner purity and perfection. Their aims were to provide society with a value system, purify the political atmosphere and spiritualize the laws of the state. Though Gandhi remained a Hindu throughout his life, when we strip away all the controversies between east and west and between religions, we can recognize the affinity he had with the faith in Christ.

Islam

Islam like Christianity was a religion of peace for Gandhi. All religions, according to him, seek to establish peace and salvation though through different ways and Islam was not an exception. The term 'Islam' can etymologically be defined as the 'Religion of Peace' as the word has been derived from the Arabic word 'salaam' or 'peace'. Gandhi learnt that, 'the very word Islam means peace which is non-violence. The sword is no emblem of Islam'. The reading of the Holy Quran convinced him of this fact. Gandhi was struck by the Prophet's (Muhammad) greatness, bravery and austere living.

Gandhi learnt the message of universal brotherhood from Islam and declared that 'the point of brotherhood is manifested in no other religion as clearly as in Islam'. He accepts the Quran's faith in a supreme God. Islam also taught the religious principles of toleration, brotherhood of men and absolute self-surrender to God, and all these ideals impressed Gandhi enough for him to practice them throughout his life.

Thus, we see how Gandhi was greatly influenced by the religious heritage of India and he borrowed considerably from Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam.

4.2.1 Influences of Some Great Thinkers on Gandhi

The depth of Gandhi's wisdom and thought reveals to us that he was a man of varied influences and experiences. The writings of John Ruskin, Leo Tolstoy and Henry David Thoreau moulded Gandhi's views on non-violence, civil-disobedience and labour. Along with them we should also mention his indebtedness to his Indian contemporaries like Tilak, Gokhale, Rabindranath Tagore and Swami Vivekananda.

Western Influences

Tolstoy, Count Leo Nikolaevich (1828-1910)

Leo Tolstoy, the Great Russian writer, influenced Gandhi through his famous book, *The Kingdom of God is Within You*. Gandhi read this book in 1894 and as he states in his autobiography, the book overwhelmed him. The underlying theme of the book is the question of violence and its peaceful resolution. Its basic insight remains valid even today. Gandhi confessed that reading this book cured him of scepticism and made him a firm believer in *ahimsa*.

Tolstoy's simplicity of life and purity of purpose influenced Gandhi deeply. He was also fascinated by the new outlook that Tolstoy gave to Christianity. Pure religion, according to Tolstoy, had its source in the unconditional love of God, from which flowed the true love for fellow human beings.

Both Tolstoy and Gandhi firmly believed that non-violence could cure all social maladies, alleviate political ills and establish peace on earth and goodwill amongst mankind. Like Gandhi, Tolstoy was also a great apostle of *ahimsa* and none in the west had so fully understood the concept as Tolstoy. He believed that India's liberation could be achieved when Indians liberated themselves from the belief that violence was the means to their liberation. They needed to believe in the power of soul and *ahimsa*. Tolstoy perceived the importance of truth, love and non-violence and Gandhi grasped the essence of these virtues and led his life directed by them. As it is observed by Christian Bartolf, 'There are many aspects of non-violence in today's life which could give us benefit in case we are prepared and willing to learn from Tolstoy and Gandhi'.

Tolstoy's philosophy of Christian anarchism repudiates the authority of the state and private property. He condemns the state and its machinery, law courts, police and military as all these offend the law of love. The pure ideal of Gandhi's conception of *sarvodaya* is similar to the Tolstoyan ideal of philosophical anarchism, a stateless society, marked by voluntary cooperation. He upheld the Tolstoyan dictum that an ideal state was an ordered anarchy, in which everyone would rule in such a manner that they would never be a hindrance to their neighbours.

Gandhi was indebted to Tolstoy for this philosophy of bread labour too. Thus we see that Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You* made Gandhi realize the infinite possibilities of universal love and sowed the seeds of an invincible belief in non-violence. His admiration for Tolstoy was so immense that he started a community living farm named after him.

John Ruskin (1819-1900)

John Ruskin was another great writer and thinker who influenced Gandhi. Gandhi was inspired by Ruskin's *Unto This Last* and was determined to change his life in line

NOTES

NOTES

with the ideals of the book. In 1903, while Gandhi was travelling from Johannesburg to Durban, one of his friends, Henry Pollack gave him a copy of this book to read during the journey. In his autobiography, Mahatma Gandhi recalled in one of the chapters, 'the magic spell of the book' wherein he describes the effects of Ruskin's famous book. He translated it later into Gujarati and titled it 'Sarvodaya', meaning the rise or welfare of all. According to Gandhi, the central teachings of the book were:

1. The good of the individual lies in the welfare of all.
2. A barber's work is as valuable as a lawyer's as everyone has an equal right to earn their livelihoods.
3. The life of labour, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil or that of a handicraftsman, is a life worth living.

He further acknowledged, '... the first of these I knew, second I dimly realized. The third had never occurred to me. "Unto This Last" made it clear as day light for me that the second and third were contained in the first. I arose with the dawn, ready to reduce these principles to practice'. Gandhi established the Phoenix Settlement near Durban in 1904, to put these ideas into practice. Here we see that Ruskin's 'Unto This Last' had a great impact on Gandhi and made him realize the dignity of labour as well as the ideal of not 'the greatest good of the greatest number', but 'the greatest good of all.'

Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862)

Gandhi was also influenced by the ideas and activities of Henry David Thoreau, the well-known American anarchist who refused to pay taxes as a protest against slavery in America.

Like Thoreau, Gandhi also believed that a free and enlightened state could be established only if people were truthful and non-violent. He held that democracy could only be realized in a stateless society based on truth and non-violence. Gandhi described it as *Sarvodaya*, a state which promoted social welfare along with spiritual upliftment. Thoreau and Gandhi fought for what they believed was right and practiced what they preached. Thus we see that Gandhi heard an echo of his own thoughts in Henry David Thoreau's writings. He freely admitted that the views expressed by him in 'Hind Swaraj' were greatly influenced by the thoughts and writings of Thoreau.

Indian Influences

Tilak, Gokhale, Tagore and Swami Vivekananda influenced the thoughts of Gandhi. Below we will see how the thoughts and ideals of these great Indians are reflected in the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi.

Bal Gangadhar Tilak (1856-1920)

It is worth noting that Gandhi declared Gokhale as his political guru and at the same time described himself as the true disciple of Tilak. The root of Gandhi's theory of political disobedience and ideas of passive resistance lies in the political tradition of extremists like Tilak and Sri Aurobindo. Gandhi's concept of *Anasakti yoga* was advancement over the *Nishkama karma yoga* of Tilak. He held that man should undertake action in a detached manner while performing his *swadharma*. Gandhi developed and improved on Tilak's interpretation of the Bhagavad Gita by giving it a moral and non-violent dimension.

Gandhian politics was a continuation of Tilak's politics and he declared with Tilak that 'swaraj was a birth right.' He also, like Tilak, used religion for political purposes,

but where Tilak's political concern was obvious and immediate and his use of religious argument could easily be connected with his politics, Gandhi entered politics as a matter of necessity as a political leader who had to use religion to support his politics. Tilak gave a mass orientation to the struggle against British rule by mobilizing the masses. He made tremendous sacrifices for the sake of the freedom of the country. As Gandhi considered himself a 'true disciple' of Tilak, he improved on and continued his programmes for the freedom struggle. He based his strategy of agitations on the principles of *swaraj*, *swadeshi*, national education and boycott which had been enunciated by the extremists under the leadership of Bal Gangadhar Tilak. Gandhi, like Tilak, considered it necessary to sacrifice and endure suffering for the cause of our country's freedom. What Gandhi owed to Tilak was the attitude of confrontation with British Bureaucracy and sacrifice and suffering for the freedom of the country.

In spite of the above similarities of views and attributes, Gandhi disagreed with Tilak and other extremists as regards ends and means. While Gandhi believed that the means must be ethically right, pure and non-violent, Tilak had no hesitation in adopting lesser means for a good end. Gandhi's highest priority went to morality and non-violence. Therefore, it may be summed up that though Gandhi considered himself a true disciple of Tilak and shared many ideas of him with the main objective of India's independence, their course of action was different to a great extent.

Gopal Krishna Gokhale (1866-1915)

Gandhi derived the notion of spiritualization of politics from Gokhale. Moreover, his theory of ends and means was drawn mostly from Gokhale's teachings. He learned from Gokhale that the means for bringing about a change in society should be pure, peaceful and legitimate. These means alone could lead to real progress.

Gokhale's firm belief in the need for spiritualization of politics, communal harmony and universal education inspired Gandhi. Both Gokhale and Gandhi excluded narrowness, sectarianism and dogmatism from religion and believed in non-violence and a structured, moral government for the universe. In the words of Gandhi 'Sir Pherozeshah had seemed to me like the Himalayas, Lokmanya like the ocean, but Gokhale was as the Ganges. One could have a refreshing bath in the Holy River. The Himalayas were unscaleable and one could not easily launch forth on the sea, but the Ganges invited one to its bosom'. Thus we see how this moderate leader influenced Gandhi so greatly even though they had a different style of functioning and conflicting views on certain issues relating to modern technology, western education and industrialization.

Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941)

Rabindranath Tagore, a renowned poet of international repute, received the Nobel Prize in 1913 for his contribution to literature. Gandhi called him 'Gurudev' and Tagore was the first person to refer to Gandhi as 'Mahatma'. Tagore played a prominent role in the *swadeshi* movement of Bengal and urged for *swaraj* or self-rule. Like Gandhi, he was also concerned with man and propounded the philosophy of humanism. For both of them humanity stood above everything else. He established Shantiniketan, an educational institution where students could come closer to nature and learn practical skills to round off their education.

Gandhi's 'Village *Swaraj*' and Tagore's '*Swadeshi Samaj*' believed that India's domination by foreign rule could be challenged by the soul-force. Both of them rejected the material civilization of the West.

On many occasions, Gandhi sought Tagore's advice and intellectual support before launching on a major course of action. They were completely in agreement

NOTES

NOTES

on the issue of communalism. Gandhi was the gospel of communal harmony and Tagore criticized communalism fiercely through his writings. Like Gandhi, Tagore also held that the state's function should be restricted because, according to him, it was state's interference that killed the initiatives and inner faculties of individuals.

Alongwith these common ideas shared by Gandhi and Tagore, there were also some differences. They differed on the efficacy of fasting and the non-cooperation movement launched by Gandhi. But inspite of these differences Tagore and Gandhi maintained a close association and friendship and they worked together for the larger goal of national freedom.

Swami Vivekananda (1863-1902)

Swami Vivekananda was another person who exercised considerable influence on Gandhi. Both these great thinkers were of the opinion that one should try to attain self-realization and God-realization through service to humanity. One of the greatest teachings of Swami Vivekananda was the principle of '*Daridra Uarayana seva*' or the worship of Narayana through the service of poor. This concept greatly influenced Gandhi.

From the above account we can sum up that many of the teachings of Swami Vivekananda like equal status of all religions, service to God through humanity, respect for all religions, Neo-Vedanta, etc., greatly influenced Gandhi and he tried to put them into practice in his own life.

4.2.2 Gandhian Concept of a Universal Religion

Religion is a universal phenomenon found in almost all societies and communities. Religion fulfils an unvoiced, deeply felt inner need of human nature and the vast majority of people all over the world crave some form of religious belief. It is the basis of all activities of man, but it is difficult to define. It is a belief in an unseen and mysterious power and man owes his obedience to it. The Oxford dictionary defines religion as, 'Human recognition of super human controlling power and especially of a personal God entitled to obedience and worship, effect of such recognition on conduct and mental attitude'. It can be a remedy to the particular unrest felt by man even when he is fully equipped with the best in his life. There is something beyond the scientific positive knowledge of the day, and no thinking person can ignore it. The essence of all religion is truthfulness, love, oneness, fellowship and toleration.

Mahatma Gandhi cannot be regarded as the founder of a new religion in the actual sense of the term. He learned simply the principles or eternal truths from the greatest traditional philosophical texts and religious teachers of the world. He held that our scriptures have laid down certain self-evident truths as maxims of life. He advised us to live according to these maxims in order to lead a religious life. His contribution lays in the fact that he tried to assimilate in his own way, the teachings that appealed to him and to apply these teachings not only in his personal life but also to social, political and economic problems. Gandhi said, 'Man without religion is a man without roots. Therefore, religion is the basis on which life structure has to be erected if life is to be real'. So he dedicated all his works, social political and economic to the name of God.

Gandhi inherited a deep faith in religion from his family traditions. All his great ideas about truth, non-violence, service, renunciation, morality, etc., are commonly found in all religions. The well-being of man is the touchstone of every religion and it was central to Gandhian thought. French novelist Romain Rolland once remarked,

‘To understand Gandhi’s philosophy, it should be realized that his doctrine is like a huge edifice composed of two different floors of grades. Below is the solid ground work, the basic foundation of religion. On this vast and unshakable foundation is based his political and social philosophy’. Religion, according to him, was not merely a means for personal purification but it was an immensely powerful social bond.

Gandhi’s religious ideas were derived from the conviction that there is only one reality—that of God, who is the embodiment of Truth. As religions are defined as a devotion to some higher principle or power, Gandhi stated, ‘Let me explain what I mean by religion. It is not the Hindu religion.....but the religion which transcends. Hinduism, which changes one’s very nature, which binds one indissolubly to the truth within and whichever purifies. It is the permanent element in human nature which counts no cost too great in order to find full expression and which leaves the soul utterly restless until it has found itself, known its maker and appreciated the true correspondence between the Maker and itself’. From the given explanation, we can understand that for Gandhi, religion is not just a theoretical concept that seeks to satisfy intellectual curiosity and urges. It is the way of life and practical necessity for him. Therefore, he says that religion should pervade every aspect of our life.

For Gandhi, religion and morality were synonymous terms. Religion enables man to have a glimpse of God and it is impossible to achieve this without a fully developed sense of morality. He said, ‘As soon as we lose the moral basis, we cease to be religious. There is no such thing as religion overriding morality. Man, for instance, cannot be truthful, cruel and incontinent and claim to have God on his side’. Religion signifies to him a belief in the supreme moral law that governs the whole universe. He was primarily interested in the ethical aspect of religion. Thus, in Gandhian thought, to reconstruct the society on a non-violent basis, moral discipline of the individual was necessary.

Gandhi recommends that the attitude towards different religions must be one of tolerance and respect. He maintained that, ‘All the great religions of the world stand on a level of equality because they stem from the same God and converge towards the same point. All of them embody truth because they are all divinely inspired’. He found examples of truth and non-violence in all religions. He believed that different religions were just different ways of apprehending the Truth. He held that every religion contains good precepts and noble teachings but some people’s interpretations and commentaries have degraded religion and distorted it.

Equality of religions follows from the fact that truth as known to man is always relative and never absolute. The true and perfect religion splits up into many forms as it passes through the human medium. ‘Even a tree has a single trunk, but many branches and leaves, so there is one true and perfect religion, but it becomes many, as it passes through human medium’. Therefore, Gandhi rejected any claim of superiority or inferiority of status in the matter of religion. Hence, there is a necessity for tolerance and respect for all religions, a more intelligent and purer love for it. Cultivation of tolerance and respect for other faults will impart to us a truer understanding of our own faith also. But it should be noted here that though Gandhi believed that all religions were true, he did not consider them as infallible. Since they were the creation of human beings, they did have imperfections.

Prayer appears to have great importance and value for Gandhi. He was of the opinion that ‘Prayer is the very soul and essence of religion, and therefore, prayer must be the very core of the life of man, for no man can live without religion’. According to him, prayer is a longing of the soul and it is necessary for the soul just as food is

NOTES

NOTES

necessary for the body. Purity achieved through it brings man nearer to God and leads him towards the goal of self-realization. A heartfelt prayer is the most potent instrument man possesses to overcome cowardice and all other weakness. Through this we will be able to gain strength and prepare ourselves to share the sufferings of others.

Gandhi made a successful attempt to provide a synthesis of religion and politics. His political philosophy is only a corollary of his religious and moral principles. His religious views coloured his politics. The religion based politics of Gandhi stresses strongly the policies being guided by with the objective to keep politics away from the evils of corruption and injustice. His religion was the religion that binds man with truth and politics, was a way to seek the truth and serve humanity. He did not believe in the separation of either politics from religion or religion from politics.

To conclude, we can say the universal religion envisaged by Gandhi breaks down the barriers between one faith and the other. He drew out the best from all religions and framed his concept of religion which contributed to the national integration, progress, mutual cooperation and peace in India and the world over.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What was the philosophy of Ramrajya?
2. What beliefs did Gandhi owe Tilak?
3. Which conviction was the basis for Gandhi's religious ideas?

4.3 GANDHIAN SOCIALISM

Gandhi belonged to the group of Neo-Vedanta thinkers of modern Indian thought and so his social philosophy had its basis on Vedanta philosophy. In accordance with the Vedanta philosophy, he held that there is one universal essence underlying all human beings and therefore a law applicable to one person should be applicable to all. His socialism was spiritual in the tradition of Vedanta philosophy. The Gandhian system is based on moral and spiritual forces, i.e., on truth and non-violence and on the development of individual expression and freedom of thought.

Gandhi always appreciated the basic principles of communism, and its aim of a classless society. But he was against the class-war theory of Karl Marx. He wanted to establish a classless society through non-violent means. He said, 'I can, most decidedly, avoid class war if only the people will follow the non-violent method, we seek not to destroy the capitalist, we seek to destroy capitalism. We invite the capitalist to regard himself as a trustee for those on whom he depends for the making the retention of and the increase of his capital'. Here we can see that Gandhi was firm in his belief that it is not possible to establish a just social order on the basis of violence. Instead, he believed that by applying the technique of persuasion and appeal to the innate good sense of the rich and the privileged, they might be made to renounce their privileges and use their superfluous wealth for the welfare of the community. This was a method suggested by Gandhi to bring about a just and equitable social order.

As Gandhi was against violence in any form, he was also against state, which he considered violence personified. Explaining his estimation of the state he said, 'The state represents violence in concentrated and organized form. The individual has a soul, but the state is a soul-less machine, it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence'. According to him, the freedom of the individual and opportunity to develop his personality, whether material, mental or spiritual must be the first concern of society. Gandhi was against the increase in the power of the State because he held that when more power is concentrated in the hands of the state, the opportunity for spiritual progress of the individual decreases.

For Gandhi, the highest goal of life is moral. No nation can hope to prosper, unless all its individuals are morally pure. The state should see that the individuality of the individual is not sacrificed at the altar of the whims of those few who lead the government. Here we see that Gandhi was against communism and in favour of the supremacy of the individual. This doesn't mean that the individual is free to behave as he likes, but he must align himself with what was best for society. He must remain a dutiful and responsible member of the state. Thus, according to Gandhi, though we should have individual freedom, we should learn to adjust our individualism to the requirements of social progress. Gandhi recommends that if the laws of the state are against the rule of ethics then it is the duty of the individual to exercise moral pressure on the State by non-violent non-cooperation. But should the state seek to move along moral lines, the individual must be cooperative. To sum up, according to Gandhi, it is the individuals who make up the state or society and the welfare of the latter depends upon the welfare of the former. This is the basis of Gandhian socialism.

NOTES

4.3.1 Sarvodaya

The idea of *sarvodaya* is the apex of Gandhian socialism. It advocates the concept of organic unity where all individuals have equal importance and the rise of everyone is dependent on the rise of every other. Gandhi's *sarvodaya* ideal thus implies universal welfare and integrated development of all. It is a philosophy which provides a check against the imperfections of the human mind and ensures uniform development of all. The essence of Gandhian philosophy of *sarvodaya* can be traced to the central teachings of India's spiritual thought. According to professor of philosophy J.N. Mohanty, 'the philosophy of *Sarvodaya* is not a set of dogmas, in its essence, it is compatible with an attempt of the spirit to prevail over matter and to socialize itself'. Through *sarvodaya* he wanted to rebuild the nation 'from the bottom upwards' and establish a new social order based on freedom, justice, equality and fraternity.

Sarvodaya: Social Order

Gandhi had a clear vision and definite approach to the problem India faced during his time. Indian society was full of deep rooted evils like caste-conflicts, child marriages, untouchability, *sati*, *pardah*, negation of education to women, dowry, polygamy, corruption, exploitation, etc. Hence it degenerated politically, socially and economically. Gandhi tried to find immediate solutions to these problems through his philosophy of *sarvodaya*. He wanted a new social order in which the poor and the downtrodden would get a just and equitable share in the gifts of nature and have the freedom to enjoy the fruits of labour. His theory of *sarvodaya* advocates the emancipation and realization of the good of all human beings. It means a society based on universal brotherhood.

In a *sarvodaya* society, there is no scope for exploitation, discrimination, inequality and violence. The *sarvodaya* society is an indivisible whole. It cannot be divided into watertight compartments called social, political and religious. He wanted the establishment of a social order based on the principle of truth and non-violence. Self-sacrifice was the essence of such social order. The *sarvodaya* social order based on non-violence is founded on the recognition of this altruistic element in human nature. Every individual should be/needs to be ready and willing to sacrifice his happiness for the sake of others. Everyone should follow the policy of giving and not taking. Our relationship with our fellowmen, in Gandhi's view, presents us with an inescapable moral obligation towards them. We have no right to possess everything while millions remain unclothed and unfed. *Sarvodaya* philosophy aims at the moral and spiritual

NOTES

regeneration of man, who then becomes capable of sacrificing his own interests for the good of the society. Gandhi argued that human culture and civilization are the products of this altruistic element in human nature.

Gandhi not only evolved the concept of *Sarvodaya* but also tried to put it into practice. His first *sarvodaya* community was the Phoenix Settlement near Durban in 1904 followed by another one in 1910 in Johannesburg called Tolstoy Farm. The inmates of these settlements had to perform all work of running the farms so that they become self-reliant and self-sufficient. In fact, through the pursuance of *Sarvodaya* ideals, Gandhi wanted to chart out an alternative course of development.

Sarvodaya: Political Order

Sarvodaya as a political doctrine is mildly anarchist. In fact, the political ideal of *sarvodaya* is anarchism in its own variety. It concedes that a fully stateless society is beyond the reach of man, and the goal of human endeavour can only be to reduce the power of the state to the minimum. Here we can see the influence of Thoreau. As a way of life, *sarvodaya* stands for the self-regulation of individual conduct and for a habit to act on one's own initiatives. As a form of social order, it envisages a society in which police and military will have little to do and the law will have minimum interference. In a non-violent society, according to Gandhi, there is no need of police, military or law courts. Even if they remain, their character and way of operating should be altered. They should consider themselves as servants of the society dedicated to the task of reforming the wrongdoer. Military should be encouraged to promote the ways of non-violence. Hence, we can say that in Gandhi's opinion, in a *Sarvodaya* society, the military, courts of justice and police in the usual sense of the term are deputed to the background. All disputes in the villages are solved by the *panchayats* and crime is reduced to a minimum. Here jails function as reform houses and while serving their term, people are taught a number of handicrafts for their future livelihood. Thus, the police act as social reformers.

The political order of *sarvodaya* is recommended for the ideal state. The governing principle of this ideal state is non-violence. In such a state, there is total absence of political power and each man is his own ruler. As power is decentralized among people, there will be no state in the ordinary sense of the term. As centralization of political power suppresses an individual's liberty, Gandhi favoured the idea of decentralization, which guards the individual's freedom. He doesn't like the glory of state sovereignty because he held that 'political power is not an end in itself but one of the means of enabling to better their conditions in every department of life'. According to Gandhi, the ultimate political ideal is a stateless democracy because state according to him is a 'soulless machine' which thrives on force and rigidity. A *sarvodaya* society, on the other hand, is built on voluntary cooperation based on the goodwill of people. Hence in a *sarvodaya* political order, tyranny of majority rule has no place.

Sarvodaya: Economic Order

Gandhi wanted to formulate an economic constitution for India where no one suffered from want of food, clothing or shelter. Hence his *sarvodaya* economy is founded on principles like simplicity, decentralization, self-sufficiency and cooperation. He wanted to bring about decentralization of economic power in the form of self-sufficient and self-governing village communities. Through this he wanted to find immediate solutions to the modern ills like economic exploitation, arbitrary state power and widening inequalities. Regional self-sufficiency is a must in the *sarvodaya* economic order where people produce whatever they require. Production must be in accordance with

the need and Gandhi preferred 'production by the masses rather than mass production'. His aim for supporting decentralization of economic power is to serve the interest of all the people by preserving and protecting the village industries. He favoured the centralization of heavy industries only if they did not hamper the growth of village and cottage industries.

In Gandhian *sarvodaya* economic order, dependence on another is slavery and self sufficiency is freedom. When every individual is self-sufficient, he can never become a burden to society. If the unit of society is a village with a manageable small group of people, the ideal of self-sufficiency becomes successful. Gandhi said, 'My idea of self-sufficiency is that every village must be self-sufficient in regard to food, cloth and other basic necessities'. He opines that if every village is self-sustained and capable of managing its internal affairs, it can defend itself against the whole world.

Gandhi always stressed that industrialization is not a solution to remove poverty. On the other hand, he had realized that mass production through industrialization is responsible for the global crisis and the mad rush for machinery is succeeding only in the creation of unequal distribution of wealth. He was not totally against all machinery, what he objected to was the craze for their indiscriminate multiplication. He welcomed establishment of factories under state-control, provided they worked for the benefit of mankind.

Gandhi noticed that the deep rooted poverty of the Indian masses is due to their departure from the *swadeshi* principles in the economic sphere. *Swadeshi* in its economic connotation means the use of only those articles which were produced by one's immediate neighbour. Gandhi believes that the economic good of all lies in strictly practicing the principles of *swadeshi*. It is a plea for protecting village industries and the *swadeshi* doctrine was consistent with the law of love and humility.

Gandhi's ethico-economic theory of trusteeship is based on the divine spirituality of man. This means that everyone must have enough for his or her needs. The aim of the trusteeship theory is to avoid concentration of economic power in the hands of the rich and this would reduce exploitation of the weak by the strong. Such a non-violent society helps to foster equality for all and leads to a *sarvodaya* economic order.

Sarvodaya and its Relation with Socialism and Communism

Gandhi called himself a socialist and even a communist but for him socialism and communism were transcendental forms of egalitarian social philosophy that find their fulfilment and culmination in *sarvodaya*. The common point between Gandhi and Marx is the extreme concern of both for the suppressed and the oppressed, the resourceless and the ignorant, the dumb and starving sections of humanity. Jayaprakash Narayan said, 'If we are true socialists, we would be true followers of *sarvodaya* as well'. But there are some differences between the two. *Sarvodaya* pleads for villagization and accepts village ownership whereas socialism believes in nationalization. Secondly, socialism adheres to the concept of violent revolution in some cases but *sarvodaya* has no place for violence in its philosophy.

The difference between *Sarvodaya* and communism are far more basic and fundamental. Communism advocates a violent technique for a change over in favour of an egalitarian society, a society free from exploitation and privilege. *Sarvodaya*, on the contrary believes in persuasion and change of heart. Gandhi believed that *sarvodaya* could be realized only by the application of a moral and ethical method. The advocates of *sarvodaya* also differ from the communists and socialists in respect of the role of the state. Communists and socialists advocate concentration of economic power in

NOTES

NOTES

the hands of the state. But an advocate of *sarvodaya* develops forms of socialist living through the voluntary endeavour of the people rather than seek to establish socialism by the use of power of the state. The remedy here is to establish people's socialism rather than state socialism. Thus, it would be safe to say that *sarvodaya* is far nobler, subtler and has a deeper meaning than socialism or communism. As a universal ideal, it aims at not only fulfilling the minimum material needs but also developing the ethico-spiritual aspects of all people. It is a vision that looks forward to the creation of a welfare state and society.

4.3.2 Concept of *Varnadharmā* or the Natural Classes in Gandhian Thought

Gandhi wanted to give a new meaning and significance to the *varna* system in the social sphere. He used *varnadharmā* as a means to promote human welfare. He held that *varnadharmā* is inherent in human nature and there are mainly four types of *varnas*, i.e., *Brahmana*, *Kshatriya*, *Vaishya* and *Shudra*, and these confer duties, not privileges. He said that 'it is a law designed to set free man's energy for higher pursuits on life'. He defended this system in the sense that there were certain social functions or duties which were related to one's order or status in society. A man was expected to develop his hereditary skills, and thereby follow the vocation of his forefathers. As pointed out by Glyn Richards, 'The law of *varna*, as he (Gandhi) called it, resulted from a realistic appraisal of the fact that men are not born equal in the sense that they do not all have the same abilities. Some are born with definite limitations which they cannot be expected to overcome and what the law of *varna* does is to ensure that each man is provided with a sphere of activity which establishes for him a place in society and guarantees that his labours are rewarded. In this sense the law of *varna* was a good thing and it was Gandhi's conviction that the ideal social order would evolve only when the implications of the law were understood'. Thus, according to Gandhi, the *varna* system was a healthy division of work based on birth.

Gandhi believed that ancient classification of Hindu society into four *varnas* had been made in the spirit of division of labour so that each and every member of the society could contribute to the betterment of society. To put it in Gandhi's own words, '*Varnasrama*, as I interpret it, satisfies the religious, social and economic needs of a community..... observance of the law deviates social evils and entirely prevents the killing of economic competition.... It ensures the fairest possible distribution of wealth. But when people in disregard to the law mistake duties for privileges and try for self-advancement, it leads to confusion of *varna* and ultimate disruption of society'. Gandhi makes it clear that *varna* reveals the duty one has to perform and so the question of superiority or inferiority does not arise here. It carries within it the spirit of duty and service to which one is born. The factor of heredity in it is significant because it helps to avoid the possibility of rift and strife by ensuring fresh distribution of work every day.

All the above said merits of the *varna* system were later misinterpreted and it gave rise to the caste system as it exists today. Gandhi was not in favour of the caste system and considered it as an excrescence upon *varna* which had to be weeded out. The caste system according to him is a manmade institution and had no religious basis. Gandhi was against the gradations of high and low that existed in the caste system. He held that the very question of superiority and inferiority demonstrates the weakness of human nature. The existing structure of innumerable castes was a negation of the old *varna* system. It imposed impediments on the growth of solidarity and was hence detrimental to the well-being of society. It encouraged complicated ritualism and ceremonialism and was against a genuine religious feeling. Therefore, Gandhi made a strong plea for the abolition of all evils and injustice that existed in the name of the

caste system. He pleaded for the restoration of the original *varna* system as he thought it would lead to true socialism. He believed that if these divisions of the *varna* system are understood properly, it would go a long way to build a strong and moral society.

4.3.3 Untouchability: A Crime Against God and Man

As a multifaceted thinker, Gandhi had a new world view where there were no distinctions between religion, nations or races. As a humanist, he was deeply aware that solutions to all social, economic, political and other problems had to be oriented to meet the requirements of every man. He emphasized, 'I shall work for an India, in which the poorest shall feel that it is their country in whose making they have an effective voice, an India in which there shall be no high class and low class of people, an India in which all communities shall live in perfect harmony. There can be no room in such India for the curse of untouchability'. Gandhi laid emphasis on human equality and so his desire for removal of untouchability was as strong as his desire for freedom. Through his writings and speeches, he emphasized the problems of untouchability and the need to remove it from its roots. He called it a curse for society. He maintained that, as originally conceived *varnadharma* had nothing to do with the idea of untouchability. He held that, 'untouchability as it is practiced in Hinduism is...., a sin against God and man and is, therefore, like a poison slowly eating into the very vitals of Hinduism'. This clearly indicates that Gandhi was very concerned about untouchability which was prevalent in Hinduism in the name of the caste system. Keeping to the ideals of social and political justice and equality, he vehemently condemned it as an impassable barrier in the path of India's progress. He strongly advocated that without social and material improvement of those people who are treated as untouchables, India cannot attain true '*swaraj*.'

While defending *varnadharma* as a rational, scientific fact, Gandhi criticizes untouchability as an inmitigable evil. Treating some people as untouchables is an abuse of *varnadharma* for him because according to him, *varnadharma* never entertains the feeling superior or inferior. Gandhi was of the opinion that, '*Varnas* and *Ashramas* are institutions which have nothing to do with castes. The law of *varna* teaches us that we have to earn our bread by following the ancestral calling. It defines not our rights but our duties. It necessarily has reference to callings that are conducive to the welfare of humanity and to no other. It also follows that there is no calling too low and none too high'. He sought to emphasize that in Hinduism there is no sanction for treating a single human being as untouchable. He held that the continuance of untouchability meant a slow destruction overtaking Hinduism. According to him, all men, irrespective of their caste and religion belong to one God and were the expressions of the same God. He said 'the observance of the vow of untouchability is not fulfilled merely by making friends with untouchables, but by loving all life as one's own self. Removal of untouchability means love for, and service of, the whole world, and it thus merges into *ahimsa*'. He considered untouchability as the greatest blot on Hinduism. According to Gandhi, there was immorality, injustice, inequality, inhumanity and soul-destroying nature in the practice of untouchability. God did not create men with the badge of superiority and inferiority. No scripture labels a human being as inferior or untouchable because of his birth, as this is a denial of God. So Gandhi instead of calling these people untouchables, named them *Harijan* or men of God.

To Gandhi, one way of removing the curse of untouchability was to bring about a change in our everyday conduct. He viewed untouchability as a moral problem and believed that it could be mitigated only by change in the hearts and minds of Hindus.

NOTES

NOTES

He felt that this feeling could not be removed by the force of law but the changes had to come voluntarily from the heart. Gandhi was not in favour of legislation for the upliftment of the untouchables. As Gandhi indicates, nothing short of a restoration of the purity of the Hindu way of life would suffice. This would involve an inner change and return to the religious and ethical ideals of truth and *ahimsa*.

As a practical social reformer, Gandhi noticed that inter-dining and inter-caste marriages were not going to abolish untouchability so long as wrong notions of superiority and inferiority existed among the *varnas*. He was totally against the running of separate schools or institutions for the sole benefit of the Harijans as these further perpetuate the idea of separation and inferiority for Harijans. He strongly felt that real cure lies in a change of heart. He prescribed a change in the social attitude towards lower castes by considering them equals. His approach was to bring change in the minds of higher castes by expressing the hollowness of untouchability. As Gandhi viewed that every fight against untouchability is a religious fight, he believed that it can only be eradicated when the majority of Hindus realized that it is a crime against God and man. It involved a change of attitude to human relationships and to states of affairs. Social change is a corollary of inner change and, therefore, although social change is not a sufficient condition, it may be regarded as a necessary condition for the amelioration of the lot of the Harijans. As a part of his constructive programme, Gandhi wanted to provide quality education to Harijans or untouchables so that they could stand equal to upper caste.

Gandhi appealed to the dominant castes to learn to respect human values and treat all equally. Focusing on the removal of untouchability, gaining access to temples, imparting education for children of lower castes, dignity of labour and village reconstruction, he wanted to bring about the social and material improvement of the *Harijans*. For this, he tried to bridge the gap between the upper and the lower castes. Thus, Gandhi's attitude towards untouchability springs from his basic conviction that we are all one in that we share the same *atman* or soul. *Sarvodaya* in Gandhi's view included the welfare of the untouchables in Hindu society and the restoration of their human rights.

Though Gandhi could not abolish the practice of untouchability, through his efforts he was able to make the practice of untouchability less socially acceptable.

4.3.4 Gandhi's Views on the Status of Women in Society

Gandhi gave a totally new perspective regarding the role of women in Indian society. He wished that women be given full freedom in social, economic and political spheres. He believed that in *sarvodaya* society women should not regard themselves as dependent, weak or helpless. Gandhi wanted women to share an equal status with men. There is no difference in the basic mental faculties of man and woman and so she too deserves the same liberty and freedom.

According to Gandhi's basic principle of essential oneness of humanity, men and women cannot be regarded as different. However, men have tended to dominate women with the result that women have developed an unfortunate sense of inferiority and have come to believe that they are inferior. Gandhi recognized that women were made to feel subordinate to men through several social practices. He devoted a great deal of time and energy to the removal of many Indian customs that stood as a barrier to the empowerment of women.

Gandhi wanted men and women to enjoy absolute equality in public life and believed that women should suffer no legal disabilities. He wanted women to have

voting right and both men and women to play a meaningful role in the family and social system. Women should have the right to participate in every activity, just like men. Gandhi further emphasized that a husband and wife were like two wheels of a carriage and if one wheel remained in working condition but the other went out of order, the carriage would not run properly. He aspired that women should be given full protection in social, economic and political spheres. He also recommended equal wages for women. According to him, in a non-violent struggle women could make greater contributions than men because non-violence calls for suffering, and women could suffer more purely and nobly than men. He declared that to call women the weaker sex was gross injustice. In a non-violent society, women should be treated as an equal partner to man in all spheres of life. Gandhi considers women not as the weaker sex but the female sex. He says, 'To call woman the weaker sex is libel, it is man's injustice to woman. If by strength is meant brute strength, then indeed is woman less brute than man. If by strength is meant moral power, then woman is immeasurably man's superior'. Hence he called women the incarnation of '*ahimsa*' and added that women should proudly occupy their rightful place by the side of men. Women should teach the art of peace to the warring world. Gandhi considers that woman is the personification of strength, endurance and self-sacrifice, but she does not realize what tremendous strength she possesses. So Gandhi insisted on a fundamental respect for her personality and an equal status for woman with man.

Gandhi believed that men and women are quite different by nature. Hence their vocations should be different. Men generally lack the qualities that make women good, nurturing mothers. However, he would not restrict women to household management. He would like them to make their contribution in every field of society.

Gandhi's attitude towards the evil customs against women

Gandhi strongly fought against all the evil customs against women which existed in India at that time.

- **Child marriage:** Gandhi thought this was a crime both against God and men and condemned it in his writings and speeches. He looked at the practice of child marriage as a moral and physical evil because he believed that both the boy and the girl should be developed physically and mentally at the time of marriage and that they should choose their own life partner. To him, it made innocent girls the object of man's lust, ruined the health of a child mother and converted tender aged girl into widows.
- **Purdah:** Another restriction imposed on women that Gandhi vigorously opposed was that of *purdah*. The main purpose of *purdah* was to preserve the purity of women by keeping them confined. At best it was an attempt by husbands to protect their wives from marauding male predators. At worse it was a violation of basic human rights which resulted in wives being treated as slaves, or as the property of their husbands. Gandhi regarded '*purdah*' as immoral, for it impeded the march towards '*swaraj*' by restricting women. It not only denied freedom, but also restricted access to light and fresh air. He refused to accept the argument that a veil protects the women morally and physically. Rather he felt it generated feelings of insecurity and inferiority in women. He firmly believed that it was not *purdah* put purity which works as a shield and gives protection to the women against a man with malicious intentions. He was sure that abolition of *purdah* would help women in gaining strength and becoming active participants in the struggle for '*swaraj*.'

NOTES

NOTES

- **Dowry:** Gandhi believed that the custom of dowry turned young girls into mere chattels to be bought and sold. It greatly lowered the status of women, destroyed their sense of equality with men and defiled the purity of the institution of marriage. Not being able to arrange for the money demanded, parents were forced to give away their daughters in marriage to unworthy suitors. He condemned the system and said that it was nothing but the selling of girls. To curb the dowry system, he wanted parents to educate their daughters so that they were empowered to refuse to marry young men who demanded dowry, preferring to remain spinsters.
- **Sati:** The most notorious of the custom concerning women was 'sati'. Gandhi found the roots of the *sati* system lay in the blind egoism of men. He regarded it as a futile exercise, as instead of restoring the dead husband to life it took away one more life. It was believed the status of being *sati* was the acme of purity. Gandhi believed that this purity could not be attained by dying. It could be attained only through constant striving of the spirit.

Education for Women

Gandhi claimed that lack of education and information is the root cause of all the evils against women. Education is as necessary for women as it is for men. He believed that low levels of literacy among women had deprived them of a socio-politic power and knowledge about their rights. Education is the most important instrument for bringing about the desired changes. He campaigned for proper education for women, as he believed that after receiving education, they would become sensitive to the glaring inequalities to which they are subjected. Many women's education centres came up in different parts of the country due to his efforts. According to Gandhi, the real wealth that parents can bequeath to their children, is strength of character and a good education. However, he did not recommend an education which aped the mannerisms of the West but wanted an education suitable to the Indian genius and environment.

Women and Economic Activity

Gandhi believed that economic freedom could indirectly play a vital role in the empowerment of women. Gandhi did not favour women going out of their homes for livelihood as he regarded their duties at home as important as man's duty to earn. He wanted women to work without disturbing their routines at home. He wanted them to take up some work, which would supplement the earning of the family e.g. spinning. Apart from supplementing the family income, it could go a long way in bringing about total change in the lives of women.

Gandhi presented the economy of the spinning wheel and supported *khadi* as a supplement to and co-extensive with agriculture. In his view, women were best suited to take up spinning and propagation of *khadi*. According to him, for the middle class, it would supplement the income of the family and for the very poor it would be a means of livelihood. He further added that the spinning wheel should be the widow's companion. He was also of the view that the *Charkha* would enable women to safeguard their virtue. He encouraged women to be economically independent. In fact he supported that women should have the confidence to ask their husbands where the money he earned came from, and if it was through ill begotten means, she should refuse to have any part of it.

Marriage

Gandhi recommends that the goal of marriage must be the same as the goal of life itself, i.e., it must be a means for realizing spiritual life. 'The ideal that marriage aims at is that of spiritual union through the physical. The human love that it incarnates is intended to serve as a stepping stone to divine or universal love.' It should be a spiritual as well as a physical union. Human love is a stepping stone to divine or universal love. Friendship and companionship should be involved in marriage and not simply the satisfaction of sexual desire. Therefore, married life must be training in spiritual love. The husband and the wife must cultivate a sense of companionship and a pattern of cooperative living. Gandhi considers that the relationship between a wife and a husband is a sacred bond guided by a law of discipline, which must be observed by both. The wife cannot be subordinate to her husband in any way. She is not her husband's slave but his better half, his colleague and friend. She is a co-sharer with him of equal rights and equal duties.

Women and Nation

Gandhi was of the opinion that India can defend herself and make progress through non-violence alone and that women could take the lead in this for God had endowed them with great powers. He believed that the salvation of any society or nation lies in the hand of mothers. She is the creator, the teacher and the guide of the human race. Women were endowed with the role and responsibility to influence and inspire their children to realize higher ideals, noble qualities and healthy dispositions in life which made them happy, peaceful and harmonious individuals. Unless women are loved and respected, unless they are healthy and happy, there will never be peace, happiness and prosperity in the country. He maintained that the women of India had the strength, ability, character and determination to stand on their own and work shoulder to shoulder with men in every sphere of life. He had full faith in their sincerity and ability and he called upon women to join the freedom struggle. Women came in great numbers to answer Gandhi's call and acted upon his advice by participating in the social and political movements.

4.3.5 Nai Talim: Gandhian Scheme of Education

Gandhian philosophy of *Sarvodaya* is an attempt at the reformation of society and also the re-orientation of the human mind. Gandhi feels that for the rejuvenation of a society, education as a science of individual development should march alongside social progress. The aim of education should be the integral development of human personality — physical, intellectual and spiritual.

Gandhi was not in favour of the prevailing system of education in India. He condemned the existing system on three grounds. Firstly it was based upon foreign culture to the entire exclusion of indigenous culture. Secondly, it not only ignored the culture of the heart and the hand, but was confined to the head. Thirdly, real education was impossible through a foreign medium, i.e., English. In Gandhi's view, the system of education implemented by the British did not contribute to the welfare of the people in India or to their moral and spiritual well-being. Rather it served to alienate Indians from their heritage and created educated elite who had no roots in the country. Such an education merely imparted instructions, or made man literate, but literacy was not education. He said, 'Education was the development of the innate potentialities of the child for a nobler and divine life. The aim of education should be the harmonious development of human personality'. Gandhi defines, 'By education, I mean an all

NOTES

NOTES

round drawing out of the best in the child and man – body, mind and spirit'. All true development is self-development. At the same time, education that neglects the physical faculties for the exposition of the inner spirit violates the basic purpose of education. Thus Gandhi insisted on giving equal importance to body as well as mind.

Gandhi's scheme of education is known as 'Basic Education', which aimed at bringing a silent social revolution. Basic education is the most simple in nature and it forms the base from which human development starts. For this basic education, he coined a new phrase '*Nai Talim*' in which craft and industries were the medium of imparting education. Gandhi was well aware that higher education without vocational training creates students fit only for white collar jobs which were limited. It does not enable them to earn their livelihood and this was a major cause for unemployment in our country. The function of '*Nai Talim*' is not only to teach an occupation, but to mould the overall development of man. Gandhi had devised the theory of craft education after carefully studying the conditions of rural India. Apart from experimenting with this scheme in his life he also extended this to the life of the children at the Phoenix Settlement, Tolstoy Farm, Sabarmati Ashram and Sevagram. Basic education propagated that one would learn better if he carried out practical learning alongside book learning.

Stages of basic education

In the Gandhian scheme of '*Nai Talim*', the pre-basic education starts from the age of two and half to seven. At this stage education concentrates on health and hygiene, games and minimum physical labour, knowledge of language and arithmetic. The next stage of education is basic level, which ranges from the age of seven and continues till fifteen. At this level of education the students choose a basic craft and learn it, so later it can be the means to earn a livelihood. Post-basic education helps awaken a keen desire and enthusiasm among the youth for the establishment of an ideal community. Integration and harmonious development of head, heart and hand is possible at this level. Students above eighteen are fit for higher education. They receive knowledge through action and development of personality. This is called self-study.

Features of basic education

Gandhi believes in the essential goodness of the nature of the world. He wanted that education be imparted in the natural surroundings of the child. He pleaded that education should be imparted in the mother-tongue of the child. To him, learning in a foreign language is artificial and unnatural. He recommended that the needs of the locality should be given prominent place in education.

In order to meet the situation in real life, Gandhi wanted every child to be equipped with proper knowledge and skills. He considered every craft as a project.

Gandhi envisioned the following aims of education:

- Bread and butter aim: Education must be able to empower an individual to earn his bread and butter. He believed in the policy of learning while earning.
- Cultural aim: For the Gandhi, culture is the quality of the soul and this quality can only be developed through education. The culture that children get from their school should be reflected in their conduct, behaviour, speech and in the way they behave towards others and elders.
- Character aim: The goal of all knowledge should be building up of character, which implies cultivation of moral ventures. To him, education without character training is a waste and meaningless. Gandhi did not consider education as just

a means to earn a livelihood and acquire status in society. Instead, he considered self-respect, dignity, character and purity of personal life as far more worthy ambitions to achieve.

- Harmonious development aim: Man is a trinity of body, mind and spirit. Thus, true education is that which develops the physical, intellectual and spiritual aspects of the child. According to Gandhi, man is neither mere intellect, nor gross animal body, nor the heart nor soul alone. A proper and harmonious combination of all three is required for the making of the whole man and constitutes the true economics of education.

The ultimate aim of Gandhi is self-realization. To him, education must train the material man to evolve himself as divine. He laid more emphasis on the moral aspect than on the intellectual aspect of education. His firm conviction about the power of truth, love and *ahimsa* made him base his idea of education on these principles. He wanted every person to be physically, mentally and spiritually trained to realize truth and love in every sphere of life.

Gandhi has advocated an activity-oriented curriculum. It included community work, corporate living and social service. A student's participation in socially useful productive work with dignity should be a compulsory part of the curriculum. The following are the contents of an ideal syllabus:

- A basic craft in accordance with the local conditions. It may be agriculture, spinning, pot-making, metal or wooden work.
- Mother-tongue
- Arithmetics
- Social studies
- General science including, botany, zoology, physiology, hygiene, chemistry and physical culture
- Art work
- Drawing and music

When Gandhi combined work and learning in his system of education, he assessed that it would benefit India, as he thought that the divorce between education and manual labour is what had led to a neglect of the villages. According to Gandhi, the attitude of superiority displayed by members of the educated elite towards manual labour, alienated man from his fellow man and created barriers in society. Hence, we say that the methodological changes suggested by Gandhi for the educational system of India involved not only the recognition of the importance of the provincial languages and their use as the media of instruction in schools but also the recognition of the need to cultivate a proper attitude to manual labour.

According to Gandhi, teachers of basic education should possess originality and enthusiasm. They must have creative genius and illustrative talent. They must have the freedom to follow their own style of teaching. Given the right kind of teachers, the children will be taught the dignity of labour and they will learn to regard it as an integral part of their intellectual growth.

Education through work can make people self-reliant. 'Mere transmission of information by the teachers to the students is not proper education. But inculcation of attitude to learn from one's own experience in every field of life should be the basic aim of education. This education will provide ample opportunity for self-employment and will check the rush of the youth to town and cities...'. Thus we

NOTES

NOTES

see that besides possessing psychological, biological and sociological soundness, Gandhi's philosophy of education combines the essentials of the philosophical doctrines, namely, naturalism, idealism and pragmatism. It was tailor made for educating rural India.

One of the main advantages of this system was that unlike the present day education system, the individual actually learnt things that he could put to use. Therefore Gandhi says, 'We have up to now concentrated on stuffing children's minds with all kinds of information, without ever thinking of stimulating and developing them. . . . You have to train the boys in one occupation – you will build up his mind, his body, his handwriting, his artistic sense and so on'. There is yet another advantage of this kind of education. It became the spear head of a silent social revolution. It brought city life and village-life closer, and sought to eradicate the evils of class difference. It tried to prevent the decay of village culture and the lust for city-life and thus lay the foundation of a just social order giving equal opportunity and initiative to every individual.

In Gandhi's scheme of education, there is no place for compulsion because what is learnt unwillingly becomes dead knowledge, which is less than ignorance. Punishment does not purify, rather it hardens the children. While imparting education the mental aptitude of the children needs to be carefully studied. Therefore, basic education is said to be a method of transforming the present social structure and to lay the foundation of a world social order based on the acceptance of human values. So in order to rear the children for peace and human happiness, the entire plan and system of education should spring out of non-violence and love, which can touch their loving emotions and noble sentiments. In the present context what is needed to make democracy function is not the knowledge of facts, but right education which can be imparted through the Gandhian scheme of 'Basic Education' or '*Nai Talim*'. This system of education can solve some of the problems of present day society, especially the problem of unemployment to some extent.

4.3.6 Environmental Protection and Ecological Way of Living

Gandhi's faith in nature cure is also a step towards environmental protection. Nature cure implies two things – ideal way of life and faith in God, both of which are conducive to the solidarity of the environment. An ideal way of life and environment conservation are both interdependent. In an ideal way of life, there is no room for illness or disease. Similarly in an ideal socio-economic system, there is no room for pollution and depletion. Nature cure is man's return to nature and natural life. Gandhi says 'the science of natural therapeutics is based on the use of the same five elements in the treatment of disease, which constitute the human body. They are earth, water, ether, sunlight and air'. If we turn towards nature cure, many of the environmental problems will be solved.

Gandhi prescribes an ecological way of living. His attack on western civilization in his *Hind Swaraj*, is in fact, an attack on the materialistic way of life. According to Gandhi, our civilization, our culture, our '*swaraj*' depends not upon multiplying our wants, self-indulgence, but upon restricting our wants i.e., self-denial. In true civilization, a simple and moral life of self-restraint is vindicated. This life-style alone can preserve the harmony of internal and external environments. Happiness is the goal of our life. A man is not necessarily happy because he is rich and unhappy because he is poor. Happiness is least concerned with the satisfaction of our wants and passions. Over consumerism is not the mark of advancement in Gandhian thought. Satisfaction of basic needs like food, clothing and education is enough for a civilized man.

Gandhi believes in voluntary poverty. He is against any kind of hoarding. Thus, he advocates a radically different way of life – a life based on the values of simplicity, morality and spirituality. If these values are actualized among the masses, we need not bother about satisfying our needs. For, ‘Nature has given enough to satisfy our needs, but not our greed...world does not have sufficient things to meet the greed of a single person’. This lifestyle has a direct impact on our environment. The excessive exploitation of natural resources and its depletion can be reduced if we consume less. We shall not need high technology based industry to speed up production and this will save the environment from being polluted. Thus, for Gandhi, environmental challenges are ultimately moral challenges which can be met only by a change in our value system.

Gandhi’s concept of economy is also ecological. The economy which can preserve the health of man as well as nature can be called an ecological economy. The ideal of Gandhi’s economy is not to raise the standard of living of man, but to heighten the status and dignity of man. He believes in the economy of less wants. In order to realize this ideal and maintain the harmony of nature he suggested:

- Instead of mass production, there should be production by the masses. This will not only generate employment opportunities for all but also control monopoly.
- Promotion of agriculture and cottage industries including *khadi* will not only supply the primary need of the people, but will also save the environment from pollution.
- Gandhi suggested the idea of trusteeship to give economy a social basis. It will be humanitarian and so competition and production of luxury items will vanish forever. There would be no exploitation which would result in an extra burden on earth.

From the above discussion, it becomes clear that Gandhi dwelled on a number of social issues that, according to him, needed to be addressed simultaneously to strengthen the political campaign against foreign domination. He fought against all social evils that thrived on illiteracy, superstitions, and vested interests and tried to eradicate them through his reforms and programmes. Through this he succeeded in mobilizing class, caste, community and gender divided Indian society into a cohesive political force against the British Empire for the freedom of our country.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

4. What was the similarity between Gandhi and Marx?
5. List the two ideas about women that Gandhi believed in.
6. State the two features of basic education.

4.4 POLITICAL THOUGHTS OF GANDHI: SATYAGRAHA

Satyagraha is the heart and soul of Gandhism. The idea and practice of *satyagraha* is Gandhi’s unique contribution to political thought. It is described as ‘the relentless pursuit to truthful ends by non-violent means’. It is the weapon of the non-violent struggle. It is an ideal weapon for the war of righteousness and in essence is the introduction of truth in political life. It is a direct corollary of truth and non-violence. It is the way in which *ahimsa* is implemented or put into action. In it, there is always unflinching adherence to truth and our inner voice, which is the voice of truth and justice.

Gandhi was aware that a theoretical emphasis on the value and importance of truth and non-violence would lead us nowhere unless we put it into practice. This

NOTES

NOTES

feeling took him to develop a technique of truth and *ahimsa*, which he named *satyagraha*. *Satyagraha* is a synthesis of the Sanskrit words '*satya*' (truth) '*agraha*' (insistence or holding firmly to). Hence the literal meaning of the word '*satyagraha*' is 'insistence on truth or holding firm to truth. The concept of *satyagraha* gave practical expression to the religious and ethical ideals of truth and non-violence. As the technique of *ahimsa*, it put the ideal of non-violence into practice and was informed by the spirit of truth. This if translated into English means truth force or a soul force or love force. It forged a bond between his actions and his basic beliefs concerning the nature of man and the nature of reality. His religious and metaphysical beliefs concerning truth or God, the soul or *atman*, and the essential unity of all existence were given existential expression through the principle of *satyagraha*. Gandhi kept experimenting with this technique throughout his life. This new method of *satyagraha*, according to Gandhi would activate the soul, mobilize its enormous latent energy and generate a new kind of spiritual power that had hitherto not been given its due place in political life. It should aim to open up the opponent's mind and heart so that rational discussion could take place in a climate of good will and central self-realization. It was a 'surgery of the soul', a way of activating 'soul force'. For Gandhi, 'suffering love' was the best way to do this. According to Gandhi, the *satyagrahi's* love and moral mobility would disarm his opponent, weaken his feelings of anger and hatred, and mobilize his higher nature.

Satyagraha is a technique to resist evil with all the moral and spiritual force that a person can command. Whenever one confronts injustice and untruth, one can resort to *satyagraha*. Thus, *satyagraha* is strength for truth and so a *satyagrahi* who wages a non-violent struggle, needs to be absolutely sure that the cause for which he is fighting for is absolutely true. The essence of *Satyagraha* is that it seeks to eliminate antagonisms without harming the antagonist themselves. This is in contrast to violent resistance, which is meant to cause harm to the antagonist. Gandhi contrasted *satyagraha* or holding on to truth with *duragraha* or holding on by force. *Duragraha* is a means to protest where opponents are harassed rather than enlightened as in the case of *satyagraha*. *Satyagrahi's* objective is to convert, not to coerce the wrong doer. The doctrine means the vindication of truth not by infliction of suffering on the opponent, but on oneself.

Gandhi's revolutionary techniques to address social and political conflict have drawn considerable attention from the international community. Referred to as *satyagraha*, these principles have been described as Gandhi's distinctive contribution to the field of conflict resolution. Thus, it is the method adopted by Gandhi for bringing about social change involving conflict that cannot be addressed through available means of persuasion. It is Gandhi's invaluable contribution for resolving conflicts in society and a step forward in the direction of social reconstruction.

Salient Features of Satyagraha

Satyagraha demands a deep sincerity and vigorous love for truth. It works on the conviction that truth represents the will and ways of God. Again, *satyagraha* is essentially based on love. It appears to Gandhi almost as a religious pursuit. It rests on a religious belief that there is one God behind everything and everyone. This is the basis of love, and unless one has this basic love for mankind he cannot practice the technique of *satyagraha*.

Gandhi describes *satyagraha* as a force against violence, tyranny and injustice. All these evils arise on account of a neglect of the truth. Hence, Gandhi says that if

we start resisting evil with evil, violence with violence, anger with anger, then we are only adding fuel to the fire. The most effective force against these evils can be one which would force them to evaporate, and that can be done by *satyagraha*.

Satyagraha is based on the conviction that there is an element of essential goodness in every man as everyone has a piece of divinity within himself. Evils result because this element is either pushed to the background or is clouded by passion, hatred and anger. The principle of non-violence is challenged every evil thought, lying, hatred and wish for ill-will. It is a state of physical and mental discipline that can bring about a change of heart in the so-called enemies. The moment this element of goodness is aroused, the individual himself will realize the wrong that he had been doing. The *satyagrahi* can do this by subjecting himself to suffering for the sake of truth. *Ahimsa* is conscious suffering. The *satyagrahi* therefore, suffers and thereby converts the opponent. Gandhi had a firm conviction that important things in the world ought to be achieved only through suffering. He said, 'Suffering is the law of human beings, war is the law of the jungle. But suffering is infinitely more powerful than the law of the jungle for converting the opponent and opening his ears, which are otherwise shut, to the voice of reason'. Thus Gandhi's *satyagraha* through self-suffering is an active moral weapon to help the individual achieve higher goals for the sake of his own community. Here, we see that the technique of *satyagraha* is based on a few tenets namely, truth, *ahimsa* and self-suffering.

Satyagraha demands extreme patience on the part of the *satyagrahi*. He must wait patiently for the good sense of the wrong-doer to prevail. It is through patient persuasive reasoning together with voluntary suffering that the *satyagrahi* must seek to melt the heart of the wrong doer and open his eyes to the truth. Thus, *satyagraha* is based on the conviction that through love, *ahimsa* and conscious suffering the forces of evil can be neutralized.

Gandhi believed that his technique was universal in its application. It can be practiced by children and adults, by men and women, by individuals and communities and by societies and nations. It requires no physical assistance or material and is capable of being exercised by men, women and children alike. It can be put to use on all possible fronts — domestic life, social and political. Its universality is derived from the fact that it is the way of God. But Gandhi also stressed the fact that if *satyagraha* is used for an unjust cause then only the person who uses it suffers. Since no violence is involved, others do not suffer from the *satyagrahi's* mistakes, only the *satyagrahi* himself.

Satyagraha is based on moral force, the force of truth and justice, the force of self-purification and self-suffering, love and service, courage and discipline. Therefore, the entire gamut of the philosophy of *satyagraha* is based on the fact that truth, *ahimsa* and morality alone can be victorious and we cannot adopt immoral principle to create a moral society.

Satyagraha vs Passive Resistance

Gandhi made an explicit distinction between *satyagraha* and passive resistance. *Satyagraha* is active resistance, acting on the path of truth. Distinguishing it from passive resistance Gandhi pointed out, '*Satyagraha* differs from passive resistance as the north pole from the south. The latter has been conceived as a weapon of the weak and does not exclude the use of physical force or violence whereas the former has been conceived as a weapon of the strongest and excludes the use of violence in any shape or form'.

NOTES

NOTES

The difference between the two can be summarized as:

Satyagraha

- It is a weapon of the strong.
- It avoids violence in any shape or form.
- It totally rejects physical force even under unfavourable conditions.
- It does not accept the injuring of one's opponent.
- It adopts non-violence.
- It proceeds on the active principle of love.
- It brings about a change in heart.

Passive Resistance

- It is a weapon of the weak.
- It adopts violence to gain its ends.
- It uses arms even during situations which do not require it.
- It contains the idea of harassing others.
- It adopts non-violence as an outward form only.
- It proceeds on the negative principle of hatred.
- It encourages the harming the enemies.

The most important characteristic of *satyagraha* is that it can be used most successfully even by one individual and that too in every sphere of life, whereas passive resistance is mainly contemplated at a large scale political level. *Satyagraha* contemplates action in resistance to injustice. But there is no internal violence towards the enemy. *Satyagraha* goes beyond passive resistance in the stress on a spiritual and moral teleology because the final source of hope and consolation for a *satyagrahi* is God.

Thus, passive resistance according to Gandhi is a 'negative' concept and has little in common with the 'active' principle of love on which *satyagraha* is based.

4.4.1 Techniques of *Satyagraha*

Gandhi compared *Satyagraha* to a banyan tree in which *satya* (truth) and *ahimsa* (non-violence) together represent the parent trunk with innumerable branches like non-cooperation, civil disobedience, direct action, fasting, economic boycott, strike, *dharna*, picketing, non-payment of tax, etc. All these techniques were not equally favoured by Gandhi. The forms of *satyagraha* that Gandhi favoured most were civil disobedience, non-cooperation, direct action, fasting and boycott. The technique of *satyagraha* thus employs various methods to be used in successive stages and many of them simultaneously.

Civil disobedience

Civil disobedience is a protest against unjust laws. It is an active, strong and extreme form of *satyagraha*. Gandhi defines it as the breach of immoral statutory enactment. He seems to be influenced by Thoreau in this regard and accordingly he feels that it is morally proper to be right and true than to be law abiding. It is a powerful and peaceful substitute to an armed revolt. It is the inherent right of every citizen. Gandhi considered it as, 'a substitute for violence or armed rebellion. It is a non-coercive method which

any law abiding citizen can adopt, provided he is saturated with the spirit of non-violence and is ready for the utmost sacrifices'. There may be individual or mass civil disobedience. Civil disobedience is primarily of two types, offensive or assertive and defensive. Either of the two types may be offered singly by individuals or by masses collectively. But where individual civil disobedience is self-led, mass civil disobedience needs leadership. Gandhi considered individual civil disobedience as more effective. It is not dependent on any fixed number. It appeals to the heart of the evil doer and one genuine civil resister can fight against the whole world to win the war of justice. Gandhi resorted to this technique chiefly in South Africa when he protested against the unjust, discriminatory racial laws.

Non-cooperation

It is the withdrawal of all support from the unjust ruling power. It is a protest against unwilling participation in evil acts. Gandhi admittedly learnt the technique of non-violent non-cooperation from Leo Tolstoy. It is used to awaken the masses to their dignity and power. It is used non-violently without any malice, ill-will or hatred towards anyone. It is the most expeditious method known of winning over opponents. It entails the renunciation of the benefits of a system with which we do not agree with. Non-cooperation, according to Gandhi, is essentially a cleansing process. It affects the *satyagrahi* more than the party and is able to give to the *satyagrahi* power to face evil and to endure suffering. It is using love for the redressal of wrongs. Its objective is not to punish the enemy but to change him through humanitarian service. Though, 'non-cooperation is one of the main weapons in the armoury of *satyagraha*...it is only a means to secure the cooperation of the opponent consistently with truth and justice'. Non-cooperation, as Gandhi conceives it, amounts to a kind of a refusal on the part of the exploited to succumb to exploitation. It may be resorted to in the form of strikes, *hartals*, boycotts and resignation from offices and titles. *Swadeshi* may be regarded as a best example for this form of *satyagraha*.

Hence both non-cooperation and civil disobedience imply a form of resistance to unjust laws. As long as a government is just, it is the duty of the citizen to support it, but when the actions of a government hurt the individual and harm the nation, it is the duty of a citizen to withdraw his support. It is his duty to practice non-cooperation and civil disobedience, but he must always be on his guard against acts of violence.

Direct action

Gandhi considered it inevitable for *Satyagraha* to become assertive when non-cooperation alone did not work. It took on the form of an open and mass rebellion. Although the word rebellion has associations with violent ways, direct action is essentially non-violent. It is direct in the sense that there is no secret about it. The best example for this kind of *Satyagraha* is the 'Quit India' call given by Gandhi in 1942.

Boycott

Another method of *satyagraha* as advocated by Gandhi was the boycott of economic, social, political, educational, legal and other institutions with the object of lodging a protest against, and putting pressure on the opposition in order to seek redressal of grievances. It is a sort of punishment and is conceived in a vindictive spirit. Economic boycott is implied in the vow of *swadeshi*. It implies the boycott of commodities produced anywhere else but locally. In the social sphere, boycott takes the form of non-violent social ostracism. Social boycott should be applied only in such a way that it is not felt as a punishment by the object being boycotted. 'It must cause pain to the

NOTES

NOTES

party using it, if it.' In the political sphere, boycott takes the form of civil disobedience. It includes resignation of offices and titles and refraining from making use of the services of those who do not represent popular will and flout public opinion. The boycott of educational, legal and other institutional means and setting up of parallel institutions according to the non-violent model is the ideal implementation of this method.

Fasting

Another significant and novel instrument of political action developed by Gandhi is fasting. This is the most effective form of *satyagraha*, according to Gandhi. It works in two ways. It aims at self-purification and by choosing death over injustice it can mend even the most obstinate of opponents. This is a weapon which depends mainly upon the soul force of the person wielding it and Gandhi himself used this weapon very successfully. He said, 'My religion teaches me that whenever there is distress which one cannot remove, one must fast and pray'. But he feels that this should be resorted to only as a last resort when all other means of persuasion have failed. Gandhi said, 'A *satyagrahi* should fast only as a last resort when all other avenues of redress have been explored and have failed....That is the last duty which is open for him to perform'.

Thus Gandhi's *satyagraha* is a powerful, novel and predominantly moral method of social change. It is the most powerful and permanent weapon to solve political, economic as well as religious problems. Gandhi demonstrated how non-violent *satyagraha* can resolve individual and natural conflict. It was the best alternative for the peaceful resolution of disputes and conflicts. *Satyagraha* as an ideal and as a weapon of conflict resolution will always be a great inspiration for generations to come.

4.4.2 Constructive Programme

Gandhi adopted constructive programme as a method of *satyagraha* for the first time during his Non-Cooperation Movement in 1920. Through constructive programme, Gandhi aimed not only to achieve political freedom for India but also for its socio-economic cultural regeneration. He viewed it as a means of establishing a non-violent society, self-reliant and self-sufficient in all aspects. Thus, in the course of this movement, national schools and institutions were started, arbitration courts and *panchayats* were established, and spinning *khadi* yarn on *charkhas* began, with the sole objective of replacing government schools and colleges, law courts and foreign goods which were to be completely boycotted.

The constructive programme was the product of Gandhi's vision of a non-violent society. It was Gandhi's firm conviction that self-reliant villages form a sound basis for a just, equitable and non-violent social order. He wanted to remove poverty, unemployment, inequality, ignorance and disease. But the slavery prevalent in our country was a major obstacle in this task and so he set about removing the same. However, he did not want to wait till the slavery was eliminated. In fact, he had in his mind a clear programme which would cast away the slavery, and which would at the same time construct the base of a non-violent society. For Gandhi, social, economic and moral freedoms were more important than political freedom and this according to him would come only through constructive programmes.

Gandhi believed that the constructive programme can be taken up by anybody. It is the drill of non-violent soldiers and through it they can make the villages feel self-reliant, self-sufficient and free, so that they can stand up for their rights. He insisted that individuals and groups volunteering to take up civil disobedience needed

to undergo a rigorous discipline through adequate practice of the constructive programme and to acquire non-violent control over the masses. In fact, it was a pre-requisite for a *satyagrahi* to follow the constructive work as an integral part of non-violence. It aimed at generating political power and awareness but not to capture it.

India is basically a country of agriculture, and it was the source of livelihood for the majority of the population. Thus the aim of constructive work was to stop *kisans*, and labourers from being exploited and make them aware of their rights. Constructive activities were far superior to political work because it displayed to the masses the power of *satyagraha* which could end all kinds of exploitation and elevate their status. The function of the constructive workers was to train the masses for *satyagraha*, to universalize *khadi* and reconstruct the village on the basis of a handicraft civilization. In Gandhi's constructive programme there was no room for violence but only for selfless service, non-violence and unflinching belief in the power and utility of constructive work.

Constructive programme was not conceived by Gandhi in a single day. It took several years to give shape and form to the programme. He expounded his whole philosophy of constructive programme and published a booklet entitled 'Constructive Programme'. The reach of the proposed programme was vast and included 18 items. The items included in this were not arranged in any order of importance. He clarified that, if anyone found that some important subject in terms of independence had been left out, he could unhesitatingly add it to the list. The list comprised of:

- Communal unity
- Removal of untouchability
- Prohibition
- Khadi
- Other village industries
- Village sanitation
- New or basic education
- Adult education
- Upliftment of women
- Education in health and hygiene
- Provincial languages
- National language
- Promotion of economic equality
- *Kisan*
- Labour
- *Adivasis*
- Lepers
- Students

After Gandhi's death, the following items were also added by his followers to strengthen the movement.

- Cow protection
- Nature Care

NOTES

NOTES

- *Bhoodan*
- *Gramadan*
- *Shantisena*

Gandhi considered that all the above items were indispensable for the emancipation of the nation through non-violence. In order to generate non-violent strength among the masses through constructive work, he established many institutions. The main function of these organizations was to promote, encourage and supervise the activities of the constructive programme.

Gandhi's constructive programme was unique and universal. It was like a power house to extract strength for *satyagraha* because without it the *satyagraha* movements would not have been successful. In Gandhi's own words, *satyagraha* without constructive programme would be 'like a paralyzed hand attempting to lift a spoon'. It provided strength and impetus to *satyagraha* movements when it seemed to weaken on the surface. It sent the workers to the remote villages throughout the nation, carrying the message of Gandhi and prepared the concrete base for *swaraj* by erecting new centres of constructive work at various places.

To sum up, as told by Gandhi, the regeneration of India was a tremendous task and so some deficiencies, lack of efforts and differences of opinions were bound to be present as a part of the process, due to the plurality and diversity of individuals. The work has had to pass through various phases and circumstances, and even today it continues in one form or the other.

4.4.3 *Gram Swaraj* or Village Republics: Gandhian Views on Democracy

The ideal government, according to Gandhi, is a democratic one. He wanted to emphasize the principle of non-violence in the actual working of democracy. The governing principle of his ideal state of *sarvodaya* is non-violence and he considered every form of violence as evil. Political power, which belongs to the state, is a kind of organized violence because it harms humanity by destroying individuality which forms the basis for all progress. The state, for Gandhi, represents violence in its concentrated form but it is necessary since human beings are social by nature. Gandhi favoured the idea of decentralization, which guards the individual's freedom. He wanted to decentralize the entire political structure. The ideal society in his opinion would be a decentralized one giving ample scope for self-development. This, however, does not mean that he gives less importance to the society. Pointing out the importance of social obligations in a society, he said, 'I value individual freedom but you must not forget that man is essentially a social being....we have learnt to strike the mean between individual freedom and social restraint for the sake of the well-being of the whole society of which one is a number'. Here it becomes clear that Gandhi was more in favour of self-government and self-revolution than a state run government. In fact his *swaraj* meant self-government. He uses the term *swaraj* to mean positive freedom, to participate in the process of politics in every way possible rather than to conceive of the state as a negative institution that restricts activities to a bare minimum.

Gandhi wanted India to be ruled according to *swaraj* or self-rule in which the Government was run by the consent of the people. *Swaraj* implied participatory democracy. It is no doubt that in a popular democratic government the majority view has to be the basis of practical application. But the majority should always try their best to pay attention to the interest of the minorities and they in turn should be able to fight for their legitimate demands. Thus to safeguard the interest of the minorities, Gandhi resorted to the system of political decentralization through *Panchayati Raj* or

village republics. Instead of letting power be concentrated in the hands of the state, Gandhi pleaded for decentralization. According to Gandhi, the ultimate political ideal is a stateless democracy. But he knew that in practice it is not possible to abolish the state altogether and nor is it possible to eliminate all use of force. Therefore, he conceded that the state and the government may exist but their powers should be reduced to the minimum. He said, 'This means that, when people came into possession of political power the interference with the freedom of the people is reduced to a minimum. In other words, a nation that runs its affairs smoothly and effectively without much state interference is truly democratic. Where such condition is absent the form of government is democratic in name'. He desired a state that would employ as little violence and coercion as possible and wanted individual actions to be regulated as far as possible by voluntary efforts. He wanted to establish a society in which the State exists outside the daily life of the common man. The ideal society would be a decentralized one giving ample scope for self-development. Gandhi's belief in the primacy of the individual led him to conceptualize a truly non-violent state composed of self-governing and self-sufficient village communities which were based on majority rule. Here everyone would have the right to engage in acts of civil disobedience against policies that were contrary to what one considered morally right. He wanted to establish political organization in the country on a non-violent basis through village communities. He wanted to make every village a unit, free and active for the universal good.

On the eve of Indian independence in 1947, Gandhi said, 'Independence must begin at the bottom. Thus every village will be a republic or *panchayat* having full powers. It follows, therefore, that every village has to be self-sustained and capable of managing its affairs even to the extent of defending itself against the whole world'. Gandhi wanted to emphasize the principle of non-violence in the actual working of democracy and wanted to decentralize the whole political structure. Centralization led to concentration of power and capital in the hands of a few, and therefore, creating the possibility of its misuse. Due to this and on account of his conviction that individual liberty and initiative alone could pave the way to progress, Gandhi stood for decentralization of political structure. Therefore he recommended village republics as the ideal form of a decentralized political and social system. He said that the ideal system which can give maximum opportunity for individual initiative and growth is the *panchayat* system. Here we can see the influence of Thoreau's classical statement 'that government is best which governs the least' on Gandhi. It means that when people come into possession of political power, the interference with the freedom of the people is reduced to a minimum. In his scheme, it was not an ascending order but a horizontal circle whose circumference is ever-widening, from individual to community, then to nation, and ultimately including the entire humanity. Explaining his vision of future India of his dreams Gandhi said, 'In this structure composed of innumerable villages, there will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be oceanic circle, whose centre will be the individual, always ready to perish for the villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majority of the oceanic circle of which they are integrated units. Therefore the outermost circumference will not wield power to crush the inner circle but will give strength to all within and derive its own strength from it'. Gandhi's decentralization programme also included the abolition of *zamindari* system and capitalism, development of cottage and small scale industries, and the maximum power was bestowed with the village *panchayats*. He saw *panchayats* as a perfect democracy based upon individual freedom and in his ideal of village *swaraj*, the individual was the architect of his own government.

NOTES

NOTES

In this structure every village was an independent republic with full powers. This implied that the village has to be an economically self-sufficient, politically sovereign and socially homogeneous republic, capable of managing its own affairs. The governing of the village was to be conducted by a body of five persons annually elected by the adult villagers. This body of persons would consist of men and women possessing necessary educational qualifications. These elected people would constitute the village government. Gandhi wrote, 'The government of the village will be conducted by the *panchayat* of five persons, annually elected, by the adult villagers, male and females possessing minimum prescribed qualification. They will have all the authority and jurisdiction required.... This *panchayat* will be its legislature, judiciary and executive combined to be operated for its year of office. Here there is perfect democracy based on individual freedom. The individual is the architect of his own government'. Gandhi was of the opinion that in a representative form of government there is a chance of individuals and small villages being neglected or ignored. But under the village republic, there would be a perfect democracy based on individual freedom. The village government or *panchayat* would formulate their rules and regulations for the smooth and effective running of things. But, the primary aim of the *panchayat* would not be legislation of laws. Legislation would be resorted to only when necessary. In order to be an effective government, the level of people's education would be considerably high, leading to the eradication of illiteracy from the village republics. The *panchayat* would be based on a strict moral sense and a feeling of mutual co-operation. He firmly believed in the 'sovereignty of the people based on the pure moral authority'. It will be a system based on love, truth, non-violence and moral sense. This would be a system of perfect democracy because this will ensure complete individual liberty and promote individual initiative.

However, Gandhi maintained that village self-sufficiency had its limits. For things which cannot be manufactured locally by the cottage industries, he recommended a co-operative system of production by industries. This was made clear by Gandhi in his own words, 'My idea of village *swaraj* is, that it is a complete republic, independent of its neighbour for its vital wants and yet inter-dependent on many others as which dependence is necessary'. A number of village republics would together constitute a single unit called a district. The intermediary units, including the districts, are named province or state and finally culminate in the Nation State. Here all will work together and co-operate with each other for the solution of their common problems. In such a democratic society equality is assured to the maximum extent and every individual enjoys full freedom to serve his society according to his ability. The state will never use its strength to crush the individual or the villages. Thus we see that in society as envisioned by Gandhi, every individual will be required to work for his living. Everyone will participate in the governance of the village republics on equal terms and it will not be operated by higher authorities. Thus Gandhi's *panchayati raj* was based on democratic decentralization in which all the units of administration had to be the equal shareholders and the dictation by the higher bodies was not allowed.

Panchayati raj legislation was enacted in most of the states of India but the respective state governments have not really handed over power to the local institutions. The *panchayati raj* institutions have been working merely as the agents of the state governments. Gandhi's dream of village *swaraj* or *panchayati raj* is still a far cry, as we are still under the rule of a top heavy structure and the villages are yet to have their due share in economic and political power and authority which Gandhi had advocated and fought for.

In spite of all the criticisms levelled against the Gandhian concept of *gram swaraj*, decentralization and local governments are still relevant and the most important elements of democracy. Gandhi's views are especially relevant in present society where we are facing the evils of centralization of powers. Decentralization of power is needed to bring the decision process closer to people in a large democratic country like India.

4.4.4 Ramrajya: Gandhian Concept of True Democracy

Democracy is considered as the best form of government because it preserves dignity of the individual and his freedom. The goal of democratic society is to assure its people the opportunity to make full use of their abilities. According to S. Radhakrishnan the first-vice-president of India, 'democracy is not merely a form of government or code of laws. It is a scheme of life, a set of values and standards. We must defend democracy not merely with our heads, but also with our hearts'. As democracy allows individuals to express themselves freely in a diversely composed society, Gandhi considered that it alone was suited to the complex and composite culture of India.

One of the important principles of democracy is that people should not feel powerless or helpless to be able to change their situation. Instead they should feel that they can influence events and processes around them and be in charge of themselves and their environment. 'Everyone is equal' is one of the strongest messages of democracy. Equality does not imply uniformity that one can be different and still be equal needs to be understood by everyone.

4.4.5 Nationalism and Internationalism

Gandhi is an embodiment of the spirit of nationalism. Ordinary Gandhian interpretation of *swadeshi* has been given a political aspect and is taken as the basis for his nationalism. It has a positive as well as negative connotation. Positively it means a political and economic principle having nationalism as its base and negatively it is a base for internationalism. Gandhian nationalism was above the sectarian outlooks perceived in terms of caste, class or other such considerations. He emphatically rejected a nationalism that sought freedom through violence. He was in favour of the use of *ahimsa* or non-violence. His nationalism has been the collective assertion of all communities, including the deprived classes of the society and had a secular outlook in spite of his attachment to Hinduism. He tried to build his nationalism on the basis of harmonious co-existence of all religions. According to Gandhi, our country was not a nation but a civilization which had benefitted from the contributions of different races and religions and was distinguished by its plurality, diversity and tolerance. By talking in terms of civilization, he tried to develop an Indian nationalism based on plurality and synthesis. His nationalistic thrust was based on the total mobilization of the masses and it brought about a qualitative difference in the Indian freedom movement.

But we should not forget that Gandhi was not a conservative nationalist. Rather he was an internationalist in approach. His nationalism was woven in the all embracing concerns for humanity. He says that nationalism and internationalism are not essentially opposed to each other. According to him, nationalism is really a pre-condition of internationalism. As he stated 'it is impossible for me to be internationalist without being a nationalist. Internationalism is possible only when nationalism becomes a fact i.e., when people belonging to different countries have organized themselves and are able to act as one man'. Nationalism does not mean narrowness, selfishness or exclusiveness, which is the curse of the modern world. Though Gandhi was mainly engrossed in the Indian freedom struggle and the problem of poverty in this country, he was equally concerned with the miseries of the downtrodden and exploited people all over the world. According to him his nationalism was only a step to internationalism.

NOTES

NOTES

Gandhi's nationalism was not exclusive and so he rejects nationalism which is based on the distress or exploitation of other nations. He held that each nation is an integral part of the world and as such no nation can exist in isolation from the rest of the world. The question of internationalism arises only when nationalism becomes a fact, i.e., only when people have organized themselves into different nations and are prepared to act as one unit. There has to be voluntary interdependence among nations. Gandhi says that true internationalism presupposes the reality of national units and also the recognition of the fact that all nations are equal. Another requirement of internationalism is that every nation must appreciate and realize the value and importance of non-violence and should go for disarmament voluntarily. He was convinced that if the nations did not disarm themselves and accept the message of non-violence, they would destroy themselves. We can conclude by saying that Gandhi's internationalism was an extension of his nationalism, which is nothing but the extension of man's self-sacrifice and love.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

7. Name the three tenets that form the basis of satyagraha.
8. State the three initiatives taken under the constructive programme.
9. List two qualities of an ideal state as envisioned by Gandhi.

4.5 ECONOMIC THOUGHTS OF GANDHI

Gandhi's Concept of Economic Decentralization

Beginning with the supposition that exploitation is at the root of all violence, Gandhi builds his economic ideas in such a manner that avoids exploitation of man by man. The remedy suggested by him to do away with the concentration of economic power was economic decentralization. He asserted that 'if India is to evolve along non-violent lines, it will have to decentralize many things'. The development of cottage and village industries occupies the most important position in a decentralized economy. Gandhi has advocated economic decentralization as the technique of non-violent democracy. He visualized a decentralized economic policy where there would be no exploitation in the economic field. He was fully convinced that in 'an under-developed country like India concentration of economic power should not lie in the hands of socio-political and economic milieu of the century'. In the economic field Gandhi was in favour of 'production by masses' rather than 'mass production'. He wanted to bring about the decentralization of economic power in the form of self-sufficient and self-governing village communities.

Gandhi did not believe that centralization would be conducive to the common welfare of mankind. According to him, every centralized activity is accomplished with some force.

- Mechanized economy is based on violence and fraud.
- Large-scale production in factories leads to maximum exploitation.
- A gap is created between 'haves' and 'have-nots'.
- As economic concentration is hand in glove with concentration of political power, it tends towards dictatorship.
- Centralization of industrial skill in big factories results not only in the centralization of large population in cities, but also curtails individual freedom.

This shows that a centralized economy leads to inequality, violence, injustice completion, exploitation and takes us away from the path of morality. Thus, Gandhi suggested a decentralized economy as a remedial measure to stall the above said evils because this type of economy offers a greater scope for equity. It is thus the most important principle in Gandhian economy. Gandhi's aim for supporting decentralization of economic power is to serve the interests of all people, leading to a *sarvodaya* economic order. He finds this a solution to all the modern ills like violence, economic exploitation, poverty and socio-economic inequalities.

4.5.1 Bread Labour

Gandhi's social and economic ideas exemplify a deep and abiding interest in the reformation of the Indian society. The Gandhian economic programme was based upon the ideal of self-sufficiency. Man, for him was the ultimate consideration and he believed that the economic good of all lies in strictly practicing the principles of *sarvodaya* economic order. The doctrine of labour occupies an important place in Gandhi's *sarvodaya* economic order.

Gandhi wanted the poor people, who he considered '*daridranarayan*', to stand on their own feet. He introduced the theory of bread labour which means that everyone should contribute towards earning his or her bread. This idea came to Gandhi through various influences, such as, the writings of Tolstoy and Ruskin along with suggestions made in the Bible and in the *Gita*. The Bible says, 'Earn thy bread by the sweat of thy brow' and the *Gita* says that, 'he who eats without labouring for it, eats stolen bread'. Gandhi said, 'If all laboured for their bread and no more, then there would be enough food leisure for all. There would be no cry of over population, no disease and no such misery as we see around. Such labour will be the highest form of sacrifice'. This will be a labour of love for the common good. Gandhi felt that this idea could also be useful in bringing about a feeling of equality among the members of a society.

By 'bread labour' Gandhi meant that in order to live man must work. It is essential for every man to realize the dignity of labour. Gandhi was of the firm opinion that the adoption of bread labour by one and all as a necessary value of life would pave the way for the establishment of a classless and casteless society. He was sure that the distinctions of rank would be abolished when everyone without exception acknowledged the obligation of bread labour. As Gandhi said, 'God created man to work for his food and said that those who are without work were thieves'.

Mere intellectual labour was not compensation or a substitute for physical labour. He clarifies: 'Let me not be misunderstood. I do not discount the value of intellectual labour, but no amount of it is any compensation for bodily labour which every one of us is born to give for the common good for all'. It is true that every individual cannot do all kinds of manual work. Gandhi was aware of this and he does not say that everybody should go to the field. Any man can choose for himself that work that he can do, he can spin or weave or do carpentry or any other work. The important point was that every one ought to perform sufficient body labour to entitle him to a means of livelihood. Gandhi wanted to stop the mad craze for white collar jobs and check the feeling of condemnation towards physical labour. The rich, who multiply their wants without offering manual labour, exploit the poor, using them as a means for the gratification of their wants. When the rich start labouring, they will be able to empathize with the millions of labourers.

Man cannot develop his mind simply by writing, reading or making speeches. Gandhi believes in eight hours of a 'day of honest and clear labour'. He did not encourage the giving out of free meals as he thought it encouraged laziness and idleness.

NOTES

NOTES

He called it a misplaced charity. Instead, he strongly recommended the organizing institution to arrange for some honest work before the meals are served to the poor. Bread labour does not exclude intellectual labour in the strict sense. One may ask that mental work is also work or labour and why should a person doing mental work also do manual labour. Gandhi says that such an attitude causes social distinctions to arise because people doing mental work consider themselves superior to persons who do physical work. But, if the person engaged in mental work also sweeps and cleans or does some other things like spinning or gardening, the distinctions would vanish because the work of cleaning or sweeping would then not be considered inferior. Also, by doing manual work, one would also be able to keep his body fit.

However, there is one condition attached to bread labour, i.e., everyone must take to bread labour voluntarily. There is no question of compulsion. Compulsory bread labour is a state of slavery. It breeds poverty, disease and discontentment. On the other hand, willing bread labour brings contentment and health. Social life has to be a life based on love and willing co-operation, and so, the doctrine of bread labour can only be socially beneficial if individuals take to it voluntarily. For the ideal society to be realized, it is necessary that the ideal of bread labour be practiced voluntarily and at the same time dignity of labour should be recognized at all costs. Bread labour should be done voluntarily and if people are convinced of its value and necessity, then there would be enough for all. Gandhi felt that the conflict between labour and capital can be eliminated only when everyone takes to some useful physical labour voluntarily. He held that agriculture, spinning, weaving, carpentry, etc. which are connected with some primary needs will flourish if all participate. Our wants will be reduced and it will lead to an increase in production also. These two things will reduce scarcity and help solve many problems faced by our country.

There is one thing that everyone can do, be their own scavenger. 'Education is as necessary as eating, and the best thing would be for everyone to dispose of his own waste'. By prescribing the adoption of bread labour by all the *varnas* and by making scavenging the concern of all, Gandhi attempted to rectify the social structure which was highly stratified into different castes with high, low caste and outcaste syndrome. To Gandhi, no labour should be below one's dignity and no livelihood demeaning. He believed that there would be no unemployment in India, if all worked honestly. According to Gandhi, if people realized the value and dignity of work, there would be enough employment and all poverty could thus be eradicated. The message of bread labour is simplicity, service of mankind and replacing the spirit of exploitation by the spirit of service. Thus, Gandhi considered it as the primary need for the economic growth of the individual as well as the nation. Gandhi had great regard for bread labour and noted that the real wealth of any nation consists in its labour. Above all, bread labour was essential for those who followed a life of truth and non-violence, as these principles preclude every possibility of exploitation, idleness and the possession of property for private profit. He wanted every man to work according to his full capacity and that, according to him, will be a sure remedy against the economic ills of the country.

4.5.2 Trusteeship

Gandhi believed in the dignity of man. It is from this deep feeling of spirituality that Gandhi derived his ethico-economic theory of trusteeship. For him, everything belongs to God and comes from God. Trusteeship as a method stands for socializing everything. When an individual has more than his proportionate portion he becomes a trustee of that portion of God's property. The rich should utilize the surplus wealth for the benefit of society at large. Gandhi claims that trusteeship is a peaceful way of liquidating class

conflict. He regarded trusteeship not simply as an economic system but as a socio-political economic arrangement against the inequality of capitalism and the centralization of power in socialism. Through it Gandhi sought to abolish capitalism to an even greater degree than proposed by the communist. He felt that social reorganization through non-violent means could be achieved by persuading the rich to hand over their wealth and possessions to society. Trusteeship could thus be the way for the socialization of wealth and property. It exhorts each individual to give up his right on the portion of wealth and property which is in excess of his requirement according to his social circumstances. It seeks to abolish the private ownership of the means of productions, not only by the extermination of haves by have-nots, but by making them cooperate with each other for the larger interest of society.

The basic tenets of the theory of trusteeship are:

- Trusteeship system provides a means of transforming the capitalist order of society into an egalitarian one. It gives capitalists a chance of reforming themselves.
- It does not recognize any right of private ownership of property except in as much as is permitted by society for its own welfare.
- It does not exclude legislative regulation of ownership and use of wealth.
- An individual is not to hold wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interest of the society.
- Not only has a decent minimum living wage been fixed but there should also be a limit fixed for the maximum income an individual may have. The difference between the minimum and maximum is to be reasonable and equitable and variable from time to time.
- The character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal greed or whim.

Gandhi gives the following reasons in support of the doctrine of trusteeship:

- There is no concentration of economic power in the hands of the state, which represents violence.
- A request can be made to the divinity of man, who is gifted with the soul.
- The private property owners are less violent when compared with state ownership of property.
- It rejects the confiscation of private property and gives a chance to the rich to act as trustees.

It is apparent that Gandhi's doctrine of trusteeship is based on a sense of morality and love. This doctrine is nothing but a sincere working out of the doctrine of non-possession. The rich also must be made to realize, through a loving process, the merit of non-possession. A critic of Gandhi might say that this doctrine is based on the assumption of honesty on the part of the rich. This is however no criticism of Gandhi who's beliefs are based on the presupposition that every man is inwardly good. He has tried to demonstrate this in various ways and he does not want to exclude the capitalist from that. Even they are good people, their good sense just has to be aroused. If the rich do not voluntarily agree to use their riches for the welfare of the community, Gandhi suggests that the people may resort to the method of non-cooperation to make them fall in line with the wishes of the community and become trustees of their possessions in the true sense of the term.

NOTES

NOTES

4.5.3 Gandhi's Attitude Towards Industrialization and Modernization

As an apostle of the law of *ahimsa*, Gandhi was a vehement critic of modern urban industrial civilization. He realized that urban civilization was undermining the authority of the law of *ahimsa* and turning into a menace for mankind. The existing state of social, ordinary and economic relations is the product of urban civilization. They are a reflection of its sterile and uncreative character. According to him, machinery and industrialism, the chief symbol of urban civilization, represent sin and are a curse on mankind. They enslave the workers, sap the moral being and cause unemployment in society. The social and political institutions created by urban civilization cramp the spirit of man. Thus to Gandhi, the real problem before humanity was to deal with the edifice of modern urban civilization and to replace it by a simpler rural type of civilization.

Gandhi's objection to machinery was directed towards the craze for it and not itself. He criticized labour-saving machinery which rendered multitudes jobless and drove them to starvation. His view was that if time and labour have to be saved, they must not be saved only for a fraction of mankind, but for all. He asserted that the impetus behind the use of machinery is not the philosophy to save labour, but greed. Therefore, he strongly resented the use of machine to enable a few to ride on the backs of millions.

He was against the use of machine because of its ill-effects on individuals and on humanity. As for the individuals, he objected to the use of machinery because of its dehumanizing influence. He wanted machinery to be the slave and not the master of man. He wished to put a stop to the mad rush for wealth through the use of machines. Mahatma Gandhi held the mania for mass production responsible for the world crisis. He thought that crisis was born out of the fact that concentration of production in certain areas raises the problem of inequitable distribution. When more and more countries adopt a programme of mass production, a clash of interests is inevitable because of the need for larger markets. Two world wars were the outcome of such a clash of economic interests. Therefore, he advocated that the use of machines must be restricted for humanitarian considerations of love and well-being of all.

Gandhi's aversion to modern industrial civilization was due to the reason that it breeds violence which is reflected in a variety of forms like exploitation of labour, racial prejudices, social discrimination, caste and class hierarchy, economic inequality, injustice, corruption and so on. This type of violence has become an integral part of the modern socio-economic structure. The modern industrial civilization is characterized by large-scale mass production with profit motivation. According to Gandhi, modern civilization is materialistic in the sense that it measures everything in terms of gains and conquests. People quite often adopt wrong means for material gains. He said 'Western civilization is material, frankly material. It means progress by the progress of matter – railways, conquest of disease, conquest of the air. These are the triumphs of civilization according to western measure'. But, for Gandhi, progress could be measured only in terms of morality and spirituality. He was of the opinion that, 'I have ventured utterly to condemn modern civilization because I hold that the spirit of it is evil. It is possible to show that some of its incidents are good, but I have examined its tendency in the scale of ethics'. He objected to the use of machinery as an instrument of greed and which deprived the mass of their opportunity of labour. He pointed out that machinery helped a section of people to live by exploiting the poor masses. So Gandhi tried to attack this with all his might.

Gandhi feels that the growth of a moral society is prevented by an over-emphasis on industrialization. He perceived that such an attitude has given rise to many kinds of

ills and evils both at the social level and at the political level. Smaller countries were exploited for procuring raw materials and stronger countries get involved in repeated wars just to maintain industrial superiority. At the national level, too much of industrialization has led to a permanent rift between the capitalists and labour. Moreover, substituting machines for human labour has created the problem of unemployment. Owing to industrial rationalization, by replacing labour by machines, a large number of labourers have been thrown out of employment. Finding no appropriate employment, many of them are forced to indulge in anti-social vocations.

However, it does not mean that Gandhi was totally against all kinds of machinery and industrialization. He recognized that machinery has its uses. What he objected to was the rush for mass production, not machinery itself. He is against any labour saving machinery because their introduction results in many unemployed men, who starve. Gandhi had stated, 'Machinery has its place. But it must not be allowed to displace necessary human labour'. He admits the stay of machinery and views our body itself as a machine along with spinning wheel and the little toothpick. He stated that, '...simple tools and instruments and such machinery that saves individual labour and lightens the burden of millions of cottages, I would welcome'. To him, man was the supreme consideration and he judged material advances by their moral and spiritual effect on human beings. He maintained that free India should seek an alternate to industrialism by practicing a simple and evolved life through strengthening its village and cottage industries.

4.5.4 Concept of Swadeshi

Gandhi realized that much of the heart rendering poverty of the masses in India is due to the ruinous departure from *swadeshi* in the economic life. His thought was that India would not have been poor if the articles of conception had not been brought from outside India. The broad meaning of *swadeshi* is the use of all home made things to the exclusion of foreign things. Gandhi believed that the economic good of all lies in strictly practicing the principles of *swadeshi*. *Swadeshi*, is a doctrine employed for the protection of the home industry. According to Man Mohan Chaudary, 'The principle of *Swadeshi* is a fundamental concept in Gandhian economic thought. It defines the relation of individual to his society and the larger world in terms of socially, responsible economic behaviour'. Thus the practice of *swadeshi* would result in innumerable self-supporting and self-contained units meeting their primary needs locally and exchange with other units such necessary commodities that are not locally producible.

The *swadeshi* spirit never allows exploitation of the raw materials of a country. It does not neglect the labour force. Wasting time and money in producing goods which are unsuitable for the Indians, amounts to the negation of the *swadeshi* spirit. It is false *swadeshi*. At the same time, *swadeshi* does not mean boycotting foreign goods. Gandhi observes, 'any article is *swadeshi*, if it sub-serves the interest of the millions, even though the capital talent are foreign but under effective Indian control'. *Swadeshi* is also one of the ways of non-violence and therefore a true believer of *swadeshi* will not harbour any ill-feeling towards foreign things. It is not a cult of hatred but a doctrine of selfless service that has its roots in *ahimsa*. Gandhi would be prepared to buy goods from any part of the world if they were required for the growth of his country, but he would insist on the use of *swadeshi* when such foreign things were found to hamper the economic status of the home industry. *Swadeshi*, thus, is not an outright rejection of everything foreign. It is based on a feeling of concern for the economic and political stability of one's own country.

NOTES

NOTES

The concept of *swadeshi* comprises of the following thoughts. The first being the reduction of wants by each individual consumer, the second, the reordering of preferences in such a way that it is made up mainly of goods produced in the neighbourhood, and the third is the co-operation of the consumer with his neighbourhood producer to make them both work effectively.

Swadeshi is one of the best ways of preventing the manufacture of goods in abundance. If a person wishes to increase his business so as to supply the needs of others who do not belong to that unit, he will find that no one else would be willing to buy his goods due to a moral responsibility towards his neighbours. Thus he would be prevented from developing into a large scale manufacturer. Even if the articles produced elsewhere are more attractive than those produced locally, they will not be allowed to flood out the local products. At the same time, the local producer is encouraged to improve the quality of his products to come up to the standard of foreign goods. Thus the consumers need to limit themselves to and help to improve the quality of local products.

If the indigenous industries are not protected from foreign competition, our native skills will be ruined and the villages which constitute the greater part of the country will degenerate. Therefore, *swadeshi* is especially prominent in villages, where production is made for consumption, not for exchange. The basic principle of *swadeshi* is to produce for the fulfilment of basic needs and not to produce for commerce, markets or profits. This requires the simplification of our economic structure. If the economy is restricted to small units, it can influence the people morally to make them self-dependent. That was why Gandhi was not only against the native multinationals which swallow the small scale industries, and create unemployment. However, he was not totally against industries and technology. In fact he wanted a balanced growth of villages as well as cities and small scale and big industries to form a harmonious peaceful society. He wanted to free economy from greed and he wanted to construct an exploitation free society as per his concept of *Swadeshi*.

To conclude, we can say that *Swadeshi* from its economic viewpoint is a belief in a self-reliant economy. It is a warning against the killing of native skills and putting the nation in the trap set by foreigners. It permits taking the help of another for building one's own economy but with great caution. Thus, the Gandhian concept of *Swadeshi* from an economic point of view stands for strong belief in self-reliance, balanced growth and human economics, i.e., the economics for a larger and more meaningful life and not the economics for profit and market.

Gandhi's economic theory was also quite humanistic. He wanted the people of India to practice using indigenous products, which would promote indigenous industries. It would lead to more and more self-dependence. According to Gandhi, machinery and large scale industrialism, the chief symbols of urban civilization, are not suitable to the Indian context. His antipathy to machinery was due to the fact that it replaced human labour and thereby increased unemployment and poverty. It also promoted the exploitation of the poor by the wealthy. The social and political institutions created by urban civilizations cramp the spirit of man. Therefore, Gandhi preferred the simple rural civilization with its religion, spirituality and love of nature. According to him, this would promote real happiness and contentment and increase the capacity for service. Here the individual would be of supreme consideration. The theory of trusteeship developed by Gandhi was also a significant aspect of his humanism.

4.5.5 *Hind Swaraj*

Gandhi challenged the foundation of modern civilization. The sophisticated, technological, aggressive and lustful aspects of the modern western civilization repelled him. In his *Hind Swaraj* he attacked large scale industrialization, and massive mechanization, and condemned western commercialization, imperialism and consumerism. Gandhi preached a return to simplicity and plainness of nature. It is in *Hind Swaraj* that we find Gandhi first announcing his own life-mission. It is the most authentic text of Gandhian social and political ideas. It was written by Gandhi in 1909 and he said about it, 'It teaches the gospel of love in place of hate. It replaces violence with self-sacrifice. It puts soul force against brute force....It is a severe condemnation of modern civilization. It contains the ultimate logical conclusion of the acceptance of the twin principle of truth and non-violence'. It is a manifesto for a new world order based on supremacy of ethics and morality over matter.

Hind Swaraj is divided into 24 chapters and two appendices. It discusses in detail about Parliament, true civilization, objects of newspaper, behaviour, nationalism, the impoverishment of India, different religions, lawyers, doctors, education, soul force, machinery, home rule, etc. It is a severe condemnation of modern civilization. It deals with practical questions in a most scientific and original way. According to Nageswar Prasad, 'One can discover these issues clearly emerging in *Hind Swaraj*. First is the emerging India of that time, its leaders and political events and Gandhi's own position in relation to them, second, and rather the most crucial issue is the entire question of resistance that is posited as an alternative to what Gandhi calls the brute force'.

Hind Swaraj is a critique of modernization, which in Gandhi's words is identified with the western, material modern civilization. It posits an ideal state of things in which there will be no machine, no railways, no doctors, lawyers and other such things. A critique of modern machine technology is that it leads to conflict among nations and ultimately to war. Gandhi was perhaps the first who realized the deeper and long-range implication of this technological progress. His *Hind Swaraj* is a warning against indiscriminate large scale mechanization of life and a pointer to the future.

The aim of *Hind Swaraj* was to confront the anarchist and violence-prone Indian nationalist with an alternate to violence. It is the foundational text for understanding Gandhi's ideology. The intention of *Hind Swaraj* is to plant seeds of peace and harmony in the minds of people. A deep-rooted understanding and appreciation of *Hind Swaraj* will prompt us to turn this world into a better place to live in.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

10. How did Gandhi seek to bring about decentralization of economic power in India?
11. What was the theory of bread labour?
12. What was the aim of trusteeship as given by Gandhi?
13. State one basic tenet of trusteeship.

4.6 SUMMARY

- Mahatma Gandhi was one of the builders of modern India who successfully infused new hope in man, both in India and abroad.
- Gandhi had a broad humanistic outlook to the problems of life and this kind of philosophy can clearly be traced in his writings, speeches, plans and schemes. His aim was to realize truth and non-violence in every aspect of life.

NOTES

NOTES

- The foremost influence on Gandhi was that of his mother, who was a deeply religious woman. Born and brought up in the Vaishanava tradition, he was a strong believer in Hinduism.
- As a staunch Vaishnavite, Gandhi believed that salvation can only be attained by devotion and total self-surrender to God and service to humanity. Being brought up in this tradition, *ahimsa* was in Gandhi's blood.
- The Bhagavad Gita was a major source of inspiration for Gandhi and it was his opinion that the Gita did not encourage warfare but instead explained its futility.
- Apart from *ahimsa*, Gandhi derived the concept of *Karma Yoga* or path of action from the Gita. He expounds Gita's message of *anasakti* or selfless action and means of practicing it.
- The chanting of the Ramayana according to Gandhi was the surest remedy for all ills. His attitude to women was also highly influenced by this epic as was his idea of the ideal state or '*Ramarajya*'.
- Among the Indian religions, Jainism, had a profound influence on Gandhi as he was brought up in Kathiaward, a place where Jainism was strongly preserved.
- Jain influence is clearly visible in the Gandhian concept of *satyagraha*, which is non-violence or *ahimsa* put into practice.
- Buddhism influenced Gandhi and he, like Buddha, was concerned with providing practical remedies for the ills and sorrows of life. The teachings of both these great men were simple, direct and practical. The futility of caste distinctions, rites and rituals and dogmas were also recognized by them.
- Christianity was another religion which exercised a profound influence on Gandhi. He often stressed on the similarities between the 'Sermon on the Mount' and the Bhagavad Gita.
- For Gandhi, Islam was a religion of peace just like Christianity. He was struck by Prophet Mohammed's greatness, bravery and austere living. Among the five pillars of Islam, Gandhi had firm faith in prayer and fasting and he gave due importance to them.
- Prominent amongst the thinkers who influenced Gandhi was Leo Tolstoy, the Great Russian writer. The underlying theme of Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You* is the question of violence and its peaceful resolution. Gandhi confessed that reading this book made him a firm believer of *ahimsa*.
- John Ruskin was another great writer and thinker to whom Gandhi owes a great deal. Gandhi was inspired by Ruskin's 'Unto This Last' which he later translated into Gujarati and titled *Sarvodaya*, meaning the rise or welfare of all.
- Ruskin also made Gandhi appreciate the dignity of labour and the supremacy of the spirit and nobleness of human nature.
- Gandhi also attached primary importance to education and tried to spiritualize the political, economic and social spheres of human life.
- Gandhi was also influenced by the ideas and activities of Henry David Thoreau, the well-known American anarchist. Thoreau's essay 'Civil Disobedience', gave moral and ethical support to Gandhi's movement in South Africa.
- According to Thoreau, man was a social being, who is generally disposed to co-operation with fellow beings for social good.

- Thoreau rejected the idea that the highest responsibility of the individual must be to the state and he refused to recognize a government, if it failed to establish justice. Gandhi's ideal of *Sarvodaya*, is based on these thoughts.
- Gandhi considered Gokhale to be his political guru and at the same time described himself as the true disciple of Tilak.
- Gandhi owed Tilak his attitude of confrontation with British bureaucracy and sacrifice and suffering for the freedom of the country.
- The root of Gandhi's theory of political disobedience and ideas of passive resistance lies in the political tradition of extremists like Tilak and Sri Aurobindo.
- Gopal Krishna Gokhale was one of the most prominent moderate leader of the Indian National Congress. He supported Gandhi and collected funds for the relief of the suffering in South Africa during his struggle there.
- Gandhi derived the notion of spiritualization of politics from Gokhale. He learned from Gokhale that the means for bringing about a change in society should be pure, peaceful and legitimate.
- Gandhi called Rabindranath Tagore 'Gurudev' and Tagore was the first person to refer to Gandhi as 'Mahatma'.
- Tagore and Gandhi believed that Indian's domination by foreign rule could be challenged by the soul-force. Both of them rejected the material civilization of the west and were in complete agreement on the issue of communalism.
- Swami Vivekananda was another person to have exercised a considerable influence on Gandhi. Both the great thinkers were of the opinion that one should try to attain self-realization and God-realization through service to humanity.
- Gandhi held that morality and religion are inseparable and morality is the core essence of religion.
- *Ahimsa* or Non-Violence, *Satya* or Truthfulness, *Asteya* or Non-stealing, *Aprigraha* or Non-possession and *Brahmacharya* or Celibacy were the five virtues Gandhi borrowed from the ancient Indian traditions.
- The two virtues added by Gandhi include *Abhaya* or fearlessness and *Dharmikta* Faith in God. When we analyze these virtues from the Gandhian perspective we see that he had given them a new meaning and outlook and lifted from the moral or religious plane to the socio-political planes.
- Among these virtues, Truth and Non-Violence form the very basis of Gandhian philosophy.
- Truth is all-pervading in Gandhian thought. He distinguishes between Absolute and Relative truth and says that Absolute Truth is God's attribute alone.
- Gandhi considered Truth and God to be synonymous and was of the opinion that if Truth is identified as God, it can serve as the basis of a universal religion and can bring people of different caste, creed, religion and nations together.
- For Gandhi, it was impossible to disassociate Truth from *ahimsa* or Non-Violence. *Ahimsa* is the practical expression of Truth. If Truth as an end is to be achieved, the only means is *ahimsa*, according to Gandhi.
- The word *ahimsa*'s negative import is non-killing or non-injury. Gandhiji gave a positive aspect to this. The positive aspect of *Ahimsa* is active love towards all and love is a kind of feeling of oneness.
- As per Gandhi's philosophy of life, if a good end is to be attained, it is also essential that the means adopted for the realization of the end is good. He is

NOTES

NOTES

convinced that ends do not justify the means and the purity of means is essential condition for realizing good ends.

- Gandhi's idea of God was largely a product of the Hindu concept of God and it was the nuclear element of his thoughts and activities.
- Gandhi regards Truth as God as not even an atheist can deny its existence. He considers God as the greatest living force or law that governs the whole universe and entire human life.

4.7 KEY TERMS

- **Agape:** It is a term used by Christian writers to signify fraternal love as opposed to eros or sexual love.
- **Anarchism:** It is a political theory wherein all forms of government authority are unnecessary and undesirable.
- **Lokasamgraha:** It is the concept of integration of society, mankind and cosmos as explained in the Gita.
- **Stitaprajna:** The term refers to a yogi who is unmoved by passions and emotions.
- **Syadvada:** It is the theory of relativity of knowledge as taught by Jainism.
- **Vedanta:** It is the school of Indian philosophy most concerned with protecting the literal truth of the Upanishads.
- **Teleological:** It is the study of ends or purposes of things.

4.8 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The philosophy of *Ramrajya* was that equal rights are ensured to prince and pauper alike.
2. Gandhi owed Tilak the attitude of confrontation with British bureaucracy and sacrifice and suffering for the freedom of the country.
3. Gandhi's religious ideas were derived from the conviction that there is only one reality—that of God, the embodiment of truth.
4. The similarity between Gandhi and Marx is the extreme concern of both for the suppressed and the oppressed, the resourceless and the ignorant, the dumb and starving sections of humanity.
5. Two ideas about women that Gandhi strongly believed in are, first that women are not inferior to men. Secondly, he felt that women would be great contributors in the non-violent struggle for independence as they were better able to bear suffering than men.
6. Two features of basic education are: that education should be imparted in the mother tongue of the student and it should be imparted in the child's natural surroundings.
7. Truth, *ahimsa* and self-suffering are the three tenets that form the basis of *satyagraha*.
8. National schools and institutions were started, arbitration courts and *panchayats* were established, and spinning of *khadi* yarn on *charkhas* began as initiatives of the constructive programme.
9. The ideal state would be a decentralized one composed of self-governing and self-sufficient village communities which were based on majority rule. It would employ minimum violence and coercion as possible.

10. Gandhi wanted to bring about the decentralization of economic power in the form of self-sufficient and self-governing village communities.
11. The theory of bread labour stated that everyone should contribute towards earning his or her bread.
12. Gandhi considered trusteeship to be a peaceful way of liquidating class conflict and using surplus wealth for the benefit of society at large.
13. Trusteeship system provides a means of transforming the capitalist order of society into an egalitarian one. It gives capitalists a chance of reforming themselves.

NOTES**4.9 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES****Short-Answer Questions**

1. How did the Ramayana influence Gandhi's opinion regarding women?
2. What three things did Rabindranath Tagore and Gandhi have in common?
3. What according to Gandhi was an ideal state?
4. Write a short note on Thoreau's arguments in support of civil disobedience.
5. What were the five cardinal virtues as defined by Gandhi?
6. What was Gandhi's concept of God?
7. What was Gandhi's definition of stealing?
8. What was the basic feature of Gandhi's concept of Truth?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Explain the impact of the great Indian religious traditions in the socio-political thought of Gandhi.
2. Describe Gandhi's expectations from a universal religion.
3. Discuss the influences of Tolstoy and Ruskin on Gandhian thought.
4. Examine in detail Gandhi's notion of truth. Discuss the implications of the formulation—'Truth is God.'
5. Highlight the importance of truth and non-violence in Gandhian thought.
6. Explain the relation between morality and religion according to Gandhi.
7. 'By religion Gandhi does not mean formal religion or customary religion, but that religion which underlies all religions'. Bring out the implications of this statement.
8. Elucidate Gandhi's views on the role of '*ahimsa*' in personal and social life.
9. Why did Gandhi insist on the purity of both the means and the ends?
10. Why did Gandhi consider '*ahimsa*' as the supreme duty?

4.10 FURTHER READING

- Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wolff, Jonathan. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Strauss, Leo, Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

NOTES

Miller, David, Janet Coleman, William Connolly (et.al.) 1991. *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grube, G. M. A, C. D. C. Reeve. 1992. *Plato: Republic*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub Co.

Grube, G. M. A. 1980. *Plato's Thought*. Cambridge: Hackett Pub Co Inc.

Balme, D. M. Aristotle. 2002. *Historia Animalium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shields, Christopher. 2007. *Aristotle*. New York: Routledge.