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CHAPTER 1

SIGNIFICANCE OF WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT

STRUCTURE

- Learning objectives
- What is political thought
- Western political thought: nature and content
- Significance of western political thought
- Review questions

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Explain political thought.
- Explain the relationship between political thought and political science
- Understand the western political thought.

WHAT IS POLITICAL THOUGHT

Political thought is the account of the political thoughts of a host of political philosophers from beginning to the end. It is the sum-total of thoughts on matters relating to politics, state and government as expressed through the thinkers. It is historical in nature because it is described as history. It analyses, amines and evaluates issues that have a universal concern and are of perennial interest even though each political theorist responds to a scrupulous political reality. It is written keeping the superior public in mind and is not confined to ivory towers for an intimate link is recognized flanked by the political procedure, institutions, events and actors. Usually political theory flourishes in times of crises which act as incentive though it is not necessary that all crises lead to political theorizing.

Political thought is the account, analysis, expression, and evaluation of the philosophies of the philosophers of a political custom. It is a custom in as distant as it comes to us as a body of thought. It is the sum-total of what stays on, and an accumulation of what is changed and what continues. It is what
keeps responding to our circumstances. What becomes out-dated is not the part of the custom.

Political thought attempts to identify values and norms and creates them an inseparable part of a scrupulous political trend. Western political thought, if we wish to identify its magic themes, evolves and revolves approximately values such as liberty and libertarian, democracy and democratic custom, equality and egalitarian. Political thought as it has lived and/or exists in India, for instance, seeks to set up ethical/moral values in politics, spiritualism, cooperative livelihood, and the like.

Political thought is primarily the revise of the state. It studies society insofar as society powers the state as political life and social life, though self-governing is inter-dependent. Likewise, it focuses on economic institutions and procedure insofar it powers the political order and procedure. It also takes into consideration ethical questions for ultimately it is concerned with a presently and good political order.

**Distinction flanked by Political Thought, Political Theory, and Political Philosophy**

Political thought and political philosophy have been used interchangeably. When we talk of the history of political thought, we refer to the classical custom that began with Plato and ended with Marx though both Germino and MacIntyre consider Hegel's political philosophy as the ending of the classical custom, for, both see Marx as re-interpreting Hegel. The works of the great philosophers depict not only the troubles faced in their respective times, but also reflect their examination, enquiry, and experience. Political philosophy may, therefore, be said to be the political thought of a scrupulous philosopher of a scrupulous age. But political philosophy is superior to the political thought of a scrupulous philosopher; it is the political thought of an age or of a society. Political thought is also intimately connected with political philosophy. It amplifies and clearly states political thoughts, puts them in a time frame. So, political philosophy does contain political thought even though all political thought is not political philosophy. The variation flanked
by political philosophy and philosophy is not in relation to the mood or method but in relation to the subject matter.

Political thought is a historical narrative, descriptive to a big extent. Though political thought is historical in its approach, it is also, at the similar time observational, empirical, operational, relative and scientific. Political theory deals with concepts and thoughts of a scrupulous thinker. Its mode of inquiry is relative and explanatory.

**Connection flanked by Political Thought and Political Science**

Political thought is the assemblage of the philosophies of the numerous political philosophers wherein each political philosopher theorizes on political issues confronting his times. Each political philosopher discusses the political thoughts of his times and the age he lives in. It is in this sense that the assertion is made that each philosopher is the child of his own age. It is through his own circumstances that each philosopher impetus as well as inspiration. He also, in this sense, symbolizes his age. His philosophy/thought responds to the times lie symbolizes. His thought is his views on the numerous political concepts. Political thought becomes political thought through moving through political philosophy.

Political thought is history-oriented. It is the political history of a scrupulous time. It is history vertically, and history horizontally. Plato discussed the concept of justice after having discussed the numerous notions of justice prevailing then: the father son traditional view of justice; the radical view of justice and the two-brother' pragmatic view of justice. As against the historically-horizontal view of justice, political thought discusses the concept of justice vertically when it examines the term 'justice' as it evolves in the writings of the subsequent political philosophers.'

History is related to political science only casually, and to the extent it helps understand political phenomena. So understood, there is much that separates the two conditions, political science and political thought. History is a feature characteristic of political thought; science, that of political science. The nature of political thought is philosophical while that of political science
is empirical. Political thought is a value-laden exercise; political science is value-free. Political thought understands the present through the help of past and thereafter builds future on the present; political science deals mainly with the present, and with the future, only marginally. These distinctions separately there are much that both require from each other.

Political science depends on political thought in more than one method. Political thought spaces data at the disposal of political science for the latter's scrutiny. A political philosopher's philosophy is examined through a political scientist through scientific apparatus. The political thoughts of a political philosopher are examined in a method that he is described as 811 idealists or a scientist. There is a valid point when Plato is said to be the father of political philosophy, and Aristotle, as the father of political science-political idealism owes its inspiration to Plato, political realism, to Aristotle.

Political thinkers do not ignore scientific methodology while putting 'forth their political philosophy. Aristotle is said to have adopted the relative method of analyzing and classifying states of his times-he is said to have read and examined 158 constitutions of his age. Hobbes, and before him, Machiavelli too had followed the scientific method in expressing their thoughts, if science means a revise derived from rigorous readings, experimentation, observations, leading to testable and consistory conclusions. Marx, to take another instance, is said to have given a scientific theory of socialism, though, though all of them had reached sure finality in political theorizing the subsequent growths negated much of this claim. As such political theory is always a mixture of information and value incorporating the subjective thoughts of the thinkers and the prevailing climate of his age.

WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT: NATURE AND CONTENT

It is impossible to imagine political thought of the West for that matter, of any society without history, Political thought is related to politics, but it is history that gives political thought its extremely foundation. We do not mean to say that political thought can be studied without politics, but we certainly want to insist that we cannot revise political thought without history, Understanding political thought in the historical context is, in information, understanding political thought in the real sense.' A political philosopher's
political philosophy emerges in the age of philosopher breaths. In information, his political philosophy is an answer to the times the philosopher lives in. His philosophy cannot be separated from history of his times. No political thinker builds up his political philosophy without taking an explanation of the age or his times. To put the point in another sense, it may be said that a political philosopher is understood only in his milieu. Plato, though an idealist, could hardly be separated from his soil his classification of states depicted the classification as it prevailed then; his theory of education was drawn heavily from what lived in Athens and Sparta then. Machiavelli's whole methodology depicted his debt to history. Karl Marx went all the method to advocate the materialistic interpretation of history. The objective circumstances of history always give the foundations on which the political philosophers have built their philosophy.

Furthermore, we can understand the political philosophy of a political thinker only in the historical context. Separate a political philosopher from his times; one will always discover a Popper condemning Plato as an enemy of open society. A contextual revise is always a safer method of understanding a text. A text without a context is a structure without a base. Machiavelli is better understood in the context of renaissance. Hobbes and Locke, with their views as separately as the north-south poles, can be better studied in the background of the English civil war. Marx call is understood in the light of the rising capitalism of the European/ Western society.

It has grown and is rising, and in information, will always stay rising. It has grown in a typical method; each subsequent philosopher condemns/criticizes the philosophy or political thoughts of an earlier philosopher, and in the procedure builds his own philosophy. Aristotle did so with Plato; Locke did so with Filmer; Bentham, with Blackstone; John Stuart Mill, with Bentham; Marx did so with Hegel, Adam Smith, Proudhon. So western political thought has grown; it proceeds on polemics, it changes, but it continues. It is continuing since the days of Plato and Aristotle. No wonder if then it is said that all philosophy is a footnote to Plato. Plato and Aristotle jointly gave the base on which stands the whole fabric of western political thought; for political idealism and political realism are the two pillars of the
Western political philosophy from where rise numerous other related shades. It is not easy to identify what the western political thought contains. The effort, indeed, would be arbitrary. Though, major contents of the western political thought can, for the sake of creation a point, be stated, to be:

- Political institutions and procedures;
- Political idealism and realism.

**Western Political Thought, Political Institutions, and Political Procedures**

Western political thought deals, mainly, with political institutions and procedures relating to them. If political theory deals with what is related to or is relevant to politics, political thought, coming as it is, from the writings of a host of political philosophers deals with political power, i.e., wherein it is vested and how it is exercised, and for what objects does it exist. The political thinkers from the earlier days to the present times have dealt with such questions relating to politics: Plato was more interested in the state as it ought to be than Aristotle who devoted all his power on the best practicable state. The ancient Roman theorists talked in relation to the nature and role of law in administration. With the medieval Church theorists, political power was made to work under the divine law, the divine law under the natural law, the natural law under the eternal law. The early contemporary political theorists were concerned with the supreme power. The contractualists were eager to answer questions as to how the state came into subsistence and as to why people obey laws. While political philosophy deals with institutions as they were, as they are, and as they require/ ought to be, Marx saw them in materialist conditions. Sabine puts the point crossways when lie says,

- "A significant function of political thought is not only to illustrate what a political practice is but also to illustrate what it means. In showing what a practice means, or what it ought to mean, political theory can alter what it is."
Political philosophers have sought to understand the political institutions of their times, have given them the meanings and, in doing so; have suggested methods of altering them. Therefore, we may say that political thought deals with institutions. Furthermore, and it is significant as well, subsequent philosophers have after having suggested the changes in the institutions, maintained stability, the political philosopher, to use Sabine's languages, is a 'connector', a 'realtor' who weaves the political fabric.

Western political thought is equally dominated, since the beginning, with an interest in the political procedures as to how and why political power is applied. Indeed, political thought deals with political institutions, but it is also related to the working of political institution. The political philosophers were and are, primarily concerned not with what a state is or what it does, but also with how a state once entrusted with power, creates use of it. In other languages, political thought has been, beside with the revise of political institutions, dominated with, if we want to provide it a word, the rule of law, i.e., the procedure as to how the political power is put to use.

The rule of law means that there has to be the law that rules the people, and not the man that rules. It is a negation of the coercive, arbitrary, and totalitarian rule. It is a justification of power and its use. The rule of law, as a concept, has sure characteristics of its own: the law is to be applied impersonally; it cannot be used as a means for attaining individuals ends; it necessity be applied indiscriminately, though it is an act of scrupulous circumstances, has to be self-governing from the particularities, it forbids people to use coercive power in excess of others; it has to respond to the common norms of society and equilibrium; it has to be in consonance to 'cause'. Plato's ideal republic was a construction of cause and one of the major concerns of the Republic was the development of leadership that would not be corrupt and would remain subservient to its rational law. Aristotle preferred the rule of law to the rule of man, howsoever wise these may be. The Romans and the medieval thinkers advocate the efficacy of law: temporal or ecclesiastical. The contractualists did refer to the natural law. The jurists, from Austin to Blackstone, and Coke, never lost sight of the juridical and legal power. The Marxists denounce the State as an instrument of use while the
anarchists reject externally imposed power. No contemporary political philosopher, if any, should preach a system without creation rule of law as the base of society.

Western Political Thought, Political Idealism, and Political Realism

The two major streams beside which the whole western political thought keeps marching on are:

- Political idealism or as one may see political philosophy,
- Political realism, or as one may call it political science.

Plato symbolizes political idealism, and is rightly described as the father of political philosophy; Aristotle symbolizes political realism, and is extremely aptly described the father of political philosophy.

Philosophy and science have dominated the course of the western political thought. For an extensive time in the history of the west, philosophy ruled political thought till in relation to the first half of the 19th Century. It was then that science, owing mainly to the development made in other social sciences and the urge to create political phenomena relevant, captured the attention of the political philosophers, especially throughout the early years and the decades of 1950s-1960s in United States. These debates characterized nothing but the tussle flanked by philosophy and science, flanked by idealism and realism. All these testified nothing but change and stability in the western custom. Berlin, in an article in Gould and Thurstoy, Modern Political Thought, writes, "Neo-Marxism, neo-Thomism, nationalism, historicism, existentialism, anti-essential liberalism and socialism, transposition of doctrines of natural rights and natural law into empirical conditions... indicate not the death of a great custom but, if anything, new and unpredictable growths." All political thought, as it has urbanized or evolved, has tossed flanked by what it ought to be and what is and constantly moves flanked by the two stages.

SIGNIFICANCE OF WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT
Western political thought, since its beginning from ancient Greece has dealt with diverse diversities of issues, and each philosopher has handled them from his own angle. Indeed, the political philosophers have, at times, disagreed on the solutions, but what is significant is the stability of the issues which have captured their intentions. The major issues relating to politics have been the concerns of political philosophers. Through attempting to discover solutions to these political issues, the political theorists have given the western political thought not only a direction, but also a unity of thought procedures. The significance of western political thought lies in the effort of the political philosophers to identify political issues, and give solutions, therefore giving political thought a meaning and a vision. Sheldon Wolin puts a point, saying, "The designation of sure behaviors and arrangements as political, the feature method that we think in relation to them, and the concepts we employ to communicate our observations and reactions... none of these are written in the nature of things but are the legacy accruing from the historical action of political philosophers". He states these political' issues: the power dealings flanked by government and subject, the nature of political power, the troubles created through social conflicts, purposes and objectives of political action, and the character and utility of political knowledge.

Feature Characteristics of the Great Works of Western Political Thought

Any writing of a political discourse does not constitute part of the western political thought, but those which do are rightly described as the great works or the classics. It is a classic because it is a "class" through itself, "a work of the first rank and of acknowledged excellence". The classics in political thought contain the works of Plato to that of Marx. The word 'classics' signify 'a conversation of several voices', 'a dialogue' flanked by dissimilar perspectives and interpretations of reality as a work.

The works on political theory are written through political philosophers from time to time, and are related to a scrupulous time, and yet they are timeless. They are timeless because they live in all times and live beyond their own time. They are timeless because they are relevant in all ages-part, present and future. They are timeless because they highlight troubles
which are troubles for all times to come: corruption in politics had been a problem in Plato's times, and it is a problem even today. The works are timeless because they deal with issues confronting every age. They are timeless because the themes they touch reflect all times in all circumstances. They are timeless because they live in perpetuity.

The works on political theory are not outstanding because what is expressed therein is original, a 'who said it first' kind. All the conditions such as 'class', 'class thrash about', 'proletariat', 'bourgeois', 'revolution', 'surplus value', which Marx used, Isaiah Berlin says, were not his, i.e., he was not the first person who used them, for they have been used through several scholars earlier. But that was not what goes to the credit of Marx. Marx's contribution lies in giving these conditions new and definite meanings, a new political thought built on them. What is original may be a significant factor, but what is more significant is the understanding of a political situation and giving to the world, a new interpretation. That is where lies the importance of Mam, and, for that matter, of any political philosopher.

The political texts have contributed a great deal to the development of the dedicated language, expressed through languages, symbols, concepts and has become the vocabulary of political, philosophy. The concept of 'common will' used through Rousseau is an instance of such vocabulary. The languages such as 'state of nature', 'civil society' and the like are other examples. These works in politics through numerous philosophers have enriched our literature.

Relevance of Western Political Thought

It is the embodiment of the writings of numerous political philosophers. These writings are works in the field of Political Science which have stood the test of time. They have survived through ages because of their intrinsic worth. They remain motivating and instructive because of their perennial themes, sound comprehension, subtle approach, and profound analysis. They wield great power, and are, basically, suggestive.

The works of political thought are outstanding not because they are universally praised. In information, they are neither praised nor denounced. Plato is rated extremely high through some like Barker, 'wilde, Whiteliead
who go to the extent of saying that all subsequent philosophy is a footnote to Plato, while others such as Popper, Crossman and Winspear, condemn him as fascist, totalitarian, and enemy of democracy. Machiavelli, to take another instance, has been denounced through Catholic writers such as Butterfield, but has been admired through secular scholars such as Allen, Gramsci, and Wolin. These works on political thought flourish because they are continuously studied, interpreted, and discussed; each subsequent reading provides a new and fresh orientation. They are a great aid to thinking. It is in this sense that they are suggestive. Plato does not impose his "communistic" devices for acceptance, but lie do stimulate our mind and reactivate it to think other possible devices. They are not only suggestive, but are essentially inspirational.

In relation to the importance of the western political thought, Sheldon Wolin writes: "In teaching in relation to the past theories, the theorist is occupied in the task of political unitation, that is of introducing new generations of the students to the complexities of politics and the efforts of the theorist to confront its predicaments, of developing the capability for discriminating judgment, and of cultivating that sense of significance... which is vital to the scientific enquiry but cannot be furnished through scientific methods, and of exploring the methods it1 which new theoretical vistas are opened." Dilthey also says; "In learning classics, we construct our life experience with the aid of experiences of the great thinkers. Communication with their experiences enriches our own experience. After all, did not Karl Marx write: only music can awaken the musical sense in man?"

The great custom of Western political theory from Plato to Hegel deals exhaustively with the major contradictions and dimensions of the political procedure. Their importance is exhibited through the information that though they were primarily concerned with the immediate troubles besetting their modern situation, yet they were able to transcend their localism. In the procedure they were able to give a framework of analysis that would enrich other eras as well through their penetrating insights and thoughtful reflections on perennial troubles of politics, power, power, legitimacy, equity, and order.
They are masterpieces as they do not belong to any one civilization, culture, or time but cherished through the whole humankind.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- What is political thought?
- What is political thought? Distinguish political thought from political theory and political philosophy?
- Describe the nature of the western political thought.
- Amplify the importance and relevance of western political thought.
CHAPTER 2

Plato

STRUCTURE

- Learning objectives
- Introduction
- Biography
- Philosophy
- The dialogues
- Review questions

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the Plato life.
- Explain philosophical foundations of Plato's political theory.
- Understand the political philosophy of Plato.

INTRODUCTION

Plato (424/423 BC – 348/347 BC) was a philosopher in Classical Greece. He was also a mathematician, student of Socrates, writer of philosophical dialogues, and founder of the Academy in Athens, the first institution of higher learning in the Western world. Beside with his mentor, Socrates, and his student, Aristotle, Plato helped to lay the foundations of Western philosophy and science. In the languages of A. N. Whitehead:

- The safest common characterization of the European philosophical custom is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato. I do not mean the systematic scheme of thought which scholars have doubtfully extracted from his writings. I allude to the wealth of common thoughts scattered through them.
Plato's sophistication as a writer is apparent in his Socratic dialogues; thirty-six dialogues and thirteen letters have been ascribed to him. Plato's writings have been published in many fashions; this has led to many conventions concerning the naming and referencing of Plato's texts. Plato's dialogues have been used to teach a range of subjects, including philosophy, logic, ethics, rhetoric, and mathematics. Plato is one of the mainly significant founding figures in Western philosophy.

**BIOGRAPHY**

**Early Life**

*Birth and Family*

The exact lay and time of Plato's birth are not recognized, but it is sure that he belonged to an aristocratic and influential family. Based on ancient sources, mainly contemporary scholars consider that he was born in Athens or Aegina flanked by 429 and 423 BC. His father was Ariston. Just as to a disputed custom, reported through Diogenes Laertius, Ariston traced his descent from the king of Athens, Codrus, and the king of Messenia, Melanthus. Plato's mother was Perictione, whose family boasted of a connection with the well-known Athenian lawmaker and lyric poet Solon. Perictione was sister of Charmides and niece of Critias, both prominent figures of the Thirty Tyrants, the brief oligarchic regime, which followed on the collapse of Athens at the end of the Peloponnesian War (404–403 BC). Besides Plato himself, Ariston and Perictione had three other children; these were two sons, Adeimantus and Glaucon, and a daughter Potone, the mother of Speusippus (the nephew and successor of Plato as head of his philosophical Academy). Just as to the *Republic*, Adeimantus and Glaucon were older than Plato. Nevertheless, in his Memorabilia, Xenophon presents Glaucon as younger than Plato.

The traditional date of Plato's birth (428/427) is based on a dubious interpretation of Diogenes Laertius, who says, "When [Socrates] was gone, [Plato] joined Cratylus the Heracleitean and Hermogenes, who philosophized
in the manner of Parmenides. Then, at twenty-eight, Hermodorus says, [Plato] went to Euclides in Megara." As Debra Nails argues, "The text itself provides no cause to infer that Plato left immediately for Megara and implies the extremely opposite." In his Seventh Letter, Plato notes that his coming of age coincided with the taking of power through the Thirty, remarking, "But a youth under the age of twenty made him a laughingstock if he attempted to enter the political arena." Therefore, Nails dates Plato's birth to 424/423.

Just as to some accounts, Ariston tried to force his attentions on Perictione, but failed in his purpose; then the god Apollo appeared to him in a vision, and as a result, Ariston left Perictione unmolested. Another legend related that, when Plato was an infant, bees settled on his lips while he was sleeping: an augury of the sweetness of approach in which he would discourse philosophy.

Ariston appears to have died in Plato's childhood, although the precise dating of his death is hard. Perictione then married Pyrilampes, her mother's brother, who had served several times as an ambassador to the Persian court and was a friend of Pericles, the leader of the democratic faction in Athens. Pyrilampes had a son from a previous marriage, Demus, who was well-known for his beauty. Perictione gave birth to Pyrilampes' second son, Antiphon, the half-brother of Plato, who appears in Parmenides.

In contrast to his reticence in relation to himself, Plato often introduced his distinguished relatives into his dialogues, or referred to them with some precision: Charmides has a dialogue named after him; Critias speaks in both Charmides and Protagoras; and Adeimantus and Glaucon take prominent parts in the Republic. These and other references suggest a considerable amount of family pride and enable us to reconstruct Plato's family tree. Just as to Burnet, "the opening scene of the Charmides is a glorification of the whole [family] connection... Plato's dialogues are not only a memorial to Socrates, but also the happier days of his own family."

**Name**

Just as to Diogenes Laërtius, the philosopher was named Aristocles after his grandfather, but his wrestling coach, Ariston of Argos, dubbed him
Platon, meaning "broad," on explanation of his robust figure. Just as to the sources mentioned through Diogenes (all dating from the Alexandrian era), Plato derived his name from the breadth of his eloquence, or else because he was extremely wide crossways the forehead. Recent scholars have argued that the legend in relation to the name being Aristocles originated in the Hellenistic age. Plato was a general name, of which 31 instances are recognized at Athens alone.

Education

Apuleius informs us that Speusippus praised Plato's quickness of mind and modesty as a boy, and the "first fruits of his youth infused with hard work and love of revise". Plato necessity has been instructed in grammar, music, and gymnastics through the mainly distinguished teachers of his time. Dicaearchus went as distant as to say that Plato wrestled at the Isthmian games. Plato had also attended courses of philosophy; before meeting Socrates, he first became acquainted with Cratylus and the Heraclitean doctrines. W. A. Borody argues that an Athenian openness towards a wider range of sexuality may have contributed to the Athenian philosophers’ openness towards a wider range of thought, a cultural situation Borody describes as “polymorphously discursive.”

Plato and Socrates

The precise connection flanked by Plato and Socrates remnants a region of contention in the middle of scholars. Plato creates it clear in his Apology of Socrates, that he was a devoted young follower of Socrates. In that dialogue, Socrates is presented as mentioning Plato through name as one of those youths secure enough to him to have been corrupted, if he were in information guilty of corrupting the youth, and questioning why their fathers and brothers did not step forward to testify against him if he was indeed guilty of such a crime (33d-34a). Later, Plato is mentioned beside with Crito, Critobolus, and Apollodorus as offering to pay a fine of 30 minas on Socrates' behalf, in lieu of the death penalty proposed through Meletus (38b). In the
Phaedo, the title character lists those who were in attendance at the prison on Socrates' last day, explaining Plato's absence through saying, "Plato was ill."

Plato never speaks in his own voice in his dialogues. In the Second Letter, it says, "no writing of Plato exists or ever will exist, but those now said to be his are those of a Socrates become beautiful and new" (341c); if the Letter is Plato's, the final qualification appears to call into question the dialogues' historical fidelity. In any case, Xenophon and Aristophanes appear to present a somewhat dissimilar portrait of Socrates from the one Plato paints. Some have described attention to the problem of taking Plato's Socrates to be his mouthpiece, given Socrates' reputation for irony and the dramatic nature of the dialogue form.

Aristotle attributes a dissimilar doctrine with respect to the thoughts to Plato and Socrates. Putting it in a nutshell, Aristotle merely suggests that Socrates' thought of shapes can be exposed through investigation of the natural world, unlike Plato's Shapes that exist beyond and outside the ordinary range of human understanding.

Later Life

Plato may have traveled in Italy, Sicily, Egypt, and Cyrene. Said to have returned to Athens at the age of forty, Plato founded one of the earliest recognized organized schools in Western Culture on a plot of land in the Grove of Hecademus or Academus. The Academy was "a big enclosure of ground that was once the property of a citizen at Athens named Academus. The Academy operated until it was destroyed through Lucius Cornelius Sulla in 84 BC. Neoplatonists revived the Academy in the early 5th century, and it operated until AD 529, when it was closed through Justinian I of Byzantium, who saw it as a threat to the propagation of Christianity. Several intellectuals were schooled in the Academy, the mainly prominent one being Aristotle.

Throughout his later life, Plato became entangled with the politics of the municipality of Syracuse. Just as to Diogenes Laertius, Plato initially visited Syracuse while it was under the rule of Dionysius. Throughout this first trip Dionysius's brother-in-law, Dion of Syracuse, became one of Plato's disciples, but the tyrant himself turned against Plato. Plato was sold into
slavery and approximately faced death in Cyrene, a municipality at war with Athens, before an admirer bought Plato's freedom and sent him house. After Dionysius's death, just as to Plato's Seventh Letter, Dion requested Plato return to Syracuse to tutor Dionysius II and guide him to become a philosopher king. Dionysius II seemed to accept Plato's teachings, but he became suspicious of Dion, his uncle. Dionysius expelled Dion and kept Plato against his will. Eventually Plato left Syracuse. Dion would return to overthrow Dionysius and ruled Syracuse for a short time before being usurped through Calippus, a fellow disciple of Plato.

**Death**

A diversity of sources has given accounts of Plato's death. One story, based on a mutilated manuscript, suggests Plato died in his bed, whilst a young Thracian girl played the flute to him. Another custom suggests Plato died at a wedding feast. The explanation is based on Diogenes Laertius's reference to an explanation through Hermippus, a third century Alexandrian. Just as to Tertullian, Plato basically died in his sleep.

**PHILOSOPHY**

**Recurrent Themes**

Plato often discusses the father-son connection and the "question" of whether a father's interest in his sons has much to do with how well his sons turn out. A boy in ancient Athens was socially situated through his family identity, and Plato often refers to his characters in conditions of their paternal and fraternal relationships. Socrates was not a family man, and saw himself as the son of his mother, who was apparently a midwife. A divine fatalist, Socrates mocks men who spent exorbitant fees on tutors and trainers for their sons, and repeatedly ventures the thought that good character is a gift from the gods. Crito reminds Socrates that orphans are at the mercy of chance, but Socrates is unconcerned. In the Theaetetus, he is establishing recruiting as a disciple a young man whose inheritance has been squandered. Socrates twice compares the connection of the older man and his boy lover to the father-son
connection and in the *Phaedo*, Socrates' disciples, towards whom he displays more concern than his biological sons, say they will feel "fatherless" when he is gone.

In many dialogues, Socrates floats the thought that knowledge is a matter of recollection, and not of learning, observation, or revise. He maintains this view somewhat at his own expense, because in several dialogues, Socrates complains of his forgetfulness. Socrates is often establishing arguing that knowledge is not empirical, and that it comes from divine insight. In several middle era dialogues, such as the *Phaedo*, *Republic* and *Phaedrus* Plato advocates a belief in the immortality of the soul, and many dialogues end with extensive speeches imagining the afterlife. More than one dialogue contrasts knowledge and opinion, perception and reality, nature and custom, and body and soul.

Many dialogues tackle questions in relation to the art: Socrates says that poetry is inspired through the muses, and is not rational. He speaks approvingly of this, and other shapes of divine madness in the *Phaedrus* and yet in the *Republic* wants to outlaw Homer's great poetry, and laughter as well. In *Ion*, Socrates provides no hint of the disapproval of Homer that he expresses in the *Republic*. The dialogue *Ion* suggests that Homer's *Iliad* functioned in the ancient Greek world as the Bible does today in the contemporary Christian world: as divinely inspired literature that can give moral guidance, if only it can be properly interpreted.

Socrates and his company of disputants had something to say on several subjects, including politics and art, religion and science, justice and medicine, virtue and vice, crime and punishment, pleasure and pain, rhetoric and rhapsody, human nature and sexuality, love and wisdom.

**Metaphysics**

"Platonism" is a term coined through scholars to refer to the intellectual consequences of denying, as Socrates often does, the reality of the material world. In many dialogues, mainly notably the Republic, Socrates inverts the general man's intuition in relation to the knowable and what is real. While mainly people take the objects of their senses to be real if anything is,
Socrates is contemptuous of people who think that something has to be graspable in the hands to be real. In the *Theaetetus*, he says such people are "eu a-mousoi", an expression that means literally, "happily without the muses". In other languages, such people live without the divine inspiration that provides him, and people like him, access to higher insights in relation to the reality.

Socrates's thought that reality is unavailable to those who use their senses is what puts him at odds with the general man, and with general sense. Socrates says that he who sees with his eyes is blind, and this thought is mainly famously captured in his allegory of the cave, and more explicitly in his account of the divided row. The allegory of the cave is a paradoxical analogy wherein Socrates argues that the invisible world is the mainly intelligible and that the visible world is the least knowable, and the mainly obscure.

Socrates says in the *Republic* that people who take the sun-lit world of the senses to be good and real are livelihood pitifully in a den of evil and ignorance. Socrates admits that few climb out of the den, or cave of ignorance, and those who do, not only have a terrible thrash about to attain the heights, but when they go back down for a visit or to help other people up, they discover themselves objects of scorn and ridicule.

Just as to Socrates, physical objects and physical events are "shadows" of their ideal or perfect shapes, and exist only to the extent that they instantiate the perfect versions of themselves. Presently as shadows are temporary, inconsequential epiphenomena produced through physical objects, physical objects are themselves fleeting phenomena caused through more substantial causes, the ideals of which they are mere instances. For instance, Socrates thinks that perfect justice exists and his own trial would be a cheap copy of it.

The allegory of the cave is intimately linked to his political ideology that only people who have climbed out of the cave and cast their eyes on a vision of goodness are fit to rule. Socrates claims that the enlightened men of society necessity be forced from their divine contemplations and be compelled to run the municipality just as to their lofty insights. Therefore is born the thought of the "philosopher-king", the wise person who accepts the power
thrust upon him through the people who are wise enough to choose a good master. This is the main thesis of Socrates in the *Republic*, that the mainly wisdom the masses can muster is the wise choice of a ruler.

The word metaphysics derives from the information that Aristotle's musings in relation to the divine reality came after his lecture notes on his treatise on nature. The term is in information applied to Aristotle's own teacher, and Plato's "metaphysics" is understood as Socrates' division of reality into the warring and irreconcilable domains of the material and the spiritual. The theory has been of incalculable power in the history of Western philosophy and religion.

**Theory of Shapes**

The Theory of Shapes typically refers to the belief expressed through Socrates in some of Plato's dialogues, that the material world as it appears to us is not the real world, but only an image or copy of the real world. Socrates spoke of shapes in formulating a solution to the problem of universals. The shapes, just as to Socrates, are roughly speaking archetypes or abstract symbols of the several kinds of things, and properties we feel and see approximately us that can only be perceived through cause. In other languages, Socrates sometimes appears to recognize two worlds: the apparent world, which constantly changes, and an unchanging and unseen world of shapes, which may be a cause of what is apparent.

**Epistemology**

Several have interpreted Plato as stating—even having been the first to write—that knowledge is justified true belief, an influential view that informed future growths in epistemology. This interpretation is partly based on a reading of the *Theaetetus* wherein Plato argues that knowledge is distinguished from mere true belief through the knower having an "explanation" of the substance of her or his true belief. And this theory may again be seen in the *Meno*, where it is suggested that true belief can be raised to the stage of knowledge if it is bound with an explanation as to the question
of "why" the substance of the true belief is so. Several years later, Edmund Gettier famously demonstrated the troubles of the justified true belief explanation of knowledge.

Later in the *Meno*, Socrates uses a geometrical instance to expound Plato's view that knowledge in this latter sense is acquired through recollection. Socrates elicits information concerning a geometrical construction from a slave boy, who could not have otherwise recognized the information. The knowledge necessity be present, Socrates concludes, in an eternal, non-experiential form.

In other dialogues, the *Sophist, Statesman, Republic, and the Parmenides*, Plato himself associates knowledge with the apprehension of unchanging Shapes and their relationships to one another, including through the procedure of More explicitly, Plato himself argues in the *Timaeus* that knowledge is always proportionate to the realm from which it is gained. In other languages, if one derives one's explanation of something experientially, because the world of sense is in flux, the views therein attained will be mere opinions. And opinions are characterized through a lack of necessity and stability. On the other hand, if one derives one's explanation of something through method of the non-sensible shapes, because these shapes are unchanging, so too is the explanation derived from them. That apprehension of Shapes is required for knowledge may be taken to cohere with Plato's theory in the *Theaetetus* and *Meno*. Indeed, the apprehension of Shapes may be at the base of the "explanation" required for justification, in that it offers foundational knowledge which itself needs no explanation, thereby avoiding an infinite regress.

**The State**

Plato's philosophical views had several societal implications, especially on the thought of an ideal state or government. There is some discrepancy flanked by his early and later views. Some of the mainly well-known doctrines are contained in the *Republic* throughout his middle era, as well as in the *Laws* and the *Statesman*. Though, because Plato wrote dialogues, it is assumed that
Socrates is often speaking for Plato. This assumption may not be true in all cases.

Plato, through the languages of Socrates, asserts that societies have a tripartite class structure corresponding to the appetite/spirit/cause structure of the individual soul. The body parts symbolize the castes of society.

- **Productive**, which symbolizes the abdomen. (Workers) — the laborers, carpenters, plumbers, masons, merchants, farmers, ranchers, etc. These correspond to the "appetite" part of the soul.
- **Protective**, which symbolizes the chest. (Warriors or Guardians) — those who are adventurous, strong and brave; in the armed forces. These correspond to the "spirit" part of the soul.
- **Governing**, which symbolizes the head? (Rulers or Philosopher Kings) — those who are intelligent, rational, self-controlled, in love with wisdom, well suited to create decisions for the society. These correspond to the "cause" part of the soul and are extremely few.

Just as to this model, the principles of Athenian democracy (as it lived in his day) are rejected as only a few are fit to rule. Instead of rhetoric and persuasion, Plato says cause and wisdom should govern. As Plato puts it:

- "Until philosophers rule as kings or those who are now described kings and leading men genuinely and adequately philosophize, that is, until political power and philosophy entirely coincide, while the several natures who at present pursue either one exclusively are forcibly prevented from doing so, municipalities will have no rest from evils,... nor, I think, will the human race."

Plato describes these "philosopher kings" as "those who love the sight of truth" and supports the thought with the analogy of a captain and his ship or a doctor and his medicine. Just as to him, sailing and health are not things that everyone is qualified to practice through nature. A big part of the *Republic* then addresses how the educational system should be set up to produce these philosopher kings.

Though, it necessity be taken into explanation that the ideal municipality outlined in the *Republic* is qualified through Socrates as the ideal
luxurious municipality, examined to determine how it is that injustice and justice grow in a municipality. Just as to Socrates, the "true" and "healthy" municipality is instead the one first outlined in book II of the Republic, 369c–372d, containing farmers, craftsmen, merchants, and wage-earners, but lacking the guardian class of philosopher-kings as well as delicacies such as "perfumed oils, incense, prostitutes, and pastries", in addition to paintings, gold, ivory, couches, a multitude of occupations such as poets and hunters, and war.

In addition, the ideal municipality is used as an image to illuminate the state of one's soul, or the will, cause, and desires combined in the human body. Socrates is attempting to create an image of a rightly ordered human, and then later goes on to describe the dissimilar types of humans that can be observed, from tyrants to lovers of money in several types of municipalities. The ideal municipality is not promoted, but only used to magnify the dissimilar types of individual humans and the state of their soul. Though, the philosopher king image was used through several after Plato to justify their personal political beliefs. The philosophic soul just as to Socrates has cause, will, and desires united in virtuous harmony. A philosopher has the moderate love for wisdom and the courage to act just as to wisdom. Wisdom is knowledge in relation to the Good or the right dealings flanked by all that exists.

Wherein it concerns states and rulers, Plato has made motivating arguments. For instance he asks which is better—a bad democracy or a country reigned through a tyrant. He argues that it is better to be ruled through a bad tyrant, than be a bad democracy. This is emphasized within the Republic as Plato describes the event of mutiny on board a ship. Plato suggests the ships crew to be in row with the democratic rule of several and the captain, although inhibited through ailments, the tyrant. Plato's account of this event is parallel to that of democracy within the state and the inherent troubles that arise.

Just as to Plato, a state made up of dissimilar types of souls will, overall, decline from an aristocracy (rule through the best) to a democracy (rule through the honorable), then to an oligarchy (rule through the few), then to a democracy (rule through the people), and finally to tyranny (rule through one person, rule through a tyrant). Aristocracy is the form of government
(politeia) advocated in Plato's Republic. This regime is ruled through a philosopher king, and therefore is grounded on wisdom and cause. The aristocratic state, and the man whose nature corresponds to it, are the objects of Plato's analyses throughout much of the Republic, as opposed to the other four kinds of states/men, who are discussed later in his work. In Book VIII, Plato states in order the other four imperfect societies with an account of the state's structure and individual character. In democracy the ruling class is made up primarily of those with a warrior-like character. In his account, Plato has Sparta in mind. Oligarchy is made up of a society in which wealth is the criterion of merit and the wealthy are in manage. In democracy, the state bears resemblance to ancient Athens with traits such as equality of political opportunity and freedom for the individual to do as he likes. Democracy then degenerates into tyranny from the disagreement of rich and poor. It is characterized through an undisciplined society existing in chaos, where the tyrant rises as popular champion leading to the formation of his private army and the growth of oppression.

**Unwritten Doctrines**

For an extensive time, Plato's unwritten doctrine had been controversial. Several contemporary books on Plato appear to diminish its importance; nevertheless, the first significant witness who mentions its subsistence is Aristotle, who in his Physics (209 b) writes: "It is true, indeed, that the explanation he provides there [i.e. in Timaeus] of the participant is dissimilar from what he says in his so-described unwritten teachings." The term literally means unwritten doctrines and it stands for the mainly fundamental metaphysical teaching of Plato, which he disclosed only orally, and some say only to his mainly trusted fellows, and which he may have kept secret from the public. The importance of the unwritten doctrines does not appear to have been seriously questioned before the 19th century.

A cause for not revealing it to everyone is partially discussed in Phaedrus (276 c) where Plato criticizes the written transmission of knowledge as faulty, favoring instead the spoken logos: "he who has knowledge of the presently and the good and beautiful... will not, when in earnest, write them in
ink, sowing them through a pen with languages, which cannot defend themselves through argument and cannot teach the truth effectually." The similar argument is repeated in Plato's Seventh Letter (344 c): "every serious man in dealing with really serious subjects cautiously avoids writing." In the similar letter he writes (341 c): "I can certainly declare concerning all these writers who claim to know the subjects that I seriously revise... there does not exist, nor will there ever exist, any treatise of mine dealing therewith." Such secrecy is necessary in order not "to expose them to unseemly and degrading treatment".

It is, though, said that Plato once disclosed this knowledge to the public in his lecture On the Good, in which the Good is recognized with the One, the fundamental ontological principle. The content of this lecture has been transmitted through many witnesses - in the middle of others, Aristoxenus, who describes the event in the following languages: "Each came expecting to learn something in relation to the things that are usually measured good for men, such as wealth, good health, physical strength, and altogether a type of wonderful happiness. But when the mathematical demonstrations came, including numbers, geometrical figures and astronomy, and finally the statement Good is One seemed to them, I imagine, utterly unexpected and strange; hence some belittled the matter, while others rejected it." Simplicius quotes Alexander of Aphrodisias, who states that "just as to Plato, the first principles of everything, including the Shapes themselves are One and Indefinite Duality, which he described Big and Small... one might also learn this from Speusippus and Xenocrates and the others who were present at Plato's lecture on the Good".

Their explanation is in full agreement with Aristotle's account of Plato's metaphysical doctrine. In Metaphysics he writes: "Now since the Shapes are the causes of everything else, he [i.e. Plato] supposed that their elements are the elements of all things. Accordingly the material principle is the Great and Small [i.e. the Dyad], and the essence is the One, since the numbers are derived from the Great and Small through participation in the One" (987 b). "From this explanation it is clear that he only employed two causes: that of the essence, and the material cause; for the Shapes are the cause
of the essence in everything else, and the One is the cause of it in the Shapes. He also tells us what the material substrate is of which the Shapes are predicated in the case of sensible things, and the One in that of the Shapes - that it is this the duality, the Great and Small. Further, he assigned to these two elements respectively the causation of good and of evil."

The mainly significant aspect of this interpretation of Plato's metaphysics is the stability flanked by his teaching and the neoplatonic interpretation of Plotinus or Ficino which has been measured erroneous through several but may in information have been directly influenced through oral transmission of Plato's doctrine. A contemporary scholar who recognized the importance of the unwritten doctrine of Plato was Heinrich Gomperz who described it in his speech throughout the 7th International Congress of Philosophy in 1930. All the sources related to the composed through Konrad Gaiser and published as Testimonia Platonica. These sources have subsequently been interpreted through scholars from the German Tübingen School such as Hans Joachim Krämer or Thomas A. Szlezák.

**Dialectic**

The role of dialectic in Plato's thought is contested but there are two main interpretations; a kind of reasoning and a method of intuition. Simon Blackburn adopts the first, saying that Plato's dialectic is "the procedure of eliciting the truth through means of questions aimed at opening out what is already implicitly recognized, or at exposing the contradictions and muddles of an opponent's location." A similar interpretation has been put forth through Louis Hartz, who suggests that elements of the dialectic are borrowed from Hegel. Just as to this view, opposing arguments improve upon each other, and prevailing opinion is shaped through the synthesis of several conflicting thoughts in excess of time. Each new thought exposes a flaw in the accepted model, and the epistemological substance of the debate continually approaches the truth. Hartz's is a teleological interpretation at the core, in which philosophers will ultimately exhaust the accessible body of knowledge and therefore reach "the end of history." Karl Popper, on the other hand, claims that dialectic is the art of intuition for "visualizing the divine originals, the
Shapes or Thoughts, of unveiling the Great Mystery behind the general man's everyday world of appearances."

**THE DIALOGUES**

Thirty-six dialogues and thirteen letters have traditionally been ascribed to Plato, though contemporary scholarship doubts the authenticity of at least some of these. Plato's writings have been published in many fashions; this has led to many conventions concerning the naming and referencing of Plato's texts.

The usual system for creation unique references to sections of the text through Plato derives from a 16th century edition of Plato's works through Henricus Stephanus. An overview of Plato's writings just as to this system can be established in the Stephanus pagination article.

One custom concerning the arrangement of Plato's texts is just as to tetralogies. This scheme is ascribed through Diogenes Laertius to an ancient scholar and court astrologer to Tiberius named Thrasyllus.

In the list below, works through Plato are marked:

- If there is no consensus in the middle of scholars as to whether Plato is the author, and
- If mainly scholars agree that Plato is not the author of the work.

Unmarked works are assumed to have been written through Plato.

- I. *Euthyphro, Apology (of Socrates), Crito, Phaedo*
- II. *Cratylus, Theaetetus, Sophist, Statesman*
- III. *Parmenides, Philebus, Symposium, Phaedrus*
- IV. *First Alcibiades (1), Second Alcibiades (2), Hipparchus (2), (Rival) Lovers (2)*
- V. *Theaeges (2), Charmides, Laches, Lysis*
- VI. *Euthydemus, Protagoras, Gorgias, Meno*
- VII. *(Greater) Hippias (major) (1), (Lesser) Hippias (minor), Ion, Menexenus*
- VIII. *Clitophon (1), Republic, Timaeus, Critias*
- IX. *Minos (2), Laws, Epinomis (2), Epistles (1).*

The remaining works were transmitted under Plato's name, mainly of them already measured spurious in antiquity, and so were not incorporated
through Thrasyllus in his tetra logical arrangement. These works are labeled as *Notheuomenoi* or *Apocrypha*.

**Composition of the Dialogues**

No one knows the exact order Plato's dialogues were written in, or the extent to which some might have been later revised and rewritten.

Lewis Campbell was the first to create exhaustive use of telemetry to prove objectively that the *Critias, Timaeus, Laws, Philebus, Sophist*, and *Statesman* were all clustered jointly as a group, while the *Parmenides, Phaedrus, Republic*, and *Theaetetus* belong to a separate group, which necessity be earlier. What is extra ordinary in relation to the Campbell's conclusions is that, in spite of all the telemetric studies that have been mannered since his time, perhaps the only chronological information in relation to the Plato's works that can now be said to be *proven* through telemetry is the information that *Critias, Timaeus, Laws, Philebus, Sophist*, and *Statesman* are the latest of Plato's dialogues, the others earlier.

Increasingly in the mainly recent Plato scholarship, writers are skeptical of the notion that the order of Plato's writings can be recognized with any precision, though Plato's works are still often characterized as falling at least roughly into three groups. The following symbolizes one relatively general such division. It should, though, be kept in mind that several of the positions in the ordering are still highly disputed, and also that the extremely notion that Plato's dialogues can or should be "ordered" is through no means universally accepted.

In the middle of those who classify the dialogues into eras of composition, Socrates figures in all of the "early dialogues" and they are measured the mainly faithful symbols of the historical Socrates. They contain *The Apology of Socrates, Charmides, Crito, Euthyphro, Ion, Laches, Less Hippias, Lysis, Menexenus, and Protagoras*. Three dialogues are often measured "middle" or "pre-middle": *Euthydemus, Gorgias*, and *Meno*.

Whereas those classified as "early dialogues" often conclude in aporia, the so-described "middle dialogues" give more clearly stated positive teachings that are often ascribed to Plato such as the theory of shapes. These
dialogues contain *Cratylus, Phaedo, Phaedrus, Republic, Symposium, Parmenides*, and *Theaetetus*. Proponents of dividing the dialogues into eras often consider the *Parmenides* and *Theaetetus* to come late in this era and be middle to the after that, as they appear to treat the theory of shapes critically or not at all.

The remaining dialogues are classified as "late" and are usually agreed to be hard and demanding pieces of philosophy. This grouping is the only one proven through telemetric analysis. While looked to for Plato's "mature" answers to the questions posed through his earlier works, those answers are hard to discern. Some scholars say that the theory of shapes is absent from the late dialogues, it’s having been refuted in the *Parmenides*, but there isn't total consensus that the *Parmenides* actually refutes the theory of shapes. The so-described "late dialogues" contain *Critias, Laws, Philebus, Sophist, Statesman*, and *Timaeus*.

**Narration of the Dialogues**

Plato never presents himself as a participant in any of the dialogues, and with the exception of the *Apology*, there is no suggestion that he heard any of the dialogues firsthand. Some dialogues have no narrator but have a pure "dramatic" form, some dialogues are narrated through Socrates, wherein he speaks in first person. One dialogue, *Protagoras*, begins in dramatic form but quickly proceeds to Socrates' narration of a conversation he had previously with the sophist for whom the dialogue is named; this narration continues uninterrupted till the dialogue's end.

Two dialogues *Phaedo* and *Symposium* also begin in dramatic form but then proceed to virtually uninterrupted narration through followers of Socrates. *Phaedo*, an explanation of Socrates' final conversation and hemlock drinking, is narrated through Phaedo to Echecrates in a foreign municipality not extensive after the execution took lay. The *Symposium* is narrated through Apollodorus, a Socratic disciple, apparently to Glaucon. Apollodorus assures his listener that he is recounting the story, which took lay when he himself was an infant, not from his own memory, but as remembered through Aristodemus, who told him the story years ago.
The *Theaetetus* is a peculiar case: a dialogue in dramatic form imbedded within another dialogue in dramatic form. In the beginning of the *Theaetetus* (142c-143b), Euclides says that he compiled the conversation from notes he took based on what Socrates told him of his conversation with the title character. The rest of the *Theaetetus* is presented as a "book" written in dramatic form and read through one of Euclides' slaves (143c). Some scholars take this as an indication that Plato had through this date wearied of the narrated form. With the exception of the *Theaetetus*, Plato provides no explicit indication as to how these orally transmitted conversations came to be written down.

**Trial of Socrates**

The trial of Socrates is the central, unifying event of the great Platonic dialogues. Because of this, Plato's *Apology* is perhaps the mainly often read of the dialogues. In the *Apology*, Socrates tries to dismiss rumors that he is a sophist and defends himself against charges of disbelief in the gods and corruption of the young. Socrates insists that extensive-standing slander will be the real cause of his demise, and says the legal charges are essentially false. Socrates famously denies being wise, and explains how his life as a philosopher was launched through the Oracle at Delphi. He says that his quest to resolve the riddle of the oracle put him at odds with his fellow man, and that this is the cause he has been mistaken for a menace to the municipality-state of Athens.

If Plato's significant dialogues do not refer to Socrates' execution explicitly, they allude to it, or use characters or themes that play a part in it. Five dialogues foreshadow the trial: In the *Theaetetus* (210d) and the *Euthyphro* (2a–b) Socrates tells people that he is in relation to the face corruption charges. In the *Meno* (94e–95a), one of the men who brings legal charges against Socrates, Anytus, warns him in relation to the trouble he may get into if he does not stop criticizing significant people. In the *Gorgias*, Socrates says that his trial will be like a doctor prosecuted through a cook who asks a jury of children to choose flanked by the doctor's bitter medicine and the cook's tasty treats (521e–522a). In the *Republic* (7.517e), Socrates explains
why an enlightened man (presumably himself) will stumble in a courtroom situation. The *Apology* is Socrates' protection speech, and the *Crito* and *Phaedo* take lay in prison after the conviction. In the *Protagoras*, Socrates is a guest at the house of Callias, son of Hipponicus, a man whom Socrates disparages in the *Apology* as having wasted a great amount of money on sophists' fees.

**Unity and Diversity of the Dialogues**

Two other significant dialogues, the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus*, are connected to the main storyline through characters. In the *Apology* (19b, c), Socrates says Aristophanes slandered him in a comic play, and blames him for causing his bad reputation, and ultimately, his death. In the *Symposium*, the two of them are drinking jointly with other friends. The character Phaedrus is connected to the main story row through character (Phaedrus is also a participant in the *Symposium* and the *Protagoras*) and through theme (the philosopher as divine emissary, etc.) The *Protagoras* is also strongly connected to the *Symposium* through characters: all of the formal speakers at the *Symposium* (with the exception of Aristophanes) are present at the house of Callias in that dialogue. Charmides and his guardian Critias are present for the discussion in the *Protagoras*. Examples of characters crossing flanked by dialogues can be further multiplied. The *Protagoras* contains the main gathering of Socratic associates.

In the dialogues Plato is mainly celebrated and admired for, Socrates is concerned with human and political virtue, has a distinctive personality, and friends and enemies who "travel" with him from dialogue to dialogue. This is not to say that Socrates is constant: a man who is his friend in one dialogue may be an adversary or subject of his mockery in another. For instance, Socrates praises the wisdom of Euthyphro several times in the *Cratylus*, but creates him seem like a fool in the *Euthyphro*. He disparages sophists usually, and Prodicus specifically in the *Apology*, whom he also slyly jabs in the *Cratylus* for charging the hefty fee of fifty drachmas for a course on language and grammar. Though, Socrates tells Theaetetus in his namesake dialogue that
he admires Prodicus and has directed several pupils to him. Socrates' thoughts are also not constant within or flanked by or in the middle of dialogues.

**Platonic Scholarship**

Although their popularity has fluctuated in excess of the years, the works of Plato have never been without readers since the time they were written. Plato's thought is often compared with that of his mainly well-known student, Aristotle, whose reputation throughout the Western Middle Ages so totally eclipsed that of Plato that the Scholastic philosophers referred to Aristotle as "the Philosopher". Though, in the Byzantine Empire, the revise of Plato sustained.

The Medieval scholastic philosophers did not have access too mainly of the works of Plato, nor the knowledge of Greek needed to read them. Plato's original writings were essentially lost to Western culture until they were brought from Constantinople in the century of its fall, through George Gemistos Plethon. It is whispered that Plethon passed a copy of the Dialogues to Cosimo de' Medici when in 1438 the Council of Ferrara, described to unify the Greek and Latin Churches, was adjourned to Florence, where Plethon then lectured on the relation and differences of Plato and Aristotle, and fired Cosimo with his enthusiasm. Throughout the early Islamic era, Persian and Arab scholars translated much of Plato into Arabic and wrote commentaries and interpretations on Plato's, Aristotle's and other Platonist philosophers' works. Several of these comments on Plato were translated from Arabic into Latin and as such influenced Medieval scholastic philosophers.

Only in the Renaissance, with the common resurgence of interest in classical culture, did knowledge of Plato's philosophy become widespread again in the West. Several of the greatest early contemporary scientists and artists who broke with Scholasticism and fostered the flowering of the Renaissance, with the support of the Plato-inspired Lorenzo de Medici, saw Plato's philosophy as the foundation for progress in the arts and sciences. Through the 19th century, Plato's reputation was restored, and at least on par with Aristotle's.
Notable Western philosophers have sustained to draw upon Plato's work since that time. Plato's power has been especially strong in mathematics and the sciences. He helped to distinguish flanked by pure and applied mathematics through widening the gap flanked by "arithmetic", now described number theory and "logistic", now described arithmetic. He regarded logistic as appropriate for business men and men of war who "necessity learn the art of numbers or he will not know how to array his troops," while arithmetic was appropriate for philosophers "because he has to arise out of the sea of change and lay hold of true being." Plato's resurgence further inspired some of the greatest advances in logic since Aristotle, primarily through Gottlob Frege and his followers Kurt Gödel, Alonzo Church, and Alfred Tarski; the last of these summarized his approach through reversing the customary paraphrase of Aristotle's well-known declaration of sedition from the Academy from *Amicus Plato sed magis amica veritas* ("Plato is a friend, but truth is a greater friend") to *Inimicus Plato sed magis inimica falsitas* ("Plato is an enemy, but falsehood is a greater enemy"). Albert Einstein suggested that the scientist that takes philosophy seriously would have to avoid systematization and take on several dissimilar roles, but perhaps appearing as a Platonist or Pythagorean, in that such a one has "the viewpoint of logical simplicity as an indispensable and effective tool of his research." Conversely, thinkers that diverged from ontological models and moral ideals in their own philosophy, have tended to disparage Platonism from more or less informed perspectives. Therefore Friedrich Nietzsche attacked Plato's moral and political theories, Martin Heidegger argued against Plato's alleged obfuscation of Being, and Karl Popper argued in *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (1945) that Plato's alleged proposal for a government system in the Republic was prototypically totalitarian. Leo Strauss is measured through some as the prime thinker involved in the recovery of Platonic thought in its more political, and less metaphysical, form. Deeply influenced through Nietzsche and Heidegger, Strauss nonetheless rejects their condemnation of Plato and looks to the dialogues for a solution to what all three thinkers acknowledge as 'the crisis of the West.'
Textual Sources and History

The texts of Plato as received today apparently symbolize the complete written philosophical work of Plato and are usually good through the standards of textual criticism. No contemporary edition of Plato in the original Greek symbolizes a single source, but rather it is reconstructed from multiple sources which are compared with each other. These sources are medieval manuscripts written on vellum (mainly from 9th-13th century AD Byzantium), papyri (mainly from late antiquity in Egypt), and from the self-governing testimonia of other authors who quote several segments of the works (which come from a diversity of sources). The text as presented is usually not much dissimilar than what appears in the Byzantine manuscripts, and papyri and testimonia presently confirm the manuscript custom.

In the first century AD, Thrasyllus of Mendes had compiled and published the works of Plato in the original Greek, both genuine and spurious. While it has not survived to the present day, all the extant medieval Greek manuscripts are based on his edition.

The oldest surviving complete manuscript for several of the dialogues is the Clarke Plato, which was written in Constantinople in 895 and acquired through Oxford University in 1809. The Clarke is given the siglum B in contemporary editions. B contains the first six tetralogies and is described internally as being written through "John the Calligrapher" on behalf of Arethas of Caesarea. It appears to have undergone corrections through Arethas himself. For the last two tetralogies and the apocrypha, the oldest surviving complete manuscript is Codex Parisinus graecus 1807, designated A, which was written almost contemporaneously to B, circa 900 AD. A almost certainly had an initial volume containing the first 7 tetralogies which is now lost, but of which a copy was made, Codex Venetus append, which has the siglum T. The oldest manuscript for the seventh tetralogy is Codex Vindobonensis 54. suppl. phil. Gr. 7, with siglum W, with a supposed date in the twelfth century. In total there are fifty-one such Byzantine manuscripts recognized, while others may yet be establish.
To help set up the text, the older proof of papyri and the self-governing proof of the testimony of commentators and other authors are also used. Several papyri which contain fragments of Plato's texts are in the middle of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. The 2003 Oxford Classical Texts edition through Slings even cites the Coptic translation of a fragment of the Republic in the Nag Hammadi library as proof. Significant authors for testimony contain Olympiodorus the Younger, Plutarch, Proclus, Iamblichus, Eusebius, and Stobaeus.

Throughout the early Renaissance, the Greek language and, beside with it, Plato's texts were reintroduced to Western Europe through Byzantine scholars. In 1483 there was published a Latin edition of Plato's complete works translated through Marsilio Ficino at the behest of Cosimo de' Medici. Cosimo had been influenced toward learning Plato through the several Byzantine Platonists in Florence throughout his day, including George Gemistus Plethon. Henri Estienne's edition, including parallel Greek and Latin, was published in 1578. It was this edition which recognized Stephanus pagination, still in use today.

**Contemporary Editions**

The Oxford Classical Texts offers the current standard complete Greek text of Plato's complete works. In five volumes edited through John Burnet, its first edition was published 1900-1907, and it is still accessible from the publisher, having last been printed in 1993. The second edition is still in progress with only the first volume, printed in 1995, and the Republic, printed in 2003, accessible. The Cambridge Greek and Latin Texts and Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries series comprises Greek editions of the Protagoras, Symposium, Phaedrus, Alcibiades, and Clitophon, with English philological, literary, and, to an extent, philosophical commentary. One distinguished edition of the Greek text is E. R. Dodds' of the Gorgias, which comprises extensive English commentary.

The contemporary standard complete English edition is the 1997 Hackett Plato, Complete Works, edited through John M. Cooper. For several of these translations Hackett offers separate volumes which contain more
through method of commentary, notes, and introductory material. There is also the *Clarendon Plato Series* through Oxford University Press which offers English translations and thorough philosophical commentary through leading scholars on a few of Plato's works, including John McDowell's version of the *Theaetetus*. Cornell University Press has also begun the *Agora* series of English translations of classical and medieval philosophical texts, including a few of Plato's.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Critically examine Plato's Theory of Education.
- Evaluate Plato's Theory of Justice is the light of the prevailing theories of justice.
- Explain the importance of community of wives and property in Plato's ideal state.
- Discuss Plato's theory of ideal state. What qualities does Plato suggest for the ruling class?
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Explain the Aristotle’s work, methodology and his time.
- Understand the philosophical foundations of Aristotle's political theory
- Political ideas of Aristotle.

INTRODUCTION

Aristotle (384 BC – 322 BC) was a Greek philosopher and polymath, a student of Plato and teacher of Alexander the Great. His writings cover several subjects, including physics, metaphysics, poetry, theater, music, logic, rhetoric, linguistics, politics, government, ethics, biology, and zoology. Jointly with Plato and Socrates (Plato's teacher), Aristotle is one of the mainly significant founding figures in Western philosophy. Aristotle's writings were the first to make a comprehensive system of Western philosophy, encompassing morality, aesthetics, logic, science, politics, and metaphysics. Aristotle's views on the physical sciences profoundly shaped medieval scholarship, and their power extended well into the Renaissance, although they were ultimately replaced through Newtonian physics. In the zoological sciences, some of his observations were confirmed to be accurate only in the 19th century. His works contain the earliest recognized formal revise of logic,
which was incorporated in the late 19th century into contemporary formal logic. In metaphysics, Aristotelianism had a profound power on philosophical and theological thinking in the Islamic and Jewish traditions in the Middle Ages, and it continues to power Christian theology, especially the scholastic custom of the Catholic Church. Aristotle was well recognized in the middle of medieval Muslim intellectuals and revered as - "The First Teacher". His ethics, though always influential, gained renewed interest with the contemporary advent of virtue ethics. All characteristics of Aristotle's philosophy continue to be the substance of active academic revise today. Though Aristotle wrote several elegant treatises and dialogues (Cicero described his literary approach as "a river of gold"), it is thought that the majority of his writings are now lost and only in relation to the one-third of the original works have survived.

LIFE

Aristotle, whose name means "the best purpose," was born in Stagira, Chalcidice, in 384 BC, in relation to the 55 km (34 mi) east of contemporary-day Thessaloniki. His father Nicomachus was the personal physician to King Amyntas of Macedon. Although there is little information on Aristotle's childhood, he almost certainly did spend some time then in the Macedonian palace, creation his first connections with the Macedonian monarchy. At in relation to the age of eighteen, he went to Athens to continue his education at Plato's Academy. Aristotle remained at the academy for almost twenty years before leaving Athens in 348/47 BC. The traditional story in relation to the his departure reports that he was disappointed with the direction the academy took after manage passed to Plato's nephew Speusippus upon his death, although it is possible that he feared anti-Macedonian sentiments and left before Plato had died. He then traveled with Xenocrates to the court of his friend Hermias of Atarneus in Asia Minor. While in Asia, Aristotle traveled with Theophrastus to the island of Lesbos, where jointly they researched the botany and zoology of the island. Aristotle married Hermias's adoptive daughter (or niece) Pythias. She bore him a daughter, whom they named Pythias. Soon after Hermias' death, Aristotle was invited through Philip II of Macedon to become the tutor to his son Alexander in 343 BC.
Aristotle was appointed as the head of the royal academy of Macedon. Throughout that time he gave lessons not only to Alexander, but also to two other future kings: Ptolemy and Cassander. Aristotle encouraged Alexander toward eastern conquest, and his attitude towards Persia was unabashedly ethnocentric. In one well-known instance, he counsels Alexander to be "a leader to the Greeks and a despot to the barbarians, to seem after the former as after friends and relatives, and to deal with the latter as with beasts or plants".

Through 335 BC he had returned to Athens, establishing his own school there recognized as the Lyceum. Aristotle mannered courses at the school for the after that twelve years. While in Athens, his wife Pythias died and Aristotle became involved with Herpyllis of Stagira, who bore him a son whom he named after his father, Nicomachus. Just as to the Suda, he also had an eromenos, Palaephatus of Abydus.

It is throughout this era in Athens from 335 to 323 BC when Aristotle is whispered to have composed several of his works. Aristotle wrote several dialogues, only fragments of which survived. The works that have survived are in treatise form and were not, for the mainly part, planned for widespread publication, as they are usually thought to be lecture aids for his students. His mainly significant treatises contain Physics, Metaphysics, Nicomachean Ethics, Politics, De Anima (On the Soul) and Poetics.

Aristotle not only studied approximately every subject possible at the time, but made important contributions to mainly of them. In physical science, Aristotle studied anatomy, astronomy, embryology, geography, geology, meteorology, physics and zoology. In philosophy, he wrote on aesthetics, ethics, government, metaphysics, politics, economics, psychology, rhetoric and theology. He also studied education, foreign customs, literature and poetry. His combined works constitute a virtual encyclopedia of Greek knowledge. It has been suggested that Aristotle was almost certainly the last person to know everything there was to be recognized in his own time.

Close to the end of Alexander's life, Alexander began to suspect plots against him, and threatened Aristotle in letters. Aristotle had made no secret of his contempt for Alexander's pretense of divinity, and the king had executed Aristotle's grandnephew Callisthenes as a traitor. A widespread custom in
antiquity suspected Aristotle of playing a role in Alexander's death, but there is little proof for this.

Upon Alexander's death, anti-Macedonian sentiment in Athens once again flared. Eurymedon the hierophant denounced Aristotle for not holding the gods in honor. Aristotle fled the municipality to his mother's family estate in Chalcis, explaining, "I will not allow the Athenians to sin twice against philosophy," a reference to Athens's prior trial and execution of Socrates. He died in Euboea of natural causes within the year (in 322 BC). Aristotle named chief executor his student Antipater and left a will in which he asked to be buried after that to his wife.

THOUGHT

Logic

With the *Prior Analytics*, Aristotle is credited with the earliest revise of formal logic, and his conception of it was the dominant form of Western logic until 19th century advances in mathematical logic. Kant stated in the *Critique of Pure Cause* that Aristotle's theory of logic totally accounted for the core of deductive inference.

History

Aristotle "says that 'on the subject of reasoning' he 'had nothing else on an earlier date to speak of". Though, Plato reports that syntax was devised before him, through Prodicus of Ceos, who was concerned through the correct use of languages. Logic appears to have appeared from dialectics; the earlier philosophers made frequent use of concepts like *reductio ad absurdum* in their discussions, but never truly understood the logical implications. Even Plato had difficulties with logic; although he had a reasonable conception of a deductive system, he could never actually construct one and relied instead on his dialectic. Plato whispered that deduction would basically follow from premises, hence he focused on maintaining solid premises so that the conclusion would logically follow. Consequently, Plato realized that a method
for obtaining conclusions would be mainly beneficial. He never succeeded in devising such a method, but his best effort was published in his book *Sophist*, where he introduced his division method.

**Analytics and the Organon**

What we today call *Aristotelian logic*, Aristotle himself would have labeled "analytics". The term "logic" he reserved to mean *dialectics*. Mainly of Aristotle's work is almost certainly not in its original form, since it was mainly likely edited through students and later lecturers. The logical works of Aristotle were compiled into six books in relation to the early 1st century AD:

- Categories
- On Interpretation
- Prior Analytics
- Posterior Analytics
- Topics
- On Sophistical Refutations

The order of the books (or the teachings from which they are composed) is not sure, but this list was derived from analysis of Aristotle's writings. It goes from the basics, the analysis of easy conditions in the *Categories*, the analysis of propositions and their elementary dealings in *On Interpretation*, to the revise of more intricate shapes, namely, syllogisms (in the *Analytics*) and dialectics (in the *Topics* and *Sophistical Refutations*). The first three treatises form the core of the logical theory *stricto sensu*: the grammar of the language of logic and the correct rules of reasoning. There is one volume of Aristotle's concerning logic not establish in the *Organon*, namely the fourth book of *Metaphysics*.

**Aristotle's Scientific Method**

Like his teacher Plato, Aristotle's philosophy aims at the universal. Aristotle, though, discovers the universal in scrupulous things, which he calls the essence of things, while Plato discovers that the universal exists separately
from scrupulous things, and is related to them as their prototype or exemplar. For Aristotle, so, philosophic method implies the ascent from the revise of scrupulous phenomena to the knowledge of essences, while for Plato philosophic method means the descent from knowledge of universal Shapes (or thoughts) to a contemplation of scrupulous imitations of these. For Aristotle, "form" still refers to the unconditional foundation of phenomena but is "instantiated" in a scrupulous substance. In a sure sense, Aristotle's method is both inductive and deductive, while Plato's is essentially deductive from a priori principles.

In Aristotle's terminology, "natural philosophy" is a branch of philosophy examining the phenomena of the natural world, and comprises meadows that would be regarded today as physics, biology and other natural sciences. In contemporary times, the scope of philosophy has become limited to more generic or abstract inquiries, such as ethics and metaphysics, in which logic plays a major role. Today's philosophy tends to exclude empirical revise of the natural world through means of the scientific method. In contrast, Aristotle's philosophical endeavors encompassed virtually all facets of intellectual inquiry.

In the superior sense of the word, Aristotle creates philosophy coextensive with reasoning, which he also would describe as "science". Note, though, that his use of the term science carries a dissimilar meaning than that sheltered through the term "scientific method". For Aristotle, "all science is practical, poetical or theoretical". Through practical science, he means ethics and politics; through poetical science, he means the revise of poetry and the other fine arts; through theoretical science, he means physics, mathematics and metaphysics.

If logic (or "analytics") is regarded as a revise preliminary to philosophy, the divisions of Aristotelian philosophy would consist of:

- Logic;
- Theoretical Philosophy, including Metaphysics, Physics and Mathematics;
- Practical Philosophy and
- Poetical Philosophy.
In the era flanked by his two stays in Athens, flanked by his times at the Academy and the Lyceum, Aristotle mannered mainly of the scientific thinking and research for which he is renowned today. In information, mainly of Aristotle's life was devoted to the revise of the objects of natural science. Aristotle's metaphysics contains observations on the nature of numbers but he made no original contributions to mathematics. He did, though, perform original research in the natural sciences, e.g., botany, zoology, physics, astronomy, chemistry, meteorology, and many other sciences.

Aristotle's writings on science are mainly qualitative, as opposed to quantitative. Beginning in the 16th century, scientists began applying mathematics to the physical sciences, and Aristotle's work in this region was deemed hopelessly inadequate. His failings were mainly due to the absence of concepts like mass, velocity, force and temperature. He had a conception of speed and temperature, but no quantitative understanding of them, which was partly due to the absence of vital experimental devices, like clocks and thermometers.

His writings give an explanation of several scientific observations, a mixture of precocious accuracy and curious errors. For instance, in his *History of Animals* he claimed that human males have more teeth than females. In a similar vein, John Philoponus, and later Galileo, showed through easy experiments that Aristotle's theory that a heavier substance falls faster than a lighter substance is incorrect. On the other hand, Aristotle refuted Democritus's claim that the Milky Method was made up of "those stars which are shaded through the earth from the sun's rays," pointing out that, given "current astronomical demonstrations" that "the size of the sun is greater than that of the earth and the aloofness of the stars from the earth several times greater than that of the sun, then... the sun shines on all the stars and the earth screens none of them."

In spaces, Aristotle goes too distant in deriving 'laws of the universe' from easy observation and in excess of-stretched cause. Today's scientific method assumes that such thinking without enough facts is ineffective, and
that discerning the validity of one's hypothesis requires distant more rigorous experimentation than that which Aristotle used to support his laws.

Aristotle also had some scientific blind spots. He posited a geocentric cosmology that we may discern in selections of the *Metaphysics*, which was widely accepted up until the 16th century. From the 3rd century to the 16th century, the dominant view held that the Earth was the rotational center of the universe.

Since he was perhaps the philosopher mainly respected through European thinkers throughout and after the Renaissance, these thinkers often took Aristotle's erroneous positions as given, which held back science in this epoch. Though, Aristotle's scientific shortcomings should not mislead one into forgetting his great advances in the several scientific meadows. For instance, he founded logic as a formal science and created foundations to biology that were not superseded for two millennia. Moreover, he introduced the fundamental notion that nature is composed of things that change and that learning such changes can give useful knowledge of underlying constants.

**Five Elements**

Aristotle proposed a fifth element in addition to the four proposed earlier through Empedocles.

- Earth, which is cold and arid; this corresponds to the contemporary thought of a solid.
- Water, which is cold and wet; this corresponds to the contemporary thought of a liquid.
- Air, which is hot and wet; this corresponds to the contemporary thought of a gas.
- Fire, which is hot and arid; this corresponds to the contemporary thoughts of plasma and heat.

Each of the four earthly elements has its natural lay. All that is earthly tends toward the center of the universe, i.e., the center of the Earth. Water tends toward a sphere nearby the center. Air tends toward a sphere nearby the
water sphere. Fire tends toward the lunar sphere. When elements are moved out of their natural lay, they naturally move back towards it. This is "natural motion"—motion requiring no extrinsic cause. So, for instance, in water, earthy bodies sink while air bubbles rise up; in air, rain falls and flame rises. Outside all the other spheres, the heavenly, fifth element, manifested in the stars and planets, moves in the perfection of circles.

Motion

Aristotle defined motion as the actuality of a potentiality as such. Aquinas suggested that the passage be understood literally; that motion can indeed be understood as the active fulfillment of a potential, as a transition toward a potentially possible state. Because actuality and potentiality are normally opposites in Aristotle, other commentators either suggest that the wording which has come down to us is erroneous, or that the addition of the "as such" to the definition is critical to understanding it.

Causality, The Four Causes

Aristotle suggested that the cause for anything coming in relation to the can be attributed to four dissimilar kinds of simultaneously active causal factors:

- Material cause describes the material out of which something is composed. Therefore the material cause of a table is wood, and the material cause of a car is rubber and steel. It is not in relation to the action. It does not mean one domino knocks in excess of another domino.

- The formal cause is its form, i.e., the arrangement of that matter. It tells us what a thing is, that any thing is determined through the definition, form, pattern, essence, whole, synthesis or archetype. It embraces the explanation of causes in conditions of fundamental principles or common laws, as the whole is the cause of its parts, a connection recognized as the whole-part causation. Plainly put the formal cause is the thought existing in the first lay as exemplar in the mind of the
sculptor, and in the second lay as intrinsic, determining cause, embodied in the matter. Formal cause could only refer to the essential excellence of causation. A more easy instance of the formal cause is the blueprint or plan that one has before creation or causing a human made substance to exist.

- The efficient cause is "the primary source", or that from which the change or the ending of the change first starts. It identifies 'what creates of what is made and what causes change of what is changed' and so suggests all sorts of mediators, nonliving or livelihood, acting as the sources of change or movement or rest. On behalf of the current understanding of causality as the relation of cause and effect, this covers the contemporary definitions of "cause" as either the agent or agency or scrupulous events or states of affairs. More basically again that which immediately sets the thing in motion. So take the two dominos this time of equal weighting, the first is knocked in excess of causing the second also to fall in excess of. This is effectively efficient cause.

- The final cause is its purpose, or that for the sake of which a thing exists or is done, including both purposeful and instrumental actions and behaviors. The final cause or telos is the purpose or end that something is supposed to serve, or it is that from which and that to which the change is. This also covers contemporary thoughts of mental causation involving such psychological causes as volition, require, motivation or motives, rational, irrational, ethical, and all that provides purpose to behavior.

   Additionally, things can be causes of one another, causing each other reciprocally, as hard work causes fitness and vice versa, although not in the similar method or function, the one is as the beginning of change, the other as the goal. Moreover, Aristotle indicated that the similar thing can be the cause of contrary effects; its attendance and absence may result in dissimilar outcomes. Basically it is the goal or purpose that brings in relation to the event. Taking our two dominos, it requires someone to intentionally knock the dominos in excess of as they cannot fall themselves.
Aristotle marked two manners of causation: proper causation and accidental causation. All causes, proper and incidental, can be spoken as potential or as actual, scrupulous or generic. The similar language refers to the effects of causes, so that generic effects assigned to generic causes, scrupulous effects to scrupulous causes, operating causes to actual effects. Essentially, causality does not suggest a temporal relation flanked by the cause and the effect.

**Optics**

Aristotle held more accurate theories on some optical concepts than other philosophers of his day. The earliest recognized written proof of a camera obscura can be established in Aristotle's documentation of such a device in 350 BC in *Problemata*. Aristotle's tools contained a dark chamber that had a single small hole, or aperture, to allow for sunlight to enter. Aristotle used the device to create observations of the sun and noted that no matter what form the hole was, the sun would still be correctly displayed as a round substance. In contemporary cameras, this is analogous to the diaphragm. Aristotle also made the observation that when the aloofness flanked by the aperture and the surface with the image increased, the image was magnified.

**Chance and Spontaneity**

Just as to Aristotle, spontaneity and chance are causes of some things, distinguishable from other kinds of cause. Chance as an incidental cause lies in the realm of accidental things. It is "from what is spontaneous". For a better understanding of Aristotle's conception of "chance" it might be better to think of "coincidence": Something takes lay through chance if a person sets out with the intent of having one thing take lay, but with the result of another thing taking lay. For instance: A person seeks donations. That person may discover another person willing to donate a substantial sum. Though, if the person seeking the donations met the person donating, not for the purpose of collecting donations, but for some other purpose, Aristotle would call the collecting of the donation through that scrupulous donator a result of chance.
It necessity be unusual that something happens through chance. In other languages, if something happens all or mainly of the time, we cannot say that it is through chance.

There is also more specific type of chance, which Aristotle names "luck" that can only apply to human beings, since it is in the sphere of moral actions. Just as to Aristotle, luck necessity involve choice and only humans are capable of deliberation and choice. "What is not capable of action cannot do anything through chance".

Metaphysics

Aristotle defines metaphysics as "the knowledge of immaterial being," or of "being in the highest degree of abstraction." He refers to metaphysics as "first philosophy", as well as "the theological science."

Substance, Potentiality and Actuality

Aristotle examines the concepts of substance and essence (ousia) in his Metaphysics, and he concludes that a scrupulous substance is a combination of both matter and form. In book VIII, he distinguishes the matter of the substance as the substratum, or the stuff of which it is composed. For instance, the matter of a home is the bricks, stones, timbers etc., or whatever constitutes the potential home, while the form of the substance is the actual home, namely 'covering for bodies and chattels' or any other differentia that let us describe something as a home. The formula that provides the components is the explanation of the matter, and the formula that provides the differentia is the explanation of the form.

With regard to the change and its causes now, as he defines in his Physics and On Generation and Corruption 319b-320a, he distinguishes the coming to be from:

- Growth and diminution, which is change in quantity;
- Locomotion, which is change in legroom; and
- Alteration, which is change in excellence.
The coming to be is a change where nothing persists of which the resultant is a property. In that scrupulous change he introduces the concept of potentiality \((dynamis)\) and actuality \((entelecheia)\) in association with the matter and the form.

Referring to potentiality, this is what a thing is capable of doing, or being acted upon, if the circumstances are right and it is not prevented through something else. For instance, the seed of a plant in the soil is potentially \((dynamei)\) plant, and if is not prevented through something, it will become a plant. Potentially beings can either 'act' \((poiein)\) or 'be acted upon' \((paschein)\), which can be either innate or learned. For instance, the eyes possess the potentiality of sight \((innate - being acted upon)\), while the capability of playing the flute can be possessed through learning \((exercise - acting)\).

Actuality is the fulfillment of the end of the potentiality. Because the end \((telos)\) is the principle of every change, and for the sake of the end exists potentiality, so actuality is the end. Referring then to our previous instance, we could say that an actuality is when a plant does one of the behaviors that plants do.

- "For that for the sake of which a thing is, is its principle, and the becoming is for the sake of the end; and the actuality is the end, and it is for the sake of this that the potentiality is acquired. For animals do not see in order that they may have sight, but they have sight that they may see."

In summary, the matter used to create a home has potentiality to be a home and both the action of structure and the form of the final home are actualities, which is also a final cause or end. Then Aristotle proceeds and concludes that the actuality is prior to potentiality in formula, in time and in substantiality.

With this definition of the scrupulous substance \(\text{(i.e., matter and form)}\), Aristotle tries to solve the problem of the unity of the beings, for instance, "what is it that creates a man one"? Since, just as to Plato there are two Thoughts: animal and biped, how then is man a unity? Though, just as to
Aristotle, the potential being (matter) and the actual one (form) are one and the similar thing.

**Universals and Particulars**

Aristotle's predecessor, Plato, argued that all things have a universal form, which could be either a property, or a relation to other things. When we seem at an apple, for instance, we see an apple, and we can also examine a form of an apple. In this distinction, there is a scrupulous apple and a universal form of an apple.

Plato argued that there are some universal shapes that are not a part of scrupulous things. For instance, it is possible that there is no scrupulous good in subsistence, but "good" is still a proper universal form. Bertrand Russell is a modern philosopher who agreed with Plato on the subsistence of "uninstantiated universals".

Aristotle disagreed with Plato on this point, arguing that all universals are instantiated. Aristotle argued that there are no universals that are unattached to existing things. Just as to Aristotle, if a universal exists, either as a scrupulous or a relation, then there necessity have been, necessity be currently, or necessity be in the future, something on which the universal can be predicated. Consequently, just as to Aristotle, if it is not the case that some universal can be predicated to a substance that exists at some era of time, then it does not exist.

In addition, Aristotle disagreed with Plato in relation to the site of universals. As Plato spoke of the world of the shapes, a site where all universal shapes subsist, Aristotle maintained that universals exist within each thing on which each universal is predicated. So, just as to Aristotle, the form of apple exists within each apple, rather than in the world of the shapes.

**Biology and Medicine**

In Aristotelian science, mainly especially in biology, things he saw himself have stood the test of time better than his retelling of the reports of others, which contain error and superstition. He dissected animals but not
humans; his thoughts on how the human body works have been approximately entirely superseded.

**Empirical Research Program**

Aristotle is the earliest natural historian whose work has survived in some detail. Aristotle certainly did research on the natural history of Lesbos, and the nearby seas and neighboring regions. The works that reflect this research, such as *History of Animals, Generation of Animals, and Parts of Animals*, contain some observations and interpretations, beside with sundry myths and mistakes. The mainly striking passages are in relation to the sea-life visible from observation on Lesbos and accessible from the catches of fishermen. His observations on catfish, electric fish (*Torpedo*) and angler-fish are detailed, as is his writing on cephalopods, namely, *Octopus, Sepia* (cuttlefish) and the paper nautilus (*Argonauta argo*). His account of the hectocotyli arm was in relation to the two thousand years ahead of its time, and widely disbelieved until its rediscovery in the 19th century. He separated the aquatic mammals from fish, and knew that sharks and rays were part of the group he described Selachē (selachians).

Another good instance of his methods comes from the *Generation of Animals* in which Aristotle describes breaking open fertilized chicken eggs at intervals to observe when visible organs were generated.

He gave accurate descriptions of ruminants' four-chambered fore-stomachs, and of the ovoviviparous embryological development of the hound shark *Mustelus mustelus*.

**Classification of Livelihood Things**

Aristotle's classification of livelihood things contains some elements which still lived in the 19th century. What the contemporary zoologist would call vertebrates and invertebrates, Aristotle described 'animals with blood' and 'animals without blood' (he was not to know that intricate invertebrates do create use of hemoglobin, but of a dissimilar type from vertebrates). Animals with blood were divided into live-bearing (humans and mammals), and egg-bearing (birds and fish). Invertebrates ('animals without blood') are insects,
crustacea (divided into non-shelled – cephalopods – and shelled) and testacea (molluscs). In some compliments, this partial classification is better than that of Linnaeus, who crowded the invertebrate jointly into two groups, Insecta and Vermes (worms).

For Charles Singer, "Nothing is more extra ordinary than [Aristotle's] efforts to [exhibit] the relationships of livelihood things as a scala naturae" Aristotle's History of Animals classified organisms in relation to a hierarchical "Ladder of Life" (scala naturae), placing them just as to complexity of structure and function so that higher organisms showed greater vitality and skill to move.

Aristotle whispered that intellectual purposes, i.e., final causes, guided all natural procedures. Such a teleological view gave Aristotle cause to justify his observed data as an expression of formal design. Noting that "no animal has, at the similar time, both tusks and horns," and "a single-hooded animal with two horns I have never seen," Aristotle suggested that Nature, giving no animal both horns and tusks, was staving off vanity, and giving creatures faculties only to such a degree as they are necessary. Noting that ruminants had multiple stomachs and weak teeth, he supposed the first was to compensate for the latter, with Nature trying to preserve a kind of balance.

In a similar fashion, Aristotle whispered that creatures were arranged in a graded level of perfection rising from plants on up to man, the scala naturae or Great Chain of Being. His system had eleven grades, arranged just as "to the degree to which they are infected with potentiality", expressed in their form at birth. The highest animals laid warm and wet creatures alive, the lowest bore theirs cold, arid, and in thick eggs.

Aristotle also held that the stage of a creature's perfection was reflected in its form, but not preordained through that form. Thoughts like this, and his thoughts in relation to the souls, are not regarded as science at all in contemporary times.

He placed emphasis on the kind(s) of soul an organism possessed, asserting that plants possess a vegetative soul, responsible for reproduction and growth, animals a vegetative and a sensitive soul, responsible for mobility
and sensation, and humans a vegetative, a sensitive, and a rational soul, capable of thought and reflection.

Aristotle, in contrast to earlier philosophers, but in accordance with the Egyptians, placed the rational soul in the heart, rather than the brain. Notable is Aristotle's division of sensation and thought, which usually went against previous philosophers, with the exception of Alcmaeon.

**Successor: Theophrastus**

Aristotle's successor at the Lyceum, Theophrastus, wrote a series of books on botany—the *History of Plants*—which survived as the mainly significant contribution of antiquity to botany, even into the Middle Ages. Several of Theophrastus' names survive into contemporary times, such as *carpos* for fruit, and *pericarpion* for seed vessel.

Rather than focus on formal causes, as Aristotle did, Theophrastus suggested a mechanistic scheme, drawing analogies flanked by natural and artificial procedures, and relying on Aristotle's concept of the efficient cause. Theophrastus also recognized the role of sex in the reproduction of some higher plants, though this last detection was lost in later ages.

**Power on Hellenistic Medicine**

After Theophrastus, the Lyceum failed to produce any original work. Though interest in Aristotle's thoughts survived, they were usually taken unquestioningly. It is not until the age of Alexandria under the Ptolemies that advances in biology can be again establish.

The first medical teacher at Alexandria, Herophilus of Chalcedon, corrected Aristotle, placing intelligence in the brain, and linked the nervous system to motion and sensation. Herophilus also distinguished flanked by veins and arteries, noting that the latter pulse while the former do not. Though a few ancient atomists such as Lucretius challenged the teleological viewpoint of Aristotelian thoughts in relation to the life, teleology (and after the rise of Christianity, natural theology) would remain central to biological thought essentially until the 18th and 19th centuries. Ernst Mayr claimed that there was "nothing of any real consequence in biology after Lucretius and Galen
until the Renaissance." Aristotle's thoughts of natural history and medicine survived, but they were usually taken unquestioningly.

**Psychology**

Aristotle's psychology, given in his treatise On the Soul, posits three types of soul ("psyches"): the vegetative soul, the sensitive soul, and the rational soul. Humans have a rational soul. This type of soul is capable of the similar powers as the other types: Like the vegetative soul it can grow and nourish itself; like the sensitive soul it can experience sensations and move in the vicinity. The unique part of the human, rational soul is its skill to receive shapes of other things and compare them.

For Aristotle, the soul (psyche) was a simpler concept than it is for us today. Through soul he basically meant the form of a livelihood being. Since all beings are composites of form and matter, the form of livelihood beings is that which endows them with what is specific to livelihood beings, e.g. the skill to initiate movement (or in the case of plants, growth and chemical transformations, which Aristotle considers kinds of movement).

**Practical Philosophy**

**Ethics**

Aristotle measured ethics to be a practical rather than theoretical revise, i.e., one aimed at becoming good and doing good rather than knowing for its own sake. He wrote many treatises on ethics, including mainly notably, the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

Aristotle taught that virtue has to do with the proper function (ergon) of a thing. An eye is only a good eye in so much as it can see, because the proper function of an eye is sight. Aristotle reasoned that human’s necessity have a function specific to humans, and that this function necessity be an action of the psuchē (normally translated as soul) in accordance with cause (logos). Aristotle recognized such an optimum action of the soul as the aim of all human deliberate action, eudaimonia, usually translated as "happiness" or sometimes "well being". To have the potential of ever being happy in this
method necessarily requires a good character, often translated as moral (or ethical) virtue (or excellence).

Aristotle taught that to achieve a virtuous and potentially happy character requires a first stage of having the fortune to be habituated not deliberately, but through teachers, and experience, leading to a later stage in which one consciously chooses to do the best things. When the best people come to live life this method their practical wisdom (*phronesis*) and their intellect (*nous*) can develop with each other towards the highest possible human virtue, the wisdom of an accomplished theoretical or speculative thinker, or in other languages, a philosopher.

**Politics**

In addition to his works on ethics, which address the individual, Aristotle addressed the municipality in his work titled *Politics*. Aristotle measured the municipality to be a natural society. Moreover, he measured the municipality to be prior in importance to the family which in turn is prior to the individual, "for the whole necessity of necessity be prior to the part". He also famously stated that "man is through nature a political animal." Aristotle conceived of politics as being like an organism rather than like a machine, and as a collection of parts none of which can exist without the others. Aristotle's conception of the municipality is organic, and he is measured one of the first to conceive of the municipality in this manner.

The general contemporary understanding of a political society as a contemporary state is quite dissimilar to Aristotle's understanding. Although he was aware of the subsistence and potential of superior empires, the natural society just as to Aristotle was the municipality (*polis*) which functions as a political "society" or "partnership". The aim of the municipality is not presently to avoid injustice or for economic stability, but rather to allow at least some citizens the possibility to live a good life, and to perform beautiful acts: "The political partnership necessity be regarded, so, as being for the sake of noble actions, not for the sake of livelihood jointly." This is distinguished from contemporary approaches, beginning with social contract theory, just as
to which individuals leave the state of nature because of "fear of violent death" or its "inconveniences."

**Rhetoric and Poetics**

Aristotle measured epic poetry, tragedy, comedy, dithyrambic poetry and music to be imitative, each varying in imitation through medium, substance, and manner. For instance, music imitates with the media of rhythm and harmony, whereas dance imitates with rhythm alone, and poetry with language. The shapes also differ in their substance of imitation. Comedy, for instance, is a dramatic imitation of men worse than average; whereas tragedy imitates men slightly better than average. Lastly, the shapes differ in their manner of imitation – through narrative or character, through change or no change, and through drama or no drama. Aristotle whispered that imitation is natural to mankind and constitutes one of mankind's advantages in excess of animals.

While it is whispered that Aristotle's *Poetics* comprised two books – one on comedy and one on tragedy – only the portion that focuses on tragedy has survived. Aristotle taught that tragedy is composed of six elements: plot-structure, character, approach, thought, spectacle, and lyric poetry. The characters in a tragedy are merely a means of driving the story; and the plot, not the characters, is the chief focus of tragedy. Tragedy is the imitation of action arousing pity and fear, and is meant to affect the catharsis of those similar emotions. Aristotle concludes *Poetics* with a discussion on which, if either, is superior: epic or tragic mimesis. He suggests that because tragedy possesses all the attributes of an epic, perhaps possesses additional attributes such as spectacle and music, is more unified, and achieves the aim of its mimesis in shorter scope, it can be measured superior to epic.

Aristotle was a keen systematic collector of riddles, folklore, and proverbs; he and his school had a special interest in the riddles of the Delphic Oracle and studied the fables of Aesop.
Views on Women

Aristotle's analysis of procreation describes an active, ensiling masculine element bringing life to an inert, passive female element. On this ground, feminists have accused Aristotle of misogyny and sexism. Though, Aristotle gave equal weight to women's happiness as he did to men's, and commented in his *Rhetoric* that a society cannot be happy unless women are happy too.

LOSS AND PRESERVATION OF HIS WORKS

Contemporary scholarship reveals that Aristotle's "lost" works stray considerably in characterization from the surviving Aristotelian corpus. Whereas the lost works appear to have been originally written with intent for subsequent publication, the surviving works do not appear to have been so. Rather the surviving works mostly resemble lecture notes unintended for publication. The authenticity of a portion of the surviving works as originally Aristotelian is also today held suspect, with some books duplicating or summarizing each other, the authorship of one book questioned and another book measured to be unlikely Aristotle's at all.

Some of the individual works within the corpus, including the *Constitution of Athens*, are regarded through mainly scholars as products of Aristotle's "school," perhaps compiled under his direction or supervision. Others, such as *On Colors*, may have been produced through Aristotle's successors at the Lyceum, e.g., Theophrastus and Straton. Still others acquired Aristotle's name through similarities in doctrine or content, such as the *De Plantis*, perhaps through Nicolaus of Damascus. Other works in the corpus contain medieval palmistries and astrological and magical texts whose connections to Aristotle are purely fanciful and self-promotional.

Just as to a distinction that originates with Aristotle himself, his writings are divisible into two groups: the "exoteric" and the "esoteric". Mainly scholars have understood this as a distinction flanked by works Aristotle planned for the public (exoteric), and the more technological works planned for use within the school (esoteric). Contemporary scholars
commonly assume these latter to be Aristotle's own (unpolished) lecture notes (or in some cases possible notes through his students). Though, one classic scholar offers an alternative interpretation. The 5th century Neo-Platonist Ammonius Hermiae writes that Aristotle's writing approach is deliberately obscurantist so that "good people may for that cause stretch their mind even more, whereas empty minds that are lost through carelessness will be put to flight through the obscurity when they encounter sentences like these." Another general assumption is that none of the exoteric works is extant – that all of Aristotle's extant writings are of the esoteric type. Current knowledge of what exactly the exoteric writings were like is scant and dubious, though several of them may have been in dialogue form. Perhaps it is to these that Cicero refers when he characterized Aristotle's writing approach as "a river of gold"; it is hard for several contemporary readers to accept that one could seriously so admire the approach of those works currently accessible to us. Though, some contemporary scholars have warned that we cannot know for sure that Cicero's praise was reserved specifically for the exoteric works; a few contemporary scholars have actually admired the concise writing approach establish in Aristotle's extant works.

One major question in the history of Aristotle's works, then, is how the exoteric writings all were lost, and how did the ones we now possess come to us? The story of the original manuscripts of the esoteric treatises is described through Strabo in his **Geography** and Plutarch in his **Parallel Lives**. The manuscripts were left from Aristotle to his successor Theophrastus, who in turn willed them to Neleus of Scepsis. Neleus supposedly took the writings from Athens to Scepsis, where his heirs let them languish in a cellar until the 1st century BC, when Apellicon of Teos exposed and purchased the manuscripts, bringing them back to Athens. Just as to the story, Apellicon tried to repair some of the damage that was done throughout the manuscripts' stay in the basement, introducing a number of errors into the text. When Lucius Cornelius Sulla occupied Athens in 86 BC, he accepted off the library of Apellicon to Rome, where they were first published in 60 BC through the grammarian Tyrannion of Amisus and then through the philosopher Andronicus of Rhodes.
Carnes Lord attributes the popular belief in this story to the information that it gives "the mainly plausible explanation for the rapid eclipse of the Peripatetic school after the middle of the third century, and for the absence of widespread knowledge of the dedicated treatises of Aristotle throughout the Hellenistic era, as well as for the sudden reappearance of a flourishing Aristotelianism throughout the first century B.C." Lord voices a number of reservations concerning this story, though. First, the condition of the texts is distant too good for them to have suffered considerable damage followed through Apellicon's inexpert effort at repair. Second, there is "incontrovertible proof," Lord says, that the treatises were in circulation throughout the time in which Strabo and Plutarch suggest they were confined within the cellar in Scepsis. Third, the definitive edition of Aristotle's texts appears to have been made in Athens some fifty years before Andronicus supposedly compiled his. And fourth, ancient library catalogues predating Andronicus' intervention list an Aristotelian corpus quite similar to the one we currently possess. Lord sees a number of post-Aristotelian interpolations in the Politics, for instance, but is usually confident that the work has come down to us relatively intact.

On the one hand, the surviving texts of Aristotle do not derive from finished literary texts, but rather from working drafts used within Aristotle's school, as opposed, on the other hand, to the dialogues and other "exoteric" texts which Aristotle published more widely throughout his lifetime. The consensus is that Andronicus of Rhodes composed the esoteric works of Aristotle's school which lived in the form of smaller, separate works, distinguished them from those of Theophrastus and other Peripatetics, edited them, and finally compiled them into the more cohesive, superior works as they are recognized today.

LEGACY

More than twenty-three hundred years after his death, Aristotle remnants one of the mainly influential people who ever existed. He contributed to approximately every field of human knowledge then in subsistence, and he was the founder of several new meadows. Just as to the
philosopher Bryan Magee, "it is doubtful whether any human being has ever recognized as much as he did". In the middle of countless other achievements, Aristotle was the founder of formal logic, pioneered the revise of zoology, and left every future scientist and philosopher in his debt through his contributions to the scientific method. Despite these achievements, the power of Aristotle's errors is measured through some to have held back science considerably. Bertrand Russell notes that "approximately every serious intellectual advance has had to begin with an attack on some Aristotelian doctrine". Russell also refers to Aristotle's ethics as "repulsive", and calls his logic "as definitely antiquated as Ptolemaic astronomy". Russell notes that these errors create it hard to do historical justice to Aristotle, until one remembers how big of an advance he made upon all of his precursors.

**Later Greek Philosophers**

The immediate power of Aristotle's work was felt as the Lyceum grew into the Peripatetic school. Aristotle's notable students incorporated Aristoxenus, Dicaearchus, Demetrius of Phalerum, Eudemos of Rhodes, Harpalus, Hephaestion, Meno, Mnason of Phocis, Nicomachus, and Theophrastus. Aristotle's power in excess of Alexander the Great is seen in the latter's bringing with him on his expedition a host of zoologists, botanists, and researchers. He had also learned a great deal in relation to the Persian customs and traditions from his teacher. Although his respect for Aristotle was diminished as his travels made it clear that much of Aristotle's geography was clearly wrong, when the old philosopher released his works to the public, Alexander complained "Thou hast not done well to publish thy acroamatic doctrines; for in what shall I surpass other men if those doctrines wherein I have been trained are to be all men's general property?"

**Power on Byzantine Scholars**

Greek Christian scribes played a crucial role in the preservation of Aristotle through copying all the extant Greek language manuscripts of the corpus. The first Greek Christians to comment extensively on Aristotle were
John Philoponus, Elias, and David in the sixth century, and Stephen of Alexandria in the early seventh century. John Philoponus stands out for having attempted a fundamental critique of Aristotle's views on the eternity of the world, movement, and other elements of Aristotelian thought. After a hiatus of many centuries, formal commentary through Eustratius and Michael of Ephesus reappears in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, apparently sponsored through Anna Comnena.

**Power on Islamic Theologians**

Aristotle was one of the mainly revered Western thinkers in early Islamic theology. Mainly of the still extant works of Aristotle, as well as a number of the original Greek commentaries, were translated into Arabic and studied through Muslim philosophers, scientists and scholars. Averroes, Avicenna and Alpharabius, who wrote on Aristotle in great depth, also influenced Thomas Aquinas and other Western Christian scholastic philosophers. Alkindus measured Aristotle as the outstanding and unique representative of philosophy and Averroes spoke of Aristotle as the "exemplar" for all future philosophers. Medieval Muslim scholars regularly described Aristotle as the "First Teacher". The title "teacher" was first given to Aristotle through Muslim scholars, and was later used through Western philosophers who were influenced through the custom of Islamic philosophy.

In accordance with the Greek theorists, the Muslims measured Aristotle to be a dogmatic philosopher, the author of a closed system, and whispered that Aristotle shared with Plato essential tenets of thought. Some went so distant as to credit Aristotle himself with neo-Platonic metaphysical thoughts.

**Post-Enlightenment Thinkers**

The German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche has been said to have taken almost all of his political philosophy from Aristotle. Though implausible this is, it is certainly the case that Aristotle’s rigid separation of action from manufacture, and his justification of the subservience of slaves and others to
the virtue – or *arete* – of a few justified the ideal of aristocracy. It is Martin Heidegger, not Nietzsche, who elaborated a new interpretation of Aristotle, planned to warrant his deconstruction of scholastic and philosophical custom. Ayn Rand accredited Aristotle as "the greatest philosopher in history" and cited him as a major power on her thinking. More recently, Alasdair MacIntyre has attempted to reform what he calls the Aristotelian custom in a method that is anti-elitist and capable of disputing the claims of both liberals and Nietzscheans.

**LIST OF WORKS**

The works of Aristotle that have survived from antiquity through medieval manuscript transmission are composed in the Corpus Aristotelicum. These texts, as opposed to Aristotle's lost works, are technological philosophical treatises from within Aristotle's school. Reference to them is made just as to the organization of Immanuel Bekker's Royal Prussian Academy edition, which in turn is based on ancient classifications of these works.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- What is Aristotle's contribution to the Western Political Theory?
- Discuss Aristotle's theory of justice and compare it with that of Plato.
- State and examine Aristotle's theory of slavery.
- Critically examine Aristotle's theory of state.
CHAPTER 4

ST. AUGUSTINE AND ST. THOMAS AQUINAS
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the St. Augustine’s life and work.
- Understand the St. Thomas Aquinas; life and work.

ST. AUGUSTINE

Life and Work

Augustine (Aurelius Augustinus) was born in 354 AD at Thagaste, now Algeria. He finished his higher education at Carthage, the capital of Roman Africa. His mother professed Christianity but the boy did not discover solace in the Christian doctrine and gave his adhesion to a domestic cult described Manichaeanism. But within a few years he broke with it and became a convert to Christianity under the inspiration of St. Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, Returning to North Africa from Italy after his conversion he devoted his life to teaching and writing. He became the Bishop of Hippo and lived a monastic life. He died in 430 AD.

Augustine's mainly well-known writings are Civitas Dei and the Confessions. The Civitas Dei was written to refute the charge that Christianity was responsible for the fall of Rome in 410 AD at the hands of Visigoths under Alaric. The Confessions recount Augustine's early life of pleasure and
indulgence and depicts his spiritual pilgrimage with great philosophic depth and emotional intensity.

**Civitas Dei versus Civites Terrena**

Augustine's answer to the critics of Christianity was in the form of enunciation of an evangelical eschatology presenting history as a constant thrash about flanked by the good and evil culminating in the ultimate victory of the good. Man's nature is twofold—he is spirit and body. Through virtue of this dual nature lie a citizen of two municipalities, the Divine Municipality on behalf of heavenly peace and spiritual salvation and the earthly municipality centered on appetite and inclinations directed towards mundane objects and material happiness. "Two loves have created two municipalities: love of self, to the contempt of God the earthly municipality; love of God, to the contempt of self, the heavenly." The Divine Municipality, the Kingdom of God on earth, which was first embodied in the Hebrew nation is symbolized through the Church and the Christianized Empire. The earthly municipality is the Kingdom of Satan exemplified in pagan empires. The pagan empires are ephemeral based as they are on the transient and mutable characteristics of human nature. Only the Christian state can withstand the vicissitudes of history and lead man to blessedness and eternal peace.

It necessity be remembered, though, that Augustine does not posit a complete separation flanked by the two municipalities in actual historical experience. These are theoretical constructs, ideal kinds devised to explain the nature of regimes which are always intermingled in history. No visible church is totally free from evil and no state is absolutely satanic. "The only foundation and bond of true municipality", says Augustine in one of his letters, "is that of faith and strong concord, when the substance of love is universal good, which is, in the highest and truest character, God himself, and men love one another, with full sincerity, in Him, and the ground of their love for one another is the love of Him from whose eyes they cannot conceal the Spirit of their love". "And these two municipalities, and these two loves, shall
live jointly, face through face, and even intermix, until the last winnowing and the final separation shall come upon the earth on the Day of Judgment."

**Justice and the State**

A significant question closely related to the distinction flanked by the two municipalities is the connection flanked by justice and commonwealth, or *res publica*. Augustine refers to Cicero's view that the substance of the state is the realization of justice and himself says that people without law and justice are nothing but group of robbers. But he also contends that only a Christian state can be presently, for one cannot provide to man his due without giving to God what is due to Him. Love of man cannot be real without love of God. Augustine's comment on Cicero on this point has led some noted scholars like A.J. Carlyle and J,N. Figgis to conclude that just as to Augustine justice is not an essential characteristic of the state.

"It would appear that the political theory of St. Augustine is materially dissimilar in many characteristics from that of St, Ambrose and other Fathers, who symbolize the ancient custom that justice is the essential excellence, as it is also the end, of the state". The argument is that since just as to Augustine only a Christian State can be really presently, a complete identification of state and justice would disqualify all pre-Christian states to be described states in any sense.

But this is certainly not a correct interpretation of St. Augustine's views. McIlwain and Sabiae have rightly taken exception to the interpretation of Augustine's point, quite in consonance with his unwilliligness to identify the earthly stale with the kingdom of Satan. Though only a Christian state call be presently in the absolute sense of the term, one cannot but attribute a type of relative justice to the non-Christian, or pre-Christian, states which seem after the worldly require of man and give means and opportunities for the farming of spiritual life. The distinction flanked by absolute justice and relative justice enables us to evaluate the states just as to the proportion in which they embody these two characteristics, always remembering: "Not from man but from above man, proceeded that which make a man live happily."
What Augustine's critics of Cicero amounts to be: "though a people may be a people without confessing the true God, no people can be a good people without that confession".

State, Property, War and Slavery

As we have already pointed out, Augustine does not regard the state as natural, though just as to him man has an innate disposition for social life. State as a repressive institution, as an instrument of coercion for enforcing order and peace is the product of sin and it was not establish in the primal state of innocence before the 'Fall' of man. This disparaging view of the state through no means implies that we have no moral duty of political obedience. Though the state is the result of sin, it is also a divine remedy for sin. Even the Christian subjects of a pagan king are under bounden duty to obey their ruler.

St. Augustine had no doubt that powers that be are ordained of God and even a wicked and sinful ruler has a right to full obedience. Any one who resists "duly constituted power" resists "the ordinance of God." So extensive as the rulers do not force their subjects into impiety and a conduct which violates spiritual injunctions and the will of God, they should be obeyed without reservation.

Though on the whole St. Augustine, like all Christian thinkers of his time, whispered in the doctrine of the Two Swords and the independence of the church and the state in their respective spheres, he was firmly of the view that heresy was a deadly sin and the state has a right to suppress it. The location of St. Augustine on religious toleration and freedom of conscience was not without contradiction. The argument offered through him proved a weapon in 'hands of Inquisitionists later on.

In relation to the property and slavery, Augustine's view marked a clear departure from Aristotle's. Both property and slavery, just as to the saint, are contrary to original human nature. But they become necessary in the actual condition of the fallen man.

In the natural condition property is held in general. After the 'Fall', in view of man's avarice and instinct of self-possession it becomes approximately impossible for general ownership to work satisfactorily. Therefore state
manage and organization become necessary. In the languages of A.J. Carlyle: "Private property is so practically the creation of the state, and is defined, limited and changed through the State." But while the legal right to private property is recognized through the Fathers, "as an appropriate and necessary concession to human infirmity… the institution cannot override the natural right of a man to obtain what he needs from the abundance of that which the earth brings forth".

Augustine's views on war and slavery are also explicated in the context of the sinful condition of man after Adam's Fall. In the ideal circumstances of idyllic innocence and eternal peace, war would be unthinkable but in the present state of strife and insecurity war becomes a necessity. Even from the moral and religious point of view, the state necessity wage war to protect the Empire and to destroy the heretics. St. Augustine, as against the early Christians, approves of military service for the Christians. He lays the base for the theory of "presently war" which was urbanized through medieval thinkers. Like war, enslavement of man through man is also not strictly in accordance with Eternal law. But it is also justified through what Troeltsch calls the Augustinian doctrine of "relative natural law". It is both a punishment and a corrective for the sinful act of men. St. Augustine's views on slavery are opposed to Aristotle's; they are more akin to Stoicism customized in the light of Christian theology, that is, the notion of the Fall of man.

**Thought**

**Anthropology**

Augustine was one of the first Christian ancient Latin authors with extremely clear anthropological vision. He saw the human being as a perfect unity of two substances: soul and body. In his late treatise *On Care to Be Had for the Dead, part 5* (420 AD) he exhorted to respect the body on the grounds that it belonged to the extremely nature of the human person. Augustine's favorite figure to describe body-soul unity is marriage: *caro tua, coniunx tua* — *your body is your wife*. Initially, the two elements were in perfect harmony. After the fall of humanity they are now experiencing dramatic combat flanked
by one another. They are two categorically dissimilar things. The body is a three-dimensional substance composed of the four elements, whereas the soul has no spatial dimensions. Soul is a type of substance, participating in cause, fit for ruling the body. Augustine was not preoccupied, as Plato and Descartes were, with going too much into details in efforts to explain the metaphysics of the soul-body union. It suffices for him to admit that they are metaphysically separate; to be a human is to be a composite of soul and body, and that the soul is superior to the body. The latter statement is grounded in his hierarchical classification of things into those that merely exist, those that exist and live, and those that exist, live, and have intelligence or cause.

Like other Church Fathers such as Athenagoras, St. Augustine "vigorously condemned the practice of induced abortion" as a crime, in any stage of pregnancy, although he accepted the distinction flanked by "shaped" and "unformed" fetuses mentioned in the Septuagint translation of Exodus 21:22–23, a text that, he observed, did not classify as murder the abortion of an "unformed" fetus, since it could not be said with certainty that it had already received a soul.

**Astrology**

Augustine's contemporaries often whispered astrology to be an exact and genuine science. Its practitioners were regarded as true men of learning and described *mathematichi*. Astrology played a prominent part in Manichean doctrine, and Augustine himself was attracted through their books in his youth, being particularly fascinated through those who claimed to foretell the future. Later, as a bishop, he used to warn that one should avoid astrologers who combine science and horoscopes. Just as to Augustine, they were not genuine students of Hipparchus or Eratosthenes but "general swindlers":

**Creation**

In "Municipality of God", Augustine rejected both the immortality of the human race proposed through pagans, and modern thoughts of ages that differed from the Church's sacred writings. In "The Literal Interpretation of Genesis" Augustine took the view that everything in the universe was created
simultaneously through God, and not in seven calendar days like a literal explanation of Genesis would require. He argued that the six-day structure of creation presented in the book of Genesis symbolizes a logical framework, rather than the passage of time in a physical method — it would bear a spiritual, rather than physical, meaning, which is no less literal. One cause for this interpretation is the passage in Sirach 18:1, *creavit omni simul*, which Augustine took as proof that the days of Genesis 1 had to be taken non-literally. Augustine also does not envision original sin as originating structural changes in the universe, and even suggests that the bodies of Adam and Eve were already created mortal before the Fall. Separately from his specific views, Augustine recognizes that the interpretation of the creation story is hard, and remarks that we should be willing to change our mind in relation to it as new information comes up.

**Ecclesiology**

Augustine urbanized his doctrine of the Church principally in reaction to the Donatist sect. He taught that there is one Church, but that within this Church there are two realities, namely, the visible aspect and the invisible. The former is the institutional body recognized through Christ on earth which proclaims salvation and administers the sacraments while the latter is the invisible body of the elect, made up of genuine believers from all ages, and who are recognized only to God. The Church, which is visible and societal, will be made up of "wheat" and "tares", that is, good and wicked people, until the end of time. This concept countered the Donatist claim that only those in a state of grace were the "true" or "pure" church on earth, and that priests and bishops who were not in a state of grace had no power or skill to confect the sacraments. Augustine's ecclesiology was more fully urbanized in *Municipality of God*. There he conceives of the church as a heavenly municipality or kingdom, ruled through love, which will ultimately triumph in excess of all earthly empires which are self-indulgent and ruled through pride. Augustine followed Cyprian in teaching that the bishops and priests of the Church are the successors of the Apostles, and that their power in the Church is God-given.
Eschatology

Augustine originally whispered that Christ would set up a literal 1,000-year kingdom prior to the common resurrection but rejected the system as carnal. He was the first theologian to systematically expound a doctrine of a millennialism, although some theologians and Christian historians consider his location was closer to that of contemporary postmillennialists. The mediaeval Catholic church built its system of eschatology on Augustinian a millennialism, where Christ rules the earth spiritually through his triumphant church. At the Reformation, theologians such as John Calvin accepted a millennialism. Augustine taught that the eternal fate of the soul is determined at death, and that purgatorial fires of the intermediate state purify only those that died in communion with the Church. His teaching provided fuel for later theology.

Epistemological Views

Augustine's intellectual development was shaped through epistemological concerns. His early dialogues both written shortly after his conversion to Christianity, reflect his engagement with skeptical arguments and illustrate the development of his doctrine of inner illumination. Augustine also posed the problem of other minds throughout dissimilar works, mainly famously perhaps in On the Trinity, and develops what has come to be a standard solution: the argument from analogy to other minds. In contrast to Plato and other earlier philosophers, Augustine recognizes the centrality of testimony to human knowledge and argues that what others tell us can give knowledge even if we don't have self-governing reasons to consider their testimonial reports.

Presently War

Augustine asserted that Christians should be pacifists as a personal, philosophical stance. Nonetheless, he asserted, peacefulness in the face of a grave wrong that could only be stopped through violence would be a sin. Protection of one's self or others could be a necessity, especially when authorized through a legitimate power. While not breaking down the
circumstances necessary for war to be presently, Augustine nonetheless originated the extremely phrase, itself, in his work *The Municipality of God*. In essence, the pursuit of peace necessity contain the option of fighting to preserve it in the extensive-term. Such a war could not be preemptive, but suspicious, to restore peace. Thomas Aquinas, centuries later, used the power of Augustine's arguments in an effort to describe the circumstances under which a war could be presently.

**Mariology**

Although Augustine did not develop a self-governing Mariology, his statements on Mary surpass in number and depth those of other early writers. Even before the Council of Ephesus, he defended the ever Virgin Mary as the Mother of God, who, because of her virginity, is full of grace. Likewise, he affirmed that the Virgin Mary “conceived as virgin, gave birth as virgin and stayed virgin forever”.

**Natural Knowledge and Biblical Interpretation**

Augustine took the view that the Biblical text should not be interpreted as properly literal, but rather as metaphorical, if it contradicts what we know from science and our God-given cause. While each passage of Scripture has a literal sense, this "literal sense" does not always mean that the Scriptures are mere history; at times they are rather an extended metaphor.

**Original Sin**

Augustine taught that Original sin of Adam and Eve was either an act of *foolishness* followed through *pride* and *disobedience* to God or the opposite: pride came first. The first couple disobeyed God, who had told them not to eat of the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The tree was a symbol of the order of creation. Self-centeredness made Adam and Eve eat of it, therefore failing to acknowledge and respect the world as it was created through God, with its hierarchy of beings and values. They would not have fallen into pride and lack of wisdom, if Satan hadn't sown into their senses "the root of evil". Their nature was wounded through concupiscence or libido, which affected human intelligence and will, as well as affections and desires,
including sexual desire. In conditions of Metaphysics, concupiscence is not a being but bad excellence, the privation of good or a wound.

Augustine's understanding of the consequences of the original sin and of necessity of the redeeming grace was urbanized in the thrash about against Pelagius and his Pelagian disciples, Caelestius and Julian of Eclanum, who had been inspired through Rufinus of Syria, a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia. They refused to agree that libido wounded human will and mind, insisting that the human nature was given the power to act, to speak, and to think when God created it. Human nature cannot lose its moral capability for doing good, but a person is free to act or not to act in a righteous method. Pelagius gave an instance of eyes: they have capability for seeing, but a person can create either good or bad use of it. Like Jovinian, Pelagians insisted that human affections and desires were not touched through the fall either. Immorality, e.g. fornication, is exclusively a matter of will, i.e. a person does not use natural desires in a proper method. In opposition to that, Augustine pointed out to the apparent disobedience of the flesh to the spirit, and explained it as one of the results of original sin, punishment of Adam and Eve's disobedience to God.

Augustine had served as a "Hearer" for the Manicheans for in relation to the nine years, who taught that the original sin was carnal knowledge. But his thrash about to understand the cause of evil in the world started before that, at the age of nineteen. Through malum he understood mainly of all concupiscence, which he interpreted as a vice dominating person and causing in men and women moral disorder. A. Trapè insists that Augustine's personal experience cannot be credited for his doctrine in relation to the concupiscence. His marriage experience, though Christian marriage celebration was missing, was exemplary, extremely normal and through no means specifically sad. As J. Brachtendorf showed, Augustine used Ciceronian Stoic concept of passions, to interpret Paul's doctrine of universal sin and redemption.

The view that not only human soul but also senses were influenced through the fall of Adam and Eve was prevalent in Augustine's time in the middle of the Fathers of the Church. It is clear that the cause of Augustine's aloofness towards the affairs of the flesh was dissimilar than that of Plotinus, a
A neo-Platonist who taught that only through disdain for fleshly desire could one reach the ultimate state of mankind. Augustine taught the redemption, i.e. transformation and purification, of the body in the resurrection.

Some authors perceive Augustine's doctrine as directed against human sexuality and attribute his insistence on continence and devotion to God as coming from Augustine's require to reject his own highly sensual nature as described in the Confessions. But in view of his writings it is apparently a misunderstanding. Augustine teaches that human sexuality has been wounded, jointly with the whole of human nature, and requires redemption of Christ. That healing is a procedure realized in conjugal acts. The virtue of continence is achieved thanks to the grace of the sacrament of Christian marriage, which becomes so a *remedium concupiscentiae* - remedy of concupiscence. The redemption of human sexuality will be, though, fully accomplished only in the resurrection of the body.

The sin of Adam is inherited through all human beings. Already in his pre-Pelagian writings, Augustine taught that Original Sin was transmitted through concupiscence, which he regarded as the passion of both, soul and body, creation humanity a *massa damnata* and much enfeebling, though not destroying, the freedom of the will.

Augustine's formulation of the doctrine of original sin was confirmed at numerous councils, *i.e.* Carthage (418), Ephesus (431), Orange (529), Trent (1546) and through popes, *i.e.* Pope Innocent I (401–417) and Pope Zosimus (417–418). Anselm of Canterbury recognized in his *Cur Deus Homo* the definition that was followed through the great Schoolmen, namely that Original Sin is the "privation of the righteousness which every man ought to possess", therefore interpreting *concupiscence* as something more than mere sexual lust, with which some of Augustine's disciples had defined it as later did Luther and Calvin, a doctrine condemned in 1567 through Pope Pius V.

Augustine taught that some people are predestined through God to salvation through an eternal, sovereign decree which is not based on man's merit or will. The saving grace which God bestows is irresistible and unfailingly results in conversion. God also grants those whom he saves with
the gift of perseverance so that none of those whom God has chosen may conceivably fall absent.

The Catholic Church considers Augustine's teaching to be constant with free will. He often said that any can be saved if they wish. While God knows who will be saved and who will not, with no possibility that one destined to be lost will be saved, this knowledge symbolizes God's perfect knowledge of how humans will freely choose their destinies.

**Sacramental Theology**

Also in reaction against the Donatists, Augustine urbanized a distinction flanked by the "regularity" and "validity" of the sacraments. Regular sacraments are performed through clergy of the Catholic Church while sacraments performed through schismatics are measured irregular. Nevertheless, the validity of the sacraments do not depend upon the holiness of the priests who perform them; so, irregular sacraments are still accepted as valid provided they are done in the name of Christ and in the manner prescribed through the Church. On this point Augustine departs from the earlier teaching of Cyprian, who taught that converts from schismatic movement’s necessity be re-baptised. Augustine taught that sacraments administered outside the Catholic Church, though true sacraments, avail nothing. Though, he also stated that baptism, while it does not confer any grace when done outside the Church, does confer grace as soon as one is received into the Catholic Church.

Augustine upheld the early Christian understanding of the Real Attendance of Christ in the Eucharist, saying that Christ's statement, "This is my body" referred to the bread he accepted in his hands, and that Christians necessity have faith that the bread and wine are in information the body and blood of Christ, despite what they see with their eyes.

Against the Pelagians, Augustine strongly stressed the importance of infant baptism. In relation to the question whether baptism is an absolute necessity for salvation though, Augustine appears to have refined his beliefs throughout his lifetime, causing some confusion in the middle of later theologians in relation to the location. He said in one of his sermons that only
the baptized are saved. This belief was shared through several early Christians. Though, a passage from his *Municipality of God*, concerning the Apocalypse, may indicate that Augustine did consider in an exception for children born to Christian parents.

**Statements on Jews**

Against sure Christian movements, some of which rejected the use of Hebrew Scripture, Augustine countered that God had chosen the Jews as a special people, and he measured the scattering of Jews through the Roman Empire to be a fulfillment of prophecy. Augustine also quotes part of the similar prophecy that says "Slay them not, lest they should at last forget Thy law". Augustine argued that God had allowed the Jews to survive this dispersion as a warning to Christians, therefore they were to be permitted to dwell in Christian lands. Augustine further argued that the Jews would be converted at the end of time.

**Views on Sexuality**

For Augustine, the evil of sexual immorality was not in the sexual act itself, but rather in the emotions that typically accompany it. In *On Christian Doctrine* Augustine contrasts love, which is enjoyment on explanation of God, and lust, which is not on explanation of God. For Augustine, proper love exercises a denial of selfish pleasure and the subjugation of corporeal desire to God. He wrote that the pious virgins raped throughout the sack of Rome, were innocent because they did not intend to sin.

Augustine's view of sexual feelings as sinful affected his view of women. For instance he measured a man’s erection to be sinful, though involuntary, because it did not take lay under his conscious manage. His solution was to lay controls on women to limit their skill to power men. Augustine viewed women not only as threatening to men, but also as intellectually and morally inferior. He equated flesh with woman and spirit with man.

He whispered that the serpent approached Eve because she was less rational and lacked self-manage, while Adam's choice to eat was viewed as an
act of kindness so that Eve would not be left alone. Augustine whispered sin entered the world because man did not exercise manage in excess of woman. Augustine's views on women were not all negative, though.

Just as to Raming, the power of the Decretum Gratiani, a collection of Roman Catholic canon law which prohibits women from leading, teaching, or being a witness, rests mainly on the views of the early church fathers—one of the mainly influential being St. Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo. The laws and traditions founded upon St. Augustine's views of sexuality and women continue to exercise considerable power in excess of church doctrinal positions concerning the role of women in the church.

**Teaching Philosophy**

Augustine is measured an influential figure in the history of education. A work early in Augustine's writings is *De Magistro* (the Teacher), which contains insights in relation to the education. Though, his thoughts changed as he establish better directions or better methods of expressing his thoughts. In the last years of his life Saint Augustine wrote his "Retractationes", reviewing his writings and improving specific texts. Henry Chadwick believes an accurate translation of "retractationes" may be "reconsiderations". Reconsiderations can be seen as an overarching theme of the method Saint Augustine learned. Augustine's understanding of the search for understanding/meaning/truth as a restless journey leaves room for doubt, development and change.

Dr. Gary N. McCloskey, O.S.A., discovers four "encounters of learning" in Augustine's approach to education: Through Transforming Experiences; as a Journey in Search of Understanding/meaning/Truth; Learning with Others in Society; and Structure the Habits (Love) of Learning. His emphasis on the importance of society as a means of learning distinguishes his pedagogy from some others. Augustine whispered that dialogue/dialectic/discussion is the best means for learning, and this method should serve as a model for learning encounters flanked by teachers and students. Saint Augustine’s dialogue writings model require for lively interactive dialogue in the middle of learners.
He introduced the theory of three dissimilar categories of students, and instructed teachers to adapt their teaching styles to each student's individual learning approach. The three dissimilar types of students are: the student who has been well-educated through knowledgeable teachers; the student who has had no education; and the student who has had a poor education, but believes himself to be well-educated. If a student has been well educated in a wide diversity of subjects, the teacher necessity be careful not to repeat what they have already learned, but to challenge the student with material which they do not yet know thoroughly. With the student who has had no education, the teacher necessity be patient, willing to repeat things until the student understands, and sympathetic. Perhaps the mainly hard student, though, is the one with an inferior education who believes he understands something when he does not. Augustine stressed the importance of showing this kind of student the variation flanked by "having languages and having understanding." and of helping the student to remain humble with his acquisition of knowledge.

Augustine introduced the thought of teachers responding positively to the questions they may receive from their students, no matter if the student interrupted his teacher. Augustine also founded the restrained approach of teaching. This teaching approach ensures the students' full understanding of a concept because the teacher does not bombard the student with too much material; focuses on one topic at a time; helps them discover what they don't understand, rather than moving on too quickly; anticipates questions; and helps them learn to solve difficulties and discover solutions to troubles. Yet another of Augustine's major contributions to education is his revise on the styles of teaching. He claimed there are two vital styles a teacher uses when speaking to the students. The mixed approach comprises intricate and sometimes showy language to help students see the beautiful artistry of the subject they are learning. The grand approach is not quite as elegant as the mixed approach, but is exciting and heartfelt, with the purpose of igniting the similar passion in the students' hearts. Augustine balanced his teaching philosophy with the traditional Bible-based practice of strict discipline.
Works

Augustine was one of the mainly prolific Latin authors in conditions of surviving works, and the list of his works consists of more than one hundred separate titles. They contain apologetic works against the heresies of the Arians, Donatists, Manicheans and Pelagians; texts on Christian doctrine, notably *De Doctrina Christiana* (*On Christian Doctrine*); exegetical works such as commentaries on Book of Genesis, the Psalms and Paul's Letter to the Romans; several sermons and letters; and the *Retractationes*, a review of his earlier works which he wrote close to the end of his life. Separately from those, Augustine is almost certainly best recognized for his *Confessions*, which is a personal explanation of his earlier life, and for *De civitate dei* (*The Municipality of God*, consisting of 22 books), which he wrote to restore the confidence of his fellow Christians, which was badly shaken through the sack of Rome through the Visigoths in 410. His *On the Trinity*, in which he urbanized what has become recognized as the 'psychological analogy' of the Trinity, is also in the middle of his masterpieces, and arguably one of the greatest theological works of all time. He also wrote *On Free Choice Of The Will* (*De libero arbitrio*), addressing why God provides humans free will that can be used for evil.

Power

Augustine is measured through contemporary historian Thomas Cahill to be the first medieval man and the last classical man. In both his philosophical and theological reasoning, he was greatly influenced through Stoicism, Platonism and Neo-platonism, particularly through the work of Plotinus, author of the Enneads, almost certainly through the mediation of Porphyry and Victorinus (as Pierre Hadot has argued). Although he later abandoned Neoplatonism, some thoughts are still visible in his early writings. His early and influential writing on the human will, a central topic in ethics, would become a focus for later philosophers such as Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard, and Nietzsche. In addition, Augustine was influenced through the works of Virgil (recognized for his teaching on language), Cicero
(recognized for his teaching on argument), and Aristotle (particularly his Rhetoric and Poetics).

Thomas Aquinas was influenced heavily through Augustine. On the topic of original sin, Aquinas proposed a more optimistic view of man than that of Augustine in that his conception leaves to the cause, will, and passions of fallen man their natural powers even after the Fall. Augustine's doctrine of efficacious grace establish eloquent expression in the works of Bernard of Clairvaux; also Reformation theologians such as Martin Luther and John Calvin would seem back to him as their inspiration.

Philosopher Bertrand Russell was impressed through Augustine's meditation on the nature of time in the Confessions, comparing it to Kant's subjective theory of time, which has been widely accepted since Kant. Catholic theologians usually subscribe to Augustine's belief that God exists outside of time in the "eternal present"; that time only exists within the created universe because only in legroom is time discernible through motion and change. His meditations on the nature of time are closely connected to his consideration of the human skill of memory. Frances Yates in her 1966 study The Art of Memory argues that a brief passage of the Confessions, 10.8.12, in which Augustine writes of walking up a flight of stairs and entering the vast meadows of memory clearly designates that the ancient Romans were aware of how to use explicit spatial and architectural metaphors as a mnemonic technique for organizing big amounts of information.

Augustine's philosophical method, especially demonstrated in his Confessions, had continuing power on Continental philosophy throughout the 20th century. His descriptive approach to intentionality, memory, and language as these phenomena are experienced within consciousness and time anticipated and inspired the insights of contemporary phenomenology and hermeneutics. Edmund Husserl writes: "The analysis of time-consciousness is an age-old crux of descriptive psychology and theory of knowledge. The first thinker to be deeply sensitive to the immense difficulties to be establish here was Augustine, who labored approximately to despair in excess of this problem." Martin Heidegger refers to Augustine's descriptive philosophy at many junctures in his influential work Being and Time. Hannah Arendt began
her philosophical writing with a dissertation on Augustine's concept of love, *Der Liebesbegriff bei Augustin* (1929): "The young Arendt attempted to illustrate that the philosophical foundation for *vita socialis* in Augustine can be understood as residing in neighbourly love, grounded in his understanding of the general origin of humanity." Jean Bethke Elshtain in *Augustine and the Limits of Politics* discovers likeness flanked by Augustine and Arendt in their concepts of evil: "Augustine did not see evil as glamorously demonic but rather as absence of good, something which paradoxically is really nothing. Arendt... envisioned even the extreme evil which produced the Holocaust as merely banal." Augustine’s philosophical legacy continues to power modern critical theory through the contributions and inheritors of these 20th-century figures.

Just as to Leo Ruickbie, Augustine’s arguments against magic, differentiating it from miracle, were crucial in the early Church’s fight against paganism and became a central thesis in the later denunciation of witches and witchcraft. Just as to Professor Deepak Lal, Augustine’s vision of the heavenly municipality has influenced the secular projects and traditions of the Enlightenment, Marxism, Freudianism and Eco-fundamentalism. Post-Marxist philosophers Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt rely heavily on Augustine’s thought, particularly The Municipality of God, in their book of political-philosophy "Empire."

While in his pre-Pelagian writings Augustine taught that Adam’s guilt as transmitted to his descendants much enfeebles, though does not destroy, the freedom of their will, Protestant reformers Martin Luther and John Calvin affirmed that Original Sin totally destroyed liberty.

Augustine has influenced several contemporary-day theologians and authors such as John Piper. Hannah Arendt, an influential 20th century political theorist, wrote her doctoral dissertation in philosophy on St. Augustine, and sustained to rely on his thought throughout her career. In his autobiographical book *Milestones*, Pope Benedict XVI, claims St. Augustine as one of the deepest powers in his thought.

- **THOMAS AQUINAS**
Thomas Aquinas, O.P. (1225 – 7 March 1274), also Thomas of Aquin or Aquino, was an Italian Dominican priest, and an immensely influential philosopher and theologian in the custom of scholasticism, within which he is also recognized as the "Dumb Ox", "Angelico Doctor", "Doctor Communis", and "Doctor Universalis". "Aquinas" is the demonym of Aquino: Thomas came from one of the noblest families of the Kingdom of Naples; his parents held the titles "Count of Aquino" and "Countess of Teano." He was the foremost classical proponent of natural theology, and the father of Thomism. His power on Western thought is considerable, and much of contemporary philosophy was conceived in development or refutation of his thoughts, particularly in the regions of ethics, natural law, metaphysics, and political theory.

Thomas is held in the Roman Catholic Church to be the model teacher for those learning for the priesthood, and indeed the highest expression of both natural cause and speculative theology. The revise of his works, just as to papal and magisterial documents, is a core of the required program of revise for those seeking ordination as priests or deacons, as well as for those in religious formation and for other students of the sacred disciplines (Catholic philosophy, theology, history, liturgy, and canon law). The works for which he is best-recognized are the Summa theologiae and the Summa Contra Gentiles. One of the 35 Doctors of the Church, he is measured the Church's greatest theologian and philosopher. Pope Benedict XV declared: "This (Dominican) Order... acquired new luster when the Church declared the teaching of Thomas to be her own and that Doctor, honored with the special praises of the Pontiffs, the master and patron of Catholic schools."

Biography

**Dominican (1225–1244)**

Thomas was born in Roccasecca, in the Aquino county of the Kingdom of Sicily (present-day Lazio region, Italy), circa January 28, 1225. Just as to some authors, he was born in the castle of his father, Landulf of Aquino. Thomas's father didn’t belong to the mainly powerful branch of the family and
basically held the title *miles*, while Thomas's mother, Dame Theodora, belonged to the Rossi branch of the Neapolitan Caracciolo family. Landulf's brother Sinibald was abbot of the original Benedictine abbey at Monte Cassino. While the rest of the family's sons pursued military careers, the family planned for Thomas to follow his uncle into the abbacy; this would have been a normal career path for a younger son of southern Italian nobility.

At the age of five, Thomas began his early education at Monte Cassino but after the military disagreement that broke out flanked by the Emperor Frederick II and Pope Gregory IX spilled into the abbey in early 1239, Landulf and Theodora had Thomas enrolled at the *studium generale* (university) recently recognized through Frederick in Naples. It was here that Thomas was almost certainly introduced to Aristotle, Averroes and Maimonides, all of whom would power his theological philosophy. It was also throughout his revise at Naples that Thomas came under the power of John of St. Julian, a Dominican preacher in Naples, who was part of the active effort through the Dominican order to recruit devout followers. There his teacher in arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music was Petrus de Ibernia.

At age nineteen, Thomas resolved to join the Dominican Order. Thomas's change of heart did not please his family, who had expected him to become a Benedictine monk and perhaps the abbot of the powerful Montecassino Abbey close to his family's domains. In an effort to prevent Theodora's interference in Thomas's choice, the Dominicans arranged for Thomas to be removed to Rome, and from Rome, sent to Paris. Though, on his journey to Rome his brothers, per Theodora's instructions, seized him as he was drinking from a spring and took him back to his parents at the castle of Monte San Giovanni Campano.

Thomas was held prisoner for two years in the family castles at Monte San Giovanni and Roccasecca in an effort to prevent him from assuming the Dominican habit and to push him into renouncing his new aspiration. Political concerns prevented the Pope from ordering Thomas's release, which had the effect of extending Thomas' detention. Thomas passed this time of trial tutoring his sisters and communicating with members of the Dominican Order. Family members became desperate to dissuade Thomas, who remained
determined to join the Dominicans. At one point, two of his brothers resorted to the measure of hiring a prostitute to seduce him. Just as to legend Thomas drove her absent wielding a fire iron. That night two angels appeared to him as he slept and strengthened his determination to remain celibate.

Through 1244, seeing that all of her attempts to dissuade Thomas had failed, Theodora sought to save the family's dignity, arranging for Thomas to escape at night through his window. In her mind, a secret escape from detention was less damaging than an open surrender to the Dominicans. Thomas was sent first to Naples and then to Rome to meet Johannes von Wildeshausen, the Master Common of the Dominican Order.

**Paris, Cologne, Albert Magnus, and First Paris Regency (1245–1259)**

In 1245, Thomas was sent to revise at the University of Paris' Faculty of Arts where he mainly likely met Dominican scholar Albertus Magnus, then the Chair of Theology at the College of St. James in Paris. When Albertus was sent through his superiors to teach at the new *studium generale* at Cologne in 1248, Thomas followed him, declining Pope Innocent IV's offer to appoint him abbot of Monte Cassino as a Dominican. Albertus then appointed the reluctant Thomas *magister studentium*. When Thomas failed his first theological disputation, Albertus prophetically exclaimed: "We call him the dumb ox, but in his teaching he will one day produce such a bellowing that it will be heard throughout the world."

Thomas taught in Cologne as an apprentice professor (*baccalaureus biblicus*), instructing students on the books of the Old Testament and writing *Expositio super Isaiam ad litteram* (*Literal Commentary on Isaiah*), *Postilla super Ieremiam* (*Commentary on Jeremiah*) and *Postilla super Threnos* (*Commentary on Lamentations*). Then in 1252 he returned to Paris to revise for the master's degree in theology. He lectured on the Bible as an apprentice professor, and upon becoming a *baccalaureus Sententiarum* (*bachelor of the Sentences*) devoted his final three years of revise to commenting on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. In the first of his four theological syntheses, Thomas composed a huge commentary on the *Sentences* entitled *Scriptum super libros Sententiarium* (*Commentary on the Sentences*). Aside from his master's
writings, he wrote *De ente et essentia* (*On Being and Essence*) for his fellow Dominicans in Paris.

In the spring of 1256, Thomas was appointed regent master in theology at Paris and one of his first works upon assuming this office was *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem* (*Against Those Who Assail the Worship of God and Religion*), defending the mendicant orders which had come under attack through William of Saint-Amour. Throughout his tenure from 1256 to 1259, Thomas wrote numerous works, including: *Questiones disputatae de veritate* (*Disputed Questions on Truth*), a collection of twenty-nine disputed questions on characteristics of faith and the human condition prepared for the public university debates he presided in excess of on Lent and Advent; *Quaestiones quodlibetales* (*Quodlibetal Questions*), a collection of his responses to questions posed to him through the academic audience; and both *Expositio super librum Boethii De trinitate* (*Commentary on Boethius's De trinitate*) and *Expositio super librum Boethii De hebdomadibus* (*Commentary on Boethius's De hebdomadibus*), commentaries on the works of 6th century philosopher Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius. Through the end of his regency, Thomas was working on one of his mainly well-known works, *Summa contra Gentiles*.

**Naples, Orvieto, Rome (1259–1268)**

In 1259 Thomas completed his first regency at the *studium generale* and left Paris so that others in his order could gain this teaching experience. He returned to Naples where he was appointed as common preacher through the provincial chapter of September 29, 1260. In September 1261 he was described to Orvieto as consensual lector responsible for the rustic formation of the friars unable to attend a *studium generale*. In Orvieto Thomas completed his *Summa contra Gentiles*, wrote the *Catena aurea*, (*The Golden Chain*), and produced works for Pope Urban IV such as the liturgy for the newly created feast of Corpus Christi and the *Contra errores graecorum* (*Against the Errors of the Greeks*).

In February 1265 the newly elected Pope Clement IV summoned Aquinas to Rome to serve as papal theologian. This similar year he was
ordered through the Dominican Chapter of Agnani to teach at the *studium conventuale* at the Roman convent of Santa Sabina which had been founded some years before in 1222. The *studium* at Santa Sabina now became an experiment for the Dominicans, the Order's first *studium provinciale*, an intermediate school flanked by the *studium conventuale* and the *studium generale*. "Prior to this time the Roman Province had offered no dedicated education of any sort, no arts, no philosophy; only easy convent schools, with their vital courses in theology for resident friars, were functioning in Tuscany and the meridionale throughout the first many decades of the order's life. But the new *studium* at Santa Sabina was to be a school for the province," a *studium provinciale*. Tolomeo da Lucca, an associate and early biographer of Aquinas, tells us that at the Santa Sabina *studium* Aquinas taught the full range of philosophical subjects, both moral and natural.

While at the Santa Sabina *studium provinciale* Thomas began his mainly well-known work the *Summa theologiae*, which he conceived of specifically as suited to beginning students: "Because a doctor of catholic truth ought not only to teach the proficient, but to him pertains also to instruct beginners. as the Apostle says in 1 Corinthians 3: 1-2, *as to infants in Christ, I gave you milk to drink, not meat*, our proposed intention in this work is to convey those things that pertain to the Christian religion, in a method that is fitting to the instruction of beginners." While there he also wrote a diversity of other works like his unfinished *Compendium Theologiae* and *Responsio ad fr. Ioannem Vercellensem de articulis 108 sumptis ex opere Petri de Tarentasia* (Reply to Brother John of Vercelli Concerning 108 Articles Drawn from the Work of Peter of Tarentaise). In his location as head of the *studium* Aquinas mannered a series of significant disputations on the power of God, which he compiled into his *De potentia*. Nicholas Brunacci was in the middle of Aquinas' students at the Santa Sabina *studium provinciale* and later at the Paris *studium generale*. In November 1268 he was with Aquinas and his associate and secretary Reginald of Piperno, as they left Viterbo on their method to Paris to begin the academic year. Another student of Aquinas' at the Santa Sabina *studium provinciale* was Blessed Tommasello da Perugia.
Aquinas remained at the studium at Santa Sabina from 1265 until he was described back to Paris in 1268 for second teaching regency. With his departure for Paris in 1268 and the passage of time the pedagogical behaviors of the studium provinciale at Santa Sabina were divided flanked by two campuses. A new convent of the Order at the Church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva had a modest beginning in 1255 as a society for women converts, but grew rapidly in size and importance after being given in excess of to the Dominicans friars in 1275. In 1288 the theology component of the provincial curriculum for the education of the friars was relocated from the Santa Sabina studium provinciale to the studium conventuale at Santa Maria sopra Minerva which was redesignated as a studium particularis theologiae. This studium was transformed in the 16th century into the College of Saint Thomas. In the 20th century the college was relocated to the convent of Saints Dominic and Sixtus and was transformed into the Pontifical University of Saint Thomas Aquinas, Angelicum.

**The Quarrelsome Second Paris Regency (1269–1272)**

In 1268 the Dominican Order assigned Thomas to be regent master at the University of Paris for a second time, a location he held until the spring of 1272. Part of the cause for this sudden reassignment appears to have arisen from the rise of "Averroism" or "radical Aristotelianism" in the universities. In response to these perceived evils, Thomas wrote two works, one of them being De unitate intellectus, contra Averroistas (On the Unity of Intellect, against the Averroists) in which he blasts Averroism as incompatible with Christian doctrine. Throughout his second regency, he finished the second part of the Summa and wrote De virtutibus and De aeternitate mundi, the latter of which dealt with controversial Averroist and Aristotelian beginninglessness of the world. Disputes with some significant Franciscans such as Bonaventure and John Peckham conspired to create his second regency much more hard and troubled than the first. A year before Thomas re-assumed the regency at the 1266–67 Paris disputations, Franciscan master William of Baglione accused Thomas of encouraging Averroists, calling him the "blind leader of the blind". Thomas described these individuals the murmurantes (Grumblers). In reality,
Thomas was deeply disturbed through the spread of Averroism and was angered when he exposed Siger of Brabant teaching Averroistic interpretations of Aristotle to Parisian students. On 10 December 1270, the bishop of Paris, Etienne Tempier, issued an edict condemning thirteen Aristotelian and Averroistic propositions as heretical and excommunicating anyone who sustained to support them. Several in the ecclesiastical society, the so-described Augustinians, were fearful that this introduction of Aristotelianism and the more extreme Averroism might somehow contaminate the purity of the Christian faith. In what appears to be an effort to counteract the rising fear of Aristotelian thought, Thomas mannered a series of disputations flanked by 1270 and 1272: *De virtutibus in communi* (On Virtues in Common), *De virtutibus cardinalibus* (On Cardinal Virtues), *De spe* (On Hope).

**Final Days and “Straw” (1272–1274)**

In 1272 Thomas took leave from the University of Paris when the Dominicans from his house province described upon him to set up a *studium generale* wherever he liked and staff it as he pleased. He chose to set up the institution in Naples, and moved there to take his post as regent master. He took his time at Naples to work on the third part of the *Summa* while giving lectures on several religious topics. On 6 December 1273 at the Dominican convent of Naples in the Chapel of Saint Nicholas after Matins Thomas lingered and was seen through the sacristan Domenic of Caserta to be levitating in prayer with tears before an icon of the crucified Christ. Christ said to Thomas, "You have written well of me, Thomas. What reward would you have for your labor?" Thomas responded, "Nothing but you Lord." After this exchange something happened, but Thomas never spoke of it or wrote it down. Because of what he saw, he abandoned his routine and refused to dictate to his *socius* Reginald of Piperno. When Reginald begged him to get back to work, Thomas replied: “Reginald, I cannot, because all that I have written appears like straw to me” (mihi videtur ut palea). What exactly triggered Thomas's change in behavior is whispered through Catholics to have been some type of supernatural experience of God. After taking to his bed, he did recover some strength.
In 1054, an extensive-lasting schism had occurred flanked by the Catholic Church and the churches in communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople, later recognized as the Eastern Orthodox. Looking to discover a method to reunite the Eastern Orthodox churches with the Catholic Church Pope Gregory X convened the Second Council of Lyon to be held on 1 May 1274 and summoned Thomas to attend. At the meeting, Thomas's work for Pope Urban IV concerning the Greeks, *Contra errores graecorum*, was to be presented. On his method to the Council, riding on a donkey beside the Appian Method, he struck his head on the branch of a fallen tree and became seriously ill again. He was then quickly escorted to Monte Cassino to convalesce. After resting for a while, he set out again, but stopped at the Cistercian Fossanova Abbey after again falling ill. The monks nursed him for many days, and as he received his last rites he prayed: "I receive Thee, ransom of my soul. For love of Thee have I studied and kept vigil, toiled, preached and taught...." He died on 7 March 1274 while giving commentary on the Song of Songs.

**Condemnation of 1277**

In 1277 Etienne Tempier, the similar bishop of Paris who had issued the condemnation of 1270, issued another more extensive condemnation. One aim of this condemnation was to clarify that God's absolute power transcended any principles of logic that Aristotle or Averroes might lay on it. More specifically, it contained a list of 219 propositions that the bishop had determined to violate the omnipotence of God, and incorporated in this list were twenty Thomistic propositions. Their inclusion badly damaged Thomas's reputation for several years.

In *The Divine Comedy*, Dante sees the glorified soul of Thomas in the Heaven of the Sun with the other great exemplars of religious wisdom. Dante asserts that Thomas died through poisoning, on the order of Charles of Anjou; Villani cites this belief, and the *Anonimo Fiorentino* describes the crime and its motive. But the historian Ludovico Antonio Muratori reproduces the explanation made through one of Thomas's friends, and this version of the story provides no hint of foul play.
Thomas's theology had begun its rise to prestige. Two centuries later, in 1567, Pope Pius V proclaimed St. Thomas Aquinas a Doctor of the Church and ranked his feast with those of the four great Latin fathers: Ambrose, Augustine of Hippo, Jerome, and Gregory. Though, in the similar era the Council of Trent still turned to Duns Scotus before Thomas as a source of arguments in defence of the Church. Even though Duns Scotus was more consulted at the Council of Trent, Thomas had the honor of having his *Summa theologiae* placed on the altar alongside the Bible and the Decretals.

In his encyclical of 4 August 1879, Pope Leo XIII stated that Thomas's theology was a definitive exposition of Catholic doctrine. Therefore, he directed the clergy to take the teachings of Thomas as the foundation of their theological positions. Leo XIII also decreed that all Catholic seminaries and universities necessity teach Thomas's doctrines, and where Thomas did not speak on a topic, the teachers were "urged to teach conclusions that were reconcilable with his thinking." In 1880, Saint Thomas Aquinas was declared patron of all Catholic educational establishments.

**Canonization**

When the devil's advocate at his canonization procedure objected that there were no miracles, one of the cardinals answered, "*Tot miraculis, quot articulis*"—"there are as several miracles (in his life) as articles," viz., thousands.

In a monastery at Naples, close to the cathedral of St. Januarius, a cell in which he supposedly existed is still shown to visitors. His remnants were placed in the Church of the Jacobins in Toulouse in 1369. Flanked by 1789 and 1974, they were held in Basilique de Saint-Sernin, Toulouse. In 1974, they were returned to the Church of the Jacobins, where they have remained ever since.

In the Common Roman Calendar of 1962, in the Roman Catholic Church, Thomas was commemorated on 7 March, the day of death. Though, in the Common Roman Calendar of 1969, Thomas's memorial was transferred to 28 January, the date of the translation of his leftovers to Toulouse.
Saint Thomas Aquinas is honored with a feast day in the liturgical year of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America on 28 January.

**Philosophy**

Thomas was a theologian and a Scholastic philosopher. Though, he never measured himself a philosopher, and criticized philosophers, whom he saw as pagans, for always "falling short of the true and proper wisdom to be establish in Christian revelation." With this in mind, Thomas did have respect for Aristotle, so much so that in the *Summa*, he often cites Aristotle basically as "the Philosopher." Much of his work bears upon philosophical topics, and in this sense may be characterized as philosophical. Thomas's philosophical thought has exerted enormous power on subsequent Christian theology, especially that of the Roman Catholic Church, extending to Western philosophy in common. Thomas stands as a vehicle and modifier of Aristotelianism and Neoplatonism.

**Commentaries on Aristotle**

Thomas wrote many significant commentaries on Aristotle's works, including *On the Soul*, *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Metaphysics*. His work is associated with William of Moerbeke's translations of Aristotle from Greek into Latin.

**Epistemology**

Thomas whispered "that for the knowledge of any truth whatsoever man needs divine help, that the intellect may be moved through God to its act." Though, he whispered that human beings have the natural capability to know several things without special divine revelation, even though such revelation occurs from time to time, "especially in regard to such (truths) as pertain to faith." But this is the light that is given to man through God just as to man's nature: "Now every form bestowed on created things through God has power for a determined act[uality], which it can bring in relation to the in proportion to its own proper endowment; and beyond which it is powerless, except through a superadded form, as water can only heat when heated
through the fire. And therefore the human understanding has a form, viz. intelligible light, which of itself is enough for knowing sure intelligible things, viz. those we can come to know through the senses."

**Psychology**

Aquinas maintains that a human is a single material substance. He understands the soul as the form of the body, which creates a human being the composite of the two. Therefore, only livelihood, form-matter composites can truly be described human; dead bodies are “human” only analogously. One actually existing substance comes from body and soul. A human is a single material substance, but still should be understood as having an immaterial soul, which continues after bodily death.

Ultimately, humans are animals; the animal genus is body; body is material substance. When embodied, a human person is an “individual substance in the category rational animal.” The body belongs to the essence of a human being. In his *Summa theologiae* Aquinas clearly states his location on the nature of the soul; defining it as “the first principle of life.” The soul is not corporeal, or a body; it is the act of a body. Because the intellect is incorporeal, it does not use the bodily organs, as “the operation of anything follows the mode of its being.”

The human soul is perfected in the body, but does not depend on the body, because part of its nature is spiritual. In this method, the soul differs from other shapes, which are only establishing in matter, and therefore depend on matter. The soul, as form of the body, does not depend on matter in this method.

The soul is not matter, not even incorporeal or spiritual matter. If it were, it would not be able to understand universals, which are immaterial. A receiver receives things just as to the receiver’s own nature, so in order for soul (receiver) to understand (receive) universals, it necessity have the similar nature as universals. Yet, any substance that understands universals may not be a matter-form composite. So, humans have rational souls which are abstract shapes self-governing of the body. But a human being is one existing, single material substance which comes from body and soul: that is what Thomas
means when he writes that “something one in nature can be shaped from an intellectual substance and a body,” and “a thing one in nature does not result from two permanent entities unless one has the character of substantial form and the other of matter.”

The soul is a "substantial form"; it is a part of a substance, but it is not a substance through itself. Nevertheless, the soul exists separately from the body, and continues, after death, in several of the capacities we think of as human. Substantial form is what creates a thing a member of the species to which it belongs, and substantial form is also the structure or configuration that gives the substance with the abilities that create the substance what it is. For humans, those abilities are those of the rational animal.

These distinctions can be better understood in the light of Aquinas’ understanding of matter and form, a hylomorphic ("matter/form") theory derived from Aristotle. In any given substance, matter and form are necessarily united, and each is a necessary aspect of that substance. Though, they are conceptually separable. Matter symbolizes what is changeable in relation to the substance – what is potentially something else. For instance, bronze matter is potentially a statue, or also potentially a cymbal. Matter necessity be understood as the matter of something. In contrast, form is what determines some scrupulous chunk of matter to be a specific substance and no other. When Aquinas says that the human body is only partly composed of matter, he means the material body is only potentially a human being. The soul is what actualizes that potential into an existing human being. Consequently, the information that a human body is live human tissue entails that a human soul is wholly present in each part of the human.

**Theology**

Thomas viewed theology, or the *sacred doctrine*, as a science, the raw material data of which consists of written scripture and the custom of the Catholic Church. These sources of data were produced through the self-revelation of God to individuals and groups of people throughout history. Faith and cause, while separate but related, are the two primary apparatus for processing the data of theology. Thomas whispered both were necessary — or,
rather, that the confluence of both was necessary — for one to obtain true knowledge of God. Thomas blended Greek philosophy and Christian doctrine through suggesting that rational thinking and the revise of nature, like revelation, were valid methods to understand truths pertaining to God. Just as to Thomas, God reveals himself through nature, so to revise nature is to revise God. The ultimate goals of theology, in Thomas's mind, are to use cause to grasp the truth in relation to the God and to experience salvation through that truth.

**Revelation**

Thomas whispered that truth is recognized through cause (natural revelation) and faith (supernatural revelation). Supernatural revelation has its origin in the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and is made accessible through the teaching of the prophets, summed up in Holy Scripture, and transmitted through the Magisterium, the sum of which is described "Custom". Natural revelation is the truth accessible to all people through their human nature and powers of cause. For instance, he felt this applied to rational methods to know the subsistence of God.

Though one may deduce the subsistence of God and his Attributes (Unity, Truth, Goodness, Power, Knowledge) through cause, sure specifics may be recognized only through the special revelation of God in Jesus Christ. The major theological components of Christianity, such as the Trinity and the Incarnation, are revealed in the teachings of the Church and the Scriptures and may not otherwise be deduced. Faith and cause complement rather than contradict each other, each giving dissimilar views of the similar Truth.

**Creation**

As a Catholic, Thomas whispered that God is the "maker of heaven and earth, of all that is visible and invisible." Like Aristotle, Thomas posited that life could form from non-livelihood material or plant life, a theory of ongoing a biogenesis recognized as spontaneous generation:

- Since the generation of one thing is the corruption of another, it was not incompatible with the first formation of things, that from the
corruption of the less perfect the more perfect should be generated. Hence animals generated from the corruption of inanimate things, or of plants, may have been generated then.

Additionally, Thomas measured Empedocles' theory that several mutated species appeared at the dawn of Creation. Thomas reasoned that these species were generated through mutations in animal sperm, and argued that they were not unintended through nature; rather, such species were basically not planned for perpetual subsistence. That discussion is established in his commentary on Aristotle's Physics:

- The similar thing is true of those substances which Empedocles said were produced at the beginning of the world, such as the ‘ox-progeny’, i.e., half ox and half man. For if such things were not able to arrive at some end and final state of nature so that they would be preserved in subsistence, this was not because nature did not intend this [a final state], but because they were not capable of being preserved. For they were not generated just as to nature, but through the corruption of some natural principle, as it now also happens that some monstrous offspring are generated because of the corruption of seed.

**Presently War**

Augustine of Hippo agreed strongly with the conventional wisdom of his time, that Christians should be pacifists philosophically, but that they should use protection as a means of preserving peace in the extensive run. For instance, he routinely argued that pacifism did not prevent the defence of innocents. In essence, the pursuit of peace might require fighting to preserve it in the extensive-term. Such a war necessity not be preemptive, but suspicious, to restore peace.

Thomas Aquinas, centuries later, used the power of Augustine's arguments in an effort to describe the circumstances under which a war could be presently. He laid these out in his historic work, Summa Theologica:

- First, war necessity happen for a good and presently purpose rather than the pursuit of wealth or power.
• Second, presently war necessity be waged through a properly instituted power such as the state.

• Third, peace necessity be a central motive even in the midst of violence.

The School of Salamanca

The School of Salamanca expanded Aquinas' understanding of natural law and presently war. Given that war is one of the worst evils suffered through mankind, the adherents of the School reasoned that it ought to be resorted to only when it was necessary to prevent an even greater evil. A diplomatic agreement is preferable, even for the more powerful party, before a war is started. Examples of "presently war" are:

• In self-protection, as extensive as there is a reasonable possibility of success. If failure is a foregone conclusion, then it is presently a wasteful spilling of blood.

• Preventive war against a tyrant who is in relation to the attack.

• War to punish a guilty enemy.

A war is not legitimate or illegitimate basically based on its original motivation: it necessity comply with a series of additional necessities:

• The response necessity be commensurate to the evil; more violence than is strictly necessary would be unjust.

• Governing authorities declare war, but their decision is not enough cause to begin a war. If the people oppose a war, then it is illegitimate. The people have a right to depose a government that is waging, or is in relation to the wage, an unjust war.

• Once war has begun, there remain moral limits to action. For instance, one may not attack innocents or kill hostages.

• The belligerent’s necessity exhaust all options for dialogue and negotiation before undertaking a war; war is only legitimate as a last resort.
Under this doctrine, expansionist wars, wars of pillage, wars to convert infidels or pagans, and wars for glory are all inherently unjust.

**Nature of God**

Thomas whispered that the subsistence of God is self-apparent in itself, but not to us. "So I say that this proposition, "God exists," of itself is self-apparent, for the predicate is the similar as the subject.... Now because we do not know the essence of God, the proposition is not self-apparent to us; but needs to be demonstrated through things that are more recognized to us, though less recognized in their nature — namely, through effects."

Thomas whispered that the subsistence of God can be proven. In the *Summa theologiae*, he measured in great detail five arguments for the subsistence of God, widely recognized as the *quinque viae* (Five Methods).

For the original text of the five proofs:

- **Motion**: Some things undoubtedly move, though cannot cause their own motion. Since, as Thomas whispered, there can be no infinite chain of causes of motion, there necessity be a First Mover not moved through anything else, and this is what everyone understands through God.

- **Causation**: As in the case of motion, nothing can cause itself, and an infinite chain of causation is impossible, so there necessity be a First Cause, described God.

- **Subsistence of necessary and the unnecessary**: Our experience comprises things certainly existing but apparently unnecessary. Not everything can be unnecessary, for then once there was nothing and there would still be nothing. So, we are compelled to suppose something that exists necessarily, having this necessity only from itself; in information itself the cause for other things to exist.

- **Gradation**: If we can notice a gradation in things in the sense that some things are more hot, good, etc., there necessity be a superlative which is the truest and noblest thing, and so mainly fully existing. This then, we call God -- note Thomas does not ascribe actual qualities to God Himself!
Ordered tendencies of nature: A direction of actions to an end is noticed in all bodies following natural laws. Anything without awareness tends to a goal under the guidance of one who is aware. This we call God. Note that even when we guide objects, in Thomas' view the source of all our knowledge comes from God as well.

Concerning the nature of God, Thomas felt the best approach, commonly described the via negativa, is to consider what God is not. This led him to propose five statements in relation to the divine qualities:

- God is easy, without composition of parts, such as body and soul, or matter and form.
- God is perfect, lacking nothing. That is, God is distinguished from other beings on explanation of God's complete actuality. Thomas defined God as the 'Ipse Actus Essendi subsistens,' subsisting act of being.
- God is infinite. That is, God is not finite in the methods that created beings are physically, intellectually, and emotionally limited. This infinity is to be distinguished from infinity of size and infinity of number.
- God is immutable, incapable of change on the stages of God's essence and character.
- God is one, without diversification within God's self. The unity of God is such that God's essence is the similar as God's subsistence. In Thomas's languages, "in itself the proposition 'God exists' is necessarily true, for in it subject and predicate are the similar."

In this approach, he is following, in the middle of others, the Jewish philosopher Maimonides.

Following St. Augustine of Hippo, Thomas defines sin as "a word, deed, or desire, contrary to the eternal law." It is significant to note the analogous nature of law in Thomas's legal philosophy. Natural law is an instance or instantiation of eternal law. Because natural law is that which human beings determine just as to their own nature (as rational beings), disobeying cause is disobeying natural law and eternal law. Therefore eternal
law is logically prior to reception of either "natural law" (that determined through cause) or "divine law" (that establish in the Old and New Testaments). In other languages, God's will extends to both cause and revelation. Sin is abrogating either one's own cause, on the one hand, or revelation on the other, and is synonymous with "evil" (privation of good, or *privatio boni*). Thomas, like all Scholastics, usually argued that the findings of cause and data of revelation cannot disagreement, so both are a guide to God's will for human beings.

**Nature of the Trinity**

Thomas argued that God, while perfectly united, also is perfectly described through Three Interrelated Persons. These three persons (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) are constituted through their dealings within the essence of God. Thomas wrote that the term "Trinity" "does not mean the dealings themselves of the Persons, but rather the number of persons related to each other; and hence it is that the word in itself does not express regard to another." The Father generates the Son (or the Word) through the relation of self-awareness. This eternal generation then produces an eternal Spirit "who enjoys the divine nature as the Love of God, the Love of the Father for the Word."

This Trinity exists independently from the world. It transcends the created world, but the Trinity also decided to provide grace to human beings. This takes lay through the Incarnation of the Word in the person of Jesus Christ and through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit within those who have experienced salvation through God; just as to Aidan Nichols.

**Prima Causa – First Cause**

Thomas's five proofs for the subsistence of God take some of Aristotle's assertions concerning principles of being. For Thomas, God as prima causa (first cause) comes from Aristotle's concept of the unmoved mover and asserts that God is the ultimate cause of all things.
Nature of Jesus Christ

In the *Summa Theologica*, Thomas begins his discussion of Jesus Christ through recounting the biblical story of Adam and Eve and through describing the negative effects of original sin. The purpose of Christ's Incarnation was to restore human nature through removing "the contamination of sin", which humans cannot do through themselves. "Divine Wisdom judged it fitting that God should become man, so that therefore one and the similar person would be able both to restore man and to offer satisfaction." Thomas argued in favor of the satisfaction view of atonement; that is, that Jesus Christ died "to satisfy for the whole human race, which was sentenced to die on explanation of sin."

Thomas argued against many specific modern and historical theologians who held differing views in relation to the Christ. In response to Photinus, Thomas stated that Jesus was truly divine and not basically a human being. Against Nestorius, who suggested that Son of God was merely conjoined to the man Christ, Thomas argued that the fullness of God was an integral part of Christ's subsistence. Though, countering Apollinaris' views, Thomas held that Christ had a truly human (rational) soul, as well. This produced a duality of natures in Christ. Thomas argued against Eutyches that this duality persisted after the Incarnation. Thomas stated that these two natures lived simultaneously yet distinguishably in one real human body, unlike the teachings of Manichaeus and Valentinus.

In short, "Christ had a real body of the similar nature of ours, a true rational soul, and, jointly with these, perfect Deity." Therefore, there is both unity (in his one hypostasis) and composition (in his two natures, human and Divine) in Christ.

- I answer that, The Person or hypostasis of Christ may be viewed in two methods. First as it is in itself, and therefore it is altogether easy, even as the Nature of the Word. Secondly, in the aspect of person or hypostasis to which it belongs to subsist in a nature; and therefore the Person of Christ subsists in two natures. Hence though there is one subsisting being in Him, yet there are dissimilar characteristics of
survival, and hence He is said to be a composite person, insomuch as one being subsists in two.

Echoing Athanasius of Alexandria, he said that "The only begotten Son of God...assumed our nature, so that he, made man, might create men gods."

**Goal of Human Life**

In Thomas's thought, the goal of human subsistence is union and eternal fellowship with God. Specifically, this goal is achieved through the beatific vision, an event in which a person experiences perfect, unending happiness through seeing the extremely essence of God. This vision, which occurs after death, is a gift from God given to those who have experienced salvation and redemption through Christ while livelihood on earth.

This ultimate goal carries implications for one's present life on earth. Thomas stated that an individual's will necessity be ordered toward right things, such as charity, peace, and holiness. He sees this as the method to happiness. Thomas orders his treatment of the moral life approximately the thought of happiness. The connection flanked by will and goal is antecedent in nature "because rectitude of the will consists in being duly ordered to the last end [that is, the beatific vision]." Those who truly seek to understand and see God will necessarily love what God loves. Such love requires morality and bears fruit in everyday human choices.

**Treatment of Heretics**

Thomas Aquinas belonged to the Dominican Order (formally *Ordo Praedicatorum*, the Order of Preachers) who began as an order dedicated to the conversion of the Albigensians and other heterodox factions, at first through peaceful means; later the Albigensians were dealt with through means of the Albigensian Crusade. In the *Summa theologiae*, he wrote:

- With regard to heretics two points necessity be observed: one, on their own face; the other, on the face of the Church. On their own face there is the sin, whereby they deserve not only to be separated from the Church through excommunication, but also to be severed from the
world through death. For it is a much graver matter to corrupt the faith which quickens the soul, than to forge money, which supports temporal life. Wherefore if forgers of money and other evil-doers are forthwith condemned to death through the secular power, much more cause is there for heretics, as soon as they are convicted of heresy, to be not only excommunicated but even put to death. On the part of the Church, though, there is mercy which looks to the conversion of the wanderer, wherefore she condemns not at once, but "after the first and second admonition," as the Apostle directs: after that, if he is yet stubborn, the Church no longer hoping for his conversion, looks to the salvation of others, through excommunicating him and separating him from the Church, and furthermore delivers him to the secular tribunal to be exterminated thereby from the world through death.

Heresy was a capital offense against the secular law of mainly European countries of the 13th century, which had a limited prison capability. Easy theft, forgery, fraud, and other such crimes were also capital offenses; Thomas' point appears to be that the gravity of this offense, which touches not only the material goods but also the spiritual goods of others, is at least the similar as forgery. Thomas's suggestion specifically demands that heretics be handed to a "secular tribunal" rather than magisterial power. That Thomas specifically says that heretics "deserve... death" is related to his theology, just as to which all sinners have no intrinsic right to life. Nevertheless, his point is clear: heretics should be executed through the state. He elaborates on his opinion concerning heresy in the after that article, when he says:

- In God's tribunal, those who return are always received, because God is a searcher of hearts, and knows those who return in sincerity. But the Church cannot imitate God in this, for she presumes that those who relapse after being once received, are not sincere in their return; hence she does not debar them from the method of salvation, but neither does she protect them from the sentence of death.
The Afterlife and Resurrection

A grasp of Aquinas's psychology is essential for understanding his beliefs approximately the afterlife and resurrection. Thomas, following Church doctrine, accepts that the soul continues to exist after the death of the body. Because he accepts that the soul is the form of the body, then he also necessarily consider that the human being, like all material things, is form-matter composite. Substantial form (the human soul) configures prime matter (the physical body) and is the form through which a material composite belongs to that species it does; in the case of human beings, that species is rational animal. So, a human being is a matter-form composite that is organized to be a rational animal. Matter cannot exist without being configured through form, but form can exist without matter—which allows for the separation of soul from body. Aquinas says that the soul shares in the material and spiritual worlds, and so has some characteristics of matter and other, immaterial, characteristics (such as access to universals). The human soul is dissimilar from other material and spiritual things; it is created through God, but also only comes into subsistence in the material body.

Human beings are material, but the human person can survive the death of the body through sustained subsistence of the soul, which persists. The human soul straddles the spiritual and material worlds, and is both a configured subsistent form as well as a configurer of matter into that of a livelihood, bodily human. Because it is spiritual, the human soul does not depend on matter and may exist separately. Because the human being is a soul-matter composite, the body has a part in what it is to be human. Perfected human nature consists in the human dual nature, embodied and intellecting.

Resurrection appears to require dualism, which Thomas rejects. Yet, Aquinas believes the soul persists after the death and corruption of the body, and is capable of subsistence, separated from the body flanked by the time of death and the resurrection. Aquinas believes in a dissimilar sort of dualism, one guided through Christian scripture. Aquinas knows that human beings are essentially physical, but that that physicality has a spirit capable of returning to God after life. For Aquinas, the rewards and punishment of the afterlife are not only spiritual. Because of this, resurrection is an significant part of his
philosophy on the soul. The human is fulfilled and complete in the body, so
the hereafter necessity take lay with souls embittered in resurrected bodies. In
addition to spiritual reward, humans can expect to enjoy material and physical
blessings. Because Aquinas’s soul requires a body for its actions, throughout
the afterlife, the soul will also be punished or rewarded in corporeal
subsistence.

Aquinas states clearly his stance on resurrection, and uses it to back up
his philosophy of justice; that is, the promise of resurrection compensates
Christians who suffered in this world through a heavenly union with the
divine. He says, “If there is no resurrection of the dead, it follows that there is
no good for human beings other than in this life.” Resurrection gives the
impetus for people on earth to provide up pleasures in this life. Thomas
believes the human who has prepared for the afterlife both morally and
intellectually will be rewarded more greatly; though, all reward is through the
grace of God. Aquinas insists beatitude will be conferred just as to merit, and
will render the person better able to conceive the divine. Aquinas accordingly
believes punishment is directly related to earthly, livelihood preparation and
action as well. Aquinas’s explanation of the soul focuses on epistemology and
metaphysics, and because of this he believes it provides a clear explanation of
the immaterial nature of the soul. Aquinas conservatively guards Christian
doctrine, and therefore maintains physical and spiritual reward and
punishment after death. Through accepting the essentiality of both body and
soul, he allows for a heaven and hell described in scripture and church dogma.

Contemporary Power

Several contemporary ethicists both within and outside the Catholic
Church (notably Philippa Foot and Alasdair MacIntyre) have recently
commented on the possible use of Thomas's virtue ethics as a method of
avoiding utilitarianism or Kantian "sense of duty" (described deontology).
Through the work of twentieth century philosophers such as Elizabeth
Anscombe (especially in her book Intention), Thomas's principle of double
effect specifically and his theory of intentional action usually have been
influential.
In recent years, the cognitive neuroscientist Walter Freeman proposes that Thomism is the philosophical system explaining cognition that is mainly compatible with neurodynamics, in a 2008 article in the journal *Mind and Matter* entitled "Nonlinear Brain Dynamics and Intention Just as to Aquinas."

Thomas's aesthetic theories, especially the concept of *claritas*, deeply influenced the literary practice of modernist writer James Joyce, who used to extol Thomas as being second only to Aristotle in the middle of Western philosophers. Joyce refers to Aquinas' doctrines in *Elementa philosophiae ad mentem D. Thomae Aquinatis doctoris angelici* (1898) of Girolamo Maria Mancini, professor of theology at, *the Collegium Divi Thomae de Urbe*. For instance, Mancini's *Elementa* is referred to in Joyce's early masterpiece *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man.*

The power of Thomas's aesthetics also can be establish in the works of the Italian semiotician Umberto Eco, who wrote an essay on aesthetic thoughts in Thomas.

**Criticism**

Bertrand Russell criticized Aquinas' philosophy on the ground that

- He does not, like the Platonic Socrates, set out to follow wherever the argument may lead. He is not occupied in an inquiry, the result of which it is impossible to know in advance. Before he begins to philosophize, he already knows the truth; it is declared in the Catholic faith. If he can discover apparently rational arguments for some parts of the faith, so much the better; if he cannot, he require only fall back on revelation. The finding of arguments for a conclusion given in advance is not philosophy, but special pleading. I cannot, so, feel that he deserves to be put on a stage with the best philosophers either of Greece or of contemporary times.

This critique is illustrated on the following examples: Just as to Russell, Aquinas advocates the indissolubility of marriage "on the ground that the father is useful in the education of the children, because he is more rational
than the mother, because, being stronger, he is better able to inflict physical punishment."

Even though contemporary approaches to education do not support these views, "no follower of Saint Thomas would, on that explanation, cease to consider in lifelong monogamy, because the real grounds of belief are not those which are alleged." It may be countered that the treatment of matrimony in the *Summa Theologica* is in the Supplements volume, which was not written through Aquinas. Moreover, Aquinas's introduction of arguments and concepts from the pagan Aristotle and Muslim Averroes was not uncontroversial within the Catholic church.

Aquinas' views of God as first cause, "depend upon the supposed impossibility of a series having no first term. Every mathematician knows that there is no such impossibility; the series of negative integers ending with minus one is an instance to the contrary." Moreover, just as to Russell, statements concerning God's essence and subsistence that are reached within the Aristotelian logic are based on "some type of syntactical confusion, without which much of the argumentation in relation to the God would lose its plausibility."

Just as to Russell, the methodology of scholasticism used through Thomas is employed for proving what is already whispered to be true. So, just as to Russell his work should be viewed perhaps as an artful, concise argument, but not a decisive proof. To the contrary, concerning Russell's criticism of Aquinas Anthony Kenny creates the following observation: "It is extraordinary that that accusation should be made through Russell, who in the book *Principia Mathematica* takes hundreds of pages to prove that two and two create four, which is something he had whispered all his life."

**Claims of Levitation**

For centuries, there have been recurring claims that Thomas had the skill to levitate. For instance, G. K. Chesterton wrote that, "His experiences incorporated well-attested cases of levitation in ecstasy; and the Blessed Virgin appeared to him, comforting him with the welcome news that he would never be a Bishop."
REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Explain St. Augustine’s concept of the two cities. In what way was it supportive of Christianity?
- What were St. Thomas Aquinas' views on the relations between faith and reason?
- In what ways were St. Augustine's views dissimilar from those of St. Thomas Aquinas?
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Explain the methods of Machiavelli’s study.
- Understand the Political thought of Machiavelli.
- Explain the Machiavelli’s Classification of forms of government

INTRODUCTION

Niccolò di Bernardo dei Machiavelli (3 May 1469 – 21 June 1527) was an Italian historian, politician, diplomat, philosopher, humanist and writer based in Florence throughout the Renaissance. He was for several years an official in the Florentine Republic, with responsibilities in diplomatic and military affairs. He was a founder of contemporary political science, and more specifically political ethics. He also wrote comedies, carnival songs, and poetry. His personal correspondence is renowned in the Italian language. He was Secretary to the Second Chancery of the Republic of Florence from 1498 to 1512, when the Medici were out of power. He wrote his masterpiece, *The Prince*, after the Medici had recovered power and he no longer held a location of responsibility in Florence. His moral and ethical beliefs led to the creation
of the word Machiavellianism which has since been used to describe one of the three dark triad personalities in psychology.

**LIFE**

Machiavelli was born in Florence, Italy, the first son and third child of attorney Bernardo di Niccolò Machiavelli and his wife Bartolomea di Stefano Nelli. The Machiavelli family are whispered to be descended from the old marquesses of Tuscany and to have produced thirteen Florentine Gonfalonieres of Justice, one of the offices of a group of nine citizens selected through drawing lots every two months, who shaped the government, or Signoria. Machiavelli, like several people of Florence, was though not a full citizen of Florence, due to the nature of Florentine citizenship in that time, even under the republican regime. Machiavelli was born in a tumultuous era—popes waged acquisitive wars against Italian municipality-states, and people and municipalities might fall from power at any time. Beside with the pope and the major municipalities like Venice and Florence, foreign powers such as France, Spain, the Holy Roman Empire, and even Switzerland battled for local power and manage. Political-military alliances continually changed, featuring condottieri (mercenary leaders) who changed sides without warning, and the rise and fall of several short-existed governments.

Machiavelli was taught grammar, rhetoric, and Latin, and became a prolific Chef. It is thought that he did not learn Greek, even though Florence was at the time one of the centers of Greek scholarship in Europe. In 1494, Florence restored the republic—expelling the Medici family, who had ruled Florence for some sixty years. In June 1498, shortly after the execution of Savonarola, Machiavelli, at the age of 29, was elected as head of the second chancery. In July 1498, he was also made the secretary of the *Dieci di Libertà e Pace*. He was in a diplomatic council responsible for negotiation and military affairs. Flanked by 1499 and 1512 he accepted out many diplomatic missions: to the court of Louis XII in France; to the court of Ferdinand II of Aragón, in Spain; in Germany; and to the Papacy in Rome, in the Italian states. Moreover, from 1502 to 1503 he witnessed the brutal reality of the state-structure methods of Cesare Borgia (1475–1507) and his father Pope Alexander VI, who were then occupied in the procedure of trying to bring a
big part of central Italy under their possession. The pretext of defending Church interests was used as a partial justification through the Borgias.

Flanked by 1503 and 1506 Machiavelli was responsible for the Florentine militia, including the Municipality's protection. He distrusted mercenaries (a distrust he explained in his official reports and then later in his theoretical works), preferring a politically invested citizen-militia, a philosophy that bore fruit. His command of Florentine citizen-soldiers defeated Pisa in 1509. Though, in August 1512 the Medici, helped through Pope Julius II, used Spanish troops to defeat the Florentines at Prato. Piero Soderini resigned as Florentine head of state and left in exile. The Florentine municipality-state and the Republic were dissolved. Machiavelli was deprived of office in 1512 through the Medici. In 1513 he was accused of conspiracy, arrested, and imprisoned for a time. Despite having been subjected to torture, he denied involvement and was released.

Machiavelli then retired to his estate at Sant’Andrea in Percussina, and devoted himself to revise and to the writing of the political treatises that earned his intellectual lay in the development of political philosophy and political conduct. Despairing of the opportunity to remain directly involved in political matters, after a time Machiavelli began to participate in intellectual groups in Florence and wrote many plays that were both popular and widely recognized in his lifetime. Still politics remained his main passion, and to satisfy this interest he maintained a well-recognized correspondence with better politically linked friends, attempting to become involved once again in political life. In a letter to Francesco Vettori, he described his exile:

- When evening comes, I go back house, and go to my revise. On the threshold, I take off my work clothes, sheltered in mud and filth, and I put on the clothes an ambassador would wear. Decently dressed, I enter the ancient courts of rulers who have extensive since died. There, I am warmly welcomed, and I feed on the only food I discover nourishing and was born to savor. I am not ashamed to talk to them and inquire them to explain their actions and they, out of kindness, answer me. Four hours go through without my feeling any anxiety. I
forget every worry. I am no longer afraid of poverty or frightened of death. I live entirely through them.

Machiavelli died in 1527 at the age of 58. He was buried at the Church of Santa Croce in Florence, Italy. An epitaph honoring him is inscribed on his monument. He died in his own establishment.

WORKS

The Prince

To retain power, the hereditary prince necessity cautiously uphold the sociopolitical institutions to which the people are accustomed; whereas a new prince has the more hard task in ruling, since he necessity first stabilize his newfound power in order to build an enduring political structure. He asserted that social benefits of stability and security could be achieved in the face of moral corruption. Aside from that, Machiavelli whispered that public and private morality had to be understood as two dissimilar things in order to rule well. As a result, a ruler necessity be concerned not only with reputation, but also positively willing to act immorally at the right times. As a political scientist, Machiavelli emphasizes that occasional require for the methodical exercise of brute force or deceit.

Scholars often note that Machiavelli glorifies instrumentality in state building—an approach embodied through the saying that "the ends justify the means". Violence may be necessary for the successful stabilization of power and introduction of new legal institutions. Force may be used to eliminate political rivals, to coerce resistant populations, and to purge the society of other men strong enough of character to rule, who will inevitably effort to replace the ruler. Machiavelli has become infamous for such political advice, ensuring that he would be remembered in history through the adjective, "Machiavellian".

Notwithstanding some mitigating themes, the Catholic Church banned The Prince, registering it to the Index Librorum Prohibitorum, and humanists
also viewed the book negatively. In the middle of them was Erasmus of Rotterdam. As a treatise, its primary intellectual contribution to the history of political thought is the fundamental break flanked by political realism and political idealism, because *The Prince* is a manual to acquiring and keeping political power. In contrast with Plato and Aristotle, Machiavelli insisted that an imaginary ideal society is not a model through which a prince should orient himself.

Concerning the differences and similarities in Machiavelli's advice to ruthless and tyrannical princes in *The Prince* and his more republican exhortations in *Discourses on Livy*, several have concluded that *The Prince*, although written as advice for a monarchical prince, contains arguments for the superiority of republican regimes, similar to those establish in the *Discourses*. In the 18th century the work was even described a satire, for instance through Jean-Jacques Rousseau. More recently, commentators such as Leo Strauss and Harvey Mansfield have agreed that the *Prince* can be read as having a deliberate comical irony. In the middle of commentators who have not seen the work as ironic, several still agree that the Prince is republican to some extent.

Other interpretations contain for instance that of Antonio Gramsci, who argued that Machiavelli's audience for this work was not even the ruling class but the general people because the rulers already knew these methods through their education.

**Discourses on Livy**

The *Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livy*, often referred to basically as the "Discourses" or *Discorsi*, is nominally talk about a classical history of early Ancient Rome. Machiavelli presents it as a series of lessons on how a republic *should* be started and structured. It is a superior work than the *Prince*, and it more openly explains the advantages of republics, but it also contains several similar themes. Commentators disagree in relation to the how much that the two works agree with each other. It comprises early versions of the concept of checks and balances, and asserts the superiority of a republic in
excess of a principality. It became one of the central texts of republicanism, and has often been argued to be a superior work to the *Prince*.

From *The Discourses*:

- “In information, when there is combined under the similar constitution a prince, a nobility, and the power of the people, then these three powers will watch and stay each other reciprocally in check.” Book I, Chapter II
- “Doubtless these means [of attaining power] are cruel and destructive of all civilized life, and neither Christian, nor even human, and should be avoided through every one. In information, the life of a private citizen would be preferable to that of a king at the expense of the ruin of so several human beings.” Bk I, Ch XXVI
- “Now, in a well-ordered republic, it should never be necessary to resort to extra-constitutional events.... ” Bk I, Ch XXXIV
- “... the governments of the people are better than those of princes.” Book I, Chapter LVIII
- “... if we compare the faults of a people with those of princes, as well as their respective good qualities, we shall discover the people vastly superior in all that is good and glorious”. Book I, Chapter LVIII
- “For government consists mainly in so keeping your subjects that they shall be neither able, nor disposed to injure you.... ” Bk II, Ch XXIII
- “... no prince is ever benefited through creation himself hated.” Book III, Chapter XIX
- “Let not princes complain of the faults committed through the people subjected to their power, for they result entirely from their own negligence or bad instance.” Bk III, Ch XXIX

**Other Political and Historical Works**

- Discorso sopra le cose di Pisa (1499)
- Del modo di trattare i popoli della Valdichiana ribellati (1502)
- Del modo tenuto dal duca Valentino nell’ ammazzare Vitellozzo Vitelli, Oliverotto da Fermo, etc. (1502) — A Account of the Methods
Adopted through the Duke Valentino when Murdering Vitellozzo Vitelli, Oliverotto da Fermo, the Signor Pagolo, and the Duke di Gravina Orsini

- Discorso sopra la provisione del danaro (1502) — A discourse in relation to the provision of money.
- Ritratti delle cose di Francia (1510) — Portrait of the affairs of France.
- Ritracto delle cose della Magna (1508–1512) - Portrait of the affairs of Germany.
- Dell'Arte della Guerra (1519–1520) — The Art of War, high military science.
- Discorso sopra il riformare lo stato di Firenze (1520) — A discourse in relation to the reforming of Florence.
- Sommario delle cose della citta di Lucca (1520) — A summary of the affairs of the municipality of Lucca.
- The Life of Castruccio Castracani of Lucca (1520) — Vita di Castruccio Castracani da Lucca, a short biography.
- Istorie Florentine (1520–1525) — Florentine Histories, an eight-volume history book of the municipality-state, Florence, commissioned through Giulio di Giuliano de' Medici, later Pope Clement VII.

**Fictional Works**

Besides being a statesman and political scientist, Machiavelli also translated classical works, and was a dramaturge, a poet, and a novelist. Some of his other work:

- *Decennale primo* (1506), a poem in terza rima.
- *Decennale secondo* (1509), a poem.
- Andria or *The Woman of Andros* (1517), a Classical comedy, translated from Terence.
- *Mandragola* (1518) — *The Mandrake*, a five-act prose comedy, with a verse prologue.
- *Clizia* (1525), a prose comedy.
- *Belfagor arcidiavolo* (1515), a novella.
•  *Asino d'oro* (1517) — *The Golden Ass* is a terza rima poem, a new version of the classic work through Apuleius.

•  *Frammenti storici* (1525) — Fragments of stories.

**Other Works**

*Della Lingua* (Italian for "Of the Language") (1514), a dialogue in relation to the Italy's language is normally attributed to Machiavelli. Machiavelli's literary executor, Giuliano De' Ricci, also reported having seen that Machiavelli, his grandfather, made a comedy in the approach of Aristophanes which incorporated livelihood Florentines as characters, and to be titled *Le Maschere*. It has been suggested that due to such things as this and his approach of writing to his superiors usually, there was extremely likely some animosity to Machiavelli even before the return of the Medici.

**ORIGINALITY**

Commentators have taken extremely dissimilar approaches to Machiavelli, and not always agreed. Major discussion has tended to be especially in relation to the two issues, first how unified and philosophical his work is, and secondly concerning how innovative or traditional it is.

**Coherence**

There is some disagreement concerning how best to describe the unifying themes, if there are any, that can be establish in Machiavelli's works, especially in the two major political works, *The Prince* and *Discourses*. Some commentators have described him as inconsistent, and perhaps as not even putting a high priority in consistency. Others such as Hans Baron have argued that his thoughts necessity have changed dramatically in excess of time. Some have argued that his conclusions are best understood as a product of his times, experiences and education. Others, such as Leo Strauss and Harvey Mansfield, have argued strongly that there is a extremely strong and deliberate consistency and distinctness, even arguing that this extends to all of Machiavelli's works including his comedies and letters.
Powers

Commentators such as Leo Strauss have gone so distant as to name Machiavelli as the deliberate originator of modernity itself. Others have argued that Machiavelli is only a particularly motivating instance of trends which were happening approximately him. In any case Machiavelli presented himself at several times as someone reminding Italians of the old virtues of the Romans and Greeks, and other times as someone promoting a totally new approach to politics.

That Machiavelli had a wide range of powers is in itself not controversial. Their relative importance is though a subject of on-going discussion. It is possible to summarize some of the main powers accentuated through dissimilar commentators.

The Mirror of Princes Genre

Gilbert (1938) summarized the similarities flanked by The Prince and the genre it obviously imitates, the so-described "Mirror of Princes" approach. This was a classically influenced genre, with models at least as distant back as Xenophon and Isocrates that was still quite popular throughout Machiavelli's life. While Gilbert emphasizes the similarities though, he agrees with all other commentators that Machiavelli was particularly novel in the method he used this genre, even when compared to his contemporaries such as Baldassare Castiglione and Erasmus. One of the major innovations Gilbert noted was that Machiavelli focused upon the "deliberate purpose of dealing with a new ruler who will require to set up himself in defiance of custom". Normally, these kinds of works were addressed only to hereditary princes.

Classical Republicanism

Commentators such as Quentin Skinner and J.G.A. Pocock, in the so-described "Cambridge School" of interpretation have been able to illustrate that some of the republican themes in Machiavelli's political works, particularly the Discourses on Livy, can be establish in medieval Italian literature which was influenced through classical authors such as Sallust.
Classical Political Philosophy: Xenophon, Plato and Aristotle

The Socratic school of classical political philosophy, especially Aristotle, had become a major power upon European political thinking in the late Middle Ages. It lived both in the catholicized form presented through Thomas Aquinas, and in the more controversial "Averroist" form of authors like Marsilius of Padua. Machiavelli was critical of catholic political thinking and may have been influenced through Averroism. But he cites Plato and Aristotle extremely infrequently and apparently did not approve of them. Leo Strauss argued that the strong power of Xenophon, a student of Socrates more recognized as an historian, rhetorician and soldier, was a major source of Socratic thoughts for Machiavelli, sometimes not in row with Aristotle. While interest in Plato was rising in Florence throughout Machiavelli's lifetime he also does not illustrate scrupulous interest in him, but was indirectly influenced through his readings of authors such as Polybius, Plutarch and Cicero.

The major variation flanked by Machiavelli and the Socratics, just as to Strauss, is Machiavelli's materialism and so his rejection of both a teleological view of nature, and of the view that philosophy is higher than politics. Aimed-for things which the Socratics argued would tend to happen through nature, Machiavelli said would happen through chance.

Classical Materialism

Strauss argued that Machiavelli may have seen himself as influenced through some thoughts from classical materialists such as Democritus, Epicurus and Lucretius. Strauss though sees this also as a sign of major innovation in Machiavelli, because classical materialists did not share the Socratic regard for political life, while Machiavelli clearly did.

Thucydides

Some scholars note the parallel flanked by Machiavellian and the Greek historian Thucydides, since both accentuated power politics. Strauss argued that Machiavelli may indeed have been influenced through pre-Socratic philosophers, but he felt it was a new combination:-
...modern readers are reminded through Machiavelli's teaching of Thucydides; they discover in both authors the similar “realism,” i.e., the similar denial of the power of the gods or of justice and the similar sensitivity to harsh necessity and elusive chance. Yet Thucydides never calls in question the intrinsic superiority of nobility to baseness, a superiority that shines forth particularly when the noble is destroyed through the base. So Thucydides' History arouses in the reader a sadness which is never aroused through Machiavelli's books. In Machiavelli we discover comedies, parodies, and satires but nothing reminding of tragedy. One half of humanity remnants outside of his thought. There is no tragedy in Machiavelli because he has no sense of the sacredness of “the general.” — Strauss.

BELIEFS

Amongst commentators, there are a few uniformly made proposals concerning what was mainly new in Machiavelli's work.

Empiricism and Realism versus Idealism

Machiavelli is sometimes seen as the prototype of a contemporary empirical scientist, structure generalizations from experience and historical facts, and emphasizing the uselessness of theorizing with the imagination.

- He emancipated politics from theology and moral philosophy. He undertook to describe basically what rulers actually did and therefore anticipated what was later described the scientific spirit in which questions of good and bad are ignored, and the observer attempts to discover only what really happens.—Joshua Kaplan, 2005

Machiavelli felt that his early schooling beside the rows of a traditional classical education was essentially useless for the purpose of understanding politics. Nevertheless, he advocated rigorous revise of the past, particularly concerning the founding of a municipality, which he felt was a key to understanding its later development. Moreover, he studied the method people
existed and aimed to inform leaders how they should rule and even how they themselves should live. For instance, Machiavelli denies that livelihood virtuously necessarily leads to happiness. And Machiavelli viewed misery as one of the vices that enables a prince to rule. Machiavelli stated that it would be best to be both loved and feared. But since the two rarely come jointly, anyone compelled to choose will discover greater security in being feared than in being loved. In much of Machiavelli's work, it appears that the ruler necessity adopt unsavory policies for the sake of the continuance of his regime.

A related and more controversial proposal often made is that he described how to do things in politics in a method which seemed neutral concerning who used the advice - tyrants or good rulers.

That Machiavelli strove for realism is not doubted, but for four centuries scholars have debated how best to describe his morality. The Prince made the word "Machiavellian" a byword for deceit, despotism, and political manipulation. That Machiavelli himself was not evil and indeed planned good, is on the other hand usually accepted.

Leo Strauss, an American political philosopher, declared himself more inclined toward the traditional view that Machiavelli was self-consciously a "teacher of evil," (even if he was not himself evil) since he counsels the princes to avoid the values of justice, mercy, temperance, wisdom, and love of their people in preference to the use of cruelty, violence, fear, and deception. Italian anti-fascist philosopher Benedetto Croce concludes Machiavelli is basically a "realist" or "pragmatist" who accurately states that moral values in reality do not greatly affect the decisions that political leaders create. German philosopher Ernst Cassirer held that Machiavelli basically adopts the stance of a political scientist—a Galileo of politics—in distinguishing flanked by the "facts" of political life and the "values" of moral judgment.

Fortune

Machiavelli is usually seen as being critical of Christianity as it lived in his time, specifically its effect upon politics, and also everyday life. In his opinion, Christianity, beside with teleological Aristotelianism that the church
had come to accept, allowed practical decisions to be guided too much through imaginary ideals and encouraged people to lazily leave events up to providence or, as he would put it, chance, luck or fortune. While Christianity sees modesty as a virtue and pride as sinful, Machiavelli took a more classical location, seeing ambition, spiritedness, and the pursuit of glory as good and natural things, and part of the virtue and prudence that good princes should have. So, while it was traditional to say that leaders should have virtues, especially prudence, Machiavelli's use of the languages virtù and prudenza was unusual for his time, implying a spirited and immodest ambition. Famously, Machiavelli argued that virtue and prudence can help a man manage more of his future, in the lay of allowing fortune to do so.

Najemy has argued that this similar approach can be establish in Machiavelli's approach to love and desire, as seen in his comedies and correspondence. Najemy shows how Machiavelli's friend Vettori argued against Machiavelli and cited a more traditional understanding of fortune.

On the other hand, humanism in Machiavelli's time meant that classical pre-Christian thoughts in relation to the virtue and prudence, including the possibility of trying to manage one's future, were not unique to him. But humanists did not go so distant as to promote the extra glory of deliberately aiming to set up a new state, in defiance of traditions and laws.

While Machiavelli's approach had classical precedents, it has been argued that it did more than presently bring back old thoughts, and that Machiavelli was not a typical humanist. Strauss argues that the method Machiavelli combines classical thoughts is new. While Xenophon and Plato also described realistic politics, and were closer to Machiavelli than Aristotle was, they, like Aristotle, also saw Philosophy as something higher than politics. Machiavelli was apparently a materialist who objected to explanations involving formal and final causation, or teleology.

Machiavelli's promotion of ambition in the middle of leaders while denying any higher standard meant that he encouraged risk taking, and innovation, mainly famously the founding of new manners and orders. His advice to prince was so certainly not limited to discussing how to uphold a state. It has been argued that Machiavelli's promotion of innovation led
directly to the argument for progress as an aim of politics and culture. But while a belief that humanity can manage its own future, manage nature, and "progress" has been extensive lasting, Machiavelli's followers, starting with his own friend Guicciardini, have tended to prefer peaceful progress through economic development, and not warlike progress. As Harvey Mansfield wrote: "In attempting other, more regular and scientific manners of overcoming fortune, Machiavelli's successors formalized and emasculated his notion of virtue."

Machiavelli though, beside with some of his classical precursors, saw ambition and spiritedness, and so war, as inevitable and part of human nature.

Strauss concludes his 1958 *Thoughts on Machiavelli* through proposing that this promotion of progress leads directly to the contemporary arms race. Strauss argued that the unavoidable nature of such arms races, which have lived before contemporary times and led to the collapse of peaceful civilizations, gives us with both an explanation of what is mainly truly dangerous in Machiavelli's innovations, but also the method in which the aims of his apparently immoral innovation can be understood.

**Religion**

Machiavelli explains repeatedly that religion is man-made, and that the value of religion lies in its contribution to social order and the rules of morality necessity be dispensed if security required it. In *The Prince*, the *Discourses*, and in the *Life of Castruccio Castracani*, he describes "prophets," as he calls them, like Moses, Romulus, Cyrus the Great, and Theseus as the greatest of new princes, the glorious and brutal founders of the mainly novel innovations in politics, and men whom Machiavelli assures us have always used a big amount of armed force and murder against their own people. He estimated that these sects last from 1666 to 3000 years each time, which, as pointed out through Leo Strauss, would mean that Christianity became due to start finishing in relation to the 150 years after Machiavelli. Machiavelli's concern with Christianity as a sect was that it creates men weak and inactive, delivering politics into the hands of cruel and wicked men without a fight.
While fear of God can be replaced through fear of the prince, if there is a strong enough prince, Machiavelli felt that having a religion is in any case especially essential to keeping a republic in order. For Machiavelli, a truly great prince can never be conventionally religious himself, but he should create his people religious if he can. Just as to Strauss he was not the first person to ever explain religion in this method, but his account of religion was novel because of the method he integrated this into his common explanation of princes.

Machiavelli's judgment that democracies require religion for practical political reasons was widespread in the middle of contemporary proponents of republics until almost the time of the French revolution. This so symbolizes a point of disagreement flanked by himself and late modernity.

The Positive Face to Factional and Individual Vice

Despite the classical precedents, which Machiavelli was not the only one to promote in his time, Machiavelli’s realism and willingness to argue that good ends justify bad things, is seen as a critical incentive towards some of the mainly significant theories of contemporary politics.

Firstly, particularly in the Discourses on Livy, Machiavelli is unusual in the positive face he sometimes appears to describe in factionalism in republics. For instance quite early in the Discourses, a chapter title announces that the disunion of the plebs and senate in Rome "kept Rome free." That a society has dissimilar components whose interests necessity be balanced in any good regime is an thought with classical precedents, but Machiavelli’s particularly extreme presentation is seen as a critical step towards the later political thoughts of both a division of powers or checks and balances, thoughts which lay behind the US constitution.

Likewise, the contemporary economic argument for capitalism, and mainly contemporary shapes of economics, was often stated in the form of "public virtue from private vices." Also in this case, even though there are classical precedents, Machiavelli’s insistence on being both realistic and ambitious, not only admitting that vice exists but being willing to risk encouraging it, is a critical step on the path to this insight.
Mansfield though argues that Machiavelli’s own aims have not been shared through those influenced through him. Machiavelli argued against seeing mere peace and economic growth as worthy aims on their own, if they would lead to what Mansfield calls the "taming of the prince."

**Machiavellian**

Machiavelli is mainly well-known for a short political treatise, *The Prince*, written in 1513 but not published until 1532, five years after his death. Although he privately circulated *The Prince* in the middle of friends, the only theoretical work to be printed in his lifetime was *The Art of War*, in relation to the military science. Since the 16th century, generations of politicians remain attracted and repelled through its apparently neutral acceptance, or even positive encouragement, of the immorality of powerful men, described especially in *The Prince* but also in his other works.

His works are sometimes even said to have contributed to the contemporary negative connotations of the languages *politics* and *politician*, and it is sometimes thought that it is because of him that *Old Nick* became an English term for the Devil and the adjective *Machiavellian* became a pejorative term describing someone who aims to deceive and manipulate others for personal advantage. *Machiavellianism* also remnants a popular term used in speeches and journalism; while in psychology, it denotes a personality kind.

While Machiavellianism is notable in the works of Machiavelli, Machiavelli’s works are intricate and he is usually agreed to have been more than presently "Machiavellian" himself. For instance, J.G.A. Pocock saw him as a major source of the republicanism that spread throughout England and North America in the 17th and 18th centuries and Leo Strauss, whose view of Machiavelli is quite dissimilar in several methods, agreed in relation to the Machiavelli’s power on republicanism and argued that even though Machiavelli was a teacher of evil he had a nobility of spirit that led him to advocate ignoble actions. Whatever his intentions, which are still debated today, he has become associated with any proposal where "the end justifies the means". For instance Leo Strauss wrote:
- Machiavelli is the only political thinker whose name has come into general use for designating a type of politics, which exists and will continue to exist independently of his power, a politics guided exclusively through thoughts of expediency, which uses all means, fair or foul, iron or poison, for achieving its ends - its end being the aggrandizement of one's country or fatherland - but also by the fatherland in the service of the self-aggrandizement of the politician or statesman or one's party.

**IMPACT**

To quote Robert Bireley:

- ...there were in circulation almost fifteen editions of the *Prince* and nineteen of the *Discourses* and French translations of each before they were placed on the Index of Paul IV in 1559, a measure which almost stopped publication in Catholic regions except in France. Three principal writers took the field against Machiavelli flanked by the publication of his works and their condemnation in 1559 and again through the Tridentine Index in 1564. These were the English cardinal Reginald Pole and the Portuguese bishop Jeronymo Osorio, both of whom existed for several years in Italy, and the Italian humanist and later bishop, Ambrogio Caterino Politi.

Machiavelli's thoughts had a profound impact on political leaders throughout the contemporary west, helped through the new technology of the printing press. Throughout the first generations after Machiavelli, his main power was in non-Republican governments. Pole reported that the *Prince* was spoken of highly through Thomas Cromwell in England and had influenced Henry VIII in his turn towards Protestantism, and in his tactics, for instance throughout the Pilgrimage of Grace. A copy was also possessed through the Catholic king and emperor Charles V. In France, after an initially mixed reaction, Machiavelli came to be associated with Catherine de' Medici and the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre. As Bireley reports, in the 16th century, Catholic writers "associated Machiavelli with the Protestants, whereas
Protestant authors saw him as Italian and Catholic”. In information, he was apparently influencing both Catholic and Protestant kings.

One of the mainly significant early works dedicated to criticism of Machiavelli, especially *The Prince*, was that of the Huguenot, Innocent Gentillet, whose work commonly referred to as *Discourse against Machiavelli* or *Anti Machiavel* was published in Geneva in 1576. He accused Machiavelli of being an atheist and accused politicians of his time through saying that his works were the "Koran of the courtiers", that "he is of no reputation in the court of France which hath not Machiavel's writings at the fingers ends". Another theme of Gentillet was more in the spirit of Machiavelli himself: he questioned the effectiveness of immoral strategies. This became the theme of much future political discourse in Europe throughout the 17th century. This comprises the Catholic Counter Reformation writers summarised through Bireley: Giovanni Botero, Justus Lipsius, Carlo Scribani, Adam Contzen, Pedro de Ribadeneira, and Diego Saavedra Fajardo. These authors criticized Machiavelli, but also followed him in several methods. They accepted the require for a prince to be concerned with reputation, and even a require for cunning and deceit, but compared to Machiavelli, and like later modernist writers, they accentuated economic progress much more than the riskier ventures of war. These authors tended to cite Tacitus as their source for realist political advice, rather than Machiavelli, and this pretense came to be recognized as "Tacitism". "Black tacitism" was in support of princely rule, but "red tacitism" arguing the case for republics, more in the original spirit of Machiavelli himself, became increasingly significant.

Contemporary materialist philosophy urbanized in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, starting in the generations after Machiavelli. This philosophy tended to be republican, more in the original spirit of Machiavellian, but as with the Catholic authors Machiavelli's realism and encouragement of by innovation to attempt to manage one's own fortune were more accepted than his emphasis upon war and politics. Not only was innovative economics and politics a result, but also contemporary science, leading some commentators to say that the 18th century Enlightenment involved a "humanitarian" moderating of Machiavellianism.
The importance of Machiavelli's power is notable in several significant figures in this endeavor, for instance Bodin, Francis Bacon, Algernon Sidney, Harrington, John Milton, Spinoza, Rousseau, Hume, Edward Gibbon, and Adam Smith. Although he was not always mentioned through name as an inspiration, due to his controversy, he is also thought to have been an power for other major philosophers, such as Montaigne, Descartes, Hobbes, Locke and Montesquieu.

- In the seventeenth century it was in England that Machiavelli's thoughts were mainly considerably urbanized and adapted, and that republicanism came once more to life; and out of seventeenth-century English republicanism there were to emerge in the after that century not only a theme of English political and historical reflection - of the writings of the Bolingbroke circle and of Gibbon and of early parliamentary radicals - but a incentive to the Enlightenment in Scotland, on the Continent, and in America.

Scholars have argued that Machiavelli was a major indirect and direct power upon the political thinking of the Founding Fathers of the United States. Benjamin Franklin, James Madison and Thomas Jefferson followed Machiavelli's republicanism when they opposed what they saw as the emerging aristocracy that they feared Alexander Hamilton was creating with the Federalist Party. Hamilton learned from Machiavelli in relation to the importance of foreign policy for domestic policy, but may have broken from him concerning how rapacious a republic needed to be in order to survive. Though, the Founding Father who perhaps mainly studied and valued Machiavelli as a political philosopher was John Adams, who profusely commented on the Italian's thought in his work, *A Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America*.

In his *Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States*, John Adams praised Machiavelli, with Algernon Sidney and Montesquieu, as a philosophic defender of mixed government. For Adams, Machiavelli restored empirical cause to politics, while his analysis of factions was commendable. Adams likewise agreed with the Florentine that human nature
was immutable and driven through passions. He also accepted Machiavelli's belief that all societies were subject to cyclical eras of growth and decay. For Adams, Machiavelli lacked only a clear understanding of the institutions necessary for good government.

20th Century

The 20th century Italian Communist Antonio Gramsci drew great inspiration from Machiavelli's writings on ethics, morals, and how they relate to the State and revolution in his writings on Passive Revolution, and how a society can be manipulated through controlling popular notions of morality. Joseph Stalin read the prince and annotated his own copy.

Revival of Interest in the Comedies

In the 20th century there was also renewed interest in Machiavelli's *La Mandragola* (1518), which received numerous staging’s, including many in New York, at the New York Shakespeare Festival in 1976 and the Riverside Shakespeare Company in 1979, as a musical comedy through Peer Raben in Munich's antitrade in 1971, and at London's National Theatre in 1984.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

- In what way does Machiavelli's works reflect his times?
- Enumerate the main features of Machiavelli's thoughts on politics and forms of government.
CHAPTER 6

Thomas Hobbes
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the Thomas Hobbes’s life and time.
- Explain the thoughts of Thomas Hobbes.

Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury (5 April 1588 – 4 December 1679), in some older texts Thomas Hobbs of Malmsbury, was an English philosopher, best recognized today for his work on political philosophy. His 1651 book *Leviathan* recognized the base for mainly of Western political philosophy from the perspective of social contract theory.

Hobbes was a champion of absolutism for the sovereign but he also urbanized some of the fundamentals of European liberal thought: the right of the individual; the natural equality of all men; the artificial character of the political order (which led to the later distinction flanked by civil society and the state); the view that all legitimate political power necessity be "representative" and based on the consent of the people; and a liberal interpretation of law which leaves people free to do whatever the law does not explicitly forbid.

He was one of the founders of contemporary political philosophy. His understanding of humans as being matter and motion, obeying the similar
physical laws as other matter and motion, remnants influential; and his explanation of human nature as self-interested cooperation, and of political societies as being based upon a "social contract" remnants one of the major topics of political philosophy.

In addition to political philosophy, Hobbes also contributed to a diverse array of other meadows, including history, geometry, the physics of gases, theology, ethics, and common philosophy.

**EARLY LIFE AND EDUCATION**

Thomas Hobbes was born at Westport, now part of Malmesbury in Wiltshire, England, on 5 April 1588. Born prematurely when his mother heard of the coming invasion of the Spanish Armada, Hobbes later reported that "my mother gave birth to twins: myself and fear." His childhood is approximately a complete blank, and his mother's name is strange. His father, also named Thomas, was the vicar of Charlton and Westport. Thomas Hobbes Sr. had an older brother, Francis Hobbes, who was a wealthy merchant with no family of his own. Thomas Hobbes, the younger, had one brother Edmund who was in relation to the two years older than him. Thomas Sr. abandoned his wife, two sons and a daughter, leaving them in the care of his brother, Francis, when he was forced to flee to London after being involved in a fight with a clergyman outside his own church. Hobbes was educated at Westport church from the age of four, passed to the Malmesbury school and then to a private school kept through a young man named Robert Latimer, a graduate of the University of Oxford. Hobbes was a good pupil, and approximately 1603 he went up to Magdalen Hall, which is mainly closely related to Hertford College, Oxford. The principal John Wilkinson was a Puritan, and he had some power on Hobbes.

At university, Hobbes appears to have followed his own curriculum; he was "little attracted through the scholastic learning". He did not complete his B.A. degree until 1608, but he was recommended through Sir James Hussey, his master at Magdalen, as tutor to William, the son of William Cavendish, Baron of Hardwick (and later Earl of Devonshire), and began a lifelong connection with that family.
Hobbes became a companion to the younger William and they both took part in a grand tour in 1610. Hobbes was exposed to European scientific and critical methods throughout the tour in contrast to the scholastic philosophy which he had learned in Oxford. His scholarly efforts at the time were aimed at a careful revise of classic Greek and Latin authors, the outcome of which was, in 1628, his great translation of Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*, the first translation of that work into English from a Greek manuscript. It has been argued that three of the discourses in the 1620 publication recognized as *Horea Subsecivae: Observations and Discourses*, also symbolize the work of Hobbes from this era.

Although he associated with literary figures like Ben Jonson and thinkers such as Francis Bacon, he did not extend his efforts into philosophy until after 1629. His employer Cavendish, then the Earl of Devonshire, died of the plague in June 1628. The widowed countess dismissed Hobbes but he soon establish work, again as a tutor, this time to Gervase Clifton, the son of Sir Gervase Clifton, 1st Baronet. This task, chiefly spent in Paris, ended in 1631 when he again establish work with the Cavendish family, tutoring the son of his previous pupil. In excess of the after that seven years as well as tutoring he expanded his own knowledge of philosophy, awakening in him curiosity in excess of key philosophic debates. He visited Florence in 1636 and later was a regular debater in philosophic groups in Paris, held jointly through Marin Mersenne. From 1637 he measured himself a philosopher and scholar.

**IN PARIS**

Hobbes's first region of revise was an interest in the physical doctrine of motion and physical momentum. Despite his interest in this phenomenon, he disdained experimental work as in physics. He went on to conceive the system of thought to the elaboration of which he would devote his life. His scheme was first to work out, in a separate treatise, a systematic doctrine of body, showing how physical phenomena were universally explicable in conditions of motion, at least as motion or mechanical action was then understood. He then singled out Man from the realm of Nature and plants. Then, in another treatise, he showed what specific bodily motions were
involved in the manufacture of the peculiar phenomena of sensation, knowledge, affections and passions whereby Man came into relation with Man. Finally he measured, in his crowning treatise, how Men were moved to enter into society, and argued how this necessity be regulated if Men were not to fall back into "brutishness and misery". Therefore he proposed to unite the separate phenomena of Body, Man, and the State.

Hobbes came home, in 1637, to a country riven with discontent which disrupted him from the orderly execution of his philosophic plan. Though, through the end of the Short Parliament in 1640, he had written a short treatise described *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*. It was not published and only circulated in the middle of his acquaintances in manuscript form. A pirated version, though, was published in relation to the ten years later. Although it appears that much of *The Elements of Law* was composed before the sitting of the Short Parliament, there are polemical pieces of the work that clearly spot the powers of the rising political crisis. Nevertheless, several (though not all) elements of Hobbes's political thought were unchanged flanked by *The Elements of Law* and *Leviathan*, which demonstrates that the events of the English Civil War had little effect on his contractarian methodology. It should be noted, though, that the arguments in *Leviathan* were customized from *The Elements of Law* when it came to the necessity of consent in creating political obligation. Namely, Hobbes wrote in *The Elements of Law* that Patrimonial kingdoms were not necessarily shaped through the consent of the governed, while in *Leviathan* he argued that they were. This was perhaps a reflection either of Hobbes's thoughts concerning the engagement controversy or of his reaction to treatises published through Patriarchalists, such as Sir Robert Filmer, flanked by 1640 and 1651.

When in November 1640 the Extensive Parliament succeeded the Short, Hobbes felt he was a marked man through the circulation of his treatise and fled to Paris. He did not return for eleven years. In Paris he rejoined the coterie in relation to the Mersenne, and wrote a critique of the *Meditations on First Philosophy* of Descartes, which was printed as third in the middle of the sets of "Objections" appended, with "Replies" from Descartes in 1641. A
dissimilar set of remarks on other works through Descartes succeeded only in ending all correspondence flanked by the two.

Hobbes also extended his own works somewhat, working on the third part, *De Cive*, which was finished in November 1641. Although it was initially only circulated privately, it was well received, and incorporated rows of argumentation to be repeated a decade later in the *Leviathan*. He then returned to hard work on the first two sections of his work and published little except for a short treatise on optics (*Tractatus opticus*) incorporated in the collection of scientific tracts published through Mersenne as *Cogitata physico-mathematica* in 1644. He built a good reputation in philosophic circles and in 1645 was chosen with Descartes, Gilles de Roberval and others, to referee the controversy flanked by John Pell and Longomontanus in excess of the problem of squaring the circle.

**CIVIL WAR IN ENGLAND**

The English Civil War broke out in 1642, and when the Royalist cause began to decline in the middle of 1644 there was an exodus of the king's supporters to Europe. Several came to Paris and were recognized to Hobbes. This revitalized Hobbes's political interests and the *De Cive* was republished and more widely distributed. The printing began in 1646 through Samuel de Sorbiere through the Elsevier press at Amsterdam with a new preface and some new notes in reply to objections.

In 1647, Hobbes was occupied as mathematical instructor to the young Charles, Prince of Wales, who had come in excess of from Jersey approximately July. This engagement lasted until 1648 when Charles went to Holland.

The company of the exiled royalists led Hobbes to produce an English book to set forth his theory of civil government in relation to the political crisis resulting from the war. The State, it now seemed to Hobbes, might be regarded as a great artificial man or monster (*Leviathan*), composed of men, with a life that might be traced from its generation under pressure of human needs to its dissolution through civil strife proceeding from human passions. The work was closed with a common "Review and Conclusion", in direct
response to the war which raised the question of the subject's right to change allegiance when a former sovereign's power to protect was irrecoverably gone. He also criticised religious doctrines on rationalistic grounds in the Commonwealth.

Throughout the years of the composition of _Leviathan_ he remained in or close to Paris. In 1647 Hobbes was overtaken through a serious illness which disabled him for six months. On recovering from this close to fatal disorder, he resumed his literary task, and accepted it steadily forward to completion through 1650. Meanwhile, a translation of _De Cive_ was being produced; there has been much scholarly disagreement as to whether Hobbes translated the work himself or not.

In 1650, a pirated edition of _The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic_ was published. It was divided into two separate small volumes ( _Human Nature, or the Fundamental Elements of Policie_ and _De corpore politico, or the Elements of Law, Moral and Politick_). In 1651 the translation of _De Cive_ was published under the title of _Philosophicall Rudiments concerning Government and Society_. Meanwhile, the printing of the greater work was proceeding, and finally it appeared in relation to the middle of 1651, under the title of _Leviathan, or the Matter, Forme, and Power of a General Wealth, Ecclesiasticall and Civil_, with a well-known title-page engraving in which, from behind hills overlooking a landscape, there towered the body of a crowned giant, made up of tiny figures of human beings and bearing sword and crosier in the two hands.

The work had immediate impact. Soon Hobbes was more lauded and decried than any other thinker of his time. Though, the first effect of its publication was to sever his link with the exiled royalists, forcing him to appeal to the revolutionary English government for protection. The exiles might extremely well have killed him; the secularist spirit of his book greatly angered both Anglicans and French Catholics. Hobbes fled back house, arriving in London in the winter of 1651. Following his submission to the council of state he was allowed to subside into private life in Fetter Lane.

LEVIATHAN
In *Leviathan*, Hobbes set out his doctrine of the base of states and legitimate governments – originating social contract theory. *Leviathan* was written throughout the English Civil War; much of the book is occupied with demonstrating the necessity of a strong central power to avoid the evil of discord and civil war.

Beginning from a mechanistic understanding of human beings and the passions, Hobbes postulates what life would be like without government, a condition which he calls the state of nature. In that state, each person would have a right, or license, to everything in the world. This, Hobbes argues, would lead to a "war of all against all" (*bellum omnium contra omnes*). The account contains what has been described one of the best recognized passages in English philosophy, which describes the natural state mankind would be in, were it not for political society:

- In such condition, there is no lay for industry; because the fruit thereof is uncertain: and consequently no civilization of the earth; no navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported through sea; no commodious structure; no instruments of moving, and removing, such things as require much force; no knowledge of the face of the earth; no explanation of time; no arts; no letters; no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.— "Chapter XIII.: Of the Natural Condition of Mankind As Concerning Their Felicity, and Misery.", *Leviathan*

In such a state, people fear death, and lack both the things necessary to commodious livelihood, and the hope of being able to toil to obtain them. So in order to avoid it people accede to a social contract and set up a civil society. Just as to Hobbes, society is a population beneath a sovereign power, to whom all individuals in that society cede some rights for the sake of protection. Any abuses of power through this power are to be accepted as the price of peace. There is no doctrine of separation of powers in Hobbes's discussion. Just as to Hobbes, the sovereign necessity manage civil, military, judicial, and ecclesiastical powers.
OPPOSITION

John Bramhall

Hobbes now turned to complete the fundamental treatise of his philosophical system. He worked so steadily that De Corpore was first printed in 1654. Also in 1654, a small treatise, Of Liberty and Necessity, was published through Bishop John Bramhall, addressed at Hobbes. Bramhall, a strong Arminian, had met and debated with Hobbes and afterwards wrote down his views and sent them privately to be answered in this form through Hobbes. Hobbes duly replied, but not for publication. But a French acquaintance took a copy of the reply and published it with "an extravagantly laudatory epistle." Bramhall countered in 1655, when he printed everything that had passed flanked by them (under the title of A Defence of the True Liberty of Human Actions from Antecedent or Extrinsic Necessity). In 1656 Hobbes was ready with The Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance, in which he replied "with astonishing force" to the bishop. As perhaps the first clear exposition of the psychological doctrine of determinism, Hobbes's own two pieces were significant in the history of the free-will controversy.

John Wallis

Beyond the spat with Bramhall, Hobbes was caught in a series of conflicts from the time of publishing his De Corpore in 1655. In Leviathan he had assailed the system of the original universities. Because Hobbes was so evidently opposed to the existing academic arrangements, and because De Corpore contained not only tendentious views on mathematics, but an unacceptable proof of the squaring of the circle (which was apparently an afterthought), mathematicians took him to be a target for polemics. John Wallis was not the first such opponent, but he tenaciously pursued Hobbes. The resulting controversy sustained well into the 1670s.
Atheism

Hobbes has been accused of atheism, or (in the case of Bramhall) of teachings which could lead to atheism. This was an significant accusation, and Hobbes himself wrote, in his answer to Bramhall's "the catching of the Leviathan" that "atheism, impiety, and the like are languages of the greatest defamation possible". Hobbes always defended himself from such accusations. In more recent times also, much has been made of his religious views through scholars such as Richard Tuck and J. G. A. Pocock, but there is still widespread disagreement in relation to the exact significance of Hobbes's unusual views on religion.

As Martinich has pointed out, in Hobbes's time, the term "atheist" was regularly applied to people who whispered in God, but not divine providence, or to people who whispered in God, but also maintained other beliefs which were inconsistent with such belief. He says that this "sort of discrepancy has led to several errors in determining who was an atheist in the early contemporary era". In this extended early contemporary sense of atheism, Hobbes did indeed take positions which were in strong disagreement with church teachings of his time. For instance, Hobbes argued repeatedly that there are no incorporeal substances, and that all things, including human thoughts, and even God, heaven, and hell are corporeal, matter in motion. He argued that "though Scripture acknowledge spirits, yet doth it nowhere say, that they are incorporeal, meaning thereby without dimensions and quantity". He also, like Locke, stated that true revelation can never be in disagreement with human cause and experience, although he also argues that people should accept revelation and its interpretations also for the cause that they should accept the commands of their sovereign, in order to avoid war.

LATER LIFE

In 1658, Hobbes published the final part of his philosophical system, completing the scheme he had planned more than twenty years before. De Homine consisted for the mainly part of an elaborate theory of vision. The remainder of the treatise dealt cursorily with some of the topics more fully
treated in the *Human Nature* and the *Leviathan*. In addition to publishing some controversial writings on mathematics and physics, Hobbes also sustained to produce philosophical works. From the time of the Restoration he acquired a new prominence; "Hobbism" became a byword for all that respectable society ought to denounce. The young king, Hobbes's former pupil, now Charles II, remembered Hobbes and described him to the court to grant him a pension of £100.

The king was significant in protecting Hobbes when, in 1666, the Home of Commons introduced a bill against atheism and profaneness. That similar year, on 17 October 1666, it was ordered that the committee to which the bill was referred "should be empowered to receive information touching such books as tend to atheism, blasphemy and profaneness... in scrupulous... the book of Mr. Hobbes described the *Leviathan*". Hobbes was terrified at the prospect of being labeled a heretic, and proceeded to burn some of his compromising papers. At the similar time, he examined the actual state of the law of heresy.

The only consequence that came of the bill was that Hobbes could never thereafter publish anything in England on subjects relating to human conduct. The 1668 edition of his works was printed in Amsterdam because he could not obtain the censor's license for its publication in England. Other writings were not made public until after his death, including *Behemoth: the History of the Causes of the Civil Wars of England and of the Counsels and Artifices through which they were accepted on from the year 1640 to the year 1662*. For some time, Hobbes was not even allowed to respond, whatever his enemies tried. Despite this, his reputation abroad was formidable, and noble or learned foreigners who came to England never forgot to pay their compliments to the old philosopher.

His final works were a curious mixture: an autobiography in Latin verse in 1672, and a translation of four books of the *Odyssey* into "rugged" English rhymes that in 1673 led to a complete translation of both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in 1675.

In October 1679, Hobbes suffered a bladder disorder, which was followed through a paralytic stroke from which he died on 4 December 1679.
He is said to have uttered the last languages "A great leap in the dark" in his final moments of life. He was interred within St. John the Baptist Church in Ault Hucknall in Derbyshire, England.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- What is man’s natural state of nature according to Hobbes?
- What are the ways in which man may escape the state of nature as explained by Hobbes?
- Do you think Hobbes' stress on a sovereign power was an argument in support of absolutist despotism? Why?
INTRODUCTION

John Locke FRS, widely recognized as the Father of Classical Liberalism, was an English philosopher and physician regarded as one of the mainly influential of Enlightenment thinkers. Measured one of the first of the British empiricists, following the custom of Francis Bacon, he is equally significant to social contract theory. His work had a great impact upon the development of epistemology and political philosophy. His writings influenced Voltaire and Rousseau, several Scottish Enlightenment thinkers, as well as the American revolutionaries. His contributions to classical republicanism and liberal theory are reflected in the United States Declaration of Independence. Locke’s theory of mind is often cited as the origin of contemporary conceptions of identity and the self, figuring prominently in the work of later philosophers such as Hume, Rousseau and Kant. Locke was the first to describe the self through a stability of consciousness. He postulated that the mind was a blank slate or tabula rasa. Contrary to pre-existing Cartesian philosophy, he maintained that we are born without innate thoughts,
and that knowledge is instead determined only through experience derived from sense perception.

**BIOGRAPHY**

Locke's father, also described John, was a country lawyer and clerk to the Justices of the Peace in Chew Magna, who had served as a captain of cavalry for the Parliamentarian forces throughout the early part of the English Civil War. His mother was Agnes Keene. Both parents were Puritans. Locke was born on 29 August 1632, in a small thatched cottage through the church in Wrington, Somerset, in relation to the twelve miles from Bristol. He was baptised the similar day. Soon after Locke's birth, the family moved to the market town of Pensford, in relation to the seven miles south of Bristol, where Locke grew up in a rural Tudor home in Belluton.

In 1647, Locke was sent to the prestigious Westminster School in London under the sponsorship of Alexander Popham, a member of Parliament and his father's former commander. After completing his studies there, he was admitted to Christ Church, Oxford. The dean of the college at the time was John Owen, vice-chancellor of the university. Although a capable student, Locke was irritated through the undergraduate curriculum of the time. He establish the works of contemporary philosophers, such as René Descartes, more motivating than the classical material taught at the university. Through his friend Richard Lower, whom he knew from the Westminster School, Locke was introduced to medicine and the experimental philosophy being pursued at other universities and in the Royal Society, of which he eventually became a member.

Locke was awarded a bachelor's degree in 1656 and a master's degree in 1658. He obtained a bachelor of medicine in 1674, having studied medicine extensively throughout his time at Oxford and worked with such noted scientists and thinkers as Robert Boyle, Thomas Willis, Robert Hooke and Richard Lower. In 1666, he met Lord Anthony Ashley Cooper, 1st Earl of Shaftesbury, who had come to Oxford seeking treatment for a liver infection. Cooper was impressed with Locke and persuaded him to become part of his retinue.
Locke had been looking for a career and in 1667 moved into Shaftesbury's house at Exeter Home in London, to serve as Lord Ashley's personal physician. In London, Locke resumed his medical studies under the tutelage of Thomas Sydenham. Sydenham had a major effect on Locke's natural philosophical thinking – an effect that would become apparent in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*.

Locke's medical knowledge was put to the test when Shaftesbury's liver infection became life-threatening. Locke coordinated the advice of many physicians and was almost certainly instrumental in persuading Shaftesbury to undergo an operation to remove the cyst. Shaftesbury survived and prospered, crediting Locke with saving his life.

It was in Shaftesbury's household, throughout 1671, that the meeting took lay, described in the Epistle to the reader of the Essay, which was the genesis of what would later become the Essay. Two extant Drafts still survive from this era. It was also throughout this time that Locke served as Secretary of the Board of Trade and Plantations and Secretary to the Lords Proprietor of Carolina, helping to form his thoughts on international trade and economics.

Shaftesbury, as a founder of the Whig movement, exerted great power on Locke's political thoughts. Locke became involved in politics when Shaftesbury became Lord Chancellor in 1672. Following Shaftesbury's fall from favour in 1675, Locke spent some time traveling crossways France as tutor and medical attendant to Caleb Banks. He returned to England in 1679 when Shaftesbury's political fortunes took a brief positive turn. Approximately this time, mainly likely at Shaftesbury's prompting, Locke composed the bulk of the *Two Treatises of Government*. While it was once thought that Locke wrote the Treatises to defend the Glorious Revolution of 1688, recent scholarship has shown that the work was composed well before this date, and it is now viewed as a more common argument against absolute monarchy and for individual consent as the foundation of political legitimacy. Though Locke was associated with the influential Whigs, his thoughts in relation to the natural rights and government are today measured quite revolutionary for that era in English history.
Locke fled to the Netherlands in 1683, under strong suspicion of involvement in the Rye Home Plot, although there is little proof to suggest that he was directly involved in the scheme. In the Netherlands, Locke had time to return to his writing, spending a great deal of time re-working the Essay and composing the Letter on Toleration. Locke did not return house until after the Glorious Revolution. Locke accompanied William of Orange's wife back to England in 1688. The bulk of Locke's publishing took lay upon his return from exile – his aforementioned Essay Concerning Human Understanding, the Two Treatises of Civil Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration all appearing in quick succession.

Locke's secure friend Lady Masham invited him to join her at the Mashams' country home in Essex. Although his time there was marked through variable health from asthma attacks, he nevertheless became an intellectual hero of the Whigs. Throughout this era he discussed matters with such figures as John Dryden and Isaac Newton.

He died on 28 October 1704, and is buried in the churchyard of the village of High Laver, east of Harlow in Essex, where he had existed in the household of Sir Francis Masham since 1691. Locke never married nor had children.

Events that happened throughout Locke's lifetime contain the English Restoration, the Great Plague of London and the Great Fire of London. He did not quite see the Act of Union of 1707, though the thrones of England and Scotland were held in personal union throughout his lifetime. Constitutional monarchy and parliamentary democracy were in their infancy throughout Locke's time.

**POWER**

Locke exercised a profound power on political philosophy, in scrupulous on contemporary liberalism. Michael Zuckert has argued that Locke launched liberalism through tempering Hobbesian absolutism and clearly separating the realms of Church and State. He had a strong power on Voltaire who described him "le sage Locke". His arguments concerning liberty and the social contract later influenced the written works of Alexander
Hamilton, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, and other Founding Fathers of the United States. In information, one passage from the Second Treatise is reproduced verbatim in the Declaration of Independence, the reference to a "extensive train of abuses." Such was Locke's power that Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Bacon, Locke and Newton... I consider them as the three greatest men that have ever existed, without any exception, and as having laid the base of those superstructures which have been raised in the Physical and Moral sciences". Today, mainly modern libertarians claim Locke as an power.

But Locke's power may have been even more profound in the realm of epistemology. Locke redefined subjectivity, or self, and intellectual historians such as Charles Taylor and Jerrold Seigel argue that Locke's An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690) marks the beginning of the contemporary Western conception of the self.

**Theories of Religious Tolerance**

Locke, writing his Letters Concerning Toleration (1689–92) in the aftermath of the European wars of religion, formulated a classic reasoning for religious tolerance. Three arguments are central:

- Earthly judges, the state in scrupulous, and human beings usually, cannot dependably evaluate the truth-claims of competing religious standpoints;
- Even if they could, enforcing a single "true religion" would not have the desired effect, because belief cannot be compelled through violence;
- Coercing religious uniformity would lead to more social disorder than allowing diversity.

With regard to his location on religious tolerance, Locke was influenced through Baptist theologians like John Smyth and Thomas Helwys, who had published tracts demanding freedom of conscience in the early seventeenth century. Baptist theologian Roger Williams founded the colony Rhode Island in 1636, where he combined a democratic constitution with
unlimited religious freedom. His tract *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience* (1644), which was widely read in the mother country, was a passionate plea for absolute religious freedom and the total separation of church and state. Freedom of conscience had had high priority on the theological, philosophical and political agenda, since Martin Luther refused to recant his beliefs before the Diet of the Holy Roman Empire at Worms in 1521, unless he would be proved false through the Bible. Locke was part of this Protestant custom. He was also influenced through the liberal thoughts of Presbyterian politician and well-known poet John Milton, who was a staunch advocate of freedom in all its shapes. As assistant to Oliver Cromwell, Milton took part in drafting a constitution of the Independents (1647) that strongly stressed the equality of all humans as a consequence of democratic tendencies.

**Constitution of Carolina**

Appraisals of Locke have often been tied to appraisals of liberalism in common, and also to appraisals of the United States. Detractors note that (in 1671) he was a major investor in the English slave-trade through the Royal African Company, as well as through his participation in drafting the *Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina* while Shaftesbury's secretary, which recognized a feudal aristocracy and gave a master absolute power in excess of his slaves. For instance, Martin Cohen notes that as a secretary to the Council of Trade and Plantations (1673–4) and a member of the Board of Trade (1696–1700) Locke was, in information, "one of presently half a dozen men who created and supervised both the colonies and their iniquitous systems of servitude". Some see his statements on unenclosed property as having been planned to justify the displacement of the Native Americans. Because of his opposition to aristocracy and slavery in his major writings, he is accused of hypocrisy and racism, or of caring only for the liberty of English capitalists.

**Theory of Value and Property**

Locke uses the word *property* in both broad and narrow senses. In a broad sense, it covers a wide range of human interests and aspirations; more
narrowly, it refers to material goods. He argues that property is a natural right and it is derived from labour.

Locke argues that the individual ownership of goods and property is justified through the labour exerted to produce those goods or utilize property to produce goods beneficial to human society.

Locke stated his belief, in his *Second Treatise*, that nature on its own gives little of value to society; he gives the implication that the labour expended in the creation of goods provides them their value. This is used as supporting proof for the interpretation of Locke's labour theory of property as a labour theory of value, in his implication that goods produced through nature are of little value, unless combined with labour in their manufacture and that labour is what provides goods their value.

Locke whispered that ownership of property is created through the application of labour. In addition, he whispered property precedes government and government cannot "dispose of the estates of the subjects arbitrarily." Karl Marx later critiqued Locke's theory of property in his own social theory.

### Political Theory

Locke's political theory was founded on social contract theory. Unlike Thomas Hobbes, Locke whispered that human nature is characterized through cause and tolerance. Like Hobbes, Locke whispered that human nature allowed men to be selfish. This is apparent with the introduction of currency. In a natural state all people were equal and self-governing, and everyone had a natural right to defend his “Life, health, Liberty, or Possessions”. Mainly scholars trace the phrase "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," in the American Declaration of Independence, to Locke's theory of rights, though other origins have been suggested.

Like Hobbes, Locke assumed that the sole right to defend in the state of nature was not enough, so people recognized a civil society to resolve conflicts in a civil method with help from government in a state of society. Though, Locke never refers to Hobbes through name and may instead have been responding to other writers of the day. Locke also advocated governmental separation of powers and whispered that revolution is not only a
right but an obligation in some circumstances. These thoughts would come to have profound power on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

**Limits to Accumulation**

Labour creates property, but it also does contain limits to its accumulation: man’s capability to produce and man’s capability to consume. Just as to Locke, unused property is waste and an offence against nature. Though, with the introduction of “durable” goods, men could exchange their excessive perishable goods for goods that would last longer and therefore not offend the natural law. The introduction of money marks the culmination of this procedure. Money creates possible the unlimited accumulation of property without causing waste through spoilage. He also comprises gold or silver as money because they may be “hoarded up without injury to anyone,” since they do not spoil or decay in the hands of the possessor. The introduction of money eliminates the limits of accumulation. Locke stresses that inequality has come in relation to the through tacit agreement on the use of money, not through the social contract establishing civil society or the law of land regulating property. Locke is aware of a problem posed through unlimited accumulation but does not consider it his task. He presently implies that government would function to moderate the disagreement flanked by the unlimited accumulation of property and a more almost equal sharing of wealth and does not say which principles that government should apply to solve this problem. Though, not all elements of his thought form a constant whole. For instance, labour theory of value of the Two Treatises of Government stands face through face with the demand-and-supply theory urbanized in a letter he wrote titled *Some Thoughts on the Consequences of the Lowering of Interest and the Raising of the Value of Money*. Moreover, Locke anchors property in labour but in the end upholds the unlimited accumulation of wealth.

**On Price Theory**

Locke’s common theory of value and price is a supply and demand theory, which was set out in a letter to a Member of Parliament in 1691, titled
Some Thoughts on the Consequences of the Lowering of Interest and the Raising of the Value of Money. Supply is quantity and demand is rent. “The price of any commodity rises or falls through the proportion of the number of buyer and sellers.” and “that which regulates the price... [of goods] is nothing else but their quantity in proportion to their rent.” The quantity theory of money shapes a special case of this common theory. His thought is based on “money answers all things” (Ecclesiastes) or “rent of money is always enough, or more than enough,” and “varies extremely little...” Regardless of whether the demand for money is unlimited or constant, Locke concludes that as distant as money is concerned, the demand is exclusively regulated through its quantity. He also investigates the determinants of demand and supply. For supply, goods in common are measured valuable because they can be exchanged, consumed and they necessity be scarce. For demand, goods are in demand because they yield a flow of income. Locke develops an early theory of capitalization, such as land, which has value because “through its constant manufacture of saleable commodities it brings in a sure yearly income.” Demand for money is approximately the similar as demand for goods or land; it depends on whether money is wanted as medium of exchange or as loanable funds. For medium of exchange “money is capable through exchange to procure us the necessaries or conveniences of life.” For loanable funds, “it comes to be of the similar nature with land through yielding a sure yearly income... or interest.”

Monetary Thoughts

Locke distinguishes two functions of money, as a "counter" to measure value, and as a "pledge" to lay claim to goods. He believes that silver and gold, as opposed to paper money, are the appropriate currency for international transactions. Silver and gold, he says, are treated to have equal value through all of humanity and can therefore be treated as a pledge through anyone, while the value of paper money is only valid under the government which issues it.

Locke argues that a country should seek a favorable balance of trade, lest it fall behind other countries and suffer a loss in its trade. Since the world
money stock grows constantly, a country necessity constantly seek to enlarge its own stock. Locke develops his theory of foreign exchanges, in addition to commodity movements, there are also movements in country stock of money, and movements of capital determine exchange rates. The latter is less important and less volatile than commodity movements. As for a country’s money stock, if it is big relative to that of other countries, it will cause the country's exchange to rise above par, as an export balance would do.

He also prepares estimates of the cash necessities for dissimilar economic groups (landholders, laborers and brokers). In each group the cash necessities are closely related to the length of the pay era. He argues the brokers – middlemen – whose behaviors enlarge the monetary route and whose profits eat into the earnings of laborers and landholders, had a negative power on both one's personal and the public economy that they supposedly contributed to.

The Self

Locke defines the self as "that conscious thinking thing, (whatever substance, made up of whether spiritual, or material, easy, or compounded, it matters not) which is sensible, or conscious of pleasure and pain, capable of happiness or misery, and so is concerned for itself, as distant as that consciousness extends". He does not, though, ignore "substance", writing that "the body too goes to the creation the man." The Lockean self is so a self-aware and self-reflective consciousness that is fixed in a body.

In his Essay, Locke explains the gradual unfolding of this conscious mind. Arguing against both the Augustinian view of man as originally sinful and the Cartesian location, which holds that man innately knows vital logical propositions, Locke posits an "empty" mind, a tabula rasa, which is shaped through experience; sensations and reflections being the two sources of all our thoughts.

Locke's Some Thoughts Concerning Education is an outline on how to educate this mind: he expresses the belief that education market the man, or, more fundamentally, that the mind is an "empty cabinet", with the statement,
"I think I may say that of all the men we meet with, nine parts of ten are what they are, good or evil, useful or not, through their education."

Locke also wrote that "the little and approximately insensible impressions on our tender infancies have extremely significant and lasting consequences." He argued that the "associations of thoughts" that one creates when young are more significant than those made later because they are the base of the self: they are, put differently, what first spot the tabula rasa. In his Essay, in which is introduced both of these concepts, Locke warns against, for instance, letting "a foolish maid" convince a child that "goblins and sprites" are associated with the night for "darkness shall ever afterwards bring with it those frightful thoughts, and they shall be so joined, that he can no more bear the one than the other."

"Associationism", as this theory would come to be described, exerted a powerful power in excess of eighteenth-century thought, particularly educational theory, as almost every educational writer warned parents not to allow their children to develop negative associations. It also led to the development of psychology and other new disciplines with David Hartley's effort to discover a biological mechanism for associationism in his Observations on Man (1749).

RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

Some scholars have seen Locke's political convictions as deriving from his religious beliefs. Locke's religious trajectory began in Calvinist trinitarianism, but through the time of the Reflections (1695) Locke was advocating not presently Socinian views on tolerance but also Socinian Christology; with veiled denial of the pre-subsistence of Christ. Though Wainwright notes that in the posthumously published Paraphrase (1707) Locke's interpretation of one verse, Ephesians 1:10, is markedly dissimilar from that of Socinians like Biddle, and may indicate that close to the end of his life Locke returned nearer to an Arian location.

Locke was at times not sure in relation to the subject of original sin. So he was accused of Socianism, Arianism, or Deism. But he did not deny the reality of evil. Man was capable of waging unjust wars and committing
Criminals had to be punished, even with the death penalty. With regard to the Bible Locke was extremely conservative. He retained the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. The miracles were proofs of the divine nature of the biblical message. Locke was influenced that the whole content of the Bible was in agreement with human cause. Although Locke was an advocate of tolerance, he urged the authorities not to tolerate atheism, because the denial of God's subsistence would undermine the social order and lead to chaos. That excluded all atheistic diversities of philosophy and all attempts to deduce ethics and natural law from purely secular premises, for instance, man's "autonomy or dignity or human flourishing". In Locke's opinion the cosmological argument was valid and proved God's subsistence. His political thought was based on "a scrupulous set of Protestant Christian assumptions." Locke's concept of man started with the belief in creation. We have been "sent into the World through [God's] order, and in relation to the his business, [we] are his Property, whose Workmanship [we] are, made to last throughout his, not one another Pleasure." Like the two other extremely influential natural-law philosophers, Hugo Grotius and Samuel Pufendorf, Locke equated natural law with the biblical revelation, since in their view both had originated in God and could so not contradict each other. "As a philosopher, Locke was intensely interested in Christian doctrine, and in the *Reasonableness* he insisted that mainly men could not hope to understand the detailed necessities of the law of nature without the assistance of the teachings and instance of Jesus." Locke derived the fundamental concepts of his political theory from biblical texts, in scrupulous from Genesis 1 and 2 (creation), the Decalogue, the Golden Rule, the teachings of Jesus, and the letters of (Paul). The Decalogue (Ten Commandments) puts a person's life, his or her honorable reputation (i.e. honor and dignity), and property under God's protection. Freedom is another major theme in the Old Testament. For instance, God's actions in liberating the Israelites from Egyptian slavery in the Decalogue's prologue were the precondition for the following commandments. Moreover, Locke derived vital human Equality, including the equality of the sexes ("Adam and Eve") from Genesis 1:26–28, the starting point of the theological doctrine of Imago Dei. To Locke, one of the consequences of the principle of
equality was that all humans were equally free and so governments needed the consent of the governed. Only when Locke had derived the fundamental characteristics of his concept of man and ethics from the biblical texts – life, equality, private property, etc. Following Locke, the American Declaration of Independence founded human rights on the biblical belief in creation: "All men are created equal, (...) they are endowed through their Creator with sure unalienable rights, (...) life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Locke's doctrine that governments require the consent of the governed is also central to the Declaration of Independence.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Critically examine the limitations on the ownership of property as defined by Locke.
- Write a short note on John Locke's ideas on Consent, Resistance and Toleration.
- What were Locke's views on Sovereignty?
CHAPTER 8
JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter you should be able to:

- Understand the Jean Jacques Rousseau’s life and work.
- Explain the political thoughts of Jean Jacques Rousseau

LIFE AND TIMES

Rousseau was born of a poor family in Geneva. Rousseau's mother died a few days after giving birth to him, and his father was unable to raise Rousseau in any coherent fashion. From the age of twelve he was apprenticed to several masters, but lie failed to set up himself in any trade or art. For mainly of his life he remained in poverty, surviving through dint of his ingenuity and benevolence of women. For temporary material advantages he even changed his
religion and accepted charity from people he detested. In 1744 he went to Paris; tried his hand at several schemes—the theatre, opera, music, poetry, without creation much success of anything. Yet his personality opened for him the doors of the best salons in Paris, where he met leading encyclopedias as well as influential, charming women, with many of whom he maintained secure liaison. But he shunned the exalted society, never shedding his plebian, puritanical background of a low-middle class family.

Rousseau existed at a time when the absolutist feudal order presided in excess of through Louis XV reigned France. Political power, privilege and social prestige were the monopoly of the king, clergy and the nobility, who existed extravagantly at the expense of the masses occupied in a grim battle of survival. Having been denied even the minimum required of decent livelihood through the corrupt and inefficient bureaucracy of the King, discontent was rampant and the desire for change had created a climate of defiance. Sharing the discontent and the desire for change was a new emergent class of the French bourgeoisie, which establish the extant order too restrictive for its own development and had joined hands with the peasantry.

In shaping the climate of opinion and the spirit of dissent against the ancient regime the French played a major role. Enlightenment judged everything based on cause and experience alone. Inevitably it brought under attack several things that had hitherto been taken for granted, including the church and the traditional political institutions of France. Rousseau shared some of the enlightenment thoughts, but not wholly. In so distant as the philosophers desired change, pinned their faith in man as a free agent, Rousseau was with them, but he did not share their thought of progress implied in their modernity and had greater regard for feeling than respect for rationality. Rousseau whispered that the part of what was wrong with contemporary man is that he had lost touch with his feelings. Philosophers' insensitivity towards feelings and emotion led to revolt against 'cause'.

**REVOLT AGAINST CAUSE**

Rousseau attacked Enlightenment, in a prize-winning essay written in 1749 on the question: "Has the progress of science and arts contributed to corrupt or purify morality?" Rousseau science was not saving but bringing moral ruin upon us. Progress was an illusion. What appeared to be advancement was in reality regression. The arts of civilized society served only to 'cast garlands of flowers in excess of the chains men bore'. The development of contemporary culture had not made men either happier or more virtuous. Virtue was possible in an easy society, where men existed austere and frugal lives. In the contemporary sophisticated society man was corrupted, and greater the sophistication the greater the corruption.

As for the grand Baconian hope of creating abundance on earth, Rousseau saw more evil than good in it. Abundance to him spelt luxury, and luxury was notoriously the breeder of
corruption. Luxury, undermined nations as it undermined men. Athens, the centre of vices, was doomed to perish because of its elegance, luxury, wealth, art and sciences. He also establish support in Roman history—so extensive as Rome was poor and easy she was able to command respect and conquer an empire; after having urbanized luxury and engulfed the riches of the Universe Rome fell prey to peoples who knew not even what riches were.

Rousseau argued that 'our minds have been corrupted in proportion as the arts and sciences have improved'. The much-vaulted politeness, the glory of civilized refinement, was for Rousseau, a 'uniform and perfidious veil' under which he saw jealousy, suspicion, fear, wildness, reverse, hate and fraud.' Against intelligence, the growth of knowledge and the progress of sciences, which the Enlightenment whispered to be the only hope of culture, Rousseau set amiable and benevolent sentiments, the goodwill and reverence. He privileged sentiments and conscience in excess of cause, and proposed that all moral valuations he had done on the foundation of sentiments. Intelligence was dangerous because it undermined reverence; science was destructive because it takes absent faith; cause was bad because it sets prudence against moral intuition. Without reverence, faith and moral intuition there is neither character nor society.

CRITIQUE OF CIVIL SOCIETY

The themes introduced in his prize winning essay were urbanized further in his second essay written in 1754 on "what is the origin of inequality in the middle of men, and is it authorized through natural law?" The second Discourse, as this essay is described, is a narrative of the fall of man-how his nature got twisted, warped and corrupted with the emergence of civil society, which in turn was necessitated through the rise of the institution of private property and the require to defend it through institutionalizing social inequality through law'. Here, Rousseau is extolling the 'natural man' and pouring scorn in excess of the so-described 'civilized men'. The problem evidently was not with man, but the nature of society in which he was livelihood.

Tracing the fall, Rousseau says that in the state of nature, which is a condition prior to the emergence of society, man was a 'noble savage'; existed in separation and had a few elementary, easily appeased needs. It was neither a condition of plenty nor scarcity; neither there was disagreement nor cooperative livelihood. There was no language or knowledge of any science or art. In such a situation man was neither happy nor unhappy, had no conception of presently and unjust, virtue and vice. The noble savage was guided not through cause but through two instincts—self love or the instinct of self-preservation, and sympathy or the gregarious instinct.

The state of nature, which was one of innocence, did not last forever. In course of time, the noble savage who existed in separation exposed the utility and usefulness of labor. Without yet having given up their primitive dispersal, men began to collaborate occasionally
and created a degree of provisional order. Later men began to build shelters for themselves
and families stayed jointly—a stage Rousseau calls the patriarchal stage. But as lie
consolidated his first social dealings, he gave himself to labor and to thought, i.e., to the use of
cause and language. This brought in the first fall for man, wrenching him from the happiness
of the 'patriarchal stage' even as the detection of division of labor, enabled men to pass from a
survival economy to an economy of productive development. The emergence of metallurgy
and agriculture was indeed a great revolution, but iron and corn, which civilized men, ruined
humanity.

The farming of earth led to the enclosure of land, and this necessarily gave rise to the
thought of property. As Rousseau puts it in a well-known statement: "The first man who after
fencing off a piece of land, took it upon himself to say "This belongs to me" and establish
people easy-minded enough to consider, was the true founder of the civil society".

Once men began to claim possessions, the inequality of men's talents and skills led to
an inequality of fortunes.

Disagreement led in turn to a demand for a system of law for sake of order and
tranquility. The rich especially voiced this demand, for while the state of violence threatened
everyone's life it was 'worse for the rich because it threatened their possessions also. Hence
the expedient of a 'social contract' was thought of through a rich man to the detriment of the
poor.

The result, says Rousseau, was the origin of civil society and laws, which gave new
fetters to the poor, and new powers to the rich; which destroyed natural liberty for ever, fixed
for all the law of property and inequality, transformed shrewd usurpation into settled right, and
to benefit a few ambitious persons, subjected the whole of human race thenceforth to labor,
servitude and wretchedness.

Rousseau suggests though, that things require not have turned out as badly as they
had. If, with the establishment of the government, men, 'ran headlong into chains', that was
because men had the sense to see the advantages of political institutions, but not the
experience to foresee the dangers. To this theme Rousseau was to return some years later in
the Social Contract.

It may though be noted here that Rousseau was not depicting the transition from state
of nature to 'civil society' as a historical information.

SOCIAL CONTRACT

Though Rousseau critiqued 'civil society', he did not suggest man to choose the
savage subsistence, as some of his contemporaries mistook him. In information Voltaire even
ridiculed Rousseau for wanting us to walk on all four. In the Discourse itself, Rousseau
exclaims: "What then is to be done? Necessity societies be totally abolished? Necessity meum
and tuum be annihilated, and necessity we return again to the forests to live in the middle of
bears? This is a deduction in the manner of my adversaries, which I would as soon expect and let them have the shame of drawing."

There was therefore no going back to the state of nature. For Rousseau society was inevitable, without which man could not fulfill him or realize his native potentials. If lie was critiquing civil society it was because it was not founded on presently principles and had corrupting power. The task so was to make a new social order that would help man realize his true nature.

To such a task Rousseau devoted himself in Social Contract. The key to the construction of the ideal social-political order was to handle the problem of political obligation, namely, why should man obey the state through a proper reconciliation of power with freedom, as it ought to be—a task which, just as to Rousseau, was unsatisfactorily and inadequately done through his predecessor philosophers.

*Social Contract* opens dramatically: "Man is born free, and he is everywhere in chains". His purpose is how to create the chains legitimate in lay of the illegitimate chains of the modern society. With such a purpose, Rousseau's theoretic problem is: "To discover a form of association capable of defending and protecting with the total general forage, the person and the property of each associate, and in which each, while uniting himself with all, may still obey himself alone, and remain as free as before", through a social contract.

The social contract involves: "the total alienation of each associate, jointly with all his rights, to the whole society." Each man provides himself to all; he provides himself to nobody in scrupulous: "As there is no associate in excess of whom he does not acquire the similar right as he yields in excess of himself, he gains an equivalent for everything he loses, and an augment of force for the preservation of what he has." Reduced to its essence, the participants of the social contract agree amongst themselves that: "each of us puts his person and all his power to the general use under the supreme direction of the General Will; and as a body we receive each member an indivisible part of the whole".

As a result of the contract, the private person ceases to exist for the contract produces a moral and communal Body, which receives from the similar act its unity, its general identity, its life and its will. This public person shaped from the union of all scrupulous individuals is the State when it is passive; the Sovereign when it is active; a Power, when compared with similar institutions.

After the institution of a state, Rousseau visualizes a great transformation in the human being. It substitutes in his conduct a rule of justice for the rule of instinct and provides to his action a moral character which theretofore lie had lacked. Rousseau goes to the extent of saying that he is transformed from a stupid and limited animal into an intelligent creature and man.

But such a transformation would be fantastic, quite improbable, if the contract is conceived as a single, specific occurrence. But for Rousseau, the contract is not a single event, but a method of thinking. Therefore conceived, contract becomes a procedure and we can think of alteration of human nature as also being gradual and not instantaneous. Here we have
a conception of man whose moral sensibilities and intellectual prowess slowly evolves and develops pari passu with the widening and deepening of man's social dealings brought in relation to the through a continuous participation in the General Will.

**THEORY "OF GENERAL WILL**

Through creation the General Will sovereign and individuals as participants in the General Will, Rousseau reconciled power with freedom as none before him had done. In order to understand how Rousseau achieved this end, we require to appreciate the nature of the General Will.

In the *Discourse on Political Economy*, where he had first stated the concept of General Will, Rousseau says that "General will tends always to the preservation and welfare of the whole and of every part, and is the source of the laws, constitutes for all the members of the state, in relation to one another and to it, the rule of what is presently and unjust." It aims always at the public good and is dissimilar from the will of all, for while the former aims at the general interest, the latter aims only at the private interests and is a sum of scrupulous wills.

The generality of the will is not so much a matter of numbers as of intrinsic excellence and goodness; it is not an empirical information so much as a moral information. It is an outcome of the moral attitude in the hearts of citizens to act justly. It is produced whenever all individual members of group, sacrificing their private interests, unite in aiming at some substance whispered to be good for the whole group. The general will comes from all and apply to all and embodies the free rational will of all.

Rousseau though recognizes that unanimity amongst members on general will may not be possible at times, because while people may be willing the good; they might not always be understanding or knowing it correctly. This happens, particularly when factions create it hard for self-governing citizens to pursue the general good. In such situation Rousseau suggests that if we "...take absent from the wills the several scrupulous interests which disagreement with one another, what remnants as die sum of die differences is the general will." But there is one significant condition here—the result will be general will, only if and so distant as, all the individuals of a group are moved (even in the pursuit of their private interest) through the thought of themselves as members of a group, all of whose members have interests deserving respect and consideration,

Such being the nature of general will, there is no problem in obeying the general will but if some one refuses to obey it, Rousseau says that he will be compelled to do so: "This means nothing less than that he will be forced to be free", otherwise the social contract will become an empty formula. Moreover, such compulsion is justified because the individual has given his prior consent for being restrained through the state, knowing well that socially cohesive conduct in the extensive run best promotes his own interests, and knowing also that
lie will occasionally discover the attractions of some more immediate selfish good too strong to resist and so lie should be restrained whenever lie yields to such temptation.

In other languages, when a man is being compelled to obey the general will, through the whole body of citizens, it only means that lie is being salted to follow his own best interest, which he at a scrupulous instance is unluckily unaware of. Obeying the General Will is then, an expression of the moral freedom of the individuals. Therefore, when general will rules in excess of the people, the latter should have no grumble in relation to the corrosion of their liberty. Because obedience to the sovereign is no longer an obedience to any external power or arbitrary rule through one or few; it is actually an obedience to the rational part of their own selves or to a self-government — a government that would do what one's rational self would, indeed, want to do.

**GENERAL WILL AS THE SOVEREIGN**

It is also clear that Rousseau's conception of sovereignty is dissimilar from both Hobbes and Locke. In Hobbes, the people set up a sovereign and transfer all powers to him. In Locke's social contract the people set up a limited government for limited purposes, but Locke shuns the conception of sovereignty — popular or monarchical — as a symbol of political absolutism. Rousseau's sovereign, on the other hand, is the people, constituted as a political society through social contract.

Unlike almost all other major political thinkers, Rousseau considers sovereignty of the people inalienable and indivisible. The people cannot provide absent, or transfer, to any person or body their ultimate right of self-government, of deciding their own destiny. Whereas Hobbes sets up a ruler as sovereign, Rousseau draws a sharp distinction flanked by sovereignty, which always and wholly resides in the people, and government, which is but a temporary agent (as in Locke's conception) of the sovereign people. Whereas, in Locke, the people transfer the exercise of their sovereign power, legislative, executive and judicial, to organs of government, Rousseau's concept of inalienable and indivisible sovereignty does not permit the people to transfer their legislative function, the supreme power in the state. As to the executive and judicial functions, Rousseau realizes that they have to be exercised through special organs of government, but they are totally subordinate to the sovereign people, and that there is no hint or suggestion of separation or balance of powers.

As Sovereignty of the General Will is inalienable and indivisible, it cannot be represented. Second, representative assemblies tend to develop scrupulous interest of their own, forgetting those of the society. Not surprising, Rousseau's preference was always for direct democracies of Swiss municipality-republic though such a preference was anachronistic, when contemporary nation-state were emerging. Nor can the General Will be delegated in any method whatever. Any effort to, delegate will means its end. As he said; "The
moment there is a master, there is no longer a sovereign.” It is only the “voice of people” that is "the voice of God."

CRITICAL APPRECIATION

There appears to be an obvious divide and fundamental logical discrepancy flanked by his earlier writings in Discourse on Inequality and the later work Social Contract. As Vaughan says, the first stage of his work is marked with defiant individualism, while in the latter there is an equally defiant collectivism.

Rousseau himself though never felt such an opposition. In the Confessions he says that every strong thought in the Social Contract had been before published in the Discourse on Inequality. Sabine opines that Rousseau is correct in his opinion, though it is also true that incompatible thoughts abound in his writings. Much that appears defiant individualism persists in Social Contract: As for instance, the use of the concept of social contract for generation of General will.

The variation flanked by the earlier works and the Social Contract is merely that in the former lie is writing himself free from the uncongenial social philosophy and in the latter he was expressing a counter-philosophy of his own. The social philosophy from which he disengaged himself was that of systematic individualism, which whispered that man was moral and rational; had sense of ownership and inherent rights; that man cooperated out of enlightened self-interest; that society or social group was created out of universal selfishness and was utilitarian in nature meant for the protection of rights and promotion of happiness or self-satisfaction; and that in itself it had no value though it protects values.

Rousseau was critical of this systematic individualism in Locke because, it did not concur with human nature, the method lie understood it. For Rousseau, the attributes of rationality, the power to calculate, die desire for happiness, the thought of ownership, and the power to communicate with others and enter into agreement for creating a government are all attributes acquired through man through living in society and not attributes of a natural man. Besides, Rousseau thought that it was absolutely false to think that cause through itself would ever bring men jointly, if they were concerned only with their individual happiness, because even the thought of self-interest arises societies in which men live. Secondly self-interest is not more natural or innate than die social needs that draw men jointly in societies. Rousseau measured that in excess of and above self-interest, men have an innate revulsion against sufferings in others. The general foundation of sociability is not cause but feeling. The calculating egoist of the theories exists not in nature but only in perverted society. Consequently, their theories were wrong and had shades of die 'evil contract' in the Discourses on Inequality. Human nature could best be understood through going beyond the stage of socialization. This neither Hobbes nor Locke does; for them the state of nature is a stage prior to political order. Though Hobbes says state of nature is pro-social, it is in information not
because the attributes of the Hobbessian man are those of a public person. Natural egoist is a fiction for Rousseau.

In developing his counter-philosophy, Rousseau got immense help from the classical Greek thought:

- That it is in die nature of man to associate with others in organic methods/which means that the development of each is dependent upon the development of all. Without such organic dealings man cannot realize his true nature or attain his full stature as a man; solitude and separatism is contrary to his nature—Robinson Crusoe is therefore a false model.
- That it is only in society that man acquires right, freedom and morality—outside the society there might be independence, and right as mere force only but no morality;
- That man is what the society creates him; if the socialization is bad, his nature will be twisted and warped;
- That society is the chief moralizing agent and so symbolizes the highest moral value; and
- That political subjection is essentially ethical and only secondarily a matter of law and power.

With insights gleaned from Classical Greek philosophy, Rousseau worked out his own political theory. It rejected systematic individualism, compelling one to think that society was more than a heap of individual atoms; that good of all—the 'public good' cannot be produced through each individual's pursuit of private interests or universal selfishness. Unless men thought beyond their private interests, in conditions of public interest or the good of the whole of which they are integral part, they could not attain their own good.

Moreover, only when individuals are disposed towards thinking in conditions of public good, that power, which is required for order and, freedom, which is needed for felicity or self-development can be reconciled. Locke and Hobbes both failed in this reconciliation because they had a false theory of man. Locke becomes fearful of power while securing liberty; for the sake of order and tranquility sacrifices individual at the altar of the sovereign.

There is much value in the philosophical insight of theory of General Will and it led to an alternative conceptualization of state, not as a machine but as an organism; but Rousseau did not care to work out the practical implications of his theory. One consequence of this has been that whereas Rousseau had set out to give a philosophical justification for democratic governance and resolve the tension flanked by power and freedom establish in the mechanistic theory of state, quite contrary to his intentions, Rousseau became for several an apotheosis of totalitarianism.

Theory of General Will unluckily provided a pretext for any arbitrary ruler to coerce recalcitrant subjects, pleading that they, much as they are enslaved to their scrupulous wills,
do not know what the general will is. In this context 'the paradox of freedom' in Rousseau, acquired dangerous propensities. Liberty became an 'honorific' word, the name for a sentiment with which even attacks on liberty could be baptized.

But even more dangerous was the implied view that a man whose moral convictions are against those generally held in his society is merely capricious and ought to be suppressed. As Sabine comments this was perhaps not a legitimate inference from the abstract theory of General Will, because freedom of conscience really is a social and not merely an individual good. But in every concrete situation the general will has to be recognized with some body of actual opinion, and moral intuitionism usually means that morality is recognized with standards, which are usually accepted. Forcing a man to be free therefore becomes a euphemism for creation blindly obedient to the mass or the strongest party.

In a method such abuse happened because the theory of general will was too abstract and there was difficulty with regard to its site or identification. That general will is always right is merely a truism because it stands for social good, which is itself the standard of right. But how does this absolute right stand in relation to several perhaps conflicting judgments in relation to the it? Who is entitled to decide what is right? Sabine writes that Rousseau's effort to answer these questions produced a diversity of contradictions and evasions. Likewise Wayper comments that unluckily Rousseau cannot help us here. "He can never tell how we can be sure of finding the General Will....So much vagueness in relation to the something as significant as the finding of the General will is to be regretted."
Notwithstanding such criticisms, the significance of Rousseau cannot be ever diminished. In protection of Rousseau it may be said, as Ebenstein has observed, that he was the first modern writer to have attempted, though not always successfully, to synthesize good government with self-government in the key concept of the general will. The classical doctrine of Plato and Aristotle had accentuated good government at the expense of self-government. And the more contemporary thoughts of Locke and the liberal’ school were concerned principally with self-government; it relegated the problem of good government into background.

Secondly, Rousseau also was clearer than the conventional liberal doctrines that the end of government is not confined to the protection of individual liberty but also comprises equality because 'liberty cannot exist without it.' In the Social Contract one may not notice the hostility that he showed to the institution of private property in the Discourse on Inequality but he does not abandon the ideal of economic equality. No citizen "shall be ever wealthy enough to buy another, and none poor enough to be forced to sell himself." Rousseau realizes that in practice it is extremely hard to uphold the ideal of equitable sharing of property, but it is precisely because the force of circumstances tends continually to destroy equality that the force of legislation should always tend to its maintenance. Whereas Locke failed to see property as a relation of power of man in excess of man, Rousseau clearly recognized property as a form of private power that had to be kept under manage through the general will.

Third, Rousseau was not socialist in the contemporary sense of the term, yet indirectly this part of Rousseau—the stress on equality—has aided the development of the socialist sentiment through sharpening the awareness that political liberty and crass economic inequality are ultimately incompatible if democracy is to survive and expand. And secondly that all rights, including those of property, are rights within the society and not against it.

Fourth, Rousseau himself was in no sense a nationalist, though his philosophy contributed to nationalism. Through reviving the intimacy of feeling and the reverence connoted through citizenship in the municipality-state, he made it accessible, at least as an emotional coloring, to citizenship in the national state. The cosmopolitanism implied through natural law, he chose to regard as merely a pretext for evading the duties of a citizen.

To our present times, Rousseau's thoughts are still extremely relevant, for, how often we have lamented character of the representative, party-democracy and feared the state turning against the people. And as bulwark against such depredation, have wished to strengthen the civil society for the sake of protecting and retrieving our freedom. No less frequent has been the lament that the troubles of our society caused through the spawning of
many primordial ties have arisen because of the failure to take the value of citizenship seriously. His theory of popular sovereignty is a constant reminder to citizens to guard against the usurpation of power through the executive. The record of free government everywhere has proved that there can be no reliance on contrivances and institutions alone in the eternal thrash about for liberty, and that its survival depends, in the last analysis, on those moral qualities that Rousseau calls General will, justice, virtue. In addition, we an also discover attendance of Rousseau in Rawlsian theory of distributive justice, in the conception of development as expansion of human capabilities. And perhaps it would not be wrong to suggest that Rousseau, as critic of civil society is a precursor of Marx and much of the radical thought ever since.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Examine the nature and characteristic of Rousseau's General Will.
- Evaluate Rousseau as a critic of civil society.
- "Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains." Explain and examine Rousseau's attempt to bring about reconciliation between liberty and authority.
CHAPTER 9
EDMUND BURKE

STRUCTURE

- Learning objectives
- Introduction
- Criticism of the French revolution
- Critique of natural rights and social contract
- Limits of cause
- Citizenship and democracy
- Religion and toleration
- Criticisms of Burke
- Review questions

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the life and work of Edmund Burke.
- Explain the Edmund Burke’s political thoughts.

INTRODUCTION

Edmund Burke (1729-1797) is measured as the mainly significant conservative political thinker that England has produced. Conservatism as an significant political ideology began with him in the similar method as liberalism began with John Locke (1632-1704). Though there is close to unanimity in relation to the his brilliance there is no consensus in relation to the him in conditions of political categorization. Berlin described him as an ultra conservative while O’ Brien viewed him as a liberal and pluralist opponent of the French Revolution. Laski described him a liberal because of his sympathetic attitude to the American Revolution and the Irish Question.
and his criticisms of the British colonial rule in India. Some saw him as a progressive conservative, for "he supported political and economic progress within the framework of England's recognized institutions". Kramnick described him as "the gravedigger of the Enlightenment" for his virulent anti-clericalism and disembodied rationalism.

Burke's thought is hard to categorize. First, he showed no clear preference for he had both liberal as well as conservative tendencies which became apparent in his support to the American Revolution and his opposition to the French Revolution. Second, Burke was a prolific writer in his extensive career as a parliamentarian and so mainly of his writings were situational and could not be measured as well formulated political theory texts. His mainly significant political tract appeared as a reaction to the French Revolution of 1789 proving that there exists a clear connection flanked by crisis and important growths in political theorizing. Though his fame rests mostly for his critique of the French Revolution there were other concerns in him as well.

**Restraining Royal Power**

In the custom of Whiggism, Burke was a vocal opponent of arbitrary monarchical power and patronage. Though, lie was also conscious of the importance of the institution of monarchy as a natural attraction for obedience and reverence and that it also strengthened the principle of stability. But these positive characteristics were minor, compared to its significant role in developing a mixed and balanced government, for which it had to be streamlined. In developing this theme the power of Richard Hooker (1554-1600), Locke and Charles-Louis de Secondat Montesquieu (1689-1755) were apparent. Burke was an admirer and defender of the British constitution, as he whispered that it adequately ensured good government, order and liberty of its people.
Ireland

Burke stood with the Irish cause, though expediency and the interests of a successful political career compelled him to sacrifice theoretical consistency. Furthermore, his open and public stand was careful, compared to his private correspondence. But in spite of this limitation, which was understandable because of the prevailing mood and consideration for his political survival, he always accentuated the desirability of the emancipation of the Roman Catholics of Ireland. He also spoke of the inevitability of the Irish emancipation.

East India Company

For in relation to the a decade, Burke spoke extensively against the oppression, use and misrule in India through the East India Company. "There is nothing more noble in Burke's career than his extensive effort to mitigate the evils of company rule in India". He criticized British rule in India. Being an old culture, much older than Britain, its traditions and customs were to be respected. Interestingly, Henry Suiinner Maine (1 822-88) used these arguments to challenge John Austin's (1790-1859) theory of sovereignty. Burke's interest in Indian affairs sustained with his primary initiative in launching impeachment proceedings against Warren Hastings in 1787. He challenged Hastings' assertion that it was impossible to apply Western criteria of power and legality to oriental societies. The proceedings sustained for eight extensive years, though in the end, Hastings was acquitted.

American Colonies

Burke championed the cause of American colonies. In the midst of emotional and angry debates like the right of Parliament to tax colonies and
the right of resistance to American settlers, he lifted the whole controversy to a
dissimilar and a higher stage altogether. He refused to examine the problem
from the point of view of abstract rights, and raised some extremely serious
and fundamental questions, which were reiterated in the course of his critique
of the French Revolution. Furthermore, he charged that the British policy was
inconsistent, and accentuated the require for legislative cause.

**CRITICISM OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION**

The French Revolution, at least in the initial era had lot of support in
England. One popular protection was from Richard Price (1723-91). Burke's
masterpiece appeared as a critique of Price. His scathing criticism surprised
several, destroying several of his secure friendships. Equally shocking for
several was the clear variation flanked by the young and the old Burke.
Burke's earlier criticism of die king's manage in excess of the parliament, his
efforts of more than a decade to expose oppression, use and misrule in India
through the East India Company, and his championing the cause of the
American colonies was at variance with his total denunciation of the French
Revolution. Unlike several other contemporaries, he refused to draw any
parallels flanked by the French events and the Glorious Revolution of 1688.
Burke's Reflections was written throughout the revolutionary years.

In Reflections, Burke made a detailed criticism of both the theoretical
and practical characteristics of the Revolution. He pointed out the dangers of
abstract theorizing, but was realistic enough to give for an alternative mode of
social progression. Unlike Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821) and Louis Gabriel
de Bonald (1754-1840), who outrightly defended orthodoxy and absolutism,
Burke provided a framework for change with stability. "A state without the
means of some change is without the means of its conservation. Without such
means it might even risk the loss of that part of the constitution which it
wished the mainly religiously to preserve". As Burke pointed out, these two
principles of conservation and correction operated in England throughout the
critical eras of the Restoration and the Revolution, when England did not have a king. But in both these critical times, a totally new one did not replace the whole edifice of the old order. Instead, a corrective mechanism was achieved to rectify the deficiencies with in the existing constitutional framework. As such, it balanced the old and the new.

Burke criticized Jacobinism for its wholesale attack on recognized religion, traditional constitutional arrangements and the institution of property, which he saw as the source of political wisdom in a country. He often used the term "prejudice", through which he meant attachment to recognized practices and institutions. These provided a bulwark against sweeping changes, particularly those that followed from a rational critique. He did not support everything that was ancient, only those that held society jointly through providing order and stability. His main audience in the Reflections was the aristocracy and the upper middle class of English society, which he perceived to be the upholders of stability and order. He challenged the English ruling class to respond appropriately to the plight of the French Queen, otherwise it would reflect the lack of chivalry and demonstrate that the British political order was not superior to that of the Continent.

Burke further argued that the era of the Magna Carta to the Bill of Rights was one of slow but steady consolidation, reflecting stability and change. This enabled the British constitution to preserve and give unity within the context of diversity. Inheritance was cherished as a political necessity, for without it both conservation and transmission were not possible. While there was a procedure of gradual change in Britain the French made an effort to achieve a complete break with the past and make afresh with emphasis on equality and participation. With this inherent belief in natural aristocracy, he debunked the extremely effort to make a society of equals. Burke emphasized the necessity of well-ordered state, to be ruled through a combination of skill and property. Such an order would be inherently based on inequality. He
connected the perpetuation of family property with stability of a society. There was no lay for either proportionate equality or democratic equality in his preference for aristocratic rule. Like Adam Smith (1723-90), he stressed the importance of preserving and protecting property. He favored accumulation of wealth, rights of inheritance and the require, to enfranchise property owners. While Burke was socially conservative, he was a liberal in economics, the two being fused jointly uneasily.

CRITIQUE OF NATURAL RIGHTS AND SOCIAL CONTRACT

Burke pointed out the intricacies of human nature and the complexities of society, and because of such thoughts no easy analysis of human nature or power was possible. Rejecting any claim of either economic or political equality, he provided a theory of rights within this big framework of his political philosophy. He accentuated partnership, but denied any corresponding equal rights in the enjoyment of economic and political privileges. In understanding and perpetuating this philosophy, the British constitution had stood the test of time. Emphasizing the utmost require for stability, Burke pointed out that in the regions of morality, principles of government and thoughts of liberty, there was no require to create a fresh beginning every time. Giving the instance of the English attainment, he pointed out the inevitability of a continuous procedure of adaptability and change within the superior structure. Rejecting atheism and pointing out the enormous importance of religion for a proper functioning of civil society, he characterized the individual as a religious animal. He saw no disagreement flanked by the subsistence of an recognized church, an recognized monarchy, an recognized aristocracy and an recognized limited democracy. The point that Burke made was that in the contemporary age the coexistence of institutions was of utmost importance for effective functioning and efficiency. He stressed the information that all power was to be exercised as a trust, arid in this his
philosophy was akin to that of Locke, but he accentuated that the stability of society had to be preserved at any cost. The overall structure of society could not be presently reduced to a mere contract flanked by two or more parties. It was not a trade agreement involving paper, coffee, calico or tobacco. Such agreements reflected only transient interests, which could be dissolved through the parties involved. The intricacies of social relationships had to be understood on a extremely dissimilar plane.

...It is a partnership in all science, a partnership in all art, a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in several generations, it becomes a partnership not only flanked by those who are livelihood, but flanked by those who are livelihood, those who are dead and those who are to be born. Each contract of a scrupulous state is but a clause in the great primeval contract of eternal natures, connecting the visible and invisible world, just as to a fixed compact sanctioned through the inviolable oath which holds all physical and all moral natures, each in their appointed lay.

Beside with the rejection of the contract, Burke rejected the other Lockeian fundamentals—natural law, the rights of the individual and the separation of Church and the state. The only laws that he recognized were the laws of God and the laws of a civilized society. Burke did not reject the argument of human rights, except that he sought to rescue the real rights from the imagined ones. He shared with Locke the view that political philosophy was based on theological foundations but rejected the derivative of political and juridical equality from the argument that God created all human beings as equal. He also rejected the thought of creating order with the help of human cause. He charged the doctrine of natural rights with 'metaphysical abstraction'. It failed to take into explanation the differences that lived flanked by societies. Following Montesquieu, he insisted that dissimilar countries merited dissimilar legal and political systems, keeping in view the differences
pertaining to climate, geography and history. The universality of natural rights doctrine overlooked national, geographical and cultural distinctions.

Though his criticism of natural rights seemed similar to that of Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), there were important differences. Burke's conception of human well being was not hedonistic as in the case of Bentham. In information, it was more like Aristotle's (384-22 BC) thought of eudaimonia linking moral virtue and duty with that of political morality and duty. Furthermore, Burke suggested maximization, but through stressing the moral to the mathematical he was closer to Aristotle's 'phi-onesis'. He also rejected the utilitarian thought of trade-offs. Unlike Bentham, Burke was also careful in relation to the endless new schemes. Besides emphasizing political virtue, Burke also stressed the require for an elite, which enjoyed a privileged location because of its contribution to the general good. He placed aristocracy under this category. In parliament, this elite could be distinguished from others with reference to ownership of property, for inheritance was a sure cause for conservation. In this context, the French National Assembly did not consist of property owners. Instead they were lawyers who were "artful men, talented, aggressive, ideologically inclined, impractical and dangerous, if not alienated". The vital problem was that the talent that made a good lawyer was not enough to create a good ruler and be a part of the natural aristocracy. The vital shortcoming of a lawyer was that his experience had a extremely narrow base, which meant that both the diversity of humankind and complexities of public were beyond his grasp.

**LIMITS SF CAUSE**

Burke questioned the extremely vital argument that a stable political structure could be recognized only on the foundation of cause. He pointed to the limits of cause and its role in understanding society. In information, Burke questioned the whole approach of rationalistic thought, an argument reiterated through Michael Oakeshott (1901-90). Quoting Aristotle, he cautioned against
a priori deductive reasoning in moral arguments. The philosophy of the French Revolutionaries was a 'false philosophy', because of its insistence that all power derived its sustenance from cause. As opposed to cause, Burke accentuated wisdom as something more than prejudice. The philosophy of natural rights based on the new principles of liberty and equality was not conducive to the establishment of order. Veneration of power urbanized in excess of a era of time, and the denunciation of one power through a dissimilar group led to its denunciation as well. The abstract ideology inevitably led from subversion to anarchy, because it brought a consciousness of rights but not of duties of order, discipline and obedience to power. Burke repeatedly stressed that societies needed awe, superstition, ritual and honor for their stability, and to be able to secure the loyalty and support of those on whom it depended. He warned that a state, which dismissed this whole edifice aside in the name of rational enlightenment, would ultimately be a state based merely on a lust for power.

Burke accentuated that the dignity of the human being came through socialization. One rendered obedience to society not because it benefited us, or because we had promised to obey it, but because we saw ourselves as an integral part of it. Though he rejected the divine right of kings, he affirmed, like Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC), that nothing was more pleasing to God than the subsistence of human 'civitates'. He accused the natural rights theorists of not merely "imprudence and intellectual arrogance but of blasphemy and impiety as well".

CITIZENSHIP AND DEMOCRACY

Burke was also perturbed through the democratic aspirations of the French revolution, in scrupulous through the doctrines of popular sovereignty and common will. He regarded democracy as the "mainly shameless thing in the world". He was skeptical of the political skill of the ordinary people, He
was an elitist, totally unconcerned in relation to the plight of the masses. For him, the best form of political practice was one that was played through a few of the enlightened and aristocratic elite. Burke whispered that elections gave an opportunity for the enfranchised citizens to choose a wise elite to govern them. In a customized form, Schumpeter provided a similar model of elitist theory of democracy in the 1940s. Like Aristotle, Burke favored citizenship limited to a segment of adults who had the leisure for discussion and information, and were not mentally dependent. The Whigs in England and America favored ownership of property as a necessary condition for citizenship. In view of the information that average individuals were guided through their baser instincts, government had to stay them apathetic so as to prevent their selfishness from undermining communal life.

Burke accepted inequalities as natural and unavoidable in any society, and that some would enjoy an enhanced status. In the well-ordered society, this ruling elite was a genuine one, a 'natural aristocracy', for the mass of people were incapable of governing themselves. They could not think or act without guidance and direction. For Burke, government was not based on common will, but wisdom. For Burke, political representation "is the representation of interests and interest has an objective, impersonal and unattached reality". For Burke, aristocracy of virtue and wisdom should govern for the good of a nation. As in other regions, even in representation, there was no clear and well laid out theory of representation. But out of Burke's speeches and writings appeared some key thoughts. He regarded the members of parliament as an elite group, a group of natural aristocracy. The mass of ordinary people needed the guidance and direction from this elite since they could not govern through themselves. Representatives were genuinely superior to the electorate. The representatives had to possess the capability for rational decision creation. They were to be men of practical wisdom. This was a negation of Jean Jacques Rousseau's (1712-78) theory of direct democracy. The representatives require not consult or be bound through
the views of the voters. Furthermore, obligation and ethical thoughts, and questions of right and wrong guided governmental action. Burke championed rational parliamentary discussion, which provided the right answers to political questions. And as a participant, the representative require not consult the voters. They would enjoy complete freedom, for they have no interest other than the national interest. With contempt for the average voter, Burke advocated restricted suffrage so that the selection procedure of the natural aristocratic group of parliament would become fool proof. He also distinguished flanked by actual representation and virtual representation. Since an region would have one dominant interest, he saw the merit of virtual representation against actual representation. Virtual representation was based on general interest. Through this logic, even people who did not vote were represented. The localities, which did not have actual representation through this criterion, would have virtual representation. Burke was careful in noting that this logic of virtual representation did not hold for the disenfranchised Catholics of Ireland and the people of the American colonies. Pitlcin rightly pointed out that Burke's location was highly inconsistent. His view of representation endorsed the 17th Century notion of representation, and had extremely little relevance in modern times. Though, it helps us to understand the anti-democratic bias prevalent throughout Burke's era. The Burkean theory centered on the parliament. Conniff tried to refute Pitkin's analysis through questioning the theory of objective interest and a commonly held agreement of the parliamentary elite on what constituted the general good. Though, Burke's insistence that every recognizable constituency had one dominant interest and that a consensus could always emerge out of parliamentary discussion vindicated Pitkin.

**RELIGION AND TOLERATION**

Burke's views on religion exhibited both liberal and conservative perceptions. He defended traditional practices of the recognized church, unless
there was an 'intolerable abuse'. He equated attack on the recognized Church of England as tantamount to an attack on England's constitutional order. He was influenced that the recognized church would foster peace and dissuade civil discord. His liberal temperament made him advocate and defend toleration for mainly religious sects, including non-Christians. He was perturbed that the Protestants did not support toleration for the Catholics. He did not consider in the truth of any scrupulous religion but was concerned in relation to the effect of changes in traditional religious practice on political stability. Toleration and religious freedom could be refused if it threatened civil peace and measured atheism as complementary to political radicalism. He was condescending towards Rational Dissenters as being better than atheists, for at least they whispered in God, though not in the divinity of Christ. Though, he castigated all those who corrupted and attacked religion as being destructive of all power, thereby undermining equity, justice, and order—the foundations of human society.

Burke did not quarrel with the atheists as extensive as they did nothing to publicly attack or subvert religion. While he began to dislike Hume for his open contempt of religion, he remained friendly with the irreligious Smith, even though the latter blamed Roman Catholicism for impeding economic and political progress, but there was no denunciation or revolt against religion. Burke's critique of the French Revolution was also due to the latter's anti-clericalism. The well-known cry "hang the bishops from the lampposts" throughout the early days of the Revolution was an indication of the "insolent irreligious in opinions and practices". The nationalization of the Church's property through the National Assembly in 1790 was a move against traditional religion, and represented the superior goal of subverting establishing power and civil society. The revolutionary fervor only fostered hatred, animosity and suspicion, rather than affection and trust. It undermined the traditional civilizing ties of the French citizens. Burke "placed a great deal of emphasis on manners and etiquette that controlled passions and will."
CRITICISMS OF BURKE

Thomas Paine (1737-1809) criticized Burke's location in his Rights of Man (1791). In his reply, he defended Enlightenment liberalism and tried to correct "the flagrant misrepresentations which Mr. Burke's pamphlet contains". Both agreed that in modern European society there lived a extremely big proportion of illiterate and unenlightened people. Burke, following Aristotle, argued that individuals differed in their capacities, which is why any effort to stage would never succeed. Paine, on the contrary, attributed the extremely big numbers of illiterate people in the 'old' world to bad governments. In total contrast to Burke, he championed the cause of universal suffrage, representative government, the rule of law, and a sympathetic attitude to the poor. He denounced the hereditary system, whether in the name of monarchy or aristocracy, for a "hereditary governor is as ridiculous as an hereditary author". Unlike Burke, Paine, following Locke, justified government as an outcome of a social contract flanked by the people themselves. Lie was critical of the British constitution for being unwritten, creation it unhelpful as a reference point. Its precedents were all arbitrary contrary to cause and general sense.

Burke and Paine were representative symbols of the conservative and radical responses to the French Revolution. It was noteworthy that both of them championed the American cause, but were on opposite sides with regard to the French experiment. Their vital disagreements could be understood in light of their support to the American cause. For Burke, "Taxation without representation" violated traditional English rights and liberties and that the English were on the wrong face of history, because they violated their own well-recognized practices. For demanding redressal, die Americans did not base their arguments, like the French did, on a notion of natural rights. Paine, on the other hand, establish that the British action in America was a violation of universal cause and natural rights. He rejected hierarchical power, and
asserted that "setting up and putting down kings and governments is the natural right of citizens". He regarded aristocrats as a class of unproductive idlers and parasites, who existed off the surplus and the use of the industrious classes. As such, in a rational, reconstructed society they would not be missed at all. The striking parallel flanked by a radical Paine, a liberal John Stuart Mill (1806-73) and a socialist Claude Henri Comte de Rouvroy Saint Simon (1760-1825) is too clear to be missed.

Early Liberal Feminists like Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-97) and Catherine Macaulay Sawbridge (1731-91) criticised Burke and regarded the French Revolution as something new and unique, spreading the message of an enlightened spirit. Wollstonecraft echoing several contemporaries of her time, in her reply to Burke, pointed out the apparent contradictions of a liberal Burke supporting the American cause, and the conservative Burke opposing Jacobinism. His praise of hereditary rights and custom and his emphatic stress on the conservation of existing political dealings indicated a lack of cause and a predominance of sentiment, leading to social stagnation, hindering the progressive and dynamic nature of socio-political life. She accused him of championing the maintenance of unequal property, and if necessary, of despotism and tyranny, for property not only restricted liberty through creating inequalities, but also undermined sociability. In the middle of unequals just as to Wollstonecraft there could be no friendship and mutual respect.

Wollstonecraft, unlike Burke saw the Church as fundamentally corrupt, having, secured vast property from the poor and the ignorant. With the help of David Hume's (1711-76) History d England (1754-62), she tried to illustrate that English laws were product of contingencies rather than the wisdom of the ages. She insisted that only those institutions, which could withstand the scrutiny of cause and were in accordance with natural rights and God's justice, deserved respect and obedience. Furthermore, she assailed Burke for defending a 'gothic affability' more appropriate for a feudal age, than the burgeoning commercial age marked for its 'liberal civility'. Rejecting Burke's
theory of prescriptive rights, Wollstonecraft contended that human beings through birth were rational creatures with sure inherited rights, especially equal rights to liberty compatible with that of others. She criticized Burke's views on women as a "symbol of man's require for a feminine ideal, not woman for herself". Wollstonecraft, like Paine, portrayed Burke as a brilliant but misguided voice of the past. Though Paine's criticism of Burke was more effective and well-recognized, as apparent from his well-known phrase that Burke "pitted the plumage but forgot the dying bird", it was Wollstonecraft who advocated a more radical stance than Paine for ameliorating the plight of the poor. Paine did not have any plan for social leveling other than taxing the rich and insisting that the appalling circumstances of the poor necessity be improved, but he failed to offer any economic solution to the problem. On the other hand, Wollstonecraft suggested the adoption of economic means for improving the condition of the poor through dividing estates into small farms and endorsed plans for the working class, which could lead to their betterment. Wollstonecraft was the first to lay stress on the equal rights and status for women through pointing to the incompleteness of the natural rights doctrine, which understood the individual, to be a male and left out the female.

Another refutation came from James Mackintosh's Vindiciae Gallicae in 1791. In it he insisted that Burke had trampled upon the ideals of Whiggism and aligned himself instead with Tory superstition and chivalry. In opposition to Paine, Mackintosh invoked the ideals of 1688 in explaining the events in France. He supported the Revolution, for it attempted to create France a commercial society.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Explain Burke's criticisms of natural rights and social contract.
- Write a short note on Burke's views on citizenship and democracy.
- How are Burkes ideals different from our beliefs of today?
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the life and work of Immanuel Kant
- Explain the political thoughts of Immanuel Kant

INTRODUCTION

Immanuel Kant was a German philosopher of the late 18th Century (1724 - 1804). He was a professor of philosophy at the University of Konigsberg in Prussia. He was a modern of Rousseau, Hume and Adam Smith. He was 65 years old at the time of the French Revolution of 1789, which he praised for its republican goals, while criticizing it for its use of immoral means. Kant whispered that a political-legal order could be presently, only if it pays homage to morality. He wrote:

- A true system of politics cannot... take a single step without first paying tribute to morality.... For all politics necessity bend the knee before right, although politics may hope in return to arrive, though slowly, at a stage of lasting brilliance.
Accordingly, in his moral and political philosophy, Kant's main concern was with the necessary, universal and critical-rational principles of morality and justicerightness (recht) in German, (which is not to be confused with the notion of individualistic rights). These are to serve as normative standards for justifying or criticizing and reconstructing the political organisation of societies at the national and international stages.

Kant's major contribution was his critique of pure cause and epistemology but his political philosophy is also considerably rich and novel. His political theory emphasized the necessity of treating every single person as an end in itself. His well-known saying "treat humanity in your person, and in the person of everyone else, always as an end as well as a means, never merely as a mean" enabled him to emphasize the rights of man, rule of law, a good legal procedure and educational opportunities which would enhance human cause and enlightenment.

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ENLIGHTENMENT

We may begin through locating Kant in the extensive history of moral and political thoughts through noting that while his "critical philosophy" was a culmination of the intellectual movement of the European Enlightenment, it, at the similar time, marked a clear departure from its separation of politics from morality. That is, while espousing the Enlightenment's enthronement of human cause (in excess of Divine Will or Law of Nature), Kant took the supreme principle of that extremely cause to be the Moral Law (to be tested through what he termed as cause's Categorical Imperative) of the freedom, autonomy and equality of every human being as a moral person. Through taking the Moral Law or the Categorical Imperative of moral-practical cause as the supreme principle of human cause, lie distanced himself from his empiricist and rationalist precursors and contemporaries.

Kant acknowledged that he was an Enlightenment thinker. He viewed his mature works to be contributions to the ongoing procedure of Enlightenment. In an article entitled "What is Enlightenment?" (1784), he defined it as the bold and outrageous passage of humanity from a condition of intellectual immaturity and mental laziness to the age of cause. He wrote:

- Enlightenment is man's leaving his self-caused immaturity. Such immaturity is not caused through the lack of intelligence, but through lack of determination or courage to use one's intelligence without being guided through another. *Sapere Audel Have the courage to use your own intelligence! [This] is so the motto of the Enlightenment.*

Kant hoped to contribute to creation the ordinary people become self-aware of the universal, necessary, formal and a priori circumstances or structures of cause, which are implicitly present as normative thoughts in their everyday thinking and acting as finite rational
beings livelihood in this world. For this new self-awareness, Kant felt that a "Copernican Revolution in Metaphysics" is required. Me viewed his own mature works to be exercises in such a philosophical revolution

**KANT'S "COPERNICAN REVOLUTION IN METAPHYSICS"

To his readers, Kant proposed his Copernican-like revolution in philosophy in the following languages:

- Hitherto it has been assumed that our knowledge necessity conform to objects. But all attempts to extend our knowledge of objects through establishing something in regard to them a priori, through means of concepts, have, on this assumption, ended in failure. We necessity so create trial whether we may not have more success in the tasks of metaphysics if we suppose that objects necessity conform to knowledge.

The understanding does not derive its laws from, but prescribes them to nature. While the earlier Copernican Revolution in astronomy or, rather, cosmology replaced the earth-centric view of the cosmos with the heliocentric or sun-centric "view, Kant's Copernican-like revolution in philosophy placed the human being at the centre of the world of knowledge and action. For Kant, the human being is neither a mere passive recipient of the "impressions" of the natural world nor a mere passive subject in the moral world but an active or creative agent in them. Kant did agree with the rationalist and empiricist thinkers of the Enlightenment in placing "human nature" or "human cause" rather than the power of the Church, despotic rulers, custom or custom at the centre or source of human knowledge and morality. He though felt that the empiricists (e.g. Locke and Hume) reduced human nature to the stage of the senses, instincts, feelings and preferences, whereas the rationalists (e.g. Descartes and Leibniz) narrowed or restricted human cause to an egoistic, monadic or intuitive substance. Kant's transcendental-idealist view of human cause and its universal, formal principles of justice and morality would overcome these limitations.

**TRANSCENDENTAL-IDEALIST VIEW OF HUMAN CAUSE

Kant's "transcendental idealism" is "idealistic" in that it is thoughts-constituted, ideal-oriented (rather than "realist") and critical-reconstructive (rather than traditionalist). These characteristics of his thought are reflected in the titles of several of his books, e.g., *Thoughts towards a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View* (1784). Through "transcendental" thoughts or principles, he means the necessary, universal, formal, apriority circumstances or structures of the possibility of any knowledge or moral action through rational beings. As finite rational mediators, human
persons, he says, have not only the faculties or capacities of sense and understanding but also the faculty of theoretical and moral-practical cause. He writes:

- Man now discovers in himself a faculty through means of which he differentiates himself from all other things, indeed even from himself in so distant as he is affected through objects; and that faculty is cause. This, as pure self-action, is elevated even above the understanding... with respect to thoughts, cause shows itself to be such a pure spontaneity that it distant transcends anything which sensibility can give it.

The faculty of understanding has its a priori formal categories or concepts (e.g., legroom, time and causality), which it imposes on our perceptual experiences to create them understandable. Likewise, the faculty of "practical cause" or "rational will" has its "synthetic a priori" principles or laws of the morality and justice/right of our thought and action. He writes:

- In the theory of duties, man can and should be represented from the point of view of the property of his capability for freedom, which is totally supersensible, and so basically from the point of view of his humanity measured as a personality, independently of physical determinations (homo noumenon).

As suggested in this passage, the "transcendental thought " or norm of the freedom or autonomy (and equality) of the human person as a moral agent is central to Kant's theory of moral duties or obligations. These thoughts, Kant notes, are contained in the Moral Law, which has traditionally been recognized as the Golden Rule. Just as to that Rule, what we do to others should be what we would have them do to us,

Kant also felt that the fundamental thought of the Moral Law is contained in Rousseau's concept of the Common Will as a will on behalf of the true will of each member of the society. In information, Rousseau's thought of the self-governing capacities of human beings had a great power on Kant's key thought of the autonomy of the human being as a moral agent.

Just as to Kant, the vital thought of the Moral Law is this: what creates a maxim of action moral is its universalisability—a universalisability, which implies the normative thought of the freedom/autonomy and equality of all human beings as moral mediators. Through autonomy of the moral agent, Kant means her or his freedom from both external coercion and from being determined internally through passions, appetites, desires, etc. The thought of the autonomy of the moral agent implies the thought of her or his a priori moral obligation towards the autonomy of other moral mediators. This is a distinctive aspect of Kant's moral and political philosophy.
FORMULATIONS OF THE CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE

The *a priori*, formal, normative thought of the freedom/autonomy and equality of all moral mediators, Kant argues, is the "Categorical Imperative" of pure practical cause, which, he maintains, can and should be used to assess or test the morality of our maxims of action. He provides many formulations of the Categorical Imperative, which, in any of its formulations, is, in his view, the supreme principle of pure practical cause or rational will. His three major formulations are presented below. The first formulation (Universal-Law Formulation) is made from the standpoint of the moral agent. It states:

- Act only on that maxim, which you can at the similar time will that it should become a universal law.

A variant of the first formulation (which can be referred to as the Universal-Law-of-Nature Formulation) reads as follows:

- Act as if the maxim of your action were to become through your will a universal law of nature.

The second formulation (End-in-Itself Formulation) is made from the standpoint of those who are affected through (or, in other languages, those who are the recipients of) our actions. It reads:

- So act that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the similar time as an end, never merely as a means.

The third formulation (Kingdom-of-Ends Formulation) views the mediators and their recipients as a moral society of self-legislating moral actors. It states:

- All maxims as proceeding from our own creation of law ought to harmonize with a possible kingdom of ends as a kingdom of nature.

The Categorical Imperative of practical cause, says Kant, is "categorical" in that it is not hypothetical or conditional to the scrupulous wishes or inclinations of this or that moral agent or cultural society. For Kant, morality is not what produces good for ourselves or for others, but what has to be done as an absolute or categorical duty—a duty arising from the presuppositions or *a priori* (inherent or pre-given) structure of our practical cause or rational will. To act morally, in other languages, is to act out of a sense of duty, i.e., out of respect for the Moral Law or the Categorical Imperative, and not out of thoughts of self-interest, instrumental rationality (as taught through Hobbes) or the protection of any natural right to private property.
(as taught through Locke), In this respect, Kant's moral and political philosophy marks a major departure from that of Hobbes and Locke.

THE UNIVERSAL LAW OF RIGHT (RECHT) OR JUSTICE

As the supreme principle of moral-practical cause, the Categorical Imperative is, just as to Kant, valid not only for our "inner world" of thoughts, convictions, motivations, etc. but also for our "outer or external world" of INTER-RELATIONSHIPS with other human beings. The WORLD OF OUR external dealings with other human beings is, though, a world of unavoidable LEGROOM-and-time-constraints on our freedom of action. For instance, we cannot all be at the similar lay or inhabit the similar piece of land at the similar time! Accordingly, the Categorical Imperative of moral-practical cause as applicable to our external realm of action contains a law or principle OF right (recht) or justice for CREATION MY FREEDOM of external action compatible with everyone freedom of external action. Kant writes:

- Right is... the totality of circumstances, under which the will of ONE person can be unified with the will of another under a universal law of freedom.

He formulates the Universal Principle of Right (Recht) or Justice as follows:

- Every action is presently THAT in itself or in its maxim is such that the freedom of the will of each can coexist with the freedom of everyone in accordance WITH universal law.

He also gave a variant of the similar law as:

- [ACT externally in such a method that the free use of your will is compatible with everyone JUST AS to a universal law.

This universal law of right (recht) or justice is a "juridical law," which, unlike an "ethical LAW" (which regulates our "inner world" of thoughts, motivations, etc.), LEGITIMIZES, in accordance with the Categorical Imperative, the use of coercion for its implementation. He writes:

- [My] external and rightful freedom should be defined as a warrant to obey no external laws except those to which I have been able to provide my own consent. Likewise, external and rightful equality within a state is that connection in the middle of
citizens whereby NO one can put anyone else under a legal OBLIGATION without submitting simultaneously to a law which requires that he can himself be put under the similar type of obligation through the other person.

Kant goes to the extent of saying that his universal principle of justice or right (recht) has a conjoint principle, which regards as presently the resort to "universal reciprocal coercion with the freedom of others."

PROPERTY, SOCIAL CONTRACT AND THE STATE

As the universal law or principle of external freedom, right/justice morally enables and regulates (even through presently or rightful coercive means) the freedom of human beings in their external, spatial dealings with one another. Just as to Kant, this principle or law yields, or is conjoint with, a "permissive law" or "juridical postulate" of practical cause, which provides to everyone the right of property in any of the things of the world (in accordance with the universal law of right/justice).

In Kant's view, all the non-human things of the world are at the disposal of humanity as a whole, Our freedom to own/use them can be restricted in the light of practical cause's a priori formal, universal law of right/justice, to which all positive, juridical laws necessity conform. Anyone who first occupies or possesses a piece of land, for instance, necessity be assumed to be doing so as part of humanity's "external freedom" in accordance with practical cause's a priori formal law of right. Since the first acquisition of land or things of the world affects the freedom of action of everyone else, its full moral justification cannot rest on a mere unilateral action. Just as to Kant, so, the moral legitimacy of any original appropriation of property remnants provisional until it is ratified through a universal agreement of all who are affected through it. Only such a universal agreement of all who are affected through the original appropriations of property can fulfill the requirement of the Universal Principle of Right/Justice! It is towards the realization of this
ideal requirement of universal Right or Justice that Kant offers his "social contract conceptualization" of the state and of a "pacific union" of states on a global stage.

He speaks of the state as "a union of a multitude of men under laws of Right." Describing the social contract as an thought of cause (rather than as an event), i. E. as an analogue of cause's Categorical Imperative, Kant writes:

- The act through which people shapes itself into a state is the original contract. Properly speaking, the original contract is only the thought of this act, in conditions of which alone we can think of the legitimacy of a state. In accordance with THE original contract, everyone within people provides up his external freedom in order to take it up again immediately as a MEMBER of a commonwealth that is, of a people measured as a state.
- It [The social get in touch with] is in information merely an thought of cause, which nonetheless has undoubted practical reality; for it can oblige every legislator to frame his laws in such a method that they could have BEEN produced through the united will of a whole nation, and to regard each subject, in so distant as he can claim citizenship, as if he had consented with THE common will.

The cause or motivation, which Kant provides for the social contract, is dissimilar from the reasons given through Hobbes and Locke. The motivations they provide is rational self-interest and the fear of violent death (Hobbes) or THE natural right to self-preservation and the protection of property rights (Locke). For Kant, the motivation for the contract is to secure a rational right to property, whereby the contractors could, WITH moral justification, exclude others FROM access to it, to which they (i. E. the contractors) only had a provisional right in the state of nature. He writes:

- From private right in the natural condition there now arises the postulate of public right: In relation to an unavoidable coexistence with others, you should CREATE the transition from the state of nature to a juridical state, i.e., one of distributive justice,

Kant, unlike Hobbes or Locke, thinks of the institution of property as inseparable from the civil He writes:

- But the state of a legislative, universal and truly united will is the civil state. So, something external can be originally acquired only in conventionality with the thought of a civil state, that is, in reference to it and its realization, though before ITS reality (since other wise the acquisition occurs only in the civil state).
Just as to Hobbes, property rights are created through the sovereign state, which is assumed to be self-governing from property. For Locke, property rights in the state of nature are absolute. They are, so to say, self-governing from the state, which only has to guarantee and protect those "natural rights." For Kant, there can be no absolute natural rights to property, presently as there is no state that is self-governing from property. Our right to property, says Kant, can only be legitimate or presently if it is in accordance with the Universal Principle of Right/Justice. Our property rights can so be only provisional until they are ratified both through a civil state and through a peaceful confederation of nations/states of the world.

PERPETUAL PEACE

A distinctive characteristic of Kant's political philosophy is its cosmopolitanism, globalism or internationalism. He does not separate domestic politics from international politics. Paying tribute to the cosmopolitan character of Kant's political philosophy, Wolfgang Kersting writes:

- While Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau were satisfied with overcoming the interpersonal natural condition and allowed the power of political philosophy to end at the border of the state, Kant took political philosophy beyond the borders of states and saw its foremost substance in the "highest political good"... of a presently order of world peace.

Kant whispered that for achieving this "highest political good," namely, perpetual peace in the middle of the nations/states of the world, we have to overcome not only the "natural condition" (or "state of nature") in the middle of individuals within nations or states but also the "natural condition" of anarchy or was-proneness in the middle of the states. In information, he saw these two stages of natural condition to be interrelated.

He maintained that the universal principle of right/justice has to govern not only domestic politics but also international politics. Me writes:

- Moral-practical cause within us pronounces the following irresistible veto: There shall be no war, either flanked by individual human beings in the state of nature, or flanked by separate states, which, although internally law-governed, still live in a lawless condition in their external relationships with one another. For war is not the method in which anyone should pursue his rights... It can indeed be said that this task of
establishing a universal and lasting peace is not presently a part of the theory of right within the limits of pure cause, but its whole ultimate purpose.

- **Kant disapproved** of the reduction of global politics to international diplomatic dealings of governments. He described for re-conceptualizing international society as the global society of mankind.

Kant did admit that there is a distinction flanked by domestic laws and the Law of Nations in that the latter, unlike the former, is concerned both with the connection of one state to another and of individuals in one state to individuals in another and of an individual to another whole state."

Just as to Kant, what raises the human being above the animal world is one's capability for action in accordance with the principles of moral-practical cause. This means that man "is not to be valued merely as a means to the ends of other people, or even to his own ends, but is to be prized as an end in himself". Hence, when principles of political justice are grounded in moral-practical cause, they will help prevent wars, in which there is the mainly blatant use of human beings as means to the ends of others. The autonomy principle of moral-practical cause, says Kant, also calls for a "republican" form of government, under which the citizens will not be treated as the mere apparatus of the sovereigns.

Kant argues that the enlightened or rational individuals know that the hardships of war fall on them, rather than on their rulers, who, in information, tend to gain from conflicts and wars. He assumes that all the citizens of all the countries have a general interest in international peace, while the ruling cliques or regimes tend to have an interest in international conflicts and wars. In his view, so, the democratization or republicanization of governments can contribute to international peace. Since wars bring more dangers and hardships to the ordinary citizens than to their rulers, republican/democratic governments would discover it hard to decide to go to war.

In his essay, *Perpetual Peace* (1795), he wrote that in the interest of perpetual peace, all the nation-states should agree to be guided through three "definitive articles" of peace, namely:

- The states should adopt republican constitutions;
- Republican states should form a "pacific union" or confederation for the prevention of wars;
- The "pacific union" should create and put into practice a cosmopolitan law to ensure "universal hospitality" towards foreigners and to prevent foreign conquests and plunder.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**
• In what way is Immanuel Kant's political philosophy international in character?
• Giving examples explain Kant's idea of 'Categorical Imperative'.
• Explain the Kant’s political ideas on morality.
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the Jeremy Bentham’s life and work.
- Explain the Jeremy Bentham’s political thoughts.

INTRODUCTION

Utilitarianism is essentially a British school of political theory. It consisted of a group of writers, politicians, officers and social reformers. The mainly well-known members of the group are Jeremy Bentham, James Mill and John Stuart Mill. Their primary theoretical interest lay in conceiving a framework of political rules leading to a science of politics. In practice they emphasized on the utmost necessity of legal and social reform and evolving efficient political institutions. Their impact in common and that of Bentham's own efforts at substantial reforms in scrupulous drew substantial popular support. John Stuart Mill's tribute to Bentham as the father of British innovation and as a great critical thinker was justified.
Bentham not only wanted to reform the social and legal institutions of his day, but was also a strong supporter of democratic reform—of universal suffrage, shorter annual Parliaments and the secret ballot. He was the founder of a group described the Philosophical Radicals, who, influenced through the French revolution, and rejecting Burke's condemnation of it, advocated that social institutions should be judged through the principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Any social practice, which did not advance this happiness should be reformed.

**LIFE AND TIMES**

Bentham was born in 1748 in England in the family of a wealthy and successful attorney. After an Oxford education at Queen's College (1760-63), Bentham began attending the London law courts in 1763. In those days, the only method for would-be lawyers to learn in relation to the law was through attending court proceedings; it was Bentham's luck that from some years ago, the University of Oxford had begun organizing a series of lectures on law through William Blackstone. Bentham attended these lectures in 1763, and when Blackstone published his lectures as the well-known *Commentaries* in 1765, Bentham caused quite a stir through writing an very critical commentary on a few paragraphs of this work. Once he began, Bentham never seemed to stop writing, although mainly of his writings were fragmentary. It was his friend, Etienne Dumont, a Genevan, who organized his early writings into a book form, and published them in translation in French as *A Theory of Legislation* in 1802. This work became accessible to Bentham's countrymen only when it had been translated back in to English in the 1820s. In the middle of the writings of Bentham published originally in English are *A Fragment on Government* (1776), *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789) and the *Constitutional Code* (1830). The Code was supposed to be his magnum opus, and he had planned it as a three volume work, but he was able to publish only the first volume in his lifetime.
Bentham was not so much a practicing lawyer as a legal reformer. Mainly of his work was written with the purpose of bringing in relation to the legal and political reform in Britain. He even went to Russia as an adviser to Catherine the Great in 1785 and spent three years there. Back house, in the 1790s, he entered into a contract with the British government to undertake prison reform—to design and build a structure described the Panoptic on—an ideal prison. Very disappointed when this project fell through, lie turned to the reform of political institutions. In 1809 he first met James Mill, who was to become his lifelong associate and jointly they set up, in 1824, the Westminster Review, a journal devoted to the philosophy of Utilitarianism. Bentham died in 1832 while the thrash about for parliamentary reforms was on in England.

Utilitarian Principles

Bentham began the first chapter of An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation therefore: "Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think: a man may pretend to abjure their empire: but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while. The principle of utility recognizes this subjection, and assumes it for the base of that system, the substance of which is to rear the fabric of felicity through the hands of cause and of law."

For Bentham, utilitarianism was both a descriptive and normative theory—it not only described how human beings act so as to maximize pleasure and minimize pain, but it also prescribed or advocated such action. Just as to the principle of utility (or the greatest happiness principle, or the felicity principle) the cause of all human action, that which motivates human beings to act, is a desire for pleasure. Utility or happiness is defined in conditions of pleasure: a thing/action is useful if it brings in relation to the
happiness; that is, pleasure: "Through utility is meant that property in any substance, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good or happiness." A person's interest also has the similar content—That of pleasure—"something is in the interest of a person when it tends to add to the sum total of his pleasures or diminish the sum total of his pains."

In The Principles, Bentham listed fourteen types of easy pleasures that move human beings—including the pleasures of sense, wealth, ability, power, benevolence and malevolence. Diminishing pain also means more pleasure—there are twelve types of pain which individuals seek to avoid—for instance, the pains of the senses, or of an ill name.

Not only do individuals behave in this manner, but they use the evaluative conditions of good and bad to name those behaviors which bring them pleasure or pain. Now this is a location as old as Hobbes. What is new with Bentham and his claim of utilitarianism being a moral theory is the advocacy of such action. What brings in relation to the pleasure is morally good, that which leads to pain is evil and should be avoided, (emphasis added)

Human welfare can only be furthered if individuals maximize pleasure and minimize pain. As early as 1776, in the Preface to the Fragment, Bentham had written: "It is the greatest happiness of the greatest number that is the measure of right and wrong."

What is so moral in relation to the an individual seeking his pleasure? Bentham's answer to the charge of utilitarianism being, instead of a theory of morality, a theory actually of selfish psychological hedonism is that utilitarianism does not propose that one seek only one's own pleasure. In deciding whether to act in a scrupulous manner, one has to be impartial flanked by one's own pleasure and that of all those affected through that act. "...if all happiness is either the happiness of the agent himself or the happiness of others", then we can clearly illustrate that utilitarianism is concerned with the happiness of others. Let us take the instance of punishment—if punishment is to have some utility, and to have utility is to generate happiness,
then punishment is obviously not going to create the person who is being punished happy. It will instead create others happy through creation it less probable that the crime is committed again. It is true that for Bentham the society is a 'fictitious' entity—nothing more than individual members constituting it. "The interest of the society then is...the sum of the interests of the many members who compose it." It remains true, though, that the interests (happiness) of others are to count as much as the interest of oneself.

The context of one's action determines the circle of individuals affected through it. For government officials, all the members of their state are affected through their action, so the government has to calculate the balance of pleasure and pain on a country wide, level. A private individual has to consider only the pleasures and pains of those few directly affected through his action. Therefore the government is concerned in relation to the happiness or welfare of all its citizens, and the individual is to think of the happiness of other persons separately from himself—that is then, what creates utilitarianism a moral theory.

Bentham recognized four common motives for human action. The purely social motive of benevolence moves only a few individuals. Such benevolent individuals pursue the happiness of others even at the cost of their own happiness, An individual acting out of the semi-social motive of love of reputation or praise, pursues others' happiness only when it promotes his own as well. The majority of humankind act out of the asocial motive of self interest, when one's own happiness is pursued, taking care not to cause others pain but not pursuing their happiness either. Finally, there are some individuals moved through dissocial motives, who actually experience pleasure through harming others.

Bentham also provided a calculus for determining the balance flanked by pleasure and pain from any action. Just as to this felicific calculus, one necessity provide a numerical value to the intensity, duration, certainty or uncertainty, and propinquity or remoteness, of the pleasures and pains of the
persons affected through one's actions, and one necessity undertake the action only if the value of the pleasure is higher than the value of the pain. One should also factor in the fecundity of the pleasure producing act, as well as the purity and extent of the pleasure being produced. In calculating pleasure and pain, one necessity be careful to abstract both from the substance which is the source of the pleasure/pain, as well as from the person whose pleasure/pain is being calculated. This means that the pleasures every one is to count as one, and the pleasure from a worthwhile action like writing a history of Egypt is not through definition of higher value than that from gambling with a deck of cards.

Human beings seek happiness, their own and that of others. They ought to seek happiness, their own and of others. To seek, though, is one thing; the question is, how they can attain what they seek. What is required, in common, for human beings to reach the happiness they are searching for? Human happiness, for Bentham, depended on the services men rendered to each other. Government can ensure these services through creating a system of rights and obligations. Political society exists because government is necessary to compel individuals to render services to each other to augment their happiness—this then is how Bentham made the transition from his utilitarianism to his political philosophy.

**BENTHAM'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY**

"Government cannot be exercised without coercion; nor coercion without producing unhappiness," Bentham said. Now, unhappiness is to be avoided, so the only justification for government is that without it more unhappiness would be produced in society. The raison d'etre of government is to attach sanctions to sure unhappiness producing actions so that individual citizens will not be motivated to perform them. Or, the coercion which is, through definition, part of the nature of government, is essential to make a system of rights and obligations to further the welfare of society.
Did Bentham visualize or construct a pre-political state for mankind? Bentham did contrast political society with natural society, defining political society as follows: "When a number of persons (whom we may approach subjects) are supposed to be in the habit of paying obedience to a person, or an assemblage of persons, of a recognized and sure account (whom we may call governors or governors) such persons altogether (subjects and governors) are said to be in a state of political SOCIETY." "When a number of persons are supposed to be in the habit of conversing with each other, at the similar time that they are not in any such habit, they are said to be in a state of natural SOCIETY," was what Bentham had to say in relation to the state of nature. The state of nature is not an asocial or anti-social state. It is an ongoing society, with men in conversation, that is, in interaction with each other. For Bentham there was no pure state or nature or political society, but there was a continuum flanked by the two: "Governments accordingly, in proportion as the habit of obedience is more perfect, recede from, in proportion as it is less perfect, approach to a state of nature..."

The common end of government is the greatest happiness of the greatest number. In specific conditions, the ends of government are "survival, abundance, security, and equality; each maximized, in so distant as it is compatible with the maximization of the rest." Bentham defined survival as the absence of everything leading to positive physical suffering. He advised the government to encourage industrialization to generate employment so that each individual could seem after his own survival, But if an individual was unable to do so, the government was to set up a general finance from contributions from the rich, for the well being of the poor.

If survival keeps the citizens from being unhappy, abundance is necessary to maximize their happiness. Through ensuring prosperity, that is, surplus wealth in the hands of individuals after their vital needs are met, the government encourages the citizens to fulfill all their desires. Bentham thought that affluence could best be increased through guaranteeing to each
man the due reward of his work and security of his possessions. The state should also encourage the invention of new apparatus and gadgets, and offer rewards, for socially useful inventions; it should develop technological manpower, and encourage thrift and hard work. "Above all it should fight those characteristics of religious thought that encourage men to despise comforts and luxuries."

For Bentham, security had many components—the security of person, of property, of power, of reputation, and of condition of life. Through the latter, Bentham meant something like social status. Every citizen's security, in each of these characteristics, was to be provided for through the government; security of property, for instance, is provided through seeing to it that valid contracts are kept through everyone.

Bentham was concerned in relation to the four types of inequality—moral, intellectual, economic and political. He did not propose any events to reduce moral and intellectual inequalities, but inequalities of wealth and power were to be mitigated. Differences flanked by the rich and the poor were to be evened out—"the more remote from equality are the shares possessed through the individuals in question, in the mass of the instruments of felicity, the less is the sum of felicity, produced through the sum of those similar shares" but not at the cost of the security of property. Inequalities of power could be "minimized through reducing the amount of power attached to public offices to the barest minimum, through declaring every sane adult eligible for them, and through creation their incumbents accountable to those subject to their power."

The last service to be provided through the government was that of encouraging benevolence in the citizen body so that every member of the body politic voluntarily, and with enjoyment performed the 'countless small services' of which the fabric of the felicity of society was built. The government could, for instance, "fight the religious and sectarian prejudices
which limit men's sympathies and incline them to treat outsiders as less than fully human."

So distant, we looked at how the government fulfills its goals in specific methods. What is more significant, is Bentham's theory of how the government reaches its goals in common. Bentham whispered man to be a creature so dependent on others for his well being that human life would be miserable and even impossible if men did not render several kinds of services to one another...society is ultimately only a system of services men render one another. Government creates sure of these services through creating a system of obligations and rights. It does this through putting in lay a system of offences with their corresponding punishments: it is a punishable offence, for instance, not to pay one's taxes; it is a punishable offence to steal someone else's money. These punishable offences ground the services men render each other—the positive service, or obligation, of contributing to the finance of general possessions, or the negative service, or obligation of not interfering with someone's right to property. These services, or obligations, in turn, then ground everybody's rights—my right to property, or my right to survival. Each right only exists because of a corresponding obligation, and the government is to be extremely careful in specifying these obligations. "My rights may or may not be a source of pleasure to me, but the corresponding obligations they impose on others are sure sources of pain to them. The government so should never make rights, 'instruments of felicity' though they are, unless it can be absolutely sure that their probable advantages would more than compensate for their sure disadvantages."

In a political society the sovereign can get the citizens to act as he wants through two methods, through influencing their will, which Bentham calls impetration, and through the threat of corporeal punishment, which Bentham calls contestation. Although the former power is based on the latter, creation the latter the foundation of the sovereign's sovereignty, Bentham
points out that a political society based on impetration is stabler and longer lasting than a society based on contestation.

How is one to ensure that the government will make that system of rights and obligations, which will best fulfill the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Bentham's utilitarianism led him to consider that the government that would best serve the people's interests would be the democratic form of government. Only in such a government could a harmony flanked by the interests of the governed and those in government be engineered. In a democracy, what would maximize the happiness of the rulers is to be returned to office, and they know that the best chance of this happening is if they maximize the happiness, or in other languages, seem after the welfare and interests of the ruled. They know that if they go against the interests of the ruled, they will be voted out of office. From this argument, Bentham logically derived the following: the right of every adult to vote, frequent national elections, as frequent as one every year, transparency of government business which meant a free press, unlimited access to government offices, and the right to attend legislative sessions. "Once annual election, universal franchise, and fullest publicity are recognized, no government, Bentham thinks, would ever 'dream' of pursuing its interest at the cost of that of the society."

THE PANOPTICON

The Panopticon is the name that Bentham gave to a model prison that he intended for the British government in the 1790s. A piece of land was bought through the government, on which Bentham was to supervise the construction of the new prison. Though, much to Bentham's disappointment, approximately the year 1802, the project fell through.

The design of the Panopticon was to serve as a model for any disciplinary institution — not presently a jail home, but any school, hospital, factory and military barracks could have the similar structure as well. The
thought of the Panopticon has become significant again today with Foucault crediting Bentham with creating a new technology of power. The Panopticon symbolizes "one central moment in the history of repression — the transition from the inflicting of penalties to the imposition of surveillance." This is how Foucault describes the architecture of the prison structure: "A perimeter structure in the form of a ring. At the centre of this, a tower pierced through big windows opening on to the inner face of the ring. The outer structure is divided into cells each of which traverses the whole thickness of the structure. These cells have two windows, one opening on to the inside, facing the windows of the central tower, the other, outer one allowing daylight to pass through the whole cell. All that is then needed is to put an overseer in the tower and lay in each of the cells a lunatic, a patient, a convict, a worker or a school boy. The back lighting enables one to pick out from the central tower the little captive silhouettes in the ring of cells. In short, the principle of the dungeon is reversed; daylight and the overseer's gaze capture the inmate more effectively." The prisoners, who have no get in touch with each other, feel as if they are under the constant watch of the guards. "There is no require for arms, physical violence, material constraints. Presently a gaze. An inspecting gaze whom each individual under its weight will end through interiorizing to the point that lie is his own overseer, each individual therefore exercising this surveillance in excess of, and against, himself."

To have overthrown the feudal or monarchical form of power and replaced it with a new model of contemporary shapes of power, is to have brought in relation to the a revolution in political theory, even if one is infamous for doing so. Critics of liberalism Have often claimed that the connection flanked by the government and the citizens, for liberal theorists, approximately mirrors the Panopticon. Liberalism devalues horizontal links flanked by citizens—what unites a citizen body is each individual's separate political obligation to obey the government. Although liberalism claims to ground the government in the consent of the governed, this consent is, just as
to critics, (as the Panopticon model shows) only a mythical or manufactured consent.

Fellow liberals, who are from the rights based custom of liberalism, have also criticized some of the vital tenets of utilitarianism. Kymlicka, for instance, has pointed out that Bentham was wrong in thinking that human beings only seem for, or should only seem for, pleasure. If an individual could hook himself to a machine which constantly generated sensations of pleasure, without having to do anything else, that would not satisfy that person. Human beings seek to undertake sure behaviors for the sake of those behaviors, not only for the pleasurable sensations they get from doing them.

Bentham like all the other significant political thinkers was a child of his times. It is true that the essential foundation of his utilitarian ethics was self-interest, egoism and individualism. Though the society for him was a fictitious body, yet one significant purpose of legislation was to enhance the pleasure of others, presently not of one self which means convergence of private with public interest. Bentham was opposed to any type of oppression and brutality and he understood that the mainly significant is to begin with reform of the legal system to create it efficient, clear, transparent and easy. His humanism is writ big in all his works and the first major reform that brought in democracy in Britain was the Reform Act of 1832 which was made possible mainly due to his untiring efforts.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Why did Bentham call the theory of natural rights nonsense upon stilts?
- What do some commentators mean when they claim that Bentham's Panopticon represents a radically new form of power?
- Is there any difference between Bentham’s ideas of happiness and the Greek notion of eudaemonia?
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES
After reading this chapter, you should be able to:
- Understand the Alexis De Tocqueville life and work.
- Explain the Alexis De Tocqueville political ideas.

INTRODUCTION
Sheldon Wolin has pointed out that The Federalist Papers (1787-88) and Democracy in America (1835) are the two classics in American political theory. While the former symbolizes the thinking of the founding fathers of the American Republic, the latter "is invoked more often in support of some interpretation of present day American politics". The author of Democracy in America, Charles-Alexis Henri Clerel de Tocqueville (1805-59) was one of the mainly imaginative French political theorists, sociologist and a historian of the 19th Century. His writings reflected the concerns of a historian, a political scientist and a sociologist creation it hard to categories these. Tocqueville was concerned with the future of the democratic society and was conscious of the tumultuous social changes that his times produced and the impact it had. He
understood democracy as an unstoppable march towards equality in all its dimensions—legal, political, social and economic.

Tocqueville beside with his friend Gustave de Beaumont (1802-65) visited America in 1831 to revise its democratic institutions and draw lessons for France and penned them down in two volumes entitled Democracy in America. He analyzed the federal constitution, the question of people's sovereignty, the role of the constitution and warned in relation to the tyranny of the majority, a theme, that John Stuart Mill (1806-73) subsequently urbanized. He could grasp the new and universal trend, namely the desire for equality and its intricate connection with individual liberty and democracy. He stressed on the importance of local self-government, decentralized administration, widespread ownership of property and voluntary associations for maintenance of political liberties, stability of government and protection against the tyranny of the majority. Like Charles-Louis de Secondat Montesquieu (1 689-1755) lie admired English political institutions and the English aristocracy. Unlike France, the English aristocracy constantly renewed itself and was in a location to wield its power through proper exercise of political experience and wisdom. He could perceive the momentous changes sweeping his time, which was why he described it as the end of an era and a beginning of a new one. Both Montesquieu and Tocqueville dissected the merits and demerits of the dissimilar shapes of governments not in an abstract timeless sense but in its historical, political and social contexts.

Tocqueville, just as to J.S. Mill was the first to write in relation to the democracy and its actual functioning in the belief that it could become a viable political system. An aristocrat, Tocqueville became a liberal while learning and writing in relation to the American democracy. He measured freedom or liberty as the core political value, which stood threatened through the lethal combination of political democracy and social equality, Democracy in America is measured as the "best ever written work on democracy and the best
book ever written on America”. Tocqueville measured America to be at the forefront of a great democratic revolution and that it would bring to Europe an approximately complete equality of condition like the one that lived in the New World. His aim was to describe the impact of democratic social circumstances not only on politics but also ‘on civil society, on habits, thoughts, and mores’. He did not think it was necessary for Europe to imitate American political institutions but stressed that the revise of America would yield instruction from which Europe could gain.

An analysis of the writings of Tocqueville does not allow us to basically conclude that he was an aristocratic reactionary. Curtis labeled him as an aristocratic conservative, while Kirk regarded him as a liberal conservative in the similar custom as Edmund Burke (1729-97). In Tocqueville’s writings one discovers both liberal and conservative dimensions. His passion for freedom and its protection and the desire to protect property rights symbolize the liberal tendencies. As a conservative he was the first to caution against the dangers in relation to the too much of democracy.

**ON DEMOCRACY, REVOLUTION AND THE CONTEMPORARY STATE**

Tocqueville accepted that there have been healthy aristocracies. But the French landed nobility was undermined through the policies of the absolutist monarchs who had centralized the government tools and excluded the old aristocracy from provincial administration. The aristocracy had its privileges but without any link flanked by duty and privileges. Tocqueville regarded the link of interdependence and obligation flanked by social groups as of crucial significance. He often compared the French nobility with their counterpart in England and praised the latter’s modest and low key profile which allowed their sustained participation in local administration and politics
throughout the 19th Century. Tocqueville was equally critical of the Irish aristocracy, usually absentee landlords who remained unconcerned in relation to the plight of their tenants. He concluded that an aristocracy once dislodged could never be restored.

Though Tocqueville disliked revolutions yet he offered a balanced view. He conceded that “while one great revolution may set up liberty in a country, many revolutions in succession create orderly liberty impossible there for a extensive time”. He disliked the reign of terror and despotism of the French Revolution. Our Economists had a vast contempt for the past. “The nation has been governed” Letronne declared, ”on wrong rows altogether; one has the impression that everything was left to chance”. Starting out from this premise, they set to work and there was no French institution, though venerable and well founded, for whose immediate suppression they did not clamor if it hampered them to even the slightest extent or did not fit in with their neatly ordered scheme of government.

When we closely revise the French Revolution we discover that it was mannered in precisely the similar spirit as that which gave rise to so several books expounding theories of government in the abstract. Our revolutionaries had the similar fondness for broad generalizations, cut-and-dehydrated legislative systems, and a pedantic symmetry; the similar contempt for hard facts; the similar taste for reshaping institutions on novel, ingenious, original rows; the similar desire to reconstruct the whole system instead of trying to rectify its faulty parts. He did not, like Burke criticize the French Revolution in its totality for he approved of its commitment to freedom and equality. But what he disapproved was the subsequent stress on extreme equality that undermined liberty and human greatness.

Though lie proclaimed himself to be an aristocrat through instinct, one which despised and feared the masses he was prepared to accept the defeat of his class as inevitable. He described his age as a new one characterized through a desire for equality, a movement that was ardent, insatiable, incessant
and invincible. America for him symbolized this new universal trend. He was worried that this passion for equality would lead to uniformity, which would eventually destroy liberty. The power of public opinion led to conventionality rather than individuality, mediocrity rather than excellence, materialism rather than spiritualism.

Tocqueville took note of the widespread respect for the rule of law in America whereas in France arbitrary rule had only encouraged contempt for the law. In America and England local self-governing institutions were strong whereas in France the sale of municipal offices through the Crown had weakened the custom. In America people naturally shaped associations and groups whereas in France, individualism and reliance on omniscience of central government were much stronger. In America there was no fear from an elected chief executive since the constitution not only limited the powers of the government but also had an elaborate mechanism of checks and balance to counter any excess. In France, through contrast, the extensive recognized custom of centralized administrative power and a weak legislature made the elected president at the head of the executive a threat to liberty.

As a sociologist Tocqueville took interest in the ethos of society and pointed to the contractual nature of contemporary relationships without any moral obligations or human affections. He understood the role of the state as one that would unify all special interests of the several social classes into a whole body politic. He could see the require for an adequate and equitable system of taxation if the state had to last for extensive. His insights into the economic foundations of the contemporary state enabled him to brilliantly analyze the character of the absolutist state. In L’ancien regime et al Revolution (1856) he discussed in detail the unfair sharing of taxes and services in the middle of the classes with the peasantry bearing the brunt. The absolutist state was made possible when the king liberated himself from constitutional institutions such as estates or parliaments in order to become
free and self-governing to raise taxes for his own military or domestic projects.

Tocqueville was also careful in relation to the spread of democracy. He understood democracy to mean not only increased political participation but also civic and social equality. The abrogation of privileges was a means to an inevitable trend to the creation of an egalitarian society. The consequences of this change were momentous. Removal of social barrier led to new innovations. It also meant constant change within the social structure, as in a democratic society, unlike its precursors, there would be absence of natural leaders. Individuals would have to fight for political location on the foundation of interests rather than privileges. The passion for equality would lead to social leveling eroding any differences in the middle of human beings. Equality conferred power in excess of public opinion and that meant the rule of the average person in the street. He argued that equal social circumstances could lead to either sovereignty of all or the absolute power of one man. It is, in fostering free and participatory political institutions that lie saw the key to resisting the despotic tendencies inherent in the principle of equality. Tocqueville’s notion of the inevitable progress of equality is similar to the modern notion of modernization. It is a historic procedure that would undermine all traditional or aristocratic political order that did not result in democratic self-government.

Tocqueville defined liberty as absence of external political restrictions. He remained skeptical and fearful of the excessive emphasis on equality. We took note of the threat of the tyranny of the majority’ which would manifest itself in the form of intolerance of individual deviation from the social norm. But he was realistic enough to accept the inevitable progress towards equality and attempted to reconcile equality with liberty. His political ideal was freedom under the rule of law. He was insistent that people ought to have as distant as possible direct manage in excess of their own affairs, through vibrant local government and free associations, something that was dissimilar
from decentralization under feudalism. He, like Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) measured strong local institutions as a preventive to arbitrary intervention through central power and the revolutionary subversion of the state, an aspect that the neo-conservatives in the United States revived in the last quarter of the 20th Century.

Through tyranny of the majority in America, Tocqueville did not consider like James Madison (1751-1836) in a permanent and deep division in the society flanked by majority and minority but a widespread consensus in the middle of citizens who rarely felt that laws enacted through the majority were arbitrary or unjustly coercive. Equal political rights and active participation in the political procedure gave individuals "an equal love and respect for the laws of which they consider themselves the author". Besides political equality there was social equality, which was so widespread that it underpinned the thought of majority rule. He also pointed to the issue of uniformity considering it in the middle of the undesirable characteristics of American life. He observed that unlike Europe there was presently one society in America. "It may be either rich or poor, humble or brilliant, trading or agriculture; but it is composed everywhere of the similar elements. The plane of uniform civilization has passed in excess of it. The man you left in New York you discover again in approximately impenetrable solitude: similar clothes, similar attitude, similar language, similar habits, similar pleasures". Tocqueville attributed this striking uniformity to the spirit of equality that made possible stable society life. The problem of uniformity was not a political one. Government and laws were seldom used for oppression and coercion as there was no separate and separate group of citizens to coerce and oppress. Neither was majority rule a source of power and despotism. Instead what it ensured was that fundamental differences did not arise within the society. What Tocqueville feared was the ‘moral power' of the public opinion in America, which not only regulated people's actions but also molded their extremely nature as well. He also noted with appreciation the extent of
uniformity as it seemed to suggest that the majority of spirits were joined jointly in the expression of sure common opinions. Though, this uniformity and harmony indicated a voluntary, tyranny. Besides uniformity, there lived profound separation and dependence that made possible for psychic coercion and thereby reinforced the uniformity inherent in an egalitarian society. He also observed that the old categories of political thought were inadequate to deal with this new state of affairs. Unlike traditional shapes of despotism that oppressed through political coercion the new form is neither political nor overtly oppressive. It is social in nature. J. S. Mill took note of this observation and incorporated it in his arguments for freedom of individuality, his critique of majority power and egalitarianism in his treatise On Liberty (1859), Mill whispered that if people had the right thought in relation to the democracy then the tyranny of the majority that Tocqueville warned in relation to the could be abated. Unlike Tocqueville, Mill was sanguine that if the best minds could ensure their ascendancy through calling for democracy, for democracy accompanied through representation, would not threaten to induce debasement of intelligence or cultural deprivation, Representative democracy would ensure a free society without a dominant power. Unlike Tocqueville who eulogized the aristocracy Mill regarded it as a menace to the progress of civilization.

Tocqueville, like Montesquieu measured commerce as the inevitable and appropriate development of rising social equality and individual freedom. Though, he could also perceive the destructive face of unrestrained materialism and the hazards of excessive economic inequality, He pointed to the twin dangers of the connection flanked by democracy and equality that would result in 'tyranny of the majority' and also whether democracy was enough to overcome the powerful in egalitarian tendency latent in the development of capitalism.
Tocqueville regarded slavery as not only inhuman but also contrary to the enlightened self-interest of the slave owners themselves. He rejected Joseph-Arthur Gobineau’s (1816-82) thought of racial hierarchy and warned against the selective misuse of the thesis, like the anti-abolitionist leaders in America who argued that the blacks were dissimilar and inferior but suppressed the proposition that the Anglo-Saxon race was also on the decline. He measured racial hierarchy as another form of aristocracy that was destined to crumble through the onslaught of democracy and social equality.

RELIGION

The 16th Century as exemplified in the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) is acknowledged to be the beginning of secular politics in Europe. Machiavelli though anti-Church and anti-clergy measured religion as necessary for individual's social life and for the health and prosperity of the state. Religion beside with good laws and a well-disciplined citizen militia would produce order, which in turn brings forth peace, fortune and success. As a social force, religion played a pivotal role for through its doctrine of rewards and punishment it induced proper behaviour and good conduct that was necessary for the wellbeing of society. While Machiavelli understood that religion was socially useful he could not comprehend its intrinsic link with liberty, a theme that Tocqueville succinctly urbanized in opposition to the mainstream Enlightenment credo to uphold cause and liberty through being anti-religion.

The striking originality of Tocqueville lies in recognizing the extraordinary importance religion played in strengthening democracy in America. Me measured religion as a 'political institution' and vital to the preservation of freedom in a democratic society particularly from the despotic tendencies that equality of circumstances unleashed. He observed: “despotism may govern without religion... liberty cannot”. Democracy, because of equality of circumstances needed moral lies and hence needed religion. He
pointed to the utility of religion rather than the truth of any one religion. This extraordinary emphasis on religion was because he regarded it to be crucial to establishing democracy in France and other Christian states of Europe. He concluded that due to the variance flanked by “the spirit of religion" and "the spirit of freedom" democracy failed in Europe. The alliance flanked by the Catholic Church and the French monarchy, although injurious to religion in itself, was feature of a more calamitous alliance flanked by Christianity and the moribund aristocracy. The Church measured democracy to be antithetical to religion and consequently an enemy. In America the two were closely connected which explained the success of democracy there.

America, the nascent Puritan commonwealth rejected Europe's aristocratic heritage and accepted the principles of democracy. The Puritans brought to the New World a Christianity that was democratic, constitutional and republican. They introduced such principles as the participation through the people to rule, the free voting in matters of taxation, fixing the responsibility of political representatives, guarding personal liberty and trial through jury. They instilled a love of freedom anchored in religious conviction through teaching Americans that their freedom is a gift from God and so had to be taken seriously and used wisely. Christianity associated itself with the principles of liberal democracy that it initiated to make, and hence could hope for an autonomous legroom that was both enduring and timeless.

Historically, for Tocqueville democracy began when Jesus unequivocally proclaimed universal human equality thereby creation the realization of democracy possible. Furthermore the Christian teaching that was significant for a democratic society was the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Religion taught human beings to strive for eternal happiness through resisting "the selfish passions of the hour" and therefore democratic individuals would learn that only through persistence and hard work something permanent could be attained in both private and public spheres. They acquired the art of managing their life. Through believing in “super
sensual and immortal principles" they learnt to focus on the spiritual rather than the base and therefore develop an instinctive love for liberty. At a first glance it appeared that religion was divorced from American politics. The clergy restricted their sovereignty to religious matters and did not criticize the fundamental principles of the republic. Though, in reality they actively promoted them. Tocqueville felt that if Christianity did not exercise such self-restraint then it ran the risk of not getting marginalized. American clergy not only accepted the supreme power of self-interest but also enlisted the selfish passion for the service of religion. They showed in their congregations that Christian virtues were compatible with freedom and prosperity as well as salvation therefore bringing both the head and heart to the altar. Furthermore, the dictum “the things that are Caesar's" and "the things that are not Caesar's" made it mandatory that no political or military power could enjoy complete power in excess of human beings. This was the primary cause for the end of European feudalism.

Tocqueville, though himself a practicing Catholic, acknowledged, like Max Weber (1864-1920) later, that the Protestant Ethic encouraged individualism and freedom but with proper respect for political power. With greater social equality and the support of the middle class, this spirit extended to democracy. The combination of all these factors led to the American success with a harmonious development of both Christianity and democracy in America. Interestingly, this unique attainment of America has been made possible through realizing the principle of separation of the Church and the state. This has prevented the consolidation of vested religious interests' in scrupulous political parties and groups as has happened in Europe. In America there was a harmonious coexistence of religion and democracy. In information, democracy facilitates the spread of religion through guaranteeing the right of religious beliefs. All religious faiths gained through political liberty and consequently religion also supports the separation of state and Church.
Besides religion the second significant factor conducive for democracy in America was equality of circumstances. Interestingly, this attribute through itself did not lead to freedom and was compatible with a new type of despotism made possible through the forces of individualism and materialism that democracy unleashed. While old aristocracies with its hierarchical class structures allowed people to forge firm and lasting political ties democracies with its doctrine of equality loosened those bonds. Big number of human beings became economically self-governing and as a result wrongly assumed that they had complete manage of their destinies. This false sense of independence changed the sentiments of obligation that aristocracy fostered into radical self-interest.

Religion appeared as the savior of democracy through checking this degeneration. Tocqueville conceded that religion might not be able to contain the whole urge of individualism and the pursuit of well being, but was the only mechanism of moderation and education. He saw religion sustaining moderate individualism with drive for material prosperity, both of which were essential for the success of democracy. Instead of seeing religion as an antithesis of human liberation as Karl Heinrich Mars (1818-83) did, Tocqueville felt a happy blending of democracy and religion was possible and desirable.

Tocqueville was categorical that democracy did not rest on either constitutional arrangements or laws but on mores of society, which embraced both habits and opinions made possible through religion for it inculcated moral habits, with respect for all human beings. This was necessary in a free society in the absence of political manage. This was the essence of the success of American religion. In contrast in Europe the champions of human freedom attacked religious opinions not realizing that without religious faith despotism was inevitable and liberty unrealizable. The lack of self-restraint due to destruction of faith led to the reign of terror after the French Revolution. In the absence of religion, atheism and tyranny would be the fate of all contemporary democracies.
A successful political democracy has to be grounded on moral institutions, which means religious faith. The dynamics of the democratic procedure and its interaction with society at big minimizes theological thoughts and the otherworldly attitude that religion fosters. The version to democratic life means religion would have to accept the philosophies of well being and prosperity. In return religion purifies and regulates through emphasizing honest means to reach these ends. The greatest advantage of religion is moderation and self-manage. The fine balance of democracy and religion and its uninterrupted success in America contrasted with the stark failure of irreligious communism provides credence to Tocqueville's analysis.

**WOMEN AND FAMILY**

Like Mary Wollstonecraft (17-59-97), Tocqueville attacked the institution of arranged marriages for it encouraged loose sexual morals thereby undermining personal freedom. He is critical of the French Revolution which might have democratized the country's political life but failed to make a civilization of freedom. He was impressed with the high stage of sexual morality in America which was seen as a private affair buttressed through religion particularly Christianity rather than political traditions. The sexual code as outlined through the Christian ethics incorporated virginity outside of marriage, continence and fidelity within marriage, and strict avoidance of all shapes of license. Besides religion other factors like racial makeup, climate, social condition and role of statesmanship also played a important role. Marriages in America were not arranged and that enabled women to enjoy personal happiness and sexual connection based on mutual respect and love. Marital freedom guaranteed a high stage of chastity.

For Tocqueville Americans educated their women through giving them freedom rather than exerting parental power. Americans valued chastity because it promoted healthy commercial habits, kept families productive and helped in maintaining political stability, the key to prosperity proving that
chastity was not due to religion alone but also had its secular origins. This was not the case with European women. Nevertheless they enjoyed unprecedented equality with their spouses for marriage was a contract flanked by two mature, morally responsible and free adults. Tocqueville observed that American women despite their lack of formal political power were able to contribute to America's freedom and prosperity because of the dignity and freedom in their personal lives.

In America there was no adultery or crimes against women. In the 1830s women could fearlessly undertake extensive journeys alone. Men also adhered to the sexual morals partly due to marital freedom and restraints imposed through an articulate public opinion, and partly due to their ambition to pursue wealth creation them practical, non-erotic and busy, Tocqueville regarded prostitution as a regrettable but wise concession keeping in mind the lust of the male.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Discuss Tocqueville views on democracy, revolution and the modern state.
- What role did religion play in politics according to Tocqueville?
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J. S. MILL
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the Mill’s life and work.
- Explain the Mill’s political thoughts.

INTRODUCTION

The economic principles of utilitarianism were essentially provided through Adam Smith's classic work *The Wealth of Nations* published in 1776. The political principles of classical utilitarianism mainly appeared out of Bentham's application of rationalistic approach and his deep suspicion of "sinister interests" of all those entrenched in power and as a counter check he advocated annual elections, secret ballot and recall. But the Benthamite presumption of a mechanical formula of quantifying all pleasures and all pains equally exemplified through his well-known uttering 'pushpin is as good as poetry' could not satisfy his mainly well-known pupil John Stuart Mill who himself
admitted that he was "Peter who denied his master". In his writings the first great criticism of Benthamite Utilitarianism appeared and with considerable impact of Wordsworth and other romantic poets he tried to work out a synthesis of rationalism and romanticism. In the procedure he transformed the whole underpinning of Benthamite utilitarianism through claiming that pleasures have great differentiation and that all pleasures were not of equal value as a dissatisfaction of a Socrates is more valuable than the satisfaction of a fool.

J. S. Mill's importance lies not only in his criticism of utilitarianism but also in his rich contribution to liberalism through his memorable protection of freedom of speech and individuality and in his protection of a liberal society as a necessary precondition for a liberal state.

**LIFE AND TIMES**

John Stuart Mill was born in London on 20 May 1806. He had eight younger siblings. All his learning came from his father James Mill and he read the books his father had been reading for writing the book on India, History of *British India* (1818). At the age of eleven he began to help his father through reading the proofs of his father's books. Immediately after the publication of *History of British India* James Mill was appointed as an Assistant Examiner at the East India Home. It was a significant event in his life as this solved his financial troubles enabling him to devote his time and attention to write on regions of his prime interest, philosophical and political troubles. He could also conceive of a liberal profession for his eldest son, John Stuart. At the beginning he thought for him a career in law but when another vacancy arose for another Assistant Examiner in 1823, John Stuart got the post and served the British government till his retirement.

As James Mill decided to teach his son all through himself at house, the father was denied the usual experience of going to a regular school. His education did not contain any children's book or toys for he started to learn Greek at the age of four and Latin at eight. Through the time he was ten he had read several of Plato’s dialogues, logic and history. He was familiar with the writings of Euripides, Homer, Polybius, Sophocles and Thucydides. He could solve troubles in algebra, geometry, differential calculus and higher mathematics. So dominant was his father's power that John Stuart could not recollect his mother's contributions to his formative years as a child. At the age of thirteen he was introduced to serious reading of English Classical Economists and published an introductory textbook in economics entitled *Elements of Political Economy* (1820) at the
age of fourteen. From Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834), Isidore Auguste Comte (1798-1857), Goethe (1749-1832), and Wordsworth (1770-1850) he came to value poetry and art. He reviewed Alexis de Tocqueville's (1805-59) *Democracy in America* in two parts in 1835 and 1840, a book that left a thorough impact on him.

From the training that John Stuart received at home he was influenced that nurture more than nature played a crucial role in the formation of character. It also assured him of the importance education could play in transforming human nature. In his *Autobiography*, which he wrote in the 1850s he acknowledged his father's contribution in shaping his mental abilities and physical strength to the extent that he never had a normal boyhood.

Through the age of twenty Mill started to write for newspapers and periodicals. He contributed to every aspect of political theory. His *System of Logic* (1843) which he began writing in 1820s tried to elucidate a coherent philosophy of politics. The *Logic* combined the British empiricist custom of Locke and Hume of associational psychology with a conception of social sciences based on the paradigm of Newtonian physics. His essays *On Liberty* (1859) and *The Subjection of Women* (1869) were classic elaborations of liberal thought on significant issues like law, rights and liberty. His The *Thoughts on Representative Government* (1861) provided an outline of his ideal government based on proportional representation, protection of minorities and institutions of self government.

His well-known pamphlet *Utilitarianism* (1863) endorsed the Benthamite principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, yet made a important departure from the Benthamite assumption through arguing that this principle could only be defended if one distinguished happiness from pleasure. His essays on Bentham and Coleridge written flanked by 1838 and 1840 enabled him to critically dissect Benthamism.

In 1826 Mill experienced 'mental crisis' when he lost all his capability for joy in life. He recovered through discovering romantic poetry of Coleridge and Wordsworth. He also realised the incompleteness of his education, namely the lack of emotional face of life. In his re-examination of Benthamite philosophy he attributed its one-sidedness to Bentham's lack of experience, imagination and emotions. He made use of Coleridge’s poems to broaden Benthamism and made room for emotional, aesthetic and spiritual dimensions. Though he never wavered from the fundamentals of Benthamism though the major variation flanked by them was that Bentham followed a more simplistic
picturisation of human nature of the French utilitarians whereas Mill followed the more sophisticated utilitarianism of Hume.

Mill acknowledged that both *On Liberty* and *The Subjection of Women* was a joint endeavour with Harriet Hardy Taylor whom he met in 1830. Though Harriet was married Mill fell in love with her. The two maintained an intimate but chaste friendship for the after that nineteen years. Harriet's husband John Taylor died in 1849. In 1851 Mill married Harriet and described her the honour and chief blessing of his subsistence, a source of a great inspiration for his attempts to bring in relation to the human improvement. He was confident that had Harriet existed at a time when women had greater opportunities she would have been 'eminent in the middle of the rulers of mankind' Mill died in 1873 at Avignon, England.

**EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN**

The *Subjection of Women* (1869) begins with the revolutionary statement, "the principle which regulates the existing social dealings flanked by the two sexes—the legal subordination of one sex to the other—is wrong in itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement; and... it ought to be replaced through a principle of perfect equality," Mill's referent for the legal subordination of women was the mid 19th Century English law of the marriage contract. Through this law, married Englishwomen could hold no property in their own name, and even if their parents gifted them any property that too belonged to their husbands. Unless a woman was legally separated from her husband, (a hard and expensive procedure) even if she existed absent from him, her earnings belonged officially to him. Through law, only the father and not the mother was the guardian of a couple's children. Mill also cited the absence of laws on marital rape to prove the inequality suffered through the Englishwomen of that time.

What Mill establish paradoxical was that in the contemporary age, when in other regions the principles of liberty and equality were being asserted, they were yet not applied to the condition of women. No one whispered in slavery any more, yet women were sometimes treated worse than slaves and this was accepted as beyond questioning. Mill wanted to explain this resistance to women's equality in the contest of a common acceptance of the principles of equality and liberty. We did so through first presenting and then defeating the arguments for women's subordination, and then providing his own arguments for women’s equality.
The first argument for women's inequality which Mill refuted was that since historically it has been a universal practice, so there necessity be some justification for it. Contra this, Mill showed that other so described universal social practices like slavery, for instance, had been rejected, so perhaps given time women's inequality would also become unacceptable. Mill also said that from the subsistence of something, one could argue for the rightness of that thing, only if the alternative has been tried, and in the case of women, livelihood with them on equal conditions had never been done. The cause why women's inequality had survived slavery and political absolutism was not because it, was justifiable, but because whereas only slave holders and despot had an interest in holding on to slavery and despotism, all men, Mill argued, had an interest in women’s subordination.

A second argument for women’s inequality was based on women’s nature—women were said to be naturally inferior to men. Mill’s response was that one could not create arguments in relation to the women's inequality based on natural differences because these differences were a result of socialisation. Mill was usually against by human nature as a ground for any claim, since he whispered that human nature changed just as to the social environment. At the similar time, Mill also pointed out that in spite of being treated so differently from men, several women throughout history had shown an extraordinary aptitude for political leadership —here Mill cited examples of European queens and Hindu princesses.

The third argument refuted through Mill was that there is nothing wrong with women’s subordination because women accept it voluntarily. Mill pointed out that this claim was empirically wrong—several women had written tracts against women's inequality and hundreds of women were already demonstrating in the streets of London for women's suffrage. Further, since women had choice but to live with their husbands, they were afraid that their complaints in relation to the their location would only lead to worse treatment from them. Lastly, Mill also claimed that since all women were brought up from childhood to consider—“that their ideal of character is the extremely opposite to that of men; not self-will, and government through self-manage, but submission, and yielding to the manage of others,”—what was not to be remarked was that some women accepted this subordination willingly but that so several women resisted it.

The last point against which Mill argued was that for a family to function well, one decision maker is needed, and the husband is best suited to be this decision maker.
Mill scoffed at this argument—the husband and wife being both adults, there was no cause why the husband should take all the decisions.

Having refuted all of these four arguments for women's inequality, Mill wrote: “There are several persons for whom it is not enough that the inequality has no presently or legitimate defence; they require to be told what express advantage would be obtained through abolishing it.” The question was, would society benefit if women were granted equal rights. Answering in the affirmative, Mill detailed four social benefits of women’s equality.

The first advantage would be that the family would no longer be "a school of despotism". Just as to Mill, the patriarchal family teaches all its members how to live in hierarchical relationships, since all power is concentrated in the hands of the husband/father/master whom the wife/children/servants have to obey. For Mill such families are an anachronism in modern democratic polities based on the principle of equality. Individuals who live in such families cannot be good democratic citizens because they do not know how to treat another citizen as an equal: “Any sentiment of freedom which can exist in a man whose adjacent and dearest intimacies are with those of whom he is absolute master, is not the genuine love of freedom, but, what the love of freedom usually was in the ancients and in the middle ages—an intense feeling of the dignity and importance of his own personality; creation him disdain a yoke for himself,...but which he is abundantly ready to impose on others for his own interest or glorification.” In the interests of democratic citizenship then, it was necessary to obtain equality for women in the family.

Another advantage, Mill pointed out, would be the "doubling of the mass of mental faculties" accessible to society. Not only would society benefit because there would be more doctors, engineers, teachers, and scientists (all women); all additional advantage would be that men in the professions would perform better because of competition from their female colleagues.

Third, women enjoying equality will have a better power on mankind. Under dealings of subordination, women assert their wills only in all sorts of perverse methods; with equality, they will no longer require to do this.

Finally, through giving women equal rights, their happiness would be increased manifold, and this would satisfy-Mill argued, the utilitarian principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number.
Note some of Mill's conceptual moves—for instance, the link he recognized flanked by the private and the public. Unlike other liberals, who not only saw the extant family as the realm of freedom, but since this freedom was mostly defined as arbitrariness, disassociated the family as irrelevant to superior public concerns of liberal democracy, Mill argued that without the reform of the patriarchal family, it would be impossible to firmly ground democracy. Note that he was not merely saying that without equal rights to women, ‘the democratic project is partial, but that democracy in the political/public sphere will remain shaky unless we bring up or make democratic citizens in egalitarian families.

What still creates some feminists uncomfortable is that Mill insisted that patriarchal families are an anachronism in modern society: “[t]he social subordination of women therefore stands out as an in accessible information in modern social institutions...a single relic of an old world of thought and practice...” Several feminists now talk in relation to the capitalist patriarchy—the reinforcing of patriarchal institutions through contemporary capitalism.

**THE IMPORTANCE OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY**

*On Liberty* (1859) begins with a paradox—civil liberties are under greater threat in democratic than in despotic regimes, wrote Mill. In the absolutist states of earlier times, the ruler’s interest was seen as opposed to that of the subjects, who were specially vigilant against any encroachment on their existing freedoms. In contemporary democracies based on the principle of self government, the people feel less under threat from their own government. Mill berated this laxity and said that individuals needed to be more vigilant in relation to the the danger to their liberty not only from the government, but also from social morality and custom.

Why is it significant to protect individual liberty? When individuals create their own choices, they use several of their faculties—“The human faculties of perception, judgement, discriminative feeling, mental action, and even moral preference, are exercised only in creation a choice...The mental and moral, like the muscular powers, are improved only through being used...He who chooses his plan for himself, employs all his faculties. He necessity use observation to see, reasoning and judgement to foresee, action to gather materials for decision, discrimination to decide, and when he has decided, firmness and self-manage to hold to his deliberate decision.” Individuals who act in a sure fashion only because they have been told to do so, do not develop any of these faculties.
Emphasising that what is significant is "not only what men do, but also what manner of men they are that do it", Mill said that we might be able to 'guide' individuals in 'some good path'—without allowing them to create any choices, but the 'worth' of such human beings would be doubtful.

Mill clarified and detailed his location on liberty through defending three specific liberties, the liberty of thought and expression including the liberty of speaking and publishing, the liberty of action and that of association. We will follow Mill's argument in each of these cases.

Liberty of thought and expression: “If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind.” Mill provided four reasons for this freedom of expression. For Mill, since the dominant thoughts of a society usually emanate from the class interests of that society's ascendant class, the majority opinion may be quite distant from the truth or from the social interest. It's more than likely that the suppressed minority opinion is true, and that suppressing it will only prevent or at least delay mankind from knowing the truth. Human beings are fallible creatures—and their certainty that the opinion they hold is true is justified only when their opinion is constantly opposed to contrary opinions. Mill wanted us to provide up the assumption of infallibility—when our certainty in relation to our beliefs creates us crush all contrary points of view so that our opinion is not subject to criticism.

What if the minority opinion were false? Mill gave three reasons for why it should still be allowed freedom of expression. It's only through constantly being able to refute wrong opinions, that we hold our correct opinions as livelihood truths. If we accept an opinion, even if correct, on the foundation of power alone, that opinion becomes a dead dogma. Neither do we understand its grounds, and nor does it mould our character or move us to action. Finally Mill argued that truth is a multifaceted thing and usually contrary opinions both contain a part of the truth. Suppressing one opinion then, leads to the suppression of one part of the truth.

When it comes to the liberty of action, Mill asserted a extremely easy principle: "the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection...the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised in excess of any member of a civilised society, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is
not a enough warrant." Mill acknowledged that it was hard to draw a row flanked by self-concerning and other concerning action, and he provided some hypothetical examples as proof of this difficulty. If a man destroys his own property, this is a case of other concerning action because others dependent on that man will be affected. Even if this person has no dependants, his action can be said to affect others, who, influenced through his instance, might behave in a similar manner.

Against this, Mill said that only when one has specific obligations to another person, can one be said to affect his or her interests; so the case of an individual affecting others through his instance will not stand. On his own ground, Mill cited all kinds of restrictions on not eating pork or beef, or priests being required not to marry, as examples of unnecessary restrictions on self-concerning action. Other examples are Sabbatarian legislation which prevents individuals from working or even singing and dancing on Sundays.

Mill wrote that sometimes even in the case of other concerning action, no restrictions can be placed on one—for instance, if one wins a job through competition, this action can be said to affect others' interests through ensuring that they do not get the job, but no restrictions are applicable here. Likewise, trade has social consequences, but believing in the principle of free trade, Mill argued that lack of restrictions on trade actually leads to better pricing and better excellence of products. And when it comes to self-concerning action, as we already showed, the principle of liberty requires the absence of all restrictions.

Mill defended freedom of association on three grounds. First, "when the thing to be done is likely to be done better through individuals than through government. Speaking usually, there is no one fit to conduct any business, or to determine how or through whom it shall be mannered, as those who are personally interested in it." Second, allowing individuals to get jointly to do something, even if they do not do it as well as the government might have done it, is better for the mental education of these individuals. The right of association becomes, for Mill, a "practical part of the political education of a free people, taking them out of the narrow circle of personal and family selfishness, and customizing them to the comprehension of joint concerns—habituating them to act from public or semi-public motives, and guide their conduct through aims which unite instead of isolating them from one another." Further, government operations tend to be everywhere alike; with individuals and voluntary associations, on the contrary, there are
varied experiments, and endless diversity of experience. Third, if we let the government do everything, there is the evil of adding unnecessarily to its power.

Mill’s ideal was improvement — he wanted individuals to constantly better themselves morally, mentally and materially. It was to this ideal that he saw individual liberty as instrumental: “The only unfailing and permanent source of improvement is liberty, since through it there are as several possible self-governing centres of improvement as there are individuals.” Individuals improving themselves would naturally lead to a better and improved society.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

Mill began his Representative Government through stating that we can only decide which is the best form of government, through examining which form of government fulfils mainly adequately the purposes of government. For Mill, the point of having a government was that it perform two main functions: it necessity use the existing qualities and skills of the citizens to best serve their interests, and it necessity improve the moral, intellectual and active qualities of these citizens. A despotic government may be able to fulfil the first purpose, but will fail in the second. Only a representative government is able to fulfil these two functions. It is a representative government that combines judiciously the two principles of participation and competence which is able to fulfil the two functions of protecting and educating the citizens.

Let us seem more cautiously at what Mill had to say in relation to the the first function of government. Mill began his discussion of this subject through introducing Bentham’s concept of sinister interests. How does representative government ensure that the general interest of society is being furthered instead of the partial and sinister interest of some group or class? Even though Mill distinguished flanked by short term and extensive term interests, he was sure that every individual and every class is the best judge of its own interests. He scoffed at the thought that some human beings may not be aware of their ‘real’ interests, retorting that given these persons’ current habits and dispositions, what they choose are their real interests. It follows then that participation in the political procedure necessity be as extensive as possible, so that every individual has a say in controlling the government and therefore protecting his interests. It is on this foundation that Mill demanded the right to vote for women. He advocated the extension
of the suffrage to cover everyone except those who could not read and write, did not pay taxes or were on parish relief.

It was this similar impetus for wanting everyone to be represented that made Mill support Hare's system of proportional representation for electing deputies to Parliament. Under the current system, Mill pointed out, minorities went unrepresented, and since they too needed to protect their interests, another electoral mechanism should be establish to ensure their representation.

Whereas his belief in participation led him to advocate a widening of the franchise, his belief in competence led him to recommend plural voting. In information, he said that the franchise should not be widened without plural voting being introduced. Plural voting meant that with everyone having at least one vote, some individuals would have more than one vote because they were, for instance, more educated. It assumed a graduated level of educational attainments, awarding at the bottom, one additional vote to a skilled labourer and two to a foreman, and at the top, as several as five to professional men, writers and artists, public functionaries, university graduates and members of learned societies. Plural voting would ensure that a better calibre of deputies would be elected, and so the common interest would not be hampered through the poor excellence of members of Parliament.

Mill sought to combine his two principles in other institutions of representative democracy as well. Take the representative assembly, for instance. Mill said that this body necessity be 'a committee of grievances and 'a congress of opinions'. Every opinion existing in the nation should discover a voice here; that is how every group's interests have a better chance of being protected. At the similar time Mill argued that this body was suited neither for the business of legislation nor of administration. Legislation was to be framed through a Codification Commission made up of a few competent legal experts. Administration should be in the hands of the bureaucracy, an institution characterised through instrumental competence, that is, the skill to discover the mainly efficient means to fulfil given goals. Mill's arguments employed two types of competence—instrumental and moral. Instrumental competence is the skill to discover the best means to sure ends and the skill to identify ends that satisfy individuals' interests as they perceive them. Moral competence is the skill to discern ends that are intrinsically superior for individuals and society. Morally competent leaders are able to recognise the common interest and resist the sinister interests that dwell not only in the government but also in the
democratic majority. The purpose of plural voting is to ensure that morally competent leaders get elected to the legislature.

What in relation to the the other goal of government, that of creation the citizens intellectually and morally better? Again it is a representative government that is based on a combination of participation and competence which is able to improve the excellence of its citizens in the mental, moral and practical characteristics. Let us again seem at some of the specific institutional changes recommended through Mill. He wanted to replace the secret ballot with open voting, that is, everyone necessity know how one has voted. For Mill, the franchise was not one's right in the sense of, for instance, the right to property, which implies that one can dispose of one's property in any arbitrary manner. The franchise is a trust, or a public duty, and one necessity cast one's vote for that candidate whose policies appear to best further the general interest. It is the require to justify one's vote to others that creates the vote an instrument of one's intellectual and moral growth. Otherwise one would use one's vote power voting for instance, for someone because of the colour of his eyes. Everyone necessity have the franchise, but it necessity be open—this is how Mill combined the principle of participation and competence in the suffrage, to ensure the improvement of the voting citizens.

We discover here the motif of improvement again. Representative government scores in excess of despotism not because it better protects the given interests of the citizens, but because it is able to improve these citizens. The citizens develop their capabilities through being able to participate in government, minimally through casting their vote, and also through actually taking decisions in local government. At the similar time, this participation is leavened through the principle of competence to ensure that the political experience does have an educational effect;

**BEYOND UTILITARIANISM**

Having looked separately at three tests, let us bring out some common themes in Mill's writings. Mill never gave up his self-characterisation as a utilitarian, no matter how distant his principles seemed to have moved absent from that creed. When he spoke in relation to the rights, for instance, he subsumed rights under the concept of utility, defining rights as nothing else but some very significant utilities. As we all know, Mill's father, Janies Mill, was the closest associate of Jeremy Bentham, the founder of utilitarianism. J.S. Mill grew up in the shadow of utilitarianism, and even after his emotional crisis in his early twenties, he supervised to write a defence of utilitarianism.
Throughout his work we have seen him applying the standard of utility. One consideration for giving equality to women was that it would augment their happiness. The principle of liberty was defended on the grounds of its social utility—social progress depended on individual freedom. A customized liberal democracy was characterised as the best form of government because of its usefulness.

Utilitarianism (1862) is the slim tract which Mill put jointly to answer all the objections that had been raised against this philosophy. The work begins through Mill pointing out that there has been, in excess of the centuries, little agreement on the criteria of differentiating right from wrong. Rejecting the thought of human beings having a moral sense like our sense of sight or smell, which can sense what is right in concrete cases, Mill put forward the criteria of Utility or the Greatest Happiness principle as the foundation of morality. That action is moral which increases pleasure and diminishes pain. In defending utilitarianism here, Mill made an important change from Bentham’s location. Pleasure is to be counted not only in conditions of quantity but also in terms of excellence. A qualitatively higher pleasure is to count for more than lower pleasures. “It is quite compatible with the principle of utility to recognise the information, that some types of pleasure are more desirable and more valuable than others...It is better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a pig satisfied.”

Having responded to the criticism that utilitarianism assumes an animal like human nature, Mill moved to the after that serious problem. Why would individuals be interested in the happiness of others? Mill answered in terms of the "social feelings of mankind; the desire to be in unity with our fellow creatures; a powerful principle of human nature." Because “the social state is at once so natural, so necessary, and so habitual to man,” Mill whispered that our taking an interest in other's happiness was not questionable at all.

Finally, the only objection that Mill took seriously was that justice instead of utility is the base of morality. Mill's response was first to link justice with rights—an injustice is done when someone's rights are violated—and then to assert that rights are to be defended because of their utility. "To have a right, then, is, to have something which society ought to defend me in the possession of. If the objector goes on to inquire, why it ought? I can provide him no other cause than common utility". A society in which individuals are sure of enjoying their rights is the one, which just as to Mill is able to progress. Therefore rights do not replace the concept of utility; for Mill utility was the justification for rights.
REVIEW QUESTIONS

- How does Mill attempt to subsume justice and rights under the concept of utility’?
- How would you choose between a natural rights and a utilitarian defence of individual liberty?
- What did Mill mean by the statement that "the family is a school of despotism"? Explain his claim that children who grow up in such families cannot be good democratic citizens.
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Explain the Hegel’s work and life.
- Explain the Hegel’s political thoughts.

INTRODUCTION

Hegel was a product of German Idealism, which drew considerable inspiration from Rousseau and Kant and integrated it with modern popular desire for German unification leading to the rise of the nation states in Europe. Hegel like Fichte echoed the sentiment of idealism.

His assertion that the real will of the individual is not in negation but an affirmation with society meant that the rational will of the individual was expressed in the totality of the will of the state. The consciousness and moral power of the state subordinated the individual will. Through the dialectical
logic of a spirit, the march of History moves from the imperfect to the perfect stage rationally removing all the obstacles of acquiring the distinction flanked by 'is' arid 'ought' as real became rational. Though the state is the mainly significant institution of this present ideal, the other two significant components were civil society and the family. Freedom played an significant role in Hegel but Hegelian version of freedom was associated with rationality unlike the thrust of British liberalism, which associated freedom with liberty and individuality.

**LIFE AND TIMES**

Born in 1770 in the princely state of Wurtemberg (Southern Germany), Hegel studied theology because his father wanted him to become a clergyman. In 1793 he got the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) from the University of Tubingon. Thereafter he became a tutor at Bern and Frankfurt and worked as such for in relation to the seven years. In 1801 he got a job as lecturer at the University of Jena and later became a Professor. In 1816 he was appointed Professor of Philosophy at the University of Heidelberg and in 1818 he became Professor of Philosophy at the Berlin University. This location was held till then through the renowned German philosopher Fichte. Beside with this assignment Hegel also worked the official advisor of Emperor of Prussia (Germany). He held these two positions till his death in 1830.

Hegel wrote extensively on several characteristics of Political Philosophy. It was at Jena that he wrote his first major work Phenomenology of Mind, which was published in 1807. This was followed through publication of Science of Logic in 1811-12. After the publication of this work Hegel earned the recognition as an outstanding philosopher of Germany. His third work, Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences, which he wrote throughout his stay at Heidelberg, made him well-known all in excess of Europe. It was at Berlin that he wrote his major work in political theory, Philosophy of Right. He also delivered extremely scholarly and brilliant lectures, which were
published through his son after his death under the title, Philosophy of History. His writings and lectures and his several positions as Advisor of the emperor earned him international fame and won him several followers. He became not only the King of philosophers but also the philosopher of kings.

**SPIRITUAL ANCESTRY**

Hegel’s writings illustrate that many philosophers and thinkers of the past immensely influenced him. Hegel borrowed his dialectical method from Socrates. So the ancestry of Hegelian doctrine of dialectical idealism can be traced back to these two great Greek thinkers of the past. One can also discern some power of Aristotle's teleology on Hegel. Teleology is a theory of knowledge just as to which a thing is understood in conditions of its end or purpose. For instance, the end or purpose of a watch is to tell time. So telling time is the true nature or the true end or purpose of watch. The great German rationalist Immanuel Kant's power is also discernible in Hegel's writings. The Hegelian thought that the state is founded on cause and the laws made through the state are the dictates of pure cause is quite similar to the Kantian location. Like Kant, Hegel did not provide to the individuals the right to resist or oppose the state or the laws made through it. There are even traces of Rousseau's power on Hegel. Like Rousseau's Common Will, the Hegelian Thought, Spirit or Cause is infallible. Again like Rousseau, Hegel provides primacy to public interest in excess of the private interest. You would recall that Rousseau had drawn a distinction flanked by the actual will and the real will. To put it in Hegelian conditions, Rousseau’s actual will is that which promotes the self-interest of the individual while the real will is that which promotes the public interest. Because the common will is the condensation or the sum total of all the real wills (based on cause) it is infallible.

Hegel’s philosophy was historicist in nature. Historicism is a doctrine, which is variously understood through dissimilar thinkers. In its mainly common sense it is rooted in the assumption that there are limits to scientific
knowledge in relation to the human behaviors and achievements and such inadequate scientific knowledge cannot be used as a means for controlling the future course of events. Contrary to this, historicism is connected to ambitions for subjecting all human happenings to rational manage.

**Power of Historical Events**

In the previous part some of the major powers on Hegel have been spelled out; but Hegel was not influenced only through the great thinkers of past. Some major modern events also influenced him. Two events which exercised considerable power on Hegel were the French Revolution (1789) and the subjugation of Germany through Napoleon in the beginning of the 19th Century. French Revolution overthrew the old oppressive feudal order and projected the vision of a new society wedded to the values of liberty, equality and fraternity. The values of liberty and fraternity pal titularly influenced his writings. The subjugation of the German state through Napoleon disillusioned him and he set out to resolve the perennial political troubles of the states. The reconciliation that he advocated in his writings is unique and paradoxical in several compliments.

Before we take up an analysis of Hegel’s political philosophy it is necessary for us to bear in mind that although he borrowed several of his thoughts from Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, Kant and Rousseau, he used them to evolve his own philosophy. He assimilated their thoughts in his logical system. In other languages, the Hegelian political philosophy stands separately from each of them.

**IDEALISM**

In the history of political thoughts there are two major schools of thought in relation to the nature of reality — idealism and naturally, rationalism and empiricism. The question in relation to the that nature of reality is ontological; while the question in relation to the knowing it is
epistemological just as to the Idealist school, of which Hegel is a major proponent, (the other one being Plato), true knowledge of every thing in the world — material and non material—is deduced from thought of the thing. In other languages, the thought of the thing, is more significant than the thing itself. So, what is real and permanent is the “thought of a thing” not the thing as much. This is so because the physical world is constantly in a state of flux and change but the thought is permanent. The physical world is only a manifestation of the thought. For instance, the true knowledge of table or chair lies in comprehending the thought of table or chair. An actually existing table is a table in so distant as it has the features of table- hood. A carpenter is able to create a table because he has the thought of table in his mind and the table that he creates is only a manifestation or approximation of that thought. The conditions hot and cold are understood as thought. The knowledge of actually existing things is relative and hence imperfect. When you say that water in this glass is hot it is only a relative truth because as compared to boiling water it is cold but as compared to water in the refrigerator it is hot. So the real knowledge is to comprehend the thought of hot and cold.

Hegelian idealism is often referred to as Absolute Idealism because it gives us with a set of categories (hot and cold, pleasure and plain) in conditions of which all human experiences of the past and the present can be understood. There is another dimension of Hegelian idealism. This may be described Idealist Interpretation of History. Just as to this theory it is the thoughts that constitute the true motor of history. What provides momentum to history is the development of thoughts. All changes in society, economy, polity and civilization take lay because of development of thoughts. Hegel’s Idealism which is often described Absolute Idealism sees a sure connection flanked by the subject and the substance. It is a connection flanked by the subject and the substance. It is a connection flanked by a knowing subject and the objective world, which is recognized, i.e. connection flanked by the mind and the world.
Dialectical Method

Hegel’s political philosophies rest mainly on his dialectical method. As already pointed out Hegel borrowed his method from Socrates who is the first exponent of this method. Hegel has himself expressed his debt to Socrates for this method. The dialectic means to talk about. Socrates whispered that one can arrive at the truth only through constant questioning. It was the procedure of exposing contradictions through the method of discussion. Having taken a clue from Socrates Hegel argued that absolute Thought or the Spirit, in search of self-realization moves from Being to non-being to becoming. To put it in easy languages, an thought moves from a thesis to antithesis until a synthesis of the two is establish. Synthesis has in it elements of thesis as well as antithesis. In due course the synthesis itself acquires the status of a thesis and provides rise to its own antithesis. This procedure goes on. In practice, Hegel applied his dialectical method to the domain of thoughts. So, his method may be described as dialectical idealism. It means that every thought (thesis) provides rise to a counter thought (antithesis) and the original thought and counter thought (merge) to provide rise to a new thought (synthesis). This new thought, in due course, itself becomes a thesis and provides rise to its antithesis and the procedure goes on. Hegel argued that through the use of his dialectical method he has exposed the greatest formula in the history of philosophy. He maintained that the march of cause in history was a intricate dialectical procedure. It is a mechanism through which thought propels itself. Dialectical idealism was a logical tools for interpreting the history in its true perspective.

Use of Dialectical Method

Having stated his dialectical method Hegel argued that a phenomenon can be best understood just as to the law of dialectics, i.e. when contrasted with its opposite. Pleasure is best understood in opposition to pain, heat in
opposition to cold, goodness in opposition to badness, justice in opposition to injustice and so on. Hegel has given many instances of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. The following instances given through him are noteworthy and you should keep in mind them.

- Family is the thesis, civil society is its antithesis and state is the synthesis.
- Likewise, despotism is thesis, democracy is its antithesis and constitutional monarchy is the synthesis.
- Inorganic world is the thesis, organic world is its antithesis and human beings are the synthesis.

Hegel whispered that the true nature of thing can be recognized only if its contradictions are also recognized. In this sense, his theory of dialects is rooted in contradiction or negation. He measured contradictions as the driving force of the whole procedure of development. This is the fundamental law of the cosmos as also of thought.

PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

Hegel’s philosophy of history is contained in the lectures that he delivered while he was at the Berlin University. He does not attach much importance to the material things. He views them merely as the cumulative result of development of absolute Thought. Absolute Thought is dynamic and ever evolving. It moves forward in search of self-realisation. This is termed through Hegel as unfolding of the cause. The whole universe is the result of this procedure of unfolding of Cause. In information, Hegel’s philosophy of history is somewhat similar to the Christian theology, which sees history as a pattern of meaningful events which can be understood in conditions of cosmic design. It is unfolding of cause under God's guidance or as willed through God. The Absolute Thought moves forward in an evolutionary procedure. In this evolutionary procedure the absolute Thought or the spirit takes several
shapes, discarding the earlier ones and getting newer ones. The first stage in this development is the physical or the inorganic world. At this initial stage the Absolute Thought (or Spirit) acquires the form of gross matter. The second stage in this procedure is the organic world: animals, plants etc. This stage is an improvement on the earlier stage. The third stage is the development of human beings. Each stage is more complicated than the previous stage. The development of human beings marks a qualitatively higher stage because the human beings are rational mediators capable of distinguishing flanked by good and bad. The fourth stage marks the development of family system, In addition to rational element it involves mutual cooperation and accommodation. The fifth stage marks the development of Civil Society. Here economic inter-dependence is the main characteristic in addition to mutual cooperation and accommodation. The last and highest stage witnesses the development of the state, which symbolizes a perfect moral order. Hegel argues that family symbolises unity; civil society symbolises particularity and the state symbolises universality. The unity of the family, particularity of the civil society is realised with the appearance of the state as the actuality of the universal order. Both the family and civil society are to some degree rational but only the state is perfectly rational and perfectly ethical. In short, the evolutionary procedure passes through the following stages and each successive stage is a separate improvement on the predecessor stages:

- Inorganic world
- Organic world
- Human beings
- Family
- Civil society
- State

It should be noted that with the help of the above argument Hegel tried to solve the vital problem in relation to the connection flanked by matter and
Spirit. He did so through arguing that matter is only a manifestation of Spirit in its crude form. Matter is not only a negation of Spirit but also the conscious realization of Spirit.

The second significant dimension of Hegel’s philosophy of history is the doctrine of historicism. It is hard to explain this doctrine. Broadly speaking, historicism is a doctrine, which holds that the whole course of history is predetermined course. The human intervention or human effort can be effective only if it falls in row with the dialectical direction of the world history. Like the stoic God history leads the wise man and drags the fool.

The third major dimension of Hegel’s philosophy of history is the use of Aristotelian teleology. Just as to it every thing in the world is moving towards the realization of its end, its true nature. From the point of view of the human actors, history is a union of irony and tragedy; from the point of view of the Whole it is a cyclic. When we seem at Hegel’s philosophy of history in its totality we can say that it is an effort to synthesize Kant’s and Herder's philosophies of history. Kant advocated scientific understanding of history, while Herder emphasized the lay of feelings and speculation. In this sense Hegel’s philosophy of history is speculative cause. Let us elaborate this point.

For filler understanding of thrust of Hegel’s philosophy of history you necessity understand that there is philosophical as against empirical history. The historians of latter category insist on accurate delineation of the facts which is their paramount concern. The former (philosophic historians) on the other hand are not satisfied with mere narration of facts and attempt to give divination of the meaning and seem for the exhibition of cause's working in the sphere of history. They do not feel satisfied through mere reproduction of empirical facts and attempt to incorporate their knowledge of the Thought , the articulation of cause. Therefore they elevate empirical contents to the stage of necessary truth.

For Hegel the world history exhibits the development of the consciousness of freedom on the part of Spirit. Hegel actually applies his
philosophy of history when he says that in the oriental world (China etc) there was despotism and slavery and freedom was confined only to the monarch. But in Greek and Roman civilizations although slavery was there, yet the citizens enjoyed freedom. In Europe particularly in Germany there is emphasis on liberty for all and infinite worth of each individual is recognized. The world history therefore consists of definite stages of progression — Oriental, Greek, Roman and Germanic. In short, Hegel’s philosophy of history consists of two parts:

- The common pattern and
- Several stages in this common pattern.

Finally, Hegel’s philosophy of history talks of doctrine of moving forces in historical change. He argues that Cause's great design can be accepted out with the help of human passions. Sure great men (like Caesar or Alexander) are chosen as instruments of destiny. Such men are necessary if the plot of history is to be accepted out. This amounts to saying that thoughts are significant but there necessity be will power to implement them.

**THEORY OF STATE**

The mainly seminal contribution of Hegel to Political Philosophy is his theory of state. Like Plato, Hegel is a great system builder. His theory of state is rooted in the axiom: "What is rational is real and what is real is rational". It means that whatever exists in the world is just as to Cause and whatever is just as to cause exists. Hegel’s theory of state is based on the vital premise in relation to the gradual unfolding of Cause or Spirit or Absolute Thought through a dialectical procedure. Cause gets its perfect realization in the state. Therefore, the state is Cause personified. State is rational, state is real; so what is rational is real. Here, real does not only mean that which is empirical but that which is fundamental. In information, Hegel distinguishes flanked by
real and that which merely exists. That which merely exists is only momentary and mere surface manifestation of underlying forces which alone are real. Therefore, Hegel sought to bridge the gap flanked by the rational and the real. The real is nothing but the objective manifestation of spirit.

This implies that for Hegel all states are rational in so distant as they symbolize the several states of unfolding of Cause. Through doing so he took a conservative location because it tantamounts to saying that whatever happens is manifestation of unfolding of Cause. No event ever occurs unless ordained through Cause. So every event takes lay just as to a rational plan. He measured the state as "March of God on Earth" or the ultimate embodiment of Cause.

State, for Hegel, is the highest manifestation of Cause because it emerges as a synthesis of family (thesis) and civil society (antithesis). Family fulfills man's biological needs — food, sex and love. It is the first manifestation of spirit but it cannot fulfill the higher or more intricate needs for which we require a civil society. While the vital characteristic of family is unity based on love the civil society is necessary for the fulfillment of his competitive self-interest and for the satisfaction of diverse human needs, particularly the economic needs which the family cannot fulfill. The civil society is organized on the foundation of individual's material needs, which are not wholly private and yet are primarily self-concerning. It is less selfish than the family. It is saved from disintegration because men begin to realize that their needs can be met only through recognizing the claims of others. Civil society educates the individual where he begins to see that he can get what he needs only through willing what other individuals require. It is not a complete organic unity. Such unity is realized only when the tension involved in the contradiction flanked by family and civil society is transcended in the final synthesis of the state. The civil society looks after the material needs of human beings and so, Hegel sees it as state in its embryonic form. The state looks after the universal interests of the whole society and it acquires an organic character.
Through method of summing up this intricate Hegelian theory of state we may say that first it has divine origin because the state is divinely ordained growth of absolute Thought or Cause. There can be no spiritual development beyond the state as there can be no physical development beyond man. It is the march of God on earth. Secondly, Hegel is statistic because the state in his philosophy is not a means to an end but an end in itself. The state does not exist for the individuals but the individuals exist for the state. Thirdly, for Hegel the whole (state) is greater than the parts (individuals) that constitute it. Their (individuals') importance is only due to the information that they are members of the state. Therefore, Hegel creates the individuals totally subordinate to the state. Only the state knows what is in individual's interest. State in that sense is infallible. It is also infallible because it is divine. Hegel argued that, “all the worth which the human being possesses—all spiritual reality—he possesses only through the State. For his spiritual reality consists in this, that his own essence—Cause—is objectively present to him, that it possesses objective immediate subsistence for him. The State is the Divine Thought as it exists on earth”.

THEORY OF FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Hegel’s theory of state leads us to another significant conclusion. Because only the state knows what is in individual’s interest and because the state is always infallible and because the state is divine so the individuals have no rights outside the state or against the state because state itself is the fountain of rights. Freedom of the individual lies in the complete obedience of the laws of the state. It is only as an obedient citizen with the universal. In other languages, state is a super-organism in which no one has any individual preferences dissimilar from those of the superior element. Therefore, one aspect of Hegel’s philosophy which is of greatest significance is the exaltation of the state and complete negation of the individual's rights and freedoms.
Real freedom of the individual can be realized only in the state. The only method for the individual to be free is to willingly obey the laws of the state.

In a subtle sense, Hegel’s location on the question of connection flanked by state and individual is extremely secure to Rousseau’s location. You will recall that Rousseau had argued that each individual has two wills—actual will which is selfish and the real will which is rational. Freedom in Rousseau's philosophy means subordination of actual wills to the real wills (the Common will). In the similar method in Hegel’s philosophy the individual is free only if he identifies himself consciously with the laws of the state. Because the state for Hegel is infallible and because it can never be wrong so, if there is ever a disagreement flanked by individual and the state, the individual is always wrong and the state is always right.

It is also motivating to compare Hegel’s location with the location of Hobbes on this (relation flanked by the individual and the state). Hegel maintains that individuals have no right to resist the state or disobey the commands of the state. To take an analogy—presently as parts of human body cannot revolt against the body in the similar method the individuals cannot revolt against the state. Given this location of Hegel we can say that the Hegelian state is like the Hobbesian Leviathan in new garb. In information, in Hegel the location of state vis-à-vis the individual is more exalted than in Hobbes. Hobbes at least grants to the individual the right to revolt against the state if the state fails to protect his life. The individuals in the Hobbesian social contract agreed to submit themselves to the state in the hope that it (state) will ensure safety of their life and property. If the state (or the sovereign) is unable to do so then the individuals have the inherent right to refuse to obey the sovereign. Though, Hegel does not grant any such right to the individual. This is so because the state for Hegel is the embodiment of cause and individuals are the products of the state. In some sense the connection flanked by state and individual Hegel is an organic connection, while in Hobbes it remnants a mechanical connection based on contract.
REVIEW QUESTIONS

- What were the major influences on Hegel?
- What is Hegel's Philosophy of History?
- What are Hegel's views about freedom of the individual?
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the Marx’s life and his work.
- Discuss the political thoughts of Marx.

INTRODUCTION

In the whole history of political thought, both in power and in criticism, few political theorists can match Karl Heinrich Marx. Reflecting on the modern world from the background of Victorian optimism in England, Marx was confident of human liberation through transcending the realm of
necessity to a realm of freedom. Beside with Friedrich Engels (1820-95), with whom he shared an unparalleled partnership, Marx dissected 19th Century capitalism as 'scientific socialism’ mainly to aloofness themselves from the early socialism of Owen, ‘Fourier and Saint-Simon whom they dubbed as 'utopian socialists'.

Like Hegel, for Marx, the revise of history was of crucial significance. Rejecting Hegelian dialectical idealism, Marx offered dialectical materialism emphasizing that the primacy of the mode of manufacture of the material means of life essentially circumstances the overall subsistence of human beings as manifested in human relationships. Understanding reality in conditions of base that incorporated mode and relationships of manufacture and the superstructure that incorporated political, cultural and intellectual dimensions, Marx observed that individual consciousness was determined through societal procedure. Emphasizing all history as the history of class 'thrasb about, Marx’s stages of social development had five dissimilar stages: (a) primitive communism, (b) slavery, (c) feudalism, (d) capitalism and (e) communism. Marx’s major concentration was on analyzing modern capitalism as in the first three he had little interest and desisted from creation a blueprint for the future communist society except providing a sketchy outline. He analyzed capitalism dialectically praising its role in revolutionizing the means of manufacture while condemning it for its inequities, wastage and use. Though he was mistakenly confident that the days of capitalism would be in excess of soon. Several commentators consider that the best method to understand Marx is to see him as a critic of 19th Century capitalism.

LIFE AND TIMES

Marx was born at Trier in Rhineland (Prussia) in a Jewish family. He embraced Christianity throughout his childhood. He studied History, Law and Philosophy at Bonn, Berlin and Jena. He received his doctorate (Ph.D.
Degree) in Philosophy from the University of Jena. It was throughout his student days that he was attracted to socialism—a doctrine, which was measured quite dangerous through the rulers of those times. Because of his socialistic convictions and his radical anti-state views he was expelled from Prussia and was forced to take shelter in France and Belgium. While he was in France he sustained organizing the German workers working in that country. Consequently the French Government under the pressure of the Prussian Government expelled him from France. In 1849 he migrated to England and stayed there till his death in 1883.

**Beginning of an Intellectual Journey**

Marx has written so extensively on several issues of Philosophy, Economics, Politics and Society that it is hard to talk about all his intricate thoughts in a few pages. Because of a wide range of issues on which he wrote it is equally hard to put him in a straight jacket of any one discipline. Throughout his student days Marx was attracted to Hegelian Idealism but he soon shifted his interest to Humanism and ultimately to Scientific Socialism. He was also influenced through some of the major movements of his times. Throughout his formative years the thought of development, in one form or the other, was extremely much in the air. While one version of development was articulated through Hegel (Development of Absolute Thought or Spirit), the other version was propounded through Darwin (in his Origin of Species). Although Marx accepted a few of the modern themes, he rejected some others. His mainly seminal contribution lies in offering an alternative theory of historical development — the theory of Dialectical Historical Materialism. Through this theory he rejected the Hegelian and Darwinian theories and propounded his own theory to explain the course of human history. Marx also entered in polemical argument with several of his contemporaries, particularly Proudhon and Bakunin and several socialist groups of Europe,
THEORY OF ALIENATION

One of the mainly original contributions of Marx is his Theory of Alienation. This is contained in his early work—Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts—which were written in 1843 but were exposed almost fifty years after his death. These Manuscripts illustrate that ‘early Marx’ was mainly interested in the problem of alienation.

In order to understand Marxian Theory of Alienation it is significant to understand Hegel’s views on alienation. This is so because Marx borrowed his thought of alienation from Hegel. And Feuerbach's, particularly from Hegel. He did so while dealing with the Hegelian notion of Phenomenology. For Hegel, alienation is the state of consciousness as it acquaints itself with the external world in which objects appear to man external or alien. Nature is a self-alienated form of Spirit/Absolute mind. Man is self-alienated Spirit/God in the procedure of de-alienating itself. Feuerbach's location is presently the opposite, i.e. that man is not self-alienated God; rather God is self-alienated man. Just as to Hegel, consciousness emancipates itself from this alienation through recognizing that the objects that appear to consciousness to exist outside it are only a phenomenal expression of consciousness. In other languages, it is recognition through consciousness that objects are merely alienated or reified consciousness. Marx vehemently attacks Hegel for identifying the subsistence of objects with alienation, which creates the objective world a mere phantasm. Marx does so through distinguishing flanked by objectification and alietation, Objectification is based on the premise of material subsistence of the objects; while alienation is a state of consciousness resulting from specific kind of connection flanked by men and objects. Such relationships cannot be a fantasy because objects are real.

Since Marx recognizes the autonomous subsistence of objects, alienation can be got in excess of only through 'substance-creating praxis', i.e. through changing the extremely circumstances in which the objects are created. In short, whereas for Hegel alienation is a state of consciousness
subject to elimination through another state of consciousness, for Marx alienation is related to the real existing objects and can be overcome in the real sphere of substance-related action.

In Marx’s view one consequence of Hegelian location is that the whole history is reduced to an act of thinking because Hegel sees all concrete events only as manifestation of Thought or Spirit. Since in Hegel the abolition of alienation is merely at the stage of consciousness it becomes ‘impossible to abolish real alienation. Hence, men are forced to legitimize their chains. Secondly, for Marx alienation is rooted in the historical situation and its consequences. In the capitalist society the creation of objects (manufacture) does not help man to realize himself, i.e. to realize his potential. This inability of man to realize his potential while being occupied in the creation of objects causes alienation. Hence, alienation will be overcome when the manufacture of objects will lead to unfolding of the human potentialities.

In capitalism manufacture takes lay in alienating circumstances and this creates objectification (creation of objects) into dehumanization. The substance produced through the laborer through his labour, its product, now stands opposed to him as an alien being as a power self-governing of him. In essence, labour itself becomes an substance. What is embodied in the product of his labour does not belong to the laborer, it is no longer his own. It belongs to some one else: the capitalist. The greater this product is, the more he is diminished and de-humanized. Therefore, you can say that, for Marx, labour becomes a dehumanizing act when it is not a voluntary but a coercive action. But what creates the labour coercive is not the nature of labour (nature of laborer’s work)per se but the historical circumstances in which this labour is performed. Hence, the society that will abolish alienation will not abolish labour, it will only abolish the alienating circumstances in which labour is performed. In other languages, labour will exist even in a socialist and a communist society but it will not be a coercive action. The crucial question is whether the work serves ‘as a means for subsistence for the laborer or becomes
the extremely content of his life. This amounts to saying that objectification (producing objects through one's labour) will continue even under communism but alienation will not.

From the above explanation you necessity have noticed that alienation as it exists in a capitalist society has several dimensions. Though, three dimensions are fundamental: i) Man's alienation from nature; ii) alienation from humanity or fellow workers; and iii) alienation from himself. Alienation from nature implies that the laborer is alienated from his faculty and capability of shaping the world because the world appears to him as his master. Secondly, alienation occurs because of the worker's inability to 'own' the product of his work, which belongs to someone else, Not only this, even his labour is not his own because he has sold it to another. Moreover, what is embodied in the product of his labour is no longer his own. Hence, he gets alienated from the substance of his labour. This substance which he has produced assumes an external subsistence. It exists independently outside him and appears alien to him. It stands opposed to him as an autonomous power, as a hostile force. Thirdly, alienation occurs because work for the laborer is not voluntary but it is imposed on him. It is forced labour that he has to perform. It is not for the satisfaction of his needs but for the satisfaction of others’ needs. Hence, work for him becomes drudgery, a monotonous and boring action. For twelve hours the worker weaves, spins, drills, turns, builds, shovels, breaks stones, carries loads without knowing why he is doing all this. Another aspect of alienation is the power of dead, objectified labour (machinery) in excess of the livelihood labour (the worker). In this procedure the worker becomes an appendage of the machine. His product and his machines become his real masters. Me feels alienated from himself. It is because of this that man feels himself to be freely active only in animal functions—eating, drinking and procreating—while in his human functions he is reduced to an animal. The animal in him becomes human and the human in him becomes animal, Marx further explains it through saying that:
The less you eat, drink, buy books, go to theatre or to ball or to the public home, and the less you think, love, theories, sing, paint, fence etc, the more you will be able to save and the greater will become your treasure which neither moth nor rust will corrupt-scour capital. The less you are, the less you express your life, the more you have, the greater in your alienated life and the greater is the saving of your alienated being.

The quotation shows that property for Marx is not the realization or fulfillment of personality but its negation. Hence, it is not only the property-less (the workers) who are alienated, but so are those who have property (the capitalists). The possession of property through one person necessarily entails its non-possession through another. Though, in Marx’s view the problem of alienation cannot be solved through assuring property to all (which is in any case impossible) but through abolishing all property dealings. Hence, the abolition of capitalism is a necessary pre-requisite for the abolition of alienation.

Communism for Marx is not only the positive abolition of private property but also the abolition of human self-alienation. So, it is the return of man to himself as a social, i.e. really human being. Secondly, Marx argued in his The German Ideology that the main cause of alienation is fixation of action due to which what we ourselves produce becomes objective power us, going out of our manage, thwarting our expectations, bringing to naught our calculations. Man will be redeemed from alienation in the communist society because nobody will have any exclusive sphere of action and each one can become accomplished in any branch he wishes. There it will be possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, doing presently that which provides me pleasure without ever becoming a hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic. This will be the real state of freedom for man from alienation and use.
DIALECTICS

Marx borrowed his dialectical method from Hegel but customized it in a fundamental method. While Hegel had applied his dialectical method in the domain of thoughts, Marx applied the Dialectics to explain the material circumstances of life. In the procedure of doing so he denounced the Hegelian philosophy of dialectical idealism, on the one hand, and the theory of mechanistic materialism, on the other. Hence, the Marxian theory of society and history may be described Dialectical Materialism. (In information, Engels in his Anti-Durhing applied the dialectics even to physical nature. This has become a subject of intense debate in the middle of post-Marx Marxists). Marxian dialectical materialism, urbanized through Engels has three dimensions:

The law of:

- Transformation of quantity into excellence. It means that quantitative changes lead to qualitative revolutionary situation.
- The law of unity of opposites (contradiction), and
- The law of negation of negation (thesis-antithesis and synthesis).

Marx holds that the material and the ideal are not only dissimilar but opposite and constitute a unity in which the material is primary and the mind (thought) secondary. This is so because matter can exist without mind but mind cannot exist without matter because historically it (mind) has urbanized out of matter: In this method Marx totally inverted the Hegelian location. You would recall that for Hegel mind was primary and matter secondary. Marx pointed out that with Hegel "dialectics is standing on its head. It necessity be turned right face up." This he did through creation matter primary and mind secondary.
THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

The mainly seminal contribution of Marx is his theory of historical materialism. In his Socialism: Utopian and Scientific Engels defined historical materialism as a theory which holds that the ultimate cause which determines the whole course of human history is the economic development of society. The whole course of human history is explained in conditions of changes occurring in the manners of manufacture and exchange. Starting with primitive communism the mode of manufacture has passed through three stages: slavery, feudalism and capitalism and the consequent division of society into separate classes (slave-master, serf-baron and proletariat-capitalist) and the thrash about of these classes against one another. The mainly profound statement of Marx which explains his theory of historical materialism is contained in his Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. In this work Marx contends that:

- The economic structure of society, constituted through its dealings of manufacture is the real base of society. It is the foundation on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite shapes of social consciousness.

Besides with it, the society's dealings of manufacture themselves correspond to a definite stage of development of its material productive forces. Therefore, the mode of manufacture of material life determines the social, political and intellectual life procedure in common.

The common dealings as well as shapes of state are to be grasped neither from themselves nor from the so-described common development of human mind, but rather they have their roots in the material circumstances of life. As the society's productive forces develop (animate power getting replaced through inanimate power—for instance oxen ploughing getting replaced through ploughing with tractor) they conflict with the existing dealings of manufacture which become a fetter on their further growth. Therefore, begins the epoch of social revolution. This contradiction flanked
by forces of manufacture and dealings of manufacture divides the society into classes. As people become conscious of this disagreement they fight it out. The disagreement is resolved in favour of the productive forces and new, higher dealings of manufacture, whose material circumstances have matured in the womb of the old society emerge. The bourgeois mode of manufacture not only symbolizes the mainly recent of many progressive epochs, but it is the last antagonistic form of manufacture.

Marx’s materialist interpretation of history therefore explains the common course of human history in conditions of growth of productive forces. The productive forces, as already pointed out, consist of means of manufacture (machines, apparatus and factories) and labour power. The dealings of manufacture correspond to society's productive stage. In addition to ancient, feudal and bourgeois manners of manufacture Marx also talked of the Asiatic mode of manufacture. On the one hand, Marx distinguished flanked by forces of manufacture and dealings of manufacture on the other lie distinguished flanked by the base and the super-structure. For Marx, the productive forces are not objective economic forces which do not require the mediation of human consciousness for their emergence or subsistence, Likewise, the distinction flanked by the material base and the ideological super-structure is not the distinction flanked by matter and spirit but flanked by conscious human action aimed at the creation and preservation of circumstances of human life, and human consciousness which give rationalization and legitimization of specific form that human action takes.

Like his dialectics, Marx constructed his materialist conception of history out of the Hegelian system itself which had sought to bridge the gap flanked by the rational and the actual. Marx, in information, borrowed such concepts as civil society and property from the Hegelian system and set them in a revolutionary connection to the concept of the state. Hegel confronts civil society as a sphere of materialism and counter-poses it to the state as sphere of idealism. In sharp contrast to this, Marx holds that dealings as well as shapes
of state are to be grasped neither from themselves, nor from the so-described common development of human mind but rather they have their roots in the material circumstances of life. You necessity also understand the method in which Marx differentiates flanked by his materialist conception of history and Hegelian idealist conception of history. To Hegel, it is the life procedure of the human mind, i.e. the procedure of thinking which under the name of the thought provides momentum to history. Therefore, for Hegel, the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of the thought, while for Marx the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected through human mind and translated into shapes of thought. To put it differently, while in the Hegelian scheme consciousness determines subsistence; in the Marxian scheme it is the social being (circumstances of subsistence) that determine their consciousness. Therefore, the connection flanked by economic and the political in Marx is such that the political structure reflects the socio-economic circumstances. It is the economic information of life, which produce or determine the nature of thoughts. Therefore, Marx reduced all thought and action to the material circumstances of life. Consciousness is nothing but the reflection of material circumstances of men's subsistence. Though, this connection flanked by material circumstances and thoughts is not necessarily direct and automatic. It is rather intricate. Marx expressed his location in a extremely technological language. He argued that the doctrine that men are products of circumstances and up-bringing and that, so, changed men are products of other circumstances and changed up-bringing forgets that it is men that change circumstances and that educator himself needs education.

The statement of Marx will help you to understand that in Marx epistemology ceases to be merely a reflective theory of cognition but becomes a vehicle for shaping and molding reality. Therefore, Marx’s epistemology occupies a middle location flanked by classical (mechanical) materialism and classical idealism. Since, it synthesizes the two traditions, it transcends the classical dichotomy flanked by subject and substance. In short, Marx denies
the validity of traditional mechanistic materialist manners of consciousness. To Marx, reality is always human reality, not in the sense that man forms nature because this act of shaping nature also forms man and his relation to other human beings. It is a total procedure, implying a constant interaction flanked by subject and substance "My connection to my surroundings is my consciousness".

In a subtle sense, the Marxian philosophy of Historical materialism is dissimilar not only from Hegelian philosophy; it is also dissimilar from that of Feuerbach. While Feuerbach saw the unity of man and nature expressed through man's being a part of nature, Marx sees man as shaping nature and his being, in turn, shaped through it. To put it in easy languages, whereas Feuerbach naturalizes man, Marx humanizes nature. Marx argued that man not only satisfies his needs through his get in touch with nature but also creates new needs as well as possibilities of their satisfaction. Therefore, just as to Marx, man’s needs are historical not naturalistic. The never-ending dialectical pursuit of their creation and satisfaction constitutes the main course Historical development. Here again, the Marxist location is dissimilar from pragmatists. While pragmatism starts with the premise that man adopts himself to a given pre-existing environment, Marx views man not adopting himself to the environment but shaping his world. To put it differently, reality is viewed through classical materialism and pragmatism as if it were merely a passive substance of perception; while, for Marx, reality is not only shaped through man but it also reacts on man himself and forms him. Therefore, it is a two-method interaction: man shaping nature and getting shaped through nature.

**THEORY OF CLASS WAR**

The understanding of the concept of "class" is central to the understanding of Marxian philosophy. The sole criterion on the foundation of which the class of a person is determined is his ownership (or manage) of means of manufacture (land, capital, machines & technology). Those who own
or manage the means of manufacture constitute the bourgeoisie (exploiters),
and, those who own only labour power constitute the proletariat (exploited).
Therefore, classes are defined through Marx on the foundation of twin criteria
of a person's lay in the mode of manufacture and his consequent location in
conditions of dealings of manufacture. The lack of ownership (or manage) of
means of manufacture and lack of property and the immediate require to get
work i.e. the class of concrete labour are some of the feature characteristics of
the proletariat class. Since class is based on ownership (or manage) of means
of manufacture and ownership of property; the disappearance of class
variation depends on the disappearance of property as the determining factor
of status.

In Communist Manifesto Marx-Engels said: “The history of all
hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles”. They argued that
class disagreement is the real driving force of human history. In the capitalist
societies class differentiation is mainly clear, class consciousness is more
urbanized and class disagreement is mainly acute. Therefore, capitalism is the
culminating point in the historical development of classes and class
disagreement. The distinctive characteristic of bourgeois epoch is that society
as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two
great classes directly facing each other—bourgeoisie and proletariat.

Marx also made a distinction flanked by the objective information of
subsistence of a class and its subjective awareness in relation to the its being a
class—class consciousness. Division of labour is the main source of historical
emergence of classes and class antagonisms. Each new class which puts itself
in lay of the one ruling before it, is compelled, merely in order to carry
through its aims, to symbolize its interest as the general interest of all the
members of society. The class creation a revolution appears from the
extremely beginning not as a class but as the representative of the whole
society.
Through a detailed historical analysis Marx showed that no major antagonism disappears unless there emerges a new antagonism. Therefore, common antagonism flanked by the rich, and the poor has always been there but in capitalism it has been sharply polarized into antagonism flanked by the capitalist and the proletariat. Therefore, in capitalism the emergence of proletariat has a special significance. It is not presently a historical phenomenon because its suffering, its use and its dehumanization is a paradigm' for the human condition at big. This is so because in proletariat class Marx sees the modern and the final realization of universality. He endows this class with a historical significance and mission. It can redeem itself only through a total redemption of humanity. When the proletariat announces the dissolution of the existing class- based social order it only declares the secret of its own subsistence, because it is the effective dissolution of this order that will lead not only to the emancipation of the proletariat but to the emancipation of humanity. For such emancipation of humanity it is essential to abolish the institution of private property. Private property as private property, as wealth is compelled to uphold itself, and thereby its opposite—the proletariat, in subsistence. The proletariat is compelled as proletariat to abolish itself and thereby its opposite, the condition for its subsistence, what creates it proletariat, i.e. private property. Emancipation of society from private property, from servitude takes the political form of emancipation of humanity as a whole. All human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to manufacture and all kinds of servitude are only modification or consequence of this relation. Hence, the proletariat can abolish all classes and all class antagonisms through abolishing itself as a separate class. In final analysis Marx visualized the emergence of a classless society. Such class-less society will also be a stateless society because with the disappearance of classes the extremely rationale for the subsistence of state will disappear. Just as to him the rationale for the subsistence of state is to defend the interest of the bourgeoisie.
THEORY OF SURPLUS VALUE

Another key characteristic of class dealings in capitalism, just as to Marx, is the expropriation of surplus value through the bourgeoisie from the labour of the proletariat. The theory of surplus value is discussed through Marx in great detail in his Capital. The theory of surplus value is rooted in the labour theory of value propounded through Ricardo and classical economists. The labour theory of value holds that labour spent through the laborer in the manufacture of a commodity is the sole criterion for determining its value. Of course, it will also depend on the "use-value" of that commodity. Marx admits that human labour cannot make value through itself alone. It uses instruments of manufacture which are owned through the capitalist. The capitalist buys the "labour power" of the laborer and applies it to the raw material to produce commodities which have an exchange value. The variation flanked by the exchange value of the commodity and the wages paid to the worker through the capitalist in producing that commodity is surplus value.

In information, Marx explains the whole procedure of use with the help of his theory of surplus value. It is a separate characteristic of capitalist mode of manufacture. To put it in easy languages, surplus value accrues because the commodity produced through the worker is sold through the capitalist for more than what he (the worker) receives as wages. In his Capital Marx elaborated it in a extremely technological language. He argued that the worker produces a commodity which belongs to the capitalist and whose value is realized through the capitalist in the form of price. The value of the commodity depends on the capital involved in its manufacture. This capital has two parts—constant capital and variable capital. Constant capital relates to means of manufacture like raw material, machinery, apparatus etc used for commodity manufacture. The variable capital refers to the wages paid to the worker. It is the Value of what the laborer sells (his labour power). Surplus value is the variation flanked by the value produced through the worker and
what he gets in exchange for this value of his labour,. This is described variable capital because it varies from beginning to the end. It begins as value of the labour power and ends as the value produced through that labour power in the form of a commodity. Labour power has therefore a unique excellence of its skill to make value.

Marx argued that the capitalist appropriates part of the labour of the worker for which he (the worker) does not get paid. Therefore, surplus value is unpaid labors of the laborer. It can be variously measured in conditions of time as well as in conditions of money. Suppose a worker works for ten hours in producing a commodity. He may get paid for only what is equivalent to his eight hours labour. Therefore, his two hours labour has been appropriated through the capitalist: Marx also argued that slowly the proportion of surplus value becomes more and more. The worker was not paid for his two hours labour out of ten hours that he had spent in producing a commodity because he was paid only for his eight hours labour. Through and through, the proportion of unpaid labour will augment from two to three, four or five hours. Finally, a stage comes when the worker gets paid only the minimum that is necessary for his survival. (His survival does not mean only his personal survival but also the survival of his family so that when this worker is not able to work (due to old age or death or illness) his children may take his lay). The working class consists of those who own nothing but their own labour power which they are forced to sell in order to live. Just as to Marx, the history of capitalist manufacture is a history of struggles through the capitalist to augment his surplus value and resistance through the workers against this augment.

There is a variation in the method in which surplus value was created in the slave society and under feudalism and the method it is created in the capitalist society. In the former the slave or the serf who created surplus value was tied to his master or the feudal lord but in capitalism there is a 'free contract' into which the worker 'voluntarily' enters with the capitalist. Of course, this freedom is a myth because the worker has no option but to sell his
labour power. He necessity enter into contract with some capitalist. The only option that he has is to choose the capitalist to whom he wants to sell his labour power. Therefore this freedom is freedom to choose his exploiter. The slave and the serf did not have this freedom.

**THEORY OF REVOLUTION**

The vital cause of revolution, just as to Marx, is the disjunction that arises flanked by dealings of manufacture and the means of manufacture. As means of manufacture (technology etc.) grow with growth of scientific knowledge, they go out of step with the existing dealings of manufacture. A stage is reached where the dealings of manufacture become a fetter on the manufacture procedure itself. This provides rise to immanent demand for a transition to a new mode of manufacture. The capitalist mode of manufacture appeared from the womb of feudal order in the similar method as feudal mode of manufacture appeared from the womb of the slave society. Likewise, socialism will emerge from the womb of bourgeois society itself. This is so because capitalism constantly revolutionizes its own means of manufacture and therefore undermines its own circumstances of subsistence. In information, the bourgeoisie produces its own grave diggers. Marx asserted that the bourgeois dealings of manufacture are the last antagonistic form of social procedure of manufacture— antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism but class antagonism arising from the social circumstances of life of the individuals. Therefore, the productive forces developing in the womb of bourgeois society make material circumstances for the resolution of that antagonism.

Marx’s assertion that the bourgeois dealings of manufacture are the last antagonistic form of social procedure of manufacture is rooted in the assumption that all the previous historical movements (revolutions) were movements of minorities in the interest of minorities. The proletarian revolution will be dissimilar from them. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of
capitalist society cannot stir, cannot raise itself to the location of ruling class without the whole superincumbent strata of officials being sprung into the air. Beside with it, Marx also spelled out the method, which will be followed through the proletariat class to achieve its objective. In the Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels declared that communists scorn to hide their views and aims. They openly declare that their purpose (revolution) can only be achieved through the forcible overthrow of the whole capitalist order. Therefore, the emancipation of the proletariat is predicated through Marx on the emancipation of humanity.

Here it is significant for you to bear in mind that in the history of revolutions there is a debate in relation to the role of subjective (human) and objective (material) factors in creation a revolution. Whether it is the mere subsistence of a proletariat class which will bring in relation to the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism or is it the consciousness of this proletariat which is necessary for doing so? Marx’s location in this regard is extremely important. He sees a dialectical connection flanked by philosophy's comprehension of the world and its skill to change it. Theory necessity evolve a proper interpretation of the world before it is able to change it. The ultimate task of philosophy is not merely to comprehend reality but also to change it. Praxis revolutionizes the existing reality through human action. Revolutionary praxis has, so, a dialectical aspect. Objectively, it is the organisation of the circumstances leading to ultimate human emancipation and subjectively, it is the self-change that proletariat achieves through its self detection through organisation.

Therefore, the dilemma of determinism vs. voluntarism is transcended through Marx through the dialectical nature of revolutionary consciousness. Objective circumstances themselves will not bring in relation to the revolution until and unless the proletariat grasps the information that through shaping its own view of the world it also changes it. If revolutionary consciousness exists then revolution is bound to happen. When the worker comprehends that under
capitalist manufacture lie is degraded to the status of a mere substance, a commodity; lie ceases to be a commodity, an substance and becomes a subject (active agent). This is revolutionary consciousness. The understanding of the existing reality through the proletariat is, so, necessary condition for the possibility of revolutionizing it. In other languages, it is only an understanding of the internal dynamics of capitalism through the proletariat that will enable it to create revolution which will signal the transition from capitalism to socialism.

**DICTATORSHIP OF PROLETARIAT**

Dictatorship of the proletariat is another significant concept in Marx’s writings. Marx did not write extremely clearly and systematically in relation to the dictatorship of the proletariat and in relation to the exact nature and form of post-revolutionary communist society. At best his treatment is sketchy. In a letter to Wedemeyer (March 5, 1852) Marx said that he had not exposed the concept of classes and class struggles.

What I did that was new was to prove: (a) that the subsistence of classes is only bound up with scrupulous phases in the development of manufacture; (b), that the class thrash about necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat; (c) that this dictatorship (of the proletariat) itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes leading to the establishment of a classless society.

Therefore, the dictatorship of the proletariat is a necessary intermediate point or a middle stage on the path, from capitalism to socialism and communism. In the Critique of the Gotha Programme he further clarified that flanked by capitalism and communist society lies a era of revolutionary transformation from one (i.e. capitalism) to the other (i.e. socialism). In political sphere this transformation will take the form of dictatorship of the proletariat. It is the first step in the revolution of the working class which will raise the proletariat to the location of a ruling class. In Marx’s view throughout
the dictatorship of the proletariat there will be a regime in which the proletariat will manage the state power. Such a middle stage of dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary because the destruction of whole capitalist social and political order cannot be fully achieved without capturing the state power and without by it as an instrument to make circumstances for the ushering in of a communist social order.

VISION OF A COMMUNIST SOCIETY

Communism is explained through Marx as a form of society which the proletariat will bring into subsistence through its t-evolutionary thrash about. In Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels argued that the communists have no interests separate and separately from the interests of the proletariat as a whole. In his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts Marx defined communism as the positive abolition of private property. It also entailed the abolition of classes and abolition of division of labour. In economic conditions the communist society will be a "society of associated producers". In political conditions communism will be the first state in the history of mankind to use political power for universal interests instead of partisan interests. Therefore, it will be dissimilar from the state in capitalism which is no more than the Managing Committee of the Bourgeoisie. For Marx the state in capitalism is serving the extensive-term interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole. It promotes and legitimizes the use of the proletariat through the bourgeoisie.

In Critique of the Gotha Programme Marx talked of two stages of communist society. In the first state communism will bring in relation to the socialization of means of manufacture. It means that the means of manufacture will not be in the hands of any one class but in the hands of society as a whole. At this state wage labour will continue to exist and the organizing principle of the economy will be: ‘from each just as to his capability to each just as to his work’. It means that every one will work just as to one's skill and get just as to the amount of work done. At the second and the final stage the communist
society will ensure the end of man's power through the objective forces. As already stated communism for Marx is not only the positive abolition of private property but also the abolition of state and abolition of human self-alienation. It will be a class less and stateless society in which government of men will be replaced through administration of things. It will be return of man to himself as a social, i.e., really human being. Communism is viewed through Marx as the true final solution of the disagreement flanked by subsistence and essence; objectification and self affirmation; freedom and necessity; individual and the species.

Marx also claimed that communism is the final solution to the riddle of history and knows itself to be this solution. Man in communism will become conscious of himself as the prime mover of history as well as its product. As stated earlier, since communism will ensure the disappearance of social division of labour; it will become possible for man to do one thing to day, another tomorrow "to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening and criticize after dinner without ever becoming a hunter, a fisherman, a shepherd or a critic' (German Ideology). Moreover, it will be a state of plenty where every one will work just as to capability (skill) and get just as to require. The creation of new needs will also ensure the creation of means for their satisfaction. History will not come to an end; it will continue' in conditions of creation of new needs and creation of methods of their fulfillment.

It should be noted that under communism alienation will come to an end but labour will continue to remain a vital require. The sphere of material manufacture will remain' in the realm of necessity. The realm of freedom will begin only in the leisure time. Therefore, work will continue to be an obligation even in a communist society.

COMMON ASSESSMENT
Marx is undoubtedly one of the mainly influential philosophers of contemporary times. His thoughts have acquired the status of a powerful ideology. His thoughts on Alienation, Historical Materialism, Class War, Surplus Value and his vision of a Proletarian Revolution, Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Socialism and Communism have been extensively discussed, debated, customized and sometimes even rejected through his followers and adversaries. His writings are so voluminous and his themes are so wide-ranging that Marx has come to mean dissimilar things to dissimilar people. For instance, there are studies which seek to distinguish flanked by 'early' and 'later' Marx. While 'early' Marx is projected as a humanist philosopher interested in redemption of mankind from alienation; the later' Marx is viewed as an economist and a revolutionary interested in abolishing use. ‘Early’ Marx is Marx of the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts; while the 'later' Marx is Marx of the Communist Manifesto, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy and Capital. There are also studies which see an underlying unity flanked by the 'early' and the 'later' Marx. Some studies have even tried to assess the power that Engels exercised on Marx and power that Marx exercised on Engels. Such studies have a valid point to create because initially Marx was basically a philosopher, while Engels was basically an economist. Due to power that they exercised on one another Marx moved from Philosophy to Economics; while Engels moved from Economics to Philosophy. So much so that it is approximately impossible to provide a universally acceptable and a non-partisan assessment of Marx.

Marx’s vision of a new social order in which there will be neither alienation nor use, no classes, no class antagonism, no power, no state is highly fascinating and because of this attraction, Sabine described Marxism a utopia but a generous and a humane one. Though, though he admitted that historical growths are always open to many possibilities yet he did not agree that such possibilities were open to his own theory. Though, not putting his own theory to the possibility of dialectical critique as Avineri said, was a
grave mistake. Berlin commenting on his tremendous popularity for generations establish that to be a negation of Marx’s rigid framework of determinism. Plamenatz distinguished flanked by a German Marxism and Russian Communism. Harrington portrayed the modern radical view of Marx as being an excellent critic of capitalism but unable to give a detailed alternative to it. This failure of Marx is mainly because of the information that he was writing at a time when democracy was only one of the possibilities and not a universal reality as it is today. Because of this lacuna he could not grasp the dynamics of democracy and the importance of civil and political liberties for any civilized society.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- What is Marxian theory of alienation?
- Critically examine Marx’s theory of surplus value.
- Discuss Marx’s theory of historical materialism.
CHAPTER 16

PRE-MODERN SOCIO-RELIGIOUS POLITICAL THOUGHT IN INDIA: THE DIVERSE STRANDS

STRUCTURE

- Learning objectives
- Introduction
- State and sovereignty in ancient India
- State and sovereignty in medieval India
- Religion and polity
- Review questions

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Our focus in this chapter will be to familiarize you with the major trends in pre-modern Indian political thought. With the help of historical texts like Manusmriti, Arthasastra, Fatwa-i-Jahandari, and Ain-i-Akbari which are considered as important treatises on statecraft, we will try to explain the evolution of the Indian political thought.

INTRODUCTION

To understand contemporary Indian political thought, it is essential to have a broad view of the historical procedures through which the modern polity has appeared. We have civilization which is comparable with the Greek civilization and as Plato and Aristotle are measured as the pioneers of western political custom, so are our ancient and medieval texts on statecraft. Whether it is the concept of monarchy, republicanism, council of ministers, welfare state, diplomacy, espionage system or any other political concept/institution which is recognized in contemporary political parlance, all these have
references in our early political traditions. Stale, society and governance are interlinked to each other. If we seem at our past we will discover that there was a time when people used to live in small groups based on kinship ties and there was no require felt for a power to manage people's life. But with the growth of population and clashes flanked by groups of people, require was felt for a power who would give the required protection to his people and whose order would be obeyed through all. With the coming of groups of people jointly, society came into subsistence which was followed through the emergence of state and the art of governance. So in a method we can say that individual needs led to the emergence of society and it is the communal require of the society which in turn led to the formulation of several structures and theories related to state and governance. Therefore, the social-historical context becomes a determinant factor in the development of state as well as the thoughts related to statecraft. Keeping this in mind when we seem at our past we discover that starting from the Vedic society till the establishment of the British rule India passed through several phases and also had undergone several political experiments. All these traditions and experiences in one method or other have contributed in creation what we call contemporary Indian political thought. With the help of historical texts like Manusmriti, Arthasastra, Fatwa-i-Jahandari, and Ain-i-Akbari which are measured as significant treatises on statecraft, we will attempt to explain the development of the Indian political thought. We will introduce you to the custom based on Brahmical, Buddhist and Jain literature, then the Islamic political custom and finally, the connection flanked by religion and state in India.

**STATE AND SOVEREIGNTY IN ANCIENT INDIA**

In her seminal work on social formations in the mid-first millennium B.C. Romila Thapar has explained transition from lineage society to state. In lineage society the vital element was the extended family under manage of the eldest male member. The size of the family was dependent on economy and
environment and it was the genealogical relationships which tied the families jointly. It was through kinship - and rituals, that the chief exercised his power in excess of the clans. Differentiation came in within society flanked by the ruler and the ruled because of kin connections and wealth. Though, shift from rustic to peasant economy, population growth, social and cultural heterogeneity beside with other factors led to the emergence of state systems. In the opinion of Romila Thapar conquest, extensive trade, the decline of political elite and democratic procedures led to the change towards state system. The Vedic era represented the lineage system but later on rising stratification in society indicated the tendency towards state formation. With the formation of state the issue of governance of the state became a major concern of the society. In the Shanti Parva of the Mahabharata we discover the reference to Matsyanyaya, a condition in which small fishes become prey to big fishes. This analogy was given to explain the anarchic condition in a society where no power exists. To avoid this kind of crisis, people collectively agreed to have a set of laws and to appeal to the god for a king who will uphold law and order in society. It is also argued that without appealing to any divine agency people on their own selected a person on whom the power was vested to protect human society. We discover references to both Divine Origin of Kingship as well as Social Contract Theory of Kingship. Though theological and metaphysical environment had a strong power in shaping the ancient Indian thinking, several studies on ancient Indian polity suggest the emergence of polity as a self-governing domain. Whether it was a Divine Origin of Kingship or Social Contract, we discover monarchy as the dominant form of government in the early Indian polity. The seven constituents of the state as prescribed in the Shanti Parva of the Mahabharata are as follows:

- Swamin or the sovereign,
- Amatya or the officials,
- Janapada or the territory,
- Durga or the fort,
• Kosa or the treasury,
• Danda or the Army,
• Mitra or the Allies.

All these are measured as the natural constituents of a state. State is visualized as an organic body having seven organs. Swamin or the king is measured as the head of this structure. After that to him is the Amatya or the council of ministers through which the king governs the state. Janapada means territory having agricultural land, mines, forests, etc. Durga or fort suggests the fortification of the capital. Danda refers to the power of law and of power. Mitra is the friendly state. Looking at this structure of state one discovers lot of resemblance with the attributes of the contemporary state. Manusmriti strongly advocated for a political power. Manu was of the opinion that in the absence of a political power, there would be disorder in society. It is the duty of the king to ensure justice in the society and protect the weak. Through taking his due, through preventing the confusion of the castes (Varna), and through protecting the weak, the power of the king grows, and he prospers in this (world) and after death. Manu was in favor of social hierarchy and caste system and his notion of justice was based on diverse customs and practices of dissimilar castes. He suggested that though the king derived his power from god, in practice he should be guided through the Brahmanas. The rationale behind it was the assumption that Brahmanas possess knowledge and knowledge should rule. Manu prescribed the structure of State in conditions of villages, districts, and provinces which resembles our present day structure of administration. If one looks at the rationale behind this organizational structure, one may easily discover that the principle of decentralization of power was the guiding principle behind this organisation. He also advocated an assembly of the learned as well as the officers of the state to advise the king and this shows his concern for the public opinion. Members were expected to be objective and fearless in taking decisions on the foundation of dharma.
Village and district authorities were suggested to function independently and only when there was any require, the king was expected to help. Welfare of the common people was one of the major concerns of the king. ‘If the inhabitants of the municipalities and the provinces be poor, the king should, whether they depend upon him immediately or immediately, illustrate them compassion to the best of his power Wiping the tears of the distressed, the helpless and the old, and inspiring them with joy, constitute the duty of the king’. (Mahabharata- Shanti Parva, cited in A. Appadorai, Indian Political Thinking). Commenting on the political thoughts explained in the Manusmriti, V.R.Mehta in his Indian Political Thought, has remarked that ‘It is indeed astounding to know that extremely early in the development of Indian political thought, the thoughts of decentralization, welfare state and public opinion are so clearly spelled out’.

Scholars are of the opinion that Arthasastra is not the work of one Kautilya and the date of Kautilya is also a matter of debate in the middle of historians. It is also argued that there are interpolations in the Arthasastra. Whatever be the truth the information remnants that Arthasastra, as a text, deals with several functions as well as the methods of running the state. Moving ahead of Manu, Kautilya advocated a strong monarchy but he was not favorable to the thought of absolute monarchy. While in the earlier custom, the king was guided through Brahmanical power; in Arthasastra the king is measured to have the last word in all matters. Arthasastra tells us as to how a king should manage his senses and discharge his duties, how a king should protect himself from any threat on his life and the importance of selection of right counselors and priests. There is an elaborate discussion on the civil law explaining several events required for an effective administration and on criminal law to take care of those people who are measured as a threat to the country. Kautilya cautioned the king to be vigilant in relation to the motives and integrity of his ministers and also talked in relation to the common selfish nature of people, bribery, and corruption inherent in administration. He
suggested that through reward and punishment, the king should set a standard for others to follow. In his opinion, the king is above others but not above 'dharma'. Here dharma means obeying customary and sacred law and protection of his subjects' life and property. This was measured as the vital duty of a king. Suggestions have also been given to deal with friendly and hostile neighbors, organisation of armies, for spies to stay a watch on internal and external growths. We are told that army should be placed under a divided command since this is a sure guarantee against treachery. The notion of welfare state is further strengthened in Arthasastra. The king is expected to protect agriculturists from oppression and to take care of the orphans, the aged, and the helpless. Happiness of his people should always be the concern of a wise king, otherwise he may lose people's support; a good king should take up welfare behaviors in the interest of all. Just as to Kautilya 'in the happiness of his subjects lies the happiness of a king, in their welfare, his welfare. The king shall consider as good, not what pleases himself, but what pleases his subjects' (Arthasastra). Another significant concept which we come crossways in the ancient political custom is the concept of Danda. Danda primarily implies the sense of coercion or punishment. Danda is required for discipline. If the laid down norms of the state which are basically determined through sacred and customary laws are not obeyed through any individual or if anybody is involved in an action which goes against the interest of the state, the king has every right to punish the guilty. So disciplining the citizens was a significant action of the king. The Buddhist canonical literature suggests that a monarch should rule on the foundation of the Law of truth and righteousness; he should not allow any wrongdoing in his kingdom and should seem after the poor. A king was measured as a chosen leader of the people and his significant duty was to protect his people and to punish the wrongdoers.

Tiru-k-Kural, composed through Tiruvalluvar throughout the second century A.D., is measured as one of the well-known classics of Tamil literature. In this text, beside with other facets of life, we discover significant
thoughts related to polity. It talks in relation to the an adequate army, an industrious people, ample food, possessions, wise and alert ministers, alliance with foreign powers and dependable fortifications as essentials of a state. King’s qualities and duties, responsibilities of the ministers, importance of spies to stay watch on several behaviors within the state, diplomacy, etc. are other significant issues on which we discover mention in the Tiru-k-Kural. 'Statecraft consists in getting support without letting your weakness be recognized' (Tiru-k-Kural, cited in A.Appadorai, Indian Political Thinking).

Though monarchy was predominant in the ancient Indian polity, references to republic are also established in literary traditions. Since Alexander, the Great's invasion of India in 327-324 B.C. we come crossways references to several spaces governed through oligarchies from Greek and Roman accounts of India. Later on, the Buddhist Pali canon tells us in relation to the subsistence of several republics, mainly in the foothills of the Himalayas and in North Bihar. It is suggested that these were mostly tributary to the greater kingdoms but enjoyed internal autonomy. An instance of this was the Sakyas who were on the borders of contemporary Nepal and to whom the Buddha himself belonged. Another such instance was the Vrijjian confederacy of the Lichhavis who resisted the great Ajatasatru. Steve Mulilberger, in an article entitled 'Democracy in Ancient India' has written that in ancient India, monarchical thinking was constantly battling with another vision, of self-rule through members of a guild, a village, or an extended kin-group, in other languages, any group of equals with a general set of interests. This vision of cooperative self-government often produced republicanism and even democracy comparable to classical Greek democracy. In the Janapadas, there were Sanghas or Ganas managing independently their territory. Details of the working of such assemblies can be establishing both in Brahmanical and Buddhist literature. From Panini's explanation (5th B.C.), we discover references to the procedure of decision creation through voting. In the Buddhist literature, we discover rules concerning the voting in monastic
assemblies, their membership, and their quorums. All these point to the information that democratic values and public opinion were extremely much respected in ancient political custom in spite of the dominant trend of monarchical government.

STATE AND SOVEREIGNTY IN MEDIEVAL INDIA

Coming of Islam in India and the establishment of the Muslim political power marked the beginning of a separate stage in the Indian political thought. Islamic political thought is centered approximately the teaching of Muhammad and the belief in the universality of the law of the Koran. In contrast to the Vedantic philosophy, the Muslims consider Koran as the only and final power. Before the coming of Islam, the political structure in India was not based on the philosophy and belief of a single text. Rather several religious traditions contributed towards the development of political traditions in ancient India. In Islamic thought the Shariat based on the Koran is measured as the final power and the purpose of the state is to serve the Shariat. In matters of governance, the Muslim elite were influenced through political thoughts in Islam. Based on two authoritative texts written throughout the Muslim rule in India- Fatwa-i-Jahandari and Ain-i-Akbari dealing with the nuances of governance- we can formulate our thoughts in relation to the dominant trend of the political thought of medieval India. Fatwa-i- Jahandari was written through Khwaja Ziauddin Barani. In this book Barani recapitulates and further elaborates the political philosophy of the Sultanate on the foundation of his earlier narrative, Tarikh-i-Firozeshahi. Some scholars are of opinion that Barani's thoughts carry a sense of religious fanaticism. Keeping in mind the information that Barani belonged to an era when Islam was presently creation its ground in India, we may overlook this limitation in Barani's thoughts. Separately from this limitation, Barani's thoughts related to kingship in medieval era are of immense importance. The king as the representative of God on earth is measured as the source of all powers and
functions of the state. Barani is of the opinion that whatever means the king adopts to discharge his duties is justified as extensive as his aim is the service of religion. We discover Barani's suggestions to the king as to how to discharge his functions as the head of the state.

Just as to Al Barani, "It is the duty of the Sultans before they have made up their minds in relation to the an enterprise or policy and published it in the middle of the people, to reflect cautiously on the likelihood of its success and failure as well as its effects on their location, on the religion and the state, and on the army. In Barani's opinion the king should devote himself to governance of his state in such a method that helps him in reaching nearer to God. Welfare of the religion and the state should be the ideal of a good state. A king should be guided through wise men. Bureaucracy is required to run the administration and Barani is an advocate of blue blood aristocracy. He talks in relation to the necessity of hierarchy in administration and points out the composition, classification, nature, and relation of bureaucracy with the Sultan and the people of the state. He is emphatically against the promotion of low-born men. He writes that 'The noble born men in the king's court will bring him honor, but if he favors low born men, they will disgrace him in both the worlds'. He says that kingship is based on two pillars- administration and conquest and it is on the army that both the pillars depend. He also emphasizes on king's concern concerning internal security and foreign dealings. Along with the enforcement of the Shariat, to Barani, dispensing of justice is an essential function of a sovereign. Implementation of law and obedience to law should be the primary concern of a king. Barani refers to four sources of law:

- Te Quran
- Te Hadish (traditions of prophet (Pbuh))
- Te Ijma (opinions and rulings of the majority of Muslim theologians and
- Qiyas (speculative method of deduction).
To this he added Zawabit or state law as a significant source of law in administering the state. With the changing complexion of society and the rising complexities of administration in addition to the accepted principles of traditional Islamic law, Barani advocated for Zawabit or the state laws whose base is non-religious. State laws cannot be contradictory to the orders of the Shariat and its primary objective is to regulate the works of several governmental departments and to foster loyalty. Barani also talks in relation to the recognition of individual rights, i.e. the rights of wife, children, old servants, slaves, etc. and he considers the recognition of people's rights as the foundation of the state. Punishment was measured as an essential means to uphold discipline in the state. Barani refers to several circumstances of the punishments, particularly the death punishment to be awarded through the king. The real importance of Fatwa-i-Jahandari lies in the information that it shows in what methods the original Islamic theory of kingship went through changes in excess of the years in the Indian context. Barani's vast experience in the working of the Delhi Sultanate and the prevailing social order get reflected in his political thoughts.

The other valuable text on statecraft explaining the dominant trend of political thoughts throughout the Mughal rule in India is Abul Fazl's Ain-i-Akbari; Abul Fazl was one of the mainly significant thinkers of the sixteenth century India. Being a great scholar having sound knowledge of dissimilar meadows of learning in the Muslim and the Hindu traditions, he had contributed in formulating several of Akbar's political thoughts. Abul Fazl was influenced through the thought of the divine nature of royal power. He made a distinction flanked by a true king and a selfish ruler. A true king should not be concerned much in relation to himself and power, rather people's well being should be his prime concern. To him, an ideal sovereign is like a father who rules for the general welfare and is guided through the law of God. Though Abul Fazl whispered in 'the divine light of royalty', he did not envisage any role for the intermediaries to communicate the divine order. Abul Fazl says,
Royalty is a light emanating from God, and a ray from the sun....Contemporary language calls this light farri izidi (the divine light) and the tongue of antiquity described it kiyan khwarah (the sublime halo). It is communicated through God to kings without the intermediate assistance of any one’. The Ulemas and the Mijtahids, like the Brahmins in Hinduism, acted as power and interpreter of customary laws to king. But in Abul Fazl's formulation, the intermediaries are not required to interpret religious and holy law and the king himself is expected to judge and interpret holy law. Abul Fazl writes that ‘when the time of reflection comes, and men shake off the prejudices of their education, the thread of the web of religious blindness break and the eye sees the glory of harmoniousness...although some are enlightened several would observe silence from fear of fanatics who lust for blood, but seem like men.... The people will naturally seem to their king and expect him to be their spiritual leader as well, for a king possesses, self-governing of men, the ray of divine wisdom, which banishes from his heart everything that is conflicting. A king will, so, sometimes observe the element of harmony in a multitude of things.... Now this is the case with the monarch of the present age. He now is the spiritual guide of the nation'. At the core of his political thoughts was the belief that the king should be guided through the principles of universal good and to fulfill his royal duty, he could go beyond the holy law. This was an important shift in matters of governance compared to earlier political thinking. The reforms introduced through

Akbar through the abolition of jizya composed from the non-Muslims or a ban on cow slaughter reflected the spirit of new political theory articulated in Ain-i-Akbari. Abul Fazl was a believer in strong centralized monarchical government and for better governance he advocated the sharing of works in the middle of several departments. It was with the help of a highly centralized bureaucracy that the Mughal sovereign ruled in excess of the empire. Abul Fazl's classified society into a four tier system, where rulers and warriors occupied the first location. Learned people were placed in the second
category, artisans and merchants in the third and the laborers belonged to the fourth category. Although this was not based on an, egalitarian philosophy he talked in relation to the importance of each category for the welfare of the state. Therefore the picture of political power that emerges from the revise of Ain-i-Akbari was of a centralized monarchy and the governing principle of the state was the well being of its people.

**RELIGION AND POLITY**

Discussion on the pre-contemporary Indian political thought will remain partial if we do not take into explanation the connection flanked by religion and polity. Let us begin with the views shared through Gandhi and Maulana Azad concerning religion and politics. Gandhi said that those who talk in relation to the separation of religion and politics do not know what religion is. Maulana Azad wrote that there will be nothing left with us if we separate politics from religion.

It is motivating to note that these two great Indian thinkers belonged to two dissimilar religious traditions but both were of the opinion that religion cannot be separated from politics. It may be little bewildering as to how we can claim secularism as the guiding principle of the Indian political custom. It may sound contradictory but if we analyze cautiously, the inner meaning of political thoughts expressed in our several religious traditions, it would be clear to us as to how religion and state are integrated in our political philosophy. The history of India shows that ours is a unique civilization which has, in excess of the years, accommodated several religious traditions. In every religion, whether it is Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Islam, Sikhism or Christianity, with the development of society and new growths, several sects appeared having differences in expressing their loyalty to the almighty. Each religion talks in relation to the moral values and one's duty towards the other and the society at big. References to the virtues of honesty, humility, selflessness, compassion for the poor, etc. are scattered in the teachings of
several religious orders. Nowhere the distinction has been made in the middle of subjects beside religious rows although there might have been individual rulers who deviated from this principle. Those deviations should be measured as aberrations rather than the guiding principles of kingship; here it would be pertinent to refer to Dr. S. Radhakrishnan who said that 'the religious impartiality of the Indian State is not to be confused with secularism or atheism. Secularism as here defined is in accordance with the ancient religious custom of India. It tries to build up a fellowship of believers, not through subordinating individual qualities to the group mind but through bringing them into harmony with each other. This fellowship is based on the principle of diversity in unity which alone has the excellence of creativenesses. The point to be noted here is that the meaning of secularism is based on our religious custom. When we seem at our past, we discover that in the days of Brahmanical power, a part of our society started looking for alternative methods to realize the ultimate truth, and this search resulted in the emergence of Jainism and Buddhism. Several people including the ruling power welcomed the new religious traditions. Likewise when Islam came to India there might have been attempts through a few to create Islam, state religion but we discover that the similar era witnessed the growth of Sufism or Akbar’s Tauhid-i-Ilaahi (described Din-i-Ilaahi) which focused on universalism. The similar era is significant for the growth of Bhakti movement. The Bhakti doctrine preached human equality which is measured as direct impact of Islamic thought. It dreamt of a society based on justice and equality in which men of all creeds would be able to develop their full moral and spiritual stature. The Sufi orders had a power on the teachings of the Sikh Gurus, and in the middle of the followers of Guru Nanak were both Hindus and Muslims. A Muslim chronicler of Shivaji wrote that Shivaji, throughout military campaign, tried to avoid any insulting action against the Muslims 'and if a copy of the Quran was captured through his soldiers, it was supposed to be respectfully restored to the Muslims'. There will be no dearth of references in
our several religious traditions to suggest that at the core of our several traditions lays the spirit of tolerance, universalism, and compassion for the humanity. These teachings from religious traditions are expected to be the guiding principles of governance. Rajdharma suggests more in relation to the sovereign's responsibility towards his subjects rather than misuse of power given to the sovereign through his subjects. It is within this framework that one should attempt to interpret the coexistence of religion and polity in India rather than finding the meaning of secular state as state divorced from religion. So when several contemporary political thinkers provide importance to religion in their political philosophy, we necessity attempt to understand its significance in proper historical perspective. At the similar time one has to be careful in relation to the misuse of religious sentiments for scrupulous sectarian interest.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Explain the major features of political ideas in Ancient India.
- Discuss the important ideas regarding sovereign authority during the medieval period.
- In what way has religion influenced the polity in pre-modern India?
CHAPTER 17

ORIENTALIST DISCOURSE AND COLONIAL MODERNITY

STRUCTURE

- Learning objectives
- Introduction
- Dissimilar strands of recent scholarship
- Nationalism, history and colonial knowledge
- Review questions

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- An attempt will be undertaken to understand the concept of Orientalism and the question of modernity and its colonial roots in India.
- Understand the different strands of Recent Scholarship.
- Explain the nationalism and colonial modernity

INTRODUCTION

In this element, an effort will be undertaken to understand the concept of Orientalism and the question of modernity and its colonial roots in India. This is a relatively new field that has opened up new questions and has significantly reconstituted the old field of colonial history, both for the ex-colonized societies as well as of the colonizers themselves. The history of Europe too, is now increasingly marked through an awareness of the methods
in which the colonial encounter crucially shaped the self-image of Europe itself. We will mainly be concerned, though; with the history of the Indian subcontinent.

Although the stage will be concerned with the debate on the colonial era, it is necessary to understand that it is a field that is irrevocably constituted through the present context. In the last few decades, particularly since the 1980s, this field has given rise to a whole new body of work and serious, often extremely sharp debates in the middle of scholars. It was throughout this era that an intense and fresh engagement with the whole question of our colonial modernity came to the fore. What is crucially significant in relation to the development in the scholarship on the Indian subcontinent is that it focuses, unlike earlier writings on colonial history, on the politics of knowledge implicated in that history. In an extremely important method, it foregrounds the manner in which our knowledge of 'our own' history - and our own selves - is framed through and understood through categories produced through colonial knowledge.

Before we go into a discussion of our actual subject matter, let us create a preliminary observation. Indian history today is no longer what we have recognized it to be so distant from our history text-books. The new growths have illuminated characteristics of that history that were hitherto sheltered in darkness. What do we mean when we say some characteristics were 'sheltered in darkness'? It is not as though some entirely new 'facts' have been uncovered. New facts have certainly become recognized to us, or recognized facts, often measured unimportant, have acquired new meaning because the method we seem at that history has now changed.

DISSIMILAR STRANDS OF RECENT SCHOLARSHIP

There are at least four dissimilar strands of scholarship that have come jointly since the 1980s, that have been at the root of this transformation.
The Neo-Gandhian Critique

In the first lay, there has been since the early 1980s, the reactivation of an older Gandhian critique of modernity. Central in this strand has been the work of scholars like Ashis Nandy, Veena Das and scholar-activists active in the environment and science movements like Claude Alvares and Vandana Shiva. Much of the critique of this set of scholars has been directed at a critique of science and rationality as the ruling ideological coordinates of modernity, alongside the related notion of development followed through the Nehruvian state. Though not all scholars associated with this strand have an explicitly Gandhian orientation, they broadly extend elements of Gandhi's rejection of contemporary Western civilization and its faith in science and cause as the circumstances of human freedom. Ashis Nandy directed his main attack on this ideological constellation of modernity; namely the constellation of science, cause and development. He also extends that critique to the nation-state itself, which he sees as the institutional embodiment of modernity, as an institution that is always intolerant of popular beliefs and methods of livelihood. Nandy sees in the project of the contemporary nation-state, an inherent drive towards homogenization, towards cultural genocide and the desire to reduce life to a few, easily definable and negotiable categories. His central argument in this respect is that notions of the self in the South Asian context have been mainly fluid and it is only with the onset of the contemporary nation-state that the attempts have been made to fix identity into singular categories like Hindus and Muslims. He points to the information that even today, there are hundreds of societies who combine elements of both Hinduism and Islam and discover it hard to 'classify' themselves in neat and exclusive categories. Such an argument is substantiated, for instance through anthropological surveys through scholars like K. Suresh Singh.
The Subaltern Studies School

The second strand can be recognized in the work of the Subaltern Studies School of Indian Historiography. This school too made its first public appearance on the scene in the early 1980s - although its work began in the late 1970s. This group of historians and some political scientists came from a primarily Left-wing political background and much of their initial work was a continuation of the concerns that they had urbanized through the impact of Maoist political practice in the 1970s. Significant in the middle of scholars of this school were historians Ranajit Guha, Gyanendra Pandey, Shahid Amin, David Hardiman and Dipesh Chakrabarty and political scientists like Partha Chatterjee and to some extent, Sudipta Kaviraj. The general thread that links the effort of the early work of the Subaltern historians with that of scholars like Ashis Nandy was a critique of nationalism and nationalist historiography and a concern with popular consciousness. Through a series of volumes published in the 1980s, the Subaltern historians launched a major critique of nationalist historiography which subsumed all histories into the 'History of the Nation'. Through initiating this critique, they sought to recover what Ranajit Guha described "the small voice of history". They sought to understand what those who participated in the nationalist or peasant struggles in the colonial era thought, why they participated and what were the shapes of their motivation and participation. In other languages, they sought to recover the subjectivity and agency - the autonomy - of the subaltern classes, the word 'subaltern', as several of you would know, comes from the writings of the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci. In the early subaltern studies, this term was used to distinguish it from other more restrictive categories like class. 'Subaltern' basically means 'subordinate' and could be used to designate dissimilar types of social, economic, and political subordination. As Guha put it in his "Preface" to the first volume, it would "contain subordination in South Asian
society whether it is expressed in conditions of class, caste, age, gender, and office or in any other method.”

**The Anthropological Studies in the US**

The third strand comes from within the field of region studies from anthropologists like Bernard Cohn, mainly situated in the United States. Bernard Cohn’s work spans a much longer era starting from the mid-1950s. He had been writing on questions relating to colonial knowledge of India and the methods in which this knowledge transformed the extremely society it claimed to revise. His researches also showed how this knowledge’s constituted political subjectivities in the colonial world. Under his stewardship a whole generation of scholars from the University of Chicago, like Nicholas Dirks, Arjun Appadurai and others worked on the dissimilar modalities of colonial knowledge to illustrate how it was thoroughly embedded in the colonial project and power. It was a knowledge that provided the intellectual justification for Britain's civilizing mission in India, where, in Ranajit Guha’s languages, "an official view of caste, a Christian missionary view of Hinduism and an Orientalist view of Indian society as a 'static, timeless, spaceless' and internally undifferentiated monolith, were all produced through the complicity of power and knowledge." Approximately the 1980s, this anthropological work gets reconfigured into a dissimilar type of framework that explicitly situates itself within the field of our discussion. In an influential essay published in 1984, "The Census, Social Structure and Objectification in South Asia", Cohn showed, for instance, how the colonial censuses not only produced knowledge in relation to the India and its people, but also produced an India that was not necessarily the India that lived prior to the advent of colonial rule.
Edward Said's Orientalism

Finally, there is the work of Palestinian-American scholar, Edward Said that could be said to have made possible the coming jointly of these dissimilar bodies of work. With the publication in the 1978, of Said's highly acclaimed tract Orientalism, dissimilar efforts to deal with the continuing legacy of the West in the former colonies as well as in immigrant societies in the West received a major fillip. In this tract, which became extremely influential in and approximately the mid-1980s, Said showed how sure constructions of the East or the 'Orient' have been crucial to Europe's self-image. He showed through a reading of major literary texts as well as political documents, parliamentary speeches and such other sources, how the ‘Orient’ was a peculiar European construction - backward, superstitious, barbaric and irrational on the one hand and exotic and pristine on the other. Said emphasizes, though, that it should not be assumed that "the structure of Orientalism is nothing more than a structure of lies or of myths"; it should be understood as a "body of theory and practice". This body of knowledge, he argues, undoubtedly had an older history, but “in the era from the end of the eighteenth century, there appeared a intricate Orient appropriate for revise in the academy, for display in the museum, for reconstruction in the colonial office, for theoretical illustration in anthropological, biological, linguistic, racial and historical theses in relation to the mankind and the universe, for instances of sociological theories of development, revolution, cultural personality, national or religious character."

It can easily be seen that all the strands of scholarship had already begun in dissimilar methods to challenge the extremely frameworks of knowledge that had dominated our understandings of our history. With the exception of the early Subaltern Studies school, all the others had explicitly begun asking fundamental questions in relation to the Western knowledge -
especially colonial knowledge - itself. Even in the case of the Subaltern historians, their relentless interrogations of nationalist and elitist history-writing and the quest for subaltern autonomy led them eventually to question some of the extremely crucial methods in which nationalism itself was structured through western knowledge. That these dissimilar and diverse strands could come jointly because of another intellectual development in Europe and the United States. This was what is loosely described the post-structuralist current - or what is often loosely termed 'postmodernism - which launched a vigorous internal critique of the whole custom of Western philosophy and metaphysics since the Enlightenment. Though, that is not our immediate concern here and we shall return to some of its more relevant characteristics later. Let us now look at the main contentions of colonial discourse theory.

NATIONALISM AND COLONIAL MODERNITY

While we have delineated the main currents of thought that went into the renewed interrogations of colonial history, our main concern in the rest of the element will be mainly with the work of Subaltern historians and scholars like Kaviraj and Nandy. It is not within the scope of this element to create an assessment of the whole body of work produced under the rubric of Subaltern Studies. What we are concerned with here mainly is the later body of work - what Sumit Sarkar has described the late Subaltern Studies'. For it is there that the concern with Orientalism and colonial discourse acquires it mainly articulate expression. It is there that the mainly sustained and thorough-going examination of both colonial discourse and the peculiar characteristics of what Partha Chatterjee have described "our modernity” has been accepted out. Much of the later work of Bernard Cohn himself and his students like Nicholas Dirks and Gyan Prakash too can be said to fall broadly within the similar body of work. In the discussion that follows, we will talk about sure
themes that emerge from this body of work, rather than proceed in a strictly chronological order.

We have mentioned that the early work of the Subaltern Studies scholars was concerned with the search for subaltern autonomy; that is, of trying to understand shapes of subaltern consciousness and their divergences from those of nationalist political elites, even when they participate in movements led through the latter. This concern naturally led to explorations of how elite consciousness too is/was shaped in a context of colonial subjugation. It led to an exploration of nationalist discourse, its structure, and assumptions, as well as to explorations of shapes of subaltern consciousness. Two things started becoming apparent in the course of these explorations. First, that nationalism was not basically one monolithic ideological formation that every modern society necessity has. The situation was complicated through the information that societies like India's were inserted into modernity through the agency of colonialism. The desire to be contemporary here was, so, enmeshed with the desire to be free and self-governing; that is be 'Indian'. Early nationalist elite were forced to articulate their politics in a condition of subjugation where they simultaneously aspired to the principles of universal equality and liberty embodied through contemporary thought, and had to spot their variation from the West. Second, as a consequence, it was also becoming apparent that nationalism so, also involved a formidable and creative intellectual intervention, formulating and defending its main postulates in the battlefield of politics, as Partha Chatterjee put it. With the publication in early 1983, of Benedict Anderson's now classic Imagined Societies, the possibilities had opened out for a more sustained investigation of how nations are invented. With the publication of this immensely insightful book, the thought that there is anything natural or eternal in relation to the nations was laid at rest. All nations, Anderson argued, are imagined societies. We should clarify one general misconception here. When Anderson suggests that nations are
imagined societies, he does not suggest that nations are so ‘unreal’ or ‘fictitious’. On the contrary, he claims, they are real and call forth such passion that people are ready to die and kill for it, precisely because they are brought into subsistence as a consequence of communal imagination.

_Nationalism as 'Variation'_

Let us now turn to some of the characteristics of nationalism and colonial modernity. Attaining the nationhood and self governance, the nationalists understood, was the only method to be contemporary. That was the method the world they exposed, actually was. The great intellectual question that the nineteenth century intelligentsia had posed to itself was “why did India become a subject nation? How did a small island nation described Britain attain mastery in excess of this vast landmass?” Their answer, we now know, was that this was because India, on the eve of colonial subjugation, was internally divided. That there were hundreds of dissimilar principalities and quarrels, deep internal divisions like those of caste and it was these that made it impossible for the country to resist colonization. In the contemporary world, these could not continue. If we have to become free, we had to overcome the deep internal divisions and usher in a form of self-government that will recognize its entire people as free citizens. The only method this could be achieved was through the attainment of nationhood, for that was the method contemporary societies lived. Yet, it was something that troubled the emergent nationalist elite. How could they be contemporary and yet not basically ape the methods of the Western colonial masters. Being contemporary and striving for nationhood that is for liberation from colonial rule required the subjugated nation, so, to spot its variation from the rulers. It had to be a modernity that was dissimilar in crucial methods from the baggage of western modernity as they saw it. The search for a dissimilar, Indian modernity was then what animated the discourse of nationalism in India. In his essay on "The Census and Objectification", for instance, Bernard Cohn cited from a 1943 text
through Jawaharlal Nehru where Nehru observed: "I have become a queer mixture of the East and the West, out of lay everywhere, at house nowhere... They are both [i.e. the East and the West] part of me, and though they help me in both the East and the West, but they also make a feeling of spiritual loneliness... I am a stranger and an alien in the West... But in my own country also, sometimes, I have an exile's feeling."

This quotation through Nehru highlights one of the mainly abiding inner conflicts of Indian, but more usually, of all postcolonial nationalisms. If we keep in mind that Nehru was through distant the mainly radical of modernists in the middle of all the nationalists, we can imagine what would have been the situation of other nationalist leaders. In information this is an anxiety that is apparent in the middle of the intellectual elite of Indian society extensive before the formal appearance of nationalism towards the end of the 19th century. Ashis Nandy for instance, showed in an early essay that there was a resurgence of the phenomenon of Sati in Bengal towards the end of the 18th century. Through an examination of statistical proof, he argues that it was only in this era that "the rite suddenly came to acquire the popularity of a legitimate orgy." Before that it had declined considerably in mainly parts of the country. Nandy suggested that it was in "the groups made psychologically marginal through their exposure to Western impact" that the rite became popular. These groups so felt the pressure "to demonstrate to others as well as to themselves their allegiance to traditional high civilization." The Bengali elite being the closest to western get in touch with was, therefore mainly affected through this anxiety to be dissimilar. The question of modernity was of course not yet on the agenda at this time, more to the point, in that respect, is Dipesh Chakravarty's reading of early nationalist tracts in Bengal that concerned domesticity and the location of women. While mainly writers of the latter half of the 19th century were clear that "women of this country" were "uncivilized, lazy, quarrelsome" and. so bad for domestic happiness, due to
lack of education, they were also influenced that education itself could produce undesirable traits in women. For education could also create them “arrogant, lazy, immodest, and defiant of power”. This was clearly a fear in relation to the contemporary education and exposure to Western thoughts that was being expressed through the early elite.

Anxieties in relation to the Nation's Women

The concern with women' is apparent in both, Nandy's exploration of Sati and Chakravarty’s explorations of domesticity. It is the 'Women's Question' so, argues Partha Chatterjee, that becomes the location for a major nationalist intervention. Chatterjee explores what he calls the nationalist resolution of the women's question to suggest that the method in which nationalism sought to spot out its variation was through demarcating a sphere of inner sovereignty. What is the nationalist resolution of the women's question? Chatterjee notices that in the last years of the 19th century, with the appearance of nationalism, all the significant questions of social reform centered on the status of women, (like widow remarriage, education of women, against child marriages etc), disappear from public discourse. This happens, he contends, because nationalism starts its journey through demarcating an 'inner' and an ‘outer’ sphere and declaring itself sovereign in the inner, cultural sphere. In the outer sphere its subjugation is given information, but in the inner domain of civilization it claims complete sovereignty. It refuses to create the question of women a matter of negotiation with the colonial state. On the other hand, it does not basically rest content with the old status of women. It rather embarks on a project of creating a 'new woman', educated, active in public life and at the similar time fully aware of her domestic, womanly duties. This 'inner domain’ then, suggests Chatterjee, becomes the sphere where nationalism begins to spot its variation from colonial, Western modernity. But through valorizing cultural variation,
nationalism was not always being contemporary. In information, as several other studies illustrate the assertion of cultural variation often became a method of relegating questions of internal inequalities flanked by groups to the sphere of the 'unspeakable'. The problem then, Chatterjee suggests is that there appeared to be a contradiction lodged at the heart of the nationalist project: its search for modernity was marked through a thrash about against modernity in some sense. "What was national was not always secular and contemporary, and the popular and democratic quite often traditional and sometimes fanatically anti-contemporary."

**Cultural Split and Liberal thoughts**

Sudipta Kaviraj introduces three more motivating characteristics in his delineation of the characteristics of colonial modernity. First, he argues, contemporary colonial education introduced a split in the Indian cultural life, through bringing into being two “rather exclusive spheres of English and vernacular discourse.” The concerns that animated these dissimilar spheres were extremely dissimilar. While the English-speaking world was more concerned with thoughts of individual liberty, those working in the vernacular world were distant less concerned with democracy as a form of government. The vernacular nationalist intelligentsia was more concerned with the problem of "communal freedom of the Indian people from British rule" rather than with that of individual freedom. Indian nationalist elite encountered the great liberal thoughts of equality, freedom, and autonomy in a context of subjugation and were so, more immediately concerned with issues of national sovereignty. They, so, chose to transfer these thoughts into their own concerns. Here, we see the second characteristic: Liberal thoughts, Kaviraj contends, did have “a deep and profound power in Indian political argument” but this power was not in conditions of implanting liberal thoughts but nationalist ones. This is not a minor or trivial variation but in a sense crucial, for as Kaviraj points out, the
thought of equality flanked by nations or societies can be totally blind to the thought of internal equality within the national society. Hence, even somebody like Gandhi could easily justify the caste system while claiming national equality and freedom from the British.

**A Dissimilar Sequence and Dissimilar Modernity**

This second characteristic, just as to Kaviraj, is also connected to a third: Modernity in India followed an extremely dissimilar sequence from that in the West. Modernity is a historical constellation, Kaviraj argues, that comprises three separate procedures: capitalist industrial manufacture, political institutions of liberal democracy and the emergence of a society where old society bonds' have been mainly dissolved and the procedure of individuation has taken lay. This means that in the lay of old shapes of belonging, there have appeared new interest-based associations.

This is what is described in political theory, 'the legroom of civil society'. In the historical trajectory of the West, democracy appeared after the other two procedures had urbanized to a high degree. Initial disciplining of the working class, for instance, took lay in a context where there was no possibility of democratic resistance. In information, democratic aspirations were, at least partly, a consequence of the procedure of capitalist industrialization. In India, on the other hand, democracy and parliamentary institutions preceded the other two procedures. Kaviraj links this dissimilar sequence to a type of populist politics that comes to control the political scene in India and several post-colonial countries.

It is this problem that Partha Chatterjee has recently conceptualized in his thought of "political society". Chatterjee argues that what is described civil society in the West is a domain of the individuated, rights-bearing citizen that is governed through rules of free entry and exit and individual autonomy. Non-Western societies, he suggests, are marked through a permanent hiatus
flanked by this domain of civil society, which is governed through the normative ideals of Western modernity and the vast regions of society that relate to the developmental state as 'populations' that are subject to the policy interventions through the state. Mere, it is the responsibility of the government rather than any notion of rights that becomes the ground on which claims of these populations are negotiated. We cannot go into a longer discussion of this concept as elaborated through Chatterjee, but it is significant to note that just as to him, one of the crucial defining characteristics of 'political society' is that it is a domain where the thought of a society still holds a powerful sway - as opposed to the individual who is the defining feature of civil society. It is the argument of scholars like Chatterjee and Kaviraj that this peculiar characteristic of non-Western modernity should not be understood as a 'lack' or 'underdevelopment' or as a 'partial modernity'. Rather, they should be seen as the specific method in which modernity in the colonial context came to be constituted. It has a dissimilar history from that of Western modernity and is likely to have a dissimilar future.

NATIONALISM, HISTORY AND COLONIAL KNOWLEDGE

So distant we have talked in relation to the nationalism, assuming that there was one single entity described nationalism - and that was Indian nationalism. As it happens, there was neither a single nationalism, nor for that matter, a single Indian nationalism. We know, for instance, that the Indian National Congress espoused one type of Indian nationalism that we may call 'secular-nationalism'. We also know that the Muslim League espoused, at least from approximately 1940 onwards, a Pakistani nationalism. This is often referred to as the 'two-nation theory'. This was also propounded through someone like Vinayak Damodar Savarkar who stood for explicitly Hindu-Indian nationalism. We also know for instance, that there was throughout the nationalist era a Bengali nationalism, an Assamese nationalism, Malayali nationalism and such other nationalisms. The question is that if there was an
already existing substance/nation described India, how do we explanation for
the information that so several dissimilar people saw it in so several dissimilar
methods? Sudipta Kaviraj answers this question, in his well-recognized essay
"The Imaginary Institution of India", through claiming that the India that we
talk of so unproblematically today, was not really a detection; it was an
invention! Through calling it detection as Nehru did in his Detection of India,
we appear to imply that "it was already there", presumably from time
immemorial. If you are asked today to describe what India is, you will mainly
almost certainly point to its geographical boundaries stretching from Kashmir
to Kanyakumari and Bay of Bengal to the Arabian Sea; you will recount the
dissimilar linguistic, religious, caste, and tribal groups that inhabit this
landmass. You will also almost certainly say that because of all this India
symbolizes a 'unity in diversity'. And yet, what if you are told that before the
nineteenth century, nobody exactly knew the physical stretch of this landmass
and that our ancestors had no thought of how several societies and religions
lived in this land. Nor did they have any thought of how several people there
were in each society. What then is the picture of India that you will draw?
How did the early nationalists draw the picture of their India?

Construction of India in the 19th Century

Take for instance the information that the first tentative maps of 'India'
— the name for India too did not exist at that time - were drawn up through
James Rennell, a colonial official in Bengal, flanked by 1782 and 1788. It was
only through 1818 that, with the East India Company's annexation of big parts
of the subcontinent, that and thought of the geographical stretch of the land
began to emerge. It was only in the 19th century that the thought of a
geographical entity described 'India' was consolidated. As Mathew Edney's
detailed documentation and analysis of the mapping of India argues, "In
constructing a uniform and comprehensive archive of India, the British fixed
the scope and character of the region's territories. They situated and mapped
the human landscape of villages, forts, roads, irrigation schemes, and
boundaries within the physical landscape of hills, rivers, and forests. It was
also in the 19th century that the first censuses of India were done and only in
1881 that the first comprehensive census took lay. It was then that the thought
of the dissimilar societies that inhabited the land became accessible, as also
their numbers. But this was not all. It was not basically that the British
compiled information in relation to the land in an objective manner. To count
and create sense of a vast population of a land like the Indian subcontinent,
they had to classify the population into dissimilar groups. As there were no
clear-cut notions of society, the British defined them in their own methods for
purposes of classification. Big categories such as 'Hindu' and 'Muslim', as well
as those of caste (in which they fitted thousands of jatis) were in a sense,
colonial constructs, devised primarily for the purpose of census enumerations.
It is not as though religious denominations and jatis did not 'exist' before the
censuses, but there were big zones of indefinable 'grey regions' that were not
easily amenable to classification. These hundreds of categories had to be
reduced to a few, easily handle-able, administrative categories. For that
purpose their boundaries had to be precisely defined, in doing so, colonial rule
actually created new categories, and fixed them in sure specific methods, as a
lot of historical work now shows. This is not a matter that we can go into at
any length here, but a few points should be noted.

Kaviraj has made a distinction flanked by what he calls 'fuzzy' and
'enumerated' societies. One of the methods in which the extremely act of
enumeration and classification transformed the method in which societies
exist, is captured through Kaviraj in this distinction. Individuals in pre-
contemporary, fuzzy societies did not have a fixed sense of identity but that
does not mean that they had no sense of identity. Individuals, he argues, could
on appropriate occasions, describe themselves as vaishnavas, Bengalis or
maybe Rarhis or Kayasthas, villagers and so on. But none of these would be a complete account of their identity. Each of these could extremely precisely describe their conduct in specific situations but it was radically dissimilar from the identity of contemporary enumerated societies in one method. It was only when one singular identity was fixed that they would begin to inquire, as contemporary societies do, in relation to the how several there were in the world, what was their representation in public institutions, how were they being discriminated against and so on. So, as Dipesh Chakrabarty asserts, "through the 1890s, Hindu and Muslim leaders were quoting census figures at each other to prove that whether or not they had received their legitimate share of benefits (such as employment and education) from British rule." In that sense, contemporary notions of majority and minority and such other questions become possible to pose only with the emergence of such enumerated societies. It is from this angle that Gyanendra Pandey contends, in his Construction of Communalism in Colonial North India, that even though there were sectarian conflicts in the middle of Hindus and Muslims before colonialism, they were usually local conflicts with several dissimilar roots. They were not communalism in the contemporary sense because there was no sense of a 'society' in the first lay. At any rate, he argues, there was no sense of an all-India Hindu or Muslim society before colonial practices and knowledge inscribed this variation as essential to Indian society. We can see for instance, that the whole discourse in relation to the Muslim population overtaking the Hindu population could only begin to take form once the thought of a majority and minority was made possible through practices of enumeration and classification.

One of the major facts that emerge then from the discussion of colonial governmental practices is that our extremely thought of India, its geographical boundaries, its population and its cultural composition etc are all shaped through the knowledge produced through the colonial state. What is mainly
significant is that all subsequent politics, including nationalist politics, was shaped through this knowledge. In the initial phases of the nationalist movement, it was not really clear what nationalism was all in relation to the. There was a critique of colonial rule, to be sure. But then, this critique was not being mounted on behalf of a clearly defined nation described India. As several studies have shown, there was often a Bengali nationalism or an Assamese nationalism and such others that were the first identifications of the anti-colonial elite. As the thought of India became more entrenched and as its contours became more clearly defined, nationalism quickly appropriated this India as the ideal candidate for the new nation-to-be.

**Nationalist Imagination and Indian History**

There was one problem, though. How could a so recent an entity claim to any type of legitimacy as a nation? For the extremely thought of nationhood required that the new political society lay claim to an ancient history. For the big part of the nineteenth century so, we see early nationalists vigorously at work to invent a history of India. As Kaviraj puts, in this era, particularly in Bengal, "history breaks out everywhere". Significant thinkers like Bankimchandra Chattopadhyay proclaim, “we necessity have a history”. Bankim in information, puts it more vehemently that "Even when they go hunting for birds, sahebs [i.e. Britishers] write its history, but alas, Bengalis have no history." Notice that even at this stage, Bankim was only thinking of Bengal and Bengali as his nation; nevertheless the desire to have a history was already powerful." What does this search for history mean? Does it mean that Bengalis or Indians had no past? Certainly that was not the case. But as in all pre-modern cultures, the connection to the past was of a dissimilar type. What is it that made 'history' in the contemporary sense dissimilar from the earlier accounts of the past? If we seem at the accounts that are accessible in the pre-colonial era, they are either accounts of genealogies of kings or they are orally
transmitted stories of scrupulous events. For there to be history there had to be a society—an enumerated society—whose history it would be. There had to be a more concretely and rigidly defined sense of a society or a people whose history could then be written. This sense arose only when the thought of 'India' became a tangible reality. Much of the effort of the nationalists of dissimilar hues was directed then at defining the political society such that it could incorporate all the diverse elements within the land described India. And this India had to have a history. Where did the possessions for writing a history of India come from?

**Orientalism and the Colony's Self-knowledge**

It is well recognized that academic knowledge in relation to the India—its history—was produced through the efforts of the great Orientalist scholars of the late 18th and 19th centuries. The founding of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1784, through British Orientalists like William Jones, can be measured as a milestone in this enterprise. O. P. Kejariwal’s The Asiatic Society of Bengal and the Detection of India's past for instance document the work of this pioneering institution in the excavation of India's past. You might be surprised to know, as Kejariwal was when he started looking at the work of the Asiatic Society, that till as late as 1834, the names of ancient emperors like Samudragupta and Chandragupta Maurya were not recognized to anybody. He even mentions with some excitement, "I exposed that even Asoka and Kanishka, not to mention their dynasties, were strange names till the Society's work brought them to light". He goes on to observe that it was astonishing for him to see that even the history of other well recognized dynasties like the Palas, the Senas, the Maukharies, the Valabhis and such others were strange till the 19th century, when the Asiatic Society scholars brought them to light. This is not the lay to dwell on the details of the voluminous work done through Orientalist scholars of the 19th century to unearth the history of India.
What is significant for us to note is that if right upto the 19th century, what we know today as the "ancient nation" of India did not have a clear geographical form, did not have an explanation of the dissimilar cultures and societies that existed in it, did not have a history, then what was it that made possible the story that we know today - that 'India' is an ancient nation, which had an apparent Golden Age in the time of the Gupta and Mauryan Empires, and so on? The point being made here through scholars whom 'we have been discussing above is that India, like mainly other nations is a relatively new and contemporary entity. Like other nations, it is the work of a communal imagination that was at work from the second half of the 19th century onwards, which deftly appropriated the work done through Orientalist scholars, in order to produce the narrative of a great and ancient civilization. This was the nationalist imagination that retrospectively produced a History of the Nation, in which all the separate histories of the dissimilar entities that today form a part of the landmass described India, became reconfigured as the History of India. So when 19th century nationalists like Bankimchandra proclaimed require for history, they were actually proclaiming require for a history of this contemporary, rationalistic type. This is why Kaviraj claims that India was an substance of invention and not a detection, That is why there is something worth thinking in relation to the for instance, in Kaviraj’s claim that incorporating the history of the Satavahanas or of the Indus valley civilization into a history of 'India' involves a sure disingenuousness. Or, let us say, on the foundation of present geographical boundaries can we then lay claim to the Indus Valley civilization and Mohenjodaro because they fall in present-day Pakistan? In other languages, how legitimate is the effort to claim all past histories as parts of present-day India's national history?

Now, the information that "we did not have a history" before the 19th century should not be understood to mean that 'we' did not have any sense or connection with the past. Nationalists of the 19th and early 20th centuries
routinely saw this as a sign of our backwardness, of a 'lack' that showed that we were not contemporary. Here, a significant point should be kept in mind. One of the methods in which post-structuralism has questioned the general sense of Western Rationalism since the Enlightenment is through demanding its notion of 'human history' as a singular and linear development. We know, for instance, that the story of human history as a story of progress from lower to higher shapes has been the foundation of contemporary historical consciousness. Post-structuralism has, in the middle of other things, challenged the thought that there can be only one method - the historical method - of relating to the past. Again, but it is useful to bear in mind that such historical self-consciousness is a feature of modern enumerated societies who require to continuously give definitions of their communal selves to themselves and to others. If pre-modern societies did not require any rational explanation of their past, it was basically because their methods of being in the world did not require them to demonstrate who they are. The notion of time in such societies marks no clear separation flanked by mythical time and existed time. One of the methods in which this understanding of history and historical time has affected lives in the colonies - and continues to do so - is that it institutes a scrupulous historical journey for all societies as though they were a single entity. In that story, Europe appears as the lay where history is, because it is foremost in the level of progress. All societies then become condemned to replay European history on their ground. One of the lessons of the body of work is that we have to begin writing our own histories, not through rejecting Europe but through denying it and its history the universal status that it has acquired.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Explain Nationalism's concern with orientalism and colonial discourse.
- Discuss Nationalism and its features with reference to liberal ideas.
- Critically examine the construction of India in the 19th century.
CHAPTER 18
SALIENT FEATURES OF MODERN
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES
After reading this chapter, you should be able to:
- Understand the salient features of modem Indian political thought.
- Explain the phases of modern Indian thought.
- Discuss the social reform and the "Hindu Renaissance".
- Discuss the Muslim political thoughts.

INTRODUCTION
This element deals with the salient characteristics of contemporary Indian political thought. This is not an easy exercise as there is no single body of thought that we can call 'Indian'. Nor is there a stability of concerns crossways time - say flanked by the early nineteenth century and the late nineteenth century. Taking a synoptic view so necessarily reduces the complexities and does not do full justice to minority or subordinate voices,
relegating them further to the margins. You will do well to bear in mind that mainly of the contemporary Indian political and social thought is marked through the experience of the colonial encounter. It was within this universe that mainly of our thinkers, hailing from dissimilar societies and social groups, embarked on their intellectual-political journey.

TWO PHASES OF CONTEMPORARY INDIAN THOUGHT

We can broadly divide contemporary Indian thought into two phases. The first stage was that of what has often been referred to as the stage of 'Social Reform'. Thinkers of this stage, as we shall see, were more concerned with the internal regeneration of indigenous society and because its first effervescence occurred in Bengal, it was often referred to as the 'Bengal renaissance'. Nationalist historians of course, even started referring to it as the Indian renaissance, but this will be an inaccurate account for reasons that we will see shortly. The second stage, more intricate and textured in several methods, is the stage that we can designate as the nationalist stage. The concerns in this stage shift more decisively to questions of politics and power, and of freedom from colonial rule. It is significant to keep in mind that what we are calling the 'nationalist stage' is merely a shorthand expression, for there were precisely in this era, several more tendencies, and currents that cannot basically be subsumed under the rubric of 'nationalism'. At the extremely least, there are significant currents like the Muslim and Dalit that spot the intellectual and political 'search for the Self' in this era.

Before we go into the specific characteristics of the thinkers of the two broad eras that we have outlined, it is necessary to create a few clarifications. Though mainly scholars have tended to see these as two separate phases or eras, this method of looking at the history of contemporary Indian political thought can be quite problematic. These periodisations can only be extremely broad and tentative ones, made for the purpose of convenience of revise; on no explanation should they be rendered into fixed and hermetically sealed eras. In
information, we can more productively see them as two broad currents which do not necessarily follow one after the other. As we shall see, there are several social reform concerns that take on a dissimilar form and continue into the nationalist stage. In information, the nationalist stage itself reveals two extremely separate tendencies in this respect. On the one hand, there is the dominant or hegemonic nationalism, represented in the main through the Indian National Congress, where the social reform agenda is abandoned in an important method; on the other there are other contending narratives that insist on privileging the reform agenda much to the discomfort of the nationalists. We shall soon see why. We shall also have the occasion to note that, in this respect, Gandhi remnants approximately the one figure within this hegemonic nationalism, who keeps trying to bring in the reform agenda into the nationalist movement.

SOCIAL REFORM AND THE ‘HINDU RENAISSANCE’

There was a veritable explosion of intellectual action throughout the nineteenth century, particularly in Bengal and Western India. In Bengal there was the Young Bengal movement, and publicists, thinkers and social reformers like Raja Rammohun Roy, Iswarchandra Vidyasagar, Keshub Chandra Sen, Michael Madhusudan Dutta, Surendranath Banerjee, Swami Vivekananda and such other personalities who embodied this effervescence. In Western India there were reformers like Bal Shastri Jambhekar, Jotirao Govindrao Phule, Ramakrishna' Gopal Bhandarkar, Gopal Ganesh Agarkar and Swami Dayanand Saraswati (whose action was mainly in North India), such other luminaries who directly addressed the question of internal regeneration of Indian society. They launched the mainly vigorous critique of their own society, with the aim of bringing it out of its backwardness. As Rammohun Roy put it, it was the "thick clouds of superstition" that "hung all in excess of the land" (i.e. Bengal), that worried him mainly. As a consequence, he whispered, polygamy and infanticide were rampant and the
location of the Bengali woman was “a tissue of ceaseless oppressions and miseries”. Idolatory and priest craft were often held responsible through thinkers like Dayanand Saraswati, for the destruction of the yearning for knowledge. He whispered that it was institutions such as these that had made Hindus fatalist and inert. The issues that dominated the concerns of the social reformers were primarily related to the status of women in Indian society. Sati, widow remarriage and the education of women were central issues raised through the reformers. To this end, they re-interpreted custom, often offered ruthless critiques of traditional practices and even lobbied support with the colonial government for enacting appropriate legislations for banning some of the more obnoxious practices like Sati.

Needless to say, while the location of women was a matter of central concern, there was another equally significant question - that of caste divisions and untouchability that became the focus of critique of several of these reformers. Though, you necessity bear in mind that their approach to caste was dissimilar from those of reformers like Jotiba Phule and later, Dr Ambedkar. Unlike the latter, they did not seek the emancipation of the lower castes, but their assimilation into the mainstream of Hindu society. Mainly of the reformers held not only that Hindu society had become degenerate, insulated and deeply divided into hundreds of dissimilar societies and castes, but also it had become thereby incapable of forging any type of ‘general will’. Hindu society so, had to be reconstituted and reorganized into a single society. Swami Vivekananda or Dayanand Saraswati so, sought to reorganize somewhat beside the rows of the Christian Church, as Ashis Nandy suggests. If Vivekananda was candid that no other society "puts its foot on the neck of the wretched as mercilessly as does that of India", Dayanand Saraswati sought to redefine caste 'in such a method that it ceased to be determined solely through birth. He sought to contain the criterion of individual accomplishment 'in the determination of the caste-status of an individual.
Two Intellectual Moves of Reformers

There are two separate moves made through the reformers that we necessity bear in mind. First, their critiques drew extremely explicitly from the exposure to Western liberal thoughts. To several of them British power was the livelihood proof of the validity and 'invincibility' of those thoughts. They were so, open admirers of British rule. For instance, as Bal Shastri Jambhekar saw it, a mere sixty or seventy years of British rule in excess of Bengal had transformed it beyond recognition. He saw in the lay of the “violence, oppression and misrule” of the past, a picture of “security and freedom” where people were able to acquire “a superior knowledge of the Arts and Sciences of Europe". Jambhekar’s statement is in information, fairly representative of the understanding of the early reformers with regard to British rule. It should be remembered that the first generation of reformist thinkers began their intellectual journey in the face of a dual challenge. On the one hand, there was the overwhelming attendance of colonial rule that did not basically symbolize to them a foreign power but also a contemporary and ‘advanced’ society that had made breathtaking advances in the field of thoughts - of science and philosophy. To them, it embodied the exhilarating growths of science and contemporary methods of thinking that a country like India — which to mainly reformers was essentially Hindu — had to also adopt, if it was to emerge as a free and powerful country in the contemporary era. On the other hand, there was the continuous challenge thrown before the emerging indigenous intelligentsia through Christian missionaries who mounted a powerful critique of Hinduism and some of its mainly inhuman practices like Sati, female infanticide, and caste oppression - particularly the abominable practice of untouchability. Questions of widow re-marriage and the education of women, so were major issues of debate and contention. These formidable challenges required two simultaneous intellectual moves: (a) an acknowledgement of the rot that had set in, in Hindu society and a thorough
going critique of it. For this purpose, they welcomed contemporary liberal thoughts and philosophy with open arms, (b) as we saw, in the last element, they were equally anxious to retain a sense of their own Self. Complete self-negation could not create a people great. So, mainly of the reformers, drawing on modern Orientalist scholarship, claimed a great and ancient past. Even a influenced Anglophile like Rammohun Roy, for instance had the occasion to reply to a missionary critic that "the world is indebted to our ancestors for the first dawn of knowledge which sprang up in the East" and that India had nothing to learn from the British "with respect to science, literature and religion." This awe of Western knowledge and achievements and a simultaneous valorization of a hoary Indian past, were general characteristics of the reformers of all shades - even though the specific emphasis on dissimilar characteristics varied from thinker to thinker. For instance, Dayananda was not really influenced, as several others were, through Western thinkers and philosophers. Nevertheless, he too acknowledged the immense progress made through the West. He attributed this progress to the high sense of public duty, energetic temperament and adherence to own religious principles, rather than to their scientific and philosophical achievements. He so drew extremely dissimilar conclusions from his reading of the modernity and progress of the West, which focused on the regeneration of Hindu society through religious reform.

There are reasons to consider that the early responses to British rule and the so-described Renaissance were a distinctly Hindu phenomenon. For several reasons that we cannot go into in this element, it was within Hindu society that the first critical engagement with colonial modernity began. Other responses from societies like the Muslims, had their own separate specificities and history and we shall talk about them separately. Though, we can identify two immediate reasons for this relatively early effervescence within Hindu society. One immediate cause for the Hindu response was of course, the information that it was precisely sure practices within Hindu society that
colonial rule sought to address. A second cause was that, for specific historical reasons, it was the Hindu elite that had an access to English education and exposure to the radical thoughts of the Enlightenment. It will be wrong, though, to present what was essentially a response from within Hindu society as an "Indian renaissance".

There was a time when mainly scholars would consider the Bengal Renaissance in scrupulous, as an analogue of the European Renaissance. More specifically, the "role of Bengal in India's contemporary awakening" as historian Sushobhan Sarkar argued, was seen as analogous to the role played through Italy in the European Renaissance. Later historians like Sumit Sarkar and Ashok Sen though, reviewed the legacy of the Bengal Renaissance in the 1970s, and came to the conclusion that the portrayal of the intellectual awakening of this era was actually quite flawed. The tendency to see the division flanked by the reformers and their opponents as one flanked by 'progressives' and 'traditionalists' was an oversimplification of the story of the renaissance. They noted the "deeply contradictory" nature of the "break with the past" inaugurated, for instance through Rammohun Roy, which combined with it, strong elements of a Hindu elitist framework. Sumit Sarkar, in information, presented a much more modest and complicated picture of the Renaissance than had been drawn through earlier historians and scholars. It creates more sense, so, to see these responses as Bhikhu Parekh does, as primarily Hindu responses to the colonial encounter. Parekh has suggested that for these Hindu thinkers, their own self-definition and their effort to understand what colonial rule was all in relation to the, were part of the similar exercise: they could not describe and create sense of themselves without creation sense of colonial rule and vice versa.

In this context, an intense soul-searching marked the behaviors of the early intelligentsia. The encounter with colonialism and through it, with thoughts of equality and liberty, made them aware of some of the inhuman practices still prevalent in Indian society. It was the part that was able to avail
of Western education and steeped so in Western values that became the harbinger of reforms.

**Manners of Reformist Thought**

Bhikhu Parekh has suggested that the arguments of these Hindu reformers relied on one or more of the following four manners of arguments derived from custom but deployed with a separate newness to meet the demands of changing times. First, they appealed to scriptures that seemed to them to be more hospitable to their concerns. Vidyasagar for instance relied on the Parasharasmriti, while Rammohun Roy invoked the Upanishads. Second, they invoked what they described sadharandharma, which they interpreted to mean the universal principles of morality. Third, they appealed to the thought of a yugadharma, or the principles that accord with the needs of the prevailing Yuga or epoch. Fourthly, they invoked the thought of loksangraha, and "argued that the practice in question had such grave consequences that unless eradicated, it would destroy the cohesion and viability of the Hindu social order." As instances, he mentions that Vidyasagar argued that unmarried widows were turning to prostitution or corrupting their families; K.C. Sen contended that child marriages were endangering the survival of the Hindu jati; Dayananda Saraswati whispered that image worship was leading to internal sectarian quarrels.

V.R. Mehta has suggested that there are at least two significant theoretical issues involved in these intellectual initiatives of the reformers. First, they worked strenuously to change the attitude towards fate and other-worldliness and assert the importance of action in this world. While they sustained to assert the importance of the soul and spirituality as a distinctive characteristic of Hindu/Indian thought, they shifted the emphasis to underline the significance of "enterprise in the service of the society." In that sense, they asserted the significance of secular, this-worldly concerns, in the face of the challenges of the contemporary world. Secondly, the main focus of their
enquiry though, remained not the individual but society, society and humanity as a whole. They do not see society as and aggregate of individuals in pursuit of their self interests but as an organic whole. He suggests that this was so for two reasons. Firstly, there was already a strong custom in India that emphasized the wholeness or oneness of being. Secondly, the individualist thought society was already under attack in much of the nineteenth century thinking in Europe itself.

There is a third characteristic that he also mentions in relation to later social reform thought - the concern with the welfare of the people and the attraction that thoughts such as 'socialism' and 'equality' held for thinkers like Vivekananda and Bankimchandra.

Mehta also locates three broadly identifiable sources of the elements that went into the constitution of Renaissance thought. The first, the "civilization and temper of European Renaissance and the Reformation", and more particularly the thoughts of Bentham, Mill, Carlyle and Coleridge through which came a sense of democracy and rule of law and private enterprise. These thoughts became accessible to the indigenous elite through the advent of English education. The second was the power of the thoughts of German philosophers like Schelling, Fichte, and Herder. This is a current though, that influenced the later-day nationalists more than the early reformers - with their sharp emphasis on the thoughts of volk, society, duty and nation that were more immediately the concern of nationalists like Bankimchandra, Vivekananda, Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo Ghosh. The third source recognized through Mehta is Indian traditional thought. Here the work of great Orientalist scholars like William Jones and Max Mueller, who had brought ancient Indian civilization and learning to light, became the foundation for a renewed appeal to the greatness of that past. Though, as you will see in subsequent elements, it was the first and third of these sources that made up the framework of the reformist thinkers. The concern with ‘nation’ and a rejection of everything British and colonial was strikingly absent in the middle of them.
THE ARRIVAL OF NATIONALISM

'Nationalism' could be said to have made its appearance in the last part of the nineteenth century. In this stage, the concerns and approach of the thinkers change in an extremely important method. Here there is a strong concern with the 'freedom of the nation' and an approximately irreconcilable hostility towards colonial rule. Unlike the social reformers before them, they placed no trust on the institutions of the colonial state for affecting any reform. On the contrary, they displayed a positive opposition to what they now measured the 'interference' through the colonial state in the 'internal matters' of the nation. Alongside this, there is a parallel move towards privileging of the political thrash about in excess of social reforms.

The ‘Inner’ and ‘Outer’ Domains

Partha Chatterjee observes that there is a disappearance of the 'women's question', so central to the concerns of the reformers, from the agenda of the nationalists towards the end of the nineteenth century. We may also mention here the information that practically the first major nationalist mobilization took laid approximately the Age of Consent Bill of 1891, where the nationalists argued that this was gross interference in the affairs of the nation and that Hindu society would be robbed of its distinctiveness if this were allowed to pass. As you would know, this Bill was meant to prohibit marital intercourse with girls below the age of twelve. You would also know that in the past, mainly reformers had in information solicited colonial legal intervention in the prohibition of sure practices, even when these supposedly intervened within the so- described 'private' sphere. It should also be remembered that this was a controversy that spread distant beyond the borders of Bengal and lay behind the final parting of methods flanked by Gopal Agarkar and Bal Gangadhar Tilak - the former supporting the cause of social reform and the latter staunchly opposing it. Chatterjee suggests that this
disappearance of women's issues from the agenda of the nationalists had to do with a new framework that had been set in lay through then. This framework was feature of what Chatterjee calls nationalism's 'moment of departure' and was a fairly elaborate one, where the overriding concern was that of the nation's sovereignty. Here, Chatterjee argues that nationalism began through creation a distinction flanked by two spheres: the 'material and the 'spiritual', or what is another name for it, the 'outer' and 'inner' sphere. This was a distinction already made through the reformers and even they would, on occasions, claim that they were spiritually superior to the Birtish, even if the latter had made important material progress. What the nationalists did then, was to carry in excess of this distinction into the formulation of an entirely novel type. It conceded that as a colonized nation it was subordinate to the colonizers in the material sphere. But there was one domain that the colonizer had no access to: this was the inner domain of civilization and spirituality. Here the nation declared itself sovereign. What did this mean? This meant that henceforth, in this inner domain, it would not allow any intervention through the colonial state; From now on, the questions of social reform would become an 'internal matter' that would be dealt with after the nation attained freedom in the material domain. This did not mean though, that all nationalists were against reforms per se. What it did mean was that these questions would now be dealt with after the power of the state passed into the hands of the nationalists.

There is another aspect of this distinction that Chatterjee does not deal with, but which we can easily see in relation to the question of caste reforms. Soon after the Age of Consent agitation, the nationalists led through Tilak threatened to bum down the pandal of the Indian Social Conference that used to be held simultaneously with the sessions of the Indian National Congress and used to be a forum for discussing questions of social reform. This was the era when the so-described 'moderates' were in the leadership of the Congress. The methods of the moderates like Gokhale and Ranade were in the
framework of constitutional reform and extremely much in row with the location of the early reformers. With the arrival of nationalism, all this changed and soon power within the Indian National Congress passed into the hands of the so-described 'extremists', in scrupulous the Lal-Bal-Pal combine (i.e. Lala Lajpat Rai, BalGangadhar Tilak and Bipin Chandra Pal). Unlike the women's question there was no resolution here with regard to caste reforms; they were basically deferred “in the superior interests of anti-colonial unity”. All issues of social reform were henceforth to be measured “divisive” of national unity. As it happens, there is one more thing that happened here: with the demarcation of the 'inner' sphere as a sphere of sovereignty, several socially conservative thoughts could also now easily inhabit the nationalist movement, It is here that we necessity locate the strident critique of nationalism that was made not only through leaders and thinkers like Jotiba Phule and B.R. Ambedkar but also several Muslim leaders who began to see the emergent nationalism as a purely Hindu affair. As nationalism became a mass movement and since mainly nationalists saw the incipient nation as primarily Hindu, there was an rising resort in this stage to a revival of Hindu symbols for mobilization.

Although Gandhi himself resorted to the use of Hindu symbols, he was acutely aware of the unfinished agenda of social reform. Here it is motivating though, that while he situated himself squarely within the framework of nationalism as defined through his precursors, and held on to the thought of sovereignty in the inner sphere, he nevertheless made an significant departure in conditions of his insistence on the question of the social reform. Unlike other nationalists, he was not prepared to abandon it altogether and would repeatedly insist upon require of Hindu society to redeem itself through exorcising untouchability from within itself through 'self-purification'. It is also motivating that while he himself used the thought of 'Ram Rajya' as a utopia of nationhood, he made untiring efforts to draw the Muslims into the mainstream of the nationalist thrash about.
Concerns of the Nationalists

At this stage, it is necessary to point out that it will be wrong to see the divisions flanked by dissimilar strands as those flanked by 'progressives' and 'conservatives' or 'modernists' and 'traditionalists'. For, as several scholars have pointed out, even the nationalists who rejected the standpoint of the reformers, were working for a thoroughly modernist agenda. Their valorization of Hindu custom was not a valorization of existing practices of Hindu religion. In information, they all wanted, much like the reformers, a contemporary and reorganized Hindu society that would become the centre-piece of the emerging nation. Being 'Hindu' to them was the sign of national identity rather than a religious one. It is for this cause that, as Bhikhu Parekh notes, these thinkers (whom he calls 'critical traditionalists') were mainly preoccupied with themes of statecraft, autonomy of political morality, political realism, will power, and courage - issues that were absent from the discourse of the reformers. And these were all entirely contemporary concerns. This concern with 'Hinduness' as a marker of national, rather than religious identity was extremely much there not only in the case of Congress nationalists but also of Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, the author of the ideology of Hindutva. It is not surprising that Savarkar, who stayed absent from the Gandhi-dominated Congress movement, was a thorough modernist and atheist who was opposed to all types of superstitions and was greatly influenced through the scientific and philosophic achievements of the West. In information, Savarkar greatly valued the work done through Ambedkar and unlike Gandhi who was suspicious of his motives, he associated him with his Hindu Mahasabha functions. What is even more motivating is that Savarkar’s critique of Gandhi was precisely because of Gandhi’s wholesale rejection of contemporary civilization, science and technology. In a sense, like Nehru the secular-nationalist, Savarkar's complaint with Gandhi related to his 'irrationality' and 'backward-looking' thoughts.
This is precisely the conundrum of the nationalist stage that has eluded several scholars and historians. For, it is the proclaimed anti-modernist and sanatani Hindu Gandhi who stood steadfastly for Hindu-Muslim unity as the precondition of India's freedom, while the modernist and secular leaders like Madan Mohan Malaviya, Purushottamadas Tandon and Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi often seemed to be speaking a language of Hindu nationalism. It was Gandhi who made the Khilafat-Non Cooperation movement collaboration of Hindus and Muslims possible. It is true that Gandhi's insistence on a Hindu sanatani identity could not eventually convince either the Muslims or the Dalit/lower caste leaders in relation to the sincerity in safeguarding their interests. In the case of the Dalits, in information, the problem was distant more intricate at one stage, for what they wanted was a self-governing political voice within the new nation and that could not be achieved merely through Gandhian self-purification methods.

THE TRAJECTORY OF MUSLIM THOUGHT

We have traced the broad contours of nineteenth and twentieth century thought as it appeared from within Hindu society. The history of Muslim society in India is still steeped in a sea of ignorance and misconceptions and a lot more work needs to be done to unearth the dissimilar types of trends of thought that appeared from within it. We will sketch a broad outline of this below but let it be stated at the outset that the situation is no less intricate and variegated and the general myth of a monolithic Muslim society is as ill-founded as that of any other society. There are a range of responses to the changing world that we encounter here too. A case in point for instance, is the role of the Ulama (i.e. religious scholars) of Farangi Mahal, brought out through the pioneering research of Francis Robinson in the mid 1970s. Robinson noted that this tendency, so active in the second decade of the twentieth century, had been consigned to silence, buried under the narratives of both the Indian and the Pakistani nationalisms. He pointed out the crucial
role played through Maulana Abd-al Bari of Farangi Mahal in the pan-Islamic protest, particularly the Khilafat movement and in the base of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-I- Hind, which worked, for the mainly part, in secure cooperation with the Indian National Congress and remained opposed to the Muslim League demand for a separate homeland.

With regard to Muslim society in India, we might require to steer clear of two diametrically opposed viewpoints. One, represented through Hindu nationalists, who sees Muslims as an alien body continuously at odds with and insulated from local society and civilization, and the other represented through the secular-nationalists who see merely a syncretic civilization that expressed the combined elements of Islamic and Hindu civilization. We require to see the procedure through which what was once and elite Perso-Islamic civilization of the ashrafs (the gentry or the nobility), slowly enters into a dialogue with the local traditions of learning, of the arts and music etc. This is a procedure that spans centuries and there are contradictory pulls and trends that are at work throughout. To take presently one instance, as Robinson observes, mainly eighteenth century Sufis whispered in the doctrine of wahdat-al-wujnd (the Unity of Being), which saw all creation as the manifestation of a single Being and therefore made it possible for them to search for a general ground with the Hindus. But this teaching of the 13th century Spanish mystic Ibn al-Arabi, was also challenged through the Naqshbandi order which insisted on the more sectarian doctrine of wahdat-al-shuhud (or the Unity of Experience) which insisted on the formal teachings of scriptures as they encapsulated God's revelation. This tendency though, remained distant less popular for an extremely extensive time. Though, we cannot dwell on this prehistory of contemporary Muslim thought in this element at any length but it should nevertheless be kept in mind as a background.
The advent of British rule meant a more immediate loss of political power for the ruling Muslim elite, especially in North India and Bengal. And this contest with British power sustained through the century from the Battle of Plassey (1757) to the Great Revolt - the so-described 'Mutiny' - of 1857, which saw a huge participation of Muslims as a whole and, not merely of the elite. As a consequence, in the immediate era following the institution of the power of the British, the connection flanked by the erstwhile ruling elite and the colonial rulers came to be marked through deep hostility and antagonism. One of the consequences of this hostility was a sure inwardness that came to describe Muslim attitude towards the contemporary. Through and big, they seemed to stay absent from English education and thoughts and institutions associated with British power. This, as you can see, is in sharp contrast with the attitude of the early Hindu intelligentsia which embraced the new thoughts and institutions with considerably less difficulty. One instance of this complexity can be seen in the instance of Delhi College, recognized in 1825, which began to impart both Oriental and Western education jointly in the similar institution. In 1827, it began the teaching of English. Though, after the revolt of 1857, Western education was discontinued and could only be restarted in 1864. Nonetheless, the information that such an institution was recognized designates a sure openness towards Western knowledge, despite the overall experience of hostility vis-à-vis the British. Mujeeb Ashraf, in information, claims that Delhi College became one of the models for institutions like Jamia Millia Islamia in the later era. Delhi College produced significant nineteenth century reformers and writers like Zakaullah, Muhammad Husain Azad and Nazir Ahmad Nazir.
The Reform Initiative

The crucial turning point in this respect, though, is the emergence of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (1817-99) who is recognized to be the harbinger of liberalism and modernity in Muslim society. He opposed the Great Revolt as he whispered that not only had British rule come to stay but also that there was much to be gained through imbibing contemporary thoughts from its get in touch with. It is well recognized that in order to propagate contemporary scientific knowledge, he recognized his Mahommedan Anglo-Oriental College, which in due course, became the Aligarh Muslim University. In 1870, after his return from a trip to England, he began publishing his Urdu journal, Tahzib-ul-Ikhlaq, which exhorted Muslims to reform their religious thoughts. Sir Syed’s vital intellectual move was to argue that Islam was not incompatible with contemporary thoughts and values. For this cause, though he was not a religious scholar through training, his insistence on reform took recourse to a well recognized method of ijtihad that calls for the use of self-governing reasoning in order to stay up with changing times. Theologically, so he took it upon himself to distinguish the essence of Islam from the inessential parts, which he described as ‘social customs and practices' that had attached to it and which he argued, had lost relevance in the contemporary world. In the middle of these, for instance was the Islamic prohibition on charging interest. In doing so, he began to insist on the Quran as the sole legitimate source of Islam. Alongside the Quran, he proclaimed the importance of Cause and Nature, in his effort to combat the 'overgrowth' of superstition and 'unreasonableness' that was attached to the religion in excess of the centuries. It was a move, you can see, that was clearly parallel to the type of move made through the Hindu reformers in relation to their own society. There was undoubtedly a big body of support for his project in the middle of the educated Muslims as he supervised to raise enough money through contributions for setting up the Aligarh College.
In the middle of the other significant figures associated with Syed Ahmad Khan's reform moves were those of Sayyid Mahdi Ali, better recognized as Muhsin-ul-Mulk and Maulana Shibli Numani. Muhsin-ul-Mulk differed from Syed Ahmad Khan insofar as he sought to win in excess of the Muslim clergy to their face and so establish it necessary to dialogue with them in conditions of Islamic principles. Shibli Numani is measured, beside with poets Altaf Husayn Hali and Mohammed Iqbal as one of the key literary figures of contemporary Muslim society in India. A founder of contemporary literary criticism in the vernacular language, he also had a reputation as a great poet and historian of Islam. While Shibli supported the efforts of the Aligarh school, he was approximately entirely rooted in the vernacular world and the world of Islam. His ambition was to reform Islam from within. Just as to Ayesha Jalal, he is a more intricate figure as he eludes classification either as a 'liberal modernizer' or as an 'anti-contemporary traditionalist.

Islamic learning, in later years he took on a dissimilar project - that of trying to bridge the gulf flanked by the Aligarh modernizers and the 'traditionalists' represented through the Ulama of Deoband and Farangi Mahal. In his later years he also became a critic of Syed Ahmad Khan, whom he held responsible for stunting the growth of political consciousness in the middle of the Muslims. Shibli was in the middle of those significant voices who remained a strong critic of the Muslim League, which he saw as a forum of upper class, landlord elements of North India, and whispered that the interests of the Muslims would be better served through overcoming its 'minority intricate' and malting general cause with the Congress.

**The Anti-imperialist Currents**
The Aligarh school came under fierce attack from the more theologically inclined Muslims the learned Ulama. The disagreement flanked by the Aligarh school and the Ulama has often been seen as the disagreement flanked by the 'modernizers' and the 'traditionalists' but this is in some sense an oversimplification. The Ulama's main problem with Syed Ahmad appears to have been with what they measured his eulogisation of the British - his Angreziyat or Englishness. There was here something parallel to what we witnessed in the case of the nationalists departure from the social reformers, insofar as the Ulama saw his Angreziyat as being too collaborationist. It is motivating so that his mainly strident critics were also those who were more clearly anti-imperialist and sought to ally with the nationalist movement for liberation from the British rule. In the middle of the mainly scathing of his critics was the Persian scholar Jamaluddin-al-Afghani who was also an advocate of Hindu-Muslim unity against the British. Afghani's strident anti-colonialism combined with a deeply religious Islamic universalism, says Ayesha Jalal, establish a receptive audience in the middle of several Muslims put off through Syed Ahmad Khan's loyalism vis-à-vis the British.

Into the twentieth century, other significant figures like the poet-philosopher Mohammed Iqbal, Mohammed Ali Jinnah, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi came to the fore. Through the time nationalism appeared as a strong mass force and it was becoming clear that it was increasingly being dominated through Hindu ethos, Muslim politics and thought went through motivating transformations. Mohammed Iqbal was, at one stage, one of the great modernizers of Islam, who infused a sense of action and celebration of individual freedom in this world, into the religion, He was supremely concerned with combating the fatalism, contemplation and resignation that is normally associated with pre-contemporary religions and strove hard to articulate a notion of the Self (khudi) that would take its destiny into its own hands. As W.C. Smith put it, to that end he even transformed the notion of a transcendent God into an immanent one - into a God that lives
here, in this world, arguing that the will of God is not something that comes from without but surges within the Self, to be absorbed and acted upon. In doing this, he was actually creating a sharp critique of Islam as it was practiced through the mullahs. While Iqbal imbibed much from European philosophy—especially Nietzsche and Bergson—he was equally contemptuous of those who thought they could become contemporary through basically aping the West. Here again, much like the Hindu thought we discussed earlier, we can see a clear critique in his thought, of the "materialistic" and -"irreligious" nature of Western thought. It is motivating too, that like much of modern Hindu thought, he too sought to extricate science from his overall attack on the West, arguing that while repudiating the latter, the East should adopt the former. It is also motivating that like all reformers from Syed Ahmad Khan to Ameer Ali, he also took recourse to ijtihad. Though, he also qualified the recourse to ijtihad, through arguing that in times of crisis of Islam, such as was his time, this should be resorted to with circumspection.

It is also significant to keep in mind that while being a votary of Islamic universalism and a trenchant critic of the western thought of territorial nationalism, Iqbal was till pretty late in his life a celebrator of a deeper unity of Hindus and Muslims as evidenced in some of his finest poetry. Here we will not go into the intricate political procedure through which Iqbal, inveterate enemy of territorial nationalism finally through his lot with the movement for Pakistan.

The figure of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad symbolizes the more supposedly 'traditionalist' Muslims, who like other believers in Islamic universalism, are often seen as a paradox through mainly scholars. For, like the other traditionalists like the Ulama of Deoband, he was a strong believer in Islamic universalism, that is, the thought of a worldwide Islamic ummah, even while remaining as one of the mainly steadfast supporters of a composite Indian nationalism. This is a paradox that awaits greater research, which alone will explain why the so-described traditionalist and theologically inclined
Muslims establish it easier to create general cause with the Hindu-dominated Congress. This stands in sharp contrast to the location of someone like Jinnah who was a liberal and secular politician but eventually became the driving force for the thrash about for Pakistan.

THE REVOLT OF THE LOWER ORDERS

The significant point that needs to be registered here in relation to the work and thought of lower caste leaders like Jotirao Phule, EVR Ramaswamy Naicker - also recognized as Periyar and B.R. Ambedkar is that it differed from the trends recognized in the case of both Hindu and Muslim thought in two crucial methods. Firstly, at no point did these thinkers provide up the social reform agenda and in information their constant critique of nationalism remained connected to this question. Secondly, they did not suffer from the deep ambivalence with regard to the West that marked the thought of reformers and nationalists alike in the case of the Hindu thinkers or of Shibli Numani, Muhsin-ul-Mulk and Iqbal in the case of the Muslims. You will read in relation to the respective thoughts of these figures later but for now we will briefly outline some of the reasons for this stark variation.

It is significant to note in this context, that to mainly leaders of the lower castes, particularly the Dalits, the notion of a putative Hindu society basically did not carry any positive significance. To them, the memories of past and continuing humiliation and degradation through practices like untouchability and violent exclusion from society as such, constituted their in excess of-riding experience that framed all their responses. In their perception, so, there was something insincere in the efforts of even the reformers who merely wanted the assimilation of lower castes into mainstream Hindu society without disturbing the power structure in anyway.

Phule’s main concern so, is with an all-out attack on Hinduism and caste — where he sees caste as central to the subsistence of the former. In information to mainly of the radical lower caste thinkers, Hinduism is merely
another name for Brahmanism and they prefer to refer to it through that name. So Phule, like Periyar after him, seeks to unite all the non-Brahmans or shudra-atishudras against the power of the Brahmans. It is also necessary to note that in this thrash about approximately all the radical lower caste leaders provide special importance to the question of women's education and emancipation. Plule so recognized the first school for shudra-atishudra girls in 1848, at great risk, for he knew that it would invite the wrath of the upper castes. Later he also recognized a school for girls of all castes.

In a method, education was the key to Dalit or in the case of Periyar, Non-Brahman liberation, for it was their exclusion from the arena of knowledge that was seen as the main mechanism of their oppression. In the new, contemporary world, the possibilities had opened out for the lower castes to take their destiny into their own hands. For the first time, their exclusion was significantly broken down, with the arrival of colonialism, which not only opened the doors of education to them, but also opened up secular public spaces where they could move in relation to the without fear of upper caste retribution. This being 'the case, the Dalit and Shudra leaders were less concerned with marking their variation from the ‘irreligious’ and 'materialistic' West and more directly concerned with breaking down the chains of bondage that had shackled them for centuries. To them colonial rule, if anything, appeared as their major benefactor. It is precisely for this cause that they saw the continuation of the social reform agenda as being of critical significance for the emancipation of the Dalits/Shudras. It is not as if they had great faith in the social reform of the upper caste, bhadralok reformers of the nineteenth century but the abandoning of even that limited agenda through nationalism was something that Ambedkar had occasion to recall bitterly in his writings and speeches. He especially recalled the role of Tilak and his followers in stopping the sessions of the Social Conference in the late 1890s.

It is important that even when the focus of Dalit and lower caste thinkers shifted to the explicitly political terrain — witnessed for instance in
the work of Periyar and Ambedkar, their central preoccupations remained with the structure of power within the emergent nation: who would wield power within an self-governing India? What would be the location of the Dalits in the new dispensation? And central to this structure of power was the question of 'social reform' - not in the vague sense of 'uplift' of the untouchables that Gandhi was seeking to do, without of course disturbing the power of the upper caste elite - but in the more radical sense given to it through Phule. These thinkers and leaders also realized that if the British were to leave without the question of power being settled, they would be yoked into slavery once again. It is from this fear that the main plank of Ambedkar's and Periyar's political life appeared: the vexed question of 'safeguards' or 'communal proportional representation' as it was also described. The radical lower caste leaders realized that independence would come, sooner or later; therefore it was necessary to stake a claim for power through bargaining hard on the question of safeguards, while the British were still here. It is this battle that Ambedkar was forced to partially lose thanks to Gandhi's emotional blackmail - his notorious fast- unto-death and the eventual Poona Pact.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Discuss the phases of modern Indian thought.
- Explain the relevance of social reform movement in India
- Discuss various aspects of Muslim thought in India.
CHAPTER 19
EARLY NATIONALIST RESPONSES:
RAMMOHAN ROY, BANKIM CHANDRA CHATTERJEE,
DAYANAND SARASWATI AND JYOTIBA PHULE
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the Rammohan Roy’s thoughts.
- Explain the Bankim’s ideas in shaping nationalism.
- Understand the Dayanand Saraswati’s religion-political thoughts.
- Explain the Jyotiba Phule’s thoughts.

INTRODUCTION

There are two dissimilar phases of Indian nationalism. The first one continues till the formation of the Indian National Congress in 1885 whereas nationalism, in its second stage, was articulated through popular mobilization approximately several types of anti-imperial ideologies. Of all the competing
ideologies, Gandhian ‘non violence' was perhaps the mainly popular ideology in organizing anti-imperial movements in India. Unlike the second stage when the national intervention was primarily political, viz., the capture of state power, the first stage was mainly dominated through the zeal of reform that appeared to have brought jointly several individuals with more or less similar ideological agenda. In these types of behaviors, individuals played decisive roles in sustaining the zeal of those who clustered approximately them. What inspired them was perhaps the thought of European Enlightenment that traveled to India simultaneously with colonialism. Drawn on the philosophy of Enlightenment, neither was the British colonialism condemned nor were there attempts to expose its devastating impact on India’s socio-political map in the extensive run. In other languages, colonialism was hailed for its assumed role in radically altering the archaic socio-political networks sustaining the feudal order. It is possible to argue that colonialism in this stage did not become as ruthless as it was later. And, in contrast with the past rulers, the British administration under the aegis of the East India Company seemed to have appreciated social reforms either as a hatter of faith in the philosophy of Enlightenment or as a strategy to infuse the Indian social reality with the values on which if drew its sustenance. With this background in view, this element will focus on the early nationalist response to the British rule that was mainly appreciated in comparison with the socio-political nature of the past rulers. Not only will there be an argument seeking to explain the uncritical endorsement of the British rule through the socially radical thinkers, but there will also be an effort to focus on the changing nature of colonialism that also had a noticeable impact on their conceptualization of the British rule in India that became coterminous with use extremely soon.

**EARLY NATIONALIST RESPONSE**

It would be appropriate to identify the sources from which they seemed to have derived their thoughts in the context of an incipient colonial rule. The
first formidable power was definitely the Enlightenment philosophy that significantly influenced the well-known 1832 Macaulay's minutes. Seeking to organize Indian society in a typical Western mould, Macaulay argued for all introductions of English education and British jurisprudence for their role in radically altering the feudal foundation of Indian society. What was implicit in his views was the assumption that the liberal values of the British diversity would definitely contribute to the required social transformation in India. So, the arrival of the British in India was a boon in disguise. Not only did colonialism introduce Indians to Western liberalism but it also exposed them to the socially and politically progressive thoughts of Bentham, Mill, Carlyle and Coleridge, which drew attention to a qualitatively dissimilar mode of thinking on issues of modern relevance. The second equally significant power was the thoughts of German philosophers, Schelling, Fichte, Kant and Herder. These thoughts gained ground as the intellectual challenge against the British rule acquired momentum. In information, there are clear traces of German thoughts in Bankim’s writings. Unlike Ram Mohan Roy whose historical mission was to combat the social evils in the form of inhuman customs, including the sattee, Bankim sought to champion the goal of freedom through drawing upon the German philosophy and Hindu past. Conceptually, the notions of volk, society and nation seemed to have inspired the early nationalists, including Bankim presumably because they contributed to homogeneity despite differences in the context of foreign rule. So, the primary concern of the early nationalists was not uniform: for some, the introduction of the thoughts of European Enlightenment was unwarranted basically because that would destroy the extremely foundation of civilization of India that drew, in a considerable method, on the Hindu past; while there are others who adopted a extremely favorable stance vis-à-vis the English rule and its obvious social consequences. The third important power in the early stage of Indian nationalism was the French revolution and its message for Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Ram Mohan was swayed through the thoughts that inspired the
French revolution. In his writings and deeds, Roy launched a vigorous attack on the archaic social mores dividing India beside caste and religious cleavages. For him, the priority was to make a society free from decadent feudal values that basically stood in the method of attaining the goal of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. The final source is of course the traditional Indian thought that was interpreted in the context of colonial rule. Not only were there writings of William Jones and Max Muller on India's rich cultural traditions, there were contributions from the renaissance thinkers, including Vivekananda, that provided the foundation for redefining India's past glossing mainly the stage of Muslim rule in India. Inspired through the message of Bhagvad Gita, the renaissance thinkers supported the philosophy of action in the service of the motherland. What they tried to argue was the thought that successes or failures were not as significant as the performance of one's duty with 'the purest of motives'. Their attack on fatalism in Hinduism and Buddhist religion clearly shows how realists they were in conceptualizing the outcome of human action. For them, life could be transformed in this world through individuals believing in the philosophy of action. So, it was not surprising that both Vivekananda and Dayananda insisted on karma, or service to the humanity, as the best possible method of justifying one's subsistence as human beings.

The discussion of sources is extremely useful in underlining the importance of intellectual threads in shaping the nationalist thoughts of the early nationalist thinkers like Rammohan Roy, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, Dayananda Saraswati and Jotirao Phule.

THOUGHTS OF RAMMOHAN ROY

Rammohan Roy was a social thinker par excellence. His role in doing absent with sattee in the middle of the orthodox Brahmins was historical. Through founding Brahma Samaj, Roy sought to articulate his belief in the
Islamic notion of 'one god'. In his conceptualization, social reform should precede political reform for the former laid the base for liberty in the political sense. Given his priority, Roy did not appear to have paid adequate attention to his political thoughts. Although he despised colonialism, he appeared to have endorsed the British rule presumably because of its historical role in combating the prevalent feudal forces. Not only was the British rule superior, at least, culturally than the erstwhile feudal rulers, it would also contribute to a dissimilar India through injecting the values it represented. His admiration for the British rule was based on his faith in its role in radically altering traditional mental create-up of the Hindus. The sustained British rule, he further added, would eventually lead to the establishment of democratic institutions as in Great Britain. Like any other liberals, Ray also felt that the uncritical acceptance of British liberal values was almost certainly the best possible means of creating democratic institutions in India. In other languages, he appreciated the British rule as 'a boon in disguise' because it would eventually transplant democratic governance in India. The other region for which the role of Ram Mohan was decisive was the articulation of demand for the freedom of press. Beside with his colleague, Dwarkanath Tagore, he submitted a petition to the Privy Council for the freedom of press, which lie justified as essential for democratic functioning of the government. Not only would the freedom of press give a device for ventilation of grievances it would also enable the government to adopt steps for their redressal before they caused damage to the administration. Viewed in the liberal mould, this was an extraordinary step in that context for two reasons:

- The demand for freedom of press was a important development in the rising, though limited, democratization in the middle of the indigenous elite in India; and
- The thought of press freedom, if sanctioned, would act as 'a safety valve' for the colonial ruler because of the exposition of grievances in the public domain.
Rammohan Roy had played a progressive role in a scrupulous historical context. While conceptualizing his historical role, Roy appeared to have privileged his experience of British colonialism in excess of its immediate feudal past. Through undermining the obvious devastating impact of foreign rule on Indian society, politics and economy, he also clearly supported one system of administration in excess of the other rather consciously basically because of his uncritical faith in British Enlightenment in significantly transforming the prevalent Indian mindsets. One may discover it hard to digest his invitation to the British planters in India despite their brutalities and ruthlessness vis-à-vis the Indian peasants if discussed in separation. But this was perfectly rationalized if one is drawn to his argument justifying the stability of the empire on the foundation of its economic strength. The more the planters acquire 'wealth', argued Roy, the better would be their defense for stability in India. Given his historical role, it would not be wrong to argue that Ram Mohan Roy discharged his responsibility in tune with the historical requirement of his role in the scrupulous context of India's growth as a separate socio-political element. It would so be historically inaccurate to identify him as pro-imperial thinker basically because nationalism did not acquire the features of the later era. His thoughts whether supporting the British or criticizing the past rulers - were both historically conditioned and textured; he authored his historical role in the best possible method reflecting the dilemma of the era and the aspiration of those groping for an alternative in the social and political doldrums of incipient colonialism.

**BANKIM’S THOUGHTS IN SHAPING NATIONALISM**

Bankimchandra Chattopadhyay (1838-94) was almost certainly the first systematic expounder in India of the thought of nationalism. His unique contribution lay in conceptualizing nationalism in indigenous conditions. In opposition to the Muslim rule, Bankim elaborated the thought through
drawing upon the Bhagavad Gita that was widely translated in Bengali in the nineteenth century. In his translated version of Gita, what Bankim provided was a reinterpretation in the light of Western knowledge to create the Gita more appropriate reading for the Western-educated intelligentsia in the newly appeared context of the nationalist opposition to the British rule. An entirely new Gita appeared reflecting the concerns of those seeking to give a national alternative to foreign rule.

What was primary in Bankim’s thought was his concern for national solidarity for on it depend the growth of the Hindu society. National solidarity is conceivable, as Bankim argued, only when there is a change in one’s attitude in the following two methods: first, the conviction that what is good for every Hindu is good for me and my views, beliefs and actions necessity is constant with those of other members of the Hindu society. And, secondly, one should inculcate a single-minded devotion to the nation and its interests. This was a thought that Bankim nurtured in all his novels and other writings because he whispered that without care and love for the nation (and implicitly for the country) one basically failed to justify one's subsistence as an element in a cohesive whole, described nation. Here lies a significant theoretical point. Unlike typical liberals, Bankim was in favor of society and the role of the individual was explained in conditions of what was good for the former. He admitted that the get in touch with the British enabled the Hindu society to learn its weaknesses not in conditions of physical strength but in conditions of what he defined as 'civilization'. Hindus lack the civilization basically because they are so diverse, separated through language, race, and religion and so on, and it would not be possible for them to make circumstances for national solidarity unless this divisive content of Hindus totally disappeared.

From the notion of national solidarity, Bankim now delved into anushilan or his concept of practice. Elaborating this notion in his 1888 essay entitled 'The Theory of Religion', Bankim defined it as a system of civilization', more complete and more perfect than the Western concept of
civilization, articulated through the Western thinkers like Comte and Mathew Arnold. Critical of the agnostic Western view of practice, anushilan was based on 'bhakti' (devotion) that implied a combination of 'knowledge and duty'. In practical conditions, anushilan means that it simultaneously imparts knowledge of what is good for the society and what the society is supposed to do under specific circumstances. Anushilan implies duty that is the performance of an act for which one should not expect reward. In other languages, the society is duty-bound to perform sure acts not out of choice but out of devotion to a cause or a goal. From this, he derived the thought of duty towards the nation. There was no choice and the society had to work for 'the defense of the nation' that was totally crippled due to specific historical circumstances. For Bankim, this selfless and non-possessive notion of devotion lay at the base of dharma or religion.

Through underlining the importance of dharma in national solidarity, Bankim sought to make circumstances for a separate identity for the Hindu society. Not only was it necessary for a subject nation, it was also mainly appropriate for structure a strong society on the foundation of its inherent cultural strength and not merely through imitating the West. Superior in the domain of sciences and industry, the West represented a civilization that succeeded in conquering the East, Hence he argued for emulating the West in the domain of material civilization. But in the domain of spiritual civilization, the East was certainly superior and hence should not be bypassed. Combining these two thoughts, Bankim therefore suggested that the West could be emulated in the domain in which it was superior while internalizing the spiritual distinctiveness of the East. So, in the construction of a national identity, Bankim does not appear to be entirely xenophobic but a creative ideologue of the early nationalist movement appreciating the strength and weakness of both east and west simultaneously. In other languages, the variation-seeking project of Bankim constitutes what Partha Chatterjee defines as 'the moment of departure' in our national thought.
RELIGIO-POLITICAL THOUGHTS OF DAYANAND SARASWATI

While Bankim had a clear political message for the nation that lacked solidarity, Dayananda (1825-83) who founded the Arya Samaj had concerns similar to those of Rammohan. Primarily a social reformer, the latter whispered that the success of the British in subjugating the Hindu society was mainly due to its divisive nature and also the failure in realizing its strength. If Rammohan drew upon Upanishads, Bankim upon the Gita, Dayanand while articulating his nationalist response, was inspired through Vedas. The other contrasting point that marked Dayananda off from the rest lies in the utter absence of the power of European civilization and thought on him. Rammohan was fascinated through European enlightenment and his response was articulated accordingly. The power of the positivist and utilitarian philosophy was apparent in Bankim's conceptualization of national solidarity. Unlike them, Dayananda establish the Vedic messages as mainly appropriate for inspiring the moribund nation, plagued through many 'ills' that could easily be cured. Seeking to construct a strong Hindu society, Dayananda was strikingly dissimilar from other early nationalists in two specific methods: first, his response was essentially based on a conceptualization that is absolutely indigenous in nature presumably 'because he was not exposed to the Western thoughts. Secondly, his response was also an offshoot of a creative dialogue with the traditional scriptures, especially the Vedas - which appeared to have influenced the later Extremist leadership for its appeal to separate civilization features of India. Unlike those who were drawn to Western liberal thoughts, Dayananda was almost certainly the only thinker of his generation to have begun a debate on the relative importance of the ancient scriptures in inspiring a nation that was divided on innumerable counts.

Two thoughts stand out in Dayananda’s The Satyarth Prakash (Light of Truth) that was published in 1875. First, the thought of God as an active agent
of creation appeared to have appealed him mainly. He asserted that the empirical world was no illusion but had a self-governing and objective subsistence. His refutation of advaita and nirguna Brahman separated him from Rammohan and Vivekananda as his denial of sakara and avatara distinguished him from Bankim and Ramakrishna. On this foundation, he further argued that human action was an index of punishment and reward through God. Here a theoretical effort was made through Dayananda to assess individual acts in conditions of sure well-defined norms of behaviour in the name of God. This was what inspired Aurobindo who establish in this contention a clearly-argued theoretical statement not only for analyzing human behaviour at a critical juncture of history but also for mobilizing a vanquished nation for a goal that was to be rewarded through God. In other languages, through redefining God in a creative manner, Dayananda actually articulated the Old Testament God of justice and not New Testament God of love. Underling the importance of Divine in shaping human action, the Arya Samaj founder was perhaps trying to play on the religious sentiments for meaningful social behaviors. This was, in his views, the vital requirement for a nation to grow and prosper.

The second significant thought that stems from The Satyarth Prakash is actually a comment on the divisive nature of Hindu society. Just as to him, the British victory in India was mainly due to 'our own failings'. 'It is only when brothers fight in the middle of themselves that an outsider poses as an arbiter'. Furthermore, the Hindu society was inherently crippled due to practices like child marriage, carnal gratification that clearly defied the Vedas and the principles it stood for. In his languages, what caused an irreparable damage to our society was 'untruthfulness and neglect of Vedas'. Hence the first task was to grasp the substance of Vedas where lay the distinctiveness of the Hindus as a race. No attack on the British' would succeed till this was accomplished to our satisfaction. This was almost certainly the cause why the Arya Samaj was not allowed to involve in direct political campaign against the British.
These thoughts were unique given their roots in Hindu scriptures. Here lies the historical role of Dayananda who explored the Vedas primarily to inculcate a sense of identity in the middle of the Hindus who, so distant, remained highly fractured and were unable to resist the foreign rule. In other languages, he turned to the Vedas to discover a 'pure' Hinduism with which to confront the corruption of Hinduism in the present. He felt that the Vedas contained Hindu beliefs in their mainly ancient and pure form showing God to be presently and infinite creator. He described for the purging of the degenerate practices of Hindus in the present. He was critical of the present divisive caste system that had distorted the Vedic practices since social hierarchies of Vedic society was based on merit, skill and temperament of the individual, rather than on his birth.

Likewise, while conceptualizing God as a creative agency and not solely a spiritual being, he purposely redefined the Vedic notion of God to rejuvenate a moribund nation that appeared to have lost its vigor and zeal. Through defending reward and punishment as inevitable for good and bad 'deeds' respectively, Dayananda almost certainly sought to eradicate 'the evils', impeding the growth of the Hindu society. In other languages, for Dayananda the primary task was to strengthen the moral base of the Hindu society that, given its inherent weaknesses, remained highly divided. Like Rammohan, Dayananda was a social reformer with approximately no interest in politics. And, accordingly lie scripted the role of the Arya Samaj in a strictly non-political method. The reasons are obvious. In the context of a strong colonial rule, the evinced political role of the Samaj would certainly have attracted the attention of the government that was not desirable especially when the organisation was at its infancy. Through deciding to stay absent from politics, not only did Dayananda fulfill his historical role but also left behind a clearly-articulated nationalist response that drew absolutely on Hindu traditions and especially
JYOTIBA PHULE: A SOCIAL REVOLUTIONARY

Jotirao Phule (1827-90), like Dayananda, had the desire for a form of social organisation that would reflect the merits and aptitudes of the individual, rather than enforcing birth as the foundation both for job and for religious status. The play, Tritiya Ratna (The Third Eve), which he published in 1855 is a powerful exposition of his ideology. The play is in relation to the use of an ignorant and superstitious peasant couple through a cunning Brahmin priest and their subsequent enlightenment through a Christian missionary. Three significant points stand out in this play. First, critical of Brahmin power, he made a wider point concerning the oppressive nature of Hindu religion that, in its present form, imposed an ideological hegemony on the shudras and through suggesting many purifying rituals, it also contributed to material impoverishment of the untouchables. Secondly, through underlining the role of a Christian missionary who rescued the couple from the clutches of the greedy Brahmin, Phule seemed to have explored the possibility of conversion as almost certainly the only practical device to get-out of the exploitative Hindu religion. Although in the play, Phule did not talk in relation to the conversion per se he through supporting the conversion of Pandita Ramabai, a Chitpavan Brahmin scholar, defended arguments in its support. To him, Christianity was not only an escape from Brahminical oppression but also a religion offering salvation, thirdly, underlying this story, there remained another major ideological point concerning the importance of education in sustaining the Brahminic hegemony in Hindu society. He was persuaded to consider that access to education, and particularly, literacy in English, conferred vital social possessions on the Brahmins as a social group. As a result, the Brahmins sustained to control the modern social, political and administrative domains. Through acquiring the new skills in the changed circumstances of the British rule, the Brahmins so sustained their power through redefining their soles in accordance with the necessities of the day. In other languages, through being English literate, the Brahmins appeared as the
mainly useful social group that the British government could ill-affords to ignore given their obvious role in running the administration.

What historical role did Phule play? Similar to the early nationalists, the principal message that he conveyed was concerned with his model of a society free from Brahminic use. For him, the British rule was a boon in disguise for having struck at the base of the caste hegemony of the Brahmans. Presumably because of this dimension of the foreign rule, Phule appeared to have underplayed the exploitative nature of colonialism. It was also possible that Phule accorded top priority to his mission of securing a respectful lay of the shudrutishudra (untouchables) in the society in which the Brahmans held the hegemony. Phule was not so much against the Hindu scriptures per se as he was against the values and thoughts sustaining the prevalent Hindu system. In other languages, through deliberately articulating his opposition to Brahminical discourse and not Hinduism as such, Phule was perhaps trying to aloofness from the bandwagon against Hinduism. In his view, Hinduism is rooted in Shruts (Vedas) and the Smritis and Brahmans distorted them to rationalize their hegemony. Likewise, the interpretation that the Varna system (the division of society into four dissimilar groups) was god-given and hence unassailable was derived from 'the selfish desire' of the Brahmans to perpetuate their power on the rest of the society. So, not only did he reject the Hindu system and its theoretical literature altogether but also argued, rather persuasively, against the dichotomous nature of the Hindu society nurturing Brahminic hegemony in excess of the shudras. This was an arrangement in which, he argued further, members of the privileged segment of the society, viz., the Brahmans, tended to justify their hegemony through reference to the religious tracts and distorted practices. On the foundation of his criticism of Hindu theology, he challenged the notion of avatara as an agency of change when the society was totally demoralized. In the Hindu conceptualization of avatara, Phule establish another design, quoted in a religiously-justified distorted version of 'good' and 'bad' to avoid friction in Hindu society. Drawn
on his mission to make an equitable order striking at the roots of the
dichotomous Hindu society, he never reconciled himself to the Brahminical
gods and beliefs sustaining them. In other languages, through demanding the
Brahminical exposition of Hinduism from the shudras perspective, Phule
successfully articulated an alternative discourse of history and it’s unfolding.

For Phule, literacy and especially English education, was mainly useful
in considerably eradicating the Brahminic hegemony. Not only was literacy a
powerful device in radically altering the existent social order it would also
bring in relation to the gender equality. Phule was perhaps the first nationalist
to have seriously pursued the women literacy and an exclusively girls school
was recognized in 1842 at his behest. In this respect, he, like Rammohan,
appeared to have appreciated the British rule for having laid the material and
institutional base of a contemporary-equalitarian society. Though persuaded
through liberalism of the Western diversity, Phule was not particularly happy
with the British response to people’s needs and demands. Like the other early
nationalists, there was no doubt that what prompted Phule to endorse foreign
rule was its role in creating a totally new socio-political system undermining
the prevalent hegemony of the Brahmns in excess of the shudras.

The other distinctive dimension in Phule’s response is that he stands
out in the middle of the early nationalists for having implemented his
thoughts, as distant as possible, into practice. The Satyashodhak Samaj (the
Society of the Seekers of Truth) that came into being in 1873 was founded
with this objective in mind. Not only was the Samaj involved in girls' formal
education, widow remarriage and campaign against prohibition, it also led to
vigorou搅拌 debates on the nature of Hindu society and the scriptures, especially
Vedas on which it was based. So, Phule was a forerunner of Gandhi in the
sense that mainly of the major socio-political issues that the Mahatma raised
were broached through him in a context when the British rule did not appear to
be as oppressive as it later became. Through uniformly arguing against the
orthodox Hinduism, denying a majority of their legitimate dues, he provided a
powerful social critique of the prevalent Brahminical practices and values, justified in the name of religion and religious texts.

NATIONALIST RESPONSE: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL

Another major feature of the early nationalist response is the method the nation was conceptualized. Through avoiding reference to Muslims, these nationalist thinkers seemed to have clearly recognized the constituents of the proposed nation. Through drawing on exclusively Hindu traditional tracts like Upanishads or Vedas, the early nationalists recognized the sources of inspiration for the nation at its formative stage that clearly set the ideological tone in opposition to Islam and its supportive texts. Their thought of nation had so a narrow foundation since Muslims hardly figured in the conceptualization. The explanation almost certainly lies in the historical context characterized through the declining decadent feudal civilization, supported through the Muslim rulers on the one hand and the rising acceptance of the values of European modernity on the other. Separately from Bankim who had strong views on the Muslim rule, none of the early nationalist thinkers articulated their opinion on this issue in clear conditions. What drove them to embark on a nationalist project was the mission to revamp and revitalize the Hindus who failed to emerge as a solid block due mainly to the inherent divisive nature. Whether it was Dayananda or Bankim, the thought of consolidating the Hindus as a race seemed to have acted in a decisive manner while articulating their response. Given his interest in Persian literature and Islamic civilization, Rammohan held dissimilar views from Bankim. Since Phule was critical of the dichotomous Hindu society, he argued in a reformist language and reference to Muslims did not appear to be relevant. In his perception, the British rule was providential basically because it provided him with intellectual possessions to combat the archaic practices in Hinduism.

What is apparent now is that in articulating a nation, these thinkers discharged a role that was historically conditioned. It would so be wrong to
basically label them as partisan due to their indifference or critical comments on the Muslims and their rule. Through critically endorsing the British rule as mainly appropriate for the nation they were persuaded in two methods: first, the Enlightenment philosophy provided an alternative system of thought to critically assess Hinduism and traditional scriptures on which it was based. Secondly, through drawing upon the civilization possessions of the nation, these thinkers had also articulated an intellectual search for a model that was socio-culturally meaningful for the constituencies it was conceptualized. In this sense, the thought of nation, though narrowly constituted, appears to be a product of historical circumstances in which they were placed.

There is a final point. Their response was hardly political. While Dayananda eschewed politics altogether for the Arya Samaj, Rammohan was concerned more with eradicating the evil practices in Hindu society. Bankim's historical novel, Anandamath, had a political message in his support for the sannyasi rebel against the ruler. Although his thoughts of state and state power are not so well-urbanized, his argument for the spiritual superiority of the East appears to have given him an intellectual edge in excess of other early nationalists. Phule was also reluctant to essay the role of the Satyasadhok Samaj in political conditions. What was central to him was to challenge the Brahminical hegemony in excess of the shudras who constituted a majority. Given this well-defined priority, Phule scripted the role of the Samaj accordingly. Furthermore, the avoidance of a clear political role was perhaps strategically conditioned in a context when an anti-British stance was likely to draw government attention. In other languages, apprehending damage to the mission they undertook, these thinkers were persuaded to adopt an agenda allowing them to pursue their ideological mission without governmental intervention. Despite all these, the thoughts they floated galvanized the masses into action when the nationalists confronted the British government for a final illustrate -down. Not only did they inspire the Extremists, they also provided intellectual possessions to Gandhi and his followers. So, the early nationalist
response shapes an integral part of the nationalist thought that was differently textured in dissimilar historical circumstances depending on what was central in the nationalist vision.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- What was the basic argument in the early nationalist response for rejuvenating the moribund Hindu society?
- How do you account for the difference between Rammohan, Bankim and Phule on the one hand and Dayananda on the other?
- How was nation conceptualized in the early nationalist response?
CHAPTER 20
MODERATES AND EXTREMISTS:
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES
After reading this chapter, you should be able to:
- The nationalist movement was articulated differently in different phases of India's freedom struggle. The aim of this unit is also to focus on the major personalities who sought to articulate as coherently as possible the respective ideological points of view.

INTRODUCTION
The nationalist movement was articulated differently in dissimilar phases of India’s freedom thrash about. Separately from ideological shifts, there were noticeable differences in the social background of those who participated in the thrash about against the British. For instance, the Gandhian
stage of Indian nationalism, also recognized as the stage of mass nationalism, radically altered the nature of the constituencies of nationalism through incorporating the hitherto neglected sections of Indian society. It would not be an exaggeration to mention that Indian masses regardless of religion, class and caste plunged into action in response to Gandhi’s anti-British campaign. That Gandhi had inaugurated a totally new stage in Indian freedom thrash about can easily be shown through contrasting it with its earlier phases, namely, the moderate and extremist phases. In modern historiography, 'the Moderate' stage begins with the formation of the Indian National Congress in 1885 and sustained till the 1907 Surat Congress when 'the Extremists' appeared on the political scene. The vital differences flanked by these two groups lay in their perception of anti-British thrash about and its articulation in concrete programmes. While the Moderates opposed the British in a strictly constitutional method the Extremists favored 'a strategy of direct action' to harm the British economic and political interests in India. Through dwelling on what caused the dissension in the middle of those who sincerely whispered in the well-being of the country, the aim of this element is also to focus on the major personalities who sought to articulate as coherently as possible the respective ideological points of view.

**DEFINING MODERATES AND EXTREMISTS**

While Moderates and Extremists constitute contrasting viewpoints, their contribution to the freedom thrash about in its early stage is nonetheless important. Moderates like Dadabhai Naoroji, Surendranath Banerji, Pherozeshah Mehta, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, M. G. Ranade, were uncritical admirers of Western political values. They held the concept of equality before law, of freedom of speech and press and the principle of representative government as inherently superior to their traditional Hindu polity which they defined as 'Asiatic despotism'. So emphatic was their faith in the British rule that they hailed its introduction in India as 'a providential mission' capable of
eradicating the 'mis rule' of the past. Given the reluctance of the Crown to introduce representative institutions in India, Dadabhai Naoroji lamented that the British government in India was 'more Raj and less British'. What he meant was that though the British rule fulfilled the vital functions of Hindu kingship in preserving law and order in India, its reluctance to introduce the principle of representative government was mainly disappointing. So, despite their appreciation of British liberalism their admiration hardly influenced the Raj in changing the vital nature of its rule in India.

MODERATE IDEOLOGY

The moderate philosophy was mainly eloquently articulated through Surendranath Banerji (1848 - 1925) in his 1895 presidential address to the Congress. In appreciation of the British rule, Banerji therefore argued: 'we appeal to England slowly to change character of her rule in India, liberalize it, to adapt it to the newly urbanized environments of the country and the people, that in the fullness of time India may discover itself in the great confederacy of free state, English in their origin, English in their character, English in their institutions, rejoicing in their permanent and indissoluble union with England'.

It appears that the Moderates were swayed through British liberalism and were persuaded to consider that in the extensive run the crown would fulfill its providential mission. Banerji appears to have echoed the thought of Dadabhai Naoroji, (1825-1917) who in his 1893 Poona address, underlined the importance of 'loyalty to the British' in protecting India's future. As he stated, 'until we are able to satisfy the British people that what we inquire is reasonable and that we inquire it in earnest, we cannot hope to get what we inquire for, for the British are a justice-loving people... [and] at their hands we shall get everything that is calculated to create us British citizens'. Despite his 'loyalist' attitude, Naoroji was perhaps the first Congressman who argued strongly for a political role for the Congress that so distant was recognized on a non-political platform. While conceptualizing the role of the Congress in the
British-ruled India, Naoroji had no hesitation in announcing that the Congress 'as a political body [was] to symbolize to rulers our political aspirations'.

There are two points that require to be highlighted here. First, as apparent, the Moderates recognized specific roles for the Congress that sought to mobilize people in accordance with what was construed as the mainly appropriate goal in that context. The guiding principle was to avoid friction with the ruler. In information, this is how G. K. Gokhale explained the birth of the Indian National congress. Just as to him 'no Indian could have started the Indian national congress..., if an Indian had come forward to start such a movement embracing all India, the officials in India would not have allowed the movement to come into subsistence'. Secondly, the philosophy stemmed from an uncritical faith of the early nationalists in the providential mission of the British and hence the British conquest of India was not 'a calamity' to be lamented but 'an opportunity' to be seized to 'our advantage'. So it was not surprising for Ranade to uncritically appreciate the British nation that came into subsistence 'through ages of thrash about and self-discipline which illustrates better than any other modern power the supremacy of the reign of law'. This is what differentiated the British government from other colonial powers which endorsed dissimilar systems of law for the colonies. The British nation so 'inspires hope and confidence in colonies and dependencies of Great Britain that whatever temporary perturbation may cloud the judgment, the reign of law will assert itself in the end'. Thirdly, the moderates whispered that the stability of the British rule was sine- qua-non of India's progress as 'a civilized nation'. In other languages, the introduction of the British rule was a boon in disguise basically because Hindus and Muslims in India, argued Ranade, 'lacked the virtues represented through the love of order and regulated power'. Hailing the British rule as 'Divine dispensation', he further appreciated the British government for having introduced Indians to 'the instance and teaching of the mainly gifted and free nation in the world'. Finally, Ranade defended a strong British state in India to ensure equality of wealth and
opportunity for all. Through justifying state intervention in India’s socio-economic life, he differed considerably from the vital tenets of liberalism that clearly restricts the role of the state to well-defined domain. Here the Moderates performed a historical role through underlining the relative superiority of a state, drawn on the philosophy of enlightenment, in comparison with the decadent feudal rule of the past. To them, the imperial state that slowly unfolded with its devastating impact on India’s economy, society and polity, was a distant substance and hence the thought never gained ground in their perception and its articulation.

Underlying the Moderate arguments defending the British rule in India lay its 'disciplining' function in comparison with the division and disorder of the eighteenth century. And also, the exploitative nature of imperialism and its devastating role in colonies did not appear to be as relevant as it later became. So, the moderate assessment of British rule, if contextualized, appears to be appropriate and drawn on a new reality that was clearly a break with the past. Finally, it would be wrong to dismiss the role of the Moderates in India's freedom thrash about given their loyalist attitude to the rule for two reasons:

- There is no denying that the Moderates never launched mass agitations against the alien state in India; but through providing an ideological critique of the British rule in India keeping in view the grand ideals on which the British civilizations stood, they actually initiated a political dialogue that loomed big in course of time; and
- The Moderate constitutional and peaceful method of political mobilization, if contextualized, appears to be a milestone in India’s freedom thrashes about for it paved the ground for other types of anti-imperial protests once it ceased to be effective.

**EXTREMIST IDEOLOGY**

In contrast with the Moderates who pursued a policy of reconciliation and compromise with imperialism, the Extremists demanded time-bound
programmes and policies harming the British interests in India. This new school of thought represented an alternative voice demanding the Moderates' compromising policies of conciliation with imperialism. Disillusioned with the Moderates, the Extremists whispered in 'self reliance' and sought to achieve Swaraj through direct action. So, there were two stages at which the Extremist critique had operated. At one stage, they questioned the Moderate method of 'mendicancy' that, for obvious reasons, appeared 'hollow' when the imperial logic of the state prevailed in excess of other thoughts.

In other languages, the failure of Moderates in obtaining concessions for the Indians indicated the changing nature of the colonial state that had shown its true color as soon as its political manage in India was complete. So it was a stage in which the Extremists articulated their opposition both to the Moderates and the British government. At another stage, the Extremists also felt the need of being self-reliant economically to fight the British state that gained in strength through exploiting India's economic possessions. Swadeshi was not merely an economic design but also a political slogan on which India was sought to be made strong through being self-reliant. This was a region where serious intellectual contributions were made through the exponents of Extremism — BG Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal, Aurobindo in the middle of others. Unlike the Moderates who insisted on constitutional means to reform the British state, not only did the Extremists dismiss this plea as 'mainly unfortunate' but also ruled out the possibility of negotiations with the ruler for 'verbal' concession.

There were many factors that had contributed to the disillusionment of the Extremists with the Moderates. First, the rising government atrocities, especially in the wake of the 1905 Bengal partition agitation, clearly revealed the inadequacies of the constitutional and peaceful means. In information, the Congress strategy of persuasion was usually interpreted as a sign of weakness through the British government and its supporters. Hence, there was a rising pressure for a change of strategy to force the power to succumb to the
demands of the Indians. Articulating the feeling of the extremist part of the Congress, Tilak therefore exhorted: 'political rights will have to be fought for. The Moderates think that these can be won through persuasion. We think that they can only be obtained through strong pressure'. As apparent, the friction flanked by the two sections of the Congress reached a pinnacle and a formal division was imminent. Secondly, the uncritical acceptance of Western enlightenment of the Moderates was also rejected as a sign of emotional bankruptcy, especially, given the rich heritage of Indian civilization. What contributed to the sense of pride in the middle of these youths in Indian values and ethos was certainly the socio-religious movements of the late nineteenth century seeking to articulate an alternative theoretical design for nationalist intervention. The ideal of Bhagavad Gita inspired them to pursue a row of action against the alien rule for its effort to denigrate Indian and its cultural distinctiveness. Vivekananda was a central figure in this nationalist conceptualization and his teachings remained an important source of inspiration for those who were critical of blind adherence to the western ideals. Thirdly, the recurrence of famine and the lackadaisical attitude of the British government brought out the exploitative nature of colonial power in clear conditions. Even in the context of huge human sufferings, the government did not adopt events to ameliorate the circumstances of the victims. In information, there were indications that the government deliberately withdrew relief in regions that suffered the mainly. The true nature of colonialism came to the surface and it was alleged that the indifferent alien power left no stone unturned to gain maximum at the cost of human miseries. What caused maximum damage to the already crippled Indian economy was an economic policy of the British government that had stopped the supply of food granules to the affected regions on the plea that it would avoid famine in spaces where there was apparently no crisis of food. Nobody was persuaded through this logic. Even the Moderate Leaders like Naoroji and Ranade were critical of this governmental stance in the context of
severe human agony that could have been avoided had the government followed 'a humane policy' even after the outbreak of famine in sure parts of India. The atmosphere was surcharged with anti-British feelings and the failure of the Moderate Congress to persuade the British for relatively pro-people welfare policies catapulted the Extremists to the centre stage. Finally, the anti-Indian repressive events throughout the tenure of Curzon as the Viceroy (1899-1905) revealed the extent to which the Moderate methods of conciliation failed. Persuaded through his belief that Indians lacked the capability to rule, the Viceroy adopted many legislations - the 1904 Indian Universities Act, the 1899 Calcutta Corporation Act, to name a few - in which the representation of Indians was both drastically reduced and bypassed conveniently to fulfill his design. What was mainly distinctive in his reign was the decision to partition Bengal in 1905 that galvanized the masses into action against this imperial device of creating a religious division in the middle of the Indians. Although Curzon ostensibly undertook this administrative step for efficiency in administration, what prompted him was the principle of divide and rule. Since Curzon attributed the success of political movements in Bengal to the Hindu-Muslim unity, he deliberately adopted this measure to permanently separate the Hindus from the Muslims. This design caught the attention of the nationalist irrespective of religion and ideology and even a typical Moderate leader Surendranath Banerji while criticizing Curzon for Bengal partition hailed 'this mainly reactionary of Indian viceroys' as someone who 'will go down to the posterity as the architect of Indian national life'. Through releasing those forces in the wake of the partition agitation 'which contributed to the up building of nations', argued Banerji, 'Curzon had made us a nation'.

As apparent, through the early part of the twentieth century and especially in the context of the 1905 Bengal partition agitation, the Moderates lost credibility since their anti-imperial strategies failed to gain what they aspired for. Moreover, their faith in the British liberalism did not work to their
advantage and it dawned on the later nationalists, particularly the Extremists, that the colonial power in India drew more on use and less on the vital tenets of liberalism. So, the rise and consolidation of Extremism as a political ideal in contrast with the Moderate philosophy is a clear break with the past since the principles that inspired the late nineteenth century nationalists appeared to have totally lost their significance.

**MODERATE - EXTREMIST COMPARISON**

The distinction flanked by the Moderates and Extremists is based on serious differences in the middle of themselves in their respective approaches to the British Empire. Based on their perception, the Moderates hailed the British rule as mainly beneficial in contrast with what India had confronted before the arrival of the British. Until the 1905 Bengal partition, the Moderate philosophy was based on loyalty to 'the Empire that had shown signs of cracks in the aftermath of atrocities, meted out to those opposing Curzon’s canonical design of causing a fissure in the middle of the Indians through highlighting their religious schism. For an extremist like Bipin Pal, it was mainly surprising because 'how can loyalty exist in the face of injustice and mis-government which we confront everyday'. Opposed to the Moderate stance, the Extremists always measured the British rule as a curse that could never render justice to the governed in India. Not only did they challenge the British government for its 'evil' design against the Indians, they also criticized the Moderates for having misled the nationalist aspirations in a method that was clearly defeating. Instead, the new nationalist outlook, articulated through the Extremists drew mainly on an uncompromising anti-imperial stance that also fed the revolutionary terrorist movement in the late nineteenth and early part of the twentieth 'century. Secondly, the variation flanked by the Moderates and Extremists was based on their respective approaches to the outcome of the nationalist intervention. While the Moderates stood for the attainment of 'self government' through gradual reforms, the Extremists insisted on complete
Swaraj. In other languages, the model of self-government, as apparent in the
dominion of Canada and Australia, appeared to be an ideal form of
government for India. The Extremist arguments were qualitatively dissimilar.
Through demanding complete swaraj, Tilak, the mainly prominent of the
Extremists, exhorted that 'swaraj is my birthright' and 'without swaraj there
could be no social reform, no industrial progress, no useful education, no
fulfillment of national life. That is what we seek and that is why God has sent
us into the world to fulfill Him'. In appreciation of this attitude, Bipin Pal, a
member of the Lal-Bal-Pal group, was categorical in stating that the principal
goal of the extremist thrash about was 'the abdication of the right of England
to determine the policy of the Indian Government, the relinquishment of the
right of the present despotism to enact whatever law they please to govern the
people of this country'. Secondly, the Extremists were not hesitant in
championing 'violence', if necessary, to advance the cause of the nation while
the Moderates favored constitutional and peaceful methods as mainly
appropriate to avoid direct friction with the ruler. In contrast with these means,
the Extremists resorted to boycott and swadeshi that never evoked support
from the Moderates. While defending boycott, Tilak argued that 'it is possible
to create administration deplorably hard and to make circumstances
impossible for the British bureaucracy through fighting for our rights with
determination and tenacity and through boycott and strike'. Urging those
associated with the British bureaucracy, Tilak further argued that with the
withdrawal of the Indians from the administration, 'the whole machinery will
collapse'.

This strategy, first 'adopted in the context of the 1905 Bengal partition
agitation, was further extended to the nationalist campaign as a whole,
presumably because of its effectiveness in creating and sustaining the
nationalist zeal. The economic boycott, as it was characterized in modern
parlance, caused consternation in the middle of the British industrialists more
than the other kinds of boycott. Thirdly, the Moderates appeared to be happy
under the British presumably because of their belief that Indians were not capable of self-rule. This was what prompted them to support the British rule uncritically. The views of the Extremists were, for obvious reasons, diametrically opposite. While articulating his opposition to this thought, Tilak argued that 'we recognize no teacher in the art of self-government except self-government itself. It values freedom for its own sake and desires autonomy, immediate and unconditional regardless of any thoughts of fitness or unfitness of the people for it'. Here too, the Moderate-Extremist distinction is based on serious ideological differences. While the former supported a loyalist discourse, the latter basically rejected the stance in its articulation of anti-imperialism. Fourthly, in the Extremist conceptualization of thrash about against imperialism, the ideal of self-sacrifice, including the, supreme sacrifice figured prominently while in the Moderate scheme of political thrash about, this thought appeared to have received no attention. This almost certainly designates two dissimilar faces of Extremism: on the one hand, there was the public appearance where the strategies of boycott, swadeshi and strike were pursued to articulate the nationalist protest; the sudden violent attack was, on the other, also encouraged to terrorize the British administration that was rattled following the incessant violent interventions through those who preferred underground militant operation. One of the preferred manners of action was assassination of 'brutal' British officials. Such acts would strike terror into the hearts of the rulers, arouse the patriotic instincts of the people, inspire them and remove the fear of power from their minds. And it had propaganda value because throughout the trial of those involved in conducting violent attacks on the British officials, the revolutionaries, and their cause received adequate publicity not only in the pro-government but also in the nationalist media. Finally, while the Moderates drew upon the British diversity of liberalism, the Extremists were inspired through the writings of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee and the teachings of Vivekananda. In view of their faith in constitutional means of opposition to the British rule, Moderates preferred-the
path of conciliation rather than confrontation whereas the Extremists, espousing the demand for Swaraj, plunged into direct action against the government through resorting to boycott and strike. Unlike the Moderates who drew upon the thoughts of Gladstone, Disraeli and Burke to refine their political strategy, the Extremists establish Bankim's Anandamath, a historical novel that narrated the story of the rise of the Hindu Sannyasis vis-à-vis the vanquished Muslim rulers and Vivekananda's interpretation of Vedanta philosophy. The poem "Bande Matarara" in Anandamath clearly set the tone of the Extremist philosophy in which the notion of 'Mother' seemed to be prominent. Mother on behalf of simultaneously the divine motherland and the mother-goddess, Durga, conveyed both patriotic and religious devotion. This was an articulation that generated mass emotional appeal which the Moderate form of constitutional agitation failed to arouse. Bankim and Vivekananda were almost certainly the mainly effective ideologue who evoked Hindus imageries, well-tuned to the modern scene. Through overlooking the non-Hindu custom totally and accepting the Hindu custom as Indian custom, they though, nurtured a narrow view of history which is misleading given the cross-fertilization of multiple traditions in Indian civilization.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LAL-BAL-PAL

The Extremist ideology created a leadership trio of Lal-Bal-Pal (Lala Lajpat Rai, Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Bipin Chandra Pal), who, while critiquing the Moderates, altered the nationalist vocabulary through incorporating swadeshi, boycott and national education. So popular were Lal-Bal-Pal in Punjab, Maharashtra and Bengal respectively, that Moderates seemed to have lost their credibility in these regions. Of the trio, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, rooted in Maharashtra, was perhaps the mainly articulate militant leader of this stage of freedom thrash about. Extensive before his active involvement in the Congress, Tilak articulated his nationalist thoughts in both Kesari (in Marathi) and Mahratta (in English). In 1893, he transformed
the traditional religious Ganapati festival into a campaign for nationalist thoughts through patriotic songs and speeches. Likewise, in 1896, he introduced the Shivaji festival to inspire the youth through drawing upon the patriotism of Shivaji in opposition to the Moghul ruler, Aurangzeb. It would be wrong though to blame as a 'revivalist' since he supported, mainly enthusiastically, the Ganapati and Shivaji festivals. In information, Tilak himself responded to this charge through saying that these festivals were planned to provide to the people 'a sense of belonging and to evoke in them a pride in their past'. He also dismissed the thought that he was in favor of bringing back 'the reign of Shivaji or of Peshwas' while arguing strongly for 'popular and representative government' in opposition to the 'oriental ideal of revivalism'. He rose to prominence through organizing a successful campaign for boycott of foreign clothes in Maharashtra in 1896 in protest against the imposition of taxes on cotton. His involvement in the no-tax campaign in regions, adversely affected through the 1896-7 famine in Maharashtra, had clearly articulated his mission of expanding the Congress base through incorporating the peasants, a constituency that was basically beyond the Moderates purview. Through deciding to serve the plague victims in Poona throughout the 1897, Tilak became a leader of the people who automatically were drawn to him for humanism. Separately from his role in serving the victims, he wrote many pieces in Kesari condemning the arrangement and the steps, the government undertook in combating this deadly disease, In information, the killing of Rand, the chairman of the Plague Commission in Poona in 1898 was attributed to the popular resentment against official events even in the government document. Tilak was arrested following the assassination but was released soon because of lack of proof of his involvement. Two significant characteristics in Tilak's political philosophy separated him from the Moderate thinkers. First, unlike the Moderates who argued for gradual introduction of democratic institutions in India, Tilak insisted on immediate swaraj or self rule. His concept of swaraj was not
complete independence but a government constituted through the Indians themselves that 'rules just as to the wishes of the people or their representatives. Similar to the British executive that 'decides on policies, impose and remove taxes and determine the allocation of public expenditure', Indians should have the right 'to run their own government, to create laws, to appoint the officers as well as to spend the tax revenue'. This is one dimension of his thought; the second dimension relates to the notion of prajadroha or the right of the people to resist a power that loses legitimacy. In Tilak's conceptualization, if the government fails to fulfill their obligation to the ruled and becomes tyrannical, it lacks legitimacy to rule. What is motivating to note that Tilak's prajadroha also justifies the enactment of laws to prevent unlawful behaviors of the people. If contextualized, this thought creates sense because he was aware that a total rejection of the government would invite atrocities on the nationalists who had neither the organizational backing nor a strong support base in the middle of the people. So, his support for governmental preventive mechanisms was strategically conditioned and textured.

Tilak was a nationalist par excellence. In view of his uncritical acceptance of Vedanta philosophy and orthodox Hindu rituals and practices, Tilak was accused of being sectarian in multi-religious India. That he upheld the mainly reactionary form of Hindu orthodoxy was apparent in his opposition to the 1890 Age of Consent Bill that sought to rise the age of consummation of marriage of girls from ten to twelve years. While the Moderate spokesman, Ranade hailed the bill for its progressive social role, Tilak establish in this legislation an unwarranted intervention in Hindu social life. Likewise, his involvement in the Cow Protection Society alienated the Muslims to a big extent from the Extremist campaign, Tilak's argument in favor of cow protection drew upon the sacredness of cow in Hindu belief disregarding totally the importance of beef in Muslim diet. Furthermore, the organisation of national festivals in honor of Shivaji, the Hindu hero of the Marathas and also redefining of an essentially Hindu religious festival — the
Ganapati utsav - in nationalist conditions, set the ideological tenor of Tilak's political philosophy where Muslims seemed to be peripheral if not entirely bypassed.

It is necessary to pause here for a moment and reassess Tilak's worldview critically with reference to the context in which it was articulated. There is no denying that underlying all these religious shapes lay the national patriotic purpose. Under the cover of religious festivals, Tilak sought to make a nationalist platform for an effective mobilization against the British that would not allow, for obvious reasons, a political campaign adversely affecting the imperial interests. Under circumstances of severe governmental repression of all political agitation and organisation, before the nationalist movement had struck roots in the middle of the masses, the use of such apparently religious and orthodox shapes of nationalist outpouring appears to be strategically conditioned and Tilak appeared as a master planner in refining these in the pre-Gandhian stage of India's freedom thrash about. So, not only did he articulate the voice of protest in a unique vocabulary, but also he expanded the constituency of the nationalist politics through proclaiming the supposed spiritual superiority of the ancient Hindu civilization to its Western counterpart. In other languages, Tilak played a historical role in the construction of a new language of politics through being critical of 'the denationalized and westernized' Moderate leaders who blindly clung to typical western liberal values disregarding their indigenous counterparts while articulating their opposition to the British rule. It is possible to argue that Tilak had a wider appeal for his campaign was couched in a language that drew upon values, rooted in Indian civilization and civilization in contrast with what the Moderates upheld, which were totally alien. So, Tilak was not merely a nationalist leader with tremendous political acumen; he himself represented a new wave of nationalist movement that created an automatic legroom for it through:
• Providing the mainly powerful and persuasive critique of Moderate philosophy and
• Articulating his nationalist ideology in a language that was meaningful to those it was addressed.

This is how Tilak is transcendental and his thoughts of swadeshi, boycott and strike had a important sway on Gandhi who refined and well-tuned some of the typical Extremist methods in a totally changed socio-economic and political context when the nationalist thrash about had its tentacles not only in the district towns but also in the villages that unluckily remained peripheral in the pre-Gandhian days of freedom thrash about.

THE 1907 SURAT SPLIT

From 1905 to 1907, the thrash about flanked by several trends within the nationalist articulation of freedom thrash about was fought out also at the annual sessions of the Congress, culminating in the Surat split of December, 1907. The flashpoint was the 1905 Bengal partition that appeared to have enabled the Extremists to give a sharp critique of the Moderate strategies that miserably failed. The Moderate method of constitutional agitation, articulated in three Ps - petition, prayer and protest - remained mainly an academic exercise that seemed to have exhausted potentials with the consolidation of several groups championing direct action against the British. Condemning the Bengal partition and the repressive events, Gokhale in his 1905 Benarases presidential address referred to economic boycott in a extremely lukewarm manner to avoid further repression through the' government. The 1906 Calcutta Congress fulfilled the Extremists goal partly in the sense that the Congress president, Dadabhai Naoroji officially endorsed the resolutions on boycott, swadeshi, national education and self-government. The Extremists effort to extend the boycott resolution to cover provinces other than Bengal as well was defeated beside with the resolution on boycott of honorary offices
and of foreign goods. Enthusiastic in excess of the victory of the Liberal Party in England, the Moderate leadership was hopeful of a series of reform events including the annulment of the Bengal partition. The appointment of John Morley as the secretary of state in early 1907 was hailed for his liberal views and was expected to inaugurate a new face of British colonialism in contrast with the bitter legacy of the Curzon era. Despite changes in the British political climate, the friction flanked by the Moderates and Extremists had shown no abatement and they were preparing themselves distant a head-on collision in the 1907 Surat Congress presided in excess of through Rash Behari Ghosh who was vehemently opposed through Tilak and his colleagues from Maharashtra and Bengal. This was perhaps the only annual meeting of the Congress that was dissolved without deliberations.

On the surface, one may discover that the Surat Congress ended in a fiasco because it failed to amicably settle the Extremist-Moderate dichotomy. In other languages, what came out of this failed meeting of the Congress was mainly attributed to the irreconcilable contradiction flanked by the Extremists and Moderates in excess of the anti-imperial political agenda. There is, though, another dimension if one goes below the surface. The antagonism that split the Congress in Surat was the product of a fierce thrash about flanked by 'the Tilakites of Poona' and Moderates of Bombay, led through Pherozeshah Mehta. In information, the Bengal Extremists, including Aurobindo wanted to avoid the split within the Congress so as not to weaken the Swadeshi movement in Bengal. This was expressed clearly at the Bengal Provincial Conference at Patna, presided in excess of through Rabindranath Tagore in which a resolution for an immediate session of the Congress was accepted unanimously. Even Tilak's effort did not yield results. The Bombay Moderates remained adamant and at its 1908 Allahabad convention, the split was formalized through debarring those, opposed to 'the strictly constitutional methods' from participating in the Congress meetings and deliberations. The mainly obvious victim of this division was the nationalist movement itself that
appeared to have taken a backseat throughout internecine feud in the middle of the Moderates and Extremists. Interestingly, it would be hard, if not impossible, to demarcate the Extremists and Moderates in conditions of their class background. Supporting mainly the Hindu vested interests, both of them, though separated ideologically, were a product of an era when the nationalist politics was primarily confined to the urban regions. While the extremists, through encouraging 'individual heroism' and 'revolutionary terrorism', inaugurated a new stage in nationalist agitation, Tilak's 1896-7 no tax campaign for the famine-stricken peasants in Maharashtra was a concrete step in expanding the constituency of nationalist politics through addressing the issues that hitherto remained neglected in the Congress agenda.

AN EVALUATION

Of the dissimilar phases of Indian nationalism, the Moderate and Extremist phases represented the voice of an incipient nationalist movement that was neither properly crystallized nor had a support base in the middle of the masses. Based on their faith in British liberalism, Moderates were perfectly justified in pursuing the policy of reconciliation. The 1909 Morley-Minto Reform was almost certainly the upper limit of what the Moderates could have gained under the circumstances. Even the revocation of Bengal partition was mainly attributed to the reform zeal of the Liberal government in Britain. So, Moderate efforts did not, at least on paper, go waste. What was though mainly extra ordinary was the information that Moderate campaign let loose a procedure, of which Extremism was also offshoot, whereby new thoughts were set in motion. The nationalist zeal, which so distant was articulated in the annual sessions of the Congress in a strictly constitutional and peaceful method, was translated into a diversity of actions, including boycott, swadeshi and strike. This resulted in an immediate expansion of the constituencies of nationalist politics that, under the Moderates, represented mainly the upper crest of Indian society. Despite sharing more or less the
general social background with the Moderates, the Extremists though addressed the issues of the peasantry and workers, of course in their conditions, to underline the ideological differences with the former.

What lay at the root of the acrimonious exchange flanked by the Moderate and Extremist leaders throughout the short-lived 1907 Surat Congress was perhaps the irreconcilable differences flanked by the two. Articulating the ideological schism in almost certainly the mainly sordid manner, both these groups seemed to have allowed them to be swayed through thoughts other than anti-imperialism. That is why Rabindranath Tagore lamented that through determining to capture the Congress through hook or crook, the Moderate and Extremists failed to conceptualize, let alone realize, the vital nationalist goal of serving the people and thereby made a mockery of themselves and also what they stood for. Despite Tagore’s own effort in bringing these two forces jointly in the aftermath of the Surat fiasco, the adoption of resolutions in the 1908 Allahabad convention through the Moderates for permanently disqualifying the Extremist part of the Congress underlined the declining importance of nationalism as a cementing ideology vis-à-vis the British imperialism. Also, the Extremist alternative was not qualitatively dissimilar although the Extremists were more militant and their critique of British rule was articulated in stronger conditions. They neither created a viable organisation to lead the anti-British movement nor could they describe the movement in a method that differed from that of the Moderates.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

- What are the distinctive features of Moderate and Extremist philosophy?
- What are the factors that contributed to the growth of Extremists in Indian nationalism?
- In what ways, Dadabhai Naoroji was an epitome of Moderate politics?
- How did Tilak differ from the Moderates? How did he articulate swadeshi, boycott and strike?
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the renaissance of Hinduism.
- Explain the Swami Vivekananda’s Philosophy of Neo-Vedanta.
- Explain the transition of Hinduism: From Vivekananda to Sri Aurobindo
- Discuss the Sri Aurobindo’s political thoughts.

INTRODUCTION

In 19th century, India came under the British rule. Due to the spread of contemporary education and rising public behaviors, there urbanized social awakening in India. The religion of Hindus was extremely harshly criticized through the Christian missionaries and the British historians but at the similar time, researches accepted out through the Orientalist scholars revealed to the
world, the glorious custom of the Hindu religion. The Hindus responded to this through initiating reforms in their religion and through establishing new public associations to spread their thoughts of reform and social development in the middle of the people. They wanted to provide new birth to Hinduism.

The procedure of renaissance of Hinduism started with Raja Ram Mohan Roy and it was further urbanized through the Arya Samaj of Swami Dayanand, the Prarthana Samaj and the Satyashodhliak Samaj of Jotiba Phule. Sri Ramakrishna Mission, founded through Swami Vivekananda, played a key role in renaissance and reformation of Hindu society. There was a new interpretation of Vedanta philosophy and Swami Vivekananda and Sri Aurobindo Ghosh were two major interpreters of Neo-Vedanta philosophy. They were of the opinion that Neo-Vedanta philosophy would augment cultural strength of Hinduism and pave the method for the growth of nationalism in contemporary India. They interpreted Indian nationalism in the context of reformation and rejuvenation of Hinduism.

RENAISSANCE OF HINDUISM AND THE ROLE OF SRI RAMAKRISHNA MISSION

Rama Krishna Mission played a key role in the renaissance of Hinduism. It was recognized through Swami Vivekananda. It was named after his teacher Sri Ramakrishna Paramhamsa. Ramakrishna (1836-86) was a son of soil and never lost his rustic simplicity, He was a mystic who preached self-less devotion of God and ultimate absorption in him. He personified the rebirth of ancient custom in the midst of rising westernization. He preached the people to follow the path of self-less devotion and claimed that service of man was service of God. He asked his disciples to live pure life, free of passions, desires, hatred and pride. He condemned no one and saw well in all. It was his firm belief that the religions of the world were not contradictory but were several phases of one eternal religion.
His disciple Swami Vivekananda recognized the Ramakrishna Mission to serve the people. He wanted to discover a new path of progress for Hinduism because he was not happy with the reform movements as they were imitations of the western methods. He had three alternatives before him.

- First, to follow the path shown through Raja Ram Mohan Roy and join Brahmo Samaj,
- Secondly, to follow the path of total renunciation and go to Himalayas to attain the goal of liberation,
- Thirdly, to follow the path of service to the society and to create social awakening in the minds of the people between resuscitation of the Indian society.

Vivekananda chose the third path and told the Indians to see Narayana in the form of a poor beggar dying of starvation. Therefore, for Vivekananda the Ramakrishna Mission should stand for selfless service of the people, ceaseless efforts to discover truth and thereby for reawakening of the spirit of India. Throughout Vivekananda's life time and after his death, Sri Ramakrishna Mission played a key role in the renaissance of Hinduism.

**SWAMI VIVEKANANDA’S PHILOSOPHY OF NEO- VEDANTHA**

Vedanta philosophy was one of the mainly significant ancient philosophies of India which whispered that God alone was real and the visible world was unreal and the absorption of individual soul in the one supreme soul was the goal of every human being. That was described liberation and it could be achieved with the help of true knowledge. Raja Ram Mohan Roy was a supporter of non-dualists monism. He expounded the concept of fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. But Vivekananda followed the Vedanta preached through his teacher which was rooted in the traditional Indian wisdom of Bhakti custom, He did not consider in the path of renunciation and asked people to perform their duties in the spirit of selflessness. There were
three significant principles of Neo-Vedanta philosophy of Vivekananda. They were as follows:

**Vedanta Whispered in the Oneness flanked by God and Man and the Solidarity of Universe**

It did not stand for a life of renunciation but stood for self-less action in the services of humanity. Hence, service of man should be measured as service of God. It propagated the principle of universal tolerance and whispered that dissimilar religious faiths were dissimilar paths to reach the goal of liberation. Therefore; for Swami Vivekananda, Neo-Vedanta philosophy stood for service, sacrifice and freedom. He did not want the Neo-Vedantists to remain inactive but to work for the awakening of the masses. He wanted young Indians to dedicate themselves in the cause of resurgence of India.

**SWAMI VIVEKANANDA ON NATIONALISM**

Swami Vivekananda is measured as one of the prophets of the Indian nationalism because he tried to awaken Indian people who were lying in deep slumber. He wanted to see the emergence of a strong and self-confident India which would provide the message of the Vedanta to the world. He maintained that the Indians should be proud of their history, civilization and religion and should attempt their stage best to reform them - in the light of the demands of time. The awakening of the spirit of India was the goal for young people. Hence, he asked them to "arise, awake and stop not till the goal is reached."

Vivekananda was highly critical of the British rule in India because he held that due to their rule, Indians lost confidence, famines engulfed the land, farmers and artisans were reduced to poverty and penury. The British were exploiting Indians in all the spheres of economic action. They had let loose the reign of terror and struck fear in the minds of the people. Due to exploitative economic policies of the British government, Indians could not develop their
natural possessions and her productive potential was sapped. It was imperative that Indians should know the evil effects of the British rule in India.

Vivekananda was of the opinion that the national regeneration of India would begin when people became fearless and started demanding their rights. Also, he asked the Indians to develop solidarity and oneness of the spirit through the eradication of social evils, superstitions and caste-arrogance. He was of the opinion that caste system divided the Indian society into classes and created the feeling of inferiority, and superiority in the middle of them.

He held that though there was a diversity of races, languages, religions and cultures in India, there lived a general ground flanked by Indian people. There was a general religious custom which could be depended upon to build national spirit. Just as to Europe, the foundation of national unity was political thoughts but in Asia, religion shaped the foundation of it. It was not necessarily a scrupulous religion as such, but all religions would help us develop the national integration. For the Indians, religion was a unifying force as the spirituality was blood in the life of India. All differences melted in it. Indians preserved their faith in the mainly hard circumstances.

It was the duty of the educated Indians to create its knowledge accessible to the people in their oneness and solidarity. He exhorted Indians not to get involved in the divisive issues of race and language and imbibe the spirit of unity. He said that Hindus should not blame Muslims for their numerous invasions because the Muslim conquest came as a salvation to the downtrodden masses in India. One fifth of India did not become Muslim because of sword but because of their egalitarian message. So, national unity could not be fostered through caste disagreement but it would be secured through raising the lower to the stage of higher classes and not through bringing the upper to the lower stage. The privileges of classes should cease and it was the duty of every aristocracy to dig its own grave and the sooner it did so the better. The more it delayed, the more it would fester and died worse death. India should be of one mind and of one resolve. Hence, we necessity
revive the whole of India. India necessity conquers the world not with the help of gun, but with the help of spirituality.

For the growth of national spirit in India, independence of mind was necessary. India should expose herself to the outside world but she should not get scared of any one because her freedom would come through heroism and bravery. Indians should be proud of their country and declare that all Indians, despite their dissimilar castes and religions, are brothers. Therefore in Vivekananda's theory of nationalism, there were four significant components which were as follows:

There was unity and oneness of the Indian people despite their outward diversity. It was necessary to remove caste differences to inculcate the spirit of social solidarity societies. National spirit in India could be urbanized through young people through devoting their life to social service and national awakening.

**Swami Vivekananda on Democracy**

Vivekananda was a great advocate of democracy and he wanted to awaken the young people to set up free and democratic government in India. For him, the principle of liberty was significant because he held that there could not be growth in society as well as that of an individual without liberty. He said that every one should have liberty of thought, discussion, food, marriage and dress. He wanted to democratize the Indian society through abolishing caste privileges, through opposing cunning of priest craft and social tyranny.

Vivekananda was a supporter of equality of all men and pleaded for the abolition of caste and class privileges. He thought that the spirit of equality in India could be inculcated through the spread of knowledge and education. Caste system was a hindrance to the development of India into a strong nation. He held that in democracy, power rested with the people. He was of the view that for the democratization of the country, the western thinkers tried to
perfect the political and social order but the Eastern thinkers laid more stress
on perfection of individual. For, sound social and political institutions were
ultimately rooted in the goodness of individuals. For him, religious tolerance
was crucial for the growth of democracy because that alone could promote the
cause of liberty, equality and fraternity.

**Swami Vivekananda on Social Change**

Vivekananda wanted an overall development of India and the
eradication of poverty and degeneration of the people. He was an opponent of
aristocracy and feudalism. He pleaded for bridging the gap flanked by the rich
and the poor. For that purpose, he wanted to awaken the toiling masses of the
country. He was of the view that in future, the Shudras or those who were
toiling hard would become the rulers of the country. The socialist and
anarchist movements in the Western countries indicated this. Vivekananda
urbanized his own theory of social change to explain this.

Vivekananda's theory of social change was based on the Indian concept
of history. It was a theory of political cycle that visualized periodic and
circular change in the regimes on the foundation of law of change, with the
help of historical evidences from the history of Greece, Rome and India. He
held that in every individual, there prevailed three qualities of Sattva
(Knowledge) Rajas (Valour) and Tamas (ignorance) and in every society and
in every civilization, there lived four classes of the people. All societies which
had urbanized division of labour had four classes of Brahmins, Kshatriyas,
Vaishyas and Shudras. Just as to Swami Vivekananda, on the foundation of
historical examples and law of nature, each of this class in every society
governed the country, one after another in succession.

Vivekananda was of the opinion that in the first stage of human
development in approximately all ancient civilizations of the world, the power
was in the hands of the Brahmin or a priest. He ruled with the help of magic.
His power was overthrown through the Kshatriyas or warriors who shaped
monarchical or oligarchic governments. But the power of this class was overthrown through the Vaishyas or traders. In mainly of the contemporary nations, such as England, the power of controlling society was in the hands of Vaishyas, who amassed wealth through carrying out commerce and trade. They became powerful only in the 18th and 19th centuries. Several a kingly crowns had to kiss the ground due to the rising power of commercial classes. Now, the Vaishyas had enormous power in their hands. So, the conquest of India was not the conquest through Christianity but it was a conquest through the commercial classes, whose flag was a factory chimney, whose warriors were merchant men and whose battlefields were the market spaces of the world. It was the opinion of Vivekananda that the power of the Vaishyas would be overthrown through the Shudras.

Just as to Vivekananda, as per the law of nature, wherever there was an awakening of new and stronger life, there it tried to conquer and take the lay of the old and the decaying. Nature favored the dying of the unfit and the survival of the fittest. The power of the Kshatriyas was brought down because of its dictatorship. He maintained that the real power of the society rested with the Shudras who produced wealth with the help of their labour power. But they were treated harshly through the ruling classes. But they would gather strength and overthrow the rule of commercial classes. The Shudras would become great not through acquiring the qualities of Brahmins, Kshatriyas or Vaishyas, but through retaining their own qualities as producers of wealth. In the Western world, we had seen that the ranks of the Shudras were rising and with the augment in their awakening, they would capture power. The last stage of social change was the victory of Shudras and the capture of political power through them. The rise of Socialist and anarchist movements in Europe substantiated this.

Therefore, in the political theory of Vivekananda, the awakening and freedom of India was synchronized with the rise of Shudras and workers and peasants to political power. He was a supporter of nationalism and provided
the foundation of Neo-Vedanta to it. He used religion and civilization in the cause of nationalism.

TRANSITION OF HINDUISM: FROM VIVEKANANDA TO SRI AUROBINDO

In the social and political thoughts of Swami Vivekananda, we had seen the rise of Hinduism and Indian nationalism. New Hinduism became the tool of national consciousness in India. But this consciousness was broad enough to contain Muslim, Parsee, Christian and other minorities in India. In the political thoughts of Vivekananda, we could see the rudimentary elements of nationalism. But with the growth of national consciousness, Bengal produced another great nationalist thinker in whose political thoughts we could see the development and growth of Indian nationalism. In the beginning of the 20th century, nationalism became more aggressive and anti-colonial. Sri Aurobindo Ghosh was instrumental in giving radical content to nationalism in India.

The Political career of Aurobindo Ghosh began in the last decade of 19th century as he spent 13 years of his life in England to get the best English education. He returned to India and studied history and philosophy. In the procedure, he became one of the authentic exponents of Hinduism and Hindu philosophy. He joined the extremist group in the Congress and took a leading role in the anti partition movement in Bengal. Throughout this era, he mobilized people through speeches and writings. He was a leading member of the radical group in the Congress party. The British government tried to suppress the Swadeshi movement. Tilak and Aurobindo were arrested, Lala Lajpat Rai was deported and several were put behind the bars, Beside with Aurobindo, his revolutionary brother Barinder was arrested on the charges of sedition. In the trial, Aurobindo was acquitted but Barinder was sent to gallows. In the jail, he had sure spiritual and mystical experiences and as a result, he decided to leave politics and concentrate on the life of philosophy.
and Yoga. In a brief political career, Aurobindo accepted forward the procedure of the renaissance of Hinduism on the foundation of Vedanta and deepened the concept of spiritual nationalism.

Sri Aurobindo's political thoughts could be divided into two phases. In the first stage, he expounded the concept of Indian nationalism and urbanized the theory of passive resistance. In the second stage, as a great sage of India, he wrote extensively on the ideal of human unity and the essential features of Indian model of state structure. Therefore, in the first stage, he was a militant nationalist eager to liberate his motherland from the bondage. In the second stage, he was a great sage who sought to provide message to the world in the ideals of the human unity and nationalism to achieve the goal.

**Sri Aurobindo on Renaissance of Hinduism**

As we have seen, Sri Aurobindo was a prominent figure in the renaissance of Hinduism and he wanted to complete the task left partial through Swami Vivekananda and Bankimchandra Chatterjee. Aurobindo accepted forward the development of Neo-Vedanta and declared that the true message of Vedanta was selfless action or Karma Yoga. In the theory of Karma Yoga, a person was enjoined to perform his duties without aspiring distant the fruits thereof, The Geeta taught us to fight against injustice because life is a series of struggles.

Aurobindo was of the opinion that there was require of the renaissance of Hinduism which described for the awakening of the Indian soul which was in deep slumber. It could achieve its glory through the philosophy of Vedanta which gave more importance to spirituality than to science. The West glorified science but science is a light within a limited room and not the sun that which illumines the world. The spirit of every human heart had to be awakened to revive the glory of Hinduism. Hinduism should change the rags of the past so that its beauty might be restored. It necessity alter its bodily appearance so that her soul might be newly expressed. Just as to Sri Aurobindo, the goal of new
Hinduism was to pave the method for emergence of Indian nationalism and to harmonise the world and the spirit. He held that the genius of the Hindu was not for pure action but for thought and aspiration realized in action.

**Sri Aurobindo on Evil Effects of British Rule**

Aurobindo was a harsh critic of the British rule in India. He did not agree with the opinion of the moderates that it was a divine dispensation. He said that it was a curse for the majority of the Indian people because the foreign rule in India sapped moral and mental energies of the Indian people. The British rule ruined the economy of India and did not allow the latter to develop as a self-governing nation. It disorganized the Indians into a crowd, with no centre of strength or means of resistance. Her industries and trade were ruined and agriculture devastated. The British government in India was the worst kind of bureaucratic despotism motivated through plunder and power. India was held in subjection for the benefit of the British ruling classes. The British claim of a good government was false and a good and efficient government was no substitute for self-government and freedom.

It was the contention of Aurobindo that the spirit of India could be freed only through securing complete independence of the country. Freedom from foreign rule was an inalienable right of the people. The evil effects of the British rule could be eradicated only through overthrowing it. Its continuance would further worsen the situation in India.

**SRI AUROBINDO’S CRITIQUE OF POLITICAL MODERATES IN INDIA**

When Aurobindo Ghosh entered Indian politics, it was dominated through the moderate leaders who were of the view that British rule in India was a divine dispensation. Aurobindo was highly critical of their approach to
politics. Hence, he wrote a series of articles in the ‘Indu Prakash’ of Pune under the title 'New Lamps for Old' and severely criticized the politics of petitions and prayers of the moderate leaders. He said that the Congress leaders had extremely narrow and limited ideals. The Congress was selfishly frigid of social development and awakening of the masses and organically infirm. It was unaware of deeper facts; so, it did not articulate the popular opinion of the whole Indian people. It lacked the spirit of sincerity, wholeheartedness, right kind of methods and right kind of leaders because when the blind led the blind both were bound to fall in a ditch,

Aurobindo argued that throughout Ram Mohan Roy's era, politics of prayers and petition was the only possible policy, but it was wrong to continue it even in the later years. He pleaded for the adoption of new and strong methods. He wrote that the thoughts that governed the country were purely western; hence, they could not seize the attention of the people. The Indians should realize that both the liberals and the conservatives were supporters of the continuance of the British rule in India; so, the Congress should not expect much from John Morley — the liberal leader - because he was an ardent supporter of imperialism.

He described for a complete change in the policy of the Congress party because under the moderate leadership, the Congress confused sufferance with freedom and favor of foreign despotism with the right of citizenship. If the Congress did not understand it, it would remain unfit for freedom and the standing hindrance to the country's freedom. He pleaded for the adoption of new policies and programmes to replace the politics of supplication accepted out through the moderates.

**Sri Aurobindo on the Essence of Politics**

After the partition of Bengal, there was a tremendous upheaval in the country and a big number of the people joined the Swadeshi movement led through the radical group of the Congress party. Aurobindo joined Tilak,
Bipinchandra Pal and Lala Lajpat Rai to popularize the programme of the party. He was a philosopher of new party. He wanted the Congress to be with people, speak in their language, identity itself with the wishes and aspirations of the people and Indianise the movement in the true sense of the term.

Aurobindo said that Swaraj, Swadeshi, national education and boycott were four methods of the new party. For him, 'Swaraj' meant complete independence because he argued that a political agitation was not launched to secure a few seats in bureaucracy and in assembly but to secure right of self-government to the people. Swadeshi meant by the products that were manufactured in our country only and national education stood for imparting education to Indians that suited to their temperament, needs and civilization. Boycott meant not by the products manufactured in England. All these four methods were necessary to train the people in national spirit and to be architects of liberty. Therefore, for Aurobindo, new politics stood for self-development and self-help. He hoped that it would inculcate the spirit of nationalism in people.

Sri Aurobindo on Nationalism

Sri Aurobindo Ghosh was measured as a prophet of the Indian nationalism. Beside with Bankimchandra, Tilak and Dayanand, he urbanized the theory of nationalism in India. Through their self-less work, the forces of nationalism were released.

Sri Aurobindo's theory of nationalism was based on Vedanta philosophy which saw unity and oneness in man and God. There was an essential unity in India despite the subsistence of the outward differences because the spirit of unity and oneness pervaded it. For her rejuvenation, India needed 'Shakti' or the power that was physical, moral, material and spiritual. The power or strength of a nation depended on the unity of her nation. Taking a clue from Bankimchandra, he declared that India was infecting Mother India which represented united power and Shakti of millions of her children. Mother
India represented infinite power of her people: He recognized Mother India with God and maintained that it was God's divine mission to set India free. Also, it was divine work to serve 300 million Indian people. There was a deep divine purpose in India's freedom because India's freedom movement represented time spirit that would liberate resurgent Asia and all the subject people in the world.

Aurobindo was critical of those people who claimed that due to cultural, racial and linguistic diversity and divisions in the Indian society, India could never become a nation. He pointed out that if we cautiously studied the history of Europe and England of the last two centuries, we would realize that their condition was no method dissimilar from India. But now England and several other countries of Europe had appeared as nations. India would also succeed to form as a nation because it was a law of history. He held that without political freedom, true advancement of the country was not possible. He was of the opinion that education played a key role in the development of national consciousness in the country.

Aurobindo pointed out that there were sure essential elements in the formation of nationality. These essential elements were geographical unity, general past, a powerful general interest impelling towards unity and sure favorable political circumstances which enabled the impulse to realize itself in an organized government. Its goal was to set up a single and united subsistence. Just as to Sri Aurobindo, a general enthusiasm coalescing with a general interest was the mainly powerful promoter of nationality. He pointed out that there lived the necessary circumstances for the growth of nationalism in India because Indians had been slowly realizing the importance of national unity and offering united resistance to foreign rule.

Aurobindo recognized the importance of villages in the Indian life and pointed out that unlike in the West, where the municipality was the Centre of all political action, in India village was the backbone of national persistence. Indian villages were democratic, autonomous and self-governing. So,
regeneration of the village was significant for the regeneration of India. He said that village should retain its autonomy and self-government but at the similar time, 'should seek to promote national cohesion. Hence, he held that the days of self-governing village had gone and necessity not be revived. National unity could only be achieved when the rural population was urbanized into a mighty, single and compact democratic nationality. The ideal of national Swaraj necessity be modeled on the old village society which was self-enough, autonomous and self-governing.

Aurobindo's concept of nationalism was based on the philosophy of Vedanta which stood for unity flanked by God and man. He used Hindu religious thoughts and symbols. He realized that the ideal of Indian nationalism was mainly Hindu in character but he pointed out that this nationalism was wide enough to contain the Muslim, his civilization and traditions. He said that the Hindu should win Swaraj for himself as well as for the Muslim. A big part of his theory of nationalism was based on awakening the dormant spirit of nationalism that was latent in the soul of India. The thrash about against the foreign rule would enable it to achieve self-realization.

**Sri Aurobindo on Passive Resistance**

The new party of the radicals wanted to use new methods against the government to secure political rights for the Indian people. Aurobindo thought that the method of passive resistance, which was used through the Irish nationalists, would be ideal for India. Hence, he urbanized theory of passive resistance in a series of articles published in the weekly described 'Bande Mataram'.
Theory of Passive Resistance

Just as to Sri Aurobindo, for a subject country, the attainment of political independence was its highest goal. But there were dissimilar means to attain that goal. In India, for Indian patriots, three alternative means were accessible to win Swaraj and they were as follows.

- The method of prayers and petitions.
- The method of armed revolt.
- The method of self-development and passive resistance.

In the Indian context, Sri Aurobindo pointed out that the adoption of method of prayers and petitions was out of question because its futility was proved. Again, in the Indian context, the method of armed revolt or resistance was not possible or desirable. Hence, Indians had no alternative but to take recourse to self-development which was expressed in the methods of Swadeshi and boycott. Pursuit of both the methods strengthened the cause of self-help. The programme of self help and self-development would be opposed through bureaucracy and government because it challenged their power. In such a situation, the people should adopt passive resistance to the government. Passive resistance meant the resistance to power of the government in an organized manner and through peaceful means. The use of arms was not allowed in passive resistance.

Just as to Sri Aurobindo, in India, attainment of political freedom was the goal of passive resistance. Freedom in India was necessary to stop the drain of wealth and to carry out social reforms. The programme of Swadeshi, national education, boycott and establishment of arbitration courts was the programme of self-development. But this programme, on its own, would not be in a location to secure political freedom for India. Political freedom could only be secured through organized passive resistance accepted out on a big level. This policy was followed through Parnell in Ireland. Its main substance
was to paralyze the functioning of the government through withdrawing support and co-operation to the government.

**Methods of Passive Resistance**

The essence of passive resistance was to challenge the power of the state through following non-violent means because under the present circumstances armed disagreement or a violent aggressive resistance in the form of sabotage, assassinations and terrorism was not possible and desirable. He said that “ultimately our methods depended upon the kind of opposition we met and the kind of response they gave to our agitation.” Those who were agitating for noble cause should be ready for sufferings and sacrifices because passive resistance required more universal endurance. One of the major benefits of passive resistance was that through this method, we would be in a location to involve people and let them learn methods of thrash about and sufferings. It would train the Indians in heroic actions and boost their morale. It would bring pressure on the government to stay the promises it had made to people.

Just as to Aurobindo, passive resistance worked on two stages. At the first stage, it encouraged the people to pursue the methods of self-development such as Swadeshi, and national education and at the second stage, it sought to exert pressure on the government to conced the demands of the people. Just as to him, in the passive resistance, the following measures would be undertaken to achieve success:

- Refusal to assist the government.
- Refusal to pay taxes to the government.
- Boycotting the products manufactured in the foreign countries.
- Boycotting the government schools, colleges and law courts.

Sri Aurobindo was of the opinion that to pursue the policy of passive resistance effectively, we should develop a well-knit political organisation,
linking province to province and district to district. This organisation would symbolize the national will of the people. Though the method of passive resistance was as legal as the method of prayers and petitions, keeping the thrash about within the bounds of law was not its pre-condition. Occasionally, the passive resistance had to break the unjust and oppressive laws which required a high degree of truthfulness and courage. The main purpose of passive resistance was to create law unworkable through a common and organized disobedience. It was his opinion that disagreement was the heart of passive resistance and it brooked no meek submission to power. Passive resistance method could be changed if the situation so demanded. He held that the norms of common ethics should not be applied to him because he was a Kshatriya and a fighter and not a saint. Aurobindo pointed out that if the government did not consider the legitimate' demands of the people, the people would go underground and take recourse to sabotage and terrorism. Terrorism might perish of inanition; coercion was its food. Sri Aurobindo’s theory of passive resistance was influenced through the Irish house rule movement against the British rule. It is to be noted that Aurobindo's thoughts on resistance could be measured as precursor to the Gandhian theory of Satyagraha. He was of the opinion that with the development of passive resistance movement, the aspirations of the people would grow and they would acquire the capability to actualize national self-consciousness and national will in their day to day behaviors.

SRI AUROBINDO ON THE INDIAN THEORY OF STATE

Sri Aurobindo renounced active politics in 1910 and left for Pondicherry to pursue his spiritual goals. All attempts to bring him back to national politics did not succeed. In the second stage of his life, Aurobindo appeared as a great sage and a philosopher and received worldwide respect. He became the authentic representative of Indian wisdom. He wrote in 1947, a book explaining the spirit and form of the Indian polity.
Just as to Aurobindo, ancient Indian thinkers urbanized an Indian model of state structure which was democratic in character in the sense that it allowed communal freedom and self-government and autonomy to the village and the society. It was a synthesis of communal autonomies of village, town, caste, guild and family. The state was a means of holding jointly and synthesized free and livelihood organic systems and autonomies into fields and livelihood organisms. Indians successfully struck the right balance flanked by stability and change. It was an organic totality of social subsistence. Ancient Indian system had a capability to renew itself. Just as to Aurobindo, the Indians did not want to set up a mechanical state that laid exaggerated dependence on legislation, administration and force. The Western thought of state was artificial and the state in the West was imposed upon the people. The Indian system was flexible and was built up from within. The Western state was based on a rigid uniformity but in the Indian system, new elements were harmonized without destroying the original elements and existing institutions. It was a creation of practical cause and the general experience of communal self-government.

Aurobindo was of the opinion that a rich and creative thought was necessary to make a transmitting medium flanked by the spirit and the external world. The Indians did not develop creative thought, hence, they had lost independence. He said that Indians should not imitate the West and reproduce the ideals and shapes of West because it was not creative. Instead of blindly following the West, they should recover their ancient creative power and in the light of principle of Dharma, retrieve the spirit and form of Indian polity.

Political Thoughts of Sri Aurobindo - A Critical Revise

Sri Aurobindo can be measured as one of the greatest political thinkers in contemporary India. He added approximately a religious fervor to nationalism through identifying mother India with ‘Shakti’ or power of the Indian people. He defined the essence of religious nationalism in a manner
which, for its sheer passion, had never been surpassed. He came to idealize his native land and faith and recognized one with other. The fervor of his faith in 'India' helped his countrymen to transcend the differences of caste, language, custom which had hindered the development in the middle of them. Secondly, his thoughts on passive resistance broke new grounds in the sense that in his theory, he had visualized mainly of Gandhian thoughts and programmes though he had differed with him on the issue of primacy of truth and non-violence. Thirdly, in his theory of state, he sought to symbolize the authentic Indian custom to the world and claimed that the Indian theory of state structure was superior to the Western theory of state structure.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Discuss Sri Aurobindo's theory of Nationalism.
- Discuss briefly the main features of renaissance of Hinduism.
- Write a short note on the Neo-Vedanta philosophy of Swami Vivekananda.
CHAPTER 22

HINDUTVA:

V. D. SAVARKAR AND M. S. GOLWALKAR
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Describe briefly causes of emergence of politics of Hindutva in India.
- Discuss the main features of Hindu nationalism of V. D. Savarkar.
- Bring out Savarkar's views on nation and state.
- Briefly examine Golwalkar's ideas on Hindu nationalism.

BACKGROUND OF THE RISE OF HINDU NATIONALIST IDEOLOGY

After the failure of Non-cooperation movement, there was growth of communal and separatist thoughts both in the middle of Hindus and Muslims. Both of them claimed that their ideology was not a communal ideology but it was a true nationalist ideology which took into consideration the civilization and religion of the people. After 1922-23, the followers of Lokmanya Tilak
started supporting the Hindutva movement. Beside with them the newly educated Hindu middle class also supported it. The Mopala revolt in Kerala created a lot of unrest in the Hindu society.

The main arguments of the Hindutva supporters were as follows:

- In the past, the Hindus suffered several defeats and lost their independence to the foreign invaders because of lack of unity. They had numbers, velour and possessions at their command but they faced defeat due to lack of unity.
- The Hindus had been losing their numbers due to the aggressive proselitisation through the Christian missionaries and the Muslims. As a result, in an extensive time they would be reduced to a minority in their land of birth. Hence, in order to uphold the stage of Hindu population, the Shuddhi and Samghatana movements should be launched. Shuddhi stands for re-conversion of Hindus.
- There was a need to protect the political interests of Hindus because the British government was hostile to them; the Muslims aggressively pursued their separatist agenda and the Congress under the false notion of secularism was betraying the cause of Hindus.

In India, we could see the emergence of two traditions of Hindutva, the first custom was led through V. D. Savarkar and the second custom was led through M. S. Golwalkar. Though both the traditions professed their allegiance to the ideology of Hindutva, their emphasis and methods differed.

**Political Career of V. D. Savarkar**

V. D. Savarkar (1883-1966) was a charismatic leader, who played an important role in the freedom thrash about of India. For his revolutionary behaviors he was sent to Andamans in 1911 and was brought back to India in 1922. Subsequently, he was kept confined to Ratnagiri town from 1923-1937.
Throughout this era, he suffered great hardships and made countless sacrifices in the cause of freedom of the country. There were two phases in the ideological development of Savarkar. In the first stage of his life, he was influenced through the philosophy of the Italian nationalist Joseph Mazzini and supported the concept of the composite Indian nationalism, which was not dissimilar from the nationalism of Aurobindo and Tilak. Throughout this era, religion played a significant role in his concept of nationalism, but it did not exclude any religious society from it. But in the second stage of his career after 1922-23, Savarkar became the supporter of Hindu nationalism. After his release from the confinement in 1937, he joined the Hindu Mahasabha and became its President from 1938 to 1945.

Savarkar's Views on Social Change

V. D. Savarkar was a product of renaissance in the Western India and in his early days he was influenced through the philosophy of Gopal Ganesh Agarkar, a rationalist philosopher. Agarkar was deeply influenced through the thoughts of Herbert Spencer, J. Bentham and J.S.Mill. Savarkar was not a religious man and throughout his life, he eschewed all religious practices. From the European philosophical custom, he borrowed three significant thoughts:

- In nature and in all human societies, the principle of life thrash about determined the course of action because in this life thrash about, the fittest survived and those who could not stand the thrash about got eliminated.

- Violence was in-built in the creation of nature and the nature abhorred absolute non-violence. But due to gradual development of human beings, both violence and non-violence got intertwined. Hence, in this hard life, man should acquire strength and power to overcome the troubles he faced.
There was no absolute morality in the world. Morality or immorality of a scrupulous action was ultimately determined through the factors such as time, legroom and substance. The use of all weapons was desirable provided it was directed against slavery and imperialism. Therefore it was relativist ethics.

Savarkar was a supporter of positivist epistemology and accepted the direct proof of the senses as the only valid source of knowledge. He rejected the sanctity of religious scriptures and maintained that all religious scriptures were man-made and their teaching could not be applied to all societies in all times. He rejected otherworldly philosophy of Shankara and Ramanuja and discounted otherworldly pursuits of man. He held that to secure the progress of the country, to acquire more power and strength and to live good and wealthy life, we necessity pursue these worldly goals. For that purpose, we necessity use science and technology. He favored the pursuit of science and cause and criticized 'irrational and superstitious practices of Hindus.

Therefore, in Savarkar's theory of social change, the principle of life thrash about played a significant role. For him, cause, science and technology were significant to bring in relation to the change in the society.

V. D. SAVARKAR ON SOCIAL REFORMS

Savarkar was a great supporter of social reforms and he exhorted the Hindus to accept contemporary practices based on science and cause and reject the religious superstitions and customs which were standing hindrance to the social progress. All the religious scriptures were man-made and they were subject to scrutiny of cause. Due to blind faith in the scriptural power, the Hindus became superstitious, fatalist and credulous. This weakened their desire to know more. They neglected science and technology.
Savarkar was a critic of caste system. He held that both 'Chaturvarna' and caste system proved extremely disastrous for the unity of Hindu society. The 'Chaturvarna' was based not on any scientific criterion, but was a creation of scriptures and age old beliefs. It gave birth to inhuman practice of untouchability. The caste encouraged and institutionalized inequality, divided Hindu society into numerous compartments and sowed the seeds of hostility and hatred in the middle of the Hindus. Historically, Hindus constantly faced defeats at the hands of invaders because of the caste system. The untouchability was a distortion and it was wrong to consider any human being as untouchable. It militated against the spirit of human brotherhood. Hindus had urbanized many shackles that had been keeping them in chains which were based on the principles of purity and impurity. Hindus enslaved women due to these wrong customs.

Savarkar wanted the Hindus to reject blind faith in the Vedas and customs and tried to acquire material strength. They should accept the supremacy of machines and technology and break all bonds of blind faith and customs. It was incumbent upon Hindus to weed out all the defects in their society so that they could emerge as a strong nation in the world.

For Savarkar, social reforms, rationalism and science were needed for the development of a Hindu society which would enable it to acquire the necessary strength. He said that in contemporary times, nation was accepted as a viable element for human beings. In the international politics, disagreement and competition was raging flanked by dissimilar nations of the world. In the international politics, language of strength was understood. Hence, Hindus should acquire strength through the pursuit of science and technology, so that they could protect their national interest as well as self-interest.

HINDU NATIONALISM OF V. D. SAVARKAR

Savarkar was the first systematic exponent of the Hindu nationalism. He elaborately described his theory of Hindutva in his book 'Hindutva'
published in 1924. Through that time, he had abandoned his concept of Indian nationalism that he borrowed from Joseph Mazzini in favor of Hindu nationalism. In the procedure of developing his concept of Hindu nationalism, he rejected some of the arguments of territorial nationalism. He held that the subsistence of a mere territory did not create nation but nation was made through the people who constituted themselves as a political society, bound jointly through cultural affinities and traditions.

**Hindutva as Cultural Nationalism**

Savarkar was a supporter of cultural nationalism. He was of the opinion that identity formation was the essence of nationalism. India had received such identity from the Hindu religion. This identity was evolved in excess of an extensive era of time. Despite having outward differences, the Hindus were internally bound jointly through cultural, religious, social, linguistic and historical affinities. These affinities were urbanized through the procedure of assimilation and association of countless centuries. It molded the Hindus into a homogeneous and organic nation and above all induced a will to a general national life. This homogeneity was significant because other sections in the society had divergent cultural traditions.

Savarkar argued that it was cultural, racial and religious unity that counted more in the formation of the nation. While defining nation, Savarkar wrote that nation meant a political society which had occupied a contiguous and adequate territory and urbanized self-governing national identity. This society was internally organized and was bound jointly through cultural and racial affinities. He held that the Hindus had become nation because they possessed all these features.

Savarkar was of the opinion that Hindus constituted nation because they had urbanized secure affinities with the land bound through Himalayas to the Indian Ocean and the Indus River. Hindus measured India as their fatherland and holy land. Savarkar tried to illustrate that those people...
constituted nation who measured India as fatherland and holy land. In this
definition, Savarkar effectively excluded those people who did not consider
India as their holy land - because their sacred religious spaces were not
situated in India. For him, Hindu nationalism stood for the unity of all Hindus.
For him, Hindu society and not Hindu religion came first; Hindus were a
nation because they were a self-enclosed society which was internally
organized on the foundation of racial, religious and linguistic affinities. The
Hindus shared a general historical past Savarkar knew that ultimately,
nationalism was a psychological feeling and it was necessary to cultivate
national consciousness in the middle of the Hindus. The general affinities
should be used to strengthen the national consciousness. He wanted Hindus to
cultivate the affinities that encouraged national consciousness and undermine
the tendencies that divided the Hindu society.

**Hindu Nation and Indian State**

Savarkar wanted the Hindu nation to be strong and powerful so that
India could survive as a self-governing strong nation in the ferocious life
thrash about that was going on flanked by dissimilar countries of the world.
He held that in the modern times, nation had been recognized as the only
viable political entity and all the societies of the world had been organized on
the foundation of nation. Hence, everybody had to think in relation to the
national policies in the context of nation only. There was nothing parochial or
sectarian over it.

For Savarkar, Hindus as a society, shaped nation. Hence, he laid stress
on the principle of exclusion. He excluded Muslims and Christians from the
Indian nation because they did not consider India as a holy land because their
sacred religious spaces were situated outside India. Hence, he laid emphasis
on the variation flanked by Hindus and Muslims. So, he wrote that everything
that was general in the middle of us weakened our resolve to oppose them;
Hindus were constantly fighting against Non-Hindus to save their society.
Hence, he launched the Shuddhi movement to reconvert the converted Hindus to Hinduism and to purge Marathi language of Arabic and Persian languages. The Muslims were not assimilated in India, in information, they tried to absorb Hinduism but they failed in their efforts. The prolonged resistance of the Hindus to Muslim invasions molded them into a strong and resolute nation.

What were the rights and positions of minorities in such a Hindu nation? Savarkar held that nation was a cultural category but state was a political category. All Hindus were the members of the nation. Non-Hindus might not become members at the nation but they were members of the Indian state. He maintained that Hindus did not advance any claims, privileges and rights in excess of and above non-Hindu sections. He wrote, "Let Indian state be purely Indian, and let there be no distinction as distant as franchise, public services, offices and taxation on the ground of religion was concerned. Let all citizens of the Indian state be treated equally just as to their individual worth irrespective of their racial and religious percentage in the common population." He was ready to concede all rights to the minorities but did not think it necessary to concede the demands of special interests advanced through Muslims.

Therefore, Savarkar made a distinction flanked by the Indian state and Hindu nation and measured the Hindu nation as a part of the Indian state.

**Hindu Nationalism of V. D. Savarkar- A Critical Revise**

Savarkar was the first Indian thinker who declared that Hindus shaped separate nation in, India. He stood for a strong Hindu nation which would withstand and survive ferocious life thrash about in the middle of the nations. He sought to popularize the Hindu nationalism throughout his life with the help of the Hindu Mahasabha.

There are obvious tensions and logical inconsistencies in the Hindu nationalism of V. D. Savarkar. He could not properly describe the concept of nationalism because Hindus, Muslims and Christians shared general traditions
and affinities in India even in the religious field. His advocacy of cause, science and technology was instrumental in the sense that for him they were useful because they helped him forge strong Hindu nation. Cause and science in the West were the culmination of the development of social philosophy which fought against religious prejudices and superstitions. The similar could not be used to strengthen the cause of religious nationalism. From that point of view, the use of the word 'cause' was deplorable because rationally speaking the whole of societies could not be excluded from the definition of the nation on the grounds of loyalty and patriotism because the betrayers of the national interest could come from any society. Also, his distinction flanked by the nation and the state was not convincing because both of them (nation and state) could not be separated and they came jointly as nation state. He conceded all the citizenship rights to non-Hindus except the membership of the nation. This would definitely make distinctions in the middle of the people and destroy national unity. A big part of the society would feel that they were excluded from the national mainstream for no fault of theirs. Savarkar's advocacy of the relativist ethics did not resolve these tensions because cause, science and relativist ethics did not recognize ascriptive loyalties. They had to be applied to all human beings crossways the board.

**The Growth of Hindutva and the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh (RSS)**

The second school of Hindutva or Hindu nationalism was expounded through the leaders of the RSS. The RSS was recognized through Dr. Keshav Baliram Hedgewar in 1925 to protect the interests of the Hindus. Dr. Hedgewar was a follower of Lokmanya Tilak and in his young days, he had contacts with some armed revolutionaries of Calcutta. Hedgewar was secure to Dr. B. S. Munje. In 1920-21, Dr. Hedgewar took part in the non-cooperation movement. After the suspension of the movement, the dealings flanked by the Hindus and the Muslims got deteriorated. Hedgewar thought that due to the disorganised nature of Hindu society, the Hindus were suffering losses in the
communal riots. Hence, he decided to set up a strong organisation of the Hindus to protect their interests.

In 1925, he recognized the RSS. It was a cultural organisation in the sense that it did not directly participate in politics. Dr. Hedgewar set three objectives before the RSS and they were as follows:

- Mobilization of the Hindus to protect their interests and to bring in relation to the unity and coherence in all their behaviors.
- Opposition to British militant and communal Muslim politics and the Congress which had been following the policy of appeasement of Muslims.
- Raising the power of the R.S.S., in all walks of life through patiently undertaking organizational work and through inculcating the spirit of patriotism. Just as to Dr. Hedgewar, the vital purpose of the RSS was not to capture political power but to augment the power of Hindus in the public life of the country.

Throughout Dr. Hedgewar's time, the R.S.S. became popular in the middle of the white collar middle classes. It did not take part in the civil disobedience movement of 1930 and did not directly get involved in the political behaviors of the Hindu Mahasabha. In 1940, Dr. Hedgewar nominated a young university Professor Mr. Madhav Golwalkar as the chief of the R.S.S. The RSS did not join the tumultuous Quit India Movement of 1942. Golwalkar sustained to inhabit the location of the chief of the RSS up to 1973. It was M. S. Golwalkar who expounded the RSS' concept of Hindu nationalism. His was an impressive personality. He had studied ancient Indian philosophical texts. Throughout his life - Guruji as he was described, was a great teacher and commanded unique respect and following. His enunciation of the Hindu nationalism became popular in the middle of the youth.
HINDU NATIONALISM OF M. S, GOLWALKAR

The Hindu nationalism of M. S. Golwalkar was dissimilar from that of V. D, Savarkar in the sense that Golwalkar's theory of nationalism was based on Indian spiritualism. Savarkar was a modernist and he did not oppose westernization. But Golwalkar was a supporter of Hindu civilization and opposed the Western method of life. He held that the Indian spiritualism was superior to the Western materialism. He whispered that India was a holy land and it was the divine will that India should lead the world.

Nation as Motherland

Golwalkar was an exponent of cultural nationalism and he recognized nationalism with love for our motherland. He held that the Hindus measured India as their motherland because, since thousands of years they had been recognized with this holy land. In this holy land only, Hindus registered all their great achievements. Hindus were children of this ancient land as they were nurtured through water flowing from her rivers and food produced through her rich soil. It was wrong to consider that India became a nation in the recent past. In information, she had been existing as a nation since thousands of years. There might be some outward differences, but there lived vital unity in India. All Hindus were bound jointly through similar religion, similar language and similar civilization. The Great Sage Sankara realised this principle and recognized his religious centers at four dissimilar corners of India. He held that all Hindus were permeated through the spirit of unity and solidarity.

While discussing dissimilar elements of Hindu nationality, Golwalkar pointed out that subsistence of contiguous territory was the first element of nationality. The second element of nationality was the features of the people who inhabited that territory. The people should consider this land as a holy land and motherland. They should be united through general civilization, general traditions, and general historical past and general ideals. This
commonality brought them jointly and helped them evolve their own method of life. Third element of nationality was general economic interests of the people livelihood in that scrupulous territory. All these elements contributed in creation the national character of our country. Therefore, in Hindu nationalism of M. S. Golwalkar cultural factors played an extremely significant role. Therefore he laid emphasis on developing the right kind of attitude in the minds of the people through giving them proper training and education. He was of the opinion that the Hindu method of imparting right kind of values and practices to the people was useful. It is only through this that the Hindu nation could evolve into national organism pulsating with the spirit of unity and oneness.

**Territorial Nationalism Rejected**

We have seen in our previous discussion that M. S. Golwalkar was a supporter of the cultural nationalism and he defined his nationalism in the light of cultural traditions of the Hindus. He rejected the concept of territorial nationalism as humbug. He held that an assortment of people having dissimilar cultures and languages could not become nation basically because they resided in a scrupulous territory. This group of divergent people could not be described nation because it could not function as a coherent whole. It was not permeated through the livelihood spirit of unity and oneness. It lacked the life, blood and the livelihood spring of civilization. Just as Golwalkar, it was the cultural affinity and general historical traditions that bound the people jointly and made them of one mind and one body.

Golwalkar was of the opinion that territorial nationalism was lifeless, unscientific and unnatural. If we accepted the principle of territorial nationalism, then the country would get converted into 'Dharmashala'. Anybody could become a member of one nation. But this theory of nationalism was wrong because a nation was normally shaped of the people
who had urbanized general cultural affinities and who measured India as their motherland. He was of the opinion that the concept of territorial nationalism was responsible for the partition of the country and disunity in the country. It had sapped our national power and destroyed the life spring of nationalism that nourished the national spirit of the Indian people. Territorial nationalism was unnatural and unscientific because Muslims did not consider themselves as a part of the nation. He maintained that it was this divisive- and anti-national agenda that resulted in the partition of the country. The Partition of India was a standing instance of the failure of the concept of territorial nationalism. As against this, Golwalkar’s cultural nationalism was based on five principles: general religion, general race, general language, general civilization and country. These five principles generated the national consciousness in the minds of the people and made them of one mind and of one resolve.

**Hindu Nationalism and Minorities**

Golwalkar rejected the concept of the Indian or territorial nationalism as reality. He claimed that due to sure historical and cultural factors, Hindus in India constituted a nation and they measured India as their motherland. But as distant as other religious societies in India were concerned, they did not consider India as their motherland or holy land. They took pride in the information that they were heirs of the invaders of India. They were invaders who waged wars against Hindus to stay them in subjection. They had urbanized extra territorial loyalties. Though mainly of the converted Muslims and Christians were originally Hindus, because of their conversion, they lost their devotion and affection for motherland. They started claiming the foreign racial genealogies as their own. So, Golwalkar was of the opinion that these minorities could not be measured as a part of the Hindu nation.

Golwalkar was of the opinion that the non-Hindu minorities could also become a part of the Indian nation, if they abandoned their separatist
tendencies and accepted all the traditions as their own. He exhorted the Muslims and the Christians to join the mainstream and be a part of the Hindu national custom. He held that these societies should Indianise themselves through accepting and imbibing the Hindu cultural and historical traditions. They should consider themselves as inheritors of the great Hindu heroes described in the epics and take part in the celebration of Hindu festivals. They should imbibe the Hindu method of life. He pointed out that it was not necessary for them to leave their religion. They should practice their religion as they wanted because they had freedom of religion and worship. Also, through accepting the Hindu method of life, they could remain Muslims and Christians. It was high time that they should return back to house and be a part of the great national custom. Golwalkar said that he did not want to do this with the help of coercion or force, but through love and persuasion. He held that the minorities would enjoy all social and political rights but they would not be given any privileges.

Arguing further, Golwalkar pointed out that since extensive, Hindus had urbanized unique method of assimilation and absorption which enabled the foreign elements that entered into society to get integrated into Indian society without losing their identity. The best instance of this assimilation was that of Parsis who came to India from Iran to escape the religious persecution and became a part of the great Indian custom without losing their religion and identity.

Golwalkar was highly critical of the so described progressive and secular Hindus for encouraging the procedure of identity formation in the middle of the minorities and backward castes. They Justified these divisive tendencies on the grounds of secularism and democracy. Instead of promoting the procedure of integration in dissimilar parts of Hindu society, they were encouraging the divisive tendencies to grow. He was of the opinion that these westernised and denationalized Hindus would not be able to forge unity of the Indian nation on the grounds of pluralism and secularism. These procedures
were urbanized as a reaction and therefore they would not be in a location to develop a positive content in their behaviors.

GOLWALKAR ON SOCIAL ORGANISATION

M. S. Golwalkar was a supporter of Hindu method of life and looking from that perspective, he establishes that mainly of the criticisms leveled against the ancient Indian Varna system were baseless. It was his contention that the present caste system was a degenerated form of the Varna system and the practice of untouchability was inhuman and wrong. It was wrong to blame India's caste system for the defeats the Indians suffered at the hands of foreign invaders.

It was his contention that originally, the Varna system was based on the functional specialization. Charturvarna was measured to be the form of God as the four Varnas constituted his limbs. All Varnas were measured equal and the system was based on mutual help and mutual assistance. All the varnas contributed equally to the growth and prosperity of the society.

Varna and caste system were not responsible for the defeat of the Hindus. Historically speaking, Hindus were the only people in the world who fought bravely and incessantly against the Muslims and saved their religion in the mainly trying circumstances. The only regions which succumbed to Islam were parts of Punjab and Bengal and North West province. One of the major reasons for that collapse was the subsistence of a weak caste system in these regions.

Golwalkar was of the opinion that in the Varna system, due to functional specialization, the people could perfect their skills as a family custom, avoided competition flanked by the people which was a bane of present capitalist system and ensured sources of livelihood for each and every member of the family. Hence, it was a scheme of employment insurance without the state intervention. Satisfaction of the individual self-discipline and elasticity were the features of the Varna system. Though occasionally,
Golwalkar attributed the lack of unity in the middle of the Hindus to caste distinctions, he did not undertake any programme to reform caste system. His justification of the Varna system was a part of the ideological custom that was urbanized in modern India in the 19th Century.

POLITICAL THOUGHTS OF M. S. GOLWALKAR

Galwalkar was of the view that the Indian perspective of nationalism and politics was essentially spiritual, hence, Indians stood for peace and non-violence. But in the changed circumstances, Hindus should acquire strength of arms including atom bombs to safeguard their national interests. Hindus faced defeats in the past because they did not acquire latest 'weapons and militarily they did not prepare themselves well. He agreed with Savarkar that there was a thrash about for dominance in the middle of dissimilar countries of the world; so, India should attempt to become a strong nation. He argued that non-violence was the method of cowards and the strength was necessary to protect the good and to eradicate the evil in the world. So, the Vedas say that 'Veer bhogya Vasundhara’ -the 'earth is enjoyed through the brave.

Three World Views of Change

Golwalkar maintained that capitalism, communism and Hindu spiritualism were three world views of change. He was of the opinion that the Hindu perspective of change was superior to the other two perspectives.

While criticizing capitalism, Golwalkar pointed out that, capitalism was based on greed and use. In the name of equality of opportunity and individual freedom, the more powerful and intelligent in the middle of the people had exploited the weaker and poorer sections of society and recognized their own monopoly in excess of people. The rights of individuals became useless and right to vote was exploited through the capitalist classes to win political power. The capitalist system caused untold miseries to the working classes and it reduced millions of people to poverty and penury.
The second system of change was that of Communist system which appeared as a reaction to the capitalist system. It offered materialist interpretation of history. But the materialist interpretation of Marx proved wrong because his prediction of inevitability of revolution did not materialize. The Communists captured political power in the name of working classes and promised them that they would be given freedom, peace and prosperity. But instead of fulfilling these promises, they imposed a worst kind of dictatorship on the people. They had not been in a location to solve the vital troubles of bread and shelter both in Russia and China. Both the systems failed to solve the vital troubles of the people because they were the fruits of the similar seed and shared several things in general. Their attitude was materialistic because they tried to measure pleasure in satisfying vital physical needs and wants of the body.

Just as to Golwalkar, the Hindu spiritualism was the third perspective of change which was superior to both capitalism and communism. Hindus did not approve of the materialistic perspective of life and thought that the satisfaction of material needs and physical wants was not the goal of life. Hindus whispered that human life was homogeneous which was permeated through the supreme spirit. A man existed not to maximize his pleasures and powers but to help and assist others. Hindus did not see duality of dealings flanked by man and man but saw harmony, mutual help and accord in their dealings. Every human being was a part of society and their mutual interests were not contradictory. The ultimate goal of life, just as to the Hindu perspective was the establishment of a society where there would not be any punishment, or any punisher, and people would protect each other through the principles of Dharma, which is the highest stage of society.

Just as to Golwalkar, the Western models of social organisation and change failed because they laid more stress on the system than on the individual. In fact, Individual was the foundation of the society and hence, development of the individual was the goal of Hindu social life.
Negative and Positive Hindutva

Just as to Golwalkar, there prevailed two kinds of Hindutva in India. The first kind of Hindutva was described negative Hindutva and the second kind of Hindutva was described positive Hindutva. The negative Hindutva was urbanized as a reaction to the Muslim communalism or the Congress secularism. The negative Hindutva was based on hatred. It constantly thought negatively in relation to the others and vice versa. So, we should not develop our social system in contrast to the Muslims and the British, because there would not be any positive content in it. Those leaders who followed negative Hindutva remained firm supporters of Hindutva, but because of their fierce opposition to Muslims in their minds culturally they became Muslims. The work of organisation and development of Hindus had nothing to do with Muslims because it was not undertaken to oppose Muslims as such. He said that negative Hindutva was a means to capture political power.

Golwalkar was of the opinion that his Hindutva was positive Hindutva in the sense that it was not urbanized as a reaction to any adversary. It was his contention that the essence of positive Hindutva was the organisation of Hindus as a social force in the society, which would continue to remain steadfast and resolute in the mainly trying circumstances. The seizure of political power was not the objective of positive Hindutva because it whispered that all our troubles could not be solved with the help of political power. There were several historical evidences in the past that showed that great empires recognized with the help of political power were destroyed through the savage invaders. For instance, the Roman Empire was reduced to dust through the Huns. They were destroyed because they were raised on the weak base of political power. But the Hindus never thought that the acquisition of political power was the ultimate goal of life. The secret of resilience of Hindu society could be established in their attitude towards life. They built their social and political organisations not on the foundation of
force but on the foundation of Dharma. The King was not as respected as the great sages who were the experts in Dharma. The national regeneration of Hindus was not brought in relation to the through great Kings but through great sages, like Sankaracharya, Chaitanya and Nanak. In contemporary times, the similar role was played through Sri Ramakrishna Paramhamsa, Vivekananda, Aurobindo, Dayanand and Ramteertha. Golwalkar maintained that the great goals in life were not achieved with the help of political power; history had shown that great religions such as Islam and Christianity got corrupted because of political power. The lust for political power destroyed great religious movements; the Communist experiment of establishing the socialist society in Russia with the help of political power had failed. If the state decided to undertake the task of rejuvenation of cultural values and social organisations, it had not achieved success but in the procedure, it corrupted other cultures and societies as well.

Golwalkar argued that it was the goal of positive Hindutva to remain outside the seat of political power but manage it from outside so that it would work in the interest of the society. The greatness of a nation lies not in political power but outside it. So, he pleaded for developing a strong and well organized society which could work as bedrock. He had compared the society to the sun which gave light, power and strength to the dissimilar organs of society. The goal of the RSS was to develop individual as well as society so that it could become strong, united and powerful. The vision of Golwalkar was a political vision and it was based on the programme of an organized and conscious effort to change the social, cultural and political life of the society. Though he rejected political power, the state power as sovereignty and national strength were crucial to his vision of a Hindu nation.

Hindu Nationalism of M. S. Golwalkar - A Critical Revise

Beside with Savarkar, Golwalkar can be measured as a philosopher of Hindutva. Golwalkar sought to develop his Hindutva on the foundation of the
Indian spiritualism or non-dualistic monism of Sankaracharya. But there were some tensions in his location because in the "Vedanta", there was unity flanked by the individual soul and the supreme soul. This unity pervaded all human beings including the Hindus and Muslims. The Indian spiritualism did not create distinction flanked by Hindu and non-Hindu souls. Secondly, he tried to reject the concept of territorial nationalism but his own concept of cultural nationalism was based on territoriality of motherland! His concept of cultural nationalism also faced some troubles because his exclusion of Muslims and Christian societies from nation on the grounds of extra-territorial loyalties was questionable. We can provide many examples to prove that both Hindu and Muslim societies had produced traitors to nation. The whole society cannot be blamed for the betrayal of a few. Golwalkar's concept of positive Hindutva, which did not pursue political power was not convincing because he was a supporter of strong natives and strong nation state. The RSS was not disinterested in political power; perhaps he wanted the RSS to remain outside political power while organisations of the Sangha Parivar could pursue it. The RSS would stand above political power but manage it from without. So, Golwalkar’s critique of political power was motivating but hard to fit into his overall orientation of the militant nationalism.

There were vital differences in the political thoughts of Savarkar and Golwalkar. Savarkar’s agenda was a modernist agenda and he wanted to set up contemporary Hindu society in India. He was opposed to both Varna and caste system. He was worshipper of political power and for him state power was crucial in the protection of the country. Golwalkar was opposed to the procedure of Westernization and he was of the opinion that negative Hindutva would not be in a location to solve our vital troubles. He did not want to abandon the vital principles of the Hindu civilization; so, he supported Varna and caste system. The vital contradiction in Golwalkar’s political thoughts was that he wanted to develop an extremely strong nation state in India, but at the
similar time, he wanted to stay absent from political power! Both the thoughts could not go jointly.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Write a short note on Savarkar's theory of social change.
- What, according to Savarkar, is the role of social reforms in strengthening the Hindu nation?
- Examine briefly Golwalkar's ideas on Hindu nationalism.
- Write a short note on the rise of the RSS in Indian politics.
CHAPTER 23
MUSLIM THOUGHT:
SIR SYED AHMED KHAN, MOHAMMED IQBAL,
MAULANA MAU.DOODI AND MOHAMMED ALI JINNAH

STRUCTURE
- Learning objectives
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- Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (1817-1898)
- Mohammad Iqbal (1876-1938)
- Mulana Maudoodi (1903-1979)
- Mohammad Ali Jinnah (1876-1948)
- Review questions

LEARNING OBJECTIVES
After reading this chapter, you should be able to:
- Analyze Sir Syed Ahmad Khan's views on Hindu-Muslim Unity.
- Summaries Mohammad Iqbal's ideas on Nationalism and his contribution to the Muslim Thought.
- Briefly analyze M.A. Jinnah's contribution to the 'Two Nation Theory'.

INTRODUCTION
The Muslim thought in modern India can be understood properly only in its superior historical setting. It is significant to note that the development of the Muslim political thought was an intricate phenomenon involving historical context of the Muslims' social, cultural and political life and interactive procedure with the colonial rule which had been recognized in India.
particularly in the aftermath of the Revolt of 1857. Many issues had appeared, such as relative backwardness of Muslims in relation to modern tendencies which had come in the wake of the establishment of the colonial rule. The question of accommodation of several social groups including Muslims in the existing and future power structures became a significant issue which was widely debated in the middle of all groups. Equally significant was the issue of religion- cultural identity of several societies which went through a procedure of redefinition in the late nineteenth century as well as the first half of the twentieth century. All these issues appeared in excess of the years with varying responses from dissimilar social groups which, in the extensive run, affected inter-society dealings. These growths also affected the political procedures which were unfolding in the course of an articulation of anti-colonial nationalist ideology.

While all these issues were matter of concern for all, it is significant to recognize that the response of the Muslims to all these issues was not uniform but varied since the Muslims did not constitute a monolithic society. The Muslims were divided on rows of language, region and class as any other religious society. When a society is vertically as well as horizontally divided, the response to any issue would mainly certainly be as divided. It is vitally significant to recognize that thoughts of many leaders, that we shall be shortly discussing, can only be seen in their evolutionary perspectives since they were not fixed in a timeframe and were constantly evolving. In the course of development of the thoughts of the person under discussion we shall discover that in sure compliments there is stability while in others there is a contradiction. The contradiction and stability may be seen as the running thread in the thoughts of all those under discussion. It is up to the readers to discern the meaning of those thoughts in historical time.

**SIR SYED AHMAD KHAN (1817-1898)**
Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was one of the mainly formidable figures of the late nineteenth century India. He appeared on the Indian scene as one of the great reformers, educationist and modernizer within the Muslim society. He was born on 17th October 1817 in one of the respected families associated with the Mughal court. Sir Syed was a direct witness to the declining fortunes of the Mughals and was conscious in relation to the information that while the glory of the Mughals was as good as gone, the political force which was gaining ground was that of the British. In any case, the British East India Company had already gained tremendous power in the eastern part of India in the second half of the eighteenth century. Slowly it had been spreading its power in other parts of India as well. The British had started knocking on the doors of Delhi under the Mughals and through 1803 they had succeeded in confining the Mughal rulers within the precincts of the Qila-i-Mualla (The Red Fort). It was a part of the rising experience of Syed Ahmad Khan to have seen that the Mughals were surviving on the suffrage of the British since 1803. It is not surprising so that Syed Ahmad Khan took a minor post with the British at the age of twenty one years despite some opposition in the family. Subsequently he passed the examination of the Munsif and was appointed at Mainpuri. In 1842 he was transferred to Fatehpur Sikri and in 1846 re-posted at Delhi and stayed here for in relation to the nine years. Throughout his stay at Delhi he occupied himself in academic pursuits and separately from other things, he produced an significant work Asar-us- Sanadeedd, a monumental work on the monuments of Delhi which was widely acclaimed. Later in 18.55 he was given promotion and appointed as Sadr Amin at Bijnor. While Sir Syed was posted here at Bijnor, the Revolt of 1857 broke out which had shaken the British. Here at Bijnor, Sir Syed had played an active role in saving the lives of many British officers. In this Revolt Sir Syed's family too suffered loss of some family members and was able to take his mother and aunt to safety in Merrut with great difficulty.
Sir Syed, having seen the Revolt and subsequently its brutal suppression through the British, was influenced that the British were too powerful and any effort to resist them might not be fruitful at all. From this time onwards, the British started suspecting the Muslims as big as they were violently opposed to them (British). As a consequence of such an approach, the Muslims were treated more harshly than any other social group involved in the Revolt. The prospects looked bleak as regards the communal lives of the Muslims in India, and Sir Syed took it upon himself to bring in relation to the reconciliation flanked by the Muslims and the British. In the immediate aftermath of the Revolt, Sir Syed wrote many pamphlets (Bookiets) on several issues concerning the Revolt. The first was, *Tarikh-i-Sarkashiye Bijnor*, with a narrative of the growths as regards the Revolt. Though more significant was his *Asbab-i- Baghawat-i- Hind* published in 1858, in which he tried to explain several underlying causes of the Revolt. Though, his central argument was that the Revolt came in relation to because the British were entirely unaware of the Indian opinion since Indians were deliberately kept out of the governance of their country. He argued, as if addressing the government of the day, that, "It is from voice of the people that the government can learn whether its projects are likely to be well received. This security can never be acquired unless the people are allowed a share in the consultation of government." It is hard to set up any co-relation but the information remnants that within a short time, Indians were to be incorporated in the Governor- Common's Council as per the provisions of the Indian Council Act of 1861.

After having influenced the British that it would serve their interests to take Indian opinion too in the governance of India, he wrote another pamphlet, *The Loyal Mohammedans* of India in 1860, in which he argued that it was not true that all the Muslims were the enemy of the British as enumerated, that there were many Muslims who had stood through the British throughout the tumultuous days of the Revolt. From this time onwards, Sir Syed devoted his
whole life to bring in relation to the reconciliation flanked by the British and the Muslims.

**Contribution to Contemporary Education**

Sir Syed was, through now, influenced that in order to stem the declining fortunes of the Muslims, it was significant that they took to modern education as it was introduced through the British. With this purpose in mind, he founded the Scientific Society in 1863 at Ghazipur, in Uttar Pradesh. The vital objective was to translate scientific literature, into Urdu. In this project, he was supported through all including many Hindu friends. The subjects such as mechanics, electricity, pneumatics and natural philosophy received scrupulous emphasis. Subsequently, this society was shifted to Aligarh. In 1866, Sir Syed started a journal on behalf of the Society described the Indian Institute Gazzette. Throughout 1869-70, he traveled to England and was able to observe the British educational institutions and was impressed through them. Upon his return from this extended journey he urbanized a thought that in order to improve educational standards of the Muslims of India, there necessity be contemporary educational institutions for them. This was the superior objective in mind with which he founded Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental (MAO) College in 1875/1877. It was proposed that here, while contemporary education would be imparted to the Muslims, they would also have some training in the preservation of their cultural heritage. It is motivating to note that while MAO College was founded for Muslims, its doors were open to all. Several graduates in the early years of this college were Hindus. He also wanted the Indian Muslims to bring in relation to the reforms in their society with the help of a magazine described *Tahzib-ul Akhlaq*, in which he ridiculed several practices which were out of tune with contemporary trends of the time. For all his efforts to reconcile the Muslims with the British, contemporary education, his advocacy for fresh interpretation of the *Quran* and keeping the door of the MAO College open to all, he was
fiercely attacked through the conservative Muslims. He remained undaunted in his endeavour.

**Hindu-Muslim Unity**

Sir Syed was also a champion of the Hindu-Muslim unity. He had once described the Hindus and Muslims as two beautiful eyes of a beautiful bride. He wrote two essays in *Tahzib-ul-Akhlaq*, one in 1888 and another 1898 exhorting Muslims to provide up killing of cows since this would bring in relation to the a good neighborly dealings flanked by the Hindus and the Muslims. There were innumerable occasions when he strongly advocated for this unity flanked by the two significant religious societies.

While these were some characteristics of the several thoughts of Sir Syed where he was committed to superior well being of the Muslims, there were sure other characteristics as well where he seemed to suggest separate political options for the Muslims and did not wish them ever to come closer to the Congress. Some of these tendencies were visible from the time the movement to replace Urdu in Persian writing with that of Hindi in Nagari writing had appeared in the United Provinces in 1867. The protagonist of this movement had argued that Urdu was not the language of the masses as Hindi was, and therefore, such a demand was raised. Sir Syed was disturbed through such a development since he was himself given to use Urdu extensively in producing all types of literature and treatises. This sudden development on the language and writing question led him to argue that, "Now I am influenced that these two nations will no not work unitedly in any cause. At present there is no hostility flanked by them. But, on explanation of the so described educated people it will augment a hundred fold in the future," Later, in a letter dated 29th April 1870 to Nawab Mohsinul Mulk he wrote, "This is proposal which will create Hindu-Muslim unity impossible to achieve. Muslims will never agree to Hindi and if the Hindus, in accordance with their latest attitude, insist
on Hindi, they will reject Urdu. The inevitable consequence of such a move will be that the two will be permanently separated."

In the political realm too, Sir Syed did not have any conception of bringing religious societies jointly for sure political action. On the contrary he maintained that these societies would have separate political options separate from each other. This was the driving force which made him argue that the Indian National Congress was not in the best interest of the society of Muslims. He thought the Congress was likely to take a confrontationist stance in due course of time, which would be injurious to the interest of the Muslims since they had already suffered as a consequence of the Revolt of 1857. He further thought that a mere passing of resolutions through the Congress did not create it national in character. In common he argued with Muslims that they should stay absent from the Congress. Sir Syed was also opposed to the principle of election even for the local boards and district boards. He argued that keeping in view the kinds of social differences that lived in the Indian society, it would be imprudent to introduce the principle of elections. He suffered from a strange fear that, in the event of elections, several religious societies would vote for leaders of the respective societies which would result in the political marginalization of the Muslims. Instead he favored the principle of nomination, which would ensure sure representation of Muslims too. In creation these arguments, Sir Syed betrayed sure elite bias. He himself was nominated to the Imperial Legislative Council in 1878.

It is another matter altogether that there were not several in the middle of Muslims who paid heed to his exhortations. For instance, Badruddin Tayabji refuted Sir Syed’s argument and said that Muslims’ interest would be better served through advancing the common progress of India. There were scores of Muslim delegates participating in the proceedings of the Indian National Congress since 1887 and several of them came from the similar province as Sir Syed’s. The Ulema of Darul Uloom at Deoband were issuing Fatwas exhorting Muslims to join the Congress.
It is significant to keep in mind that in a country such as India where diversity of all hues lived for such an extensive time, religious societies were no exception. Every society threw up diverse options keeping in mind the class, linguistic, local and other backgrounds in mind. After all Sir Syed was not preaching any hatred flanked by societies. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan died on 27th March 1898.

MOHAMMAD IQBAL (1876-1938)

Mohammad Iqbal is commonly referred to as Allama Iqbal for the cause that he was measured as one of the significant intellectuals in the middle of the Muslims in the first half of the twentieth century. Even though he is widely recognized for his Urdu and Persian poetry, he was a practitioner of the politics as well. Flanked by his poetry and politics, he was able to blend elements of philosophy as well, in which he had received training in Germany in the beginning of the twentieth century. He started his career as a poet rather early in life who, later on, acquired immense maturity. He is one of the few Urdu poets whose compositions required prior initiation for better comprehension. Though, we shall concern ourselves more with his social, cultural and political world view than his poetry.

Early Life

Mohammad Iqbal was born on 22nd February 1873 at Sialkot, in Punjab. His forefathers were Kashmiri Brahmins who had embraced Islam in relation to the three hundred years ago. Mohammad Iqbal looked at his ancestry with pride and gave enough reflection to it in his poetry as well. His initial education was in a traditional Maktab. Later he joined Sialkot Mission School and upon completing matriculation, he went to Lahore for higher studies and joined the Government College there and completed his B.A. in 1897. Two years later, he secured his Masters' degree and was appointed as a lecturer in the Oriental College, Lahore to teach History, Philosophy and
English where he served flanked by 1899 and 1905. He went to Europe and secured a Ph.D at Munich and returned to Lahore in 1908. In the course of his stay in Europe, he also obtained degree to practice as a barrister.

**Thoughts on Nationalism**

Before Mohammad Iqbal had visited Europe he was given to espouse a rather strong sense of patriotism. For instance his well-known song *Sare Jahan se Acha Hindustan Hamara* was the ultimate tribute to the motherland, India. His poem, *Naya Shivala* too was an instance of sincere exhortations to his countrymen to provide up petty mindedness and develop broader vision and perspective in relation to the corporate life as Indians. Though, upon his return from Europe he seemed to develop some distaste for nationalism because of the method several European nations were pursuing this. The era he was in Europe was truly an age of aggressive nationalism. Nations were attempting to run down each other. Such observations of Iqbal led him to consider that nationalism was too narrow an ideology to create an ideal of human and territorial groups. Though, the point that necessity be noted here is that nationalism in a colonial society such as India was not directed towards dominating any other nation but seeks liberation from colonial rule and use at the hands of the British. The Indian nationalism, as it was unfolding in the course of its development, was more progressive than jingoistic.

**Political Behaviors**

While Iqbal had his one step firmly rooted in poetry and philosophy, his second step slowly started setting into the world of politics as well. He had become familiar with the Muslim League propagation of the demand for separate electorates while he was still in England in 1906. After his return to India in 1908, he joined the provincial Muslim League in Punjab. From this time onwards, Iqbal's concerns remained only with the promotion of the
Muslims' interests. In order to engage himself in this exercise, he argued with Muslims that there was no point in opposing the British. He disagreed with several Muslim individuals and groups who were active in the freedom thrash about and accused them of harboring too much of the Western thoughts which he thought the nationalism were. In 1909, he argued that for Muslims, the foundation for nationhood was Islam itself, since nationality for Muslims was not based on material and concrete notion of such a country in conditions of sure physical embodiments. Iqbal argued that in Islam the essence was 'non-temporal' and 'non-spatial' and could not be bound through character and characteristics of a scrupulous social group alone. The question of nationality in Islam was based on abstraction and potentially expansive groups. The values of communal life for the Muslims were based on firm grasp of the principles of Islam. Iqbal whispered that Islam was a potent source to challenge the 'race-thought ', which had proved to be the hardest barrier in actualizing the humanitarian ideal; so, the Muslims necessity rejecting it. He asserted that Islam was non-territorial and whispered in encompassing the whole humanity, therefore rejected the limited and narrower boundaries. He asserted that the 'thought of nation' as some type of principle of human society was in direct conflict with Islam since it whispered in the principle of human society. In the course of articulation of his political philosophy, he disagreed with those who whispered that religion could coexist with political nationalism. He asserted that in a country such as India where dissimilar faiths lived, creation the land or geographical territory as the foundation of nationhood would, in the extensive run, result in undermining the religion itself because in the event of such a development, Islam will be reduced to mere 'ethical ideal', without its accompanying 'social order'.

Iqbal was elected to the Punjab Legislative Assembly in 1927 and actively participated in the debates of the Assembly. While participating in the Budget discussion on 5th March 1927, he pleaded for more allocation for rural sanitation and medical relief for women. In the course of the proceedings of
the Home, he also pleaded for more funds for mass education, which he thought was absolutely essential in the interest of the people. Though, at the similar time, Iqbal was keen that Muslims should develop their own educational institutions without which their history and cultural achievements would be overshadowed. On several occasions in the Assembly debates, he kept on emphasizing that to talk in relation to the united nationalism was a futile exercise since all the societies were more concerned in relation to their exclusive interests rather than the 'national' interests. All through he never allowed his focus shift absent from this location.

In the wake of the communal riots in Punjab in 1927, he pleaded for harmony in the middle of the societies. While Iqbal was a member of the Punjab Legislative Assembly he was elected the Secretary of the All India Muslim League. But he soon ran into differences with several leaders of the League on the issue of the boycott of the Simon Commission, which was an all white commission for creation suggestions to bring in relation to the constitutional changes in the existing Government of India Act 1919. He left the Secretaryship of the League but sustained to remain loyal to the ideology and superior principles of the party. Later in 1930 he was invited to preside in excess of the session of the Muslim League at Allahabad. In this session he delivered a speech which was to have delineated sure options which hitherto was not envisaged through anybody else. He argued, "To base a constitution on the conception of a homogeneous India, or apply to India principles dictated through British democratic sentiments is unwittingly to prepare her for a civil war.... The formation of a consolidated North-West Muslim Indian states appears to be the final destiny of Muslims, at least of North-West India....I so demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim state in the best interest of India and Islam.” This statement of Mohammad Iqbal in a method contradicted much of what he was saying since the beginning of 1909 that Islam and several of its principles could not be kept confined to any geographical limits since they were expansive in nature. But his new set of
thoughts was to become an ideological reference point for the League in times to come.

Though, it has to be noted that Iqbal did not uphold consistency in his formulations on the question of nationalism. In March 1933 he remarked that nationalism implied sure race consciousness which was against the grain of his conviction. He argued that if such a consciousness was allowed to take lay in the Asian context, it was recipe for some type of disaster. Again in 1938 he argued that it was not the national unity but human brotherhood alone was the unifying force for the mankind since such a thing would be above the thoughts of race, color, language and nationality. He whispered that in order to achieve higher goals of humanity, it was significant to blur these distinctions. He reiterated the similar principles in his response to Husain Ahmad Madani’s argument for territorial nationalism encompassing all religious societies of India. While Iqbal was arguing for a universal brotherhood, just as to him, it was to be based on his conviction that it was Islam alone which would give such a ground. It is not hard to discern so, sure contradictions in his worldview of universal brotherhood based only on Islam, therefore leaving out all other philosophy for similar options. Another glaring contradiction that we can notice is that his universalism was tampered with an argument for the Muslims maintaining their separate identity in a clearly demarcated geographical region.

Iqbal's participation in the modern political procedure was full of contradiction and inconsistencies. Though his contributions in the realm of poetic creativity were distant more enduring. He breathed his last on 21st April 1938.

MULANA MAUDUDI (1903-1979)

Syed Abul A'la Maududi popularly recognized as Maulana Maududi, is one of the greatest revivalists of Islam in the 20th century. Separately from having produced a big number of literature concerning Islam and Muslims, he
was the founder of the Jamat-i-Islami in 1941. Maulana Maududi was born on 2nd September 1903 in a devout Muslim family of Aurangabad, in the present day Maharashtra. His educational training was steeped in Islamic studies right from the beginning. Towards the secure of the second decade of the twentieth century he was drawn to the nationalist movement in the wake of the Non-cooperation-Khilafat movement and was impressed through Gandhiji’s work so much that he wrote a book on his personality and work but it was confiscated through the British Government. After a brief stint with a paper described Taj at Jabalpur, he came in get in touch with Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind a body of Muslim theologians committed to the cause of Indian’s thrash about for independence, which was founded towards the end of 1919. He became the editor of the paper launched through it described the Muslim and served it till the end of 1923 when this paper was closed. Subsequently the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind launched another paper described al-Jamiat which Maulana Maududi again joined it as the editor and sustained to serve the paper till the end of 1927.

The time Maulana Maududi broke his links with the Jamiat, he launched himself as an self-governing Islamic thinker with the Publication of al-Jihad fil-Islam in 1927, which he had written to address several issues which had arisen as a consequence of the assassination of Swami Shardhanand and went into some length to argue that not all acts of aggression, a Muslim deserves to describe as Jihad. This book was considerably noticed in religious and political circles. Though Maulana Maududi did not have any defined pursuit of career. He came to much wider prominence with the editorship of Tarjuman-ul-Quran at Hyderabad since 1936. His writings attracted even Mohammad Iqbal, who invited him to Pathankot and pursue his studies there. He offered the support of some Wakf property there. He moved to Pathankot in January 1938 to set up Darul Islam Academy. Though the death of Mohammad Iqbal soon after, made Maulana Maududi return to Lahore to teach Islamiyat at Islamia College there.
Views on Nationalism

There appears some shift in Maulana Maududi's world-view as regards the Muslims being a part of the territorial nationalism or separate from it. We have already discussed the point that in the early years Maulana Maududi strongly whispered in the composite territorial nationalism but from this time onwards he seemed to have undergone ideological transformation. He started arguing that Islamic 'nationhood' was more rational than the territorial nationalism. It had the capability to absorb all, so capable of absorbing all and lay the base of cultural unity. He argued that Islamic 'nationhood' could not coexist with other 'nationalities' of race, language and country. He asserted that Muslims necessity sever all links with the land of birth. In Maududi's perception, Islamic and geographical nationalism were two mutually exclusive entities, so he was apprehensive that geographical nationalism in the middle of Muslims would undermine Islamic 'nationhood' and unity. He thought that Indian leaders were mistaken in their belief that in order to fight the British, they necessity make a general nationality. He disagreed with Husain Ahmad Madani's contention that in the Indian context a religious society did not constitute a nation unto itself. On the contrary, all religious societies necessity politically merges jointly in order to emerge as a separate nation on territorial foundation. Though while Husain Ahmad Madani was creation these arguments on behalf of the Jamiat- ul-Ulema-i-Hind, he was also conscious of the information that while Muslims were willing to join the procedure of the creation of a nation, they necessity retain their separate religion-cultural identity. Maududi's notion of Islamic 'nationality' reached an incomprehensible length when he argued that all those who were struggling against the British should be aware that if the British were to transfer power to non-Muslims then the extremely participation of a Muslim in this procedure would not be valid from the point of view of religion. He further argued that if the Muslims truly want to fight for the freedom from the British then they should have one clear
objective in mind that they would strive to create India *dar-al Islam* where it would be possible for Muslims to organize their life just as to the principles of Islam. Approximately 1937-38 Maulana Maududi proposed some type of state within a state where the Muslims would enjoy freedom to organize their life just as to the Sharia and preserve their 'national life'.

Maulana Maududi’s conception of the Muslims constituting some Lind of transcendental nation was so strong that he neither endorsed the Congress' approach to bring the whole of India under popular sovereignty of all its people, nor did he endorse the Muslim League's claim that Indian Muslims were a nation unto themselves in order to justify their demand for the partition of India and the creation of Pakistan. Just as to Maulana Maududi, the Muslim League notion of nationalism too was self limiting. In order to propagate the religious and political philosophy of Maulana Maududi, a party was recognized under his leadership described the Jama’it-i-Islami on 25th August 1941. At the time of founding the Jamal, a constitution was also drawn up where the emphasis was more on religious matters rather than political.

Encouraged through the criticism of the Congress too, the Muslim League thought of enlisting the support of the Maulana Maududi twice through Maulana Zafar Ahamad Ansari. He was once invited in 1937 to join the research group of the League; in 1945 again similar type of invitation was extended to him through Maulana Ansari. On both the occasions he turned down the League's invitation. In a booklet titled as *Rah-i-Amal* published in 1944, Maulana Maududi argued that theirs (Muslims) opposition was neither to the Hindus nor the British. Their only aim and objective was establishment of the sovereignty of God. Keeping this in mind he castigated all other Muslim organisations for being obsessed with ‘freedom’ either from the Hindus or British imperialism. Just as to him, the real salvation of the Muslims was in deliverance from the rule of those other than God.

Maulana Maududi did not endorse the Muslim League's claim for Pakistan for it was not in tune with his conception of Islamic 'nation' since
such a demand was based on the notion of territorial nationalism. He could not have accepted it. It is another matter altogether that in 1948 Maulana Maududi himself migrated to Pakistan and ran into troubles with the Pakistan Government from time to time.

MOHAMMAD ALI JINNAH (1876-1948)

Mohammad Ali Jinnah traveled extensive distances in his political career finally to become the Qaid-i-Azam, which literally means a great leader to the Pakistanis since he had the credit of founding Pakistan after seeking the partition of India on 14th August 1947. It was argued through the All India Muslim League and M.A Jinnah in March 1940 that Indian Muslims were not only presently a religious society seeking sure constitutional arrangements which would ensure better and secure future of the Muslims of India, but also create it a separate nation. Once such a declaration was made, the after that logical step was to demand a state in the name of Pakistan. The man who accepted this demand to its fruition was the one and only M.A.Jinnah.

Mohammad Ali Jinnah was born on 25th December 1976 in the family of a relatively wealthy business family of Jinnabhai in Karachi. After his initial education in Karachi and Bombay, Jinnah went to England to revise law which he soon completed at the age of eighteen years with two more years of stay there at Lincoln Inn's formal training. At the age of twenty he returned to India to join the Bar first in Karachi and later in Bombay and soon recognized himself in the middle of the legal fraternity of the municipality.

Jinnah became a part of the Congress led politics through joining the party in 1906. At the annual session of the Congress, the similar year, he acted as the private secretary to Dadabhai Nauroji who was the president of the Indian National Congress for that year. He came quite secure to a moderate Congress leader, Gopal Krishna Gokhale and received his initial political training under him and soon earned recognition. He was a part of the battery of lawyers who defended Lokmanya Tilak in 1908 when he was prosecuted
through the British. In 1909 he was elected to the Imperial Legislative Council from Bombay and excelled in his performance in defending many issues which affected the lives of Indians including the thrash about which was going on in South Africa under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. He spoke in relation to the harsh treatment meted out to the Indians there. Jinnah supported Gokhale in 1912 when he came up with the Elementary Education Bill and argued for more allocation of money for the purpose. While Jinnah was still in the Congress, he joined the Muslim League as well on the suggestion of Maulana Mohammad Ali and Wazir Husain in 1913. The similar year he was instrumental in accepting the Wakf Validating Bill through the then Viceroy, which was meant to safeguard the interests of the beneficiaries of the Muslim family trusts against the folly of any one member of the family. This scrupulous act of Jinnah earned him recognition in the middle of the Muslims.

**Hindu-Muslim Unity**

Presently like Syed Ahmad Khan, Jinnah was also keen to work for the well being of the Muslims. Though, his concern for the Muslims was not meant to be at the cost of the Hindu-Muslim unity. As a matter of information it is significant to note that till the elections of 1937 he whispered that both the societies’ necessity join hands to remain strong in order to overcome the difficulties placed on the Indians through the British Government. Some reflection in this regard was manifest at the time of the Lucknow Pact of 1916 which envisaged sure seat sharing formula flanked by the Hindus and Muslims, in which the Muslims gained better advantages in Muslim minority provinces such as United Provinces while they had conceded more ground to the Hindus and others in the Muslim majority provinces such as the Punjab and Bengal. Significant national leaders played a crucial role in this like Tilak. Jinnah too played a significant role in bringing in relation to the agreement.

Jinnah was one of the several leaders who did not approve of mixing religion with politics. In the context of the emerging Non-cooperation-khilafat
movement, he did not approve of religion being pressed in the service of politics. He was sounding sure note of caution that the consequences of such a strategy might prove to be counterproductive. Throughout 1919-1920, strong religious feelings were stirred in the middle of the Muslims on the issue of Khilafat, an Islamic institution in the hands of the Ottomans of Turkey for considerably extensive time. Though after the defeat of Turkey in the First World War, it was feared through Muslims that soon Ottoman Empire would be fragmented and several Holy spaces would fall in the hands of the non-Muslims, which was unacceptable to them. In any case, for quite sometime, pall-Islamic upsurge had already generated anti-colonial sentiments in the middle of the Muslims. Keeping all these growths in mind, Gandhiji decided to go beside with the Muslims and agreed to lead the movement. His understanding was that he, as a good Hindu, was duty-bound to stand through his Muslim compatriots in times of their distress. In the context of all these growths, the Indian National Congress, despite its initial reluctance, finally decided to extend support to Gandhiji; this was the movement with which Jinnah did not agree at all and resigned from the Congress in 1920 not to come back to it ever again.

**Jinnah and the Muslim League**

It necessity be pointed out that while Jinnah left the Congress, he retained his association with the Muslim League. Though, after leaving the Congress, he remained politically dormant but sprung to action once again when it was announced that an all-white Simon Commission would visit India to revise the working of the Government of India Act 1919 and create recommendations for bringing in relation to the changes in it. All shades of political opinion barring some, decided to boycott the Commission. At this point of time the Muslim League was split into two wings - one led through Mohammad Shafi of the Punjab and the other through M.A.Jin'nah. The Shafi wing of the League agreed to cooperate with the Commission whereas the
Jinnah faction decided to go beside with the Congress in boycotting it. In view of these growths, it was resolved that instead of cooperating with the Commission, Indians would work out their own constitution acceptable to all. In the context of this resolve that Indians would work out their own constitution, several groups activated themselves to come up with proposals which might be given some consideration while preparing the constitution. Several prominent Muslim leaders met in Delhi on 20th March 1927 under the presidentship of Mohammad Ali Jinnah to talk about Muslim representation in the legislature and after extensive deliberation came up with sure proposals which are popularly recognized as the Delhi Declaration. It was for the first time that several Muslim leaders had agreed to provide up separate electorates, which was measured a stumbling block in bringing the two significant societies jointly. The Declaration said that giving up separate electorates should be conditioned upon the following:

- Sind to be separated from the Bombay Presidency and made a separate province
- Reforms to be introduced in the North-West Boundary Provinces and Baluchistan on the similar footing as any other province in India
- In Bengal and Punjab proportion of representation to be made in accordance with the size of population
- In the Central Legislature, Muslim representation to be not less than one-third,

It was said that after these demands were accepted, Muslims would accept joint electorates in all the provinces so constituted and create to Hindu minorities in Bengal, Punjab and North-West Boundary Province similar concessions that the Hindu majorities in other provinces were prepared to create to the Muslims. The Madras session of the Congress held in December 1927 broadly accepted the suggestion made in the Delhi Declaration and gave assurances to Muslims that their legitimate interests would be secured through
reservation of seats in the joint electorates on the foundation of population in every province and in the Central Legislature. It had also agreed to other proposals concerning Sind, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan. In order to work out a constitution, an All Parties Conference was constituted which, in turn, constituted a Drafting Committee under the chairmanship of Motilal Nehru. In the course of deliberations and consultations with all concerned parties, it came to the fore that despite the Congress approval of the Delhi Declaration, the Hindu Mahasabha was not willing to concede demands rose through several shades of Muslim opinion. As a result, in the final Statement which is popularly recognized as the Nehru Statement, these issues were ignored therefore causing disappointment to several Muslim groups. Though in order to get the final approval of the said Statement, an All Parties Conference was convened in Calcutta in December 1928. In this meeting Jinnah made a fervent plea with members present there that for the sake of unity in the middle of the societies particularly the Hindus and Muslims, "It is absolutely essential to our progress that Hindu Muslim resolution should be reached, and that all societies should live in friendly and harmonious spirit in this vast country of ours." He further added through method of caution, "Majorities are apt to be oppressive and tyrannical and minorities always dread and fear that their interests and rights, unless clearly defined and safe-guarded through statutory provisions, would suffer." Jinnah was shouted down in this All Parties Conference. With disappointment Jinnah came back to Bombay and soon after left for England with an intention to settle down there practicing law.

This episode was a turning point in the political life of Jinnah. Determined to stay in England but on the persuasion of Liaqat Ali Khan, the future first Prime Minister of Pakistan, Jinnah decided to return to India in 1934. Soon he was elected as the permanent President of the All India Muslim League. He worked hard to expand the social base of the League. There was one opportunity to test the electoral strength of the League in the context of
1937 elections, which was held under the provisions of the Government of India Act 1935. The said Act was severely criticized through all, including Jinnah. Yet several, including the Congress, thought of by this opportunity to test their respective strengths. The Muslim League could secure only 109 out of total 482 Muslim seats in all British Indian provinces. It was nowhere secure to forming the majority in Muslim majority provinces. It turned out to be a sad commentary on the League's performance in the 1937 elections. Combined with such dismal performance, it (League) was alarmed through the Muslim Mass Get in touch with Programme of the Congress and feared that such a programme would undermine its claim to symbolize Muslims. Coupled with this, there were also two unsuccessful attempts to form coalition Ministries in Bombay Presidency and United Provinces. The Muslim League adopted an aggressive attitude towards the Congress and the Congress-led ministries in several provinces. It charged them of pursuing anti-Muslim policies and started describing the Congress as caste-Hindu party instead of national party.

**Two Nation Theory**

In its opposition to the Congress, the Muslim League crossed all limits and finally came approximately to the thought of describing the Muslims of India not as a religious society or a minority in a Hindu-majority country but a separate nation. Therefore just as to the League's formulations, India was house to not one but two nations which led the demand that India be partitioned so that there could be separate homeland to the Muslims as well. This understanding was put to crystallization in the annual session of the Muslim League held in Lahore on 23rd March 1940. The Resolution adopted here is popularly recognized as the Pakistan Resolution or Two-nation theory. In this resolution it was said that the Muslims of India on explanation of their religious, cultural and historical distinctiveness in contrast with the Hindus, constituted a nation unto themselves. Since then, Jinnah reiterated this location
on all occasions and from all platforms. From this time onwards, the Muslim League, under Jinnah, did not seem back and never measured any resolution which was not conceding Pakistan. In this effort, of the League, the British Government was more than obliging right since the time of August Offer of 1940 and right through the Cripps Mission of 1942 and the Cabinet Mission of 1946. In the Simla Conference held in 1945, Jinnah had argued that in the event of any interim arrangements of ministry formation, only the Muslim League would have the right to nominate Muslim members. In an unsaid manner, Lord Wavel, the then Viceroy, conceded this demand rose through the Muslim League. As a consequence several Muslim political leaders in provinces such as Punjab switched sides in favor of the League and in the elections of 1945-46 it was able to secure approximately 75% of the Muslim votes. Though it is significant to mention that these elections were held under the provisions of the Government of India Act 1935 and the average franchised percentage did not exceed more than 15% of the total population, Muslims being no exception to it.

It is pertinent to recall that there was opposition to Jinnah-s formulations of Muslims constituting a nation from within the Muslims, separately from the Congress and others. For instance within one month of the passing of the ‘two-nation theory’, several Muslim political formations from dissimilar parts of the country and on behalf of dissimilar sections but firmly committed to the cause of Indian nationalism, came to form a coalition described Azad Muslim Conference. In April 1940 a vast convention was organized in Delhi where ‘Two-nation theory’ was challenged. It was argued that while Muslims were a separate religious society with their cultural worldview, they did not constitute a nation as claimed through Jinnah and the Muslim League. In many spaces the League had to face electoral challenge from the constituent of this Azad Muslim conference. For instance in Bihar six Muslim League candidates were defeated in the provincial elections in 1946 through the candidates of All India Momin Conference, a body of Muslim
weavers. Jamaiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind, a body of Muslim theologians, too kept on demanding the League for its demand for partition. It vehemently argued that Muslims were not a nation but a religious society and it was an integral part of the single territorial nationhood beside with the rest of the people of India.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Who is Sir Syed Ahmed Khan? And explain his contribution to Muslim unity.
- Who is Mohd. Iqbal? Briefly describe his thoughts on nationalism.
- Who is Maulana Maudoodi? Briefly describe his thoughts on nationalism.
- Explain the Jinnah’s Two Nation Theory.
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES
After reading this chapter, you should be able to:
- Explain Naicker's ideology of mobilization to establish just serial order.
- Explain pandita Rama Bai's contribution to Women's rise and reform.
- Explain the various contribution of Nazrul Islam to the growth of Nationalism in India.

INTRODUCTION
Concern for Indian nation was never expressed in a homogeneous method. Social and political thinkers of contemporary India understood the nature of Indian society and polity in dissimilar methods for obvious reasons; so, construction of nation was never uniform. While some of them intended an overarching and encompassing Indian identity, others constructed Indian
nation on the base of scrupulous identities like religion, caste, ethnicity and
gender, language, etc. An effort has been made to understand the central
thoughts and concerns of some of the thinkers of contemporary India who
represented and championed scrupulous identities; they contain: E.V.
Ramaswamy Naicker(1879-1973), Pandita Ramabai( 1858-1922), Jaipal
Singh(1903-1970)5 Kazi Nazrul Islam(1899-1976) and Bhai Kahn Singh
Nabha(1861- 1938). All these thinkers, unluckily, have not received enough
attention in the 'mainstream' literature of political science, despite their
immense socio-political contributions and mobilization capabilities.

E V. RAMASWAMY NAICKER (1879-1973)

E.V. Ramaswamy Naicker, popularly recognized as Periyar (Great Sage), was born in Erode, in a family of well-off artisans. He married at an early age of 13, but after six years became an ascetic. Wandering all in excess of India, particularly the Hindu pilgrimage centers, he experienced the 'evils' of Hinduism and the priestly exploitations.

Critique of Hinduism and Brahminical Power

Periyar’s negative perception of Hinduism and Brahmins needs to be analyzed in the socio-political context of Tamil Nadu. Like their counterparts in other provinces, in Tamil Nadu as well, Brahmins always enjoyed a dominant location in the Hindu scriptures and rituals. Though constituted only in relation to the 3 per cent of Tamils, they sustained to control the public spheres even under the colonial rule. Their resolution in fertile regions further enhanced their social power. In the pre-colonial Tamil Nadu, although Brahmins did not monopolise the ownership of land, they virtually monopolized scribal job, which enabled them to acquire Western education much faster than others under the colonial rule. This gave the Brahmins an early lead in the professions. Further, they used a dialect having a separate
character and with a distant greater Sanskritic content. Therefore, several Tamil Brahmins were extremely conscious of the sanskritic nature of their sub-civilization and claimed with pride to be 'Aryans', suggesting a quasi-racial distinction from other classes.

To Naicker, Hinduism was a tool of Brahminical power and the Brahmins epitomized Hindu arrogance and perpetrated social injustice. He castigated Hinduism as an opiate through which the Brahmins had dulled and subdued the masses. Naicker blamed the Aryans for introducing an unjust and oppressive social system in the country and espoused a Dravidian racial consciousness to defend the rights of the Dravidians against the Aryan power. He argued that a Hindu may be a Dravidian, but a Dravidian "in the real sense of the term cannot and shall not be a Hindu."

Naicker was influenced that Hinduism perpetuated casteism, and necessity be resisted. Therefore, he publicly ridiculed the Puranas as fairy tales, not only imaginary and irrational but also grossly immoral.

Critique of the Congress and Mahatma Gandhi

The scope of the associational action and self-government increased in the early decades of the century. Brahmins set the tone of Madras municipality politics in the 1910s, of the House Rule Leagues sprouting throughout the World War I and of nationalist mobilization after the War. They controlled Congress's state stage leadership until World War II, Naicker was active in the Congress-led Freedom Thrash about for sometime. He participated in the non-cooperation movement, offered satyagraha and defended khadi, But Naicker's efforts to get Tamil Nadu Congress to adopt resolutions in favor of caste quotas in political representation were continually defeated flanked by 1919 and 1925.

Moreover, he got disenchanted with the 'paternalistic' characteristics of Gandhi's social programme, which he thought, was conducive to the legitimation of the prevailing social order. Periyar was opposed to Gandhi's
reconstructed version of varnashrama dharma as it did not correspond to the method the caste system had historically functioned. Periyar also interpreted Gandhian nationalism as a hegemonic project to uphold the dominance of the Brahmins and 'Brahminism' in Indian society and the predominant power of north India in the national politics. Naicker's rising dissatisfaction with Gandhi and the Congress, which he began to express from 1925 onwards in the journal Kudi Arasu, led him and his followers to establish the Self Respect Association in 1926.

Protesting against the Brahminical dominance in high politics, he quit the Congress and urbanized Dravidian cultural alternatives to the prevailing hegemonic Brahminical civilization. In 1925, he organized the "Self Respect Movement", intended as Dravidian Uplift, seeking to expose Brahminical tyranny and the deceptive methods through which they controlled all spheres of Hindu life. Therefore, Naicker advocated: "God should be destroyed; Religion should be destroyed; Congress should be destroyed; Gandhi should be destroyed; The Brahmin should be destroyed."

Naicker's methods of thrash about incorporated the destruction of the images of Hindu deities such as Rama and Ganesha. Just as to Periyar, "Rama and Sita are despicable characters, not worthy of imitation and admiration even through the lowest of fourth-rate humans." Ravana (a Dravidian hero presented as a demon in the north), on the other hand, is depicted as a Dravidian of “excellent” character. In his preface to The Ramayana: A True Reading, he slates that "the veneration of the story any longer in Tamil Nad is injurious and ignominious to the self-respect of the society and of the country." Periyar's methods of breaking idols and taking out anti-God processions, earned him a lot of criticism. Yet he was adamant that from his radical point of view, idols were symbols of Brahminical ideology and superstition.
Naicker's Discourse

Portraying Naicker as presently anti-Brahmin or anti-God would be not doing justice. He was a radical social reformer. His determined campaign against Hindu orthodoxy accompanied through rationalism and social reform, transformed the social landscape of Tamil Nadu. His radical social reform campaign caught the imagination of the underclass. As in the Self-Respect Movement, one of Naicker's vital objectives was to remove all 'superstitious belief' based upon religion or custom. No member was allowed to wear the sectarian marks of faith crossways his forehead. Members were urged to boycott the use of Brahmin priests in ceremonies. He campaigned for widow remarriage and inter-caste marriage. Therefore, his thrust on non-Brahminism necessity be placed in the context of the rigid rituals that had legitimized caste oppression at that time.

Naicker claimed that his brand of politics was oriented on the contrary, towards the emancipation of the subordinate groups in Tamil society, much as liberalism had opposed upper class and clerical dominance in the West. Naicker sought to associate himself with the enlightenment heritage through elaborating a materialist ontology and a genealogy of Brahminical morals as founded on a resentment of worldly non-Brahmin virtues. Further, he claimed Rousseau, Marx and Ingersoll as sources of inspiration and pointed to a future in which caste divisions and 'superstition' would yield lay to pluralism, secularization and acceptance of contemporary science and technology. Such self-symbols promoted some scholars to view

Significant characteristics of Naicker's ideology and the manner in which it was deployed in mobilization were out of tune with liberalism. Distant from relying on the concept of abstract citizen central to British liberalism, Naicker adopted ethnic categories drawn from colonial knowledge and sought to accord Shudra primacy in the political society. In contrast to the north, the south India, even before the colonial rule, had experienced
considerable social mobility at dissimilar points and the intermediate castes increasingly rejecting the traditional varna order. As kingly power grew, mercantile and warrier groups acquired more land as well as dominance. The onset of the British rule constricted the kingly path to political power. Naicker's vision of Shudra primacy provided the ideological foundation on which later Dravidian ideologues reinforced the dominance of non-Brahmin elite, both old and new, such as rich farmers, merchants and industrialists. Therefore, the emancipatory potential of Naicker's notions of social identity remained a subsidiary aspect of dravidianist project right through.

Dravidian Mobilisation

Naicker conceived Dravidian society primarily in conditions of a coalition of megacastes— the non-Brahmin Hindu castes of Tamil Nadu, i.e. Tamil speaking Hindus who were neither Brahmins nor SCs. Non-Brahminism endured in Tamil Nadu because it was connected to Tamil nationalism from the 1930s onwards in a populist discourse. The opposition to Brahmin dominance had the potential of serving as a banner for subordinate non-Brahmin groups to buttress their dominance.

Under the Congress Ministry of C. Rajagopalachari in 1937, Hindi was introduced to the South as a compulsory subject in schools. Taking it as an affront to Tamil civilization and its rich literary traditions, Naicker waved black flags of rebellion in his first anti-Hindi campaign. The campaign forced the government to change Hindi into an optional subject. Naicker saw the imposition of Hindi as a subjugation of Tamil people which could be avoided only through the creation of a Dravidian state. In 1938, Naicker was elected President of the Justice Party. The Party resolved that Tamil Nadu should be made a separate state, loyal to the British Raj and "directly under the Secretary of State for India."

In 1939, Naicker organized the "Dravida Nadu Conference" for the advocacy of a separate and self-governing Dravidasthan. The demand was
again reiterated the following year in response to the Lahore resolution demanding Pakistan passed through the Muslim League. Naicker gave full support to the scheme for Pakistan and tried to enlist support for the creation of a Dravidasthan. The vital presupposition of the movement was that the Dravidian non-Brahmin peoples (Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, and Malayalam) were of a racial stock and civilization, which distinguished them from the Aryan Brahmins.

In 1944, the justice Party was reorganized as Dravida Kazagham(DK). The substance of the DK was proclaimed to be the attainment of a sovereign self-governing Republic, which would be federal in nature with four elements corresponding to the linguistic divisions, each having residual powers and autonomy of internal administration. It would be a "classless society," an egalitarian Dravida Nadu to which the depressed and downtrodden could pledge allegiance. The party proclaimed its opposition to the British Raj, and Naicker described upon the DK members to renounce all titles conferred through the British and resign all offices linked with the National War front. This action greatly enhanced the prestige of the movement and the DK could no longer be measured a handmaiden of the British, as was the Justice Party from the extremely beginning.

**Pandita Ramabai (1858-1922)**

Pandita Ramabai (1858-1922) was one of the greatest women of contemporary India. Exceptionally learned, Ramabai, an outspoken champion of women's rights and social reform, earned the unique distinction of being the sole woman representative in the male-dominated world of gender reforms. As Ramabai 'transgressed' the boundaries and contested patriarchy in her educational and missionary behaviors, she understandably became the mainly controversial upper-caste woman of her times, and hence, was consciously 'erased' from the contemporary Indian history for a extensive era.
Early Life: Non-conformist Background

Ramabai's father Anant Shastri Dongre, a Chitpavan Brahmin, a non-conformist, invited the ire of his powerful conservative society brethren when he decided to teach Sanskrit to his wife which was regarded 'heretical'. Sanskrit, the 'divine language' was after all reserved for the upper-caste men. As consequences of his non-conformism, he had to live outside the society and took to wandering the country with his family, livelihood off of donations as a puranic storyteller. His life was unique in the sense that while leading a Brahminical method of life, he strongly rejected some of its core principles. Ramabai learnt Sanskrit and Puranas in those hard days, full of suffering and pain. Therefore, Ramabai's break with Brahminism was inevitable, considering the life and the legacy she inherited from her father.

After the death of her parents, Ramabai arrived in Calcutta in 1878 at the age of nineteen. Interestingly, the religious elite of the municipality warmly welcomed her and encouraged her to revise the Vedas and Upanishads despite the prohibition on women to do so. She impressed the religious elite of the municipality with her mastery in excess of Sanskrit language and texts and received the title of 'Pandita' (Scholar) and 'Saraswati' (Goddess of Learning). Ramabai soon took up her social reform agenda through traveling widely in Bengal and addressing women on the require for their education and emancipation, drawing heavily on the mythological figures of educated and self-governing women.

Contesting Patriarchy: Hinduism and Christianity

Ramabai's reading of Dharmashastras made her deeply conscious of the contempt with which women of all castes and men of the lower caste were treated in these texts. Like women, rules did not permit the Shudras to perform the similar religious acts as the upper castes. Ramabai rejected this
discrimination in her personal life when she decided to accept the marriage proposal from a Bipin Behari, a Shudra, thereby decisively breaking with the custom. Bipin was excommunicated as it was an inter-caste marriage through civil registration. Presently after two years of marriage, Bipin’s death forced widowhood on young Ramabai at the age of twenty-four. After her initial experiences of oppressive widowhood, Ramabai refused to be confined to the domestic legroom and catapulting herself into the public arena.

Returning to Maharashtra, Ramabai experienced her first public encounter with the forces of patriarchy when she set up the Arya Mahila Samaj in 1882 in Poona to mobilize women, and aroused instant hostility. She brought out a book in Marathi, Stree Dharma Niti [Morals for Women] with the objective of counseling the helpless and ignorant women. The Kesari commented: "In reality, it is the task of men to eradicate these and other evil customs in our society. Women cannot so interfere in it for several years to come - even if they are 'panditas' and have reached the ultimate stage of reform... Our women will have to be under the manage of men for a extensive time to come.” Undeterred, Ramabai set up a house for high-caste Hindu widows and made an appeal to the Hunter Commission to give training facilities to women to become teachers and doctors enabling them to serve other women.

Though, she failed to connect to the women in Maharashtra and felt alienated as she had no society, no social base and no real emotional bonds to fall back upon. This led to her search for solace in religion and God which could simultaneously accommodate her social agenda as well as her personal quest for religious fulfillment. Therefore she got converted to Christianity through the Anglican Church.

Ramabai’s encounter with the patriarchy of the Anglican Church crossways the globe was no less harsh. When she was offered a professorship which would involve her teaching to male students, the Bishop of Bombay protested, or "Above all things, pray consider that her power will be ruined
forever in India if she is recognized to have taught young men." Ramabai promptly replied: "It surprises me extremely much to think that neither my father nor my husband objected [to] my mother's or my teaching young men while some young people are doing so." Therefore, the major contestation in Ramabai's educational and missionary behaviors was that of patriarchy.

A Christian convert and renowned social reformer, Pandita Ramabai was a scholar of Hinduism who had profound disagreements with its philosophical premises, particularly with regard to women, and later as a Christian convert who rebelled against Christian dogma. Therefore, her life was a narrative of intricate contestations — that of a woman against male hegemony both in Hindu society as well as Anglican Church, that of an Indian convert against the British Anglican bishops and nuns, that of an Indian Christian missionary against the oppression of Hindu women.

JAIPAL SINGH (1903-1970)

Jaipal Singh (1903-1970), was a multi-faceted personality—a distinguished parliamentarian, a champion sportsman, an educationist, a powerful orator and above all, the leader of the Adivasis. Jaipal alias Pramod Pahan was born at the Takra village of Khunti subdivision of the present day Jharkhand. In childhood, his job was to seem after the cattle herd. His destiny had a turn approximately with his admission to St. Paul's School, Ranchi, in 1910. Then Jaipal moved to England and graduated from St John's College, Oxford with Honours in Economics. Jaipal was selected in Indian Civil Service from which he later resigned. In 1928 Amsterdam Olympics, he captained the Indian hockey team which won the gold medal. In 1934, Jaipal joined teaching at the Prince of Wales College at Achimota, Gold Coast, Ghana. In 1937, he returned to India as the principal incumbent of the Rajkumar College, Raipur. In 1938, he joined the Bikaner princely State as foreign secretary. Jaipal thought that with his varied experience he could be more useful to the country through the Congress. His encounter with Rajendra
Prasad at the Sadaaquat Ashram in Patna, though, did not go well. The then Governor of Bihar, Sir Maurice Hallet offered to nominate him to the Bihar Legislative Council but Jaipal declined. In deference to their wishes, Jaipal then decided to go to Ranchi and assess the situation for himself. The return to Ranchi was Jaipal's homecoming.

When the news got approximately that Jaipal had arrived in Ranchi, there was great excitement in the middle of the Adivasis. The united Adivasi forum described Adivasi Sabha, shaped in 1938 made him the president of the organisation. As several as 65,000 people gathered to listen to Jaipal's presidential speech on January 20, 1939. They came from all in excess of, walked on foot for days jointly to have a glimpse of him as they had done in the past for Birsa Munda, the legend. His oratory, simultaneously in English, Hindi, Sadani and Mundari, mesmerised men and women from all walks of life.

"The Adivasi movement stands primarily for the moral and material advancement of Chhotanagpur and Santhal Parganas," he declared and set as his goal a separate administrative status for the region. He was instantly the people's "Marang Gomke" — their Supreme Leader. The history of the region changed henceforth. With Jaipal at the helm, there was no looking back. He worked ceaselessly for a better future for his fellow Adivasis everywhere, even beyond the frontiers of south Bihar.

The Adivasi Sabha was changed into All India Adivasi Mahasabha. On the national political front, Jaipal had alienated himself from the Congress personally. He played an active role in the anti-Compromise Congress conference at Ramqarh in 1940 in secure alliance with Subhas Bose. He went against the Congress stand and supported the British in the World War II and recruited men and women from Chhotanagpur for the British army.

Since 1946, he was a member of the Constituent Assembly, the Provisional Parliament and was elected four times to the Parliament until his death in 1970. As a secure friend of the doyen of anthropology, S.C. Roy and
Verrier Elwin and supported through Ambedkar, he led his "glorious thrust about" both inside and outside the legislature to set up the Adivasi identity. With the creation of the Jharkhand Party and the induction of non-Adivasis into it in 1950, he changed the emotive cultural movement in Jharkhand into a local political movement, free from any communal bias.

The Jharkhand Party (JHP) was the first legitimate political party that drew the political agenda and gave the direction to the future of Jharkhand politics. The party became so strong that it played a vital role in the formation of the government in the neighboring province of Orissa in 1957.

**Championing Adivasi Identity**

The dominant view in the Assembly reflected a patronising attitude towards the tribals; the discontent in the tribal regions lived due to their exclusion from the mainstream development pattern. It was whispered that an industry-led model of development would be a panacea for all ills in the tribal regions. The emphasis was on the 'civilizing mission' and assimilation of tribals into the national mainstream.

Jaipal Singh countered this dominant view. Participating in the debates on the Draft Constitution, on 24 August 1949, Jaipal Singh delivered an significant speech on Adivasi identity. He raised the subsistence of a tribal society in Jharkhand. He emphasized that the tribal people were the true and original inhabitants of India, and as such had a claim to the whole of India. Yet, he emphasized that reservation of seats for tribals in the legislatures was necessary. He also made an effort to divorce the case of Scheduled Tribes from that of the Scheduled Castes.

Jaipal argued that Adivasi Society always emphasized on equality and democracy. As he stated: "Adivasi society was the mainly democratic element in this country. Can the rest of India say the similar thing?... In Adivasi society all are equal, rich or poor. Everyone has equal opportunity and I do not wish
that people should get absent with the thought that through writing this constitution and operating it we are trying to put a new thought into the Adivasi society.

What we are actually doing is you are learning and taking something Non-Adivasi society has learnt much and has still to learn a good deal. Adivasis are the mainly democratic people and they will not let India get smaller or weaker..... I would like the members [to] not be so condescending. Assembly Debates 1949)

Asserting an Adivasi identity and advocating a key role for the society in the national politics, he observed: "What is necessary is that the backward groups in our country should be enabled to stand on their own legs so that they can assert themselves. It is not the intention of this Constitution, nor do I desire it, that the advanced society should be carrying my people in their arms for the rest of eternity. All mat we plead is that the wherewithal should be provided... so that we will be able to stand on our own legs and regain the lost nerves and be useful citizens of India.... I may assure non-Adivasis that Adivasis will play a much better part than you imagine, if only you will be honest in relation to the your intentions and let them play a part they have a right to play." (Constituent Assembly Debates 1949).

KAZI NAZRUL ISLAM (1899-1976)

Kazi Nazrul Islam (1899-1976), the national poet of Bangladesh, was born in Churulia, Burdharman district, West Bengal. He lost his father in his childhood and had a financial hardship, thereby forced to work as a teacher in a lower Islamic school at the age of nine, Though his education went only up to tenth grade, he sustained learning Arabic and Persian languages. As a boy, he translated Persian ghazals and Arabic writings in Bengali. He also educated himself enough to enjoy the writings of Keats, Shelly and Whitman. Nazrul became a literary genius, writing 50 books of poetry and songs, 6 books of stories and novels, 3 books of translations, 53 plays, verse-plays and operas
movie scripts, 5 books of essays and 4000 songs and ghazals. He holds the world record of recorded songs, for mainly of which, the music was composed through Nazrul himself.

The Rebel Poet (Bidhrohi Kobi)

Nazrul was opposed to the British rule of India and took an active part through his writings on Swadishi and Khilafat movement. He had to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a year for his writing Andamoyeer Agamaney which appeared in Dhumketu. Rabindranath Tagore described Nazrul “Dhumketu”—the Comet. For Mahatma Gandhi, Nazrul's poem was "the song of the spinning wheel" and Nazrul was "the ultimate spirit of the spinning wheel" and freedom ran through his vein. Nazrul similar to be recognized as Bidrohi Kobi—the rebel poet—for his astonishing masterpiece “The Bidrohi." This was a furious manifesto of self-conscious against immorality. As Sajid Kamal describes: "A universal proclamation, an affirmation, an inspiration, an invocation, of 'The Rebel' within the hearts of each of the general humanity which lay oppressed, subjugated, exploited, resigned and powerless." It is said that Nazrul would have been Nazrul even if he had not written anything else but "The Bidrohi." Therefore, Kazi Nazrul Islam refused to compromise with the unjust.

Hindu-Muslim Issue

In the context of the Hindu-Muslim riots in Calcutta in 1926, quoting Rabindranath in 'Hindu- Muslim [The tale of tails]', he emphasized Gurudev's comment: You see, one can sever the tail that is outside, but who can sever the tail that is inside?"
To Nazrul, those who grow tails—inside or outside—become animals. Those tailed animals whose ferocity or cruelty is obvious through their "horny" display and one does not have to be as much concerned in relation to the them.

In this context, Nazrul criticizes the conscious effort perpetuated through Hindus and Muslims to construct their respective oppositional identities through Tiki (tuft) and Dari (beard). Nazrul’s satire is striking: "The birthplace of this inner tail necessity is Tiki-pur and Dari-stan. What a primitive (adim) and overpowering propensity of human being to be like animals! Their sadness in relation to the not being able to grow tail has establish a remedial consolation in rising Tiki—Dari."

Nazrul regrets how the universal relation of humanity has been transformed into adversity/animosity through raising walls after walls. He observes that one can live with the truth of religion, but the overbearing nature of the books of laws/codes make all the troubles. Nazrul does not discover difficulty "tolerating Hinduhood (hindutto) or Muslimhood (musalmanotto), but Tiki-tto/Dari-tto is intolerable because those appear to engender lot of animosity and friction." Nazrul argues that such symbols which construct the essentials of religious identities have nothing to do with religion. Therefore, he comments: "Having Tiki is not essential to being a Hindu, it might be pedantry. Likewise, Dari is not essential to being a Muslim, it's mullatto. These two brands of hair—bunches have caused so much hair—pulling."

A strong believer in composite civilization Nazrul blames pundits and Mullahs for being responsible for constructing confrontational identities on the foundation of meaningless outer symbols and divides the societies. As he concludes: "Today's squabble is also flanked by pundit and mullah, not flanked by Hindu-Muslim. The mace of Narayan and sword of Allah won't have problem, because they are the similar, and weapon in the: hand of someone does not strike the other hand of the similar person. He is pronoun (shorbonam), all names have merged in Him. In all this fight and squabble it is
comforting that Allah or Narayan is neither Hindu nor Muslim. He has no Dari or Tiki. Absolutely "clean"! I am so upset in relation to the this Tiki—Dari because these appear to be reminders to human beings that I am dissimilar, you are dissimilar. These outwardly marks create humanity forget her eternal blood relation."

He discovers it unfortunate that Krishna—Muhammad—Christ have become communal property, and all these squabbles centre on this property rights. "One is saying, our Allah; the other is saying, our Hari. As if, the Creator is like cow-goat. And the charge of settling such matters is on the shoulder of Justice Sir Abdul Rahim, Pundit Madan Mohan Malyobbo, etc. One easily can see the outcomes through visiting the wards (full of wounded bodies) of the Medical College.”

BHAI KAHN SINGH NABHA (1861-1938)

Bhai Kahn Singh, a distinguished Sikh scholar, was born in the village of Sabaz Banera, Patiala. His father Narain Singh was the in-charge of a Gurdwara at Nabha. Kahn Singh did not attend any formal school or college, yet he mastered many branches of learning through traditional education. Through the age of ten he could recite with ease the Guru Granth Sahib. He also studied Sanskrit as well as Persian. In 1887, he was appointed tutor to Tikka Ripudaman Singh, the heir apparent of Sikh State of Nabha. From the Maharaja’s private secretary to the judge of the High Court, he held dissimilar positions in the state.

In 1885, he accidentally met Max Arthur Macauliffe who was working on Sikh scriptures and history of early Sikhism. Macauliffe took Kahn Singh to England and depended a great deal on his advice and guidance acknowledging his contribution; he assigned Kahn Singh the copyright of his 6-volume The Sikh Religion. From in the middle of Bhai Kahn Singh’s numerous works, Gurshabad Ratanakar Mahan Kosh, the first encyclopedia of Sikhism, will always remain a monumental one. Besides his maiden work Raj
Dharam (1884), his other prominent works contain: Gurmat Prabhakar, concepts and institutions, Gurmat Sndhakar, an anthology of significant Sikh texts, scriptural and historical, Gur Chand Divakar and Gur Sabad Alankar, dealing primarily with rhetoric and prosody employed in Guru Granth Sahib and some other Sikh texts. His Gur Girah Kasauti answers some of the questions raised through his pupil, Tikka Ripudaman Singh, in relation to the meanings of sure hymns in the Guru Granth Sahib, and his Sharab Nikhedh is a didactic work stressing the harmful effects of drinking. In the middle of his other works are Visnu Purana, Sadd and Chandi di Var. Bhai Kahn Singh existed his life totally immersed in his scholarly pursuits and left a permanent imprint on the subsequent Sikh literature. His works sustained to enrich the modern Sikh life in its diverse characteristics and his writings subtly molded the course of Sikh awakening at the turn of the century.

**Hum Hindu Nahin: We are not Hindus**

In 1898, he published Hum Hindu Nahin (We are not Hindus) with a specific purpose. The title creates Kahn Singh's view abundantly dear. It was a response to the Arya Samaj propaganda that Sikhs were presently a sect of Hindus. His book set forth forcefully the Sikh standpoint with regard to the Sikh identity. It represented the dominant view of the Singh Sabha movement and has ever since retained the fame, which it so quietly acquired. It is worth stressing that the approach adopted in this book is neither hostile nor aggressive. In his presentation, he took great care to stress that he sought peace, not discord.

Bhai Kahn Singh was a revolutionary Gursikh distant ahead of his times. Kahn Singh justified the require of such a work as 'We are not Hindus' when "it is perfectly obvious that the Khalsa is indeed separate from Hindu society." He brings out the significance of his work through a parable, which runs briefly as follows: Guru Gobind Singh once sheltered a donkey with a
lion skin and set it loose in the wasteland. Men as well as cattle thought it was a lion and were so frightened that none dared approach it. Released from the misery of carrying burdens and free to graze meadows to its heart's content, the donkey grew plump and strong. It spent its days happily roaming the region approximately Anandpur. One day, though it was attracted through the braying of a mare from its old stable. There it was recognized through the potter who removed the lion skin, replaced its pannier-bags, and once again began whipping it to create it work.

The Guru used this parable to teach his Sikhs an significant lesson. “My dear sons,” he said, “I have not involved you in a mere pantomime as in the case of this donkey I have freed you, wholly and totally, from the bondage of caste. You have become my sons and Sahib Kaur has become your mother: Do not follow the foolish instance of the donkey and return to your old caste allegiance. If forgetting my languages and abandoning the sacred faith of the Khalsa you return to your several castes your fate will be that of the donkey. Your courage will desert you and you will have existed your lives in vain.” Therefore, Kahn Sing emphasizes the casteless aspect of Sikhism which creates it dissimilar from the caste-ridden Hinduism.

Kahn Singh regretted that several of his brethren were in information neglecting this aspect of the Guru’s teaching. They regard themselves as Sikhs of the Khalsa but accept the Hindu custom though Sikh religion is separate from the Hindu religion. The cause for this, as Kahn Singh argues, "is that they have neither read their own Scriptures with care nor studied the historical past. Instead they have spent their time browsing through erroneous material and listening to the deceitful languages of the self-seeking. The tragedy is that these brethren are falling absent from the Khalsa."

Kahn Singh was influenced that India "will flourish when people of all religions are loyal to their own traditions, yet willing to accept other Indians as members of the similar family when they recognize that harming one means harming the' nation, and when religious differences are no longer an occasion
for discord." He advised the Sikhs to practice their religion in the harmonious spirit of Guru Nanak, “for therefore we shall ensure that mutual envy and hatred do not spread. At the similar time, you will grow in affection for all your fellow countrymen, recognizing all who inhabit this country of India as one with yourself." Therefore, Bhai Kahn Singh, while advocating a separate Sikh identity, does not view it as oppositional to other religious/society identities.

Kahn Singh made a pioneering contribution to the Singh Sabha Movement. He had to face expulsion from the Nabha state because he recommended idols be removed from Darbar Sahib. He also undertook enormous efforts to set up the Khalsa college at Amritsar, thereby boosting a movement for Sikh education.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Write a note on Naicker’s Dravidian movement in Tamil Nadu.
- Write a note on Jaipal Singh’s political leadership.
- Write a note on Bhai Kahn Singh and his views on Sikh identity.
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Explain briefly the philosophy foundations of Gandhiji’s political philosophy.
- Highlight the Gandhian concepts of economic equality and swadeshi.
- Comment on Gandhi’s views on the End-Means unity.
INTRODUCTION

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948), herein after Gandhiji, was undoubtedly the mainly authentic and celebrated representative of the wisdom and civilization of India in our times. His countrymen address him, with respect, as the Mahatma. For Several, in the middle of the greatest, Gandhiji was the great. He was a social reformer, an economist, a political philosopher and a seeker of truth. We consider him as a 'yugapurusha', one who inaugurated a new era.

The contribution of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi to the Indian national movement was unparalleled. He made the Indian National Congress a peoples’ Congress and the national movement a mass movement. He made people fearless and bold and taught them the non-violent methods for fighting against injustice. He had a passion for individual liberty which was closely bound with his understanding of truth and self-realisation. His search for truth led him to create deep forays within his own inner self as it led him to probe into the natural and social world approximately him, particularly the custom which he measured his own.

Gandhiji’s philosophy was a profound engagement with modernity and its pitfalls. Against the evils of wanton industrialization, materialism and selfish pursuits, Gandhiji suggested, in turn, swadeshi, primacy of the self and trusteeship; against the institution of state, as the force personified, and the prevalent notion of democracy where only heads are counted, he favored a swaraj kind of democracy where everything springs from the free individual and where decisions are made bottom-up with the locus of power below. He proposed a minimal slate, vested only with coordinative powers, that supports decentralization with the autonomous individual as its base of support.

A spiritual perspective infuses Gandhiji's whole approach to life. His political understanding and practices, suggestions on the economy, social
mobilization and practical life have their foundation in morality and ethics. Pursuit of Truth is his mantra and non-violence was integral to it.

In the middle of Gandhiji’s notable writings, mention may be made of An Autobiography: The Story of my Experiments with Truth; The Composed Works of Mahatma Gandhi; Panchayati Raj; Satyagraha in South Africa; Sarvodaya and Hind Swaraj. He edited Young India which he later renamed as Harijan which remained his mouthpiece.

As is true in relation to the anyone else, Gandhiji was also influenced through several: Tolstoy (Gospels in Brief, What to Do, The Kingdom of God is within You), Ruskin (Unto This Last), Thoreau (Essay on Civil Disobedience), Swami Vivekananda, Gokhale and Tilak, presently to mention a few. There is the strong stamp of his family and the Indian national movement with its cross-currents on him. He was familiar with the teachings of the major religions of the world. He was exceptionally well-read and even translated such works as Plato’s Republic into Gujarati. He maintained extensive correspondence with some of the mainly outstanding figures of his time. He maintained a whipping schedule traveling to dissimilar parts of the vast Indian subcontinent sometimes traversing extensive distances on foot. Several associated themselves personally secure to him and he left his imprint on several who came into get in touch with him. He learnt from everyone he came crossways and no important event of his times escaped his attention. His assassination brought to a secure a life of undaunted courage resting on the call of conscience, committed to the service of his country, general welfare and universal love.

**PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF GANDHI’S POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE**

Gandhiji was a deeply religious man. This perspective shaped his politics, his economic thoughts and his view of society. Though, the religious approach that he imbibed was markedly dissimilar from other religious men.
He wrote to Mr. Polak, "Mainly religious men I have met are politicians in disguise; I though, who wear the guise of a politician, am at heart, a religious man. My bent is not political but religious.

"He accepts the inner oneness of all subsistence in the cosmic spirit, and saw all livelihood beings as representatives of the eternal divine reality. Divine attendance envelops the whole world and it creates its reflective attendance felt in men and women. Gandhiji whispered that man's ultimate goal in life was self-realisation. Self-realisation, just as to him, meant seeing God face to face, i.e., realizing the absolute Truth or, what one may say, knowing oneself. He whispered that it could not be achieved unless man recognized himself with the whole of mankind. This necessarily involved participation in politics. Politics is the means, par excellence, to engage with the world. Such an engagement is expressed in service. Gandhiji was clear in his mind that Truth could not be attained through merely retiring to the Himalayas or being bogged down with rituals but in actively engaging with the world, keeping oneself open to the voice of God and critically reflecting upon oneself and letting others to reflect on you.

"Man's ultimate aim is the realisation of God, and all his behaviors, social, political,' religious, have to be guided through the ultimate aim of the vision of God. The immediate service of all human beings becomes a necessary part of the endeavour, basically because the only method to discover God is to see Him in His Creation and be one with it. This can only be done through service of all. I am a part and parcel of the whole, and I cannot discover Him separately from the rest of humanity. My countrymen are my adjacent neighbors. They have become so helpless, so resource less, and so inert that I necessity concentrate myself on serving them. If I could persuade myself that I should discover Him in a Himalayan cave I would proceed there immediately. But I know that I cannot discover Him separately from humanity."
It is only through the means of self-purification that self-realisation can be attained. The fasts, prayers and works of service that he undertook were all directed towards such an end. In his Autobiography, Gandhiji says that self-realisation required self-purification as its ethical base. Man's moral life flows from such a search inward into his own self and expresses itself in outward action of fellowship and concern to others. Gopinath Dhawan writes in this connection: "This ethical outlook is the backbone of Gandhiji's political philosophy even as his ethics has for its base in his metaphysical principles. To him the moral discipline of the individuals is the mainly significant means of social reconstruction." Gandhiji invoked the five-fold moral principles: truth, non-violence, non-stealing, non-possession and celibacy. The observance of these moral principles would purify man and enable him to strive after self-realisation.

**VIEWS ON HUMAN NATURE**

Gandhiji's views on man, human nature and society are in consonance with his philosophical outlook and reflect his convictions concerning morality and ethical pursuit of life. At the similar time he was deeply aware of the imperfections of human beings. What is significant, though, is the disposition: "There is no one without faults', not even men of God. They are men of God not because they are faultless but because they know their own faults.... and are ever ready to correct themselves. "Conscious as Gandhiji was in relation to the man's weaknesses as an individual or a member of a group, he still did not think of man merely or only as a brute. Man, he was influenced, was after all a soul as well. Even the mainly brutal of men, fie felt, cannot disown the spiritual element in them, i.e., their potentiality for goodness. While concerning the individual as imperfect, he had great faith in human nature. "I refuse", he says, "to suspect human nature. Its will is bound to respond to any noble and friendly action". At another lay, he says, There are chords in every human heart. If we only know how to strike the right chord, we bring out the
music." What distinguishes man from the brute is the self-conscious impulse to realize the divinity inherent in him. He writes: "We were born with brute strength but we were born in order to realize God who dwells in us. That indeed is the privilege of man and it distinguishes him from the brute creation." He argued that every man and woman has capability in them to change their life and change themselves truly into the self they are. "Man as animal," he says, "is violent, but as spirit (he) is non-violent. The moment he awakens to the spirit within he cannot remain violent."

Man is inherently predisposed towards his self-realisation. In him, moral qualities and social virtues such as love, cooperation, and tolerance preponderate in excess of violence, selfishness and brutality, and man keeps working for higher life. He writes: I consider that the sum total of the power of mankind is not to bring us down but to lift us up and that is the result of the definite, if unconscious, working of the law of nature".

Gandhiji whispered that human nature is, in its essence, one and that everyman has the capability for the highest possible development: "The soul is one in all; its possibility is, so, the similar for everyone. It is this undoubted universal possibility that distinguishes the human from the rest of God's creation."

**CONNECTION FLANKED BY RELIGION AND POLITICS**

The modern world attempted to spot off religion from the political domain and made religion a purely personal affair. Religious beliefs and commitments through themselves are not supposed to form the political realm. Against such a location Gandhiji described for the reinsertion of religion in shaping public life and saw an intimate connection flanked by the health of a polity and religious pursuits.
Concept of Religion

What does religion stand for? How does one create sense of diversity of religions? Gandhiji’s answer was, "I consider in the fundamental truth of all great religions of the world... they were at the bottom all one and were all helpful to one another." There were, just as to 'him, as several religions as there were minds. Each mind, he would say, had a dissimilar conception of God from that of the other. All the similar they pursue the similar God. He insisted that religion be differentiated from ethics. Fundamental ethical precepts are general crossways religions although religions may differ from each other with respect to their beliefs and practices. "I consider that fundamental ethics is general to all religions. Through religion I have not in mind fundamental ethics but what goes through the name of denominationalism".

Religion enables us to pursue truth and righteousness. Sometimes he distinguished religion in common and religion in a specific sense. One belongs to a specific religion with its beliefs and practices. As one proceeds through the path suggested through it one also outgrows its limitations and comes to appreciate the general thread that binds all religions and pursuers of truth. Gandhiji once said: "Let me explain what I mean through religion. It is not the Hindu religion which I certainly prize above all other religions, but the religion which transcends Hinduism, which changes one's extremely 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 discover full expression and which leaves the soul utterly restless until it has establish itself knows its maker and appreciates the true correspondence flanked by the Maker and itself. Any type of sectarian foreclosure, he felt, was a violation of human nature and its authentic striving. He said, "Religion does not mean sectarianism. It means a belief in ordered moral government of the universe. It is not less real because it is unseen. This religion transcends
Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, etc. It does not supersede them. It harmonizes them and provides them reality". Talking in relation to the specific religions, he says, "Religions are dissimilar roads converging to the similar point. What does it matter that we take dissimilar roads, so extensive as we reach the similar goal? In reality, there are as several religions as there are individuals". While diversity of religions is admissible, he did not think that any religion can claim itself as superior in excess of others. In information, when a religion claims itself superior to others its credentials are suspect and it becomes a hurdle in the path of our self-realisation: “So extensive as there are dissimilar religions, every one of them may require some distinctive symbol. But when the symbol is made into a fetish and an instrument of proving the superiority of one's religion in excess of others, it is fit only to be discarded.

**Concept of Politics**

Politics, for Gandhiji, was but a part of man's life. Though lie thought that an augment in the power of the state did the greatest harm to mankind through destroying individuality which lay at the root of all progress, yet he viewed political power as a means that enabled people to better their circumstances in every department of life. Politics so is an enabling action. He wrote, "my work of social reform was in no method less ox: subordinate to political work. The information is that when I saw that to a sure extent my social work would be impossible without the help of political work, I took to the latter and only to the extent that it helped the former".

Political action of man is closely associated with other behaviors of man and all these behaviors, just as to Gandhiji, power each other. "Life is one indivisible whole, and all my behaviors run into one another". So political action is intimately related to other walks of life and pursuits. What he hated in politics was the concentration of power and the use of violence associated with political power.
Connection flanked by Religion and Politics

He formulated the connection flanked by politics and religion as an intimate one. Religion cannot be divorced from politics. Given the fundamental objective of life as self-realisation, if politics does not enable religious pursuits it is not worthwhile at all. He stated categorically, "For me, politics bereft of religion is absolute dirt, ever to be shunned". He further thought that political action that divorces itself from the quest of self-realisation is not worth the salt. Politics creates the circumstances for pursuits which members of a polity feel are vital to the creation of their selves. What could be more vital than pursuit of one's own self? He felt, "For me there is no politics without religion - not the religion of the superstitious and the bind, religion that hates and fights, but the universal religion of toleration."

Politics is intimately related to the whole behaviors of human life. This is particularly true in modern times. He wrote, "The whole gamut of man's behaviors today constitutes an indivisible whole. You cannot divide social, economic, political and purely religious work into watertight compartments."

While concerning politics as the method through which men can rule themselves without violence and religion as the embodiment of ethical and moral rules, Gandhiji argued that their secure connection has to be recognized. So much importance did he attach to politics that he insisted on taking part in politics as if it is something religious in nature.

As apparent, Gandhiji looked at politics with a view to reform it. He firmly whispered that he could lead a truly religious life only when he took part in politics. But the motivation that imbues one in participation in public life is significant.

The Gandhian view of politics was a politics where people participated in public affairs for purposes of serving others. Hence, for him, all political behaviors concerned themselves with the welfare of everyone. As political action is closely related to the cause of the people it is essential that such
action be permeated through religion or at least should be the concern of the people who are religiously motivated. Politics permeated through religion, just as to him, means politics dedicated to serve the cause of humanity which eventually leads to a better understanding of truth. For him, the kingdom of God lies here in this world, in the men here, and within men, those whose political action is directed towards the service of humanity. To quote him, "I could not be leading a religious life, unless I recognized myself with the whole of mankind, and I could not do so unless I took part in politics".

For Gandhiji, politics, is one method of seeking a part of the whole truth. Political action helps man to achieve the capability to rule himself, a capability wherein he obeys rules of the society without any external force or external imposition. Religion and politics, so understood, create, a good case for swaraj. He regards concentration of power as detrimental to the individual freedom and initiative.

Gandhiji never measured political power as an end; it was a means to enable people to better their condition in every walk of life. If the life of a polity becomes self-regulated, there was no require to have representative government. It will then be an enlightened anarchy. In such a state everyone will be his own ruler respecting the self-rule of others in excess of themselves. It would then be a totally non-violent society and state. He though felt that no society can ever become totally non-violent but if it does 'it would be the purest anarchy'. The latter is the ideal to strive for. In the ideal state, so, there is no political power because there is no state.

UNITY OF ENDS AND MEANS

That the ends and means are related to each other is one of the vital tenets of Gandhian philosophy. Gandhiji drew no distinction flanked by the means and the ends implying thereby that one leads to the other and that the latter is the effect of the former, Such an assertion, for him, approximates the scientific principle of the connection flanked by cause and effect. Gandhiji
would not like to attain the noblest end if that was to be achieved through impure means.

**Connection flanked by Means and Ends**

He felt that the connection flanked by means and ends are integral and constitutive. "Means and ends are convertible conditions in my philosophy of life". Refuting those who opined that 'means are after all means', he said, "means are after all everything". As the means so the end. There is no wall of separation flanked by means and ends. While good ends have to be cherished they are not in our manage. But means are in our manage. "Indeed the Creator has given us manage (and that too extremely limited) in excess of means, none in excess of the end. Realisation of the goal is in exact proportion to that of the means. This is a proposition that admits of no exception." So, "If one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself."

He rebuked those who think that if one seeks good ends the morality of means can be left to themselves. For him, "Impure means result in impure end... One cannot; reach truth through untruthfulness. Truthful conduct alone can reach Truth".

He argued that means and ends are enmeshed into each other. "Are not Non-violence and Truth twins?" He replies, "The answer is an emphatic 'No'. Non-violence is embedded in Truth and vice-versa. Hence has it been said that they are faces of the similar coin. Either is inseparable from the other."

Inspired through the Gita, the ethical principle that he upheld was atmasakti. One does not perform his duty expecting the fruit of his action and does it for the sake of duty. It sought detachment from the fruits of action. "Through detachment I mean that you necessity not worry whether the desired result follows from your action or not, so extensive as your motive is pure, your means is correct. Really it means that things will come right in the end if you take care for the means and leave the rest to Him."
His approach to action was to be stated through him in categorical conditions "I have.... concerned myself principally with the conservation of the means and their progressive use. I know if we can take care of them, attainment of the goal is assured. I feel too that our progress towards the goal will be in 'exact proportion to the purity of our means. This method may appear to be extensive, perhaps too extensive, but I am influenced that it is the shortest."

SATYA, SATYAGRAHA ANDAHIMSA

Truth or Satya, for Gandhiji, is God himself. He so changed the statement, "God is Truth", later in his life into, "Truth is God" and suggested that it was one of the fundamental discoveries of his life's experiments. It is Truth, he says, that exists; what does not exist is untruth. The life of man, for Gandhiji, is a march of his pursuit in search of Truth or God.

Just as to Gandhiji, truth is what the inner self experiences at any point of time; it 'is an answer to one's conscience; it is what responds to one's moral self. He was influenced that knowledge alone" leads a person to the truth while ignorance takes one absent from the truth.

Satyagraha means urge for Satya, or truth. Satyagraha is not merely the insistence on truth; it is, in information, holding on to truth through methods which are moral and non-violent; it is not the imposition of one's will in excess of others, but it is appealing to the reasoning of the opponent; it is not coercion but is persuasion.

Gandhiji highlights many attributes of satyagraha. It is a moral weapon and does not entertain ill-feeling towards the adversary; it is a non-violent device and calls upon its user to love his enemy; it does not weaken the opponent but strengthens him morally; it is a weapon of the brave and is constructive in its approach. For Gandhiji, a Satyagrahi is always truthful, morally imbued, non-violent and a person without any malice; he is one who is devoted to the service of all.
Truth, he firmly whispered, can be attained only through non-violence which was not negative, meaning absence of violence, but was positively defined through him as love. Resort to nonviolence is recourse to love. In its positive sense, non-violence means love for others; in its negative sense, it seeks no injury to others, both in languages as well as deeds. Gandhiji talked of non-violence of dissimilar people. There is the non-violence of the brave: one has the force but he does not use it as a principle; there is the non-violence of the weak: one does not have faith in non-violence, but he uses it for attaining his objectives; there is the nonviolence of the coward: it is not non-violence, but impotency, more harmful than violence. For Gandhiji, violence was a better option than cowardice.

Through non-violence one appeals to the truth that nestles in people and creates the latter realize it in themselves, come approximately, and join hands in the general march to truth beside with those whom they earlier measured as their adversaries. Given the enmeshing of means and ends, Gandhiji, often saw Love, Truth, God and Non-violence as interchangeable conditions. Truth or God or Self-realisation being man's ultimate goal in life, this goal can be attained only through non-violence or ahimsa.

CONCEPT OF SWARAJ

Gandhiji's concept of Swaraj was not merely confined to freeing India from the British yoke. Such freedom he desired but he said that he did not want to exchange 'king log for king stork'. Swaraj is not transfer of political power to the Indians. Nor does it mean, as he emphasized, mere political self-determination. For him, there was no Swaraj in Europe; for him the movement of Swaraj involved primarily the procedure of releasing oneself from all the bondages one is prey to both internal and external. It involves a movement of self-purification too. It is not the replacement of one kind of power through another. He felt, "the real Swaraj will come not through the acquisition of power through a few but through the acquisition of the capability through all
Swaraj, he used to say, is power of the people to determine their lot through their own efforts and form their destiny the method they like. In other languages, "Swaraj is to be attained through educating the masses to a sense of their capability to regulate and manage power".

Swaraj is usually translated in English as 'Independence'. Gandhiji, though, gave this term a much deeper meaning. “The word Swaraj is a sacred word, a Vedic word, meaning self-rule and self-restraint and not freedom from all restraint which 'independence' often means”. He saw swaraj as freedom for all plus self-manages through all. It is related to the inner strength and capability of a people which enable them to understand and manage their social world: “The outward freedom that we shall attain will only be in exact proportion to the inward freedom to which we may have grown at a given moment. And if this is the correct view of freedom, our chief power necessity is concentrated upon achieving reform from within”.

Freedom from within means manage in excess of oneself, which, in turn, means a life based on understanding one's own self. Gandhi perceived non-violence as the key to attain such freedom and self-manage. Non-violence needs to be imbued in our thought, languages and deeds. Once non-violence as love takes possession of these dimensions of the person then a sense of duty prevails in excess of those of rights. We tend to do things for others without expecting returns thereon. "In Swaraj based on Ahimsa, people require not know their rights, but it is necessary for them to know their duties. There is no duty that does not make corresponding rights and those rights alone are genuine rights, which flow from the performance of duty.

Swaraj is therefore a vital require of all. It recognizes no race, religion, or society. "Nor is it the monopoly of the lettered persons. Swaraj is to be for all, including the former but emphatically including the maimed, the blind, the starving, toiling millions. A stout hearted, honest, sane, literate man may well be the first servant of the nation." Swaraj will necessarily be inclusive of the poor and the toiling masses. So, he adds, "Let there be no mistake as what
Purna Swaraj means. It is full economic freedom for the toiling millions. It is no unholy alliance with any interest for their use. Any alliance necessity means their deliverance." In the similar vein, Gandhiji made it extremely clear that India's Swaraj did not mean the rule of majority society i.e. Hindus. 'Every society would be at par with every other under the Swaraj constitution.' Swaraj, implying government based on the consent of the people is not a gift which comes from above, but it is something that comes from within. Democracy, so, is not the exercise of the voting power, holding public office, criticizing government; nor does it mean equality, liberty or security, though significant as they all are in a democratic polity. It is when the people are able to develop their inner freedom which is people's capability to regulate and manage their desires impulses in the light of cause that freedom rises from the individual and strengthens him. His Swaraj had economic, social, political and international connotations. Economic Swaraj, as he says himself, "stands for social justice, it promotes the good of all equally including the weakest, and is indispensable for decent life." Social Swaraj centers on "an equalization of status." Political Swaraj aims at enabling people to better their condition in every department of life." In the international field, swaraj emphasized on interdependence. "There is", he says, “No limit to extending our services to our neighbors crossways state-made frontiers. God never made those frontiers."

ON PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

Gandhiji did not subscribe to the view that democracy meant the rule of the majority, He gave many definitions of democracy on many occasions. When we put them jointly, Gandhiji may say, “Democracy necessity in essence... mean the art and science of mobilizing the whole physical, economic and spiritual possessions of all the several sections of the people in service of the general good of all.” He further said, "true democracy or the Swaraj of the masses can never come through untruthful and violent means,
for the easy cause that the natural corollary to their use would be to remove all opposition through the suppression or extermination of the antagonists. That does not create the individual freedom. Individual freedom can have the fullest play only under a regime of unadulterated Ahimsa.” Democracy is a reflective and deliberative action marking the attendance of everyone. “In true democracy every man and woman is taught to think for himself or herself. How this real revolution can be brought in relation to the I do not know except that every reform, like charity necessity begin at house." Democracy extends consideration to the viewpoints of others as it expects consideration to one's own viewpoint. "The golden rule of conduct (in a democracy), he said, “is mutual toleration, seeing that we will never all think alike and that we shall always see Truth in fragments and from dissimilar angles of vision. Conscience is not the similar thing for all. Whilst, so, it is a good guide for individual conduct, imposition of that conduct upon all will be an insufferable interference with everybody-else's freedom of conscience.”

Gandhiji was wedded to adult suffrage. He felt that it is the only method to safeguard the interests of all: the minorities, the poor, the dalits, the peasants and women. He hoped that the voters provide weight to the qualifications of the candidates, not their caste, society, or party affiliation. He wanted men of character to enter legislatures for even if they commit mistakes they would never do anything against the interests of the voters. Men and women without character elected through the people would destroy the democratic system.

Referring to parliamentary democracy in 1931, Gandhi envisaged a constitution of self-governing India "which will release India from all thralldom and patronage, and provide her, if require be, the right to sin”. He laid down his vision of an self-governing India as follows: "I shall work for an India in which the poorest shall feel that it is their country in whose creation 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 societies shall live in perfect
harmony. There can be no room in such an India for the curse of untouchability, or the curse of intoxicating drinks and drugs. Women will enjoy similar rights as men. Since we shall be at peace with all the rest of the world, neither exploiting nor being exploited. We shall have the negligible army imaginable. All interests not in disagreement with the interests of the dumb millions will be scrupulously respected whether foreign or indigenous. Personally, I hate distinction flanked by foreign and indigenous. This is the India of my dreams.... I shall be satisfied with nothing less.

**GRAM SWARAJ OR DEVELOPMENT FROM BELOW**

Just as to the Gandhian thinking, democracy can function smoothly and just as to the concept of swaraj only if it is decentralised. "Centralization as a system is inconsistent with non-violent structure of society". He wanted the centre of power to move from municipalities to villages. While conceptualizing the decentralised system of rule, Gandhi advanced his theory of Oceanic Circle, which he explained in the following languages:

- "In this structure composed of innumerable villages, there will be ever-widening never ascending circles. Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained through the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes a life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral elements.

So, the outermost circumference will not wield power to crush the inner circle but will provide strength to all within and derive its own strength from it. Gandhi defended such a location even at the cost of being described a utopian. “I may be taunted with the retort that this is all Utopian and, so, not worth a single thought. If Euclid's point, though incapable of being drawn
through human agency, has an imperishable value, my picture has its own for mankind to live. Let India live for this true picture, though never realizable in its completeness”.

The structure blocks of democracy have to be villages. Gandhiji wanted each village to have an annually elected Panchayat to manage the affairs of the village. Each village following the oceanic circle theory would be autonomous yet interdependent. As Gandhiji argued, "My' thought of village swaraj is that it is a complete republic, self-governing of its neighbors for its own vital wants, and yet inter-dependent for several others in which dependence is a necessity”.

THOUGHTS ON THE ECONOMY

Gandhiji’s political philosophical thoughts came to form his thoughts on the economy centrally. His economic thought revolves approximately the following normative thoughts:

- Economic procedure necessity work towards equality and non-use
- It necessity be constant with full employment
- It necessity give low priced consumer goods which satisfy the needs of the people
- All those industries with sophisticated technology necessity be in the public sector
- No mass manufacture without equal sharing.

For Gandhiji, the two cardinal principles in his economic thought are the promotion of equality jointly with social justice. For the purpose the three principles which he prescribed are:

- Of non-possession i.e. economic policies to be pursued on require-base and not on the want- base
- Inequality arises with irrational desires to have more than what one wants
- In technologically advanced countries, people do not consume goods in the similar proportion they produce; labour-intense technologies are to be preferred to the capital-rigorous ones.

Gandhiji's economics stressed on equality, social justice, full employment and harmonious labour-capital dealings. The last two centuries produced a good number of social thinkers and scientists. Mam offered an alternative to the capitalistic system articulated through Adam Smith. He described it communism. In flanked by capitalism and communism stood socialism. Capitalism gave rise to colonialism and use of the poor against which Gandhi fought all through his life. But he opposed capitalism as much as communism. For him the individual, his freedom, dignity and satisfying life were more significant than mere economic progress, which both capitalism and communism promised to deliver, Anything that did not liberate the man was unacceptable to Gandhi.

Morality and ethics inhabit a central lay in Gandhian concept of economics. "True economics never mitigates against the highest ethical standard, presently as all true ethics to be worth its name necessity. An economics that inculcates Mammon worship and enables the strong to amass wealth at the expense of the weak is a false and dismal science. It spells death. True economics, on the other hand, stands for social justice; it promotes the good of all, equally including the weakest, and is indispensable for decent life."

In Gandhian economics, the supreme consideration is the human being. Every man has the right to live and, so, to discover work to meet his vital needs of food, clothing, shelter, education, health and self-esteem. He felt, 'these should be freely accessible to all as God's air and water are ought to be. They should not be made a vehicle of traffic for use of others. Their monopolization through any country, nation or group of persons would be unjust'.
He argued that we necessity utilize all human labour before we entertain the thought of employing mechanical power. "Real scheduling", just as to Gandhi, "consists in the best utilization of the whole man-power of India and the sharing of the raw products of India in her numerous villages instead of sending them outside and re-buying finished articles at fabulous prices."

**SARVODAYA: THE RISE OF ALL**

Gandhiji was critical of the path both capitalist and socialist economies had taken, America harbors huge poverty amidst abundant wealth. "America is the mainly industrialized country in the world, and yet it has not banished poverty and degradation. That is because it neglects the universal manpower and concentrates power in the hands of the few who amass fortunes at the expense of the several." Socialist economies, he felt, put the cart before the horse: "As I seem at Russia where the apotheosis of industrialization has been reached, the life there does not appeal to me. To use the language of the Bible, 'what shall it avail a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul? In contemporary conditions, it is beneath human dignity to lose one's individuality and become a mere cog in the machine. I want every individual to become a full blooded, fully urbanized member of the society."

While he looked at socialism positively, he felt that it was deeply enmeshed in violence “Socialism was not born with the detection of the misuse of capital through capitalists. As I have contended, socialism, even communism is explicit in the first verse of Ishopanishad. What is true is that when some reformers lost faith in the method of conversion, the technique of what is recognized as scientific socialism was born.... I accepted the theory of socialism even while I was in South Africa. My opposition to socialists and others consists in attacking violence as a means of affecting any lasting reform." Further, socialism has only one aim that is material progress. "I want freedom for full expression of my personality.... Under the other socialism, these are no individual freedom. You own nothing, not even your body."
Against capitalism and socialism, Gandhi proposed the concept of Sarvodaya, which was based on three vital principles:

- That the good of the individual is contained in the good of all;
- That the lawyer's work has the similar value as the barber's, in as much as all have the similar right of earning their livelihood from their work;
- That a life of labour, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman is the life worth livelihood.

**THEORY OF TRUSTEESHIP**

One of the mainly original contributions of Gandhiji in the region of economics is the concept of trusteeship. Gandhiji wanted complete equality in so distant as the vital needs of the people were concerned. In information he wanted the vital needs of all including animals to be met satisfactorily. But at the similar time, he wanted people to have incentives to remain economically active and produce more. This naturally would lead to some people having more than what they require. They would be rich but there would be no poor because the vital needs of all would be satisfied.

To ensure that those who were rich did not use their property for selfish purposes or to manage others, he derived the term "Trusteeship". Explaining the meaning underlying this term he said, 'Everything belonged to God and was from God. So, it was meant for His people as a whole, not for scrupulous individuals. When an individual had more than his proportionate portion he became trustee of that portion for God's people'.

He wished that the thought of trusteeship becomes a gift from India to the world. Then there would be no use and no reserve. In these distinctions he establishes the seeds of war and disagreement.

He elaborated on his thought of trusteeship extensively. He suggested "as to the successor, the trustee in office would have the right to nominate his successor subject to the legal sanction."

The thought underlying the concept of trusteeship was twofold:
• All humans are born equal and hence have a right to equal opportunity. This means that all necessity have their vital needs fully satisfied.
• All humans, though, are not endowed with equal intellectual and physical capability. Some would have greater capability to produce than others. Such person’s necessity treats themselves as trustees of the produce beyond their vital needs.
• Violence and force as manners of sharing of produce have to be rejected,

EVILS OF INDUSTRIALISM

Gandhiji was against industrialization on a mass level because it leads to several insoluble troubles such as the use of the villagers, urbanization, environmental pollution etc. He wanted manufacturing to be done in villages and through the villages. This would stay the majority of the people of India fully employed; they would be able to meet their vital needs and would remain self-reliant. Even contemporary machines could be used provided they did not lead to unemployment and become the means of use. Gandhiji measured the prevailing industrialization as a disease. ‘Let us not be deceived through catchwords and phrases', he admonished. Modern machines ‘are in no method indispensable for the permanent welfare of the human race.' He was not against machinery as such; he was against industrialism, i.e. industrial and mechanical mentality. "Industrialization is, I am afraid, going to be curse for mankind. Use of one nation through another cannot go on for all time. Industrialism depends entirely on your capability to use... India, when it begins to use other nations as it necessity if it becomes industrialized - will be a curse for other nations, a menace for the world".

It is because of this perspective that Gandhi suggested the boycott of mill made cloth and manufacture of handmade cloth in each and every household particularly in the rural regions. The efforts he made to promote Khadi were presently a beginning of the movement he wanted to launch to
promote village industries in common. One necessity see Gandhiji's concept of vital education (nai taleem) in relation to his movement for village industries.

**CONCEPT OF SWADESHI**

Swaraj as we would see later does not mean presently political freedom. Gandhi ascribed a distant deeper meaning to this term. It means self-manage to begin with. Swaraj and Swadeshi go jointly. Swadeshi is 'that spirit in us which restricts us to use the services of our immediate surroundings to the exclusion of the more remote". "Much of the deep poverty of the masses", he felt, "is due to the ruinous departure from swadeshi in the economic and industrial life." Swadeshi will not merely reinforce autonomous local elements but also build cooperative dealings with others with whom they require to associate. 'If we follow the swadeshi doctrine, it would be your duty and mine to discover our neighbors who can supply our wants and to teach them to supply them. Then every village of India will approximately be self-supporting and self-contained element exchanging only such necessary commodities with other villages as are not in the vicinity producible".

Swadeshi and self-sufficiency go jointly. The former is possible only if the latter is accepted as a matter of principle. Each individual, each family, each village and each region would be economically self-reliant, "Self-sufficiency does not mean narrowness; to be self-sufficient is not to be altogether self-contained. In no circumstances would we be able to produce all the things we require. So though our aim is complete self-sufficiency, we shall have to get from outside the village what we cannot produce in the village; we shall have to produce more of what we can in order thereby to obtain in exchange what we are unable to produce".

There are two other concepts, which go jointly with Swadeshi: they are Decentralization and Cooperation. "Interdependence is and ought to be as much the ideal of man as self-sufficiency. Man is a social being. Without inter-relation with society he cannot realize his oneness with the universe or
suppress his egotism... If man were so placed or could so lay himself as to be absolutely above all dependence on his fellow-beings, he would become so proud and arrogant, as to be veritable burden and nuisance to the world. Dependence on society teaches him the lesson to humility”. He felt that the value of self-sufficiency central to swadeshi has its limits. ‘Self Sufficiency too has a limit. Drops in separation could only fade absent; drops in cooperation made the ocean which accepted on its broad bosom greyhounds”.

The concept of Swadeshi, for Gandhi, is encompassing. In religion, it means to be faithful to our ancestral religion; in politics, it means the use of indigenous institutions; in economics, it emphasized on the use of things produced in the immediate neighborhood; one necessity prefer in the vicinity produced things even if they are of relatively inferior excellence or costly. It does not mean that one should hate foreign-made products. Gandhiji had a lay for foreign-made goods, especially medicines and life-saving drugs if they are not produced in the country.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Discuss Gandhiji's views on religion and its relationship with politics.
- Discuss Gandhiji's views on truth and non-violence.
- Explain the uses of power according to Mahatma Gandhi.
- Do the present day village panchayats meet the requirements of Gram Swaraj?
CHAPTER 26
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES
After reading this chapter, you should be able to:
- Explain Nehru’s scientific temper.
- Explain Nehru’s theory of culture.
- Explain political ideas of Nehru.

INTRODUCTION
The contribution of Jawaharlal Nehru is rightly acclaimed as the maker of contemporary India. Having faith in the Indian people, he sought to build a democratic polity, an economically modernized nation and a country whose role in the society of nations he perceived clearly. He was both a philosopher as well as a practical political leader. He did learn the western approach of livelihood and life, and to that extent he did imbibe in himself the western culture and western democratic thought with a clear tilt towards a close to-communist thinking, yet, in his latter years, he acquired, as Michael Brecher
said (Nehru: A Political Biography), "a deeper appreciation of Indian history and philosophy and enriched the foundation for subsequent thought and action." He was influenced through the growths of the 19th and 20th centuries as he establishes them in the world, but at no point of time, he closed his eyes from the ground realities of the country he belonged. Though he belonged to life of comforts and luxuries, lie remained a man of masses.

Jawaharlal Nehru (henceforth, Nehru) was born in 1889. He received education at his house in Allahabad and at Harron and Cambridge. Throughout his seven years stay in England, he imbibed the traditions of British humanist liberation, subscribing mainly to ethos propagated through Mill, Gladstone and Morley. In the middle of those whose thoughts influenced Nehru were George Bernard Shaw and Bertrand Russell. He was not a political philosopher like Hobbes, Rousseau, I or Marx, but he was certainly a man of thoughts as also of action.

Nehru was one of the indomitable fighters of Indian freedom who led the Congress movement (under Gandhiji's leadership) beside with a host of other leaders such as Vallabhai Patel, Subhash Chandra Bose, Jaya Prakash Narayan, Rajendra Prasad, to mention a few. He led the interim government in 1946 and became the first Prime Minister of the self-governing India and occupied this location till his death in 1964. Throughout the era of national movement, Nehru suffered imprisonment several a times and had presided in excess of the Congress a couple of times. He was the Congress President in 1929 when it adopted the historic resolution of ‘Purna Swaraj’.

NEHRU’S SCIENTIFIC TEMPER

Nehru was basically a scientist in his approach. In information, he was the first amongst the nationalist leaders who did recognize the importance of science and technology for the modernization of the Indian society. For a contemporary educated Indian and this is true as well, Nehru represented the desire to be contemporary and scientific in one's outlook. To Nehru, Science
constituted the extremely essence of life, without which, he would say, the contemporary world would have establish it hard to survive. Science, being the dominant factor in contemporary life, Nehru asserts, necessity guide the social system and economic structure. Emphasizing the achievements of science which contain mighty and fundamental changes in numerous meadows, what is the mainly significant of all changes is the development of the scientific outlook in man. Jointly with the scientific method, the new outlook of man alone could offer to mankind hope and expectation of a good life and an ending of the agony of the world, Nehru argued. He was aware of the difficulties inherited "in nurturing science and technology in a society where thought procedures were governed through traditional mores." He was never tired of speaking in relation to the scientific temper or fighting irrationality.

Addressing the Indian Science Congress in late thirties, Nehru stated: "Politics led me to economics and this led me inevitably to science, and the scientific approach to all our troubles and to life itself. It was science alone that could solve these troubles of hunger and poverty, of insanitation and literacy, of superstition and deadening custom and custom, of vast possessions running to waste, of a rich country inhabited through starving people."

Like his father, Nehru was an agnostic. Nehru had never been able to absorb the religious devoutness of his mother. In spite of his in excess of thirty years' get in touch with Gandhiji whose prophetic personality impressed everyone, Nehru sustained and in information, remained agnostic. He was not a dogmatic or militant atheist, but he was not a spiritualist either. He writes: "Often, often as I seem at this world, I have a sense of mysteries, of strange depths. What the mysterious is I do not know. I do not call it God because God has come to mean much that I do not consider in.." But what he could call spiritual, the term that he used often, was nothing but one that we subscribe to 'moral' or 'ethical' and Nehru was, only in that narrow sense, religious; religious in the framework of science. Science was Nehru’s mantra: "science
as the method of observation and precise knowledge and deliberate reasoning”.

Science and Religion

Nehru's scientific temper did not permit him to be dogmatic. He had, so, no attraction for any religion, for he saw nothing more than superstition and dogmatism in the religion, in any religion. Behind every religion, Nehru argued, lay a method of approach which was wholly unscientific. But he did recognize that religion does give some type of a satisfaction to the inner needs of human nature and provide a set of moral and ethical values of life in common. Religion was acceptable to Nehru only to that limited extent. He was not a religious man, nor would he ever spend time, as a routine, for morning and evening worshipping. Science was much preferable to religion, Nehru used to argue and sustained.

As Nehru had scientific temper, it was natural that he would be a secularist. V.P. Varma (Contemporary Indian Political Thought) writes, "But for a person (Jawaharlal Nehru, for instance) who is an agnostic, materialist or atheist, it is easy to adopt a secularist attitude." "Jawaharlal was", he continues, "an agnostic and was not emotionally involved in religious disputations."

Secularism is basically the separation of religion from politics. Politics is associated with public behaviors. Religion is an individual affair, giving everyone the right to practice one's own religion. Referring to the concept of secularism, Nehru says "Some people think that it means something opposed to religion. That obviously is not correct. What it means is that it is a state which honors all faiths equally and provides them equal opportunities; that as a state, it does not allow itself to be attached to one faith or religion, which then becomes the state religion." As a part of religious society anyone can share any belief. People observe their religious festivals, rituals and customs. But at the similar time, if anybody wants to come out of this belief system, he
has a right to do so. If somebody is an atheist, he is free not to have any faith. State is not going to interfere in somebody's belief system.

Nehru did not take religion in a narrow sense: religion does not teach hatred and intolerance; all religions speak the truth; that is the essence of each religion. He was of the view that the religious foundation of politics does not help social progress. At the similar time, Nehru had respect for Gandhi’s view on the role of religion in politics. He was of the opinion that Gandhi had a moral view of politics. For Gandhi, religion can teach the politicians to be moral and ethical; it has a role in a society for teaching moral values and maintaining an ethical order. To that extent, Nehru was one with Gandhi. But at the similar time he opposed the view that political parties should be organized on the foundation of religion. That created hatred flanked by dissimilar religions and hatred breeds violence and intolerance in the middle of people. He agreed to the point that religious equality can be the foundation of creating a peaceful and harmonious society. Without social peace, no social progress is possible. Changing the religion of a group can make social disharmony; though he theoretically agreed to this point of view, he did not support it politically.

Nehru was a secularist. He disapproved both the Hindu communalism as well as the Muslim communalism. His loyalty to secularism has been a great relief to the minority group in India. His belief in scientific methodology with its stress on rationalism has helped the development of his nationalist political ideology.

Scientific Humanism

It is not easy to declare Nehru irreligious; he was, in information, not opposed to religion. He did recognize that religion 'supplied a creeper craving of human beings'. He did admit that religion served a important human purpose as "the resting ground for 'faith' and 'faith in progress, in a sense, in ideals, in human goodness and human destiny". Just as to Nehru, it was from
'faith' that 'the inner imaginative urges' which distinguished man from other begins, flowed, and it was to these urges that the ends of a life bore reference. Science too, Nehru says, suggested the subsistence of the inner world of spirit, but the latter was beyond the reach of science, for his understanding of science was that it explained the 'How's of the subsistence but left the 'why's' of its alone'. Obviously then, man had to turn inwards to his intuition to see the world of spirit. Therefore, flanked by science and intuition, the role was clear: science could help refine one's senses; intuition could help understand the spiritual world. The only adequate philosophy of life, 'the integral vision of life', as Nehru described it, was, the one that had the 'temper and approach of science allied to the philosophy and with revenge for all that lies beyond'. "It was", as Nehru had said, "philosophy which explained the matter of subsistence while science explained the manner of it.". So, Nehru concludes: "Lest the approach of life grew lopsided, with either the outer self or the inner-self, and not both as combined when as the whole life, reconciling of the scientific with the spirit of philosophy was necessary for 'balancing of an individual's outer and inner life." Nehru, therefore, adds the environmental dimension to Gandhi's worldview on the one hand, and though he drifts absent from Gandhi, he aligns himself with him on the other. Though he got influenced through Marx's scientific approach, he alienated himself from him for his hostility to the spirit of man. To that extent Nehru combines the scientific aspect of the Marx and the spiritualist aspect of Gandhi, especially in his scientific humanism. Scientific humanism shapes the vital content of Nehru's view of human connection.

Nehru's scientific humanism had the combination of scientific dimension as well as the spiritual dimension. Unlike Gandhi's uni-dimensional approach, there is a in-dimensional approach in Nehru. Just as to Nehru, "the method to the spiritualization of human relationships lay through that of the circumstatices environing them". Nehru himself admitted that it was in the interest of matt to have faith in the essential spirituality of manhood, but he
emphasized that faith was merely the concluding end of the rationalist procedure. He was of the opinion that man would never have faith in the spirituality of the human being unless circumstances environing him compelled it. He asserted that the method to the spiritualization of the social progresses lay through the objectivization of the spirit of man alone and to the realisation of the social procedures lay through the objectivisation of the spirit of man alone, and to the realisation of it.

The key to man's troubles lies, as Nehru whispered, if people tried to imbibe in themselves the highest ideals, such as humanism and scientific spirit. He did not see any disagreement flanked by the two: "there is a rising synthesis flanked by humanism and scientific spirit, resulting in the type of scientific humanism". He writes: "the contemporary mind, that is to say, the better kind of the contemporary kind, is practical and pragmatic ethical and social, altruistic and humanitarian. It is governed through a practical idealism for social betterment. It has discarded to a big extent the philosophic approach of the ancients, their search for ultimate reality as well as the devotionalism and mysticism of the medieval era. Humanity is its god and social service, its religion". Endowed with a scientific and rational temper, Nehru always looked upon science as an effective means for the liberation of man.

NEHRU’S THEORY OF CULTURE

As an active politician and an author with sociological realism and political pragmatism, Nehru would hardly subscribe to the concept of culture as an organic unity permeated with some primordial systems. Nehru could never entertain such a perspective of India's structural cultural stability, but he did appreciate the vicissitudes of India's historical transformations from the days of the ancient Harappan civilization to the modern one. He was not the man who would acknowledge the revelation of God or Dharma in the Indian cultural manifestations. Nehru is a naturalist determinist who upholds physical, geological, zoological, chemical and anthropological data, but sees
no spiritual governance of the cosmic procedure. So with Nehru's historiology, there are no providential dispensation and no emotional attachment to any specific culture.

Though Nehru was a Brahmin, he did not attach any meaning to ritualism; he did admire the Gita gospel of dedicated disinterested altruism, and was never thrilled through the exalted orations of the Visvarupa of the Gita’s eleventh chapter. He was more influenced through Russell and Lenin than through the notion of Nirvana. The external materialistic attempts of the Western- Soviet worlds fascinated Nehru more than the Puranic cosmography of the oriental world. That does not mean that Nehru was all Marxist-Leninist. He did know the strength of Marxism - Leninism, but he also knew that it was weak in domains relating to humanist values, when it ignored the positive characteristics of capitalistic system, and also when it came to dwell solely on materialistic factors. Nehru was a blend of the two extremes: the external civilization advancement jointly with a quest for the realisation of values in all spheres of human behaviors. Professor Varma holds the view: "Towards the latter part of his life, Jawaharlal would have agreed that materialistic dialectics and class polarity cannot be adequate apparatus for understanding the widespread ramifications of alienation." “Values”, he continues, "in turn, lose their significance if they are solely regarded as class ideological responses."

Nehru’s concept of culture was not spiritual, but material; it was not eternal, but humanist; it was, more or less, this worldly, historical and to that extent a blend of secular and temporal, social and economic values. His culture was not dogmatic, fundamentalist, fanatical, narrow, prophetic, angological, divine and godly. It was one that was an apostle of compassion, altruism, humanism and one which was more secure to liberty, equality, fraternity, human rights, and rationalistic. Speaking in relation to the concept of culture, Professor Varma says, "Cultural comprehensiveness requires an emancipated mind liberated from the shackles of dogmatic and revealed theology, the renunciation of unjust demands for the retention of unfounded
socio-economic vestiges and the abjuration of all claims to impose one's limited conceptions of ethics, justice and social norms on others professing loyalty to divergent creeds and religious tenets.” In relation to the Nehru’s culture, Professor Varma concluded, "Jawaharlal and some other top spokesmen of Gandhian values establish it easy to reconcile democratic liberalism with social toleration and cultural pluralism because they had genuine commitment to the demands of patriotism oriented towards cosmopolitan fulfillment. Jawaharlal was sincere in his advocacy of secularism as a political and cultural value,"

**POLITICAL THOUGHTS OF NEHRU**

**On Nationalism**

Nehru was a great nationalist, though he had no theory of nationalism. He did consider in the objectivity of the fundamental unity of India nurtured on cultural foundations which was, just as to him, “not religious in the narrow sense of the term. He did accept the narrow diversities, but, at the similar time, he admired the unity running throughout the Indian history. He was, indeed, inspired through the concept of cultural pluralism and synthesis. To him, nationalism was a noble stage of self-magnification. He writes: "Nationalism is essentially a group memory of past achievements, traditions, and experiences, and nationalism is stronger today than it has ever been.... Wherever a crisis has arisen, nationalism has appeared again and dominated the scene, and people have sought comfort and strength in their old, traditions. One of the extra ordinary growths of the present age has been the rediscovery of the past and/or the nation." But nationalism has also solid - social, political and economic - foundations.

Through nature, Nehru was a nationalist and was a rebel against authoritarianism. He did not like the politics of talks, of too much submission and appeal to authorities and that was why he always establishes himself akin
to Bal Gangadhar Tilak. He says: "So distant as political matters were concerned, I was, if I may say so, an Indian nationalist desiring India's freedom, and rather, inclined, in the context of Indian politics to the more extreme wing of it, as represented then through Mr. Tilak.” But he was in the method in agreement with Tilak's, deep religious motivations.

Nehru's nationalism had its clear distinctive characteristics. It was a composite and a livelihood force and as such could create the strongest appeal to the spirit of man. Only such a kind of socialism could be a driving force for freedom, and it alone could provide a sure degree of unity, vigor and vitality to several people all in excess of the world. But Nehru did not appreciate the narrow and fanatical kind of nationalism. R.C. Pillai writes in relation to the Nehru's views on narrow nationalism: "Nationalism would be harmful, if it ever made the people conscious of their own superiority. It would be mainly undesirable if the spirit of nationalism pushed up any people towards aggressive expansionism," Nehru himself says of the Indian nationalism as liberal and tolerant: "Nationalism is essentially an anti-feeling and it feeds and fattens on hatred and anger against other national groups...”

Translated into action, Nehru's nationalism was patriotism and independence of the country. In information, Nehru's nationalism was a firm commitment to the thought of complete independence of the country. In his sharply worded rejoinder to all those who still advocated dominion states, Nehru mainly emphatically stated, method back in 1928, “If India has a message to provide to the world, it is clear that she can do so more effectively as an self-governing country than as a member of the British group.” And in 1928, he presided in excess of the Lahore Congress session and got the Puma Swaraj resolution passed.

ON Democracy

Nehru was a great champion of democracy. Throughout his life, he laid emphasis on the importance of democracy and desired passionately that self-
governing India would go beside the full democratic procedure. He had a great passion for freedom. Grown in the Western democratic traditions, Nehru absorbed, since childhood, several of the dominant concepts of contemporary democratic thought. He had read extensively philosophers such as Rousseau, Montesquieu, Mill and made reference of their works in the writings. He conferred and wrote in his An Autobiography, "My roots are still perhaps partly in the 19th century and I have been too much influenced through the humanist liberal custom to get out of it totally”.

For Nehru, democracy was an intellectual condition, it was primarily a method of life, based on the hypothesis that the freedom was integral to the being of man. He was also aware that freedom required a set of circumstances, He writes: "Self-discipline, tolerance, and a taste of peace - these were the vital circumstances for livelihood a life of freedom”. He did not subscribe to the view that unrestrained freedom made any sense. He held, M.N. Jha says, "that the state was born to create a reality of the freedom of its citizens, for, it served to counteract the evil powers of the lower instincts of the individual man in the social procedure." The state, Nehru held, was a spiritual necessity for man to clear the particularistic convictions that the religions promote.

Nehru was a true democrat, for he never doubted the soundness of democracy as a spiritual proposition. In his view, the spiritualisation of a social procedure was, "synonymous with the maximization of democracy within it, and the latter described for the objectivisation of not merely the guarantees of rights but also of rights themselves."

Nehru's concept of democracy had specific implications. In the early years of liberation thrash about, democracy, for Nehru, meant the ideal of self-rule or responsible government. Later, with the socialist thoughts altering his world-view, he came to see democracy as one that emphasized an equality of opportunity to all in the economic and political field and freedom for the individual to grow and develop to the best of his personality.
**Individual Freedom and Equality**

Nehru was a democrat through nature, temperament and conviction; he held individual freedom and equality as significant components of any democratic polity. Just as to Nehru, the creative spirit of man could grow only in an atmosphere of freedom. To promote and preserve the values of human life, both society and individual necessity enjoy freedom. The purpose of a democratic society, Nehru held, was essentially to give necessary circumstances of creative development. Why necessities India accept the democracy procedure? Nehru gave the following cause.

“It is not enough for us merely to produce the material goods of the world. We do want high standard of livelihood, but not at the cost of man’s creative spirit, his creative power, his spirit of adventure, not at the cost of all fine things of life which have ennobled man throughout the ages. Democracy is not merely a question of elections.”

Nehru whispered in the primacy and autonomy of the individual; the state had no right to suppress the individual, no development could be attained if man's creative abilities were to remain suppressed. Nehru's concept of individual freedom necessarily implied freedom of speech, and expression, of association, of several other meadows of human behaviors. The common health of a society, Nehru whispered, was mainly determined through the freedom of its people. In Nehru’s democratic thought, equality constituted an significant component of his concept of democracy. "The spirit of the age is in favor of equality...” Nehru declared. The doctrine of equality, just as to Nehru, meant equal opportunities for all; it presupposed a sure faith in and respect for humanity as a whole, and a belief that the progress and well-being of individuals, groups, or races mainly depended upon the enjoyment of equal opportunities through all, with more opportunities to the weaker sections of society.
On Parliamentary Democracy

Indian cultural traditions and historical experience under the British rule helped Nehru to support the parliamentary democracy instead of Presidential system of the USA. Parliamentary democracy is much more flexible to accommodate diverse social groups. No social group is allowed to go out of the system as the system is ready to bear the agitation organized through such a group to a point. Even Nehru did not agree to the demands of such groups but accommodated their demands in a democratic procedure. Once the system accepts the demands, the agitation fritters absent. For instance, the states' reorganization on the foundation of language is a classic case. There was agitation through Telugu people for the separation of Andhra from Madras Presidency; Nehru as the Prime Minister accepted the demand through constituting a Committee of Re-organisation of States on the foundation of language with some reservation. This is the spirit of a democratic leader. Extremely often the leader may not agree to the point theoretically but accepts it as the best policy for creating a healthy system. Once the states are reorganized on the foundation of language, the Indian democracy functions as a federation; though in the Constitution it is written as a union of states, in practice it functions as a federation. Federation helps in structure an institutional framework for nurturing the cultural identities of a linguistic group. In the Indian Constitution there is a sharing of powers flanked by the centre and the states. Legal and institutional arrangements hold the key to democracy, while linguistic federalism gives the flesh to the skeleton democracy. This political arrangement has been working for fifty years without creating troubles of unmanageable magnitude, though there are troubles for the Indian Federation from the peripheral states.

Parliamentary democracy supports cabinet form of executive that can accommodate each state and society in it. The formation of Council of Ministers helps to provide a lay to each group and state. This creates a healthy
federation through accommodating and incorporating representatives from dissimilar groups. In the Presidential system it is not possible, as the formation of the executive becomes prerogative of the President. Further, there is a chance that the President can turn into an authoritarian personality. This is not possible in the parliamentary system. The Prime Minister is one of the Council of Ministers though he is the leader of the Home and leader of the nation. He cannot but be a democrat as he listens to several viewpoints not only from the Ministers as his colleagues, but also from the Chief Ministers. Nehru was always in constant communication with the Chief Ministers; sometimes there was opposition from the Chief Ministers to his viewpoint but he listened to them. In the case of Hindu Code Bill he had a strong variation with the President of India, Rajendra Prasad. But he tried to accommodate Prasad's viewpoint in creation the Hindu Code Bill, though he characterized the bill as a conservative one. Nehru opposed the intervention through the President, as unconstitutional, on the grounds that in the Indian democracy, the President is a nominal head. As a Prime Minister, he recognized the President's location and wanted the latter to lead as a friend and guide, and not as a master of the team.

Parliamentary democracy depends on the balancing of institutions. Nehru played a decisive role in bringing a balance flanked by the legislature, executive and judiciary. He had a high regard for the legislature. He made it a point to attend every session of the Lok Sabha. He tried to listen to the opposition with a sharp attention. He saw to it that his cabinet colleagues did some homework before attending the session. He, as a team leader, provided leadership to his team for performing better in Parliament. He cooperated with his colleagues and the opposition leaders for showing to the world that India's nascent democracy functions well. The outside intelligentsia, who did revise the functioning of Indian Parliament, gave due recognition to Nehru as a Parliamentarian, who got due cooperation from the opposition and his colleagues. There were several stalwarts on the opposition front, leaders like
Lohia, Masani and Kripalani. There were political leaders outside the parliamentary system like JP Narain and Vinoba who recognized the leadership qualities of Nehru. Extremely often these non-parliamentary leaders, branded as the 'saintly politicians' of this country had a better power in politics than the political parties and Nehru was able to get necessary cooperation from these outstanding leaders as well. He directed the administration to give all cooperation for creation the Bhoodan movement a success.

Parliamentary democracy depends on the periodic election for getting a mandate of the people, wherein a political party puts forth an election manifesto and faces the election which is mannered through the neutral power, the Election Commission. The Congress, under the leadership Nehru, faced the common election to the Lok Sabha and secured the majority in the Lok Sabha and shaped the government at the centre. It is motivating to note that the Congress Party under Nehru’s leadership faced the common election successfully till he was alive. He placed an Election manifesto in 1946 common election concerning the abolition of the Zamindari System. The common public gave wide support to him, though the election was held before Independence. His leadership was recognized and got legitimacy in the middle of the people of India. In the 1952 common election, the manifesto of the Congress accepted the question of the implementation of the programmes of the first five year planned document which contained the state's role in both the rural and industrial economy. The public accepted this overwhelmingly. The Congress Party won each election on the foundation of its performance, competing with the opposition political parties like the Socialist, Swatantra and Communists, But Nehru had a high regard for these political leaders and parties. He helped some of the leaders to get elected in the through-election to the Lok Sabha and did not field any candidate against the opposition leaders. He was concerned in relation to the excellence of the debates in the parliament which was possible only with the attendance of the top leaders on the
opposition face. Moreover, participation in electoral politics strengthens the parliamentary democracy. Competitive politics is based on the participation of dissimilar political parties with a dissimilar ideology. Election becomes the festival for the parliamentary democracy. Nehru used to participate in these festivals with all seriousness. Election studies mannered through the self-governing academia illustrate that the 'Congress had got the electoral support from each part of the society, both in conditions of caste and class. Electoral politics help in the mobilization of several social groups into the system whose demands stay rising the capability of the political system.

NEHRU ON SOCIALISM

Nehru's interest in socialism can be traced to his Cambridge days when the Fabianism of George Bernard Shaw and the Webbs attracted him. He was, throughout those days, attending the lectures of John Maynard Keynes and Bertrand Russell, which influenced his thoughts. The fast changing political, social and economic thoughts taking lay throughout the world sharpened his socialistic powers. India's millions livelihood in poverty made Nehru a socialist, notwithstanding the Marxist ideology of Marx and Lenin which had its profound impact on him. Socialism, with Nehru, was not merely an economic doctrine; it is a vital creed', Nehru spoke at the 1936 Congress session, "which I hold with all my head and heart." He was influenced that there was no other method of ending the appalling mass poverty and sufferings in India except through socialism.

Nehru was of the opinion that no ideology other than socialism could fit in the democratic pattern as that of India. He was influenced that no democracy could succeed without imbibing socialist pattern. The essence of socialism, Nehru used to say, lies in "the manage through the state of the means of manufacture", and the thought inspiring socialism was the prevention of the use of the poor through the rich. The socialist method, to Nehru, was that of "the ending of poverty, the vast unemployment, the
degradation and the subjection.” He laughed off Gandhi’s claim to being a socialist and rejected the Marxian thesis of the dictatorship of proletariat. Under India’s peculiar circumstances, Nehru came to advocate the socialistic, if not socialism, pattern of society.

Nehru’s concept of socialism was not the abolition of private property, but the replacement of the present profit system through the higher ideal of cooperative service. His socialism was not the state ownership of the means of manufacture, but was their societal and cooperative ownership. Nehru brought socialism secure to democracy.

Nehru’s socialism has the distinctive feature of progressive industrialization through which alone the Indian economic troubles (poverty, backwardness, low rate of manufacture) could be solved and through which alone the contemporary India could be built. He strongly whispered that in industrialization, “the only solution for this lay in utilizing contemporary science and technology for accelerating the progress of industrialization on which depended also the prospects of agricultural development”. For industrialization, Nehru ruled out the capitalistic model and pleaded the socialist model through limiting the similar to nationalization of sure key industries and cooperative approach in agriculture while allowing the private sector to participate in industry and agriculture. That was what one may say the essence of socialistic pattern of society... the model which was made to work through:

- Economic scheduling;
- Mixed economy,
- Five years plans.

Nehru knew that the socialistic pattern of society was “not socialism in its pure form but this form would,” he was influenced, "lead the country in the direction of socialism."
Nehru's concept of socialism had a vision of future India and of modernizing India. He wrote: “For we have to build India on a scientific base to develop her industries, to change that feudal character of her land system and bring her agriculture in time with contemporary methods to develop the social services which she lacks so utterly today.” If India has to modernize itself, it necessity, Nehru said, "lessen her religiosity and turn to science. She necessity gets rid of her exclusiveness in thought and social habit which has become like a prison to her, stunting her spirit and preventing growth."

**NEHRU’S INTERNATIONAL OUTLOOK**

Nehru's important contribution lies in the development and growth of an international outlook. Indeed, he was a great nationalist and as such had a vision of self-governing India's foreign policy which was in tune with India’s national interest. Non-alignment as foreign policy was nationalistic in its objectives. India could not have devoted itself to modernization, nor would it have successfully protected her frontiers, had it aligned with any one of the two military blocs. Her economy, politics, social subsistence, internal circumstances would have been at risk if India would have chosen the path of joining any bloc of the post-war days. So, if Nehru sought to build an self-governing non-aligned foreign policy for India, it made sense and brought to the fore Nehru as a nationalist.

But Nehru was, despite his being a nationalist, a great internationalist. He was the architect of non-alignment as a movement and as a force on the international forum. At heart, Nehru was internationalist, an advocate for the United Nations, a champion of the world. He had a role for India in the society of nations. India, so, Nehru argued, "necessity is prepared to discard her narrow nationalism in favor of world cooperation and real internationalism.” He used to insist that the states should uphold a reasonable balance flanked by nationalism and internationalism. Narrow nationalism, just as to him, leads to
imperialism which he discarded out rightly, to fascism which he denounced at the first opportunity, to use of one state through another which he thought posed a threat to world peace. He would rather visualize the emergence of a world federation, and a world republic, and not an empire for use. Nehru says: "The world has become internationalized, manufacture is international, markets are international and transport is international. No nation is really self-governing, they are all interdependent."

If romantic loyalties had made Nehru a nationalist, “the rational and pragmatic thoughts," Professor Varma says, "for human welfare made him a believer in peaceful coexistence and the ideals of "one world". In an age of nuclear fission, hydrogen fusion and the prospects of neutron bombs and chemical warfare’s, Nehru could have been an apostle of world peace, a champion of disarmament, and a true believer of the ideals of the United Nations. There is only one alternative to world terrorism, and it is, as Nehru rightly says, world peace.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Explain Nehru's scientific temper and his concept of scientific humanism.
- State briefly the main tenets of Nehru's political ideas.
- State the evolution of Nehru's concept of socialism. What are the characteristics of his theory of socialism?
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Identify issues of conflict between Gandhi and Ambedkar.
- Highlight the conception of rights in Ambedkar's thought.
- Review Ambedkar's understanding of Hinduism.
- Highlight the characteristic features of untouchability, according to Ambedkar.

INTRODUCTION

Babasaheb Ambedkar is one of the foremost thinkers of contemporary India. His thought is centrally concerned with issues of freedom, human equality, democracy and socio-political emancipation. He is a unique thinker of the world who himself suffered much humiliation, poverty and social stigma, right from his childhood, yet he rose to great educational and philosophical heights. He was a revolutionary social reformer who demonstrated great faith in democracy and the moral foundation of a society. He was one of the principal critics of India's national movement led through
M.K. Gandhi. He built civic and political institutions in India and criticized ideologies and institutions that degraded and enslaved people. He undertook many major studies on the economy, social structures and institutions, law and constitutionalism, history and religion with methodological rigor and reflectivity. He was the Chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Indian Constitution and defended its key provisions with scholarly precision and sustained arguments without losing sight of the ideals it upheld while, at the similar time; holding firmly to the ground. He embraced Buddhism, recasting it to respond to contemporary and socially emancipatory urges, with hundreds of thousands of his followers and paved the method for its resurgence in Contemporary India.

LIFE SKETCH
Babasaheb Ambedkar (1891-1956) was born in the untouchable Mahar Caste in Maharashtra on 14 April, 1891. He suffered all types of social humiliations in childhood as well as in his subsequent life on explanation of the stigma of untouchability. In the class room he was not allowed to sit beside with the rest of the students. He had to drink water only in his hand- cup in school, poured through members of the upper castes from above. Learning Sanskrit language was denied to him. Inspite of all these hurdles, he successfully completed his graduation from Bombay University and went on to do his Masters and Ph.D. from Columbia University in U.S.A. He was influenced through the liberal and radical thought currents in America and Europe, more particularly with the thought that appeared following the French Revolution. Struggles against racial discrimination in America helped his resolve to fight against caste- based oppression in India. He came to be deeply concerned with untouchability and caste system that prevailed in India. At the similar time, he probed the impact that colonialism had on the economy, politics and social life of India.
His M.A. dissertation on Administration and Finance of the East India Company and his Ph.D. thesis on The Development of the Provincial Finance in British India at Columbia University and his D.Sc. dissertation on The Problem of the Rupee - its Origin and Its Solution were brilliant contributions to the analysis of colonial economy and politics and to anti-colonial economic thought.

After he completed his Ph.D. at Columbia University, he returned to serve the administration of Baroda Maharaja who had sponsored his education in America. But even after such exceptional qualifications, he had to suffer the pangs of untouchability in Baroda administration. He left his service and was for some time Professor of Political Economy at the Sydenham College of Commerce and Economics, Bombay. He made a representation before the South borough Committee that preceded the Montague-Chelmsford reforms of 1919 and pleaded for separate representation to the depressed classes, as the untouchable and low castes and societies were then recognized. He started Mooknayak, a fortnightly in Marathi in January, 1920 and played a leading role in the first All-India Conference of Depressed Classes held that year, presided in excess of through Shahu Maharaj of Kolhapur. He joined the London School of Economics to do his D.Sc, which he completed in 1922 and was invited to the Bar-at-Law from Grey's Inn in the similar year. He started his legal practice in Bombay in 1923 and played an active role in the political mobilization and organisation of the untouchables. He shaped the Bahishkrit Hitkarini Sabha (Depressed Classes Welfare Association) in 1924. In 1927, he was nominated to the Bombay Legislative Council. He led the well-known Satyagraha at Chowdar Tank in Maliad demanding rights for untouchables from general water tank, from which they were hitherto barred. He started the fortnightly journal Bahishkrit Bharat in Marathi and shaped two organisations, Samaj Samata Sangh and Samata Sainik Dal in 1927 to reinforce the demand for equality of the depressed classes. In 1928, the Depressed Classes Education Society, Bombay was founded. The fortnightly journal Samata too
was brought out in the similar year. Throughout these years, Dr. Ambedkar remained active as the professor of law. In 1928, he made his deputation before the Simon Commission, enquiring into the issue of constitutional reforms in India. He led the Satyagraha at Alarm temple, Nasi demanding temple entry to untouchables in 1930. He presided in excess of the First All India Depressed Classes Congress, held in Nagpur in 1930.

Dr. Ambedkar’s emphasis on self-help and the task of emancipation of untouchables as primarily resting on themselves, his vision of Modern India and his thoughts on rights, democracy and representation increasingly pit him against the Indian National Congress and M.K. Gandhi, its undisputed leader. This opposition was poignantly visible at the Round Table Conference in 1931 where Dr Ambedkar demanded separate electorate for the depressed classes, which, M.K.Gandhi, as the sole representative of the Congress vehemently opposed. M.K. Gandhi went on a fast unto death against the communal award of 1932 that granted separate electorate to the untouchables. Dr.Ambedkar negotiated on behalf of the Depressed classes and signed the Poona Pact, agreeing for the joint electorate with reservation for depressed classes that led to the withdrawal of the fast through M.K. Gandhi.

In 1936, Dr Ambedkar founded the Self-governing Labour Party which contested 17 seats in the elections of 1937 in the Bombay Province and won 15 of them. The World War II and the demand of the Muslim League for Pakistan introduced new and intricate issues in the national movement. Dr Ambedkar recognized a dissimilar party, the Scheduled caste federation in 1942 and was appointed as a member of the Viceroy's Council in the similar years for a era of five years.

Ambedkar was elected to the Constituent Assembly from Bengal and in the Assembly, made a plea for a united India with the Congress and the Muslim League working jointly. He was appointed as the Chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Indian Constitution and became the law minister in
the Nehru Cabinet in August 1947. In both these capacities he conceptualized, formulated and defended a free and egalitarian framework for public life in India with extensive safeguards for the disadvantaged and autonomy for religious minorities and linguistic and cultural groups in India.

Ambedkar resigned from the Nehru Cabinet in 1951 and strove to work out an alternative to the lack of social and economic democracy in India and the inability of the Constitutional democracy to effectively function in its absence. Such a search eventually led him to conversion to Buddhism and the proposal for the establishment of the Republican Party of India. He died on 6 December, 1956 mourned through millions. He left behind a intricate body of thought scattered crossways a big number of writings and speeches, an eventful public life spanning crossways civic and political life and a radical agenda for economic, social and cultural reconstruction.

**His Writings**

Dr. Ambedkar wrote many books. Unlike his contemporaries, he had done a lot of original research on his texts. Separately from writing the Indian Constitution as the Chairman of its Drafting Committee and defending it in the marathon debates of the Constituent Assembly, he wrote many books that reflect systematic thinking. Separately from his doctoral dissertations on The Problem of the Rupee (1923) and The Development of Provincial Finance in British India(1925) he wrote Annihilation of Caste(1936), Thoughts on Pakistan (1940), What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables (1945), Who were the Sudras? (1946), The Untouchables: who were They and Why they became Untouchables? (1948) States and Minorities (1947), Thoughts on linguistic States (1955) and his magnum opus The Buddha and his Dhamma (1957) are the mainly significant. Separately from them he wrote numerous articles, submitted learned memoranda, delivered lectures and commented on the issues in the journals he published.
B. R. AMBEDKAR’S THOUGHT AND THOUGHTS

Dr. Ambedkar's thought has several dimensions. There were extremely few issues that he left untouched. He formulated his opinion on several crucial questions that India was confronting throughout his times. His versatility is reflected in his social and political thought, economic thoughts, law and constitutionalism.

Ideological Orientation

Dr Ambedkar described himself as a 'progressive radical' and occasionally as a 'progressive conservative' depending upon the context of demarcation from liberals, Marxists and others as the case might be. He was an ardent votary of freedom. He saw it as a positive power and capability, enabling people to create their choices without being restrained through economic procedures and use, social institutions and religious orthodoxies and fears and prejudices. He thought that liberalism upheld a narrow conception of freedom which tolerated vast accumulation of possessions in a few hands and the deprivation and use that it bred. He thought that liberalism is insensitive in relation to the social and political institutions which, while upholding formal equality, permitted huge inequalities in the economic, social and cultural arenas. He argued that liberal systems conceal deep inequalities of minorities such as the circumstances of the Blacks in U.S.A, and Jews in Europe. He further argued that liberalism was often drawn to justify colonial use and the extensive injustices it sustained. Liberal stress on the individual ignored society bonds and the necessity of the latter to sustain a reflective and creative self. Further liberalism ignored the repression and the alienation of the self that exploitative and dominant structures bred. He establish that liberalism has an inadequate understanding of state and the events that state has to necessarily adopt to promote and foster good life. He felt that the principle of equality before law is truly a great advance as compared to the inegalitarian orders that it attempted to supplant but it is not adequate. He advanced
stronger notions such as equality of consideration, equality of respect and equality of dignity. He was sensitive to the notion of respect and the notion of society was central in his consideration.

Ambedkar recognized sure crucial regions on which he was in tune with Marxism. He argued that the task of philosophy is to change the world, as Marx suggested in his theses on Feurbach, and he saw the central message of the Buddha as demanding the similar, There is disagreement flanked by classes and class-thrash about is writ big in social dealings. He argued that a good society demands extensive public ownership of the means of manufacture and equal opportunity to everyone to develop his or her self to the fullest extent, He, though, rejected the inevitability of socialism without the intervention of human agency concretely working towards it; the economic interpretation of history which does not acknowledge the crucial role that political and ideological institutions play and the conception of the withering absent of the state, He decried the strategy of violence as a means to seize power and described for resolute mass action to bring in relation to the a good society. He underscored the transformative effect of struggles in transforming those launching the struggles and the social dealings against which they are launched. He further argued that a desirable political order can be created only through acknowledging a moral domain which he saw eminently expressed in the Buddha's teachings.

He was extremely critical of the Brahmanical ideology which, he felt, has been the dominant ideological expression in India. He argued that it reconstituted itself with all its vehemence through defeating the revolution set in motion through the Buddha. It subscribed to the principle of graded inequality in organizing social institutions and dealings; defended the principle of birth in excess of the principle of worth; undermined cause and upheld rituals and priest-craft. It reduced the shudra and the untouchable to perpetual drudgery and ignominy. It defended inequality and unequal sharing of resource and positions and sanctified such events through appeal to doctrines
such as karma-siddhanta. It upheld the principle of the superiority of mental labour in excess of manual labour. It had little sympathy towards the degraded and the marginalized. It left millions of people in their degraded condition, absent from civilization, and defended their abominable circumstances. It had little lay for freedom and for re-evaluation of choices. It prelisted society into umpteen closed groups creation them unable to secure ranks, foster a spirit of society and strive towards shared endeavors. It took absent from associated life its joys and sorrows, emasculated struggles and strivings and deplored sensuousness and festivity. He constructed Brahmanism as totally lacking in any moral values and thoughts based on such values.

Ambedkar was a bitter critic of Gandhi and Gandhism. He attacked Gandhi’s approach to the abolition of untouchability, an approach that denied its sanction in the shastras and which described upon caste Hindus to voluntarily renounce it and create reparations for the similar. Ambedkar felt that rights and humanity cannot be left of the mercy and prejudices of people who have urbanized a vested interest in undermining them. He did not demarcate the caste system and varna system, as Gandhi did, but saw both of them as upholding the similar principle of graded inequality. Even if untouchability is abolished through the Gandhian appeal to conscience, which Ambedkar did not think possible, untouchables will continue to inhabit the lowest rung of society as a layer of the shudras. He saw Gandhi not merely caving in to Hindu orthodoxy but reformulating such orthodoxy afresh, Gandhi was dispensing moral platitudes to untouchables and trying to buy them with kindness while letting others to promote their interests, without hindrance. He rejected the appellation ‘Harijan’ that Gandhi had bestowed on untouchables and poured scorn an it.

Ambedkar rejected several central notions as propounded through Gandhi such as Swaraj, non-violence, decentralization, Khadi, trusteeship and vegetarianism. He subscribed to a contemporary polity with contemporary economy. This worldly concerns were central to his agenda rather than other-
worldly search. He felt that an uncritical approach to Panchayat Raj will reinforce the dominant classes in the countryside handing in excess of additional possessions and legitimacy to them to use the social classes and groups below them.

**Cause and Rights**

Ambedkar saw the contemporary era as heralding a triumph of human cause from myths, customs and religious superstitions. The world and man, he argued, can be explained through human cause and endeavour. The supernatural powers require not be invoked for the purpose. In information the supernatural powers themselves reflect weak human capacities and an underdeveloped state of human development: He so saw the expression of human cause manifest in science and contemporary technology positively. If there are troubles with regard to them then the similar cause is capable of offering the necessary correctives. Further, he saw knowledge as eminently practical rather than speculative and esoteric. He felt that speculative knowledge. Ambedkar’s attitude to religion remained ambivalent. While he did not subscribe to a belief in a personal God or revelation, he felt that religion, as morality, gives an enduring base to societies and enables communal pursuit of good life. Such a religion elevates motives, upholds altruism and concern for others, binding people in solidarity and concern. It cares and supports and strives against use, injustice and wrong-doing.

He argued that freedom, equality and fraternity are essential circumstances for good life and a regime of discrete rights require to be constructed on them as the base. He understood rights not merely within the narrow confines of liberal individualism but as individual and group-rights. He defined both kinds of rights in the Constituent Assembly debates. Further he argued for both civil and political rights and social and economic rights. He did not see them in opposition but as reinforcing one a other. If there is a disagreement flanked by them, they have to be negotiated through civic and
political forums. He also subscribed to the rights of minorities and cultural groups to uphold their distinctive beliefs and identities while at the same time affording them proper circumstances to take their rightful lay in public affairs. He defended preferential treatment accorded to disadvantaged societies not only for reasons of equality but also on grounds of egalitarian social structures, and for the pursuit of a sane and good society.

**Religion**

Ambedkar dwelt extensively on major religions of the world, particularly Hinduism, Islam, Christianity and Buddhism. He wrote a great deal on Hinduism and Buddhism. The mainstream trajectory of religious development that he traced in early India was the Vedic society getting degenerated into Aryan society; the rise of Buddhism and the social and moral transformation that it brought in relation to the and the counterrevolution in the development of a specific ideological and political expression which he termed Brahmanism.

He establishes that the Hindu scriptures do not lend themselves to a unified and coherent understanding. They reflect strong cleavages within and crossways sects and tendencies. There are cleavages within the Vedic literature; the Upanishadic thought, often, cannot be reconciled with the Vedic thought; the Smriti literature is, quite often, in contention with the Sruti literature; gods come to be pitted against one another and Tantra is in contention with the smriti literature. The avatars of Hinduism, such as Ratna and Krishna, cannot be held up for adulation as exemplaries. He saw the Bhagavadgita as primarily putting forward a set of arguments to save Brahmanism in the wake of the rise of Buddhism and the inability of the former to defend itself through appeals to rituals and religious practices.

Ambedkar urbanized a new interpretation of Buddhism and saw it as socially occupied. It privileged the poor and the exploited and was concerned with the sufferings and joys of this world. It does not subscribe to the
subsistence of God or the eternity of soul. It upholds cause, affirms the subsistence of this world, subscribes to a moral order and is in tune with science. He saw the great values of freedom, equality and society as central to the teachings of the Buddha.

Ambedkar had both theological and sociological criticism against Christianity and Islam. Both of them subscribe to a transcendental domain which, separately from its affront to human cause, begets authoritative and paternalistic tendencies. In a sense they dwarf human cause, freedom of enquiry and equality of persons. Their pronouncements cannot be reconciled with scientific cause. Christian belief that Jesus is the son of God militates against cause. Both these religions, he felt, accommodated themselves to graded inequality and ranking to dissimilar degrees. Their precepts have often led their adherents to resort to force and violence. He saw the Buddha standing tall against the protagonists of both these religions.

**Caste**

Ambedkar’s understanding of caste and caste system underwent sure important changes overtime. Initially he recognized the features of caste as endogamy superimposed on exogamy in a shared cultural milieu. He felt that evils such as sati, child-marriage and prohibition of widow-remarriage were its inevitable outcomes. Once a caste closed its boundaries, other castes too fallowed suit. The Brahmins closing themselves socially first gave rise to castes. Ambedkar sustained to emphasize the endogenous feature of caste but roped in other characteristics such as division of labour, absence of inter-dining and the principle of birth which he had initially measured as integral to endogamy. He also establishes that caste name is significant for the sustained reproduction of caste. He argued that castes as discrete entities have to be distinguished from caste system based on the principle of graded inequality. At the pinnacle of this system are the Brahmins. We argued that ranking on the foundation of graded inequality safeguards the stability of the system and
ensures its sustained reproduction which easy inequality would not have permitted. The dissenting members are accommodated as another grade in the hierarchy of deference and contempt that deeply spot the caste system. Ambedkar thought that caste is an essential characteristic of Hinduism. A few reformers may have denounced it but for the vast majority of Hindus breaking the codes of caste is a clear violation of deeply held beliefs. The principles governing varna system and caste system are one and the similar. Both of them uphold graded inequality and subscribe to the doctrine of birth rather than worth.

Ambedkar argued for the annihilation of caste without which wielding society bonds, and upholding freedom and equality becomes well-nigh impossible. He suggested inter-caste marriages and inter-caste dining for the purpose although the latter, he measured, is too feeble an exercise to constitute enduring bonds. He further argued that shstras which defend have to be abandoned as they justify and legitimise graded organisation of society. He also felt that priesthood in Hinduism should be open to all the co-religionists on the foundation of certified competence rather than on birth. At the similar time he thought this project is well nigh impossible to be accepted out because what is to be renounced is whispered to be religiously ordained.

Untouchability

Ambedkar distinguished the institution of untouchability from that of caste although the former too is stamped through the similar principle of graded inequality as the latter. Untouchability is not merely an extreme form of caste degradation but a qualitatively dissimilar one as the system kept the untouchable outside the fold and made any social interaction with him polluting and deplorable. He argued that in spite of differences and cleavages all untouchables share general disadvantages and meted out the similar treatment through caste Hindus: they are condemned to ghettos on the
outskirts of the village, are universally despised and kept absent from human association.

He did not subscribe to the location that untouchability has its foundation in race. He saw it as a social institution defended through the ideology of Brahmanism. While he did not extensively probe the reasons for the origin of untouchability in one instance, he proposed a extremely imaginative thesis that untouchables were broken men livelihood on the outskirts of village societies who, due to their refusal to provide up Buddhism and beef-eating, came to be condemned as untouchables.

Given the deep-seated beliefs and practices of untouchability prevailing in India, Ambedkar thought that no easy solution can be establish for the malaise. Removal of untouchability required the transformation of the whole society wherein respect and rights towards the other person becomes a method of life rather than a mere constitutional mechanism. Given the entrenched interests and prejudices revolving approximately the institution of untouchability, it was something too much to expect from entrenched groups. So he felt that the primary burden of emancipating themselves fell on the untouchables themselves. Such-self-help required not only struggles but also education and organisation, Further a constitutional democracy with preferences at several stages can help enormously in such an endeavour.

**Constitutional Democracy**

The major region of Ambedkar’s work was on constitutional democracy. He was adept in dissimilar constitutions of the world particularly those that provided an expansive notion of democracy. Rule of law as a bond uniting people and just as equal participation of people in communal affairs was quite central to his imagination. He was deeply sensitive to the interface flanked by law on one hand and customs and popular beliefs on the other. He though felt that customs may defend parochial interests and popular beliefs might be deeply caught in prejudices and may not uphold fairness. They may
not be in tune with the demands of time, morality and cause. But if law upholds freedom and democracy then it could be placed at the service of general good. Given the extensive-drawn prejudices and denial of justice in public civilization he thought that the role of the state based on law and democratic mandate is crucial. He envisaged a democracy informed through law and a law characterized through sensitivity to democracy. Law upheld cause and morality but without the authoritative injunctions of law, the former had no teeth.

Such a stress on democracy and law made Ambedkar to strongly stress the autonomy of the state. State needs to transcend the parochial interests galore in society which often tend to reduce the state as an instrument of their purpose. He argued that ascriptive majorities which are permanent, and not amenable for political dissolution and reconstitution, too can be measured as parochial interests. They can undermine rights but at the similar time pretend that they are upholding constitutional democracy.

**SOCIAL JUSTICE AND SUPPORTIVE POLITY**

Ambedkar was the first major theoretician in India who argued that consideration for the disadvantaged should be the constitutive foundation of a state if the state is committed to the upholding of rights. He urbanized a intricate set of criteria to determine disadvantage. Untouchability was only one of the great social disadvantages, although it was one of the mainly degrading and despicable one. He concentrated on socially engendered disadvantages not because lie was unaware of natural and hereditary disadvantages but he felt that mainly disadvantages are upheld through dominant social dealings which effort to convert them as natural disadvantages foreclosing attention to them and absolving superior society from any responsibility towards them. He left behind a system of safeguards for the disadvantaged in common and the untouchables in scrupulous. He thought that a set of positive events are a
better guarantee than merely the moral conscience of society although the latter is a prerequisite to sustain such events in the longer run.

With regard to a scheme of safeguards he advanced three kinds of events although all these three kinds of events were not seen through him as appropriate to all the disadvantaged groups and equally so. Their appropriateness is something to be worked out in response to the concrete circumstances of the concerned group. He demanded an autonomous political representation to the disadvantaged groups not merely to ensure their political attendance but to ensure that the concerned groups undertake their pursuits of development, preservation or reproduction, as the case may be, through themselves. He envisaged definitive constitutional events for the purpose rather than merely rely on public conscience. He argued that such representation will enable these groups to take into explanation the superior and the general issues into explanation and pitch their specific demands accordingly. He sought reservation for the disadvantaged groups in public employment to the extent they fulfill the requirement for such employment.' He felt that they would be inevitably marginalized if such support was not legally extended to them. He sought extensive supportive policy events towards these groups so as to extend to them the benefits of several developmental and welfare events that a state undertakes.

Ambedkar saw preferential events as resting on an inclusive conception of rights rather than merely the goodwill or benevolence of the majority. In information goodwill itself needs to be cultivated with an awareness of such rights. In the absence of such farming, goodwill and benevolence often collapse into narrow pursuit of interests masquerading themselves in the language of altruism.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- What were Ambedkar’s significant differences with Marx?
- Discuss the significance of reason in Ambedkar's thought.
• Why does Ambedkar regard Buddhism as appropriate to the modern world?
• Why does Ambedkar think that caste system is impermeable to demands of Equality?
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Explain Tagore’s life, work and thoughts.
- Explain Tagore's critique of nationalism.

INTRODUCTION

Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941) was an outstanding literary figure of India who exerted considerable power on human thinking in the modern world. This power extended to the political arena as well through his lucid elucidation of significant concepts like nationalism, freedom, human rationality and his several differences with Mahatma Gandhi’s (1869-1948) philosophy and strategies.

While Gandhi was a political and social activist and Tagore was a poet, there was extraordinary consistency in the enunciation of their major political themes, which they urbanized and refined reflecting on major events of their time. Furthermore, in Tagore there was a quest of a poet for human perfection and completeness and not merely a pragmatic analysis of a scrupulous
problem or a situation. His expression was an eloquent appeal of his faith in the human spirit and the optimism through which the whole humankind could think of realizing freedom, breaking all artificial barriers, which had been built in excess of the years. These barriers built on prejudices and hatred were the stumbling blocks in the method of achieving the ultimate aim of a beautiful and harmonious world for all paving the method for human perfection with flowering of human creativity and with triumph of human dignity. The contemporary Indian political custom of assimilating the Western thoughts with the Eastern ones, which began with Rammohan Roy, reached its culmination in Tagore.

THEORY OF FREEDOM AND SELF-REALISATION

A specific Indian thought of freedom that started to evolve with Rammohan, was articulated subsequently through Swami Vivekananda (1863-1902), Aurobindo Ghosh (1872-1950), Gandhi’ and Tagore. Rammohan wanted to synthesize Indian and Western thoughts with an unflinching commitment to his own custom. Vivekananda like Rammohan was rooted in the Indian custom. Aurobindo, Gandhi and Tagore reiterated his emphasis on harmony without losing sight of one's identity and civilization.

For Tagore, freedom was not merely political emancipation but the mingling of the individual with the universe depicted in his song- my freedom is in this air, in the sky and in this light of universe. The goal of freedom lay in creation one perfect. He significantly remarked that several nations and people were powerful but not free because realisation of freedom was something extremely dissimilar from merely by coercive power. It was the condition and attitude of life in which one might wish to develop his best. The human being as a part of this great universe could enjoy real freedom only when he could harmonise his dealings with the world. It is a bond of unity where power leads to disunity.
Tagore’s notion of freedom was influenced through Expressionism (191 0-24) and political theorists of the early Twentieth century like Ernest Barker, Mary Follet and Harold Laski who vigorously pleaded for a plural society as a vital precondition for the successful functioning of democracy. He shared with Eliot the thought of the contemporary society as mechanical and hollow thwarting the creative human spirit and energies. He desired a freedom that would enable a human being to realize his thoughts and aspirations as it establish expression in dissimilar kinds of creative art with the help of cause and scientific outlook and through allowing the potentialities of industrialization towards human liberation.

Tagore guided through the Upanishadic doctrine of Satyam, Sivam and Advaitam (truth, of goodness and unity) was utterly dissatisfied with the philosophy of glorification and expansionism pursued through powerful nations for that thwarted human creativity. This was apparent in his two symbolic works Raktakorabi and Muktadhara. Though, like Russell, he sustained to retain his faith in the human being as apparent from his Russian Chithi and Africa with its clear preference for socialism, democracy, freedom and social justice that transcended national boundaries and races.

For Tagore, freedom of the individual was the foundation or the growth of human civilization and progress. It was the inner urge of a person to be in harmony with the great universe. Freedom was everything creative and spontaneous in human mind and spirit. It was the capability to make a better order. Tagore was against unquestioned conventionality which he described as "the state of slavery which is therefore brought on is the worst form of cancer to which humanity is subject". As a believer in individual action he rejected the claim of finality of any action and insisted that there were several paths to individual salvation and moral progress. He conceived of history as the gradual unfolding and realisation of absolute truth and through it the individual revelation and fulfillment and in the end the emergence of the truly free and content human being. He remarked to Einstein that his religion was
the religion of man. His was quest for the eternal and it is due to such generous and humane thoughts that civilization assumes meaning.

Tagore, like the early Indian liberals measured the real problem of India as social and not political. A narrow vision of political liberty would grossly be inadequate in establishing a good society for that would deny individual's moral and spiritual freedom. He castigated even the free self-governing countries being a reflection of this narrow view. Mere political freedom could not create one free, as cleavages and weaknesses of society would pose a danger to politics. Without creating confidence in the average person, he would always feel inferior and “the tyranny of injustice” would perpetuate. It was in this emphasis of comprehending the essential foundation of realizing freedom through broadening the base through inculcating a sense of identity and pride in every single individual in the world that Tagore's conception departed from other popular political theories of freedom which focuses more on the abstract individual.

**EMPHASIS ON HUMAN CAUSE**

In Sabhyatar Sankat or Crisis in Civilization (1941) he mentioned his admiration of the humanistic custom of English literature, which shaped the foundation of his faith in contemporary civilization. He admitted that India's link with the outside world was recognized with the arrival of the British and cited Burke, Macaulay, Shakespeare and Byron as those who inspired and generated a confidence in the triumph of the human being. Indians aspired for independence but whispered in English generosity and the British character, which reflected their philosophy of universal fellowship. Like other modern Indian thinkers, Tagore also whispered that India benefited from her get in touch with the West in common and Britain in scrupulous. He measured the British victory in excess of India as the victory of modernity. The right to freedom in a contemporary world is a vital human right.
Tagore not only mentioned how as a young person he was immensely influenced through John Bright but also the pain he felt at the denial to Indians the industrial power that made Great Britain a world power. He also pointed out to the lack of modernity and absence of scientific temper in India, a void filled through coming into get in touch with the West thereby creation the nineteenth century an age of co-operation with Europe. Though Europe in the twentieth century failed through its own criterion for it was unable to transmit its vital civilization traits to others. In this context he provided an motivating contrast flanked by the nature and purpose of the British rule with that of the Soviet rule, the two powers that administered a number of divergent races. Britain through its rule had made the subject races docile whereas the Soviets were trying to create them strong. India experienced the strength of the West but not its liberating power. The British official policy was in sharp contrast to outstanding individuals like C.F, Andrews that Britain produced, which was an unparalleled feat, and one that reinforced his faith in humanity and in the ultimate triumph of human cause and freedom.

CRITIQUE OF NATIONALISM

Tagore’s perception of the dual role, one positive, “the spirit of the West” and the other negative, "the nation of the West" was the starting point of his analysis of nationalism as it urbanized in the West. He paid glowing tributes to the achievements of the West in the field of literature and art which he described as "titanic in its uniting power..., sweeping the height and the depth of the universe" and also mentioned the attendance of outstanding individuals fighting for the cause of humanity. Though, behind this beneficence also lay the malefic aspect, “by all her power of greatness for ends, which are against the infinite and eternal in Man”. He attributed this contradiction to the malady of the nation-state. The nation, which represented the organized self-interest of a whole people, was also the "least human and least spiritual” and the major evil in the modern world. It built a "civilization
of power” which made it exclusive, vain and proud. One form of its manifestation was the colonization of people and subjecting them to use and suffering. In this context Tagore cited the instance of Japan—which had secured the benefits of Western civilization to the maximum possible extent without getting dominated through the West. He measured the nation to be nothing else than an “organisation of politics and commerce”. Its emphasis on success made it a machine that stifled harmony in social life and eclipsing the end of good life, namely the individual, He mentioned the anarchists who opposed any form of imposition of power in excess of the individual, He rejected the philosophy of a balance of terror on the premise that man's world was a moral one. He denounced communal sectarianism and nationalism and criticized abstract cosmopolitanism. Berlin wrote:

- “Tagore stood fast on the narrow causeway, and did not betray his vision of the hard truth. We condemned romantic over attachment to the past, what he described the tying of India to the past "like a sacrificial goat tethered to a post", and lie accused men who displayed it - they seemed to him reactionary- of not knowing what true political freedom was, pointing out that it is from English thinkers and English books that the extremely notion of political liberty was derived. But against cosmopolitanism he maintained that the English stood on their own feet, and so necessity Indians, In 1917 he once more denounced the danger of "leaving everything to the unalterable will of the Master," be he Brahmin or Englishman”.

Tagore saw extremely clearly two clear-cut alternatives to the present scenario: one to continue to fight amongst one another and second, to locate the "true foundation of reconciliation and mutual help". This strong denunciation of nationalism was surely hastened through the First World War. In what is a Nation? he analyzed Renan’s (1823-1892) views and categorically declared imperialism as the logical culmination of a nation and that race,
language, commercial interests, religious unity and geographical site did not constitute the human essence. In the early years of the twentieth century he noted the dangers of narrow religious beliefs and aggressive nationalism at the expense of liberalism and offered universalism as an effective substitute, reflected in several of his later writings including the Gitanjali.

Tagore wrote of the European dominance of Asia and Africa while dissecting the causes of the First World War. The root cause of the War was the German scramble for colonies and division of the world into the ruler and the ruled. He aptly remarked that when such philosophy was propounded outside Europe, the Europeans did not understand its bitterness but when they were at the getting end they felt the pinch. Germany’s action at that time was not a unique one but a part of the history of European civilization. He also prophesied correctly that the First World War would not be the last one and that another war was inevitable.

The immediate reception of Tagore’s criticisms of nationalism was a mixed one. The American Press was hostile. The Detroit Journal warned the people against “such sickly saccharine mental poison with which Tagore would corrupt the minds of the youth of our great United States”. Within India some of his contemporaries took exception to his remarks. For instance, some members of the Ghadar Party mistook his criticisms “as betrayal of Indian nationalist aspirations”. They thought that Tagore, who was knighted through the British a year ago, was a British agent and was sent to the United States to discredit India. In Japan, initially he received great ovation as poet-seer from the land of the Buddha. But when in his lectures he warned them against imitating the lust for power of the Western civilization as well as its worship of the nation state he was virulently criticized. When he cautioned Japan to follow only the humane values of the West his popularity declined. Though, a small number of Japanese intelligentsia became aware of the significance of Tagore’s plank. After the war, it came to be recognized that typed copies of
Tagore’s Nationalism were distributed amongst soldiers on the Western front. There were speculations that this was the work of the European pacifists.

A British soldier Max Plomann admitted after the war that he left the army forever in 1917 after reading Tagore’s work. Rolland in a letter dated August 26th 1919 expressed views similar to that of Tagore’s. Tagore characterized the contemporary age as European because of Europe's leadership in innovation, science and technology and emphasis on cause. But he was equally conscious of its weaknesses namely arrogance of power, exploitative and dominating nature and desire for supremacy. Though the time and context of Tagore formulations has drastically changed, his concerns, namely non-acceptance of Euro-centricism and its inability to transmit vital traits of a universal civilization remain valid even today.

**DIFFERENCES WITH GANDHI**

The essence of Gandhi’s whole political philosophy is in the Hind Swaraj (1908) and Tagore’s in Swadeshi Samaj (1904). Both of them had a great deal of respect and reverence for one another, though this mutual respect did not prohibit them from expressing vital disagreements in relation to the their respective perceptions of modern reality and the desired nature of the movements in the given Indian situation. A major controversy erupted flanked by them following Gandhi’s return to India from South Africa and his meteoric rise in Indian politics culminating in the non co-operation movement and Tagore’s articulation of a philosophy of universalism and his criticism of the cult of nationalism throughout the First World War.

Tagore-regarded India's vital problem to be social and not political, though like Gandhi, he was conscious of the acute differences and conflicts in the Indian society. As such society and not politics was his primary region of focus. He could perceive that the triumph of science had united the whole country into one, which made possible for seeking a unity that was not political. This perception led him to conclude that India could offer a solution
in this regard for she "never had a real sense of nationalism". Concerning the nationalist upsurge he was influenced that it would popularize the thrash about for independence but would be unproductive in the overall context of its own development for the quest of freedom would imperil its realisation.

Tagore urbanized this argument after a careful scrutiny of the Gandhian leadership and strategy. He derived the vital framework of this evaluation from his earlier experiences throughout the days of agitation against Bengal partition of 1905. In that movement, initially Tagore took an, active part popularizing Raksha Bandhan and nationalistic songs. It was immediately throughout the era after the publication of Swadeshi Samaj that he passionately pleaded for the revitalization of the decaying villages and creation of new awareness amongst the ordinary people. Though initially he was in the forefront of the movement, he became disillusioned since he could extremely clearly see that there was no concern in relation to the require for mass awareness and that the municipality-based middle class were keen on protecting its own selfish interests. After withdrawing from the movement he made serious attempts to rebuild the village life within the Zamindari system, the then prevailing system. This background is significant for comprehending his vital disagreements with Gandhi.

Tagore’s first written proof in relation to the Gandhi’s preferences and policies were in a letter written on 12th April 1919 from Shantiniketan advising Gandhi to be caution's in relation to the programme of non co-operation for in no method did it symbolize India’s moral superiority. He took note of the significant changes that came with the rise of Gandhi in Indian politics. He thought extremely highly of Gandhi’s leadership and could also see that the proposed non cooperation movement would engulf the whole country and would be much better than the anti-partition movement of Bengal. He could also grasp the significant variation flanked by the present stage and the earlier ones. Earlier the political leaders did not seem beyond the English educated people, whereas in contrast, Gandhi appeared as the
spokesperson of millions of poor illiterate Indians. He spoke their language and wore their dress. Though his precepts were practical and not bookish they lacked logic and scientific reasoning. They did not contain a philosophy for awakening the nation. Instead of following the path of truth Gandhi attempted a shortcut through taking the easy path.

Subsequently he was perturbed through the information that everyone talked in the similar voice and made the similar gestures and characterized this development as symbolizing the worst manifestations of nationalism for it indicated a slavish mentality and had nothing to do with the alien rule. What he resented mainly was the information that the Gandhian directives, which incorporated manual spinning of yarn and burning of foreign cloth, were medieval in nature. None of these stipulations were dissected critically and were accepted as dogmas. The Gandhian directives were followed mechanically and not rationally. Moreover the emphasis on simplicity would retard economic advancement for the narrow form of swadeshi would only result in restrictive provincial attitude, isolationism and provoke unnecessary hostility in the rest of the world. Gandhi’s plans would lead to India’s separation preventing western knowledge and advancements from reaching India.

Disagreeing with Gandhi, Tagore pointed out that it was not possible to estimate the exact magnitude of idle time in the middle of the middle class and that peasants who constituted eighty-percent of the Indian population without a meaningful job for six months in a year. He wondered whether it was desirable to popularize the use of the spinning wheel. Instead he preferred constructive programmes like co-operative agriculture for that would eliminate the malaise of small unproductive holdings and fight poverty. He felt that popularizing a scientific concept like co-operative agriculture would be more significant than any political action. He thought it was wrong of Gandhi to instruct Indian women to stop reading English and also opposed Gandhi’s call for boycott of government schools. Though critical of the existing system he
felt that in the absence of a better alternative it would only result in perpetuating ignorance, superstitions and backwardness. In 1928 Tagore criticized Gandhi's defense of varnashrama through arguing that the system was inefficient as the job follows birth and not individual capability. Hereditary job was mechanical, repetitive, obstructed innovation and retarded human freedom, He lamented that a true kshatriya was conspicuous through its absence in India. Likewise he dismissed Gandhi’s blame on untouchability as the cause of the Bihar earthquake on 5th February 1934, as unscientific, unreasonable and that it failed to explain the information as to why the poor and the lower castes suffered more than the privileged and upper castes. On 20th May 1939 in a letter to the Congress he warned against the worship of power within the Congress when some of Gandhi’s followers compared Gandhi to Mussolini and Hitler therefore insulting Gandhi before the whole world, As a desired alternative, Tagore pleaded for "universal humanity and gave a call for recognizing the vast dimensions of India in its world context" because “henceforth any nation which seeks separation for itself necessity come into disagreement with the time-spirit and discover no peace. From now onwards the thinking of every nation will have to be international. It is the striving of the new age to develop in the mind this faculty of universality".

In response to these charges Gandhi replied that "Indian nationalism is not exclusive, nor aggressive, nor destructive. It is health-giving, religious and so humanitarian". He defended the use of the spinning wheel for that was the only method to ‘realize the essential and livelihood one-ness of interest in the middle of India's myriads". Its purpose was to symbolize "sacrifice for the whole nation". To the charges of narrow provincialism and dangers of his type of nationalism he pointed out: "I hope I am as great a believer in free air as the great poet. I do not want my home to be walled in on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the cultures of all the lands to be blown in relation to the my home as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet through any". Furthermore, Gandhi did not regard his patriotism to be
exclusive; "it is calculated not only to hurt any other nation but to benefit all in the true sense of the word. India's freedom as conceived through me can never be a menace to the world". Tagore too shared the similar attitude toward cultural diversity but was more careful than Gandhi for his perception of the possible decay and degeneration as lie saw in the later growths at the time of the partition of Bengal in 1905.

Rolland characterized Tagore’s revolt against Gandhi as “the revolt of the free soul”. C.F. Andrews expressed similar views in relation to the Tagore. "Nehru wrote in 1961 "Tagore's article The Call of Truth and Gandhi’s reply in his weekly Young India which he described 'The Great Sentinel’ made wonderful reading. They symbolize two characteristics of the truth, neither of which could be ignored". Tagore’s role was that of a critical but sympathetic observer of the nationalist upsurge in India, which he wanted to be based both on cause and a concern for the masses, He criticized Gandhi whenever he felt that the Mahatma was deviating from these planks. He not only criticized but also provided an alternative perception to that of Gandhi. He acknowledges his greatness and lauded his role in fighting casteism, untouchability and communalism but was equally forthright in pointing out the limitations of the Gandhian schemes. For instance he criticized Mahatma's vital education scheme of 1937 popularly recognized as the Wardha Scheme on two grounds. First, he questioned the desirability of the precedence of material utility in excess of development of personality. Second, the scheme of a special kind of education for the rural poor would limit the choice of their vocation and that it is “unfortunate that even in our ideal scheme education should be doled out in insufficient rations to the poor”. He recognized the lack of vital education as the fundamental cause of several of India’s social and economic afflictions and desired lively and enjoyable schools.

Tagore had the courage of conviction to point out the inadequacies of Mahatma's vision. Since some of his criticisms are well founded, it is time to work out a synthesis with the experience of last five decades particularly in the
major regions of our shortcomings like rural reconstruction, education and give the requisite incentive for the rural poor to lead a decent and dignified life.

ANALYSIS OF BOLSHEVISM

Tagore visited Europe and the United States many times but he went to the USSR only once when he was seventy years old and measured the trip a pilgrimage and felt that had he not gone his life would have remained partial. The trip was for two weeks only and he could not go anywhere else except to be in Moscow. The Letters from Russia expressed his recollections of the Soviet Union. It is not a travelogue but a reflective explanation of what he saw and what he liked and disliked. Mainly of the letters were written after he left the Soviet Union. Before going there, an motivating incident took lay in Tokyo, where a young man from Korea entered into a conversation with Tagore which the latter recorded himself. The questions and answers revolved approximately the emergence of the new Soviet society. In this conversation, the Korean emphasized on the question of the animosity flanked by the rich and the poor and the inevitability of the revolution. After a few months of this conversation, Tagore went to the Soviet Union. He was not as overwhelmed as the Korean young man as he had serious doubts in relation to the new civilization being propagated through the new socialist regime. He praised the Soviet efforts of creating a new society giving rights to ordinary people and for starting communal enterprises in significant regions like education, agriculture, health and industry.

Tagore attributed the widespread human suffering as the cause for the rise of Bolshevism but subsequently denounced the regime's use of violence, cruelty and repressive brutality. Its forced harmony was based on uncertain foundations. The get in touch with flanked by the leader and the followers was elusive and imperfect and a constant source of trouble. Added to this “the habit of passive following weakens the mind and character. Its extremely
success defeats itself”. In repudiating violence there is a parallel in the outlook flanked by Tagore and Gandhi. Both distanced themselves from the Bolshevik practice mainly because of its glorification and practice of violence.

Tagore appreciated the information that the Bolsheviks had ended several of the evil practices of the Czarist regime except one significant practice, that of suppression of opinion and advised the Bolsheviks to end this evil. He was always against unquestioned allegiance, which was one of his criticisms of Gandhi’s leadership in India. He, as a believer in the importance of freedom of mind, could easily see the dangers of suppression of dissidence and alternative points of view within the Soviet system. He was against the preaching of anger and class hatred, which the Soviets taught and that any good society necessity acknowledges the subsistence of variation of opinion through freedom of expression. His primary interest was with the new educational system and he was pleased with the vigor with which it spread throughout the Russian society. The attainment was not only numerical but also in its intensity creating a sense of self-respect. Though, his insights did not miss its major defects as it turned the system into a mould whereas humanity is a livelihood mind and that “either the mould will burst into pieces or man's mind will be paralyzed to death or man will be turned into a mechanical doll”. He looked to Bolshevism as a medical treatment for a sick society and could not conceive of it being a permanent characteristic of a civilized society. He commented “indeed the day on which the doctor's regime comes to an end necessity be hailed as a red letter day for the patient”.

Tagore’s explanation of the Soviet Union was a balanced one, which highlighted both the negative and positive characteristics. In this respect lie compared more favorably with H.G. Wells rather than with Sidney and Beatrice Webb who also visited the Soviet Union in the 1930s. The Webbs, unlike Wells, ignored the negative characteristics of the Soviet society.

REVIEW QUESTIONS
• Discuss Rabindranath Tagore’s idea of freedom and self-realisation.
• Discuss and distinguish the basic disagreement between Tagore and Gandhi.
• Evaluate Tagore's views on Bolshevism.
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COMMUNIST THOUGHT:
M N ROY AND E M S NAMBOOPIRIPAD
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES
After reading this chapter, you should be able to:
- Understand evolution of communist movement in India.
- Understand M N Roy’s thoughts.
- Understand E M S Namboodiripad’s Communist Theoretician

INTRODUCTION
Communist thought in India has its origins in the writings of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and their followers. The Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917 had a tremendous impact on the whole world. The social democratic parties, reflecting the thoughts of Marx and Engels, had already been recognized in the major countries in Europe. The Bolshevik revolution in
Russia created the erstwhile Soviet Union and the communist parties came to be recognized in several parts of the world, especially in Asia, Africa and the Latin American countries for strengthening the on-going liberation struggles and providing a boost to the spread of communist thought.

The Indian Communist Party was recognized in 1924 and worked in secure association with communist movements guided and inspired through the Communist International also described the Comintern. M N Roy, with his feature Marxian views, influenced the world communist movement, though he was disillusioned through communism in later life, The Indian Communist Leader and Theoretician EMS Namboodiripad kept holding the red flag till the end of his life. Communist thought in India is an motivating explanation of the development of the Marxian thought and philosophy as it grew in the Indian circumstances.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA

The communist movement in India drew on the vital tenets of Marxism through accepting the Marxist analysis of dialectical materialism and the materialist interpretation of history. As such the socio-economic cultural development era has been interpreted through the Indian Communists in conditions of the sociology of class thrash about. Like all the Marxists, the Indian communists jointly with the other communists, consider in the destruction of capitalism and the eventual establishment of a socialist/communist society. The Indian Communists regard imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism, presently the method Lenin did. In India, the communists consider and in information, propagate that the working class in alliance with the other toiling masses is alone capable of bringing in relation to the socialist revolution. They also consider in proletarian internationalism.

The communist movement in India, therefore, has its intellectual arid ideological roots in the philosophy of Marxism. The Indian Marxists not only accept Marxism, but also interpret the Indian socio-political growths in the
Marxian approach; at times, the interpretation appears imposed while at others, it becomes a victim of oversimplification. They accept the following Marxist formulations as gospels beyond any doubt:

The state and society are separate entities: the kind of society dictates the kind of state. Accordingly, the state is not self-governing of society; its connection with society is that of a superstructure and a base.

- The state is an instrument of the society: those who manage the society also manage the state; the state is the state of the dominant class.
- The state, in a class society, is also a class institution and as such seeks to set up the values of society. The capitalist state is the state of the capitalists, through them and for them.
- In a capitalist society, the working class will organize itself and will seek to overthrow the capitalist society; in the pre-capitalist society, the workers beside with the capitalists could overthrow the feudal society.
- With the abolition of the capitalist class society, there would usher the classless socialist society, which with its political organ-the dictatorship of the proletariat-would set up socialism and pave method for a classless - stateless communist society.
- In the thrash about for liberation, the socialist forces all in excess of the world would support the colonial- exploited people in their disagreement against the capitalist-imperialist society.
- At first, the thrash about flanked by the colonial people and the imperialist state first, and thereafter, the thrash about flanked by the socialist states and the capitalist states would end in the victory of socialism.

The Indian communist writers/scholars, has made important contributions at the stage of theoretical construction. They have tried to apply the concepts and propositions of historical materialism to the studies of Indian history and philosophy. Their analysis of the Indian situation of past and present has been instructive, though with loopholes here and exaggerations there.
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communist Party of India was founded in September, 1924 perhaps at the initiative of Satya Bhakta of Uttar Pradesh. There were only 78 members belonging to the Indian Communist Party at the time of its base. Later the membership rose to 250. Muzaffar Ahmed (The Communist Party of India and its Base Abroad) holds that the Communist Party of India was founded abroad and was affiliated with the Communist International. He states that the Communist Party was shaped towards the end of 1920 at the Tashkent Military School. David Druha thinks that the Communist Party was founded in 1921 at Tashkent. In December, 1929 a communist conference was hold at Kanpur, and was chaired through M. Singaravelu Chettiar where a resolution was adopted calling for the formation of a Communist Party of India (CPI) with the headquarters in Bombay.

Some differences appeared within the Communist Party in relation to its link with the Communist International. Although the Communist Party of India was not legally a component of the Communist International, its ties with the international revolutionary movement were nevertheless being consolidated. There were closer links with the Communist Party of Great Britain. Its delegation of George Allison and Philip Spratt came to India in 1926-27.

The communists, much before the formation of the legal Communist Party of India, had associated themselves with the liberation thrash about. The Kanpur Conspiracy Case in 1924, was decided against the communist leaders - S A Dango, Nalini Gupta, Muzaffar Ahmed and Shaukat Usmani - awarding them imprisonment. In the conspiracy case, in 1020, more than two dozens of communists leaders including S A Dange, S V Ghote, Joglekar, Nimbalkar, Mirojkar, Shaukat Usmani, Philip Spratt, Bradly, Muzaffar Ahmed were involved, and they were all sentenced to extensive conditions of imprisonment.
The Communist Party of India, through 1928-29 had set before itself the goal of creating a mass-level revolutionary organisation and an anti-imperialist alliance. The sixth world Congress of the Communist International, in September 1928, had passed a resolution to strengthen the communist parties and the trade union organisations in the colonial countries and warned such bodies against the national-reformist bourgeois organisations, including the temporary agreements with them in excess of agitations launched against imperialistic forces.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA BEFORE INDEPENDENCE

Years after its formation, the Communist Party of India sought to strengthen its location in the trade unions, organizing them, guiding them and propagating Marxism and Leninism so as to prepare them for revolutionary thrash about against the nationalist bourgeoisie and the imperialistic-capitalistic forces. In the sphere of trade union movement, the Communist Party of India (CPI) did achieve definite success through creation inroads in the workers’ bodies. So, in the 1930s, it was able to have its power in the middle of the peasants and workers. As the labour movement gained ground, the behaviors of the workers, peasants, and political parties, including the CPI became more intensified.

In the 1930’s, the CPI adopted a United Front from above through aligning itself with the nationalist movement, but it kept its separate identity in the middle of the workers and the peasants. The CPI, as it was a banned organisation, came closer to the Congress and numerous communists joined the Indian National Congress (INC) and shaped socialist group within the congress, which came to be recognized as the Congress Socialist Party (CSP). They remained in the Congress until 1939 when they were expelled on the issue of double membership.
With the axis power Germany invading the Soviet Union in 1941 throughout World War II, and with the Soviet Union joining the Allied powers, the situation of the Indian Communists became precarious. The ban on the CPI through the Britishers in India was lifted and the CPI which was until then, considering the 1939 war bourgeois war, began not only suffering the war, but also declared it as the people's war against the fascists. The CPI did not support the 1942 Quit India Movement. Professor Verma (Contemporary Indian Political Thought) has stated that when the Congress leaders (following the 1942 Quit India Resolution) were in jail and the foreign government was following a ruthless policy of repression, suppression and terrorization of all nationalist forces, the communists strengthened themselves and claimed to have 30,000 members while, in 1942, the party had only 2500 members. Throughout the War, the communists cleverly recognized their manage in excess of the All India Trade Union Congress also.

The communists were divided in excess of the question of independence of the country which was only a couple of months absent, especially after the formation of the interim government headed through Jawaharlal Nehru. They were plagued through questions such as: Was the country really free? Was the transfer of power notional or real? Should the CPI support Nehru's Congress? In the debate within the CPI, P C Joshi thought that the transfer of power and independence were real and that the Nehru Government should be supported. On the other hand, B T Ranadive and Dr. Adhikari held the view that independence was not real and that real independence could be achieved only under the leadership of the CPI and that the CPI, instead of supporting the Nehru Congress Government, should fight against it. The opposite view also whispered, in harmony with the Soviet theory that India only appeared to be self-governing within the framework of a customized imperialistic system. That is why in the second party congress held in Kolkatta (1948), the CPI accepted Stalin’s view of two camps: the capitalist and the communist, and so attacked imperialism, feudalism as well as the
bourgeois Congress. B T Ranadive replaced P C Joshi as the Common Secretary of the CPI.

**THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA AFTER INDEPENDENCE**

**Towards Parliamentary Strategy**

With relatively a more militant left, the CPI immediately after independence, adopted a United Front tactic from below: aligning itself with the workers and peasants against the Indian National Congress. Now the CPI strategy was on course of a revolution – with strikes, sabotage and violence. For Ranadive, following the Soviet Row, the working class was an instrument of revolution. He discounted the peasant uprising in the Telangana Region, much to the annoyance of the Andhra Pradesh communists, even at the cost of losing office of the Common Secretary of the CPI. Rajeshwar Rao became the Common Secretary of the CPI in 1950.

With the shift of the Nehru Government towards the former Soviet Union, the CPI was officially advised to abandon ’adventurous’ tactics and to adopt the policy of contesting Parliamentary Elections. Moderates like PC Joshi, S A Dange and Ajoy Ghosh welcomed the policy shift and the politburo of the Central Committee drew up a draft calling for the creation of a broad anti-feudal and anti-imperialistic front embracing the national bourgeoisie. The path of the parliamentary strategy was clear; Ajoy Ghosh became the Common Secretary of the CPI in 1951.

The CPI moved, from 1950 onwards to a procedure of gradual change- from a class disagreement approach to class alliance, from revolutionary strategy to parliamentary strategy. The 1957 Lok Sabha elections saw the victory of the Communist Pasty of India in Kerala and later on, forming the Government. The 5th Extraordinary Congress of the CPI held in Amritsar
(April, 1958) maintained that though it was not possible to achieve success through peaceful and democratic means, yet the parliamentary road to socialism was not altogether infeasible.

Towards Divisions From Within

The dismissal of the Kerala Communist Government in 1959 made the CPI’s dealings with the Congress strained. The Chinese invasion of India in 1962 made polarization rather apparent in the CTI beyond any repair. The right faction, headed through S A Dange recognized the Indian claims to the territories occupied through the Chinese in 1962; the left faction of the CPI regarded the right's plea as a betrayal of the international proletarian unity. A centrist group led through EMS Namiodiripad and Ajoy Ghosh blamed both the Indian and the Chinese leaders for the border disagreement. In 1962, the balancer, Ajoy Ghosh died; Dange became the Chairman of the CPI and EMS Namboodiripad, the Common Secretary; it was though a short existed unity. As the split of the International Communist movement became clear with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China taking opposing stands, the division of the CPI could no longer be delayed; the CTI came closer to the former USSR and the CPI (Marxist), to the People’s Republic of China.

The Soviet Union recognized the CPI as India's legitimate Communist Party; the CPI attributed the split to the Chinese machination. The CPI (M), though neutral on the ideology issue, came to be dubbed as hostile to the Soviet location. But even the Chinese distanced themselves from the CPI (M).

The two communist parties remained divided on sure issues. The CPI, through adopting the national democratic front strategy thought of aligning itself with the Indian National Congress, which the CPI regarded as the vehicle of "bourgeois" nationalism. The CPI (M), through adopting the people’s democratic government strategy thought of remaining absent from the Congress which it regarded as an anathema. In the coming years, the CPI
came to be associated with the congress and its laurels and failures came to be counted with those of the congress. The congress began losing ground, votes and legislative seats after 1977, exception being the brief spell in 1980; so did the CPI. In the meantime, the CPI (M) became popular both with the urban and rural poor and was successful in forming governments in Kerala and West Bengal.

Towards Co-operation of the Communist Forces

Ideologically, the two communist parties remained separately; the CPI aligning with nationalist-bourgeois forces while the CPI (M) working its own strategy of people's democratic government. On the question of Sino-Soviet differences, the CPI supported the Soviet Union and the CPI (M), while disapproving the Soviet Location, did not though support China either. On the border issue flanked by India and China, the CPI’s location is that the Chinese should vacate the Indian territories while the CPI (M) favors a mutually agreed formula on the border issue.

With the CPI on the decline, especially after the disintegration of the Soviet Union as a single state, the two communist parties are drawing secure to each other, and, now coming up with a United Front election manifesto. Infact, the two communist parties have not had much of differences on economic demands. Both condemn the monopoly-capitalistic strategy; both disapprove of the role of multi-national companies in India’s economy; both seek to strengthen socialist events; both demand social security legislation in favor of the workers and the peasants. Both, in common, are functioning, in spite of their revolutionary-Marxist foundation, primarily as socialist-oriented democratic parties within the parliamentary democratic frame work.

M N ROY: FROM MARXISM TO RADICAL HUMANISM
Manvendra Natli Roy (1887-1954), whose original name was Narendra Nath Bhattacharya had the unique distinction of having worked with Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. He began his political life as a militant nationalist, believing in the cult of the bomb and the pistol and the necessity of armed insurrection. The futility of this path made him a socialist and then a communist. He joined the Communist International, but was thrown out of it as he differed from its aim of being a movement all in excess of the world.

Roy passed through three phases in his career. In the first stage, which lasted up to 1919, he was a national revolutionary, smuggling arms for the terrorists of Bengal. In the second stage, Roy was a Marxist occupied in active communist movement first in Mexico and then in Russia, China and India. In the last and final stage, Roy appeared as a radical humanist, completing his journey from Nationalism to Communism and from Communism to Radical Humanism. He was in his student life, a revolutionary as well as an intellectual. He had a zest for new thoughts and a quest for freedom. This is how he drifted from Marxism towards Radicalism. Marxism and Radicalism constitute the features of his philosophy.

**Roy’s Marxism**

Roy's baptism as a Marxist began in Mexico in 1917 where, beside with Bosodin, he accepted Marxism as a philosophy for excellence. He accepted all the major tenets of Marxism and sought to interpret the Indian situation beside Marxist lives. This is apparent from the following:

- Roy submitted his thesis on Colonial Revolution at the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920. To him, world capitalism was drawing its main strength of contemporary European capitalism and so extensive as the latter was not deprived of this source of super profit, it would not be easy for the European working class to overthrow the capitalist order. Therefore, it be concluded that the revolutionary movement in Europe was absolutely dependent on the course of revolution in India and other Asian Countries. In order to overthrow foreign capitalism, it was advisable to create use of the co-operation of the bourgeois
nationalist elements, but only in the initial stages. The foremost task was to form a communist party to organize peasants and workers and lead them to revolution. If, from the outset, the leadership is in the hands of a communist vanguard, the revolutionary masses will be on the right road towards their goal and they will slowly achieve revolutionary experience.

- Roy gave a Marxist interpretation to Indian history. Its main characteristics were gradual decay of the rural economy, steady rise of capitalism, the conquest of India through the British bourgeois to capture new markets, to discover new meadows of use and export of capital. The 1857 uprising was the last effort of the de-throwned feudal potentates to regain their power; Indian National Congress was the organisation of intellectual bourgeois to carry out their political thrash about and to facilitate economic development. Colonial use prevented the normal economic development of India and the working class was too backward to fight for socialism.

- Roy does not identify Marxism with communism; Marxism is a philosophy while communism is a political practice. Roy whispered in socialization of the procedure of manufacture. When labour is performed collectively, its product necessity is collectively owned. Private property necessity ceases to be an economic necessity before it can be abolished. Roy rejects the dictum that dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary to achieve communism. He believes that a revolution cannot be made to order. In an industrially backward country like India, the establishment of proletariat dictatorship cannot be envisaged. In India such a thing cannot happen; nor did lie agree with the thought of 'withering, absent of the state'.

- Roy foresaw two things in establishing socialism in India ~ an agrarian revolution and structure up of contemporary industry under the manage of a really democratic state. Roy did not consider socialism an immediate issue for India. Socialism was not a matter of desire for him, It was a matter of necessity. Socialism becomes a historical necessity when majority feels a necessity for it.

**HUMANIST CRITIQUE OF MARXISM**

Just as to Roy, Marx’s theory of class thrash about has subordinated individual consciousness. He was also critical of Marx giving too much
prominence to the working class. To him, polarization of capitalist society into the exploiting and the working class never takes lay. The middle class does not disappear. It is the middle class which produces revolutionaries, Lenin recognized this information, but failed to recognize the middle class as a class. Therefore, Roy denounced the theory of class thrash about. Society could never survive without some type of a social cohesive force and as such, class thrash about cannot be the only reality, Roy measured the proletariat as the 'mainly backward stratum of the society'. He gave a lay of pride to the middle class and the individual. He also denounced the theory of dictatorship of the proletariat as this would set up totalitarianism. Revolutions cannot bring in relation to the miracles. What was needed was a judicious synthesis of rationalism and romanticism. As a radical humanist, he thought that revolution was to be brought in relation to the not through class thrash about or armed violence, but through proper education. Revolution would not bring in relation to the any sudden change. He also did not agree with Marxian economic interpretation of history as it had several flaws. For Roy, the biological urge of self-preservation preceded the economic motive of earning a livelihood. He criticized the Marxian dialectics, The development of democracy to socialism was a continuous procedure, and not a dialectical procedure.

Roy did not regard surplus value as a peculiar characteristic of capitalism. The creation of surplus value and the accumulation of capital were also necessary in a socialist society. The only variation flanked by a socialist society, unlike a capitalist society, was that the surplus value was not appropriated through a scrupulous class.

Roy made extremely serious observations in relation to the India's polity. He remarked that the Indian traditions of leadership lend themselves to authoritarianism. Leader is measured infallible. The attendance of a charismatic leadership designates the fascist tendency in the Indian politics. One may agree with Roy that India lacks a democratic custom and the subsistence of a peculiar social structure and the tendency to hero worship
creates for authoritarian custom. His warning in relation to the Fascist danger in the Indian politics has proved to be true.

Roy feels that no country’s interests are ever served or promoted through war. He welcomed the U.N. as a positive step towards world peace. He also suggested the thought of a world government because a world composed of national states can never have peace. Roy's conception of peace was based on a humanist base. This can be attained through mutual trust, and cooperation. It presupposes a unity of outlook and a society of interest in the middle of people without national and class differences. Cause and persuasion are the foundations on which lasting peace can be built.

While discussing Roy's philosophy of New Humanism, his approach to the radical democratic state in conditions of a co-operative general-wealth has to be analyzed. This problem involved the reconciliation of the concept of direct democracy with the ideal of cooperative state. Roy was optimistic in relation to the it. He said "Even in big political elements and highly intricate social organisation of the contemporary world, direct democracy will be possible in the form of a network of small cooperative general wealth". He envisaged its development through voluntary efforts. Its function would be subject to enlighten the public opinion and intelligent public actions. The thought is also based on the cooperative aspect of human nature. To achieve the democratic spirit and outlook, Roy emphasized on the education. Education for democracy consists in creation the people conscious of their rights to exist as human beings in decency and dignity. It helps them to think and to exercise their rational judgment. This would also create democratic institutions vibrant, where universal suffrage is given. He did not agree with state supervised education, as it creates ‘a high degree of conformism and subservience to an recognized order. Roy also visualizes a polity in which economic democracy and political democracy support each other. He recognizes scheduling with freedom.
Roy's Radical Humanism

In the later years of his life, Roy became an exponent of "New Humanism". He distinguished this from other humanist philosophy and termed it radical. Though Roy is influenced in his approach through the scientific materialism of Hobbes, Ethics of Spinoza and Secular politics as propounded through Locke, he reconciled all these to propound a rational thought of freedom with the concept of necessity. The central purpose of Roy's Radical Humanism is to co-ordinate the philosophy of nature with social philosophy and ethics in a monistic system. "It is for this cause that Roy claims it as humanist as well as materialist, naturalist as well as nationalist, creativity as well as determinist".

Roy’s thought revolves approximately Man. “It is the man who creates society, state and other institutions and values for his own welfare. Man has the power to change them for his greater welfare and convenience. His belief lies in "Man as the measure of everything". As a radical Humanist, his philosophical approach is individualistic. The individual should not be subordinated either to a nation or to a class. The individual should not lose his identity in the communal ego of such notions. Man's being and becoming, his emotions, will and thoughts determine his life approach. He has two vital traits, one, cause and the other, the urge for freedom. The cause in man echoes the harmony of the universe. He states that every human behaviour, in the last analysis, is rational, though it may appear as irrational. Man tries to discover out the laws of nature in order to realize his freedom. This urge for freedom leads him of a search for knowledge. He considers freedom to be of supreme value. While rationality gives dynamism to a man, the urge for freedom provides him direction. The interaction of cause and freedom leads to the expression of cooperative spirit as manifested in social connection. Therefore, Roy's radical humanism culminates into cooperative individualism. Roy's conception of human nature becomes the foundation of society and state. He
attributes their origin to the act of man for promoting his freedom and material satisfaction.

Roy presents a communal pattern of social growth. Groups of human beings settled down in scrupulous localities for the farming and the organisation of society. Each group marks out an region as its communal domain. The ownership is general because land is cultivated through the labour of the whole society. The fruits of communal labour belong to all collectively. But this does not last extensive. With the origin of private property, there arises the necessity of similar power to govern the new dealings. This provides birth to the state. Roy defines state as 'The political organisation of society'. The rise of the state is neither the result of social contract, nor was it ever super-imposed on society. The development of the state is not only historical, but also natural. It was a spontaneous procedure promoted approximately mechanically, through the general regulation of the necessity of co-operation for the security of all concerned, for the administration of public affairs. Roy is aware of the coercive character of the state. He blames it on more and more concentration of power in a few qualified officers enjoying Cull power to rule, He criticizes it and wants to reshape the state on the foundation of the principles of pluralism, decentralization and democracy. For him, the state necessity exists and discharges its limited functions beside with other equally significant and autonomous social institutions. He reduces the functions of the state to the minimum. He pleaded for decentralization where maximum possible autonomy should be granted to the local elements,

- Roy was a supporter of not only a democracy where every citizen will be informed and consulted in relation to the affairs of the state, but also of radical democracy as well. Such a democracy will neither suffer from the inadequacies of formal parliamentary democracy, nor will it allow the dangers of dictatorship of any class or elite. The vital characteristic of the radical democracy is that the people necessity has the methods and means to exercise sovereign power
effectively. Power would be so distributed that maximum power would be vested in local democracy and minimum at the apex.

• Roy also contemplated an economic reorganization of the society in which there would be no use of man through man. It would be a planned society which would maximize individual freedom. This is possible when society is recognized on the foundation of cooperation and decentralization.

• Education would be significant in Radical democracy. As a radical humanist, Roy came to consider that a revolution should be brought in relation to the not through class thrash about or armed violence, but through education.

• Roy emphasized the concept of moral man. To him politics cannot be divorced from ethics. Roy traces morality to rationality in man. Cause is the only sanction for morality. Without moral men, there can be no moral society. Moral values are those principles which a man should observe for his own welfare and for the proper working of society.

• He advocates humanist politics. This will lead to purification and rationalization of politics. Today, man is debased to the stage of an unthinking beast power politics. To him, politics can be practiced without power. "Party politics has given rise to power politics". To him any party government can, at best, be for the people, but it is never of the people and through the people. In a country like India, he laments in relation to the evils of party politics that exist, where ignorant conservative people are exploited in the elections. Therefore, he favored the abolition of the party system which will enable politics to operate without an incentive of power. In the absence of that corrupting agency, morality in political practice would be possible.

• Roy's social order rises with the support of enlightening public opinion as well as intelligent 'action of the people. Roy stands for 'Revolution through Consent'. He concedes the right of the people to resist tyranny and oppression, but he rules out the use of violent methods. Today, the contemporary slate is too powerful to be overthrown. Lastly, just as to Roy, "One cannot be a revolutionary without possessing a scientific knowledge. The world stands in require of change. Science has given confidence to a rising number of human beings, that they possess the power to remake the world, Therefore, education becomes the essence and condition of revolution and re-construction, Revolution through
consent does not operate through the politics of power, but through the politics of freedom”.

To conclude, Roy's learning is indeed impressive. He has written a six thousand page book, ‘The Philosophical consequences of contemporary science'. His book, 'Cause, Romanticism and Revolution' is a important contribution to political thought through an Indian writer. While India has embarked upon the path of parliamentary democracy, in its neighborhood, several countries were swamped through some form of totalitarianism. He was an Ethical Revisionist in the history of socialist thought. He began his academic pursuits as a Marxist, but slowly approximately totally restated all the prepositions of Marx. He gave a moral restatement of Marxism. Roy's application of the Marxist concepts arid generalizations to the structure and procedures of the Indian economy and society appear thought provoking and enlightening.

E M S NAMBOODIRIPAD: THE COMMUNIST THEORETICIAN

Ernakulam Manakkal Sankaran Namboodiripad (1909-1998 was one of the architects of United Kerala, a renowned, brave and committed socialist, historian and Marxian theoretician who took an active part in the communist movement of India. He was born in Perinthal Manna Taluk of the present Malapuram District. His early years were associated with UT Bhattathripad and several others. He became one of the office bearers of “Yogaskshema Sabha”, an organisation of progressive youth. Throughout his college days, he was associated with the Indian National Congress and the thrash about for freedom. In 1934 he joined the Congress Socialist Party and was later elected as the Kerala State Congress Secretary. Namboodiripad was widely regarded as the mainly intellectually sophisticated politician who sustained to be a major power in the politics of Kerala and South India throughout the 1970s.
The two principal C.P.M. leaders, Jyoti Basu and Namboodiripad are in the middle of the mainly highly regarded active political leaders in India. They dominated the party since the 1964 split from the CPI and their prominence has attracted a highly competent younger group of leaders. They belong to the C.P.M. party which is influenced through the former Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

E.M.S Namboodiripad belonged to the more militant wing of the Communist Party. He was deeply disturbed through the fiercely anti-Chinese foreign policy the congress had adopted after the Sino-Indian border war in 1962 and through the Congress role in overthrowing the C.P.I led government in Kerala in 1959.

EMS Namboodiripad supports the thought that the Maoist notion of a peasant based revolution was more relevant to the Indian situation than the worker based thoughts of Marx and Lenin. He remained committed to the Socialist thoughts and his compassion towards the downtrodden working class made him join the ranks of the communist, for which he had to also go in hiding for several years. India achieved its independence in 1947 and the state of Kerala was shaped in 1956. In 1957, EMS Namboodiripad led the communists to victory in the first popular election in the state. Soon he introduced the revolutionary land reforms ordinance and the education bill, which actually caused the dismissal of his government. EMS Namboodiripad has been a strong supporter of decentralization of power and possessions and the Kerala literacy movement as well.

EMS Namboodiripad was described through the Frontline magazine as a “Thinker, History Maker, the tallest communist leader India has seen, an anti - imperialist and freedom fighter, social reformer, writer, journalist, and theoretician." K R Narayanan, the then President of India described him as “a man of unusual vision, acumen and determination. A scholar, historian and journalist, he was above all an educator of the people as well as their leaders. Interestingly, for the last many decades, he analyzed the socio-political scene
from the firm-rootedness of his intellectual location and enriched Indian political thought to his extremely last days”. “It was certainly”, the CPI Common Secretary Bardhan said, “Namboodiripad’s ideology that shaped Kerala the method it is to-day. The thoughts and writings of EMS have influenced a generation of communists. We all have read EMS we have listened to EMS. We have fought against EMS. We have rallied behind EMS. We have stood for EMS and stood against him. But we could never ignore EMS”.

As a true Marxist-Leninist, EMS Namboodiripad emancipated the rural poor and the wage earner keeping in view the peculiar Indian circumstances; land reforms were a great feature of EMS' communist ideology. He got the land reforms through method of legislation and through strengthening the Kisan Movement which addressed itself to the troubles concerning small landholders and agricultural labour.

For a person of his caliber, the growth of individual capital in India in common and Kerala in scrupulous depended, as EMS Namboodiripad thought, on the growth of consciousness of the people in favor of material manufacture. EMS Namboodiripad favored industrialization via the private sector. He said ‘because the possibility of industrialization through the public sector was not extremely bright in Kerala, so we brought the private sector from outside'.

Namboodiripad was a great communist theoretician who tried to relate the Marxian principles to the Indian realities. In the procedure, lie made his own Marxist interpretation to the Indian situation. That he stood for the toiling masses, the rural laborers, arid the exploited workers is a information of history. But he, as a centrist of the Marxian ideology, favored the socio-economic changes in the peculiar Indian circumstances existing then. In agriculture, his method was cooperativisation; in industry, it was first the introduction of industrialization and thereafter, its socialization.

Namboodiripad, like a true Marxist, whispered that Marxism was not a static ideology; under dissimilar circumstances, its interpretations can be
dissimilar and for bringing in relation to the socio-economic changes, its strategy also differs in dissimilar circumstances. That was why, to take an out of the context instance, EMS Namboodiripad whispered that after the growths in the former Soviet Union following the 1989 years, there could be no restoration of Soviet Communism, and that communism would have to absorb important postulates of other ideologies.

The conflicting trends in the middle of several segments of the Communist party in India were because of competing ideological powers from native and alien social structures. Analyzing it beautifully, Namboodiripad said, “The disagreement here was flanked by an outdated decadent indigenous social system and a foreign social system that was being newly evolved. While, on the one face, one part is eager to build a new society, another part is eager to protect its own land and the ancient customs and traditions feature of it. It is only through introducing the essence of contemporary society that came to the country through the foreigners, and modernizing our society can we protect our country from attack through foreigners.”

Some of the leading members of the Communist parry were in favor of having a general front with the Congress party. G, Adhikari was of the view that in order to build a strong national democratic movement and to prevent disruption in the Communist party, it was desirable to cooperate with the left-wing forces of the Congress party. The decision concerning this was also taken up through the Vijayawada Congress of the party. The conference took a decision to develop an approach of thrash about and unity which will enable the organisation to unite the democratic forces "following the parties of democratic opposition. Namboodiripad was not in favor of this row in politics. Commenting on Namboodiripad’s attitude, Adhikari said, “His (Namboodiripad’s) bland subjective hatred for the leadership of the majority has led him to propound theories which serve as an alibi for the left-opportunist row.”
Namboodiripad rejected the approach of People's Democracy of the Leftists. He said, "The origin and development' of the inner-party differences which have led to the split of the party, should be traced not to the evil intentions, misdeeds of sure individual leaders, but to sure objective factors."

A majority of the members of the CPI (M) were extremely much critical of the Congress government under Nehru for its decision to overthrow the Namboodiripad’s government in Kerala, Just as to Lenin, "It would be a profound error to think that the revolutionary proletariat is capable of "refusing "to support the Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks against counter-revolution through method of revenge, so to speak, for the support they have given in smashing the Bolsheviks, in shooting down soldiers at the front and in disarming the workers. First this would be applying philistine conceptions of morality to the proletariat. (since, for the good of the cause, the proletariat will always support not only the vacillating petty bourgeoisie but also the big bourgeoisie); secondly - and that is the significant thing - it would be philistine effort to obscure the political substance of the situation through ‘moralizing’.

There has been no constant ideological approach in the middle of the leaders of both the Communist parties - CPI and CP(M). Concerning the merger of both these parties, Namboodiripad’s vacillating attitude created a lot of confusion. The old slogan of ‘non-capitalist path of development’ as applied to India was abandoned through the CPI in its Fourteenth Congress in Calcutta in 1989. It put emphasis on the anti-imperialist, anti-federal and anti-monopoly approach of the party towards the modern issues. One also observes separate divergent approaches through the Left leaders in the CPI(M) on the international issues. For instance, in the Thirteenth Congress of the CPI (M) in Trivandrum in 1989, Namboodiripad fully advocated the policies of the Mikhail Gorbachev administration whereas another significant leader B.T.Ranadive was extremely critical of it.
After having these references in relation to the Namboodiripad, it would be advisable to have a brief analysis of some of his thoughts and attitudes concerning Marxist-Leninist theory, Indian history, caste and politics in India, national integration and unity and the like. Namboodiripad was one of the leading theoreticians and Left leaders of the Communist movement in India. His association with the Left movement in the country in excess of four decades was a blessing for the left and democratic movement. Let us have a brief in excess of view of some of his thoughts.

**Marxist Leninist Theory**

Just as to Namboodiripad, the First World War marked the beginning of the end of capitalist power in excess of the nation-state systems in dissimilar parts of the world. With the victory of the Communism in the October Revolution in Russia the history of humanity witnessed for the First time, the victory of the working class in excess of the capitalist structures of a country. The ever-lasting spirit of the Russian revolution influenced not only the Eastern Europe but also a major part of the international system. It changed the extremely political map of the world from capitalism to socialism.

While discussing in relation to the crisis of the capitalism and Marxist-Leninist theory Namboodiripad said, "In these crises a great part not only of the existing products but also of the previously created manufacture forces is periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity - the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly discovers itself put back into a momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of survival; industry and commerce appears to be destroyed; and why? Because there is too much civilization, too much means of survival, too much industry, too much commerce. "Marx discussed in relation to the this crises in his classical work Capital. Not only both Marx and Engels discussed in relation to the recurring cyclical crises steadily leading to
its inevitable destruction but also pointed out that the active force which arises within womb of capitalism will surely destroy the capitalism itself. Marx said, "Not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has described into subsistence the men who are to wield those weapons - the contemporary working class - the proletarians."

Just as to Namboodiripad, the formation of the socialist camp comprising many nations would ultimately lead to the virtual end of the colonial systems. While analyzing the central characteristics of the world political scene he cautioned us to be aware of the weaknesses and difficulties of the countries of the socialist world. He said that the socialist world is not an island in the ocean of humanity. It coexists with the capitalist world. "While it is possible for the Socialism to exert its power on the capitalist world it in its turn faces the dangers of the penetration of the power of the capitalist world." The present day crises in the capitalist world are bound to have its impact on the Socialist world. So, one has to be careful to see that economic scheduling proceeds on the well-tested principles of balanced and proportionate development.

He emphasized that the extensive-term perspectives of the Socialist development programmes should be based on the step through step nationalization, collectivization and social manage of all the means and instruments of manufacture, including land. He cautioned both State and the Party leadership not to neglect the supreme task of fighting the evil powers of alien class ideology which appears in several manifestations, including the iron grip of religion on the minds of the people. This analysis of Namboodiripad shows now to what extent his philosophy has become relevant in the modern society

**On Caste Conflicts**

Namboodiripad said that the destruction of the 'age-old' village system and the development of the new capitalism through the British administration
resulted in two apparently contradictory characteristics in the Indian society and politics: the emergence of working class as a class and the disruption of the unity of the working class and the toiling people as evidenced in the rising conflicts flanked by 'backward' and 'forward castes'. These tensions were built into the national movement in which the leaders often highlighted the revival of the 'age-old' Indian civilization and civilization thereby emphasizing division of society into a hierarchical system of castes. He talked in relation to the two contradictory characteristics of the Indian politics: the rising unity of the working class against the Bhootlingam Statement and the Industrial Dealings Bill in 1973, and the rising conflicts flanked by the 'backward' and 'forward' societies. He advised us to have a proper understanding of the nature and depth of these two crises, and to resist oppression that acts as one of the contributing factors giving rise to tensions and conflicts in the middle of 'higher' and 'lower' castes. He referred to the non-Brahmin movements in dissimilar parts of the country. It is significant to keep in mind that the thrash about waged through the millions of people belonging to the hitherto oppressed castes and societies has become now an integral part of the struggles for secular democracy. It would so, be rational to conclude that the demand for reservations made through the 'backward' societies would be a presently demand.

**National Unity**

One of the significant aims of the freedom thrash about was to bring in relation to the unity in the middle of several castes, religious societies and linguistic groups under the banner of revolt against the British administration. The thrash about also highlighted the removal of evil systems such as untouch skill and inferior status to women. The Bhabnagar Session (1961) of the Congress emphasized on this aspect. It said, "Under the cover of the political and social behaviors the old evils of communalism, casteism, provincialism and linguism have again appeared in some events. Communalism which has in
the past done so much injury to the nation is again coming into proof and taking advantage of the democratic tools to undermine this unity to encourage reactionary tendencies. Provincialism and linguism have also adversely affected the causes for which the Congress has been fighting for in excess of decades. It is so of the utmost importance that every effort necessity be made to remove these evils or the adoption of this resolution was followed through the appointment of the National Integration Committee.

Namboodiripad said that "the revivalism of the majority gave a contemporary 'secular' garb of 'nationalism' to the essentially Hindu communalist approach. The revivalism of the minority was on the other hand taking an openly communal stand." He measured revivalism as a serious threat to the national unity.

The betrayal of the national bourgeoisie in the matter of national language and virtual abandonment of the democratic approach to the troubles of languages and linguistic states has created rising political discontent in the middle of the people. Besides, the economic development programmes have not been able to remove disparities in the middle of the people. Rising powers to the peoples representatives, complete restoration of the fundamental rights of the people, removal of anti-people events, local autonomy for the tribal regions, equal rights for all citizens irrespective of religion, caste and sex, free compulsory education upto secondary stages, people's cultural programmes, and equitable possessions sharing in the middle of all regions are some of the events highlighted through him.

Namboodiripad was extremely much critical of the abominable treatment given to women in the society. He said that the society is to be modernized, if Hindu, Muslim, Christian and other women - even in the middle of the Hindus - are to be enabled to enjoy privileges of a contemporary monogamous family having equal rights with men, the thrash about of women as women should be further accepted forward. "That women as an integral part of the toiling classes -working classes, the peasantry - should so
participate with men in all these movements is also undeniable." Emphasizing the role of the organisations of women, he said that these organisations 'too should realize that their own thrash about for equality can be led to successful conclusion only if the general organisations of the working people are strengthened and if they embrace in their ranks both men and women.'

**Strategy of Indian Revolution**

The draft political resolution prepared through the National Council of the ‘Right’ Communist party for their Congress held at Cochin in October 1971 emphasized on "a Left and democratic government at the centre with the Congress at its head. They officially described it an alliance of ‘Left democratic forces inside and outside the Congress'. Namboodiripad was extremely much critical of this approach. The CPI(M) gave a call for a thrash about against the whole camp of reaction represented through all parties of the ruling classes, including and dominated through the ruling Congress Party. He advocated for a well-coordinated political thrash about against three main enemies of the people - imperialism or foreign monopoly, feudalism or all the antiquated socio-cultural, economic and political institutions within the country, and the rapidly rising monopoly capital with the foreign collaboration.' He was emphatic in relation to the proletarian internationalism of the working classes towards the world socialist movement. He said that 'Indian revolution is an integral part of the procedure of transition from capitalism to socialism that takes lay on a world level. But this does not mean that India is ripe for this transition. India has to go through another revolution as the main pre-condition for the transition from capitalism to socialism."
Namboodiripad was of the opinion that although historians claim to be ‘impartial’, 'objective' and interested only in 'discovering the truth', their work invariably reflects the philosophy of the class they belong to. Some of the historians stand for scrupulous religious societies, local, linguistic or cultural groups or societies. Their writings often reflect their approaches to the troubles of the history and civilization of India. Often the conflicting views of dissimilar historians, on behalf of scrupulous schools of history make social tensions and instabilities. He said, "Historians other than those guided through the theory of historical materialism are handicapped through the information that they do not see the history of human society as one of man’s thrash about against nature in the course of which he enters into mutual dealings with other members of the society. Nor do they perceive that these mutual reactions become what are recognized as dealings of conflicts flanked by the exploiting and exploited classes." It is indeed necessary to seem upon the history of all human societies as the history of class thrash about. While referring to the revise of the history of India, one should begin with the quest for understanding the nature of the pre British society, its weakness, and growths of these weaknesses, existing socio-economic structures, and political regimes. The political philosophy of EMS Namboodiripad is indeed a valuable contribution to the growth of social sciences of the modern society.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Mention, in brief, the growth of communist movement in India.
- Distinguish between Socialism and Communism.
- How far was M N Roy influenced by Marxism?
- Mention the contribution of EMS Namboodiripad to the communist thought in India.
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand history of socialist movement in India.
- Explain congress socialist party’s Programmes and Policies
- Understand socialist thought of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia.
- Understand socialist thought of Jayaprakash Narayan

INTRODUCTION

The growth of socialist thought as a philosophy of social and economic reconstruction is mostly the product of the Western impact on India. One of the leading saint-philosopher of India, Ghosh’s criticism of the middle class mentality of the leaders of the Indian National Congress and his plea for the social development of the "proletariats" in his articles to the magazine “Indu Prakash in 1893, B, G. Tilak's reference to the Russian Nihilists in the Kesari in 1908, C.R.Das’s reference to the glorious role of the Russian Revolution in
the modern international system, and particularly his emphasis on the role of the trade union movements in the structural development of the social and political system of India, in his Presidential address at the Gaya Session of the Indian National Congress in 1917, and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's eloquence in relation to the New Economic Policy of 1926 and other growths in the Soviet Union in his articles and books such as Soviet Russia, Autobiography; and Glimpses of World History, are some of the examples of the impact of the Soviet thoughts and thoughts on the minds of the leading Indian thinkers and political leaders.

One of the leading figures of the freedom thrash about in India, Lala Lajpat Rai was measured through some critics as the first writer on Socialism and Bolshevism in India. The Marxist leader, M.N.Roy was extremely critical of Lala Lajpat Rai’s writings, particularly his book, The Future of India. He measured him as "a bourgeois politician with sympathy for socialism". Roy, in his book, 'India in Transition and Indian Problem" was also critical of the bourgeois attitude of the leaders of the Indian National Congress. Roy was not a blind follower of Russian communism. He measured Russian communism as a form of state capitalism. In his book, Russian Revolution, he regarded the Russian Revolution as "a fluke of history".

**HISTORY OF SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA**

The socialist movement became popular in India only after the First World War and the Russian Revolution. The unprecedented economic crisis of the twenties coupled with the capitalist and imperialist policies of the British Government created spiraling inflation and rising unemployment in the middle of the masses. Just as to John Patrick Haithcox, imperialism was measured as a form of capitalist class government planned to perpetuate the slavery of the workers. The success of the Russian Revolution under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky and the economic growth of that country inspired intellectuals and
political leaders of the developing countries of the Third World including India.

A number of radical groups and youth leagues opposing the policies of the British government were born in India. A left wing was created within the Congress Party under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose. In November 1928 an organisation described the Independence for India League was created under the leadership of S. Srinivas Iyengar. Both Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose were its joint secretaries. This left oriented pressure group within the Congress spearheaded the movement for complete political, social, and economic independence. In the Lahore Session of the Congress, in 1929, Jawaharlal Nehru, with the help of this left wing group, got a resolution for complete independence passed. After this resolution for independence was passed, the Independence for India League got slowly disintegrated.

Throughout the first two decades of the twentieth century a number of political parties based on religion, caste, and society came into subsistence in India. Just as to a leading social scientist, Gopal Krishna, "Articulate political parochialism - feature of a society where primary loyalties continue to centre approximately caste and society, social and geographic mobility was minimal and attitudes were not enlightened through an awareness of the superior national society - resulted in the early formation of communal and caste parties, seeking in their own method to participate in the procedure of political modernization."

The Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh (RSS), the precursor of the Jan Sangh, was born in 1925. The Justice Party, an anti-Brahmin movement in the Madras Presidency, came into subsistence in 1917. Both the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha were shaped in 1906.

As a result of the impact of the Russian Revolution, mainly of the left parties were shaped in the Third World countries. The Communist Party of India (CPI) was born in 1925. This left party was connected with the
Communist International of Moscow. Besides, a lot of radical splinter groups also were born in dissimilar parts of India.

The Communist Party, with the help of the Communist International and the British Communist Party, made rapid progress in the field of trade union movements till the Sixth Comintern Congress in 1928. With the criticism of the Congress Party as an instrument of 'bourgeoisie nationalism' and Gandhism, which Lenin regarded as 'revolutionary', as an "openly counter-revolutionary force", the Communist Party got alienated from the masses as well as from the freedom thrash about. M.N.Roy also started his radical group in 1930 after he was expelled from Comintern in 1929.

The failure of the two civil disobedience movements of 1930 and 1932 and the compromising attitude of the Congress at the two Round Table Conferences made a number of young leaders disillusioned. Throughout this time, Gandhi also suspended his Satyagraha movement and started concentrating on constructive programmes. Several Congressmen measured this development as failure of Gandhi’s non-violent thrash about. In this atmosphere of disillusionment an effort was made to form the Congress Socialist Party, a Marxism oriented organisation within the Congress Party in 1934.

The socialist groups were also shaped in Punjab, Bengal, Benares and Kerala. In Poona the task of forming the socialist party within the Congress was entrusted to Chattopadhyay, Yusuf Meherally and Purshottam Trikamdas. Other leaders who were instrumental in the formation of the Congress Socialist Party were: Jayaprakash Narayan, Minoo Masani, Asoka Mehta, Achyut Patwardhan, N.G.Goray, M.L.Dantwala, Acharya Narendra Deva, Dr.Rammanohar Lohia and S.M. Joshi. While in prison, these leaders prepared the blue print for the Congress Socialist Party. Therefore the Congress Socialist Party (CSP) was born out of the disillusionment with the civil resistance movement, growth of constitutionalism, and anti-national role of the
Communist Party of India and its alienation from the national mainstream. Some socialist critics are of the opinion that if the Communist Party of India would not have shown its anti-Gandhi and anti-freedom thrash about mentality, and the Congress Party would not have been dominated through the conservative elements, perhaps the Congress Socialist Party would never have been born at all.

Throughout the thirties, Jawaharlal was measured as a great champion of the socialist philosophy. Every young leader of the Congress Party looked upon him as the symbol of socialism. In a letter to Minoo Masani on December 1934, Nehru welcomed the "formation of the socialist groups within the Congress to power the ideology of the Congress and the country."

Through 1934, several socialist groups were shaped in dissimilar parts of the country. It was then realised that these groups were to be brought under one socialist platform. Jayaprakash Narayan organized a conference of socialist members in Patna in May 1934. He also revived the Bihar Socialist Party. The All India Congress Socialist Party was shaped at this conference. Gandhi’s decision to withdraw the civil disobedience movement and the revival of the rightist Swaraj Party precipitated the formation of the Congress Socialist Party in 1934. Gandhi’s favorable attitude towards the Swarajists like B.C.Roy, K.M., Munshi, Bhulabhai Desai and others and the Congress decision to withdraw the civil disobedience movement and launch parliamentary programmes in the forth-coming Patna meeting on 18 May 1934, made socialist forces in the Congress to make the Congress Socialist Party on 17 May 1934.Acharya Narendra Deva was made the chairman and Jayaprakash Narayan as the organizing secretary, of the committee to draft the constitution and the programmes of the Congress Socialist Party.

**CONGRESS SOCIALIST PARTY: PROGRAMMES AND POLICIES**
The birth of the Congress Socialist Party in May 1934 was a landmark in the history of the socialist movement of India. While assessing the programmes and policies of the Congress Socialist Party, it will be desirable to keep in mind the contribution of the Meerut Conspiracy case in spreading the ideology of the early 1930s. Besides, the creation of the All India Kisan Sabha in 1936, and the role of the Youth League and Independence for India League can never be ignored in the growth of the socialist thought in India. The Congress Socialist Party provided an all India platform to all the socialist groups in India. The publication of the Party and the writings of the socialist leaders inspired the youth of India in dissimilar parts of the country to take up constructive programmes for the upliftment of the downtrodden. Ashok Mehta’s Democratic Socialism, and Studies in Asian Socialism, Acharya Narendra Deva's Socialism and National Revolution, Jayaprakash Narayan's Towards Thrash about (1946), and Dr. Rammanohar Lohia's The Mystery of Sir Stafford Cripps (1942) played a important role in spreading the messages of socialism in India.

It was declared in the Socialist conference of 1934 that the vital objective of the Party was to work for the "complete independence in the sense of separation from the British Empire and the establishment of socialist society." The Party membership was not open to the members of the communal organisations. Its vital aim was to organize the workers and peasants for a powerful mass movement for independence. Programmes incorporated a planned economy, socialization of key industries and banking, elimination of the use through Princes and landlords and initiation of reforms in the regions of vital needs.

The ideology of the Congress Socialist Party was a combination of the principles of Marxism, the thoughts of democratic socialism of the British Labour Party, and socialism mixed with the Gandhian principles of Satyagraha and non-violence. The Party was under the power of deep Marxist thoughts in its formative stage. The leading members of the Congress Socialist Party
belonged to dissimilar streams of thought. Just as to Masani, “I was a staunch democrat of the Labour Party type and had little sympathy with communist methodology or technique though I was a rather starry-eyed admirer of the October Revolution in Russia.... JP on the other hand was a staunch believer in the dictatorship of the proletariat, whatever that may mean. Marxism was the bed rock of his socialist faith.”

Some of the leaders of the Congress Socialist Party like Acharya Narendra Deva and Jayaprakash Narayan were the strong supporters of the Marxist trend in the CSP. Through 1940s, JP came under the spell of Gandhi and the Gandhian socialism. Through 1954, he was disillusioned with the functioning of party politics. He left CSP and joined the Sarvodaya movement, Other leaders like M.L.Dantwala, M.R.Masani, Ashok Mehta, and Pursottam Trikam Das were the followers of the principles of the British Fabian socialism. Masani left the CSP in 1939 and became a strong supporter of free enterprise. He was instrumental in the formation of the Swatantra Party in 1959. Achyut Patwardhan and Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was the follower of Gandhian methodology in the Party. Patwardhan became a follower of J. Krishnamurthi in 1950 and left all party politics. Dr. Lohia sustained to be a prominent Gandhian socialist leader throughout.

The ideological differences in the middle of the leaders of the Congress Socialist Party had a deep impact on the policies, programmes and organizational development of the Party. In the formative stage of the Party, all the leaders remained jointly because of their strong sense of nationalism, camaraderie, and brotherhood, and what is often referred to as their "rigorous personal friendship”. Just as to Madhu Limaye, they were all from a similar urban, middle class, highly educated background. They were also young and idealistic, possessed a strict code of ethics and had great "respect for values of truth and decency. Of all the leaders, JP was the mainly prominent cohesive factor. He was measured as the mainly significant leader of the socialist movement. Because of his organizational capability and strong Marxist
approach, the Party, in the formative stage, followed the Marxist approach and principles."

The 1936 Meerut Thesis put emphasis on the Party to follow and develop into a national movement, an anti-imperialist movement based on the principles of Marxism. Just as to this thesis, it was "necessary to wean the anti-imperialist elements in the Congress absent from its present bourgeois leadership and to bring them under the leadership of revolutionary socialism."

This task can be accomplished only if there is within the Congress an organized body of Marxian socialists....Marxism alone can guide the anti-imperialist forces to their ultimate destiny. Party members necessity so fully understands the technique of revolution, the theory of practice of the class thrash about, the nature of the state and procedure leading to the socialist society." This thesis was adopted at the Faizpur Conference of the Congress Socialist Party in 1936.

The socialists played an significant role in the 1942 Quit India Movement, and in organized trade union movements of the country. Their rising popularity was neither lilted through the leading members of the Congress nor through the communists and the Royalists. The communists were not part of the nationalist thrash about against the British imperialism. They also did not like the popularity of the trade union movements under the leadership of the socialists. They criticized them as fascists and symbol of 'left reformism'.

The Congress leaders were not extremely sympathetic to the role of the socialists inside the Congress organisation. The socialists of the Congress, particularly the CSP members, were opposed to the constitutional arrangements of the 1935 Act and did not like the Congress decision to participate in the elections in the states although ultimately persons like Acharya Narendra Deva participated in the elections. The Congress decision to form ministries in the states after the elections in 1937 was opposed through the socialists. Leading members like Jayaprakash Narayan of the CSP were
influenced that this extremely constitutional arrangement would make obstacles in the growth of the 'revolutionary mentality in the Congress'. In his statement at the Nasik Conference of the Congress Socialist Party in 1948, Jayaprakash Narayan said, “Looking back, though, and in spite of the years, I still consider it was wrong to have accepted offices then. While it acquiesced no advantage, it gave birth to a mentality of power politics within the Congress that threatens now to become its undoing.”

The soft attitude of the Congress organisation towards the landlords, its policies concerning the Princely states, and its opposition to the Kisan movements in the states also embittered the connection flanked by the socialists and the leading members of the Congress. The Congress organisation was not extremely sympathetic towards the Kisan movements under the leaders of the CSP, They even went to the extent of passing an official resolution at the Haripura Session in 1938 asking its members not to associate with the Kisan organisations. The victory of Subhas Chandra Bose against Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Gandhi’s candidate, was not extremely much liked through the Congress leaders. In March 1939, a Congress resolution moved through G.B. Pant, asked the newly elected Congress President Subhas Chandra Bose, to nominate the members of his Working Committee as per the advice of Gandhi. At this critical moment of the CSP, its members were divided on the issue of support towards Bose. Jayaprakash Narayan and the communists in the organisation wanted to support Bose. Dr.Lohia, Masani, Ashok Mehta and Yusuf Meherally were not in favor of Bose as they thought that the decision to support Bose would result in the polarization of the national movement into two camps and would ultimately weaken the nationalist thrash about against the British government. The decision through the socialist members to abstain from voting on the resolution, shocked Bose to such an extent that he decided to resign from the Presidentship and form his own party, the Forward Bloc. All these growths weakened the CSP as an emerging organisation of the socialist: forces in the country. In the Nasik
Convention of the CSP, in March 1948, the socialists ultimately took the decision to leave the Congress and to form the Socialist Party of India.

In 1952, immediately after the first national election, the Socialist Party and the Krishak Mazdoor Praja Party (KMPP) of J.B.Kripalani took a decision to merge into a single organisation.

The socialist organisations in India then had two vital objectives:
- They wanted to develop into an all-India organisation for social and economic reconstruction and
- Development of the weaker sections of the social structure and also as an ideological framework for political emancipation of India.

The Bolshevik theory of democratic centralism deeply influenced the ideological deliberations of the Congress Socialist Party till the independence. With the attainment of independence in 1947 and death of Gandhi in the after that year, the Congress Socialist' Party underwent a important transformation. It moved absent from the communist principle of democratic centralism and Marxist methodology towards the region of democratic socialism. Also, in order to achieve a mass base, the CSP diluted some of its earlier ideological frameworks and methodology. Soon the electoral procedures of adjustments, alliances, and even mergers were undertaken with political organisations that neither whispered in democratic procedures nor in the principles of nationalism, socialism and democracy. From a revolutionary path, it moved towards parliamentary methods of coalitional approach.

The Congress Socialist Party adopted the principle of democratic socialism in the Patna Convention of the party in 1949 more seriously. While emphasizing its ideological purity the party was more careful in relation to the its constructive behaviors in the middle of the peasants, poor and the working class. In its well-known Allahabad Thesis of 1953 the party proposed to go for all electoral alliance adjustment with the opposition parties. But the Party was
not prepared to have any united front or coalition with any political party. In
the Gaya session of the Party statements the separate identity of the Congress
Socialist Party was also emphasized. The Party was reluctant to have any
electoral adjustment or coalition with the Congress, Communist or Hindu
Fundamentalist Party or Organisations. But this attitude was toned down and
diluted throughout the Common Elections of 1957 and thereafter.

In 1952, the Congress Socialist Party strongly advocated for the greater
synthesis of the Gandhian ideals with socialist thought. Dr. Rammanohar
Lohia as the President of the Party put emphasis on a decentralised economy
based on handicrafts, cottage industries and industries based on small
machines and maximum use of labour with small capital investment.
Throughout the Panchamarhi Socialist Convention in May 1952, this row of
thought of Dr. Lohia did not impress many Socialist leaders of the Party. In
June 1953, Ashok Mehta’s thesis of the “Political compulsion of a backward
economy” pleaded for a greater cooperation flanked by the Socialist and the
Congress Party. As a counterpoise to Ashok Mehta’s thesis, Dr. Lohia offered
the “Theory of Equidistance”. This theory advocated equidistance from the
Congress and the Communists through the Socialist parties. As a result of
these two streams of thought the Congress Socialist Party was divided into two
clamps. Some of the members even thought of quitting the party to join the
Congress.

One of the prominent leaders of the Congress Socialist Party, Acharya
Narendra Deva was not in favor of the Socialists to join the Congress. He was
a staunch believer in the principle of dialectical materialism of Marx. He said,
"We can perform the task before us only if we attempt to comprehend the
principle and purposes of Socialism and to understand the dialectical method
propounded through Marx for the correct understanding of the situation and
create that understanding the foundation of true action we necessity create our
stand on scientific socialism and steer clear of utopian socialism or social
reformism. Nothing short of a revolutionary transformation of the existing
social order can meet the needs of the situation. He whispered in the moral governance of the world and primacy of moral values. He measured socialism as a cultural movement. He always emphasized the humanist base of socialism; he was not in favor of the Gandhian philosophy of non-violence in its entirety. He was in favor of broadening the foundation of mass movement through organizing the masses on an economic and class-conscious foundation. He was in favor of an alliance flanked by the lower middle class and the masses. He said that "They could become class conscious only when an appeal was made to them in economic conditions" to understand India. He pleaded for an alliance flanked by the Socialist movement and the National movement for a colonial country. He said that political freedom was an "inevitable stage on the method to socialism". He was a strong supporter of George Sorel’s Syndicalist Theory of “Common Strike". He said, "In India, unlike Russia, the proletarian weapon of strike has not yet been the signal for mass action; but the working class can extend its political power only when through by its weapon of common strike in the service of the national thrash about, it can impress the petty bourgeoisie with the revolutionary possibilities of a strike”.

Throughout the socialist movements in the pre independence stage, and subsequently throughout the 1940’s, 50’s and 60’s, greater emphasis was put on the acceleration of agricultural manufacture, cooperative, land ceiling, reduction of unemployment, and the raising of the livelihood standards of the suppressed and backward societies. The socialist party always advocated for the separation of the judiciary from the administration and its decentralization on the rows of the Balwant Rai Mehta committee statement. The vital philosophy of the Socialist thought in India was based on a synthesis of secularism, nationalism and democratic decentralization procedure.

SOCIALIST THOUGHT OF DR. RAMMANOHAR LOHIA
Rammonohar Lohia articulated his approach in what he described Seven Revolutions such as equality flanked by man and woman, thrash about against political, economic and spiritual inequality based on skin colour, removal of inequality flanked by backward and high castes based on traditions and special opportunity for the backward, majors against foreign enslavement in dissimilar shapes, economic equality, planned manufacture, and removal of capitalism, against unjust encroachments on private life, non proliferation of weapons and reliance on Satyagraha were the vital elements of his thought. In his book on Marx, Gandhi and Socialism, Lohia made an analysis of principles of democratic socialism as an appropriate philosophy for the successful operation of constructive programmes. He said, “Conservatism and communism have a strange identity of interest against socialism. Conservatism holds socialism as its democratic rival, and does not fear communism except as a threat of successful insurrection. Communism prefers the continuance of a conservative government and is mortally afraid of a socialist party coming to office, for, its chances of an insurrection are then deemed”.

Lohia made a important contribution in the field of socialist thought in India. He always laid greater emphasis on the combination of the Gandhian ideals with the socialist thought. He was a proponent of the cyclical theory of history. He whispered that through the principles of democratic socialism the economy of a developing country could be improved. Although Dr.

Lohia was a supporter of dialectical materialism he put greater emphasis on consciousness. He was of the opinion that through an internal oscillation flanked by class and caste, historical dynamism of a country could be insured. Just as to Dr. Lohia, the classes symbolize the social mobilization procedure and the castes are symbols of conservative forces. All human history, he said, has always been "an internal movement flanked by caste and classes - caste loosen into classes and classes crystallize into castes". He was an exponent of decentralised socialism. Just as to him small machines, cooperative labour and village government, operate as democratic forces
against capitalist forces. He measured orthodox and organized socialism "a dead doctrine and a dying organisation".

Lohia was extremely popular for his Four Pillar State concept. He measured village, mandal (district), province and central government as the four pillars of the state. He was in favor of villages having police and welfare functions.

He propounded his theory of New Socialism at Hyderabad in 1959. This theory had six vital elements. They were egalitarian standards in the regions of income and expenditure, rising economic interdependence, world parliament system based on adult franchise, democratic freedoms inclusive of right to private life, Gandhian technique of individual and communal civil disobedience, and dignity and rights of general man. In his Panchamarhi conference address in 1952 he said, “The tensions and emptiness of contemporary life appear hard to overcome, whether under capitalism or communism as the hunger for rising standards is their mother and general to both. Capitalists expected their ideal kingdom to arise out of each man’s self interest operating under a perfect competition; communists still expect their ideal kingdom to arrive out of social ownership in excess of means of manufacture. Their general fallacy has now shown up that the common aims of society do not inevitably flow out of sure economic aims. An integrated connection flanked by the two sets of aims has to be set up through the intelligence of man."

Lohia advocated socialism in the form of a new civilization which in the languages of Marx could be referred to as "socialist humanism". He gave a new direction and dimension to the socialist movement of India. He said that India's ideology is to be understood in the context of its civilization, traditions, and history. For the success of democratic socialist movement in India, it is necessary to put primary emphasis on the removal of caste system through systemic reform procedure. Referring to the caste system lie said, “All those who think that with the removal of poverty through a modern economy, these
segregations will automatically disappear, create a big mistake." He often highlighted the irrelevance of capitalism for the economic reconstruction and development of the Third World countries.

Lohia was opposed to doctrinaire approach to social, political, economic and ideological issues. He wanted the state power to be controlled, guided, and framed through people's power and whispered in the ideology of democratic socialism and non-violent methodology as instruments of governance.

Lohia was deeply influenced through Leon Trotsky's theory of "permanent revolution". He preached and practiced the concept of "permanent civil disobedience" as a peaceful rebellion against injustice. To him the essence of social revolution could be achieved through a combination of jail, spade and vote. His theory of “immediacy” was extremely popular in the middle of the youth. He wanted that organisation and action necessity continue as parallel currents and strongly pleaded for "constructive militancy” and "militant construction".

Lohia was influenced that no individual's thought could be used as the sole frame of reference for the ideology of any movement. Although he was in favor of Marx’s theory of dialectical materialism, he was aware of its limitations. He emphasized both the economic factors and human will as significant elements of development of history. He was influenced that "logic of events" and "logic of will" would govern the path of history.

He was not influenced through the Marxist thesis that the revolutions were to happen in the industrially urbanized societies. He said that communism borrowed from capitalism its conventional manufacture techniques; it only sought to change connection in the middle of the forces of manufacture. Such a procedure was unsuitable for the circumstances prevailing in India. He pleaded for small element technology and decentralised economy. For him the theory of determinism was not a solution for the custom bound Indian society where class distinctions and caste stratifications rule the
day. The Marxist theory of class thrash about is not an answer for the intricate social structures of India.

Lohia was influenced that the concept of "welfare-statism" was not an answer for the social and economic progress of countries in the Third World. The Marxist concept of class thrash about had no lay for the peasant because he was "an owner of property and an exacter of high prices for their food." Dr. Lohia always emphasized on the role of peasants in the economic, political and social growths of the country. Just as to him, "Undoubtedly, the farmer in India, as elsewhere, has a greater role to play, than whom none is greater, but others may have equal roles to play. The talk of subsidiary alliances flanked by farmers and workers and artisans and municipality poor necessity is replaced through the concept of equal connection in the revolution." He gave a call for the civil disobedience movements against all shapes of injustice and for the creation of a new world order.

Lohia was of the view that the universal male power and obnoxious caste system as the two vital weaknesses of India's social structure and pleaded for their eliminations at all stages. He said, "All politics in the country, Congress, Communist, or socialist, has one big region of national agreement, whether through design or through custom, and that is to stay down and disenfranchise the Sudra and the women who constitute in excess of three-fourth of our whole population." He appealed to the youth to be at the forefront of the social reconstruction procedure to eliminate these social evils. He said, "I am influenced that the two segregations of caste and women are primarily responsible for this decline of the spirit. These segregations have enough power to kill all capability for adventure and joy." Poverty and these social segregations are inter-connected and thrive 'on each other's worms. He asserted, "all war on poverty is a shame, unless it is, at the similar time, a conscious and sustained war on these two segregations."

Religion and politics, said Lohia, are deeply inter-connected and have the similar origin. Although the jurisdictions of religion and politics are
separate, a wrong combination of both corrupts both. He was of the view that both religion and politics could be judiciously administered to develop the infrastructures of the political systems. He said, "Religion is extensive term politics and politics is short term religion. Religion should work for doing well and praising goodness. Politics should work for fighting the evil and condemning it. When the religion instead of doing something good confines itself to praising the goodness only, it becomes lifeless. And when politics, instead of fighting evil, only condemns it, it becomes quarrelsome. But it is a information that imprudent mixture of religion and politics corrupts both of them. No scrupulous religion should associate itself with any scrupulous politics. It creates communal fanaticism.

The main purpose of the contemporary ideology of keeping religion separate from politics is to ensure that communal fanaticism does not originate. There is also one more thought that power of awarding punishment in politics and religious orders should be placed separately, otherwise it could provide impetus to conservatism and corruption. Despite keeping all the above precautions in view, it is all the more necessary that religion and politics should be complementary to each other, but they should not encroach upon each other's jurisdiction.

As a socialist thinker and activist, Lohia has carved out for himself a unique lay in the history of Indian socialist thought and movement. Although there has been a tendency in the middle of the modern researchers not to recognize him as an academic system-builder in the custom of Kant, Hegel or Comte, his democratic socialist approach to seem at ideology as an integrated phenomenon is now being widely accepted throughout the world.

**SOCIALIST THOUGHT OF JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN**

Jayaprakash Narayan popularly recognized as JP was a confirmed Marxist in 1929. Through the middle of 1940s he was inclined towards the Gandhian ideology. Till 1952 JP had no faith in non-violence as an instrument
of social transformation procedure. The transformations of the Russian society in the late 1920s had thereafter changed his outlook towards Marxism and the procedure of dialectical materialism. Soviet Union was no more an ideal model for him for a socialist society. The bureaucratized dictatorship with the Red Army, secret police and guns produced an inherent disliking for the Soviet Pattern of development. He was influenced that it did not produce "decent, fraternal and civilized human beings". He said in 1947, "The method of violent revolution and dictatorship might conceivably lead to a socialist democracy; but in only country where it has been tried (i.e. the Soviet Union), it had led to something dissimilar, i.e. to a bureaucratic slate in which democracy does not exist. I should like to take a lesson from history".

JP was influenced that there was inter-connection flanked by nature of the revolution and its future impact. He was influenced that any pattern of violent revolution would not lead to the empowerment of people at the grassroots stage. He said, "A Soviet Revolution has two parts: destruction of the old order of society and construction of the new. In a successful violent revolution, success lies in the destruction of the old order from the roots. That indeed is a great attainment. But at that point, something vital happens which almost strangles the succeeding procedure. Throughout the revolution there is widespread reorganized revolutionary violence. When that violence assisted through other factors into which one require not go here, has succeeded in destroying the old power structure, it becomes necessary to cry halt to the unorganized mass violence and make out of it an organized means of violence to protect and defend the revolution. Therefore a new instrument of power is created and whosoever in the middle of the revolutionary succeeds in capturing this instrument, they and their party or faction become the new rulers. They become the masters of the new state and power passage from the hands of the people to them. There is always thrash about for power at the top and heads roll and blood flows, victory going in the end to the mainly determined, the mainly ruthless and best, organized. It is not that violent
revolutionaries deceive and betray; it is presently the logic of violence working itself out. It cannot be otherwise”.

JP was extremely much critical of dialectical materialism on human development. He was influenced that this methodology would affect the spiritual development of man. His concept of Total Revolution is a holistic one. He used this term Total Revolution for the first time in a British magazine described The Time in 1969. Underlying the emphasis on the Gandhian concept of non-violence and Satyagraha he said, “Gandhiji’s non violence was not presently a plea for law and order, or a cover for the status quo, but a revolutionary philosophy. It is indeed, a philosophy of total revolution, because it embraces personal and social ethics and values of life as much as economic, political and social institutions and procedures.”

The concept of Total Revolution as enunciated through JP is a confluence of his thoughts on seven revolutions i.e. social, economic, political, cultural, ideological and intellectual, educational and spiritual. JP was not extremely rigid concerning the number of these revolutions. He said the seven revolutions could be grouped as per demands of the social structures in a political system. He said, "For instance the cultural may contain educational and ideological revolutions. And if civilization is used in an anthropological sense, it can embrace all other revolutions.” He said, “Economic revolution maybe split up into industrial, agricultural, technological revolutions etc. Likewise intellectual revolutions maybe split up into two - scientific and philosophical. Even spiritual revolution can be viewed as made of moral and spiritual or it can be looked upon as part of the civilization. And so on.” The concept of total revolution became popular in 1974 in the wake of mass movements in Gujarat and Bihar. He was deeply disturbed through the political procedure of degeneration in the Indian politics of the time. Throughout his Convocation Address at the Benaras Hindu University in 1970 he said, "Politics has, though, become the greatest question spot of this
decade. Some of the trends are obvious, political disintegration is likely to spread, selfish splitting of parties rather than their ideological polarization will continue; the devaluation of ideologies may continue; frequent change of party loyalties for persona; or parochial benefits, buying and selling of legislatures, inner party indiscipline, opportunistic alliance in the middle of parties and instability of governments, all these are expected to continue."

JP was deeply moved through the mutilation of democratic procedure, political corruption and fall of moral standards in our public life. He said that if this pattern of administrative procedure continues then there would not be any socialism, welfarism, government, public order, justice, freedom, national unity and in short no nation. He said, "No ism can have any chance, democratic socialism symbolizes an incessant thrash about for the establishment of a presently, casteless, social and economic order under a democratic system in which an individual is provided with proper environment." In his address in Patna on 5th June 1974 he said, "This is a revolution, a total revolution. This is not a movement merely for the dissolution of the assembly. We have to go distant, extremely distant".

In a letter to a friend in August 1976, JP defined the character of the Total Revolution. He wrote, "Total revolution is a permanent revolution. It will always go on and stay on changing both our personal and social lives. This revolution knows no respite, no halt, certainly not complete halt. Of course just as to the needs of the situation its shapes will change, its programmes will change, its procedure will change. At an opportune moment there may be an upsurge of new forces which will push forward the wheels of change. The soldiers of total revolution necessity stay certainly busy with their programmes to work and wait for such an opportune moment."

JP's Total Revolution involved the growths of peasants, workers, harijans, tribal people and indeed all weaker sections of the social structure. He was always interested in empowering and strengthening India's democratic system. He wanted the participation of people at all stages of decision-creation
procedure. He wanted that electoral representatives should be accountable to his electors, not once in five years but if is unsuitable before the expiry of his five year term he should be replaced. The political representative necessity is continuously accountable to the public. He wanted electoral reforms to be introduced in the political system to check the role of black money in the electoral procedure of the country. He said that some type of machinery should be recognized through which there could be a major of consultation with the setting up of candidates. This machinery should "stay a watch on their representatives and demand good and honest performance from them". Concerning the statutory provision for recalling the-elected representatives he said 'I do recognize of course that it may not be extremely easy to devise appropriate machinery for it and that the right to recall may be occasionally misused. But in a democracy we do not solve troubles through denying to people their vital rights. If constitutional experts apply their minds to the problem, a solution may eventually be establish."  

JP was deeply disturbed through the growth of corruption in the Indian political system. He said "I know politics is not for saints. But politics at least under a democracy necessity know the limits which it may not cross." This was the focal point of JP’s Peoples Charter which he submitted to the Parliament on 6th March 1975. He said "Corruption is eating into the vitals of our political life. It is disturbing development, undermining the administration and creation a mockery of all laws and regulations. It is eroding people’s faith and exhausting their proverbial patience."

JP wanted a network of Peoples Committees to be recognized at the grass roots stages to take care of the troubles of the people and the programmes for development. He wanted the economic and the political power to be combined in the hands of the people. Analyzing his economic programme he said, "A Gandhian frame laying emphasis on agricultural development, equitable land ownership, the application of appropriate technology to agriculture such as improved labour, rigorous apparatus and
gadgets..., the development of domestic and rural industries and the widest possible spread of small industries”.

JP's programme of Antyodaya meaning, the upliftment of the last man was an essential aspect of his socialist thought. On 21st March 1977, in a statement he said, “Bapu gave us a good yardstick. Whenever you are in doubt in taking a scrupulous decision keep in mind the face of the poorest man and think how it will affect him. May this yardstick guide all their actions.” Right to work was an integral part of his concept of Total Revolution, he said “Once the state accepts this obligation, means will have to be establish for providing employment to all. It is not so hard to do so.” JP was also scrupulous in relation to the social reforms such as elimination of dowry system, development of the circumstances of the harijans and abolition of the caste system in India's political system.

Analysing his concept of an ideal state, he said in 1977 that "the thought of my dream is a society in which every individual, every resource is dedicated to serving the weak, a society dedicated to Antyodaya, to the well being of the least and the weakest. It is a society in which individuals are valued for their humanity, a society in which the right of every individual to act just as to his conscience is recognized and respected through all. In short, my vision is of a free, progressive and Gandhian India.”

Minoo Masani said, “All through the vicissitudes and jig-jags of JPs life, there has throughout been a non-violent means for total revolution.” JP, throughout his career, highlighted the role of students and youth in the field of people’s movement. He said "Revolutions and not brought in relation to the through those who are occupied in the race for power and office whether in the government or in non official organisations. Not also through those who are totally preoccupied with the burden of providing bread to their families and are wary of adopting any risky step. The youth of a country alone are free from these constrains. They have idealism, they have enthusiasm, and they have a capability to create sacrifice from which older men shrink." In his letter
to youth in August, 1976 he said, "for the extensive and endless battle for Total Revolution there is a require of new leadership, the forces of history are with you. So go ahead with full confidence. Victory is certainly yours."

Throughout his life JP has always tried to put men in the centre of picture. JP said, “In the society that I have in view for the future, man should inhabit the central lay, the organisation should be for man and not the other method round. Through that I mean that the social organisation should be such as allows freedom to every individual to develop and grow just as to his own inner nature, a society which believes in and practices the dignity of man, presently as a human being."

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

- Explain the history of socialist movement in India.
- Discuss the evolution and origin, programme and policies of the Congress Socialist Party.
- Examine the socialist thought of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia,
- Explain the socialist thought of Jayaprakash Narayan.
“The lesson content has been compiled from various sources in public domain including but not limited to the internet for the convenience of the users. The university has no proprietary right on the same.”