



MODERN PERSPECTIVE OF MOHAN DAS GANDHI WITH REFERENCE TO HIS ARTICLES ON LABOUR, UNITY & SWADESHI

Dr. Purushottam Singh

Assistant Professor of History
Vikramajit Singh Sanatan Dharam College
Kannur U.P. India

Mahatma Gandhi was born at Porbandar on the second of October 1869. His ancestors were Vaishya by caste and profession, but his father, uncle and grandfather were service holders. His father was, for some time, prime minister in the court of Rajkot and also in Vankaner. Although his parents were orthodox Vaishnavas, they were enlightened enough to make all necessary arrangements for giving modern education to their children. Mohan Das Karamchand Gandhi grew in a mixed but balanced set up. He was initiated into religious and moral traditions, and yet his mind was sufficient open to the changing needs of time. His early educational career was uneventful except for his association with one of his friends who tempted him to evil like smoking etc. these experiences had a good effect as they aroused in Gandhi the ever present moral sense. In 1888, he was sent to England for legal studies.

His father was dead by then and he could receive his mother's permission for going abroad only after taking a vow in the presence of his mother not to touch meat and not to keep bad company. In fact, later on his vow became for him a symbol of resolute will and came to convince him that sincere determination for doing anything good was bound to succeed. In England, besides his legal

studies, he also came to acquaint himself with the great and good things of the west.¹ (B.K.Lal, 2010) He returned to India in 1891 after qualifying as a barrister-at-law. After staying in India a very brief period he went to South Africa and his bitter experiences of various acts of racial discrimination committed by the white people of that place changed the entire course of his life and action. Basically he went to cities of Durban and Paradorin in South Africa to conduct his role of barrister for Indian firm 'Dada Abdullah and sons'. There for the first time, he started his moral experiments of trying to conquer evil by love. He started passive resistance by openly defying immoral laws and thus started putting to practice his moral and religious ideas.² (Chadha Yogesh, 1997 and others) The term "Satyagrah" was first introduced by Gandhi against the racial discrimination in South Africa. The term "satyagrah" literally means arguments and actions for truth and the term was nothing new in Indian Philosophy, but Gandhi was the first man to use the term practically for mass and to become a mass leader. British scholar Judith Brown criticizes Gandhi's "Satyagrah" as she declares this weapon of action to be "tricky", but the events of South Africa was the starting of the action of Gandhi not the whole episode of "satyagrah".³ (Judith Brown, 1989 and others) Gandhi's work in South Africa had



helped to return to the Indians their honour, but some of the objectionable laws were still on the statute book and Indian continued to remain in an unenviable position. He was aware that the efficacy of "Satyagrah" as a solution to the problems of mankind was questionable. There is a law of nature that a thing can be retained by the same means by which it was been acquired. A thing acquired by violence can be retained by violence alone, which one acquired by truth can be retained only by truth. In an essay entitled 'The Soul as it is and how to deal with it', in Hibbert Journal, Professor Gilbert Murray of Oxford wrote on Gandhi as given under-

"Person in power should be very careful how they deal with a man who cares nothing for sensual pleasures, nothing for riches, nothing for comfort or praise or for promotion, but is simply determined to do what he believes to be right. He is a dangerous and uncomfortable enemy, because his body, which you can always conquer, gives you so little purchase on his soul."⁴ (Chadha Y., 1998, p.192)

With his unique experiences of South African moral and political adventures, he came to India determined to make efforts for the independence of India from colonial rule by applying the technique of "satyagrah". He also been taken a decision to work for the social reform of India by trying to remove social evils like untouchability, social disparity etc. On his final arrival to India, a meeting in honour of Gandhi was scheduled especially of natives of Gujrat province

of India. A young lawyer of Bombay High Court was very interested to meet the Gandhi and was influenced by the actions of Gandhi in South Africa. His birthplace in Gujrat province was 60 miles away from the birthplace of Gandhi. He was Mohammad Ali Jinnah who first met to Gandhi on this occasion and was single Muslim to speak in praise of Gandhi. Jaswant Singh argued for the importance of the event while American Scholar Stanley Wolpert is silent in this regard.⁵ (Jaswant Singh, 2009) Wolpert is also authority on Gandhi as he is author of a famous book on Gandhi too.⁶ (Wolpert, 2001) Vinoba Bhave was responsible for the need for organizing the Indian villages on a co-operative community basis through land grant. The ideal of democracy of Panchayati Raj should not be treated as a sentimental proposition based on medieval notions. A study of modern economic and political thought in the West would indicate that institutions are important to the establishment of democracy on stable foundations. "If man's faith in social action is to be revived," states Prof. Joad, "the State must be cut up and its functions distributed."⁷ (Joad, 1953, pp.120-121) In his Fabian Socialism, Prof. Cole maintains that for diffusing widely among ordinary men and women a capacity for collective activity "we must set out to build our society upon little democracies". Gandhi did not stand for a social and economic order based on material values alone. He always upheld the ideal of plain living and high thinking and worked for a higher standard of life and not merely for a higher standard of living.



"Civilization, in the real sense of the term", remarks Gandhi "consists not in the multiplication but in the deliberate and voluntary restriction of wants." Unfortunately, this ethical and moral aspect of economic life has often been neglected to the detriment of real human welfare. Modern economists are now emphasizing the urgent need for 'investment in man' in addition to 'investment in goods' for achieving broad-based and speedy economic growth. Prof. Schumpeter rightly observes that for the success of economic and political democracy, "individuals with adequate ability and moral character must exist in sufficient numbers"⁸ (Schumpeter, 1976). The same idea has been forcefully expressed by Mr. Crosland in the following words: "We do not want to enter the age of abundance only to find that we have lost the values which might teach us how to enjoy it."⁹ (Crosland, 1956, p. 529) Therefore, this human and moral aspect of our planning which must be constant in mind by all workers, officials as well as non-officials, who are engaged in this great adventure of building up a New India of Gandhi's dreams. I have four selected articles of Mahatma Gandhi to analyze the views of Gandhi regarding India's future.

CHOICE BEFORE LABOUR

Two paths are open before India today, either to introduce the Western principle of "Might is Right" or to uphold the Eastern principle that truth alone conquers, that truth knows no mishap, that the strong and the weak have alike a right to secure justice. The choice is to

begin with the labouring class. Should the labourers obtain an increment in their wages by violence, even if that be possible? They cannot resort to anything like violence howsoever legitimate may be their claims. To use violence for securing rights may seem an easy path, but it proves to be thorny in the long run. Those who live by the sword die also by sword. The swimmer often dies by drowning. Look at Europe. No one seems to be happy there, for, not one is contented. The labourer does not trust the capitalist and the capitalist has no faith in labourer. Both have a sort of vigor and strength but even the bulls have it. They fight to the very bitter end. All motion is not progress. We have got no reason to believe that the people of Europe are progressing. Their possession of wealth does not argue the possession of any moral or spiritual qualities. King Duryodhana was a master of untold wealth, but with all that he was a pauper in comparison with Vidur and Sudama. Today the world adores Vidur and Sudama, whereas, Duryodhana's name is remembered only as a byword for the evil qualities one should shun. ...In the struggle between capital and labour, it may be generally said that more often than not the capitalists are in the wrong box. But when labour comes fully to realize its strength, I know it can become more tyrannical than capital. The mill-owners will have to work on the terms dictated by labour if the latter could command intelligence of the former. It is clear, however, that labour will never attain to that intelligence. If it does, labour will cease to be labour and become itself the master. The capitalists do not fight on the strength of money



alone. They possess intelligence and tact. The question before us is this: When the labourers, remaining what they are, develop a certain consciousness, what should be their course? It would be suicidal if the labourers rely upon their numbers or brute-force, i.e. violence. By so doing they will do harm to industries in the country. If on the other hand they take their stand on pure justice and suffer in their person to secure it, not only will they always succeed but they will reform their masters, develop industries and both master and men will be as members of one and the same family. A satisfactory solution of the condition of labour must include the following:

- (1) The hours of labour must leave the workmen some hours of leisure;
- (2) They must get facilities for their own education;
- (3) Provision should be made for an adequate supply of milk, clothing and necessary education for their children;
- (4) There should be sanitary dwelling for the workmen;
- (5) They should be in a position to save enough to maintain themselves during their old age.

None of these conditions is satisfied today. For this both the parties are responsible. The masters care only for the service they get. What becomes of the labourer does not concern them. All their endeavors are generally confined to obtaining maximum service with minimum payment. The labourer on the other hand tries to hit upon all tricks whereby he can get maximum pay with minimum work. The result is that although the labourers get an increment there is no improvement in the work turned out. The relations between the

two parties are not purified and the labourers do not make proper use of the increment they get. A third party has sprung up between these two parties. It has become the labourers' friend. There is need for such a party. Only to the extent to which this party has

Disinterested friendship for the labourers can it befriends them. A time has come now when attempts will be made to use labour as a pawn in more ways than one. The occasion demands consideration at the hands of those that would take part in politics. What will they choose? Their own interest or the service of labour and the nation? Labour stands in sore need of friends. It cannot proceed without a lead. What sort of men give this lead will decide the condition of labour? Strikes, cessation of work and strike are wonderful things no doubt, but it is not difficult to abuse them. Workmen ought to organize themselves into strong labour unions, and on no account shall they strike work without the consent of these unions. Strike should not be risked without negotiation with the mill-owners. If the mill-owners resort to arbitration, the principle of Panchayat should be accepted. And once the Panch are appointed, their decision must be accepted by both the parties alike.

Whether they like it or not. It is my universal experience that as a rule labour discharges its obligations more effectively and more conscientiously than the master who has corresponding obligations towards the labourers. It, therefore becomes necessary for labour to find out how far labour can impose its will on the masters. If we find that we are not adequately paid or housed, how



are we to receive enough wages, and good accommodation? Who is to determine the standard of comfort required by the labourers? The best way, no doubt, is that you labourers understand your own rights, understand the method of enforcing your rights and enforce them. But for that you require a little previous training-education. In my humble opinion labour can always vindicate itself if labour is sufficiently united and self-sacrificing. No matter how oppressive the capitalists may be, I am convinced that those who are connected with labour and guide the labour movement have themselves no idea of the resources that labour can command and which capital can never command. If labour would only understand and recognize that capital is perfectly helpless without labour, labour will immediately come to its own.¹⁰ (Naidu,1917,p.146)

We have unfortunately come under the hypnotic suggestion and the hypnotic influence of capital, so that we have come to believe that capital is all in all on this earth. But a moment's thought would show that labour has at its disposal capital which the capitalists will never possess....There is an English a very potent word, and you have it in French also, all the languages of the world have it-it is "No" and the secret that we have hit upon is that when capital wants labour to say "Yes" labour roars out "No" if it means "No". And immediately labour comes to recognize that it has got the choice before it of saying "Yes", when it wants to say "Yes" and "No", when it wants to say "No", labour is free of capital and capital has

to woo labour. And it would not matter in the slightest degree that capital has guns and even poison gas at its disposal. Capital would still be perfectly helpless if labour would assert its dignity by making good its "No". Then labour does not need to retaliate but labour stands defiant receiving the bullets and poison gas and still insists upon its "No". The whole reason why labour soften fails is that instead of sterilizing capital as I have suggested, labour, (I am speaking as a labourer myself) wants to seize that capital and become capitalist, therefore, who is properly entrenched and organized, finding among the labourers also candidates for the same office, makes use of a portion of these to suppress labour. If we really were not under this hypnotic spell, every one of us, men and women, would recognize this rock-bottom truth without the slightest difficulty.¹¹ (Young India, 14.01.1932)

THE WAY TO EQUAL DISTRIBUTION

The real implication of equal distribution is that each man shall have the wherewithal to supply all his natural needs and no more. For example, if one man has a weak digestion and requires only a quarter of a pound of flour for his bread and another needs a pound, both should be in a position to satisfy their wants. To bring this ideal into being the entire social order has got to be reconstructed. A society based on nonviolence cannot nurture any other ideal. We may not perhaps be able to realize the goal, but we must bear it in mind and work unceasingly to near it. To the same extent as we progress towards our goal we shall find contentment and happiness, and to that



extent too shall we have contributed towards the bringing into being of a non-violent society. It is perfectly possible for an individual to adopt this way of life without having to wait for others to do so. And if an individual can observe a certain rule of conduct, it follows that a group of individuals can do likewise. It is necessary for me to emphasize the fact that no one need wait for anyone else in order to adopt a right course. Men generally hesitate to make a beginning of they feel that the objective cannot be had in its entirety. Such an attitude of mind is in reality a bar to progress. Now let us consider how equal distribution can be brought about through non-violence. The first step towards it is for him who has made this ideal part of his being to bring about the necessary changes in his personal life. He would reduce his wants to a Minimum, bearing in mind the poverty of India. His earnings would be free of dishonesty. The desire for speculation would be renounced. His habitation would be self-restraint exercised in every sphere of life. When he has done all that is possible in his own life, and then only will he be in a position to preach this ideal among his associates and neighbors. Indeed at the root of this doctrine of equal distribution must lie that of the trusteeship of wealthy for the superfluous wealth possessed by them. For according to the doctrine they may not possess a rupee more than their neighbors. How is this to be brought about? should the wealthy be dispossessed of their possessions? To do this we would naturally have to resort to violence. This violent action cannot benefit society. Society will be

the poorer, for it will lose the gifts of a man who knows how to accumulate wealth. Therefore the non-violent way is evidently superior. The rich man will be left in possession of his wealth, of which he will use what he reasonably requires for his personal needs and will act as a trustee for the remainder to be used for the society. In this argument honesty on the part of the trustee is assumed. As soon as a man looks upon himself as a servant of society, earns for its sake, spends for its benefit, then purity enters into his earnings and there is ahimsa in venture. Moreover, if men's minds turn towards this way of life, there will come about a peaceful revolution in society, and that without any bitterness. It may be asked whether history at any time records such a change in human nature. Such change has certainly taken place in individuals. One may not perhaps be able to point to them in a whole society. But this only means that up till now there has never been an experiment on a large scale in non-violence. Somehow or other the wrong belief has taken possession of that ahimsa is pre-eminently a weapon for individuals and its use should, therefore be limited to that sphere. In fact this is not the case. Ahimsa is definitely an attribute of society. To convince people of this truth is at once my effort and my experiment. In this age of wonders no one will say that a thing or idea is worthless because it is new. To say it is impossible because it is difficult is again not in consonance with the spirit of the age. Things undreamt of are daily being seen, the impossible is ever becoming possible. We are constantly being astonished these days at the amazing discoveries will be made in the field of non-violence



.But I maintain that far more undreamt of are daily being seen, the impossible is ever becoming possible. We are constantly being astonished these days at the amazing discoveries in the field of non-violence. The history of religion is full of such examples. To try to root out religion it from society is a wild goose chase. And were such an attempt to succeed, it would mean the destruction of society. Superstition, evil customs and other imperfections creep in from age to age and mar religion itself remains because the existence of the world in a broad sense depends on religion. The ultimate definition of religion may be said to be obedience to the law of god. God and his law are synonymous terms. Therefore God signifies an unchanging and living law. No one has really found him. But avatars and prophets have by means of their tapasya, given to mankind a faint glimpse of eternal law. If, however, in spite of the utmost effort, the rich do not become guardians of the poor in true sense of the term and the latter are more and more crushed and die of hunger, what is to be done? In trying to find the solution to this riddle I have lighted on Non-violent Non-co-operation and civil disobedience as the right and infallible means. The rich cannot accumulate wealth without the co-operation of the poor people in society. Man has been conversant with violence from the beginning, for he has inherited this strength from the animal in his nature. It was only when he rose from the state of a quadruped to that of a man that the knowledge of the strength of ahimsa entered into his soul. This knowledge has grown within him slowly but surely. If this knowledge would become strong and would learn

how to free themselves by means of non-violence from the crushing inequalities which have brought them to the verge of starvation.¹² (Harijan, 25.08.1940)

THE TILLERS OF THE SOIL

If Indian society is to make real progress along peaceful lines, there must be a definite recognition on the part of the moneyed class that the ryot possesses the same soul that they do and that their wealth gives them no superiority over the poor. They must regard themselves even as the Japanese nobles did, as trustees holding their wealth for the good of their wards, the ryots. Then they would take no more than a reasonable amount as commission for their labours. At present there is no proportion between the wholly unnecessary pomp and extravagance of the moneyed class and the squalid surroundings and the grinding pauperism of the ryots in whose midst the former are living. A model jaminder would therefore at once reduce much of the burden the ryot is now bearing, he would come in intimate touch with the ryots and know their wants and inject hope into them in place of the despair which is killing the very life out of them. He will not be satisfied with the ryots' ignorance of the laws of sanitation and hygiene. He will reduce himself to poverty in order that the ryot may have the necessaries of life. He will study the economic condition of the ryots under his care, establish schools in which he will educate his own children side by side with those of ryots under his care, establish schools in which he will educate his under own children side by side with those of ryots. He will



purify the village well and the village tank. He will teach the ryot to sweep his roads and clean his latrines by himself doing this necessary labour. He will throw open without reserve his own gardens for the unrestricted use of the ryot. He will use as hospital, school, or the like most of the unnecessary buildings which he keeps for his pleasure. If only the capitalist class will read the signs of the times, revise their notions of God-given right to all they possess, in an incredibly short space of time the seven hundred thousand dung-heaps which today pass muster as villages can be turned into abodes of peace, health and comfort. I am convinced that the capitalist, if he follows the Samurai of Japan, has nothing really to lose and everything to gain. There is no other choice than between voluntary surrender on the part of the capitalist of superfluities and consequent acquisition of the real happiness of all on the one hand, and on the other the impending chaos into which, if the capitalist does not wake up betimes, the awakened but ignorant and famishing millions will plunge the country and which not even the armed force that a powerful Government can bring into play can avert. I have hoped that India will successfully avert the disaster.¹³ (Young India, 05.12.1929)

COMMUNAL UNITY

Everybody is agreed about the necessity of communal unity. But everybody does not know that unity does not mean political unity which may be imposed. It means an unbreakable heart unity. The first things essential for achieving such unity is for every in his won person Hindu, Muslim, Christian,

Zoroastrian, Jew, etc. shortly, every one of the millions of the inhabitants of Hindustan. In order to realize this, every congressman will cultivate personal friendship with person representing faiths other than his own. He should have the same regard for the other faiths as he has for his own.¹⁴ (Gandhi,1948,p.8)

Hindus and Musalmans, Christians, Shikhs and Parsis must not settle their difference by resort to violence....Hindus and Musalmans prate about no compulsion in religion. What is it but compulsion, if Hindus will kill a Musalman for saving a cow? It is like wanting to convert a Musalman to Hinduism by force. And similarly what is it but compulsion, if Musalmans seek to prevent by force Hindus from playing music before mosques? Virtue lies in being absorbed in one's prayers in the presence of din and noise. We shall both be voted irreligious savages by posterity if we continue to make a futile attempt to compel one another to respect our religious wishes. If Hindu-Muslim unity is endangered because an Arya Samaj preacher or a Musalman preacher preaches his faith in obedience to a call from within, that unity is only skin deep. Why should we be ruffled by such movements? Only they must be genuine. If the others wanted to return to the Hindu fold they had a perfect right to do so whenever they liked. But no propaganda can be allowed which reviles other religions. For, that would be negation of toleration. The best way of dealing with such propaganda is publicly to condemn it. Every movement attempts to put on the cloak of respectability. As soon as the public tear



the cloak of respectability. As soon as the public tear the cloak down, it dies for want of respectability. It is now time to examine the treatment of two constant causes of friction. The first is cow slaughter. Though I regard cow protection as the central fact of Hinduism, central because it is common to classes as well as masses, I have never bearable to understand the antipathy towards the Musalmans on that score. We say nothing about the Musalmans that daily takes place on behalf of Englishmen. Our anger becomes red-hot when a Musalman slaughters a cow. All the riots that have taken place in the name of the cow have been an insane waste of effort. They have not saved a single cow, but they have on the contrary stiffened the backs of the Musalmans and resulted in more slaughter...Cow protection should commence with ourselves. In no parts of the world perhaps are cattle worse treated than in India. I have wept to see Hindu drivers goading their jaded oxen with the iron points of their cruel stick. The half starved condition of the majority of our cattle is a disgrace to. The cows find their necks under the butcher's knife because Hindus sell them. The only effective and honorable way is to befriend the Musalmans and leave it to their Honor to save the cow. Cow protection societies most turn their attention to the feeding of cattle, prevention of cruelty, preservation of the fast disappearing pasture land, improving the breed of cattle, buying from poor shepherds and turning in to middle self-supporting dairies. Hindus do sin against god and man when they omit to do any of the things I have described above. They commit no sin, if

they cannot prevent cow slaughter at the hands of Muslmans, and they do sin grievously when in other to save the cow, they quarrel with the Muslmans. The question of music before mosques, and now even Arati in Hindu temples, has occupied my prayerful attention. This is a sore point with the Musalmans as cow slaughter is with the Hindus. And just as Hindus cannot compel Musalmans to refrain from killing cows, so can Musalmans not compel Hindus to stop music or Arati at the point of sword. They must trust the god sense of the Hindus. As a Hindu, I would certainly advise the Hindus, without any bargaining spirit, to consult the sentiment of their Musalman neighbors and wherever they can, accommodate them. I have heard that in some places, Hindus purposely and with the deliberate intention of irritating Musalmans, commence. This is an insensate and unfriendly act. Friendship presupposes the utmost attention to the feelings of a friend. It never required consideration. But Musalmans should never expect to stop Hindu music by force. To yield to the threat or actual use of violence is a surrender of one's self-respect and religious conviction. But a person, who never will yield to threat, would always minimize and, if possible, even avoid occasions for causing irritation. I am convinced that the masses do not want to fight, if the leaders do not. If, therefore the leaders a free that mutual rows should be, as in all advanced countries, erased out of our public life as being barbarous and irreligious, I have no doubt that the masses will quickly follow them. Were Hindus and Musalmans and Sikhs always at war with one another when



there was no British rule, when there was no English face seen here? WE have chapter and verse given to us by Hindu historians and by Musalman historians to say that we were living in comparative peace even then. And Hindus and Musalmans in the villages are not even today quarrel at all.... This quarrel is not old.... I dare say, it is coeval with the British advent, and immediately this relationship, the unfortunate, artificial unnatural relationship between Great Britain and India is transformed into a natural relationship, when it becomes, if it does become a voluntary partnership to be given up, to be dissolved at the will of either partly, when it becomes that, you will find that Hindus, Musalmans, Sikhs, Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Christians, untouchables, will all live together as one man.¹⁵ (Young India, 24.12.1931)

Mahatma Gandhi was a champion of 'Swadeshi', or home economy. People outside India know of Gandhi's campaigns to end British colonialism, but this was only a small part of his struggle. The greater part of Gandhi's work was to renew India's vitality and regenerate its culture.¹⁶ (Prabhu,1947,p.15) Gandhi was not interested simply in exchanging rule by white sahibs for rule by brown sahibs; he wanted the government to surrender much of its power to local villages. For Gandhi, the spirit and the soul of India rested in the village communities. He said, "The true India is to be found not in its few cities, but in its seven hundred thousand villages. If the villages perish, India will perish too." locally based economy enhances community spirit, community relationships, and community well-being. Such an

economy encourages mutual aid. Members of the village take care of themselves, their families, their neighbors, their animals, lands, forestry, and all the natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations. Mass production leads people to leave their villages, their land, their crafts, and their homesteads and go to work in the factories. Instead of dignified human beings and members of a self-respecting village community, people become cogs in the machine, standing at the conveyor belt, living in shanty towns, and depending of the mercy of the bosses. Then fewer and fewer people are needed to work, because the industrialists want greater productivity. The masters of the money economy want more and more efficient machines working faster and faster, and the result would be that men and women would be thrown on the scrap heap of unemployment. Such a society generates rootless and jobless millions living as dependants of the state or begging in the streets.¹⁷ (Vyas,1962,p.45) In swadeshi, the machine would be subordinated to the worker; it would not be allowed to become the master, dictating the pace of human activity. Similarly, market forces would serve the community rather than forcing people to fit the market. Gandhi knew that with the globalization of the economy, every nation would wish to export more and import less to keep the balance of payments in its favor. There would be perpetual economic crisis, perpetual unemployment, and perpetually discontented, disgruntled human beings. To determine the four articles of Gandhi we should go through the following quotes given as under-



"When it (violence) appears to do well, the good is only temporary; the evil it does is permanent."

"Happiness is when what you think, what you say, and what you do are in harmony."

"Hate the sin, love the sinner."

"I believe in equality for everyone, except reporters and photographers."

"You must not lose faith in humanity. Humanity is an ocean; if a few drops of the ocean are dirty, the ocean does not become dirty."

"Victory attained by violence is tantamount to a defeat, for it is momentary."

"An eye for an eye makes the whole world blind."

While concluding the ideas of Gandhi on labour and Swadeshi, we should realize the views of Gandhi on socialism and communism. According to Gandhi, "The Socialists and Communists say they can do nothing to bring about economic equality today. They will just carry on propaganda in its favor and to that end they believe in generating and accentuating hatred. They say when they get control over the State they will enforce equality. Under my plan the State will be there to carry out the will of the people, not to dictate to them or force them to do its will. I shall bring about economic equality through non-violence, by converting the people to my point of view by harnessing the forces of love as against hatred. I will not wait till I have converted the whole society to my view but will straight away make a beginning with myself. It goes without saying that I cannot hope to bring about economic equality of my conception, if I am the owner of fifty motor cars or even of ten bighas of land. For that I have to

reduce myself to the level of the poorest of the poor. That is what I have been trying to do for the last fifty years or more, and so I claim to be a foremost Communist although I make use of cars and other facilities offered to me by the rich. They have no hold on me and I can shed them at a moment's notice, if the interests of the masses demand it. I would categorically state my conviction that the mania for mass-production is responsible for the world crisis. Granting for the moment that machinery may supply all the needs of humanity, still it would concentrate production in particular areas, so that you would have to go about in a roundabout way to regulate distribution; whereas, if there is production and distribution both in the respective areas where things are required, it is automatically regulated, and there is less chance for fraud, none for speculation. You see that these nations (Europe and America) are able to exploit the so-called weaker or unorganized races of the world. Once these races gain an elementary knowledge and decide that they are no more going to be exploited, they will simply be satisfied with what they can provide themselves. Mass-production, then at least where the vital necessities are concerned, will disappear. When production and consumption both become localized, the temptation, the temptation to speed up production, indefinitely and at any price, disappears. All the endless difficulties and problems that our present-day economic system presents, too, would then come to an end." Gandhi admitted the partition of India first due to the result of communal riots derived after the speech of Jinnah



known as 'direct action day' on 16.08.1946. Congress president Maulana Abul Kalam Azad writes in his famous writing 'India wins Freedom' as, "the country was free before the people could fully enjoy the sense of liberation and victory. They woke up to find the great tragedy had accompanied freedom. Congress as well as Muslim League had accepted the partition."¹⁸ (Maulana Azad, p.224) similarly contemporary scholar Lal Khan points out the partition in his famous treatise. Lal Khan writes, "The AICC met on 14 June 1947. Congress which has always fought for the unity and independence of India was considering on official resolution for dividing the country. Sardar Patel argued that the resolution for division did not arise out of weakness or compulsion but was the only true resolution in the context of existing circumstances. It became necessary for Gandhi to intervene in the debate."¹⁹ (Lal Khan, 2007, p.70) Gandhi's quest for unity ended with his death on 30 January 1948 when he was assassinated by Nathuram Godse. Gandhi in modern sense has great social meaning that he was ready to reduce himself to the level of the poorest of the poor. Again we can quote Jaswant Singh as he has discussed the several views including Jinnah's view on death of Gandhi, but Wolpert is silent.

References:

1. Basant Kumar Lal,(2010) Contemporary Indian Philosophy, Motilal Banarasidas Publishers, Delhi, 8th reprint, pp.91-92
2. Chadha , Yogesh,(1997), Gandhi: A Life, John Wiley and Sons, New York ; Dalal, C.B,(1971), Gandhi: 1915-1948; A Detailed Chronology, , Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi
3. Brown, Judith M. Gandhi, (1989) , Prisoner of Hope, Yale University Press, New Haven; Erikson, Erik,(1969) Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence, , Norton, New York ; Gandhi, Mahatma (1983), Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth, Dover, New York, ; Ruhe, Peter,(2001) Gandhi, Phaidon Press, New York
4. Chadha Yogesh, (1998), rediscovering Gandhi, Arrow books limited, London,p.192
5. Jaswant Singh, (2009), Jinnah: india Partition independence, Rupa and Company, New Delhi , also Hindi translation of this book by same publisher . Stanley Wolport,(1984), Jinnah of Pakistan, oxford, Hindi translation of the book by Abhay Kumar Dubay (2009), entitled "Jinnah : Mohammad Ali se Quid -I-Azam tak", Vani Prakashan, New Delhi
6. Wolpert, Stanley, (2001), Gandhi's Passion: the Life and Legacy of Mahatma Gandhi. Oxford University Press
7. C.E.M.Joad,(1953) Modern Political Theory, Oxford University press , pp. 120-21
8. Joseph Schumpeter,(1976),Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy, Rout ledge
9. Anthony Crosland,(1956),Future of Socialism, London , p. 529



10. Naidu, Sarojini , Speeches and Writings of Mahatma Gandhi, Published 1917,Ganesh and Company ,Madras, p. 146
11. Young India, weekly 14-01-1932, also available on Gandhi Heritage portal
12. Harijan, English weekly, 25-08-1940
13. Young India weekly, 05-12-1929
14. Gandhi, Constructive Program , Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmadabad, 1948, p.8
Remark- Constructive Program (CP) is a term coined by [Mahatma Gandhi](#) to describe one of the two branches of his [Satyagraha](#), the other being some form on nonviolent resistance, e.g. [civil disobedience](#), sometimes referred to as "obstructive program". CP is a way of carrying out a struggle through community and self-improvement by building structures, systems, processes, and resources that are alternatives to oppression and promote self-sufficiency and unity in the resisting community. Though not as well known as his nonviolent resistance programs, Gandhi recognized the value of constructive program and used it successfully as early as the first year of his campaigns in South Africa, 1894. In fact, the value of CP in the struggle for the independence of India cannot be overemphasized, as he described civil disobedience as "an aid to constructive effort." Gandhi wrote to his friend and supporter, Jamna Lal Bajaj, saying, "My real politics is constructive work."
15. Young India, weekly, 24-12-1931
16. R. K. Prabhu (compiler),(1947) India of My Dreams, Written by M. K. Gandhi , With a Foreword by Dr. Rajendra Prasad ,Printed & Published by : Jitendra T Desai, Navajivan Mudranalaya Ahmadabad , p.15
17. Vyas, H.M.(Compiler), Village Swaraj, Written by M. K. Gandhi , ,First Published: December 1962, Printed & Published by Navajivan Publishing House Ahmedabad,p.45
18. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad,(2011), India wins freedom. First published in 1959, reprinted by Orient Black Swan, Hyderabad India ,p.224
19. Lal Khan, (2007), Partition: can it be undone, originally published by well red publications Lahore , published in India by Aakar books, New Delhi p. 70