



CHAPTER V

GANDHI ON DEMOCRACY



: CHAPTER - V :

GANDHI ON DEMOCRACY

Gandhi is one of the greatest political thinkers of our age. His approach to the problem of politics is creative, original and revolutionary.¹ His concept of democracy is not a mere echo of his master's voice, eastern or western ancient or modern.

The contemporary world knows Gandhi as the one man, unlike others, who is mainly responsible for the inculcation of religious spirit, the spirit of truth and non-violence, in to the province of politics. He once remarked " Some friends have told me that truth and non-violence have no place in politics and worldly affairs. I do not agree. I have no use for them as a means of individual salvation. Their introduction and application in every day life has been my experiment all along²"

Before Gandhi's advent on the political scene, religion and politics were divorced from each other. He made a Herculean effort to reunite them into holy wed-lock by spiritualizing politics, injecting germs of truth in to diplomacy,³ introducing

principles of non-violence into democracy. Non-violence for him includes faith in human brother-hood, and democracy is the most effective and ethical system of government to render it into visible form. Democracy is but applied religion of non-violence.⁴

In the backdrop of growing violence in India and abroad, it is worth examining whether India, as the biggest democracy on earth, can eschew violence in its different manifestation such as bundhs, gheraos, coercive mass agitations, communal riots, uncalled for strikes and hunger strikes which weaken the democratic fibre. There are unmistakable signs on the political horizon that the cult of violence is gradually gaining strength and claiming new adherents within democratic societies. Gandhi himself says : " What is happening to-day is disregard of the law of non-violence and enthronement of violence as if it were an eternal law. The democracies, therefore, that we see at work at England, America and France are only so called because they are no less based on violence than Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy or even Soviet Russia. The only difference is that the violence of the last three is much better organized than that of the three democratic powers.⁵ Violence is incompatible with democracy."

It will be a sad day if democracy fails and is replaced by mobocracy in the world. In such a world freedom of thought and expression will be denied. The individual will cease to count. And nothing will be left of society except slavery and totalitarianism. Hence the basic problem before us today is to save democracy from violence, and reinforce it so that it becomes a true institution of liberty, equality and social justice.

Even a microscopic small miscalculation in understanding human nature is bound to result in catastrophic conclusions about democracy. Gandhi as student of human nature, his analysis of the problem of democracy yielded faithful results.

As S. Radhakrishnan aptly observed that man is not only a social, religious and rational animal but also a political being.⁶ He is by nature a democratic creature. And to be a democratic creature is to believe in the equality of men.

Radhakrishnan is of the view that if man as a political being has not been much of a success, it is because he has kept religion and politics apart, thus misunderstanding both.⁷ But Gandhi was an exception to this rule. He did not separate

religion from politics, sacred from secular, pious from profane things of God from those of Caesar. For him there was no politics without religion, not the religion of the superstitions and the blind religion but the universal religion of toleration. He asserted " Politics without majority is a thing to be avoided." ⁸ Louis Fischer, Gandhi's well known biographer, comments " Actually Gandhi's politics are indistinguishable from his religion. In politics he cleaved to moral considerations, and as a saint he thought his place was not in a cave or cloister but in the hurly - burly of the popular struggle for rights and the right. Gandhi's religion made him political and his politics were religions." ⁹ As some one remarked, Gandhi was saint among saints. That is why he, as a politician, succeeded more than any other politician of his times. Rt. Hon. P. J. Noel Baker, British Labour Leader, parliamentarian and Noble Laureate, opined " Gandhi was the most successful politician of his age." ¹⁰

If man is to succeed as a political being, he will have to keep religion and politics together. Here lies Gandhi's unique contribution to the understanding of human nature in politics.

GANDHI ON HUMAN NATURE :

Gandhi does not accept the view that human nature is inflexible that it will ever remain what it is, that it will never change for better, that it will never become perfect. His belief in the capacity of non-violence rejects the theory of permanent inelasticity of human nature. He believed in the perfectibility of human nature. According to him human mind is plastic. Like a potter's clay, it can be moulded any way we like. It can be conditioned to democracy or despotism. Human nature is highly elastic. It is ever changing and never the same. Man being a teachable animal, can be taught and trained. He is perfect by nature. But if we think that man can never become perfect, it only shows that we have not yet full knowledge of his nature of the highest in him. He asserted, "I positively refuse to judge man from the scanty material furnished to us by history."¹¹ History of human nature, with special reference to democracy, is still in the making. It is yet incomplete. However, we can know a good deal about human nature by patient study, reason and intuition. By experience, speculation and sympathetic imagination, Gandhi felt convinced that human nature is essentially noble and good, trusting and affectionate, responsive and friendly.

Gandhi states that we should not be sceptical about human nature. There are, no doubt a few wicked persons in the world. But they are only drops in the ocean. He maintained " 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. You must never despair of human nature." ¹² We may conclude that to be pessimistic about the nature of man, to give up hope in his innate goodness is to accept defeat, is to fail as a student in the study of human nature in democracy.

" Human nature", in Gandhi's view, " will only find itself when it fully realises that to be human it has to cease to be beastly or brutal." ¹³ According to Gandhi, be human is to kind, to be sympathetic, to be responsive to the suffering of fellow man to be hater of autocracy and lover of democracy. He who is most human is most democratic.

To assess Gandhi's formulation of democracy, it is essential to trace the origins of concept of democracy. There are mainly two sources of democracy chronological and psychological as far as chronological is concerned, the notion that origin of ' democracy ' goes back to the modern period alone and that is only a western concept is highly mistaken and

betrays the ignorance of history. It is as ancient as the Rigveda in India, Solon in Greece and the Mirs in Russia. In fact, democracy is as old as human society itself.

Even in the Rigveda we have a dialogue between the king and Angiras who says " Be with us, I have chosen there; stand stead fast immovable. Let the people wish for thee; let not thy kingship fall away."¹⁴ There are references to the Sabha and Samiti, to Republic in the Atharva Veda. The ancient Panchayat system is still alive in the villages of India, although it has lost its prestige and purity, vigour and Republican spirit. Democracies and Republics, like that of the Vrijjis at the time of Buddha,¹⁵ were working in India centuries before Christ and probably some of them were older than the Greek Republics. Arthsastra and Mahabharata speak of Ganga-Rajya and Sangha in earliest terms.

In Greece, Solon¹⁶ makes a reference to democracy; " I have given the common people sufficient power to assure them of dignity."¹⁷ Pericles and Plato,¹⁸ Aristotle¹⁹ and Ciero²⁰ have written and spoken about democracy.

Village communities run on democratic principles were common in Russia. For example, the Mirs.

Thus we see that the word and concept of democracy are not exclusively western, nor are they the monopoly of the west. Democracy which is respect for collective wisdom, has been a common feature of normal human groups since the dawn of civilization. What is western in the concept of democracy, as we find it today, is the particular interpretation and the form it has evolved by experience. But this form cannot be said to be either the best form or the final or the only form. Gandhi writes : " Democracy of the West is, in my opinion, only so called. It has germs in it, of the true type. But it can only come when all violence is eschewed and malpractices disappear. The two go hand in hand. Indeed, malpractice is a species of violence."²¹ Western democracy, like Indian democracy, is still incomplete. Its completion will come only when violence goes root and branch.

Regarding psychological sources, according to Aristotle, the deeper source of the origin of democracy lies in human thinking. He says; " Democracy arose from men's thinking that if they are equal in one respect, they are equal absolutely."²² To be equal in one sense is to be completely equal in all respects. As we think so we act.

Man's desire for liberty, equality and fraternity led him to the discovery of democracy as a political institution. Desire and deep, feeling and action, thinking and willing, psychological conghition and political conation go together.

Thus Gandhi is in many ways considered to be an original thinker in politics, not because he was the originator of the doctrine of democracy but because he demonstrated in the practice of democracy the applicability of non-violence. In ancient times, ' Ahimsa ' was preached and practised as an individual virtue. But in modern age it was felt that without its adoption on a wider scale, permanent peace could not be established on earth. From an individual achievement it thus developed into a social necessity; and as human groups grew larger and larger, non violence became indispensable for social life. It is now an inseperable companion of and a must for democracy.

And he greatly succeeded in it. Gandhi has reanimated the old view of democracy and developed new points of view. He has reinterpreted democracy in the light of non-violence of his own conception. His main thesis is; " Science of non-violence can lead one to pure democracy."²³ This is his most distinctive and original contribution to contemporary political thought and practice.

Saratori discusses what Democracy Is Not. He says,
 " To define means to assign limits, to delimit. A concept is underfined as long as it is unlimited. That is to say that a definition must embrace the whole of what it defines, but no more. There fore, if we want to complete our definition of democracy."²⁴

In defining democracy Gandhi also follows the above mentioned technique, the negative method by stating what it is not. He says : " Democracy Is Not Dictatorship." " Democracy is not a state in which people act like sheep. Under democracy individual liberty of opinion and action is jealously guarded."²⁵

Democracy Is No Mobocracy, " Democracy is an impossible thing until the power is shared by all, but let democracy not degenerate into mobocracy."²⁶ Democracy Is Neither Slavery of Nor Mastery Over Others. " As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master - - - Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy (Lincoln)".²⁷ Gandhi literally agrees with him.²⁸

For the second part, what Democracy Is ? We need to examine Gandhi's positive statements about his view of democracy. What democracy is ? He writes : Equal opportunity For All,

■ My notion of democracy is that under it the weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest. That can never happen except through non-violence.²⁹

Everybody His Own Master. ■ In the democracy which I have envisaged, a democracy established by non-violence, there will be equal freedom for all. Everybody will be his own master.³⁰

The Poor Man's Swaraj. ■ The necessaries of life should be enjoyed by you in common with these enjoyed by the princes and the moneyed men. But that does not mean that you should have palaces like theirs. They are not necessary for happiness. You or I would be lost in them. But, you ought to get all the ordinary amenities of life that a rich man enjoys.³¹

The Head of the government by the electorate. ■ In a democracy if the electorate sets up a hooligan as the head of the government they then lie in the bed they have made or else convert the electorate through satyagraha if necessary. That is democracy.³²

Nothing Less Than the ' Kingdom of God ' within you and on this Earth. ■ Independence of my conception means nothing less than the realization of the ' Kingdom of God ' within you

and on this earth. I would rather work for and die in the pursuit of this dream, though it may never be realized. That means infinite patience and perserverence." ³³

No suppression of Minority Opinion " The rule of majority does not mean that it should suppress the opinion of even an individual if it is sound. The opinion of an individual should have greater weight than the opinion of many, if that opinion is ~~is~~ sound on merits. That is my view of real democracy." ³⁴

DEFINITION OF DEMOCRACY :

To define something is to explain its exact meaning to lay down and fix the limits of its scope, to make its conception clear as crystal. But when Gandhi tries to define ' democracy ' he realizes that it is really an up-hill task to pin-point its exact nature. Democracy is a concept which is not amenable to a single precise definition.

In spite of these difficulties, Gandhi has made an honest attempt to define democracy. His definition of democracy is; " Democracy must in essence mean the art and science of mobilizing the entire physical economic and spiritual resources

of all the various sections of the people in the service of the common good of art."³⁵ Gandhi considers democracy both a Science and an Art. As a science it teaches us to know the laws and principles governing and relevant facts, and also our experiences in the field of politics.

Hence we may redefine democracy as the normative science which deals, with the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity involved in human life and society. It is the theory of the people's government and has a special concern for the common man who is not common in its eyes but most uncommon indeed.

For Gandhi, democracy means much more than the people's government, the rule of the masses, to Gandhi man is not only mind and spirit but also body which is a means to the fulfilment of his mission of life and beyond. Democracy, should also aim at economic equality. And what is Gandhi's view of economic equality? He states; "Everyone must have balanced diet, a decent house to live in, facilities for the education of one's children and adequate medical relief. That constitutes my picture of economic equality."³⁶ Again "Economic equality is the masterkey to non-violent independence. Working for economic equality means abolishing the eternal conflict

between capital and labour. It means the levelling down of the few rich in whose hands is concentrated the bulk of the nation's wealth on the one hand and the levelling up of the semi-starved naked millions on the other."³⁷ He believes that the present inequalities are surely due to people's ignorance and with a growing knowledge of their natural strength, the inequalities must disappear. Thus democracy means abolition of inequality of wealth among the people.³⁸ Commenting further, he said that democracy has created a body for itself. But physical development and economic equality by themselves are not sufficient to establish spiritual democracy on earth. Democracy is pining for its soul. It is in ceaseless search of its spirit. Democracy is common man's soul force which expresses itself through political form of government. He rightly maintained that Democracy is government of the masses and not of the classes. Like the world, it takes all sorts of persons - the rich and the poor, the prince and the peasant, the high and the low, the strong and the weak, the educated and the unlettered - to make democracy. Gandhi states "I cannot possibly bear the idea that a man who has got wealth should have the vote but that a man who has got character but no wealth or literacy should have no vote, or that a man who works honestly by the sweat of his brow day in and day out should not have the vote for the crime of being a poor man."³⁹ Democracy represents all

the varied interests of all the various sections of the people. True democracy promotes the good of all equally including the weakest and the poorest section of the people. It is Sarvodaya,⁴⁰ the welfare of all,⁴¹ as distinguished from Ruskin's 'Unto This Last', which means Antyodaya. In Gandhi's Sarvodaya (true democracy realized),⁴² the 'last is equal to the first or in other words, no one is to be the first and none the last.'⁴³ There is no conflict between the good of the individual and the good of all. For the 'good of the individual is contained in the good of all.'⁴⁴ Thus Gandhi's concept of democracy is both qualitative and quantitative.

It is the considered conviction of Gandhi that 'not the good of the few, not even the good of the many but it is the good of all that we are made to promote, if we are 'made in his own image.'⁴⁵ The goal of democracy according to him is the common good of all and everyone.

Gandhi lays down various criterion for judging as to who a true democrat is; A born disciplinarian who is habituated to self-control; a selfless person who does not think in his own interest or of a party but in common interest; one who

relies on moral force rather than on physical force; one who voluntarily identifies himself with the poorest ; infused with humility and a lover of non-violence, i.e. truth. Moreover a democrat should be utterly selfless relying upon moral force and not the force of arms, identifying himself completely with the poorest; having the trait of humility.

In the final analysis; the term " democr-acy " is of complex significance. It stands for protean purposes, political as well as meta - political, which shape the destiny, of man both as an individual and as a member of society. Democracy implies ten meanings in the Gandhian philosophy, which need to be spelled out in detail :

As a form of government what in Gandhi's view, is the meaning of democracy ? The word " Democracy " is derived from the Greek words ' Demos and Kratos ', meaning people and power respectively. Solon, the Athenian law-giver, uses it in this sense. ⁴⁶ 'People ' and ' Power ' are the two most important constituents of democracy. In fact, there can be no democracy without them. " Democracy is an impossible thing until the power is shared by all (Gandhi)". ⁴⁷ Democracy means distribution of power among the people.

Democracy literally means the rule (Kratia or cracy) of the people, Gandhi agrees with this etymological meaning of democracy when he says " True democracy is the Swaraj of the masses.⁴⁸ And " Swaraj means government by the many.⁴⁹ Thus it is quite clear that democracy is neither autocracy, government by the one, nor plutocracy, government by the rich nor is it aristocracy, government by the (aristos). Democracy is government of all men - one and the many, the rich and the poor the high and the low, the best and the worst, the wise and the other wise. The world is composed not of some men, but of all men; not of a class but of the masses. Democracy is the people's government.

After analysing Gandhi's concept of democracy, we come to the conclusion that it is quite capacious and comprehensive in its scope.⁴ It is a multi-levelled and yet a concentric concept of far reaching consequence, a principle of a paramount practice, a doctrine of ten meanings.⁴

Gandhi looks at democracy as a form of Government, as a defender of individuality, as discipline, as an institution, as a distributor of power, as an instrument of social and economic content, as a respecter of minority opinion, as a provider for freedom of thought and expression, as a method of approach in the settlement of problems, and as a way of life.

A true democrat, in his opinion, is a defender of liberty with purely non-violent means, is a born disciplinarian is utterly selfless, has reliance on moral force, is one who completely identifies himself with the poorest of mankind, is essentially humble, is a lover of true democracy, is free from violence, is a true pacifist, and is a perfect civil resister or satyagrahi.

Gandhi's view of democracy gives us a vision a way of life, a style of living, asks us to accept ideals, norms or standards of behaviour, and apply them in all spheres and at all levels of life, individual and social, national and international, for the common good of all. He builds the superstructure of democracy on the foundation of individual moral freedom.

GANDHI'S POLITICAL THOUGHT :

The political philosophy of Gandhiji is "not a set of doctrines or dogmas, rules or regulations, injunctions or inhibitions, but it is a way of life. It indicates a new attitude or restates an old one towards life's issues and offers ancient solutions for modern problems." Gandhiji himself never claimed that he had any cut and dry views. There was no

rigidity about them. His whole life was an unending experiment. Mahatma Gandhi named his autobiography as " My Experiments With Truth ". About his own philosophy Gandhiji observed this in 1936. " There is no such thing as Gandhiji and I do not want to leave any sect after me. I do not claim to have originated any new principle or doctrine. I have simply tried in my own way to apply the central truths to our daily life and problems. The opinions I have formed and conclusions I have arrived at are not final. I may change them tomorrow. I have nothing to teach to the world. Truth and non-violence are as old as the hills. All I have done is try to experiment in both on as vast a scale as I could do. In doing so, I have sometimes erred and learnt by my error. Well, all my philosophy, if it may be called by that pretentious name, is contained in what I have said. You will not call it Gandhism ; there is no ' ism ' about it " Thus stated Gandhi himself.

Tolstoy denounces the state and its complex machinery and holds that the government is the most dangerous organisation subjecting a majority of the people to tyranny and domination of the minority wielding power and position thus bringing

calamities on it. He is of the opinion that the abolition of government will not be followed by anarchy as it will result in a more just and reasonable social organisation. He, however, goes to the extent of saying that he will not be sorry even if anarchy prevails and declares⁵¹ - - - - - even if the absence of government really meant anarchy in the negative disorderly sense of that word - which is far from being the case even then no anarchical disorder could be worse than the position to which governments have already led their people's ".

It were, perhaps, the same sentiments which led Gandhi to say to the British in 1942, " Leave India to God and if that be too much leave her to anarchy."

As against this, though Ruskin believed that all effectual advancement takes place not through public but through individual effort; he did concede that at times, general measures taken by the government or laws enacted by it may aid advancement. He, therefore, advocates Government's taking up certain activities like opening trial schools for the young and giving pensions to the old and invalid, leading to public welfare i.e., the extension of the sphere of state-interference. He further believes that the better or the

superior in the community should be given the power not only to lead and guide and rule people but even to compel and subdue others if need be. He has no particular preference regarding the form of government. " No form of government," said he ⁵² " provided it be a government, at all, is as such, either to be condemned or praised or contested for in any wise but by fools. " His only concern is to see that the wise and the kind should govern the unwise and the unkind. This is incongruous with Gandhi's way of thinking firstly because he is not in favour of treating some as superior and others as inferior and secondly because he prefers democracy to other forms of government. However, superiority as constructed by Ruskin is not based on rank or birth but only on wisdom and kindness, i.e., moral worth. Maintaining that the government is two fold visible and invisible he explains, ⁵³ " the invisible government is that exercised by all energetic and intelligent men, each in his sphere, regulating the inner will and secret ways of the people essentially forming its character and preparing its fate. " Democracy as visualised by Gandhi is government which to be managed by people who are virtuous and wedded to public welfare. In conformity with the principle of the rule by wise, Ruskin distrusts the

' Horsehood, Deghood ditto ' - the phrase coined by Carlyle for universal suffrage and advocates that the government is to be elected not on the basis of universal suffrage but on that of more votes to those who are older in age and superior in wisdom.

Along with asking the government to do its duty towards the people, Ruskin also advises the citizens to render obedience to it. Tolstoy and Gandhi also preach obedience to the laws of the state but only so long as these laws do not contravene or come in the way of one's higher and eternal obligation to infinite life and to God.

Tolstoy's life, as Gandhi said, was devoted to replacing violence as a method of removing tyranny by non-resistance to evil. According to him religion and violence ill go together. Consequently, he wrote in one of his letters to Gandhi,⁵⁴ the life of the Christian people is an absolute contradiction between their profession and the basic of their life; contradiction between love recognised as the law of life and violence as recognised inevitable in different departments of life. Though people are used to defend the existing order by bullets, bayonets, prisons and gallows

according to him, it is a way that militates against the religions way. The same hold true about different states and the ways followed by them in international relations. Not only do the government of the world ' stand with their claws but and their teeth bared ' to tear a weak nation to pieces but they hypnotise them in believing that violence is the only practicable if not the only method that works in the field of international politics. As against this, Tolstoy preaches non-resistance, non-co-operation with evil or the application of the principle of love to public life as in private life based on the Christian commandment. And if any man will sue them at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also., This is why he welcomed Gandhiji's experiment of satyagraha in South Africa as a fight between gentleness and brutality, between humility and love on one side and conceit and violence on the other and wished it success and hoped that it would serve as an example and an eye-opener not merely for Indians but for all peoples.⁵⁵

Ruskin did not share this faith or Tolstoy and Gandhi in the principle of unalloyed love and non-violence and especially its use for the mitigation of social and political ills but he was certainly against vengeance and retribution being used as bases for government actions or public policies.

Even between Tolstoy and Gandhi there is a difference of approach. Though Gandhi claimed to be disciple of Tolstoy and though ~~his~~ devotion to ~~the~~ principle of non-violence is deep and abiding, yet he is not a thoroughgoing Tolstoyan. Not being starry-eyed idealist but being practical in his outlook he accepted some violence as inevitable. Like Ruskin he would also have argued,⁵⁶ "Absolute justice is indeed no more attainable than absolute truth; but the righteous man is distinguished from the unrighteous by his desire and hope for justice, as the true man from the false by his desire and hope of truth." He was willing to do what was possible, accept what was feasible and work for that which was plausible and practical under given circumstances. So, whereas, Tolstoy is against law courts. Police and military since they contravene the law of love, Gandhi is not only prepared to tolerate the state as a necessary evil till the ideal of statelessness becomes a reality but also its police-force and prison-houses though he would not like them to function in a non-violent manner. He would not like to see civil liberty degenerating into criminal liberty; at the same time, he would insist on prison-houses functioning as reformatories. He would again like the policemen to work as member of a peace-brigade a

reformer helping and guiding people rather than threatening them with lathis and bayonets. He would permit them to bear arms and insist that they be used against criminals, robbers, unsocial elements and lunatics run amuck.

Tolstoy, Ruskin and Gandhi were pacifists, practical philosophers lovers of truth and justice, persons in whom the light of God burnt in its full glory ; but above all they were religious men.

" Most religious men I have met " wrote Gandhi ⁵⁷ are politicians in disguise. I, however, who wear the guise of a politician, am at heart religious man. They fought and fought ceaselessly against hypocrisy and falsehood, against evil and irreligion and left an indelible impression on humanity for all time to come. The description of all the three, ⁵⁸
 " it is just these religious men - however few they may be who alone can and will rend as under that enchanted circle which keeps them bound. They can do it, because all the disadvantages and dangers which hinder a worldly man from opposing the existing order of society not only do not impede a religious man, but rather increase his zeal in the struggle against falsehood, and impel him to confess by word and deed what he holds to be divine truth. Nevertheless Gandhi firmly believed in the development of villages. India through the ages has lived and even now lives in the villages. Each village community was in the past

organised as a semi-independent republic, governed by its
[consisting generally of the heads of families. In some places the panchayats]
 panchayats were elected, the electors being the heads of
 families. These village communities were in most cases
 economically self-sufficient, producing the essential
 necessities of everyday life. Their surplus products went
 to the cities and to foreign markets.

Gandhiji wanted the government of free India to rest
 on the foundation of the revived and revitalized village
 panchayats. The panchayats were not to be organised by the
 central and state governments were to be based on the villages
 units and not vice-versa. Gandhiji held that as the economic
 structure of India should be based upon decentralised industry,
 so must its political organisation rest on the devolution of
 power. He further held that democracy could be most effective
 in small units, where people could carry on a dialogue and
 confront.

One another, He had a holy fear of concentration of
 power. It must be diffused through many centres. He held
 that government is the best which governs least. He did not
 believe in making people happy through coercion. They must
 make themselves happy according to their own ideas, provided

they are not anti-social. Gandhiji further held that the strenght of the centre must rest on the strength of its foundations in the villages and not at their expense.

In no department of life has the contribution of Gandhi been so unique and significant as in the political field, national and international. At no time throughout history, as we know it, have fundamental moral values, such as truth, justice, brotherhood of man and non-violence, been applied or even recognised as valid in men's relations in the political field and more especially in the mutual dealings of organised groups and nations.

With the heritage as described above, Gandhi laid before himself certain specific aims when he began his political career in India. If one looks back with some amount of discrimination on thepast, one notices that the chief task which he set before himself was the collective organization of the working people in terms of non-violence. To this was of course, added a few ancillary aims like the political independence of India , the removal of untouchability and the like. And for these purposes, he now tried to work through a suitable organization.

.....

: REFERENCES :

1. Cf. S. Radhakrishnan : "Gandhi was a revolutionary thinker", Mahatma Gandhi 100 years, Edited by Professor S. Radhakrishnan, p. 1, New Delhi Gandhi Peace Foundation (1968)
2. N. K. Bose. : Selections from Gandhi, Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House (1957) p. 31.
3. M. K. Gandhi : In search of the supreme, Vol. II, Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House (1961) pp. 237-238.
4. M. K. Gandhi : Truth is God, Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House (1959) p. 33.
5. Democracy : "Real and Deceptive. p. 9.
6. The Reign of Religion in Contemporary Philosophy, London, Macmillan and Co., Limited (1920). : p. 25.
7. S. Radhakrishnan : Great Indians, Bombay Kitabs Limited (1949) p. 20.
8. Wit and Wisdom of Gandhi : p. 174.
9. Louis Fischer : Gandhi : His life and message for the world, p. 35
10. Speech, at the International Seminar on "Relevance of Gandhi to our Time" : Held at the Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi, January 30th to Feb. 5th, 1970.

11. Wit and Wisdom of Gandhi: p. 14.
12. Ibid. : p. 120
13. Ibid.
14. The Rigveda : A tvaharsam antaredhi dhryvah
tista avicalih; Visastva sarva
vanchantu matvatrastramadhi
bhrasat. X, 173, 1.
15. The Buddha : 567 - 487 B.C.
16. Solon : 638 - 559 B.C.
17. Quoted in Reflections : p. 7.
on Democracy.
18. Plato : The Republic (427-347 B.C.)
19. Aristotle : Politics (384-322 B.C.)
20. Cicero : 106-43 B.C.
21. Democracy : Real and Deceptive. p. 75.
22. Quoted in Reflection on : p. 7.
Democracy
23. Young India : June 30th, 1920. p. 3.
24. Giovanni Saratori : Democratic Theory,
Chapter VII on What Democracy
Is Not, p. 135.
25. Young India : March 2nd, 1922.
26. Democracy : Real and Deceptive, p. 27.
27. Abraham Lincoln : Fragments of slavery,
March 4, 1861.
28. Democracy : Real and Deceptive, p. 20.

29. Shriman Narayan
Edited by : The selected works of Mahatma
Gandhi Vol.VI,
Navjivan Publishing House(1968)
Ahemadabad. p. 447.
30. Democracy : Real and Deceptive, p. 20.
31. Ibid. : p. 5.
32. Ibid. : p. 10.
33. Shrima Narayan
Edited by : The selected works of Mahatma
Gandhi, Vol. VI. p. 446.
34. Ibid. : p. 10.
35. Democracy : Real and Deceptive. p. 3.
36. Shriman Narayan
Edited by : The selected works of Mahatma
Gandhi. Vol. VI. p. 341.
37. Democracy : Real and Deceptive. p. 68.
See also p. 70.
38. Elements of Political
Science, Chapter XII :
39. Democracy : Real and Deceptive. p. 8.
40. M. K. Gandhi. : Sarvodaya. p. 5.
41. Ibid. : p. 3.
42. Ibid. : p. 5.
43. Shriman Narayan
Edited by : The selected works of Mahatma
Gandhi. Vol. VI. p. 450.
44. M. K. Gandhi. : " Ruskin's Unto This Last " A
paraphrase.
45. My Religion : p. 124.

46. Reflections on Democracy : p. 7.
47. Democracy : Real and Deceptive. p. 27.
48. Ibid. : p. 7.
49. Ibid. : p. 3.
50. Ibid. : p. 27.
51. 'Patriotism and Government' p. 175.
in selected Essays.
52. 'Laws and Government ' : p. 291.
is Essays on Political
Economy.
53. Ibid. : p. 288.
54. Quoted by K. Nag in : Letter dated 7th September 1910
Tolstoy and Gandhi.
55. Quoted in Nag in : See his letter to Gandhi of
Ibid. October 7th, 1909. p. 63.
56. " Unto This Last " : p. 45.
57. As Quoted in G. Dhawan : The Political Philosophy of
Mahatma Gandhi,
(Ahmedabad, 1951) p. 38.
58. ' What is Religion ' : In Selected Essay, p. 93.

..... S.,....