
UNIT 2 GANDHI'S VIEWS ON STATE AND CITIZENSHIP (RAMRAJYA)

Structure

- 2.1 Introduction
 - Aims and Objectives
- 2.2 Notions of State and *Swaraj*
- 2.3 Economic basis of Political Independence
- 2.4 Constructive Programme
- 2.5 Citizenship
- 2.6 Conclusion
- 2.7 Summary
- 2.8 Terminal Questions

Suggested Readings

2.1 INTRODUCTION

It is generally agreed that one of the major consequences of the colonial rule in India is the emergence and consolidation of an overdeveloped state and a relatively underdeveloped society. This distorted development has important implications for class formation and domination in the developing societies. Richard L. Sklar points out in the context of Africa that “class relations, at bottom, are determined by relations of power, not production”. This is in total negation to the well-known Marxist theory of class consolidation on the basis of economic categories. This also means that the classification employed by the Marxists in the advanced capitalistic countries has very little practical relevance in comprehending class-based politics in post-colonial societies.

The enormity of this crucial role of the state in the developing world is reflected by the fact that the modern state is a leviathan in power, wealth and domination with regard to other societal formations, institutions and organisations. This is one major reason for the breakdown of constitutional governments in many parts of the developing world and the consequent absence of constitutionalism, civil liberties and plurality of institutions. During the period when Gandhi led the nationalist struggle in India, the colonial state had reached its zenith following Great Britain's victory in the First World War. He encountered and reacted against this state for the next three decades. Following his anarchistic leanings and his total rejection of modern industrialised civilisation of the West, he charted a new course for India by restricting the activity of the state and focusing on the grassroots development. His ideal, thereby, was far removed from the various conceptions of state projected in the Western political traditions.

Being an activist, Gandhi was also careful when making predictions and outlining his conception of an ideal state. In 1942, while replying to a query raised by Louis Fischer about the structure and the shape of the Indian society after independence, Gandhi pointed out ‘I admit that the future society of India is largely beyond my grasp’ (cited in Ganguli

1973, p.148). Gandhi devoted his energies to analysing the particular situation, innovating and modifying principles, learning from experience rather than attempting to provide a blueprint for an ideal society. His ideal remained an integral part of his vision of a society free of violence and exploitation but beyond this he refused to provide details.

Aims and Objectives

After reading this Unit, you would be able to understand

- Gandhi's notions of state and swaraj
- Gandhi's explanation of an economic basis of political independence
- His views on constructive programme and citizenship

2.2 NOTIONS OF STATE AND SWARAJ

The state, for Gandhi, represents violence in its concentrated form but is necessary since human beings are social by nature and as such morally incapable of acting in a socially responsible manner. He desires a state that would employ as little violence and coercion as possible and wanted individual actions to be regulated by voluntary efforts as far as possible. Distinguishing between state and society he opposes the notion of absolute state sovereignty in the Austinian sense. He advocates limited state sovereignty for there is an obligation higher than mere politics. His position is strengthened by his faith in individual personality evident from his remark: "If the individual ceases to count, what is left of society". Given this perception, Gandhi is generally distrustful of any increase in state power for "although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress". He prefers individual initiative and voluntary efforts. He desires the establishment of a society in which the state exists outside the daily life of the common man. The ideal society would be a decentralised one giving ample scope for self-development. It is akin to the actual reality of British society of the nineteenth century, which he saw and admired.

Gandhi's belief in the primacy of the individual led him to conceptualise a truly non-violent state composed of self-governing and self-sufficient village communities based on majority rule. It would elect district representatives who, in turn, elect provincial and national representatives. Majority rule would be subject to two constraints: first, the majority could not run roughshod on an issue on which the minority harbours strong views. Second, a human being should not act contrary to the dictates of his conscience since he is essentially a moral person. Therefore everyone has the right to engage in acts of civil disobedience against policies that are contrary to what one considers to be morally right. Political power, for Gandhi, is "the capacity to regulate material life through national representatives. If national life becomes so perfect as to become self-regulated, no representation becomes necessary. There is then a state of enlightened anarchy. In such a state everyone is his own ruler. He rules himself in such manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state, therefore, there is no political power because there is no state" (Young India, 2-7-1931).

A non-violent state must aim at the welfare and upliftment of its citizens. In such a state, the police would be social workers ready to use moral persuasion and public opinion to deal with anti-social elements. Crime would be treated as a disease that required understanding and help and not punishment. It would be a state free of exploitation and conflicts between

the labour and capital in industry, between the tenant and landlord in agriculture and between the city and village. These conflicts would be resolved through passive resistance and trusteeship. In such a state, property would also be regarded as evil, for excess of it encourages evils like exploitation, sensual indulgence and contempt for one's fellow-beings. However, he does not subscribe to forcible appropriation of individual property and proposes a system of Trusteeship. He supports a greater role of the state in economic affairs, which contradicts his otherwise, minimalist views on the state. He defends limitations on the right of inheritance, state ownership of land and heavy industries, nationalisation without compensation and heavy taxes. The concepts of *Swaraj*, nationalism, socialism, industrialisation, individualism and the state are crucial elements, which would actualise this ideal. Among all these, *Swaraj* is of special significance.

Swaraj, a word taken from the Vedas in order to replace the ambiguous word 'independence' means self-rule and self-control, unlike independence, which means freedom without restraints. *Swaraj* was self-rule or self-control, and this meant three things: first, freedom was primarily an individual, not a collective quality. Second, it included the conventional civil liberties of the press, speech, association and religion; and third, it distinguished between inner and outer forms of freedom, inner freedom as anchoring and sustaining outer freedom (Dalton, 1982, pp.144-47).

Gandhi uses the term *swaraj* to mean positive freedom, to participate in the process of politics in every way possible rather than conceive the state as a negative institution that restricts activities to a bare minimum. It does not mean that the state is all-powerful but rather an intimate relationship that ought to exist between the state and its citizens. *Swaraj* implied participatory democracy.

By *Swaraj* I mean the government of India by the consent of the people as ascertained by the largest number of adult population, male and female, native born or domiciled, who have contributed by manual labour to the service of the state and who have taken the trouble of having registered their names as voters....Real *swaraj* will come not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when it is abused. In other words, *swaraj* is to be obtained by educating the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority (Gandhi, 1947, p.14).

Gandhi's conception is similar to that of Green for both perceive actualisation of individual's entire potential within a societal framework. Like Green, Gandhi does not glorify the state. 'For both the aim was to make life morally meaningful for all people, and both viewed the community as held together not by compulsion but by the sense of a common interest of good' (Bondurant, 1967, p.162).

Gandhi clarifies on the need to bridge the gap between the white and blue-collar workers making manual labour mandatory for every single person. Elaborating on the theory of consent, he proclaims that real '*swaraj* will come not by acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when it is abused'. For achieving this, people have to be educated so that they could regulate and control authority. Like Plato, Paine and J.S. Mill, he places enormous importance on education as a precondition to the enjoyment of democratic freedom and ability to fulfill obligations. He identifies what he calls the three pillars of *Swaraj*: (a) Hindu-Muslim unity, (b) abolition of untouchability and (c) upliftment of Indian villages. Criticising Tilak, he categorically emphasises that social evils are an impediment for *Swaraj* and therefore underlines the importance of social reforms.

2.3 ECONOMIC BASIS OF POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE

For Gandhi, political independence without economic well-being is meaningless. He is conscious of the danger of continued oppression, even after independence, unless the lot of the common people is improved. For him, exploitation by a fellow Indian is as detestable as the exploitation by the British or any other foreign power. In the *Hind Swaraj* he explains this by comparing the Italian experience with that of India. Referring to Italian leaders like Victor Emanuel, Cavour and Garibaldi and Mazzini, he observes that for Cavour and Garibaldi, 'Italy meant the king of Italy and his henchmen' but for Mazzini, 'it meant the whole of the Italian people, that is, its agriculturists'. Since Mazzini's ideal has not been achieved, 'the Italy of Mazzini still remains in a state of slavery'. The gains of independence are absolutely nominal because 'the reforms for the sake of which the war was supposed to have been undertaken have not yet been granted. The condition of the people in general still remains the same'. Gandhi applies this understanding to the Indian situation and makes it absolutely clear that just formal independence of India means very little to him. National independence for him is a means to an end, and not an end in itself. Stating his position he writes:

I am sure you do not wish to reproduce such a condition in India. I believe that you want the millions of Indians to be happy not that you want the reins of government in your hands. If that be so, we have to consider only one thing: how can the millions obtain self rule? You will admit that people under several Indian princes are being ground down. The latter mercilessly crush them. Their tyranny is greater than that of the English, and if you want such tyranny in India, then we shall never agree. My patriotism does not teach me that I am to allow people to be crushed under the heel of Indian princes just as much as that of the English. By patriotism I mean the welfare of the whole people, and if I could secure it at the hands of the English, I should bow down my head to them if any Englishman dedicated his life to securing the freedom of India, resisting tyranny and serving the land. I should welcome that Englishman as an Indian (Gandhi, 1938, pp.67-68).

The example of the Indian princes as responsible for the misery and poverty of the Indian masses is of crucial significance. It makes it clear that the welfare of the masses is intimately linked with political independence. Gandhi equates political with economic freedom. The basic necessities should be available to all, irrespective of one's status: "The *swaraj* of my dream is the poor man's *swaraj*" (Gandhi, 1947, p.17). Self-sufficient villages could best achieve the welfare of the people. This emphasis is because the overwhelming majority of the Indian people live in its seven hundred thousand villages, and no effective solution to the Indian problem could be found unless and until the villages are rejuvenated. Society, for Gandhi, is not to be organised as a pyramid but "as an oceanic circle with the individual at the center, ready to sacrifice for his village, the village for a larger circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals". The urban proletariat, which is the vanguard for Marx and Engels, has very little place in Gandhi's thinking, in spite of Gandhi's early association with the mill workers of Ahmedabad. In the village-based economy and society of India, where any far-reaching, genuine welfare is yet to begin, the urban proletariat (especially before independence) is an insignificant percentage of the have-nots. Moreover, in the Indian context, there is a considerable difference between the city and village life, with an absence of sanitation, education and medical facilities.

2.4 CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAMME

Gandhi's prescription for social progress and transformation is contained in what he describes as the constructive programme. It is conceived as an alternative positive programme for social reorganisation to the one, the orthodox Anarchists offer. In its implementation, Gandhi met with partial success. It gives content to the concept of *satyagraha* and is framed with the purpose of their applicability within the Indian social and economic milieu. The programme is considered as the key to the attainment of *poorna swaraj* and consists of the following items: (1) communal harmony, (2) removal of untouchability, (3) prohibition, (4) *Khadi*, (5) cottage industries, (6) village sanitation, (7) new or basic education—*nai talim*, (8) adult education, (9) upliftment of women, (10) education in health and hygiene and (11) propagation of national language, *Hindustani*. Of these, the most important is *Khadi*.

For Gandhi, hand-spinning and hand-weaving is the salvation to the economic, political and psychological problems of India. He tries to meet the communist critique of the *Khaddar* programme by emphasising its capacity to organise the community. Decentralisation of industry is crucial for preserving the purity and cohesiveness of domestic life, artistic and creative talents of the individual members and more importantly, 'people's sense of freedom, ownership and dignity'. He wants to develop what he considers a *khadi* mentality by which he means decentralisation of production and distribution of the necessities of life thus ensuring economic and political freedom and reducing the dependence on the state and the government. He is also convinced that spinning would purify the body and soul of the spinners and would lead to spiritual progress.

Another highlight of the Constructive programme is the emphasis on the scheme of basic education by which he means the learning of the three R's (reading, writing and arithmetic) and acquisition of skill, preferably the traditional family skill. The aim is to make the individual self-supporting by the sale of products of work done by vocational training thus ensuring an assured occupation which would give the students, the material rewards which could, in turn, be diverted towards their further education and self-development. Gandhi also sees it as a practical expression of his belief in the idea of bread-labour, a concept which he borrows from Ruskin.

Gandhi is convinced that education has to be a lifelong process and should not stop with childhood. This is recommended with the view to enrich the minds of the individual, and here Gandhi, like Plato, believes in the human capacity to absorb knowledge lifelong. Moreover, education would have to be imparted in one's mother tongue as that enables the person to retain and understand what is taught. It would also instill love for one's mother tongue and pave the way for the development of a common national language, which for Gandhi would be *Hindustani*. He desires free and compulsory education for all children up to the age of fourteen.

Gandhi also drew attention to the filth and lack of hygienic conditions in the Indian villages by his emphasis on sanitation, clean drainages, well-paved roads and education in basic hygiene. He also drew special attention to the exploited and the underprivileged sections of the Indian society, namely the *Harijans* and women. He pleaded for the abolition of child marriage, *purdah* and other customs that kept women in a state of subjugation. Under his stewardship of the freedom movement, women participated in large numbers. Initially, in the 1920s, he wanted women to be confined to their homes and practice *swadeshi* by working

on the spinning-wheel but subsequently during the civil disobedience campaigns of the 1930s, he allowed them to picket liquor shops besides participating in the salt *satyagraha*. Women played an important role in many of the humanitarian works that Gandhi undertook like helping the poor, nursing the sick and promoting *khadi*. He advocated class, caste and gender equality seeing equality and justice as the bedrock of a humane and dignified society.

Through his constructive programme, to which he devoted most of his time and energy, Gandhi tried to link freedom with harmony. *Khaddar* and the spinning-wheel would bridge the gulf between the small numbers of educated urban elite with the majority of villagers. Similarly *Hindustani* would be the lingua franca of the nation as it would create one language for the entire nation. For Gandhi, both untouchability and communalism were corrosive poisons. He considered Hindu-Muslim unity as an extension of untouchability, which needed to be fought, as long as it lasted. Within this framework of social harmony Gandhi persisted with attempts to resolve particular social problems. He wanted to reconcile freedom with harmony and deal with the contradictions of caste and religion. Emphasising on compromise and cooperation, he endeavoured to reconcile divergent interests.

2.5 CITIZENSHIP

According to Gandhi all states have the intrinsic potential for oppression and violence, none more so than the modern highly bureaucratic state. His ideal is a state that is bereft of centralised power. His conception of citizenship was based on three cardinal tenets: *satya* (truth and sincerity), *ahimsa* (non-violence in thought and deed) and *dharma* (moral law and duty). According to Gandhi, all states tend to violate *satya* and *ahimsa*, which is why he described the state as a soulless machine. He distrusted state as it represented coercive power and hence reposed greater faith in the role of the individual to meet the onslaught of the state. The state represented compulsion, uniformity and violence in a concentrated form which is why his ideal was a non-violent state that would be self-governing and self-sufficient in which the majority rule would prevail with due respect for minority rights.

For Gandhi, the individual citizen is endowed with *dharma* and is the bearer of moral authority with the right and even the duty to judge the state and its laws, by the standards of *dharma*, which in turn, combined the essentials of *satya* and *ahimsa*. Since the state is a 'soulless machine' and the individual is endowed with *dharma* that encompasses both *satya* and *ahimsa*, it is therefore the paramount duty of the individual, endowed with moral authority, to challenge and even disobey the state for "every citizen renders himself responsible for every act of his government. And loyalty to a capricious and corrupt state is a sin, disloyalty a virtue. Civil disobedience becomes a sacred duty when the state becomes lawless or, which is the same thing, corrupt and a citizen who barter with such a state shares its corruption and lawlessness" (Gandhi, 1951, p.150). Describing civil disobedience as a moral right of every individual, he called it a "birthright that cannot be surrendered without losing self respect" (Ibid, p.155). The existence of injustice justifies political resistance and political protest is basically moral. Like Locke and Jefferson, he believed that loyalty to a constitution and its laws need to be reviewed and affirmed once in every generation. He also emphasised on the need for civil disobedients to be respectful of the law as they are law abiding citizens. A *satyagrahi* cooperates not out of fear of punishment but because cooperation is necessary for common good. Civil disobedience is based on profound respect for law and is resorted to publicly and nonviolently. Gandhi differed from Thoreau in stressing on strict non-violence and it is his conception "that has usually been accepted in recent discussions in civil disobedience". In more recent times, Rawls defined civil

disobedience as a “public non violent conscientious yet political act contrary to law usually done with the aim of bringing about a change in the law or policies of the government” (Rawls, 1971, p.368).

In 1922, in a written statement submitted to a court of law, Gandhi explained his transformation from being a loyalist of the British Empire to that of a non-cooperator. Listing the deeds and misdeeds of the government, he concluded that the British rule had made Indians helpless, both economically and politically, and that the only solution was non-cooperation. Writing in *Young India* in 1920 he observed:

Non-cooperation with evil is as much a duty as is cooperation with good. But in the past, non-cooperation only has been deliberately expressed in violence to the evil-doer. I am endeavouring to show to my countrymen that violent non-cooperation only multiplies evil and that evil can only be sustained by violence. Withdrawal or support of evil requires complete abstention from violence.

Until 1914, Gandhi was a believer in the Empire and even wanted Indians to take up arms to defend the Empire. He considered it his duty to enlist Indians in the army on the grounds that there could be no friendship between the brave and the effeminate people; that Indians were cowardly and that if Indians wanted to become free from reproach then we ought to learn the use of arms. Only later on that Gandhi became convinced of the efficacy of non-violence as is clear from his deposition before the Disorder Inquiry Committee which Lord Hunter presided over. Replying to queries from Lord Hunter, Gandhi delineated his method of non-violent *satyagraha*:

Lord Hunter: “If you were a Governor yourself, what would you say to a movement that was started with the object of breaking those laws which your committee determined?”

Gandhi: That would not be stating the whole case of *satyagraha* doctrine. If I were in charge of government and brought face to face with a body who, entirely in search of truth, were determined to seek redress from unjust laws without inflicting violence I would welcome it and consider that they were the best constitutionalists, and as Governor, I would take them by my side as advisers who would keep me on the right path.

Lord Hunter: People differ as to the justice or injustice of the particular laws.

Gandhi: That is the main reason why violence is eliminated and a *satyagrahi*... will fight by inflicting injuries on his person” (cited in Sankar Ghose 1984, p.154).

After Lord Hunter, Gandhi was questioned by Sir Chimanlal Setalvad.

Sir Chimanlal: You said you do not consider yourself a perfect *satyagrahi* yet. The large masses of people are then even less?

Gandhi: No, I do not consider myself as an extraordinary man.... Forty thousand Indians in South Africa, totally uncultured came to the conclusion that they could be *satyagrahis*, and if I could take you through those thrilling scenes in the Transvaal you will be surprised to hear (about) the restraint your countrymen in South Africa exhibited” (Ibid).

Clarifying his position further, Gandhi in August 1920 points out that “If India takes up the doctrine of the sword, she may gain momentary victory. Then India will cease to be the pride of my heart.... My life is dedicated to the service of India through the religion of non violence which I believe to be the root of Hinduism” (Ibid, p.155). Throughout the rest of

his life, he remains steadfast in his belief in non-violent mass action. The doctrine of non-violence and *satyagraha* are linked to Gandhi's innate attachment to truth which he describes as truth force. He is conscious of the fact that what truth is or what appears to be the truth at a particular given moment to someone may not be accepted as truth by others. He knows very well that to insist on an absolute truth is both impractical and premature at the present level of human development. "Gandhi never claimed", remarked Bondurant, "to know truth in any absolute sense and he repeatedly reminded others that man's inability to know the truth required that he maintain an increasingly open approach to those who differ from him" (Bondurant, 1967, p.19). This is the prime reason for linking *satyagraha* with non-violence. Accepting that truth is relative, he remarks "Truth is God". "There are innumerable definitions of God, because His manifestations are innumerable. They overwhelm me with wonder and awe and for a moment stun me. But I worship God as Truth only. I have not yet found Him But I am seeking after Him. I am prepared to sacrifice the things dearest to me in pursuit of this quest. As long as I have not realized this absolute truth, so long, I must hold by the relative truth as I have conceived it. That relative truth must meanwhile be my beacon, my shield and buckler" (cited in Bondurant, Ibid, p.19).

In Gandhi's ethics, self-suffering occupies an important place, which is different from cowardice, and is to be exercised with caution. The basic difference between self-suffering and violence lies in the fact that whereas violence allows injury to another person, self-suffering is free from any such possibility. This leads Gandhi to distinguish between non-violent mass action and passive resistance. It is not the violence of the weak as he consistently espouses the need for non-violence seeing it as the quality of the brave. Other than self-suffering, there is a need to overcome fear. "Just as one must learn the art of killing in the training for violence, so one must learn the art of dying in the training for non violence.... The votary of non violence has to cultivate the capacity for sacrifice of the highest type in order to be free from fear....He who has not overcome all fear cannot practice *ahimsa* to perfection" (cited in Bondurant, Ibid, p.26).

Gandhi is equally concerned about ensuring equality among all the segments of society and in doing so "he set the tone of Indian social ethical rethinking about the untouchables" (Heater, 1990, p.132). He condemned the practice whereby the untouchables were shunned by the rest and treated as outcasts. He gave them a new name to grant them human dignity by calling them *Harijans*. Opposing the 1934 Poona Pact, as it recommended separate electorates for the untouchables, Gandhi undertook fast unto death. If the pact was reached then he feared and rightly so the dismemberment of an already divided Hindu society.

Gandhi's entire purpose is to integrate the depressed classes with the nationalist mainstream economically, socially and culturally with no stigma attached to any Indian because of one's caste, creed, economic status or religion. In this integrative and equalitarian impulse, Gandhi is uncompromising in his criticism of the higher orthodox Hindus for perpetrating the inhuman caste system while asking the depressed classes also to rise to the occasion and banish bad habits which are obstacles to a larger social acceptance.

Gandhi also spoke of 'world citizenship', of 'the essential unity of God and man for that matter of all lives' holding that 'All mankind in essence are alike'. His *Advaita* doctrine, which he embraces, has certain affinities with Stoicism. Gandhi's conviction of the need for peace and justice through non-violent thought and action with a world federalist system that would pave way for world government is put into practice by Nehru with his doctrine of

non-alignment. Nehru points out that for enduring peace there is a need for the recognition of the moral law in both national and international relations, and an intrinsic relationship between right means and end.

2.6 CONCLUSION

For Gandhi, 'the fight for *Swaraj* means not mere political awakening but an all around awakening- social, educational, moral, economic and political'. He recommended the need to transform the Congress organisation into a *Lok Sevak Sangh*, a people's service organisation after India's independence. His insistence on the need to develop a system of *panchayats* and his stay in Noakhali, Bihar and his last fast for Hindu-Muslim unity in Delhi indicated his grasp of the complexities of the country and his desire to find solutions. He recognised that such tasks were less exciting and not spectacular but they were important for without achieving the basic unity of trust, confidence, equality and fair play, the formal independence achieved would remain incomplete.

The Indian state, contrary to Gandhi's vision and prescriptions, is a centralised and overdeveloped state like other post colonial states in the Third world. As a result the state, in spite of its enormity of strength and resources, has not been able to provide a consensual order. Equality and an innovative spirit have also remained a far cry. Far from liberating, the state, as Gandhi rightly pointed out, has made people more subservient. It has widened the gulf between the elite and the masses, the wide gap that exists between 'India' and '*Bharat*' with the former unable to understand the needs, aspirations and language of the latter. It is important to rectify this situation and reduce this overdeveloped state by harmonising it with societal forces and aspirations.

Gandhi provides a framework for a participatory, functional and a development state with maximum inclusion and minimum exclusion. He does not defend the all powerful leviathan and like Thoreau, desired a government that governs the least; not in the sense of having a night watchman state but a fully functional one with rough parity and active citizenry. It is not a politics of withdrawal nor does he lament like Rousseau that people are free once in five years but one in the individuals relate to the larger social unit in the form of oceanic circles without losing one's identity and without overlooking the welfare of all.

2.7 SUMMARY

The state for Gandhi represents violence in its concentrated form but is necessary since human beings are social by nature. He desires a state that would employ little violence and coercion and wanted individual actions to be regulated by voluntary efforts as far as possible. He advocates limited state sovereignty for there is an obligation higher than mere politics. His position is strengthened by his faith in individual personality. The ideal society would be a decentralised one giving ample scope for self-development. Gandhi uses the term *swaraj* to mean positive freedom, to participate in the process of politics in every way possible rather than conceive the state as a negative institution that restricts activities to a bare minimum. *Swaraj* implied participatory democracy. For Gandhi, political independence without economic well-being is meaningless. Gandhi's prescription for social progress and transformation is contained in what he describes as the constructive programme. The state is a 'soulless machine' and the individual is endowed with *dharma* that encompasses both *satya* and *ahimsa*. It is therefore the paramount duty of the individual, endowed with moral authority, to challenge and even disobey the state. Gandhi also spoke of 'world citizenship',

of 'the essential unity of God and man for that matter of all lives' holding that 'All mankind in essence are alike'.

2.8 TERMINAL QUESTIONS

1. Explain Gandhi's views on the state and *swaraj*.
2. What is the relationship between economic and political independence in Gandhi's thought?
3. Describe the role of constructive programme in Gandhi's philosophy.
4. Critically assess Gandhi's views on citizenship.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Bandyopadhyaya, J., *Social and Political Thought of Gandhi*, Bombay, Allied Publishers, 1969.

Bhattacharya, B., *Evolution of the Political Philosophy of Gandhi*, Calcutta, Calcutta Book House, 1969.

Bhattacharya, S., *Mahatma Gandhi: The Journalist*, Bombay, Times of India Press, 1962.

Bondurant, J. V., *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1967.

Chatterjee, P., *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1986.

Dalton, D., *India's Idea of Freedom*, Gurgaon, Academic Press, 1982.

—————, *Mahatma Gandhi: Nonviolent Power in Action*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1993.

Heater, D., *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education*, London, Orient Longman, 1990.

Iyer, R. N., *The Moral and Political Thought of Gandhi*, Bombay, Oxford University Press, 1973.

Mukherjee, S., *Gandhian Thought: Marxist Interpretation*, Delhi, Deep and Deep, 1991.

Pantham, T and Deutsch, K., (ed), *Political Thought in Modern India*, New Delhi, Sage, 1986.

Parekh, B., *Gandhi's Political Philosophy*, Notre Dame, Notre Dame University Press, 1989.

Woodcock, G., *Mohandas Gandhi*, New York, Fontana, 1971.