
UNIT 7 TRUSTEESHIP

Structure

- 7.1 Introduction
 - Aims and Objectives
- 7.2 Trusteeship - Roots in Indian Cultural Heritage
- 7.3 Kinds of Property
 - 7.3.1 Gifts of Nature
 - 7.3.2 Product of Social Living
- 7.4 Spirit of Japanese Nobles (Samurai)
- 7.5 State Regulated Trusteeship
- 7.6 Trusteeship Formula
- 7.7 Criticism
- 7.8 Summary
- 7.9 Terminal Questions
 - Suggested Readings

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The most important and controversial issue of economic philosophy is the right to private property. The controversy as it developed, mainly between Capitalist and Communist economists, led scholars to no definite conclusion. This (right to property) remained more a matter of dogmatic attachment to ideology than of rational convictions. The former believes that right to property is absolute and needs no intervention by the state. They believe that each man is the best judge of his own interest and would make efforts to better his own lot and also promote general good. The Communists rejected the Capitalist model on the ground that it inevitably led to the growth of monopolies and imperialism on one hand, and the perpetual immersion of the working class on the other. They suggested the revolutionary overthrow of the entire politico economic system, the socialisation of all means of production and the total elimination of 'bourgeoisie' through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Gandhi rejected both these solutions. He believed them to be based on violence, exploitation and tyranny. He was of the confirmed belief that instead of changing the property relations, if we change the uses to which property is put, we can have the desired results. He advocated trusteeship as a relevant choice between the existing but unacceptable system of Capitalist organisation and its 'inevitable' throw by violence. He believed that as far as the present owners of wealth are concerned they have to make a choice between war and voluntarily converting themselves into the trustees of their wealth. The choice is not between the two parties, that is wealth-owners and their workers, but for the society as a whole. He seeks to harmonise the economic relations and to conciliate the ultimate values into a state of equilibrium through Trusteeship.

Aims and Objectives

After studying this Unit, you should be able to understand

- the Doctrine of Trusteeship as propounded by Gandhi
- its contemporary relevance.

7.2 TRUSTEESHIP - ROOTS IN INDIAN CULTURAL HERITAGE

Trusteeship, to Gandhi, was neither an economic expedient nor a make shift for him. It was a way of life. He said: “My theory of trusteeship is no make shift, certainly no camouflage. I am confident that it will survive all other theories. It has the sanction of philosophy and religion behind it” (Harijan, 16-11-1939, p.376). The Indian philosophy, religion and morals are replete with this. The ancient Indian concept of rulers or kings was that of a real trustee. The philosophy contained in the concept of ‘Ramarajya’ bears testimony of the fact that under the Indian cultural heritage, the rulers wielded power not for their own sake but for the sake of their subjects. Bharat reigned over Ayodhya during Ramachandra’s absence as the latter’s trustee. Lord Krishna acted as the charioteer of Arjuna in the battle of Mahabharata, not with any ulterior motive or expectation of any gain from the battle; he acted as a trustee of Arjuna to give satisfaction to the latter.

In the past, the heads of Hindu joint families used to live the life of true trustees. According to K.M. Munshi, “He held the family property and was expected to manage and administer it for the welfare of the family He was expected to watch with care the advancement of its younger members belonging even to collateral branches and had to give asylum to the orphans, widows, destitutes in the family” (Munshi, 1956, pp.15-16). Writing specifically about the property, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan has pointed out, “Property according to the Hindu View, is a mandate held by its possessors for the common use and benefit of the commonwealth. The Bhagavata tells us that we have a claim only to so much as would satisfy our hunger. If any one desires more, he is thief deserving punishment”(Radhakrishnan, 1937, p.127).

Thus the concept of trusteeship should be viewed in the context of the values it stood for. Though the doctrine is as old as the age, Gandhi tried to apply this philosophical teaching to the concrete realities of life for the solution of the existing economic problems.

The words like, *aparigraha* (non possession) and ‘*samabhava*’ (equability) had gripped him. He realised that the principles of non possession and renunciation of one’s property or possession or assets as advocated in the Gita can be given effect to by way of trusteeship whereby the propertied people, while retaining their property, can still divest themselves of such possessions by holding the property in the form of trust for the real beneficiaries. His study of English Law also came to his help in deciding upon his divesting himself of all possessions. To quote from his autobiography, “My study of English Law came to my help. Snell’s discussion of the maxims of Equity came to my memory. I understood more clearly in the light of Gita teaching the implication of the world trustee ... I understood Gita teaching of non possession to mean that those who desired solution should act like trustees who, though having control over great possessions, regards not an iota of them as his own”(Gandhi, 1947, p.221).

In a letter to Polak on October 14, 1909, who was at that time in India, Gandhi employed the word ‘trustee’ for the first time. He wrote, “Then the British rulers will be servants and

not masters. They will be trustees and not tyrants, and they will live in perfect peace with the whole of the inhabitants of India. Laying his heart bare before the august audience assembled on the occasion of the opening of the Banaras Hindu University on February 4, 1916, he appealed to the 'richly bedecked noblemen' present on dais to strip themselves of the jeweller and 'hold it in trust' for their countrymen in India" (CWMG, vol.9, p.481).

7.3 KINDS OF PROPERTY

7.3.1 Gifts of Nature

Gandhi opined that all forms of property and human accomplishments are either gift of nature or the product of social living. They belong not to the individual but to the society and therefore, should be used for the good of all. He said, "Everything belonged to God and was from God, and therefore, it was for his people and not for a particular individual. When an individual has more than his proportionate portion, he becomes trustee of that portion for God's people." He further argued, "Suppose I have come by a fair amount of wealth either by way of legacy or by means of trade and industry I must know that all my wealth does not belong to me; and what belongs to me is the right of an honourable livelihood, no better than that enjoyed by millions of others. The rest of my wealth belong to the community and must be used for the welfare of the community" (Harijan, 3-6-1939, p.145).

'Land, mines and other natural resources, are the gift of nature. No individual has made them. God created these not for any particular individual or group of individuals. Man has only occupied a piece of land and demarcated it. He is only the maker of a boundary line. He cannot be called the real owner of that property. Let us take an example. There is a landlord in a village having 100 acres of land. From where he got this land? 'From his forefathers', can be the safest answer. His forefathers got the land from their forefathers and so on. Actually what would have happened? Some one from that family might have occupied that portion of land and created a boundary line. That person was not the creator of land but the creator of that boundary line. The land which should have belonged to other persons also, belongs to one particular landlord because of the boundary line'.

7.3.2 Product of Social Living

A person cannot accumulate wealth in social vacuum. Suppose a person has accumulated huge wealth and established several industries, he alone cannot make that. There may be so many persons who helped that person in accumulating that wealth. Gandhi emphasised that the ownership of the labourers and the peasants is something more than mere moral ownership. The rich cannot accumulate wealth without the help of the poor in the society. Since they have helped the capitalist in accumulating the wealth, they have their share in that also. Each is entitled to acquire only that much of wealth or property that is essential for his immediate need or his existence. None has a right to acquire more than what is needed to satisfy his absolute and immediate needs particularly, when millions are unable to satisfy their most basic requirements. He wrote, "You and I have no right to anything that we really have until these ... millions are clothed and fed better."

He allowed the people with talent to earn more but asked them to utilise their talent for the good of the suffering people. They would have their earnings only as trustees i.e., owners in their own rights but owners in the right of those whom they have exploited (Young India, 26-11-1931, p.369).

An industrious person with more than average intelligence may acquire by legitimate means,

more property than idle men and men of average or below average intelligence even without resorting to violence and exploitation. He admitted, "It is my conviction that it is possible to acquire riches without consciously doing wrong. For example, I may light on a gold mine in my one acre of land" (Harijan, 8-3-1942, p.67). Writing in the form of a reply to Shankar Rao Deo, who raised an issue, whether crores can be earned by legitimate means, 'Surely a man may conceivably make crores through strictly pure means assuming that a man may legitimately possess riches.... If I own a mining lease and I tumble upon a diamond of rare value I may suddenly find myself a millionaire without being held guilty of having used impure means" (Ibid., 22-2-1942, p.49). Although such wealth may be legitimately acquired without violence and exploitation, he was not prepared to accept it as a source of one's real happiness and his balanced growth. Rather they stand as stumbling block on the way of self realisation and blossoming of an integrated personality and all-round development of the individual since worship of the mammon and cultivation of manliness do not go hand in hand. As a remedy for such an untenable position arising out of the possession of wealth flowing into one's purse almost without any conscious effort on his part for the accumulation of the same, Gandhi suggested cultivation of a spirit of detachment for wealth and utilisation for oneself only a portion of it that is needed for meeting one's 'legitimate needs' and 'honourable livelihood'.

He accepted trusteeship as a practical proposition which shall liberate the wealthy and the possessing class of their sin of acquisitiveness and greed and effect a change over in favour of egalitarian society. Elaborating the Upanishadic mantra 'Tena Twaktena Bhunjitha' he said, 'Earn your crores by all means. But understand that your wealth is not yours, it belongs to the people. Take what you require for your legitimate needs and use the remainder for Society' (Ibid., 1-2-1942, p.20).

Gandhi knew that both physical and intellectual ability differs from man to man. Some are capable of working with greater vigour and energy than others and their labour sincerely performed and honestly executed, may prove more productive of material wealth than that of others, who are less energetic and enterprising. Besides, people with better intellectual ability and vigour may devise ways and means for greater material prosperity and intellectual excellence of the nation. The material prosperity and progress of the nation depend upon enthusiastic performance of such capable, energetic, enterprising and imaginative individuals and not on the half-hearted work of the idler, sickly, and the mentally deficient citizens. Gandhi's ideas do not imply that men of greater ability and vigour shall not work more than what is necessary to earn their absolute minimum. It also does not propagate the idea that men of more than average physical strength and vigour, resourcefulness and enterprise, intellectual ability and excellence, shall allow their additional ability and energy to be frittered away or wasted. Nor does it fix a premium on idleness, inactivity, inefficiency, mental incapacity and intellectual deficiencies. Gandhi realised that the society shall be poorer, unless such men of ability keep themselves active throughout. He clarified, "We do not want to produce a dead equality where every person becomes, or is rendered incapable of using his ability to the utmost possible extent. Such a society must ultimately perish" (Gandhi, 1949, p.24).

Gandhi preferred that such individuals with more than average, or unusual ability shall work as per their capacity but shall get in return for themselves only what is required for fulfilling their legitimate needs.

There is a finer, subtler, and a more vital chord, according to Gandhi, in every human heart, that is noble, self sacrificing and full of compassion for others. Sometimes the dust of greed, selfishness and egoism may accumulate on this chord, but properly handled, this subtle chord in human heart shall transmit the melodious music of sacrifice, self sufferings and renunciation

for the benefit of the others. "There are chords in every human heart. If we only know how to strike the right chord we bring out the music." Besides, he said later: "We must appeal to the good in human-beings and expect response."

7.4 SPIRIT OF JAPANESE NOBLES (SAMURAI)

Through the device of trusteeship, the capitalists and the privileged classes were given an opportunity by Gandhi to reform themselves. As a pragmatist, he realised that inspite of all persuasions, many moneyed men, capitalists, industrialists and landlords may not easily respond to such a moral appeal. When he found that many propertied people were not voluntarily converting themselves into trustees by shedding their greed and acquisitiveness, without any physical or mental coercion and blackmail, he administered a dose of warning to the possessing class. On the eve of Salt Satyagraha, he wrote, "All these (moneyed men, landlords, factory owners, etc.) do not always realize that they are living on the blood of the masses, and when they do, they become as callous as the British principals whose tools and agents they are. If like the Japanese Samurai they could but realize that they must give up their blood stained gains, the battle is won for non violence. It must not be difficult for them to see that the holding of million is a crime when millions of their own kith and kin are starving and that, therefore, they must give up their agency" (Young India, 6-2-1930, p.44).

He advised the *Zamindars* and *Talukdars* to imbibe the spirit of Japanese nobles, to revise their notions, and hold their wealth as trustees for the good of the people and the ryots. Without that surrender, the famishing millions would plunge the country which no government nor armed force can stop. "There is no other choice than between voluntary surrender on the part of capitalists of the superfluities and consequent acquisition of the real happiness of all on the one hand, and on the other by impending chaos, into which, if the capitalists do not wake up betimes, awakened but ignorant, famishing millions will plunge the country and which, not even the armed force, that a powerful government can bring in to play can avert" (*Harijan*, 15-12-1944, p.396).

Though Gandhi was firmly dedicated to the application of non violent technique of persuasion and conversion and non violent non cooperation for the attainment of any objective, he specifically warned while writing in the Constructive Programme: "A violent and bloody revolution is a certainty one day unless there is a voluntary abdication of riches and the power that riches give and sharing them for the common good." He repeatedly pointed out to the capitalists that their wealth was the cause of their worries and anxiety, unhappiness and insecurity. "They who employ mercenaries to guard their wealth may find those very guardians turning on them." Writing in *Harijan* he further warned the wealthy sections of the society, "As for the present owners of wealth, they would have to make choice between class war and voluntarily converting themselves into trustees of their wealth" (*Ibid.*, 31-3-1946, pp.63-64).

Gandhi was not prepared to condone violent methods for the sake of realisation of his ideas of Trusteeship. Non violence is too precious an ideal to be sacrificed by Gandhi. Besides the concept of Trusteeship was devised as an alternative to the violent overthrow of privileges so that violent method cannot take precedence, yet if the privileged sections of the society, inspite of all manners of persuasion and moral pressure fail to live up to the ideal of trusteeship, the technique of social compulsion short of violence or coercion can be employed against them.

"All exploitation", observed Gandhi, "is based on co operation willing or forced, of the exploited." If the real producers the labourers and the peasants resort to Satyagraha, accumulation of wealth will fizzle out and the spring of the prosperity of the wealthy sections

of the society will dry up. Speaking about the conversion of the recalcitrant landlords into trustees, Gandhi also suggested the adoption of the same formula of non violent non cooperation. He said, "The moment the cultivators of the soil realise their power, the Zamindari evil will be sterilized. What can the poor Zamindar do when they say that they will simply not work the land, unless they are paid enough to feed, and clothe and educate, themselves, and their children, in a decent manner? In reality the toiler is the owner of what he produces. If the toilers intelligently combine, they will become an irresistible power."

The non violent non cooperation, although a potent instrument that can compel the wealthy section of the society to act as trustees, is dependent on the promise that the labour or the working class must become conscious of the strength and should be ready to assert its right. Besides, the strength of the labour comes from its unity and collective behaviour. But in real life, labour is not united and when some labourers non cooperate with the employers, others are ready to take their place. Under these circumstances, requisite amount of pressure cannot be exerted on the propertied classes to compel them to act as trustees.

7.5 STATE REGULATED TRUSTEESHIP

Gandhi, having realised the limitations of the concept of voluntary assumption of trusteeship by the rich and the need for the adoption of the strategy of pressure to be exercised by the labourers, came around to the significance of statutory measures or legislation for giving effect to his idea of trusteeship. But the statute that Gandhi had in his mind is not one which is imposed from above by the all-pervading state that represents violence in its concentrated and organised form. It shall not be planned out and implemented by a coterie or clique of the ruling party or the bureaucracy.

His ideal picture of social and political organisation comprehended a system of self sufficient and self governing village republics, democratically organised, with Gram Panchayat as the basic unit of the government erected on the basis of consent of the people. The legislation regulating the wealth of the propertied class shall therefore emanate from such Gram Panchayats after a free and full discussion and proper appreciation of the principles by people in general. "Such a statute will not be imposed from above. It will have to come from below. When the people understand the implications of trusteeship and the atmosphere is ripe for it, the people themselves beginning with Gram Panchayats will begin to introduce such statutes. Such a thing coming from below is easy to swallow. Coming from above it is liable to prove a dead weight."

Gandhi favoured the statutes or legislations as technique of last resort to give effect to the idea of Trusteeship. He did not overlook the potency of the technique of persuasion and conversion to aid, and effectualise the statutory enactments. He felt that persuasion and conversion should precede statutory enactments so that it will make the propertied classes mentally prepared to accept the statutory enactments intended to give effect to trusteeship system. As he said, "Conversion must precede legislation. Legislation in absence of conversion is a dead letter." But the technique of conversion that he suggests is not by way of prayer and petitions, but by exhibition of potency of democratic forces or public opinion. He said, "If the owning class does not accept the trusteeship basis voluntarily its conversion must come under the pressure of public opinion."

Gandhi also felt that the state may be depended upon for the introduction of trusteeship. Educating the people in the principles of trusteeship to provide a basis to the statutory trusteeship system, or educating the workers and peasants to be conscious of their rights and

dignity so that necessary social conditions conducive to trusteeship are created, is a time consuming process. But unless the state intervenes in time, some national assets may be spoiled by unimaginative and useless owners of that property. Although Gandhi was afraid of the power of the state and the violence perpetuated by it, for the sake of the long term interest of the nation, he was prepared to allow state intervention to force trusteeship upon the possessing and the privileged class: "I would be happy indeed if the people concerned behaved as trustees, but if they fail, I believe we shall have to deprive them of their possessions through the state."

The question of inheritance is vital for any scheme of socio economic reconstruction. While advising the Congress ministries in 1937 to tax the rich persons heavily, he dealt the question of inheritance also, "For the inheritance should rightly belong to the nation."

When Gandhi wanted to fetter the original trustees' choice making it a subject to 'legal sanction', he acted as a pragmatist who felt that the trustees, however above the average men and however, self sacrificing they themselves may be, may have some weakness for their own children. If the trustees are given unrestrained power to choose their successor they may choose their own people to succeed them as trustees. This may be particularly true in case of statutory trustees who have not voluntarily renounced their possessions or possessiveness, but have been forced to act as such under the pressure of the statute enacted either by the village Panchayat or the state. Gandhi suggested that the nomination made by the original trustees needs to be confirmed by the state.

7.6 TRUSTEESHIP FORMULA

K.G. Mashruwala and N.D. Parikh drew up a trusteeship formula which was placed before Gandhi, who made a few changes in it. The final draft reads as under:

- I. Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capitalist order of the society into an egalitarian one. It gives no quarter to capitalism but gives the present owning class a chance of reforming itself. It is based on faith that human nature is never beyond redemption.
- II. It does not recognise any right of ownership of private property except so far as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare.
- III. It does not exclude legislative regulation of ownership and the use of wealth.
- IV. Thus, under state regulated trusteeship, an individual will not be free to hold or use his wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interest of the society.
- V. Just as it is proposed to fix a decent minimum living wage, even so a limit should be fixed for a maximum income that could be allowed to any person in a society. The difference between such minimum and maximum should be reasonable and equitable and variable from time to time so that the tendency would be toward obliteration of the difference.
- VI. Under the Gandhian economic order the character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed (Harijan, 25-10-1952, p.301).

7.7 CRITICISM

The principle of trusteeship has been subject to much misconceived criticism, and described as a 'make shift', as an 'eye wash', as a shelter for the rich and as merely appealing to the more fortunate ones to show a little more charity. As a means of affecting social transformation,

this theory, its ethical content notwithstanding, is seen as ineffective. Professor M.L. Dantwala, in his 'Gandhism Reconsidered', quotes a Marxist appraisal of the doctrine: "The division of the society into the property owning and the property less classes, which is the characteristic of capitalism, is sought to be retained in Gandhism also. The only difference in Gandhism is that the erstwhile capitalist, property owning classes will consider itself trustee on behalf of the proletariat. The change is purely on the subjective sphere. The objective conditions of production will continue by remaining as they were in capitalism. Production will continue by unplanned private competition among the individual trustees. These conditions of production have a compelling logic of their own which will lead to the same contradictions as are witnessed under capitalism today. The class appropriation of surplus value, which trust production will continue in a pious guise, will mean larger and larger accumulations of the capital on the one hand and pauperisation of the masses on the other... These evils cannot be banished by wishing a change in the hearts and minds of the owners of property" (Dantwala, 1945, pp.54-55).

As Professor Hiren Mukherjee says, "This apostle of pity wanted a sea change in human relationships, but he had a great deal more than the convinced conservative's caution in bringing it about; he was ready to be gentle even with fragrantly self seeking and basically anti social vested interests; and in his pre occupation with the right kind of means for social change, he would make compromises and concessions to the 'status quo' which were often paradoxical and in their implications as in the idea of the rich being 'trustees' of the poor, positively pernicious" (Mukherjee, 1960, p.204).

E.M.S. Namboodiripad has attacked not only Gandhi's philosophy but his intentions also. He said, "Not only in relation to the rural poor, but also in relation to the working class and other sections of the working people, his was an approach which, in actual practice, helped the bourgeoisie. His theory of trusteeship, his insistence on certain moral values as the guiding line for any political activity, the skilful way in which he combined his own extra parliamentary activities (constructive programme and satyagraha) with the parliamentary activities of his lieutenants, the characteristically Gandhian way of combining negotiations with the enemy even while carrying on mass direct action against him all these proved in actual practice to be of enormous help to the bourgeoisie in (a) rousing the masses in action against imperialism and in (b) preventing them from resorting to revolutionary mass action. This ability of his to rouse the masses and yet to check them, to launch anti imperialist direct action and yet to go on negotiating with the imperialist rulers made him the undisputed leader of the bourgeoisie" (Namboodiripad, 1959, p.115).

Critics of this theory include not only the Marxists but also from sympathetic reviewers of Gandhian economics, like Professor J.J. Anjaria regarding its validity as a long term solution. "As a short term measure, this is excellent; coercion is ethically bad; on any large scale, it is also not expedient. But the run away from the problem by merely appealing to the more fortunate ones to show a little more charity awful word is no solution" (Anjaria, 1944, p.31).

Nobel Laureate, Gunnar Myrdal, who calls Gandhi 'a radical liberal', maintains in his 'Asian Drama' that "the trusteeship idea is fundamentally a concept that fits into paternalistic, feudal, pre democratic society. It is so flexible that it can serve as a justification for inequality. Possibly Gandhi realized this, for he demanded a moral revolution, a change of heart among the rich. But in the real world, such a revolution is unlikely and the trusteeship ideal is nought but a vision of society where the rich are charitable so that the poor can remain weak ... by his stress on the principle of trusteeship, and his friendliness towards many in exalted economic positions, he established a pattern of radicalism in talk but conservatism in action that is still very much a part of the Indian scene" (Myrdal, 1968, p.755).

Even Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, Gandhi's political heir and most trusted disciple, wrote in his autobiography, "Again I think of the paradox that is Gandhiji. With all his keen intellect and passion for bettering the downtrodden and oppressed, why does he support a system and a system which is obviously decaying, which creates this misery and the wastes? He seeks a way out, it is true, but is not that way to the past barred and bolted? And meanwhile he blesses all the relics of the old order which stands as obstacles in the way of advance the feudal states, the big zamindaris and taluqdaris, the present capitalist system. Is it reasonable to believe in the theory of trusteeship to give unchecked power and wealth to an individual and to expect him to use it entirely for the public good? Are the best of us so perfect as to be trusted in this way? ... And is it good for the others to have even these benevolent supermen over them" (Nehru, 1936, p.528).

Whether it is the association of ideas around the word trusteeship or a deliberate refusal to understand the principle or pre conceived determined attack on the doctrine, that is responsible for these misconceptions, it is difficult to say. "Whatever it may be," writes Prof. Dantwala, "I shall content myself with restating, at the cost of repetition the basic principles of doctrine."

1. The erstwhile capitalist is reduced to the status of a manager of the trust property. But the change is not confined to the name. The schedule of rights, privileges and obligations of the two is basically different. The capitalist, instead of being sent to the concentration camp as under the socialist dispensation, is given an opportunity of conforming to the ethics of the new society. It is misnomer to call the class of trustees the property owning class. They are not different from the property managing class under the socialist economy.
2. The trustees will not be allowed to appropriate for his personal use more than twelve times the income of the poorest paid workers. The difference in income of the managerial class and the common run of the workers, permitted in Soviet Russia is much wider than is allowed under Gandhism. Yet, the critics accuse Gandhism of allowing "larger and larger accumulations of capital on the one hand and pauperisation of the masses on the other." It may also be pointed out that since the instruments of production under Gandhism will be comparatively simple and cheap, the danger of managerial class appropriating political and economic power will be much less than under socialism.
3. Production under Gandhian economy will not be unplanned. The character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed. What warrants the critics have for asserting that "production will continue by unplanned private competition", is difficult to ascertain.
4. In case the trustee does not conform to the discipline imposed by doctrine, and, as critics fear, goes on appropriating the surplus value under a pious guise, the Gandhian techniques will not rest content with "wishing a change in the hearts and minds of the owners of the property" (Dantwala, 1945, pp.55-56).

7.8 SUMMARY

The main thrust of trusteeship is very broad and deep and is thus not easy to comprehend. There is no historical example of it to go by. Besides full trusteeship cases have not been experimented anywhere. This doctrine has been either bitterly criticised or eulogised but not experimented. It was also said that Gandhi had a way of prescribing sugar coated quinine for the maladies of the society. He would administer the bitterest of truth under a thick coating of ahimsa. But his followers have developed a way of lapping up the sugar and spitting out the quinine. The theory of trusteeship has been dealt in the same manner.

7.9 TERMINAL QUESTIONS

1. Discuss Gandhi's Theory of Trusteeship. Is it practicable in our time?
2. "To make the World Happier the concept of Gandhi's Trusteeship is essential". Discuss.

SUGGESTED READINGS

- Anjaria, J. J., *An Essay on Gandhian Economics*, Vora & Co., Bombay, 1945
- Biswas, S. C., (ed.), *Gandhi, Theory and Practice, Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance*, Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, Shimla, 1969
- Dantwala, M. L., *Gandhism Reconsidered*, Padma Publications, Bombay, 1945
- Harijan, *A Journal of Applied Gandhism*, Garland Publishing Inc., New York, 1973
- Mukherjee, Hiren., *Gandhi: A Study*, People Publishing House, New Delhi, 1960
- Myrdal, Gunnar., *Asian Drama: An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations*, Three Volumes, Panteon, New York, 1968
- Namoodiripad, E.M.S., *The Mahatma and the Ism*, People Publishing House, New Delhi, 1959.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal., *An Autobiography*, The Bodely Head, London, 1958.
- Sethi, J. D., *Gandhi Today*, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi, 1976.
- Sharma, Jai Narain., *Alternative Economics*, Deep and Deep, New Delhi, 2003.
- Smith, Adam., *An Inquiry into Nature and Causes of Wealth of Nation*, The Modern Library, New York, 1937.
- The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, 1961
- Young India*, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad