

In this way, we find that Marxism, though a revolutionary doctrine, has several drawbacks.

### **18.3.6 Meaning of the term "Communism".**

In the contemporary world, Communism stands as a social philosophy, revolutionary programme and socio-economic and political basis of the social systems of more than a hundred million people. Communism exercised a great influence over Russia, China and many Eastern European countries.

Meaning of the word "Communism"—In the words of C.E.M. Joad, "Communism is a word with many different meanings, sometimes it is used to denote a theory of society like the Early Christian society where all property was public. Sometimes, it is used synonymously with socialism and for a layman, it denotes a system under which necessary goods are freely administered according to wants. Hence, Communism is not easy to define. Some people use it synonymously with socialism which in reality it is not. For while all communists are socialists, all socialists are not communists.

In fact, Communism has none of the above meanings. Here we are only concerned with communism as given in Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels. Communism in this sense of the word is essentially a theory of method which seeks to lay down the principle upon which the transition from capitalism to socialism is to be accomplished. Its two essential doctrines are the class-war and the revolutionary i.e. the forcible transference of power to the proletariat.

Modern Communism, no less than socialism, owes its inspiration to Karl Marx. In the teachings of Marx for the first time socialism and communism shed their utopianism and became realistic and scientific. We have already discussed the basic principles of Marxism in sub-section 3.2.

The main tenets of Marxian theory were worked out more fully by Lenin, the author of Russian Revolution of 1917, the father of Russian nation, Lenin accepted Marxian principles but he interpreted Marxism to suit Russian conditions or contemporary world situation. Karl Marx, Lenin believed in dialectical materialism and economic interpretation of history.

**1. Leninist Modification of Marxism—Theory of Revolution :** In his famous book, "Imperialism" Lenin says, "Besides a highly industrial country revolution can occur even in a backward country like Russia and he discusses at length the essential prerequisites of a successful socialist revolution. Lenin reinterpreted Marxism to suit Russian conditions.

**2. Imperialism—**Although Marx had anticipated imperialism as the last phase of capitalism, it was Lenin who gave the idea full form and shape. One of the main



Revolutionary tendencies in modern China began with Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen who in 1911 put forward his three principles of Nationalism, Democracy and People's Livelihood or Socialism. A series of activities took place till in 1931. Mao-Tse-Tung became the chairman of the newly established Soviet Provincial Government.

Mao-Tse-Tung, the ex-president and father of the Chinese Communist Party had deep differences with Krushchev for he believed that Stalin had rendered valuable service to Communism in Russia.

The organisation of Communist Russia had been closely followed in Communist China. Vigorous attacks have been levelled against feudalism, capitalism and imperialism. But the most important change has been in the reorganization of the peasants.

### **18.3.8 Shortcomings of Communism**

Communism suffers from the following drawbacks :

**1. Absolute Power** — Communism seeks to break the shackles of capitalism, but it fastens itself on the feet of the so-called liberated people, i.e., the workers. Communist leaders exercised absolute power under the "cloak of public ownership."

**2. Negation of Liberty**—Individual liberty is sacrificed at the altar of the state which is not correct.

**3. Antireligious** — Communism cares only for materialism and sets its face against all religious and spiritual values.

**4. Ruthless and violent** — Communism spreads hatred, violence and fanaticism all over the world for all the Communist leaders advocate the language of force only.

**5. Gap between words and deeds** — Communists preach principles which they do not hesitate to violate if these suit their purpose.

**6. Incorrect Theories** — Communism has misled the world by giving partially or fully incorrect theories like the theory of surplus value, class war, classless society etc.

**7. State not withering** — The principle of the withering away of the state is wrong because communist states are growing stronger day by day.

**8. Communist Imperialism** — Communist states themselves have developed imperialism or the policy of aggression towards other states which communism professed to fight till the end.

**9. Communist Authoritarianism** — Communism has led to authoritarian rule of one party only, that is, the Communist Party.

### **18.3.9 Conclusion**

In spite of some flaws in Marxism as well as Communism it cannot be denied that Marxism was a timely doctrine which came as a reaction to the situation of the



world. However much we may disagree with Marx and his teaching there is no gain-saying the fact that he gave a philosophy which has revolutionised the world. Even Nehruji said, "The theory and philosophy of Marxism lightened up many a dark corner of my mind. History came to have a new meaning to me."

Marxism and Communism have and are still exercising a great influence over many countries of the world. In every country there exists a party in the name of Marxism and Communism.

#### **18.4 Summary**

Marxism which is also known as scientific socialism or communism owes its inspiration to Karl Marx. Marx said that capital comes to be concentrated in the hands of a few capitalists who mercilessly exploit the workers and enjoy their share and profit. So for crushing the capitalists and for the establishment of dictatorship of the proletariat and a classless society revolution is inevitable.

Lenin added that peasantry should also support the proletarian revolution which can even occur in backward agrarian country besides a highly industrial country. He spells out the essential prerequisites of a successful socialist worldwide revolution. After Lenin, Stalin and Krushchev elaborated the Communist Principles. In China, too, Communism received valuable service through Mao-Tse-Tung.

In the end, we can say that in spite of some flaws in Marxism and Communism, these are still exercising a great influence in many countries.

#### **18.5 Key words used in the Lesson**

Marxism, communism, utopian socialism, scientific socialism, Communist Manifesto, Capitalism, proletariat, dictatorship, classless society, revolutionary programme, exploitation, dialectics, materialistic interpretation, surplus value, class-war, classless society, working class, exploited class, imperialism, Leninism, agrarian country, authoritarianism

#### **18.6 Questions for Exercise**

##### **(a) Objective Questions**

##### **1. Marxism believes in**

- (a) revolutionary change
- (b) peaceful change
- (c) political change



(d) none of the above.

**Ans. — (a)**

**2. Communism is**

- (a) synonymous with Socialism
- (b) not synonymous with Socialism
- (c) synonymous with Utopian Socialism
- (d) none of the above

**Ans. — (b)**

**(b) Short Answer Questions**

**1. Discuss the basic principles of Marxism.**

**Ans. — See 18.3.2**

**2. Enumerate the merits and demerits of communism.**

**Ans. — See 18.3.4 and 18.3.5**

**3. Discuss the main tenets of Communism.**

**Ans. — See 18.3.7**

**(c) Long Answer Questions**

- 1. Discuss critically Marxism as a political ideology.
- 2. Discuss critically Communism as a political ideology.

**18.7 Suggested Readings**

- 1. M. P. Jain : **Political Theory**
- 2. A. C. Kapur : **Principles of Political Science**
- 3. Eddy Arivatham : **Political Theory**





**Political Ideology : Monarchy****Lesson Structure**

- 19.0 Objective
- 19.1 Introduction
- 19.2 Monarchy as a Political Ideology
  - 19.2.1 Meaning and Definition of Monarchy
  - 19.2.2 Kinds of Monarchy
  - 19.2.3 Absolute or Unconstitutional Monarchy
  - 19.2.4 Merits of Absolute Monarchy
  - 19.2.5 Demerits of Absolute Monarchy
  - 19.2.6 Limited or Constitutional Monarchy
  - 19.2.7 Merits of Constitutional Monarchy
  - 19.2.8 Conclusion
- 19.3 Summary
- 19.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 19.5 Questions for Exercise
  - (a) Objective Questions
  - (b) Short Answer Questions
  - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 19.6 Suggested Readings

**19.0 Objective**

Monarchy as the political ideology regarding the form of government is the oldest one and was prevalent everywhere till the nineteenth century. Hence our main objective in this lesson is to have a clear idea about this form of government. We shall first discuss the meaning and definition of monarchy. Then we shall see the various kinds of monarchy that were prevalent in the world. Thereafter, we shall discuss the merits and demerits of the various kinds of monarchy. We shall conclude with our comments on whether monarchy is an ideal form of government.



### 19.1 Introduction

As discussed earlier, monarchy is the oldest form of government which was prevalent on most of the countries of the world till the nineteenth century. But the present trend is against monarchy. In monarchy, the source of all political authority is to be found in a supreme ruler. All the organs and officers of government are agents of this ruler.

The institution of monarchy is a product of history and it has grown as a part of the evolution of the state. In the early stages of the development of the state, the monarchical system was the most beneficial. It was characterised by singleness of purpose, unity, vigour and strength. The monarch combined in him the functions of the law-maker, the judge, the executive and the military commander. He was thus able to hold together by his own personal force a society which otherwise might have broken up into many elements.

In the beginning, the monarch was elected and then, the institution became hereditary and it is now the normal type, wherever it exists. The early Roman kings were elected. The medieval kings were both hereditary and elected. A hereditary king enjoys a life-long tenure and the office passes to his heirs according to the law of inheritance. Gradually, the king used to become despotic.

In the twentieth century, monarchy began to disappear from most of the countries of the world because people began to appreciate the democratic form of government.

### 19.2 Monarchy as a Political Ideology

Monarchy as political ideology was appreciated till the nineteenth century when it was prevalent everywhere. It was said that there could be no better government than absolute monarchy for disciplining the uncivilised people who had emerged out of barbarism.

As all the powers of government, executive, legislature, judiciary and military are concentrated in the monarchy, he is able to keep a greater uniformity of purpose in the state. He can take decisions faster which are essential for a good and efficient administration, particularly during periods of national crises and emergencies. Since the monarch is free to select his officials, he can choose the best of the people who will run the administration to the best of their ability and efficiency.

But then, it is also said that no man is fit enough to exercise absolute power. He becomes a despot and crushes the people to the ground. Even if it be admitted that monarchy is a good form of government, we who are brought up in the twentieth century can never believe that a government is good unless it is self-government.



### **19.2.1 Meaning and Definition of Monarchy**

Monarchy is made up of two words, "monas" and "archy" which means that form of government in which one person is held to be absolute, highest and the most powerful.

In the words of Gettell, "While monarchy is generally considered as a form of government in which the Head of the state derives his office through hereditary succession, any government in which the supreme and final authority is in the hands of a single person is a monarchy, whether his office is secured by usurpation by election or by hereditary succession.

Thus, monarchy is that form of government or that system of administration in which the highest authority of the state rests in the hands of one person and that person is called the "King." The king has unlimited powers. There is no legal limitation on his rights. He enjoys his office so long as he lives. After his death, his son or his nearest relative becomes the ruler. Jellinck defines monarchy as "a government by a single physical will and its essential characteristic is the competence of the monarch to express the highest power of the state."

In ancient times, this form of government was prevalent almost everywhere.

According to Mill, "For uncivilized or partly civilized, this form of government is suitable if its purpose is the welfare of the people."

In fact, this form of government is possible and useful only in the ancient period of civilization.

### **19.2.2 Kinds of Monarchy**

Monarchy has been classified into two groups according to ancient thinkers :

- (i) Hereditary
- (ii) Elective

According to hereditary monarchy, the law of heredity was used and after the death of the king, his son used to be the king.

Hereditary monarchy was prevalent in many countries of the world during ancient times and even in modern times. This form of monarchy is to be found in quite a number of countries. Hereditary monarchy is to be found at present in Nepal, Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Japan, Belgium, Holland, Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Ethiopia, Iran and Jordan.

Elective monarchy was prevalent in ancient times in Rome, Poland and the Holy Roman Empire and also in some parts of ancient India. In elective monarchy, after the death of the king, his heir was elected.

The modern thinkers have classified monarchy according to its nature into—



(1) Absolute or Unconstitutional Monarchy

(2) Limited or Unconstitutional Monarchy.

### **19.3.3 Absolute or Unconstitutional Monarchy**

It is that form of government where the source of all political authority is to be found in a supreme ruler. The head of the state, i.e. the king is all in all with regard to the government of the state. He regulates all the affairs of the state. All the organs and officers of government are agents of this ruler for the purpose of carrying out his will. All acts of government are his acts and derive their validity from his sanction. All laws are his commands though they may be formulated by his agents. As the bearer of sovereignty his authority is supreme, unlimited and self-determined. An absolute monarch can do whatever he pleases. There is absolutely no check on him. In other words, the absolute monarch represents the will of the people. The words of the king are law. No law or no constitutional principle can obstruct his will. The most important example of absolute monarchy is the monarchy in France where Louis XIV used to say, "I am the government and what I say goes."

Absolute monarchy has existed both in the East and in the West upto very recent times. In ancient period, absolute monarchy was prevalent in Egypt, Rome, Iran, China, etc. Japan was also a leading example of this type of government. In the eighties of the last century, Japan decided to abolish her old system of government and to establish in its place a new form of government.

In India Kansa, Duryodhana, Jarashandh, Ajatshatru, etc. were also absolute monarchs. France, before the revolution of 1789, Turkey during the 18th and 19th centuries, Russia before the revolution of 1917 and Germany before adopting the constitution of 1919 were all absolute monarchies.

Now-a-days in Ethiopia, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan, Iran and Nepal, absolute monarchy is prevalent to some extent.

### **19.3.4 Merits of Absolute Monarchy**

The following are the merits of absolute monarchy according to its supporters :

**(i) It is useful for uncivilized and undeveloped society**—In the beginning man was uncivilized and barbarous. Monarchy was the only important means by which the feeling of discipline could be inculcated in the people. A. C. Kapur says, "Perhaps, there could have been no better form of government than absolute monarchy for disciplining the uncouth and the uncivilized people who had emerged out of barbarism."

Even Mills says, "Despotism is a legitimate mode of government for dealing with barbarians provided the end be their improvement and the means be justified by actually effecting that end."



**(ii) All round development of the country is possible**—Hume says, "In a good monarchy, wealth remains safe. Encouragement is given to industry. Art is developed and the king resides with his people just as the father lives with his children. If the king is good, he does much for the people." In India, Chandragupta Maurya, Ashok, Samudragupta, Vikramaditya and Harsha promoted political unity among the people and in their regime, India progressed a lot. Similarly, in Germany Frederick the Great, in France Napoleon and in Russia Peter the Great and Catherine worked for the development of their people.

**(iii) Prompt decision**—Promptness of decision, unity of counsel and a consistent policy are the essential requisites of a good and efficient administration, particularly during periods of national crises and emergencies. Hence, because in absolute monarchy, the ultimate power is in the hands of one person, so in times of distress, he can take prompt decisions.

**(iv) A wise king can present good leadership during war**—If the king is wise and brave then he can prove a good commander-in-chief of the army.

**(v) Experience**—Because the king remains in his office so long as he lives, he becomes very much experienced and by his experience, the nation gets a lot of benefit. For example, in England Queen Victoria, Edward VII, George V and VI all proved very helpful for their countries.

**(vi) Uniformity in policy and stability in administration**—As all the powers of the government, executive, legislative, judicial and military are concentrated in the monarch, he is able to keep a greater uniformity of purpose in the state. Because the king remains in his office life long, there is uniformity in the good policy and stability in administration.

**(vii) Conducive to social justice**—As king is not associated with any party and as his election does not depend on any party, he can rule the country impartially.

**(viii) It imparts unity and efficiency to administration**—A sagacious king being experienced, able and impartial, appoints intelligent ministers by which unity and efficiency are found in administration. He is free to select his officials and make them work according to his directions. As the officials are strictly accountable they run the administration to the best of their ability and capacity. The absolute monarchies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, says Bryce, "saw many reforms in European countries, which no force less than that of a strong monarchy would have carried through."

**(ix) Continuity**—Because the king continues in his office for life, there is continuity in administration which results in consistency of policy.



**(x) Protection of the people against the tyranny of the landlords**—In England, the king belonging to the Tudor dynasty and in Russia Czar Alexander II protected their people against the tyranny of the landlords.

#### **19.2.5 Demerits of Absolute Monarchy**

**(i) Absolute monarchy degenerates into tyranny**—Power corrupts the king and makes him tyrannical. A despot crushes his subjects and leaves them nothing which they can call their own. The king becomes an oppressor. Absolute government is a government by one single person and right and wrong depends upon his will.

**(ii) Orthodox and Incompetent monarch leads the country to a downfall**—If the administration goes in the hands of incompetent kings, then the downfall of the country is definite. For e.g. Aurangzeb by his orthodox nature and wrong policies caused the fall of Mughal dynasty.

**(iii) Hereditary office for the Head of the state is not justifiable**—"A hereditary ruler, "says Leacock, "seems on the face of things as absurd as the hereditary mathematician or hereditary poet laureate."

The highest office of the state should be given to the most capable person. It is not necessary that ability, industry and good character are hereditary. History indicates that for Louis XIV a country has to pay the price of Louis XV and Louis XVI. Thus, kingship should not be hereditary.

**(iv) It has no place for democracy or self-government**—In absolute monarchy all the power is concentrated in the hands of the king and so the people do not have the opportunity to take part in the administration of the country. An absolute monarch dare not allow liberty and rights to his subjects. He will adopt all measures to firmly establish his authority and it remains unquestionable.

**(v) It leads to inequality of wealth**—In a monarchy, while the king, the ministers and those belonging to the administrative class roll in wealth, the common people live in utter poverty.

**(vi) Monarchy is not suitable to the modern age**—Even if it be admitted that absolute monarchy is a good form of government we, who are brought up in the twentieth century, do not believe in good government unless it is self-government. For good government is no substitute for self-government. Modern age is the age of democracy. At present every state is turning into a welfare state. Therefore, in present times monarchy is not suitable in the interest of the people.

Thus, absolute monarchy suffers from a number of drawbacks.



### **19.2.6 Limited or Constitutional Monarchy**

In absolute monarchy, people do not possess any important role in the administration of the country. That is why in the middle and the modern ages many countries rebelled against the system of absolute monarchy. Slowly limited or constitutional monarchy came to be established in England, Japan, Norway, Denmark, Belgium and Holland.

Thus, limited monarchy is that type of government in which the authority of the monarch is limited either by the prescriptions of a written constitution or by certain fundamental conventions as in Great Britain. Sometimes the constitution is promulgated by the ruler himself; sometimes, it is forced upon him by a successful revolution.

In a limited monarchy, the authority of the king or the monarch is nominal or limited. The real power rests in the hands of the Cabinet or the council of ministers who are elected members of the legislature and belong to the majority party. The king is merely a figurehead or a nominal head. Thus, in a constitutional or limited monarchy, the king is only a nominal head while all the powers are exercised by the parliament and the cabinet.

### **19.2.7 Merits of Constitutional Monarchy**

(i) The very fact that the authority of the monarch is limited shows that in essence it is a democratic form of government. The King or Queen in Britain, as Bagehot remarks, has the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, and the right to warn, beyond this he or she cannot go. He or she does not exercise any real authority. The actual government is carried only by ministers who represent the majority party. Thus, democracy is safe here. The representatives of the people get a due share in the administration of the country.

(ii) Because the king does not belong to any party, he can give impartial advice to the cabinet. The monarch thus, is an umpire in the midst of rival parties, whose main concern is to see that the game of politics is played according to rules.

(iii) The chief merit of a limited monarchy in Britain is the hereditary nature of the ruler. By virtue of a long and uninterrupted tenure of office the King or Queen gains mature administrative experience to guide his or her ministers who are generally amateurs in the art of administration.

(iv) Thus, the king gets a lot of respect in his country because the country is benefitted by his experience. In England, the King or Queen is regarded as the Head of the society or the Church. He is the head of the commonwealth of states. The different dominions regard him as the head and he is the impartial advisor to the council of ministers. Queen Victoria and Edward VII by their long experience benefitted their country a lot.



The king of England possesses four kinds of powers in practice :

(i) To the ministers

(ii) Giving caution and encouragement to the Ministers.

(iii) He has the right to get news from his minister about the administration of their country.

(iv) The king acts on the advice of the council of ministers.

Thus, England has total democracy. Because of these reasons the King or Queen of England gets a lot of respect and monarchy is held as a useful institution there. The same situation prevails in Japan, Holland, Malaysia, etc.

### **19.2.8 Conclusion**

Having seen the merits and demerits of absolute monarchy as well as the merits of limited monarchy, we come to the conclusion that absolute monarchy is not at all desirable. Limited monarchy in which democracy is safe is desirable. Thus, while absolute monarchy has practically disappeared from the world, constitutional monarchy still prevails in some of the countries.

### **19.3 Summary**

The institution of monarchy is a product of history and has grown as a part of the evolution of the state. In the early stages of the development of the state, the monarchical system was the most beneficial, for it was characterised by singleness of purpose, unity, vigour and strength. The monarch combined in him the function of the law-maker, the judge, the executive and the military commander. He was able to hold together by his own personal force a society which otherwise might have been broken into many elements.

In absolute monarchy, as discussed above, the despotic king claimed that he got his authority direct from God. This belief in the divine right of the kings to rule prevailed in all countries. The king was thus free from all human limitations. He was accountable to God alone. Some kings took a high view of their duties and governed well, but some others became tyrannical or despotic.

Even if it be admitted that absolute monarchy is a good form of government, we, who are brought up in the twentieth century, do not believe in good government unless it is self-government, for good government is no substitute for self-government.

Another type of monarchy is limited monarchy in which the authority of the Monarch is limited by the prescriptions of a limited constitution or by certain fundamental conventions as in Great Britain. The very fact that the authority of the monarch is limited shows that in essence it is a democratic form of government. A limited monarchy, according to Woodrow Wilson, "is one whose powers have been adapted to the interests of the people and to the maintenance of individual liberty."



The days of absolute monarchy are gone whereas limited monarchy still prevails in some of the countries of the world like England, Japan, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Holland, Malaysia, etc.

**19.4 Key words used in the Lesson**

Monarchy, political authority, sovereignty, despotic, barbarism, representation, dominion, emergency.

**19.5 Questions for Exercise**

**(a) Objective Questions**

**1. In a monarchy, the highest authority of the state is the**

- (a) King or Monarch
- (b) President
- (c) Councils of Ministers
- (d) Parliament

**Ans. — (a)**

**2. Which of the following types of monarchy is prevalent today ?**

- (a) Absolute monarchy
- (b) Limited monarchy
- (c) Elective monarchy
- (d) None of the above

**Ans. — (b)**

**(b) Short Answer Questions**

**1. What are the merits and demerits of absolute monarchy ?**

**Ans. —** See 19.2.4 and 19.2.5

**2. What are the merits of limited monarchy ?**

**Ans. —** See 19.2.7

**(c) Long Answer Questions**

1. Discuss critically monarchy as a political ideology.

2. What is monarchy ? Discuss critically its various types.

**19.6 Suggested Readings**

- 1. A. C. Kapur : **Principles of Political Science**





**Anarchism****Lesson Structure**

- 20.0 Objective
- 20.1 Introduction
- 20.2 Anarchism as a Political Ideology
  - 20.2.1 Definition of the term 'Anarchism'
  - 20.2.2 Supporters or Exponents of Anarchism
  - 20.2.3 Chief Characteristics of Anarchism
  - 20.2.4 Methods of Anarchism
  - 20.2.5 Organisation of the Anarchist Society
  - 20.2.6 Criticism of the Anarchist Philosophy
  - 20.2.7 Conclusion
- 20.3 Summary
- 20.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 20.5 Questions for Exercise
  - (a) Objective Questions
  - (b) Short Answer Questions
  - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 20.6 Suggested Readings

**20.0 Objective**

Anarchism as a political ideology holds that political authority in any form is unnecessary and undesirable. Hence, our main objective in discussing anarchism is to have a clear idea of anarchist philosophy. For this, we shall first define anarchism. Then, we shall discuss the various schools of anarchism, the supporters or the exponents of anarchism. After this, we shall examine the chief characteristics of anarchism. We shall also discuss the methods adopted by anarchism to achieve the goal. We shall then study the anarchist's conception of the society, its organisation, etc. Finally, the criticism levelled against anarchism will be discussed.



## 20.1 Introduction

The Anarchist philosophy developed in the nineteenth century and was opposed to the idealist philosophy. The Idealists lay emphasis on the importance of the state; the anarchists regard the state as an evil coming in the way of the development of the personality of the individual.

Anarchism, thus, regards political authority in any form as unnecessary and undesirable. The state is regarded as the embodiment of force employed in the government of the community. Liberty is supreme in the Anarchist creed, but it is sought by abolishing the state and all its institutions exercising forcible control over the individuals.

"The liberty of man", says Bakunin, one of the anarchists, "consists solely in this, that he obeys the laws of Nature, because he has himself recognised them as such, and not because they have been imposed upon him externally by any foreign will, whatsoever, human or divine, collective or individual."

The Anarchists will, therefore, like to get rid of the state and all its instruments which are the symbols of force.

Anarchism in this sense is no new doctrine. Some of the stoics of ancient Greece also did not like the authority of state. In the middle ages also, various religious sects resented the restrictions imposed by the state. Many poets and philosophers also talked against the coercive power of the state.

The socialists headed by Karl Marx regarded the existing state and its machinery as an instrument of exploitation. There have also been anarchists in countries like Britain, the U.S.A., France and Russia.

## 20.2 Anarchism as a Political Ideology

As stated earlier, the anarchists regard the state as an evil coming in the way of the development of the personality of the individual. Hence, they like to get rid of the state and all its instruments which are the symbols of force. They want a new society, a free society without distinctions of race, colour, nationality, creed, etc. Men living together in such a condition will no longer need to be under the authority of the government.

As political authority will be dissolved, people will be allowed to work and enjoy the fruits of labour on equal terms. It means the abolition of private property and capitalism. There shall be common ownership of the means of production and voluntary cooperation will replace coercion.

Hence, as an ideology anarchism may be praised but how far it is practical we shall see later.



### 20.2.1 Definition of the term "Anarchism."

Prince Kropotkin defines Anarchism as "a principle of theory of life and conduct under which society is conceived, being obtained not by submission to a law, or by obedience to any authority but by free agreements concluded between the various groups, territorial and professionally free constituted for the sake of production and consumption, as also for the satisfaction of the infinite variety of needs and aspirations of a civilized being."

Coker writes, "Anarchism is the doctrine that political authority in any of its forms, is unnecessary and undesirable. In recent times, Anarchism's theoretical opposition to the state has unusually been associated with opposition to the institution of private property and also with hostility to organised religious authority."

In the words of Huxley, "Anarchism is that society in which every person is his own ruler."

From the above definition, it becomes clear that anarchism is opposed to political authority in any form. It became a revolt against every type of authority be it political, social, religious or economic. Its aim is to emancipate man politically from the tyranny of the state, from the tyranny of the capitalists and morally from the tyranny of the priests or the church.

### 20.2.2 Supporters or Exponents of Anarchism

There are two groups among anarchists. One group—the philosophical anarchists, consisting mainly of intellectuals who limit their activity to argument and propaganda, in their effort to convince mankind of the uselessness of the state and the superiority of the regime of anarchy. The other group—the revolutionary anarchists advocate violence like assassination of government officials, destruction by bombs or otherwise of government buildings, etc.

**(i) Philosophical Anarchists**—The first modern anarchist to think strongly against the authority of the state was William Godwin. Other philosophical anarchists are Thomas Hodgskin, Joseph Proudhon, Benjamin Trucker, Henry Thoreau and Tolstoy. It can be said that Joseph Proudhon was in the real sense the father of anarchism.

Proudhon was against the state, since it had evolved out of the system of private property and had supported the inequalities in society. He used to say, "Government of man by man in every form is oppression. The highest perfection of any society is found in the union and anarchy."

Proudhon was the author of the term 'anarchy' and his followers tended towards a theory of anarchy.

All these anarchists recommended the gradual elimination of the authority of the state through peaceful methods.



**(ii) Revolutionary Anarchists**—The famous revolutionary anarchists are Michael Bakunin and Prince Kropotkin. In the same sense in which Marx is regarded as the founder of scientific socialism, Bakunin is also regarded as the founder of scientific anarchism.

Bakunin held that the institutions of private property, state and religion are all evil because they degrade and demoralise the people and hence should ultimately disappear. Despotism, he holds, is the essence of the state, whatever be its form. The system of private property is both the ground of existence and the consequence of the state. To the millions of workers it brings economic dependence, laborious toil, ignorance, and social and spiritual immobility. For the few wealthy, it provides superfluous luxury and special opportunity for physical and artistic and intellectual enjoyment." Bakunin regarded religion as an evil. He was also against the idea of God. According to him, religion should be replaced by science and knowledge. Thus, Bakunin condemned every institution and every belief which was found inconsistent with liberty.

Prince Kropotkin is the scientific interpreter of new Anarchism and he gave evolutionary and historical bases to his doctrine.

According to him, there are three hindrances to the progress of human society—the state, the property and religion. Kropotkin used to say that the state, by its very nature, is opposed to man's natural cooperative instinct. He condemns private property saying that production is the result of collective cooperative efforts of all individuals either directly or indirectly. Like Bakunin, Kropotkin rejects both on scientific and moral grounds.

The method of realising their programme, according to these anarchists, will be revolutionary. Violence and destruction should be employed to establish anarchist society.

### 20.2.3 Chief Characteristics of Anarchism

The anarchists stand for the social system organised on a voluntary basis. They would like to destroy all kinds of authority. Particularly, they attack the states, the church and private property or capitalism. The main features of anarchism are as follows :

**(i) Opposition to state**—Anarchism is anti-state with a vengeance. Anarchism regards the state as an unmixed evil which people should fight and get abolished. State authority is neither desirable nor necessary. The state is not only superfluous but injurious to society. The state has only one function and that function is "to sign its own death warrant and then to die."

The police, jails, courts, etc. which have been established by the state tend to increase rather than to check evils in society. The state perpetuates inequality and



injustice. Law, the instrument of the state, is an evil, and people obey it, as they are compelled to do so. The authority of the state is based on compulsion, fear and egoism. The state must disappear if man is to be brought back to his goodness.

The anarchists say that if we minutely examine the functions performed by the state, there is practically nothing which cannot be done by co-operative associations organised on voluntary basis. Therefore, the anarchists maintain that society can live without the state. They hold that their criticism of the state applies not only to autocracies and oligarchies but also to representative democracies.

**(ii) Opposition to Private Property and Capitalism**—Anarchism condemns the institution of private property which flourishes under capitalism. Capitalism produces evils like the degradation of workers, luxurious being of the few, who do not work, miseries to the people, immorality and unemployment. Capitalism makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. Therefore, capitalism must be destroyed completely.

**(iii) Opposition to Religion and Church**—The anarchists also condemn religion and church. According to them, the church has always been an ally of the rich. It has misled the poor and needy by preaching them to reconcile with a system that brings about their misery and degradation. Religion is, thus, a force of evil which must be destroyed.

**(iv) Establishment of a stateless and classless society**—The anarchists would like to set up a stateless and classless society which is based on fraternity and co-operation. The state will be abolished to make room for voluntary association functioning on a co-operative basis. People would cooperate with one another and work for the development and growth of all. There would be no competition but free cooperation.

The anarchists are not very clear regarding the form of society which they aim to establish. Of course, they want a stateless and classless society based on voluntary groupings of people into an organisation in which each individual would be free to join or not, as he chooses and from which he may freely withdraw at will. These associations would perform the few necessary functions of government, preservation of internal order, the enforcement of contracts, maintenance of national defence, etc.

### 20.2.4 Methods of Anarchism

The goal of Anarchism, according to Bakunin and Kropotkin, is to be attained both through evolution and revolution. The trend of social evolution is towards the anarchist goal. But, the evolution, Kropotkin said, must culminate into revolution. A revolution in one country will grow into a general European revolution. In the first phase, the revolution will be destructive and violent. It means destruction of all that is called public order, existing governors removed from their seat, prisons and forts demolished, armies disbanded, police liquidated, courts and officers removed.



After the political authority has been dissolved, people will proceed to expropriate private property; peasants expelling landlords; workers driving out factory owners. This having been secured the work of reshaping society will begin through a purely voluntary procedure.

### **20.2.5 Organisation of Anarchist Society**

Kropotkin explains in vivid terms the organisation of the Anarchist society. When the state disappears, a free society without distinction of race, colour, nationality or belief will be established in its place. Men living together in such a society will no longer be held together by the authority of the government. Every individual will work and enjoy the fruits of his work. A complex interweaving of associations with order everywhere and compulsion nowhere, forms the stuff of which an anarchist society will be formed. Local associations may combine into larger territorial combinations.

As regards economic organisation of the Anarchist society, there will be complete communism. Society will own the land and all materials and instruments of production. The product will be shared only by those who work and distribution will be done on the basis not of service but of need. When people will be properly educated in the methods of cooperative life, when there will be no inequality between the rich and the poor, and no state protection of monopolies, there will rarely be any conflict or disharmony.

### **20.2.6 Criticism of Anarchist Philosophy**

(i) Critics point out that it is impossible to establish an anarchist society on the lines suggested by its advocates. It is too much to believe that society can be built on a voluntary and cooperative basis in which there is absolutely no authority of any kind. It is an impracticable proposition. It is a vision which can result only in disaster. Any society built merely on love will not last long. It is a scheme of society which can hardly be achieved. It is impossible to think that all men shall become God all of a sudden. It is difficult to cure the criminal tendencies of all individuals. Authority in some form or the other is necessary. Otherwise, there will be complete chaos and the law of the jungle will prevail.

According to Bertrand Russell, "If, as anarchists desire, there were no use of force by government, the majority will band themselves together and use force against the minority. The only difference will be that their army or their police force would be adhoc, instead of being permanent or professional." He concludes by saying, "The anarchist ideal of a community in which no acts are forbidden by law, is not at any rate for the present, compatible with the stability of such a world as the anarchists desire. The state in some form whatever may be said in criticism of its mistakes, its inefficiency, its abuse of power, is and always will be an absolute necessity among civilized men."



(ii) Critics of the anarchist philosophy say that the state is neither wholly evil nor completely superfluous. It is rather a necessary factor in civilizing man. In fact, in modern times states are wedded to the concept of the welfare of the people, and people have gained much through the services rendered by the state.

(iii) Again the critics say that the anarchists want the state to be abolished. This is not desirable. It is not correct to say that the state is responsible for the degeneration of human beings. Critics refuse to accept that the authority of the state kills all moral values. The record of the various states all over the world shows that the state has more than justified its existence and has indirectly led to the moral development of man.

(iv) The anarchists desire to have voluntary associations working on a cooperative basis. But these associations too have to wield authority without which they cannot function. Therefore, the hope that authority can be got rid of altogether can never be justified. Authority which the anarchists put out of the society will surely come back through the voluntary associations.

(v) Critics point out that the anarchists have laid undue emphasis on liberty. They forget altogether that liberty is only a means and not an end in itself. Also they argue that liberty and authority are mutually exclusive but they fail to see that both are complementary to each other. If the state is abolished, there will be disorder and confusion. So in the absence of authority no liberty will be possible. Hence it is not correct to say that in all kinds of state, the individual is denied of liberty because we know that democratic state upholds the liberty of the people.

(vi) It is said that the establishment of an anarchist society is impossible. It is a utopian idea. The anarchists are unrealistic. Anarchism as a social system is inconceivable unless the ordinary human passions completely disappear so as to make conflicts impossible.

(vii) Like the syndicalists, the nihilists and the communists, the anarchists spread fanaticism and hatred, and depend upon the use of brute force for the realisation of their aims. It is really astonishing that they aim at building a stateless and classless society based on love and cooperation, through the means of destruction and hatred.

### **20.2.7 Conclusion**

Thus, we have seen above that anarchism as a political ideology suffers from serious drawbacks and appears to be highly impracticable. Yet it has its own value. Although the anarchists are wrong in most of their assumptions and substitutes which they propose to set up instead of the state and government, yet their accusations against the government, capitalism and religion are highly justified. In all the states we



find that most of the evils, social, economic and political, are due to bad government. The significance of anarchism lies in highlighting the dangers of overgrowth and centralisation of political power. Power must be democratised and decentralised and small units of authority must be set up. Thus, although as a movement anarchism is now practically dead, as a philosophy it is a source of inspiration to many.

### 20.3 Summary

Thus, anarchism as a political ideology is against all types of authority, be it that of the state, or the church or the capitalists. They can even make use of force to get rid of these evils as they say. They want the state as well as private property to be abolished. They advocate "liberty and equality" for all. They want voluntary associations to work instead of the state or the government. Although their ideology is highly impractical in today's world, yet as philosophy it is a source of inspiration to many.

### 20.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Anarchism, anarchists, private property, philosophical anarchists, unphilosophical anarchists, capitalism, democratised, decentralised.

### 20.5 Questions for Exercise

#### (a) Objective Questions

##### 1. Anarchism regards the state as

- (a) an evil
- (b) a blessing
- (c) unnecessary
- (d) necessary

**Ans.** — (a)

##### 2. Anarchism is

- (a) in favour of private property and capitalism
- (b) opposed to private property and capitalism
- (c) none.

**Ans.** — (b)

#### (b) Short Answer Questions

##### 1. Discuss the main features of anarchism.

**Ans.** — See 20.3.3



2. Which are the two groups of anarchists ? Discuss.

Ans. — See 20.3.2

**(c) Long Answer Questions**

1. Discuss critically anarchism as a political ideology.

2. Is Anarchism a practical ideology ? Comment.

**20.6 Suggested Readings**

1. A. C. Kapur : **Principles of Political Science**
2. A. K. Verma : **Prarambhika Samaj evam Rajniti Darshan**





**Sarvodaya****Lesson Structure**

- 21.0 Objective
- 21.1 Introduction
- 21.2 Singificance of Sarvodaya
  - 21.2.1 Meaning and Definition of Sarvodaya
  - 21.2.2 Development of the idea of Sarvodaya
  - 21.2.3 Difference between Sarvodaya, Communism and Utilitarianism
  - 21.2.4 Main Features of Sarvodaya Society
  - 21.2.5 Transformation of Society
  - 21.2.6 Critical Estimate of Sarvodaya
  - 21.2.7 Conclusion
- 21.3 Summary
- 21.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 21.5 Questions for Exercise
  - (a) Objective Questions
  - (b) Short Answer Questions
  - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 21.6 Suggested Readings

**21.0 Objective**

The philosophy of sarvodaya is a unique contribution by India to the world of thought. The term "sarvodaya" has been coined by Gandhiji, the great spiritual saint who entered public life only for the good of mankind. Sarvodaya, for Gandhiji, was not only a philosophy of life, but also a practical policy.

Hence, our main objective in discussing the ideal of sarvodaya is to have an insight into the theme of sarvodaya. After an introduction to the idea of sarvodaya we shall discuss the meaning and development of it. We shall also see the difference



between sarvodaya, communism and utilitarianism. After this we shall discuss the main features of a sarvodayi samaj. We shall also analyze the movement of sarvodaya to see what other movements are included in it. In the end, we shall critically evaluate the ideal of sarvodaya.

### 21.1 Introduction

"Sarvodaya" is Gandhi's ideal regarding the set-up of the society and the people. Although this term is new and has been coined by Gandhiji, its meaning is not new for the Indian saints have been giving this message since times immemorial. They have been reciting :—

“सर्वे भवन्तु सुखिनः, सर्वे सन्तुनिरामयः ।

सर्वे भद्राणी पश्यन्तु, मा कश्चिद्दुःखभागभवे ॥

In other words, they say that all the people of the world may live happily. All become selfless, healthy and treat others as wise people. Nobody should suffer. This is the ideal of sarvodaya. Gita's saying of “सर्व भूतहिते रतः” also stands for sarvodaya.

Thus, the idea of sarvodaya was present in Indian culture since the very beginning, but it was given a specific character or outlook by the great philosopher and saint, Mahatma Gandhi, and it was his contribution to the world of thought.

Mahatma Gandhi was not primarily a political thinker, not even a political agitator. He was essentially a religious minded man, a humanist, and a man of action and a pragmatist. He was a spiritual saint who entered public life only for the good of mankind. Sarvodaya, for Gandhiji, was not only a philosophy of life, but also a practical policy.

The philosophy of sarvodaya is a unique contribution by India to the world of thought and among the sarvodayi thinkers were Vinoda Bhave, Jai Prakash Narayan, Kaka Kalelkar, Shankar Rao Dev, Dada Dharmadhikari, Sidharaj Dhadha and Thakurdas Bang.

### 21.2 Significance of Sarvodaya

Sarvodaya is an ideal regarding the setup of the society and the ideal of the life of the people. A sarvodaya society will be an ideal social order in which no one is down-trodden. It will be a society where "love is to reign and co-operation to prevail." A moral man in a moral society is the ultimate aim of sarvodaya.

Gandhiji envisaged a society based on love, co-operation and the welfare of all. Sarvodaya stands for national unity and equality.

Hence, the significance of sarvodaya is immense. As an ideology it is great but how far is it practical, we shall discuss later when we have discussed its meaning, development, main features, etc.



### 21.2.1 Meaning and Definition of Sarvodaya

The term "Sarvodaya" is made up of two words—"Sarva" and "Udaya" which literally means "uplift of all." However, it has been variously translated as "good of all" "service to all," "welfare of all," "Gandhian socialism," etc.

Gandhiji was impressed by John Ruskin's book "Unto this last," from which Gandhiji took three important teachings—

- (i) the good of the individual is contained in the good of all.
- (ii) a lawyer's work has the same value as that of a barber in as much as both have the right of earning their livelihood from their work.
- (iii) A life of labours, i.e. the life of tiller of the soil and the handicraft, is the life worthliving.

The second and the third points follow from the first. The welfare of the individual is included in the welfare of all. Hence, the uplift or the welfare of all is important. This was the basis of Gandhi's ideal of society, called the sarvodaya. After the death of Gandhiji on January 30, 1948, Vinoba Bhave, who was Gandhi's follower and colleague, tried to elaborate Gandhi's idea of sarvodaya and give it a concrete form.

Vinoba Bhave said that sarvodaya does not aim at the welfare of a few or many but it aims at the total development of all persons living in the society.

### 21.2.2 Development of the idea of Sarvodaya

After the death of Gandhiji, a sarvodaya economic conference was held on December 22 and 23, 1949 with Kaka Kalelkar as President and it adopted a plan "to attain social, moral and economic independence," as envisaged by Gandhi. The plan was published on January 20, 1950. It aimed to establish a sarvodaya society and Acharya Vinoba Bhave, a loyal and devoted follower of Gandhi, became its chief exponent. Jayaprakash Narayan later on joined Vinoba and since then sarvodaya workers had been busy in spreading the gospel of sarvodaya adopting innumerable means to give it a practical shape.

Shankar Rao Dev describes the ideal of sarvodaya in these words, "To establish a society based on non-violence and truth, to establish a classless and casteless society in which nobody exploits anybody and in which every person or the entire community sets the opportunity to develop himself fully is the aim of the Sarvodaya Samaj."

At a function of the Sarvodaya Samaj held on the 25th December, 1975 in Pavnar Ashram, Vinoba Bhave answered the question as to what is sarvodaya and what is its aim :—



- (i) To establish a classless and casteless society
- (ii) To provide an able administration in the public sphere.
- (iii) Decentralisation should be the basis of social system.
- (iv) Total power should be in the hands of the people.
- (v) The ruling class should regard themselves not as the master, but the servant of the people.

Thus, in a sarvodaya society "there will be freedom for all and utmost equality; there will be no class and no caste; no exploitation, no injustice; and equal opportunity for each for the fullest development. Man will be the centre of such a society, but self-interest will not be the basis of social organisation. Life in such a society will be integrated and whole, so that work, art and play will form a unified pattern making possible the growth of an integrated human personality."

Sarvodaya society will thus be an ideal society.

### **21.2.3 Difference between Sarvodaya, Communism and Utilitarianism**

It seems as though sarvodaya and communism are similar, having similar aims and objectives. But this is not correct.

Between sarvodaya and communism there is difference regarding the ideal or aim and the method of revolution. The aim of sarvodaya is the total development of all the members of the society but communism or syndicalism aim at the welfare of only a class of people, that is, the proletariat and not the bourgeois class or the capitalist class. Sarvodaya, on the other hand, aims at the welfare of all, the rich, the poor, the high and the low.

For the attainment of its ends, communism advocates both right and wrong, violent and non-violent means whereas sarvodaya wants to establish the sarvodaya society through truth and non-violence.

Utilitarians like Mill and Bentham advocated "greatest good of the greatest number" as according to them it is not possible to attain the good of all. Sarvodaya is much ahead of utilitarianism because the latter advocates the good of all. Whereas utilitarianism aims at securing the material happiness of the people, sarvodaya aims at the mental, physical happiness of all.

### **21.2.4 Main Features of Sarvodaya society**

Acharya Vinoba Bhave outlined the three characteristics of a sarvodaya society and explained that wheresoever and wherever these essential conditions are fulfilled, such society possesses the virtues of a sarvodaya social order. But all these three characteristics are fundamental and they must be present and operate simultaneously. These principles are :



1. No power should be dominant in society, there should only be a discipline of good thought.
2. All facilities of the individual to be dedicated to society which must provide the individual for growth and development.
3. The moral, social and economic values of all the callings performed honestly should be the same.

The sarvodayavadis aim at the creation of a social order free from every form of authority, stateless society where "the ruler and the ruled will be merged in the individual." They reject the state and its government no matter what its form, because both are coercive institutions and force is the ultimate sanction behind them. "Even the welfare state," says Jayaprakash Narayan, "in the name of welfare threatens as much to enslave man to the state as in totalitarian state. The human society must therefore, be free from all coercive institutions. It does not mean, disappearance of the state all at once." "What we seek," says Vinoba Bhave, "is to grow out of the state of affair where there is no government into one where there is good government and from that condition to one where people are free of government altogether."

The sarvodayavadis, thus, do not exclude some form of government in the intervening stage of a sarvodaya society. Sarvodaya society is not in favour of Representative Democracy because in such a democracy there are political parties which spread wrong ideas. Due to party system democracy turns into dictatorship and people belonging to different parties are jealous of each other. Gandhiji regards the present parliamentary system as a broken lady which cannot give anything to the society.

The aim of sarvodaya is to put an end to the party system and establish true democracy based on partyless system. For this Acharya Vinoba Bhave and the sarvodayavadins advocate the establishment of Gramrajya in place of Democracy. Vinoba Bhave writes that the disputes of the villages would be settled in the village itself. Then the state will become of a kingdom of God (Ramrajya) and then there will be no dispute among people and all will live like members of one family.

The aim of sarvodaya is the decentralisation of political and economic power. By political decentralisation is meant making the local self government more powerful.

By economic decentralisation sarvodaya means the right of the producer over the means of production. For e.g. those who cultivate the lands should have right over them. In a sarvodaya society the feeling of interest on money should come to an end and everyone should work for the benefit of all and for the social benefit. The basis of sarvodaya society is to give to everyone according to his capacity and according to his need."

Sarvodaya society will be self-regulated and self-managed in small communities, rural or urban. Life in such a society will be a life of mutual aid and sharing, and of



freedom. Freedom can be enjoyed fully and democracy practised directly and intelligently only when small communities are able to manage and regulate their affairs. Coercion will not be the basis of such a society. In fact, coercion of any kind will not exist. If at all there is coercion, it can be called coercion of love.

Men composing the sarvodaya society will be bound together in love and by love, every individual for others and all others living for every individual. To Gandhi, society is just like a family and the relation between the individual and society is one of close interdependence.

That is why, sarvodaya has been defined "as a synthesis of individualism and socialism, directed at the good of all."

### 21.2.5 Transformation of Society

A stateless and classless Sarvodaya society cannot come into existence immediately and all at once. For the establishment of the Sarvodaya Samaj, the different movements which have helped it are—

1. Bhoodan Movement—Bhoodan has been the main plank of sarvodaya movement by Acharya Vinoba Bhave. Bhoodan means contribution of one's land to the good of the society as a whole. This movement is based on the following facts :

(a) Bhoodan believes that the entire land is God's and man is only the keeper of it.

(b) The entire theory of Bhoodan is based on justice and equality.

(c) Bhoodan gives birth to a new outlook. It advocates non-possession of goods and wants that everybody must make his contribution to the good of the society as a whole.

(d) Bhoodan in the true sense can change the socio-economic set up of the country.

(ii) **Sampatti Dana**—It stands for contribution of one's wealth. Wealth is needed for the cultivation of the land; to the landless, wealth is also very important, so contribution of wealth should be made.

(iii) **Gram Dana**—It stands for contribution of the entire land of a village so that the cultivation of land is done on a co-operative basis. When the produce is received, it is to be distributed equally among all. Thus the land is to be cultivated collectively and its produce is to be distributed equally.

(iv) **Gram-Rajya**—Gram-Rajya of the sarvodayis is the same as Panchayati Raj of Gandhiji.

Gram Raj means the organisation of society based upon small administrative units with a population not exceeding three to four thousand people, self-sufficient for



economic purpose and serving as ideal convenient units for representative democracy. In Gram Raj individual ownership gives way to community ownership. There is no individual possession of land, labour and wealth. The significant features of Gram-Rajya are :

**(i) Non-violence and decentralisation**—Gram Rajya is based on non-violence because in it there is no exploitation or oppression and power is decentralised among all the people.

**(ii) Absence of Party politics**—The entire system of Gram Rajya is based on mutual cooperation and service to humanity. There is no place for political parties.

**(iii) Feeling of General Welfare**—In Gram Rajya every family lives in close cooperation and all the people seem to be living as members of one community.

**(iv) Sovereignty of the People**—In Gram Rajya, the final power and authority resides in the hands of the people. Everyone lives in cooperation and brotherhood.

**(v) Secular state**—Gram Rajya is a secular state and all persons are free to profess and practise any religion or belief, so long as it does not interfere with the similar rights of others.

Such a state, with good government, paves the way for a sarvodaya society, a new social order of government, Ram Raj or Kingdom of God.

#### **21.2.6 Critical Estimate of Sarvodaya**

According to critics, there is something in common between Sarvodaya and Communism. Acharya Vinoba Bhave says, "There is no permanent conflict between the two ideologies—Marxism and Sarvodaya." Both strive for and aim at the state to disappear, abolition of exploitation and the principle from each according to his capacity to his needs. But there are two important differences between the two. The basis of Sarvodaya is spiritual whereas that of communism is materialistic. Sarvodaya is based on non-violence whereas communism resorts to violence.

Gandhiji envisaged a society based on love, co-operation and welfare of all. Sarvodaya stands for national unity and equality and condemns provincialism and religious fanaticism. To quote Gandhiji, "The base of our life is not our exclusive provincialism, whereas my province must be co-extensive with the Indian boundary so that ultimately it extends to the boundary of the earth or else it perishes. The state should undoubtedly be secular."

The critics of Sarvodaya point out that while the theoretical perfection cannot be denied, it is impossible to realise it in actual practice. Usha Mehta observes, "Sarvodaya, especially in its political aspect, is more an idea which has not yet taken a practical shape." Most of the human beings are selfish and it is too much to expect that all of them will change overnight.



The advocates of Sarvodaya plead for abolition of political parties. But political parties are bound to stay so long as there is freedom of thought and human nature is what it is.

Sarvodaya stands for direct democracy but it cannot be denied that direct democracy is not suited to modern conditions of society.

While decentralisation is a welcome suggestion, it should not be based on the self-sufficiency of the villages.

Sarvodaya seems to go wrong not in its diagnosis of the evils of modern society but in the remedies suggested for the same. What is needed is not the renunciation of politics but raising it to a higher level of understanding and action. What is needed is not less of democracy but more of the same.

### **21.2.7 Conclusion**

Whatever be the practical aspect of Sarvodaya, the personal followers of Gandhi have purified and ennobled politics, raising it to the faith of humanity. The Sarvodaites are at least a reminder to the political followers of Gandhi of his ideals. Vinoba Bhave, who professed to have no interest in politics, was nevertheless one of the strongest forces in India and the techniques of this leader had a magic effect on people in all walks of life.

We might conclude by saying that Sarvodaya is a powerful intellectual attempt to build a plan of political and social reconstruction on the basis of metaphysical idealism. It is a dynamic philosophy which can make the advent of a radically transformed humanity possible. Provided all the people accept and follow its main principles.

## **21.3 Summary**

The term "Sarvodaya" means the uplift of all. It is Gandhiji's ideal regarding the set-up of the society and the people, although the idea of Sarvodaya was present in Indian culture since the very beginning.

The aim of Sarvodaya is to establish a classless and a casteless society, to provide efficient administration by giving power in the hands of the people and by decentralisation at the bases of political and social system. There will be no exploitation of the people. The society will be based on love, co-operation and the welfare of all.

Gandhiji gave the idea of Sarvodaya which was given a practical shape after his death by his followers, Acharya Vinoba Bhave, Kaka Kalelkar, Jai Prakash Narayan, Shankar Rao Dev etc.

Although it is very difficult to realise the ideal of Sarvodaya in actual practice, it cannot be denied that it is a dynamic philosophy which can make the advent of a radically transformed humanity possible.



### 21.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Sarvodaya, spiritual saint, Indian culture, non-violence, classless, casteless society, communism utilitarianism, proletariat, partyless system, decentralisation, Bhoodan movement, sampatti dana, Gram Dana, Gram Rajya, political and social reconstruction, local self-government.

### 21.5 Questions for Exercise

#### (a) Objective Questions

##### 1. Sarvodaya aims at

- (a) the uplift of all
- (b) the uplift of a few
- (c) the uplift of many
- (d) none of the above.

Ans. — (a)

##### 2. The Sarvodaya society is

- (a) based on class and caste distinctions
- (b) a casteless and classless society
- (c) based on the distinction between the rich and poor
- (d) none of the above.

Ans. — (b)

#### (b) Short Answer Questions

##### 1. Discuss the main features of Sarvodaya society.

Ans. — See 21.2.4

##### 2. Compare the ideals of Sarvodaya with those of communism and utilitarianism.

Ans. — See sub 21.2.3

#### (c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. Critically discuss the ideal of Sarvodaya.
- 2. Is the ideal of Sarvodaya practical? Comment.

### 21.6 Suggested Readings

- |                    |   |   |
|--------------------|---|---|
| 1. A. C. Kapur     | : | <b>Principles of Political Science</b>        |
| 2. A. K. Verma     | : | <b>Prarambhika Rajniti evam Samaj Darshan</b> |
| 3. Eddy Asirvatham | : | <b>Political Theory</b>                       |





**Political Ideology : Satyagraha****Lesson Structure**

- 22.0 Objective
- 22.1 Introduction
- 22.2 Significance of Satyagraha
  - 22.2.1 Gandhiji's Methodology
  - 22.2.2 Meaning of Satyagraha
  - 22.2.3 Qualities of a Satyagrahi
  - 22.2.4 Different Forms of Satyagraha
  - 22.2.5 Circumstances under which Satyagraha is used
  - 22.2.6 Critical Appreciation
  - 22.2.7 Conclusion
- 22.3 Summary
- 22.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 22.5 Questions for Exercise
  - (a) Objective Questions
  - (b) Short Answer Questions
  - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 22.6 Suggested Readings

**22.0 Objective**

"Satyagraha" is Gandhiji's political weapon which he used from time to time to solve political problems. It is necessary to have a clear idea about this political weapon of Gandhiji. For this we shall first discuss Gandhiji's methodology. Then we shall see the meaning of 'satyagraha' so that we do not confuse it with passive resistance. After this we shall see the different qualities of a satyagrahi. We shall also discuss the different forms of satyagraha. It is also necessary to know the various situations in which "satyagraha" is used. Then, we shall critically assess the technique of satyagraha.



## 22.1 Introduction

Gandhiji had firm faith in truth and non-violence. According to him, truth is the first thing to be sought for, because there is no God higher than truth. But truth and non-violence are inseparable and presuppose each other. He who believes in non-violence believes in a living God and the living God for Gandhi is truth.

Similarly, he believed in the importance of means and ends. He did not distinguish between ends and means and regarded the two as a continuous process. He believed that "if one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself."

Gandhiji also believed in the moral purity of the individuals. On the basis of these beliefs, Gandhiji invented a new path for resisting political evils and this he called "Satyagraha."

The technique of Satyagraha is Gandhiji's unique and distinctive contribution not only to the armoury of political weapons and technique of revolution, but to the store of human knowledge as well. It is a new science or philosophy of action.

## 22.2 Significance of Satyagraha

Satyagraha is the soul force or the power of the Godhead within us. "It is the soul-force or truth-force or truth-seeking force. It is in short "Satyagraha" which means resistance to evil with all the moral and spiritual force that a person can command. It is the use of moral force or firmness in the vindication of truth." This is Gandhi's view of Satyagraha and in this lies the significance of satyagraha.

In Mahatma Gandhi's own words, "It does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil doer." "It is no negative force.....It is a force which is more positive than electricity and more powerful than even ether."

Mahatma Gandhi called himself "the keeper of the lighthouse called Satyagraha (or soul force)." "It is a principle for which I desire to live, and for which I believe I am equally prepared to die."

From what Gandhi has said about satyagraha we conclude that the significance of satyagraha is unquestionable.

### 22.2.1 Gandhiji's Methodology

Gandhism is a totally moral philosophy and so is Gandhi's methodology. An upholder of the ideals of truth and non-violence, Gandhiji held that not only the end be high and laudable, but the means should also be moral. Moral means must be adopted to achieve desirable results. He likened means "to a seed, the end to a tree,



and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree." Means are to him everything. He believed that "if one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself."

Thus, according to Gandhiji, our means must be as pure as the end. With regard to the means, we must stand firm on the ground of unadulterated good.

By emphasizing on the purity of the means, Gandhiji took a step forward for the "spiritualisation of politics." During his times and even now it was the prevalent notion that "success in politics is the highest end" and for the attainment of this end any means, right or wrong, can be used. Gandhiji did not accept this view. According to him, the means must be equally pure as the end. This was a revolutionary change in politics.

### **22.2.2 Meaning of Satyagraha**

The technique of satyagraha is a unique contribution of Gandhiji to the field of politics. Gandhiji evolved a way of resisting evil through the organisation of truth and non-violence, that is "Satyagraha" or "holding on to truth." "The technique of satyagraha", says A.C. Kapur, "is Gandhiji's unique and distinctive contribution not only to the armoury of political weapons, and the technique of revolution, but to the store of human knowledge and thought as well. It was tried and found successful in limited fields and it can be applied in new and wider fields. Satyagraha is, thus, the technique of resisting all that is evil, unjust, impure and untrue and removing all maladjustments in human relations by love, voluntary suffering and self-purification by an appeal "to the divine spark in the opponent's soul." To explain it in the words of Gandhi, Satyagraha is "a vindication of truth by bearing witness to it through self-suffering, in other words, love."

Regarding the literal meaning of the word satyagraha it is made up of two words "Satya" and "Agraha" or "begging for truth" or "vindication of truth" or "power of truth." Gandhiji calls it "power of love" or "power of the soul." Satyagraha or Soul-Force or loveforce, as Gandhiji calls it, is like a coin on whose face you read love and on the reverse you read truth.

"Satyagraha" is thus a vindication of truth by bearing witness to it through self-suffering or love. It is the opposite of coercion. It is the weapon of the strongest and the bravest." It is a weapon of those who are physically weak but morally strong. It can also be the weapon of those who are both physically and morally strong, but never of those who are morally weak." (Eddy Asirvatham)

The satyagrahi establishes spiritual identity with the opponent and awakens in him a feeling that he cannot hurt him without hurting himself. All conflicts "are sought



to be resolved by the mighty weapon of satyagraha by lifting these from the gross physical plane to elevated spiritual and moral plane where they can be adjusted by the union of the soul, by the deep calling unto the deep."

Satyagraha should not be confused with Passive Resistance :

Satyagraha is often used as a synonym for passive resistance but Gandhiji has tried to differentiate between the two. It is true that both are methods of meeting aggression, settling conflicts. However, the two are fundamentally different from each other—

(1) Satyagraha is a moral weapon based on the superiority of soul-force over physical force but passive resistance is a political weapon of expediency.

(2) Satyagraha can be practised only by the bravest who have the courage of dying without killing.

(3) A passive resister aims at embarrassing the opponent into submission. A satyagrahi aims at winning the opponent from error by love and patient suffering.

(4) There is hardly any place for love and patient suffering in passive resistance. In satyagraha, there is no room for hatred or ill-will.

(5) Satyagraha is totally non-violent whereas passive resistance takes recourse to violent means if necessary.

(6) Satyagraha can be used everywhere, but the scope of passive resistance is limited.

Thus satyagraha is not passive but active non-violent resistance. To quote Mahadev Desai, "Satyagraha is dynamic, active, but resistance is static. Passive resistance acts negatively and suffers reluctantly. Satyagraha acts positively and suffers with cheerfulness. Passive resistance is not universal in its application. It cannot be directed against one's nearest relations as satyagraha can be. Passive resistance offered in a spirit of despair weakens the resister psychologically and morally. Satyagraha emphasises all the time internal strength and actually develops the same. Satyagrahi can offer more effective determined opposition to injustice and tyranny than passive resistance.

### **22.2.3 Qualities of a Satyagrahi**

According to Gandhiji, a satyagrahi possesses some special qualities. He must be a follower of truth and non-violence in thought, words and deeds. A satyagrahi does not take recourse to lies, violence, or any impure means. Whatever he does, he does openly and is ready to accept his shortcomings. Gandhiji mentions the following qualities in a satyagrahi in his writing "Hind-Sevarajya"—truth, non-violence, non-stealing, celibacy, non-possession, physical labour, tastelessness, unafraid, secular, swadeshi and an advocate of untouchability.



### 22.2.4 Different Forms of Satyagraha

The technique of satyagraha as corporate action may take the following forms :

**(I) Non-Cooperation**—Gandhiji said that oppression and exploitation were possible because of the co-operation of the people with the government. If people refuse to cooperate with the government, they cannot function. "Even the most despotic government," Gandhiji maintained, "cannot stand except with the consent of the government which consent is forcibly procured by the despot."

This weapon of non-cooperation can be used in both private and public life. Gandhiji used it against the British regime.

The non-violent methods which satyagrahis may employ to develop the non-cooperation movement are : hartal, social ostracism and picketing.

**(i) Hartal**—Hartal means cessation or stopping of work as a measure of protest. Its object is to strike the imagination of the people and the government. For hartal to be effective two things are necessary—(a) hartal should not be frequent (b) they should be strictly voluntary. No violence should be used. According to Gandhiji those going on hartal should know handicrafts so that in times of need they can carry on their livelihood.

**(ii) Social Ostracism**—It means social boycott. Those persons who refuse to cooperate with the public in their programme of non-cooperation with the government, are to be boycotted. Boycott is an important weapon of satyagraha. Lokmanya Tilak used it when he boycotted foreign goods.

**(iii) Picketing**—It is also known as "dharna." In 1920-22 and during 1930-34, Gandhiji used it against drugs, opium and foreign goods. In the case of picketing no force should be applied. Picketing must be persuasive and not coercive. To quote Gandhiji, "The object of peaceful picketing is not to block the path of a person wanting to do a particular thing but to rely on the force of public opprobrium and to warn and even shame the blockage." Picketing should avoid coercion, discourtesy, burning of effigies or hunger strikes.

**2. Civil Disobedience**—Civil disobedience is the last stage and the most drastic form of non-cooperation. Gandhiji called it "a complete, effective and bloodless substitute of armed revolt." Gandhiji put greater emphasis on the word "civil" than on disobedience so that the movement might not become uncivil or violent. And as it is an effective and drastic remedy, it should be used rarely and with precaution. Gandhiji used it in Champaran to help the indigo planters as well as in South Africa.

**3. Hijrat**—Another form of satyagraha recommended by Gandhiji was "hijrat" which means voluntary exile from the permanent place of residence. This is done by those who feel oppressed, cannot live without loss of self-respect in a particular place and lack the strength that comes from true non-violence or the capacity to defend themselves violently. Gandhiji recommended Hijrat in 1928 to the people of Bardoli and in 1939 to those of Junagarh, Vithalgadh and Limbdi.



**4. Fasting**—The most potent form of stayagraha is fasting. Gandhiji called it "a fiery weapon." Gandhiji characterised it to be the most dangerous technique, hence it should be applied with caution. Fasting is meant not for all but for rare occasions. Fasting exerts pressure through self-suffering and it helps the purpose of resisting and converting the evil-doer.

**5. Strike**—Strike is the weapon of the labour for redressal of their legitimate grievances. Gandhiji directed the labourers to direct their attack against corruption, injustice, inefficiency and short-sighted greed of the owners. The satyagrahi strike should be non-violent in spirit as well as method. It is voluntary, purificatory suffering undertaken to convert the erring opponent. Moreover, the demands of the strikers, must be clear, feasible and just.

Hence, Gandhiji advocated the above technique of satyagraha. Gandhiji had even indicated a plan of action in case of a foreign armed aggression though he had no opportunity to test it.

#### **22.2.5 Circumstances under which Satyagraha is used**

Having discussed the different forms of Satyagraha, we must now know about the different circumstances in which it is to be used. Gandhiji instructs that satyagraha should be used in the following situations :

(i) Satyagraha is to be used only when all other methods of making the opponent understand has failed and there is no other alternative.

(ii) The general public when they go in for satyagraha should understand its utility and be mentally prepared for it.

(iii) Before starting satyagraha a person should decide his demands and be mentally prepared for it.

(iv) A satyagrahi should proceed with the feelings of non-violence and sacrifice his life. He should even be ready to lay down his life if required.

According to Gandhiji, a satyagrahi has to bear a number of difficulties. He has to tolerate the indifference of the people; he is mocked at, he is criticised by those against whom he shows his resistance. He has to undergo the oppressions of the ruling class. But when a satyagrahi obtains success, he gets praise and respect from others.

Thus, a satyagrahi should have a lot of courage, patience and purity.

#### **22.2.6 Critical Appreciation**

Whereas satyagraha of Gandhiji was praised by a number of people, some people have criticised it saying—

**(a) Satyagraha is not conducive to the idea of non-violence**—According to critics, satyagraha gives mental agony and sometimes pain to those against whom it is used. According to Arthur More, "It is a mental violence." Critics describe fasting as political blackmail.



**(b) Satyagraha cannot be used in all circumstances**—Critics say that satyagraha can be used in independent societies where there is justice and respect for mankind. But in absolute states where people are morally and intellectually lacking, Satyagraha cannot be successful.

**(c) In the international field or during war satyagraha cannot be used**—According to critics in the age of star wars and atomic wars, to talk of satyagraha is funny and absurd.

**(d) To bring about social and economic changes no non-violent means is possible**—Communists, anarchists, etc. criticise satyagraha and also Gandhism and say that social changes cannot be brought about by peaceful methods.

**(e) Possibility of misuse in the name of satyagraha**—Sometimes different political parties carry on campaign for the attainment of their selfish motives and call it "satyagraha."

In this way, satyagraha of Gandhiji suffers from some drawbacks.

### 22.2.7 Conclusion

We can conclude by saying that the success or failure, the rightness or wrongness of satyagraha depends upon those using it. In fact, the above demerits are not the demerits of satyagraha but those making use of satyagraha. Gandhiji had himself said that if a person truly follows the rules of satyagraha, he is bound to attain success and satyagraha will surely prove to be moral, non-violent and an effective weapon.

## 22.3 Summary

Gandhiji had evolved a way of resisting evil through the organisation of truth and non-violence which he called "satyagraha" or holding on to truth. Satyagraha is the technique of resisting all that is evil, unjust, impure and untrue and resolving all maladjustments in human relations by love, voluntary suffering and self-purification by an appeal "to the divine spark in the opponent's soul." It is an expression of purest Ahimsa or non-violence and it precludes hatred, deception or untruth. The explain it in the words of Gandhiji, "Satyagraha is a vindication of truth by bearing witness to it through self-suffering, in other words, love."

Satyagraha of Gandhiji is a weapon not of the weak but of the strong. It does not mean passivity. It is not passive, but active non-violent resistance. Gandhiji used to say, "With satya (truth) combined with ahimsa (non-violence), you can bring the world to your feet. Satyagraha in essence is nothing but the introduction of truth and gentleness in the political, that is, the national life."

The techniques of satyagraha are (i) non-cooperation which includes hartal, social ostracism, picketing.

(ii) Civil disobedience like hijrat, fasting, strike, etc.



## Political Ideology : Satyagraha

Satyagraha was first experimented by Gandhiji in South Africa with commendable success. It was again tried on a large scale in India to achieve national independence. No revolution for national independence has been as bloodless as the Indian revolution for independence.

### 22.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Satyagraha, political weapon, methodology, passive resistance, armoury of political weapons, technique of revolution, philosophy of action, spiritualisation of politics, satyagrahi, civil disobedience, hijrat, social ostracism, divine spark, soul-force, love-force, bloodless revolution.

### 22.5 Questions for Exercise

#### (a) Objective Questions

1. The technique of satyagraha is based on

- (a) truth
- (b) non-violence
- (c) truth and non-violence
- (d) none of the above.

Ans. — (c)

2. Satyagraha means

- (a) passive resistance
- (b) active resistance
- (c) active non-violent resistance
- (d) none of the above.

Ans. — (c)

#### (b) Short Answer Questions

1. Discuss Gandhiji's methodology.

Ans. — See 22.2.1

2. What are the different forms of satyagraha? Discuss.

Ans. — See 22.2.4

#### (c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. Discuss critically Gandhiji's technique of satyagraha.
- 2. Do you think satyagraha is practical in the modern age? Comment.

### 22.6 Suggested Readings

- 1. A. C. Kapur : Principles of Political Science
- 2. Eddy Ashirvatham : Political Theory
- 3. Ashok Kumar Verma : Prarambhika Samaj evam Rajniti Darshan

