A Report

Debating Liberal Democracy and Gandhi

Dr. Upasana Pandey

(IUC Associate, IIAS, Shimla)

Assistant Professor

Department of Political Science

Vasanta College for Women

(Banaras Hindu University)

Krishnamurti Foundation India

Rajghat, Varanasi-221001

Debating Liberal Democracy and Gandhi [@]

Abstract:

We entered into modern era with various new goals and aspirations. To accomplish those goals model of liberal democracy was evolved by political theorists. Basically Democracy and liberalism are two different principles. The idea of democracy does not just represent one value among many, such as liberty, equality and justice; but is itself a value which can link and mediate between competing prescriptive concerns. It is a guiding principle which can help to generate a basis for specification of relations among different normative concerns. Democracy does not presuppose agreement on diverse values. Rather, it suggests a way of relating values to each other and learning the resolution of value conflicts.

Liberalism desires to create a diversity of power centers. A world marked by openness and plurality compromised by the reality of 'free market', is a world of liberalism. Liberalism takes "the individual" to be ultimate moral and political unit and makes his freedom, defined as free choice, the organizing principle of social and political life. What objectives have been designed by democracy cannot simply be found in liberalism. Despite of that democracy and liberalism entered into a commitment. That was an unmatched, unwanted settlement and that is why, the settlement produced many complexities. One among those is the politics of inclusion and exclusion upon which this paper deals in detail.

Since, Gandhi is not only conscious for an individual or a particular group but also for the society of which the individual and the group are an integral and an essential part, this paper presents a comparative study of liberal democracy and Gandhi's democracy to resolve the tension of inclusion and exclusion in the contemporary discourse. For clarity of study paper divides subject matters into three parts. In the first part liberal democracy has been discussed and contested on various grounds. In the second part Gandhi's idea of democracy is been researched with a fresh look. And finally third part of the study would be highlighting findings of a comparative study of both of these perspectives.

Full paper:

Liberal democracy has not to trigger expected socio-economic changes either in India or in any other part of the world. The system of liberal democracy has been dangerous for states, various institutions and also for individuals. Liberal democracy has been testimony of gradual erosion of various socio-political structures as well as of human consciousness. Liberal democracy has facilitated various negative influences in holistic as well as in particularistic manner. The more we are marching towards liberal democracy, the more our societies are getting fractured. On the name of liberal democracy various mechanisms have evolved, which are digging grounds for discrimination in a discriminated society. High time has come now to re-examine the model of liberal democracy because it is not logical to stand by an old stick in a new society, in a postmodern society.

Behind this backdrop, this paper struggles with various questions: First, why we have assumed that democratization of institutions is the only site for excavation? Secondly, can group rights be reconciled with liberal democratic principles? And finally, why "the people" of liberal democracy has not yet turned up?

Since, Gandhi is not only conscious for an individual or a particular group but also for the society of which the individual and the group are an integral and an essential part, this paper presents a comparative study of liberal democracy and Gandhi's model of democracy.

For clarity of study paper divides subject matters into three parts. In the first part liberal democracy has been discussed and contested on various grounds. In the second part Gandhi's idea of democracy is been researched with a fresh look. And finally third part of the study would be highlighting the findings of a comparative study of both of these perspectives.

Part-I

The idea of democracy is important because it does not just represent one value among many, such as liberty, equality and justice; but is itself a value which can link and mediate between competing prescriptive concerns. It is a guiding principle which can help to generate a basis for specification of relations among different normative concerns. Democracy does not presuppose agreement on diverse values. Rather, it suggests a way of relating values to each

other and learning the resolution of value conflicts open to participants in a political dialogue, subject only to certain provisions protecting the shape and form of the dialogue itself.

The objectives which have been designed by democracy cannot simply be found in liberalism. Liberalism desires to create a diversity of power centers. A world marked by openness and plurality compromised by the reality of 'free market', is a world of liberalism. Where democracy is for "the people"; liberalism takes "the individual" to be ultimate moral and political unit. Where in democracy the people have freedom of 'voice'; the principle of 'choice' is the central ethical principle of liberalism. Liberalism insists upon 'possessive individual'[*] in its abstract sense of the term. Despite of these differences democracy and liberalism entered into a commitment. That was an unmatched, unwanted settlement and that is why, the settlement produced many complexities. One among those is the politics of inclusion and exclusion.

Liberal democracy came into existence in the early decades of ninetieth century as a new model of government. This new model of government threw upon various theoretical tensions and theorists came up with different theoretical perspectives. Macpherson argues that although liberal state accepted democratic demands, its structure and basic assumptions could allow it to accommodate them only up to a certain point. If democracy accepts political and economic equality, it will subvert the very foundational norm of liberal society and state. Democracy, therefore, had to be liberalized in order that liberal society and state could accommodate it.

To accommodate these diverse values and to make politics more and more inclusionary liberal democracy tried to produce various mechanisms. One among those is group rights. The concept of group right is not new but the way it comes is very refreshing. We can highlight some of the basic reasons which compelled liberal democrats to develop the concept of group rights: First is the consciousness which social justice created in the intellectual and political podium. Secondly, we can presume that it is introduced to liberalize liberal democracy on a larger scale. And finally, we can propose to assume that it comes as a consequence of the socialist movements in most of the communist countries.

The question: can group-rights are reconciled with liberal democratic principle, is still a centre of scholarly and political debate because liberals normally contended that only individuals, not groups, may have rights. Amongst these disturbed scenarios, defenders of group

rights are coming up with variety of group rights along lines of culture, religion, language, race, gender so on and so forth. Will Kymlicka skillfully shows that group rights are consistent with liberalism. Building on the Rawls' theory of social justice and Dworkin's concept of integrity, Kymlicka argues that, if liberals care about equality, they should recognize that members of minority culture have to struggle harder than the members of the dominant society to develop an equal amount of goods, such as self-respect. Kymlicka thus explains the importance of cultural identity and why justice involves in doing more for minorities than simply providing them with the same rights as those enjoyed by all other citizens. While Kymlicka does not explain why people depend on their inherited cultures so much for developing self-respect, he does say it is enough to accept this phenomenon exists in our world and that we should therefore treat cultural membership as one of Rawls' primary goods that the principle of justice should secure for all persons.

Although, protectors of group-rights have developed various arguments, many questions arise about the idea of group-specific rights. First, who would possess this right, is it group or individual member? In specific case of India is it only the depressed caste? or the depressed members of the depressed society? Although, these group rights are notion of an advanced and more liberal societies but still these are limited in various sense.

Now, it becomes necessary to talk about group-specific rights because new groups are emerging. These new groups include feminists, blacks, gay, homosexuals, aborigines, immigrants and others. All are claiming for their rights. And liberals were compelled to take the issue seriously. For inclusion of these new groups or to make liberal democracy more liberalized, liberals introduced the group-specific rights. While political theorists normally assume that human beings share common attributes, such as autonomy or rationality, the politics of recognition focuses on people's different needs, identities, issues, values, languages and metaphors. The politics of recognition applies to many disadvantaged groups.

However, a difficult question raised by the politics of recognition is whether all cultures should be taken to be equally valuable. It is problematic to assume that all cultures have produced equally worthy works of art and literature, or that they have all contributed equally to the development of society. The problem runs deep, because when we judge other cultures, we confront more serious questions. Logically, it is impossible to conclude that two cultures that

disagree on basic moral precepts are both equal right and thus equal respect. Recognizing this problem, Taylor makes the modest claim that all cultures, at least deserve a 'presumption of equal respect'. This is not cultural relativism, but the awareness that only come when we learn to be open-minded and recognize the limitations of our own outlook. It comes only when we can hope to understand others better and adopt a more broad-minded attitude towards different cultures.

Thirdly, group-differentiated rights are introduced due to the socialist movements across the world. The movement echoes that social justice should largely be defined in terms of 'distributive justice' or 'economic justice'. The consciousnesses which come into view in the course of socialist movements give birth to multiple new working groups. In these days of advanced means of communication and channels of information's a new group of 'knowledge workers' or 'skilled workers' have emerged. These groups are not only seeking for suitable working-conditions but also demanding for their share and direct participations in different managerial and administrative affairs. Due to these changes in economic and political scenario, it was difficult for liberal democracy to keep them away from these developments. Hence, liberals introduce various new policies in various socio-economic fronts.

Most of the changes are coming from criticism of Rawls' Theory of Social Justice. The liberal democrats who raised voice for the new working classes argue that Rawls' social justice implies only for identification and distribution of primary goals. Wherein socialist roots of the social justice encourage a view of 'human-good' that makes emphasis on the enjoyment what can be shared, rather than privately consumed. Iris Marian Young has made a more systematic and radical form of anti-distributional framework. She has argued that social justice should not be understood primarily in the terms of the distribution of material goods. Rather, it needs to pay much more attention to the way in which social structures empowers some people and oppress others. Elizabeth Anderson suggests that the proper aim of egalitarian justice is not to eliminate the effect of brute fate from human affairs, but to end oppression which by definition is socially imposed. Its proper positive aim is not to ensure that everyone gets what they morally deserve, but to create a community in which people stand in relation of equality to others.

Through these developments at different group levels, liberal-democrats try to make government available to everyone. Form of the government which liberals try to evolve is one

which serves everyone, which ad-hears everyone's claims. This is a style of governance, where everyone can get their due place for representation as well as recognition. The society, where all its members along with their respective group-associations are all equally powerful, is a multicultural society.

Defenders of liberal democracy have evolved multiculturalism as a new mechanism. It is assumed that multiculturalism is a normative value which is followed by some policies so that various cultures can survive altogether. Multiculturalism refers to cultural diversity. No multicultural society can or should ignore demands of the diverse cultural groups. Multicultural theory argues that it is unjust if the law of the land demands much greater sacrifices of minorities than it does of majority on the name of equality within a liberal democratic structural setup. Diverse cultural groups are closely attached with their cultural roots. They have not only attached but also shaped by their cultural identities and their self-respect is closely bound up with respect for it. Although multicultural societies are giving due space for the diverse cultural groups but it does not mean that they will not have any interaction among each other. It is assumed that respect for their culture also earns their loyalty, give them the confidence and courage to interact with other cultures, and facilitates their integration into wider society. And cultural diversity is also desirable for society as a whole and represents a valuable contribution as a whole.

But critics of multiculturalism argues that diverse cultural identities may generate a kind of cultural clash in various societies or the notion of multiculturalism may become hazardous for national identity as a whole. Hence, critics have suggested the 'assimilationist' model of political integration. And most of the thinkers believed that there isn't any problem in assimilation if minorities freely decide to assimilate into the dominant culture, their decision should be respected and they should be given every opportunity and help to do so.

In such a situation, a multicultural society faces two conflicting demands: first to how to accommodate diverse cultural groups and second to how to fabricate a national or coherent identity which can surpass through all these cultural groups. The need to how to devise a political structure that enables different cultural groups to reconcile them in a just and collectively acceptable manner is still a persisting problem in all multicultural societies.

It is true that multiculturalism has given rights to diverse cultural groups but it has not evolved any parameter on the basis of which these rights could be distributed. In absence of such parameter (which is not ever possible to evolve) multicultural societies are becoming very vocal as well as violent. Across the globe we have observed how different cultural groups are becoming very furious for their rights. Although in political theory multiculturalism faces many crises: crisis of individual freedom, crisis of maintaining equality and crisis of public recognition as well as social endorsement of each and every culture, but many of the thinkers have accepted the notion of multiculturalism, with some excuses. They argue that what required is not hierarchical but egalitarian multiculturalism not autocratic but democratic multiculturalism.

Many a theorists of multiculturalism have maintained that diversity is itself a valued good, important for leading a good life and for erecting a good society. But for Neera Chandhok, multiculturalism is of limited value when trying to understand minority rights in India, because its reference point is European and American society. The US and Canada are largely immigrant societies, and therefore, different from India which has historically been constituted as a plural society. It is not multicultural that defines us, but pluralism. And pluralism catapults a different academic agenda altogether.

I think whether it is multiculturalism or pluralism which without any doubt can be a very interesting debatable point for the intelligentsia but as for the minorities are concerned, and it is not only the minorities instead all the fractured societies are restlessly looking for resolution. Debate between liberty and equality is not a new debate. Since decades political theorists are struggling but they are trying to get the solution either within the parameter of Liberal or Marxist outfits. We must try to see farther than these traditional norms if we are seriously looking for inclusion of minorities into the mainstream politics.

The debate within India and around the world shows that there are serious methodological lacunae within the liberal-democratic set-up. Liberal democrats need to focus their attentions on the various contradictions or the paradoxes which are prevalent throughout in their themes. It is very difficult to maintain liberal egalitarianism or equal libertarianism. There are conceptual difficulties in these assumptions. The objective of liberal democracy is to provide utmost liberty through the yardstick of restricted equality. Although, new concepts have evolved to makeup these mistakes but patch work would not be able to resolve the basic tension. At the

one hand through various mechanisms they want to provide rights and liberties to every possible section of societies, and on the other hand they want to open up a way for assimilation. How is it possible to pursue two contradictory concepts at the same time? This is the reason why in this model of liberal democracy those who have excluded are facing adverse situations. For them liberal democracy has become as exploitative as capitalism or feudalism once were.

Liberal democracy has also lost it's 'the people'. 'The people' of these days do not know how to think and what to do. As, this liberal democracy could never treat its citizen as a virtuous being. Aristotle taught us a long back: in a republic citizens emerge as beings thus to know how to rule and how to be ruled, an assemblage of virtues that at least entail equal respect for all co-citizens. The value of dignity and fraternity in terms of relationship between the governed and the governor has vanished altogether. The idea to respect for fellow citizen constitutes the very notion of a republic. In absence of these political consciousnesses it is very difficult for liberal democracy to achieve their desired goal. Although liberal democracy has tried much to give the best but could not achieve the destination. It seems that compatibility between democracy and liberalism could not materialize. What to do in such circumstances?

Part-II

Here an effort has been made first to observe and then to examine the problem of inclusion in liberal democracy from Gandhian perspective. Since, Gandhi is not only conscious for an individual or a particular group but also for the society of which the individual and the group are an integral and an essential part; this section tries to presents Gandhi's model of democracy. Whether it is the individual or the people Gandhi had his unique understanding on the notion of democracy, identity and freedom.

Gandhi starts with individual and ends with individual, but in between he meet with society. Individual is the foundation of Gandhi's philosophy of *Swarajya*. By acknowledging the importance individual's sovereignty and his autonomous dignity, Gandhi defines meaning of the *Swaraj* as rule of self (*Swa+Raj)*. Gandhi used to say: Real home-rule (*Swaraj*) is self-rule or self-control.Accordingly, Man is the maker of his own destiny in the sense that he has freedom of choice as to the manner in which he uses that freedom. And for Gandhi only a self-disciplined and self-controlled mind can be a free person. Very early Gandhi recognized the fact that mere

getting independence will not fulfill our expectations. The country must get-rid of not only of British rule but also of conservative practices, such as untouchability, child marriage etc.

To how to build such *swaraj,* for that Gandhi had a clear conception of democracy in his own terms. Early in 1948 Gandhi wrote: True democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at centre. It has to be worked from below by the people of every village. He continues: my notion of democracy is that under it the weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest. That can never happen except through non-violence. The rule of majority has a narrow application, i.e. one should yield to the majority in matters of detail. But it is slavery to be amenable to the majority, no matter what its decisions are. Democracy is not a state in which people work like a sheep. Under democracy, individual liberty of opinion and action is jealously guarded. I, therefore, believe that the minority has a perfect right to act differently from the majority.

But for that purpose Gandhi never ever tried for democratization of institution as he knew it very well that a mere change in the system would never bring a required change in the individual. Gandhi was of the opinion that it is the conscious-being who will introduce all changes. Therefore, we must put all our efforts at an individual's sphere. If individual is good and conscious, the whole society will automatically be transformed. Creating or knowing one's self does not mean that self would be restricted only up to the individuality. Individual and society is not different and contradictory to each other but they are essentially complementary. The mutual development of both will serve the purpose. Individual will serve and in return, automatically, will get recognition. Gandhi's individual is a relational-bring hence he is peace-loving and non-violent also. Unlike western political thinkers who emphasize the isolated, separated and that is why depressed and violent individual, Gandhi maintained that the self is a relational self. There is no political self without its internal positive and negative relations with the other, and that the non-social, independent, autonomous, modern, individual self is largely as social, economic, political and cultural construction.

Gandhi accepts importance of Communal Unity in a democratic society. He asserts that: everybody is agreed about the necessity of this unity. But everybody does not know that unity does not mean political unity which may be imposed. It means an unbreakable heart unity.

One should note that Gandhi's intention is not only limited up to "the political statements" what majority-groups are making time-to-time to show their sympathy towards minorities. Awkwardly; in India the group whom are addressed as minorities, they are not minorities demographically. Actually they are "political minority". It is nasty political games which have categorized them as minorities. And those whom are called majority they are few in numbers, but politically they have captured all powerful positions in a vicious process of political development. Gandhi indicates here and says that majority needs to be changed. In his words: We want to do away with the communal spirit. The majority must therefore make the beginning and thus inspire the minorities with confidence in their bona fides. Adjustment is possible only when the more powerful take the initiative without waiting for response from the weaker.

Although Gandhi favors inclusion of minority class, he denies any kind of affirmative actions or group differentiated rights by any system of government or administration which has become very critical issue in these days. Precisely Gandhi says, for administration to be efficient, it must always be in the hands of the fittest. There should be certainly no favoritism. But if we want five engineers we must not take one from each community but we must take the fittest five even if they were all Musalmans or all Parsis. The lowest posts must, if need be, be filled by examination by an impartial board consisting of men belonging to different communities. But distribution of posts should never be according to the proportion of the numbers of each community. The educationally backward communities will have a right to receive favored treatment in the matter of education at the hands of National Government. This can be secured in an effective manner. But those who aspire to occupy responsible posts in the Government of the country can only do so if they pass the required test. Gandhi suspects of anything like reservation as it develops discriminations. Educational institutions of these days are actually facing this problem. People are losing their faith. This is not acceptable to Gandhi. Gandhi in all his efforts wants to preserve an individual's dignity along with social integrity.

Gandhi too wants to reform administration. Enthusiastic and passionate people or their active organizations can keep their eyes on administrative structures as well as its various functions. For Gandhi, the first thing is to avoid the slightest shadow of compulsion or untruth. No reform worth the name has yet, in my humble opinion, been achieved by compulsion. For,

whilst compulsion may lead to apparent success, it gives rise to so many other evils which are worse than the original evil itself.

In Gandhi's conception of free India of the non-violent type people will be conscious, aware, alert and mindful. Every individual will be working as an essential and indispensable unit of the society. As, they (*Satyagrahis*) will be getting proper training for the purpose. That is why Gandhi says that people seem to think, that when a law is passed against any evil, it will die without any further effort. There never was a greater self-deception. Legislation is intended and is effective against an ignorant or a small evil-minded minority; but no legislation which is opposed by an intelligent and organized public opinion, or under cover of religion by a fanatical majority, can ever succeed".

Even on the question of women's inclusion Gandhi had different opinion. He said: I am uncompromising in the matter of women's rights. In my opinion she should labour under no legal disability not suffered by men. I should treat the daughters and sons on a footing of perfect equality." But he added: equality of sexes does not mean equality of occupations. There may be bar against a women hunting or wielding a lance. But she instinctively recoils from a function that belongs to man. Nature has created sexes as complement of each other. Their functions are defined as are their forms. A detailed study of Gandhi on women reflects that he wants to develop women's personality in a different way. Some feminist critics have problem on his stand. But Gandhi's ultimate message is to give dignity to womanhood. Whereas primary concerns of feminists are the messy content of the body, Gandhi talks about such a truthful\non-violent society where public\private distinction is automatically dissolved. It is an inherent quality of a non-violent society to get representation from each and every section. There is not any distinction either on the basis of sex, caste, class or colour. It is an egalitarian society in real sense of the term.

Hence, Gandhi attempted not only for political inclusion of minorities but also for their social, cultural as well as spiritual inclusion. Gandhi saw the whole world through *advita* perspective. As Gandhi says, I believe in *advita* (non-duality), I believe in the essential unity of man, and for that matter, of all that lives. Gandhi never accepts the idea of multiculturalism; however he allows multiculturality. In Gandhi's philosophy various cultures have their own normative values, but they never try to get any political recognition, although they have social

and cultural endorsement. Gandhi knew that power politics will never produce any solution. Gandhi never tries to resolve any problem through political instruments. Gandhi emphasized on rule but those were self-rule and self-discipline.

Part III

It has now become necessary to present a comparative analysis of both of these studies. In the previous sections we have seen how both the models; whether it is liberal democratic model of government or it is Gandhi's model of democracy, they have turned up with various lacunae. Liberal democracy appreciates individual's rights/group-rights or liberty at utmost possible level and ready to go to any extent for inclusion of those who have not yet been part of the mainstream politics. Despite of this eagerness for inclusion, liberal democracy has not shown any serious attempt to overcome the tensions or the clashes which are coming as a side effect of the inclusionary politics. It is not ignorance, rather an intentional omission because liberal-democrats want to please everybody, those who have excluded as well as those who have not included.

Liberal democracy has developed various paradoxes and due to contradictions it has neither become liberal nor democratic in real sense of the term.

Interestingly, liberal democracy and mechanical revolution both were emerged simultaneously along with market strategy. However, they are inclining in two different directions. Where liberal democracy is looking for availability of rational choices, mechanical advancements have synchronized these choices within certain brand names and companies' products. Where in liberal democracy we are welcoming differences: differences of opinion, differences of choices, differences of identity; machines are not reacting different persons differently because machines are following uniform commands only in binary language. Even markets are also discouraging different outlooks. Through identical products markets are maintaining uniformity across the globe. Moreover, capital intensive nature of machines makes capitalists richer and poor poorer.

In a mechanically advanced liberal democratic world order we have developed a new form of consumerism. Earlier we used to buy consumer goods; these days we want the whole system to consume. Consumption is not just consumption but it has become a conspicuous consumption (Baudrillard: 1981). And this conspicuous consumption requires immense

resources and energy. To how to put a limits on all these trend which are really responsible for the politics of inclusion there is not any way out.

Further, market oriented liberal democracy and hi-tech automobile machines have produced a virtual society which has challenged all the previous inclinations. In this virtual social order, each individual occupies a position. This position is called a multidimensional social space. This is the virtual social space which he or she is developing through hi-tech social networking. Although our experiences with economic capitalism are not new but these days we have social capitalists and this social capital induces the value of social networks, which produces or reproduces inequality. To how to overcome these inequality, liberal democrats have no answer as such.

These social networking are producing a very complex as well as autonomous political, social, economic, educational fields. In such a society we eventually develop a sense of game, or a practical reason or a way of division of the world of culture, of mannerism, of taste and so on. Through these games individual develops a space and legitimates the social form of domination. It is not only dangerous but also pathetic for the individual who becomes part of all these unknowingly. The individual has no other choice but to accept these to survive. Despite of the apparent freedom of choice, despite of equality of opportunity in liberal democratic set-up; privileged or dominant classes are still preserving their position.

Moreover, theses social capitals are much more hazardous. Although capitalism is wrong in any form but when it comes into the social relations, life becomes helpless because exploiter is not visible. Not only this, we don't even have any exact mechanism to resolve the problem because the seed of the problem has now injected into our relations through these hi-tech market forces which are outcome of liberal democratic set-up. Sense of insecurity has increased.

Amartya Sen and Bhikhu Parekh while presenting the notion of global citizenship talked about public deliberations. Democracy does not only mean democratization of institutions, but it also means government by discussion. Democracy stands for public reasoning. For this, both of them with their equal voice raise their claim for global ethics and global value system.

But, we have seen that the dialogue and discussion at global level (public reasoning) is not an easy task. It has its own limits. And then, is it possible for everyone to get global citizenship? How many of us are global citizens? Who will take part in this global discussion? Moreover, merely to hold a global discussion is not enough. A sense of global belongingness is also required. Where 20% countries are dominating over 80% of world resources, is it easy to develop this sense of belongingness and to conduct a smooth global discussion and public participation?

Inclusion does not only demands for minorities, but many other things should also be included like love, peace, harmony, mutual concerns for fellow beings etc. Liberal democracy has not evolved any agenda for all these. We can see these in Gandhi's idea of democracy. As we have seen how he imagined to flourish heart culture to replace unsympathetic political culture. How he wished to encourage relational-self rather than abstract-self of liberal democracy. Despite of that even Gandhi is not beyond critical scrutiny.

For critics, Gandhi's idea of democracy or other agenda for change either in society or in politics is full of beautiful ambiguity. For them Gandhi's too much reliance on individual and his faith on *advita* do not mean anything in these days' consumerist scenario and that is why they must be questioned. Although, Gandhi set an example in front of us that whatever he is thinking is not utopia and whatever is possible for him is possible for anyone on this earth. Despite of that it is next to impossible to think to have Gandhi's *satyagrahis*. How to create such individuals whom are the foundation of Gandhi's philosophy is the real challenge. And Gandhi himself is not suggesting anything in concrete. Although he developed things like constructive programme or communal unity, but these days we have a different world order altogether.

Even though, we accept relevance of the principles developed by Gandhi like truth, non-violence & love but the approach developed by Gandhi should be revised in new context which we have these days. If we are looking for real peace or real inclusion of minorities we should develop the culture of neither majority nor minority, rather the culture of heart or the culture of harmony as Gandhi told us. How to develop this? We can evolve things like the peace teams which are working in different regions of the world to resolve tensions at international sphere. Similarly, we can also open some training schools to teach to how to develop humane political and social set-up. Counseling centre can also help us. Group of volunteers are also welcomed.

References and Notes:

1. Hall, Stuart., Held, David., & McGrew,Tony., (Eds.). (1992). *Modernity and Its Futures*. (p.41). Oxford: Polity Press.

2. Parekh, Bhikhu. (1982). *Contemporary Political Thinkers*. (p.65). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

3. Macpherson, C.B. (1975) *The Real World of Democracy.* (pp.39-41). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

4. Parekh, Bhikhu. (1982). *Contemporary Political Thinkers*. (p.65). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

5. McKinnon, Catriona. (ed.). (2010). *Issues In Political Theory*. (p. 229). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

6. Young, Iris Marian. (1990). *Inclusion and Democracy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

7. Anderson, Elizabeth. (1999) 'What is the point of equality?'. *Ethics. 109(2),*pp199-212.

8. Fraser, Nancy. (1997). *Justice Interupts.* Landon: Routledge.

9. Parekh, Bhikhu. (1988). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. London: Macmillan Press.

10. Mahajan, Gurupreet. (ed.). (2011). *Accommodating Diversity*. (p.3). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

11. Chandhok, Neera. (2011, Oct.22) *Economic and Political Weekly.* Vol. XLVI. (No. 43).

12. Bose, Sujata & Jalal, Ayesha. (Eds) (1997) *Nationalism, Democracy and Development: State and Politics in India*. (p. 3). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

13. Ibid, P.2.

14. Bhargav, Rajeev. (2010). *Ethics and Politics of Indian Constitution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

15. *Hind Swaraj*. 91.

16. *Hind Swaraj. 55.*

17. *Harijan*. (1940, May, 18).

18. *Young India.* (1932, March,2).

19. *Harijan*. (1946, Sept.29).

20. Terchek, Ronald J. *Gandhi: Struggling for Autonomy*. (p. 42).

21. *Young India.* (1922. January,26).

22. *Young India*. (1921. Feb. 2).

23. *Constructive Programme*. (p. 8).

24. *India of my dreams*. (p.224).

25. Iyer, Raghavan. (Ed.). (1973). *Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*. (p. 132.) London: Oxford University Press.

26.   A llen, Douglas. (2000). *Gandhi: Contemporary Political Thinking and Self-other Relations*. In Ray, B. N. (Ed.) *Contemporary Political Thinking*. (p.154). New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers. (p.154).

27. Pandey, U. (1992, Sept29). *Men Mahatma and Machines. Mainstream*. Mumbai: Perspective Publications. No 41.

28. *Young India*. (1929.Oct.17).

29. *Harijan*. (1939.Dec.,2)

30. *Young India*. (1924. Dec.,4).

31. Sen, Amartya. (2006). *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. (p.185). (London: Penguin).

32. Parekh,Bhikhu. (2008). *A New Politics Of Identities: Political Principles for an Independent World* (Pal grave Macmillan Publishers).

33. Baudrillard, Jean. (1983). *Simulations*. (trans. Nicola Dufresne). New York: Semiotics.

34. Raj Nair, Baldev. (2005). *The Geopolitics of Globalization*. (p.40). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

35. Pandey, U. (2010. Nov). Acknowledging Gandhi's Satyagraha through the Balkan Peace Team for Building Peace*. Anvikshiki*. Varanasi: Maneesha and Vivek Prakashan. VOL.IV .(No.6).