

का संगम ही उनके दार्शनिक मतवाद का केन्द्रबिन्दु है। प्रायः टीकाकार जिस दर्शन पर लिखते हैं उसके मन्तव्यों को ही स्पष्ट करना चाहते हैं। जैसा कि तत्त्ववैशारदीकार श्री वाचस्पति मिश्र ने छः दर्शनों की व्याख्या में किया है अथवा यदि कृतिकार किसी मत विशेष पर अनुयायी होता है तो दर्शन का स्वरूप ही विकृत कर देता है या पूर्णतः उसका विरोध करता है परन्तु आचार्य विज्ञानभिक्षु ने सांख्य, योग एवं वेदान्त तीनों दर्शनों में समन्वय प्रस्तुत किया। अन्य दर्शनों को सम्भवतः वह इससे पूर्व की अवस्था मानते हैं अतः उस पर अधिक नहीं कहा है।

योगसारसंग्रहकार ने सांख्य, वेदान्त और योग दर्शनों पर भाष्य या वार्तिक लिखा है और तीनों दर्शनों में पूर्ण आत्मीयता तथा अनुभूति की दृष्टि रखी है। तीनों दर्शनों के लिए उन्होंने— अस्मच्छास्त्रे 'अस्मन्मते', 'स्वशास्त्रे' इत्यादि पदों से अभिहित किया है। तीनों शास्त्र उनके अपने हैं। तीनों उनके लिए प्रधान है। उनका मूल विश्वास यह है कि जिन ऋषियों ने श्रुतियों के आधार पर तथ्यों का प्रतिपादन किया है व सभी दिव्य—दृष्टि वाले तथा ऋतम्भराप्रज्ञा—पूर्ण थे। अतः उनकी बातें न तो भ्रान्त हो सकती हैं और न ही परस्पर .....। विज्ञानभिक्षु ने योगसिद्धान्तों को वेदान्त से सम्बन्धित करने का प्रयत्न किया है जो योगसिद्धान्तों के उनके पूर्व के व्याख्याकारों में देखने को नहीं मिलता। योगसारसंग्रहकार पण्डित होने के साथ—साथ योगी भी थे, जो उनकी दार्शनिकता को निजता प्रदान करता है। योगसारसंग्रहकार की दार्शनिकता दो रूपों में मिलती है। एक है उनकी सांख्य, योग और वेदान्त साधनाओं का स्वरूप और दूसरा है उनका निजी दर्शन, जो कि उनके समन्वयवाद के नाम से उद्घाटित होता है। उनकी दार्शनिकता के दोनों रूप अन्ततः एकाकार हो उठते हैं, क्योंकि न तो उनका समन्वय उनके सांख्य, योग और वेदान्त—दर्शनगत सिद्धान्तों के विरुद्ध है और न ही उनके सांख्य, योग और वेदान्त—सिद्धान्त कहीं उनके समन्वयवाद का विरोध करते हैं।

**संदर्भ :-**

1. वार्तिककाचलदण्डेन मथित्वा योगसारम्। उद्धृत्यामृतसारोऽयं ग्रन्थकुम्भे निधीयते।।  
—योगसारसंग्रह, मंगलाचरण
2. न चैतावता न्यायाद्यप्रामाण्यं विवक्षितार्थं वेद्यातिरिक्तांशे बाधाभावाद्।—सांख्यप्रवचनभाष्य, पृ० 8
3. ब्रह्ममीमांसासांख्यादिषु च ज्ञानमेव विचारितं बाहुल्येन ज्ञानसाधनमाषस्तु योगः संक्षेपतः ज्ञानजन्ययोगस्तु संक्षेपतोऽपि तेषु नोक्तोऽतोऽतिविस्तरेण द्विविधम् योगं प्रतिपादयिषुर्भगवानुपतंजलिः शिष्यावधानायादौयोगानुशासनं शास्त्रमारम्यतया प्रतिज्ञातवान्।।—योगवार्तिक, ० 5
4. योगसारसंग्रह, भूमिका, पृ० 16
5. ऋते ज्ञानान्न मुक्तिः। ऋग्वेद
6. ज्ञानयोगयोर्मुख्यं फलं कैवल्यं।—योगसारसंग्रह, पृ० 15

\*\*\*\*

## Relevance of Gandhi's trusteeship on today's socio-economic Philosophy

Shiwani Burnwal\*

The focus on trusteeship in many ways runs counter to the dominant economic system that has widened the gap between the rich and the poor. Therefore, there is a need for a different approach to the analysis of trusteeship. The proposed research will be carried out through a conceptual and critical analysis. Different philosophical position regarding the concept of Trusteeship would be studied. It will be my attempt through this paper to look into the various aspect of the Gandhian trusteeship and make clear about the logical, fair and reasonable basis for the understanding of it and further to appreciate the relevance of trusteeship in today's world. Also, my endeavor would be to show how discussion on trusteeship help us to understand a new way to tackle existing socio-economic situation.

**Key words-:** Gandhian Philosophy, Trusteeship, Socio-Economic Philosophy, Capitalist View, Marxist Economic view.

### Introduction

Trusteeship - "An Individual or organization which holds or manages and invests assets for the benefit of another", is a socio-economic philosophy that was first propounded by Mahatma Gandhi. The trustee is legally obliged to make all trust-related decision in the beneficiary's interests. In other words, trusteeship is a supervisory control by one or more people over a downtrodden people. This trusteeship formed a central theme of Gandhi's economic ideas as a part of his general fight against poverty, and exploitation of weaker section of society. The existing world scenario regarding inefficient economic domain necessitates resorting to the approach of trusteeship and realigning the socio-economic philosophy on the lines of trusteeship. Perhaps the most important and rather a controversial issue of socio-economic philosophy is the right to private property. This right to private property controversy

\*Department Of Philosophy University Of Delhi

is the main contentious factor between capitalist and communist economies. Mahatma Gandhi rejected both these capitalist and communist views. According to the Gandhiji, Marxist economic view is based on violence and tyranny while capitalist socio-economic view point is based on exploitation, competition, and tyranny. Gandhiji believed that only solution of the controversy lies in the application of his concept of trusteeship. Gandhiji offered Trusteeship as an alternative. According to him, if capital is power, then labor is power too. Either can be used constructively or destructively. Therefore, capital and power should hold their power in trust. Gandhian trusteeship has potentiality to transform the very concept of ownership for both the owner of capital and labor. Trusteeship would establish the link of ownership with private profit and link it to social-profit, possession being held in trust for the welfare of all. Trusteeship provides one with a glimpse of "Mutualist socialism". Trusteeship is a partnership between all factors of production, with the aim of achieving larger social benefit rather than working towards a narrow economic objective such as profit. It would be wrong to term Gandhiji as an economist. No economic theories or principles were given by Gandhiji. But he rationalized his views of economy in such a manner that economy should not dictate life but rather form a part of a way of life. "Truth and Non-violence" were two main principles governing Gandhiji's economic, social, political and all other viewpoints. As his economic viewpoints were based on the above two mentioned principles, he became an economist of the masses. His economic approach was rooted in human dignity and gave a new direction to the existing economic problems in protecting human dignity.

The concept of trusteeship flows from the ideals of *aparñgraha* and *Ahimsa*. *aparñgraha* is the ethical ideal of non-possession, of the renunciation of ownership, of liberation from the subtle as well as the coarse bands that possessions forge for one. It is an ancient ideal believed by every religion. According to the *Isopanishad*: "*Tena Tyaktena Bhunjeethah: Ma gridha kasyaswiddhanam*"? (Enjoy by renouncing, do not covet, or cling to possessions; For, whom is wealth?) According to the above Sloka, one is asked to dedicate everything to God and then use it only to the required extent. To Gandhi, the above verse laid down a code of conduct for the individual as well as society. The person should try to refrain himself/herself from acquisitiveness and possession. Gandhiji cited five reasons to explain why one should refrain from appropriation.

- i. It is against what he called as the fundamental law of nature: "The profound truth upon which this observance is based is that God never creates more than what is strictly needed for the moment. Therefore, whoever appropriates more than what is really necessary is guilty of theft." (Harijan, 10-10-1948)
- ii. When a man is born into the world, he gains access to the resource that nature and society have created. He depends on resources that nature and society have created. If he uses any part of these resources without replacing it or contribution in commensurate measure to the replenishing of the social heritage, he is guilty of appropriating the fruits of someone else's labor. In fact, he owes a debt to society when he born and unless he works to repay this debt, he will be guilty of theft.
- iii. Seizing property that belongs to someone else for future use is cornering what someone else may need urgently, what may well spell the difference between life and death to someone.
- iv. To burden one's mind with the thought of possession is to invite an obsession that takes one away from the life of the spirit, makes one oblivious of social ethics, and leads one to mistake, the multiplication of wants for civilization.
- v. Possession means retention for future use, or for the acquisition of power. But one cannot retain a possession unless one is ready to defend it. To do so one has to use force. A man who believes in non-violence has to opt for the path of non-possession. (Gandhi 1935: 17)

By the above discussion, it is clear that how an individual should live. Every individual would work for his bread. He or she should earn his/her livelihood without exploiting others. One should minimize one's wants, use what he/she requires for current consumption and hold whatever surplus survives as a trust for a society. According to Gandhiji – "My theory of trusteeship is no camouflage. I am confident that it will survive all other theories. It has sanction of philosophy and religion behind it" (Gandhi 1939: 376). No other theory is compatible with non-violence. It is clear that Gandhian trusteeship is very easy to practice because it permits capitalist, socialist economic system at the same time. Trusteeship is based on *Ahimsa* and promotes economic equality. Gandhian trusteeship has the potentiality to abolish the eternal conflict between

capital and labor. In other words, the leveling down of the few rich in whose hands is concentrated the bulk of the nation's wealth on the one hand, and a leveling up of the semi-starved, naked millions on the other. Economic equality of his conception does not mean that everyone would have the same amount of money. But instead, it means that everyone should have enough for his/her legitimate needs. According to him, the elephant needs a thousand times more food than the ant. This is not at all inequality. Elephant need more food. By the above discussion it is clear that the real meaning of economic equality is: "To each according to his need."

One of the most significant attempts to promote trusteeship was "The Draft Indian Trusteeship Bill, 1967", proposed by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. This bill sought to provide such an opportunity to the owners of large companies and proposed necessary provisions for the democratic management of the resultant trust corporations in accordance with the principles of trusteeship formulated by Gandhiji. The provision of the bill was expected to promote increased productivity by giving the worker a sense of full and intelligent participation in the process of production, purchases, sales and investments of the enterprise. This bill was not a compulsory but a permissive measure enabling the present owners of large companies to transform their existing title based on absolute rights into trust ownership. After this, many bills were introduced in the parliament but none could be successful passed. Hence, till date "The Indian Trusteeship Bill" remains a matter of least concern.

There has emerged a conflict amongst nations following the capitalist and socialist economic policies which is proving dangerous for international peace. In such a scenario, the concept of Gandhian trusteeship can be a possible path to be followed. From the above discussion, it is clear that Gandhian trusteeship is based on *aparñgraha* and non-violence. If rich people behave as trust of their wealth, there would be no clash between the rich and the poor. Trusteeship is able to leveling the gap between the rich and the poor. That is why simple practical trusteeship formula was drawn up by Kishorlal Mashruwala and Narahari Parikh and approved, with a few changes by Gandhiji. The practical Trusteeship formulas were as follows:

1. Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capitalist order of society into an egalitarian one. It gives no quarter to capitalism, but gives the present owning class a change of reforming

itself. It is based on the faith that human nature is never beyond redemption.

2. It goes not recognize any right of private ownership of property except so far as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare.

3. It does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and the use of wealth.

4. Thus, under the state-regulated trusteeship, an individual will not be free to hold or use his wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interests of the society.

5. Just as it is proposed to fix a decent minimum living wage, even so a limit should be fixed for the maximum income that would be allowed to any person in society. The difference between such minimum and maximum incomes should be reasonable and equitable and variable from time to time so much so that the tendency would be towards obliteration of the difference.

6. Under the Gandhian system on economic order the character of production will be determined by social necessity and not be the personal whim or greed. (Gandhi 1959: 301)

It would be no overstatement to say that Mahatma Gandhi was a radical revolutionary. While framing the Trusteeship formula, he proposed to fix a decent minimum wage but at the same time he emphasized to fix the maximum income too. At the same time, he stated that the difference between such minimum and maximum income should be sensible and can vary according to the time. Gandhian conception of trusteeship is reasonable and fair enough to maintain middle path. Before giving a Judgement, Gandhiji always kept the rich and the poor people in his mind. Here we can say that, Gandhian philosophy seeks to combine Lincoln's love of liberty with Lenin's urge for equality, without restoring to the barrel of gun (Biswas 1969: 123).

The main idea of trusteeship is very broad and deep. It is not easy to comprehend. There is not a single historical example which has taken in favor of trusteeship. In fact, full trusteeship Idea has not been experimented anywhere. Irony with this doctrine is that it is bitterly criticized by the scholars, politicians and economist but never experimented. This is why the country has not yet been able to enact a law on trusteeship.

Though, the theory has become more relevant in the present India. In India, we have mixed economy model with large public sector

and a very large private sector. But the distribution of power as well as resources is concentrated in the hands of few people. This concentration of economic power is increasing day by day. There is nothing to stop it from further expanding. At the same time, we are aware of the consequences of above. Basically, these increasing economic power lead to the various kind of violence, class war, creation of a new bureaucratic class, etc. But trusteeship provides an alternative mechanism for reducing the concentration of economic power. But the question then arises: To what extent is the conception of trusteeship applicable in India and what are the chances of its survival?

From this discussion, it becomes clear that the concept of trusteeship has generally been a matter of negligence. As we have seen that in recent times neither capitalistic economy nor socialist economy is successful in dealing with the global economic crisis which has occurred in last five to ten years. Both of these economics were in the verge of collapse. In this aspect of economy, the relevance of the trusteeship in today's India is desirable.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **Primary Sources**

- Gandhi, M.K., "Trusteeship" Compiled by Ravindra Kelkar, Navjivan Publishing, Ahmedabad, 1960.
- Gandhi, M.K., "My theory of trusteeship" Bhartiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay, 1970.
- Gandhi, M.K. "From Yavada mandir", Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1935.
- Gandhi, M.K., "Capital and labour, Bhartiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay, 1970.
- Gandhi, M.K. "Economic and Industrial life and Relations" Navjivan Publishing, Ahmedabad, 1959, Part-I.

### **SECONDARY SOURCES**

- Gadre Kamal, "The coming struggle for trusteeship" Trusteeship forum, 1972.
- Diwan, Ramesh, "Trusteeship and Decentralization, Gandhi Marg, 1980.
- Marchent Vijay, "Trusteeship Management", Mumbai, 1966.
- Sethi, J.D., "Trusteeship", Gandhi Shanti pratishthan, New Delhi, 1970.
- Biswas, S.C. (ed.), "Gandhi, Theory and Practice, Social Impact and contemporary Relevance", Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla, 1969.

\*\*\*\*

