Prof. R. P. Singh
Centre for Philosophy
School of Social Sciences
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi
rpsinghjnu@yahoo.com

Gandhi's Pluralistic Perspective on the Notion of 'the Other'

In this paper, I shall discuss Gandhi's pluralist and anti-essentialist position on the notion of 'the other'. As a matter of fact, Gandhi's philosophical thinking owes much to Jainism, Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism and so on besides the enlightenment rationality of the 18th & early 19th century Europe. The Anekāntavāda of Jainism, Mahākarunā of Buddhism, Love as one the infused virtues of Christianity and the two Rg Vedic exhortations; namely, i) Ekam sat viprāh bahudhā vadanti; and, ii) Āno bhadrāh kritavo yantu visvatāh have given the profound insight to advocate pluralistic perspective on 'the Other'. Though the Absolute Reality is one but wise people call it differently. It admits of alternative approaches in terms of thought constructions and linguistic expressions. This is the basis of the emergence of 'the other'. It is proposed that let the noble thoughts come to us from 'the other(s)'. In addition, I'll bring out the discourse on purushārtha. This has been the fundamental act of philosophizing in India. It is pluralistic in its expression and can be used to resolve the apparent antinomies between self and the other, values and virtues etc. on the one hand; and, Indian and Ionian, East and West, Oriental and Occidental, etc. on the other. The ideas of European enlightenment like freedom/independence, autonomy, sovereignty, property, maturity/adulthood, public and private, tolerance, scientific rationality, secularism, end in itself, critique of religion, humanism, democracy, Nation/State, universality of moral actions, humanity as an end, etc. have also helped Gandhi to substantiate his position on 'the Other'. Though these ideas evolved and developed in Europe, yet they proliferated beyond Europe to 'other' continents and subcontinents including India. Gandhi appreciated these ideas and like a genius, he interpreted them into indigenous concepts and principles such as Truth, Simplicity, Faith, Brahmacharya, Purushārtha, Satyāgraha, Swarāj, Sarvodaya, karma, compassion, trusteeship, vegetarianism/ fruitarianism and above all non-violence with the aim of attaining swarāj- victory over one's passions, lusts, greed, etc. and independence and sovereignty of the country. Out of these concepts, I'll take into account non-violence, tolerance, autonomy and dignity to develop Gandhi's pluralistic perspective on the 'other'.

Key Words: *Anekāntavāda, Mahākarunā, Purushārtha, N*on-violence, Tolerance, Autonomy and Dignity.

Notion of 'the Other': Initially the notion of the 'other' refers to Jewish religion as God's *chosen people*. According to the *Talmud (Avodah Zarah 2b)*, God offered the *Torah* to all the nations of the earth, and the Jews were the only ones who accepted it. The story goes on to say that the Jews were offered the Torah last, and accepted it only because God held a mountain over their heads! (In Ex. 19:17, the words generally translated as "at the foot of the mountain" literally mean "underneath the mountain"!) Another traditional story suggests that God chose the Jewish nation because they were the lowliest of nations and their success would be attributed to God's might rather than their own ability. Clearly, these are not the ideas of a people who think they are better than other nation. Judaism maintains that the righteous of all nations have a place in the world to come. This has been the majority rule since the days of the Talmud. Judaism generally recognizes that Christians and Moslems worship the same God that we do and those who follow the tenets of their religions can be considered righteous in the eyes of God.

The philosophic notion of 'the other' emerged in the process of the emergence and development of 'identity' which meant 'the same'. 'Identity' has various dimensions out of which culture is one of it. Culture is the one people inherit. They have either consciously adopted or uncritically accepted the culture or reflectively revised it in rare cases. Hence human beings are culturally embedded in the sense that they grow up and live within a culturally structured world and organize their lives and social relations in terms of a culturally derived system of meaning and significance. Culture[1] could be understood in the operative terms like affinity and diversity. Culture gives rise to affinity and thereby 'identity' in the spheres of language, history, geography, people, art, architecture, etc. By virtue of identity, culture creates diversity with other cultures, or 'the others'.

Culture has cognitive, connotive and normative aspects. The cognitive aspect consists of the world view, the apparent plurality with internal coherence and identity; and reflects a continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thought. Connotive means acting in certain ways within the culture, a way of life with meaning and significance. Normative means judging or evaluating in terms of being good, equal, just, harmonious, dignified, etc. with the view of apprehending the crisis. The cultural lineage of such concepts like identity, equality, goodness, justice, dignity, harmony, etc. got re-evaluated in terms of (personal) identity, individual right, equality, autonomy, etc. in liberalism on the one hand ; and collective identity, community right, social goods, etc. in communitarianism on the other. Since there are plurality of cultures representing different versions of good life, values and convictions, it involves that plurality is the most operative term in the discourse on multiculturalism, liberalism and communitarianism. On identity, for instance, Locke holds that personal identity is a matter of *psychological continuity.* When he first tackled personal identity, he himself defined person as a 'forensic term'; we have to be able to re-identify

[1] Kroeber, A.L., & Klyde Kluchohn. (1952). *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions,* Cambridge Mass. Peabody Museum of American Archaeology. In 1952, A.L. Kroeber and Klyde Kluchohn have given 164 definitions of cultural aspects of human beings comprising of the content and the intent of culture, the universalistic character of culture, the hierarchical status of culture and the pluralistic features of culture.

persons in order to hold them responsible for their past actions and commitments.[2] Hume has apprehensions to it.[3] And much of Kant's epistemology and paralogisms, which led him to his ideas about the mind and personal identity, is a response to Hume as much as to any other philosopher.[4]

Locke further came out in support of citizenship as a cementing force which creates a uniform identity from the diversity. But multiculturalism supports collective identity as a sort of differentiated citizenship which belies in different set of rights for different ethnic groups. People should be accepted as citizens with their distinct cultural identity. The purpose of citizenship is not to strengthen national sentiment but to recognize cultural diversity. Likewise multiculturalism criticizes the liberalist notion of autonomous individual by emphasizing group rights and so on.

'The other' and 'the otherness' refers to that which is alien and divergent from that which is given, such as a norm, identity, or the self. The constitutive other often denotes a different, incomprehensible self outside of one's own. The concept that the self requires 'the other' to define itself is an old one and has been expressed by many writers. Hegel was among the first to introduce the idea of the other as constituent in self-consciousness.

Plurality on 'the Other': Jain *Anekāntavāda* and *Karunā* in Buddhism

The Vedic exhortation of *Ekam sat viprāh bahudhā vadanti* has been the fundamental act of philosophizing/ ethicizing in India. The Reality admits of alternative approaches in terms of thought constructions and linguistic expressions. It is pluralistic in its expression. Pluralism has been expressed in many ways in the later development of Indian philosophical systems; such as in the *Veda*nta philosophy, we go from one to many; in Vallabha *Veda*nta, we go from many to one; in Sankhya and Nyaya-Vaisesika systems, we go from many to many and in Buddhism, we go from nothing, i.e. *svabhāva shunya* to many. This has got its reflection in the initial characteristics of Indian society which is diverse, liberal, democratic and pluralistic in regulating and restructuring the morals, ethos and values. The pluralistic nature of Indian society is manifested in various ethnic identities, community structures,

---

[2] Locke, John. (1975). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. (ed.) P. Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon Press (original work, 2nd ed., first published 1694).

[3] Hume, D. (1978). *Treatise of Human Nature*, Oxford: Clarendon Press (original work 1739); partly reprinted in Perry 1975. He apparently held the view that a past or future being *could* not be you unless he or she were then qualitatively just like you are now. That would be a highly contentious metaphysical claim. It amounts to denying that anyone can survive any change whatever: even blinking your eyes would be fatal, resulting in your ceasing to exist and being replaced with someone else. It would mean that you did not exist even a moment ago. There would be no point in asking the persistence question if this were the case.

[4] Kant, Immanuel. (1973). *Critique of Pure Reason.* Trans. N.K.Smith. London, The MacMillan Press Ltd, p. 327. Kant held a functionalist view of the mind almost 200 years before functionalism was officially articulated in the 1960s by Hilary Putnam and others. For Kant, mind is complex set of abilities (functions, constitutive activity) crucial for knowledge-generating activity in spatio-temporal processing of, and in the application of concepts to sensory inputs. Cognition requires concepts as well as percepts. These functions are forms of what Kant called synthesis (and the unity in consciousness required for synthesis). In the synthetic unity of apperception, according to Kant, I am conscious of myself not as I appear to myself, not as I am in myself, but only that I think, not that I am . The 'I think' must be, Kant insists, capable of accompanying all my presentations. But the 'I think' always remains unknown and unknowable by means of the categories because it cannot as such be given in representation. If we try to apply the categories to the 'I think', such categories as 'substance', 'existence', 'person', etc., we come across a series of paralogisms.

linguistic identities, different nationalities, languages and so on. In search of our local identities, we have to go into the details of our tradition. Indian tradition could be divided into two kinds; namely, the *Brāhminical* tradition and the *Shramana* tradition. The former is the textual, the written, the intellectual tradition or the *Shātriya paramparā* consisting of *the Dharma Sastras, Purusarthas, Asramas* etc. And the latter is the folk tradition, the tradition of the people or the *Lokaparamparā.* Fortunately we have had both the traditions as equally strong. However, it is the folk tradition, which has a stronger social basis. It consists of three pillars - family, community and the economy. Around these activities there developed idioms, symbols, proverbs, riddles and *sutras*. This was the corpus of knowledge.

In Jainism, in the context of *anaekāntvāda,* an individual's judgement about a thing or event need not only be valid for anyone other than the subject himself, but is also conditioned by its relationship to a point of space and time, and by its mode and substance. There are seven possibilities (*Saptabhaṅgī naya*) to describe an object X of the phenomenal world subject to the factors of space, time, mode, substance, etc. The seven predications must be consistent with the facts of objective reality and be based on the principles of affirmation and negation. Also, *since the third, fifth, sixth and seventh, predications involve the concept of simultaneity and nonsimultaneity* (which accounts for the object being conditioned by time), we have changed the meanings of the connectives 'and' and 'or'.[5]In Jainism, there is pluralism to accept 'the other'.

In Buddhism, the other is appreciated with a sense of compassion. The compassion or *karunā* is understood to mean active sympathy or a willingness to bear the pain of others. In practice, *prajnā* gives rise to *karunā*, and *karunā* gives rise to *prajnā*. Truly, you can't have one without the other. They are a means to realizing enlightenment, and they are also enlighenment manifested. The Buddha taught that to realize enlightenment, a person must develop two qualities: wisdom and compassion. Wisdom and compassion are sometimes compared to two wings that work together to enable flying, or two eyes that work together to see deeply. In Buddhism, the ideal of practice is to selflessly act to alleviate suffering wherever it appears. You may argue it is impossible to elminate suffering, and maybe it is, yet we're to respond anyway. What does being nice to others have to do with enlightenment? For one thing, it helps us realize that "individual me" and "individual you" are mistaken ideas. And as long as we're stuck in the idea of "what's in it for me?" we are not yet *wise*. It is through compassion that we become thoroughly grounded in the conventional truth and thus prepared to receive the ultimate truth. Compassion brings great warmth and kindness to both perspectives. It helps us to be flexible in our interpretation of the truth, and teaches us to give and receive help in practicing the precepts.

Violence as Dehumanizing the 'Other': Before we discuss non-violence, let us try to understand what is violence? Violence could be of many kinds- individual and social, physical and psychological, structural and behavioral, economic and political, cultural and civilisational, etc. There are several variables, some explicit and others not so explicit, that qualify violence and consequently what constitutes violence becomes a matter of considerable debate and a consensual definition is more difficult to arrive at. *Oxford English*

[5] Radhakrishnan, S. 1977, *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I, London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd. pp. 298-308.

Dictionary offers a more restrictive definition that it is the "exercise of physical force so as to inflict injury on or damage to persons or property." If violence, as another edition *Oxford English Dictionary* says, is "behaviour involving physical force intended to hurt, damage, or kill", then, how about psychological violence such as verbal assault or "tongue-lashing" that has unmistakable effects on the victims. *Webster's English Dictionary* has seven distinct meanings of violence. Basically, it refers to "roughness in action", a "physical force used so as to injure or damage." Another meaning is "unjust use of force or power." Yet, in another sense violence refers to "distortion of meaning". But in every respect, violence is an act of dehumanizing the 'other'.

Again, if violence is real, its cause must equally be real. For instance, social injustice involves a form of violence? Structural violence as distinguished from behavioral violence is an important category that has received increasing attention in recent years. Gender violence and the atrocities against the *dalits* and weaker sections of our society are examples of structural violence. Tim Jacoby stresses not only the key role of structured violence, but he also calls attention to some other nuances of violence. He writes: "Violence may thus be psychological as well as physical, it may be contained within rewards and not simply punishments, and it may be present even though someone is not hurt and there is no subject-to-object relationship. It may also emerge from non-violent intentions, be latent as well as manifest and include many of the results of the international system's normal operation. Exerted at the level of the structure and not simply the individual behaviour of aggression and warfare, violence may be regarded as present whenever damage is done to a person's potential."[6] It is in this context that I propose non-violence and tolerance for recognizing the 'other'.

Non-violence as a Principle for Recognizing the 'Other': Its sources can be traced back into Jainism, Buddhism, enlightenment rationality (with reference to 'tolerance') and Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace (*with reference to Non-violent resistance*).* Gandhi was fully aware of all these sources. But he was the first to apply it in political field on a huge scale.[7] Gandhi also came under some political fire for his criticism of those who attempted to achieve independence through more violent means. He understood the problems very clearly that Soviet model of revolution cannot be applied in India. His refusal to protest against the hanging of Bhagat Singh, Sukhdev, Udham Singh and Rajguru were sources of condemnation among some parties. Gandhi explains his philosophy and way of life in his autobiography *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*[8]. He was quoted as saying, (since these quotes are self explanatory, I'll put them as they are without further analysis):

---

[6] Jacoby, T., (2008), *Understanding Conflict and Violence: Theoretical and Interdisciplinary Approaches*, London, Routledge, p. 49.

[7] *http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/mahatma_Gandhi*, retrieved on 2008.03.27.

[8] Gandhi, M.K. *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments With Truth* (available at wikisource) (1929) ISBN 0-8070-5909-9, *Gandhi, Rajmohan (1990). Patel: A Life. Navajivan Publishing House.* ISBN 81-7229-138-8.

> "When I despair, I remember that all through history the way of truth and love has always won. There have been tyrants and murderers and for a time they seem invincible, but in the end, they always fall — think of it, always."
>
> "What difference does it make to the dead, the orphans, and the homeless, whether the mad destruction is wrought under the name of totalitarianism or the holy name of liberty and democracy?"
>
> "An eye for an eye makes the whole world blind."
>
> "There are many causes that I am prepared to die for but no causes that I am prepared to kill for."[9]

In applying these principles, Gandhi did not balk from taking them to their most logical extremes in envisioning a world where even government, police and armies were nonviolent. The quotations below are from the book "For Pacifists."

> The science of war leads one to dictatorship, pure and simple. The science of non-violence alone can lead one to pure democracy…Power based on love is thousand times more effective and permanent than power derived from fear of punishment… It is a blasphemy to say non-violence can be practiced only by individuals and never by nations which are composed of individuals…The nearest approach to purest anarchy would be a democracy based on non-violence…A society organized and run on the basis of complete non-violence would be the purest anarchy
>
> I have conceded that even in a non-violent state a police force may be necessary…Police ranks will be composed of believers in non-violence. The people will instinctively render them every help and through mutual cooperation they will easily deal with the ever-decreasing disturbances…Violent quarrels between labor and capital and strikes will be few and far between in a non-violent state because the influence of the non-violent majority will be great as to respect the principle elements in society. Similarly, there will be no room for communal disturbances….
>
> A non-violent army acts unlike armed men, as well in times of peace as in times of disturbances. Theirs will be the duty of bringing warring communities together, carrying peace propaganda, engaging in activities that would bring and keep them in touch with every single person in their parish or division. Such an army should be ready to cope with any emergency, and in order to still the frenzy of mobs should risk their lives in numbers sufficient for that purpose. …*Satyagraha* (truth-force) brigades can be organized in every village and every block of buildings in the cities. [If the non-violent society is attacked from without] there are two ways open to non-violence. To yield possession, but non-cooperate with the aggressor…prefer death to submission.

[9] Ibid.

> The second way would be non-violent resistance by the people who have been trained in the non-violent way…The unexpected spectacle of endless rows upon rows of men and women simply dying rather than surrender to the will of an aggressor must ultimately melt him and his soldiery…A nation or group which has made non-violence its final policy cannot be subjected to slavery even by the atom bomb…The level of non-violence in that nation, if that even happily comes to pass, will naturally have risen so high as to command universal respect."[10]

"*Satyagraha*" literally means holding to truth. In practice, it is nonviolent action to resolve social as well as individual conflicts. It may take a number of forms such as noncooperation, civil disobedience and fasting, depending upon the nature of the conflict situation. Gandhi has not prescribed a set theory to go by, and he has repeatedly emphasized that his techniques are essentially experimental in character repeatedly emphasized that his techniques are essentially experimental in character. The basic assumption underlying *satyagraha* is that it is possible to generate extensive social action by nonviolent means and that this action helps to transform the adversary nonviolently when the cause is just. The social action engendered by nonviolent techniques is far superior to the action involving violent means, because in the latter case the solution is attended with terrifying consequences that are often beyond the control of the acting agent. Gandhi does not, however, explicitly state how nonviolent action brings this miraculous transformation he opponent, but the actual operation of *satyagraha*, whatever maybe its mysterious force, would seem to involve delicate and humane modes of communication. However, Gandhi was aware that this level of nonviolence required incredible faith and courage, which he realized not everyone possessed. He therefore advised that everyone need not keep to nonviolence, especially if it were used as a cover for cowardice. Non-violence is not only morally superior to violence but that it is also functionally more effective as a force and instrument of social action for embracing the 'other'. I'll summarize with Gandhi's assertion that "violence cannot remain unaffected before non-violence."[11]

Tolerance as another Principle for Recognizing the 'Other': (derived etymologically from Latin *tolero* meaning 'to suffer') is the practice of suffering by imposing certain restraints. This suffering is caused by the competition in the same social space. There may be reason for approving / disapproving certain practices. If P is reasonable, ~P is unreasonable. This could be puzzling and the puzzle is that I have reason to value X, which does not mean that others will have the same good reason to value X. It is this process that gives rise to disagreement which in turn prepares ground for tolerance. In other words, if disagreement is reasonable, it will give rise to tolerance. There are paradigm cases of tolerance in Jainism, Buddhism and even in Sikhism in India and in the philosophy of European Enlightenment.

---

[10] Ibid.

[11] Gandhi, M.K., (2001) *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Second Revised Edition, New Delhi, Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, Vol.97, p. 192.

Autonomy and Dignity as the Principles for Recognizing the 'Other': In the December 1784 publication of the *Berlinische Monatsschrift* (*Berlin Monthly*), edited by Friedrich Gedike and Johann Erich Biester, replied to the question posed a year earlier by the Reverend Johann Friedrich Zöllner, who was also an official in the Russian government. Zöllner's question was addressed to a broad intellectual public, in reply to Biester's essay entitled: "Proposal, not to engage the clergy any longer when marriages are conducted" (April 1783) and a number of leading intellectuals replied with essays, of which Kant's is the most famous and has had the most impact. Kant's opening paragraph of the essay is a much-cited definition of a lack of Enlightenment as people's inability to think for themselves due not to their lack of intellect, but lack of courage.

It was Kant, one of its earliest prophets, who asked that question and answered it in his article in December 1784, entitled "Answer to the Question: What is the Enlightenment"? Kant's answer is: "Enlightenment is the coming out of man from his self-imposed immaturity. Immaturity is the incapacity to serve one's own understanding without direction (*Leitung*) from another. This immaturity is self-imposed; Reason itself languishes, not because it lacks understanding; what it lacks is resolution and courage; it is unwilling to serve itself (*Sapere Aude ! Hebe Mut).* Take courage to serve your own understanding! This is therefore the Motto *(Walspruch)* of the Enlightenment."[12] It is in this rather general framework of the Enlightenment rationality that the concept of tolerance has evolved and it gets its elaborations in the categorical imperatives. Until enlightenment, the integrating intellectual principle was the belief in God. It was in theology that all human problems in experience were integrated. Now the enlightenment threw out that integrating principle - the religion as the matrix of thought process. In that place enlightenment put the human reason which could integrate everything. This was the basic change which European enlightenment brought. I myself do not subscribe to that theology as integrating element. But once you subscribe to enlightenment reason, you find that the integrating principle does not fully work. So you divide 'experience' into three compartments - science, ethics and art. In the new enlightenment thinking, technically it is human reason that reconciles the three. But that integration is very flimsy. It does not have adequate foundation. Immanuel Kant particularly was the one who was trying to distinguish between three kinds of reason-pure reason, practical reason and the judgement. In the one, you know the things (phenomena); in the other, you know how to act; in the third, you have to discern what is good. By making this separation, he held on the 'idea of reason' which was already divided in three compartments. European enlightenment has this problem that 'reason' as such is not able to fulfill the task of integrating everything. But the enlightenment was able to assert on the 'autonomy' and 'adulthood' (maturity). According to the evolutionary ideology, which was going through that time, humanity has been developing into three phases; one is the religious stage, the second stage is metaphysics. These two stages are the stages of 'immaturity' of humanity. Humanity becomes 'mature' when its knowledge becomes 'scientific' which is the third stage. Science is the mature form of human dealing with reality. Both religion and

[12] Kant, *Was ist Aufklaerung: Thesen und Definitionen,* Reclam, Stuttgart, 1986, p. 9. (Translations mine).

metaphysics belong to the 'childhood' of humanity. Maturity means repudiating religion and metaphysics.

Kant is the first philosopher who has tried to give a definition of *how* a moral action *ought* to be in conformity with the Enlightenment rationality. These are the *Principles* of human actions such as 'universality', 'end in itself' and 'kingdom of ends.'[13] These principles could be prescribed to any study of morality anywhere in which human dignity and autonomy is manifested. There have been certain attempts to define moral issues in terms of the constitution of nationality, ethnic, cultural and religious identities, etc. But if we wish to define morality in the most general sense of the terms inclusive of all specificities, Kant's categorical imperative is the only principle that could be taken into account. Kant has tried to give a definition of *how* a moral action *ought* to be *what* a moral action ought to be. These are the *Principles* of human actions which could be regarded as global such as 'universality', 'end in itself' and 'kingdom of ends.' These principles could be prescribed to humanity as a whole in terms maxims of the categorical imperative. These maxims, however, cannot be practiced, exemplified or illustrated by any action. These are simply formal principles without any content and specification. In contrast to Kantian principles, Gandhi's principles have practical possibilities.

Morals and conceptions of good are said to be relative to cultures, even large cultural identities have now disintegrated into smaller ones- cultural pluralism. Moral theories still oscillate between Utilitarianism in so far as public policy, decisions of the emerging democracies are concerned, and Kantianism, in so far as individual moral life and principles are concerned. Both of these alternatives, however appealing, are now seen to have a moral dilemma between personal and the public morality that cannot be resolved. More attractive today are Aristotelian *Ethics* expanded to include many present-day virtues and a communitarian ethics, which goes back to a sort of Hegelian *Sittlichkeit* as the basis of one's moral conceptions. It is here that the above moral dilemma can be resolved because both of these allow for pluralism and reject grand narratives. Pluralism and tolerance are the ethos of globalization. On the one hand, there are the pluralities of Nation- States, of world-religions, of large cultural, ethnic, linguistic groups, with numerous internal differences; on the other hand, there is an overwhelming sense of One World i.e. the world coming together through technology. The idea of a global village, as an ideal, is widely valued.

For Indian minds, puzzled about the notion of 'other', I will humbly recommend a change of perspective. Let us leave the moral issues raised by Aristotle, Kant, Hegel and even Marx, get out of the enlightenment frame of mind and go to the *Upanishads*[14]. There is no other way of detoxifying ourselves from the fumes of enlightenment rationality because the western way is not the only way of thinking and experiencing, let us as Indians emerge ourselves in our own rich Indian heritage, especially before its breaking up into Buddhist, Jaina and Hindu- for example, the Samkhya-Yoga heritage common to all three traditions - the great philosophical perspective that undergrads all *Upanisadic, Vedic, Buddhist, or Jaina*

---

[13] Paton, H.J. *The Moral Law: Kant's Groundwork of Metaphysic of Morals,* London, Hutchinson University Library, 1969, p.67. Also please see Singh, R.P., *Dialectic of Reason*, New Delhi, Intellectual Publishing House, 1995.

[14] Robert E. Hume, (2002) *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*, London, Oxford University Press, p.297.

thought and experience. Keep your painfully acquired critical rationality from Kant and Hegel, but do get not tyrannized by it. Stay critical, but do not reject out of hand what seems strange at first. Expose yourself without hesitation to a system of thought and experience, which has endured for millennia and awarded us with freedom, autonomy, dignity and sovereignty. It is in this context that I have attempted to place Gandhi's non-violence and tolerance as the principle of embracing the 'other' with regard for pluralistic value systems without violation of human rights, without marginalizing local identities, or the local other.