

INDAS Working Papers No. 12
September 2013

A Revival of Gandhism in India?
Lage Raho Munna Bhai and Anna Hazare

Shinya ISHIZAKA

人間文化研究機構地域研究推進事業「現代インド地域研究」
NIHU Program Contemporary India Area Studies (INDAS)

A Revival of Gandhism in India?

***Lage Raho Munna Bhai* and Anna Hazare**

Shinya Ishizaka*

A 2006 record hit Bollywood comedy film, *Lage Raho Munna Bhai*, where a member of the Mumbai mafia began to engage in *Gandhigiri* (a term meaning the tenets of Gandhian thinking, popularised by this film) by quitting *dadagiri* (the life of a gangster) in order to win the love of a lady, was sensationalised as the latest fashion in the revival of Gandhism. Anna Hazare (1937-), who has used fasting as an effective negotiation tactic in the anti-corruption movement in 2011, has been more recently acclaimed as a second Gandhi.

Indian society has undergone a total sea change since the Indian freedom fighter M. K. Gandhi (1869-1948) passed away. So why Gandhi? And why now? Has the recent phenomena of the success of *Munna Bhai* and the rise of Anna's movement shown that people in India today still recall Gandhi's message?

This paper examines the significance of these recent phenomena in the historical context of Gandhian activism in India after Gandhi. It further analyses how contemporary Gandhian activists perceive Anna Hazare and his movement, based upon interviews conducted with them during fieldwork in India in the period August-September 2011. The paper then clarifies the mechanism of how Gandhi's image has been brought into play in Indian society today, and attempts to envision the prospects for Gandhism in India's future.

Introduction

In 2006, a Bollywood comedy film, *Lage Raho Munna Bhai* (carry on Munna brother), was a record hit. It was, basically, a very simple love story: Munna *bhai* (Munna brother), a member of the Mumbai mafia, fell in love with a lady and made an all-out effort to win her love. The film was unique and interesting because Munna *bhai* quit *dadagiri* (the life of a gangster) and began to engage in *Gandhigiri* (a term meaning the tenets of Gandhian thinking, initiated and popularised by this film) in order to win her heart. What was especially funny was that Gandhi's spirit, which was only visible to Munna and the audience, appeared on the stage, giving him various pieces of advice. Responding to the

* Visiting Associate Professor, Graduate School of Asian and African Area Studies, Kyoto University
(Research Fellow, NIHU Center for Area Studies)

consultations from the people in Mumbai, Munna, with the help of Gandhi's image, gave one piece of practical advice after another for solving their everyday problems. In the end, he practiced *satyagraha* (non-violent resistance, which literally means insistence on the truth) for the lady. This film was sensationalised as the latest fashion in the revival of Gandhism in India.

In 2011, there has also been another revival of Gandhism in India: Anna Hazare's anti-corruption movement. It was a movement to demand that the Indian government establish a strong Lokpal (ombudsman) system to investigate corruption by politicians and bureaucrats, and to protect whistleblowers. This movement was significant in three ways: First, the leader of the movement, Anna Hazare, used fasting as an effective negotiation tactic, and was called the "second Gandhi," as in the famous slogan: "*inkalab jindabad! anna nahin ye andhi hai! desh ka dusra Gandhi hai! ek, do, tin, char, katam karo, bhrastachar!*" ("Long live the revolution! This is not Anna, but a storm (*andhi*)! (He is) another Gandhi in this country! One, two, three, four, stop corruption!"). He was also attired as a Gandhi follower, wearing a Gandhi cap and a simple white *khadi* (homespun cotton) dress. Second, many people joined the movement. Although the main supporters were the urban middle classes, a substantial number of people from the lower classes, especially peasants and people in rural areas, also participated in the movement. The author was in the Uttarakhand in northern India when the movement was in its height in August 2011. The author witnessed demonstration marches every evening, and heard the people shouting slogans. Third, this movement was widely covered by the media. Although the author failed to measure each article on every page, more than half of all the space in every newspaper seemed to be occupied by news of the movement. TV news programs also followed each development of the movement meticulously. Moreover, the new media, such as short message services and social networks, served as tools for the mobilisation of the younger generation.

What were the common features in those two phenomena of the revival of Gandhism? Could they, in fact, be called revivals of Gandhism? Here, two obvious characteristics can be pointed out. First, Gandhi's images were reflected in a kind of a macho and friendly hero of justice. Munna bhai, played by Sanjay Dutt, had been a powerful gangster, who converted to a non-violent defiant of his friend. Anna Hazare, who had served in the Indian army and survived the war against Pakistan before he became a social activist and committed to village reconstruction work in his native village, is a tough man who could run without eating any food for four days after being released from the Tihar jail, and at the same time, he was quite frank and witty when he was interviewed on TV shows. If we compare these two men with Gandhi, who once claimed that he was trying to become a mother to some lady disciples, both Munna and Anna

seems to be too macho. Second, both Munna and Anna basically stressed only one dimension of Gandhism: the ethical dimension. In the film, Munna provided ethically or morally correct answers to “what one should do”-type questions. Anna’s topic, corruption, was also basically an issue of individual conscience. No other issues, such as social or economic injustice, were highlighted; they only stressed personal ethics or morality. This tendency can be called the “ethicisation” of Gandhism. Most probably, it can be said that people in India have been suffering from a sense of moral hazard, and have been attracted by such appeals for recalling ethics. Christophe Jaffrelot pointed out that an earlier hope of the people for the eradication of corruption, concerning the Licence Raj system before the 1980s, was totally shut down. This occurred because corruption was increasing and becoming more intense, especially after the 1990s, due to the increase in massive illegal transactions and collusions after liberalisation, and the huge amounts of money required for election campaigns in the age of coalition politics (Jaffrelot 2010). Gandhi’s image as a simple and ascetic person with a loin cloth thus might easily serve as a symbol for recalling ethics.

Nevertheless, this paper does not analyse Indian political culture or the psyche of the Indian people. Instead, this paper squarely grapples with the more essentialist question: Were the Munna and Anna phenomena really revivals of Gandhism? To what extent could they be called Gandhian? The argument of this paper is based on the author’s research on Gandhism in the Uttarakhand area since 2003. The second section will discuss how contemporary orthodox Gandhian activists perceived Anna Hazare, and the third section will explore the significance of these phenomena in the historical context of Gandhism in India. But before going to the analysis, let us briefly explain what Gandhism is in the first section.

1. Gandhism after Gandhi

Ashis Nandy’s essay, “Gandhi after Gandhi: The Fate of Dissent in Our Times” (Nandy 2000), is helpful for thinking about how to approach the question of what Gandhism is. He pointed out that there are four Gandhis who have survived M. K. Gandhi’s death. The first Gandhi is the Gandhi of the Indian State and Indian nationalism. Although Gandhi cannot be called a proper statist or a hyper-nationalist, he has been displayed as the Father of the Nation by the Indian authorities. Nandy, however, favoured the third Gandhi, which was Gandhi as a “dissenter” of the Indian State, instead of the first Gandhi; and the main argument of the essay was about how those Gandhis in the “dissenters,” such as Vandana Shiva, Medha Patkar were radical and cool. Nandy also touched upon the global spread of Gandhi’s image, the fourth Gandhi, “as a symbol of those struggling against injustice, while trying to retain their humanity even when faced

with unqualified inhumanity” (Nandy 2000: 40).

Since ten years ago, the author has been researching Nandy’s second Gandhi, the Gandhi of the Gandhians, in India. There are many Gandhian activists in India. According to a directory of Gandhian activists published by a Gandhian institute, the Gandhi Peace Foundation, there were 680 Gandhians in India in 1996 (Balasbramanian 1996). Let us call them “orthodox” Gandhians. The orthodox Gandhian is a social activist who lives a simple and ascetic community life in the Gandhian ashram, and works for the realisation of M. K. Gandhi’s notions such as *swaraj* (self-rule) and *sarvodaya* (welfare of all). The orthodox Gandhians are grassroots social activists. They do not touch politics because they have been observing M. K. Gandhi’s last wish: Gandhi’s plan to dissolve the Indian National Congress became his final writings because he was assassinated just after he completed the plan.

Among the prominent figures for such orthodox Gandhians in India were Vinoba Bhave and Jayaprakash Narayan, or JP. Both were direct disciples of Gandhi, so they can be called first generation Gandhians. Vinoba was famous for his Bhoodan movement, which was an effort to attain the equitable distribution of land through the non-violent persuasion of landowners. Vinoba made several “foot marches (*pad yatra*)” to ask landowners for a donation of one sixth of their land, which Vinoba would distribute to landless people¹. JP was a leader of the massive movement against Indira Gandhi’s heavy-handed politics. He named his movement the “Total Revolution,” and many young people were attracted by his call for a non-violent revolution². The second generation Gandhians are the disciples of the first generation, which include Sunderlal Bahuguna, Baba Amte, Narayan Desai, S. Jagannathan, and so on³.

Previous literature on the orthodox Gandhians in India tended to stress that the stream of those orthodox Gandhians had been in decline because there was a great schism among Gandhians in the 1960 and 70s, and the nationwide Gandhian organisations, such as Sarvodaya Sangh or Sarva Seva Sangh, had been weakening after the 1970s (Ostergaard and Currell 1971; Ostergaard 1985, 1989; Harris 1987). However, in the author’s opinion, it is better to regard this as Gandhian organisations having been transformed from the centralised-type to the network-type. The Gandhian network has been maintained through various meetings, mutual visits, phone calls and, especially, prayers⁴. Gandhian publications, which are the books and booklets published by Gandhian publishers such as

¹ For the Bhoodan movement, see (Ostergaard 1985, 1989; Harris 1998: 43-53).

² For the JP’s movement, see (Ostergaard 1985, 1989; Harris 1998: 55-68).

³ For the activities of the second generation Gandhians, see (Ishizaka 2011).

⁴ For the contemporary Gandhian network, see (Ishizaka 2011: 52-57).

Sarva Seva Sangh in Varanasi and the Navjeevan Trust in Gujarat, and distributed at Gandhian institutes or the Sarvodaya Book Stalls on railway platforms, are also active. For example, *Hind Swaraj*, one of M. K. Gandhi's main works, has gone through several prints. The 16th print in September 2004 and the 17th print in September 2005 had 5,000 copies, and the 20th print in November 2008, the 21st print in 2009 and the 22nd print in 2011 were 10,000 copies.

2. Some orthodox Gandhian activists' views on Anna Hazare

How did the orthodox Gandhian activists in India perceive Anna Hazare and the anti-corruption movement?

The first example is Biharilal Bhai's views on Anna and the movement. Biharilal is a Gandhian activist based in Budhakedar in the Uttarakhand. He established a training centre for the Gandhian ideal of *gram swaraj*, which literally means village self-rule, in 1976. He had been a member of the Sevagram Gandhian ashram in central India, and had participated both in Vinoba Bhave's Bhoodan movement and JP's total revolution movement before he came back to Budhakedar to open the centre. The training centre was a boarding school, which regularly had about 60 students of elementary school level mainly from poor families around Budhakedar. The main activities at the centre were education and training, which included management of its nursery, a flour mill, a small hydropower facility and so on. Since the centre is situated just beside the Balganga, a tributary of the Ganga, it has frequently been hit by floods. The severe flood in 2007 destroyed everything, and the centre has been closed since then, although Biharilal still has a dream to restart it.

The author visited him at Budhakedar on August 25, 2011 and conducted an interview with him. His views on Anna Hazare and the anti-corruption movement were as follows.

I do not support his movement, although I am not opposing it, because the main target of the movement is an issue of the governmental system. The main objective of Gandhian activities is to achieve *gram swaraj*, in which the important thing is the self-reliance of each village. Therefore, the decentralisation of power is necessary.

There is a fundamental difference between a Gandhian fast, which is based on truth and non-violence, and a hunger-strike, which is utilised just for vested interests. Anna Hazare's was a fast. You could call it a fast because there was no violent incident in spite of the fact that such a huge number of people has joined the movement. That was possible only because Anna has no personal interest, and the people understood so.

It is true that the Uttarakhand today is developing, but, unfortunately, it is far from self-rule. It

is becoming more dependent on the outer world. To change this direction is very difficult. It will take time. *Gram swaraj* is a huge task. But, see Anna's movement; nobody suspected it would spread to be such a huge movement before it started. It wasn't built in a day. It was possible because of Anna's steady grassroots activities in his village. He has no self-interest. So, people believed him. His movement signifies that there is always a possibility for change.

Biharilal differentiated Anna's movement, which aimed at a systemic change in government, from "true" Gandhism, which ought to concentrate on the grassroots activities for *gram swaraj* on the one hand. He also claimed that the people supported and believed Anna mainly because Anna had previously been working sincerely for a long time at the grassroots level. Biharilal's measure is always how one commits to the aim of *gram swaraj*. On the other hand, he was encouraged by the rise of the anti-corruption movement. This uprising is, for him, a sign of the possibility for another people's movement.

The second example is Dhoom Singh Negi. Negi, a farmer in Kathiya village in the Uttarakhand, is a Sarvodaya worker. He had been a school teacher, but became one of the key-persons in the Chipko (forest protection) movement in the 1970s, and of the anti-Tehri dam movement in the early 1990s⁵. He has been a close associate of Sunderlal Bahuguna. These days, he is committed to the movement for the preservation of local varieties of seeds, on the one hand, and the reorganisation of Sarvodaya society in the Uttarakhand, on the other.

The author visited Dhoom Singh at Khadi, near his village, on August 28, 2011 and asked him about his views regarding Anna and the anti-corruption movement.

The rise of the anti-corruption movement is a very good thing. Corruption is definitely a serious problem in our society, but, I am not a full supporter of the movement.

There has been another anti-corruption movement, called Azadi Bachao Andolan (Save freedom movement), and I have been committed to this movement. I can point out two differences between this movement and Anna Hazare's movement today. First, Anna's is not a movement from the ground-level. Anna's movement has been mainly organised around and supported by urban civil society. Azadi Bachao Andolan is a movement much more rooted at the ground-level. Second, Anna Hazare focuses on only a single issue: corruption. Azadi Bachao Andolan has been not only against corruption, but also against some developmental projects by multinational companies, which seriously affect local people, against the Indian and international nuclear policies, and against the construction of Tehri dam. The people's

⁵ For his role in the Chipko movement, see (Ishizaka 2011: 116-118).

movement should become a multifaceted movement.

Although I am only a sympathiser, I am very much inspired by the uprising of the anti-corruption movement today. As Sarvodaya workers, we are facing huge tasks. In order to eliminate corruption at the ground-level, we have to start from more basic change. First, we have to establish a better education system, which would not simply teach just how to read and write or not only for getting employment, but for total human development. The basic education should include physical labour, because one has to work hard to live self-sufficiently. Second, local employment should be promoted. Outer-migration is still a very serious problem, especially in the Uttarakhand. Third, the priority of the agricultural policy should be on a support system which enables villagers to survive the dry season, instead of on an irresponsible adoption of new technologies such as genetic modification. If one works hard, one can survive self-sufficiently; such is the ideal image of *gram swaraj*. It is sad to live in such a world where if one pays bribes, one can live dependently. We have to work hard to let the people know this simple truth.

Dhoom Singh was also an Anna Hazare and anti-corruption movement sympathiser, but, at the same time, he had some reservations about it. His reservations stemmed from his experience of joining another anti-corruption movement and from his insight into a more fundamental way for the alleviation of corruption at the “ground-level.” He believes that the enhancement of support systems in various fields should be advanced for a “self-sufficient” village life. It can be said, therefore, that Anna’s movement reconfirmed Dhoom Singh’s belief in the necessity for “ground-level” activities toward the achievement of *gram swaraj*.

The third example is an interview with Rajiv Vora. He originated from Gujarat in western India, was raised in a Gandhian school, and was a member of a Gandhian institution in Delhi, the Gandhi Peace Foundation. He joined JP’s total movement, and was jailed for six months. After his retirement from the institution a few years ago, he set up with Niru Vora, an NGO, the Swaraj Peeth Trust, which aims to popularise Gandhian methods of non-violence and, *satyagraha*, *swaraj* (self-rule), justice and peace. The main activity of the Swarajpeeth is carrying out “Swaraj camps,” which consist of a program of a few days for reading and discussing M. K. Gandhi’s book *Hind Swaraj* with villagers. More than ten camps have been organised since 2001, especially in western Uttar Pradesh, where communal conflicts have been a serious problem. One of the main results of the camps has been the publication of the first Urdu translation of *Hind Swaraj*. They are now starting to prepare for training a non-violent peace army⁶.

⁶ For their activities, see (Ishizaka 2010).

The author met Mr. And Mrs. Vora at the India International Centre in Delhi on September 8, 2011. Rajiv Vora was highly critical of Anna Hazare, as the following citation shows (Niru Vora had a similar but slightly different opinion from Rajiv Vora).

Although the people's hope for the eradication of corruption is strong and the pure zeal of the youths who took part in the agitation is precious, I am critical of Anna and of this agitation because both the means of the agitation and the contents of the Jan Lokpal bill, which Anna and others are demanding, are problematic. First, a leader of a movement should educate people when he challenges the opponent. The most important thing is to bring about the people's awareness. Sometimes he may be confronted with repulsion from the people. The leader should stand face to face with the people in order to reform society. However, Anna has not talked to the people and he is only challenging the government and pressurising the government to accept his own demands. Moreover, his saying that there is truth on our side is not good. Second, the bill is demanding a strong and highly centralised type of ombudsman system. We need a more decentralised way of thinking. The issue of corruption is complex, and corruption cannot be removed without long-term and steady efforts.

Anna's "fast" was just a hunger strike. There was no discipline in it. He just refused to eat physically. It was a muscle show and a circus. I should say that it is not a movement, after all. It is just a carnival. Someone called it "revolution." How much the "revolution" in this country has been discounted! What sacrifices are the young people who chanted their slogans at the square paying? Revolution always hurts. Of course, we cannot blame the young people who came out to march and shout slogans in the squares and roads. It was our responsibility in conveying a wrong message to them. It is very regrettable. The most regrettable thing was that Anna was called "another Gandhi." That indicates how Gandhi's spirit and philosophy have been forgotten in this country.

Unlike Biharilal and Dhoom Singh in the rural Uttarakhand, Rajiv was based in Delhi and its mostly urban surrounding areas⁷. That fact may partly explain his harsh criticism of Anna Hazare, because Rajiv could not see Anna from a distance and say 'my task for *gram swaraj* was different from Anna's,' as Biharilal and Dhoom Singh did. He differentiated Anna Hazare from true Gandhism. Accordingly, again unlike Biharilal and Dhoom Singh who were encouraged by the rise of the movement, Rajiv deeply regretted that he could not prevent the spreading of a false image of Gandhism.

All of them (Biharilal, Dhoom Singh and Rajiv) critically evaluated Anna Hazare, and their negative evaluations came from the following two criteria: (1) how one should commit to "ground-level" activities, and (2) how the basic feature of one's thinking fits

⁷ However, they are now working in tribal and rural areas of Bihar as well.

the Gandhian line. At the same time, the orthodox Gandhian activists were deeply stimulated by the anti-corruption movement, and reconfirmed their own mission.

3. An Environmental Gandhism: A Case Study of Sunderlal Bahuguna⁸

It is true that if some phenomenon is called a revival of Gandhism, whether the phenomenon retains the core characteristics of Gandhism or not is of essential importance. However, is that all that matters? The author thinks that there is also another very important element in a “revival” or “renaissance” or “resurrection,” and that is the innovative use of the original spirit to fit contemporary needs. In other words, something new should be excavated from the source; some refreshing elements have to be present while the genuine line is maintained, rather than inflexibly preserving the old form.

We can recognise such moments in the efforts of one of the most famous orthodox Gandhians in contemporary India, Sunderlal Bahuguna.

Bahuguna is a Gandhian based in the Uttarakhand in northern India. He was born in 1927, and began public life as a freedom fighter in the Indian freedom struggle in 1940, when he was just 13 years old. Since then, he has actively committed to several social movements, such as the anti-untouchability movement, the women’s movement, and the anti-liquor movement. Further, as a Sarvodaya worker, he set up his *ashram* in a remote village in the region, and committed himself to activities for village reconstruction, especially in the fields of education and agricultural improvement. After the Chipko (forest protection) movement began in 1973, and the anti-Tehri dam movement began in 1978, he, as one of the key-persons in both movements, became known as an environmental activist not only nationwide but also globally. He was also famous for using the Gandhian tactics of “foot-marches (*pad yatra*)” and “fasts (*upvas* or *vrata*).”

Bahuguna brought about innovations in Gandhism in both its philosophical and technical spheres. He developed a new aspect in Gandhian thinking by forging an environmental Gandhian philosophy. Environmentalism as such is a recent phenomenon that appeared during the 1960s. Of course, environmental problems in today’s sense did exist even before the 1960s, but those problems were not “framed” as environmental problems. Therefore, naturally, Gandhi did not elaborate his thinking in line with environmentalism. It was Bahuguna who fashioned an environmental Gandhism. He extended the objects of “all (*sarv*)” in the Gandhian concept “*sarvodaya* (*udaya*, welfare for *sarv*, all)” from all “human beings” to all “beings,” thereby making this concept a philosophical base of

⁸ The argument of this section is based on (Ishizaka 2011).

Gandhian environmental activities. For Bahuguna, *sarvodaya*, means welfare for “all beings,” which includes human beings, animals, plants, and inanimate materials such as stones, water and air. Based on this concept with the new connotation, Bahuguna has constantly aimed to construct sustainable societies that suit the geo-biological conditions of each area. The word *sarvodaya* had been originally used by Gandhi to signify an ideal way for achieving social justice which did not allow any unhappiness for those left behind, inevitably produced by the utilitarian ideal of “the greatest happiness of the greatest number.” The concept had also been frequently used in the post-Gandhi era to suggest non-violent social change, which was implied by the sub-concept of *sarvodayapi prem* (all-embracing love), as against the Marxist method of violent revolution. Bahuguna added a new environmental meaning to the Gandhian term *sarvodaya*, and thereby broke a new ground for Gandhism.

Bahuguna’s utilisations of the Gandhian tactics of “foot march” and “fasting” were also innovative. A Gandhian “foot march” is a walking tour, which continues for several days or weeks. It is different from a demonstration march, which ends within a few hours. In foot marches, participants were required to travel on foot without money, therefore the marchers had to ask for accommodation and meals at villages en route. The most famous of Gandhi’s foot marches was the “Salt March” in 1930, which covered about 390km in 25 days. Bahuguna’s “Himalaya Foot March” in 1981-83 covered about 4,870km in roughly 300 days! On that foot march, he carried a slide set including a projector to show and explain how deforestation brought about total environmental degradation and so on, and during the march he also encouraged local artists to perform music and plays which conveyed the message of environmental protection; these devices were initiated by Bahuguna.

Gandhian activists claim that a Gandhian “fast (*vrat* or *upvas*),” “the last weapon of the *satyagrahi*’s (non-violent soldier’s) armoury” in Gandhi’s own words, is different from a hunger strike (*bhuk hartal*), which is a tool for putting pressure on an opponent during agitations. Gandhian activists claim that a Gandhian “fast” should be a kind of a voluntary self-purificatory penance as repentance (*prayaschit*). The total number of days of Gandhi’s public fasts was 145; Bahuguna’s up till now have been 302 days. During the 74-day fast against the construction of Tehri dam in 1996, Bahuguna asked for the instruction of a doctor of naturopathy. Bahuguna ingested bael, lemon and honey each day and observed a regular schedule of treatments including the application of hot compresses on the abdomen, mud packs, enemas with cold water, cold baths and so on during the fast. It can be said that Bahuguna tried to accentuate the aspect of self-purification in “fasting,” instead of the aspect of pressurisation, by incorporating the discipline of natural cures. This naturopathisation of “fasting” could be called, again,

Bahuguna's innovation.

Let us now compare Bahuguna's case with Anna Hazare's and *Munna bhai's* cases. Did Anna or *Munna* break any new scope for Gandhian thinking or philosophy by, for example, forging new Gandhian ethics which incorporated some fresh components? No. They only traced and highlighted some parts of Gandhian thinking, that is, the aspect of ethics. Did, then, Anna's fasts or *Munna's satyagraha* open some new possibilities for Gandhian tactics in today's world? The author thinks that Anna's fasts were just a superficial and partial imitation of Gandhi's, and were therefore not Gandhian "fasts" but general political "hunger strikes." The author thinks, however, that *Munna's satyagraha* had some pioneering aspects, because *Munna's satyagraha* was a tactic for a personal negotiation, not for a social movement. Incidentally, the *satyagraha* as a tool for personal negotiation has been recently focused on by some scholars of neuroscience and of complex-systems theory in Japan (Yasutomi and Honjo 2007). A personal *satyagraha* might become a new frontier in Gandhism, although in the movie, no serious attempt was made to elaborate new potentials of *satyagraha*.

However, it might be unfair to end the analysis here. There was an important element, which could be called an innovation of Gandhism in Anna's phenomena, although it might not look as if it were Gandhian at first sight. That element is Anna Hazare's active networking among Indian middle class intellectuals. Anna successfully collaborated with many urban intellectuals during the movement while maintaining his own image as that of an ordinary rural man. Although some critics described the anti-corruption movement as basically an urban middle class movement which had no roots in rural India, no one perceived Anna as an urban elite. This exquisite combination of a rural leader and urban supporters (of course, the movement also had a significant number of supporters in rural India, contrary to critics' claims) could be the main reason for the wide media coverage of the movement. Interestingly, Gandhi was also criticised for his close relations with rich capitalists. Although a more careful examination will be required, the author thinks this aspect of Anna Hazare might be of great importance.

Conclusion

The success of the film "*Lage Raho Munna Bhai*" and the rise of Anna Hazare's anti-corruption movement have been called revivals of Gandhism. This paper examines what kind of revivals they were by putting them into the historical context of orthodox Gandhian activism in India.

First, this paper analyses the orthodox Gandhians' views on Anna Hazare and the

anti-corruption movement. The orthodox Gandhians tended to evaluate Anna Hazare by the two criteria: (1) how has Anna committed to grassroots activities, and (2) how does the basic feature of Anna's thinking fit with the Gandhian line. It is important to note that the orthodox Gandhian activists were deeply impressed by the anti-corruption movement, and reconfirmed their own mission.

Second, this paper compared the recent revivals with the case study of Sunderlal Bahuguna, an orthodox Gandhian who was active in the period from the 1970s to the 90s. The phenomena of Munna and of Anna might be called an "ethicisation" of Gandhism, but they were not an innovative utilisation of Gandhism when compared with Bahuguna, who broke new ground in Gandhism by forging an environmental Gandhism and who creatively incorporated new devices into the Gandhian tactics of "foot march" and "fasting." However, the application of *satyagraha*, which has been generally conceived as a tool for social movements, for interpersonal relations in the case of *Munna Bhai* might, in a sense, be called innovative, although there was no further elaboration on the new potentials of *satyagraha* in the film. This paper also pointed out that it might be possible to call Anna Hazare's active networking among Indian middle class intellectuals an innovation of Gandhism, an aspect for which a more careful analysis is required.

Acknowledgements

This paper was originally presented at the CSAS Open Research Seminar at the Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Edinburgh, UK, held on February 23, 2012. I appreciate the comments given during my presentation. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. Biharilal Bhai, Mr. Dhoom Singh Negi, Mr. Rajiv Vora, Mrs. Niru Vora, Mr. Sunderlal Bahuguna, Mrs. Vimla Bahuguna and others for their invaluable assistance.

References

- Balasbramanian, K. (compiled), 1996, *Directory of Gandhian Constructive Workers*, New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation.
- Harris, Ishwar C., 1987, "Sarvodaya in Crisis: The Gandhian Movement in India Today," *Asian Survey* 27 (9): 1036-1052.
- Ishizaka, Shinya, 2010, "Activists Who Inherit Gandhi's Ideals" (in Japanese), *Kikan Minzokugaku (Ethnology Quarterly)* 131: 80-84. (石坂晋哉「ガンディーの志を継ぐものたち」『季刊民族学』131: 80-84、2011 年。)
- Ishizaka, Shinya, 2011, *Environmental Movement in India: Gandhism and "Connective Politics"* (in Japanese), Kyoto: Showado. (石坂晋哉『現代インドの環境思想と環境運動—ガンディー主義と〈つながりの政治〉』昭和堂、2011 年。)

- Jaffrelot, Christophe, 2010, "Indian Democracy: The Rule of Law on Trial," in *Religion, Caste and Politics in India*, Delhi: Primus Books, pp. 620-659.
- Nandy, Ashis, 2000, "Gandhi after Gandhi: The Fate of Dissent in Our Times," *The Little Magazine* May 2000: 38-41.
- Ostergaard, Geoffrey, 1985, *Nonviolent Revolution in India*, New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation.
- Ostergaard, Geoffrey, 1989, "The Gandhian Movement in India since the Death of Gandhi," in John Hick and Lamont C. Hempell (eds.), *Gandhi's Significance for Today*, London: Macmillan, pp. 203-225.
- Ostergaard, Geoffrey and Melville Currell, *The Gentle Anarchists: A Study of the Leaders of the Sarvodaya Movement for Non-violent Revolution in India*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Yasutomi, Ayumu and Seiichiro Honjo, 2007, *The Chain of Harassment* (in Japanese), Tokyo: Kobunsha.
(安富歩、本條晴一郎『ハラスメントは連鎖する―「しつけ」「教育」という呪縛』光文社、2007年。)