

A Reading of Huxley's *Brave New World* in the Context of Gandhi's *Swaraj* and Globalization

SUDHIR KUMAR
Maharishi Dayanand University
Rohtak

'But *Brave New World* is a book about the future and, whatever its artistic or philosophical qualities, a book about the future can interest us only if its prophecies look as though they might conceivably come true'.¹

Question: Do you feel, Gandhiji, that mass production will raise the standard of living of the people?

Answer: I do not believe in it at all. There is a tremendous fallacy behind Mr Ford's reasoning. Without simultaneous distribution on an equally mass scale, the production can result in a great world tragedy.²

Huxley's *Brave New World* is an intriguing text, not only because of the significance of the interpretational axis of utopia/dystopia which is often applied to analyse it, but also because it is a relevant discourse to understand the nature of some of the complex problems that we, situated in India (or in any third world society), face. The text is also 'intriguing' because it readily yields to various levels of readings which may sometimes be, as my reading of the text will try to establish, oppositional. This theoretical premise also supports the author's convention that it is a book about the future of humanity which, of course, does not exclude a domain called India from its purview.

What has really made my reading of *Brave New World* both provoking and provocative is the rapidly changing global scenario which has prompted me to relocate the text in the 'new' contexts of globalization and Gandhi's *swaraj*. The prophecies of the text seem more ominous and threatening now than before as most leaders, irrespective of the will or condition of the people they represent (in India or elsewhere), are ardent votaries of the politics of globalization and a new world (trade ?) order.

What then, is, Gandhi doing in my paper?

This is a legitimate question. My reading of *Decolonization and Development: Hind Swaraj Revisited* by Makarand Paranjape, and meeting him afterwards, made me realize how sound and pragmatic the Gandhian worldview can be, not only as an alternative discourse to save humanity from the perils of blind materialism but also as an important document of the critical canon in third world, postcolonial societies like India.³ When Huxley's novel was published in 1932, Gandhi was also carrying out his great experiment with truth, non-violence, *swaraj* and *sarvodaya*, not in the world of fiction as Huxley did, but in the world of people, real and alive, to create a brave, new world. Another reason why I club Gandhi with Huxley in presenting my arguments in this paper is because both highlighted the need to create a braver and newer world for humanity to live in. Third, the ills and injuries which a multivalent text like *Brave New World* prophesizes about the future of the world to a large extent, find redressal in Gandhian discourse.

My interpretation of *Brave New World* is in the changed and changing present context. A few examples of possible readings of *Brave New World* follow:

1. One can read the text as an allegory explaining the various symbols which have been explicitly built into the narrative. This would result in a reading based on the utopia/dystopia dichotomy which is universalistic in nature.
2. One can go even further and relate the fictional context to the (contemporary) real context of the thirties and forties – bolshevism, fascism, Hitler (Nazism) and Fordism. This entails a political/historicist reading that connects science and technology and its gross misuse in the hands of the power-hungry politicians. Even to Huxley, the theme of '*Brave New World* is not the advancement of science as such, it is the advancement of science as it affects human individuals' (p. 9).
3. The third reading may be a deconstructive exercise, if the text is read from the viewpoint of the Savage and his mothers focusing on what lies in store for the rest of humanity – this does not or cannot fit into the scientific, capitalist or materialistic grid of this brave, new world.
4. Another reading of the text may be location- or situation-specific (or culture-specific). For example, in advanced capitalist countries (or first world countries), it may remind the readers of the horrors of the misappropriation of both science and primitivism, whereas in developing (or third world)

countries, it may send warning signals to people to be cautious about mindlessly aping the Western model of globalization and capitalist growth. It may also suggest that third world people should prepare counter-narratives of resistance (e.g., Gandhism in India), whereby they may judiciously harness science and technology for the task of nation-building without being swamped by the rhetoric of a new world with its attendant neo-imperialist implications.

Apart from the fore-mentioned four kinds of readings, there may be many other interpretations based on the structure, style and tone of the narrative. This essay focuses, for the most part, on the fourth kind of reading in the Indian context of nation-building using, as and where necessary, other kinds of readings as well. Even ontologically, terms such as 'brave new world', 'nation-building', '*swaraj*' and '*sarvodaya*' are not mutually exclusive or discrete but overlapping.

Let us, first, briefly, examine the various connotations of Gandhi's *swaraj* (this term defies the usual unitary meaning[s] which have been used for analysis here. *Swaraj*, which etymologically denotes self-rule also implies the individual's capacity to rule over his (or her) self in order to establish self-rule in the outer domain of society or nation. Thus, for Gandhi, *swaraj* has an important inner domain of truth and non-violence on the basis of which he predicates national *swaraj*, universal welfare (*sarvodaya*) and the concept of *satyagraha* or truth-force. *Swaraj*, no doubt, also means an independent India, but this independence begins at the bottom and not from the top. Thus each village becomes a self-reliant republic. *Swaraj* also means the total freedom of the individual who co-operates with his neighbours and the world. *Swaraj* connotes a society which is based on truth, non-violence and a belief in God – a society which is free from the domination of machine over man. To Gandhi, *swaraj* also implies the end of all kinds of exploitation. My purpose here is to relate or link Gandhi's *swaraj* to the 'brave, new world' being hailed under the banner of globalization, as is also evident in Huxley's *Brave New World*.

For example, is Gandhi's *swaraj* not a necessary precondition to any task of national reconstruction? And if we, reeling under a heavy dose of the ideology of a free market economy, forget to bring about a *perestroika* (social reconstruction), can we ever hope to entertain even a vision of a 'brave new world'? In my line of argument, *swaraj* leads to a nation which, if reconstructed properly, contributes to *sarvodaya* or a humane world order which is quite different from a

World Bank, dictated global trade order which provides little space to the lowest common denominator of the population of the third world countries.

Let me return again to *Brave New World* to present some of the startling parallels between its fictional context and the present context where I wish to relocate it. For one, *Brave New World* is about the application or appropriation of the spirit of science and technology to effect a utopia, a radically revolutionary new way of living with a revealing motto – ‘community, identity, stability’ (p. 15). But the denizens of this utopia (of course, located in the futuristic age After Ford 632) have to pay an exacting price for this civilizational transformation. They are the servile type – automata or robots in flesh and blood (the Alphas, Gammas, Betas and Epsilons), deprived of free will and creative imagination. Each term of the motto is vastly significant. The system of power (or the ruling power) wants to have a world or global ‘community (of these unthinking or uncritical minds), with no differentiation of ‘identity’ (absolute homogenization), in order to create a ‘stability’ where no protest and no revolt is possible against the dictated norms of a new world order. Such people will constitute a huge population of slaves who, thanks to their conditioned hatching and rearing, will only ‘love their servitude’ (p. 12). In the Foreword to the text, Huxley aptly sums up the Fordist project of Government Managers, which is ‘designed to standardize the human product and so to facilitate the task of the Managers’ (p. 13). The Director jubilantly proclaims: ‘All conditioning aims at that: making people like their unescapable social destiny’ (p. 24).

The second chapter is horrifying as it deals with the conditioning of infants. Small babies are administered electric shocks and exposed to loud noises as they advance towards books and flowers to banish the ‘love of nature’, because the ‘love of nature keeps no factories busy’ (p. 29). Incidents like this, and others much more horrifying (like the sexual initiation of innocent babies) are solely guided by the ‘high economic policy’ of this ‘brave, new world’. Hasn’t America recently confessed that it brutally subjected children and adults to nuclear radiation to create radiation-free enclosures for its privileged citizens? The question now is: Who is creating a new world and for whom? America is now creating a new global order, which is eventually being controlled from the White House. Gandhi’s concepts of *swaraj* and *sarvodaya* can be used as the counter-narratives of resistance to the American hegemonic gameplan, which comes under popular camouflages of the free market economy, GATT, Dunkel and the World Trade Order to the people of the third world countries. To

Western (or American) narratives of 'development' and 'growth', *swaraj* and *sarvodaya* are counter-narratives which negate the possibility of domination and oppression of the deprived majority by the privileged few.

I believe that Huxley, in writing this futuristic narrative, was well-aware of the pre-text (or the phenomenon) of Fordism, which was fast transforming the course of West European and American capitalist developments in the early twenties and thirties. It is significant to remember that Fordism also meant an 'explicit recognition that mass production meant mass consumption, a new system of reproduction of labour power, a new politics of labour control and management, a new aesthetics and psychology, in short a new kind of rationalized modernist, and populist democratic society'.⁴ In this sense, Americanism and Fordism are not dissimilar terms. Antonio Gramsci describes Fordism in his *Prison Notebooks* as 'the biggest collective effort to date to create, with unprecedented speed, and with a consciousness of purpose unmatched in history, a new type of worker and a new type of man.'⁵ When the action unfolds, it is already AF (After Ford) 632. And the reader is told that in AF 632, the needs of science and those of economics are identical. Simply put, the governors want to enlarge the community of consumers (semi-morons) whose reasoning should be doped and drugged.

If I deconstruct the situation in AF 632, as represented by Huxley in *Brave New World*, and locate it in India in A.D. 1995, I find some frighteningly similar patterns in both periods of time. Ironically, the managers are the same (i.e., the North America and the Western Europe). But they have judiciously changed their strategies of conditioning people in order to create a global consumerist community. Behind the so-called technological/cultural advances (such as spaceships, satellites, computers, modes of communication and transport, mass media, animated cartoon movies, advertizements, beauty contests and means of warfare) runs an unadulterated stream of pure consumerism. In 1995, the advanced capitalist countries (the 'West' now includes Japan, Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea and to some extent Malaysia and Indonesia) can bring about the consumers' consent through subtle electronic signals beaming on ubiquitous television screens all over the world. One glaring example where public reaction was controlled through technological manipulation was the 'live' telecast of the Gulf War, where Cruise missiles were shown hitting human targets with immaculate precision but without the human screams and carnage that these weapon systems cause. At present these manufactured 'images' are more real than the realities.

The Allied Powers (especially America) earned a huge profit out of the Gulf War. It is evident that the interests of technology and economics are closely and cleverly allied in this new world order. The managers of globalization taught a fitting lesson to a disobedient, impudent, third world nation (Iraq). Ironically, the UN declared 1995 to be the year of 'tolerance' in the wake of human massacre in Bosnia and Chechnya.

Gandhi's philosophy is relevant here. Through both words and deeds, Gandhi wanted a non-violent world free from all kinds of violence, shunning even the violence of thought in human affairs. In his *sarvodaya* (which is the Gandhian equivalent of globalization), there is no place for the despotic, rapacious managers or the 'managed' slaves. The Savage who revolts against the utopian project in *Brave New World* is 'offered only two alternatives – an insane life in Utopia, or the life of a primitive in an Indian village' (p. 7). The leaders of the third world countries (like India, Sri Lanka and Pakistan) also consider themselves backward (a feeling of being the Savage) if they do not follow the guidelines of GATT and Dunkel-driven economic liberalization. Will poverty, hunger, disease, unemployment and illiteracy vanish from this planet in this grand America-sponsored project of a new world (trade) order? Whereas Gandhi's programme of *sarvodaya* addresses mind-boggling problems (such as hunger, poverty and exploitation) forthrightly by changing or transforming the human inwardly, the logic of globalization will push these demons into the lives of villagers, tribals, the dispossessed and, of course, a large section of urban society living in slums.

Gandhi's *sarvodaya* is based on non-violent socialism, where competition makes way for concord and where 'a firm recognition of the moral priority of social virtue over sectional interest' is linked to the diffusion of power.⁶ Given a choice, Gandhi's *sarvodaya* is preferable to Huxley's Utopia (or the one forced on us by the World Bank). The reason is obvious. Gandhi talks of a utopia rooted in the ground realities of our nation-called India – where 75 percent of the people still live in villages without the basic amenities of life. Let me quote a few lines from the *Harijan*, where Gandhi outlines national *swaraj*, which could, in its turn, become the foundation of a global *swaraj* or *sarvodaya*:

In this structure composed of innumerable villages, there will be ever-widening, never-ascending circles. Life will not be a pyramid, with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for

the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral units.⁷

Here, I find a verifiable blueprint of a future world community in which each constituent unit will be as important as the whole, foreclosing the possibility of endangering the identity (or identities) or stability of an individual or a human collectivity. In this way, Gandhi's *swaraj* also envisages 'community', 'identity' and 'stability' (contrary to the Huxley's Utopian motto) in an entirely different way.

Gandhi's politics of *swaraj* or *sarvodaya* have often been criticized as anti-modern. A discerning critic can well establish Gandhi as a postmodernist thinker who perceived beyond Euro-American-centric modernity. Gandhi does not banish all machinery (read technology here) from his *swaraj* but favours the judicious and humane use of technology to improve the condition of the poor and the down-trodden, shunning the soulless mechanization of human existence. In his *swaraj*, John (the Savage of Huxley's *Brave New World*) will not be uprooted from his native village only to be implanted and suffocated in a synthetic environment of London, devoid of human values. Even John's 'uncivilized' village will, in the Gandhian scheme of things, become a meaningful microcosm of a macrocosm (i.e., an integral unit of a larger whole). There will not be a controlling, exploitative centre outside John's village, as it will be a self-sufficient republic of people in itself. Can we presume, under the influence of Dr Manmohan Singh's policies of economic liberalization, that globalization means equality of status and rights for all? The theories of globalization are being evolved in North America and the wealthier nations of the world, and channelled to India via the Structural Adjustment Programme of the World Bank and other mechanisms. Are our voices heard in the media of the first world? How much and what type of publicity does India get in the entire corpus of, say, American media annually? A few columns of exoticism and barbarism? The answers are difficult to accept and hard to swallow.

Huxley's text is truly prophetic. It makes us ponder about the questions: 'Whose globalization?' and 'Globalization for whom?' Is it the globalization of economic exploitation or consumerism? Or does it imply the loss of national identity at the altar of globalization? Under Gandhi's *swaraj*, the production and distribution of goods can be compared with the circulation system in human bodies. According to Gandhi, 'the concentration of blood at one spot is harmful to the

body and, similarly, the concentration of wealth at any one place proves to be the nation's undoing.⁸ The concentration of wealth or power leads to endless oppression in the Gandhian worldview as can be observed in the *Brave New World* as well. One can easily see how much power and pelf is concentrated in the hands of a few managers in Huxley's utopia, and what they do to humanity by subjecting others – the unprivileged – to a ruthless process of human engineering. In today's India, the rich are becoming richer and the poor poorer under the guiding forces of a free-market economy. In Huxley's *Brave New World*, the individual has no right to introspection and protest, and is not allowed to think of the larger concerns of the world, whereas Gandhi's *swaraj* is based on complete individual freedom as it has two important aspects – the individual *swaraj* and collective *swaraj*. Both are complementary to each other. The former implies self-rule, involving the freedom of human nature from all bondage. The latter implies the sum total of an individual truth force. In Gandhian discourse, one is led from *swa* (self) to *sarva* (all), or from *swaraj* to *sarvodaya*, whereas the prevailing ideology of globalization is self-contradictory as it only talks of making the world a family of equals. In practice it is a new strategy to perpetuate the age-old dichotomy of 'us' and 'them'.

The politics of globalization may even be robed in so-called humanitarianism. In Huxley's utopia, the managers try and make a better world for better people. Similarly, one can deconstruct America playing good Samaritan to the ailing economy of its neighbour, Mexico. Indeed, it does so only to protect American trade interests (or to maintain the level of consumerism in Mexico) and not as a saviour to war-worn Mexico. This is a new way of conditioning a human collectivity, different in form but not in kind from the one demonstrated in Huxley's utopia. Another interesting aspect of Huxley's *Brave New World* is its portrayal of the condition of culture, which includes history, art, religion, literature, human relationships, love, marriage, family, home and other societal features under despotic rule. It is 'interesting' not only because of the trivialization of the accepted cultural norms implied in a man-woman relationship, marriage family, sex, religion and art in the text, but also because most of these representations are coming true under the impact of an MTV or Coca-Cola-culture being promoted and disseminated in third world countries. For example, *The Bible* and the books of great poetry are among 'the forbidden books hidden in a safe in the Controller's study' (p. 38) in *Brave New World*. Similarly, one can easily observe a reduction of religion and literature in the

postmodernist societies. Individuals in Huxley's utopia are not given books of literature because the Controller does not want to 'corrupt them' (p. 39). It is a society where students cannot imagine what 'living with one's family' and 'home' (p. 39) means.

This seems inevitable in a society where the state even regulates human emotions through various scientific and institutional devices like Dr Helmholtz Watson, a lecturer of emotional engineering. Watson considers Shakespeare to be a 'marvellous propaganda technician' (p.147), whereas the Savage relishes and understands life largely through literature. *Brave New World* also refers to a futuristic society where women, like Fanny and Lenina, are programmed. Their only meaningful function is to gratify the sexual urges of the citizens and to help in the procreation process. Today the world is also experiencing the promotion of a 'beauty myth' which dehumanizes a woman by doing all kinds of violence on her body in order to make her beautiful and smart. In Huxley's utopia, women have been commodified to an extent where they are deprived of the feelings and emotions of love. Hence the disastrous love-hate relationship between John, the Savage and Lenina. The citizens of this utopia always thank either Ford or Freud (or both of them), who have told them of the miseries and sins of the old-world familial order. 'The world was full of fathers – was therefore full of misery; full of mothers – therefore every kind of perversion from sadism to chastity; full of brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts – full of madness and suicide' (p. 41).

Problems of sexual promiscuity (now the AIDS menace) and the disintegration of families have assumed alarming proportions. Initially, this was more rampant in Western societies, but now it is common in urban centres of third world countries. Even Huxley, in his 'Foreword' to the novel, admits: 'There are already certain American cities in which the number of divorces is equal to the number of marriages' (p. 13). The number of parentless children is on the rise in West European countries as the concept of 'home' has been sacrificed to please the deity of Mammon.

Mustafa Mond informs his students in *Brave New World* about the old, sick civilization that believed in the rotten concepts of home, family and motherhood: 'And home was squalid psychically as well as physically. Psychically it was a rabbit hole, a midden, hot with the frictions of tightly packed life, reeking with emotion' (p. 40). It is a new world for new, standardized citizens who are controlled through biotechnology. To them, a Savage Reservation Area is just like another planet with its attendant horrors of poverty, ignorance, superstition, disease and death. But there is more humanity among these so-called

savages, as is evident in the Linda-Pope-John episode. The savages may be deprived of the gifts of science and technology but they are certainly not human monstrosities that the citizens of a technological utopia have become. Symbolically, utopia refers to the first world (the West), which possesses most of the sophisticated technology. The Savage Reservation Area connotes the third world that is afflicted with poverty and underdevelopment. Is not the policy of globalization not geared to make the rich nations richer and the poor ones still poorer?

In this technological paradise, dissent is ruthlessly crushed. This is exemplified by characters like Bernard Marx and John the Savage, who are charged with endangering the stability and security of the brave new world. In this soulless world, high art is just not possible, no tragedies can be written because 'the world's stable now', and its people are 'plagued with no mothers or fathers' (p. 173). The controller also warns the citizens that it is not only 'art that is incompatible with happiness, it is also science. Science is dangerous, we have to keep it most carefully chained and muzzled' (p. 177). Here, again, we find a paradoxical Catch-22 situation. The brave new world which has been built on the edifice of science and technology seems to be afraid of it too. Science and technology, as Gandhi also tells us, are not bad. It is their application to human circumstances that makes them good or bad. In his concept of *swaraj* and *sarvodaya*, he does not oppose machines or the harnessing of science to mitigate human suffering. In his 'Advice to Engineers' (published in *The Hindu*, 25 August, 1945), he states his desire clearly: 'How useful it would be if the engineers in India were to apply their ability to the perfecting of village tools and machines. This must not be beneath their dignity.'⁹ To him, the Savage and his fellow human beings would not have been 'the untouchables' as he firmly believes that in the case of 'the Indian villager, an age-old culture is hidden under an encrustment of crudeness. Take away the encrustation, remove his chronic poverty and his illiteracy, and you have the finest specimen of what a cultured, cultivated, free citizen should be.'¹⁰ Indeed, John continues to listen to the still small voice of humanity since he is basically spiritual.

But in a brave, new world, John can only retain his conscience and soul by becoming almost mad and committing suicide. To the Controller of utopia, 'God is not compatible with machinery and scientific medicine and universal happiness' (p. 183). Gandhi resists this mechanization of the human soul, as he holds that 'it is beneath human dignity to lose one's individuality and become a mere cog in the machine.'¹¹

Gandhi used the spinning wheel (*charkha*) to signify his version of man's relationship with machinery. In one of his letters, he says, 'I would prize every invention of science made for the benefit of all.... I can have no consideration for machinery which is meant either to enrich the few at the expense of the many or without cause to displace the useful labour of many.'¹²

No doubt India has also made rapid strides in the field of science and technology, as can be seen in the fields of computer software, space industry and missiles. India is now encouraging the import of Western technology to bring about a technological revolution. But can we wish away the fact that three-fourth of the goods being transported within the country are still being done by bullock carts? How many villages in India currently have the basic amenities of life, like schools, hospitals and working potable water-supply systems? Will we find a magic wand to rectify this lopsided development of our nation in the talisman of globalization or liberalization of our economy? What are the IITs and other engineering colleges in India contributing to the task of nation-building? We look to these institutions to show us how science can benefit the lowest common denominator in India. It is worthwhile to remember what Makarand Paranjape observes in this connection: 'The role of science is ambiguous and ambivalent. It both helps and hinders us depending on who is doing science, what kind of science is being done, and who benefits from it.'¹³

Makarand's questions ('Who is doing science?' and 'For whom and what purpose is it being done?') are significant when explaining the nexus between Huxley's *Brave New World* and the new world trade order (being effected under the umbrella term 'globalization'). This is because, in both these worlds, science is being done by the state agents to enhance the human capacity for consumption, and this kind of science only benefits the privileged few at the expense of the vast mass of humanity. Towards the end of the novel, John, the Savage can only utter, 'I ate civilization.... It poisoned me; I was defiled' (p. 188), since he is a representative of that part of the brave, new world which lies on the periphery or margin of civilization. Restless, angry, frustrated and defeated, John turns mad and ends his life as the 'hero' of the movie, *The Savage of Surrey*. The consumerist society does not even allow him to go insane and die without earning some profit out of his miserable end.

If the planners in India do not do some thinking aloud on the direction of development, which only means industrial development to them, we may have to witness, in the not very distant future, a

growing number of Johns in India too. That is why we, the responsible citizens in India, have to listen to Gandhi to find practical answers and insights to create, first, a new nation (*swaraj*) and then a real 'brave' and 'new' world (*sarvodaya*) where one may sing with Rabindranath Tagore:

Where the mind is without fear
and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken
up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depth of truth; ...
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father,
let my country awake.¹⁴

This is the India (read world) of the dreams of Gandhi and Tagore, which also means a new world order free from oppression and violence. Huxley's *Brave New World* is prophetic, as it cautions us, situated in third world countries at the tail of the twentieth century, of the dangerous implications of globalization (i.e., After-Fordism, post-Fordism or post-Modernism) that appropriates the (ambiguous and ambivalent) concept of a new world order to fashion only a new world trade order only to perpetuate the division of humanity into the stereotyped blocks of 'us' and 'them'. In Gandhi's vision of *swaraj*, both the physical and the spiritual are combined inalienably. *Swaraj* does not mean a return to primitivism where we dwell in a blissful ignorance of science and rationality. In '*swaraj*' is 'resisted... the usurpation by machinery of the function of man and his consequent slavery to it.'¹⁵ Huxley's text, *Brave New World*, has a social context which warns us continually against the possible dangers of late capitalism, necessitating our understanding of Gandhian *swaraj* and *sarvodaya* as terms of both interpretation and action.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Aldous Huxley, Foreword, *Brave New World* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1964), p. 9. All subsequent references to the text in this paper are from this edition, with page numbers in parenthesis.
2. Raghavan Iyer (ed.), *The Moral and Political Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987) pp. 518-19 (hereafter referred to as Raghavan Iyer). The interviewer had earlier met Ford in America, who had put forward the thesis that the demand for cheaper things would stimulate mass production. This interview with Gandhi was published in *Harijan*, 2 November, 1934.

3. Makarand Paranjape, *Decolonization and Development: Hind Swaraj Revisited* (New Delhi : Sage Publications, 1993). Also see his views in 'Defining India' (pp. 67-77), 'Defining the West' (pp. 78-85), 'Science and Technology' (pp. 169-167) and 'Conclusion: Towards a World Culture' (pp. 220-26). Hereafter cited as Paranjape, with page numbers in parenthesis. According to Paranjape, decolonization and development are both subsumed in the Gandhi's 'swaraj'.
 4. David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity : An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1994), p. 126. David Harvey, in Chapter 8, considers 1914 as the symbolic date for the initiation of Fordism in America when Henry Ford launched his automated car-assembly line at Dearborn, Michigan. Harvey, in this chapter, candidly dwells on the implications of this phenomenon in West Europe and America.
 5. *Ibid.*, p.126.
 6. Raghavan Iyer, p.13.
 7. 'Independence', *Harijan*, 28 July 1946, quoted in Raghavan Iyer, p.10.
 8. 'Sarvodaya', *Indian Opinion*, 20 June 1908, quoted in Iyer, p. 1.
 9. Raghavan Iyer, p. 530.
 10. *Harijan*, 28 January 1939, quoted in Raghavan Iyer, p. 530. This is a part of Gandhi's answer to Maurice Frydman, who put before him an interesting observation: 'When I turn from the busy West to masses in the Indian village, I seem to be moving in a different world altogether in which stagnation reigns.'
- This statement presupposes the West as the superior industrial giant, and the denigration of the third world because of its poverty, hunger and underdevelopment. This is also the case in Huxley's *Brave New World* in which utopia stands for the West and the Savage Area for the third world.
11. Raghavan Iyer, p. 529.
 12. 'A Discussion', *Harijan*, 22 June 1935, quoted in Raghavan Iyer, p. 525.
 13. See Paranjape, p. 171. Paranjape aptly uses the discourses of Karl Popper, Thomas S. Kuhn, Paul K. Feyerabend and Bernard Susser to problematize the application of science to humanity.
 14. Rabindranath Tagore, *Gitanjali* (Madras: Macmillan, 1981) p. 20.
 15. 'The Hand of Man' *Young India*, 21 March 1929, quoted in Raghavan Iyer, p. 516.