

Gandhi's Compassionate Cosmopolitan Ethics and Global Poverty¹

Santosh Kumar

PhD Research Scholar

University of Delhi, New Delhi, India

DOI:10.37648/ijrssh.v13i02.008

Received: 04 February 2023; Accepted: 20 March 2023; Published: 15 April 2023

ABSTRACT

In the post-Rawlsian world many liberal cosmopolitan philosopher and theorists have been trying to argue that love, emotion, sentiments and empathy are needed to ensure justice in this broken world. Some of them like Martha Nussbaum, Graham Long etc. have attempted to theorise on Emotion and sentiments within cosmopolitan traditions. I argue that empathy, love and sentiments are European ideas and sometimes become problematic for the reason that they do not get out of the problems of "binaries"----primarily the binary of the self and others. In my view, liberal cosmopolitans have failed to understand the ontological and metaphysical significance of the non-duality which was central to the Gandhi's understanding of cosmopolitanism. In Gandhi's theory of cosmology there is no difference between the self and other, they are not placed in tension with each other rather they complement each other and are essentially interdependent. This article humbly attempts to explore the possibilities of an alternative conception of cosmopolitanism based on universal morality through Gandhi's idea of non-violence and compassion. It probes into the possibility of universal morality of Ahimsa (non- violence) and Karuna (compassion) and argues that it is not plausible to think of it without any metaphysical supposition that we all have the same Atman. It also examines and criticizes the Western notion of cosmopolitan morality based on human fellowship without any metaphysical principle. Unlike moral cosmopolitanism, compassionate cosmopolitanism does not focus primarily on the duty rather it goes deeply into understanding the human nature and virtue--what kind of person we are and how we feel about other fellow human? It enquires into the kind of emotional attachment exists or required between fellow humans.

Keywords: *Compassion; Cosmopolitanism; Distribution; Shared Humanity; Cosmopolitan Education; Self; Others; Self-realization; interconnectedness; Agency; Oneness; Metaphysics*

Gandhi was operating in a very challenging environment dominated by the British imperialist power and a communal and casteist Indian society but he was very rigid in upholding his non-violent ethics of love and caring. And he was deeply engaged in dealing with a real question the whole humanity was facing at that time-- *How to reconstruct a decent non-exploitative and non-violent society based on certain political principles of justice in a world dominated by violence, hatred, racism, greed etc.?* Gandhi was of the view that there is a need to cultivate compassion among the people across the globe to deal with the problems like global poverty. And for this we need to transform ourselves from the narrow patriotic feelings to more broader and inclusive nationalism based on humane principles. We need to go beyond our particular ethics to universal ethics to become more open in accepting and helping others whom we do not know. Now the real question before Gandhi was to how motivate people love and care about those they do not even know. For him, cultivating compassion is a moral challenge in this very real world dominated by power, violence, hatred, racism, greed, luxury etc. Gandhi believes that any ambitious project of re-distribution is a moral challenge because it requires how to motivate powerful individuals to love and care about poor and others they don't know. For him, motivational aspect of re-distribution is a crucial issue in ensuring justice for the powerless poor. The Western moral cosmopolitans, both institutional and interactional, have prescribed duties to alleviate global poverty but the issue of-- *how to motivate people in discharging their duties and how to justify those actions is still the primary question among Western moral cosmopolitans.* Another crucial discussion is whether rational cosmopolitan traditions can address the question of duties to help the distant other.

¹ How to cite the article:

Kumar S., (April, 2023); Gandhi's Compassionate Cosmopolitan Ethics and Global Poverty, *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, Apr-Jun 2023, Vol 13, Issue 2, 98-108, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v13i02.008>

REASON AND EMOTION IN THE COSMOPOLITAN TRADITION

The role of emotion in political theory has been considered inferior to rationality though some political philosophers like Rousseau, J. S. Mill etc. have discussed the role of moral sentiments in the politics. In the Greek political tradition, especially Stoics presented the role of emotion very negatively and argue that emotion provides us false information and we should not allow them to influence our decision-making processes. But not before the 1990s, the role of emotion in political theory has received the serious attention of the political philosophers. The studies like psychology, philosophy, sociology, political theory started giving due attention to the role of emotion. Kant's philosophical works is deeply grounded in the role of rationality and he says that his project is to establish the supreme principals of morality into the reason/rationality. And most of the Western cosmopolitan traditions are influenced by the Kantian theories. Even in the 1970s, the political theorists like John Rawls over-emphasized the role of rationality in designing the basic institutions and framing the principles of political conception of justice.

Some of the contemporary cosmopolitans like Martha Nussbaum accept the role of political emotion in the politics but largely she has discussed the negative emotions like fear, anxiety, disgust, hatred, humiliation etc. However, she accepts that emotions are the very true nature of the mankind and they always play role in our value judgement and choosing the principle for the justice. The challenge is to how to use them in constructive manner to re-construct a non-exploitative society.

But unlike Nussbaum, this chapter focuses primarily on the positive emotion like compassion and tries to explore what positive role it can play in re-constructing a non-violent and non-exploitative society. And primarily it will be relying on what Gandhi has to say about the role of compassion.

Primarily, Western cosmopolitan traditions are influenced by Kantian rationalist idea of morality, without denying the significance of this I argue that Gandhi offers a better and alternative framework based on compassion and deeply rooted in the idea of shared humanity.

MORAL AND SENTIMENTAL COSMOPOLITANISM: A CONTEMPORARY WESTERN UNDERSTANDING

Prescribing a strong or thick moral obligation to the well-off to alleviate global poverty has always been an issue of serious discussion among the Western moral cosmopolitans. Moral cosmopolitans like Pogge, Caney, Gilibert, Ashford etc. are engaged in exchanging their ideas on this issue but they all are busy looking for how to justify those positive duties. The fundamental question still remains the same—how to motivate well-off of the developed nations in discharging their duties to help the distant others. Graham Long in his article, "*Moral and Sentimental Cosmopolitanism*"--explores how to answer the puzzle of motivating individuals to act on the prescribed cosmopolitan principles and also discusses justificatory argument behind those actions. Long writes:

Justification and motivation are, of course, tied together, so that to attempt to justify an action may be thought of as attempting to give other people motivating reasons to act in such a way. My account of the motivational problem need not deny or affirm that, as some thinkers view this question, moral judgments carry motivational force. Instead the motivation thesis holds that whatever motivational force these moral duties may possess—either intrinsically, or by virtue of an accompanying conative state—can find itself outweighed. On the motivation account, these duties involve incurring what we perceive as costs: They involve contributing money, effort, or political commitment (e.g., our vote). The fact that many people do not fulfil their cosmopolitan duties says something about the motivational force of the arguments presented by the cosmopolitan for bearing these costs, or else the strength of the countervailing motivations of the people to whom they are addressed.²

Long while discussing motivational account of duties, also talks about the cost involved in motivating any individual in discharging his duties like money, efforts, commitments etc. and many a times well-off of the developed nations considered (taking motivational cost into account) these duties either as over-demanding or supererogatory. And this creates a motivational gap in fulfilling the duties to help the distant others. As Long argues:

Different accounts of cosmopolitanism will posit more or less demanding accounts of our moral duties. For some of these accounts, the justification and motivation gaps will appear greater than for others. At the more minimal end, Pogge has argued that a contribution by rich nations of one percent of GDP would suffice to eliminate severe global poverty. I do not want to maintain that such a proposal faces the same obstacles as one to establish global equality of opportunity. Nevertheless, two points are perhaps worth making. First,

² Long, Graham (2009), "Moral and Sentimental Cosmopolitanism", *Journal of Social Philosophy*, Vol. 40, No. 3, p. 325

achieving a one percent contribution demands more than mere donation. It would require political action—voting, campaigning, and reform of existing institutions, both to remove obstacles (such as undemocratic intergovernmental organizations) and to create bodies capable of fair redistribution. This is to say that the gap between ideal and reality might be wider than it appears at first sight, and not easily bridged. Second, the failure to implement this relatively modest and well-argued proposal is itself evidence for my case. That is, even though the goal is modest, attainable, and moral, it is hard to say that it is close to being attained.³

To alleviate global poverty, Western moral cosmopolitans have offered various proposals and most of them are very much concerned about the motivational cost involved in the proposal and as per the cost involved they discuss what kind of obligation they prescribe to the well-off of the developed nations. Western moral cosmopolitans like Pogge offer a proposal of contributing 1 percent of the GDP of the developed nations to alleviate global poverty. He also offers a well-argued proposal of the Global Resources Dividend (GRD). But he prescribes the negative duties only to the well-off of the developed nations. For him, prescribing any kind of direct moral obligation to the well-off of the developed nations would be either over-demanding or supererogatory. And due to this reason he favours a radical change in the existing global order. Caney prescribes positive duties but he does not offer any proposal for individual moral obligation. He gets back to the egalitarian designing of the global governance. Utilitarian cosmopolitan Peter Singer, in his article *Famine, Affluence and Morality*, has argued for help the well-off of the developed nations can offer to the people in the developing nations during the crisis. And through example of Bengal famine relief he says that any motivational cost is justified in helping the distant needy if it does not push them to the marginal utility.

Martha Nussbaum's work on political emotion⁴ is a breakthrough in the study of the role of emotion in the political theory in the Western cosmopolitan tradition. In her work she explores whether patriotic feeling could be extended at the global level to make it more and more inclusive so that it can motivate individuals to love others whom they don't know as they love their loved ones. But primarily she discusses the roles of negative emotions like fear, disgust, anxiety, shame etc.

PROBLEMS WITH NUSSBAUM'S NEGATIVE EMOTIONS

The negative emotions like fear (fear of foreigners, immigrants, refugees) creates some specific forms of stigma and she does not come out of "otherization" of others. In her arguments of political emotions the binary of the self and other still exists. She does not have a sound proposal or theoretical argument for bridging the self-other gap. Her ambitious arguments for extending the patriotic feeling at the global level is also problematic because she is not arguing how to make people so sensitive that they would start believing in a more inclusive idea of patriotism.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM WITH THE MOTIVATIONAL ARGUMENT

Luxury-Need Conundrum

The primary problem is that they are focusing on the material motivation and how it could be justified. However, the root of the problem lies in the normative principles of the Western life. For most of them, luxury is not an issue while it is a serious moral problem in the world where rampant global economic inequalities force millions to live in below the threshold limit of a decent survival and compromising with the self-respect. Gandhi argues that minimum comfort is morally permissible but luxurious life beyond a moral limit where the greed of the well-off violates the basic natural principles of morality is not acceptable. As Gandhi writes:

A certain degree of physical harmony and comfort is necessary, but above that level, it becomes a hindrance instead of help. Therefore the ideal of creating an unlimited number of wants and satisfying them seems to be a delusion and a snare. The satisfaction of one's physical needs, even the intellectual needs of one's narrow self, must meet at a point a dead stop, before it degenerates into physical and intellectual voluptuousness. A man must arrange his physical and cultural circumstances so that they may not hinder him in his service of humanity, on which all his energies should be concentrated.⁵

And he says that the planet has enough for the need, but not for the greed. For him, luxury promotes accumulation and any kind of accumulation beyond the need is stealing the share of others and it cannot be morally justified. It is

³ Ibid, p. 326

⁴ Nussbaum, Martha (2013), "Political Emotion: Why Love Matters for Justice", Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

⁵ Gandhi, *Harijan*, August 29, 1936, CWMG (electronic book), New Delhi, Publication Division Government of India, Vol. 69, p. 321

interesting to note that—why they fail to accept that we share the same humanity and our needs are socially connected and morally interdependent. This is one of the main problems with the Western moral cosmopolitans.

PROBLEMS WITH CONTEMPORARY WESTERN UNDERSTANDING OF EMOTIONAL COSMOPOLITANISM

It does not believe in the principles of shared humanity

The Western moral cosmopolitans do talk about the duty to help others but most of them do not realise the urgency of the while addressing the global poverty and so they do not prescribe a robust framework of direct moral obligation. And this is the reason Pogge prescribes negative duties only and cosmopolitans Caney do prescribe positive duties but he does not offer any defensible framework. For most of them duties to alleviate global poverty is either over-demanding or supererogatory. Most of moral cosmopolitans are not convinced that violation of basic human rights of the global poor impose any direct moral responsibility on well-offs of affluent countries just because they fail to see—how do they cause global poverty directly? They do not connect to the essential characteristics of shared humanity while addressing the issues of global distribution. Gandhi argues that we cannot escape from our moral duty of helping distant others for at least two reasons; firstly, by simply saying that we are not the direct cause of someone's poverty because we inhabit the same human society; and secondly, we cannot walk away from helping others on the ground that the "others" do not share the same membership of ours" political community. And now the question is why they think this way—the fundamental problem lies not in the idea of duties they prescribe but in the principles of the life they believe in. For most of them life is essentially alienated and Gandhi in his seminal work in 1909, "*Hind Swaraj*" has criticized this mentality of modernity and argues that life is fundamentally interconnected and interdependent. He says that though we belong to the different cultures, beliefs, race but we inhabit the same humanity and our needs are socially connected. Gandhi argues that we are socially so connected and interdependent that luxury beyond a threshold limit is morally not permissible. He is of the view that even a single penny on luxury may inflict harm on others and it might push another to live in poverty

SELF-OTHER BINARY EXISTS

I argue that a global egalitarian principle of sharing the benefits and burdens requires an understanding of 'Others'. In *Young India* Gandhi writes: "*I want to identify myself with everything that lives*".⁶ He believed in the essential unity of mankind and favours a 'reflective Self' which believes in socially connected responsibility to protect the distant poor. I argue that the issue of non-compliance emerges out of the moral dilemma of the 'Self' and 'Others'. We generally do not consider helping 'Others' as our moral obligation rather as a burden on us because of the belief in the duality of 'Self' and 'Others'. Furthermore this duality leads to the issues of non-compliance and a significant question arises—why to help 'others' whom we do not know? Thus motivation to follow a duty of justice is always relational in cultural context and limits the principles of distribution of benefits and burdens. I argue that the Gandhian idea of shared humanity is a cross-cultural framework of interconnectedness that celebrates difference and promotes a distinctive form of duty of justice which is motivated by the sense of 'Trustee' rather than the 'Owner' and deeply rooted in the idea of shared humanity. However, absolute Trusteeship is a moral abstraction and also equally unattainable but it can be institutionalized even at the global level with certain moral calculation consented to by the global political community. By global political community I mean socially connected individuals with a collective moral vision to help each other and also able to exert pressure on global institutions.

The problems of non-compliance at the global level may find its answer in the Gandhian expression of the moral commonwealth where agency is a 'Reflexive Self' and is motivated from the belief in shared humanity. I argue that the Gandhian idea of the responsibility to protect would be culturally more engaged and socially acceptable. It promotes a distinct moral obligation where helping 'Others' will not be considered as burdens rather as a duty of justice.

It Assumes that Cooperation is Irrational

Living in common has been one of the main problems discussed in the Western moral cosmopolitan traditions. Most of them argue that non-cooperation is irrational and not to cooperate is productive. They believe in the fragmented life.

⁶ Gandhi, *Young India*, 1924

It Does Not Believe in the Idea of Oneness

Identifying oneself with the distant others is a major concern with the Western moral cosmopolitans. And the root of this lies in the possessive individualism of the West. They do not accept that oneness is possible around the idea of human fellowship. They believe in particularistic ethics having concerns only for their loved ones. Most of the Western moral cosmopolitans believe that self-other distinction cannot be bridged through normative principles of shared humanity.

Self-Other Debate: Gandhi's Ontological Understanding

Gandhi believed in the cosmological theory of human nature and he does not present self and other in tension with each other. For him, there is no difference between the self and other, at least moral differences. His understanding of the self is ontological whose main purpose is to identify itself with the cosmic self. As Parekh writes:

For Gandhi then the highest goal in life was to attain *moksha*, to become one with or dissolve oneself into the cosmic spirit. As a being endowed with the body and the self, a unique physical and psycho-spiritual constitution, man was prone to the illusion that individuality was the ultimate reality. He saw his fellow human beings as separate from him, divided the world into the self and the 'Other' and constantly strove to preserve, protect and assert himself as a distinct individual. Accordingly he constructed all manner of high protective walls around himself and spent his time and energy guarding them against the world, viewing their slightest weakening as a mortal threat to his identity. *Qua atman* man belonged to the cosmos, as it did to him. Being heir to such a vast treasure, he felt deeply anguished by the mean poverty of the self. *Moksha* consisted in shedding the illusion of individuality, seeing through the *maya* of the subtle and ingenious forms through which it perpetuated itself and dismantling the protective walls. In the ultimate analysis it signified infinite openness and a blissful release from the ontologically suffocating and claustrophobic world of individuality.⁷

The self, a psychological and spiritual construct, for Gandhi naturally tends to identify itself with the cosmic spirit. He says that the self always tries to identify with the supreme-being. But in the Western understanding of the self, individuals consider themselves as distinct entities from others and try their best to protect their identity as distinct individuals. His individuality is rooted in individual autonomy and not in the sociality (created by interactions of the self and others) what Gandhi argues for. They do not believe in moral interdependence. Parekh rightly writes:

Since the self and the Other were interdependent polarities, each creating and being in turn created by the other, *moksha* involved the complementary processes of dissolving the self by eliminating desires and dissolving the Other by attaining total identification with all creation. Hindu religious tradition had stressed the former and Gandhi did not add much to it. The way he defined the latter and related the two contained novel insights and represented his great contribution.⁸

Gandhi says that until we believe in the binary of the self and other, we cannot realise the interdependence. Both the self and other must dissolve themselves by realising oneness with everything in this cosmos. He says that cosmic spirit equally exists in every being and it connects to the cosmic order through an essential interdependence. Oneness is realized through complete merger of the individuals with the cosmic spirit, a supreme-being. As Parekh writes:

The second aspect of *moksha* was a relatively novel departure, and Gandhi arrived at it by means of a series of important steps. Since the cosmic spirit was manifested in all living beings and did not exist independently of them, unity with it consisted in total identification with all living beings; 'realisation of Truth is impossible without a complete merging of oneself in and identification with the limitless ocean of life'. And again, the 'only way to find God is to see Him in His creation and be one with it. I cannot find Him apart from the rest of humanity'. For Gandhi identification with the cosmic spirit involved the three increasingly higher levels of identification with all men, all living beings and finally all creation. Although he stressed all three, he tended to concentrate on the first two.⁹

For Gandhi, oneness must be realised with all living beings and this is the only way we can create an order in the society. Unlike Western moral cosmopolitans Gandhi does not believe in individuality deeply rooted in the idea of

⁷ Parekh, Bhikhu (1989), "*Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination*" MacMillan Academics Professional Ltd., p. 95

⁸ Ibid, p. 95

⁹ Parekh, Bhikhu (1989), "*Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination*" MacMillan Academics Professional Ltd., p. 96

autonomy because it leads to an incoherent social order where self is selfish, egoist and focus primarily on protecting his own identity however, for a stable social order, he must identify with living being.

Gandhi's Metaphysical Defence of the Oneness

Gandhi argues that the Western idea of the self is falsely understood as the bodily identity and so it is bounded by the realm of the empirical world, it is an ignorant understanding of the self. However, for Gandhi, the self is free from mind, body and ego. It transcends the empirical world and identifies itself with the supreme-being.

When we fail to discriminate between the Self and the non-self and through ignorance falsely identify ourselves with the body we are bound to the realm of *samsara*. We need to recognize the oneness of the Self and Brahman and see the Self as indivisible, infinite and free from all limiting adjuncts such as body, mind and ego. Perfect discrimination, however, is brought about by immediate apprehension achieved in the *samadhi* state wherein all relative ideas are transcended.¹⁰

Gandhi believes in the idea of absolute oneness and argues that spiritual gain of an individual can wipe out suffering of his surroundings. For him, individual spiritual gain is the gain of the whole world and if an individual falls spiritually the whole world fall. It clearly reflects the kind of unity and oneness Gandhi believes in. As Gandhi writes:

I do not believe that an individual may gain spiritually and those that surround him suffer. I believe in advaita. I believe in the essential unity of man and for that matter of all that lives. Therefore I believe that if one man gains spiritually, the whole world gains with him and, if one man falls, the whole world falls to that extent.¹¹

Gandhi believes in the essential unity of mankind and his idea of oneness is deeply rooted in the spiritual understanding of the being and supreme-being. He says that all life is essentially one and we all either consciously or unconsciously, working towards the self-realization of our true unity with the cosmic spirit. As Gandhi writes:

I subscribe to the belief or the philosophy that all life in its essence is one, and that the humans are working consciously or unconsciously towards the realization of that identity. This belief requires a living faith in a living God who is the ultimate arbiter of our fate. Without Him not a blade of grass moves.¹²

Agency of Shared Humanity

As Gandhi is an ardent believer in the essential unity of mankind, the kind of agency he talks about must be reflective and dialogical. Thus his idea of agency is rooted in moral interdependence of man. While discharging his duties, agency realizes that his humanity is related to his fellow men and he exists in collective. His duty is not to refrain from harming others only but he also shared some positive duties of helping his neighbours, taking interest in the well-being of society, and constructing a vibrant local community etc. He has a sense of sacrifice for maintaining social order. His every activity should bring in the "sweet smell of humanity". As Parekh writes:

For Gandhi, service to one's fellow human beings was not a separate and independent activity, but informed all one did. Being a husband, a father, a son, a friend, a neighbour, a colleague, a citizen, an employer, or an employee were not so many discrete roles, each governed by its own distinct norms and values, but different ways of realizing one's humanity and relating to one's fellow men. As a neighbour, for example, one should not only refrain from making a nuisance of oneself but should also help one's neighbours, take an active interest in their well-being and the quality of their surroundings, and help create a vibrant local community. A similar spirit of service and humanity should infuse one's manner of earning one's livelihood, which should be looked upon as a *yajna*, as one's form of participation in the promotion of communal well-being, of which monetary reward was not the purpose but an incidental though necessary consequence. Gandhi thought that, by bringing to his every activity the 'sweet smell of humanity', every person could in his own small way help transform the quality of human relationships and contribute to the creation of a better world. Such a 'quiet, unostentatious service' as consoling a widow, educating a neighbour's child, nursing a sick relative, and shopping for an invalid friend, and thus 'picking up one clod of earth' from the entire mass of

¹⁰ Richard, Glyn (1986), "*Gandhi's Concept of Truth and the Advaita Tradition*", Published Online by Cambridge university Press, Vol. 22, No. 1, p. 3

¹¹ Gandhi, *Young India*, December 4, 1924, CWMG (electronic book), New Delhi, Publication Division Government of India, Vol. 29, p. 408

¹² Gandhi's Correspondence with the Government 1942-44, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.

human unhappiness, was just as important as the more glamorous forms of social service and political action, and sometimes had more lasting and beneficial results.¹³

Agency and paying back to the Humanity

Gandhi says that we all are born debtor to the cosmos and we owe our humanity to each other. He further argues that we have received this debt involuntarily and it is huge that paying back it one life time is not possible. Taking example of the family he says that like it is not easy to repay pay our debt to our parents, paying debt back to the humanity is not easy. Paying debt to the humanity is so connected and that it is not easy to know what we owe to whom in this cosmos. This relationship is so complex that even a sense of this is obligation is not an easy task. Gandhi argues that only metaphysically we can understand this debt and what we to whom. It means in this cosmic order we all are here to pay back our debt to the humanity.

Every human being owed his humanity to others, and benefited from a world to the creation of which he contributed nothing. For Gandhi human beings were 'born debtors', and involuntarily inherited debts that were too vast to be repaid. Even a whole lifetime was not enough to pay back what they owed their parents, let alone all others. Furthermore their creditors were by their very nature unspicifiable. Most of them were dead or unknown, and those who were alive were so numerous and their contributions so varied and complex that it was impossible to decide what one owed to whom. To talk about 'repaying' the debts did not therefore make sense except as a clumsy and metaphorical way of describing one's response to unsolicited but indispensable gifts.¹⁴

Since the debt to the humanity could never be repaid so agency should discharge his duties in such a way that it does not disturb the universal arrangement of interdependence. And only this way we can contribute to the well-being of the society. We should look upon our lives as we have been born to sacrifice it for the universe. From ontological point of view, Gandhi argues that if we look at the relationship between the right and duty from the deeper sense we find that it is like looking at the same thing from two different ways. It is like one has a duty to exercise someone's right and someone has a right to discharge his duty.

Given that the debts could never be repaid and the favours returned, all that human beings could do was to 'recognise the conditions of their existence', and continue the ongoing universal system of interdependence by discharging their duties and contributing to collective well-being. They should look upon their lives as *yajna*, an offering at the universal altar, and contribute to the maintenance and enrichment of both the human world and the cosmos. As Gandhi put it, '*Yajna* having come to us with our birth we are debtors all our lives, and thus for ever bound to serve the universe.' Such service was not only their duty but also their right, for without it they lacked the opportunity to fulfil themselves and affirm their dignity. In Gandhi's view, right and duty were inseparable not only in the usual sense that one person's rights created corresponding duties for others, but in the deeper sense that they were two different ways of looking at the same thing. One had a duty to exercise one's rights and a right to discharge one's duties.¹⁵

In Gandhi's views whole humanity is a family, we have same traits, painted with the same brush, no one is better or worse. He says that I decline to draw any distinction between the people or nations. I do not accept any superiority of any nation over any other nation. Humanity is not divided into rigid walls, it's fluid and permeable and we can visit across each other realm. We all are related to each other in more than one way and we must have good will for each other. We should discharge our duties for the well-being on the whole world as a family and only then we can protect our own family because we all are interdependent and our needs are socially connected. In the well-being of the whole world our well-being lies. And Gandhi believed in the idea of *Vasudhaiva kutumbkam* (whole world is one family).

I do not think that the Germans as a nation are any worse than the English, or the Italians are any worse. We are all tarred with the same brush; we are all members of the vast human family. I decline to draw any distinctions. I cannot claim any superiority for Indians. We have the same virtues and the same vices. Humanity is not divided into watertight compartments so that we cannot go from one to another. They may occupy one thousand rooms, but they are all related to one another. I would not say, 'India should be all in all, let the whole world perish.' That is not my message. India should be all in all, consistently with the wellbeing of other nations of the world. I can keep India intact and its freedom also intact only if I have

¹³ Parekh, Bhikhu (1997), "*Gandhi: A Very Short Introduction*", Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 60-61

¹⁴ Parekh, Bhikhu (1997), "*Gandhi: A Very Short Introduction*", Oxford University Press, New York, p. 51

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 52

goodwill towards the whole of the human family and not merely for the human family which inhabits this little spot of the earth called India. It is big enough compared to other smaller nations, but what is India in the wide world or in the universe?¹⁶

Gandhi's Compassionate Cosmopolitanism

And in Gandhi's views, without compassion it won't be possible to reconstruct a cosmopolitan account of a non-exploitative society. He says that compassion recognizes the suffering of another as a reflection of our own pain. Compassion is shared suffering. Compassion is wish to see others free from suffering. In Gandhi's views, brutalizing someone is worst form of suffering inflicted on others. And if brute power is used to get victory over opponent it does not only drag down that man but also whole of mankind. But voluntary suffering to change the heart of the opponent, not only raises that man but whole of humanity. Gandhi says that only satyagrahis can exemplify the practices of voluntary suffering and can be a moral exemplar for the compassion. As Gandhi writes:

I am more concerned in preventing the brutalization of human nature than in the prevention of the sufferings of my own people. I know that people who voluntarily undergo a course of suffering raise themselves and the whole of humanity; but I also know that people who become brutalized in their desperate efforts to get victory over their opponents or to exploit weaker nations or weaker men, not only drag down themselves but mankind also. And it cannot be a matter of pleasure to me or anyone else to see human nature dragged to the mire. If we are all sons of the same God and partake of the same divine essence, we must partake of the sin of every person whether he belongs to us or to another race. You can understand how repugnant it must be to invoke the beast in any human being, how much more so in Englishmen, among whom I count numerous friends. I invite you all to give all the help that you can in the endeavour that I am making.¹⁷

Having derived experiences of brutalization from South Africa, Gandhi argues that any kind of violence used to defeat, degrade, dominate or control someone also damages the self-reflective capacity of the violators. It does not only harm the dignity and self respect of the victim only but also the violators. In his views, humanity is so interdependent that we fall collectively and rise collectively. And Gandhi argues that in brutalizing black of the South Africa, the Whites have also brutalized themselves and they do not notice that what human being they have become.

Gandhi's concept of indivisible humanity formed the basis of his critique of systems of oppression and exploitation. Such dominant groups as the whites in South Africa, the colonial governments in India and elsewhere, and the rich and the powerful in every society believed that their exploitation and degradation of their respective victims did not in any way damage them as well. In fact it degraded and dehumanized them as much as their victims, and sometimes even more. White South Africans could not deprive blacks of their livelihood and dignity without damaging their own capacity for critical self-reflection and impartial self-assessment, and falling victim to moral conceit, morbid fears, and irrational obsessions. In brutalizing blacks they also brutalized themselves, and were only prevented by their arrogance from noticing how sad and shallow their lives had become. They did enjoy more material comforts, but that made them neither happier nor better human beings.¹⁸

Gandhi has interpreted love both negatively and positively. In negative sense, love is about not inflicting even a slightest harm to the person we love. And positively it means to promote the well-being of that person. His primary contribution is that he has he differs from the negative interpretation of the term *Daya* and *Karuna* and argues that *Karuna* is a positive emotion and it cultivates the idea of universal love. And universal love motivates individuals to discharge their duties in the service of mankind.

Gandhi argued that to love someone was to wish him well and help him grow and flourish. It implied, negatively, that one did not wish to cause him the slightest harm or injury and, positively, that one actively promoted his well-being and offered every help he needed. Indian thinkers, including Buddha, had generally defined *dayii* and *karunii* in negative terms. Gandhi took a very different view and insisted that love was essentially a positive concept involving active service. Service was positive love, 'love in action' or 'active love'. Universal love meant placing oneself at the service of all living beings and devoting all one's energies to 'wiping every tear from every eye'.¹⁹

¹⁶ Gandhi, *Harijan*, September 29, 1940, CWMG (electronic book), New Delhi, Publication Division Government of India, Vol. 79, pp. 222-223

¹⁷ Gandhi, *Young India*, October 29, 1931, CWMG (electronic book), New Delhi, Publication Division Government of India, Vol. 54, pp. 2-3

¹⁸ Parekh, Bhikhu (1997), "*Gandhi: A Very Short Introduction*", Oxford University Press, New York, p. 53

¹⁹ Parekh, Bhikhu (1989), "*Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination*" MacMillan Academics Professional Ltd., p. 98

Believing in the universal unity of man and the supreme-being, Gandhi argues that universal love demands sacrifice in discharging our duties to help the distant others. He says that if a man really relates himself to the others then he must translate this feeling into action. And this is the only test of his compassion. Promoting the well-being of society is considered moral only when it is motivated by the pure love for the mankind. As Parekh writes:

For Gandhi God was not separate from but identical with the totality of living beings, and there was therefore no question of His service conflicting with theirs. Since all men were manifestations of the cosmic spirit and thus one, their salvation, like their humanity, was indivisible. The concept of personal salvation was therefore philosophically incoherent. Indeed, since it rested on the mistaken belief that the self and others were separate, the concept of personal salvation was precisely the illusion every spiritual aspirant should shed.²⁰

Gandhi believes in the ultimate identity of the living beings and he says that through self-realization of this identity salvation of human beings is possible. Since we all are integral part of the cosmic spirit so like humanity is shared, salvation is also connected and interdependent. This feeling of identity promotes love among human beings and in Gandhi's views love is the fundamental base of non-violence. As Jahanbegloo writes:

Gandhi makes love one of the key elements of his nonviolence. According to him, love is the foundation of all interconnectedness and dialogue. It is, thus, an ability to take into consideration the otherness of the Other. 'Non-violence means an ocean of compassion,' wrote Gandhi. For Gandhi, nonviolence meant promoting the livelihood of all living beings, while refraining from selfishness and humiliating others. Moreover, in relation to the otherness of the Other, Gandhi developed his nonviolence as a dual approach to the problem of suffering: on the one hand, suffering for others, and on the other hand, relieving others from their sufferings.²¹

For Gandhi, love has ability to take others into consideration. A person who believes in the universal love would not believe in the idea of otherness. Gandhi says that non-violence is the ocean of compassion. It means promoting the livelihood of all living beings and refraining oneself from harming others, both physically and mentally. A person believing in non-violence would never disrespect and humiliate others. Gandhi's non-violence is dual in approach; firstly, he talks about the suffering for others, and secondly, he believes in relieving others from suffering. In his views, a satyagrahi fits into his understanding of non-violence. A stayagrahi suffers himself, without inflicting any harm on the opponent, to benefits the society and relieve humanity from suffering. And he becomes an exemplar of compassion. And due to his believe in the ethics of non-violence, Gandhi argues that only through this ethics we can re-construct a non-exploitative society. But to teach this ethics to the generations we need to impart a kind of cosmopolitan education deeply rooted in the idea of shared humanity.

Gandhi's Cosmopolitan Education and Re-construction of Non-exploitative Society

Gandhi says that if we believe in shared humanity then we must believe in equal respect and dignity. And if we accept the fundamental values of shared humanity then a universal duty to help others flows naturally. Non-violence is a moral obligation rooted in the idea of human fellowship or oneness. It is grounded shared humanity. And this obligation demands critical self-reformation, self-realization and inner transformation. As Snauwert writes:

From Gandhi's perspective, nonviolence is a universal moral obligation, and obligation is grounded in an awareness of both the essential unity of humanity and the partiality of human knowledge. Gandhi puts forth a cosmopolitan moral perspective that is ontologically grounded in a shared humanity, which requires critical self-examination and the internal transformation of consciousness. To be a cosmopolitan entails an awareness of the essential unity of humanity, and that awareness requires that we undergo an internal self-transformation that moves us from egoic centrality toward unity.²²

Gandhi says that a non-violent understanding of shared humanity ontologically presupposes inner self-transformation and self-realization of the agency. And it is clearly reflected in Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence. But to teach ethics of non-violence, Gandhi argues that we need an education based on cosmopolitan ethics. A cosmopolitan education motivates individuals to focus self-transformation and guides them in search of Truth.

²⁰ Ibid, p. 103

²¹ Jahanbegloo, Ramin (2021), "*Nonviolent Resistance As a Philosophy of Life: Gandhi's Enduring Relevance*", Bloombury Academic, United Kingdom, p. 61

²² Snauwert, Dale (2009), "The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity", *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 19

CONCLUSION

As a moral cosmopolitan, Gandhi does not believe in the self-other distinction. He says that this distinction has no moral significance. His believe in the cosmo-centric view of human nature distinguish him from the Western moral cosmopolitanism. He has metaphysically defended the identity between the self and others. And his idea of oneness has ontological overtone and rooted in the belief that our salvation lies in the realization our identity with the supreme authority. Gandhi does not believe in local allegiance and argues that whole world is a family. Like stoics, Gandhi says that it's not a problem to help your own friends, family and co-nationals but you must also realise that you also belong to this cosmos and so you are supposed to fulfil some moral duties to maintain the cosmic order.

And in Gandhi's views Western liberals, adhering to rationalist tradition, have done moral damage to the humanity. He does not argue that reason is not needed for human life but he is of the belief that we need some positive virtue like compassion (*Karuna*) to realize our oneness with poor. He does not have any clear theory of it but says that we need to feel the suffering of others in order to help them. And his idea of suffering is dual in approach; firstly, we need to suffer ourselves for the well-being of the society, and secondly, we need to identify ourselves with the suffering of others. And this is the reason Gandhi wanted to teach satyagrahi a moral lesson of self-realization. He says that my satyagrahi is a moral exemplar for the humanity.

Gandhi is of the view that this broken world needs to be educated in the cosmopolitan ethics. His main project was to reconstruct a non-violent and exploitative society where human fellowship could be realised and we all can feel the suffering of other without the idea of otherness. For him, compassion is best practice of non-violence and it is the fundamental love of humanity. Unlike Western moral cosmopolitans like Martha Nussbaum Gandhi does not focus only on the negative emotions like racism, hatred, disgust, shame but he very emphatically focus on the positive emotion like compassion. He argues that compassion is a divine virtue and we all must cultivate it. His cosmopolitan education primarily focuses on cultivating compassion.

And due to this reason, going beyond what Western moral cosmopolitans have prescribed as institutional framework for alleviating global poverty, I place Gandhi as a *compassionate cosmopolitan* who has a better understanding of love and caring for the humanity

Financial support and sponsorship: Nil

Conflict of Interest: None

REFERENCES

1. Gandhi, *Harijan*, August 29, 1936, CWMG (electronic book), New Delhi, Publication Division Government of India, Vol. 69, p. 321
2. -----, *Young India*, December 4, 1924, CWMG (electronic book), New Delhi, Publication Division Government of India, Vol. 29, p. 408
3. -----, *Harijan*, September 29, 1940, CWMG (electronic book), New Delhi, Publication Division Government of India, Vol. 79, pp. 222-223
4. Gandhi's Correspondence with the Government 1942-44, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.
5. Jahanbegloo, Ramin (2021), "*Nonviolent Resistance As a Philosophy of Life: Gandhi's Enduring Relevance*", Bloombury Acedemic, United Kingdom, p. 61
6. Long, Graham (2009), "Moral and Sentimental Cosmopolitanism", *Journal of Social Philosophy*, Vol. 40, No. 3, p. 325
7. Nussbaum, Martha (2013), "*Political Emotion: Why Love Matters for Justice*", Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
8. Parekh, Bhikhu (1989), "*Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination*" MacMillan Academics Professional Ltd., p. 95

9. ----- (1997), "*Gandhi: A Very Short Introduction*", Oxford University Press, New York, p. 51
10. Richard, Glyn (1986), "*Gandhi's Concept of Truth and the Adviata Tradition*", Published Online by Cambridge university Press, Vol. 22, No. 1, p. 3
11. Snauwert, Dale (2009), "The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity", *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 19