

THE PRINCIPLES AND VALUES OF INDIAN CIVILIZATION: SINCE ANCIENT TIME TO CURRENT STAY

One of the world's oldest civilizations India is an unique one, with uninterrupted tradition for centuries. It has given birth to four religions – Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism and Sikhism, which are known mainly due to the principles of peaceful coexistence and non-violence. Geography, history, ethnic and linguistic variety and social structure, together with religious principles shaped this amazing civilizational pluralism, which required tolerance. Exactly these values will shape the conduct of the Republic of India after independence, both in internal and external affairs. Author deals with this continuity of civilizational values and also examines the challenges to this extremely traditional civilization in contemporary Indian development.

Key-words: Indian civilization, traditional values, tolerance, unity in diversity, Gandhian way, ahimsa, vasudhaiv kutumbakam.

Introduction. The great Indian civilization is recognized globally as the most diverse and tolerant, with thousands-years uninterrupted traditions. India is known as the world's Guru, primarily because it taught us how to conduct peacefully, to hear the others and decide all the serious problems by non-violent ways. Throughout its history Indian civilization faced a lot of challenges, and finally this great cultural massive has been adjusted for all new innovations as they enriched the culture of India. Despite many crucial changes and really big threats to the background of the civilization, India could manage to preserve the continuity of their traditions and values, and made it national proud and principal part of her current strategy in global affairs. Civilizational glory works as a soft-power now, when India is actively searching a rightful place in changing global order. At the same time, we can't be silent about present-days changes and negative trends inside Indian society and politics, and the voices are arisen about the un-tolerance and chauvinism, as well as militarization and too much pro-active course in the foreign policy.

So, the main objective of this paper is to trace the continuity of the civilizational values and behavioral principles of India, to make a bridge between the antiquity and modernity and, also to point the challenges to tolerance, non-violence and unity in diversity in present-days India. Under this objective we'll try to answer some principal questions:

- What are the factors shaped Unity in diversity as the only possible principle of Indian civilization?
- How this principle survived throughout the history, with many waves of invaders and rule of foreigners?
- What was the impact of non-violence and tolerance on the struggle for independence in India?
- Which way these traditions influenced the foreign policy and international conduct of the nation?
- Why there is a big concern in present-days India as per the threats to traditional values and civilizational principles?

The research covers the issue, which is deeply investigated in India itself and abroad, starting with the sacred literature and ancient texts (Puranas, Shastras, Arthashastra, Mahabharata), observations of Indian leaders (J. Nehru, B.R. Ambedkar, Morarjee Desai, Shashi Tharoor) and deep research of modern Indian scholars (S. Dube, A. Sen, S. Khilnani, R. Thapar, R. Guha, D. Gupta, A. Kohli, A. Kumar, A. Roy, Y. Singh and many others). Also, this issue became extremely popular in English (S. Walpert, D. McLeod, I. Talbot) and Russian (Ye. Vanina, B. Klyuev, A. Kuzenkov, A. Kotovskij) Indology schools. At the same time there is a lack of such investigations in Ukraine. Traditionally, Ukrainian scholars take the issue from one specific aspect: history (O. Chuvpylo, V. Rubel), philosophy (Ye. Pavlenko), politics (I. Poliha, P. Ihnatiev), and international relations (O. Lukash). This research is based on more complex, pluralistic observation,

as it matches the characteristic of Indian civilization. It is supposed to combine different attitudes and research paradigmas with constructivist approach as the most applicable one. Also, the author took the risk to provide her own estimations after many years of research dedicated to South Asia and India.

There are three main aspects to be examined: one is about social harmony created throughout the history, where everyone has its own place and destiny; the second is about India's conduct in the international stage; finally, we will come to the current challenges and direct threats to Indian civilizational values in contemporary social life in India.

History and Social Development. The most important feature of Indian civilization, its main characteristic is Unity in Diversity. Together with ancient tradition, which has never been stopped by various invasions and foreign rules, it formed this absolutely unique cultural and social complex with no one in global history to compare. Indian "pluralism of everything" has become a part of nation's self-identity. In fact, to be Indian really means to belong to something very pluralistic, as India was and remains to be a melting pot of different races, ethnics, cultures, religions, economic systems etc. In the past, foreign travelers, among others, Megasthenes (315 B.C.), Fa Hsien (A.D. 405-411), Huan Tsang (A.D. 630-44), Alberuni (A.D. 1030), Marco Polo (A.D. 1288-1293) and Ibn-Batutta (A.D. 1325-1351) observed and recorded this extremely impressive pluralism. **Bharatavarsha** – the name of Indian sub-continent became a synonym of something huge and diverse, but at the same time it was understood as one entity, integrated under common values. In fact, till now, every citizen of India will introduce himself as an Indian firstly, and only than he will mention his local nationality (Bengali, Tamil, Gujarati etc.).

What are the sources of this unity in diversity? To follow distinguished Indian scholar S.C. Dube, the most obvious are racial types, ethnic origins, religions and languages [3, p. 29] Also, geographic conditions should be added, as the cultural type and economic system is always shaped by the climate, fertility, natural resources. As Indian subcontinent included different geographic zones, definitely, people's activity and culture appears also varied from zone to zone. Geography is also important in case of Indian sub-continent because of its natural borders, which still gave some possibilities to cross them and to ensure the communication with the rest of Asia. As the territory was really a huge one, with different political systems and many states, small and large by size, and various tribal areas, scholars in India till now used to discuss the problems of "Indian histories" or "Our pasts" – always in plural! At the presence of this unprecedented variety the only way of Indian development was possible – to be united in diversity, which means to find out the possibility to leave peacefully, to co-opt the incomes, to exchange, to learn and to teach.

Historically, we began Indian history with Indus valley civilization (the irony is that two largest towns of this civilization, Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro are both in Pakistan now), where we can see the formation of main religious and world-view principles. But the core zone of Indian civilization's history is so called *Aryavarta* – the valley between two biggest rivers – Indus and Ganga. It was a land, where all the waves of strangers appeared to come, the area of fierce struggle, and the most productive economic zone. If the southern part of India remained less disturbed until the Western invasion, Aryavarta got all the challenges and had to communicate with foreigners, starting with those, who actually gave a name to this territory – the Aryans tribes. We are not going to discuss all the theories of the origin of Aryans, as there is still a point of discussions – where, why and how they came, or maybe they started from India inside even. But the main issue is that how they changed the life and culture of India (at least, in Aryavarta) and shaped it civilizational face. Exactly after Aryan appearance we can observe so-called Classical Indian Society with Hindu-dharm (Hinduism) and Varna-jati (caste) system as firm social structure to shape everyday conduct of everyone human being. "The ideological and social framework of Indian society began taking shape when the area of interaction between the Indo-Aryans and the earlier inhabitants widened" [3, p. 5]. It could be mentioned, that the process of Aryanization took a long time, but after all these cultural and social interactions across the sub-continent, pluralism and cultural mosaic being formed.

Another fundamental result of this process was the Caste system – the Indian social phenomenon, which became a real basement for further development of Indian civilization. Characteristic features of this system, determined by sacred texts of Hindu religion, are deeply investigated, some important things we can mention here, and first of all that it was a system, where the place of everyone was determined by the birth, law of karma and sansara, and nothing could change the position. The doctrine of Karma remains basic to Hinduism, as well as the hierarchical structure of the society. In his impressive research on castes, Prof. D. Gupta described this very essential law as follow: "The fact is that one is born into a certain caste, is an outcome of one's past deeds in an earlier incarnation" [6, p. 5]. Also he mentioned, that "...in a closed system of stratification, mobility is strongly discouraged" [6, p. 23]. Here, maybe, we can find out the explanation why sometimes there was no need to create strong states and provide strict regulations from the top, as it was a self-ruled society, with its own regulations, norms and traditions. Different teachings since that appeared to change this tradition, first of all Buddhism with its denying caste and karma, but finally it has been adopted by Hindu religion. The explanation, why it became possible, could be found in words of Mahatma Gandhi: "Hinduism is not an exclusive religion. In it there is a room for the worship of all the prophets of the world. It is not a missionary religion in the ordinary sense of the term... Hinduism tells everyone to worship God according to his own faith or dharma, and so it lives at peace with all the religions" [4, p. 5].

To understand Indian variety we have also stress the long presence of other religions, not only local like Buddhism and Jainism, but also Christianity and Islam in the country. Christianity came earlier, but the later arrival of Islam left much greater impact on Indian civilization. The first serious challenge to absolutely self-regulated Indian society was Muslim invasion and beginning of the Medieval India (1250-1750 A.D.), but the situation is not easily described, as we can observe different dynasties, means – different languages and cultures came to India. Actually,

even religion was not the same, as there is a phenomenon about Islam in India, we can see Shia and Sunni, Ashrafs (descendants of the invaders) and Ajlavs (those who have been converted into Islam), different Sufi tariqats and even new mixed teachings, up to Sikh religion. To name some most important waves of Muslim invaders, we have to mention Arab invasion of Sind and Southern Punjab (711-714 A.D.). Fatimid control of Multan (since 950 A.D.), invasion of Mahmud Ghazni in Northern India (998-1030 A.D.), Delhi sultanate (1206-1451), Lodi (Afghan) Empire (1451-1526), second Afghan Sher Shay Empire (1540-1556) and Mughal Empire (1526-1757 A.D.) as the most profound stages of Indian history. Actually, only Indian called the last rulers "Mughals", while they never identified themselves with Moguls and prefer to use the name "Timurides". Even this short excursion could vividly demonstrate a new wave of variety – of ethnics and cultures and languages, and thus we can see that Islam was different in different regions of India, sometimes it was more in common between the Muslims and Hindus in the same territory, than between the Muslims from different Indian states. So, India changed many times in different ways and produced even more multi-diverse society. Also, it may be added, that Hindu rule was never completely wiped out from India, especially the southern part, where the Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagar was a powerful state. There are varying opinions about the outcomes of the interaction of the Hindu and Islamic traditions in pre-colonial period, but usually the high robustness of the sociocultural basis of Indian civilization is highlighted. As M. Merchant mentioned in his version of the civilizational clash's review, "It is true that the early Turko-Afghan invaders were cruel, even barbaric... But it is equally true that the later Mughals, especially Emperor Akbar, were secularists: men who honored Hindus by marrying their women, recruiting their scholars into the highest positions of their court and treating them with dignity and respect" [14, p. 57].

The next part of India was connected with the Westerners, and again we can see Portuguese, Dutch, French and British invaders in sub-continent, with their religions, languages and cultures, which came before and after the collapse of Mughal Empire. But the history of India did not stop, and the dissolution of the Mogul Empire is not equivalent to the social or political degradation of the society if we interpret it in the scope of Indian socio-cultural tradition, as the Imperial type of government is not a part of this tradition. India followed its traditional civilizational values, so there's no proof of any kind of cultural decline or gap in the development.

The period of Raj – rule of the British Empire created absolutely new conditions under which Indian nation itself has been consolidated. The British presence was considerable, as Raj provided a lot of changes in Indian economy and social development, both of positive and negative character, but it could not demolish Indian diversity and traditions of tolerant co-existence. By the way, even Queen Victoria promised to not intervene into religious and confessional situation in India. Instead of this, British created a new possibility of involvement for distant parts of India with each other as well as more active connection with the world. The country was unified by a common system of administration, one Penal Code, a network of railways, as well as post-service and new educational system. We can't deny many negative trends and cruel events of the Raj, and the fact is that economically India during Raj became poorer, not richer. But at the same time, we have to accept, that due to the Western domination Indians found themselves generating new impulses

for social transformation and struggle against colonialism, caused a strengthening of Indian nationalism.

One more temptation for traditional principles and values came in 1947, when Britain had surrendered the keystone of its Empire. Finally, after two hundred years, Britain has conquered India by leaving it. This historical decision followed by the Partition and creation of two independent states instead of one, India and Pakistan. The Independence Day – August 14 in Pakistan and August 15 in India: this symbolic fact has provided a long history of complicated bilateral relations, full of entrust and enmity, up to the open military conflicts between the two. The Partition created new territorial disputes, especially over Kashmir, which would strain the relations for years to come. It was the biggest migration in 20th century, as it is estimated that over 15 million people were displaced and 1 to 2 million lost their lives in the ensuing communal violence. How it could happen in this tolerant land where people of different believing shared common lives? In India, it is still popular to blame Pakistan and its fathers for the Partition and further complicated bilateral relations: "Pakistan has a pathological hatred of India and the idea of India. It was a nation created because of it. The creators of Pakistan abhorred India's plurality. They disbelieved the assertion of many – including Gandhi that Hindus and Muslims can stay as brothers. They doubted India's assertion of secularism" [14]. So, Pakistan is blamed for denying the main principle of Indian civilization – the pluralism, the Unity in Diversity. One of the observers recently proposed his own understanding of famous Jinnah's speech in August 11, before the independence has been proclaimed: "The first speech Mr. Jinnah gave in the newly created Pakistan was astonishing in its effrontery. He talked of how he wanted Pakistan to be a secular state! Well, we know what came of it, the experiment that was Pakistan" [15, p. 2]

This irony, however, could be traced as not objective estimation, as the speech itself and M.A. Jinnah's intention in common was really about to have a very good neighboring relationship between India and Pakistan, something like The US – Canada relations. And yes, it seems, that he pursued not an Islamic state but rather a non-Hindu majority nation. What happened after his death is another absolutely unhappy story of political instability and military coups, the rise of Islamic fundamentalism, the impossibility to solve social problems which all together destroyed Jinnah's dreams and created an image of Pakistan as a terroristic state. But what about India's own responsibility, and what to do with the fact, that India and its founder fathers had absolutely opposite attitude to Pakistan – as an occasional, temporary state, which is not forever. J. Nehru himself was absolutely confident that India will be re-united once. Here we can see the background for **Akhand Bharat** – the idea of un-divided India, which appeared to be popular almost immediately after the Partition (during the 1950s and 1960s, the Bharatiya Jana Sangh passed many resolutions and expressed its hope that one day "India and Pakistan will be united to form Akhand Bharat") [8]. History of India-Pakistan relations was not a lucky story because of this attitude also, we know about wars, instabilities, mistrust and mutual accusations. So, it is not such an easy job – to divide the common history, and the shadow of the Partition is still here. It is a story of independence, but it is a story of abandoned houses, divided families, old friends who became enemies in one moment, which still hurts.

It is a very famous fact that the person, who served to independence, maybe with the biggest sacrifice, M.K. Gandhi, The Mahatma, did not celebrate August 15, 1947, as it was a day of sorrow for him because of this huge number of victims, which no one could anticipate. It is

understandable, as The Mahatma had an unrivalled moral compass, more so if you notice the decades he was active in – Hitler, Churchill, Stalin, Mao and Mussolini were his contemporaries. While the world was disintegrating into violence, fascism, militarism and war itself, Gandhi taught the virtues of truth, nonviolence and peace. When Gandhi adopted **ahimsa (non-violence)** and **satyagraha** ("holding on to truth") as methods of obtaining freedom it was a big innovation. But these methods had showed a great result: 70 years ago, India became an independent nation. M.K. Gandhi disliked the English term "passive resistance", because satyagraha required activism, not passivity. "So, non-violence, like many later concepts labeled with a negation, from non-cooperation to non-alignment, meant much more than the denial of an opposite: it did not merely imply the absence of violence. Non-violence was the way to vindicate the truth by the infliction of suffering not on the opponent, but on oneself" [19, p. 18]. That was the approach, proposed by Gandhi to get independence, and it worked. What is more, the same principles later have been implemented for India's international conduct.

Foreign Policy. Even before August 15, 1947, Indian leaders were realizing, that the core importance of the position in the global arena proclaims the main objectives of the country's foreign policy. They advocate the principle of peaceful co-existence and aim to avoid the position of strength and to be as far as possible from two military blocks' confrontation. So-called "Nehru course" which means the independent foreign policy was the only imperative for India as a great nation and ancient civilization. It became an issue of national consensus as for country's external activity and in spite of any changes in the internal affairs never has been changed by principal position. India's "state behavior" proved the tenacity to achieve foreign policy's autonomy and play a global role in diplomacy last 70 years.

The fact is that the foreign policy of independent India and its global activity had its roots in India's historical development and civilization's essence also. India itself has been many times the victim of wars and conquers which others initiated, but never played a role of aggressor. The priority of peaceful means in the solution of different types of problems possessed its significant place in ancient texts like "Arthashastra". Traditional spiritual wisdom has been strength of India through many ages, and Gandhian way is the continuation of this wisdom only. His teaching is much more concerned with traditional thought of Indians than achievements of Western social sciences, in the context of external affairs too. By words of eminent Indian diplomat J.N. Dixit, "...the emphasis on tolerance, on mutual accommodation, on the commitment to peace, on avoiding the use of force to settle disputes and on the commitment to freedom of colonial people are Gandhi's contributions to our foreign policy orientations" [2, p. 40]. Indian important impact into the worlds diplomacy is "**panchsheel**" – five principles of peaceful co-existence proclaimed in 1954. The essence of "**panchsheel**", by words of Pandit J. Nehru, is that "the only way to live in this world is through co-existence, mutual cooperation and recognition of the right of each country to live its own life". Since that the inspiring ideals rooted in the cultural traditions of India, become not only an integral part of the foreign policy of India, but have also been widely accepted in the international community. "**Panchsheel**" principles inspired the Non-Aligned Movement, and India always played an active role in its activity. Today global agenda demands re-discovering of conception of the Non-Alignment and changes in the activity of NAM. Now India sees South – South cooperation as an effective cooperative approach to the challenges of development with the goal to establish a more positive ethic of globalization.

Contemporary Indian foreign policy demonstrates the combination of two contradictory trends – Gandhian Way, sometimes called idealism, and realpolitik, which is the condition of national interests' protection. Nuclear status – is one of the most popular issues wide discussed after 1998 tests. Usual question is: how it is corresponded with the Gandhian way, principles of non-violence? The answer is: a developed India should be able to take care of its strategic interests through its ability to adjust itself to the new realities of the globalized world. "In this real world, strength respects strength only, not a weakness", by the words of A.P.J. Kalam, the creator of Indian nuclear and missile program, former President of India [1, p. 108]. J. Nehru's proposal of eliminating nuclear weapons in the world's scale was rejected, first of all by nuclear club members. Why do these countries, under the "nuclear apartheid", recommend the way of security policy to India? Through its nuclear tests in May, 1998 India repositioned itself from one of the leaders of the Third World to being a serious candidate for major-power status, accordingly to realpolitics. India has already made it clear that it aims to develop a credible minimum nuclear deterrent and it enunciated a nuclear doctrine that pledges no first use of nuclear weapons.

The Republic of India is a very bright example of how nations of the modern world could manage their transition under the rules of Globalization. Globalization means not only integration with the world economy, it brings the influence of external forces into traditional society. Globalization has challenged Eastern societies, their economy and culture through belief in progress, economic development and deep interdependent on the world's scales. Western dominated globalization has placed non-western countries into absolutely special position. It has given rise to a great number of contradictions, as well as to new ambitions of these countries. Also, globalization stands for the continuous process of domination over others by a few nations. Such approach has never been accepted in India, it has consciously promoted multi-polarity in international relations. It is well corresponded with ancient idea "*vasudhiva kutumbakam*" – "the whole world is one family". M. Gandhi stressed many times that he believes this ideal: there could be only one world devoting itself in friendly cooperation between the different parts to the advancement of humanity, where "we will live in harmony with the rest of the world" [12, p. 79]. Now this ancient tradition of unity could be re-discovered with the issue of the establishment of more justified multi-polar world order. Globalization should not become the worldwide manifestation of strong overpowering the weak, both in politics and economics, instead it should pave the way for a federation of friendly inter-dependent nations, that is Indian understanding. So, main traditional values that have helped shaping India's foreign policy are: "tolerance, the equation of means and ends, and non-violence" [11, p. 19].

It is evident that Indian foreign policy has to adapt to the rapidly changing global scenario. But it is absolutely evident too that India has any idea to reject its traditional priorities rooted in the spiritual heritage. This is important because India would like a polycentric world in which it has good relations with all nations; it needs to live in harmony to be able to deal with its pressing domestic problems. India would not want a bipolar understanding emerging between China and the United States because that would reduce the space for strategic manoeuvrability, and that is a reason of strategic partnership between India and Russia and India and EU. For both India and Russia, a desire for a multipolar world without Western domination, became a crucial idea, which caused the cooperation on both bilateral and multilateral levels. Therefore, reinventing Indo-Russian relations is an important

task facing the political leadership of both countries, who must find ways to rejuvenate the confluence of political and strategic interests if the relationship must break out of its current shackles. As the Asia-Pacific region will remain the locus of economic development in the coming decades, a dialog with the major Asian powers, which should first involve India and China, is an absolute necessity for main international actors like the US and the European Union. That is a reason why so many ways of collaboration have been created in 21st century between India and the EU, two democratic giants with the same mottoes; "United in diversity". Another good reason to be mentioned here is the same intention to create multi-centric global order, not unipolarity. At the same time, strategic partnership with The United States has been shaped by realistic approach and new international agenda, as well as a huge and extremely successful Indian diaspora in the US, where Indian Americans became a bridge between two nations.

Another important relationship, especially under 21st as "Asian century" motto, is definitely India-China partnership and rivalry. There are some important issues which should be undermined by specialists in the sphere of international relations: competitive character of India-China peaceful coexistence; current position in the modern international order; economic, military, scientific and technologic potential of both; privileges for the further development and integration to the process of globalization; level of influence in the regional and global security systems. Objective reality is that India and China have to coexist in the modern multi-polar globalized world. It is a new transformation of very popular idea, proposed by K.M. Panikkar in the middle of 20th century, which has deeply influenced political elite in the new independent India and resulted in "panchasheela" principles of peaceful coexistence. Two greatest Asian civilizations have many common characteristics, and at the same time, they are still estimated as rivals, with many unsolved problems of the past, starting with the border issue. No doubt, this direction will be one of the priorities of India's foreign policy for the nearest period, if not forever.

"As India emerges in the 21st century, evolving gradually into a middle-in-come country with increasingly global interests, it will find itself adapting to a rapidly evolving international system. India's resources today are greater than at any time in its history, and it no longer confronts existential threats" [10]. In common, contemporary India has to continue with a very pro-active diplomacy and peaceful policy of so called "positive neutrality", aimed in ensuring the national interests protection. "From non-alignment to multi-alignment with all the actors possible" – this is a way, how the foreign policy of N. Modi, current PM of India is widely estimated. The one, who proposes truly beneficial cooperation with India, will win.

Current position. In fact, since May, 2014 the government of India and N. Modi himself being absolutely nationalist in his approaches, started to implement well-known traditional principles with the aim to make India "great again". One of those principles is the idea of *swadesh* – home production, once proposed by M. Gandhi together with *swaraj*, *ahimsa* and *satyagraha*. Swadeshi in current position means first of all fast development, full support to domestic production, and proud to consume Indian products. Here we can see another example how the old ideals could survive and be implemented under absolutely new scenario. One more example how ancient regulations of Indian civilization, old and traditional, extremely complex and pluralistic, could work in modern times is Indian federalism. Many scholars believe, it was "Unity of diversity" principle which eventually led to a federal structure of the state after independence [20, p. 4].

Let's remind ourselves, that many of India's nation-states have a size and population larger than most European countries (Maharashtra with 12 million or West Bengal with 92 million). Really, it's a tribute to civilizational values that such huge entities of diverse people – in language, culture and religion could create an effective federal structure. The interconnection between federalism, secularism and democracy in Indian conditions is absolutely visible.

Secularism is said to be run from the bloodstream of India, where every known confession may be found. It is one of the basic principles of Indian nation since independence. Still, there are some threats, which should not be ignored. "Revivalism, casteism, communalism and regionalism are some of the disvalues which have emerged as a result of the development after independence" [17, p. 36].

Modern India – is not only fast developing nation, with all chances to be 3rd world's economy in nearest decades, one of the leading states in indigenous high technologies, it is named also the greatest world's democracy with 700 million looking forward young generation. Despite the complicated starting period after Independence, modern India rapidly went on to a series of political and economic successes. Its bold decision to provide democratic governance after centuries of colonial rule has proved to be sustainable. The Nobel Prize Winner, economist A. Sen, noted: "India's record in pioneering democratic governance in the Non-Western world is a widely acknowledged accomplishment, as its basic success in a maintaining a secular state, despite the challenges arising from its thoroughly multi-religious population and the hugely problematic history of violence around the ending days of the Raj" [16, p. 1]. At the same time, democracy should not explain slow transformation, even many Indian scholars consider India to be "50-50" democracy, because of casteism, nepotism, corruption and slow social transformation. Noted prof. R. Guha noticed in his famous "India without Gandhi" that it was really 50-50 success story of independent India democratic development [5]. Caste democracy and non-engagement with progressive methods have been criticized by many eminent Asian leaders, firstly by former Singapore PM. Mr. Lee Kuan Yew had an easy and often warm relationship with Indian leaders, he was caustic in his criticism of how India had developed post-Independence. His view that India was "not a real country", but "32 separate nations that happen to be arrayed along the British rail line", and his scathing criticism of its leadership and bureaucracy that were in his words "feudal" made many see him as anti-India. In 2005, Mr. Lee was invited to deliver the Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial lecture in New Delhi. It was here that he finally acknowledged India was on the path to progress, albeit a "slow and faltering" one. "India must make up for much time lost" Mr. Lee told the Indian audience [7]. But it's also well-known that Lee Kuan Yew believed in India's capacity to balance China in Asia, at least to some level, and he obviously noticed some privileges India possesses, like English as the language of education and inter-Indian communication. He did not pay much attention to democracy, as he was always mostly concerned about economic development, not political systems.

Still, India is considered the world's biggest democracy with 814 million people eligible to vote in Parliamentary elections of 2014. Actually, India's greatest achievement in democracy construction has been holding free and fair elections. Due to the complexity of electoral system and huge population, the voting process to determine the composition of the lower house of Parliament (545 seats), takes place during 5 phases. Last elections brought the victory to Narendra Modi, a candidate of BJP with strong nationalist vision of former Indian transformation. His work as a gov-

ernor of Gujarat promoted truly impressive transition in the state, which demonstrated 12,5% annual economic growth. Such success, together with his plans to fight corruption led to his brilliant victory at the elections: N. Modi came to power after 2 terms of INC-controlled government with the slogan "Nationalism is our strength, development and effective governance are our goals".

After 3 years, N. Modi's government launched a series of companies to change India, like "Make in India" (regarding swadeshi ideas), "100 smart cities", "Digital India", "Swaccha Bharat" (Clean India) etc. [13] Now, many experts estimated his governance as one of the most active, both internally and internationally. And nothing is bad with nationalism, as the ideology which once showed India the way to independence. At the same time, also voices of trouble arisen about the revival of Hindutwa's ideas, which are estimated kike chauvinistic, even not simply nationalistic. First of all, it means the restoration of "India for Hindus" principle, and unfortunately, there are some facts to prove it. One of the most quoted is about new laws to ban beef consumptions and consequences they provoked. "In the wake of a number of well-publicised incidents of lynching and mob violence, most of them related to issues surrounding cattle trade or beef consumption, a narrative Lynchistan has taken hold that there's been a spike in the incidents of lynchings and mob violence. In one telling, such violence has increased after the election of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) at the center in May 2014" [18]. So, many citizens believe that Prime Minister appears to understand better than many that cow related vigilantism, and perhaps communal violence, is a growing problem in India and it really could defame Prime Minister, the BJP, and the image of India both at home and abroad. This is not only example of right-wing changes in modern Indian society, other communal issues, together with "caste democracy", gender issue and linguistic variety (every 10"km language is changing, they have a joke!) created a space for concern and instability. Muslims are freer to practice their faith in India than, for example, Muslims in China, but at the same time they suffer disproportionately in times of communal rioting. Even in times of peace they can be shunned or stigmatized. Also, "Women and Dalits are still discriminated and exploited but are less unfree now than at any time in the past 5.000 years" R. Guha mentioned [5].

Actually, modern India has to demonstrate more intention to implement, not only proclaim traditional moral priorities. India's successes may in fact make it a more attractive target for those intent on threatening Indian values. Indian society by now lives with rising expectations, where everyone wants more, also, this society suffers from internal injustices, political and economic, and a number of disunities. Another negative trend is that we can see not only chauvinist but some revanchist steps, unfortunately, with the obvious revival of **Akhanda Bharat** idea, mentioned previously. Finally, despite a very impressive progress done during the independence era, economic liberalization and fasten rise of the last decades, social problems of 2/3 of Indian population are waiting for the nearest solutions. By the words of A. Sen, "since India's recent record of fast economic growth is often celebrated, with good reasons, it is extremely important to point to the fact that the social reach of economic progress in India has been remarkably limited" [15, p. 8]. Democratic pressures have gone in other directions rather than rectifying the major injustices of contemporary India, which are of economic, not only social character.

Conclusion. India is an ancient civilization with great tradition of tolerance. This tradition has been adopted by Gandhi and disseminated throughout the world by the Indian position in the international affairs too. The whole family

of nations should put the gratitude to a man who called himself "a politician who tries to be a saint" and proved that it is possible. His activity was commemorated once again by the 61-t session of UN Assembly in the special resolution on celebrating The International Day of Non-violence, October 2, Mohamdass Karamchand Gandhi's birthday. As the motherland of non-violence, India is widely recognized as a peaceful nation, with the great traditions of intercommunication and co-existence, rooted in its own diversity. This amazing "diversity of everything" also has a framework of unity, which has been proved in the independent period by many successful achievements, like secular federal state and establishment of democratic institutions. At the same time, unique Indian experiment with diversity should be continued by stronger efforts of present time leaders and public society to preserve tolerance in its every way, otherwise there is a threat to lose the glory of ancient times, glory of non-violent nation and peaceful civilization.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Kalam Abdul A.P.J. India 2020: Vision for the New Millennium / A.P.J. Abdul Kalam, Y.S. Rajan. – New Delhi : Penguin Books, 1998. – 324 p.
2. Dixit J.N. Makers of Indian foreign policy / J.N. Dixit. – New Delhi : Harper Collins Publishers India, 2004. – 160 p.
3. Dube S.C. Indian Society / S.C. Dube. – New Delhi : National Book Trust, 2001. – 147 p.
4. Gandhi M. What is Hinduism? / M. Gandhi. – New Delhi : National Book Trust, 2004. – 134 p.
5. Guha R. India after Gandhi. The History of the World's Largest Democracy / Ramachandra Guha. – N. Y. : Harper Collins, 2007. – 893 p.
6. Gupta D. Interrogating Caste. Understanding Hierarchy and Difference in Indian Society / Dipankar Gupta. – New Delhi : Penguin Books, 2000. – 300 p.
7. Haidar S. Lee was disappointed with India [Electronic source] / S. Haidar // The Hindu. – 2015, March 23. – Access mode : <http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/lee-kuan-yew-didnt-dislike-india-he-was-disappointed-by-india/article7023579.ece>.
8. Jaffrelot C. This Land, this Nation. Akhand Bharat is a mainstay of Hindu nationalism – because land plays a key role in its ideology [Electronic source] / C. Jaffrelot // The Indian Express. – 2008, January 12. – Access mode : <http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/this-land-this-nation>.
9. Jaishankar D. Indian Strategy in a Non-Strategic Age / D. Jaishankar // India Now and in Transition / Ed. by Athul K. Thakur. – New Delhi : Niyogi Books. – Pp. 277–286.
10. Khanna V.N. Foreign Policy of India / V.N. Khanna. – New Delhi : Vikas Publishing House, 2007. – 358 p.
11. Kripalani K. Gandhi: A Life / Krishna Kripalani. – New Delhi : Motilal Banarsidas, 1993.
12. Mahurkar U. Marching with a Billion. Analyzing Narendra Modi's Government at Midterm / Uday Mahurkar. – New Delhi : Penguin Books, 2017. – 288 p.
13. Merchant M. The New Clash of Civilizations / Minhaz Merchant. – Delhi : Rainlight, 2013. – 314 p.
14. Ranganathan A. Pakistan – Good buy and Good luck! [Electronic source] / A. Ranganathan // Newslandry.com. – 2013, May 3. – Access mode : <https://www.newslandry.com/2013/05/03/pakistan-goodbye-good-luck>.

О. Борділовська, канд. іст. наук, д-р політ. наук, доц.
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

ОСНОВИ І ЦІННОСТІ ІНДІЙСЬКОЇ ЦИВІЛІЗАЦІЇ ВІД СТАРОДАВНІХ ЧАСІВ ДО СУЧАСНОСТІ

Індія, одна із найстаріших у світі цивілізацій, є унікальною завдяки неперервним традиціям. У ній зародилися чотири релігії – індуїзм, джайнізм, буддизм і сикхізм, які відомі головним чином своїми принципами мирного співіснування та ненасильства. Географія, історія, етнічне та мовне розмаїття, соціальна структура разом із релігійними принципами обумовили цей дивовижний цивілізаційний плюралізм, який потребував терпимості. Саме такі принципи заклали основу як внутрішньої, так і зовнішньої політики незалежної Індії. У статті розглянуто цю неперервність цивілізаційних цінностей, а також досліджено виклики традиціям у процесі сучасного розвитку Індії.

Ключові слова: індійська цивілізація, традиційні цінності, терпимість, єдність у розмаїтті, шлях Ганді, ahimsa, vasudhaiv kutumbakam.

15. Sen A. Dreze J. An Uncertain Glory. India and Its Contradictions / Jean Drèze, Amartya Sen. – Princeton : Princeton University Press, 2013. – 433 p.
16. Singh Y. Social Change in India. Crises and Resilience / Yogendra Singh. – New Delhi : Har-Anand Publications, 1993. – 246 p.
17. Subramanya R. Has India Become "Lynchistan"? Observer Research Foundation [Electronic source] / R. Subramanya. – 2017, July 01. – Access mode : <http://www.orfonline.org/expert-speaks/has-india-become-lynchistan>.
18. Tharoor Sh. India. From Midnight to the Millennium / Shashi Tharoor. – New Delhi : Penguin Books, 2000. – 392 p.
19. The Success of Indian Democracy / Ed. Adul Kohli. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2001. – 298 p.

References

20. KALAM, Abdul A.P.J.; RAJAN, Y.S. (1998) *India 2020: Vision for the New Millennium*. New Delhi : Penguin Books.
21. DIXIT, J.N. (2004) *Makers of Indian foreign policy*. New Delhi : Harper Collins Publishers India.
22. DUBE, S.C. (2001) *Indian Society*. New Delhi : National Book Trust.
23. GANDHI, M. (2004) *What is Hinduism?* New Delhi : National Book Trust.
24. GUHA, R. (2007) *India after Gandhi. The History of the World's Largest Democracy*. N. Y. : Harper Collins.
25. GUPTA, D. (2000) *Interrogating Caste. Understanding Hierarchy and Difference in Indian Society*. New Delhi : Penguin Books.
26. HAIDAR, S. (2015) Lee was disappointed with India. *The Hindu* [Online] March 23. Available from: <http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/lee-kuan-yew-didnt-dislike-india-he-was-disappointed-by-india/article7023579.ece>.
27. JAFFRELOT, C. (2016) This Land, this Nation. Akhand Bharat is a mainstay of Hindu nationalism – because land plays a key role in its ideology. *The Indian Express* [Online]. January 12. Available from: <http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/this-land-this-nation>.
28. JAISHANKAR, D. (2017) Indian Strategy in a Non-Strategic Age. In: Athul K. Thakur, ed. *India Now and in Transition*. New Delhi : Niyogi Books, pp. 277–286.
29. KHANNA, V.N. (2007) *Foreign Policy of India*. New Delhi : Vikas Publishing House.
30. KRIPALANI, K. (1993) *Gandhi: A Life*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas.
31. MAHURKAR, U. (2017) *Marching with a Billion. Analyzing Narendra Modi's Government at Midterm*. New Delhi : Penguin Books.
32. MERCHANT, M. (2013) *The New Clash of Civilizations*. New Delhi : Rainlight.
33. RANGANATHAN, A. (2013) Pakistan – Good buy and Good luck! *Newslandry.com* [Online] May 3. Available from : <https://www.newslandry.com/2013/05/03/pakistan-goodbye-good-luck>.
34. SEN, A.; DREZE, J. (2013) *An Uncertain Glory. India and Its Contradictions*. Princeton : Princeton University Press.
35. SINGH, Y. (1993) *Social Change in India. Crises and Resilience*. New Delhi : Har-Anand Publications.
36. SUBRAMANYA, R. (2017) Has India Become "Lynchistan"? *Observer Research Foundation*. [Online] July 01. Available from : <http://www.orfonline.org/expert-speaks/has-india-become-lynchistan>.
37. THAROOR, Sh. (2000) *India. From Midnight to the Millennium*. New Delhi : Penguin Books.
38. KOHLI, A., ed. (2001) *The Success of Indian Democracy*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Надійшла до редколегії 08.01.2018