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Abstract

This article explores the impact of Leo Tolstoy’s doctrine of non-violence on Mahatma Gandhi through following research model of intertextuality modified by Charles Bazerman. It provides a new perspective for juxtaposing the views of Gandhi and Tolstoy. The links and affinities established between Tolstoy and Gandhi not only appear like that of two literary writers but also like that of a Master and Disciple. The technique of intertextuality as an umbrella term specifically interpreted by Bazerman has been helpful in placing the views of both writers in a verifiable form. Through keeping in view five different aspects of intertextual analysis, and comparing the views of both writers, Tolstoy’s inspirational role in the development of Gandhi’s views on non-violence has been established. It has been safely concluded that Gandhi could hardly rise to his current global position if he did not choose to be a humble servant of Leo Tolstoy.
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Introduction

The doctrine of non-violence as a strategy for any social, political, or religious struggle may be globally recognized. It is generally believed that violence may be naturally involved in any freedom movement. However, an overwhelming consensus exists among majority of the scholars that, the credit in the success of Indian freedom struggle goes to its violence-free mode. Although majority of leaders associated to Indian freedom struggle supported non-violent policy, but Gandhi
openly preached for non-violence as a root of his political philosophy. This article explores the roots of Non-violence in Gandhi’s political thought.

The views of Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910) composed in his well-known work “The Kingdom of God is within You” (1894) apparently inspired young Gandhi. Leo Tolstoy’s assertion in Chapter VIII of this work disseminating the doctrine of non-resistance to Evil by force, has perhaps educated Gandhi to fight against colonialism as an Evil without using any force or violence. It proved to be a turning point in Gandhi’s life who began to look for guidance in Tolstoy’s thought. Tolstoy’s suggestions, logically appealing and viable instructions to the exponents or leaders of Indian freedom movement through “A Letter to a Hindu” (Tolstoy, 2020) a piece of literature, seemingly provided an opportunity to Mahatma Gandhi to materialize his dream. He started correspondence with Tolstoy and gradually developed his doctrine non-violence on the foundation of Tolstoy’s views.

The significance of Gandhi’s comparison with Tolstoy is no more a debatable idea. It becomes more important when they are juxtaposed as a Master and the follower. Through reading the correspondence between Gandhi and Tolstoy (Murphy 1987) the reader is enlightened to see the common direction of both writers. Their search for truth and practice of love and non-violence to find out solutions to many difficult problems provides necessary motivation for juxtaposing them on specific issues. When a young Indian man and an aged writer from Russia having completely different geographical, social, religious, and political conditions are placed side by side the reader is either surprised by their identical views or an impact of one on the other’s views appears to be visible. How the quest for truth in Gandhi gets a path in Tolstoy’s writings. Joseph J. Doke, a Gandhi’s biographer observes: “Undoubtedly Tolstoy has profoundly influenced him. The old Russian reformer, in the simplicity of his life, the fearlessness of his utterances, and the nature of his teachings on war and work, has found a warm-hearted disciple in Mr. Gandhi” (Doke 1919, p.88).

On the unity of all religions, both writers show almost identical views. Tolstoy espouses that “religions differ in their external forms but they are all alike in their fundamental principles. And it is just these fundamental principles of all religions which constitute that true religion which alone today is natural to all men, and the acceptance of which can alone save men from their calamities”(Tolstoy 1934, p.270). Gandhi’s views also reflect the same unity of religions. Love seems to be the core of religion for both writers. A comparative analysis of both writers may help to understand the presence of global religious harmony at least in literature.

Tolstoy’s religion is based on his quest for truth through rejecting traditional church. He declares, “the ultimate fact of man’s knowledge of goodness, that of god, directly through reason and conscience, will be as clear and certain as ever, and it will be seen that we are dealing with truths that can never perish-truths humanity can never afford to part with”(Tolstoy 1958, p.386)
Gandhi also expresses his views in the same vein, “his life was a constant endeavor, an unbroken tide of strivings to seek the truth, and to practice it as he found it.” (Tendulkar 1960, p.418). A juxtaposition of Tolstoy and Gandhi may give an opportunity to evaluate their identical views from a new angle.

Tolstoy’s doctrine of non-resistance provides necessary guidelines for developing society through reconstructing social values and removing all evils like, usurpation, violence, bloodshed, and inequality. Non-resistance is also at the center of Tolstoy’s vision and social philosophy. A similar stance is shown by Gandhi in some of his popular writings. In this way, it appears to be logically more appropriate to make a comparative analysis of Gandhi and Tolstoy through following the technique of intertextuality. It provides an image of Tolstoy, as a master, teaching the lesson of non-violence to his disciple. In other words, the impact of Tolstoy’s thought on Gandhi’s views is clearly highlighted.

Existing Scholarship

To discuss existing scholarship on the doctrine of non-violence with special reference to Leo Tolstoy and Mahatma Gandhi is important. However, it is neither possible nor the scope of this article to discuss all or even majority of the works on the subject. Non-violence not only appears to be the part of human nature but also the subject-matter of all academic, social, political, and religious discourse. A vast majority of critics and research scholars have been exploring Tolstoy and Gandhi through juxtaposing their views on non-violence. However, in the available space, the writings of only few of the most prominent writers can be pinned down.

In the “Contemporary Icons of Nonviolence” (Hamling 2019) edited by Anna Hamling, the supporters of non-violence have been regarded as ‘Icons’. The recognized icons represent different religious communities including Christianity, Hinduism, Jainism, and Islam. The work is focused on non-violence through dividing it into nine chapters. In the first chapter, Tolstoy’s concept of non-violence is interpreted from its religious perspective. Tolstoy’s philosophy of non-violence is based on conscience, the voice of God within the human. In chapter two and three, Gandhi is presented as a non-violent modernist and his poetics of non-violent India. Martin Luther King Jr’s theory of non-violent action is deliberated in fourth chapter while his understanding of violence and non-violence as alternative values at the disposal of human choice is highlighted in the fifth chapter.

On the other hand, in chapter six, Abdul Ghaffar Khan’s theory of non-violence is examined as a motivating force for the construction of Islamic Pacifism in Pakistan. It was perhaps for this reason that, he was known as Islamic Gandhi. Chapter seven is focused on the power of Oscar Romero; the Archbishop of San Salvador is shown as an icon non-violence. In chapter eight, the writer examines the evolution of Nelson Mandela’s political philosophy, especially with
regards to apartheid in South Africa. Chapter nine explores Prince Karim Agha Khan’s contributions in social change and non-violent civil reshaping of the public square. In this way, the works, and the words of recognized icons of non-violence have been duly honoured.

Lavrin (1960, pp.132-139) examines the link of Tolstoy and Gandhi. Lavrin advocates that their combined discussion in academic and political circles may not be regarded as something surprising. In Russian society, even some important personalities like Lunacharsky, late commissar of Soviet education did not hesitate in using the word Hindu Tolstoy for Gandhi. In his letter on April 4, 1910, Gandhi pays his tribute to Tolstoy by regarding him a great thinker and moralist. He expresses his sense of gratitude to Tolstoy for accepting him in the circle of his followers. Tolstoy’s impact is visible on Gandhi’s doctrine of non-violence. Lavrin argues that similarity in their views is evident by virtue of their identical basis of their philosophy i.e., love and non-violence.

Coovadia (2020, pp.02-13) evaluates Tolstoy, Gandhi, and Mandela through espousing the common points of their social and political philosophy. Their views according to Coovadia, are based on possibilities of non-violence in the presence of violence. Tolstoy spoke against his own class, Gandhi read Tolstoy’s “Kingdom of God is within You” in South Africa and began to follow his path. Nelson Mandela, as a prisoner read Tolstoy’s “War and Peace” on Robben Island and became follower of Tolstoy and successor to Gandhi. They tried to create new types of political organization and imagination to replace the old promises of revolution. Their views, ways are closely connected. One point on which all of them are in total agreement is that they preferred and prepared to take part in a general peace.

Shifman and Esaulov (1960, pp.5-20) examine the role of Tolstoy’s writings in reshaping Gandhian thought. They believe that Gandhi’s first struggle was against racial discrimination in Transvaal. Gandhi had read Tolstoy’s book The Kingdom of God is Within You long before he started correspondence with him. It means that Gandhi had already adopted Tolstoy’s concept of non-violence before he was exposed to ‘A Letter to a Hindu’. Tolstoy’s truthfulness and higher level of morality had impressed young Gandhi to modify his thinking in line with Tolstoy’s views. Tolstoy’s independent thinking gave him a new direction where Gandhi left reading most of the books his best friend suggested him to read. To play an important role in the destiny of his homeland, Gandhi’s inclination to follow Tolstoy’s philosophy was perhaps a natural reaction by a staunch nationalist.

Mehta (1969, pp.343-349) suggests that Gandhi was deeply influenced by three modern writers i.e., Rachand bhai, Tolstoy, and Ruskin. Rachand bhai’s living contact, Ruskin’s Unto this Last, and Tolstoy’s The Kingdom of God is within You, had greater inspirational role in Tolstoy’s conceptual development. However, Tolstoy’s works had special impact on his thought. Tolstoy’s works made him realize that there are countless possibilities for universal love in this life. It helped
him to cure his distrust and skepticism and promote his unshakable belief in non-violence. Tolstoy and Gandhi had religion at the Centre of their lives. Both believe that science cannot provide an alternative to religion. Religion makes a rational man through providing guidelines about what to do first, second, and third. Both believe in the existence of God and that God in Human heart is something illimitable in limited being.

Lal (2009, pp.281-313) argues that Gandhi started his journey from India to London and South Africa before returning to India to be introduced as an iconic figure. He maintained his relationship with the west yet, the status of such relationship remained uncertain because of his position against western civilization he called “Satanic”. On the other hand, Leo Tolstoy, Henry David Thoreau, and John Ruskin exercised greater influence on Gandhi. In spite of having critical opinion about western civilization, Gandhi did not lose his British, European, and American friends. Lal’s argument particularly seems to be relevant that, the west has, reciprocated Gandhi’s ambivalence in an appropriate way. Gandhi is followed only for being a saintly figure and the apostle of non-violence.

Green (1981, pp.166-177) provides necessary information about Tolstoy’s writings which received positive response of an overwhelming majority of readers. Green claims that his popularity rests primarily on two novels i.e., War and Peace, and Anna Karenina. However, Tolstoy’s unconventional beliefs have given him more reputation than his novels. Martin Green tries to explore the evolution of his disruptive ideas which influenced his contemporary writers and their views. It was perhaps the impact of Tolstoy’s unconventional ideas that, Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi. He could be known as a social reformer and benefactor of his own people, but he spent whole of his life in fighting against himself, his family, his fame and even his fortune.

Hunt (1998, pp.83-95) states that whatever Gandhi achieved in India was actually the fruit of his efforts in South Africa. The training he offered to his disciples in the Tolstoy farm was truly the essence of his followers. His South African experience greatly helped him in establishing Ashram in Ahmedabad. As it was near the central jail in Ahmedabad, Gandhi attached symbolic importance to it. He professed that the training in the Ashram was focused on self-discipline and building habit of leading plain and simple life. If the followers of Gandhi are sent to jail, they will not miss anything. Their sufferings for truth will be a blessing in disguise. Even when the whole India is transformed into prison the soul of the people will be free and the alien power will not be able to restrict their freedom. The credit of such a rigorous moral training goes to his spiritual master Leo Tolstoy.

Rivett (1988, pp.29-56) seeks to throw light on Gandhi’s policy of non-violent non-cooperation by comparing his ideas with the ideas of Leo Tolstoy apparently known to be his spiritual Master. However, some ideas projected and promoted by Gandhi are directly in conflict with those of Leo Tolstoy. Gandhi also shared some of his own ideas and mixed them with those
of Tolstoy which Tolstoy never shared in his whole life. The views of Tolstoy communicated to Gandhi either through his books or his personal letters. Confusion is naturally built when one person’s ideas are disseminated by two different sources.

Kenneth Rivett claims with reference to one of Gandhi’s scholars that Gandhi’s Satyagraha is quite a different thing from Tolstoy’s non-violence. Tolstoy believed it was possible and easy to check the power of tyrants without hurting them. Gandhi also thought it was possible but did not think it easy. The writers, critics, and researchers have compared Tolstoy and Gandhi to find out similarities in their ideas. However, there is a need to follow new model for their comparative analysis. Bazerman’s model provides theoretical framework for an intertextual analysis of the impact of Tolstoy’s doctrine of non-violence on Mahatma Gandhi.

**Intertextual Analysis**

The current article is developed through following literary technique of intertextuality, a method of study mostly followed in comparative literature. It may be elaborated as a tool of research to establish a link of a text or utterance to existing text or idea. Bazerman (2004) examines intertextuality through espousing that “for purposes of analysis we may distinguish the different levels at which a text explicitly invokes another text and relies on the other text as a conscious resource”\(^{14}\). He sets some basic principles to be followed in intertextual analysis (pages 86-88). These principles can be expounded through answering two different questions i.e., How intertextuality occurs? and how to trace or recognize intertextuality?

The principles of intertextuality may be interpreted as (1) “The text may draw on prior texts as a source of meanings to be used at face value. This occurs whenever one text takes statements from another source as authoritative and then repeats that authoritative information or statement for the purposes of the new text” (Bazerman 2004, p.86), (2) “the text may rely on beliefs, issues, ideas, statements generally circulated and likely familiar to the readers, whether they would attribute the material to a specific source or would just understand as common knowledge” Bazerman 2004, p.87), and (3) “a text relies on the available resources of language without calling particular attention to the intertext. Every text, all the time, relies on the available language of the period, and is part of the cultural world of the times” (Bazerman 2004, p.88). In this way intertextuality appears to be based on meaning, concept, and language.

While looking for the answer to second question, the reader may keep in view the principles suggested by Bazerman (2004), Intertextuality can be recognized through focusing on certain techniques followed by second author to establish links between the texts, views, comments, and suggestions of first author on specific subject matter. These techniques can be discussed and pinned down as follows:
Fig. 1: Bazerman’s Intertextuality Framework

1. **Direct Quotation**: It is usually available in quotation marks in the body of new text by second author. Although the second author quotes original words from the text of first author yet the words being quoted are exclusively used by second author in particular context.

2. **Indirect Quotation**: This usually refers to the idea in another text without using the words from original source. It is a form of summary. The words used by second author (quoting author) usually represent his own understanding of the text or his interpretation of idea in his own specific context.

3. **Mentioning a person or document**: The second author usually relies on his own acquaintance with the author or original source of information while mentioning the name of person or document. He does not need to explain ideas of other writer in detail and usually is in better position to manipulate information in a better way than original source or author.

4. **Evaluation of a statement or text**: The writer of second text evaluates the weakness of original statement or text and the second author’s judgement is passed against original source or text. To examine a statement critically gives the reader or second author an edge over the writer of first text. It helps to recognize intertextual relation of both writers.

5. **Using recognizable Phrasing**: The use words or statements by second author in a text without any reference to a text already available in the writing of another author(allusion) may be interpreted as an intertextual relationship. It can be stated that all forms of intertextuality (quoting, paraphrasing, mentioning, evaluating, recognizable phrasing) can be easily recognized and analyzed.

Keeping in view the principles of intertextuality suggested by Bazerman (2004), the views of Tolstoy and Gandhi can be examined. Virginia Hartt Ringer’s statement in the opening lines of “Mahatma Gandhi and Leo Tolstoy Letters” confirms Tolstoy’s impact on Gandhi’s views. She states that, “the foundation of Gandhi’s religious and political philosophy was rooted in his South
African experience where his thoughts on these matters were first matured and launched into practice under the marked influence of Tolstoy” (Murphy 1987, p.5). Although V.H. Ringer’s opinion apparently seems to be personal however, enough details are available to confirm her assertion.

One of the major sources of information about the views of Tolstoy and Gandhi is the text of their letters. The correspondence shows that there are “similarities in their thinking and ideals and the profound influence Tolstoy had on Gandhi’s life and thought. They became such good friends that Tolstoy struggled to continue their correspondence even during his last days of illness and pain” (Murphy 1987, p.10). It gives an impression that the difference of age, culture, language, and geography did not hinder Tolstoy’s views to travel from Russia to India. It appears to be evident that on intellectual ground both were companionable.

The critics of Tolstoy believe that similarity of views does not place Tolstoy at the rank of Master. Anyhow, aged Tolstoy’s writings had some attraction for young man in India. It was perhaps Gandhi’s personal interest in the philosophy of non-resistance which helped him to come closer to Russian Master. Murphy rightly observes, “Gandhi enthusiastically became a disciple of Leo Tolstoy and inherited the difficult “search for Truth” which had preoccupied Tolstoy for much of his life. Gandhi was particularly interested in Tolstoy’s writings on non-resistance” (Murphy 1987, p.12).

Both writers believe in love for mankind at the Centre of all religions. It is love that paves the way for non-violence, a key point of their philosophy. Gandhi argues that love is manifested in non-violence (Ahimsa). Gandhi’s non-violence has two forms i.e., negative (not injuring) and positive (Charity), “I may not, therefore, hurt the person of any wrong-doer or bear any ill-will to him and so cause him mental suffering. In its positive form, Ahimsa means the largest love, the greatest charity” (Murphy 1987, p.15). It seems to be derived from Tolstoy’s assertion that, “God dwells in all of us and therefore man recognizes God in himself through love and extends this love to all men. Man needs to let love in and squeeze out hatred, guile, and vengeance from his being” (Murphy 1987, p.14).

During his stay in South Africa, Gandhi devised the term, Satyagraha, which means insistence on truth" (Satya "truth"; agraha "insistence"). It defined the principles of passive resistance. Gandhi argues, "I do not like the term 'passive resistance,' it fails to convey all I mean. It describes a method but gives no hint of the system of which it is only a part. Real beauty, and that is my aim, is in doing good against evil” (Doke 1919, p.89) Gandhi’s concept of non-resistance or passive resistance also appears to be borrowed from Tolstoy’s writings. And that, “Gandhi was profoundly impressed by Tolstoy's doctrines of non-resistance, bread labour, and non-possession” (Murphy 1987, p.18).

Gandhi mentioned the name of Tolstoy to give special identity to his ashram (spiritual hermitage or monastery) in South Africa, named Tolstoy Farm. It was perhaps a training Centre for the followers of Gandhi to make practice and live in accordance with the principles of
Satyagraha (bread, labour, non-possession) which seem to be derived from Tolstoy’s writings. Tolstoy’s views had long lasting impact on Gandhian thought and “Gandhi later continued the ideals of Tolstoy Farm at Sabaramati Ashram near Ahmedabad, India, where the members took vows of truth, non-violence, non-possession and fearlessness” (Murphy 1987, p.18).

While addressing the people of India and advising them to follow non-violent ways of resistance, he declares that “If we do not want the English in India, we must pay the price. Tolstoy indicates it. ‘Do not resist evil, but also do not yourselves participate in evil-in the violent deeds of the administration of the law courts, the collection of taxes and, what is more important, of the soldiers, and no one in the world will enslave you’” (Murphy 1987, p.42). The statement is directly quoted by M.K. Gandhi from Tolstoy’s well-known piece of writing, A letter to a Hindu (Tolstoy 2020, chapter-V, pp.20-23).

Gandhi’s assertion of using non-violence for attaining maximum power also appears to be derived from Tolstoy’s thought. Gandhi asserts that, “the task before nationalists is clear. They must win over by their genuine love all minorities including Englishmen. Indian nationalism if it is to remain non-violent, cannot be exclusive” (Dalton 2000, p.30). It is perhaps based on Tolstoy’s views in his work, A Letter to a Hindu, which states that, “If the people of India are enslaved by violence it is only because they themselves live and have lived by violence, and do not recognize the eternal law of love inherent in humanity” (Tolstoy 2020, pp.20-23).

Gandhi believes in non-violence as a doctrine of life. It is conscience which guides a man to identify any difference of good and evil. Gandhian way of fighting against evil does not allow any violence, He indicates that, “genuine non-violence means not only non-cooperation with glaring social evils, but also the renunciation of benefits and privileges that are implicitly guaranteed by forces which conscience cannot accept” (Merton 1965, p.51). It seems to be the outcome of his reading of Tolstoy’s “The Kingdom of God is Within you” which suggests, “am I, or am I not, to resist by force what I regard as evil. Men resorted to violence against others and convinced themselves and others that they were directing their violence against evil recognized as such by all” (Tolstoy 1894, p.165).

Gandhi’s construal of violence as a weakness of mankind is interpreted as a state of confusion. In this way, the increasing level of violence and confusion become almost inter-reliant and result in exposure of one’s weakness. Gandhi says, “A weak man, inclined to violence, acts justly only by accident. It is the non-violent man who is consistently fair and just. Therefore, a truly free and just society must be constructed on a foundation of non-violence” (Merton 1965, p.43). It simply appears to be in line with Tolstoy’s views who claims that “Men of the present day do not merely pretend to hate oppression, inequality, class distinction, and every kind of cruelty to animals as well as human beings. They genuinely detest all this, but they do not know how to put a stop to it, or perhaps cannot decide to give up what preserves it all and seems to them necessary” (Tolstoy 1894, p.176).
Discussion

The study of Gandhi’s views on non-violence provides acceptable evidence of Tolstoy’s impact on his thought. Majority of Gandhi’s biographers profess that the concept of non-violence promoted and vastly disseminated by Gandhi is borrowed from Russian thinker and writer, Leo Tolstoy. Although the concept existed before Tolstoy, and he did not claim its originality, however, he interpreted it in the light of its Biblical connotation. In his discussion of Jesus Christ, he espouses that the Christ of love can sacrifice everything without resisting evil by force. On the other hand, Gandhi’s religion of love also demands non-violence at its core. Philosophical affinity of Gandhi and Tolstoy results in their relation as master (Tolstoy) and disciple (Gandhi).

Through following Intertextuality as a model of research, the views of Gandhi and Tolstoy have been juxtaposed for evaluation. Intertextual framework developed by Charles Bazerman (2004), has been really facilitating, accommodating, and research friendly. Different aspects of intertextual analysis included, a vast majority of statements by both writers placed side by side in the form of direct quotations, some rephrased statements, the name of Tolstoy or his writing mentioned in Gandhi’s writing, the evaluation of text or statements (of first writer) by second author, and tracing literary allusions from recognizable phrasing in the writings of first and the second writer. The application of Bazerman’s model makes this study distinguished from other similar practices.

Gandhi categorically declares that he is inspired by the writings of Tolstoy whose influence on his thought and writings is long-lasting. The term Satyagraha (insistence on truth) promoted in Tolstoy Farm is based on Tolstoy’s views of bread, labor, non-possession. And Gandhi modified and translated these principles into truth, non-violence, non-possession, and fearlessness. In other words, Gandhi’s proposition for his people to follow Tolstoy’s advice for getting rid of English from their own soil, reflects the image of his master as a guiding angel in his mind. Gandhi also proves to be a genuine follower of Tolstoy while suggesting his people to win over by love all people including their arch enemy i.e., the Englishmen.

Gandhi’s doctrine of non-violence is not only discussed as a disobedience to social evils but also to decline all offers, privileges, honours, and benefits which may come from the forces of evil or violence. Such an absolute position can be taken only under the influence of a dynamic source of guidance. Apparently, his master Leo Tolstoy through his well-known work “The Kingdom of God is Within You” seems to be proposing a stance against those who stand with evil (violence) while fighting against evil (violence). In this way, they replace an evil with another evil. Both writers consider violence as a part of human nature. It usually turns out to be the men’s major weakness, too hard to overcome.

Gandhi’s opinion appears to be pertinent and must be accepted as an appropriate comment elaborating the status of a non-violent man to be consistently fair and just. And that a society based on justice can be built only on the foundation of non-violence. It is perhaps in line with his master’s
avowal that, men in power in today’s world, not only pretend to dislike violence but they actually dislike it against either human being or animals. But they cannot avoid violence, because the society is not based on non-violence, and violence is thus a social necessity. While interpreting the doctrine of non-violence, Gandhi and Tolstoy seem to be on same page.

**Conclusion**

Through focused study of scholarship on comparative analysis of Tolstoy and Gandhi similarities in their views on the principle of non-violence have been confirmed. The impact of Tolstoy’s doctrine of non-violence has also been proved by several researchers. The critics or research scholars have been following research techniques or theoretical frameworks suitable for their respective research endeavors. Some principles of intertextuality have also been applied. However, the model for intertextual analysis developed by Charles Bazerman (2004) appeared to be an innovative technique comparatively easier to follow in juxtaposing literary themes, works or authors.

The impact of Tolstoy’s doctrine of non-violence on Mahatma Gandhi has been confirmed with maximum clarity. It can be safely concluded that the model of Intertextuality suggested by Bazerman could be successfully applied. It can be used for comparative study of literature (poetry, novel, drama), politics (constitutions, political systems, parties, manifestos), culture (dresses, celebrations, music, dance) religion(all religions of the world including Judaism, Christianity, and Islam), sociology( Social institutions), history(historical annals), and all living languages etc. Bazerman’s five points model can also be modified if need arises.
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