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This study is a systematic comparative analysis of the political ideas of the two outstanding socialist thinkers of modern India - M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan with a view to identifying, besides the well known traits, some of the subtle nuances and the less conspicuous though immensely significant features of their thought contents. Because of its focus on ideas, this study has precluded intensive treatment of the so very well known differences of biographical evolution of Roy and J.P. though their multidimensional and epoch-making personalities in the context of their changing political faiths and concepts, during the course of their lives have been analysed and compared. The impact of Roy on J.P. was not only deep but also extended over a long period of time. And yet the differences between the two were nothing less than vital. A belated recognition on the part of J.P. of his indebtedness to Roy's political ideas came to surface in 1974 when, during the Total Revolution Movement, J.P. gave a call for the recall of corrupt legislators, and advocated the formation of People's Committees in the villages and the cities.

The study is based on an intensive analysis of all the available source-materials and a series of personal interviews. The conventional methods of library research have been sought to be buttressed by modern techniques of interviews and analysis.

It has been shown that their journeys in the spheres of political ideas (from Revolutionary Nationalism to Marxism to Radical Humanism - Roy; and from Nationalism to Marxism to Total Revolution through Democratic Socialism and Sarvodaya - J.P.) though long and varied are nevertheless circuitous. Pursuit of the goals of freedom
and truth within the framework of Indian value system and through
the instrumentality of Western scientific outlook, throughout their
lives imparted a marked uniformity to the process and development
of their philosophy and a common feature of fluidity to their thought
contents occasionally leading to the common allegations of timidity,
vagueness, contradictions, indecisiveness, etc. The common factor
between Roy and J.P. is strong enough, and clearly perceptible in
their ideological development. Except for a middle period of
difference, J.P. appears to have followed the ideological trends
and leads of Roy. Of course both changed and revised quite a few
of their ideas from time to time in the light of their experiences.

Both were staunch Marxists in the early phases of their
political career and believed in scientific socialism and its
evolutionary nature. In the later phases both renounced Marxism
and came to the conclusion that Marxist socialism was not the
solution for the problems of humanity in general and India in
particular. They ended as vehement critics of Russian totalitarianism
and statism. Their thought and ideology grew to culminate
in to philosophical formulations which were far beyond Communism -
Roy developed the philosophy of Radical Humanism and J.P. that of
the Sarvodaya and Total Revolution. The Cooperative Socialism
advocated by Roy is considerably similar to that of People's
Socialism (Sarvodaya) of J.P. in terms of its pronounced human
components and all embracing comprehension. Socialism, to them,
was not merely an economic principle but a way of life. It is
interesting to note that in the evolution of socialist thought
and ideas of Roy and J.P., a premonition like phenomenon relating
to the evolution of the global Marxist movement is discernible coinciding to the course of evolution of the world Marxist movement and ideology, from strait jacketed doctrinaire Marxism to its far more liberal and perhaps humane version of present day Euro-Communism.

Again both Roy and J.P., in the beginning, were bitter critics of Gandhi and Gandhism. During his Marxian phase, J.P.'s position in this regard was no far different from that of Roy, who had criticized Lenin in his face for believing that because Gandhi was leading a mass movement he was a revolutionary. Roy had insisted that Gandhi was bound to be a reactionary socially because in his view he was a religious and cultural revivalist. Significantly, both changed their views regarding Gandhism with maturity and experience. This change can be attributed mainly to the beliefs and norms deriving solely from the Indian value system which they gradually came to cherish. Both came to realise from the experience of the Russian Revolution that no revolution could justify indiscriminate adoption of any means or unscrupulous divorce of ethics from politics. As critics of Marxism both questioned some of the basic tenets of the ideology, e.g., the dictatorship of the proletariat, the theory of violent revolution, the withering away of the state, etc. in their own ways and in keeping with their respective approaches and ethos.

Both had renounced party-politics and believed that political work and action did not necessarily postulate a party system. The concept of democracy that they advocated promised removal of all hindrances with a view to ensuring the realization of individual
freedom, J.P. showed in this regard a remarkable influence of Roy in his writings like the Swaraj For The People and A Plea For Reconstruction of Indian Polity. Both criticized the functioning of parliamentary democracy because of its formalism, its atomisation of the individual, and the growing preponderance of professional politics under this system. It is interesting that despite their personal association with the U.S.A. they both omitted, in their criticism of democracy, any reference to the Presidential form. As an alternative to parliamentary democracy both presented their own schemes of government based on the principles of decentralisation, individual freedom and popular participation. Good many of the features of those schemes proposed for India were similar. Both suggested pyramidal structure of Indian polity, reared on the basis of an organised democracy comprising of a country-wide network of People's Committees - Roy; and a communitarian democracy composed of village communities as its basis - J.P. A lot is common between Roy's People's Committee and J.P.'s Village Community. These were the primary territorial units, autonomous in their respective spheres, organised in such a way that they might give maximum freedom to the individuals to administer their affairs. In their conception of democracies, there would be no place for political parties; there would be maximum decentralisation of powers; people would be accorded a central place and would have full sovereign rights including the

1. Justice V.H. Tarkunde was of the view that exclusion of any review of Presidential democracy by Roy and J.P. can be explained in terms of their exclusive concern about democratic form of government in the very limited context of India". (A personal interview with Justice V.M. Tarkunde on January 19, 1981, at his B-17, Maharani Bagh, New Delhi, Residence).
right to recall their representatives. To Roy, the State would become coterminous with society and to J.P., it would serve like a danger chain in a Railway train - mostly defunct.

Both emphasized on economic decentralisation which to them; was a precondition for effective political decentralisation.
Appreciating the inter-dependence of political and economic organisations they very significantly underlined in the context of India the utmost necessity of agro-industrial development of rural sector. Unlike Gandhi, both opposed the mere revival of traditional handicrafts and suggested a modern industrial economy. They believed that there would be a transition period during which conditions would be created and preparations be made for the introduction of the new democracy. To them, education of the individuals was of seminal importance in this context. Through education, imparted by non-governmental agencies; and through moral persuasion, they sought to make man conscious. But the suggestions, they made to remedy the ills of democracy, were inadequate, weak and Utopian.

Individual and his freedom constituted the basic concern of both. They criticized the various political, social and economic systems ranging from totalitarian to democratic ones which atomised the individual and eroded his liberties. Individual was an end and all the other associations, institutions and organisations were the means. Both considered man innately moral and good and sought to infuse the spirit of self-reliance in him. Freedom, to them, was an essential aspect of human nature and could only be realised by moral means. Their entire philosophy is concerned with satisfying
the man's urge for freedom. It was only through freedom that individual achieved his perfection. For both, the State was a means to an end namely 'individual's freedom and unfoldment'. Credit should be given to both for drawing attention to the growing tendencies of authoritarianism and totalitarianism resulting from the complexities of modernization, which have placed man in a helpless and hopeless position and eclipsed his moral strength and initiative.

For both, revolution meant not an event but an all-round and long term process of change in all aspects of man and his institutions. They considered revolution as a means not as an end in itself. According to them, violent revolution had always been counter-revolutionary in its impact. They advocated revolution by consent and believed in the instrumentality of persuasion and education of the individual for change.

Their thought and concern went beyond narrow national problems and issues. They visualised the organisation of a world community with a view to ensuring the higher and higher objectives of world peace and human brotherhood transgressing the confines of national and regional seclusions. Both were critical of the totalitarian State of the Soviet Russia and the Welfare State and the national Stateversions of democracies and held a common faith in the Ideal of a world State. Both criticized Communism, Imperialism, Fascism and other expansionist systems which, according to them, were the obstructions in the establishment and maintenance of a world order. Both stressed on the principles of self-determination, non-involvement and non-interference, and condemned war as a means to settle
international disputes. They always condemned the big powers for intervening into the affairs of small countries and advised the Indian government to remain aloof from power blocs and suggested creation of a third force independent of both the power blocs. Both criticized the mad race of armament which, according to them, if continued would annihilate the world.

The differences between the two are no less significant. J.P., as a socialist thinker, never took the directives from the world Communist movement. As a nationalist, he was a great propounder of Indian socialism and criticized the subordination to Moscow of the Indian Communists. Roy, on the other hand, took active part in the mobilisation of the World Communist Movement as an official of the Communist International. To Roy, national socialism in practice cannot be anything but Fascism. J.P. advocated democratic socialism and prescribed Gandhian spiritual means to achieve it. To him, there was no dichotomy between socialism and Indian culture. On the other hand, Roy did not subscribe to democratic socialism which, in his view, was a contradiction in terms. Advocacy of Indian spiritualism to Roy, was merely an attempt to revive the backward precapitalist social conditions of India. In the later phase, J.P. became a full fledged Gandhian but Roy, as a rationalist and materialist, could not accept the theological and religious ideas of Gandhiji and his ideology of Indian nationalism.

Both criticized Marxism but Roy's main emphasis was on the conceptual aspects of Marxian philosophy and with the aid of his
sharp intellect and first hand experience of theory and practice of Marxism, he succeeded much more than J.P. in making his tirade not only more systematic and scientific but also more exhaustive. J.P.'s critique of Marxism, on the other hand, was relatively superficial and mostly concerned with its practice and application in Soviet Russia. In comparison to Roy, J.P.'s critique appears to be sporadic, piecemeal and peripheral. To J.P., Gandhism was not only an alternative to Marxism but a much superior and suitable replacement ideology for India.

Another major point of difference between Roy and J.P. was relating to supernaturalism. While Roy was free from any mystical approaches and maintained a rational and scientific outlook at all levels of his thought, J.P. was drawn towards Dharma and spirituality, obviously under the impact of Gandhism. While Roy gave a full scale treatment to themes like the origin of State and its distinction vis-à-vis the government, J.P. hardly cared about these issues. He was mainly concerned with the State in its applied aspects. As regards the problem of the retention of the State, Roy believed that in the organised democracy, the State would be coincident with the entire society, and consequently, it would under a standing democratic control. But J.P.'s communitarian democracy was envisaged to be a Stateless society. It is apparent that though J.P. derived his ideas on partyless politics and communitarian democracy from Roy's writings, he tried to present them in his own improvised garb of Gandhism.

As a staunch individualist, Roy considered the individual as
a biological entity besides a social one. J.P., on the other hand, projects himself both as an individualist as well as a socialist simultaneously. He held that man should sacrifice his interests for the sake of society. He placed utmost emphasis on the idea of leading a severe self-disciplined simple life. Unlike J.P., Roy laid stress on the unfoldment of the individual, on the satisfaction of his needs and desires and on the concepts of 'enrichment', 'maturity' and 'growth'. Thus, whereas Roy's approach to the themes of individual and society was predominantly rational, J.P.'s was overwhelmingly spiritual. Roy's New Humanism excluded supernaturalism and affirmed that man with his increasing power over nature was the maker of his destiny. J.P. held the view that reason alone could not enable man to shape a better future for himself. Spiritual and moral values were of permanent importance. J.P. also did not agree with Roy's version of philosophical revolution in as much as it was a necessary precondition for a successful democratic revolution in India. Spiritual heritage of India which was upheld and applauded by J.P. and other Indian nationalists was regarded by Roy as the cause of India's cultural decay.

Their approaches regarding nationalism were different. Roy was severely critical of nationalism. To him, the spirit of nationalism was the main cause behind the wars. Therefore, to avoid

---

2. However, J.P., at a later phase when he elaborated the sevenfold revolutions in relation to his concept of Total Revolution, was almost eluding to this precondition of Roy (A personal interview with Justice V.M. Tarkunde, op. cit.).
the horror of wars, he proposed abolition of the national boundary lines and creation of a cosmopolitan commonwealth of freemen and women. J.P.'s approach to nationalism had a distinct pro-Gandhian tilt and he formulated his views on world peace within the framework of an international community-comprising of nation states. It would appear that unlike Roy who was against nationalism in any form, J.P. was only a critic of extreme nationalism. Roy zealously justified the World War II as an international people's war and pleaded for assistance to Britain in the war because it was being waged against Fascism - a great danger to world peace. To J.P., a staunch critic of colonialism, it was an imperialist war and he vehemently opposed India assisting Britain in the European war. It may be surmised that J.P. exhibited far greater pragmatism and objectivity than Roy. Or was it something deeper than this? A question of motives? We have attempted in this work to find a reply to this question mark but strictly within the confines of the specific clues.
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PREFACE

This study seeks to attempt a comparative probe into the political ideas of M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan—the two great socialist thinkers of modern India. As a systematic comparative analysis of the political ideas of Roy and J.P. this study, perhaps, is the first of its kind. It has importance for a variety of reasons. J.P., it is generally believed, except for a few years of brief digression during the middle period of his life, followed Roy's ideological trends. In the middle period, J.P. differed from Roy's views relating to the World War II as a people's war and philosophical revolution as a precondition for social revolution. In the present work, effort has been made to study the political ideas of the two thinkers with a view to identifying, besides the well-known traits, some of the subtle nuances and the less distinct though immensely significant features of the thought contents of Roy and J.P. Roy was a materialist and a spokesman of a secular philosophy. J.P., on the other hand, recognized and emphasized the close relationship between religion and politics. A belated recognition on the part of J.P. to Roy's political ideas came to surface in 1974 when J.P., during the Total Revolution Movement, gave a call for the recall of corrupt legislators, particularly in Bihar. The right to recall the corrupt legislators is one of the provisions of Roy's Draft Constitution of Free India (1945), Article 9(a). The impact of Roy
on J.P. was not only deep but also extended over a long period of time. And yet the differences between the two were nothing less than vital. It is in this context that a comparative study of the two philosophers is important for the proper understanding and assessment of the ideas of the two outstanding socialist thinkers and for a better comprehension of the evolution of socialism both as a movement and as a school of thought in Indian politics. Both the great philosophers studied and analysed the socio-political and economic problems with a keen insight and on the basis of their observations suggested a socio-political reconstruction.

This study is based on an intensive analysis of all the available source-materials and some personal interviews. Shri Jayaparakash Narayan, his Secretary Shri Sachchidanand and his close associates like Justice V.M. Tarkunde and Shri Pram Bhasin were interviewed. I have also held discussions with some Radical Humanists and Servodaya leaders like Mr. Kazi Ahmad, Mr. M.L. Sen, Mr.Natneshwar Prasad Singh and Mr. S.K. Chatterjee. Besides the

1. A Servodaya leader Mr. Ahmad is the Secretary of the Gandhi Museum, Patna (Bihar).
2. Chairman of the Radical Humanist Association (Bihar Unit).
3. Secretary of the Radical Humanist Association (Bihar Unit).
4. A prominent Radical Humanist (Hotel Princes, Patna).
extensive published material such as books, pamphlets, addresses, articles and reports written by Roy and J.P. I have also consulted all the issues of the Independent India, the Radical Humanist, the Congress Socialist, the Janata and the Everyman's, and some other journals and newspapers. I have also utilized valuable unpublished documents available in the files of the Papers of Roy and J.P., preserved at the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, Teen Murti House, New Delhi. The books and articles, written by others on Roy and J.P. have also been consulted.

This study seeks to present an exposition of the political ideas of Roy and J.P. on the basis of published as well as unpublished source and reference material. In doing so I have mainly relied upon conventional methods of library research - of sifting, analysing, comparing and assessing the source material. I have then tried to check my observations and conclusions and gain added insights into the sphere of my probe through interviews with J.P. and others. And lastly in an effort to discern the larger meaning and wider implications of the ideas of the two, I have attempted to relate their thought contents to their personality traits.

The study is divided into seven chapters. The first chapter introduces the concept of socialism, its varying
cannocations and its evolution through the ages (from Utopian socialism to Euro-Communism). It is interesting to note that in the evolution of socialist thought and ideas of Roy and J.P., a premonition like phenomenon relating to the evolution of the global Marxist movement is discernible. Comparing to the course of evolution of the socialist ideas of the two great Indian socialists, the Marxist movement world over also has grown from strait jacketed doctrinaire Marxism to its liberal version of present day Euro-Communism.

The second chapter is devoted to the biographical sketches and writings of Roy and J.P. The multi-dimensional and epoch-making personalities of Roy and J.P. in the context of their changing political faiths and concepts during the course of their life (from Revolutionary Nationalism to Marxism to Radical Humanism (Roy) and from Nationalism to Marxism to Total Revolution through Democratic Socialism and Sarvodaya (J.P.) have been analysed and compared. M.N. Roy, though comparatively less known as a political leader, emerges through his writings as one of the greatest original thinkers of modern India. He represented a unique blend of thought. He was the most colourful man among the non-Russian Communists during the times of Lenin and Stalin. The story of his life reads like an epic. He not only considered and concerned himself
with the theoretical but also the practical aspects of Communism. His political philosophy derives from experience and not merely from speculation. In case of J.P., though it is true that he could not produce many original ideas yet he establishes himself as a great Indian political thinker attempting to combine the two rather incompatible traits of empiricism and idealism and taking pains for his entire life to defend the individual and his freedom. He commented on each and every problem facing the country and was seldom concerned with the usual considerations of consistency and, at times, even coherence in his theoretical formulations. In J.P. the leader and the thinker often appeared to be engaging each other resulting into Utopian and impractical idealism on the one hand lopsided unrealistic formulations on the other; conforming, perhaps to the relative preponderance of the thinker or the leader at the time. This antagonism between the thinker and the leader in J.P. appears to have imparted a certain degree of inconsistency and unpracticability both to his idealistic as well as his empirical formulations.

The third chapter analyses their conceptual contribution to the theory of socialism. Roy's ideas on Scientific Socialism, Twentieth century Jacobinism, Communitarian Socialism and on Co-operative Socialism, and J.P.'s ideas (who was an apologist for Marxism and the
foremost leader, propagandist and spokesman of Indian socialism) on Marxist Socialism, Democratic Socialism, People’s Socialism and Total Revolution which, to him, was the true and ultimate form of Socialism, have been analysed and compared.

The fourth chapter focuses on their criticism to Gandhism and Marxism. Roy and J.P. both criticized Gandhi and Gandhism in their Marxist phase. Both started as staunch Marxists but soon got disillusioned with certain aspects of this ideology. Both got to criticize some of the basic tenets of Marxism. Their assessment and appreciation of Gandhi and Marx constitute the theme of this chapter.

In the fifth chapter their main objections against the functioning of parliamentary democracy have been discussed. Their own concepts of democracy, that is, organised democracy (Roy) and Communitarian democracy (J.P.) which they visualised for India as an ideal polity and their views on education, as a means and postulate for democracy, have also been analysed.

The sixth chapter deals with their ideas on individual, his freedom, the State and theory and techniques of revolution. Both gave in their thought the central place to the individual and considered the State as a sub-organisation of society with no entitlement to trespass.
into individual freedom and initiative. Roy built his philosophy around the man and J.P. consistently emphasised on individuality and dignity of the man. Freedom and truth were the beacons of light of their life journeys. The State was a man-made institution and a means to achieve the goal of individual freedom. In the beginning both subscribed to Marxian theory of revolution but in their later phases both advocated peaceful mass action as a means for the transformation of the society.

The seventh chapter describes and compares the ideas of both the thinkers on the theme of international peace and amity. Their ideas and viewpoints on the main international problems and issues like the World War II, Pakistan dispute, Chinese aggression, the means of settlement of the international disputes, the Indian foreign policy and the world community constitute the contents of this chapter.

Lastly, the conclusion provides an overview of the theme and findings thereon.

January, 1981

( BHOLA SINGH )
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<table>
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<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.B.S.S.S.</td>
<td>Akhil Bharat Seva Seva Sangh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.C.C.</td>
<td>All-India Congress Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.I.</td>
<td>Communist Party of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.S.U.</td>
<td>Communist Party of the Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.S.P.</td>
<td>Congress Socialist Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.C.I.</td>
<td>Executive Committee of the Communist International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.N.C.</td>
<td>Indian National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.M.P.P.</td>
<td>Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.M.L.</td>
<td>Nehru Memorial Museum and Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.S.P.</td>
<td>Praja Socialist Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J.P.</td>
<td>Radical Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

CONCEPT OF SOCIALISM

Socialism is the watchword and the catchword of our age. It has been described as 'the greatest question of our time'. The socialist idea dominates the modern spirit. Since the birth of socialist republic in U.S.S.R. followed by its recurrence in numerous countries of Europe and Asia, the socialism has emerged as a major ideology and force in the world politics. As an ideology seeking to propound the cause of the downtrodden, socialism has set its seal upon our time. There are people who believe that when history records the chapter on modern times it will be entitled as 'the Era of Socialism'. The economic history of the twentieth century is an almost continuous record of the progress of socialism, as an overpowering social and economic movement.

So much has been written and said about the 'new religion' - socialism that it has become almost impossible to present a definite, precise and universal version of its concept. No unanimously acceptable definition of socialism is available till date. There were six hundred

2. Ibid.
separate known definitions of socialism available wayback in 1882. In his book, published in 1924, Dan Griffith listed two hundred and sixty such definitions. In the 'Dictionary of Socialism' the writer reproduced about forty different definitions of socialism, without being able to pretend that his list was exhaustive.

We may at best begin by stating that socialism refers to the goal of a societal organisation in which society or the State will hold all the instruments of production and distribution. But for achieving this goal socialism appears and obtains as a methodology, a philosophy, a movement and a creed urging on a faith and a religion in the context of its appeal and emotion vis-a-vis its followers. It works like "an ethical code, ... a historical category, a judicial principle" and assumes the form of "a popular movement and a scientific analysis, an interpretation of the past and a vision of the future, a war cry and a nation of war, a violent revolution and a gentle revolution; a gospel of love and altruism and a campaign of hate and greed; the hope of mankind and the end of civilization; the dawn of a millenium and frightful catastrophe".

It is in this context that the term socialism evades an all-embracing definition. The phrase is of a changeful and an evolutionary nature. According to Shadwell, "Socialism is the most complicated, many sided and confused question that ever plagued the minds of men". To Ramsey Muir, "Socialism is a chameleon-like creed. It changes its colour according to its environment..." All the world over, socialism has the reputation of being like a hat that has lost its shape because everyone has worn it. Rappaport has expressed the difficulty in defining the socialism. "If I am asked whether I am a socialist myself; I cannot but frankly reply: I do not know. It all depends upon what one understands by socialism". In 1959, Ashok Mehta said: "Socialism needs to be viewed as a house of many mansions. It may be that men will choose different mansions according to their taste and temperament".

William Graham refers to three different meanings of socialism: First, socialism is a scheme of social relations.


8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.


which aims at the equal distribution of wealth; or at preventing too great an inequality. In this sense, William Morris has defined the term socialism. To him, socialism is "the realization of a new society based upon a practical equality of conditions for all, and the general association for the purpose of satisfying the requirements of all these equals". Like William Morris, Bakunin defined that socialism is "the organization of society in such a manner that every individual, man or woman, would at birth find equal means for the development of their respective faculties and their utilization by labour. The organization of society in such a manner that the exploitation by one man of the labour of his fellowmen would be impossible; and where everyone will be allowed to enjoy the social wealth only to the extent of his direct contribution to the production of that wealth". According to Wyndham Albery, "the term socialism is derived from the Latin word, 'socius', which signifies a comrade, an ally, or a partner. It denotes some one of equal rank or status. Hence, socialism means a fraternity of comradeship, in which all shall be regarded as equal, in which all share as partners, and in which all shall work in alliance and co-operation, and in its application to Government of

12. Ibid.
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the State it signifies that the work shall be in the service of the common weal. Socialism extends political democracy into social and economic spheres. As Sydney Webb defined, it as "the economic side of the democratic ideal."

Like Westerners, the Indian socialists have also emphasized on equality. To Mahatma Gandhi, "Equality is the essence of socialism." In 1947, Mahatma Gandhi stated, "Socialism is a beautiful word, and, as far as I am aware, in Socialism all the members of the society are equal; none low, none high. In the individual body the head is not high because it is the top of the body nor are the soles of the feet low because they touch the earth. Even as the members of the individual body are equal, so are the members of the society. This is socialism." To Jayaprakash Narayan, "Socialist society is one in which the individual is prepared to subordinate his own interest to the larger interest of the society." To Jawaharlal Nehru also equality

18. Ibid.
Appeared to be essence of socialism. Subhash Chandra Bose said that “Justice, equality, freedom, discipline and love were the essence of socialism”.

Secondly, according to William Graham, socialism means the system in which the state will endeavour to establish or secure through laws or institutions, greater equality of conditions for all, or to prevent too great inequality. In this sense, N. Janet defines socialism to be “every doctrine which believes it to be the business of the state to correct the inequalities of riches that exists amongst men, and to establish the equilibrium legally by taking from those who have too much to give to those who have not enough, and to do this in a permanent manner, and not merely in particular cases, such as that of a general distress or a public calamity”. Similarly to Leroy-Beaulieu, “Socialism is a generic term which expresses certain modes of interference by the state in the relations between producers or between producers and consumers. This interference has not for its object solely security, fidelity to engagements freely entered into by individuals; it proposes to rectify or to correct social inequalities.
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to modify the natural course of things, to substitute for contracts, whose terms have been fully debated and fully agreed to, official types of contracts, to come to the aid of the party reputed to be feeble, and to hinder the contractor reputed to be strong from drawing the whole of the possible advantages: natural or economic. To which he adds that, "Socialism proceeds by way of regulations or by competition of the State with private industries". M. de Laméleus also says that "every socialistic doctrine aims at introducing greater equality into social conditions; and, secondly, it tries to realise these reforms by the action of the law or the State".

In the third sense, says William Graham, "Socialism is that system—economic and political, in which the production of wealth is carried on solely by the State, as the collective owner of the land and instruments of production, instead of by private capitalist employers or companies, while the distribution in like manner is made by the State on some assumed principles of justice, which give to each in proportion to his work...." In this sense, J.F. Mill in Political Economy says, "Socialism is any system, which requires that the land and the
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instruments of production should be the property, not of individuals, but of communities or associations, or of the government". A. Schaefer in The Quintessence of Socialism has taken the same view and says that: "the alpha and omega of socialism is the abolition of private and individual property as a means of production, and the transformation of private into collective capital". In support of this view: T.H. Kirkup in History of Socialism says that socialism is "the theory which proposes that land and capital, which are the requisites of labour and the sources of all wealth and culture, should be placed under social ownership and control". Kirkup, in his another work Inquiry, says that "Socialism is a theory of social evolution, based on a new principle of economic organization, according to which industry should be carried on by cooperative workers jointly controlling the means of production". Today, it is generally called as "collectivism". The term is used interchangeably with collectivism and communism - which may be regarded as extreme form of socialism.

27. Ibid., p. 40.
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One thing is common to all the three varieties of meaning of socialism that they aim at greater equality in economic and social conditions. To socialists this goal is to be achieved by the instrumentality of the state or by the voluntary efforts of individuals; whereas, to others it is to be realized and maintained by the efforts of the state alone.

Briefly, it can be said that the constant theme of Socialism is the end of exploitation of man by man. It is a theory which advocates that type of social order which promises insurance against the evils of industrialization and mechanization of production, that is, against exploitation of labour, children and women. Positively, socialism is that form of society in which men and women are not divided into opposing economic classes, but live together under conditions of approximate social and economic equality, using in common the means that lie to their hands of promoting social welfare.

**Essentials of Socialism**

The following are the ingredients of socialism:

1. More emphasis on society than on individuals. It

---

subordinates the interests of the individuals to the higher interests of the society as a whole. Its emphasis is on the organic unity of society. (2) Elimination of Capitalism. (3) Extermination of competition. Competition for more profits is unhealthy and anti-social. (4) Equality of opportunity. To C.W.H. Cole, equality means - "that society ought to afford to all its members, irrespective of their virtues or vices, their strength or weakness, a tolerable basic standard of living, high enough to keep them in health and reasonable comfort and to enable them to bring up their children after a fashion that will allow them, in their turn, as far as possible, an equal chance of making the best of their lives". (5) Abolition of private property in land. (6) Prohibition of private enterprise. (7) Establishment of a right system of distribution. (8) Evolution rather than revolution is the keynote of socialism.

But to understand socialism fully, its strength and weaknesses, we should have some knowledge of its past history. It is believed, a historical perusal would help


comprehension of not only of the evolution and sophistication of the concept, but also its various currents and tributaries.

**Origin of Socialism**

Socialism had its origin in the West. Though the socialist sentiments, for instance, the urge for social amelioration and concern for the depressed, the craving for social justice and cooperative spirit etc. are implicit in human thought and have been expressed in the scripture of the East as well as of the West. The doctrine of socialism, as we understand it today, is not older than the nineteenth century, although the term was in the air since the times of the Greeks.

---

34. The earliest description of communism is that given by Plato (427 to 347 B.C.) in his book, *Republic*. Plato has outlined a new socio-economic order based on communism of wives and property. His communism is quite different from the communism of today. What he recommends is neither the socialisation of the means of production nor the equitable distribution of wealth. In fact, he proposes the separation of the economic and political power as an effective measure to secure society from political selfishness. Some trace back socialism to "Moses" and even to the *New Testament*. Moses aimed at preventing the growing inequality amongst the Jews (William Graham, op. cit., pp. 22-23). In the *New Testament*, Lord Jesus Christ tells his disciples: "If thou will be perfect go and sell what thou hast and give it to the poor" (Quoted by M.L. Sharma, *Gandhi As A Socialist*, op. cit., pp. 14). Such prescriptions merely indicate a moral outlook to social organisation, but certainly not the abolition of the institution of private property as a means of exploitation.
Even a cursory survey of the origin, history and development of socialism is apt to run into the size of a book. We have therefore attempted below to highlight only the most conspicuous landmarks of its history. The development of the socialist thought can be divided into three stages: first, socialism before Marx; secondly, from Communist Manifesto of Marx to the Russian Revolution (1917) and thirdly, from Russian Revolution to the present day.

So far as is known the word 'Socialism' was first used in print in Italy in 1903, but entirely unconnected with the meaning it acquired later on. The term 'Socialist' was used for the first time in modern sense in Great Britain in 1827. It appeared in 'Cooperative Magazine' to

35. Thus, modern socialism wears a three-faced mask; bearing Utopianism (or early socialism), Marxism and Revisionism. Whatever was said and written in the name of socialism before Marx has been called Utopian socialism. Whatever was considered after Marx has often been called Revisionary socialism. C.F. Markham in his book, A History of Socialism (London: A and C Black Limited: 1930, pp. 291-292), has divided the history of socialism into three distinct phases. First: the theoretic-Utopian phase of Owen, St. Simon and Fourier. Secondly, the revolutionary phase of socialism with Marx and Engels as its scientists and, finally, Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin as its greatest exponents. The third phase is of constitutional socialism of which Lassalle was perhaps, the first actual organizer; Jouyes, MacDonald, Fisher, Branting, Staunton and Vandervelde the principal politicians and Sidney Webb the chief thinker.

describe the followers of Robert Owen and also to denote the tendencies opposed to liberal individualism. In 1833, the word 'Socialism' was first used in Le Globe, a French periodical, to describe the ideals of Saint Simon and Fourier. By 1840, it had come to be used freely in Europe to explain and characterise the schools of St. Simon; Fourier; Owen and others, who attacked on the existing system of commercial competition and put proposals for a new way of life based on collective control.

From the earliest time to Karl Marx, the prophets of socialism have spoken with one voice of the golden age to which they looked forward; wherein 'there will be liberty, peace, justice and brotherly affection. No nation shall lift sword against another. There will be all-round and free development of all'. These Utopians were dreaming for the good life of the people. Their socialism was Utopian. They were humanitarian, who reacted strongly against the harsh environment of capitalism. Socialism was the product of the imagination of some brilliant minds stimulated by their
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During the eighteenth century, numerous writers especially in France, approximated a socialist stand-point. but they were more or less isolated individuals. They could not attract any significant following. The next landmark in the development of socialism was the French Revolution of 1789. Actually, it was not a socialist revolution. But this revolution cleared ideological and psychological barriers to the development of a genuine socialist movement and thought.

Saint Simon, Fourier and Owen were the first to proclaim and raise slogans against the practical working of institutionalism and the capitalist system—laissez-faire. Saint Simon (1760-1825) in his book, New Christianity, showed a great desire for the application of Christian brotherhood to industry. He believed that engineering could eradicate the poverty. He and his disciples, Lazard (1791-1833), Enfantin (1796-1854) and Leroux (1797-1871) drew up plans of a vast network of railways and of great

---

39. The Utopians had imagined that their so-called socialism would bring perfection; create a paradise; solve all the problems; sinners would become saints and heaven would be brought to earth. Sir Thomas More in his Utopia (1516) has expressed deep feelings and sympathies for the poor and suffering humanity. It was a beautiful dream of the poet and so had little to do with the later development of the socialist movement and thought. The remarkable Utopia of Comenius and of Civitas Solis are nearer to Republic of Plato. Harrington's Oceana (1656) may be called a liberal socialist Utopia. It emphasized on the equal distribution of landed property.
canals’. Francois-Marie Charles Fourier (1772-1832), a contemporary of St. Simon, developed a different scheme. The leading principle of Fourier was that if men were permitted to follow their own bent, they would select that kind of work for which each was best fitted and would do it cheerfully and well. He suggested the grouping of workers into cooperative associations. His scheme was more like Owen’s scheme of village cooperatives. He believed that socially healthy and psychologically satisfying life could be developed in an associative agricultural community. His Utopia is based on agriculture, not on industry and engineering, as in St. Simon.

In France, socialism entered in a new phase after the revolution of 1830. Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865) startled Paris with his first important and famous book, written in 1840; namely, *Qu’est ce que la Propriété*. Individual freedom and justice was the criterion of his socialism. In his *Paradise*, "the state need survive only


as a constitution-making body ... A state of producers and not of politicians was his ideal".

During the early nineteenth century, Robert Owen (1771-1858) in England was well known as the advocate of humanitarian reform and utopian socialism. He believed that only if men were educated in right social ideas, they would give up competition and would live with cooperation. His socialism was founded on education. Unlike Fourier and St. Simon, Owen desired "to construct cooperative colonies where agricultural and industrial activities would both be pursued with up-to-date methods". The two books, namely, City of the Sun by Companella, and Looking Backward, by Edward Bellamy, are well known in the history of utopian socialism.

It has often been claimed that in Germany, early socialism began from about 1800 A.D. and that it originated in the theories of Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814). But the most important representative of early socialism in Germany was Moses Hess (1812-1875). Fichte stated that "labour and distribution should be organized collectively.


and everyone should receive a fixed amount of capital, constituting his property, for a fixed amount of labour."

with Bruno Bauer (1809-82) and Karl Grun (1813-87), Moses Hess made a group known as 'true socialists'. Another socialist in Germany was Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-64). He popularised the wage theory of Ricardo. He began an active campaign to organize the workers. He wanted to make workers legally the most powerful factor by instituting complete democracy. According to him: "neither the cooperative nor the trade union movement could offer a way out of this dilemma, but that only the true road toward freedom was the intervention of the State ..." Thus, his socialism was State socialism.

Though all the Utopians were different in their backgrounds, temperaments and interests; they were humanitarians and keen observers of their environment. No doubt, all these Utopians were not realistic in their approach.

50. Capitalist System.
to the future, but there was much truth in their treatment
of the past and, particularly, of the present. The Utopian
socialists were confined to pointing out the theoretical
criticism of capitalism and in drawing up an ideal social
order. They stressed the moral failings of capitalism and
the moral goodness of socialism. The pre-Marxian socialists
could not provide an effective political force to socialism.
"They sketched the moral attributes of future society,
but on the crucial question of gaining the power necessary
to turn their theory into practice, they were vague,
53
misinformed and romantic. However, all was not in vain.
They made a positive contribution to the modern political
thought by criticizing the then existing social order. They
were the first to make socialism a public issue. They spread
the new ideal all over the world. They analysed history
and provided much raw material to Marx and Engels. They
had already sowed the 'seeds of socialism. Marx had only
to till the ground and water it so that it may flourish
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53. Ibid., p. 50. Also see J. Bandopadhyaya, 'Socialism: A
Review', Jamata, Vol. XIX, Nos. 1 and 2, Republic Day
Numbers, 1964, p. 11. (Here, writer has given six
special characteristics of Utopian socialism which
distinguish it from Marxism). Also see J. Bandopadhyaya,
'The Concept of Socialism', Proceedings of the Seminar
on Socialism in India, 1919-1939, Part I (New Delhi,
and give fruits to the coming generations'.

Socialism, in its present comprehensive and systematic form came into existence in this world in the middle of the nineteenth century. It owes its origin principally to the writings of Karl Marx (1818-1883). Karl Marx and Frederick Engels (1820-1895) are regarded as the founder of scientific socialism. Marx and Engels both were different in their method and approach from the Utopians. To Utopians, socialism was the product of the imaginative response of some brilliant minds to the social injustice prevailing in their times. Marx brought socialism down from the clouds. He showed that it was the next step in the historical development of the human race. It was the necessary and inevitable outcome of the evolution of the capitalist society. Marx transformed the Utopian socialism into scientific socialism.

A comprehensive and detailed outline of the new socialism was given in the form of the 'Communist Manifesto'.

---


55. According to Marx: "Socialism is the form of society, which will succeed Capitalism, just as Capitalism is the form of society, which succeeded feudalism" (Cited by Leo Huberman and M. Swezy Paul, *Introduction to Socialism* (New Delhi: Progressive Book Depot, 1989), p. 25.)
written by Marx and Engels for the Communist League in late 1847 and early 1848. This pamphlet is only of twenty-three pages in the original edition. In this pamphlet, the essence of their doctrine is clearly laid down. Since then it has become the foundation-stone of the socialist movement in every corner of the earth. The publication of the Manifesto marked the turning point in the history of socialism. After its publication all the earlier brands of socialism went into oblivion and the Marxian brand became a world-wide movement. It became more powerful and popular than its predecessors. The Manifesto opens with the famous statement: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle".

Marx had derived the philosophical ideas from two main sources: Hegelian dialectics and eighteenth century French Materialism. That is why his philosophy is commonly known as dialectical materialism. There are three cornerstones of the political philosophy of Marx — first, Materialistic or economic interpretation of history; second, the doctrine of class struggle; and third, the concept of surplus value.

The dialectic materialism is one of the aspects of the philosophy of Marx. He borrowed his idea of the dialectic from Hegel; although Marx applied it for a different purpose.

According to Marx, Hegelian dialectic, based on the evolution of ideas, is standing on its head. He replaced the Hegelian idea with matter. Thus, he claimed to put the dialectic right side up. To Marx and Engels, the matter is primary and is the source of sensations, perception and ideas. Mind is secondary. It is a mere reflection of matter. Thought is a product of matter. As a result, Hegelian dialectic joined together with Marxist materialism came to be known as dialectic materialism.

As in nature, contrary forces are always present in the history. They enter into a struggle which culminates in the destruction of the old forms and emergence of the new ones. Such is the law of development. To Lenin:

57 development is the "struggle of opposites". Dialectical development takes place from lower to the higher. Marx wrote that "no development that does not negate its previous forms of existence can occur in any sphere". The negation of an old one by a new one in the process of development is the natural result of the operation of the unity and struggle of opposites. According to Marx, two contradictions face each other in society. Capital was the thesis and
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labour was its anti-thesis. According to him, capitalism had completed its cycle of evolution. It was dissolving.

Historical Materialism or materialistic/economic interpretation of history is the extension of the principle of dialectical materialism to the study of social life and history. It means the application of the principle of dialectic materialism to the development of society. It purports to be a scientific generalisation of history.

The theory of economic interpretation of history is based on the fact that man must live to eat. He is moved to activity and struggle by his material needs. Production is the most important of all human activities. Society is the result of an attempt to secure the necessities of life. Society has never succeeded in producing all what is required by it. As a result of this, there had always been strains and stresses. The history of mankind constitutes a succession of socio-economic formations. Mankind, as a whole, has passed through four main stages - primitive Communist stage, slave system, feudal system and capital system. Mankind is living now in the epoch of transition to the next stage - the Communist stage, the first phase of which is called socialism.

In the first stage, i.e., primitive Communist age the forces of production were very slight and communally
owned. In this stage, there was no private property; there would be no exploitation of man by man. In all the rest three stages, the class which controls the forces of production controls the rest. This domination creates a continuous state of tension and struggle. In all the stages, the human evolution, the conditions of production determine the structure of society. To Marx, the economic power has been the ultimate power, which has determined the political and social relations between men. To quote Marx, "All the social, political and intellectual relations, all religious and legal systems, all the theoretical outlooks, which emerge in the course of history, are derived from the material conditions of life".

Then mankind emerges from the primitive Communist stage; at every stage of society a particular class controls and exploits the other classes. The class which owns the means of the production dominates all the other institutions of society. The State is one of them. They use the machinery of the State to suppress the other classes and to maintain their position. The history of mankind is the history of class war. In every stage of development, each dominant class certainly develops into opposite and as a result of the clash between the two the new ruling class emerges.

At last, the capitalist and the proletarian face one another. Capitalism, as the thesis creates organised labour as the antithesis. As a result of a clash between the two, a synthesis in the form of a classless society takes place. The production relations of socialist society are the relations of cooperation and mutual assistance among the workers; free from exploitation. There is social ownership on the means of production.

The materialistic interpretation of history has been criticised. It ignores the non-economic factors in making the history. In addition to economic interpretation of history, there are also political, ethical, religious, scientific, linguistic etc. interpretation of history.

The second important principle of Marx's philosophy is the doctrine of class-struggle. According to Marx, the history of mankind is the history of class-war. Marx believed that society was divided into two parts: that is, the rich and the poor; the exploiters and the exploited. There could be no cooperation at all between the two. There could be no reconciliation between the capitalists and the workers. According to Marx, "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles: freemen and slaves; Patrician and Plebian; Baron and Serf; Guild-master and Journeymen; in one word; oppressor and oppressed; standing constantly in opposition to each other. carried
on an uninterrupted warfare: now open, now concealed.

In fact, humanity has evolved to higher stages of development through conflicts. Each system of production has given rise to two principal classes: the owners and the toilers. These classes are hostile to each other. The class which owns the means of production and distribution governs the society and exploits the other classes. The exploited classes resist the oppression and exploitation to exist. Hence, there begins the conflict between the ruling and exploited class. The conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is the final conflict. The victory of the proletariat, which is inevitable, will make the society classless. There can be no class conflict in this society. Lenin, later, introduced the transitional phase of 'dictatorship' of the proletariat to bridge the transition of capitalist society into the 'classless society' of Marx.

The Marxist theory of class-struggle has been criticised. It is based on hatred of one class to another, not of sympathy and brotherhood. History tells us that there has not been any period when there was any clear division between the rich and the poor. There has also not been two distinct classes but many sub-divisions in the classes, which lived freely and cordially. It is also pointed out
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that there has never been a long-continued class-war, as propounded by Marx.

The theory of surplus value was another contribution of Marx. Value is a quality of a thing, which is inherent in it. According to Marx, this value is created by human labour alone. All other factors, that is, material used in it, are not so important and essential. Hence, labour is the only legitimate source of value. According to Marx, surplus value is 'congealed labour' or labour not paid for. It is the difference between value of a thing produced by labour and the wages received by the labourer. Since the industrial revolution, the capitalists are in complete control of all the means of production. The capitalists create and control competitive conditions for the labour. The labourer is not paid the value created by his labour. The labourer produces more value than he is paid for. The value of a thing being due to labour alone, the whole profit (after compensating the capitalist for his own labour etc.) should be paid to the labourer. But it does not happen in practice. The capitalists pay only a little to the labourer and the rest of the value (surplus value) is kept by him as his profit. Thus, the capitalists steal the value created by the labourers.

The theory of surplus value has been criticised on many grounds. Marx does not consider the factor of demand
in deciding the value of a thing. The machinery, steam power, natural gifts, that is, coal and other minerals also are the important factors in creating the value. The labourer can not do alone. Both capital and labour are required for the creation of value or wealth. The capitalist has also to pay taxes, depreciation charges etc.

Marxian thought is contained of several elements due to which it triumphed over all the former varieties of socialism: (i) Marxian socialism made a definite turn toward Communism; (ii) It rejected all the religious and moral claims of pre-Marxian socialism and became scientific. (iii) It ridiculed the experimental method of former socialism as Utopianism and accepted an evolutionary interpretation of human history. (iv) It abandoned the principle of cooperation with other classes and glorified the class-struggle as the source of all virtues for the proletariat. The working class would play a historic role in bringing about a better social order. (v) It not only developed the feeling of dignity in the neglected working class, but also infused a self-consciousness in them.

As school of thought, socialism has undergone certain changes with the changing condition of time and place. There have developed varieties of socialism, some independently

and some under the influence of Marx. Marxian socialism has been reviewed and modified. A general figurative depiction is provided below:

- State Socialism/collectivism.
- Cooperative Socialism.
- Revolutionary Socialism: (i) Communism (ii) Syndicalism.
- Evolutionary Socialism.
- Democratic Socialism: (i) Fabian Socialism; (ii) Guild Socialism; (iii) Christian Socialism

Reference may be made here to the Revisionist movement and its most important leader Bernstein (1850-1932). It challenged the orthodox Marxist teachings. Revisionism neither believes in the revolutionary crisis nor in the revolutionary solution as a way out from capitalism to socialism. It believes in establishing socialism through peaceful means by social action. In 1899, Bernstein challenged the fundamental thesis of Marxian system. Bernstein criticised the economic interpretation of history by Marx. According to him, non-economic factors also played an important part in the evolution of history. According to Bernstein the theory of surplus value was not practical. He believed that surplus product did not go primarily to the capitalists.

---

The Russian Revolution of 1917 and establishment of the Communist International marked another turning point in the historical development of socialism. It transferred the stage of main action from Western to Eastern Europe and the oppressed nations of Asia and Africa. Under the guidance of Communist International, socialism began to strike its roots in the far off lands of Asia and Africa. Russian Revolution gave rise to a global Communist movement. The Communists started with the belief in the Marxian principle of economic interpretation of history and accepted class struggle as the only way to socialism.

Lenin (1870-1924) was the real heir of Marx. But he brought certain changes in Marx's ideas and methods. He interpreted Marxism under the influence of the Bolshevik experience and practice. First, he emphasised on the revolutionary aspect of Communism. He believed in the early writings of Marx. To Ashok Mehta, "Lenin's Bolshevism was Marxism in its early effervescence. For both, the Paris commune was the fountain of light. But while Marx felt in it


the needs and possibilities of decentralisation, saw the
commune as a social cell, Lenin viewed it as a political
weapon. He believed in force, not pacific means, as a
means to eradicate the capitalism and to establish Communism.
Secondly, he did not believe in class-consciousness in the
workers to bring about a revolution, as Marx believed. He
emphasised on the unity of the Communist Party to bring
about revolution by violent means. Thirdly, Lenin brought
the Marxian philosophy up-to-date. His philosophy is
considered to be Marxian in the imperialist stage of the
capitalist system. Trotsky (1879-1940) was an internationalist.
Like Lenin, he believed in establishing the proletarian
dictatorship by violent revolution. He did not believe in
democracy and compromise.

Joseph Stalin (1879-1953) was the successor of Lenin.
Against Trotsky, Stalin gave the slogan of "Socialism in
at least, one country first". He concentrated all the
energy to establish Communism in Russia alone. Later on,
he also became an internationalist and propounded the theory
of world encirclement of Communism before the final setting
up of class society. Regarding Leninism, he said, "Leninism
is Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and of the proletarian
revolution". Nikita Khrushchev followed Stalin. Khrushchev
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attacked the cult of Personality and disclosed certain mistakes committed by Stalin at the 20th Congress of CPSU in 1956. He made the Communist Party more strong. The Russian State became more powerful. President Brezhnev is also following the same policy and programmes.

The aims of Communism have been explicitly set forth in the works of Lenin; Trotsky; Bukharin; Stalin; Mao and others. The central theme of the meaning of Communism in the present context is reproduced here from the programme of the Communist Party of Soviet Union as on October 31, 1961: "Communism is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society; under its the all-round development of people will be accomplished by the growth of the productive forces to continuous progress in science and technology; all sources of public wealth will rush forth abundantly and the great principle from each according to his ability to each according to his needs' - will be implemented. Communism is a highly organized society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established; a society in which labour for the good of society will become the prime and vital requirement of everyone; a necessity recognized by all; and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people".

Soviet Union was the first socialist state in the world. It led the international Communist movement for a long time. With the establishment of Communism in China, in Asia; and the change in the political atmosphere in Europe, after the World War II, there has been a clear split in the world Communist movement. The Soviet Union's leadership has been challenged. The views of the Soviet Union regarding some fundamental issues, like "the role of the European Communist parties in industrial democracies of the West; the relationship with other non-Communist political parties; their strategy regarding onward march of the revolution; probabilities of its success under the Soviet leadership, etc." have not been accepted by the European Communist parties. They saw that the political freedom and economic equality, both essential and insinuable principles of socialism, have been lost in the Soviet Union. The socialist parties of Europe started on an independent carrier of their own. The story of Euro-Communism is the story of these Soviet hegemony defying Communist

68. Particularly in three Latin countries France, Italy and Spain, the predominance of Communists is beyond doubt. For a number of years they practised the Soviet ideology and prescription quite religiously, causes then some embarrassment. They departed from Leninist-Stalinist communism to Euro-Communism. They realised that there existed a great gulf between the Communist ideal both in the actualities of the Soviet state and in its foreign policy and treatment of its allies. They became aware of the distinction between German Marxism and Russian Communism.

parties in France, Italy and Spain in particular.

The first open expression of the trend, which later came to be known as 'Euro-Communism', was voiced by the Italian Communist leader, Palmiro Togliatti, in the wake of the shocking revelation about Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956. Since then it gradually gathered momentum. A more vociferous expression of this trend appeared in the document known as the 'Tagliatti Memorandum'. It made a number of substantive points, which later became the corner-stones of 'Euro-Communism'. The other important Marxist theories, which nurtured the development of this trend were 'Gramsci's theory of hegemony, Togliatti's polycentrism, Marchais' enunciation of socialist democracy of universal validity, Corrillo's insistence that Marxist theory emerged from a 'concrete analysis of concrete reality' and Berlinguer's historic compromise. But non-Marxists like Mitterrand in France, Moro and Andreotti in Italy and Suarez and King Juan Carlos in Spain also played crucial roles in popularising 'Euro-Communism'. The main points of Euro-Communism are as below:

---
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(1) Evolutionary perspective of transition to Socialism:

Euro-Communists have rejected the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into socialist society. Togliatti in his Memorandum said, "There, thus, arises the question of the possibility of the working people winning positions of power within the framework of a state, whose nature as a bourgeois state has still not changed, and, hence, there also arises the question of the possibility of a struggle to gradually remake this nature from within". In a joint declaration, issued by the Italian and the French Communist parties, in Rome on November 15, 1975, stated: "The Italian and French Communists hold that the march towards socialism and the building of a socialist society, which they propose as the prospect for their countries, must be achieved within the framework of a continuous democratization of economic, social and political life. Socialism will constitute a higher phase of democracy and freedom: democracy realized in the most complete manner.

"In this spirit, all the freedoms - which are a product both of the great bourgeois - democratic revolutions and of the great popular struggles of this century, headed by the working class - will have to be guaranteed and developed ... The French and Italian Communists declare themselves for the plurality of political parties, for the

73. Ajit Roy, op. cit., pp. 35 and 56.
right of existence and activity of opposition parties, for the free formation of majorities and minorities and the possibility of their alternating democratically; for the lay nature and democratic functioning of the state; for the independence of the judiciary...

"A socialist transformation of society pre-supposes public control over the principal means of production and exchange; their progressive socialisation and implementation of democratic economic planning at the national level ..."

(ii) Critic of the socio-political developments in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in Eastern Europe: Everything is not going on well in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. According to Togliatti, there is the "problem of overcoming the regime of restricting and suppressing the democratic and personal freedom which was introduced by Lenin ..." In the Soviet Union, there

74. Ibid., pp.55-56. Also see Amal Chattopadhyaya, 'The Real Face of Euro-Communism', The Radical Humanist, Vol.41, No.12, March, 1978,p.29. Also see 'Euro-Communism: An Enigma' by Yogendra Mahade, The Radical Humanist, Vol.41, No.10, 1978,p.21. (In 1978, there arrived an understanding between the French, Italian and Spanish Communist parties. Their leaders issued a statement, in which they favoured the multi-party system, existence of political opposition and its activities and democratic alternative. They also considered a pluralistic society with diversity of opinions as a stepping stone in the direction of social democracy).
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is absence of "the broadest freedom for the workers to participate in an organised way, in the direction of the entire social life". There is no freedom within the party organisation and out of it. Santiago Carillo, Secretary-General of the Spanish Communist Party in his book, *Euro-Communism and the State*, attacked on the Soviet Russia. Tracing the developments and deviations of the Soviet Union since its early years, he says that the "proletarian state as visualised by Lenin does not exist anywhere, even less in the country, which is offered to us as a model' ... in the U.S.S.R. of today there exists a bureaucratic class, which enjoys an immoderate and uncontrolled power at different levels', and which takes decisions over the heads of the working class and even of that of the party". According to Carillo, "forces of labour and culture will share power instead of the Communist Party monopolising it; the mixed economy is acceptable; proprietors will be free to organise themselves economically as well as politically; right to strike - including political - will be guaranteed".
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(iii) A call for a sharp break from the past pattern of transition to socialism Togliatti is against any rigid formulation about the broad tactics of struggles for socialist transformation. According to him: "within the framework of present historical development and the general prospects of which it holds out: ... the concrete forms and conditions for the advance to, and victory of, socialism will both now and in the immediate future greatly differ from what we had in the past".

(iv) Independence of national sections of the international Communist movement: According to Togliatti each party must learn to act independently. For the first time, in this process, the Italian and Spanish Communist parties signed a joint declaration in July, 1975 to work democratically for progress. Another development for Euro-Communism was the visit of French Communist Party delegation, headed by its General-Secretary Georges Marchais to Rome in November, 1975, and signed a joint declaration with the Italian Communist Party.

The Italian Communist leader, Enrico Berlinguer, in his speech at the 29th European Communist Parties
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Conference held in Berlin in June 1976, said: "In Italy, where the working class and our Party have been and are protagonists in the fight to restore, defend and develop democracy, we are fighting for a socialist society that has at its foundation: the affirmation of the value of the individual and collective freedoms and their guarantee; the principle of secular, non-ideological nature of the state and its democratic organisation: the plurality of political parties; and possibility of alternation of government majorities; the autonomy of trade unions; religious freedom; freedom of expression; of culture; the arts and the sciences. In the economic sphere: a high level of productive development must be ensured by means of democratic form of planning."

The Spanish leader Santiago Carrillo at Berlin Conference in June, 1976 more specifically emphasised: "For a long time, Moscow was the womb of the Communist movement. Now we have grown up. Communism has lost the character of a church with a Pope. Now is the time for all socialists and progressive forces to work together independently in each country to achieve freedom and democracy". He even went to the extent of declaring that "Soviet socialism was
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in the primitive stage". The Hungarian Communist leader Janos Kadar pleaded for the independence of the Communist parties of the Western Europe. He said: "it is wholly natural for Communist parties working in analogous conditions to strive together to find an original path to socialism; with or without the dictatorship of proletariat; with or without a pluralist socialism".

The Communist parties of Italy, Spain and France condemned the Soviet invasion on Czechoslovakia in 1968. Santiago Carrillo said: "The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 was the last straw. Any idea of internationalism ended for us ... Progress of the socialist movements in developed capitalist countries would aid the Soviet society and the Soviet Communists in making progress in their transformation (from the present dictatorship) into an authentic worker's democracy. This is a historic necessity that would greatly benefit the cause of socialism. So it is all the more lamentable than in 1968 our Czechoslovak comrades were not allowed to continue their experiment".


Some of these European Communist parties even extended their implied support to the NATO as a sort of shield against the threat of the Soviet intervention against any experiment in 'Democratic Socialism' of the 'Euro-Communism' variety in the West European countries. The Italian Communist leader, Enrico Berlinguer, believes that "so long as Europe is divided into hostile camps the chances of creating a socialist society of his desire are brighter within the orbit of the NATO Pact rather than that of the Warsaw Pact, especially in view of the Czech experience in 1968".

Thus, the ideal of Euro-Communism is explicitly distinct from Leninist formulations. This implies rejection of the pivotal and exclusive role of the Communist Party, doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat, classical Marxist economic theory and of Moscow as the only model for all the Communist societies. Democratic pluralism, freedom of the press, multiple culture and the idea of alternation in power have become acceptable ideals.

But Euro-Communism excludes the Communist Party of Japan, which started for the first time on the path now called Euro-Communism. Moreover, Euro-Communism is
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less a positive programme of action than a convergence of negative reactions against the Soviet Union. It has not become yet really a unified practical and theoretic project.

In India, the Communist parties have reacted to the issues raised by the European Communist parties (Euro-Communists). The C.P.I., in its report on international developments adopted at its eleventh Congress stated: "We do not agree with certain erroneous and harmful views, which are being currently propagated, distorting Marxism-Leninism and repudiating some of its fundamental tenets --- Our party stands by the commonly agreed conclusions of the 1957, 1960 and 1969 international meetings of Communist and worker's parties and consistently defends them from the attacks being made from various non-Marxian standpoints.

"Our party holds that the question of integrating the general and specific, the national and the international, in the social revolution in a country can only be resolved on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism. Our party holds that the winning of political power by the working class in alliance with other working people, the establishment of proletarian statehood, socialist democracy and the defence of the revolution from internal and external enemies remain essential conditions for the building of socialism irrespective of specific conditions in different countries."
"The example of existing socialism is to-day a powerful force influencing the social development all over the world. Anti-Sovietism is a form of anti-Communism and it must be constantly combated."

Thus, the C.P.I. rejects the fundamental principles, e.g., the concepts of national Communism and of independence of Euro-Communism. The C.P.I. believes to carry the world Communist movement with the CPSU as its vanguard. The C.P.I. opposed "the Maoist'sinification' or 'asianisation' of Marxism-Leninism". Some prominent leaders of the C.P.I.(M) seem to agree with the proposition of Euro-Communists to their stress of independence of the Communist parties in different countries, that is, 'independence' from the CPSU in the first place.

The C.P.I. does not denigrate to Euro-Communists and their way of thinking. It has fraternal relations with the Communist parties of Italy and France. It likes to learn from these parties on the basis of equality and autonomy. And it has great respect for the successes and
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experiences of the CPSU. On its historical experience,
the C.P.I. believes that 'independent study, analysis,
and elaboration on its own line has not, in the least,
meant that anti-Soviet or positions of democracy from
the Soviet Union. In 1950, the C.P.I. adopted its new
constitution. In that it is stated that "in the socialist
society, which in India could possibly be won by peaceful
transition being the form of the revolutionary leap; there
would be the rule of the working class and its allies in
the shape of proletarian statehood ("dictatorship of the
proletariat" was terminologically dropped), and that there
would be the right of opposition to the government subject
to the socialist constitution". In 1964, the C.P.I. adopted
its programme, in which it worked out such concepts as
"the path of independent capitalist path and its specific
contradictions; the rule of the entire capitalist class
through the parliamentary - democratic form of the state;
the anti-imperialist essence of nonalignment; the national
democratic program: revolution, state and joint leadership
as a transition to working class leadership".

Thus, the Communist movement in India has not copied
the Euro-Communism. It has learnt much from Moscow and
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has modified according to the conditions of the country. Nevertheless, in a country like India, having a brief history of democracy, the characteristic features and trends of Euro-Communism are relevant and essential for the healthy development of the progressive movement as a whole.

The above historical survey indicates the socialism as a broad ideology since its inception till date has subscribed to the strategy of evolutionary change; except for its Communist sub-school, which believed in revolution. Euro-Communism signifies the recent trend of some sections of Communist movement also opting for evolutionary strategies. If the attitude of Soviet Communist Party and its leadership towards the very recent developments in Poland (official recognition of trade unions and their rights to strike and bargain etc.) as also their own recognition of individual initiative in economy is indication of a change - it is a change in favour of liberalism and tolerance. Communism, world over, is exhibiting happy signs of a slant towards liberal democratic socialism.
CHAPTER II

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES AND WRITINGS OF
M.N. ROY AND JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN

Having dealt with the concept of socialism in its varied facets, in the present chapter we would attempt to portray the life and works of two outstanding socialists of India, namely, M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan. It is interesting to note that in the evolution of socialist thought and ideas of M.N. Roy as also of Jayaprakash Narayan a premonition like phenomenon relating to the evolution of global Marxian movement is discernible. Like the evolution of socialist ideas of the two great Indians, the world Marxian movement also grew from strait-jacketed doctrinaire Marxian to its liberal version of present day.

India has produced in this century a number of outstanding men of genius. Among them have been Tagore, the poet; Aurobindo, the Spiritual philosopher; Gandhi, the moralist and politician; and Nehru, the statesman. To that group belongs M.N. Roy, the political theoretician and humanist, and Jayaprakash Narayan, the socialist and sarvodaya.

M.N. Roy (1867-1954) has been put in the rank of Lenin and Mao Tse-Tung as a theoretician and has been called the most colourful man of all non-Russian Communists.
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in the era of Lenin and Stalin. Among his Indian contemporaries, Professor C.L. Parikh says: "Manabendra Nath Roy was without a peer; there is, perhaps, no comparable figure in the East. He was unique in the universality of his experience. A dozen different countries spread over three major continents provide the background of his chequered career. He occupied leading positions in the great movements of Nationalism, Communism and Humanism..."

Another former associate of M.N. Roy, Professor Sibmarayan Roy says: "As I think M.N. Roy, I believe, has his peers, if not in the East, certainly in the West. But in the wealth of experience which went into the shaping of his thoughts, he was altogether unique and had none to compare either in the past or in the present. From Socrates to Kantayana, from Kung Fu-tzu to Croce, I know of no philosopher who possessed his sweep of experience".

Manabendra Nath Roy was born in a village, namely:


4. The original name of M.N. Roy was Narendra Nath Bhattacharya. He was generally called 'Naren'. He changed his name from Narendra Nath Bhattacharya to Manabendra Nath Roy at Palo Alto, the seat of the University of Stanford, when he reached there in 1916, on the advice of Dhan Gopal Mukerjee.
Arbela, district Twenty-Four Paragnas; West Bengal; on March 21, 1887 at 1.30 P.M. in a priestly family. His father, Pandit Limabandhu Bhattacharya, was a school teacher. Roy was brought up and educated at Chingripota where his father acquired some property and lived till his death in May, 1905. Roy received his early education in the village school. After passing his Entrance Examination, he joined the National College in Calcutta; founded by Aurobindo Ghosh. Later, he joined the Bengal Technical Institute and left it for ever. He had not much attraction for education. Even in his school days, he participated in various political activities of the national movement and later he became an active member of the revolutionary movement in Bengal.

Broadly speaking, Roy's biography can be divided in three principal stages. In the first stage, he was a nationalist anarchist. As a revolutionary, his single

aim was to overthrow the British Rule from India and see her free. This period begins in 1901 and ends in 1917. During this stage, he was only a militant nationalist. He was a conspirator all his political life until then. The second phase began when Roy had to go abroad. There he came under the influence of Marxism. This phase begins in 1917 and ends in 1946. During this period, Roy, more or less, remained a staunch Marxist and Communist. The third and the last phase of his biography began when Roy went beyond Communism and evolved step by step a new philosophy, namely: Integral, Radical or New Humanism. This phase begins in 1947 and ends with his death on January 25, ten minutes before midnight and the dawn of the Republic Day of 1954.

Thus, the biographical evolution of H.N. Roy passed through three stages. They are national Anarchism: Marxism and New Humanism. These stages, though different from each other, figure along a continuum of a thought process of organic growth and development. Freedom is the common trait.

11. K.K. Awashti in his book, however, maintains that the three stages are fundamentally different from each other. (K.K. Awashti, Scientific Humanism: Socio-Political Ideas of H.N. Roy: A Critique (Jaipur, College Book Depot, n.d.), p. 6.)
of all these three stages, Ellen Roy, wife of M.N. Roy, holds, "It should, however, not be thought that the phases mentioned here were sharply separated from one another or that there were any violent mutation in his life. Rather they led logically and naturally one to the other and were but stages in a process of organic growth and development. Roy never disavowed his past; to the end he acknowledged Jatin Mukherjee and Karl Marx to be his principal mentors - next in importance only to that greatest mentor of all, like itself. --- This integrity was derived from two basic elements in the structure of his personality - his love of freedom and his devotion to truth". Throughout his life, Roy had pursued one quest - the quest for human freedom. He himself, in a lecture in 1946, observed, "When as a school boy of fourteen I began my political life, which may end in nothing. I wanted to be free.... In those days we had not read Marx. We did not know about the existence of the proletariat. Still, many spent their lives in jail and went to the gallows. There was no proletariat to propel them. They were not conscious of the class struggle. They did not have the dream of Communism. But they had the human urge to revolt against the intolerable

12. 'M.N. Roy: The Man and His Ideas' (Editorial), The Radical Humanist, Vol. XX, Nos.3-4, January 25, 1956, p. 27.
conditions of life. They did not know exactly how these conditions could be changed. But they tried to change them any how. I began my political life with that spirit, and I still draw my inspiration rather from that spirit than from the three volumes of *Capital* or three hundred volumes by the Marxists”.

It is apparent that to M.N. Roy, Marxism only appealed as a mere convincing explanation for his innate human inquisitiveness. The driving force of his Marxism, the sheet anchor of his philosophy, was his humanism. Marxism, as such, to Roy - the humanist, was only a relatively more truthful treatment of the problems of society. With evolution of his mind and person as also with more close contact with Marxism he appears to have realised the failings of this philosophy and cult. Perhaps, conditioned by his Indian personality traits comprising of inquisitiveness, spiritualism, humanism, tolerance and morality, his Marxism ultimately culminated into a far more mature accommodating, tolerant and benevolent thought with humanism as its hallmark.

For Roy, truth and freedom were not mere ideas to be professed but they were the ultimate realities of human life. He always corrected himself on the basis of his new

experiences, and, perhaps, due to this passion for truth he could not get any success in his political career. He always fought for cause, which he considered to be just. He said: "Lie-hunting is my profession. This is a thankless job. But someone must tell the truth, if it is not to remain an empty concept. I have been lie-hunting ever since I learnt to think for myself to distinguish facts from fictions. It has not won me popularity". One of the close friends of Roy since boyhood, Hari Kumar Chakravarty, once said: "From boyhood Roy had a thirst for knowledge. He used to say as a young man that knowledge is freedom, and the urge for freedom is inherent in every man".

The first phase of his political life begins from the age of fourteen. One of his co-workers wrote that "Narendra, almost a boy, hardly fourteen, and yet virile and energetic, full of revolutionary enthusiasm, rushed into a little room, in which we were holding an informal talk on the problems then facing us in Bengal and elsewhere. He had a talk with us. After this, he offered himself as a whole-timer for the cause of liberty of India from the foreign yoke. He declared on oath that he would be prepared to do the impossible; for, there was nothing impossible

for revolutionary. Soon after, he joined us; he proved
to be of very great value to our movement and possessed
rare qualities found only in a great leader of men”.

In the first decade of the twentieth century, Indian
nationalists were divided into three groups: (i) The
Moderates; (ii) The Extremists and (iii) The Terrorists.
The terrorists were denounced as anarchists. They called
themselves revolutionaries. In the middle of the first
decade of the twentieth century, some youth of Bengal;
dissatisfied with the political progress made by Moderates
and Extremists, organised societies and groups to impart
the physical training to youths. The partition of Bengal
in 1905 created resentment all over the country. The
terrorists believed in revolutionary violent methods, which
had been widely-practised in Russia. They hoped that
ultimately they would be able to bring about a revolution
in India and to overthrow the British Rule. M.N. Roy
belonged to these revolutionary groups.

"Anusilan Samiti", a well known revolutionary
society was established under the leadership of Barrister
Pramatha Mitra. Later on, Jatindra Nath Banerjee became
its chief propounder. M.N. Roy was one of the most trusted
lieutenants of Jatindra Nath Banerjee. Like other youths

Roy was influenced with Bankim's 'Anand Math', a famous novel and thought and action of Swami Vivekanand. Roy revealed that "Bankim Chaterji's Anand Math was our common source of inspiration. Therein we found our revolutionary ideal. As a matter of fact, we had distributed amongst ourselves the roles of the prominent figures of that drama.

They were sanyasins. We had taken the vow to follow in
their foot-steps". For the first time, in his revolutionary activities, Roy was arrested in 1907 in connection with Chingripota political dacoity case. In 1910, he was again arrested in connection with Howrah Conspiracy case. In both the cases he was discharged by the Magistrate. Later on, Roy was implicated in two other dacoity cases, which were committed by revolutionaries, known as the Garden Reach and the Delinghat dacoity case.

With the outbreak of World War I in August 1914, between England and Germany, the Indian revolutionaries tried to take advantage of the situation. Secret agents were sent to Germany to import arms and money from Germany. Roy was also sent to Java in April 1915 to bring arms. But he returned to India in the middle of June without success. He was again sent to Batavia to discuss with

18. Ibid., Epilogue by V.B. Karmik, p. 568.
Germans for overland transport of arms. In his Memoirs, he wrote: "The attempt to smuggle arms in ships having failed, I went abroad for the second time with the alternative plan of bringing arms overland from China". He failed this time also in his mission. He did not return to India, but went to Japan. He could not succeed in his mission, either in Japan or in China. He decided to contact the Indian revolutionaries in America before going to Germany. He wrote: "Having spent a year and a half wandering through Malaya, Indonesia, Indo-China, the Phillipines, Japan, Korea and China; in Summer 1916, I landed at San-Francisco". With this begins the second stage of his biography.

M.N. Roy landed in San-Francisco on June 14, 1916. To avoid the trouble of police, next day he went to Palo Alto, the seat of the University of Stanford. There he met Ch speopol Mukherji, a revolutionary colleague of Roy in India. On Mukherji's advice, he changed his name to M.N. Roy. He stated: "Accordingly, the same evening, M.N. Roy was born in the campus of the Stanford University". Here:

---
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he met with Evelyn Trent, a bright and attractive graduate student. She was of radical views. They were married in New York. The conversion of Roy to Marxism started here. Evelyn also played a considerable role in this conversion process. She was a great asset to Roy in his work until their separation in 1926.

After a few months, Roy left for New York. He met Lala Lajpat Rai there, the most important Indian leader in exile. They became close friends. Lala Lajpat Rai wrote in his diary in 1916: "My experience of Indian revolutionaries in the U.S. has been very sad and disappointing... Their patriotism was often tainted by consideration of gain and profit... the only one of the Bengali revolutionaries for whom I have had genuine respect is M.N. Roy". Roy studied the Marxist literature in the New York Public Library. In his Memoirs he stated: "It was not long before I accepted socialism; except its materialist philosophy. That was my last ditch, which I defended still for quite a long time".

This transition from revolutionary nationalism to socialism


was a big event in Roy's political career.

In the early 1917, Roy secretly escaped to Mexico, to avoid legal proceedings in connection with the 'Hindu-German conspiracy case', in which he was an accused and was on a personal bail. The Russian Revolution took place while Roy was in Mexico. It influenced Roy very much. About its impacts Roy wrote: "I was sucked up in that electrified atmosphere ... It was a mutation in my political evolution: a sudden jump from die-hard nationalism to Communism". Roy wanted to go to China in quest of arms. But something went wrong and the journey was cancelled. He was not very keen on undertaking the journey. He gave up the venture and returned to the Mexico city. He dedicated himself in the pursuit of socialist philosophy. In the mean time, Borodin, the representative of the Communist International, came to see Roy. The two became good friends. Borodin's friendship marked a turning point in Roy's life and completed Roy's conversion to Communism. Roy himself wrote: "He initiated me in the intricacies of Hegelian Dialectics as the key to Marxism. My lingering faith in the special genius of India faded as I learned from him the history of European culture". Roy was elected the General-Secretary
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of the Mexican Socialist Party in December 1910. In 1919, it was converted into the Communist Party by ceaseless efforts of Roy to become the first Communist Party outside Russia. Borodin persuaded Roy to attend the Second Congress of the Communist International as a delegate of Mexican Communist Party.

Ultimately, Roy decided to go to Russia. He was very sad to leave Mexico to which he described as the land of his rebirth. He remarked, "An entirely new vision flashed before my mind. It was of a new chapter of my life". The first literary work of M.N. Roy was an essay, which was published in Mexico in Spanish as "An Open Letter to President Wilson". He also published two books in Spanish, from Mexico. They were 'La India En Pena, Su Presente Y Su Pervivencia' and 'The Way to Durable Peace'.

He left for Moscow in November 1919. To Roy, the journey to Moscow was a "Pilgrimage to the Holy Land of Revolution". On his way he stayed in Berlin for some time.

28. Ibid., p. 212. He wrote, "I left the land of rebirth an intellectually free man, though with a faith. But the philosophical solvent of the faith was inherent in itself. I no longer believed in political freedom without the content of economic liberation and social justice. But I had also realized that intellectual freedom - freedom from the bondage of all tradition and authority - was the condition for any effective struggle for social emancipation". Ibid., pp. 219-220.
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He met German Communists and also some Dutch Communists. He contacted the members of the Indian Revolutionary Committee, which was set up in 1916, in Berlin. Roy learned much and made many friends there. While in Berlin, Roy had already prepared a manifesto to put before the Communist International regarding Communist position on the national and social struggle in India. He wrote: "That I learned during my several month's stay in Germany about the conditions in Europe and their immediate perspective fostered in me the feeling that the proletariat in the metropolitan countries would not succeed in their heroic endeavor to capture power unless imperialism was weakened by the revolt of the colonial peoples".

Roy left Berlin for Moscow in April 1920. He reached Moscow two and a half months before the meet of the Second Congress of the Communist International (to be held from 16th July to 7th August 1920). After his arrival in Moscow, he met Miss Angelica Balabanova, the first General-Secretary of the Communist International. She gave him a copy of the thesis written by Lenin on the national and colonial question for discussion at the Second Congress. On the left hand corner of the front page, there was a

note under the signature of Lenin: "Com. Roy, for Criticism and Suggestion". Miss Balavenova also conveyed Roy to see Lenin after some time. He met Lenin the same day. Lenin's first remark on meeting him was: "You are so young. I expected a grey-bearded wise man from the East". The meeting was very brief, but it was evidently one of the most important events of Roy's life.

Regarding the colonial thesis written by Lenin, Roy differed from Lenin fundamentally. He submitted the supplementary thesis at the instance of Lenin. Both the theses were later submitted to the National and Colonial Commission for its consideration. Lenin was in favour of giving support to "Revolutionary Bourgeois Democratic Movements in the colonies. Roy, on the contrary, stressed the importance of social struggle, as distinguished from National struggle in these countries and was of the view that Communist should not lend support to the Bourgeois Democratic Movements as such, but only to the revolutionary elements inside the National Movement. Roy argued before

34. Ibid. p. 59. Also see M.N. Roy's Memoirs; op. cit.; p. 335.


the Commission that national bourgeoisie was more afraid of the growing strength of the masses than of imperialism. He stressed that the bourgeoisie would ultimately desert the national struggle and compromise with imperialism in a revolutionary situation. At the end, with some modifications both the theses were adopted by the Congress. It was accepted to support only "revolutionary movements of liberation, rather than all bourgeoisie - democratic liberation movements, as stated in the original draft". It was an original contribution of M.N. Roy. There was a case where Roy showed an original mind of high order. This was a landmark in the history of Indian political thought and Roy's contribution to it, something that India can take pride in.

Lenin has a place by the side of Marx and Engels; Roy has place by their side. The role of Gandhiji in national politics was also a point of difference between Lenin and Roy. Roy wrote: "Lenin believed that, as the inspirer and leader of a mass movement, he was a revolutionary. I maintained that, as a religious and cultural revivalist, he was bound to be a reactionary socially, however.

37. John Patric Haithcock, *Communism and Nationalism in India*, p. 11.

revolutionary he might appear politically”. Roy believed that the leadership of the Indian nationalist movement should be in the hands of the proletariat. He was elected to the “Presidium of the Communist International and was for several years the Head of its Eastern Section”.

Roy was appointed a member of the Central Asiatic Bureau of the Communist International at Tashkent. He gave training to a group of Muslim Muhajirins: in Communist ideology, at Tashkent. The emigre Communist Party was founded there in late 1920 or in early 1921. At Tashkent an Indian military school was started. Its aim was to train an army for Indian liberation. Roy wrote: “My plan was to raise, equip and train such an army in Afghanistan. Using the frontier territories as the base of operation and with the mercenary support of the tribesmen, the liberation army would march into India and occupy some territory, where a civil government should be established as soon as possible”. The school was closed down on strong British objection. Roy
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came back to Moscow and founded the Communist University for the Toilers of East in 1922. Roy himself was its Director. In 1922, Roy became a candidate member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. In 1924, he became a full voting member of the Presidium and of the Secretariat of the Communist International. He reached the peak of his influence in 1926. A few subsequent years he spent in visiting different countries for his propaganda work to develop the revolutionary movement in India.

"Thereupon, he was expelled from one country after another. He could not find refuge either in Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Holland, Germany, Belgium, France or any other country ruled and governed by the capitalist classes".

During this period he wrote some important works. In 1920:

- he outlined the principles and programmes of the Indian independence movement. In the same year, he wrote 'The Problems of India'.

The most authoritative book of Roy, 'India in Transition' was published from Geneva, in 1922. He analysed critically


the Indian society and the perspective of the development of the Indian national movement from Marxist point of view. In the same period, 'One Year of Non-Cooperation', with the collaboration of Evelyn Roy, 'The Aftermath of Non-Cooperation', 'The Future of Indian Politics' and a booklet, 'Political Letters' were published. He also began the publication of his journal, 'The Vanguard of Indian Independence' (The title was later changed into 'Advance Guard' and then into 'Vagesa').

In 1927, he was sent to China, as head of a delegation of the Communist International to advise the Communist Party of China. China was then in the throes of a revolution. A meeting of the Executive Committee of the Communist International was held in November, 1926. A new thesis was adopted regarding China and Roy was sent to organise action according to the new line. Roy wrote about the new thesis and his mission to China: "The meeting of the Executive Committee of the Communist International in November, 1926 adopted a new thesis on the Chinese question; the central point of which was that the Chinese Revolution must from that time be developed as an agrarian revolution. The leadership of the Chinese Communist Party as well as the representatives of the Communist International in China were of a different view. They still maintained that the nationalist bourgeoisie should be helped to lead the
revolution and class struggle should not be accentuated for the sake of national unity. I was alone to advocate the different point of view that the Chinese Revolution had reached a critical moment in which it must strike out a new course and a fetish should not be made of the alliance with the Kuo Min Tang. The Executive of the Communist International adopted my point of view which was opposed in the beginning by Stalin himself. But Stalin was brought around to my view and the thesis adopted by the ECCI was drafted by me. Immediately afterwards, I left for China. 47 Borodin did not agree with Roy. Thus, Roy's China mission failed and he came back to Moscow in September, 1927.

By 1928, in the September of which the Sixth Congress of the Communist International was held, Roy had moved to the right in regard to his national and colonial policy, which he had been advocating since 1925. After consolidating his control over the Russian Party and the Communist International, Stalin adopted Roy's Left Policy. Accordingly, the Indian Communists were directed to leave the Indian National Congress, a bourgeois nationalist organisation, and to organise an anti-imperialist movement under the leadership of the proletariat. Roy himself was now opposed to this policy. He prepared a new theory on the Indian

question, which came to be known as the theory of decolonisation. According to Roy, decolonisation takes place when there arises crisis in the capitalism and imperialism. Roy wrote, "when imperialism forced by its inner contradiction, permits even encourages (as lately in the case of India) partial industrialisation of colonial country the basis of antagonism between bourgeoisie and foreign imperialism narrows down ... the native bourgeoisie outgrows the previous state of absolute colonial oppression". According to Roy, after the World War I, the British imperialism had changed its strategy of exploitation of India. It began to industrialise the colony and giving concessions to the Indian bourgeoisie. He wrote, "In the last analysis colonial possessions represent labour. If more labour could be employed in more fruitful processes of production, the colonial exploitation would be more profitable. Land as a means of production was exhausted. Therefore, the interest of imperialism in crisis of capitalism in decay, necessitated the introduction of other means of production than land in the colonial countries. That process was 'Decolonisation'. He thought that India

was in the process of decolonisation. It started in India from the capitalist crisis in Britain after the World War I. The appointment of an Industrial Commission in India, during the war, to him, was a proof.

When the Sixth Congress of the Communist International was held in September, 1928, Roy was absent. He was held responsible for the Communist failure in China. He was also criticised for advocating the theory of decolonisation. He was officially expelled from the Communist International in September, 1929. After his expulsion, he stayed one more year in Berlin, where he wrote his famous work: 'Revolution and Counter-revolution in China' (In German).

He met Ellen Cartschalk, and spent his last week with her who came to India in 1937 and became Roy’s wife and collaborator.

Roy left for India with a forged passport in the name of L.R. Mahmud and reached Bombay in the middle of December, 1930. He met some political and trade union leaders. He met Jawaharlal Nehru also and went to Karachi to attend the Congress Session at the invitation of Nehru, held in March, 1931. It is said that Roy was the author of the famous resolution on fundamental rights.
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resolved at the Karachi Congress. But Nehru had denied and stated that it was he who prepared it in consultations with Gandhiji. In July, 1931, he was arrested in connection with Kampur Conspiracy case. Roy defended himself before the Magistrate. He contended that "the British rule in India was not a legally established rule and that, therefore, an attempt to overthrow it was not illegal". It was later published in book form under the title 'My Defence'. Finally, he was sentenced for six years. During his jail period, he studied intensively the philosophy and science. He sent regularly one letter to Ellen Gotschalk. She preserved all those letters and later, in 1943, they were published in book form entitled 'Letters From Jail'. These letters are remarkable documents. When he was released from jail in November, 1916, he brought out with him nine closely hand-written volumes. Most part of it was later published in the form of books as 'Insect : Its Philosophy, Professions and Practice', 'Historical Role of Islam', 'Materialism', 'Heroes of Twentieth Century', 'Ideal of Indian Womanhood', and some others. As a result of his deep study in jail, he wrote later on an outstanding book, namely, Reason. 54
Romanticism and Revolution (1952). From jail, he also wrote

several letters to the leaders of the Indian National Congress. The important among those were the letters, which were written on the emergence of the C.S.P. in 1934. These letters later were published as 'Letters By M.N. Roy To The Congress Socialist Party' (1937). A pamphlet was also smuggled out from jail and later was published under the title, 'China in Revolt'. Another smuggled article was published as 'Whither Congress'!

After his release from jail in November, 1936, Roy joined the Indian National Congress. He attended the Faisalpur Annual Session of the Indian National Congress held in the last week of December, 1936. In his presidential address, Nehru extended warm welcome to Roy. He became a member of the A.I.C.C. He launched a weekly journal, namely, "Independent India" on April 4, 1937, from Bombay. In 1949, its name was changed to "Radical Humanist". In the Congress, he made sustained efforts to change the Constitution of the Congress. He saw that the Congress had a "highly centralised leadership and on the other hand, an amorphous mass of primary members, who have neither any right nor responsibility". He wanted to transform the Congress into a mass political party. His writings on this issue were
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collected and published in the form of a booklet entitled, "On the Congress Constitution", in 1938. He was a staunch critic of Gandhian leadership. Dissatisfied with the Gandhian group, Roy established the League of Radical Congressmen, "to carry forward the work of activism and democratizing the Congress", in May 1939. The World War II broke out in September 1939. Roy characterised it as a war waged by the fascists against freedom. In a protest against Gandhian leadership he contested the election of Presidentship against Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, in the Rangarh Session of the Indian National Congress held in March, 1940. Roy lost the election. However, the differences with the Congress became wide when Roy advocated unconditional support to the war against Fascism. He wrote, "My advocating support to the war was incompatible with the Congress policy of anti-war activities". He wrote extensively on the issue of war in 'Independent India'. He wrote a book on this issue, namely, 'India and War'.

This divergence of opinion on the issue of war led to his break with the Congress. It came in September 1940. He launched the Radical Democratic Party in December, 1940. Professor B.N. Las Gupta wrote that, "Roy's Radical Democratic Party was the only section of Indian

people, which held fast the view that this war would not only restore and re-establish democracy, but also incidentally liberate progressive forces all over the world. Roy used to go further than this and held the view that if the allies won, Labour Party would come to power in Britain and in that case, India would get independence. With the establishment of R.W.P., begins a new chapter of Roy's political career. At the Dehra Dun Summer camp held in May, 1940, Roy made speeches which were published in book form, entitled, 'Scientific Politics'. In November, 1941, 'Indian Federation of Labour' was organised under the guidance of M.J. Roy.

The next few years, Roy devoted to think on the question of post-war economic development of the country. It was a very critical period of his life. He was not satisfied with the prevailing situation. He found nowhere democracy in actual practice. During this period, Roy began to realize the inadequacies of Marxism and Communism. He believed that after the war, the world would revolve around two poles, the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. According to Roy, "Neither capitalism nor Communism was the answer to the situation. Capitalism had already proved

its bankruptcy. Communism had also falsified all hopes. On the other hand, Communism held out the threat of a civil war on the national as well as on the international plane. It was, therefore, to go beyond Communism and evolve an ideology, a political structure and social institutions, which would ensure freedom as well as equality, security as well as free scope for development”. He, ultimately, realised that party politics was not conducive for democracy. Analysing himself, he told his colleagues in 1946, “I feel very uncomfortable in politics. I feel like a fish out of water. But having been drawn into this whirlpool since my early youth, I have not been able to get out of it. Perhaps the time is coming when I shall at least do so”. As a result of this disillusionment, he dissolved his own Radical Democratic Party in December, 1948. During this period he wrote many books and pamphlets, such as 'From Savagery to Civilisation' (1943), 'Nationalism on Antiquated Cult', 'National Government or People's Government' (1943), 'Alphabet of Fascist Economics' (1944), 'People's Plan' (1944), 'Poverty or Plenty', 'Planning New India' (1944), 'Constitution of Free India: A Draft' (1944), 'Problem of Freedom' (1944), 'Jawaharlal Nehru' (1945), 'Russian Revolution', 'New Orientation' (1946), 'New
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HUMANISM' (1947); 'SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY' (1947). In 1945, and 1946, Roy elaborated and expounded the philosophy of Radical Humanism. His speeches of this period were edited by Ellen Roy, entitled: 'POLITICAL POWER AND PARTIES' in 1960. In 1945, Roy began the publication of a quarterly journal for the discussion and elaboration of philosophical and ideological problems. It was called "The Marxian Way". Three years later, the name was changed to 'The Humanist Way'.

After having dissolved the R.D.P., Roy completely devoted himself to the development of the wider and more broad based humanist movement. He wanted to bring about a 63 philosophical revolution in the country. As he believed: "A political revolution or a social revolution presupposes a philosophical revolution. That is to say, the mentality of the people must change; that spirit of conformity must go which upholds an established order; the predisposition to obey authority; the desire to follow blindly as the 64 way of least resistance and least effort." Since the dissolution of the R.D.P., he devoted himself to the thinking and writing of the philosophy of Radical Humanism. He wrote: "Since then I have belonged to no political

63. V.N. Karnik, op. cit., p. 578.
organisation, occupying myself with philosophical and historical writing, as founder-director of the Indian Renaissance Institute, Dehra Dun, which is a cultural-educational organisation founded with the object of re-educating the educators and young intellectuals of India in the spirit and with the ideas of Radical (or Integral) Humanism. During this period, he completed the Memoirs. He drew pen-portraits of some of the important peoples that he met in the course of his tours around the world. They were published later in book form; namely, 'Man & Mot'. The most important work that he wrote during this period was 'Reason, Romanticism and Revolution' in two volumes, published in 1952 and 1955 respectively.

In this book, he described the essence of philosophy of New Humanism. He wrote: "New Humanism lays emphasis on the basic fact of history that man is the maker of his world-man as a thinking being, and he can be so only as an individual. The brain is the instrument of thought, and it is individually owned. It cannot be possessed collectively. Revolutions are heralded by iconoclastic ideas conceived by gifted individuals. A brotherhood of men attracted by the adventure of ideas; keenly conscious of the urge for

freedom, fired with the vision of a free society of free men, and motivated by the will to remake the world; so as to restore the individual in his position of primacy and dignity, will show the way out of the contemporary crisis of modern civilization.

"In the last analysis: education of the citizen is the condition for such a reorganization of society as will be conducive to common progress and prosperity without encroaching on the freedom of the individual. New Humanism advocates a social reconstruction of the world as a commonwealth and fraternity of freedom, by the cooperative endeavour of spiritually emancipated moral men.

"New Humanism is cosmopolitan. A cosmopolitan commonwealth of spiritually free men will not be limited by the boundaries of national states-capitalist, Fascist, Socialist, Communist or any other kind - which will gradually disappear under the impact of the twentieth century renaissance of man".

Besides these books and pamphlets, several articles of Roy appeared in the journals like The Radical Humanist, Pacific Affairs, Manchester Guardian and in the newspapers like Anirat, Ezra Patrika and in some other newspapers.


The last article of Roy appeared in *The Radical Humanist* of January, 1954.

M.N. Roy, the great revolutionary fighter for freedom, a thinker and writer of brilliance passed away ten minutes before midnight on January 25, 1954, at his Denga Lun residence. Many rich tributes were paid to Roy in India and abroad. One of his close associates Tarka Teerth Laxman Shastri Joshi called him the ‘first philosopher of modern India’. He observed, “The story of his life reads like an Epic, the concluding chapter of which constitutes a philosophy of life, integrating the fundamentals of science and the moral experience of Man”. Justice V.M. Tarkunde, a close associate of M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan acknowledged him as a “Prophet of a New order”. On hearing the news of death of Roy, Jayaprakash Narayan stated, “In the death of M.N. Roy, India has lost one of her great sons. No one in modern India had such a long revolutionary life so full of drama and adventure. In the international Communist movement, he had held the highest position in the oriental section, and was the
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closest Asian associate of the great Lenin. When that movement began to degenerate into imperialistic expansionism, Roy had the rare courage, at the risk of his brilliant career and even his life, to oppose it at the highest levels. In his return to India, he had to suffer a long imprisonment. In recent years, he had retired from active politics, but had been doing path-breaking thinking. Not only India, but world society, needed at this movement his intellectual leadership. In the same year (1954) in an article J.P. wrote, "the romance of Roy's dangerous life, which no Indian, not even Netaji, has equalled in recent times; and the impelling force of his intellect made me an ardent admirer. This admiration I maintained even when the gulf of political differences was wide between us".

Thus, throughout his entire life which passed through three stages - Nationalism, Marxism and Radical Humanism, freedom and truth remained his aims. The love of freedom made him an anarchist revolutionary; and when he saw the limitations of that ideology, he became a Communist and


finally when Communism too revealed its totalitarian character; he became a radical humanist. He neither equated it with national independence nor with the ending exploitation. Freedom to him had a wider meaning. It was "the progressive disappearance of all restrictions on the unfolding of the potentialities of the individuals, as human beings, and not as cogs in the wheels of a mechanised social organism". His love of truth protected him all his life from the line of partisanship and dogmatism, narrow-mindedness and conformism. His new humanism is something like the proverbial return of the prodigal. It signifies the ultimate retreat of an original Indian brain after its sordid and varied wanderings into the realms of collectivism of varied ideologies to the ultimate precincts of individual thought and idea seeking to cover humanity within its all-embracing concern.

JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN (1902-1979), popularly known as J.P., was born on October 11, 1902, in a village namely Sitabdiara in Bihar. Sitabdiara is situated in the confluence
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of Gargoo and Ganges. He was the fourth child of his parents - Phul Rani Devi and Hardar Dayal. J.P. lived an eventful life. To Professor B.N. Verma, while Gandhi was the father of the nation and Nehru was its architect, holder of the key to the stage, J.P. was the voice, which resounded on the stage of India and gave life to the drama being enacted there.

There are many facets of his biography. His political career began as a nationalist. In U.P.A., he became a Marxist. From a near Marxist socialist through democratic socialism, he became a Servodayee, and finally a supra-party national leader. But freedom and responsibility remained the basic impulses of his life. He wrote, "Freedom became one of the beacon lights of my life, and it has remained so ever since. Freedom, with the passing of years transcended the mere freedom of my country and embraced freedom of men everywhere and from every sort of trammel. Above all, it meant freedom of the human personality, freedom of the mind, freedom of the spirit. This freedom has become a passion of life and I shall not see it compromised for bread, for power, for security, for prosperity, for the

78. Sitabdatra Village lies some Eight Kilometers from Patna.
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After his primary education, J.P. was sent to Patna. In 1919, he passed matriculation examination with first position and was awarded a merit scholarship. As a science student of the Patna College, he came in contact with revolutionary leaders. The revolutionary movement in Bengal was going on. Lal Gangadhar Tilak, the leader of the extremist group of the Indian National Congress gave the slogan, "Swaraj is my birthright and I shall have it". The historical Russian Revolution took place in the year 1917. All these events had a tremendous impact on J.P. He read about Gandhi’s life and his writings and the Geeta. The simplicity of Gandhiji and his identification with the common man had a profound impact on him. But Gopal Krishna Gokhle was the first influence on him. J.P. wrote a tearful poem when Gokhle died.

In 1920, he was married to Prabhavati Devi, the eldest daughter of Braj Kishore Prasad, a well known Congress leader.


31. Jayprakash Narayan in his childhood was called by the nickname, "Baulji". It was in America that Jayprakash Narayan became "J.P." His Professors found it easier this way, and the appellation stuck.

leader of Bihar. J.P. was eighteen years of age and
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Prabhavati oli fourteen. It was the second year of his
marriage and his intermediate examination was only a few
days away when Gandhiji started his non-cooperation movement.
Gandhiji asked the students to boycott all educational
institutions maintained by the British Government. J.P. left
the Patna College and joined the movement. He wrote: "As
a boy, like most boys of those days, I was an ardent
nationalist and leaned towards the revolutionary cult of
which Bengal was the noble leader at that time. But even
then the story of the South African Satyagraha had fascinated
my young heart. Before my revolutionary leanings could
mature; Gandhiji's first non-cooperation movement swept
over the land as a strangely uplifting hurricane. I, too,
was one of the thousands of young men of those days, who,
like leaves in the storm, were swept away and momentarily
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lifted up to the skies".

When Gandhiji called off the movement in 1922, J.P.
enrolled himself in the Bihar Vidyapeeth, founded by the
nationalist leaders. After passing the intermediate examina-
tion, J.P. wanted to join higher studies. But there was
no teaching facility of science beyond intermediate in the
Vidyapeeth. J.P. did not like to join the English Government
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aided educational institutions. So, he went to U.S.A. for higher education. In 1922, J.P. left for the United States of America and reached San Francisco on October 8. He lived there for seven years. He studied there by turn at the universities of California, Iowa, Wisconsin and Ohio. He took the Master's degree in Sociology from the University of Ohio. The subject of his M.A. thesis was "Cultural Variations". At Ohio University, J.P. was very popular amongst his teachers and colleagues for his uncommon idealism. One of his Professors, Richard C. Steinmetz, wrote: "Perhaps his most remarkable trait, to one liking in a materialistic civilization, is his idealism. It impresses his daily life as well as his world outlook. It has been my experience in living with him to be surprised again and again by little unexpected acts of unselfishness". Another eminent Professor of Sociology, F.E. Lusit wrote: "He is a careful and critical thinker, and a searcher after truth; of course, he is a wide reader. He is, in every sense, a scholar in the making. For want of necessary financial resources, J.P. had to work there in the fields.

85. His wife Prabhavati went to Sabarmati Ashram and remained there till J.P. came back from the United States. She learnt the philosophy of Gandhiji. Later, in conversion of J.P. to Gandhism, his wife played a considerable role.


factories and hotels to meet his expenses. "And", in his
own words: "I didn't only clean toilets; I also worked as
a shoeshine boy". He worked ten hours a day, seven days
a week.

While at Wisconsin University, J.P. made a lot of
friends not only Americans, but Russians, Poles, Germans;
Dutchmen and the French also. One of his closest friends,
was a Polish Jew named Avrom Landy, who was a member of the
American Communist Party, and also a member of an underground
Communist cell at the University. J.P. attended occasionally
the meetings of this cell. Landy introduced J.P. to Marxism.
Under his and Manuel Gomez, a Mexican born leader of the
American Communist Party, influence, Jayaprakash Narayan studied
Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. He read almost everything
that Marx had written and which was available in English,
including the three volumes of the *Capital*. He wrote:
"... it was in land of resilient and successful capitalism,
in the United States of America ... that I became a convert
to Marxism, or precisely, to Soviet Communism as it was then.
It was at Madison, Wisconsin the home of La Follette
progressivism then; the in the company of Jewish and
European born fellow students I drank deep at the fountain
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of Marxism. I think we left nothing unread of Marxism that was available in the English language then and with the help of a brilliant student of German even read some of the untranslated Marxism classics.

It was during this time, he was introduced by Landy to the works of M.N. Roy. The writings of M.N. Roy made an impact on his political mind and even aroused in him a suspicion of Gandhism. He read the writings of Roy like, 'The Aftermath of Non-Cooperation', 'India in Transition' and the issues of his journal called 'Musam' and some of his pamphlets. In 1954, J.P. wrote, "The first time I came to know anything of M.N. Roy was in the United States. I was studying in Madison, Wisconsin, then. It must have been the year 1925...". Through the Communist cell J.P. was introduced to the flaming political tracts powerfully written, closely reasoned, and attempting to tear to shreds the ideology of Gandhi's non-cooperation movement. "The Aftermath of Non-Cooperation", and a pamphlet whose exact title I forget, but which dealt with the question - 'What is to
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be gone boy?" I still vividly remember. Later, when I was working in Chicago in the stockyards, among other places, I came across 'India in Transition', which impressed me as a masterly exposition. Then also came issues of the 'Nasssa', published from Paris'.

Thus was it that J.P. made his acquaintance with M.N. Roy. "Naturally, he had a great hand in moulding my thought and leading me to Communism, which was still a revolutionary doctrine. That Roy was a colleague of Lenin and was a big personality in the Communist International, made him in my young eyes a hero and a great Indian... In the States I was drawn towards him as a disciple to the master".

This overwhelming impact of Roy converted a nationalist J.P. into a confirmed Marxist. "The pungent writings of M.N. Roy that found their way from Europe into the Communist cells, particularly of Asian students, completed the conversion to Marxism".

---

92. Ibid.
93. Ibid.
94. J.P. Narayan, From Socialism to Servodaya, op.cit.,p.10. Also in a personal interview with J.P. on 1st September, 1979, at his Kadam Kaun, Patna, residence. J.P. told: "I am one of the followers of M.N. Roy. I read his books and some pamphlets in U.S.A. When he came to India, I went to Calcutta to see him... He was an original thinker".
To Marxist J.P. freedom still remained the goal but the Marxist science of revolution seemed to him a surer and quicker way to it than the technique of Gandhiji. As a Marxist, J.P. also believed that political freedom must be accompanied with freedom from economic exploitation and poverty. He wrote: "As I embraced Marxism, I naturally came to regard the American state of those days as reactionary". But, "Freedom still remained the unchanging goal, but the Marxist science of revolution seemed to offer a surer and quicker road to it than Gandhiji's technique of civil disobedience and non-cooperation. The thrilling success of the great Lenin, accounts of which we consumed with unsatiated hunger, seemed to establish beyond doubt the supremacy of the Marxist way in revolution".

After completing his M.A., J.P. started to make arrangements to enrol for Ph.D. In the meantime, he received a letter from his father intimating his mother's serious illness. He left the United States for India in September, 1929, after seven years stay there. He reached to India in November, 1929, at the age of twenty-seven. His father had then retired from service. His wife, Prabhavati was staying with Gandhiji at Sabarmati Ashram and had taken the vow of celibacy. J.P. respected the decision of his wife. During this time the nationalist movement had reached its peak of

frenzy. Gandhiji was preparing for the next phase of struggle for independence. J.P. went to Wardha to see Gandhiji; he met also Jawaharlal Nehru there. J.P., with Gandhi and Nehru, went to attend the Lahore Session of the Indian National Congress, held in December, 1929. Nehru was impressed by him and invited J.P. to come to Allahabad and head the Labour Research Department of the Indian National Congress. J.P. assumed this responsibility on March 1, 1930. He stayed at Allahabad with Nehru. His relations with Nehru became very close. He addressed him as "Shai" and retained this style in his later life as also in his correspondence with his daughter Smt. Indira Gandhi. For two months in 1930, he also served as a Private Secretary of Ghanshyam Das Birla, an industrialist and one of Gandhi's hosts. In the early 1930, Gandhiji launched the Salt Satyagraha. J.P. joined the fray with full enthusiasm. He was a great nationalist fighter.

J.P., being a confirmed Marxist, did not join the Communist Party in India. The anti-nationalist stand of the
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Indian Communists compelled J.P. to decide otherwise. The Communist Party, following the comintern line those days, stayed away from the freedom struggle. It denounced the struggle as representing only the interests of the bourgeoisie. In a dialogue he stated, "but when I came back to India; I did not join the Communist Party here. For, although Indian Communist friends talked a great deal about anti-imperialist struggles, they did little to justify their revolutionary stance. On the other hand, I found that Gandhi and his followers were doing a lot. They were fighting the Britishers and going to jails. The Communists also appeared dogmatic to me; and I did not join the Communist Party because of lack of dogmatism in my make up".

Apart from this attitude of Indian Communists, what drew him away from them was the policy of the International Communist movement led by Lenin. J.P. never became a complete apologist for Russian Communism. He wrote, "Communists in this country as elsewhere, have made themselves laughing stocks by acting as puppets of Moscow". He thought to establish a separate Communist Party and tried to explore its possibilities. He also contacted M.N. Roy in this

connection. However, for lack of enough support he could not pursue this move.

Even when in America, J.P. did not forget Gandhiji. In an interview, a fellow student, Saul D. Ozar, recalled his experience with J.P. as follows: "I'll tell you a very interesting discussion that I had with him. He admitted that though he was very impressed with Marxism, he was very unimpressed with Communists as he found them... He told me that the major thing that bothered him was the morality, character, integrity of the Communists. He found them people that he did not like. Intellectually, he was trapped, but he was a man of deep ethical feeling. He was never able to give it up. He never really made the transformation to materialism". It is apparent that he was profoundly aware of and understood Marxism that he had studied it and had absorbed it, but it was still to him a strange mixture of materialism with Gandhism at that time. It was obvious that there was some conflict in his mind about the Marxism Gandhism dichotomy and he was trying to reconcile it.

The second disobedience campaign was started in 1932.


Gandhi, Nehru and other important leaders were put behind the bars. J.P. became the acting General-Secretary of the Congress. He organised the underground office and directed the struggle in the various parts of the country. Eventually, he was also arrested in Madras on September 7, 1932, and was sent to Nasik Central Jail. The Free Press Journal of Bombay reported his arrest in headlines as "Congress Brain Arrested". In jail, he came in contact with some young Congress leaders like Yusuf Meherally, Achyut Patwardhan, Ashok Mehta, M.K. Masani, S.N. Joshi, G.G. Gore and M.L. Lantawala. They prepared a blue print of a socialist party to be organized within the Congress. It later came to be known as the Congress Socialist Party. J.P. was its main architect.

A conference of the Congress Socialists was called on May 17, 1934, at Patna; on the eve of the Patna Session of the Indian National Congress. J.P. was elected Organising Secretary of the newly formed party. He toured the country and propagated the socialist ideas on Marxist line. He criticised the Gandhian and the Congress method of non-violence. He urged the people to develop a mass movement consisting of the working classes and the peasants against the British Government. He was the foremost leader, propagandist and

spokesman of Indian socialism. The first convention of the C.S.P. was held on October 21 and 22, 1934 at Bombay. J.P. was elected its General-Secretary and subsequently in the third session, held at Faizpur in 1936, he became its Chairman. He drafted the Meerut and Faizpur Theses of the C.S.P. Thus, in the formative period of the C.S.P., he played a pioneering role and left his stamp on the character of the party. In this period, he wrote a book entitled *Why Socialism*, published in 1936. Here he says: "There is only one type, one theory of socialism - Marxism". He outlined in this book a broad programme of the C.S.P.

When the C.S.P. came into being, there were mainly four other political groups into existence. These groups claimed to be socialists. These were: the Communists, the Royists, the Punjab Socialist Party, and the Bengal Labour Party. J.P. initiated for the United Front policy. He was in favour of creating a broad socialist front to fight against imperialism. At its Meerut session, held in January, 1936, the C.S.P. invited the Communists to join the party. Mambodhripad, A.K. Gopalan, P. Sundarayya, Ram Murthy, V. Ahmed, Latijvale and many others became the members of the C.S.P. Four of them were co-opted to the Working Committee. But later J.P. came to the conclusion that the policy had

---

"disastrous consequences". As the World War II began, the CPI labelled the CSP a counter-revolutionary party. At last, at the Ramgarh session of the CSP, the Communists were expelled from the party. Since then, J.P. believed that the CPI was 'not a free agent but a tool of Moscow'. Besides that belief, he heard of 'the infamous trials of renowned Russian Communist leaders', which were taking place in Russia. These happenings influenced his thinking and he drifted away from Communism for ever.

When M.N. Roy was in jail, the CSP was launched. Royists played an important role in the formation of the CSP. Many members of the Roy group took part in the activities of the party and held the positions in it. They contributed in shaping the programme and policies of the CSP. Substantial parts of the Royists manifesto were incorporated into the CSP programme adopted at Bombay in 1934. J.P. hoped
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that because of their early association, the Royists would merge with the CSP. But when Roy came out of jail, the events took a different turn. Roy opposed the formation of the left group within the Congress. From jail, he wrote three letters to the CSP in May, 1934, May 1935 and February, 1936 respectively and expressed his unwillingness in this regard. In the first letter, he wrote: "The struggle for the leadership of the Congress must take place not under the flag of socialism, but of democratic national revolution. The present political situation demands not the organisation of a Socialist Party inside the Congress; ... but the capture of the Congress as such by the radical national revolutionary elements". In his second letter, he wrote: "To be effective, the left wing of the Congress should free itself from the handicap of operating under the label of the Congress Socialist Party.... My point is that such a party cannot be inside the Congress. It must be independent of the Congress, although its members will individually remain in the Congress and constitute the driving force behind the left wing".

In effect, M.N. Roy was pleading for amalgamation of all the leftists into a single political grouping within

---
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the Congress and from that base operate in the Congress with the object of freeing it from its ideological, political and organisational deficiencies and convert it into a mighty mass instrument in the struggle against imperialism.

In his third letter to the executive committee of the CSP, he wrote, "My conviction is that a Marxist Socialist Party cannot be otherwise organised in this country". After his coming out of jail, Roy opposed the United Front policy. In one of its resolutions, the CSP declared Roy the disrupter and the saboteur of the United Front. The issues to concentrate upon were: "(1) his disruptive attack on the CSP; (2) his opposition to collective affiliation; (3) his attacks on the CI and the Soviet Union; (4) his support to the bureaucratisation of the INC; (5) his support to the compromising moves of the extreme right". The complete break with the CSP of Roy came when he supported the Congress move of setting up the Congress Ministries in the provinces. The CSP opposed this move. At this time, J.P. wrote: "Perhaps he had come to realise that the Congress Socialist Party could not be a plaything in his hands, nor a platform that he could use it to boost his own ego..."

111. Ibid. ('To the Executive Committee of the Congress Socialist Party'), Letter No. 3, p. 55.


In 1939, J. P. published an English weekly, called 'Congress Socialist', from Bombay. To propagate the socialism, he organised the Kisan and Handspinning bodies. He organised a 'Youth Society', a Women's Society and a 'Self-Help Society' as supplementary socialist bodies. He also organised socialist book clubs in the cities.

In September, 1939, the World War II broke out. J. P. opposed it and called it an imperialist war. M. N. Roy, however, called it a people's war against Fascism. J. P. was arrested in February, 1940 on charges of making an unlawful speech on 18th February at Jamshedpur. He was imprisoned for nine months. Gandhi was very unhappy over his arrest. He wrote, 'The arrest of Sri Jayaprakash Narayan is unfortunate. He is no ordinary worker. He is an authority on socialism. It may be said that what he does not know of Western socialism nobody else in India does. He is a fine fighter. He has forsaken all for the sake of the deliverance of his country. His industry is tireless. His capacity for suffering is not to be excelled ...'. In jail, J. P. kept on writing articles.
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115. J. P. Narayan, 'Facing War' (An article on War Policy), J. P. Narayan Papers Subject Files, File No. 39 (Teen Murti House, New Delhi); op. cit., p.10. Also see J. P. Narayan, Towards Total Revolution; op. cit., vol.I, pp. xxix and xxxv (J. P. issued a circular, 'War Circular No. 2', on December 31, 1939, from Lucknow, appealing the Congress leaders to launch a mass movement for independence during this time to take advantage of the war.
and somehow he managed to smuggle them out and these appeared in the 'Search Light', 'National Herald' and 'Bombay Chronicle'. These articles appeared under the sign 'A Congress Socialist'.

While he was in jail, he drafted a resolution for the Ramgarh Session of the Indian National Congress, 1940. He requested Gandhiji to place it before the Working Committee of the Congress at Ramgarh. The draft resolution entitled 'An Outline Picture of Swaraj' gives the picture of democratic socialist society as envisaged by J.P. Here we find the impact of Gandhiji on his ideas. This phase of democratic socialism of J.P. lasted till 1952.

He was released from the prison after the completion of his term, but suddenly he was re-arrested and was kept without trial in the Deoli Camp. He kept up his political activities in jail through political discussion and debates.

One day, when Prabhavati came to visit J.P., he tried to smuggle out a packet of letters from jail. But the guard detected the move and seized the letters. A few days later the contents of one of these letters appeared in the newspapers, in which he had advocated the use of violence. Gandhiji, however, took exception to the publication and contents of that letter and wrote: "I know that Jayaprakash does not agree with my non-violent principle, but he is not to blame for that. He spent many years in America, and was educated

there. It is natural that his thinking be influenced by
the doctrines of foreign movements. But one thing is clear:
whatever he has done has been completely in the cause of
national freedom. Whatever our disagreements and differences,
I have not for a moment doubted his courage, sacrifice and
strength of purpose. I do not think a foreign power that
has ruled India for an age through force and violence, has
the right to accuse Jayaprakash of believing in violence.
By publishing his letter, the Government has tried to bring
him into disrepute. If they think Jayaprakash is guilty
of believing in violence, then the foremost offender is
the Government itself...."

In August, 1942, 'Quit India Movement' was launched
by Gandhiji. J.P. was still in Hazaribagh Central Jail. He,
with six fellow-prisoners, managed to scale the walls of
prison and escaped. Soon after, he, along with certain other
Congress leaders, launched an underground movement and
trained a guerilla brigade. He wrote three letters to the
'Freedom Fighters' in January, 1943, September, 1943 and
in August, 1944, respectively, and a fourth was addressed
119
to the Americans. Through these letters, he exhorted the
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People to carry on the struggle to overthrow the British imperialism completely. Throughout the colonial period, he often advocated "the use of arms in the struggle for freedom," contrary to the stand of Gandhiji. In 1944, he himself acknowledged that he did not believe in non-violence. After a few months, J.P. left for Nepal. He organised and trained an 'Azad Dasta' (Freedom Brigade) there. The mission of this organization was to paralyse the machinery of the British Government. Finally, he was arrested in a running train in Punjab in September, 1943, and in December, he was declared a State prisoner. He was kept in Lahore Fort. Here, he kept a diary and noted in it his jail life. It was later published under the title: 'Inside Lahore Fort' in 1959 by the Socialist Book Centre, Madras. The booklet gives an authentic account of his jail life and a gradual transformation of his ideas along with Gandhian lines. At the time of his release in 1946, he had become a mass leader with a popularity comparable to Nehru and Subhash Chandra Bose.

After his release he engaged himself in reviving the C.S.P. He undertook a tour of the country. In July, 1946, he visited Lahore and in one of his speeches, blamed the
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Congress for adopting the constitutional methods. He believed that the time was ripe for a revolution. In 1946, he published an article entitled, 'My Picture of Socialism' in Janata. In it, he declared that he still believed in Marxism, but the presence of rival thinkers within the Marxist socialism, for instance, Stalinists and Trotskyists in the Soviet Union and Communists and Royists in India, led him to believe that 'the socialist movement in India must evolve its own picture of socialism in the light of Marxist thought, of world history and of conditions in this country, and our historical background'. In 1946, Yusuf Meherally edited a collection of his speeches and writings under the title, 'Towards Struggle'.

In 1947, J.P. published another article in Janata, namely, 'The Transition to Socialism'. Here J.P. advocated for the adoption of the peaceful and democratic path to establish socialism in India. Mahatma Gandhi was shot dead on January 30, 1948. It was a great shock to him. In March, 1948, the Socialist Party held its annual convention at Nasik. J.P., its Secretary, put the report in which he emphasized on the purity of means and denounced the power
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politics. In June, 1950, at the annual session of the Socialist Party held in Madras, J.P., the General Secretary, presented the report in which he advocated "the creation of a society of free and equal peoples; a society based on certain values of human and social life, values which could never be sacrificed in the name of theory or the party line or expediency of any sort". He also said, "If Marx were alive today, I am sure, he would certainly not have withdrawn himself into a shell and closed his eyes to Gandhiji's precepts and practices". It was at this conference that the differences between J.P. and Ram Manohar Lohia came out openly on the question of American aggression in Korea in 1950, which, of course, was condemned by J.P. Thus, after Gandhi's death, there was a profound transformation in the political and moral make up of J.P.

In 1951-52, J.P. was busy in party activities for the election. He attempted to create a joint platform for all democratic and socialist parties in opposition to the Congress, but he could not succeed. In the General Election of 1952, the party performed poorly and J.P. was blamed for the failure, but he was not disheartened. According to

125. Ibid., pp. 59-61.
126. Ibid., pp. 67-68.
him, the reason of the failure was "the presence of a large number of candidates against the Congress in almost every constituency". Therefore, in June, 1952, J.P. negotiated a merger between the KNPP and the Socialist Party and, thus, was born the Praja Socialist Party (PSP).

Vinoba Bhave began the Bhoomi Movement in 1951. J.P. went to district Danda (U.P.) to visit Vinobaji and was deeply impressed. He came back and went on a three weeks fast at Poona to purify himself. He wrote: "This fast has been for me a cleansing experience. I claim no more than that and I think it could not have done any harm to the party --- each day brought new inner strength and sometimes an unanticipated experience". After the fast, he wrote, "The detachment, self-control, conquest over desires are necessary for us". These weeks of introspect shook the confidence of J.P. in the intellectual validity of scientific socialism. However, he continued to be busy in party affairs. In February, 1953, Nehru invited J.P. to join the Government along with some of his co-workers. In a letter to Nehru, he expressed his views. In the same letter he suggested a 14-Point Minimum Programme, which might constitute a concrete

130. A land-gift movement.
Ground for the Congress-PSP agreement. Nehru expressed his inability to implement these reforms and the talk for co-operation was dropped. The letter of J.P. contains his political philosophy in a nutshell. He wrote, "... we all desire without the shadow of any doubt to create a new society, in which there is no exploitation, in which there is economic and social equality, in which there is freedom and well-being for all ...". To achieve this goal, he expressed his firm belief in Gandhian methods. In 1951, he wrote an article in Janata entitled, "Socialism and Servodaya" and recommended a serious study of the 'Servodnya Plan' for economic development, which was prepared by Gandhian workers in 1950. He wrote, "Gandhism is socialism".

In 1952, he wrote an article, 'Incentives to Goodness'. Here J.P. emphasized on the postulate goodness of the individual for a good society. He advocated a path beyond materialism to find the incentives for goodness. Thus, he abandoned dialectical Materialism and adopted Gandhism. In March, 1953, J.P. accompanied Vinoba to Gaya. He saw
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135. Janata; Vol. II, No. 13; October 12, 1952; p. 3. (J.P.) one time a worshipper at the shrine of the Lialectical Materialism, now accepts the autonomy of moral values. In his article, 'Incentives to Goodness', he pointed out the moral hallowness of materialism.
that Shoodan was the practical solution to the land problem. He accepted its philosophy of Ahimsa. His, however, was still associated with the P.S.P. To J.P., Shoodan was an effective and pure way to socialism. In 1953, in his address to the First Asian Socialist Conference held in Rangoon, he stated: "Socialism is ninety percent practice and ten percent theory". Here he criticized the Russian method of one-party-dictatorship and the system of parliamentary democracy. He strongly recommended peaceful means for establishing a socialist society. In the same year, he published an article entitled: "A Plea For Gandhism" in Janata, wherein he acknowledged Gandhism as a solution to the ideological problems of socialism. According to him, "Both socialism and Communism are faced with failures. Communism...has ended up in State capitalism and dictatorship...Socialism...has become only a parliamentary or legalistic creed. Thus, both the methods of violence and of parliamentary action have failed. Gandhism, to my mind, offers the third action".

He was getting sceptical about the relevance of party system for the reconstruction of Indian society. On
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September 12, 1953, he wrote to M.N. Roy expressing his desire to discuss with him the question of non-party politics. Roy had given considerable thought to this subject.

In April, 1954, at the Sixth Sarvodaya Conference held at Bodh-Gaya, J.P. declared to dedicate his life to the Bhooman Movement. He became a Jeevandan. He refused to accept any office in the PSP though he remained an ordinary member of the party. He retired from active party politics. In his article entitled, "Jeevandan" in the Janata, he wrote: "The decision I took was not made on the spur of the moment. I was being slowly driven to it for months past. Nor did the step signify repudiation of the ideals for which I had stood so long. It meant, rather, that I had realised that those ideals could be achieved and preserved better through the Bhooman or the Gandhian way". In his address at the Second Asian Conference held at Bombay in 1956, J.P. stated the importance of Bhooman in the struggle for socialism.

139. J.P. Narayan, Towards Total Revolution, Vol. I, op. cit., p. XCIII. Also see The Radical Humanist, Vol. 41, No. 12, March, 1978, p.8. (Wherein he wrote, "... I had gone to talk with Roy about non-party democracy, in which I was becoming deeply interested and about which he had done more thinking than anyone in this country, or for that matter, in any country, ... ").
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Soon after the Sarvodaya Conference, J.P. established a Sarvodaya Ashram in a backward village in Gaya district, called Sokhodevara. In 1956, a collection of his speeches and articles appeared under the title, 'Socialism to Sarvodaya'. In 1957, J.P. gave up even the basic membership of the P.S.P. On this occasion, he issued a long statement, which was published in the form of a pamphlet entitled, ‘From Socialism to Sarvodaya’. Here J.P. gave a vivid account of the ideological evolution of his thought. He expressed that he had not withdrawn from party and power politics, because of any personal frustration, but it had become clear to him that such politics could not deliver the goods; the goods being the same old goals of equality, freedom, brotherhood, peace. He talked of the full of the Sarvodaya politics, which drew him to the movement. "The politics of Sarvodaya can have no party and no concern with power. Rather, its aim will be to see that all centres of power are abolished. The more this new politics grows, the more the old politics shrinks. A real withering away of the state’.145
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In April, 1958, a collection of his letters, speeches and writings appeared under the title, *Towards a New Society*.

In April, 1958, J.P. and Prabhavati went on a tour at the invitation of various socialists and pacifist organizations of Europe. He came back to India in September, 1958. Shortly after his return, he issued a statement, that is, *'Back to Mahatma Gandhi'* to the press. He voiced his conviction that the only way to move the people was to awaken to go back to Gandhiji. According to him, *Sarvodaya* was a higher and truer form of democratic socialism. In February, 1959, a small pamphlet appeared under the title, *'The Dual Revolution'*. This contained a statement of his Gandhian conviction that social revolution must be preceded by human revolution. In 1959, J.P. returned to Sukhodevara and wrote an essay entitled, *'A Plea For Reconstruction of Indian Polity'*: This contained his formulations of a partyless democracy and his ideas concerning the inadequacies of the parliamentary democracy. He advocated in this pamphlet adoption of a decentralised socio-political order in India. In February, 1961, another important collection of his articles and writings appeared under the title, *'A Picture of Sarvodaya Social Order'*: followed in the same year by another pamphlet, *'Swaraj for the People'*: Here J.P. stressed the need and urgency of direct participation
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of the people in the management of their affairs as far as possible. In this pamphlet, J.P. advocated the Panchayati Raj for India. In the 'Introduction' of this pamphlet he acknowledged the contribution of M.N. Roy. He wrote: "Those among them, who are acquainted with me ... know well the influence of Roy on the evolution of my thought and the high regard, in which I have always held him even I have found it difficult some times to agree with him ... at no time have I claimed to have made an original contribution to political thought. I am indebted not only to Roy, but to many others - most of all to Gandhiji".

In 1970, an important collection of his selected speeches and writings was published in a book form entitled: 'Communitarian Society And Panchayati Raj'. In this book he expressed the view that the whole social system should be decentralised and reconstructed on the basis of communitarian society and Panchayati Raj. Besides these, he wrote a few other pamphlets, such as 'Political Trends' (1951), 'Sarvodaya Answer to Chinese Aggression' (1963), 'The Challenge After Nehru' (1964), 'Some Impression of My European Tour' (1958), 'Tasks of Social Research (ed.)', 'Three Basic Problems of Free India' (1965), 'Appeal to All' (1967), 'A Time to Speak' (1967), 'Evolution Towards Sarvodaya' (n.d.), 'For Peaceful Settlement' (1966), 'Desh Ki

In late 1968, he launched a movement for Bihar-dan. In 1970, he toured and camped at Mushahari to solve the Naxalite's problem. He wrote an article in October, 1970, narrating the story of his mission of peace in Mushahari. It was later published as 'Face to Face'. In 1972, a collection of his speeches and writings was published under the title: 'Marti Vichar Vatra' (Hindi). In 1971, J.P. employed his efforts to solve the dacoits problem of the Chambal valley. On April 15, 1973, his wife Prabhavanti died.

His failing health and the death of his wife deeply influenced his life pattern. He wrote: "After Prabha's departure I had lost interest in life ...". In 1973, Opposition parties formulated plans for a joint front. The leaders met J.P., but he was reluctant to take a plunge into political action at this stage of his life. The situational compulsions in India like growing inflation and unemployment, an utter loss of confidence in the Government and wholesale erosion of public morality obliged and prompted J.P. to get reinvolved in active politics. In Gujarat a powerful student-led movement emerged demanding disbanding of the state legislature. In 1974, he visited Ahmedabad and voiced his views. He came back to Patna and led the movement organized by the 'Chhutra Sangharsh Samiti'.

He addressed a series of public meetings. In one of his addresses on April 8, 1974, at Congress Maidan, Patna, J.P. said: "For 27 years I have watched events unfold, but I can stand on the sidelines no longer. I have vowed not to allow this state of things to continue ...". On June 3, 1974, J.P. addressed a famous public meeting at Gandhi Maidan, Patna. Here he gave the idea of Total Revolution. The speech was later published as 'Sampran Kranti Ke Live Aawahan' (Hindi).

On Bihar movement, there arose serious differences between Vinoba Bhave and J.P. From 1954 to 1971, J.P. played an active role in the Sarvodaya movement, but gradually he came to realise that Sarvodaya movement alone would not be able to solve the problems of the country. He felt that Vinoba's movement, in its existing form, could not become a potent instrument for change. It could not bring a revolutionary change in the country's social structure. Ultimately, on the issue of the involvement of the Sarva Seva Sangha in Bihar movement, J.P. took a stand, which was contrary to that of Vinoba. In July, 1974, out of twenty-four members of Sarva Seva Sangha, twenty-one supported J.P.'s move. He began to organise the ad hoc People's Action Committees at Panchayat, Block and District levels, and Students Action Committees in every high school, college.
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and University and in every constituency.

On June 25, 1975, J.P. addressed a public meeting at Ramila ground in Delhi, organised by the Janata Front, demanding the resignation of Mrs. Indira Gandhi from Prime Ministership in compliance with the High Court judgement.

On the morning of June 26, Emergency was declared in India and J.P. was arrested and later released on November 12, 1975. In jail, he fell seriously ill. In jail, he kept a diary, in which he recorded day-to-day happenings. Later, it was published under the title, *Prison Diary*. It gives a glimpse of his jail life and also throws light on his views on the concept of Total Revolution. On October 7, he wrote in his diary: "I have been saying that total revolution is a combination of seven revolutions - social, economic, political, cultural, ideological or intellectual, educational and spiritual. This number may be increased or decreased. Giving the meaning of economic revolution, he wrote: It means revolution in the economic structure of society and its economic institutions, as also their new, revolutionary forms. Economic revolution implies both change and new creation."

---

151. Allahabad High Court had allowed the election petition of Raj Narayan against Mrs. Gandhi on June 12, 1975, and she was unseated from Rai Bareli Parliamentary constituency.
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On January 18, 1977, when Mrs. Gandhi declared that
the Lok Sabha elections would be held in March, the five
Opposition parties formed the 'Janata Party' finally on
January 23. Since then, ailing J.P. campaigned for the
Janata Party and toured West Bengal, Punjab, Rajasthan,
Gujarat, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. By this time, he had become
very ill and had to be admitted to Jaslok Hospital, Bombay.
The Janata Party won the election with sweeping majority.
The people voted in the name of J.P. He was the main architect
of the Janata Party and father of the peaceful revolution
through the ballot box in March, 1977.

Soon after the elections, J.P. reminded the new leaders
of the ideal of service unto the last (Antyodaya). During
the Bihar Movement, in his speeches and statements, J.P.
gave the idea of Total Revolution. Later, all these speeches
and statements were published under the title, 'Total
Revolution' in 1975. Another collection entitled 'Samput
Kranti Ki Khoj Men: Meri Vichar-Vatna', Vol. II (Hindi) was
published in 1978. His health deteriorated further and for
a long period he hovered between life and death. At last,
he died in his sleep early on October 6, 1979, at the age of
77 at his Kadam Kuan, Patna, residence.

the upliftment of the masses and down trodden upto
the lowest level).
Thus, J.P., who passed through many phases of his life, that is, nationalist, socialist, Sarvodaya and total revolution, was always concerned with the preservation of humanist values of liberty and rational outlook. He was a pilgrim in search of a way to achieve the objective. The main goal of his life and philosophy remained constant; that is, to create a society where man would be the measure of everything.

**Comparison**

To sum up the biographical sketches of M.B. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan reveal that the journeys from Nationalism to Marxism to Radical Humanism (Roy) and from Nationalism to Marxism to Total Revolution through Sarvodaya (J.P.) are long enough, but circuitous. Between Roy and J.P. there seems to be unanimity on the issue of individual freedom and his autonomy. The common factor is strong enough between Roy, a revolutionary and a philosopher and J.P., a spiritualist and saint. There are some differences between the two, but they are mostly at metaphysical level. Both were intellectuals of outstanding mould, both had a forceful urge to bring about social justice through engineered change, both had a strong vein of idealism and concern for the down-trodden, both represented a queer mix of 'oriental' and 'occidental' brought about by the determinants of their Indian births and genes and very sound educational base of and prolonged
personal contact with the west. To illustrate the common traits of thought and action of Roy and J.P., we can not do better than to quote J.P. himself on this issue. He wrote, "It has been the matter of deep satisfaction to me that, after a middle period of difference, we had moved close together at the end just as I was close to him at the beginning....Towards the end, both of us, each in his own way, had moved away from Marxism in the same direction and to the same goals".

CHAPTER III

M.N. ROY AND JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN ON THEORY OF SOCIALISM

Having dealt with, in the preceding chapter, the evolution of thought of Roy and J.P. in the context of their life span, we now propose to discuss in the present chapter their conceptual contribution to the theory of socialism.

M. N. ROY

Scientific Socialism

In the second phase of his political life, Roy was a staunch Marxist. He was the chief spokesman of Indian Marxism. In the second Congress of the Communist International held in 1920, Roy put forward his own thesis on the National colonial question. He stated his views, which differed with those of Lenin, in his book, 'India in Transition'. He gave a Marxist interpretation to the modern Indian history. According to him, India was not under the feudal system. The feudal system was destroyed by peaceful means. "Feudalism as the basis of social economics, received the first death-blow in the earlier years of the British possession in the middle of the 18th century, when the political power passed into the hands of the representatives of a foreign commercial

1. See Chapter II.
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According to him, the last vestiges of feudal power were shattered by the failure of the 1857 revolution. 'The revolution of 1857 was nothing but the last effort of the dethroned feudal potentates to regain their power'. After the failure of 1857 revolt, the entire country was brought under the British Crown - an instrument of capitalist exploitation.

According to Roy, India was divided into four distinct classes, namely: (1) the landed aristocracy, including the native chiefs, (2) the bourgeoisie and the intellectuals, (3) the petty peasantry and (4) the working class, including the landless peasants. The landholding class invested their accumulated wealth in commercial and industrial enterprises and thus, the modern Indian bourgeoisie emerged. The Indian intellectuals - the basis of modern bourgeoisie, were the product of British imperialism. When the British Government introduced the modern education, in the second decade of 19th century, the modern intelligentsia grew rapidly and captured the professions of medicine, law and teaching. The increasing wealth of intelligentsia and the
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absence of the profitable means of investment caused discontentment in their ranks with the British Government. According to Roy, this economic necessity forced "the intellectual bourgeoisie to begin its political struggle which was initiated in the form of Indian National Congress". Its aim was to replace or, at least, to minimise the power of the British Government.

Reviewing the position of peasantry in India, Roy found that the capitalist economy had brought under its control almost the entire of agricultural production. The Indian peasantry was subjected to the exploitation of foreign as well as native capital. To Roy, "The secret of misery of the rural population lies in the fact that the agricultural production has been brought completely within the sphere of capitalist exploitation; foreign and native combined. The unrestricted export of foodgrains, together with the merciless speculation carried on by the native traders, raises the price continually on the one-hand, while, on the other, the lack of employment among an ever-growing section of the rural population creates great scarcity of money. So, even when there is food, the people die of hunger, because they have no money to buy it with".

7. Ibid., p. 70.
8. Ibid., p. 56.
In India, to Roy, proletariat was "the class of industrial workers living exclusively on wages earned in the cities". The belated growth of the urban proletariat in India was due to the retarded industrial development of the country. The East India Company took about hundred years to undermine the feudalism. After 1857, the whole of India came under the capitalist exploitation. Normally, with the coming of capitalism, there should have been industrialisation in India, but India did not pass through the stage of mercantile capitalism to industrial capitalism. Operating under the strong urge to retain the monopoly of British capitalism over Indian market, the British continued industrial development of Britain at the cost of India. According to Roy, the development of large-scale industry would determine the future of India. It would strengthen the labourers. As a result, the native bourgeoisie would seek compromise with imperial bourgeoisie. To Roy, 'the workers and peasants consciously organized and fighting on the grounds of class-struggle would have to take responsibility to win the freedom for India'. Under these circumstances, according
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to Roy, the workers should be educated to understand their class interests. He stated, "Our object should be to create discontent everywhere against the present system of exploitation, and to intensify it wherever it exists. Thus, the ideal of Swaraj would be brought within the understanding of the workers and peasants of India. Let us lead them forward under the slogans: 'Down with Foreign Rule'; 'Down with All Exploitation'; 'Lend to the Peasant and Bread to the Worker'".

To Roy, socialism was synonymous to Communism and was, therefore, a philosophy of class struggle, culminating into an equitable society. It was more than a philosophy of struggle and reconstruction. It was a revolutionary philosophy of life. "Socialism (that is to say Communism) is not equitarianism. It does not seek to level down humanity to a uniform standard. Socialism will establish equality only

14. According to Roy, 'Swaraj' would guarantee to the worker the full value of what he produces. Swaraj (political independence) was the first step to economic freedom and social emancipation. The programme of national reconstruction would consist of the following: "(1) That our National State (Swaraj) will be based on the principle of universal suffrage; (2) That the principal means of production, distribution and exchange (land, mines, factories, railways, waterways, etc.) will be owned by the Democratic State and operated under the control of Worker's Committees, elected by and from among the workers employed therein; (3) That landlordism be abolished, and the ownership of land be vested in the State, which will distribute it among those who cultivate it". (M.N. Roy, What Do We Want? (Bombay: Maciketa Publications Limited, 1971), pp. 250-251 and 255-256.
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in respect of opportunity. In the socialist society, every man and woman will have equal opportunity to attain the highest level of creativeness and intellectual progress. Artificially created inequalities will be removed ....

Socialism is more than an economic theory. The plan of revolutionary political action on the part of the working class is not the whole of socialism. Socialism is not comprehensively defined by calling it an ideology of social reconstruction. Socialism is a revolutionary philosophy of life". On the question of comprehension and implementation of the concept of socialism, Roy was of the view that the economic theories formulated by Karl Marx could not be properly understood except in the light of his philosophical teachings; and that the political programme of socialism could not be effectively acted upon unless the leaders of that action were inspired by the revolutionary philosophy of life, which constituted the foundation of Marxism.

Interestingly enough, Roy made a subtle distinction between Marxism and Communism. To him, Marxism was a philosophy and Communism was only a political strategy - the means to the end. For that matter socialism or Communism "is common ownership of the means of production and


17. Ibid.
distribution. He explained, "In brief, socialism is the abolition of private property in the means of production, distribution and exchange. The basic thing, however, is production. Private property in that key position of public economy once abolished, socialisation of distribution and exchange inevitably follows .... Therefore: the more exact definition of socialism would be 'abolition of private property in the means of production'.

In 1922, Roy published his book, 'India's Problems and Its Solution'. In this book, in a thoroughly Marxian style he criticized Gandhism and the bourgeois leadership of the Indian National Congress. He advocated for the creation of a revolutionary mass party to intensify the discontent against the existing economic and political system of the country. In place of the Congress ideology of the civil disobedience, Roy advised 'militant action of the masses' for the immediate political and economic demands of the people. Accordingly, 'A programme for the Indian National Congress' was prepared and circulated on the eve of Gaya Congress, held in December, 1922. This programme advocated complete national independence for India, universal suffrage and a federal republic. Its social and economic programme


contained the following items:

(I) Abolition of landlordism.
(II) Reduction of land rent to a minimum.
(III) State aid for Modernization of agriculture.
(IV) Abolition of all indirect taxes and a progressive income-tax.
(V) Nationalization of public utilities.
(VI) Development of modern industries under state aid.
(VII) Eight hour day. Fixation of minimum wages by legislation.
(VIII) Legalization of labour organizations.
(IX) Worker's Councils in big industries.
(X) Profit sharing to be introduced in all big industries.
(XI) Free and compulsory education.
(XII) Separation of State and religion.
(XIII) A national militia to replace the standing army.

In his book, "The Future of Indian Politics" written in 1926, Roy emphasized the importance of a 'People's Party. He criticized the Swaraj Party as a defender of capitalism and landlordism. The democratic party of the people would be contained of petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the

20. M.N. Roy and Evelyn Roy, One Year of Non-Cooperation: From Ahmedabad to Gaya (Calcutta: Communist Party of India, 1923), pp. 105-111. (This programme was criticised in the Indian Press as an infiltration of Communist ideology. Most newspapers gave it wide publicity. It was also printed in the Government publication: Communism in India: Myself and the Communist Party of India; by Musaaffar Ahmed and in the Documents of the History of the Communist Party of India.

proletarian. In its objectives, Roy included "(a) complete independence; (b) the establishment of a republican government; (c) radical agrarian reforms; and (d) advanced social legislation." At the time of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, Roy advocated the theory of "decolonization." Here he explained the changing character of imperialism. After his expulsion from the Communist International, Roy continued to devote his efforts towards the strengthening of the Indian revolutionary movement. At its Lahore Congress, held in December, 1929, the Indian National Congress accepted the complete national independence resolution as its immediate objective. Roy welcomed the decision and took the opportunity to put before the Congressmen a concrete programme of national revolution, through his pamphlet, namely, 'The Lessons of the Lahore Congress'. It included the following items: "(1) Establishment of a Federal Republic of India with an advanced Democratic Constitution; the Executive being fully responsible to a single chamber Parliament elected by universal (men and women) adult suffrage; (2) Provincial autonomy in local matters; the province, reconstructed for assuring as far as possible linguistic and religious homogeneity, having government as democratic as the Central Government; (3) Abolition (without compensation) of the Native States and landlordism by the
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decree of the Democratic National State empowering the peasants to confiscate the land; (4) Nationalization of the land; the cultivators having the occupancy right in return for the payment to the Government of a unitary land-tax, which shall not exceed 15 per cent of the net income; (5) Abolition of all other charges on the peasantry (for example irrigation-tax) and of indirect taxation (salt-tax, excise duties, protective customs duty, etc.); (6) Complete exemption of taxation for peasants living on uneconomic holdings; (7) Liquidation of agricultural indebtedness in the case of the peasants in the state of insolvency; (8) Legislation for the control of usury (interest not to exceed 10 per cent per annum); (9) Organization of agricultural banks with state aid for providing cheap credit to the peasants; (10) Nationalization of the mineral resources and public utilities; (11) Legislation fixing the working day for the wage-labourer to eight hours; (12) Minimum wages guaranteeing a constantly rising standard of living of the worker to be fixed by law; (13) Social insurance (against unemployment, sickness, old age and maternity), the employers and the contributing 75 per cent of the fund; (14) Legislation of Trade Unions and the worker's right to strike and organize their class political party; (15) Freedom of the press, platform and association; (16) Freedom of religion and worship; (17) Protection for minorities; (18) Right to bear arms; (19) Free and compulsory primary
Roy came back to India in 1930, as a confirmed Marxist. He was put in jail for six years (1931-1936). During his jail period, he modified some of the formulations of Marxism, particularly relating to the tactics of revolution. He found that Indian working class was very backward to realise the necessity of fighting for socialism. He saw that most of the leaders of the socialist movements were from intellectual middle classes. He came to realize that Marxism might be elaborated, amplified and even revised in the context of the knowledge of modern science. According to L.P. Sinha, "During this period of forced seclusion he pondered over some of the assumptions of Marxism and started modifying some of them, specially those in respect of the strategy and tactics of Revolution. He came gradually to occupy a Menshevik position, and held that the existing stage in Indian Revolution was only one of Bourgeois Democratic Revolution. Though he did not deny the possibility of National Revolution passing over into a socialist revolution in a hypothetical future, yet for all practical purposes he argued as if this would not happen". In his later writings, we find this trend becoming more pronounced.


In jail, he wrote an article entitled 'Whither Congress?' wherein Roy advocated transformation of the Congress into the organ of a mighty mass movement against foreign imperialism and national reaction. The most important writings of his jail period were the three letters to the C.S.P. In his first letter he expressed the need of democratic national revolution. He drafted a programme for the Left-Wing of the Congress, wherein, he sought to transfer the ownership of land from the non-productive rent-receivers to those directly concerned with the actual production, to increase the purchasing power of the masses, to foster industrial and commercial prosperity, equitable distribution of national wealth; freedom of press, speech and association, free secular education to all children below fifteen years of age; equal political, economic and social rights for women; welfare of all masses and minorities.

After the release from jail in 1936, Roy called upon all the anti-imperialist organisations in India to achieve freedom through mass struggle. 'Socialism was not the issue of the day. To achieve democratic freedom, with the establishment of a government of the people and by the


people was the immediate task. In the editorial of the first issue of Independent India, Roy demanded transfer of the ownership of land to the cultivators, productive-employment of social labour, establishment of a genuine democratic state, rapid growth of modern mechanized industry, abolition of all privileges.

Thus, we find that Roy did not think it necessary to follow in India the same lines as were predicted by Marx for European development. He rejected the Marxian principle - the dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary means to achieve socialism. In India, the proletariat was numerically weak and politically inexperienced. So, according to Roy, the proletariat could not bring about the socialist revolution alone. In India, dictatorship of the proletariat would mean rule of minority. According to Roy, bourgeois democratic revolution was a historical necessity for India. He characterised the impending Indian revolution as a bourgeois democratic revolution, which would take the form of "clash between a class based on land as the means of


production and another based on new means of production,

32 namely, capital'. To Roy, the only way for the economic
development of India was to carry out "an agrarian revolution,
and build up modern industry under the control of a really
33 democratic State". The bourgeois democratic revolution
would create conditions in India favourable for a convenient
development towards the socialism. There would be an
intervening period, during which the conditions for socialism
would be created. To Roy, "The introduction of the mechanical
means of production on a large scale; the abolition of all
pre-capitalist restriction on production; the attainment
34 of a certain minimum economic level" were the historic
preconditions for the establishment of socialism. In Roy's
opinion, political freedom for India was the first postulate
for the ultimate objective of socialist society. He wrote,
"The political independence of the nation would be followed
by the economic emancipation of the masses...." He further
added, "The real and lasting freedom of a people demands
their complete and unconditional social emancipation". (which
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34. M.N. Roy, Scientific Politics (Lectures in the All-
India Political Study Camp, Dehra Dun: May and June, 1940),
(Dehra Dun: The Indian Renaissance Association Limited,
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means the abolition of private ownership in the means of production, distribution and exchange). In the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the Indian proletariat would be able to exercise its hegemony. The Indian revolution would be led by a multi-class party. The bourgeois-democratic revolution would transform itself, in course of time, into a socialist revolution.

In June, 1939, Roy organized the League of Radical Congressmen. In September, 1940, he left the Congress and organized the Radical Democratic Party in December, 1940. He advocated what he called 'Twentieth Century Jacobinism'. According to Roy, 'We live in the atmosphere of the sixteenth and seventeenth century. We are confronted with tasks, which were accomplished by the revolution of that epoch. But Marxism was formulated in the nineteenth century. ... We are living in a pre-Marxian period'. So, Roy opined that Marxism could not be applied on our then existing problems. Roy used the term Jacobinism to highlight the distinct nature of the problems of change and reconstruction in India, which was of a pre-Marxian nature, but which, nevertheless had a distinct tendency to pass into Marxian developmental syndrome with the passage of time. 'Jacobinism is to be appreciated historically as the shadow of Marxian...

Thus to Roy, 'Marxism applied to a bourgeois democratic revolution, Marxist theory applied in practice to the problems of the bourgeois democratic revolution, is Jacobinism. Therefore, Marxism applied to the social problems of the seventeenth and eighteenth century to be solved in the atmosphere of the twentieth century can be called twentieth century Jacobinism'.

Roy considered twentieth century Jacobinism as something midway between a bourgeois revolution and a proletarian revolution. The credit of the Indian revolution would be neither of the proletariat nor of the bourgeoisie, but of the Jacobins, that is, "the petty-bourgeoisie acting as the vanguard of the rising proletariat together with the proletariat acting as an integral part of the petit bourgeoisie". That revolution would provide the transition to socialism. According to him, "once the revolution takes place in our time, though with a Jacobin ideology and with a Jacobinist programme, the tendency towards a direct development to socialism, which was inherent in Jacobinism, will most probably prevail in our country". In formulating this Roy had in mind the petty-
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bourgeoisie, who, at the time of French Revolution, acted as the great grand-father of the proletarian revolution. Roy's conclusion was quite similar to that of Edward Bernstein, a left wing German revisionist. V.P. Verma had regarded Roy as the Indian Bernstein.

Communitarian Socialism

In 1943 and 1944, Roy devoted his thought to the question of post-war reconstruction of the country. He formulated a scheme for planning in India, namely, Peoples' Plan, published in April, 1944. The Radical Democratic Party adopted the Peoples' Plan in May, 1944.

41. Ibid., pp. 145-146. ("According to Roy for the Indian revolution in its present stage, we should fix our sights neither upon the Russian Revolution nor any other revolution of our times. We would have to go further back and our prototype may be found in the Jacobins of the French Revolution. The Jacobins carried through the bourgeois revolution in the teeth of the opposition of the bourgeoisie. The representatives of the bourgeoisie, who had heralded the revolution, went over to the camp of counter-revolution, and the Jacobins carried it through against the feudal aristocracy as well as the big bourgeoisie. The relation of classes in contemporary India was somewhat analogous to the Jacobinism and was represented by Babesuf and his followers.


43. People's Plan for Economic Development of India was prepared by the post-war Reconstruction Committee set up by I.S.I. It was released for public discussion by M.N. Roy, General-Secretary of I.S.I., in 1944.

Roy laid down three conditions for the economic development of any country. These were: (i) abundance of labour; (ii) availability of capital to be invested; and (iii) internal market. The first two conditions existed in India, but the third, that is, internal market was very limited in India. It was due to poverty and low purchasing power of the people. To increase the purchasing power of the agricultural sections, "mechanical means must be introduced in the process of production. That means industrialisation of the country". The essential features of the People's Plan were the following: "(1) The primary motive of production will be to supply the requirements of the people to raise the standard of living as distinct from increasing purchasing power; (2) Priority for the agricultural production through the mechanisation, modernisation and collectivisation; (3) Expansion of agricultural production coupled with rationalisation of agricultural economy, would relieve the burden on the peasantry by rationalising land and liquidating indebtedness; (4) Expansion of present industries and establishments of new ones for supplying the minimum requirements of the people, which are not at present satisfied; (5) State financing of the mechanisation
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of agriculture and expansion of industries for supplying the requirements of the people; (6) Requirements to be satisfied are food, shelter, clothing, health and education; (7) State control of industries financed with public funds; (8) The P.C. guaranteed profit from industries financed with private capital; (9) To relieve the pressure of labour on land, new land to the extent of fifty P.C. of land under cultivation at present will be cultivated; railway mileage will be increased by 50 P.C., roads enlarged 150 P.C., extensive public work, particularly irrigation, construction of houses to provide decent living conditions to the rural population and the working and middle classes in cities and towns; building of schools and hospitals".

Roy believed in bracketing political planning with economic planning. He said, "without political planning, economic planning is found to be an idle speculation". A really democratic government should be established in India where "people will be in effective control of political power". Only then planned economy would be possible. Therefore, Peoples' Plan was followed in a couple of months by the

47. 'Peoples' Plan for Economic Development of India', Independent India, Vol. 8, No. 11, April 19, 1944, p.126. Also see M.N. Roy, Peoples' Plan for Economic Development of India (Delhi, Indian Federation of Labour, 1944), pp.6-7.
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Draft Constitution of Free India prepared by Roy in 1944.

The Draft visualises a democratic State. The supreme power rests with the people. Organised democracy would be the source of all constitutional authority. The basic institutions would be the People's Committees in villages, towns and cities. 'Chapter One' on 'Rights and Fundamental Principles' and 'Chapter Eleven' on 'The Economic Organisation of Society' of the Draft give a clear picture of Roy's socialist approach. Wherein, he visualised that land and underground riches would be the collective property of the people. Basic industries and credit system would be subject to state control. Cultivators would be entitled to hold land subject to the payment of a unitary land tax. The State would promote large-scale cooperative agriculture through the supply of modern machinery and cheap credit. An irreducible standard of living for all working in the fields, factories, mines would be guaranteed by minimum statutory

50. M.N. Roy, Constitution of Free India - A Draft (Delhi: Radical Democratic Party, 1945), (Roy's Draft Constitution, consists of 137 articles, gives a clear picture of a general social and political theory, which claims to diagnose and provide a remedy for all ills like poverty, ignorance and inequality. The Draft Constitution is based on the fundamental principles of Radical democracy - Twenty-Two Theses adopted by the R.L.P in its Third Conference held in Bombay in December, 1946. It aims to establish a Radical Democratic State based on Popular Sovereignty).
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wages. Adequate remunerative employment or relief would be a right of a citizen. Nobody would labour for more than eight hours a day for six days a week. Every worker would be entitled to one month's leave with full pay every year; and women workers to three month's maternity leave with full pay. There would be statutory provision of social security for the old, sick and infirm. Free, compulsory and secular education would be provided to all children up to the age of fourteen.

There would be guarantee for freedom of speech and press, and right of association for safeguarding the economic conditions and political status of workers and toiling masses. Right of minorities would be protected by proportional representation on all economic bodies. The economic life of the country would be reorganised in such a way that there would be guarantee to every citizen of all the material requirements for civilised existence and also adequate leisure for cultivating the finer aspect of life. The State would plan production and regulate distribution to that end. Production would be for use. There would be freedom of enterprise, individual and collective subject to satisfy the requirements of the people.

53. Ibid., Article 1(g) to (r).
54. Ibid., Article 1(s) to (y).
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Cooperative Socialism

In his last phase of life, Roy came to realise that party system and power politics were not the solution for relieving the people from their problems. Consequently, he dissolved his R.C.P. in December, 1948 and founded the Indian Renaissance Movement. In order to bring about a social revolution, he propounded the philosophy of New Humanism (or cooperative socialism). In cooperative socialism the individual would be independent unit of society. There would be no domination of any kind on the individual to limit his freedom. "Man is freedom loving, romantic and creative animal. He would submit to no domination, dictation or bondage. So, it would be the task of the cooperative commonwealth to give every individual opportunities for direct participation in the governance of the State through the Panchayats".

The idea of Co-operative Socialism is based on the belief that the tendency to cooperate is deeply rooted in human nature. He believed that cooperative socialism could be a substitute to capitalism-based on competitive economy, on one side and to communism - based on collective economy on the other. Through cooperative socialism the present political crisis can be resolved. Roy believed in direct democracy in the form of a network of small cooperative

---

commonwealths. There would be no clash between individual interest and the community interest. "The cooperative approach, moreover, does not stand merely for forms of enterprise or political institutions. It is the name for a social philosophy. It has an ethical-spiritual dimension. Regarded as such it is an alternative to orthodox liberalism as also to recent varieties of corporativism and communism".  

Roy's cooperative socialism is based on widespread decentralization and a spirit and practice of cooperation. In cooperative socialism, man would enjoy his freedom as well as his security. According to Roy, the greater would be the ties of cooperative socialism; the greater would be the freedom of the individual and benefits of mankind. The cooperative economy, according to Roy, should be guided by two considerations: "(1) the basic purpose of national economy is to provide food, shelter and clothing for the people; and (ii) one must cut the coat according to the cloth available". Economic life of society would be reorganised on the basis of mutual cooperation independent of the State interference. The new economy would consist of consumers' and producers' cooperatives. The people would conduct and coordinate the economic activities of the society through

57. Amlan Dutta, Cooperative Socialism, reproduced in Ibid., p. 115.

these institutions. Full advantage would be taken of modern science and technology. The village would be a suitable unit for this purpose. "The working population of the village can, thus, form itself into a cooperative community for all the three purposes of estate management, farming operations and the running of the village industries". The cooperative economic system would be built up from the bottom upwards. Over the local cooperatives at the base, there would be a pyramidal structure at the district, regional, provincial and national level cooperative. All the activities at various levels would be performed by these cooperatives. The State would interfere only in economic matters when demanded. The local and regional cooperatives would look after the economic interests of the people within their territorial jurisdiction. "Commodities will have to be exchanged and local multi-purpose cooperative societies will be integrated into one larger economic system". Large scale industries would be developed with the help of the surplus pooled by these local cooperatives. Roy said, "Built on the basis of a cooperative agriculture and locally developed industries, the superstructure of the large scale production of certain specified articles or exploitation of natural


resources, such as mining, will also be cooperative. They will be owned by local cooperative societies - the new source of capital formation”.

The private owned industries would have the freedom to develop and complete with the new system. They would also have the option to join the cooperative system or to remain independent and compete with cooperative economy. According to Roy, if they decide to remain independent, they would gradually be wiped out because of the “impossibility to compete with a non-profit-making economy sustained by the cooperative efforts of practically the entire society”. Thus, without any coercion by the state, the profit motive oriented private enterprise would be eliminated.

The cooperative economy would be a planned economy. But planning process would ensure active participation and adequate freedom of individual. Roy gave the first preference to agriculture rather than to industrialisation in India - a backward country, in his planning. According to Roy, the recognition and development of agriculture as “the foundation of a healthy rational modern economy stands a greater chance than any other method to succeed in removing the poverty of the Indian people”. Rural consumers and subsidiary...

industries would be organised on a small scale on cooperative basis to provide employment. Roy favoured the cooperative method of farming because initiative would remain with the local unit in this method.

According to Roy, capitalism, socialism, communism, and welfare State etc. were unable to give freedom, democracy and security to the individual. The only alternative, in his view, was cooperative socialism. It was not merely a method of economic attainment, but a way of life. It would provide greater freedom to the individual and larger benefits to mankind. It was a new orientation in the history of socialism. It placed M.N. Roy in the ranks of pioneers of world socialist thought.

**JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN**

During the early years of his political career, J.P. was an apologist for Marxism. He had been the foremost leader, propagandist and spokesman of Indian socialism. Gandhiji regarded him as the greatest Indian authority on socialism.

**Marxian Socialism**

J.P. regarded socialism as a complete theory of socio-economic reconstruction. 'It is much more', he said, 'than

---

a theory of personal ethics. To him, socialism was a theory and technique of widespread planning. It involved a technological reconstruction of the total aspects of society. Its aim was "harmonious and well-balanced growth of the whole society".

Between 1929 and 1946, J.P. was an ardent believer in Marxian socialism, but at no stage he was attracted towards the Indian or the Russian Communists. It was due to the anti-nationalist stand of the Indian Communists and the violent purges in the Soviet Union that he disapproved of both of them. In the early phase of his thought socialism was synonymous to Marxism. He regarded socialism as an economic principle. According to him, the aim of socialism should be to eradicate the economic inequality and concentration of wealth in a few hands. There would be social ownership of the means of production. He wrote about his picture of socialism: "It is a society, in which all are workers - a classless society. It is a society in which human labour is not subject to exploitation with interest of private property, in which all wealth is truly national - in which there are no unearned incomes and no large economic disparities, in which human life and progress are planned and where all live for all".

67. Ibid., p. 65.
During this period, he believed in the principle of dialectical materialism of Marx. He believed like Marx that material forces affect the individual and social institutions. He observed: "Social division (class) is an organic process of society. Marx showed that its primary source lay in the manner in which men earned their livelihood". Again pointing out the difference between socialism and Gandhism, J.P. stated that "The starting point of socialism is the inquiry into the causes of economic inequality; into the origin of princes, landlords, capitalists and poorers; into the secrets of human exploitation". According to him, Marxist dialectical materialism provided the basis of a socialist's inquiry into the causes of inequality.

J.P., in his book, *Why Socialism*, analysed the class organisation in Indian society. According to him, the Indian bourgeoisie, that is, the industrialists, landlords, highly paid government servants, the titled gentry, the middlemen, were the partners with the British imperialism to exploit the Indian masses. The Indian industrialists "exploit the masses as junior partners of imperialism ..."? J.P. believed

71. Ibid., p. 88.
72. Ibid., p. 142. (To J.P., the term 'Masses' included workers, peasants and the lower middle classes).
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that Indian bourgeois could not lead the anti-imperialist movement. They had always been in league and compromise
with the British imperialism. Referring the New Constitution, granted by the British imperialism: J.P. stated: "That
Constitution represents ... just such as compromise between imperialism and the upper classes of India for the further
exploitation of its masses. And, as it is already history, the Constitution was made possible by the pressure of the
latter themselves. The bourgeois was dependent on the imperialism for their benefits but the masses were not.
Therefore, according to J.P., "the masses are the only classes in India, which are uncompromising anti-imperialist.
They alone stand for the complete independence of the country. Others either openly ridicule and oppose the idea or only
pay lip-service to it". The masses were poverty stricken.
It was due to the disproportionate ownership and control of the means of production. He stood for social and economic
equality. Socialism to him, is also a theory and technique of comprehensive planning. It involves a technological
reconstruction of the total aspects of society. Its aim is the "harmonious and well-balanced growth of the whole society".
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The following fifteen point programme of the All-India Congress Socialist Party outlined in 1934 by J.P. clearly highlights the Marxist slant of his ideology during this time. They are:

1. Transfer of all power to the producing masses.
2. Development of the economic life of the country to be planned and controlled by the State.
3. Socialization of key and principal industries (e.g. steel, cotton, jute, Railways, Shipping, Plantations, Mines), Banks, Insurance and Public Utilities, with a view to the progressive socialization of all the instruments of production, distribution and exchange.
4. State monopoly of foreign trade.
5. Organization of cooperatives for production, distribution and credit in the unsocialized sector of economic life.
6. Elimination of princes and landlords and all other classes of exploiters without compensation.
7. Redistribution of land to peasants.
8. Encouragement and promotion of cooperative and collective farming by the State.
9. Liquidation of debts owed by peasants and workers.
10. Recognition of the right to work or maintenance by the State.
11. “To everyone according to his needs and from everyone according to his capacity” to be the basis ultimately
of distribution and production of economic goods.

12. Adult franchise on a functional basis.

13. No support to or discrimination between religions by the State and no recognition of any distinction based on caste or community.

14. No discrimination between the sexes by the State.

15. Repudiation of the so-called Public Debt of India. 78

J.P. criticized the Congress programme and its objectives. According to him, the programme, objectives and declarations of the Congress did not give it the character of a representative body of the masses. Its objective must include, as a minimum, the following points:

1. Complete independence, in the sense of separation from British imperialism.

2. All political and economic power to the producing masses (including brain workers).

3. Nationalization of all key and large industries, banks, mines, plantations, etc.

4. Abolition of landlordism in all its forms.

Also see: Towards Struggle; op. cit., pp. 101-102.
(In the Meerut Thesis (1936) of the C.S.P. it was stated: “Marxism alone can guide the anti-imperialist forces to their ultimate destiny”. In the Faizpur Thesis (1937) of the C.S.P. it was stated: “The struggle of the Indian Masses for freedom will not reach its objective unless the working class is the vanguard of that struggle”).
5. Land to the tiller of the soil.

b. Liquidation of all debts owed by peasants and workers.

Socialism can be realized only by the abolishing private ownership of the means of production and to establish over them the ownership of the whole community. Only, thus, can the cruel process of economic exploitation of the vast masses be halted. J.P. criticized the inadequacy of the Karachi Congress of 1931 resolution on Fundamental Rights. He stood for the reduction of land revenue, the limitation of consumption expenditure and the nationalization of industries. The most important economic and social task in India, according to him, was to eliminate the rural and heartless exploitation of the masses. This could be achieved only if the people control their economic and political affairs. Since 1934, J.P. believed that Socialism alone could be the basis of freedom of India. In 1940, he submitted a draft resolution to the Ramgarh Congress, wherein he advocated collective ownership and control of all large scale production. He urged that the State should nationalize heavy transport, shipping, mining and the heavy industries. He wrote: "The law of the land will be based on the will of the people freely expressed by them. The ultimate basis

79. Ibid., p. 155.
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of maintenance of order shall be the sanction and concurrence of the people.

The free Indian State shall guarantee full individual and civil liberty and cultural and religious freedom, provided that there shall be no freedom overthrown by violence the constitution framed by the Indian people through a Constituent Assembly.

The State shall not discriminate in any manner between citizens of the nation. Every citizen shall be guaranteed equal rights. All distinctions of birth and privilege shall be abolished. There shall be no titles emanating whether from inherited social status or the State.

The political and economic organisation of the State shall be based on principles of social justice and economic freedom. While this organisation shall conduce to the satisfaction of the national requirements of every member of society, material satisfaction shall not be its sole objective. It shall aim at healthy living and the moral and intellectual development of the individual. To this end to secure social justice, the State shall endeavour to promote small-scale production carried on by individual or cooperative effort for the equal benefit of all concerned. All large-scale collective production shall be eventually brought under collective ownership and control; and in this behalf the State shall begin by nationalising heavy
transport, shipping, mining and the heavy industries. The textile industry shall be progressively decentralised.

The life of the villages shall be reorganised and the villages shall be made self-governing units, self-sufficient in as large a measure as possible. The land laws of the country shall be drastically reformed on the principle that land shall belong to the actual cultivator alone, and that no cultivator shall have more land than is necessary to support his family on a fair standard of living. This will end the various systems of landlordism on the one hand and firm bondage on the other.

The State shall protect the interests of the classes, but when these impinge upon the interests of those who have been poor and downtrodden it shall defend the latter and thus restore the balance of social justice.

In all State-owned and State-managed enterprises, the workers shall be represented in the management through their elected representatives and shall have an equal share in it with the representatives of the Government.

In the Indian States, there shall be complete democratic government established and in accordance with the principles of abolition of social distinction and equality between citizens, there shall not be any titular heads of the States in the persons of Rajas and Nawabs.
This is the order, which the Congress envisages and which it shall work to establish. The Congress firmly believes that this order shall bring happiness, prosperity and freedom to the people of all races and religions in India, who together shall build on these foundations a great and glorious nation."

According to J.P., Socialism is not opposed to the dominant values, which have been cherished in the Indian culture. Indian culture has always laid emphasis on the emancipation of the individuals and the downtrodden. Sharing of social burdens has always been one of the dominant values of it.

J.P. stood for village reorganization. He emphasised that villages should be made self-governing and self-sufficient units. He suggested that land should belong to the actual cultivator. He also suggested the idea of cooperative farming. He wrote, "The only solution is to

---
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clear away all the vested interests that lead in any manner whatever to the exploitation of the tiller of the soil; liquidate all agrarian debts; pool the holdings and establish cooperative and collective farming; state and cooperative credit and marketing system and cooperative subsidiary industries”.

According to J.P., cooperative efforts and planning only could provide the balance between agriculture and industry. In his ‘Third Letter to the Fighters of Freedom’ written in August, 1946, he formulated a thirteen-point constructive work programme to establish Gram Raj. He suggested the following types of work for this: "(1) Enrolment of Congress members. Attempts should be made to enrol every adult villager. Meetings of the enrolled members should be held. Flag salute. (2) A cultural centre should be opened where newspapers should be read and such other activities conducted as adult literacy, dramatics, folk
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songs, study circles, library, posters, agricultural
advice, etc. (3) Sevadal and Akhada work. (4) Problems
of sanitation, roads, bunds, etc. tackled in a practical
way. Collective labour for common purposes should be
encouraged. (5) Untouchability work. (6) Communal harmony
work. (7) Prohibition. (8) Survey of conditions. (9) Redress
of grievances. (10) Founding of Grain Banks. (11) Propaganda
in neighbouring villages. (12) Co-operative marketing.
(13) Work among women and children”.

Side by side with the cooperative and collective
farming, J.P. suggested that the State should set up its
own industries. As an orthodox Marxist, he also suggested
municipal or community ownership of industries besides
the ownership by the State or by the Producer’s Cooperative.
He wrote, “I advocate development of these co-operatives
and community owned industries firstly, because I do not
believe it possible to find employment for many years to
come for our surplus population, which would swell further;
at least, by twenty percent by the revolution in agriculture;
in large industry alone; secondly, because I desire to
prevent the State from acquiring the sole-monopoly in
industry and employment. The State under Socialism threatens,

89. J.P. Narayan, ‘Third Letter to the Fighters of Freedom’,
Ibid., pp. 238-239. Also see J.P. Narayan, Communitarian
Society and Panchayati Raj (ed. by Brahmanand);
(Varanasi: Navachatra Prakashan 1970), p. 49. Also
as in Russia, far from withering away, to become an all-powerful tyrant maintaining a stranglehold over the entire body of citizens. This leads to totalitarianism of the 90 type we witness in Russia to-day”.

**Democratic Socialism**

With the passage of time and in the wake of his growing experience, J.P. progressively realised that democracy was essential for socialism. He observed: “There can be no Socialism without democracy. It is a common mistake these days to think that there must be the dictatorship of the proletariat in a socialist State. This is against the teaching of Marx. The dictatorship of the proletariat has a place only in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, and in this period too it is not inevitable in every case”. He described his concept of socialism as “an economic and political democracy. In this democracy man will neither be slave to capitalism nor to a party or the State. Man will be free. He will have to serve society, which will provide him with employment and the means of livelihood, but within limits he will be free to choose his avocation and station in life. He will be free to express his opinions and there will be opportunities for him to rise to his full moral stature. There will
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be no great difference between man and man—except the
difference of physical and mental endowments—for there
will be no great difference in incomes".

In another article entitled, "The Transition to
Socialism": J.P. continued to describe his theme as 'democra-
tic socialism'. Here J.P. talked of democratic methods to
establish a socialist society. He pointed out 'violent
revolution and dictatorship might conceivably lead to a
socialist democracy, but in the only country (U.S.S.R.)
where it has been tried, it has led to something very
different; that is, to a bureaucratic state, in which
democracy does not exist. I should like to take a lesson
from history". The direct experiences of J.P. with the
C.P.I. and the trials of renowned Russian Communist leaders
in thirties were the main reasons of his disillusionsment
with Marxism and his resultant conversion to democratic
socialism. Quoting the speech of Marx at the Hague
Convention of the first International, J.P. justified his
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Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1955), p. 11. Also see
Ibid., Introduction, p.xiv. Also see Srinivasanand: 'J.P.
Redefine Socialism', Jayaprakash Narayan: His Life
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stand of peaceful means to establish socialism in India. He questioned some tenets of Marxism and consequently came closer to Gandhiji. He wrote, "... all this questioning and rethinking was gradually bringing me near to Gandhi". But I had not yet been completely converted and so found myself at the half-way house of democratic socialism. Mine would yet be a revolutionary socialism, I thought, which would transfer society from the roots and would yet preserve and uphold the great human values of freedom, equality and brotherhood'. At Nehru's request, J.P. joined the Congress Working Committee in September, 1946, and at Neerut Session in November, he moved the following resolution, which was adopted unanimously. "In the opinion of this Congress Swaraj cannot be real for the masses unless it makes possible the achievement of a society, in which democracy extends from political to the social and economic spheres, and in which there would be no opportunity for privileged classes to exploit the bulk of the people, not for gross inequalities such as exist at present. Such a society would ensure individual liberty, equality of opportunity and the fullest scope for every citizen for the development of his personality". For the first time, the C.S.P. in its Kanpur Session, held in March, 1947, emphatically asserted that
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there could be no socialism without democracy. In his annual report, as General Secretary, of the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Party, J.P. emphasized on ethical values and good means to achieve Socialism. In his report, J.P. indicated an evolution of his thought away from Marxism and in the direction of Gandhism. He wrote, "There were many things that Mahatma Gandhi taught us. But the greatest thing he taught us was that means are ends; that evil means can never lead to good ends and that fair ends require fair means. Some of us may have been sceptical of this truth but recent world events and events at home have convinced me that nothing, but good means will enable us to reach the goal of a good society, which is Socialism".

J.P. believed that greater the freedom, higher would be the level of socialism. In his report, as General Secretary at the Patna Conference of the Socialist Party he stated:

---

98. Resolutions, Congress Socialist Party, 1947; held at Kanpur (Bombay, Socialist Party, 1947), p. 12. In his Statement at Kanpur Conference, J.P. dealt with Socialist objectives. Giving the picture of his Socialist Society he wrote, "It is a democratic society where everyone is a worker and all men are equal including women, where there are equal opportunities for all and wages do not differ so much as to create distinction of class; where all wealth is owned by the community; where progress is planned where labour is joyful and fruitful life is richer, fuller, beautiful". (J.P. Narayan: "The Objective of Socialism: What the Socialist Party Strives For?", Janata, Vol. 2, No. 9, March 23, 1937, p. 4.).
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"Democratic socialism must become our life's mission, the philosophy of our life. We must accept democracy and all that it stands for; for thus alone can we reach the goal of socialism. Democratic socialism involves acceptance of democratic means, peaceful methods and constructive approach, in the attainment of our goal". This view was reiterated by J.P. in Madras Conference in the following year. Here, he pointed out that "in the present conditions of India, and further anticipated conditions, the democratic method is the only right method to work for socialism". Describing the goals of socialist movement, he observed: "The aims of socialist ... were not mere overthrow of the capitalist order and establishment of a party dictatorship, but the creation of a society of free and equal peoples, a society based on certain values of human and social life; values which could never be sacrificed in the name of theory or the party line or expediences of any sort". At the Special Convention of the Socialist Party, held at Panchmari, J.P. emphasised on democratic means to be followed under the then existing conditions of the country. Explaining his position
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to his partymen, J.P. stated that Marxism was itself a confluence of three streams of ideas, that is, classical economics of Britain, revolutionary socialism of France and philosophy of Germany. Consequently, he pleaded to combine the Marxian thought with the thought and practice of Mahatma Gandhi and achieve a synthesis of their own.

After the General Election, 1952, the K.M.D.P.P. led by J.B. Kripalani and the Socialist Party merged together and the P.S.P. came into existence. In 1953, Jawaharlal Nehru wrote to J.P. for cooperation between the Congress and the P.S.P. in the fields of national reconstruction and development. Following that gesture, J.P. formulated a fourteen-point 'Minimum Programme for National Reconstruction', on the basis of which, he expressed his willingness to extend cooperation to the Congress. The talk did not bring any concrete results. The 'Programme', however, shows the standpoint of J.P.'s ideology. In the 'Draft Programme', J.P. gave a picture of society, in which there would be no exploitation. There would be economic and social equality, freedom and well-being for all.

105. Ibid., p. 27.

Since 1948, J.P. came closer to Gandhi and pleaded for ethical politics. He increasingly came to distrust the principle of Dialectical Materialism. By 1952, he stood fully and firmly for Gandhism. He observed: "For many years I have worshipped at the shrine of the Goddess of Dialectical Materialism, which seemed to me intellectually more satisfying than any other philosophy. But while the main quest of philosophy remains unsatisfied, it has become patent to me, that materialism of any sort robs man of the means to become truly human. In a material civilization man has no rational incentive to be good. It may be that in the kingdom of dialectical materialism fear makes men conform and the party takes the place of God. But when that God himself turns vicious, to be vicious becomes a universal code".

People's Socialism

The trend of J.P.'s ideological leanings towards Gandhism and Sarvodaya reached its high water-mark when he attended the Bodh Gaya Sarvodaya Conference in 1954 and declared there to dedicate his life for the cause of Sarvodaya and Bhoomi. Thereafter began the phase of Sarvodaya, which he called People’s Socialism. As early as 1951, J.P. declared that Sarvodaya was not a "crankish

108. J.P. Narayan, From Socialism to Sarvodaya (Kashi, Akhil Bharat Sarva Seva Sangh, 1958), p. 39. Also see J.P. Narayan, Towards a New Society, cit., p. 34.
creed", but it was the first attempt to establish a new
social order - "a classless and casteless society. He
wrote: "Some years back it became clear to me that socialism
as we understand it today cannot take mankind to the
sublime goals of freedom, equality, brotherhood and peace ... 
unless socialism is transformed into Sarvodaya; those goals
would remain beyond its reach ....". J.P. expounded the
contents of 'Sarvodaya Plan' and suggested to the Congress
to accept and implement it. "The ideal that the plan sets
out to achieve is that of a non-violent, non-exploitative -
cooperative society, which shall not be based on caste or
class and in which there shall be equal opportunity for all.
The present competitive economy shall be replaced by a
social economy based on cooperation. Proprietorship in
agriculture land shall vest in the tiller of the soil under
regulations laid down by society". He added that socialism
was not just the Sarvodaya plan. It was much more. He stated
that Bhoodan was the first step towards a total revolution -
social, political and economic."It stands", he said, "for a

109. J.P. Narayan, Socialism, Sarvodaya and Democracy,
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111. Sarvodaya Plan was prepared in 1949 at Wardha by the
constructive workers. It was based on Gandhian
principles for national reconstruction.
112. J.P. Narayan, Socialism, Sarvodaya and Democracy,
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society, which strives of the good of all, and in which everybody would be happy. In such a society, there would be no distinction of high and low. The man would be the architect of his own government.

In the First Asian Socialist Conference in Rangoon, J.P. only advocated Gandhi's path of peace and love to achieve socialism. J.P. pleaded for a revolution in the values of life, which, to him, would be the real revolution. 'Law would not be helpful in this regard'. He believed in Gandhian method of internal change in man. He advised the people to limit their wants and to share and to cooperate with their fellowmen. He defined a socialist society 'as one in which the individual is prepared voluntarily to subordinate his own interests to the larger interests of the society'. According to him, state can not force the individual to live


according to this ideal. Only the Gandhian and Sarvodaya principles showed the way of sharing of wealth, which was the real and full socialism. Socialism to him was a way of life. "Socialism for me was always a way of life. It represented a set of values, to which we owed allegiance voluntarily and which we tried to put into practice in our lives. Those values we did not see developing anywhere as a result of merely institutional changes, whether economic or political."

In 1957, J.P. disassociated himself from party politics and advocated people's socialism instead of State socialism. He realised that representative government was not enough. It was necessary to decentralise the political and economic centres to give power of self-government to the people at large. His goal was to create a classless, stateless and partyless society. He sought to build up from below, on the model of the ancient Indian village order - village self-government (Gram Raj). In his two pamphlets, 'A Plea for Reconstruction of Indian Polity' and 'A Plea for the People: J.P. outlined his picture of village self-government.

117. J.P. Narayan, 'Gandhi, Vinoba and Bhoodan Movement' (Adopted from an address given before the United Nations Association, Coleford, England); J.P. Papers Subject File No. 14 (Articles by J.P. III/A) (New Delhi, NNML), p. 7. Also see J.P. Narayan, 'On Some Impressions of my European Tour' (Text of Speech delivered at Sapru House on September 22, 1958), J.P. Papers, Subject File No. 54 (Newspaper clippings); (New Delhi, NNML), p. 5.

According to J.P., the people’s socialism or communitarian socialism would only be realised when the social structure of society would be of a pyramidal structure - a communitarian society. He suggested at the bottom of this structure there would be face to face communities. He visualised a chain of communities; building from the primary community to the world community. According to him, all the communities from bottom to top would be organically inter-related and independent in their spheres. No control would be imposed from above. There would be maximum economic and political decentralisation. The primary community would be self-governing, self-sufficient, agro-industrial and urbo-rural. The primary communities would form a regional community. It would come into existence by an organic process of growth. It would be an integrated community in itself. It would be autonomous, like the primary community, in the spheres in which the primary communities had delegated their powers to it. In the same order, a number of regional communities would form a still larger community, that is,

119. J.P. Narayan, A Plea For Reconstruction of Indian Polity, (Kashi, Akhil Bharat Sarva Seva Sangh Prakashan, 1959), pp. 50-51. (The community would be built up of personal relations and choice, and freedom within the limits of self-imposed discipline and common culture. There would be participation by the members in all communal affairs. It would be a cooperative society. The cooperation in the community would encompass its entire of life, rather than only its economic sector; and all the members of the community rather than only those who purchase shares).
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the district community. The district communities in turn would federate together to form the provincial community. The provincial communities would come together to form the National Community. He believed that a day might come when the national communities might federate together to form a World Community.

In this communitarian society, there would be progressive decrease in the functions and powers from bottom level to the top. And there would be utmost scope for the people. This type of communitarian polity, according to J.P., only could guarantee the participating democracy.

"The economy of the communitarian society would also be decentralized like-wise. To J.P., "political decentralization cannot be effective without economic decentralization". The aim of the economy would be welfare of the community and each of its members, not individual profit. It would be neither "exploitative nor competitive but cooperative and co-sharing". It would be balanced and of limited wants. It would also be in cooperative harmony with nature. Further,
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it would be as self-sufficient as possible, so that it might provide the primary food, clothing, shelter and other necessities of life to its members. It would produce for self-consumption. Planning would begin from the regional community. 'Regional plan would be the unit out of which the whole national plan would have to be constructed'. All the natural resources would belong to the community. Each community would have possession of land and of natural resources that falls within its boundaries. There would be equality in incomes. The worker would be given central position in the community. 'The communities would be of agro-industrial character. A greater part of the industries in the primary, regional and district communities would be of the owner-worker type. The rest would be cooperative and a few units might be of the private-employer-employee type. The provincial and national undertakings would be of the cooperative, communal or even-private type'. There would be self-government in industries and other economic undertakings. In each community, that is, regional, district, provincial, etc., there would be different associations representing owner-workers, other workers and owners, managers and technicians. All these associations would be
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federated in each communal area into an Economic Council. Each community would have its own Economic Council. It would advise and be represented in the political communal body concerned. The Associations and Councils would have powers to make rules and to govern the activities of their member institutions'. Private enterprise would also partake with the spirit of private as well as communal welfare. But private enterprise would also be subjected to the principles of self-government.

In the communitarian society, the role of the State would be minimum. The State should regulate and legislate for the formation of a Panchayati Raj but "the day-to-day working of Panchayati Raj", according to him, "should be put outside the purview of the State Government". At another place opposing the State machinery, J.P. stated, "It is not possible to achieve any success through

128. Ibid., pp. 60-81.

129. Ibid., p. 82. (J.P. believed in using the recent technology for production. He said, "for my purpose the debate between the modern and the traditional is irrelevant. What I am suggesting is, indeed, a most modern type of economy, the like of which does not exist or has existed anywhere, and to create which the utmost possible help of science, including social sciences, would be required. In other words, a new machine technology as well as a new socio-economic technology, would have to be created. J.P. Narayan, 'Communitarian Society and Panchayati Raj', op. cit., p. 90).
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developing the power of the State". Thus, J.P. maintained that in the communitarian society, the people's socialism (Servodaya and Gramdan) could be achieved. To him, it was a real and unique form of socialism. He pointed out that Gramdan was "a form of socialism the like of which history had not seen before".

**Total Revolution**

Since 1974, J.P. advocated the philosophy of Total Revolution which, to him, was the true alternative form of socialism. In a letter to friends he wrote, "I have faith only in such socialism in which the economic power would be in the hands of the working people themselves and individual freedom and civil liberty would remain secure. In my opinion a socialist revolution will be successful when the economic power (and political authority also) is in the hands of the people and they will be able to build their future without any outside interference. The total revolution of which I speak today is such a revolution and is based on socialism with real equality and human freedom". Here he


was influenced with the teachings of Gandhiji, Vinoba and M. Roy and Lenin to a certain extent. According to him the ideal of Total Revolution was similar to that of the Gandhian idea of Purna Swaraj. He observed, "any Gandhian approach or model is one of a continuous revolution which I have called Total Revolution. Satyagraha or non-violent struggle is the essence of this revolution. It is also dialectical in a special sense - it makes a struggle between individual and society, authority and freedom, Elite and the masses, Property and Non-possession, Labour and Capital and so on ...". Bhoojan to him was the first step towards total revolution. He wrote, "Bhoojan is not a programme of merely collecting and distributing lands. It is rather the first step towards a total revolution social, political and economic".

In this phase, J.P. advocated persuasion and conversion - social revolution through human revolution to achieve total development and welfare of the society. Giving the meaning of Total Revolution, J.P. advocated a seven-fold scheme of revolutions. He said, "I have been


saying that total revolution is a combination of seven revolutions - social, economic, political, cultural, ideological or intellectual, educational and spiritual. This number may be increased or decreased. For instance, the cultural revolution may include educational and ideological revolutions ... Economic revolution may be split up into industrial, agricultural, technological revolutions etc. Similarly, intellectual revolution may be split up into two - scientific and philosophical. Even spiritual revolution can be viewed as made up of the moral and spiritual or it can be looked upon part of the cultural. And so on".

According to J.P., the Total Revolution would bring revolution in all aspects of society as well as the individual simultaneously. It would change the entire system. Its methodology would be non-violent and peaceful. 'The philosophy of total revolution aims at renunciation of the lust of power'. The people would be the real masters of the political power. He suggested the organization of people's committees in each assembly constituency polling booth. These would
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act as watchdogs of democracy and people's rights and duties. The people's committees would set up candidates and would send a representative selected by general consensus to an assembly constituency people's committee. The people would have right to recall their representatives who have ceased to enjoy the confidence of a majority of voters. He wrote: "in a democracy the people do have the right to ask for the resignation of an elected government if it has gone corrupt and has been misruling. And if there is a legislature that persists in supporting such a government it too must go so that the people might choose better representatives".

J.P. visualised a radical change in the ownership of the means of production. As a Gandhian, he laid emphasis on agricultural development; equitable land ownership; the application of appropriate technology to agriculture; the development of domestic and rural industries and the widest possible expansion of small industries; regional planning (Planning from below) and development. The concept of total revolution may be taken as a synthesis of socialist revolution


and the agrarian rural realism of the Sarvodaya. J.P. had given in this scheme the central place and utmost importance to the individual.

Thus, all through the way of development of his thought from Marxism through democratic socialism and Sarvodaya to Total Revolution, J.P. remained an ardent advocate of all-round development of individual and society. As a matter of fact, it is this seminal and consistent factor, which appears to have steered the course and determined direction of the development of his thought through its various stages. He has been one of the greatest thinkers of Indian socialism.

Comparison

Both M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan changed some of their ideas from time to time in the light of experience. The ideological development of both the thinkers was somewhat similar. Both were ardent Marxists in their early phases of political career. Both began by analysing the Indian society from the Marxist viewpoint. And came to the conclusion that the reason of poverty of the Indian masses was not merely the foreign economic exploitation but Indian bourgeois

class also played important role in exploiting the natives.

Both believed in scientific socialism and its evolutionary nature. Socialism to them was the common ownership of the means of production and distribution and equal opportunities to all the people. Both agreed initially to bring socialism by the power of the State. Nationalisation of all the means of production, distribution and public utilities was to be brought about by the State power.

Neither Roy nor J.P. was satisfied with Gandhism and the bourgeois programme of the Indian National Congress. To transform the Indian National Congress into a radical and socialist organisation both drafted their programmes for change in the Congress.

Roy and J.P. both agreed that to achieve freedom was the first postulate for the establishment of a socialist society in India. Without political independence the socialist programme could not be implemented. The law of the land had to be based on the will of the people. The people were to be in effective control of the political power.

Both placed a great emphasis on agricultural development of the country. The agriculture was to be mechanised

and modernised. They suggested cooperative farming. Land
was to be redistributed and tiller be made the owner of
the land. The State was to provide the financial aid to
promote the agricultural production. To balance the economy
of the country both favoured setting up of industries—
both large and small scale; State owned as well as community
owned. An agro-industrial economy was prescribed by both 145
as the remedy for India and its development. Both gave a
lot of importance to planning in the economic development.
Both sought to reorient the village life and make it self-
sufficient.

In their later stages both Roy and J.P. renounced
Marxism. They came to the conclusion that Marxist socialism
was not the solution for the problem of humanity in general
and India in particular. Socialism, they realized, tended
to culminate into State capitalism. Socialisation of the
means of production was not the cure of all evils of
capitalism. Both Roy and J.P. grew into vehement critiques
of the Russian totalitarianism and Statism. Their ideologies
and thought went beyond Communism. In the post-Independence
period, Roy developed the philosophy of Radical Humanism
and J.P. joined the Sarvodaya movement. In this phase most
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of their ideas were considerably similar. The cooperative socialism advocated by Roy is similar to that of J.P.'s people's Socialism (Sarvodaya) in terms of their pronounced human components and all embracing comprehension. Socialism to them was not merely an economic principle but a way of life.

Both agreed that the main problem was not that of production but of centralisation. Both advocated the maximum decentralisation. They proposed to reorganise the political and economic system independent of the State interference. Both visualised the pyramidal structure of the political and economic system. The village was to be its basic unit. From village to the national level, they visualised formation of a communitarian society and dreamt of the ultimate formation of a world community. The State had a minimum role to play in this economic system.

Both agreed on cooperative agriculture. The motive behind the production would be consumption not profit. The economic development would be planned. But planning would not be imposed from above; it should begin from bottom. People were to be given fullest scope of participation in their economic management. Both were critical of the Second

Five Year Plan. Workers were given central place in economic organisation by both.

Besides these similarities there seem certain differences between the two socialist thinkers. J.P. never took the directives from the World Communist movement. He came to India as a confirmed Marxist, but did not join the Communist movement in India. He joined the Indian National Congress straight away. He was a great propounder of Indian socialism. To him, socialist movement in India was a part of the national freedom struggle. 'The association of the socialist movement with freedom struggle had an important consequence. Nationalism, which might in theory be regarded as a departure from socialist internationalism, in practice, helped the socialists to escape from the embrace of the Communists. It was on this issue of subordination to Moscow that they parted company'. Roy, on the other hand, took active part in the mobilisation of the World Communist movement as an official of the Communist International. He was the most colourful of all non-Russian Communists in the era of Lenin and Stalin. Roy did not like orthodox nationalism. He wrote: "National-socialism in practice cannot be anything but Fascism. It was in Germany; it has not been any different in India ...".

J.P. advocated democratic socialism and Gandhian spiritual means to establish it. According to him, there was no dichotomy between socialism and the Indian culture. He talked of co-sharing and limitation of wants. His emphasis was on human values. M.N. Roy did not like democratic socialism. Democratic socialism was written of as "contradiction in terms". According to Roy, if democratic socialists ever come to power in India, "either their socialism or their democracy will go by the board". Roy believed that every possible human need should be satisfied. He believed in the enrichment of the individuals. According to him, "the advocacy of Indian spiritualism was merely an attempt to revive the backward pre-capitalist social conditions of India".

Thus, it may be concluded that while J.P. was very near to Roy in his socialist thinking, he had some basic and vital differences also with the man he admired so much and from above he drew considerable inspiration in his thinking.
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CHAPTER IV

M.N. ROY AND JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN'S CRITICISM OF GANDHISM AND MARXISM

In the last chapter, we have dealt with the conceptual contribution of M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan to the theory of socialism. The current chapter is dealt to an analysis of their criticism to Gandhism and Marxism. Roy and J.P. Lohia were critical of Gandhi and Gandhism in their Marxian phase of political career. Although in the later phase of their political careers, they came closer to Gandhi. Roy in his last phase of political career, as a Radical Humanist, was much near to Gandhi. J.P., except for his brief orthodox Marxian phase, remained a Gandhian for the whole of his political career.

M.N. Roy and Gandhism

As a Marxist, Roy criticized the mediavalism and conservatism of Gandhian social ideology. The first detailed criticism of Gandhism appeared in his first major book, India in Transition. In this book, Roy argued that Gandhism has now reached a crisis “and its “impending wane ... signifies the collapse of the reactionary forces and their total alienation from the political movement”. Roy saw Gandhism
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as a temporary obstacle in the path of history. He believed that Gandhism would fall victim to its own contradictions. He regarded Gandhism as "the acutest and most desperate manifestation of the forces of reaction trying to hold their own against the objectively revolutionary tendencies contained in the liberal bourgeois nationalism". He also wrote: "Gandhism is nothing but petty bourgeois humanitarianism hopelessly bewildered in the clashes of the staggering forces of human progress".

According to Roy, the non-violent revolution of Gandhi was impossible. There was bound to be bloodshed in the course of freedom struggle. The Non-cooperation movement led by Gandhiji could not be expected to win by soul-force alone. He observed: "This victory will be won not through the soul-force but with blood and tears and will be maintained by blood and iron". It is obvious that the Marxian approach to revolution was conditioning Roy's analysis of non-violent freedom movement of India.

Roy and his wife, Evelyn kept on criticizing Gandhism through a series of articles and pamphlets. In his book:
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India's Problems and Its Solutions, published in 1922, Roy criticized the Gandhi leadership as bourgeoisie leadership which had betrayed the revolutionary forces. In 1923, another book, entitled, One Year of Non-Cooperation, was published. Here Roy acknowledged the constructive contribution of Gandhiism in the national movement. He paid tributes to the saintly personality of Gandhi. But according to him, there were various shortcomings and contradictions in it.

First, according to Roy, there was lack of any suitable economic programme in Gandhi to win the support of the masses. After the first World War, he observed, there was discontent among the peasants and workers. But Gandhiji did not place any concrete economic programme before the masses that could provide better living conditions and higher wages. Referring disapprovingly to evil spiritual Swaraj, Roy said, "Gandhiji held before the eyes of the famished workers a fabulous spiritual Swaraj to be attained not by energetic and wholesome birth pangs of revolution, but by the old, familiar method of suffering, sacrifice and non-violence, repentance and prayer."
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Secondly, Gandhi wanted to unite all antagonistic classes - exploiters like the landlords and capitalists with the exploited, that is, peasants and workers. According to Roy, the interests of these opposing classes are bound to be divergent. Further, Gandhi sought the support of the capitalists, landlords and zamindars in organizing the people's movement. His theory of trusteeship was, in practice, a moral exhortation to the 'haves'. 'Have nots' could derive no concrete relief. To Roy, "Gandhi could not think in terms of a radically different economic order in which there shall be no place for landlords and capitalists. For all practical purposes, he took the permanence of the classes with the welfare of the people through a process of moral conversion".

Thirdly, Gandhism had incorporated metaphysics into politics leading to a confusion between spiritual and material aims. Political dynamism was sacrificed at the altar of subjective considerations of conscience. According to Roy, "Religion is opium for the people. When a religion is made out of politics, or politics is debased to the level
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of religion, it operates as an even stronger drug". Analysing Gandhism, he wrote: "Gandhism is not a co-ordinated system of thought. There is little of philosophy in it. In the midst of a mass of platitudes and hopeless self-contradic-
tions, it harps on one constant note - a conception of morality based upon dogmatic faith. But what Gandhi preaches is primarily a religion; the faith in God is the only reliable guide in life ...". Gandhi was a nationalist and an ardent believer in Indian culture. He appealed to Hindu religious values to gain support for the nationalist movement.

Roy was critical of India's Hindu-based heritage. He wrote: "Non-violence, resignation, perfect love and release from the pain of living - this is the substance of Indian philosophy handed down through the ages by a powerful caste of kings, priests and philosophers, who found it good to keep the people in subjection. Mr. Gandhi is nothing but the heir of this long line of ghostly ancestors ...". In the second Congress of the Communist International in 1920, Roy had insisted that "as a religious and cultural revivalist, he was bound to be reactionary socially, however revolutionary

he might appear politically. Roy believed that Gandhi's style of political leadership was against the growth of democratic attitudes. He preached what was already enshrined in Hinduism. For Roy, "Hinduism was a slave ideology and Gandhi another in a long line of ideological jailers who for centuries had fettered the Indian mind in the name of spirituality. Instead of encouraging man to reach beyond his grasp ... Gandhi would consign man to the suffocating restrictions imposed by the caste system, religious superstition, and village life". Thus, to Roy, blind faith was the central theme of Gandhism. The reason of the popularity of Gandhism in India was the intellectually backwardness of the country. He wrote: "faith is the mainstay of their (Indians; existence) prejudice; the trusted guide of life; and superstition; their only philosophy".

Fourthly, the Gandhian economics of 'Charhna' could not convince the Marxist Roy. He characterized it as


"reactionary economics". Evelyn Roy wrote: "Mankind has progressed by painful stages from being slave to nature to slave of machines which his own intelligence has invented to conquer national forces ... To go (back to the Vedas) back to the charkha (spinning wheel) is to put away the progress of two thousand years and all the bright hopes of a future age ...". It was, however, a backward step not forward. Roy believed in advanced economics. To him, "material well-being constitute the basis of intellectual growth and moral development. Man created the machines which socialism proposes to place at the service of man". Gandhism is very much shocked by the machine civilization. It proposes "to throw the body away with the bath water". To Roy, Gandhism throws back humanity to primitive forms of production to enable the people to lead simple life.

Fifthly, he criticized that there was total lack of any revolutionary quality in Gandhi's approach to social change. He saw in Gandhism only a "weak and watery reformism which shrinks at every turn from the realities of the

20. Ibid., pp. 56-57.
23. Struggle for freedom. Gandhian suffered from many inconsistencies, vacillations and contradictions. Gandhi declared Non-Cooperation and mass civil-disobedience as the instruments to gain Swaraj within a year and then withdrew all these measures to compromise with Viceroy. The withdrawal of the Non-Cooperation, in Roy's opinion, was an instance of the 'rank betrayal of the revolutionary forces...'. Gandhi criticized the Western civilization, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, wanted to continue with a Home Rule within the British Empire. Gandhian programme also contradicts its unbounded faith in God. Roy wrote: "the belief in a benevolent God must not permit the Mahatma to look upon the world with an eye of criticism or even of uneasiness... it is not permissible to tinker with the God's world".

24. While in prison, Roy read and wrote voluminously. His three volumes of 'Prison Diaries' contain frequent references to Gandhi. He directed his criticism towards the moral virtues which Gandhi idealized. He dismissed Gandhism as a

---
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political philosophy. To him, Gandhism was only 'a mass of platitudes and hopeless self-contradictions emerging from a conception of morality based upon dogmatic faith. As such, it is religion, not philosophy; a religion which has become politicized and, thus, serves as 'the ideological reflex of India's cultural backwardness and superstition'.

According to Roy, the admirable virtues like love, goodness, sacrifice, simplicity and absolute non-violence which are said to be the pillars of Gandhism, when followed by the masses, only make them weak. To overthrow the ruling classes is impossible and the result could only be 'voluntary submission of the masses to the established system of oppression and exploitation'.

To Roy, the sort of Gandhi's tenets was his cult of non-violence. 'Ahimsa would not serve any noble purpose in politics'. It would only tend 'to support the forces of violence and exploitation. If Gandhi's non-violence were practised, capitalism would remain entrenched'. According to him, 'for the liberation of society, the masses should


capture the power because the ruling class can not be persuaded. The government maintained by violence and brute force can not be overthrown without violence and brute force. The Gandhian principle of "Non-violence arrested the revolutionary urge of the people". Roy came to the conclusion that Gandhi's values were based on 'blind faith and offer only the message of medievalism which idealizes the savage living on the tree'. Gandhism inhibited the real progress. To Roy, the real progress lay in the dynamic process of modern civilization - in the forces of rationalism, technology, modern science and economy of abundance.

After his release from prison in 1936, Roy condemned Gandhism as a reactionary social philosophy. He regarded Gandhi, during this period, as his arch enemy, who should be destroyed as quickly as possible. He wrote an article namely, 'Gandhiji: A Critical Appreciation', wherein he appreciated Gandhi's qualities better than many of his ardent admirers. It is interesting that while publicly appreciating Gandhiji, he harboured a hidden contempt for the man. This
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disparity between the public posture and the private view
between the publicised word and the secretly held conviction
projects Roy in a certain factor of amorality in the make up
of his personality traits at this stage of his life. We may
note here in the context that J.P.'s moral credentials
are par excellence. It is possible to hold the opinion that
whereas in terms of intellectual calibre, sharpness and
equipment Roy had a definite edge over J.P.; the latter was
far ahead of the former in regard to moral scruples and
integrity. This lacuna in Roy appears to have been eroded
by the time he entered his Radical Humanism phase wherein he
abundantly compensates for his earlier moral apathy. But his
personal correspondence demonstrates that Roy regarded him
as his enemy during this period. In 1937, he wrote a Marxist
comrade abroad, "Our real fight is against the right wing
which is still very powerful thanks to the popularity of
Gandhi --- I am sticking at the very root. Gandhian ideology
must go before the nationalist movement can develop its
enormous revolutionary potentialities. And Gandhi has
recognized in us his mortal enemy. As a matter of fact, in
his inner circle I am branded as the enemy No. 1". During
this time, he criticized mainly the Gandhian theory of
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writing the appreciation of Gandhi, he wrote one of
his Indian associates - Mahan Lai Sen (September 12, 1939)
for help in the great effort 'to destroy this curse of
Gandhism').
non-violence. He regarded it as a subtle intellectual device for concealing the capitalist exploitation of the country'. He also criticized the bankruptcy of the Congress leadership and stated that "Under Gandhi's leadership the Congress was being turned into a spinners' association." At another place, he wrote: 'The fact is that Gandhi is the Congress and the mahatma is an avowed and unashamed revivalist. Nationalism in so far as it is represented by the Congress, is identical with Gandhian, and Gandhism is medievalism'. As a political philosopher, Roy called Gandhi an 'anarchist mystic' and his views 'Transcendental Politics'. Roy did not believe in Gandhian leadership's ability to win the national freedom because the guiding principle of Gandhism was compromise. In his opinion, with all apparent sincerity, 'Mr. Gandhi was a shrewd politician'. Regarding the popularity of Gandhi, he observed: 'Political backwardness of the masses is the foundation of Gandhi's popularity. It is not as a political
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leader, but as a Mahatma, that Gandhi commands the confidence and adoration of the masses. The belief in miracles is naturally with the ignorant and the superstitions. It is only as a miracle that the Gandhian technique could ever bring Indian freedom. The change of heart on the part of Imperialism to the extent of liquidating itself would be a variable miracle. It defies all realistic political calculations. The correct conclusion to be drawn from the undeniable fact of Gandhi's popularity, according to Roy, "is that the conditions for an effective struggle for freedom are not yet matured. The further conclusion is that this popularity, which only represents the blind faith and helplessness of the ignorant and the superstitions, checks the process of the creation of those conditions". He took Gandhi as the embodiment of Indian backwardness and obscurantism.

Throughout the World War II period and later Roy equated Gandhism with Fascism. He observed that Gandhism as a philosophical tradition had led to Hitlerism. He referred to some genealogical kinship between Gandhism and Fascism; both being offsprings of the spiritual view of life; both being inspired by the revivalist ideal and
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denying the progressive significance of modern civilization. He called Gandhi the prophet of Indian fascism. He opined, "because fascism is nationalism on the other hand, Gandhism is the accepted ideology of Indian nationalism. That is the relation between Gandhism and Fascism." To him, Gandhism was petty-bourgeois humanitarianism oscillating between God and man. He wrote, "Gandhism is diseased at the core. It is the product of a pathological mentality of guilt, fear, obsession and self-hatred."

Inspite of all these shortcomings and drawbacks, Roy admits of some positive contributions of Gandhiji. In 'One Year of Non-Cooperation' he appreciated the greatness of Gandhiji, and compared him to Thomas Aquinas, Savonarola and Saint Francis of Assisi. He acknowledged the following constructive contribution of Gandhism in the national movement: (i) The use of mass action for the enforcement of political demands; (ii) The building up of a nation-wide organization; such as the Indian National Congress; (iii) The liberation of the national forces from governmental repression.
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by the slogan of non-violence; and (iv) The adoption of the
 techniques of Non-Cooperation, non-payment of taxes and
 Civil-Disobedience in the struggle against foreign rule.
 He recognized Gandhi as a great patriot. He wrote, "M.K. Gandhi
 will live in the annals of his country as one of its greatest
 saints and patriots long after his political failures are
 forgotten".

 There came a great change in Roy's view regarding
 Gandhism, when he was in jail. Soon after his release from
 prison, he wrote an article entitled, 'Gandhiji: A Critical
 Appreciation', wherein he appreciated Gandhi's greatness.
 He wrote, "let us admire, respect and properly appreciate
 him for the great services that he has rendered to the
 struggle for freedom".

 Further, the partition of India; Gandhi's campaign
 against the communal violence and Gandhi's assassination
 brought a profound change in Roy's attitude toward Gandhi.
 After his death a new respect for Gandhi emerged in Roy's
 thinking. Although, he did not accept the religious view and
 the related version of nationalism of Gandhi; in evolving
 his philosophy of Radical Humanism, he came closer to Gandhi
 in his emphasis on human solidarity, the relation of means
to ends, the necessity of some form of economic and political
 decentralization, and the rejection of party politics. In
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his two articles entitled, 'The Message of the Martyr' and 'Homage to the Martyr', Roy expressed for the first time the extent of his ideological agreement with Gandhiji. He acknowledged the moral and humanist essence of Gandhi's message. He insisted in the latter article that Gandhi sincerely wanted politics to be guided by moral considerations; and his endeavour to introduce morality into political practice was the positive core of Gandhism.

The changed attitude of Roy took a permanent form in his later writings. After a full year of Gandhi's death, he wrote: "Practice of the percepts of purifying politics with truth and non-violence alone will immortalise the memory of the Mahatma. No monuments of mortar and marble will perish, but the light of the sublime message of truth and non-violence will shine forever". In the last five years of his life Roy, like Gandhi, came to believe that ends could not justify the means. He wanted to purify politics by keeping it out of both struggle for power and the party system. He wrote: "Humanist politics must be a moral force; it must be get out of the struggle for power of the political parties". Like
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Gandhi, he believed that ‘leadership should come from detached individuals (i.e. spiritually free men). Such men would not hanker after power’.

Thus, once a bitter critic of Gandhism, Roy turned to Gandhi in the final phase of his life and thought. It must, however, be understood that Radical Humanism is not merely a variation of Gandhism. Roy’s persistent emphasis on atheistic humanism, rationalism and materialism distinguish his thought considerably from that of Gandhiji.

**Jayaprakash Narayan on Gandhism**

In the early phase of his political career, J.P. had been closely associated with Gandhiji. He was attracted by Gandhiji’s emphasis on economic equality and simplicity and his passion for social justice. But during his Marxian phase he criticized Gandhism bitterly. As an orthodox Marxist, he came to believe that Marxism provided a truer diagnosis of the economic ills of society. According to him: ‘the Marxian science of revolution offered a surer and quicker way of social and economic transformation than the technique of Gandhiji’.


According to J.P., Gandhi had accepted the well-established traditional order. He did not try to find out the roots of the evil. He wrote: "there was nothing new or distinctive about it; nothing that was peculiarly Indian. Similar alternatives to socialism were advanced in the West. And all these alternatives had pronounced fairly resemblances. What Gandhi said had been said by church divines and philosophers of the old order in Europe at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution ...". He emphasized that Gandhi had reiterated the same principles, which were expressed by the Western writers. There might be difference in emphasis but the spirit was the same. For instance, "class-struggle was futile; capital and labour were interdependent and necessary for each other; revolution was wasteful; a synthesis of the contending forces of society was a higher ideal than revolution; enlightened control of profits, wages and prices was necessary and possible; the theory of trusteeship", were the familiar principles of Western bourgeois professors, thinkers and churchmen.

J.P. ridiculed Gandhi's theory of trusteeship and his vision of 'as raja'. Gandhi believed in improving the behaviour of higher classes towards the poor. He also believed
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that the interests of both princes and paupers would be protected. But J.P. regarded Gandhism as being well-intentioned but "dangerous" in its blindness to pressing economic issues. He also regarded it as being deceptive for the masses. He wrote: "This philosophy amounts to deception - self-deception and, hence, the deception of the exploited people". He further argued: "The wealth of landlord and capitalist comes from the labour of the ryots and workers, and is, therefore, in the famous phrase of Proudhon, theft. To condone their theft, to let it go unquestioned, nay, to sanctify it, is deceptive philosophy - no matter how unconsciously so".

J.P. dubbed Gandhiji as the protector of the interests of the higher classes. He wrote: "By not questioning the right of the prince, landlord and capitalist to continue their functions, Gandhiji has signified his tacit approval of this large scale, organized theft and violence". J.P. further wrote that his approval was open. He referred to the interview of Gandhi with the Zamindars of U.P. when Gandhi promised the landlords that "he would resist any attempt to deprive them of their property". He also told the Mill owners
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of Ahmedabad that "it was their moral right to make the money they were making". He went on to the extent of censoring Gandhism as being 'a serious bogy of timid economic analysis, good intentions and ineffective moralising'.

J.P. did not believe in the Gandhian theory of change of heart and conversion. It could not solve the problem in India. He wanted to change the social environment which shapes the human behaviour to establish a socialist society. It could be done by acquiring full power over the State not by conversion of heart of the individuals. He favoured use of the coercive apparatus of the State for affecting an economic transformation of society in India. He did not believe in Gandhian doctrine that that State was best which governed the least. J.P. said: "Those who desire to construct a socialist society should have the power and the requisite sanction behind them to do so.... Behind every piece of legislation lies the state's power to persuade and, ultimately, to coerce".
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Throughout the colonial period, as an ardent Marxist, J.P. did not accept Gandhi's methods of non-violence. He was a convinced believer in violence, class struggle and expansion of state power for achieving national as well as socialist aims. He was profoundly impressed by the achievement of Russian Revolution. He hailed Stalin as the 'world-leader of the present socialist movement.' He even defended the violence in the Russian politics as being political violence for creating a new social order. To him, Russia was a symbol of steady economic success. He admired R. Palme Dutt's Fascism and Social Revolution. During the Quit India movement, he advocated insurrectionary methods for achieving national independence. He wrote: "it appears to me, the struggle of 1942 can not be disowned on ground of violence". He urged the people to develop a mass movement comprising the working classes and the peasants against the government.

He also criticized Gandhi's constructive programme and
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the cottage industries. He criticized the 'pledge concerning Khadi Spinning and other aspects of the programme that were asked of Congressmen on 26 January, 1940'.

Inspite of his criticism of Gandhi, he came under the personal influence of Gandhi increasingly with the passage of time. He came to know the developments in the Soviet Union under Stalin and became critical of it. He realised that Marxism left no room 'for ethical and moral considerations, the only motivation that can impel human beings to seek something beyond their individual well-being'. He stressed the use of non-violent means. This changed view of J. P. was evident in a draft resolution sent by him to Gandhi, to put before the Rampur Session of the Congress in 1940. He moved closer to Gandhian line of thinking. Simla Prasad observed that "The fascination of Gandhian ideas" was clearly discernible in him. He also added that the ardour for Gandhism
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"had been gradually growing since as early as 1940; if not
earlier, in the beginning, perhaps, unconsciously". J.P.
himself admitted in an interview that "As a matter of fact,
I was drawn to Gandhism as early as in 1921 when I was a
student of science in Patna". Replying to another question,
he said: "He fought violence with non-violence. The way
he practised his method attracted me most ... Gandhi’s
respect of human values drew me closer to him". Some
passages of his diary show that he was drawing closer to
Gandhism and he knew it. He was against the views of
Professor Brijmohan that Gandhiji had done a "disservice
to the cause of Indian freedom". He observed, "As for the
Professor’s charges, they are not new. I do not agree with
them as they have been stated; much less with the spirit
behind them. I am no believer in non-violence. But I do not
think that by teaching the unarmed Indian people the method
of civil resistance, Gandhiji has done a disservice to the
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country. On the contrary, I consider this to have been his greatest service to the nation....

I do not say that Mahatmaji's economic views are now entirely acceptable to me, but I think that day has definitely been left behind when one merely created a few jokes at the spinning wheel and village self-sufficiency and called it a critique of Gandhism". In his article: 'My Picture of Socialism' published in 1946, J.P. clearly was thinking and writing under the impact of Gandhi.

After the death of Gandhi, and after witnessing the communal bloodshed of the post-partition period, he was further convinced with Gandhiji and his ideas. He observed, "There are many things that Mahatma Gandhi taught us. But the greatest thing he taught was that means are ends, that evil means can never lead to good ends and that fair ends require fair means. Some of us may have been sceptical of this truth but recent world events and events at home have convince me that nothing but good means will enable us to reach the goal of a good society, which is socialism". At the Madras Conference of the Socialist Party in July, 1950:
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J.P. said, "If Marx were alive to-day, I am sure he would certainly not have withdrawn himself into a shell and closed his eyes to Gandhiji’s precepts and practices". After his fast in 1952, J.P. wrote: "The detachment, self-control, conquest over desires are necessary for us". He became pledged to the concept of inner moral metamorphosis stressed by Gandhi. He recognized that Gandhi was a pragmatic experimental philosopher who believed in mass action and had the courage of his conviction. He wrote: "Gandhiji emphasized the need to change man in order to change society. Socialism recognizes that social change is not secure without changing man". In 1954, he became a Jeevandani to the Sarvodaya movement. Thus, J.P. gradually moved from Marxism to Gandhism and Sarvodaya. He pledged that there should be no suspicion between the forces of democratic socialism and Gandhism. Like Gandhi, he emphasized on purity of means and decentralization of economic and political sources. During his total revolution phase, he discovered 'total revolution as a Gandhian alternative of social revolution for social change.' Here, his main emphasis was, like Gandhi, on economic and political decentralization and peaceful means.
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Comparison

From the above description, it may easily be summed up that M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan both started as bitter critics of Gandhi and his ideas and techniques. In his Marxist phase J.P. had adopted the same extreme position which was maintained by Roy. Ajit Bhattacharyya observed, "J.P. too far from an uncritical admirer of Gandhi's politics and strategy. He did not attend his prayer meetings, though Prabhavati did. His sense of nationalism was too strong to accept the extreme position adopted by M.N. Roy, who had criticized Lenin to his face for believing that because Gandhi was leading a mass movement he was a revolutionary. Roy had insisted that Gandhi was bound to be a reactionary socially because in his view he was a religious and cultural revivalist".

Both changed their views regarding Gandhism with maturity and experience. J.P. moved from socialism to Gandhism via democratic socialism and then to Sarvodaya to total revolution. This move was mainly due to the belief and the values, which he gradually came to cherish, that ends alone could not justify the means. Similarly, Roy, a revolutionary Communist, moved from Marxism to Radicalism and then to Humanism. Referring to his transformation, he said that "he had come

to reject the Jesuitic belief that the end could justify
the means - any means or that the cause of revolution could
always justify the adoption of the methods of violence
and coercion'. Both came to realize from the experience
of Russian Revolution that no revolution can justify
indiscriminate adoption of any means or unscrupulous divorce
of ethics from politics.

But while J.P. became a full fledged Gandhian and
accepted his idea of nationalism, belief in Indian culture
and religion - God, soul, rebirth etc., Roy as a rationalist
and materialist could not accept the theological and religious
ideas of Gandhism. Roy did not accept the Gandhian ideology
of Indian nationalism.

M.N. Roy on Marxism

Both Roy and J.P. started as Marxists in the early
phase of their political life. But later both got disillusioned
with the ideology. Disenchantment with Marxism led Roy into
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96. J.P. Narayan, From Behind the Bars in Independent India,
(Calcutta: Samajwadi Yuva Jansabha, 1976), p. 186;
wherein he wrote: "It is God's grace that inspite of
long-term chronic diseases, I have lived so long. May
God grant me the wisdom and the will to devote whatever
time is left for me to the service of the country and
the people".
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developing his philosophy of Radical Humanism and J.P. wound up by joining the Servodaya movement and propounding his philosophy of total revolution.

Till 1940, Roy remained a Marxist though he modified his ideas in between. As time passed by, he gradually realised the philosophical inadequacies of Marxism. After the World War II, he devoted himself to developing the Radical Humanist movement and abandoned the teleological aspects of Marxism in favour of emphasis on Marxist humanism. After deep study of both theoretical and practical aspects of the teachings of Marx, he repudiated quite a few and made important modifications in many more. He wrote: "Marx's proposition that consciousness is determined by being placed materialist physics on a sound scientific foundation. His subsequent thought, particularly, sociological, however, did not move in the direction indicated by the significant point of departure. Marxism, on the whole, is not true to its philosophical tradition. In sociology, it vulgarises materialism to the extent of denying that basic moral values transcendent space and time. With the impersonal concept of the forces of production, it introduces teleology in history, brazenly contradicting its own belief that men is the maker

of his destiny. The economic determinism of its historiology blasts the foundation of human freedom, because it precludes the possibility of man ever becoming free as an individual. Yet, contemporary sociological thinking has been considerably influenced by the fallacious and erroneous doctrines of Marxism, which do not logically follow from its philosophy.  

Roy criticized in detail some of the fundamental tenets of Marxism, such as - the theories of economic determinism of class struggle of surplus value, of Revolution and of Dictatorship of the proletariat. According to Roy, the Theory of Economic Interpretation of History ignores other factors of life. He wrote, "The economic interpretation of history has brought Marxism to grief. A philosophy of history, which ignores other factors of human life than the forces of production, particularly, the dynamics of ideas, and disregard moral problems, can not be a reliable guide for constructive social activity. Marxist historicism has been put to test and found wanting. A new philosophy of history is the crying need of the hour to show civilized mankind the way out of the crisis." Thus, According to Roy, Marxism has neglected the role of will, ideas, moral and cultural values. Roy did not believe in the Marxist...


principle that man was conditioned only by economic factors. He said that "man's needs to emancipate himself to higher plane of moral, intellectual and social life need not be necessarily confined within the economic needs alone". He pointed out that, in the study of human history, besides economic factors, the importance of social and ideological considerations should also be appreciated. To Roy, Marxism when "freed from the fallacy of economic determinism, the humanist liberation, nationalistic spirit of Marxism will go into the making of the new faith of our time. It is a part of the accumulated store of human knowledge which must be claimed by the builders of the future". Thus, according to Roy, "Karl Marx may have put Hegel on his feet, but he has certainly placed himself on the head".

Roy also asserts that the Economic interpretation of history does not logically follow from the materialist philosophy. The quintessence of Materialist philosophy is monism and the economic determinism is dualist conception. So, the two, according to Roy, can not be identified. He

also criticized Marx for tracing everything to the means of production. According to him, Marx had started from a society engaged in economic activity and did not go behind the means of production. He asked as to who produced the first means of production? He stated, "the brain is the most important means of production".

To Roy, economic determinism would leave no reason for the creative role of man. He pointed out that man needed emancipation from economic needs and wanted to achieve a higher plane of moral, intellectual and social life. For Roy, the foundation of society is 'the urge of man for freedom', which is the 'biological urge for self-preservation'. He advocated that man should be freed from economic determinism. He rejected the Marxist belief in the teleological nature of the State. According to Roy, the State should perform the bare minimum functions. Roy advocated that man should live in a socially and psychologically conducive atmosphere, free from all kinds of cultural and intellectual regimentation.

Roy was a severe critic of the Marxist theory of surplus value. He referred to it as 'social surplus': which
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is used for all the progress of society. According to Roy, it is the fallacious Marxist theory of surplus value, which stated that the appropriation of surplus value by the capitalist class represented the exploitation of labour and was the main cause of the ever-lasting class struggle.

He reiterated that if production of surplus value represented the exploitation of labour, then, labour was exploited also under socialism. Under the socialist economy of Russia, labour was exploited even more to produce larger surplus value to be accumulated into new capital. Roy held that all the development is the surplus production of the collective labour of the entire society. According to him, "Social progress, particularly development of the means of production, since the dawn of history, has been conditional upon the fact that the entire product of any time of the labour of the community was not consumed. The margin can be called social surplus, which has through the ages been the lever of all progress". Roy believed that the appropriation of social surplus by any particular class must go. He, however, says that the method for ending this system is not economic but moral.
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He also criticized the Marxian Theory of class struggle. He observed that the 'history of civilization was the history of class struggle' was wrong. According to Roy, there were also some cohesive forces in the society. He wrote: "We have learned that the history of human society is the history of class-struggle. But there is another side of picture - the cohesive force in society. Without that force, human society would have broken down long ago, and there would have been no evolution of civilization. There is some social interest which binds class together". On the question of antagonism between the two opposite classes, leading to the elimination of the decadent class, Roy was of the view that "No class is ever destroyed owing to its antagonism to any other class. Its abolition becomes necessary only when its interests become antagonistic to the welfare of society as a whole". Elucidating further he observed, "There is some social interest which binds classes together. Capitalism grows out of the exploitation of labour, but at the same time, capitalist society raises the entire society on a higher level; in so far as the working class is a part of society, inspite of all antagonism and exploitation, in the beginning, its interest is identical.
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with that of the capitalists'. Criticizing the theory of class-antagonism he again observed; "orthodox Communism or Marxism does not open up a vista of unlimited progress and freedom. It tells us that on such a day the world is going to die. I do not believe in horoscopes, not even if it were cast by Marx himself."

According to Roy, if all history is the history of class struggles, it will come to an end with the rise of a classless society. He denounced the Marxist proclamation that 'Communism was the last stage of human evolution as it assumed that there would be no more progress. This Communist Utopia will mean complete social stagnation. He observed, "humanity must commit suicide, because if mankind does not progress any more, if there is to be no further room for social evolution, then there is stagnation, and under conditions of stagnation, life disintegrates". He further wrote: "In a classless society, the dialectics of history will cease to operate; progress will come to a standstill; humanity will die". And also, "under such circumstances, Marxism would become not a philosophy of
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freedom but death sentence of mankind".

According to Roy, the prophecy of Marx that there would be polarization of industrial society into two classes - the bourgeoisie and the proletariat - did not come true. The middle class has not disappeared but has gained added political importance. Roy even regarded socialism as a middle class ideology. He believed in the leadership of the revolution of the middle class. After the World War I, the cultural and political leadership, he observed, had passed into the hands of the middle classes.

Roy was also critical of Marxian principle of dictatorship of the proletariat. According to Roy in this type of society all the means of production came to be owned by the state. And the state is controlled by a particular class; that is, proletariat. This does not end the exploitation. In this type of proletarian states, individual freedom is crushed. According to Roy, any organization which subordinates the individuals, who create the society, can not be regarded the saviour of mankind. He wrote: "A political system and
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an economic experiment which subordinate the man of flesh
and blood to an imaginary collective ego, be it the nation
or a class. cannot possibly be the suitable means for the
attainment of the goal of freedom ... Any social philosophy,
or scheme of social reconstruction which does not recognise
the sovereignty of the individual, and dismisses the ideal
of freedom as an empty abstraction, can have no more than
a very limited progressive and revolutionary significance”.

Roy dismissed the Marxian utopia of withering away of
the State. He wrote: “Here is something worse than a fallacy;
it is an absurdity. The State is the political organisation
of society. It can never disappear unless human society
revert to the stage of savagery”. Even in Soviet Russia
after the establishment of the proletariat dictatorship
for such a long period, there seemed to be no indication of
withering away of the State. Therefore according to Roy,
it was just an utopia. After its establishment the dictator-
ship itself became a vested interest. No voluntary transfer
of power happened. Roy also rejected the Marxian idea of
capturing power through armed insurrection. In the modern
age this method has become inadequate. He wrote: “Scientific
inventions since the day of Marx have vastly increased the

127. M.N. Roy and Philip Spratt: Beyond Communism: op. cit.;
(Principles of Radical Democracy, 22 Thesis); Thesis
No. 8, p. 145.

128. M.N. Roy: New Orientation; op. cit., p. 150. Also see
Ibid., Thesis No. 9, p. 145.
military might and coercive strength of the existing States, and have rendered the idea of a minority insurrection impracticable and out of date."

After criticizing the philosophical and theoretical aspects of Marxism, Roy also criticized its practice, that is, Communism. He made a distinction between the two. To him, “Marxism is not identical with Communism; the one is a philosophy, and as such, a statement of eternal truths; the other is a political practice.” According to Roy, like Fascism, Communism is also collectivism where there is no individual liberty. He wrote: “Both Communism and Fascism stand for collectivism; The Communist collective ego is the proletarian class; and the Fascist collective ego is the nation. Both sacrifice the individual on the altar of the collective ego.” In the same work he wrote: “It is now a matter of experience that Communism in practice creates a new status quo, under which the human individual has precious little freedom.” Referring to prevalence of the element coercion both in the Czarist and the Communist Russia he wrote: “In the practice of Communism in USSR, the influence of Hegelian ethics is obvious. There, whatever is, is good; everything done, for the defence of the new
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order is moral; might is right." In Communism there is no possibility, according to Roy, to cherish the capitalistic cultural values. He concluded that Communism represented 'cultural segmentation' and 'economic enslavement under proletarian dictatorship'. Proletarian dictatorship had become identical with Communism.

Despite his severe criticism of Marxism, Roy did not abandon the ideology entirely. He maintained, "criticism is neither rejection nor negation. All critics of Marxism are not necessary anti-Marxists, for Marxism is not a system of dogmas; it knows no final or absolute truth". He considered Marxism as a new intellectual innovation in history. He wrote, "As a matter of fact, Marxism is the highest form human knowledge has attained so far. It is based on the accumulated store of human experience; gathered ever since the dawn of civilization.... It is the human heritage. It is the highest form of philosophy". It is the philosophy for the future of the entire mankind. "It is so because it is the positive outcome of the entire past of mankind". This
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apparent contradiction of a severe critic and an enthusiastic admirer of Marxism in Roy appears to have inevitably resulted into his theory of 'radicalism', representing a philosophical synthesis of the sorts. Roy's philosophy of radicalism became a kind of revised Marxism. It picked the humanitarian and intellectual elements of Marxism and blended them into a new philosophical compound. Roy admitted: "radicalism is not a deviation from Marxism; much less a negation. But it does propose revision of Marxism ...

radicalism proposes to rescue Marxism from degeneration into orthodoxy". Thus, radicalism emerged as a new approach and version of Marxism philosophy.

Jayapragash Narayana on Marxism

J.P. returned to India from U.S.A. as a confirmed Marxist in 1929. But he did not join the Communist Party in India. He saw that the Communist Party, following the comintern instructions, stayed away from the freedom movement led by Casabani. As an orthodox Marxist, he still admired russia for her achievements. He felt that the Indian Communists had strayed from the correct Marxist approach but believed that they might be brought back to the proper course. On this belief, J.P. opened the doors of the C.S.P.
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to the Communists and some important Communists were placed in high positions in the party organisation. The Communists, on their part, however, were infiltrating into the C.S.P. to wreck it from within. Then this fact came to be known: the Communists were expelled from the party in 1940. This occurrence left a deep impression on J.P. mind and sensibilities. It created a great repulsion in J.P. towards the ways and methods of the Communists.

Another experience of J.P. which made him doubtful about the Russian model, was the reports of mass purges, trials, deportation and liquidation of kulaks, which were going on in Russia in the late thirties. All this weakened J.P.'s confidence in Soviet Russia as in the Indian Communist Party. The impact of the indigenous ideas, particularly of Gandhism was progressively increasing on him. J.P. realised that the conditions in India were different to those in Russia or other Communist or Socialist countries.

All these experiences and impacts led J.P. to question some of the tenets of Marxism. Though, he remained a Marxist till 1940. The final parting from Marxism, however, came


in 1952, when he went on a three weeks fast at Poona. He wrote, "my final break with Marxism, though not with politics, had come during the three weeks fast at Poona (1952).

It was then that a long process of questioning started by the Russian purges came to an end and it became clear that materialism as a philosophical outlook could not provide any basis for ethical conduct and any incentive for goodness".

As a socialist, J.P. was inspired by Marxism but was never a doctrinaire Marxist. He had been incessantly denouncing the dark and dismal activities of Indian and international Communism. He complained that the Communists had converted Marxism into a dogma. He believed that Marxism in India would have to be applied and practised creatively not dogmatically. He wrote, "Marxism is a science of society and a scientific method of social change that includes social revolution. As such there can be no room for dogmatism or fundamentalism in Marxist thought. Those who, on the one hand, call Marxism scientific and, on the other, introduce dogmatism into it do it great disservice. In science there is no such thing as final truth. Science progresses by progressive elimination of untruth from human knowledge. If Marxism is a science, Marx could not have
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expounded ultimate truths, but only made approximations to them. To-day, with a vastly developed store of human knowledge and vastly greater experience and observation of capitalist society, we are in a position to make for greater approximations to the truth than Marx.

J.P. criticised the Russian practice of dictatorship of the proletariat. He believed in a fully democratic state in a socialist India. He wrote: "It is a common practice these days to think that there must be the dictatorship of the proletariat in a socialist state. This is against the teachings of Marx. The dictatorship of the proletariat has a place only in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. And in this period too it is not inevitable in every case. ... It is, however, the very essence of Marxism that once the transition is over, the State must become a fully democratic institution. Then the old ruling classes have been destroyed and society has been converted entirely into a society of workers; it is idiotic to talk of a dictatorship of the proletariat because the proletariat cannot dictate over itself." He further explained that dictatorship of the proletariat did not mean the dictatorship of a party as the Communist Party in Soviet Russia had made
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it to be. According to him: "dictatorship of the proletariat
in Marxist theory does not mean the dictatorship of a
single party, such as the Communist Party in Russia. It
means the dictatorship of a class, the working class, or
in industrially backward countries, such as India and post-
communist Russia, of a combination of the toiling classes,
such as workers, peasants and the lower middle class. . These
classes may have one or more political parties and these
parties must all be united in the dictatorship or have
freedom to function freely under the dictatorship. The
dictatorship of the proletariat never meant that parties
of the working class or other toilers would be suppressed;
it meant only the suppression of the ruling classes and
their political and economic institutions".

J.P. was of the view that in Communism there was one
party rule—without freedom to organise any rival political
associations—no civil liberties and total control of
national economy, education, agriculture, press etc. in the
hands of a class of rulers. 'It leads to the ascendency
of a powerful controlling bureaucratic elite'. There was
absence of feedback responses from the side of the people.
"Thus", according to him: "Communism is a case of arrested
revolution". He viewed that bureaucratic centralisation,
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absence of economic democracy and lack of popular control
over economic processes had resulted into the emergence
of a Russian state capitalism. J.P. was against the statism
or state capitalism. He believed that there should be "the
dispersal of ownership at various levels, so that an
economic dictatorship does not arise".

He condemned the neglect of values in Stalinism. He
wrote: "Russian or Stalinist interpretation of socialist
philosophy has reduced it to a cross machiavellian code of
conduct utterly devoid of any sense of right or wrong; good
or evil". J.P. criticized the theory of violent revolution.
He favoured the democratic means to establish socialism.
"If the theory of violence as a midwife of revolution was
not challenged in its entirety", according to J.P., "at
least, this much became clear to me (a) that in a society
where it was possible for the people by democratic means
to bring about social change it would be counter-revolutionary
to resort to violence and (b) that socialism could not
exist, nor be created in the absence of the democratic
freedoms"
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Referring to the Marx's speech on tactics at the Hague Convention of the First International in 1872, J.P. stated that Marx had himself clearly conceived two ways: that is, peaceful and violent for achieving socialism, which of the two ways should be adopted would depend on the conditions prevailing in a particular country. He said: "In Russia there was no democracy, so Lenin took the path of violent revolution though it may be doubtful to-day how far was Lenin justified in disbanding the Constituent Assembly when he had no majority in it. There is democracy in England; and its scope has developed greatly since Marx's days. Accordingly, we find British Labour installed in Government by a democratic process and putting socialist schemes into practice in a democratic fashion. Not even the blindest fanatic would dream of the possibility or necessity of a violent revolution in Great Britain to-day". Thus, he was a great advocate of democratic methods and equal critic of insurrectionary methods.

J.P. regarded Marxism as an amoral philosophy, because, according to him, it believed in the principle that the end justified the means. He stated: "In Marxism any means are good means provided they serve the ends of the social
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revolution. Thus, Marxism as a philosophy of action is immoral. J.P. deplored the excessive use of violent methods in Russia to execute the policies of collectivization. In 1946, he said: "In Russia, collectivisation was pushed through at great human cost and under a ruthless dictatorship. Estimates run up to as high a figure as twenty millions of those who had to be 'liquidated' in order to make collectivisation a success. I do not favour such a colossal repression of the toiling peasant masses, nor does socialist theory permit it. Abolition of landlordism, redistribution of land, and breaking up of big holdings would require state coercion to be used against fifteen to twenty percent of the agricultural population perhaps. But collectivisation might require sixty to seventy percent of that population to be repressed. I do not find any justification for any political party, speaking and acting in the name of the toiling masses, to indulge in such wholesale repression. Twenty percent may be coerced in the interest of the remaining eighty percent, but there is no justification for repressing seventy percent of the peasants 'even for their own good'. Cooperative farming itself would require a good measure of coercion... Collectivization, on the other hand, would require a degree of wholesale repression that is repugnant to socialism, which
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above all, is the expression of the will of the toiling masses". He advised the Indian socialists to eschew the unclean and unscrupulous Communist methods. The Communists, he said, "even in intra-party struggles between power groups, they practise lying and deceit, character assassination, kidnapping and shooting". According to J.P., all the Communist states had come out of violence. He stated, "All existing Communist regimes are the offsprings of violence - physical violence. And since their establishment they have never submitted themselves to the verdict of the people. Elections have no doubt been held, but in the absence of Opposition parties and civil liberties, they have been like Hitler’s election. Communists denounced the latter, but justified their own one-party rule in the name of their own kind of democracy".

J.P. also questioned the Marxist prophecy that in the ideal society, that is, Stateless society, the State would wither away. According to J.P., in place of the State withering away, it had become more powerful and totalitarian in Russia. He wrote: "Placing before them the great ideal of a Stateless society, the Communists set out to do every-
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thing through the power of the State. The result was that the State went on acquiring greater and greater powers and in place of the State withering away, there emerged the totalitarian State.

Neglect of individual was the inevitable corollary of Communist totalitarianism and so J.P. held the view that "The individual is not free and enjoys no protection against arbitrary losses of his already restricted freedom, his job or even his life. The State in such a system acquires an unchallenged control over the life, liberty and happiness of its subjects". J.P. believed that in the totalitarian countries, there could not be any place for individual or group incentive to improve their conditions and manage their affairs. In his report at Nasik Conference of the Socialist Party, he stated: "The experience of totalitarian countries, whether Fascist or Communist, has shown that if the State is looked upon as the sole agent of social reconstruction, we get nothing, but a regimented society in which the State is all-powerful and popular initiative is instinct and the individual is made of a cog in a vast unhuman machine".

J.P. thus came to the conclusion that the values, which the Communism had set before itself, were no-where visible in practice in Russia. In fact, laudable values like human dignity, equality, freedom and peace had been replaced by a new set of questionable values like the revolutionary violence, the dictatorship of the proletariat, democratic centralism, collectivesection and the like. He wrote in 1956, "After forty years of revolution, human freedom and human dignity lie trampled in the dust. The State, far from withering away, has become an all-powerful monster. Equality is a distant dream. International brotherhood has degenerated into a new kind of colonialism ... Peace has come to mean preparedness for war".

**Comparison**

On the basis of above perusal of views of M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan against Marxism and Gandhism, it may be surmised that both were critical of some of the basic tenants of Marxism, e.g., dictatorship of proletariat, theory of violent revolution, withering away of the State, etc. in their own ways and according to their respective approaches.

Whereas, Roy's main emphasis was on the conceptual

---


criticism of Marxist Philosophy. J.P. mainly criticized it for its practice in Soviet Russia. Roy criticized each and every aspect of Marxist philosophy before propounding his philosophy of Radical Humanism. His critique was more systematic and comprehensive. J.P.'s main concern was the practice of Marxism in Soviet Russia, which, according to him, had distorted the ideology and in comparison to Roy, J.P.'s critique appears to be sporadic, piecemeal and less comprehensive.

Roy criticized Marxism from the stand-point of international Communism. J.P., on the other hand, kept in view the Indian situation. He warned the Indian socialists to learn a lesson from the Russian Communism. According to him, Marxism could not be practised in India in the same manner as in Russia. Because there were deep and far-reaching differences in the circumstances, ethos, culture and tradition of the two countries. He appealed to the Indian Communists: 'to declare their independence of Moscow road and to choose their own/to socialism'. To him, Gandhism was not only an alternative to Marxism but a much superior and suitable replacement ideology for India.
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CHAPTER V

CONCEPT OF DEMOCRACY: M.N. ROY AND JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN

In the last chapter, we have discussed how Roy and J.P., once staunch Marxists, criticised the main tenets of Marxism and also some of the principles of Gandhism. In the current chapter, we will discuss their main objections against the functioning of Parliamentary democracy, and seek to analyse their own concepts of democracy (organised democracy (Roy) and communitarian democracy (J.P.), which they visualised for India as an ideal polity. Their views on education, as a means and postulate for democracy, have also been analysed.

M.N. Roy and Jayapraakash Narayan both accepted the popular definition of democracy as a government of the people, by the people and for the people. According to them, though it is the best form of government yet it is no where so in practice. It is often associated with Parliamentary democracy which, according to them, is not democracy at all in real meaning. Both criticised the Parliamentary democracy and party system implied in this type of democracy. Both gave their own picture of a partyless democracy, that is, organised or radical democracy (Roy) and communitarian or participating democracy (J.P). In visualising their picture of democracy, they gave emphasis on education.
of the people to making it functional.

M.N. Roy’s Criticism of Parliamentary Democracy

Roy advocated democracy because of its belief in individual freedom and sovereignty of the people. According to him, though democracy is the best form of government yet it has not been given a chance anywhere. In one of his lectures, he stated: “all talk of democracy; yet no where do we find government of the people, by the people. There is a big discrepancy between the theoretical ideas and ideals evolved in the nineteenth century and the actual picture of to-day”. About Parliamentary democracy, Roy was of the view that it is not a democracy at all. In effect, because of its representative nature, it is a government on behalf of the people. He wrote, “If democracy means government of the people and by the people; the democratic experiment has been a dismal failure. Modern democratic governments are neither governments of the people nor by the people; they are governments for the people, which means the people are not ruled by themselves; and, therefore, Parliamentary governments are not democratic governments”. Thus, democracy has no where been practised


in its ideal form. He asserted that "democracy started from the two generally admirable principles of individual freedom, but having started from these exceptional principles, in practice democracy immediately deviated from its points".

M.N. Roy critically examined the inadequacies of parliamentary democracy. Roy blamed Rousseau's theory of general will, which sought to bridge the gulf between theory and practice of parliamentary democracy. It led to dictatorship. Roy wrote: "there are some millions of people with will of their own. But there is one general will of the nation, which is more important than the wills of all the people who compose the nation. All of whom must subordinate their wills to general will ... and this metaphysical concept of general will can indeed become the moral sanction of dictatorship".

In parliamentary democracy, the sovereign individual in practice remains a passive spectator. He wrote: "In parliamentary democracy, power nominally belongs to the entire people. But in practice the individual is divested of all power the individual is helpless in parliamentary

democracy”. At another place he states, “Parliamentary democracy formally recognised the sovereignty of the individual, but in practice deprived all but a privileged few of effective use of that sovereignty. The sovereign individual became a legal fiction. For all practical purposes, most individuals were deprived of all power and even of their dignity”.

The practice of delegation of power, to Roy, is a negation of democracy. It means surrender of sovereignty. He stated, “Every individual is sovereign and has right to choose the government of his country.... Now, the practice of democracy shows that between two elections the sovereign people is no where in the picture and has absolutely no possibility of controlling those who are ruling the country on behalf of them; and consequently delegation of power, for all practical purposes, has become surrender of power. The people exercise their sovereignty by surrendering it from time to time.” Once the individual’s sovereign power is delegated, he has no control over legislators. He wrote, “However, once elected, the legislators could give any law they wished. The

sovereign people had absolutely nothing to say in the making of laws which they must obey. They were completely at the mercy of the legislators, who could not be in any way controlled by the electorates".

"Further, once the laws were made, they became permanent features of the Statute Book, which was sacrosanct. The sovereign people may have nominal right to change all laws, including the fundamental law (Constitution)....But the parliamentary procedure left very little power to the people to bring about any revision of the Constitution.... So, for all practical purposes, Parliamentary democratic government became a dictatorship for the Lams". Both parliament and government become independent of the individuals after the delegation of power. He asserted: "representatives meet in Parliament; the parliament forms a government; and both parliament and government tend to become increasingly remote and independent of the theoretically sovereign people". Thus, parliamentary democracy, according to Roy, is nothing more than the government for the people in which the people are always ignored and their role is only to cast a vote in favour of a particular candidate after four or five years. Roy argued, "sovereignty can not be transferred because

---

it is an inalienable right of man."

According to Roy, the only guarantee for democracy is that power must always remain in the hands of people. He states: "As soon as, on one pretext or another, power is taken away from the people by delegation, even for the shortest period of time, democracy is killed... In a society which makes slaves of most individuals, even if power remains formally vested in the people, democracy becomes a sham". According to Roy, delegation of power to the representatives by the voters is the curse of parliamentary democracy. He wrote: "For parliamentary democracy implies delegation of sovereign power which originally belongs to the individual. The individual robbed of his sovereignty, is reduced to the position of a mere cog in the wheel, once his sovereign power is delegated, first to a body of legislators, and thereafter to the executive which is further removed from the body of representatives".

Centralisation of powers is another weakness of parliamentary democracy. According to Roy, centralisation of power leads to dehumanisation of the individuals. He


wrote, "one weakness of parliamentary democracy is that it leads to great concentration of power in the hands of executive viz. Cabinet. Under modern conditions control of parliament over the cabinet has become extremely tenuous; the cabinet form of government does by no means foster genuine democratic leadership. The government by an all powerful committee may easily degenerate into a short personal dictatorship; if the prime minister who presides over this committee happens to be a towering personality head and shoulders above his colleagues". Even the people's representatives have no share in decision-making. The executive bureaucracy; committees of experts take the important decisions and the legislators have been reduced to a mere rubber stamp.

In parliamentary democracy, political parties are said to be necessary for its success. But M.N. Roy was a severe critic of the party systems in modern democracies. According to him, political parties have very recent origin. They are not co-present with politics. He stated, "Those who identify democracy with the party system overlook the fact that political parties are relatively recent institutions. ...Political parties as we know them today are a development only of the nineteenth century, when the doctrine of representative government replaced the earlier idea of

democracy. Parliamentaryism, based on the theory of the
devigation of power to elected representatives, made of
16
democracy a mere formality. Thus, according to him, it is
wrong to say that parliamentary democracy can not be possible
without political parties.

Political parties try to capture power by any means.
According to him: "A party is organized with the object
of capturing power. it is done with the ostensibly possible
argument that some people know just how society should be
organised; therefore, the voters must vote for them so that
they come to power and impose the blessings they have in
mind from above on the people, who could otherwise never
even think of those blessings; much less achieve them on
their own". The democratic postulate of party system was
in direct contradiction to the sovereignty of the individual.
It meant that "people can not rule themselves and they are
required to delegate their sovereign rights to elect
representatives". At another place he said: "party politics
implies the denial of democracy; it implies that people can
not do anything by themselves; it is a denial of the potential
intelligence and creativity of all men, of the sovereignty
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of the people”. To capture the power, political parties play on the emotions of the people. To Roy, “The vice of deceiving the people is inherent in this practice”. According to Roy, democracy has degenerated into demagogy. He asserted, “under the democratic system a party can come to power only with the consent of the people. It is quite evident and that was also the experience in practice that any party which could make the most glittering promises had the greatest chance of obtaining the consent of the people. The result was that democracy degenerated into demagogy”. The political parties capture the State power to bring about change ‘as a means’ but after success they treat power as an end in itself. He stated, “It seems to capture the State machinery … and on being successful, seeks to monopolize and perpetuate its hold on it instead of diffusing the power among the people as a whole”. Therefore, Roy believed “political parties leads to concentration of power and hence carries in it the germs of the destruction of democracy”.

19. Ibid.
The Party system leads to complete erosion of the status of individual from the political scene. Only the mass of the people and the political parties remain in action, he narrated. "The individual man and his judgment, his discretion and will are no more in the picture. Appeals are not made to individual voters and their power of reasoning, but to the sentiment of masses. The purpose of election propaganda is to create a state of mass hysteria, to create either hatred for one or bias in favour of some other party. Consequently, when the time comes for the sovereign people to make the crucial decision of selecting persons who can be entrusted with their fate for a period of four or five years, the electorate is in a state where no discriminating judgment is at all possible; whipped up into a state of frenzy and driven like cattle to the polling stations to cast their votes. With music, brass-bands, flags and shouting, the judgment of the people is dulled and benumbed; they are placed under some spell and in that condition they are asked to decide their fate. Voters are canvassed for a party; the voters may not even know the man who is going to be their representative. According to Roy, 'once popular vote brings a man to the Parliament, his responsibility is not to the people who vote for him, but to the party machinery, which has ensured
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his election by supplying the money and the brass-band'.

In fact, in party-system, the real sovereign — the individual — is forgotten and the focus is shifted to an unbecoming process of power-games. Roy asserted, "modern parliamentary democracy is degenerated into a scramble for power among party machineries. Different parties approach the people with the claim to represent them more faithfully than others; to be better defenders of popular interests and aspirations; and, therefore, ask for the vote of the people. Under the best of circumstances, these parties alternate in power and divide the government between themselves. Government of the people and by the people is completely forgotten and has been replaced by government for the people; in other words, it is not a really democratic form of government".

Another defect of the party-system, according to Roy, is related to the principle of representation. The party when in power claims to be the representative of the people; in fact, it is the rule of the minority. He stated, "a representative government represents only the party, which controls it, and the membership even of the largest party is only a small fraction of the people. In other words,
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representative party government is rule of a minority". According to Roy, with the rise of the political parties in modern states, the idea of popular sovereignty has disappeared. He asserted, "with the rise of the party system, the idea of popular sovereignty became a constitutional fiction. The party system resulted from the difficulty of practising direct democracy in large modern states with numerous populations. And with the rise of party system, politics became a scramble for power". Party system gives importance to those individuals who can be instrumental in capturing power. Thus, parties serve the purpose of promoting the ambition of individuals. Roy said, "Under such circumstances, the sovereignty of the individual becomes meaningless; democracy demands that the sovereign individual must merge himself in a party, be a subservient part of an impersonal party machine. In an atmosphere of political backwardness and general ignorance, this system can be abused; people of questionable character can occupy positions of public trust by virtue of belonging to a political party". Thus, representative government, according to Roy, is a government by a party and not by the people.

Due to the inadequacies of the representative democracy:
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dictatorship emerged in a number of modern European countries. 

He argued "under the parliamentary system, we have party dictatorship, and no democratic constitution creates a foolproof guarantee against the rise of such dictatorships. Any majority party can establish a dictatorial regime .... A more than ninety percent majority of the German people voted for Hitler, and in many other countries dictatorial regimes were established constitutionally. Political parties virtually usurp all power on behalf of the people and the process of usurpation goes on inside the parties too; till the supreme power for all practical purposes comes to be vested in a handful of people in the State at the top. The very process of the functioning of democracy through the political parties leads to the destruction of democracy itself. And thus, according to Roy, Totalitarianism silently creeps into the structure of formal democracies.

Roy agreed that parliamentary democracy could not solve the problem of poverty amidst plenty. According to him, "An economy that starves the fixed income group and fills the coffers of the unscrupulous few and starves millions in depression by throwing them on the street, cannot command the respect of humanity for long. All the beautiful names like free enterprise or free economy given
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to it can not obliterate the moral revulsion roused by facts like the destruction of food and other commodities in surplus areas; while the people go hungry elsewhere". He criticized the free economy, which is exercised under the parliamentary democracy, but he does not fully agree with the socialist criticism of parliamentary democracy, that is, without giving equality in the economic sphere, democracy is nothing but a fraud; liberty has no meaning, and it is a democracy of the rich few who exploit the poor. His answer to this socialist assertion was that socialism itself failed to enlarge the scope of freedom and to ensure positive access for a fuller life and a richer personality. To Roy, equality is an ethical proposition rather than economic. It implies that inherent values of an individual should be recognized and that all restraints on the potentialities of the individual should be progressively eliminated.

Thus, Roy reached the conclusion that parliamentary democracy 'is only a formal democracy; far different from the real democracy'. According to him, parliamentary democracy is not only full of inadequacies but it is dangerous also, because it leads to totalitarianism. To Roy, such formal democracy is not capable of playing any progressive role in the present circumstances.
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Roy's Concept of Organised Democracy

To escape from the defects, dangers and fallacies of the formal democracy, Roy suggested the formation of Radical Democracy or organised Democracy. Roy's conception of organised democracy is based on decentralisation and elimination of political parties. Under it the power would be in the hands of the people, who would actively participate in the government of the country. It provides a scheme of government without political parties. Decentralisation and diffusion of power would be its method of operation. Helping to secure an all-round development of individual personality guaranteeing the dignity of the individual and freedom in its widest connotation would be its end. Roy's concept of organised democracy is based upon the foundations of organised local democracies, that is, people's committees, on which he visualises to build a pyramidal structure of the State. He claims that under his conception of organised democracy, the principle of 'government of the people and by the people', that is, direct democracy, will be practicable in the modern world. He wrote: "Even in large political units and highly complex social organisations of the modern world direct democracy will be possible in the form of a network of small co-operative common-wealths, which will

31. The distinctive features of the Radical Democracy, which he called Organised Democracy or Real Democracy, are contained in Constitution of Free India - A Draft, and in the New Humanism, written by Roy.

replace the helpless atomised voter of formal parliamentary democracy".

In Roy's scheme of organised democracy, there is no place for political parties. The basic unit of organised democracy is people's committees, which is an elected body of a small local community. Roy erected the structure of partyless democracy through the mechanism of people's committees. There will be decentralisation and diffusion of political power in the society. There will be no centralised State, governing all the aspects of individual's life. He wrote, "Seats of effective political power being located throughout the length and breadth of society (through local people's committees) the State will become coterminous with society and become an instrument of human freedom instead of its enemy". Roy has accorded the supreme status to the individual in the society. To him, the man is the measure of all things, the maker of history. He wrote, "No scheme of decentralisation is likely to work unless there is a philosophical revolution and the individual has known that he is the architect of his own destiny. 'Radical democracy',


to Roy, is a 'government composed of spiritually free
individuals accountable, in the first place, to their
respective consciences'. In his scheme of partyless democracy,
the leaders will 'function as guides, friends and philoso-
phers of the people rather than their would-be rulers'.

Roy gave a concrete shape to his vision of ideal
democracy in a Draft Constitution. He felt that as people's
power grew in a country, the existing political parties
would become increasingly irrelevant. This view led him to
dissolve his Radical Democratic Party in December, 1948.
The second chapter of the Draft Constitution deals with the
composition, organisation and functions of people's committees.
Every village, town and city will have local people’s
committees. To Roy, the foundation of the State is organised
democracy, and all the sovereign power is to be expressed
through these people’s committees. But all authority is
to emanate from the people. There should be one member for
every fifty votes and these members or representatives will
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be elected for one year by all men and women of their respective locality who have attained the age of eighteen years.

Above the people's committees, there will be the structure of sub-divisional and district people's committees. The sub-divisional people's committee will be composed of delegates from each local people's committee in the sub-division, and the district people's committee will be composed of five delegates from each sub-divisional people's committee. These sub-divisional and district committees will perform the function of the local self-government. The local people's committees will remain sovereign primary organs of democratic authority and power. At the provincial level, there will be a Provincial People's Council, composed of the Governor and Deputies of the People, which will be the highest authority in the province. The Governor and Deputies will be elected for five years and four years respectively by universal adult suffrage. The Provincial People's Council
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will exercise executive as well as legislative powers; and there shall be no separation of powers. Like parliamentary democracy, there shall be a Council of Ministers. To check the concentration of powers in the hands of Ministers, Roy suggests to standing committees to exercise vigilance over respective departments. Before proposing, all the legislations will be referred to appropriate standing committees for consideration and recommendation. To control the Governor, it is provided that forty percent of members can demand recall of the Governor and it will be decided by a referendum of entire electorate of the province.

At the apex of Roy's structure of organised Democracy will be Supreme Peoples' Council which will give final sanction to all legislative and executive acts of the Government. The Supreme People's Council is bi-cameral, consisting of the federal assembly and the Council of State. The two, in their joint session, will be called the 'Supreme People's Council'. The Governor-General, elected by the
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entire electorate (all adults of 18 years or above) of
the federal Union for five years, will convene and preside
over joint session of the Supreme Council. The Supreme
People's Council will be composed of the Governor-General,
the Council of State and the Federal Assembly. The Federal
Assembly will be composed of the deputies of the people
of the Federal Union. The deputy or deputies will be elected
by every man and woman of eighteen or above, under the
jurisdiction of the Local People's Council at the ratio
of one for hundred voters. All the electors of the consti-
tuency will meet to elect deputies from their respective
constituencies. The Federal Assembly will be elected for
four years. All the powers of legislation of the Federal
Union is vested in the Federal Assembly.

The other chamber of the Supreme Peoples' Council,
that is, the Council of State will be constituted on the
basis of equality. The number of members shall be equal for
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The basic feature of radical democracy is that the people must have ways and means to exercise sovereign power effectively. For this Key recommended a vigorous system of local government. The primary function of the local people's committees will be to make individual citizens fully conscious of their sovereign right and enable them to exercise the right intelligently and consciously. The local people's committees will continuously pass resolutions to guide its representatives in the Federal Assembly, and the Provincial Council and express opinion on proposed legislation in the federal or provincial sphere. People's committees can recommend the recall of the representatives of the particular constituency, either in Federal Assembly or in the representative Provincial Council. People's committees will have the power to initiate legislation and demand referendum. He wrote: "The right of recall and referendum will enable organised local democracies to wield a direct and effective control on the entire State machinery. They alone will have the right to nominate candidates for election to various legislative bodies. Such a democracy will transcend the limits of party politics. Individual men will have the chance of being recognised on their merits. Party loyalty and party patronage will no longer eclipse intellectual independence, moral integrity and detached wisdom".
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People's committees are to exercise real power and representatives in the Assembly and Parliament will be merely their spokesmen. He wrote: "And at the election time, when all parties come and offer their candidates, the People's committees may decide to vote for none of those party candidates but elect one from among themselves as their candidate and the people will vote for him. The person who will be thus elected and go to the Parliament will not be responsible to any existing political party machinery. He will be and remain responsible to his local democracy, of which he himself is a part; he will be directly responsible to the people who sent him to the Parliament; he will not have to act on the behests and discipline of any extraneous authority and he will have to report to and inform his fellow citizens in his constituency about all his actions and the problems of the wider community, and take his mandate from them alone in all matters and act accordingly to his best ability and conscience".

Normally the Governor-General will dissolve the Federal Assembly on the advice of the Prime Minister. But in case he does not, he shall refer the matter to the People's committees, who, with their majority vote, will decide the dispute ultimately. The Governor will dissolve the Provincial People's Council before the expiry of its

normal term on a demand by local People's Committees representing a majority of the provincial electorate. The People's Committees will also function as the election machinery of the State. They will prepare electoral rolls and all official announcements shall be made through them.

If a legislation passed by the Federal Assembly is not ratified by the Provincial Government, the matter will be referred to the People's Committees for approval. If the People's Committees support the objection, the matter will be finally decided by a referendum through the People's Committees. Local People's Committees, representing one-third of the total number of voters, can demand referendum for any Provincial legislation. People's Committees will also have the right to recall a deputy, if approved by a majority in a referendum of the entire electorate of that constituency.

The People's Committees are also to act as the units of local self-government. Sanitation, public health, primary and secondary education, public works, promotion and organisation of producer's and consumers' cooperatives, maintenance
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of law and order and administration of justice in cases of petty crimes besides collecting taxes, will be the important functions of the People's Committees in their respective jurisdictions. Thus, in the pyramidal structure of radical democracy, man will have a real hand in the day-to-day administration. The People's Committees will have the sovereign right of controlling the entire State machinery.

The draft constitution of Roy also gives a list of the fundamental rights of the citizens and also lays down certain fundamental principles. e.g., the sovereignty belongs to the entire people who shall have the power to control both executive and legislative branches of the government. The people will have the right to alter and modify the political organisation of the society. They will also have right to revolt against tyranny and oppression.

Thus, according to Roy, these People's Committees will create conditions that will "stimulate amongst the people the urge for freedom, the desire to rely on themselves, and to be makers of their own destiny, the spirit of free thinking, and they will never submit to any external
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authority by exchanging their freedom for the security of slaves. A new renaissance based on rationalism, individualism and cosmopolitan humanism is essential for democracy to be realised and capable of defending itself.

**Transition Period**

Roy believed that the change from party politics to politics without parties (from Parliamentary democracy to organised democracy) would not take place in one or two days. The change would be brought about gradually by raising the intellectual level of the people. In a lecture, he stated, "It goes without saying that this change-over cannot take place from to-day to tomorrow nor will an entire country discard the old practice and adopt the new one all at once. It will be a process, and the process itself will be uneven. This change-over from party-politics to democratic politics will be brought about gradually by raising the intellectual level of the people by quickening their sense of self-respect and self-reliance. Therefore, democracy is not possible without education". In the transitional period, he preferred Parliamentary democracy to a dictatorship. He stated, "In the transition period, Parliamentary democracy, with all its manifest failures and inadequacies, will be obviously preferable to a dictatorship". in the transitional
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period, there should be provision for men of intelligence, creative genius, integrity, wisdom and moral excellence occupying top place in the State. According to Roy, in this transitional phase, these spiritually free men would guide and lead the functioning of the governmental machinery. He wrote, "Values operate through individuals, therefore, a government composed of spiritually free individuals accountable, in the first place, to their respective consciences, is the only possible guarantee for securing the greatest good of the greatest number. Democracy must have that philosophical reorientation, if it is to survive the present crisis and resist the powerful onslaught of dictatorship". But his scheme was not like the Platonic conception of philosopher kings. He pointed out, "What is suggested is not a rule of the intellectual elite, but such an organization of society as will give unlimited scope for the unfolding of the creative genius of man, by placing the executive power of the State under the control of free individuals free from the influence of vested interests and also from the vagaries of the collective ego, so very susceptible to demagogic appeals. That is why in a transitional period democracy must 90 be elective as well as selective."

In the transitional phase, to bring about the best elements of the entire community, Roy suggested the second
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chamber in the federal Assembly, that is, Council of State should be formed on the selective basis. Roy insisted that 'the residuary power should be vested in a Council of State representing men of science, intelligence, integrity, wisdom, moral excellence; men, who as a rule, keep aloof from the rough and tumble of politics; and therefore are not to be found among professional politicians ... such Council of State shall have the power of planning, guidance, supervision and execution of plans for the development of the society'.

According to Roy, radical democracy presupposes the economic reorganisation of society. "To begin with, the economic life of society must be progressively freed from the paralysing and corrupting control of vested interests. In consequence thereof, intellectual independence will be accessible to a greater number". The economic reorganisation of society should be 'as to eliminate the possibility of exploitation of man by man. Progressive satisfaction of material necessities is the precondition for the individual members of society unfolding their intellectual and other finer human attributes'. In this economy the production would be for use and the distribution according to human needs. This society would be a planned society. 'The new
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society, being founded on reason and knowledge, will necessarily be planned. But it will be planning with the freedom of the individual as its main objective. The new society will be democratic - politically, economically, as well as culturally. It will be democracy capable of defending itself.'

Education

Roy pointed out that the main problem of democracy was to make men conscious of their innate rationality. And to him, education was the only way to it. Education was a precondition for the success of democracy. He wrote that "the original sin of the discredit democratic practice was to forget the wisdom of Plato who said that education was the condition for democracy". The political parties neglect the factor of education, because they can easily sway the backward uneducated and ill-informed electorate. Believing in the innate obligation of the political parties to educate the masses, he himself transformed his political party into a cultural and educational movement. He stood for a philosophical revolution, without which, he said, "no social change in the direction of greater freedom is possible". Roy suggested that even parliamentary democracy should be introduced only when people are prepared for it. Organized
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democracy would only be successful when the citizens would be politically conscious and with a high degree of political articulation, People's Committees would be the school for the politics and civic education of the citizen. To him, "the process itself is the best education". At the time of election campaign, masses may be educated. He said: "In the eve of an election, when various parties will make big promises to catch votes, the electorate shall be advised and helped to examine the promises and vote intelligently. That will mean political education". He further added: "In the same occasion the people should be told that they are not obliged to vote for this or that party, that they can just as well vote for a logically nominated candidate who will be their man, known to them, and therefore can be controlled more easily".

By education, Roy did not imply reading and writing or primary or traditional higher or scientific education but the ability and training of individual to develop and realize his own potentiality, rationality and responsibility.
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Explaining his idea of education, he said: "It is the process of raising the intellectual and cultural level of the people". In the same lecture, he stated: "Education for democracy does not consist in teaching just reading and writing, but in making people conscious of their humanness, in making them conscious of their right to exist as human beings, in decency and dignity. Education means to help them to think, to apply their reason". Education must create faith in a man in himself, and he must be made conscious that the present social order is his own creation and has power to create a new social order. In one of his lectures, he stated: "that is needed is different kind of education; an education which will not be imparted with the purpose of maintaining any given status quo but with the sole purpose of making the individuals of a community conscious of their potentialities, help them to think rationally and judge for themselves, and promote their critical faculties by applying it to all problems confronting them".

Roy was against the compulsory government sponsored education because it would not be able to teach men to develop their critical faculties. He stated: "The purpose
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of government education is to create mental conformism. You have to sing patriotic songs, salute national flags and read patriotic history as compiled and edited by governments, so that all people be merged into a homogeneous collectivity and forget that they are individuals endowed with certain sovereign faculties and entitled to be free ... Democracy will not be possible until people are taught to remember precisely their critical faculties, which governments naturally fear, and apply them for the administration for their community. And this is not taught under government-sponsored systems of national education".

Jayaprakash Narayan's Criticism of Parliamentary Democracy

J.P. was influenced with Roy and Gandhiji in his views on democracy. Like Roy, J.P. also was of the view that the Lincolnian definition of democracy was nowhere to be seen in practice. He called the concept of Western democracy as 'democratic oligarchy'. He criticized the Parliamentary system of democracy and as an alternative to it, he visualised the picture of 'Communitarian' or participatory democracy like that of Roy's organised democracy.
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Discussing the inadequacies of Parliamentary democracy, J.P. almost repeated the views and arguments of Roy. According to J.P., the first fundamental defect of Parliamentary democracy is that it has atomised the society. To him, "the State can not be an arithmetic sum of individuals. The people, the nation, the community can ever be equated with the sum of individual voters". Parliamentary system, according to Roy, is not democratic. Quoting H. Maddra, he wrote: "The present system is not democratic at all. It does not represent the demos, that is to say the population taken as a political entity, but the lace, the human particles of the mass accumulated without organization or collective consciousness. The present system is therefore leocratic rather than democratic". According to J.P., Parliamentary democracy is based on a negation of the social nature of man and the true nature of human society. He wrote: "This democracy conceives of society as an inorganic mass of separate gains of individuals, the conception is that of an atomised society. The brick with which the present edifice of democratic polity is constructed is the individual voter and the whole process of democracy rests on the arithmetic of votes. The individual voter casts his vote as an atom.

109. Ibid.
110. Ibid.
of society, not as a living cell in organic relationship with other living cells. It is not the living together that is expressed and represented in the institutions and processes of democracy, but an abstracted individual."

Another defect of democracy, according to J.P., is that under parliamentary system the representative government is a minority government. "Wherever there are more than two parties, this happens quite often, but even under two party systems, it is not a rare phenomenon". On the basis of his experience, he further wrote: "that present-day mass elections manipulated by powerful, centrally controlled parties, with the aid of high finance and diabolically clever methods and super media of communication represent far less the electorate than the forces and interests behind the parties and propaganda machines."

Demagogy is its next defect. According to J.P., politicians indulge in half-truths; sometimes in outright lies. They make dishonest pleasing promises to arouse false hopes instead of public policy to catch the votes. Consequently, the real interests of the nations are sacrificed at the altar of demagogy. He wrote, "It also tends to involve
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prejudice, passions and emotions, which deform them; and
to indulge in electoral outbidding which does not hesitate
to sacrifice the good of the country, and even the real
and long-term interests of the electors to their own
immediate and apparent interests".

The most serious fault, according to J.P., of the
Parliamentary democracy, is its inherent tendency toward
116 centralism'. In the modern all powerful national States,
the individuals have no direct control over the State. The
sovereign individuals become helpless. He wrote: "The
sovereign people being dispersed over the length and breadth
of the country like particles of sand over the desert and
having no other organised political force than the national
State itself to interpose between themselves and that State,
the latter naturally becomes all powerful. The issue of
power in such State is decided not by the fictitious 'people'
but by a balance between political parties and such organised
interests as industrialists and bankers and powerful labour
117 unions". A natural outcome of centralization of power and
administration to J.P., is bureaucracy. In the Parliamentary
democracy, the central executive, being over-burdened with
work, is dependent upon bureaucrats, who gradually become
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all powerful. And this tendency, according to J.P., leads to dangerous autocracy of the bureaucrats. In this type of all powerful state, the people become passive and irresponsible. Because, according to J.P., "They are not prepared to shoulder the responsibility of citizenship themselves; the responsibility of community life. They are content to cast their votes, they are content with throwing their votes to whoever they wish and then be satisfied with that. They have performed their duties as a citizen and therefore nothing remains for them to do; the rest is for the State to do." J.P. finds the answer of the problem in decentralization. So he insisted on "more and more decentralization so that the people directly participate in the administration of their affairs and control the civil servants who owe their jobs and are directly responsible to them."

An inevitable concomitant of parliamentary democracy is the party system which has been criticized by J.P. According to him, "Parties create dissensions where unity is called for; exaggerate differences where they should be
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minimised. Parties often put party interests over the national interest”.

“Because centralisation of power prevents the citizen from participating in government, the parties, that is to say: small caucuses of politicians, rule in the name of the people and create the illusion of democracy and self-government”. According to J.P., the voters have no control over the parties. “The parties are run by caucuses that are beyond democratic control”. “Party rivalries give birth to demagoguery, depress political ethics, put a premium on unscrupulousness and aptitude for manipulation and intrigue”. The people are given chance to elect their representatives, but due to highly organised, centralised parties having their own funds and their own means of propaganda, the choice of the people becomes very much limited. They in any case leave to select from amongst the candidates, set up by the political parties. Further, J.P. believed that ordinary voters could not express their opinion intelligently on all the complicated issues that
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are placed before the people at the time of elections. He wrote: "And when we came to our own country with the backward electorate that we have - most of them illiterate, most of them are such that they have not travelled beyond their district - is it possible for such persons to express their opinion on international affairs? Is it possible for them to give an intelligent answer?" He condemned the party system as "emasculating people and as seeking to reduce them to the position of sheep whose only function of sovereignty would be to choose periodically the shepherds who would look after their welfare". Therefore, parties find no place in the communitarian democracy as conceived by J.P. He wanted to "do away with centralised control and party government". In the communitarian democracy, that he advocated, 'there may conceivably be parties, but they are likely to be local factions, and in any case, their role in the state will not be as commanding as that of the parties in Parliamentary system'.

Another serious defect of Parliamentary democracy is
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the system of election. This system is very expensive and
appalingly wasteful. According to J.P., "The fabulous
expenses involved have the effect of mortgaging democracy
to moneyed interests or large sectional organisations as
trade unions". A general election creates unnecessary
passion and excitement; it befogs the mind of the people
instead of educating and enlightening them and tends to
favour demagoguery. According to J.P., in our country,
elections have become increasingly irrelevant from the view-
points of the people and of democracy. He stated, "The
meaning and significance of elections are being eroded due
to use of money, power, deception, corruption and physical
force in them". Describing the role of individual in
democracy in India, J.P. said, "Democracy in our country
gives only this much right to the people that they cast
their votes when an election comes round. Beyond this you
and I have no other role as citizens in this democratic
process. But this right is also snatched away from us since
the elections are increasingly neither fair nor free".
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Thus, J.P. came to the conclusion that Parliamentary democracy is inadequate democracy. Although he made it clear that despite of its shortcomings, of all the different forms of democracy that history had known till date, Parliamentary democracy was the best. According to him, Parliamentary democracy may be a government for the people and of the people, but it is not a government by the people. He stated: "that no example of Parliamentary democracy exists today or has existed before which would satisfy the third part of the definition, namely, government by the people. It may be a government with the consent of the people; but it is not a government by the people". As an alternative to Parliamentary democracy, he visualised the picture of communitarian democracy or participatory democracy.

J.P.'s concept of Communitarian Democracy

J.P.'s conception of communitarian democracy is based on the idea of communitarian society, where, there would be full political and economic decentralization. The individual would be in the central place. There would be no role of political parties. People would be able to participate in administration and feel the sensation of Swaraj. He wrote:
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"What I have in mind is what Gandhiji often used to emphasize, namely, that as you proceed from the bottom level of government to the top, each higher level should have less and less functions and powers. To back to the image of the inverted pyramid, the broad upper levels of present day democracy must be drastically sawed off and large portions of the vast upper floors brought down to earth, so that the pyramid of democracy could become a real pyramid — narrow at the top and broad at the bottom. In such a system the people at each level would have the fullest opportunity to manage all those affairs that might pertain to that level. Such a system of democracy could give people a stake in democracy as the sensation of Swaraj".

J.P. advocated communitarian way of life. He laid down certain conditions for Panchayati Raj so that it might become the base of true participating democracy. These were: education of the people; non-interference of the political parties; real devolution of power; allocation of minimum resources at each level of local authority; exercise of real control over civil servants under its charge and keeping the day-to-day working of Panchayati Raj outside the purview of the State Government.
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To enable people to exercise sovereign power effectively, J.P. advocated Sharaj from below as the basis of his picture of Indian polity. He visualised a communitarian society in which primary community would be the basic unit which would consist of a revenue village. He wrote, "In the true community there is communion, i.e., sharing, participation, fellowship, ...; there is identity of interest; a feeling of unity in the midst of diversity; a sense of freedom within the framework of accepted social responsibilities; differentiation of functions converging to the single goal of the good of the community and its members". The members of the society would participate in all communal affairs. The community would be a cooperative society. It would be self-regulating and self-determining in its internal matters. Agriculture, industry, capital, labour, skill, intelligence would be synthesised in the service of the community. The communities would be agro-industrial.

The next step in building up of communitarian society would be regional community. A number of primary communities
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would come together and corporate amongst themselves to build it. It would be an integral community in itself. He wrote: "at the regional level there is an integration of institutions and activities of the primary communities... just as in its internal administration the primary community is autonomous; so in the spheres in which the primary communities have delegated their powers to the regional community, the later is autonomous". The regional community would not be a higher body that could control the internal affairs of the primary community. Both would be equally sovereign in their spheres.

The regional communities would have to come together to form a still larger community - the district community. It would also be an integral community and its relationship with regional communities be of a similar pattern to that of the latter with the primary communities. In this manner the district communities in their turn would federate together to form the provincial community, and the union of Provincial communities would emerge into the national community. Like M.H. Roy, J.P. hoped that "A day might come
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when the national communities might federate together to form the world community'.

Two conclusions may be drawn from the design of J.P.'s communitarian democracy. First, 'as we proceed from the inner to the outer circles of communal life and organization, there is less and less to do for the outer communities. The national community has only a few matters to attend, e.g. defence, foreign relations, currency, inter-provincial coordination and legislation.' Secondly, 'such a social organisation offers the utmost scope for the people - who are no longer an amorphous mass of human grains but organised in self-governing communities - to govern themselves'.

According to J.P., only this kind of communitarian polity can guarantee the participating democracy.

J.P. emphasised enormously on popular participation. To the extent to which democracy becomes truly participative, the rush of totalitarianism would be stemmed and even rolled back. When suggesting certain conditions for Panchayati Raj to serve as the base of a true participating democracy, he wrote, 'I have been emphasising here the element of peoples' participation as a true measure of democracy. Now, if there
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is any level of self-government at which the fullest participation of the people is practicable, it is at the village level. It is only there that direct democracy can adequately function." J.P., therefore, proposed the political structure for Indian polity which would rise storey by storey from the foundation. In this political organisation, there would be decentralization; people would work for their own welfare and would participate in ordering and running of their lives. Decisions would be taken by consensus of opinion, political parties would not exist; there would be indirect elections; the State would not be a coercive power and, above all, man would be in the central place.

The highest political institution of the local community would be the General Assembly - the Gram Sabha. Every adult villager would be considered its member. It would elect an executive - the Panchayat to run the village administration by general consensus of opinion. The Panchayat would function through sub-committees. In the Panchayat or in its sub-committees, there would be no member appointed by the State Government.

The next stage of political structure would be that of the regional community. Here, the Gram Panchayats would

have to be integrated into Panchayat Samiti. It would be an autonomous self-governing community, having the powers and obligations to do all that might be within its competence. It would be a representative body of the Gram Panchayats. It would also be the executive body at its level and would function through committees.

The next story above the Panchayat Samiti would be that of the District Council. It would be formed by the integration of the Panchayat Samitis. It would have 'all the powers and obligations necessary to do everything that may be within their competence'. It would be the executive body of the District community and would function through committees.

At the next level of the political structure, there would be the State Assembly (Prant Sabha). It would also be formed by the integration of District Councils of a State. The State Assemblies, in their turn, would come together and create Lok Sabha (Nashtra Sabha). 'Thus the political institution at each level is an integration of all the
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institutions at the lower level. The State Assembly and the Lok Sabha would appoint committees at their levels, which would be the executive bodies, responsible to the State Assembly and the Lok Sabha respectively.

The legislative powers would be exercised by the communities at their levels. Each community would have powers "to make rules and laws in order to manage its internal affairs, provided they do not conflict with the interests of other communities at the same level and with the rules and laws laid down by the communities at higher levels". The higher communal bodies would legislate in their allotted spheres. Other communal bodies, e.g., educational and economic associations, could also pass rules and laws. The general body of each community would appoint small, workable committees, which would be directly responsible to the general body concerned. Each committee would have a Chairman and a Secretary. There would be a Coordinating Committee, to coordinate the work of different committees. It would consist of one representative from each committee. Its decisions would be binding upon committees.
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The committees would be in perpetual session and would execute the policies decided by the representative communal bodies. There would be no Ministers, Chief Ministers or Prime Minister as at present at the Provincial and National levels. In their administrative functions, the committees would be assisted by paid civil servants.

The Presidents of the different representative communal bodies would have no administrative functions. Their duty would be to see that their representative bodies "functions properly and according to the rules laid down". However, if the democratic apparatus breaks down, the Presidents would have extraordinary emergency powers at their levels. The President of the Rashtra Sabha would also be Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces and would be responsible to the Sabha for the defence of the nation. He would be assisted by a defence committee, of which he would be the Chairman.

Thus, J.P. suggested to give utmost powers to the communities so that people might learn and acquire self-
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confidence. That is why he said that "police, justice, taxation, collection, social services, planning, should all be decentralised to the maximum possible extent." In this democracy, power would be exercised from below upwards rather than from above downwards. About the central authority, J.P. said: "so long as it exists, it would be like a danger chain in a railway train. Passengers do not always have their attention fixed on this chain, but they make use of it in times of danger. Similarly, the lower units will be self-reliant, and will not always look to the central authority, but would seek its help and support when required". The representatives of the higher bodies would remain under the control of the lower bodies. To enable the people to have effective hand in shaping the institutions at the State and Union levels, J.P. suggested a tentative procedure for electing the State Assemblies and Lok Sabha as follows:

"Each Gram Sabha in every constituency should select, at a properly convened general meeting, two delegates to an electoral college ... in the following manner. At that

166. Ibid., p. 235.
169. That might also be called the 'Electoral Council'.
meeting nominations should be called for, and all the names proposed and seconded should be listed, preferably on a prominently displayed board ... each name should be voted upon - votes being taken by show of hands - and the votes received by each nominee entered against his name on the board. Thereafter, these should be repeated balloting in order to eliminate all except two of the nominees. This might be done by dropping, at each ballot, the name receiving the least votes at the previous ballot, and the remaining names.

170

The Electoral Council would meet at a central place in the area. Its task would be to set up candidates for election. J.P. suggested the following procedure for this purpose:

"First, there should be nominations, and then votes taken on each name proposed and seconded. Persons receiving not less than a given minimum of votes, say 30 percent, should be declared to be the candidates from the constituency for the Vidhan or Lok Sabha as the case might be".

171


171. The chosen delegates of the Gram Sabhas of the constituency concerned, that is, the Vidhan Sabha or the Lok Sabha constituency.

According to J.P., the Electoral Councils should try their best to set up not more than one candidate for every seat. "If, however, this does not happen to be practicable in some cases the names selected in the manner described above should be declared to be the candidates." Final elections should then be held as follows:

"The names of the candidates selected by the Electoral Council should be sent to all the Gram Sabhas of the constituency concerned. Each Sabha should convene a general meeting where votes should be taken for each candidate. Thereafter one of two alternatives should be followed:

(1) The candidate receiving the largest number of votes should be declared to be the person whom the particular Gram Sabha wants to represent it in the highest Sabha. Of all such persons the one receiving the largest number of Gram Sabha votes is finally declared to be the Member of the Vidhan or Lok Sabha (as the case might be) from that constituency.

(2) Alternatively, the votes received by each candidate at the general meeting of each Gram Sabha should be recorded. Then the votes that each has received at the different Gram Sabha meetings all over the constituency should be totalled. The candidate receiving the largest

173. Ibid., p. 46.
number of such votes then becomes the Member from that constituency. J.P. hoped that such a system of election would bind structurally the upper storey of the democratic edifice with the lowest, lending prestige, strength and meaning to the Gram Sabha and lifting it out of the possible morass of localism. It would further give a direct opportunity to every adult citizen to participate in choosing the highest organs of democracy.

During the Total Revolution phase, J.P. advocated the formation of People's Committees as a part of the work for Total Revolution. He suggested organisation of People's Committees in each Assembly constituency polling-booth. These People's Committees would consist of non-party members with non-caste and non-class attitudes of minds: pledged to act as watch-dogs of democracy and people's rights as well as duties. There should be some representation of students and youth of that area. "Each People's Committee from each polling-booth should send one representative selected by general consensus to an Assembly constituency People's Committee".
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In another place, J.P. suggested to organise Gram Sabhas in the countryside and neighbourhood and work Councils in the cities and towns. The Gram Sabhas could be comprised of all adult residents of the village. In the urban areas, J.P. suggested neighbourhood Councils made up of a hundred families living in the neighbourhood of one another. "In factories, offices, educational institutions and other work places 'communities of work' may be formed on the shop, office or any other convenient basis, for a participative manner of deliberation, decision and action". According to J.P., these Sabhas would "meet regularly, discuss their common problems and evolve cooperative and collective forms of action to manage their affairs". In the context of State Assembly elections, J.P. suggested the formation of a Gram Sabha Delegates Council. It would be formed by the elected delegates of the Gram Sabhas. The Gram Sabha Delegates Council would meet in the central place of the constituency, before the elections to select its candidates for the State Assembly. The decisions of the Gram Sabhas
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or the Delegates Council would be taken by general consensus or by a process of elimination. The Gram Sabha Delegates Council would continue to function until the next election. It would keep contact with the Gram Sabhas and keep in touch with the M.L.A. J.P. said that if the people's candidate was found indulging in corrupt practices, people could recall him. He asserted, "The right of recall is the people's birth right, whether it is enshrined in the Constitution or not". In another place, he remarked, "in a democracy the people do have the right to ask for the resignation of an elected government if it has gone corrupt and has been misruling. And if there is a legislature that persists in supporting such a government it too must go so that the people might choose better representatives".

Soon after the Lok Sabha elections and establishment of the Janata Sarkar in 1977, J.P. appealed the formation of People's Committees in all the villages and mohallas in the country. This, he believed, would enable the citizens to exercise increasing control over the local functionaries of the state and would lay the foundations of a participating democracy.
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democracy. According to J.P., the village peoples' committee would be the foundation committee. It would consist of 5 to 15 members elected by general consensus of all the adult citizens of the village. Next to Peoples' Committees, there would be Panchayat Peoples' Committee which would be formed by the convenors and two representatives of each village Peoples' Committee. The next would be the Block Peoples' Committee consisted of convenors and five representatives of each Panchayat Peoples' Committee. The Assembly Constituency Peoples' Committee would be formed by the convenors and 4 or 5 representatives of the Panchayat Peoples' Committees, not of the Block Peoples' Committee. The next, the Lok Sabha Constituency Peoples' Committee, like the Assembly Constituency Peoples' Committee, would be organised by the convenors and representatives of the Panchayat Peoples' Committees.

Like the countryside Peoples' Committees, there would be Urban Peoples' Committees too. Neighbourhood Peoples' Committee would be the foundation Peoples' Committee. With integration of convenors and representatives of neighbourhood committees, Mohalla Peoples' Committee would be formed
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and with the integration of convenors and representatives of Mohalla Peoples' Committees, the Ward Peoples' Committee would be formed. Lastly, the City Peoples' Committee would be formed with the integration of representatives and convenors of the Wards. But the Constituency Peoples' Committee would consist of convenors and representatives of all the Wards in the constituency. The representatives of the professional organizations e.g. lawyers, doctors, teachers, correspondents organizations should also be invited in the Wards or City Peoples' Committees.

The Peoples' Committees would be required to perform the following four main categories of functions: (a) watchdog functions with respect to the functioning of the administration; (b) resistance against injustices; (c) constructive work and (d) educating the communities in the theory and practice of popular democracy.

In giving the picture of his communitarian democracy, J.P. emphasised on economic decentralisation, without which, according to him, 'political decentralisation could not be effective'. The economy in communitarian democracy would be cooperative and co-sharing. It would be self-sufficient.
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small-machine and labour intensive economy. There would be balance of agriculture and industry. Its aim would be 'full utilization of local and regional resources, human and material, to the satisfaction of local and regional needs, not private benefit'. There would be scope for communitarian planning. The private enterprise would have fullest scope in the communitarian democracy, subject to private as well as communal good, that is, the sense of purushartha. This type of economic structure would be built along with political structure of peoples' democracy.

Transition Period

J.P. like Roy, recognised the inevitability of a transitional period, which will precede the functionalization of his 'partyless democracy'. In the transition period, J.P. suggested some steps to be taken to prepare ground for the establishment of the ultimate objective of a partyless democracy.

The first step in this connection, according to him, was that like the Congress and the P.S.P., other political parties should agree upon abstaining from setting up their
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candidates in the Village Panchayats, the Panchayat Samitis, and the District Councils. The candidates should be selected by the Electoral or Voters' Councils. Another suggestion he gave on the eve of the third general elections, that where there were no Electoral Councils, ad hoc Voters' Councils might be set up through a procedure similar to that of the Electoral Council. For example a constituency could be divided into a number of small areas, and voters' meetings might be held in each area at which two or more delegates could be elected. These delegates would form Voters' Councils which would select candidates in the same manner as was done by the Electoral Council.

In another suggestion, he said that all the candidates and their canvassers should appear together on the same platform and explain their policies and offer mutual criticisms in the presence of one another. Each speaker could be given equal time and after their performance, the audience could put them questions. If this practice of joint meeting would be followed, the evils of separate meetings, e.g., mutual misrepresentation, recrimination,
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even outright abuse, fanning communal, religious and other passions, and confusion, misleading and miseducation of the electorate, might be avoided. And there would also be an appreciable reduction in election expenses.'

Speaking about the programme of the total revolution, of which the formation of Peoples' Committees was a part, J.P. said that it might take several generations to realise it. In a statement, issued on April 30, 1977, he said: 'I know that the attainment of such a high objective (of Total Revolution) is possible only when several generations strive for it increasingly with a will'. Although, the aim of total revolution in Bihar was not partyless democracy. Like Roy, J.P., however, was of the view that education was a prerequisite for the transformation of existing democratic system into the communitarian democracy.

**Education**

J.P. also gave education the prime importance in his scheme. According to him, "education of the people, understood
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in the widest sense of the term, is an essential condition for the success of the experiment". J.P. regarded education as the most powerful means for creating self-regulated enlightened classes and the stateless society of his concept. He did not like the present system of education which, to him, was responsible for the accumulated sense of injustice, grievances, dissatisfaction and outbreak of violence in the society. Expressing his resentment on the present system of education, he wrote in his article, 'Face to Face', published in 1970, "responsible for the accumulated sense of injustice, grievance and hurt among the poor and down-trodden that is now seeking its outlet in violence. Responsible again are the system of education and the nature of planning that are producing an ever-expanding army of ill-educated, frustrated and unemployed youth and that are accentuating economic disparities and leading to further polarisation of classes". J.P. believed that the primary aim of education should be to impart knowledge and training, that is, it should aim at preparing the youth to earn his livelihood independently. Besides, its aim should also be to convert man into better human being. Speaking at the convocation of the Mysore University on November 29, 1965, J.P. observed, "While the aim of education is to impart knowledge and training, it is universally agreed that its no lesser aim is
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to make man human, i.e., a better human being.... Much has been done to understand and change man's environment but so little to understand and change man himself.

According to him, the true function of education would be to build a bridge between that inner and outer knowledge of individual so as to achieve a synthesis of understanding. It would lead to a common goal. He said: "Then that happens, education might come into its own and be able to perform its true function of making both man and his environment, so that the outward and inward activities of men might come to be co-related and oriented to a common goal".

He was of the view that the education should be practical as well as theoretical. The students should go to villages and do some social work. The practical experience of village life would help them to develop their personality. He emphasised on rural education, which would be non-bookish, practical and technical education, with special emphasis on training in agricultural techniques. It would include large-scale practical adult education. Thus, he believed
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that this type of education would develop in the youth the qualities of cooperation, brotherhood and service.

J.P. expected the educators of the people to come from all possible quarters. He wrote, "This education can best be imparted by disinterested, non-partisan agencies, engaged in social service or tasks of rural development. Political parties might also make a great contribution in this respect: provided they addressed themselves to the task in a non-partisan spirit. Perhaps the best way for them would be to create a common agency through which to carry on this work. Government officers and agencies might also do useful work in this sphere. Schools, libraries, cooperative societies have an important role to play here." He also suggested the formation of 'a non-party and purely educative body of voters called the All-India Voters' Association', or a centre jointly set up and conducted by the Union Ministry of Community Development, the All-India Panchayat Parishad, other All-India Local Self-Government Organizations, Sarva Seva Sangh and other all India rural service agencies'. According to him, election time would obviously be a time of mass education. At the time of election campaign, the
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parties and persons who believe in the ideas of organised democracy should make coordinated effort to educate public opinion.

Comparison

There are many similarities between M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan's concepts of democracy. J.P. shows remarkable influence of Roy in his writings. He felt indebted to Roy for the impact on the evolution of his thought. Both admit that in the existing circumstances, democracy is the best form of government. But it has not been given a chance. Both, however, admit that the fundamental of democracy, that is, popular sovereignty, has never been realised or even practised by any government. Both criticize parliamentary democracy, and there are similarities in their planks of criticism. For instance, Roy thinks that parliamentary democracy is no democracy at all. It is not the government of the people, by the people but on behalf of the people. The sovereign individuals in practice remain passive spectators. After elections, individuals have no control over their representatives. Individuals are ruled by a group of party men. Democracy is converted into dictatorship of
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Cabinet. J.P. too criticises Parliamentary democracy like Roy, in detail. According to him, democracy may be a
government of the people and for the people but not by the people (it is at best with the consent of the people). People
have a very limited choice to select from the candidates set up by the political parties. The individual is atomised.
He casts his vote as an atom of society. Ordinary voters can not express their opinion intelligently on the complicated
issues. Consequently, political parties rule over the sovereign citizens.

Both criticise election system in Parliamentary democracy. According to Roy, representatives are not elected
intelligently. Man is lost in the crowd and elections take place playing upon the crowd mentality. Persons, who are
elected, are those who know how to play on mass mentality. To J.P. the system of election is very expensive and
appalling wasteful. It creates unnecessary passions and excitaments and fails to elect good and able men. Both
agree that democracy is converted into demagoguery.

Both hold that the greatest fault of Parliamentary democracy is its inherent tendency toward centralisation of
power. Both are champions of maximum decentralisation. According to Roy, centralisation of power leads to a
dehumanisation process, wherein all the powers are centralised in the executive and important decisions are taken by the
executive, bureaucracy and committees of the experts. Even
the representatives of the people have no say in it, and are reduced to a mere rubber stamp. J.P. was also of the view that in the modern states, individuals have no control over the government and finds himself reduced to a position of helplessness. The important issues in such states are decided by the political parties, industrialists, bankers and powerful labour unions. It gives birth to powerful bureaucracy and paves the way for administrative autocracy.

Both are critical of the evils created by party system in Parliamentary democracy. Roy rejects the idea that parties are co-present with politics. Political parties imply the denial of sovereignty of the individual and democracy. To J.P., parties often put group interests above the national interest and are run by the caucuses that are beyond democratic control. Party rivalries give rise to demagogy, which eliminates political ethics.

Both feel that representative government is in effect only a minority government. To Roy, it represents only the party, which controls it and membership, even of the largest party, is only a small fraction of the people. Thus, democracy is a government by a party and not by the people. To J.P., a government which is elected under universal suffrage represents only the minority of the total voters where there is multi-party system. Even under two party-system, it is a frequent phenomena.
Both reach the conclusion that Parliamentary democracy is formal democracy. As an alternative to it, both present their schemes of government based on the principles of decentralization, individual freedom and popular participation. Good many of the features of these schemes proposed for India are similar. Roy suggests a pyramidal structure of Indian polity reared on the basis of an organised democracy composed of a country-wide net-work of Peoples' Committees. Like Roy, J.P. also visualises a pyramidal structure of Indian polity based on a communitarian democracy composed of village communities as its basis. In Roy's organised democracy and J.P.'s communitarian democracy, there is no place for political parties. J.P., however, says that 'there may be political parties but they are likely to be local fraction. Their role will not be commanding. There is maximum decentralisation of power. People will actively participate in the administration and will be accorded a central place. There will be no centralised State. To Roy, the government will become co-terminous with society and to J.P. it will serve like a dumper chain in a railway train.

A lot is common between Roy's Peoples' Committee and J.P.'s Village Community. These are primary territorial units, which will be autonomous in their spheres and will be free from outside interference. These local units are to be organised in such a way that they give maximum freedom to the individual to administer his affairs. The higher
organs of the polity (in case of Roy, sub-divisional and
district Peoples' Committees and Provincial and Supreme
Peoples' Councils, and in case of J.P., Regional, District,
Provincial and National Committees) will be formed electorally
from the lower organs and will have largely residual and
coordinating functions. Both dream of World-Federation and
agree that only those matters should be given to the central
organ, which are of national importance. The higher organ
will remain in control of the lower bodies. Roy does not
provide for any separation of power at the lowest level.
Peoples' Committees are to act as the legislative and the
executive. But J.P., besides the above mentioned framework
of the social organisation of the communitarian democracy,
recommends a separation of legislative and executive powers.
During the total revolution phase, J.P., like Roy, advocated
the formation of Peoples' Committees in the villages and
the cities.

In their new democracy, both give full sovereign
rights to the individuals including the right to recall
their representatives. Both give emphasis on economic
decentralisation, which, to them, is a precondition for
effective political decentralisation. Both agree that the
new democracy, which they envisage, can not be built in a
day or two. There will be transition period during which
conditions will be created to introduce new democracy. Both
agree that education of the individual is of seminal importance
for the success of true democracy. According to them, individual must be oriented, made conscious and moral by education. Both hold the view that during the period of election campaign, masses may be educated, and insist that education should be imparted by non-governmental agencies.

Besides these similarities between Roy and J.P., there are some points of disagreement too. The first major point of difference of J.P. from Roy is that of on spiritualism or supernaturalism. In an inaugural address at the All-India Radical Humanist Association Conference held in Calcutta on December 29, 1973, J.P. expressed his complete agreement with the Draft, except for one point. The point of disagreement was the statement in the second fundamental principle in the Draft, that "Humanism excludes supernaturalism and affirms that man with his increasing power over nature is the maker of his future". Disagreeing with the statement, J.P. said "modern science, particularly modern psychology does definitely point to a reality beyond the human mind. Whatever the nature of the human spirit may be, it definitely seems to be of a higher order than the mind". He viewed
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that reason alone would not enable man to shape a better
future for himself. He referred with approval to Vinoba's
statement that "the age of Reason and Politics is over
and new age of spirituality and science has dawned". He,
however, added: "It may be discovered that what is called
'supernatural to-day is after all a part or an aspect of
nature, but those laws are different from those that are
termed natural laws at present'. But it must be clearly
understood that by supporting spiritualism J.P. does not
support the Indian orthodoxy. Thus, whereas Roy is free
from mystical approach and maintains rational and scientific
outlook at all levels of his thought on the reconstruction
of Indian polity, J.P. is drawn towards the concept of
Dharma and spirituality; obviously, under the impact of
Gandhism, in which he finds an example of 'synthetic,
organic, communal organisation of Indian society'. J.P.
wants to revive the ancient concept of Dharma so that 'India
may again be organised on the basis of self-determining
and mutually coordinating and integrating communities'.

Another point of disagreement between Roy and J.P.
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is that J.P. does not take the positive stand that the philosophical revolution (which according to Roy is necessary) is a pre-condition of the success of Indian democracy. Roy believed that India came under foreign rule because it was culturally backward and not that its cultural backwardness resulted from foreign rule. Roy regarded that the very spiritual heritage of India which was upheld and applauded by Indian nationalists was the cause of India's cultural decay. This idea of Roy did not find favour with J.P. while emphasising the necessity of educating the people for the realisation of Panchayati Raj, J.P. observed: "A hundred or two hundred years of slavery of a kind which this country had never seen before completely destroyed the power of the people to think for themselves and to come together and face their tasks together". However, J.P.'s total revolution implies comprehensive transformation of society in which the democratic values - liberty, equality and fraternity will permeate the political, economic and social spheres of life. This is a long term programme.

Another disagreement between Roy and J.P. is on the issue of the State. In Roy's conception of organised democracy the 'State will be coincident with the entire society', and consequently, it will be 'under a standing democratic control'.

Roy does not feel it necessary to abolish it. But J.P.'s 221
communitarian democracy will be a 'Stateless society'.
Here, J.P.'s thinking exhibits a deep impact of Gandhiji.
His ultimate aim is to 'do without the State'.

Thus, we find that J.P., as he himself admits, derived
his idea on partyless politics and communitarian democracy
from J.N. Roy's writings. But he tried to present it in
the garb of Gandhism. In the last phase, i.e., total
revolution phase of his political life, J.P. again borrowed
an idea from Roy, when he gave the right of recall to the
people.

Before we conclude this chapter a few additional
observations would be in order. First, Roy and J.P. had
criticized the functioning of Parliamentary democracy in the
modern world but interesting enough they omitted any reference
to presidential democracy. The omission is all the more
glaring if we take into account the fact that both Roy and
J.P. had been in America for a considerable period of time
and had had a fairly close contact with American academics
and intelligentsia.

Secondly, political parties are inevitable even in
Roy's scheme of democracy and its mechanism of election etc.
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Although both criticized party system in modern democracy and recommended partyless democracy, they appear to have given scant attention to the deeper implications of the problem. It has been discovered and established beyond doubt that political parties not only are inevitable in a democratic system irrespective of its types, but also indispensable in certain ways even in other modern systems of government including totalitarian regimes. Roy talked about the election of small local Peoples’ Committees. But it is apparent that whether Roy liked it or not, political parties would have invariably become operative in some form or the other because of the very process of election itself. The importance and inevitability of opposition and, therefore, political parties in any democracy cannot be over-emphasized. Where officially party politics is barred, it has been found that there is opposition through the instrumentality of factionalism from within the ruling party. Roy and J.P. appear to have over supported the problem of political parties and dealt with it in a superficial manner. J.P. talked of partyless democracy, but in his last phase of political life, he did not talk about partyless democracy. Probably he had realized the inevitability of political parties in democratic systems.

Thirdly, decentralization in a country like India does not seem to be in accordance with our political ethos. Roy and J.P. both based their new organized polity on the
Principle of political decentralisation. But political decentralisation has hardly been in keeping with the tradition of India. For example, in the Panchayati system sufficient powers have been given to the local bodies, but the reports after reports on the working of Panchayati raj show that their functioning is unsatisfactory. And one of the basic causes has been the misfeasance and nonfeasance on the part of the representatives of the people at these bodies. Neither Roy nor J.P. appears to have shown any comprehension of the possible risks of decentralisation and, therefore, none of them has paid any attention to devising any mechanism of ensuring against misuse of the principle of decentralisation. Although both Roy and J.P. talked about recall as an effective check on elected representatives, none of them has pursued or elaborated this idea and technique to a satisfactory extent. Thus, the whole structure with its widespread decentralisation is apt to be slow and lethargic. J.P.'s scheme of governance by committees is not only too idealistic but also risky if experience of the functioning of such committees at municipal and Panchayati raj level is taken into account for guidance.

Thus, we might conclude by observing that while their critique of democracy (Parliamentary) is fairly sound and valid; their scheme of an alternative system is
rather weak and utopian. The scheme of division of power between the various layers of government is defective. It is also wide open to possibilities of misuse. We might, of course, always say that people would learn to use it in due course of time but can we afford the risk and luxury of learning democracy as propounded by Roy and J.P. by the process of trial and error? Then there is also the sterling question if we will ultimately learn it right.
CHAPTER VI

M.N. ROY AND JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN ON

INDIVIDUAL, STATE AND REVOLUTION

In the last chapter, we have explained that Roy and J.P. criticized the Parliamentary type of democracy, because the system utterly neglected of the individual and his personality. They gave their own picture of democracy, that is, organised democracy (Roy) and communitarian democracy (J.P.) and put the individual in the central place. They considered State as a sub-organization of the society, which had nothing to do with individual freedom and initiative. Both accorded sovereign rights to the individual in their conception of democracy. In this chapter, we will discuss broadly their ideas on individual, his freedom, State and the theory and technique of revolution.

M.N. Roy on Individual

It will not be an exaggeration if we say that Roy built his philosophy around man. Man is the centre of his philosophy. He starts with the individual and holds the view that individual is the end and other political and social institutions are means to this end. "Man is the arch type of society". To Roy, "man is the measure of everything".

2. Ibid., Thesis No. 22, p. 152.
Individual, according to him, has created the society and the State and he is prior to these institutions. He stated, "We find that society is the creation of individuals. The individual comes first; he is prior to society; society is for attaining the end, which is the freedom and progress of the individual." Roy believed in the sovereignty of the people. In the Draft Constitution he wrote, "All authority emanates from the people." He did not accept any dualism between the human soul and the human body. As a thorough-going materialist, he held that man was part of nature and like the rest of nature, he was also amenable to its laws.

Roy tried to analyse human nature in the light of new scientific knowledge. He criticised all the existing socio-political philosophies because they were based on wrong notions of human nature. Man does not behave morally under supernatural or social compulsions. Man is not selfish. His nature is not to believe but to reason. According to him, the crisis of modern civilisation is spiritual crisis. The cause of all evils of our time is wrong notion about

3. Ibid., p. 116.


human nature. Man was not created by God. He holds that
man is a physical entity. Roy's approach to understand
human nature is biological. According to him, human nature
is subject to the evolutionary-process. He said, "To
change is human nature. Otherwise, there lies no sense
in regarding the history of civilisation as an evolutionary
process". There is a continuity of progress from the
sub-human level to the human level. Consciously or
unconsciously, living organism always tries to gain maximum
freedom. He said, "The struggle for existence in the
negative sense is quest for freedom. The environments are
continually trying to crush the organism; and the struggle
for existence is the striving of the organism to free
itself from the tyranny of nature. On the sub-human
biological level, that is very largely mechanical struggle.
But the quest for freedom is purposive. When the struggle
for existence takes place with purposiveness on the human
level of evolution, we call it quest for freedom".

According to Roy, reason, morality and freedom are
the tripple eternal attributes of human nature. The physical
universe is a law-governed and living nature is a part of
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this system. Rationality is a biological property in man. Consciousness is the property of life, and life itself is determined by physical process. Consciousness means awareness of the environment. Further, the growth of nervous system serves as the means of inter-relations between the organism and the environment. This process of growth culminates in the formation of the brain which physiologically is called mind. The mind is the highest expression of life. "The mind becomes conscious of the environments; the radius of which gradually expands until the entire nature is embraced. It being consciousness of a law-governed system; human mind is necessarily rational in essence". Roy held that the intellectual and spiritual life of man was conditioned by the elementary instinct of reason, which, to him, was a product of pre-human biological evolution. Therefore, rationality is a biological function. Thus on biological grounds, Roy comes to the conclusion that human nature is not to believe but to reason. He holds that, superstition, magic, fetishism, animism and natural religion can be traced to the instinctive rationality of primitive man. Reason is antecedent to them. According to him, the brain produces ideas. To Roy, "The brain is a means of production, and produces the most revolutionary commodity - ideas".


Morality, like rationality, is another attribute of human nature. According to Roy, morality can be traced to man's innate rationality. There is a causal relation between rationality and morality. He wrote, "Morality must be referred back to man's innate rationality. ... The innate rationality of man is the only guarantee of a harmonious social order, which will also be moral order; 10 because morality is a rational function". At another place, he stated, "In the light of modern scientific knowledge, it is discovered that man's rationality is a biological property. Reason is not a metaphysical category. Moral values are placed on a firm foundation when they are referred back to innate rationality of man. They need no other sanction than conscience, which is not the voice of God, but results from rationality. The discovery of physical basis of reason and the rationalist secular sanction of morality frees Humanism from the mystic connotation traditionally associated with it". The man is moral because he is instinctively a rational being. Man chooses good from bad instinctively which is a biological property, not by any inner voice or fear of God. He wrote, "There are

rules of conduct even among higher animals. Those rules go into the composition of human instincts. They are part of man's biological heritage - the constant of human nature. In man, they express themselves as the sense of morality. He knows from experience what is good for him and what is bad for him. Therefore, he generalises what is good for him, is good for all like himself; and what is bad for him is also bad for all. That is the origin of morality".

**Individual Freedom**

Freedom, like rationality and morality, is also an essential aspect of human nature. According to Roy, there is no contradiction between the reason and freedom. He said, "Rising out of the background of the law-governed physical nature, the human nature is essentially rational. Reason, being a biological property, it is not the anti-thesis of will. Intelligence and emotion can be reduced to a common biological denominator. Historical determinism, therefore, does not exclude freedom of the will". Freedom also has a physical connotation. Freedom expresses the struggle for existence in animal species and a conquest for freedom in human beings. Freedom is also the continuation of a pre-human biological tendency. He said, "The quest for freedom

---

is the continuation, on a higher level of intelligence and emotion of the biological struggle for existence. To him, therefore, the rational and moral individual is the end, and the social and political institutions are the means. These institutions must help the individual to realise his fullest freedom. He said: "Social institutions and relations must, therefore, contribute to the freedom of the individual and help the realisation of his full stature."

Defining the term freedom, Roy said: "Freedom is progressive disappearance of all restrictions on the upholding of the potentialities of individuals, as human beings, and not as cogs in the wheels of a mechanised social organism. Again, at another place, Roy said: "Quest for freedom in human evolution is purposive. The struggle for existence is no longer carried out by mechanical adoption on the human level, it is carried on by purposive efforts for the conquest of nature. ... Science is a search for truth and it is the result of man's quest for freedom. Therefore, we say that search for truth is

the corollary to the search for freedom".

Roy regarded freedom as the basic human value. He declared: "Freedom is the supreme value of life; because the urge for freedom is the essence of human existence". He did not equate it with national independence nor with the ending of the exploitation of the masses. He believed that free individuals can alone build up a society of freedom and equality. Throughout his life, he endeavoured for the cause of freedom.

M.N. Roy was not satisfied with physical freedom only. In his orthodox Marxian phase of political life, he was immensely impressed with the Marxian belief of economic freedom. But later he changed his views and became an advocate of intellectual freedom, which, according to him, was one of the most important desirables for human happiness and cultural progress. He placed the intellectual freedom

18. V.N. Ojha, M.N. Roy and His Philosophical Ideas, op. cit., p. 312. Also see M.N. Roy, New Humanism - A Manifesto, op. cit., p. 39, wherein he wrote, "Freedom is the progressive elimination of all the factors - physical, social, psychological, which obstruct the unfolding of man's rational, moral and creative potentialities. The function of social relationships should be to secure for individuals, as individuals, the maximum measure of freedom".


at the top in his structure of freedom. He said, "Freedom is not a beautiful castle built in the air of imagination. It rests on the triple pillars of humanism, individualism and rationalism." He was not in favour of giving unlimited freedom to the individual. According to him, man should not be motivated by evil objectives for personal gains only. In the interest of the community, individual might be asked to undergo reasonable suffering. He accepted the interference of the State only for the welfare of the community.

Roy rejected every system which ignored the freedom of the individual. For instance, he criticized liberalism, socialism, Fascism, Nazism, Nationalism etc., because these systems, more or less, denied the freedom to the individual. Rejecting the ideal of nationalism, he said, "Nation is a metaphysical concept, yet, human beings, of flesh and blood, must sacrifice everything to make the nation great and glorious. That is the essence of Nationalism. That is, to sacrifice, a reality at the altar of a fiction, of an illusion". He believed that the presence of foreigners would not make a nation slave as the mere presence of only the nationals would not make a nation free. He wrote, "It makes no difference whether the relation of

exploitation is between men born in the same country or
those born in different countries." He pointed out that
there were many examples in the history where in the name
of nationalism, people exploited their own country men.
According to him, nationalism is a medieval idea. It
maintains that nation is more important than the individuals
who compose it. 'Nationalism becomes the emotional core
round which gathers the ideology of the past, which a
progressive movement must aim to change considerably.'
Nationalism leads to Fascism and irrationalism. It is a
totalitarian dogma.

His love for intellectual freedom was so great that
he rejected the idea of God and religion. His theory of
freedom was founded on his practical experiences and
observations. He wrote: "I deduce my conclusions not from
books but from experience.... Ever since my boyhood I have
fought against injustice and for freedom. When I realised
that God presented the greatest obstacles on the path of
human freedom, I rejected God and since then, I have fought
against those who claim to derive their authority from God".
He regarded freedom as the supreme value which was the
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source of other human values. He wrote, "However, I regard freedom as the supreme value, from which all human values are derived. Freedom is the supreme value because the urge for freedom is the essence of human existence; and it is never in the danger of being mystified because it can be traced all the way down the progress of biological evolution; indeed it is coincident, if not actually identical, with life. Since all the ethical values are derived from the soulless, animal heritage of man, they need no sanction, which transcends human existence". He declared, "There is nothing more divine than freedom".

His emphasis was on individual freedom. His philosophy of radicalism is concerned with man, not with nation or with class. He believed that only individual could experience freedom. "The position of individual, therefore", he wrote, "is the measure of the progressive and liberating significance of any collective effort or social organisation. The success of any collective endeavour is to be measured by the actual benefit for its constituent units". At another place, he wrote, "There can be only one measure of the degree of freedom enjoyed by any class or country, and

that measure is the actual amount of freedom enjoyed by the individuals composing that country or class".

Roy believed that freedom was not an instrumental value. He said, "It is not a means to something; it is an end in itself. It is not ideal to be attained in some distant time, but something to be experienced every day of our life. And those who experience freedom can alone be the real defenders of freedom". Roy went into the analysis of the concept of freedom deeply and expressed its dimension of balance and harmony. Freedom lies in the relation between the privileges of self and of others because man is always dependent on others through tradition, cooperation and nature. Culture is the foundation of freedom. He, who feels completely in harmony with his cultural background, should feel himself to be free. He said, "Economic well-being and political freedom are also ingredients of the total human culture... But in the last analysis, greater emphasis should be laid on the deeper layers of human nature. Freedom does not concern merely the relations between man and man. In the first place, it must be experienced individually. Keenly conscious of the urge for freedom and capable of experiencing it, individuals


will build a really free society. Culture, therefore, is the foundation of freedom, which can be reinforced by the satisfaction of all other human requirements.

On the basis of freedom, according to Roy, a difference between the civilised and the uncivilised man can be made. Freedom enables man "to be progressively free from the tyranny of natural phenomena and physical and social environments". Freedom is helpful in developing the intellectual and other human potentialities. Roy also believed that freedom could not be realised by immoral means. He said, "Quest for freedom, knowledge, truth - that is the hierarchy of humanist axiology. Our values are not autonomous dicties; they are inter-related, locally as well as ontologically. Therefore, we say that freedom cannot be attained by immoral means, nor will an enlightened man be a liar".

According to him, man can be more free if he is more independent economically. For the moral and intellectual freedom, economic independence is necessary. There must be equity in distribution and no economic exploitation.
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He wrote: "Progressive satisfaction of material necessities is the precondition for individual members of society unfolding their intellectual and other finer human potentialities. An economic reorganisation, such as will guarantee a progressively rising standard of living, is the foundation of the Radical Democratic State. Economic liberation of the masses is an essential condition for their advancing towards the goal of freedom".

To him, "Man is born free and Freedom is his birth right". He criticized every system - economic, social, political etc., which attacked the individual and his liberty. The social institutions were made by men to exercise their freedom. The institutions are not above their creators. He said: "Social institutions and relations must, therefore, contribute to the freedom of the individual and help the realization of his full stature". He fought for the whole of his life for it. In his own words: "My whole political life, which is nearly forty-seven years old, has been nothing but a tormented soul's search for freedom".

Roy's entire philosophy is to satisfy man's urge for


freedom and quest for truth. He was a great advocate of individual's dignity and his liberty. According to one of Roy's admirers, "The master passion of Roy's life was urge for freedom". And further, "the freedom was for him an empirical fact: a psychological urge at the root of everyman's personal being".

Jayaprakash Narayan on Individual

Like M.N. Roy, J.P. also emphasised consistently on the individuality and the dignity of man. From the very beginning of his political life, J.P. gave top importance to the individual and his status. He observed, "Individualism has been the prominent motif in our culture only in the sense that the perfection of the individual has been its ideal; never in the sense of narrow, self-seeking individualism, which is the motif in capitalist society. And if individual perfection is the goal, the socialist has not the least difficulty in showing that such perfection can come about only by aiming at the utmost common good". During the early phase of his political life, he did not think the individual as an end in himself. He gave equal importance to the society and the social good.
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He believed that the individual perfection could be achieved only through the common good. His thinking was that the environment and the society by themselves moulded the individuals as well as social institutions. To him, the society, the social environment and the economic forces were more important. A change in these institutions would bring about a better society by itself. He considered the individual to be of little importance in the context of the social whole. He observed: "it is the social environment which shapes human behaviour".

But in the later phase of his political career, J.P. came to realise the importance of the individual as an end in himself. For him, no political philosophy was more important than man; it was only means to an end, that is, the individual. He declared that man was not just a heap of matter. Man is an ethical being. He is a constituent unit of the social system. He said, "human nature, apart from the instincts of self and race preservation, is most likely of a neutral character which acquires moral tones in accordance with social conditioning". He felt that
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materialism did not provide any incentive for goodness. He recommended adoption of non-material (spiritual) approach, because it "elevates the individual to a moral plane, and urges him, without reference to any objective outside of himself, to endeavour to realise his own true nature and fulfil the purpose of his being. This endeavour becomes the powerful motive force that drives him in its natural course to the good and the true. It will be seen as an important corollary of this that only when materialism is transcended does individual man come into his own and become an end in himself".

Thus, J.P.'s approach to man was spiritual. He was influenced with Gandhiji in this aspect. He believed in the change of heart because, according to him, the spirit of man is Godly. All are the creatures of the same God. He stated, Dhoodan "is being conducted in the belief that man is amenable to change. That is so, because all of us are essentially one; fragments of the same Almighty"...

He believed in human values - the spiritual values. He believed in training of man to make him good inspired by certain ethical values. Therefore, he insisted on going beyond materialism. He said, "I feel convinced, therefore,
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that man must go beyond the material to find the incentive to goodness. As a corollary, I feel further that the task of social reconstruction cannot succeed under the inspiration of a materialist philosophy". He was against making man subordinate to machine. To him, science and spirituality complement each other and need one another. The individual should identify himself with others only then he would advance spiritually. He said, "the more he identifies himself with larger and larger numbers of people the more spiritually advanced he is. He wants to identify himself with his family ... he identifies himself next may be with the community ... then he may identify himself with his State, may be with his nation, with his country and ultimately with the whole world. This is spiritual realisation. It comes as a result of the fact that the individual sees himself in others in essence in spite of temporal differences". The material values are also important but he believed that material requirements should be satisfied not in isolation but in harmony with spiritual requirements. These should be a synthesis between spiritual and material values.
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According to him, the constituents of the society are the individuals. For a good society, the constituent individuals should also be good. He observed, "social reconstruction is impossible without human reconstruction. Society cannot be good unless individual men are good, and particularly those men who form the elite of society". He believed that a new man was necessary for the success of democracy. He wrote, "For man really to enjoy liberty and freedom and to practise self-government, it is necessary voluntarily to limit his wants". He placed the individual in the central position in the reconstruction of Indian polity. To him, "the very foundation of democracy is belief in man - individual man - not as a means but as an end". He fully believed in man's worth and dignity, and in his rights and responsibilities. According to J.P., in Sarvodaya society, all the powers of administration and construction would be in the hands of people. He stated, "We have to snatch initiative from the hands of politicians; from Parliament and legislatures and give it back to the
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people. This is our job ... if there is any salvation, that salvation has to come from below. Salvation will not come from the legislators.

In his total revolution phase, J.P. believed in transferring all the powers to the people at large and not to a few who claim to exercise power on behalf of the people. To him, "A truly successful revolution is that which transfers power not to a group, but to the people at large. A total revolution, therefore, is that which transfers total power to the people at large". For total revolution, J.P. believed in changing the entire system - political, economic, social etc. as well as the individual, intellectually, culturally, morally or spiritually. Without a change in the individual, there would not be a total revolution. He visualised such a society in which all powers of administration and reconstruction would be in the hands of the people not in the clutches of the elites and at the same time the individual would be dutiful and hard-working, not selfish and narrow-minded. Man would be the architect of his own fate.

Thus, analysing the human nature, J.P. placed the


individual in the central position of his scheme of reconstruction of the Indian polity. He believed in the goodness of the individual and in the inherent spirituality in him. While Gandhi's emphasis was more on individual reconstruction, Marx's emphasis was on social reconstruction. J.P. placed equal emphasis on human as well as social aspects for the reconstruction for a new society. He wanted to change human values through a social revolution. He appealed to minimise the human needs but the minimum needs; according to him, food, clothes and house, should be fulfilled for all.

Individual Freedom

J.P. was a great champion of individual freedom. There has always been an inner urge for freedom in J.P. throughout his life. In his own words, "Freedom became one of the beacon-lights of my life and it has remained so ever since. Freedom with the passing of the years, transcended the mere freedom of man everywhere and from every sort of trammel - above all, it meant the freedom of the human personality, freedom of the mind, freedom of the spirit".

________________________________________________________
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According to J.P., man should be free to develop his personality. To reach the high pinnacle of great nobility, the man should be free. Everyone should have equal opportunity for one's all-round development. In his nationalist phase, he criticised exploitation of the people by the Britishers. As a Marxist, he criticised the economic exploitation of man by the foreign and Indian Government. India had to become independent. The poor must be free from the chains of material poverty. Freedom should include 58 freedom from exploitation, from hunger, from poverty. Swaraj meant to him, the rule of the poor and the downtrodden. He emphasised on linking national movement for freedom with the movement for economic and social emancipation of the masses. The intellectuals must be free to think. The State would be the means to achieve the free society and, "the system of society best suited to man is that which allows him the most freedom and creativity in his relationships with people and with nature". According to him, man without freedom is not a human being. He stated, "A society which denies man, his freedom in truth denies his humanity, because if the freedom of the spirit is taken away then man becomes only an animal". Later on, he talked
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about spiritual freedom as he believed that there is an element of Godliness inside every human being. To him, freedom and responsibility were the ultimate ethical impulses.

J.P. was averse to every political system in which there was lack of individual freedom. Once a great admirer of Soviet Russia, J.P. became its strong critic, because of want of individual freedom in the system. He rejected the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat only because there was no democratic freedom envisaged. J.P. was of the view that "the peoples' instinct is always in favour of freedom and democracy and it is never natural for them deliberately to subject themselves to a dictatorship". He also criticized the Parliamentary system of government and the party system only because there was no scope for individual dignity and liberty. To him, totalitarianism was a crime against man. It was an insult to man to deny him his freedom. Man by nature should work for freedom.

63. For details see Chapter V.
During the total revolution phase, he was primarily committed to the preservation of the humanist value of liberty. His philosophy of total revolution is deeply and thoroughly committed to resuscitate the rights and liberties of the individuals.

Thus, throughout his journey, from nationalism to Marxism to total revolution through democratic socialism and Sarvodaya, freedom, individual dignity, equality and brotherhood had guided the course of his life – thought and action.

Comparison

Individual and his freedom constituted the basic concern for both M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan. Both laid great stress on individual dignity, initiative and liberty. Both gave the central place to the individual in their political philosophy and criticized the systems – political, social and economic, etc., which atomized the individual and eroded his liberties. For both, individual was an end and all the other associations and organizations were the means. The individual was sovereign and source of all powers. For both, man was moral and good by nature. Both tried to infuse the spirit of self-reliance in the individual.

Both were the champions of individual freedom. Freedom, to both, was an essential aspect of human nature.
and the basic human value. Freedom as an end could only be realised by moral means. Their entire philosophy was concerned with satisfying the man's urge for freedom. Without freedom, to them, man was not a human being in real sense. It was only freedom through which the individual reaches his perfection.

While there are many similarities between Roy and J.P., the differences between the two are also significant. Roy was a staunch individualist. Individual, to him, was a biological entity, not a social one. He did not accept any authority over the individual; e.g., society, nation or State. On the other hand, J.P. was an individualist as well as a socialist. He held that man should sacrifice his interests for the sake of society. To him, social interest was higher than individual interest. J.P. believed that the good of the individual could be best obtained by subordinating his interest to the higher interest of the community. To him, there was no dichotomy between the two. Moreover, J.P. emphasised on leading a severe self-disciplined simple life. To him, goodness lay in self-sacrifice, in reducing one's needs, in suppressing one's impulses and in privation. Unlike J.P., Roy laid stress on the 'unfoldment' of the individual, on the satisfaction of his needs and desires, on enrichment, on maturity and growth. Roy believed

in man's ability and desire so he stressed on the independent development of the individual according to his circumstances and needs.

Another difference between the two was regarding their philosophical approach to the individual. Roy's approach was rational, while that of J.P. was spiritual. Roy's "Humanism excludes supernaturalism and affirms that man with his increasing power over nature is maker of his future". J.P. did not agree with this view. He said: "whatever the nature of human spirit may be, it definitely seems to be of a higher order than the Mind". His view was that reason alone would not enable man to shape a better future for himself. He agreed completely with Vinoba's statement that "the Age of Reason and Politics is over and a new Age of Spirituality and Science has dawned". However, he added, "It may be discovered that what is called 'Supernatural' to-day is after all a part or an aspect of nature, but whose laws are different from those that are termed 'natural laws' at present". But J.P.
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was not a supporter of Indian orthodoxy like Gandhi. He had no objection to the statement in the Draft Declaration of the Radical Humanist Association, which read “In order to build up and strengthen political and economic democracies, the contemporary world, and in particular the underdeveloped part thereof, requires a new renaissance based on the humanist values of freedom, rationalism and morality”.

M.N. Roy on State

Being an ardent believer in individual freedom and sovereignty, Roy believed that any institution, e.g., society, State, etc., was not above the individual. Every institution had been created by the individuals for their benefit. Society was the sum total of individuals, who compose it. The individuals created the society for the sake of their self-science and self-improvement. There was no divine factor responsible in creation of the society. Agreeing with the social contract theory, Roy believed

70. A draft declaration of the aims and objects of the Radical Humanist Association was prepared for an All-India Conference of the Radical Humanist Association, which was held in Calcutta in December, 1973. A copy of the draft was sent to J.P. in advance. J.P. had inaugurated the Conference.


that the society and the State were artificial structures created by men. He wrote, "Coming out of the background of biological evolution the human species starts their struggle as individuals. In the course of time, the isolated individuals realised that together they could carry on the struggle more successfully. That was the origin of society".

Regarding the origin of the State, Roy stated that "primitive men created society for the purpose of carrying on the business of regulating their affairs and relations. In the beginning, the purpose was mainly to defend themselves against the impact of natural phenomenon and more powerful beasts, and, later on, to march ahead on the road to human progress on higher levels. Subsequently, when the original human communities became larger, an increasingly electorate machinery had to be created for carrying on public administration of society which came to be known as State". Thus, the State came into being as the political organisation of society.

To Roy, State and society were means to achieve the individual freedom which was the end. They can not
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deprive the individual of his freedom. He said, "A political philosophy, which cannot guarantee individual freedom, or cannot think of freedom in that sense, is bound to be misleading". Regarding his views on the role of the State, Roy was influenced by the Marxian-Leninist interpretation of the State in his earlier phase of political career. After experiencing the role of the Communist State in Soviet Russia, Roy changed his outlook. He realised that individual could not be subordinated to the State. The State would not wither away. It should not be considered as a necessary evil. To him, "The ideal of Stateless society is obviously an absurd utopia". The State should have limited powers. He said, 'The State being the political organisation of society, the widest diffusion of power makes coterminous with society'. According to Roy, the functions and responsibilities of the State would be limited so that it could not encroach upon the freedom


77. For Marx, the State was an organ of capitalism, an instrument of class struggle and exploitation, and it would wither away.
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of the individual. He observed that in modern political organisations the sovereign individual had been forgotten and the institutions created by the individual, had attained the greater importance. He wrote, "it was completely forgotten that from the primitive time society was formed, all institutions had been created by man like so many instruments to serve the purpose of his being and becoming. Ultimately, it came to be believed that the creation was of greater importance than the creator, to the extent it was entitled to claim the creator of its first victim".

Thus, according to Roy, the State would be limited by the objective of the freedom of the individual. But he realised that instead of becoming means, the State had become a hurdle in the unfoldment of the individual. It had grown beyond the individual's reach. He stated, "To-day, the State has become an abstraction. In the written Constitutions, the State is divided in three branches - the legislative, the executive and the judiciary. If that is all that the State is; then the States must exist only in the capitals and nowhere else. The State, supposed to be the political organisation of society as a whole, has come to be completely divorced from the life of society.

if you think of society in terms of human beings constituting society. The individual has nothing to do with the State, that, the political administration of society. It exists only in some central place; far away, beyond the reach and influence of the members of society, and from there makes decisions and imposes its decisions and the people has no say in them.

The Radical Democratic State, which Roy wanted to establish, was coexistent with society. The State should take up as little as possible responsibilities in its hands. Like State, there are other institutions in the society through which individuals - having many faceted personality - seek to realise their freedom. According to Roy, the State should create conducive conditions for individual freedom. It should maintain harmony in social relations and coordinate the functions of different autonomous institutions. The only functions that a State should perform, according to him, were "to create conditions in which the individual can enjoy widening measure of freedom, to maintain harmony in social relations and to coordinate the activities of diverse and autonomous institutions". He believed that there were certain matters:

---
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like cultural, moral, educational and even economic, which were to be completely beyond the jurisdiction of the State. The scientific and artistic growth should also be out of the control of the State. He was most critical of the concept of welfare State.

Roy made a distinction between the State and the government. The State is a political organisation of a country, and the government is to administer its affairs. He wrote: "The first thing that must be known is that the State and the Government are not the same thing. The function of the Government is to administer the affairs of a State. The Government is composed of a number of individuals, some of whom may change from time to time, and others act as permanent officials.... The State is a permanent institution." The State was superior to Government. The State did not effect by any change in Government. A State could be replaced by another State only by overthrowing the former.

Roy did not believe in National State and he criticized the idea of Nationalism. His ideal was World State. But he maintained that a World State could not be
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possible as long as nation State existed. He visualised a cosmopolitan common wealth of freemen and women.

Thus, we find that the State, according to Roy, had been created by the individuals as a political organisation of the society. He has given secondary place to the State. The State is a means not an end in itself. He criticised the totalitarian and the welfare State, and believed in a State which has very limited powers. The State would be coterminous with the society. He believed in the World State, and was a critique of the concept of the nation State.

Jayaprakash Narayan on State

J.P. was not worried about the shape and origin of the State. He was mainly concerned with the State as it was in existence. His views about State evolved with his career and thought process. As a Marxist, the State was, to him, a necessary tool and an instrument of power in society. He maintained that 'no party in the world of today can build up socialism unless it has the machinery of the State in its hands'. To him, State also appeared as a coercive power. He explained, "When the State is in your hands, you can legislate; you can use the whole magnificent apparatus
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of propaganda and education that modern science has made available; you can enforce your will. And if there is resistance, you can use the coercive arm of the State—the police and the army to crush it. Behind every piece of legislation lies the State's power to persuade and ultimately, to coerce." During this phase, J.P. attributed to state a progressive role and recognized its continued necessity. The State was for planning and regulating the whole political and economic life of the country, such as the socialisation of the key industries and the monopolisation of the foreign trade by the State. In the pre-independence period, he appreciated considerably the achievements of the Soviet State.

As the authoritarian nature of the Soviet State was revealed to him, he gradually lost his faith in the State as an all-pervasive force. He felt that the Soviet Communists had erected one of the most regimented State in the world. It was no more a peoples State. He stated, "We have to-day there a structure which is a one party dictatorship...; and in this one party dictatorship we have a completely bureaucratic State, which can not in any way be described as a Worker's State, as a people's State. Obviously for the socialist movement of the world:
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the Russian picture of political organisation would be found wanting and unacceptable. He would have to devise a different structure”. In the post-independence period, J.P. seemed to have lost all sympathy for the totalitarian State of Soviet Union. In 1948, he observed, "... the experience of the totalitarian countries, whether Fascist or Communist has shown that if the State is looked upon as the sole agent of social reconstruction, we get nothing but a regimented society in which the State is all powerful and popular initiative is extinct and the individual is made a cog in the vast unhappy machine”. He came to realise that the ideal of Stateless society was not achievable. He wrote: "The old belief that state ownership and management of the means of production, distribution and exchange will lead to economic self-government, elimination of exploitation and equitable distribution of the products of labour, a Stateless order of society, has not been confirmed by experience”. He emphasised on communitarian society in place of centralised State.

In the post-independence period, J.P. advocated

setting up of cooperatives and community owned industries in place of State-owned industries to avoid totalitarianism. He observed: "I desire to prevent the State from acquiring the sole monopoly in industry and employment. The State under socialism threatens, as in Russia, far from withering away, to become an all-powerful tyrant maintaining a stranglehold over the entire body of citizens. This leads to totalitarianism of the type we witness in Russia today". He pleaded for decentralisation and the necessity of evolving primary social institutions on the grass-root but to minimise the dependence on the State. He felt the need of a fully democratic State in India and opposed the idea of dictatorship of the proletariat. He observed: "The State in socialist India must be a fully democratic State. It is a common mistake these days to think that there must be the dictatorship of the proletariat in a socialist State. This is against the teachings of Marx. The dictatorship of the proletariat has a place only in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism.... It is, however, the very essence of Marxism that once the transition is over, the State must become a fully democratic institution". According to J.P., even in a socialist state 'the State
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will only be an instrument in the hands of a popular socialist movement, i.e., of the people organised independently of the State for a socialist way of living rather than the source and fountain-head of all authority and will. He was critical of the principle of absolute sovereignty of the State. To him, the ultimate source of power ought to be the people, not the State.

J.P. was also critical of one-party dictatorship. As a solution, he conceived the idea of a State without any political party. He suggested the abolition of party system. Logically, he maintained, "If the State is to melt away, to wither away, the party must also wither away". In the Sarvodaya phase of his political career, J.P. further contemplated the means to minimise the importance of the State. He pointed out that "the Bhooman or Sarvodaya movement insists that if our ultimate aim is to do without the State we must here and now create those conditions, in which the people will rely more and more on themselves and less and less on the State. No one can tell whether the State will ever completely disappear, but if we accept the ideal of a non-violent democracy, we must begin to-day to work for it". Thus, like Gandhi, J.P. came to appreciate
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that form of a society in which greater reliance was to be put on the individual and on self-help than on the State.

J.P. like Gandhi, believed in the withering away of the State. But he was not sure whether the State would wither away fully. Therefore, he pleaded for devolution of power to the maximum extent and a greater role of the individual to achieve a non-violent democratic social order. He observed: "As questioning about politics were not confined to the party system alone, fundamental questions arose in my mind as to the place and role of the State in human society, particularly in relation to the goals of social life that had fixed themselves before me. Perhaps, my schooling in Marxism with its ideals of a Stateless society, made these questions more pointed and troublesome. Though I had given up the basic postulates of Marxism, ...

I continued to feel strongly that human freedom could be fully and wholly realised only in a Stateless society. I was, and am, not sure if the State would ever wither away completely. But I am sure that it is one of the noblest goals of social endeavour to ensure that the powers and functions and spheres of the State are reduced as far as possible. I became at this time; and still am, an ardent believer, like Gandhi, in the maxim that that government was the best that governed the least*. Explaining the

aims of Sarvodaya on November 23, 1952, at Sitamarhi.

J.P. said, "Sarvodaya aims at the creation of a society in which the State is relegated to a secondary position. It exists only for a case of emergency, which like the alarm chain of the railway trains of which the passengers are not even aware".

He envisaged to organise the social order in such a manner in which the power of the State were to be diffused into smaller units of communitarian centres; e.g., the Village Panchayats. He believed that the smaller units of power would enable the individual to play a greater part. To save man from alienation from himself and from the fate of robotism; 'the State and other institutions of society should be reduced to human scale'. In the reorganised decentralised society, the units of power would be located at the bottom not concentrated at the top in a monolithic State. It was his firm conviction that a centralised State could never achieve the ideals of a true democracy.

J.P. was totally against the monistic State because it retained the sole centre of power in society. He said that "the intermediate associations between the individual

---


and the State should be purposely and deliberately created so that freedom might not be nominal but real, and democracy might not be only government by consent but also by direct participation. To him, the State was only a part of society.

His ideal was Panchayati Raj or the Swaraj from below. There would be devolution of power. To him, it meant that 'the centre has only as much of it as required to discharge its central functions and all the rest is exercised by the lower organs'. According to J.P., the State should regulate and legislate for the formation of a Panchayati Raj; but the 'day to day working should be outside the purview of the State Government'. He wanted not the elimination of the State-control altogether but only its curtailment to the minimum possible level so that the working of the communitarian units was not subjugated completely by the State. He did not suggest Statelessness in his communitarian concept of Indian polity.
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J.P. was also critical of the welfare state. He believed that in the name of welfare the state had assumed larger powers and responsibilities. He observed, "In the present world the state not only in its totalitarian form but also in its welfare variety is assuming larger and larger powers and responsibilities. The welfare state, in the name of welfare, threatens as much to enslave man to the state as the totalitarian". The welfare state had snatched the initiative from the individuals and had retarded development of the individual's personality.

J.P. also criticized the nation state. He gave the concept of a world community in his communitarian polity. As he proceeded from inner to the outer circles of communal organization, he dreamt that 'a day might come when the national communities might federate together to form the world-community. He was a nationalist but did not believe in aggressive version of nationalism. According to him, the world community only could do justice to the suppressed sections of Asian and African humanity. He also held that
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"A revolutionary at this age and time of history where man is landing on the moon should have no lesser ideal than to build a world community of human beings; a real human family..."

During the final phase of his political life, J.P. advocated for Peopled Government from below against the totalitarian state. He emphasized on the devolution of power reaching to the lowest level, that is, village level. He wanted to achieve the ideals of Gandhi's Gram Raj and Vinoba's Gram Swaraj through the establishment of the Janata Governments from the village upwards to the Panchayat and the block levels. He did not talk about partyless democracy or Stateless society during this phase. He felt that it was the ultimate aim to be achieved in future.

Thus, J.P.'s concept of State remained fluid and shifting in consonance to his phases of political evolution. During his Marxian phase, he considered the State as a powerful organisation of society. But after that he talked of a sort of anarchism of his own type. He conceded that a fully Stateless society was beyond the reach of men, and
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the goal of human endeavour could only be to reduce the power and scope of the State to the minimum. He maintained this position, for the rest of his political life.

Comparison

For both, Roy and J.P., the State was a means to an end that was individual freedom and unfoldment. Both criticized the totalitarian State of Soviet Russia. Both were the advocates of diffusion of power to the lowest level. Both were critical of the welfare State because they were in favour of giving the least responsibilities to the State. Both were critical of the nation State and for both the ideal was a World State.

Besides these similarities, there are differences also. Whereas, Roy gave a full account of the origin of the State and its distinction via a via the Government, J.P. did not care about the origin of the State. He was mainly concerned with the State as it was in existence.

There was a difference between Roy and J.P. over the retention of the State. Roy believed that in the organised democracy, the State "will be coincident with the entire society" and consequently, will be "under a standing democratic control". He did not want to abolish

it altogether. On the other hand, J.P. was under complete influence of Gandhism. He believed in a Stateless society. J.P.'s ultimate aim was to "do without the State", though he conceded that a fully Stateless society was beyond the reach of individual and the goal of human endeavour could only be to reduce the powers and scope of the State to the minimum.

M.N. Roy on Revolution

Roy's ideas on theory and technique of revolution underwent change in consonance to the changing phases of his political career. In his early phase as a revolutionary nationalist, he believed in terrorism. As a Marxist, he placed his faith in Marxist theory of revolution and abandoned his old idea regarding terrorism. He wrote: "Our old ideas of Revolution put the cart before the horse".

He came to believe the Marxist theory that revolution was an abrupt culmination of a process of evolution, not a smooth continuous development. In one of his circulars he wrote: "An important historical event which marks the close of a given historical period and opens up a new one
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is called a revolution. Since the social factors, economic classes and political institutions, that used to be benefitted by the state of affairs obtaining in the closing periods, would not permit a change which spells the end of their domination, often their total annihilation, without a fierce resistance, political violence and social convulsion are usually the features of the historical phenomena which is called 'revolution'. The forces that go into the making of the new epoch are originally conceived and go on gathering strength within the framework of the old which eventually must burst if the norms of the new contained therein are to fully fructify. This process is to be noticed throughout all the physical existence. Revolution, therefore, is in the very nature of things; it is quite constitutional."

Roy also subscribed to the Marxian theory of class struggle of revolution and in the Marxian assumption that revolutions take place as a historical necessity. According to him, from time to time, the process of history is obstructed by the constraints of the society, which puts a limit to human creativeness, mental as well as physical. He wrote: "The urge for progress and freedom, born out of the biological struggle for existence, asserts

itself with a renewed vigour to break down the obstacle. A new social order conducive to a less hampered unfolding of human potentialities is visualised by men, embodying the liberating ideas and cultural values created in the past. A new philosophy is born out of the spiritual heritage of mankind, to herald a reorganisation of society. The most important thing in Marxian theory of revolution was the method of capturing the political power by the proletariat to change the economic relations of production. As a Marxist, he wrote, "According to my new faith revolutions took place of necessity. No individual was indispensable. They were brought about by the operation of new social forces. The maturity of the latter was the objective condition for the revolution.... Social forces antagonistic to the established order must in the first place be politically mobilised".

When he came back to India, he persisted in his belief in the Marxian theory of revolution. In 1937, he wrote: "Revolutions cannot be made to order. They come as a course of historical necessity". But for India, he suggested bourgeois democratic revolution. Because, to him, the
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conditions in India were not ripe for proletarian revolution. 123
But it was after all a Marxist concept.

In his humanist phase, however, Roy rejected the Marxist theory of revolution with all its assumptions in the same way as he had rejected the terrorist theory in the Marxian phase. Criticizing the Marxian theory, he wrote: "Then we discovered what is called a new way of Revolution. Gradually by a process of critical thinking, we were led to doubt the very notion of Revolution, which maintains that history is not a continuous process, but that there must be breaks. We re-examined that generally accepted theory of history, which we ourselves had accepted for many years, subjected it to the search light of history ... and discovered that it was not true. History has not been marked by periods of catastrophes. There has been a zig-zag, upward and downward movements, but nowhere there has been such a thing that an entire old order had been abolished and something entirely new come into its place". 124

In this phase of his political life he advocated the strategy of philosophical revolution and stood for 125 'Revolution by consent'. He rejected the theory of class-struggle. To him, revolution was not economic in content.
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but it had moral sanction which was of the greatest
importance. The revolution had to be led by moral men
for its success, and the ideal way of revolution was
pursuasion. He stressed to replace the economic man by
moral man.

He rejected the Marxian assumption that the old
orders should first be destroyed for the revolutionary
reconstruction. He wrote: "But we have to change our idea,
that there can be no change unless whatever exists is
first destroyed. We came to realise that, even in the most
adverse circumstances, it is possible to create something
new if we go on creating something good in the midst of
established orders". Thus, in his humanist phase he
preferred philosophical revolution through peaceful means
in place of cataclysmic way of revolution for building up
a new social order. He believed that the "cataclysmic way
of revolution is not the only way of revolution; that way
has compelled us too often to use those bad means that
do not lead to good ends". He stressed on peaceful moral
means during this phase. Another factor for his rejection
of Marxian theory of revolution, was its assumption on the
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capture of State power by a political party. Contrary to it, Roy's theory of revolution was based on the assumption of power by the people. There would be no scope for political parties to capture power in his new technique of revolution. Contrary to Marxian faith that the change must begin at the institutional level, Roy advocated to change man and his ideas through a philosophical revolution. According to him, behind every institution there were men and ideas and unless these were changed there could be no social reconstruction. Social reconstruction should be taken up after philosophical revolution had been achieved.

To Roy, revolution was a means to an end, not end in itself. According to him, the Marxian theory of revolution and the Russian revolution were negation of freedom. Criticizing the Russian Revolution, he wrote, "A theory and practice and tactics of revolution which completely eliminates the concept of liberty on the plea of discipline of a revolutionary army, cannot lead to freedom". He was of the view that the old pattern of revolution had led to counter-revolution in the past. The history of revolution had been a history of counter-revolution. After the Russian Revolution, efforts had been afoot in country after country for revolution but every time the revolution had been suppressed and counter-revolution had triumphed. To
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Roy, Russian Revolution was neither according to Marxian schedule nor was a proletarian revolution. It was also not a means to freedom. It was only a dictatorship of the minority. It had not taken into account the superiority of the middle class.

To bring about revolution, Roy sought to awaken the man's urge for freedom, which was implied in human nature. He did not recommend the violence or insurrectionary methods or capture of State power by any other means. Revolution was generally associated with bombs, revolvers and secret societies in India. But to Roy, revolution was higher than that. He wrote, "No less futile is sporadic terrorism carried on by secret societies. Those who resort to the futility of this extremism possesses an equally wrong conception of revolution. Violence is not per se an essential attribute of revolution. Under the present State of society, political and social revolutions can hardly be expected to be bloodless and non-violent; but everything bloody and violent is not revolutionary. A particular social system and political institution can never be overthrown by assassinating individuals upholding them." According to him, to establish a good society, the


individuals, who constitute it, should be made good through the instrumentality of education. He advocated philosophical revolution to bring about consciousness in the society. He believed that the philosophical revolution, which was heralded by gifted men, had given birth to other revolutions. He wrote: "Revolutions are heralded by iconoclastic ideas conceived by gifted individuals. A brotherhood of men attracted by the adventures of ideas, keenly conscious of the urge for freedom, fired with the vision of a free society of free men and motivated by the will to remake the world ... will show the way out of the contemporary crisis ...".

Roy considered revolution, that is, a radical reconstruction of society, necessary. According to him, all the people should be included in the revolutionary forces except a few vested interests who wanted to preserve the social status quo. But the leadership should be in the hands of middle class intellectuals. Such persons had always been the spearhead of a revolutionary struggle. The philosopher politicians would revolutionise the outlook of the people and bring about a philosophical revolution. Existence of such philosopher revolutionaries was the precondition of any revolution. He observed: "Revolutions presupposes iconoclastic ideas. An increasingly large

number of men conscious of their creative power, motivated
by the indomitable will to remake the world, moved by
the adventure of ideas, and fired with the ideal of a
free society of freemen, can create the conditions under
which democracy will be possible". To Roy, the immediate
aim of revolution was to educate the people not to change
the institutions. The educated, good and fit individuals
would change the institutions. He wrote, "Until now
efforts have been made to create institutions, which
would educate men, which would create conditions for man
to be good ... but the approach of New Humanism starts
from the individual. It says that only moral men can
constitute a rational society".

Roy ruled out the possibility of a violent revolution
and insurrectionary methods. He suggested the method of
education and persuasion for social change. The technique
of revolution, advocated by Roy, did not imply a thorough
destruction of the present social order as a pre-condition
to establish a new social order. Roy favoured gradual
replacement of the old by the new social order. The method
would be peaceful and non-violent. Roy suggested that the
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propagators of new philosophy would organise the study clubs or humanist groups to create a democratic atmosphere in society. These groups would impart education to the people. Gradually, a democratic outlook and cooperative spirit would develop among the members. They will begin to solve their local problems themselves. He stated: "After all people in a small place can organise their own schools, their producers and consumers co-operatives. They can take the initiative in digging wells, building roads, improving public sanitation etc. etc. They can do it here and now, without waiting, either for government to do it, or for revolution to happen.... If people in their democratic local units will begin doing these things themselves, they will find out that they have themselves created the revolutions". These study clubs would be converted into peoples' committees, and thus Parliamentary democracy might be gradually and peacefully converted into Radical democracy and the party Government into a People's Government. To Hoy, therefore, technique of revolution neither involved violence nor was it an abrupt change. It implied a long term process of social changes through the method of propaganda, persuasion and education.
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Jayaprakash Narayan on Revolution

Like H.N. Roy, J.P. also held a shifting position regarding the theory and technique of revolution. During the colonial period when he was a staunch nationalist socialist, he was a confirmed believer in the class struggle and in insurrectionary methods for achieving national as well as socialist aims. He advocated openly to adopt violent means for achieving the independence. He gave no importance to the Gandhian method of Satyagraha as an effective weapon for achieving independence and was critical of Gandhian and the Congress method of non-violence. He urged the people to develop a mass movement comprising the working classes and the peasants against the British Government. It is, thus, obvious that initially he believed in proletarian revolution and the concept of class struggle. To J.P., Parliamentary democracy was not likely to be much effective.

During the course of the 1942 Quit India Revolution, J.P. organised underground militant resistance. In one of his letters to the Freedom Fighters, J.P. explained:

"Congress has stated repeatedly during this war that if
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India became free, or even if a national government were set up, it would be prepared to resist aggression with arms. But, if we are prepared to fight Japan and Germany with arms, why must we refuse to fight Britain in the same manner. J.P. organised an 'Azad Dasta' (Army of Liberation) and directed revolutionary effort through insurrection, sabotage and arms. Thus, throughout the colonial period, J.P. often advocated the use of arms in the struggle for freedom, contrary to the stand of Gandhiji. In 1944, he acknowledged that he was not a believer in non-violence. In April, 1946, in an answer to the question, asked by the Home Member of the Indian Government in Agra jail, whether he would resort to violence to win Independence, J.P. answered: "we want independence - if we can achieve that through Ahimsa, then that will be good. But if necessary, we will not shrink from using violence to attain our ends".


During the post-independence period, when he came closer to Gandhiji, J.P.'s attitudes underwent far-reaching change and he advocated the need for adopting democratic means. His two important articles, namely, 'My Picture of Socialism' and 'Transition to Socialism' emphasised the need to adopt democratic methods for socialism. The death of Gandhiji and the bloody riots of the post-partition period further convinced J.P. of the futility of violent means. He whole-heartedly accepted the Gandhian technique of non-violent and peaceful means and observed: "There were many things that Mahatma Gandhi taught us. But the greatest thing he taught us was that evil means can never lead to good ends. Some of us may have been sceptical of this truth but recent world events and events at home have convinced me that nothing but good means will enable us to reach the goal of a good society, which is socialism". To him: "A real revolution is a revolution in the values of life". J.P. thus came to the conclusion that democratic method was the only right method for achieving socialism.

Like M.N. Roy, J.P., on the basis of his experience of Russian revolution, felt that no revolution could justify


the adoption of any means. In 1951, he wrote, "The first aspect of Gandhism that must interest the socialist is its moral or ethical basis: its insistence on values. Russian or Stalinist interpretation of socialist philosophy has reduced it to a cross Machiavellian code of conduct utterly devoid of any sense of right or wrong, good or evil. The end justifies the means; and when the end is power - personal or group power - there is no limit to the depths to which the means will sink to secure the objective. The struggle for power in every Communist country - not against the old order but amongst Communist power-seekers themselves - has led to a totalitarian society which is so different from what was proclaimed by the fathers of socialism as the goal of the social revolution". He was of the view that the non-violent democratic methods should be given the first and full trial and only when it failed, the question of revolutionary methods could arise at all. According to him, five kinds of activities were comprised within the term 'democratic method'. These were "organisation, propaganda, agitation, struggle and constructive work". He criticised the violent means as counter-revolutionary. In 1957, he explained, "If theory
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of violence as a midwife of revolution was not challenged in its entirety; at least, this much became clear to me (a) that in a society where it was possible for the people by democratic means to bring about social change it would be counter-revolutionary to resort to violence and (b) that socialism could not exist, not be created, in the absence of the democratic freedoms". To J.P., Bhoomyan Movement was the first step towards a total revolution. The non-violent revolution was entirely dependent upon mobilising the sanction of the enlightened masses. It emphasised upon changing the views of the people and their methods of behaviour in society. Sarvodaya movement had tried to persuade the political parties and the people that peace could be achieved only through peaceful means. To him, "good ends have never been achieved by bad means".

During the Gromdan movement, J.P. advocated a permanent revolution. According to him, "When a Village Council (Gram Sabha) is set up, it becomes a potential agency of permanent revolution". Thus, during the Gandhian
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and Sarvodaya phase of his political life, J.P. stressed adoption of democratic and non-violent moral means for social revolution.

The social revolution, according to J.P., would bring about an all round change in all aspects of human life as well as institutions. Explaining the social revolution, he wrote, "A social revolution is a fundamental change in the economic, political and social power structure, so that power comes to be exercised at the workplace. This implies fundamental change in property relationships, in respect of ownership, management, and disposal of profits. It implies end of exploitation: employer - employee relationships and socio-economic inequality. This also implies universal freedom and a radically different set of values governing individual and social lives". The purpose of total revolution was both internal and external change - changing the entire social frame from within and also from the outside, individual as well as institutions. Total revolution aimed at bringing about a basic change in the present system through peaceful methods. It would bring about a revolution in all aspects of life of the society and the

individual. It would bring a change in individual as well as collective units of the society. The revolution, according to J.P., was not an event. It was a phase and a social process. It would take time to reach its perfection. To him, it was a means not an end in itself.

According to J.P., there were three ways for social revolution: '(1) Kanoon (constitutional means); (ii) Ketal (violent); and (iii) Karuna (non-violent means). He believed that social revolution could be brought about neither by constitutional means nor by violent means. It could be brought about only by non-violent means. Non-violent revolution would lead to generation of power at the ground level and would be quicker than a revolution by constitutional means and a violent revolution. Non-violent social revolution would be brought about directly by the people. The methods would be persuasion and conversion. He stressed on persuasion as a means to convert the ideas and values of the people, and voluntary implementation of the new ideas and values. Non-violent non-
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cooperation or resistance might to be offered if in the process of revolution necessity would arise. He stressed on social revolution (by persuasion and conversion) through human revolution. It was the quickest method and worked from below.

Criticising the technique of violent revolution, J.P. felt that in reality it did not bring about a revolution in as much as it uprooted the old social order and fundamental values. It failed in achieving the very objectives for which the revolution was made. He referred to the French Revolution, the American Revolution, the Russian Revolution and the Chinese Revolution, which were brought about by the people without the participation of the people. To J.P., all these revolutions were only palace revolutions and not social revolutions. On the basis of his experience of these revolutions, he said that violent revolutions had ended up in the betrayal of the revolutions and the betrayal of the people. He found that man had been enslaved everywhere in society wherever violent revolutions took place. Thus, to him, "the revolutionary method should be based on methods which aim
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primarily to change human beings, change their values of life, change their attitudes towards life, their attitudes towards things, their attitudes towards men, towards nature.

During the total revolution phase, J.P. advocated Gandhian non-violent militancy to attain permanent social change. There could be no real people's revolution through violence. It could come only through peaceful means and had to be carried out by the people themselves. Referring the Mao's saying that power comes from the barrel of a gun, J.P. said that people did not have guns. Those who had guns carried out a revolution in the name of the people and then established their own rule. He realised that the observance of complete non-violence was not possible in a mass movement. So he stressed to achieve the objective of social change through peaceful people's power. According to him, such a large number of youths could not be trained immediately to observe complete non-violence. Therefore, he advocated peaceful mass struggle in a physical sense.
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irrespective of the condition of non-violence in thought also. He advised to defend the violent attack by peaceful means. His slogan, during the Bihar Movement, was 'Hamara Chaha Jaiza Ho, Haath Hamara Nahin Uthega'. The ordinary people could not follow complete non-violence as Gandhian conditions of complete non-violence were very hard. He said, "it was not that violence was good or non-violence was good. We have adopted peaceful methods as a strategy for peoples' action. There should be no violence from our side". He explained that it would be his endeavour to keep the movement free from violence but the violence might break here and there due to provocations and repressive measures of the Government, hirelings of certain political parties and anti-social elements.

J.P.'s emphasis was on voluntary mass action for bringing about a revolutionary change. To him, "By insisting on two principles: that ends do not justify all means; and
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that the state or political power is not the only agency of revolutionary change; that the new order that one cherishes cannot be postponed till political power has been captured in sufficient measure; that the building of the new society has to begin here and now, both in men and institutions; that voluntary collective effort in creating the new society is as important as change enforced by law. Thus, J.P.'s technique of revolution was neither violent nor completely non-violent. It was a pragmatic technique of peaceful mass action. The revolution, to him, was a process which would reach gradually its perfection. Conversion and persuasion were his chief instruments and methods.

Comparison

The ideas and position of both Roy and J.P. had pursued a course of change and revision on the theme of theory and technique of revolution. In the early phase of their political life, both were inclined towards Marxist theory of revolution; that is, class struggle and proletarian revolution; and violent means to achieve the objective of revolution. In their later phase both criticized and abandoned the Marxist theory and the technique of violent revolution. The transition of both Roy, a revolutionary Marxist and J.P., a nationalist, was in some respects similar. From Marxism

to radicalism and then to humanism (Roy) and from socialism to Ganchism and Servodaya and then to total revolution (J.P.) resulted mainly from their innate belief in moral values like; the ends alone could not justify the adoption of undesirable means, or the invocation of the name of revolution alone could not sanction the use of violence, or their overriding concern for the individual. Both rejected the violent and insurrectionary method or coercive state power and stressed on peaceful moral means.

For both, revolution meant an all-round change in all aspects of man as well as his institutions. Both favoured gradual replacement of the old order by the new social order to bring about a social revolution. To them, revolution was a long term process of social change and not an event. Both regarded revolution a means and not as end in itself. Both were critical of Russian revolution and other violent revolutions of the world. To them, no revolution could justify the adoption of any means or the divorce of ethics from politics. To them, violent revolution had always been counter-revolutionary in its impact. Both advocated revolution by consent. Both relieved in persuasion and education of the individuals for social change.

J.P., however, did not appreciate and agree with

Roy's version of philosophical revolution. To Roy, philosophical revolution was a precondition for a successful democratic revolution in India. According to Roy, cultural backwardness of India was the reason for the imposition of British rule and discarded the idea that cultural backwardness resulted from foreign rule. The spiritual heritage of India which was upheld and applauded by J.P. and other Indian nationalists was regarded by Roy as the cause of India's cultural decay. J.P. did not appreciate this idea of Roy. He observed, "A hundred or two hundred years of slavery of a kind which this country had never seen before completely destroyed the power of the people to think for themselves and to come together and face their tasks together. J.P. was not against a renaissance movement which was actually emerging in India based on rationalism, self-reliance and exposure of all forms of orthodoxy and blind faith, but he did not think that such a movement was of necessity a precondition for the success of a democratic revolution in India.

CHAPTER VII

M.N. ROY AND JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN ON

INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND AMITY

Having dealt with the ideas of Roy and J.P. on socialism, Gandhism and Marxism, democracy, individual, his freedom, state and revolution in the preceding chapters, the ideas of both the thinkers on the theme of international peace and amity have been discussed in this last chapter. Their ideas and viewpoints on the main international problems, e.g., World War II, Pakistan dispute, Chinese aggression, on the means to settle international disputes, on Indian foreign policy and on world community constitute the contents of this chapter.

M.N. ROY

Roy was a great advocate of world unity for cultural salvation of mankind at large. He studied history widely. According to him, "Scientific reading of prehistory reveals the common foundation of human culture and raises the hope that the dream of one world may some day be realised". He believed that the struggle for national freedom also had an international dimension. He criticized the idea of parochial Nationalism and Fascism. He also gave a serious thought to the problem of war and peace. His New Humanism offered a remedy to the problems of international relations. It was

cosmopolitan in outlook and envisaged establishment of a world federation to ensure world peace.

Once an ardent revolutionary nationalist, Roy criticized Nationalism for breeding racial hatred. 'It is reactionary and devoid of any social purpose. Its motive force is racial animosity, which is glorified or rationalized on the plea of conflict and culture. And the so-called cultural nationalism, in its turn, aggravates the racial bias of nationalist politics. The fiction of social and cultural unity is dramatized to distract people's attention from the facts of social inequality'. The idea of Nationalism had divided the world into small national boundaries. To him, Nationalism was like "the philosophy of frog in the well". To avoid the wars in future and to maintain world peace, the national ambitions and interests should be abandoned. It should be replaced by world brotherhood. The faith in Nationalism was an out-modeled idea and he warned that 'it will be suicidal for mankind to persist with the dogma of nationalism'.


According to Roy, the Indian freedom struggle could not be isolated from international struggle against imperialism. He further held that national freedom would not mean freedom of the entire community. It only meant freedom of a part of the community. The ideal of national States was contrary to the principle of world government. He appealed to the Indian nationalists to participate in a spirit of cosmopolitanism and cooperation with other peoples who, in their own despair and grievous situation were crying out for salvation from the recurring treachery of war. He criticized the theory of Nationalism propounded by Gandhiji and his followers. He stated, "The people who are proudly teaching the cult of the Mahatma should not forget that their own nationalism is taking them further and further away, day by day, from this very teachings, because their nationalism demands a powerful army, and all the latest equipments of warfare and military defence; and the demand is being increasingly taken for granted by all patriots and nationalists in the country". He appealed to shun the attitude of nationalist exclusiveness because India could not develop within the framework of a national State. He stated, "The modern world is such that all the national

States believing themselves to be independent are in reality inter-dependent, and what happens in far away parts of the world has its repercussions in every other country.

Roy conceived of a commonwealth of freemen and women, free from the boundaries of national States. He believed in the cooperative fellowships of man. His philosophy of New Humanism is pledged to the ideal of a commonwealth and fraternity of freemen. He wrote, "New Humanism is cosmopolitan. A cosmopolitan commonwealth of spiritually freemen would not be limited by the boundaries of national States - capitalist, fascist, socialist, communist, or any other kind, which will gradually disappear under the impact of the twentieth century renaissance of man".

He also supported the ideal of internationalism because it would end the international economic competition. Under its backdrop, the backward and underdeveloped countries would not be exploited further by the rich countries. According to him, if the nation States were dissolved and an organic unity of the international society was accepted, the poverty and unemployment may be removed from the entire world. He
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criticized socialism and communism. Socialism, which was supposed to unite the mankind in reality divided it further and communism had turned to the most extreme form of nationalism. He was amazed to observe that the Communist world, who preached internationalism, practised an acute form of nationalism. Hence, his plea 'to see the whole mankind united as a single family'.

Roy had made distinction between cosmopolitanism and internationalism. According to him, internationalism maintains the existence of separate national States, but 'a true world government can not be built only on the neutralization of nation-states'. He pleaded for cosmopolitan humanism, which was the only hope for world peace. He observed: "No effort, however, bombastic and expensive, on the governmental level can take the world out of the present impasse. The hope lies in human endeavour; the cultural sanction of national States must be progressively withheld by a growing number of individual men and women in each country outgrowing the tribal mentality and cultivating the spirit of cosmopolitan Humanism. That is the only hope".

Discussing the Indian contribution to the world peace, Roy

alluded to the Indian preachings of "a really cosmopolitan brotherhood of humanity, which is the only permanent guarantee against the danger of war, in a world in which there will be no need of armed forces, whose existence are taken for granted only because wars are taken for granted".

Besides nationalism, fascism, according to Roy, constitutes another big hurdle in the way of world peace and unity. He was critical of fascism too. To Roy, fascism in effect was the highest form of nationalism. He wrote:

"nationalism necessarily culminates in fascism which carries the metaphysical conception of State to its absurd climax. Fascism lays bare the totalitarian essence of the concept of nation, as something distinct from the people - a collectivity which exists and thrives at the cost of the individuals composing it". Roy was so averse to the Indian nationalism that on the question of Kashmir, he held the view that it might prove disastrous for the peace of the sub-continent. The national spirit was the main reason for war between India and Pakistan. He upheld the right of

self-determination for the people of Kashmir. When the mediation effort by Sir Owen Dixon failed, Roy wrote: "The State of Jammu and Kashmir is easily capable of partition. It was never ... really a unit of geographically, demographically and economically.... A partition of the State on the basis of the principles which governed the partition of the sub-continent, giving as things stand Jammu to India and Kashmir Valley to Pakistan, would under the circumstances be the best solution of the problem. The solution will also be in accord with the known wishes of the overwhelming majority of the population in each area". After the partition, Roy suggested to both the countries to maintain mutual interdependence. 'Both should have common foreign policy and common defence arrangements. Both should decide common line of action to develop their own communities.'

According to Roy, reactionary nationalism is an integral part of international fascism. Its victory would be disastrous for the Indian people and for the freedom and democracy as a whole. He regarded fascism as "the logical outcome of post-Negelian idealism". According to him:

---
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fascism culminates into a spiritual philosophy of expediency. In 1942, he observed that there were conditions for the growth of fascism in India. He stated, "Even before the war, Indian nationalism had found spiritual affinity with fascism. Therefore, in India conditions were very congenial for the growth of fascism. There was political justification as well as ideological predisposition". To Roy, the most important characteristic feature of fascism was the cult of superman, and this characteristic was present in the Indian leadership tradition, e.g., Gandhi and his political successor, Nehru. According to him, if Gandhi was the spiritual guide of the Congress, Nehru was its effective leader, and as such, prone to be leader of Indian Fascism. He regarded Nehru as the standard bearer of Congress nationalism who only tried to rationalise Gandhian medievalism. He believed that the Congress politics of nationalism would land India in the camp of fascism. He said, "Pure nationalism has triumphed in Congress politics; only to show that it will land India in the camp of Fascism. The leaders may not have ever wished the slightest of doing that. But they are victims of their thought process'.
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Roy considered the World War II an international civil war - a war between democracy and totalitarianism. He wanted the Indian government to give an unconditional support to British resistance to Fascism in World War II. He stated: "This is an international civil war. Let the Indian people take their rightful place in this historic struggle and win their own freedom". When the Working Committee of the Congress was to meet at Bardiya on September 14, 1939, Roy addressed a letter to the Congress President. In the letter he wrote: "Holding fast to the principle that war is not the civilised method for settling controversial international issues, and firm in its determination not to allow the Indian people to be dragged into other people’s quarrels; the Congress cannot but sympathise with the victims of Fascist aggression and be willing to cooperate in freeing the world from that standing menace. Such an attitude would not be in complete harmony with the object of the Congress, which is to secure the liberation of the Indian people. Nor would it in any way amount to cooperation with Imperialism if the opportunity is availed for asserting India’s right of self-determination...." He believed that the war would put an end to the cult of Fascism. The


destruction of fascism was necessary for freedom. To him, the end of fascism might coincide with the end of imperialism in India. It was, therefore, India's duty to support Britain in defeating the Fascism. India would be able to 'gain her freedom by virtue of contributing to the defence of world freedom'.

According to Roy, World War II was neither a war between two groups of imperialists nor a war between imperialism and fascism. To him, imperialism and fascism were born of capitalism; therefore, there was no contradiction between the two. Fascism was the politics of monopoly capitalism. So, the World War II was not an imperialist war but an international civil war. He was the only Indian thinker who consistently emphasised the anti-fascist character of the World War II. He replaced Lenin's conception of imperialist war by his theory of international civil war.

After the termination of the war, Roy reiterated his theory of international civil war, and referred to the phase of a cold war between Communism and its adversaries. He advised

---


non-participation and non-involvement to the third world countries like India. In the wake of nuclear weapons, he felt that if the third world war happened, it would mean the end of human civilization. He wrote, "One does not require a very high degree of imaginativeness to realise that another world war will have the most disastrous consequences; most probably amounting to a complete break down of modern civilization. The greatest possible efforts must be made to head off that threatening catastrophe".

As an ardent advocate of individual freedom, Roy condemned the Russian Communism and considered American democracy as a lesser evil. But Roy never favoured the use of military forces as a means to check the expansion of Communism. According to him, the military forces would destroy democracy in the process. A modern war would slow down the economic recovery of European countries and thus would lead to the sacrifice of political freedom. He, therefore, criticized the American foreign policy, which stressed on military potential to check the Communism. Roy believed that if every country were allowed to choose their form of government without the interference from outside, the world


peace would remain undisturbed. The aggressive foreign policy of U.S.A. had created tension in the world. In the question of foreign policy, it is interesting, that he praised the foreign policy of Russia under Stalin and in the post-Stalin period which, according to him, was essentially peaceful.

He criticized both the power blocs, that is, American and Russian. And while exhorting to the developing countries, non-involvement in this bloc rivalry, he proposed to create a powerful third force independently. At the time of Korean war when India supported U.N. intervention in Korea, Koy pleaded for 'a policy of complete neutrality without any reservation whatsoever'. According to him, the neutral foreign policy, followed by Nehru was not genuine. He held that the compulsions of economic development, internal security and external threat of Communism (especially from China) would compel Indian government to side with the American camp. He wrote: "The tentacles of Communism triumphant in China are spreading out to threaten India through Tibet, Nepal, Eastern Turkistan and Kashmir. As a matter of fact, international Communism has practically encircled India on the land. The governments of Russia and Red China stand behind this menace to India. How could the
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Government of India, even with a superman at the helm, remain neutral, particularly, when it has taken side in the international civil war waged inside the country? It has taken up a position where it must be dependent upon America”.

Roy was totally against war or brute force as a means to solve the international disputes. He was a strong advocate of international peace and maintained that “peace at any price is the sanest policy for all but the lunatic”.

The problem of democracy versus Communism could only be solved by peaceful means. War could not defend democracy.

He even preferred Communism to war. He wrote, “Let us live to fight for freedom, even under Communism, if that cannot be avoided”. As an alternative to groupism and power bloc rivalries he suggested the practice of New Humanism. Real peace could be established only by developing a spirit of cosmopolitan humanism. According to Roy, a world composed of nation states can never be peaceful. Nationalism and internationalism are contradictory political cults. The everlasting peace can be built on the foundations of reason and persuasion. Therefore, he envisaged the idea of “a cosmopolitan co-operative commonwealth of creativemen”.
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The cosmopolitanism would be professed and practised by individuals and not by the institutions.

Thus, we come to the conclusion that Roy attached great importance to the objective of world peace and brotherhood. He criticised the cults of nationalism, fascism, Communism and parliamentary democracy, which, according to him, were hurdles in the way of world peace. He condemned the use of brute force as a means of settling the international disputes and preached the ideal of cosmopolitanism, which, in his view, offered the only solution to the problems of world peace.

Jayaprakash Narayan

Like A.N. Roy, J.P. was also a great advocate of international peace and friendly relations between the countries. In a draft resolution submitted to the Ramgarh Congress of 1940, J.P. advocated for peace, disarmament, amicable settling of the disputes and friendly relations between the countries. He wrote, "The free Indian nation shall work for peace between nations and total rejection of armaments and for the method of peaceful settlement of national disputes through some international authority freely established. It will endeavour particularly to live on the friendliest terms with its neighbours whether they be great powers or small nations, and shall covet no foreign territory". His philosophy of Sarvodaya was for 'creating

the foundations of a peaceful life'.

In his inaugural address to the War Resisters International Conference in 1960, J.P. pleaded for creating a non-violent social order internally and raising of a Shanti-Sena for non-violent defence through martyrdom; externally. J.P. in a joint statement with Salvador de Madariaga supported the idea of Peace Brigades to maintain international peace. He suggested that 'there should be an unarmed international police of parachutists. The charter should ensure their inviolability, right to anywhere and at any time, when once given an assignment by the U.N., and the right to interfere in any conflict of any nature'. According to him, dual revolution - social revolution together with human revolution could only be the guarantee for peace.

He was critical of Communism and believed that "modern Communism is not different from imperialism". According to Roy, Communism had become expansionist and aggressive and as such a horror for the small countries.
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He said, "Communism under Russia and Chinese guidance has become expansionalist and aggressive, just as nineteenth century capitalism under the leadership of Britain, France, Germany had become aggressive and expansionist.... Lenin wrote a famous thesis on imperialism as the last phase of capitalism. Some one should write another thesis on Communist imperialism as the first phase of a new imperialism".

Disapproving the World War II, he and his Congress socialists had opposed assisting Britain in European War. He was a staunch critic of colonialism and imperialism of any sort. In the 1950's as an alternative to the Western World' and the 'Communist World', J.P. and Nehru, with their socialist and Parliamentary colleagues, respectively, had encouraged the growth of 'a Nonaligned World'. During the 1960's, J.P. and his Gandhian colleagues developed the concept of a 'Fourth World' - a peace making world made up of individual negotiators and marchers, a voluntary peace brigade; and nations small enough and sufficiently politically decentralised to resist the slide into violence and authoritarianism, which was overwhelming the other three
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worlds. He urged immediate and effective steps towards
general disarmament, self-determination for small nations,
e.g., Tibet and Taiwan, and as an effective international
instrument to assure the defence of weak and backward
nations, the institution of an unarmed World Peace Guard.

In 1975, he warned the non-aligned and socialist
countries, and the intellectual and the people of Western
countries that the days of imperialism were not over.
Referring to the U.S. decision to rearm Pakistan, in a
message to the all-party national Seminar on 'Rising
Threat of Intervention in Asia', J.P. said, "The arming of
Pakistan, the threats by the U.S. leaders to the oil-producing
countries, the proposed build-up of the Diego Garcia base
and other steps taken by the United States to build an
infra-structure in this part of the world are warnings to
the third world nations that the days of imperialism are
not yet over".

In J.P.'s view the Western world and the Communist
as well as the socialist countries had failed to remove
colonial exploitation and violence - generating competition
from the world. He condemned the imperialism of both the
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capitalist and the Communist countries. According to J.P., man's permanent condition is peace, not war, but the violence is prevailing in the society. "There are feudalism, capitalism, colonialism, imperialism, totalitarianism. There are caste and colour, rich and poor, learned and illiterate. All these are forms of expression of violence. As long as they remain there will be violence in the world and there will be wars".

To J.P., all war was a crime against humanity. He was determined never to participate in any war, whatsoever. He believed in 'international disarmament: the destruction of all atomic, chemical and biological weapons; and unilateral disarmament for India. In his convocation address at Mysore University in 1965, J.P. told the audiences that "peace concerns me because I am convinced that war solves no problems.... I know as you know that even after the most devastating war, peace has to be made.... War, my dear friends, is not the permanent condition of man; that is peace.

"I know further that war is a pestilence that will destroy my country, as it will destroy Pakistan, as it will destroy China. We all desperately need peace in order to
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grow and develop, to be able to feed and clothe ourselves; to educate our children; to fight disease and premature death".

J.P. reacted sharply to issues involving violence and suppression. In 1950, J.P. condemned the American aggression in Korea. According to him, "the two great powers, U.S.S.R. and the U.S. stood on the two sides, and the Koreans were merely pawns in the game". His stand was that the 'status quo ante bellum' should be restored in Korea. In 1956, when Soviet Russia attacked on Hungary, J.P. condemned it and also the Indian representative, Krishna Menon, who failed to criticize the act of Russia at the United Nations. In March, 1959, when China invaded Tibet, J.P. condemned it and did his best to create world public opinion against China. According to him, the future of Tibet should be decided by Tibetans themselves. In a press conference at Patna, he said: "It is for them to decide. If they decide to owe allegiance to the Peking Government, it is none of anyone's business to oppose it".
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He demanded immediate withdrawal of the Chinese troops from Tibet and described the Chinese advance as an aggression against Tibet. He made a strong plea to create a strong world public opinion against Chinese brutality and oppression in Tibet. According to J.P., the right to self-determination should be given to Tibet because it, after all, was the birth right of all nations. He was of the opinion that every country should be independent, and no country should attack or interfere in the matters of another country.

In 1961, J.P. criticized the Government of India for marching troops into Goa. His attempt to find a peaceful solution to the Nagaland problem was also an effort in conformity to his convictions. J.P. led a peace mission
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into the area in 1964 and the team managed to bring about a truce. He persistently tried to foster an agreement of friendly relations and brotherhood between the people of India and Pakistan. He formed a group namely Indo-Pakistan conciliation group in 1962 and visited Pakistan in 1964; to create links between influential persons of both the countries. He stressed the need for conciliation with Pakistan. He appealed to the Indian Government to follow the active policy of drawing near to the neighbouring countries; e.g., Burma, Ceylon, Malaya, Pakistan, Nepal and others. But in 1965, he condemned Pakistani aggression on Kashmir. According to him, the issue of Kashmir was between the people of Kashmir and the Indian Government, and the Government should settle the issue to the satisfaction of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. He stressed the need for a solution within the Indian Union and maximum autonomy for Kashmir. According to him, the Indo-Pakistan differences could be solved on a 'give and take' basis. To him, "It was wrong to have gone to the United Nations to settle this dispute, which involved it in more complications ...".

58. Ibid., Vol. XX, No. 39, October 17, 1965, p. 3.
J.P. was very much worried over the problem of border conflict between India and China in 1962. He advocated non-violent means to face Chinese aggression. He preached renunciation of war and army, and appealed to settle the dispute by pacific means. He stated, "non-violence is the only answer to the situation of the world is facing today. Our means of peaceful settlement like negotiations across the table, good offices, adjudication, arbitration, friendship march and similar methods may succeed, or may fail - but there is no failure for a people who have accepted non-violence and have prepared themselves to resist whatever evil that might come with non-violence". He suggested the Indian Government to disarm unilaterally, to demobilise the Indian army and to take the weapons of non-violence in place of violent arms. According to J.P., in the war armies and civilian people both die and the death leads to more and more deaths, and ultimately complete annihilation. Therefore, he emphasised non-violent method to meet the Chinese aggression. He people would say: "Alright not a single shot would be fired on our side; you go on killing; we are prepared to die; but we will not..."
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submit, we will not accept your rule; we will not bow down before you, we will not cooperate with you".

J.P. had all the time been an ardent advocate and supporter of the policy of non-alignment. He stressed the utility of remaining aloof from power blocs. According to him, India would endanger the cause of peace if she joined the power blocs. To settle the boundary dispute between India and China, J.P. sought to 'find some impartial judges or arbitrators in whom both of us have trust and refer this boundary issue to them'. At another place, emphasising on merits of settling the international disputes by arbitration, J.P. said, "Arbitration is universally regarded as an ideal method of settling private disputes. Why cannot the same method be applied to international disputes? The Indo-China dispute, far better than the Kashmir dispute, is a fit subject for arbitration .'. India should always be prepared for a peaceful settlement. "That is not weakness but strength.... If the Indian people were to
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accept the philosophy of non-violence, they would be un conquerable”.

As one of the three Chairman of the 'World Peace Brigade', J.P. with A.J. Muste and Rev. Michael Scott organised a 'Peace March' from Delhi to Peking. The objectives of the marchers was to establish friendly relations between the people of India and China to urge the peaceful solution of any disputes between the two nations. Its aim was also to establish communications between elements in these and other countries represented in the March which were genuinely seeking peace, despite differences in view-point or ideology. Welcoming the marchers at Patna on May 21, 1963, J.P. said, "Though India is preparing for military defence, we should realise that armaments offer no real defence; rather they only lead to a ruinous race in armaments and to a succession of wars each more destructive than the last. What kind of security is there in that?"

J.P. was deeply distressed at the massacre in Bangladesh in May, 1971. He undertook a tour round the principal capitals of the world to awaken the international conscience against the killing of the people in Bangladesh.

According to him, Bangladesh was fighting for the same
issues and values, that is, democracy and self-determination,
for which India had fought her battle for freedom. He
advocated recognition of Bangladesh immediately. Bangladesh
had abolished the two nation-theory. He praised Mujibur
Rahman for creating a secular force out of intellectuals
and masses. J.P. on behalf of the Sarve Seva Sangh and
the Gandhi Peace Foundation, went on a mission of peace,
from May 16 to June 27, 1971, to Cairo, Rome, Belgrade,
Moscow, Helsinki, Stockholm, Bonn, Paris, London, Washington,
New York, Ottawa, Vancouver, Tokyo, Jakarta, Singapore
and Kuala Lumpur.

J.P. criticized the U.N.O. for its failure in
restraining the great powers. He stressed the need to
discover a surer way for safeguarding human liberty and
the security and independence of nations. He referred to
the actions of violation of world peace by big powers, e.g.,
America in Vietnam, China in Tibet, Russia in Czechoslovakia,
where United Nations remained an impotent onlooker.

Thus, we find that J.P. was a great advocate of
international peace and friendly relations amongst the
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countries. He criticized colonialism and imperialism of both the Communist and the capitalist countries. According to him, there were hurdles on the path of world peace. He wanted the Indian Government to remain out of the power blocs. He stressed on disarmament, renunciation of war and army, right of self-determination, and non-interference in the internal matters of other countries. He condemned the violence and suppression of all sorts and continuously pleaded for settlement of international disputes by arbitration or by other pacific means. War was not in conformity with the human nature; Servodaya social order of J.P. was based on peace.

Comparison

Both M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan were great advocates of world peace and good friendly relations amongst the countries. Both criticized Communism, imperialism, fascism and other expansionist systems which, according to them, were the obstructions in the establishment and maintenance of the world peace. Both stressed on principles of self-determination, non-involvement and non-interference. Both condemned war as a means to settle international disputes; for they believed that by nature man did not like war but was peace loving.

Both reacted promptly to the issues involving violence and suppression. They always condemned the big
powers for intervening in the affairs of the small countries. Both were critical of power blocs and advised the Indian Government to remain aloof. As an alternative, they suggested to creation of a third force independent of both the power blocs. Both criticized the competitive race for armament, which, according to them, if continued would annihilate the world.

There were, however, some differences of details and approaches between Roy and J.P. Roy criticized nationalism, especially the one propounded by Gandhi and Nehru. To him, the spirit of nationalism was the main cause behind the wars. Therefore, to avoid the horror of wars, he proposed to abolish the national boundary lines and to create a cosmopolitan commonwealth of freemen and women. J.P., on the other hand, was a loyal follower of Gandhi and his ideal of nationalism though he never supported the aggressive brand of nationalism and formulated his views on world peace within the framework of an international community comprising of nation-states.

Roy zealously justified the World War II. To him, it was an international people's war. He pleaded for assistance to Britain in the war, because it was being waged against Fascism, which was a great danger to world peace. He was the only Indian thinker and leader, who supported the war efforts of Britain. On the other hand, J.P., a staunch critic of colonialism, opposed assisting Britain in the "European War"
According to him, it was an imperialist war and not a people's war as Roy would want people to believe. It is easy to discern a certain streak of a-priori and dogmatism in the views of Roy on this score. In his analysis of the nature of world war as also the objective of world peace to be pursued and realized in the context of nation-states, it may be surmised that J.P. exhibited for greater pragmatism and objectivity than Roy.
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CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

In the preceding chapters, effort has been made to analyse and compare, at a considerable length, the political ideas of M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan in the perspective of their evolution and change. Conclusions pertaining to various themes have already been stated at the end of the preceding chapters. In this chapter, therefore, we propose to sum up the study with a view to ensuring compactness and compression. We can begin by eluding to a seminal characterization of the political ideas of both Roy and J.P., namely, inflexible faith in the cherished human ideals and a strong moral sensibility to human suffering. It is in the context of this basic motivation that their journeys to the sphere of political ideas (from revolutionary Nationalism to Marxism to Radical Humanism—Roy, and from Nationalism to Marxism to Total Revolution through Democratic Socialism and Sarvodaya—J.P.) which may well appear to a casual and perfunctory inquirer a zigzag and tortuous chart of unsteadiness and blind groping, can be understood in their causal perspective. There were clear beacons of light that remained glittering and unabated throughout their lives and that constantly led them on to a higher and higher path of truth and freedom, resulting, apparently, into varied stances of thought and ideas.
The journeys are long enough but circuitous. The common factor is strong enough between Roy, a revolutionary and philosopher and J.P., a spiritualist and saint. Both were intellectuals of outstanding mould; both had a forceful urge to bring about social justice through engineered change; both had a strong vein of idealism and a concern for the downtrodden; both represented a queer mix of oriental and occidental brought about by the determinants of their Indian births and genes and very sound educational bases of and prolonged personal contact with the West. To illustrate the common traits of thought and action of Roy and J.P., we can not do better than to quote J.P. himself on this issue. He wrote: "It has been the matter of deep satisfaction to me that, after a middle period of difference, we had moved close together at the end just as I was close to him at the beginning .... Towards the end, both of us, each in his own way, had moved away from Marxism in the same direction and to the same goals".

The ideological development of both the thinkers was somewhat similar. Both changed some of their ideals from time to time in the light of their experiences. Both were ardent Marxists in their early phases of political career. Both began by analysing the Indian society from the Marxian

1. Vide Chapter II, footnote No. 155.
view-point. And both came to the conclusion that the reason of poverty of the Indian masses was not merely the foreign economic exploitation, but Indian bourgeois class too, which played important role in exploiting the natives. Both believed in scientific socialism and its evolutionary nature. Socialism to them was the common ownership of the means of production and distribution and equal opportunities to all the people. Both agreed initially to bring socialism through the power of the State. Nationalisation of the means of production, distribution and public utilities was to be brought about through the State power. Both were unsatisfied with Gandhism and the bourgeois programme of the Indian National Congress. To transform the Indian National Congress into a radical and socialist organisation both drafted their programmes for change in the Congress.

Both agreed that to achieve freedom was the first postulate for the establishment of a socialist society in India. Without political independence the socialist programme could never become a reality. The law of the land had to be based on the will of the people and the people were to be in effective control of the political power. Both placed great emphasis on agricultural development of the country. The agriculture was to be mechanised and modernised. They suggested cooperative farming and redistribution of land wherein the tiller was to be made the owner of the land.
The State was to provide the financial aid to promote the agricultural production. To balance the economy of the country, both favoured setting up of industries - both large and small scale, state owned as well as community owned. An agro-industrial economy was prescribed by both as the remedy for India and its development. Both gave a lot of importance to planning in the economic development. Both sought to reorient the village life and make it self-sufficient.

In their later phases, both renounced Marxism and came to the conclusion that Marxian socialism was not the solution for the problems of humanity in general and India in particular. Socialism, they realised, tended to culminate into state capitalism. Socialisation of the means of production, they discovered, was not the cure for all evils of capitalism. Both grew into vehement critiques of the Russian totalitarianism and Statism. Their ideologies and thought went beyond Communism. In the post-independence period, Hoy developed the philosophy of Radical Humanism and J.P. joined the Servodaya Movement. The Co-operative Socialism, advocated by Hoy, is considerably similar to that of J.P.'s People's Socialism (Servodaya) in terms of their pronounced human components and all embracing comprehension. Socialism to them was not merely an economic principle, but a way of life.
Both agreed that the main problem was not that of production, but of centralisation and so both advocated maximum decentralisation. They proposed to reorganise the political and economic system considerably devoid of the State interference. Both visualised the pyramidal structure of political and economic system. The village was to be its basic unit. From village to the national level, they visualised formation of a Communitarian society and dreamt of the ultimate formation of a world community. The State had a minimum role to play in this economic system. The motive behind the production would be consumption and not profit. The economic development would be planned. But planning would not be imposed from above; it should begin from bottom. People were to be given fullest scope of participation in their economic management. Both were critical of the Second Five Year Plan of India. Workers were accorded a central place in the economic organisation of both.

Both started as bitter critics of Gandhi and his ideas and techniques. In his Marxian phase, J.P. had adopted the same extreme position, which was maintained by Roy. According to Ajit Shattacharjee, "J.P. was far from an uncritical admirer of Gandhi's politics and strategy. He did not attend his prayer meetings, though Prabhavati did. His sense of nationalism was too strong to accept the extreme position adopted by M.N. Roy, who had criticized
Lenin to his face for believing that because Gandhi was leading a mass movement he was a revolutionary. Roy had insisted that Gandhi was bound to be a reactionary socially because, in his view, he was a religious and cultural revivalist*. Significantly, both changed their views regarding Gandhi with maturity and experience. J.P. moved from Socialism to Gandhiism via Democratic Socialism and then to Sarvodaya to Total Revolution. This change can be attributed mainly to the belief and the values which he gradually came to cherish: that ends alone could not justify the means. Similarly, Roy, a revolutionary Communist, moved from Marxism to Radicalism and then to Humanism. Referring to his transformation, he said that 'he had come to reject the Jesuitic belief that the end could justify the means - any means or that the cause of revolution could always justify the adoption of the methods of violence and coercion! Both came to realise from the experience of Russian Revolution that no revolution could justify indiscriminate adoption of any means or unscrupulous divorce of ethics from politics. Both were critical of some of the basic tenets of Marxism, for example, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the theory of violent revolution, the withering away of the state etc. in their ways and in keeping with their respective approaches.

2. Vide Chapter IV, Footnote No. 94.
There are many similarities between Roy and J.P. on the theme of democracy. The democracy that they advocated promises removal of all hindrances to individual freedom. J.P. showed in this regard, a remarkable influence of Roy in his writings. Both admitted that in the existing circumstances democracy was the best form of government, but it had not been given a proper chance for the fundamental democracy, i.e., popular sovereignty had never been realised or even practised by any government. Both criticized parliamentary democracy, and there are similarities in their planks of criticism. Parliamentary democracy, in their view, was not the government of the people and by the people, but on behalf of the people. The sovereign individuals in practice, remain passive spectators. After elections, voters have no control over their representatives. Individuals are ruled by a group of partymen and democracy is converted into dictatorship of the Cabinet.

Both criticized election system in parliamentary democracy. According to Roy, representatives are not elected intelligently. Man is lost in the crowd and elections are conducted by playing upon the crowd mentality. To J.P., the system of election is very expensive and appallingly wasteful. It creates unnecessary passions and excitements, and fails to elect good and able men. Both agreed that democracy is converted into demagogy. Both held that the greatest
fault of parliamentary democracy is its inherent tendency toward centralisation of powers. According to Roy, centralisation of powers leads to a dehumanisation process wherein all the powers are centralised in the executive and important decisions are taken by the executive, the bureaucracy and the committees of experts. Even the representatives of people have little say in it, and are reduced to a mere rubber stamp. J.P. held the view that the important issues in modern democracies are decided by the political parties, industrialists, bankers and powerful labour unions. It gives rise to powerful bureaucracy and paves the way for administrative autocracy.

Both were critical of the evils of party system in parliamentary democracy. Roy rejected the idea that parties are co-present with politics. Political parties imply the denial of sovereignty of the individual and, hence, democracy itself. To J.P., parties often put group interests above the national interests and are run by the caucuses that are beyond democratic control. Party rivalries give rise to demagogy, which eliminates political ethics. Both felt that representative government is in effect only a minority government. To Roy, it represents only the party which controls it, and the membership, even of the largest party, is only a small fraction of the people. Thus, democracy is a government by a party and not by the people.
To J.P., a government, which is elected under universal suffrage, represents only the minority of the total voters.

As an alternative to parliamentary democracy both presented their schemes of government based on the principles of decentralisation, individual freedom and popular participation. Good many of the features of these schemes proposed for India are similar. Roy suggested a pyramidal structure of Indian polity reared on the basis of an organised democracy composed of a country-wide network of People’s Committees. Like Roy, J.P. also visualised a pyramidal structure of Indian polity based on a communitarian democracy composed of village communities as its basis.

In Roy’s organised democracy and J.P.’s communitarian democracy, there is no place for political parties. J.P., however, conceded the possibility of political parties being allowed to operate only as local fractions. There would be maximum decentralisation of power. People will actively participate in the administration and would be accorded a central place. There would be no centralised State. To Roy, the government would become co-terminous with society and to J.P., it would serve like a danger chain in a railway train.

A lot is common between Roy’s People’s Committee and J.P.’s Village Community. These are primary territorial
units which would be autonomous in their respective spheres. These local units were to be organised in such a way that they might give maximum freedom to the individuals to administer their affairs. The higher organs of the polity (in case of Roy - sub-divisional and district People's Committees; and provincial and supreme People's Councils; and in case of J.P. - Regional, District, Provincial and National Committees) would be formed electorally from the lower organs and would have largely residual and coordinating functions. Both visualised a world-federation and agreed that only those matters should be given to the central organ which are of national importance. The higher organs would remain under the control of the lower bodies. Roy did not provide for any separation of powers at the lowest level. People's Committees were to combine both the legislative and the executive functions. But J.P. recommended a separation of legislative and executive powers. During the Total Revolution phase, J.P., like Roy, advocated the formation of People's Committees in the villages and the cities.

In their new democracies, both gave full sovereign rights to the individuals including the right to recall their representatives. Both emphasised on economic decentralisation which, to them, was a precondition for effective political decentralisation. Both agreed that the
new democracies, which they envisaged, can not be built in a day or two. There would be a transition period during which conditions would be created to introduce the new democracies. Both agreed that education of the individuals is of seminal importance for the success of true democracy. Both held the view that during election periods masses may be educated, and insisted that education should be imparted by non-governmental agencies. Thus, J.P. derived his idea of partyless politics and communitarian democracy from Roy's writings. But he tried to present it in the garb of Gandhism. In the Total Revolution phase, J.P. again borrowed an idea from Roy when he gave the right of recall to the people.

Both criticized the functioning of parliamentary democracy in the modern world, but interestingly enough they omitted any reference to presidential democracy. The omission is all the more glaring if we take into account the fact that both had been in America for a considerable period of time and had had a fairly close contact with American academics and intelligentsia. Although both criticized party system in modern democracy and recommended partyless democracy, they appear to have given scant attention to the deeper implications of the problem. It has been discovered and established beyond doubt that political parties are not only inevitable in a democratic system
irrespective of its types but also indispensable; in certain ways, even in other modern systems of government including the totalitarian regimes. Roy talked about the election of small local People's Committees. But it is apparent that whether Roy liked it or not, political parties would have invariably become operative in some form or the other, because of the very process of election itself. The importance and inevitability of opposition and, therefore, political parties in any democracy cannot be over-emphasized. Even where officially party politics is barred, it has been found that there is opposition through the instrumentality of factionalism from within the ruling party. Both appear to have simplified the problem of political parties and dealt with it in a superficial manner. It is significant that in the last phase of his political life, J.P. almost seems to have abandoned the idea of a partyless democracy. Probably he had realised the inevitability of political parties in democratic systems.

Both based their new organised polity on the principle of political decentralisation. But political decentralisation, it seems, has hardly been in keeping with the tradition and political ethos of India. For example, in the Panchayati system sufficient powers have been given to the local bodies, but reports after reports on the working of Panchayati Raj
show that their functioning is unsatisfactory. And one of the basic causes has been the misfeasance and non-feasance on the part of the representatives of the people at these bodies. Neither Roy nor J.P. appears to have shown any comprehension of the possible risks of decentralisation and, therefore, none of them has paid any attention to devising any mechanisms of ensuring against a misuse of the principle of decentralisation. Although both talked about recall as an effective check on elected representatives, none of them has pursued or elaborated the idea and technique to its logical extent. Thus, the whole structure with its widespread decentralisation is apt to be slow and lethargic and, perhaps, unrealistic. J.P.'s scheme of governance by Committees is not only too idealistic, but also risky if experience of the functioning of such Committees at Municipal and Panchayati Raj level is taken into account for guidance. Thus, while their critique of democracy (parliamentary) is fairly sound and valid, their scheme of an alternative system is rather weak and Utopian. The scheme of division of power between the various layers of government is defective. It is also wide open to possibilities of misuse. We might, of course, always say that people would learn to use it in due course of time, but the sterling question is that, 'can we afford the risk and luxury of learning democracy as propounded by Roy and J.P. by the process of
trial and error; And then there is also the ultimate problem of finally learning it right.

Individual and his freedom constituted the basic concern of both. According to a central place to the individual in their political philosophy, they criticized the various systems - political, social and economic etc., which atomized the individual and eroded his liberties. Individual was an end and all the other associations, institutions and organisations were the means. Both considered man as innately moral and good and sought to infuse the spirit of self-reliance in the individual. Freedom, to both, was an essential aspect of human nature. Freedom as an objective could only be realised by moral means. Their entire philosophy is concerned with satisfying the man's urge for freedom. Without freedom, to them, man was not a human being in real sense. It was only through freedom that the individual achieves his perfection.

For both, the State was a means to an end, namely, 'individual's freedom and unfoldment'. Both criticized the totalitarian State of Soviet Russia and concept of Welfare State, because they were in favour of giving the least responsibilities to the State. They were also critical of nation State owing to their common faith in the ideal of a world State. On the theme of theory and technique of
revolution, the ideas and positions of both had pursued a course of change and revision. Starting as staunch believers of the Marxian theory and technique of revolution, they ended as its strong critics. This transition, from Marxism to Radicalism and then Humanism - Roy, and from Socialism to Gandhism and Sarvodaya and then to Total Revolution - J.P., resulted mainly from their innate belief in certain moral values, like - the ends alone could not justify the adoption of undesirable means or the invocation of the name of revolution alone could not sanction the use of violence - and their over-riding concern for the individual. Both rejected violent, insurrectionary and coercive methods and stressed on peaceful moral means.

For both, revolution meant an all round change in all aspects of man and his institutions. Both favoured gradual replacement of the old order by a new social order to pave the way for a social revolution. To them, revolution was a long term process of social change and not an event. Both considered revolution as a means and not as an end in itself. To them, violent revolution had always been counter-revolutionary in its impact. Both advocated revolution by consent and believed in the instrumentality of persuasion and education of the individual for change.
Both were great advocates of world peace and good friendly relations amongst the nations. Both criticized Communism, imperialism, fascism and other expansionist systems, which, according to them, were the obstructions in the establishment and maintenance of a world order. Both stressed on the principles of self-determination, non-involvement and non-interference and condemned war as a means to settle international disputes for they believed that man by nature did not like war. Both reacted promptly, spontaneously and strongly to the issues involving violence and suppression. They always condemned the big powers for intervening into the affairs of small countries and advised the Indian Government to remain aloof from power blocs. As an alternative, they suggested creation of a third force independent of both the power blocs. Both criticized the mad race for armament which, according to them, if continued would annihilate the world.

While there are many similarities between Roy and J.P., the differences between the two are no less significant. J.P., as a socialist thinker, never took the directives from the world Communist movement. He came back to India in 1929 as a confirmed Marxist, but did not join the Communist movement in India. He joined the Indian National Congress straight away. He was a great propounder of Indian socialism.
To him, socialist movement in India was a part of the national freedom struggle. This association of the socialist movement with freedom struggle had an important consequence. Nationalism, which might in theory be regarded as departure from socialist internationalism, in practice helped the socialists to escape from the embrace of the Communists. It was on the issue of subordination to Moscow that the Indian socialists and the Communists parted company. Roy, on the other hand, took active part in the mobilisation of the world Communist movement as an official of the Communist International. He was the most colourful of all non-Russian Communists in the era of Lenin and Stalin. Roy did not like orthodox nationalism. To him, national socialism, in practice, can not be anything but Fascism. It was so in Germany; it could not have been any different in India.

J.P. advocated democratic socialism and prescribed Gandhian spiritual means to achieve it. According to him, there was no dichotomy between socialism and the Indian culture. He talked of co-sharing of wealth and limitation of wants. His emphasis was on human values. On the other hand, Roy did not subscribe to democratic socialism which, in his view, was a contradiction in terms. According to Roy, 'if democratic socialists ever would come to power in India, either their socialism or their democracy will
go by the board. Advocacy of Indian spiritualism, to Roy, was merely an attempt to revive the backward precapitalist social conditions of India. Thus, it may be concluded that while J.P. was very near to Roy in his socialist thinking, he had some basic and vital differences also with the man he admired so much and from whom he drew considerable philosophical inspiration.

J.P., like Roy, criticized some of the basic principles of Gandhism, but later he became a full fledged Gandhiste and accepted his idea of nationalism, deriving from a belief in Indian culture and religion—God, soul, rebirth, etc. Roy, on the other hand, as a rationalist and materialist, could not accept the theological and religious ideas of Gandhism. He also could not accept the Gandhian ideology of Indian nationalism. Both criticized Marxism but whereas Roy's main emphasis was on the conceptual criticism of Marxist philosophy, J.P. mainly criticized it for its practice and application in the Soviet Russia. Roy criticized Marxist philosophy comprehensively before propounding his own philosophy of Radical Humanism. His critique of Marxism was by far more systematic, scientific and exhaustive than J.P.'s whose main concern was the practice of Marxism in the Soviet Russia, which, according to him, had distorted the ideology. In comparison to Roy, J.P.'s critique appears to be sporadic, piecemeal and peripheral.
Roy criticized Marxism from the stand-point of international Communism. J.P., on the other hand, kept in view the Indian situation. He warned the Indian socialists to learn a lesson from the Russian Communism. According to him, Marxism could not be practised in India in the same manner as in Russia, because there were deep and far-reaching differences in the circumstances, ethos, culture and tradition of the two countries. He appealed to the Indian Communists to declare their independence of Moscow and to choose their own brand of socialism. To him, Gandhism was not only an alternative to Marxism but a much superior and suitable replacement ideology for India.

Another major point of difference between Roy and J.P. was relating to 'spiritualism'. In an inaugural address at the All-India Radical Humanist Association Conference held in Calcutta on December 29, 1973, J.P. expressed his complete agreement with the Draft, except for one point. The point of disagreement was the statement in the second fundamental principle in the Draft, that "Humanism excludes supernaturalism and affirms that man with his increasing power over nature is the maker of his future". Disagreeing with the statement, J.P. said:

3. Vide Chapter V, Footnote No. 212.
4. Ibid., Footnote No. 213.
"modern science, particularly modern psychology does definitely point to a reality beyond the human mind. Whatever the nature of the human spirit may be, it definitely seems to be a higher order than the mind". He viewed that reason alone would not enable man to shape a better future for himself. He referred with approval to Vinoba's statement that "the age of Reason and Politics is over and a new age of spirituality and science has dawned". He, however, added, "It may be discovered that what is called supernatural today is after all a part or an aspect of nature, but whose laws are different from those that are termed natural laws at present". Thus, whereas Roy was free from any mystical approaches and maintained a rational and scientific outlook at all levels of his thought, on the question of reconstruction of Indian polity, J.R. was drawn towards the concept of Dharma and spirituality, obviously under the impact of Gandhism, in which he found an example of synthetic, organic and communitarian organisation of Indian society.

While Roy gave a full-scale treatment to themes like the origin of State and its distinction vis-à-vis the
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government, J.P. hardly cared about these. He was mainly concerned with the state in its applied aspects. Over the issue of the retention of the state, Roy and J.P. took different stands. Roy believed that in the organised democracy, the state would be coincident with the entire society, and consequently it would be under a standing democratic control. Roy did not feel it necessary to abolish the state. But J.P.'s communitarian democracy was envisaged to be a Stateless society. Here J.P.'s thinking exhibits deep impact of Gandhiji. His ultimate aim was to do away with the state, though he conceded that a fully stateless society was an unrealizable goal and so the practical objective of human endeavour could only be to reduce the powers and scope of the state to the minimum. Thus, J.P., as he himself admitted, derived his idea on partyless politics and communitarian democracy from Roy's writings, but he tried to present it in the garb of Gandhism.

Roy was a staunch individualist. Individual, to him, was a biological entity besides a social one. He did not accept any authority over the individual, e.g., society, nation or state. On the other hand, J.P. was an individualist as well as a socialist. He held that man should sacrifice his interests for the sake of society. To him, social interest was higher than individual interest. J.P. believed
that the goal of the individual could be best attained by subordinating his interest to the higher interest of the community. There was no dichotomy between the two. J.P. placed utmost emphasis on the idea of leading a severe self-disciplined simple life. To him, goodness lay in self-sacrifice, in reducing one’s needs, in suppressing one’s impulses and in privation. Unlike J.P., Roy laid stress on the unfoldment of the individual; on the satisfaction of his needs and desires; on enrichment and on maturity and growth. Roy believed in man’s ability and desire, so he stressed on independent development of the individual according to his circumstances and needs. It is apparent that whereas Roy’s approach to the themes of individual and society was predominantly rational, J.P.’s was overwhelmingly spiritual. Roy’s Humanism excludes supernaturalism and affirms that man with his increasing power over nature is the maker of his destiny. J.P. did not agree with this view and held that reason alone would not enable man to shape a better future for himself, spiritual and moral values were of permanent importance.

J.P. also did not agree with Roy’s version of philosophical revolution. To Roy, philosophical revolution was a precondition for a successful democratic revolution in India. According to him, cultural backwardness of India was the reason for the imposition of British Rule.
and discarded the idea that cultural backwardness resulted from foreign rule. The spiritual heritage of India, which was upheld and applauded by J.P. and other Indian nationalists, was regarded by Roy as the cause of India's cultural decay. J.P. did not agree with this view of Roy and observed, "A hundred or two hundred years of slavery a kind which this country had never seen before completely destroyed the power of the people to think for themselves and to come together and face their tasks together". J.P. was not against a renaissance movement which was actually emerging in India based on rationalism, self-reliance and exposure of all forms of orthodoxy and blind faith but he did not think that such a movement was of necessity a precondition for the success of democratic revolution in India. J.P.'s Total Revolution implied a comprehensive transformation of society in which the democratic values - liberty, equality and fraternity would permeate the political, economic and social spheres of life. This was of necessity a long term programme.

Similarly, there were some differences of details and approaches between Roy and J.P. regarding nationalism. Roy was critical of nationalism, especially the one propounded by Gandhi and Nehru. To him, the spirit of nationalism was the main cause behind the wars. Therefore, to avoid the

---

horror of wars, he proposed to abolish the national boundary lines and to create a cosmopolitan commonwealth of freemen and women. J.P.'s approach to nationalism, on the other hand, had a distinct pro-Gandhian tilt. Expressing himself totally opposed to the aggressive brand of nationalism, J.P. formulated his views on world peace within the framework of an international community comprising of nation-states.

Roy zealously justified the World War II. To him, it was an international people's war. He pleaded for assistance to Britain in the war, because it was being waged against Fascism - a great danger to world peace. On the other hand, J.P., a staunch critic of colonialism, opposed assisting Britain in the European war. According to him, it was an imperialist war and not a people's war as Roy would want people to believe. It is easy to discern a certain streak of a priori and dogmatism in the views of Roy on this score. In his analysis of the nature of World War as also the objective of world peace to be pursued and realised in the context of nation States, it may be surmised that J.P. exhibited far greater pragmatism and objectivity than Roy.

The above comparative study of the political ideas and approaches of Roy and J.P. leads us to the conclusion that there are more similarities than differences between these two outstanding political philosophers of modern India.
We might conclude this work by making the following points:

First, the ideological development of both the political thinkers was somewhat similar. Except for a middle period of difference, J.P. followed the ideological trends and leads of Roy.

Secondly, freedom and truth were the beacons of light in their journeys in the spheres of political ideas due to which there was a uniform line of development and a common feature of fluidity in their thought occasionally leading to the allegations of timidity, vagueness, contradictions, indecisiveness, etc.

Thirdly, the ideal to both was individual freedom and autonomy. Credit should be given to both for drawing attention to the growing tendencies of authoritarianism and totalitarianism resulting from the complexities created by modern civilisation which have placed man in a helpless and hopeless position and eclipsed his moral strength and initiative. Their attempts to save individuals from atomisation and alienation are similar. Their struggle was people oriented and their schemes of social reorganisation offer the utmost scope for the individual. They sought to make man conscious through education, persuasion and moral conversion and believed in revolution by consent.
Fourthly, both were the great critics of the functioning of parliamentary democracy because of its formalism, its atomisation of the individual, and the growing preponderance of the executive and the bureaucracy under this system, though they omitted any reference of presidential democracy. They wanted a different type of democracy - organised from below on the basis of suitable local republics in the villages as well as in the cities. Maximum decentralisation in every field was their ideal. But the suggestions, they made to remedy the ills of democracy, we have already discussed, were inadequate, weak and Utopian.

Fifthly, both had renounced party-politics and believed that political work could be done without forming a political party.

Sixthly, appreciating the interdependence of political and economic organisations, they very significantly emphasized in the context of India the utmost necessity of agro-industrial development of rural India. Unlike Gandhi, both opposed the mere revival of traditional handicrafts and suggested modern type of economy.

Seventhly, their thought and concern went beyond narrow national problems and issues. They visualised the organisation of a world community with a view to ensuring
the higher and larger objectives of world peace and human brotherhood transgressing the confines of national and regional seclusions.
APPENDIX I

PRINCIPLES OF RADICAL DEMOCRACY

TWENTY-TWO THESSES

ONE

Man is the archetype of society, co-operative social relationships contribute to develop individual potentialities. But the development of the individual is the measure of social progress. Collectivity presupposes the existence of individuals. Except as the sum total of freedom and well-being, actually enjoyed by individuals, social liberation and progress are imaginary ideals, which are never attained. Well-being, if it is actual, is enjoyed by individuals. It is wrong to ascribe a collective ego to any form of human community (viz.: nation, class, etc.), as that practice means sacrifice of the individual. Collective well-being is a function of the well-being of individuals.

TWO

Quest for freedom and search for truth constitute the basic urge of human progress. The quest for freedom is the continuation, on a higher level of intelligence and emotion, of the biological struggle for existence. The search for truth is a corollary thereof. Increasing knowledge of nature enables man to be progressively free from the tyranny of natural phenomena, and physical and social environments. Truth is the content of knowledge.

THREE

The purpose of all rational human endeavour, individual as well as collective, is attainment of freedom, in ever increasing measure. Freedom is progressive disappearance of all restrictions on the unfolding of the potentialities of individuals, as human beings, and not as cogs in the wheels of a mechanical social organism. The position of the individual, therefore, is the measure of the progressive and liberating significance of any collective effort or social organisation. The success of any collective endeavour is to be measured by the actual benefit for its constituent units.
Rising out of the background of the law-governed physical nature, the human being is essentially rational. Reason being a biological property, it is not the antithesis of will. Intelligence and emotion can be reduced to a common biological denominator. Historical determinism, therefore, does not exclude freedom of the will. As a matter of fact, human will is the most powerful determining factor. Otherwise, there would be no room for revolutions in a rationally determined process of history. The rational and scientific concept of determinism is not to be confused with the teleological or religious doctrine of predestination.

The economic interpretation of history is deduced from a wrong interpretation of Materialism. It implies dualism, whereas Materialism is a monistic philosophy. History is a determined process, but there are more than one causative factors. Human will is one of them, and it cannot always be referred directly to any economic incentive.

Ideation is a physiological process resulting from the awareness of environments. But once they are formed, ideas exist by themselves, governed by their own laws. The dynamics of ideas runs parallel to the process of social evolution, the two influencing each other mutually. But in no particular point of the process of the integral human evolution, can a direct causal relation be established between historical events and the movements of ideas. (‘Idea’ is here used in the common philosophical sense of ideology or system of ideas). Cultural patterns and ethical values are not mere ideological super-structures of established economic relations. They are also historically determined by the logic of the history of ideas.

For creating a new world of freedom, revolution must go beyond an economic reorganisation of society. Freedom does not necessarily follow from the capture of political power in the name of oppressed and exploited classes and abolition of private property in the means of production.
Communism or Socialism may conceivably be the means for the attainment of the goal of freedom. How far it can serve that purpose, must be judged by experience. A political system and an economic experiment which subordinate the man of flesh and blood to an imaginary collective ego; be it the nation or a class, cannot possibly be the suitable means for the attainment of the goal of freedom. On the one hand, it is absurd to argue that negation of freedom will lead to freedom; and, on the other hand, it is not freedom to sacrifice the individual at the altar of an imaginary collective ego. Any social philosophy or scheme of social reconstruction which does not recognise the sovereignty of the individual, and dismisses the ideal of freedom as an empty abstraction, can have no more than a very limited progressive and revolutionary significance.

The State being the political organisation of society, its withering away under Communism is a utopia which has been exploded by experience. Planned economy on the basis of socialised industries presupposes a powerful political machinery. Democratic control of that machinery alone can guarantee freedom under the new order. Planning of production for use is possible on the basis of political democracy and individual freedom.

State ownership and planned economy do not by themselves end exploitation of labour; nor do they necessarily lead to an equal distribution of wealth. Economic democracy is no more possible in the absence of political democracy than the latter is in the absence of the former.

Dictatorship tends to perpetuate itself. Planned economy under political dictatorship disregards individual freedom on the plea of efficiency, collective effort and social progress. Consequently, a higher form of democracy in the socialist society, as it is conceived at present, becomes an impossibility. Dictatorship defeats its professed end.
TEN

The defects of formal parliamentary democracy have also been exposed in experience. They result from the delegation of power. To make democracy effective, power must always remain vested in the people; and there must be ways and means for the people to wield the sovereign power effectively, not periodically, but from day to day. Atomised individual citizens are powerless for all practical purposes, and most of the time. They have no means to exercise their sovereignty and to wield a standing control of the State machinery.

ELEVEN

Liberalism is falsified or parodied under formal parliamentary democracy. The doctrine of laissez faire only provides the legal sanction to the exploitation of men by man. The concept of economic man negates the liberating doctrine of individualism. The economic man is bound to be a slave or a slave - holder. This vulgar concept must be replaced by the reality of an instinctively rational being who is moral because he is rational. Morality is an appeal to conscience; and conscience is the instinctive awareness of, and reaction to, environments. It is a mechanistic biological function on the level of consciousness. Therefore, it is rational.

TWELVE

The alternative to parliamentary democracy is not dictatorship, it is organised democracy in the place of formal democracy of powerless atomised individual citizens. The parliament should be the apex of a pyramidal structure of the state reared on the base of an organised democracy composed of a countrywide network of People's Committees. The political organisation of society (the State) will be coincident with the entire society, and consequently the State will be under a standing democratic control.

THIRTEEN

The function of a revolutionary and liberating social philosophy is to lay emphasis on the basic fact of history that man is the maker of his world - man as a thinking being; and he can be so only as an individual. The brain is a means of production, and produces the most revolutionary commodity. Revolutions presuppose iconoclastic ideas. An increasingly large number of men, conscious of their creative power, motivated by the indomitable will to remake the world, moved by the adventure of ideas, and fired with the ideal of
a free society of free men, can create the conditions under which democracy will be possible.

SIXTEEN

The method and programme of social revolution must be based on a reassertion of the basic principle of social progress. A social renaissance can come only through determined and widespread endeavour to educate the people as regards the principles of freedom and rational co-operative living. The people will be organised into effective democratic bodies to build up the socio-political foundation of the post-revolutionary order. Social revolution requires in rapidly increasing number of the new renaissance, and a rapidly expanding system of People's Committees, and an organic co-ordination of both. The programme of revolution will similarly be based on the principles of freedom, reason and social harmony. It will mean elimination of every form of monopoly and vested interest in the regulation of social life.

SEVENTEEN

Radical democracy presupposes economic reorganisation of society so as to eliminate the possibility of exploitation of man by man. Progressive satisfaction of material necessities is the precondition for the individual members of society unfolding their intellectual and other finer human potentialities. An economic reorganisation, such as will guarantee a progressively rising standard of living, is the foundation of the Radical Democratic State. Economic liberation of the masses is an essential condition for their advancing towards the goal of freedom.

EIGHTEEN

The economy of the new social order will be based on production for use and distribution with reference to human needs. Its political organisation excludes delegation of power which, in practice, deprives the people of effective power; it will be based on the direct participation of the entire adult population through the People's Committees. Its culture will be based on universal dissemination of knowledge and on minimum control and maximum scope for and incentive to, scientific and creative activities. The new society, being founded on reason and science, will necessarily be planned. But it will be planning with the freedom of the individual as its main purpose. The new society will be democratic - politically, economically as well as culturally. Consequently, it will be democracy which can defend itself.
MURZIN

The ideal of Radical Democracy will be attained through the collective efforts of spiritually free men united in the determination of creating a world of freedom. They will function as the guides, friends and philosophers of the people rather than as their would-be rulers. Consistently with the goal of freedom, their political practice will be rational and therefore ethical. Their efforts will be reinforced by the growth of the people's will to freedom. Ultimately, the Radical Democratic State will rise with the support of enlightened public opinion as well as intelligent action of the people. Realising that freedom is inconsistent with concentration of power, radical democrats will aim at the widest diffusion of power.

TWENTY

In the last analysis, education of the citizen is the condition for such a reorganisation of society as will be conducive to common progress and prosperity without encroaching upon the freedom of the individual. The People's Committees will be the schools for the political and civic education of the citizen. The structure and function of the Radical Democratic State will enable detached individuals to come to the fore-front of public affairs. Manned with such individuals, the State machinery will cease to be the instrument in the hands of any particular class to coerce others. Only spiritually free individuals in power can smash all chains of slavery and usher in freedom for all.

TWENTY-ONE

Radicalism integrates science into social organisation and reconciles individuality with collective life; it gives to freedom a moral-intellectual as well as a social content; it offers a comprehensive theory of social progress in which both the dialectics of economic determinism and dynamics of ideas find their due recognition and it deduces from the same a method and a programme of social revolution in our time.

TWENTY-TWO

Radicalism starts from the dictum that "man is the measure of everything" (Plato) or "man is the root of mankind" (Marx) and advocates reconstruction of the world as a commonwealth and fraternity of free men, by the collective endeavour of spiritually emancipated moral men.
In the original version of the "Principles of Radical Democracy" as published in the first edition, Theses 19 and 20 ran as follows:

The ideal of Radical Democracy will be attained through the collective efforts of spiritually free men united in a political party with the determination of creating a world of freedom. The members of the party will function as the guides, friends and philosophers of the people rather than as their would-be rulers. Consistently with the goal of freedom, the political practice of the party will be rational and therefore ethical. The party will grow with the growth of the people's will to freedom, and come to power with the support of enlightened public opinion as well as intelligent action of the people. Realising that freedom is inconsistent with concentration of power, its aim will be the widest diffusion of power. Its success in attaining political power will only be a stage in that process, and by the logic of its own existence, the party will utilise political power for its further diffusion until the State becomes coterminus with the entire society.

In the last analysis, education of the citizen is the condition for such a reorganisation of society as will be conducive to common progress and prosperity without encroaching upon the freedom of individual. The Radical Democratic State will be the school for the political and civic education of the citizen. Its structure and function will enable detached individuals to come to the forefront of public affairs. Manned with such individuals, the State machinery will cease to be the instrument in the hands of any particular class to coerce others. Only spiritually free individuals in power can smash all chains of slavery and usher in freedom for all.
APPENDIX II

CONSTITUTION OF FREE INDIA - A DRAFT (1945)
by M.N. Roy

CHAPTER I
THE DECLARATION OF RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

Article 1. This Constitution is promulgated with the purpose of establishing the following rights, and enforcing the following fundamental principles of democratic freedom:

(a) The supreme sovereignty belongs to the entire people, and shall be exercised directly through the control of the executive as well as the legislative functions of the State, by elected representatives of the people.

(b) The people have the inalienable right to alter and modify the political organisation of society.

(c) The right of revolt against tyranny and oppression is sacred.

(d) Autonomous Indian Provinces, formed as far as possible on the basis of linguistic and cultural homogeneity and freely agreeing to unite in a federation, shall form the Federal Union of India.

(e) All territorial units in India, including those that remain out of the Federal Union, shall have a uniformly democratic Constitution.

(f) The State being the political organisation of society, it shall in all cases be identical with the entire people.

(g) The land as well as the underground riches are collectively property of the people.

(h) Promotion of the productivity of labour through the introduction of modern mechanical means of production, is a responsibility of the State.

(i) Basic industries and the credit system shall be subject to State control.

(j) The State shall start large-scale industries under collective ownership.
(h) Cultivators are entitled to hold land, without any disability, subject to the payment of a unitary land tax to be fixed by law.

(i) The Government shall promote large-scale co-operative agriculture through the supply of modern machinery and cheap credit.

(j) An irreducible standard of living for all labouring in fields, factories, mines, transport, offices and schools, shall be guaranteed by minimum wages fixed by law.

(k) Adequate remunerative employment or relief is a right of citizenship.

(l) Nobody shall labour for more than eight hours a day, for six days a week, and every worker shall be entitled to one month's leave with full pay every year, and women workers to three months' maternity leave with full pay.

(m) There shall be statutory provision of social security for the old, sick and incapacitated.

(n) Education for all children up to the age of fourteen shall be free, compulsory and secular.

(o) The promotion of public health and sanitation shall be a charge on public revenue.

(p) The freedom of press and speech is guaranteed to all but the enemies of the people.

(q) The right of association for the purpose of safeguarding and amelioration of economic conditions and the political status of workers, employees and peasants shall be guaranteed.

(r) All citizens of the Federal Union of India are guaranteed inviolability of the person. No person shall be placed under arrest except on order by legally constituted Court.

(s) The inviolability of the homes of citizens and privacy of correspondence are protected by law.

(t) Individual citizens will have full freedom of worship.

(u) There shall be identical rights and responsibilities of citizenship for men and women.

(v) The rights of minorities shall be protected by proportional representation through separate electorates on all elected public bodies.
CHAPTER II
THE SOURCE OF AUTHORITY

**Article 2.** All authority emanates from the people.

**Article 3.** The foundation of the State is organized democracy.

**Article 4.** The sovereign democratic power expresses itself through local People's Committees in villages, towns and cities.

**Article 5.** The People's Committees will be elected every year by all the men and women of the respective localities who have attained the age of eighteen years.

**Article 6.** The number of the members of a People's Committee will be one-fiftieth of the total number of voters in the locality.

**Article 7.** The territorial delimitation and population basis of the People's Committees will be fixed by law under this Constitution.

**Article 8.** The functions of the People's Committees are:

(a) to help and enable citizens to exercise their sovereign right, individually as well collectively;

(b) to make democratic power effective.

**Article 9.** In discharge of their sovereign democratic right, the People's Committees will perform the following functions in the respective Provincial Governments and (in the case of the Federal Provinces) in the Federal Government:

(a) Nominate candidates to seek election to the Federal Assembly and to the Provincial People's Councils.

(b) Give constant expression to the will of the people for the guidance of their representatives in the Federal Assembly and the respective Provincial People's Councils.

(c) Discuss and express opinion on proposed legislations by the Federal Assembly and the respective Provincial People's Council.
(d) Recommended the recall of the representatives of the particular constituency, either in the federal Assembly or in the respective Provincial People’s Council, on the ground that the representative has failed to act according to the mandate of his constituents.

(e) Recommended the recall of the Governor General and/or of the respective Provincial Governor.

(f) Initiate legislation by the Federal Assembly and/or respective Provincial People’s Council.

(g) Demand a referendum on any legislative or executive measure either of the federal or the respective Provincial Government.

CHAPTER III

THE FEDERAL UNION: FORM AND STRUCTURE

Article 10. This Constitution extends to the whole territory hitherto covered by the British Indian Empire and the Feudatory States within the geographical boundaries of India.

Article 11. Provinces delimited by the Provisional Government on the basis of linguistic and cultural homogeneity, and in accordance with administrative convenience, will constitute a Federal State which will be called the Federal Union of India:

Provided that no Province which desires to remain outside the Federal Union shall be a constituent unit thereof.

Article 12. Before the Federal Union of India is constituted, the Provincial People’s Councils elected in the Provinces under the provisions of this Constitution shall have the right to entertain a proposal that the Province concerned may keep out of the proposed federal Union.

If the proposal is passed by a majority of the Provincial People’s Council, it shall be submitted to a referendum of the adult population of the Province.

The referendum will be ordered and conducted by the Provincial Government set up in the Province according to the provisions of this Constitution.

The proposal must be supported by a majority of voters in the Province in order to be effective.
Article 13. Provinces which remain out of the Federal Union of India shall be governed by all the provisions of this Constitution in so far as they do not relate exclusively to the Federal structure.

Article 14. Any of the Provinces which remain out of the Federal Union may constitute themselves into another Federation.

Article 15. The Federal Union of India will conclude a treaty of co-operation and mutual assistance with the Provinces remaining outside the Union, or with their separate federation as the case may be, on matters of mutual interest including customs, currency and railway administration.

Article 16. The Federal Union of India will be a member of the larger federation known as the British Commonwealth provided that it will be called the Indo-British Commonwealth of Free Peoples.

Article 17. The condition of India's membership of the Indo-British Commonwealth will be stipulated in a treaty, provided that the membership shall be consistent with the provisions of this Constitution.

Article 18. All the component units of the Federal Union of India shall be uniformly democratic according to the principles declared in Chapter I of this Constitution.

Every component unit of the Federal Union shall also establish the Rights of Citizenship proclaimed in Chapter I of this Constitution.

Article 19. After the Federal Union of India is constituted, the constituent units of the Federation shall retain the inherent right to secede from the Union.

The proposal of secession must be submitted to a referendum by the established Government of the Province, and shall be effective if it receives the sanction of a majority of all the voters in the Province.

Article 20. Within the jurisdiction of the Federal Union of India, the Supreme People's Council will be the depository of all State power.

The Supreme People's Council will be composed of the Governor General (to be elected as hereinafter prescribed), the Council of State and the Federal Assembly.
CHAPTER IV

THE FEDERAL UNION: THE FEDERAL ASSEMBLY

Article 21. The Federal Assembly will be composed of the deputies of the people of the Federal Union.

Article 22. There shall be one deputy for every 500,000 inhabitants.

In the case of cities and towns having populations of more than 1,000,000, the proportion shall be one deputy for 250,000 inhabitants.

Such cities and towns will be enumerated at the time of fixing constituencies.

Article 23. All men and women who have attained the age of eighteen years are entitled to vote in the election of deputies to the Federal Assembly.

Article 24. Every voter is entitled to seek election to the Federal Assembly.

Article 25. The deputies to the Federal Assembly shall be elected according to the following procedure:

(a) Each group of voters under the jurisdiction of a local People's Committee will choose electors at the ratio of one elector for one hundred voters.

(b) The electors of one constituency will meet to elect the deputy or deputies to the Federal Assembly.

(c) The candidate for election may or may not be one of the electors.

(d) If an elector offers himself for election, he will be entitled to vote for himself.

(e) The People's Committees will function as the election machinery of the State. They will prepare electoral rolls. All official announcements regarding the election shall be made through the People's Committees.

(f) The Federal Government shall bear the expenses of the deputies for attending the meetings to elect deputies to the Federal Assembly.
(g) The dates fixed for election, primary as well as final, shall be public holidays. Wages for those days shall be paid in full.

More detailed electoral rules will be formed by the Provisional Government.

Article 26. The Federal Assembly will be elected every four years.

Article 27. Members of the Federal Assembly shall receive salaries.

Article 28. The Federal Assembly shall meet within three months of the election of deputies.

Not more than six months shall elapse between two sessions of the Federal Assembly.

Article 29. The Federal Assembly may be dissolved before the expiry of its normal term by the Governor-General, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister.

Article 30. The Governor-General may not order dissolution on the recommendation of the Prime Minister; but in that case, he shall refer the dispute to the People's Committees in the Federal Union, stating his reasons for not acting according to the recommendation of the Prime Minister.

Article 31. A majority verdict of the People's Committees each casting one vote, shall settle the dispute.

Article 32. The Governor-General has the right to dissolve the Federal Assembly on his own initiative provided that a majority of the People's Committees in the Union will support dissolution.

Article 33. A new Federal Assembly shall be elected within ninety days after the dissolution of the old Assembly. But the interval shall never be less than that of sixty days.

CHAPTER V

THE FEDERAL UNION & THE COUNCIL OF STATE

Article 34. The members of the Council of State will be appointed by the Provincial Governments of the federating Provinces.
Article 35. The number of members shall be equal for all Provinces.

Article 36. The members of the Council of State shall be chosen according to the following procedure:

(a) The following professional groups will nominate panels of ten names belonging to each profession: engineers, economists, scientists, medical men, jurists, historians.

The Provincial Governments will appoint two out of each panel as members of the Council of State.

(b) The Provincial Governments will further appoint two persons from among those who have made outstanding contributions to modern thought in philosophy or the social sciences.

(c) In addition, the Provincial Governments will appoint three civil servants as members of the Council of State.

Article 37. Members of the professional groups who are remuneratively connected with any commercial or industrial concern, except as salaries employees will not be eligible to membership of the Council of State.

Preference will be given to those engaged in teaching.

Article 38. The Provincial Governments shall not have power to cancel the appointment of any member of the Council of State.

Article 39. The members of the Council of State will be appointed for six years, and be eligible for reappointment.

Article 40. The Council of State will have a panel of presidents composed of one representative of each professional group.

Article 41. The Council of State will be in session simultaneously with the federal Assembly.

Article 42. The Council of State may meet when the Federal Assembly will not be in session to advise the Council of Ministers on urgent political, economic or administrative questions.

Article 43. The power of planning the development of the different branches of society (economic, health, education and culture) is vested in the Council of State.
CHAPTER VI

THE FEDERAL UNION : THE SUPREME PEOPLE'S COUNCIL

Article 44. The Council of State and the Federal Assembly will meet in joint sessions with Governor-General as the Supreme People's Council.

Article 45. The sessions of the Supreme People's Council will be convened by the Governor-General.

Article 46. As the highest organ of State authority, the Supreme People's Council will give the final sanction to all legislative as well as executive acts of Government.

CHAPTER VII

THE FEDERAL UNION : THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Article 47. The Governor-General will be elected for five years by the entire electorate of the Federal Union composed of all the men and women who have attained the age of eighteen years.

Article 48. Every citizen of the Federal Union who has attained the age of thirty years is eligible for election as the Governor-General.

Article 49. The Governor-General will preside over all the joint sessions of Council of the State and the Federal Assembly meeting as the Supreme People's Council.

Article 50. The Governor-General will sign and place his seal on all legislation after they have received the final sanction of the Supreme People's Council.

Article 51. The Governor-General will order dissolution of the Federal Assembly and election of a new Assembly, according to the provisions of this Constitution.

CHAPTER VIII

THE FEDERAL UNION : THE ORGANS OF LEGISLATIVE POWER

Article 52. The legislative power of the Federal Union is vested in the Federal Assembly.
Article 53. There shall be no division of jurisdiction.

Article 54. The Federal Assembly has the power to legislate on all matters.

Legislations enacted by the Federal Assembly and ratified by the Supreme People's Council shall be binding for the federated Provinces.

Article 55. Legislation enacted by the Federal Assembly shall be submitted for endorsement of Provincial Legislatures (Provincial People's Councils) of the federated Provinces.

Article 56. The Legislations by the Federal Assembly concerning the following subjects shall not require endorsement of the Provincial Legislatures:

- Defence
- Foreign Relations
- Foreign Trade
- Customs
- Currency
- Posts and Telegraph
- Railway Administration
- Ports and Maritime Shipping
- Air-navigation

Article 57. Provincial People's Councils of federated Provinces have the right to object to an Act of the Federal Assembly, provided that the particular legislation will not relate to any of the federal subjects enumerated in the preceding article.

The objected legislation shall be referred to the local People's Committees in the objecting Province.

A favourable verdict of the People's Committees shall overrule the objection.

If the referendum supports the objection, the dispute between the Province and the Centre shall be submitted to a Federal Referendum through the People's Committees.

Pending the Referendum, the law shall be in operation in the whole of the Federal Union.

In case of the Federal Referendum favouring the objection, the disputed legislation shall lapse.

In the contrary case, the objecting Provincial Legislature shall endorse the Act of the Federal Assembly.

Article 58. Legislations will be proposed by

(a) The Council of Ministers; and

(b) Non-official members of the Federal Assembly;
Provided that legislation relating to or involving taxation or the expenditure of Federal revenues shall be initiated only by the Council of Ministers.

Article 59. All proposed legislations shall be first submitted for the consideration of the Council of State.

Disapproval of the Council of State shall not prevent the Council of Ministers from introducing any Bill in the Federal Assembly.

But in that case, the view of the Council of State will be stated by one of its members to the session of the Federal Assembly.

Article 60. Disapproval of the Council of State will be no bar for the Federal Assembly to enact a legislation.

Article 61. No legislation enacted by the Federal Assembly shall be signed by the Governor-General and put into operation unless it is ratified by the Supreme People’s Council.

Article 62. The Supreme People’s Council will have the right to veto any Provincial legislation in the Federal Union on the ground that it is repugnant to the Federal Constitution or contradicts any particular Federal law.

Either on the advice of the Council of Ministers or on his own initiative, the Governor-General will recommend the vetoing of a Provincial legislation.

The Provincial Government concerned will have the right to appeal to the Supreme Federal Court against the veto.

Article 63. In case of conflict between a Federal law and a Provincial law, the former shall prevail.

CHAPTER IX

THE FEDERAL UNION : THE ORGANS OF EXECUTIVE POWER

Article 64. The Governor-General is the chief executive of the Federal Union of India.

Article 65. The Government of the Federal Union will be carried on by a Council of Ministers.
Article 66. The Council of Ministers shall in all matters be responsible to the Supreme People's Council.

Article 67. The Governor-General will charge some members of the Federal Assembly to form the Government. The member so charged will select from other members of the Federal Assembly his colleagues to compose the Council of Ministers. He will be called the Prime Minister.

Article 68. The Council of Ministers will remain in office so long as it will enjoy the confidence of the Supreme People's Council.

Article 69. Either Chamber of the Supreme People's Council may pass a vote of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers. But the Government shall not resign unless the vote of no-confidence is endorsed by the Supreme People's Council.

Article 70. The responsibility of the Council of Ministers is collective.

Article 71. No member of the Council of State shall be a member of the Council of Ministers.

Article 72. The different departments of the Government will be under the vigilance of Standing Committees of the Supreme People's Council.

Each Standing Committee will be composed of 11 members of the Federal Assembly and 8 members of the Council of State, in the latter case, one representing each professional group.

Each Standing Committee will elect a Secretary who shall be chosen from the members belonging to the Council of State.

The Secretary will be the Convenor of the Standing Committee.

The Standing-Committees will be presided over by the Minister in charge of the respective Department of the Government.

Article 73. Federal laws shall be carried into execution by the Provincial Government in the Federal Union, under the directions of the Federal Executive, unless the latter provides otherwise.
CHAPTER X
THE PROVINCES

Article 74. All the Provinces, federated or otherwise, are fully autonomous, provided that they shall be uniformly democratic according to the provisions of this Constitution.

Article 75. In the case of Provinces forming the Federal Union of India, the unrestricted nature of their autonomy expresses itself in the unreserved right of secession.

Article 76. The highest authority in the Province is the Provincial People’s Council composed of the Governor and Deputies of the People.

Article 77. There shall be no division of power. Both the legislative and executive powers shall be vested in the Provincial People’s Councils.

Article 78. Each province will have a Governor, who will be the chief executive of the Province.

Article 79. The Governor of the Province will be elected by all the men and women inhabitants, who have attained the age of eighteen years.

Article 80. The Governor will hold office for five years. Every citizen of the Province who has attained the age of thirty years is eligible for election as Governor.

Article 81. The Deputies to the Provincial People’s Council will be elected directly by the men and women inhabitants of the Province who have attained the age of eighteen years.

Article 82. The ratio between the number of Deputies and the population of the province will be one to 100,000. In towns and cities with populations over 25,000 the ratio will be one to 50,000.

Article 83. The Deputies to the Provincial People’s Council shall be elected according to the following procedure:

(a) The People’s Committees will function as the election machinery of the Province. They will prepare electoral roll. All official announcements shall be made through the People’s Committees.

(b) Every voter is entitled to seek election to the Provincial People’s Council from any constituency.
(c) The dates fixed for election shall be public holidays. Wages for these days shall be paid in full.

**Article 84.** The Deputies of the Provincial People's Council will be elected every four years.

**Article 85.** The Deputies of the Provincial People's Council shall receive salaries.

**Article 86.** The Provincial People's Council shall meet within three months of the election of Deputies.

No more than six months shall intervene between two sessions of the Council.

**Article 87.** The Provincial People's Council has the right to legislate on all subjects except (in the case of federated Provinces, those reserved for the Federal Assembly.

**Article 88.** Provincial law shall be according to the spirit and letter of this Constitution.

**Article 89.** The right of proposing legislation belongs to:

(a) The Governor;
(b) Provincial Council of Ministers; and
(c) Other members of the Provincial People's Council.

Provided that legislation involving taxation or the expenditure of Government revenues can be initiated only by the Provincial Council of Ministers.

**Article 90.** Local People's Committees representing one-third of the total number of voters in the Province will have the right to demand that an Act of the Provincial Legislature be referred to the citizens.

In that case, the Governor shall submit the particular legislation to a general Referendum.

The result of the Referendum shall be decisive.

Pending the Referendum, the disputed law shall not be put into force.

**Article 91.** The Governor shall sign and promulgate all laws made by the Provincial People's Council.

**Article 92.** A Provincial Council of Ministers will be formed by a member of the Provincial People's Council, who will be charged to do so by the Governor.
Article 93. All the members of the Provincial Council of Ministers shall be sitting members of the Provincial People's Council.

Article 94. The Council of Ministers shall be responsible to the Provincial People's Council.

The responsibility is collective.

Article 95. The Council of Ministers shall resign on the Provincial People's Council passing a vote of no-confidence by a seventy per cent majority.

Article 96. On a vote of no-confidence being carried by a smaller majority, the Governor may or may not accept the resignation of the Council of Ministers.

Article 97. The Governor may dissolve the Provincial People's Council before the expiry of its normal term.

(a) if no Council of Ministers can command a majority; and
(b) on the demand of local People's Committees representing a majority of the Provincial electorate.

Article 98. The Provincial People's Council will elect Standing Committees to keep vigilance on the functioning of the various departments of the Provincial Government.

Each Standing Committee will be composed of fifteen members of the Provincial People's Council.

Each Standing Committee will elect a President from among its members.

The Minister in charge of the respective department shall attend meetings of the Standing Committees whenever required and supply all necessary information.

Article 99. All proposed legislations shall be placed by the Council of Ministers before the respective Standing Committees for their consideration and recommendation.

Article 100. People's Committees in a particular electoral district of the Provincial People's Council representing 25 per cent of the total number of voters have the right to demand the recall of the deputy from that constituency.

The Governor shall submit the demand to Referendum of the entire electorate of the constituency.
The Deputy shall resign if the demand for his recall is supported by a simple majority of the electorate.

The vacant seat in the Provincial People's Council shall be filled up within sixty days.

If the demand for recall fails to secure a majority, no second demand for recall shall be entertained against the same deputy for a period of 12 months.

Article 101. Forty per cent of the members of the Provincial People's Council have the right to demand the recall of the Governor.

The Governor shall submit the demand to a general referendum.

The Governor shall resign if the demand for his recall is supported by a simple majority of the Provincial electorate.

On the demand for recall failing to secure a majority another demand for recall cannot be entertained within a period of twelve months.

Article 102. Within the Federal Union of India, any dispute between two or more federated Provinces, falling outside the jurisdiction of the Supreme Federal Court, will be referred to the Supreme People's Council of the Federal Union, whose verdict shall be binding for all parties concerned.

CHAPTER XV

THE ECONOMIC ORGANISATION OF SOCIETY

Article 103. This Constitution is promulgated with the object of reorganising the economic life of the country, so as to guarantee to every citizen all the material requirements for a civilised existence, and also adequate leisure for cultivating the finer aspects of life.

Article 104. Economically the Federal Union of India and every non-federated Province is a Co-operative Commonwealth.

Article 105. Goods will be produced primarily for satisfying the requirements of the people.
**Article 106.** The entire production, agricultural as well as industrial, shall be planned with that purpose.

**Article 107.** To plan production and regulate distribution are functions of the State.

**Article 108.** There shall be a Statutory Planning Authority in the Federal Union of India, and in the non-federated Provinces.

**Article 109.** The Planning Authority will be constituted by the Provincial People's Council in the Federal Union.

The Planning Authority will be composed of experts and representatives of State enterprises, industrial and agricultural.

The State Bank will be represented on the Planning Authority.

Persons concerned with private industrial enterprises, except as salaried employees, shall not be eligible to appointment on the Planning Authority.

**Article 110.** The Planning Authority in Federal Union will be directly subordinated to the Council of State and function under its advice and general supervision.

**Article 111.** The federal and Provincial Governments are entitled to raise loans to finance the economic development.

**Article 112.** The Federal and Provincial Governments are entitled to make budgetary provisions for extending credit to industrial and collective agricultural enterprises.

**Article 113.** Industrial and agricultural enterprises financed by the State shall be collective property of the people.

The net income from these enterprises shall be treated as public revenue, and as such included in the budget.

**Article 114.** The State Bank will control the entire credit system of the State.

**Article 115.** The ownership of land, underground riches and railways is hereby transferred to the people.

**Article 116.** The Federal Government or, in the case of a non-federated Province, the Provincial Government, shall
complete the transaction within one year by paying fair compensation to the previous private owners, whether individual or corporate.

The compensation shall be estimated at seven times the net average yearly income.

The compensation shall be paid in three per cent self-redeeming bonus of the State Bank, payable for forty years.

Where, however, the private ownership was vested in religious or charitable institutions, the compensation shall correspond to the net average income received hitherto.

Compensation bonds are not negotiable. They shall be deposited with the State Bank and serve as covering for its credit and/or the currency notes issued by it.

Article 117. The freedom of enterprise, individual as well as corporate, is guaranteed subject to the principle that the purpose of production is to satisfy the requirements of the people.

Article 118. In planning the economic life of society with the aforesaid object, the State has the right to fix the maximum and minimum return on private investment, the prices of goods produced or exchanged, the remuneration and working conditions of wage-earners and salaried employees, and to take over private enterprises under State ownership by paying fair compensation to the owners thereof.

CHAPTER XII

THE JUDICIARY

Article 119. The highest judicial authority in the Federal Union of India shall be the Supreme Federal Court.

The Supreme Federal Court will consist of the Chief Justice of India and four or more federal judges.

Article 120. The Chief Justice of India will be appointed by the Governor-General. The other federal judges will be appointed by the Governor-General in consultation with the Chief Justice.
Article 121. The Chief Justice of India and the federal judges shall serve till they attain the age of sixty-five, unless they resign earlier.

They cannot be dismissed except with the previous sanction of the Supreme People’s Council.

Article 122. The original jurisdiction of the Supreme Federal Court shall consist of:

(a) Disputes between the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments of the federated provinces, or between the latter *inter se*, concerning their legal or constitutional rights.

(b) References made by the Federal Government or the Provincial Government of a federated Province regarding the interpretation of the Constitution.

Article 123. The Supreme Federal Court shall hear appeals from the decisions of the Provincial High Courts of federated Provinces in civil and criminal cases, provided the cases involve legal questions of special or general interest.

The Supreme Federal Court will make rules defining the condition for the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction.

Article 124. There shall be Provincial High Courts in all Indian Provinces.

There shall be highest judicial authority in non-federated Provinces.

Article 125. The Provincial High Court shall consist of a Chief Justice and six or more judges.

The Chief Justice and judges shall be appointed by the Provincial Governor.

Article 126. The Chief Justice and judges of the Provincial High Court will serve till they attain the age of sixty-five unless they resign earlier.

They cannot be dismissed except with the previous sanction of the Provincial People’s Council.
CHAPTER XIII
LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

Article 127. In addition to all the rights and responsibilities specified in this Constitution, the local People's Committees will also perform the functions of local self-government in their respective jurisdictions.

Article 128. The functions of local self-government are:
(a) Sanitation and public health;
(b) Education primary and secondary (up to matriculation);
(c) Building and maintaining roads and public parks;
(d) Promotion of the organisation of producers' and consumer's co-operative societies;
(e) Maintenance of public order (local police administration);
(f) Administration of law in cases of petty crime.

Article 129. The organs of local self-government will perform these functions on behalf of the Provincial Government and/or on its own initiative.

Article 130. As organs of local self-government the People's Committees will have the right to collect taxes subject to the approval of the Provincial Government.

Article 131. There will be sub-divisional and district People's Committees to perform the function of local self-government.

Article 132. The sub-divisional People's Committee will be composed of delegates from each local People's Committee in the sub-division.

Article 133. The sub-divisional officer will be the Chairman of the sub-divisional People's Committee which, in addition to its function of local self-government, will advise and help him in the discharge of all his duties.

Article 134. The district People's Committee will be composed of five delegates from each sub-divisional People's Committee.
Article 135. The District Officer will be the Chairman of the District People's Committee which, in addition to the function of local self-government, will advise and help him in the discharge of all his duties.

Article 136. The sub-divisional and district People's Committees will be organs of local self-government.

They shall not supersede the sovereign status of the local People's Committees, which are the primary organs of democratic authority and power.

Article 137. The sovereign right of controlling the entire State machinery, according to the provisions of this Constitution, is vested exclusively in the local People's Committees.
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