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Satyagrahi Samajwad relates itself to Gandhian and socialist thought in India. Acharya Javdekar hoped that Satyagrahi Samajwad can be realised in India with the help of socialist and Gandhian workers. In his practo-political framework, Acharya Javdekar thinks of Gandhian workers as pure (Shuddha) Satyagrahis and the socialists as weak (Shabal) Satyagrahi workers. Javdekar attributes the task of nation building to these two forces. Therefore it becomes necessary to understand and analyse the exact relationship between Satyagrahi Samajwad and Gandhian and socialist ideologies. The present chapter attempts to undertake this task. It compares the argument of Satyagrahi Samajwad with that of later Gandhian thinkers and socialists in India.

The two ideologies represent two very important ideological formulations towards emancipation. Later Gandhian thinkers like Vinoba Bhave attempted to develop the Gandhian thought. Socialists in India on the other hand tried to combine the insights of Gandhi and Marx. In this sense socialists engaged themselves in a similar task to that of Satyagrahi Samajwad. The comparison of the two can help in understanding similarities and differences between Satyagrahi Samajwad and the socialist theorization in India. It would also help in identification of Satyagrahi Samajwad
with the socialist thought in India. Javdekar develops Satyagrah Samajwad on the lines of Gandhian thought. He treats Satyagraha as a central concept of his ideological formulation. In this sense Satyagrah Samajwad is integrally related to the Gandhian thought. Therefore it is essential to look at the relationship between Satyagrah Samajwad and the thought of later Gandhian thinkers. The present chapter therefore on the one hand attempts to compare Satyagrah Samajwad with Gandhian thought and on the other with that of the socialists. The two-fold comparison would help in locating Satyagrah Samajwad within the context of emancipatory thought that developed in India in contemporary times.

The communist variety of thought emerged as yet another important emancipatory formulation in India. However, Satyagrah Samajwad is not compared with the communist thought. It is mainly because Acharya Javdekar did not treat communist thought as supportive to Satyagrah Samajwad. He opposed the orthodox communism followed by Russian as well as Indian communists. Indian communists never recognised Gandhian contribution towards development of emancipatory thought in India. Gandhian thought was seen as a bourgeois political thought. Communist groups were in general critical of the Indian freedom movement. They criticised Gandhi's political thought on several grounds. Gandhian motion of trusteeship; the use of philosophy of Varnashramdharma and complete negation of industrialism were not accepted within the communist framework of thought. Gandhian acceptance of
principle of nonviolence was seen as inadequate by the communists. Satyagrahi Samajwad therefore does not treat the Indian version of communism as supportive to its own argument. Acharya Javdekar basically objected to the use of violent means by the communists. He was also against the understanding of reality only in terms of class war. He advocated establishment of a strong socialist party to combat the danger of communism in India. In sum; Satyagrahi Samajwad does not share a positive relationship with the communist politics in India. It is both interesting and essential to analyse the reason for it. However, the task is left for the concluding chapter of this dissertation. At the moment the point is made with a specific purpose. The present chapter attempts to relate Satyagrahi Samajwad with other emancipatory theoretical formulation in India. However, it does not include the communist thought in it. It is because of the fact that Satyagrahi Samajwad does not share positive relationship with the communist thought in India at both theoretical as well as practico-political level. At the theoretical level objections are raised against the use of relative standards of morality; negation to spirituality and the sanction to violence. At the practico-political level the disapproval takes shape out of denial of nationalist agenda and Gandhian politics. Therefore, the communist ideological strands in India remain outside the context of Satyagrahi Samajwad. The present chapter relates Satyagrahi Samajwad to Gandhian and socialist thinking in India.

The comparison is essential and important for many reasons. It helps in defining the distinctive nature of Satyagrahi
Acharya Javdekar attempts to combine insights of Gandhi and Marx in Satyagrahi Samajwad. For him even Gandhi approved of the socialist ideal. However, later Gandhians were critical of Marx. They attempted to realise the ideal society using the Gandhian principle of 'change of heart'. It is important to relate Satyagrahi Samajwad to such currents of thought, as it consistently attempted to show the insufficiency of mere moral change. Socialists on the other hand combined Gandhi and Marx; but at a different level from Satyagrahi Samajwad. Socialists mainly emphasised a strategic use of Satyagraha while Satyagrahi Samajwad viewed it as a complete philosophy and life guiding principle. It is also interesting to note that Acharya Javdekar recognised Praja Socialist Party as the leader of Satyagrahi socialist revolution in India. He advised the Gandhians to rally behind the socialist political forces. However, the later socialist thinking in India did not recognise Satyagrahi Samajwad as important contribution to the socialist thinking. In fact it was completely neglected by the socialist forces. It is also important to understand the reasons for the neglect. The comparison of Satyagrahi Samajwad with other socialist formulations opens up a possibility of understanding the complex relationship between the two. The comparison would also be helpful in deciding status of Satyagrahi Samajwad as emancipatory ideology. It would provide some important clues for critical assessment of the ideology. The dissertation finally aims to look the theoretical and political possibilities in Satyagrahi Samajwad; to lead Indian society towards emancipation. These possibilities may be
identified through its comparison with the other related emancipatory theorisations in India.

**The Gandhian Formulation**

We may begin the exercise by comparing Satyagrahi Samajwad with Gandhian thought developed by the later Gandhian workers in India. The basic theoretical as well as political contribution in this respect comes from Acharya Vinoba Bhave (1895-1982). Gandhian circles recognised him as the most important inheritor of Gandhian legacy. Vinoba Bhave interpreted Gita to develop Gandhian thought on the spiritual lines. Bhoodan movement initiated by him; was seen as a novel Satyagrahi experiment during the post-independence period. Acharya Javdekar himself regarded Bhoodan movement as a revolutionary measure to end economic injustice with the help of nonviolent means. Acharya Vinoba Bhave also formulated the theoretical statement of Gandhian political thought in a book titled 'Swarajya-Shastra'. Satyagrahi Samajwad can be compared with the tenets of this book to understand its relationship with the later Gandhian thinking.

Along with Vinoba Bhave; many other Gandhian workers attempted to develop Gandhian thought. However, no rigorous theoretical formulation can be identified in their thought. These Gandhian workers mainly utilized the Gandhian framework at personal level. They mainly advocated a moral change at the individual level to end all sorts of conflicts and contradictions.
Unconditional acceptance of nonviolence remained the ideal for individual according to them. Such acceptance is a part of the vows or duties of individual. The framework mainly remains moral-spiritual and restricts itself to personal level. However, scattered expressions of political thinking in many of the Gandhian workers can be utilized to develop an argument about the later Gandhian thinking. Important Gandhian workers which may be referred to for such a formulation will include Acharya Dada Dharmadhikari (1899-1990); Kishorilal Mashruwala (1890-1952); Acharya Kaka Kalelkar (1885-1981); J.C. Kumarappaa (1892-1960) among others. The views of Acharya S.J. Bhagwat (1903-1973) and Shankarrao Deo (1895-1974) may also be referred to because they worked along with Acharya Javdekar. Acharya Bhagwat was a close associate of Acharya Javdekar and Shankarrao Deo was a prominent Gandhian leader in the politics in Maharashtra. J.C. Kumarappaa mainly developed Gandhian Economics. He emphasized complete decentralization of the economic system. Therefore it is essential to take note of his ideas. Kishorilal Mashruwala wrote a very important book titled 'Gandhi and Marx' in 1950. The book attempts a comparison of Gandhian and Marxian thought systems. Vinoba wrote the introduction to this book, which also proves to be very important. In the introduction to Mashruwala's book Vinoba expresses his own views about the relationship between Gandhi and Marx. Mashruwala's book in one sense formulates the 'official' statement of Gandhians on the relationship between Gandhi and Marx. It is important to note that Acharya Javdekar
wrote a series of articles in Navbharat; where he critically reviewed the book by Mashruwala. It is necessary to take a note of Mashruwala's writings while looking at the relations between Satyagrahi Samajwad and Gandhian thinking. The survey of Gandhian tradition of thought; developed by later Gandhians takes place in this framework. The attempt is to understand their theoretical and political argument. It will be further related to Satyagrahi Samajwad to understand the specific nature of the ideology.

Gandhi and Marx

Mashruwala's book views Marxian ideology as inadequate and therefore unacceptable. In its preface Vinoba takes a clear position against the ideology of Marxism. According to Vinoba, the two ideologies of Gandhism and Marxism are completely opposite to each other. These two ideologies are irreconcilable, differences between them are fundamental according to Vinoba. In fact communism is devoid of any philosophical content. Only its votaries have erected grand philosophical edifice around it. Mashruwala's entire book echoes the same argument of essential opposition between Gandhi and Marx.

The main point of difference between Gandhism and Marxism is centrality of violence in Marx and that of nonviolence in Gandhi. Therefore Vinoba is completely against the formulation stating 'Gandhism is communism minus violence.' According to Vinoba the difference between violence and nonviolence should not be understood at the strategic level. The position regarding
violence changes the complete nature of any political ideology. The theoretical basis as well as socio-political, economic thought is influenced by the position of an ideology regarding violence. Communism is rejected by both Vinoba and Mashruwala on this ground.

Communism is regarded by Vinoba as the ideology of attachment or Aasakti. It is a result of its sheer materialistic position. Materialist position leads to universalisation of conflict. Communism treats conflict as the essence of life according to Vinoba. The centrality of conflict neglects basic philosophical premises about human existence. According to Vinoba Communism denies the existence of Atma which is beyond both mind and matter. Atma or the spirit becomes the basis of human existence. However, communism denies the existence of spirit. Therefore communism does not have any place for spiritual qualities or virtues. Communism is a soul-less ideology and a soulless ideology has no place for the freedom of the individual according to Vinoba. The Gandhian ideology which aims at positive individual freedom cannot fit itself in the framework of this extreme doctrine.

Mashruwala expands Vinoba's argument by emphasizing the important position of Atma in Gandhian framework of thought. According to him "Ethics by itself may not require a spiritual basis to justify it. But it is the Spirit; Atma or God which keeps a person on the right line at a critical moment." To the most earnest seeker the faith in Atma is a conviction and a
conclusion based on introspection, observation and thinking as any other truth of science, according to Mashruwala. Gandhian thought recognises the important role played by spirit in changing human life and therefore treats moral change as the final goal. According to Mashruwala if a choice has to be made between the moral and the economic-political goal; the former must be regarded as more important one. Communist ideology does not recognise the existence and importance of Atma. It is based on materialistic assumptions. Therefore it can be combined with Gandhism according to Mashruwala.

Marxist materialist position leads to determinism according to Vinoba. He treats Marxism as a deterministic ideology. According to Vinoba 'The (communist) thinkers have arrived at a conclusion, that just as an arrow, that has been shot, will not deflect from its path, but must take determinable course, so also it is with mankind. Its past history decided once for all its future course. There is no longer any freedom of action left for us.'

Mashruwala's entire book utilises the same understanding of Marxism stated by Vinoba in the introduction to the book. According to both Vinoba and Mashruwala materialistic; deterministic position leads to acceptance of relative morality. It becomes one of the fundamental limitations of Marxism. Materialist position is completely negative to morality according to Vinoba. It glorifies conflict and violence. Marxism divides the society permanently into two social groups. In this sense
It is a limited and partial ideology according to Vinoba. He treats the communist ideology as on par with communal ideologies because they think in terms of division of society into oppositional groups. Vinoba's framework treats the term 'conflict', itself as immoral. According to him the ideology of social change must be based on co-operation and co-existence and not on conflict.

Other Gandhian thinkers echo, the same thoughts in their writings on the philosophy of Sarvodaya. Dada Dharmadhikari stated that 'real' thought is objective and all encompassing. He developed notion of 'the thought' as having independent and objective existence. He perceive it as a pure, sacred thing, beyond partial; subjective thinking of an ideology. The real thought guarantees freedom to everybody. It leads human race towards co-operation and not conflict. Only the human race possesses the capacities to develop the objective thought. Therefore the ideologies of social change must be based on the concept of impartial, objective thought according to Dada Dharmadhikari. Conflict implies subjective and partial thinking.

Vinoba also clearly states that the real failure of Marxism lies in its understanding of the human society as embedded in a continuous conflict. The notion of conflict is a result of its materialist position according to Vinoba. Gandhism on the other hand emphasizes love and cooperation among all human beings. Marxism includes no possibility for love and co-existence, therefore the two ideologies can not be combined according to Vinoba.
Marxism is doomed as inadequate; unacceptable ideology completely irreconciliable with Gandhism; by the later Gandhians. Vinoba does accept the contribution of Marxism in highlighting social injustice and establishing egalitarian ideal. However, with its emphasis on material questions and their solutions through class conflict Marxism is seen as inadequate. Later Gandhians attempt to provide a more permanent solution by initiating moral change. Vinoba's political programme; as depicted in Swarajya-Shastra relies on change of heart as the only permanent method of social change.

Swarajya Shastra

Swarajya Shastra; a small booklet originally published in 1942 discussed Vinoba's ideas regarding the ideal political system. The book defines Swarajya or self-government as the government of each by each i.e. it is such a government that it will seem to each to be his own rule; or government by all or Ramrajya. Vinoba emphasises that Swarajya is a term that appears in Vedic language. The book discusses the nature of swarajya as well as the political programme to achieve it. It begins the argument by defining the 'political.'

The problem of politics is defined by Vinoba as the problem of inflicting order on human beings. Since man does not exist as single individual but only in a group, besides material problem of subduing nature and sustaining life, he is faced also with the social problem of establishing orderly relationship with
the fellows. This problem gives rise to the science of political organisation according to Vinoba. Political organisation covers distribution of material wealth as well as social values. The problems of economic and social system together constitute the essence of politics. Natural differences among human beings; of intellectual and physical capacities; are recognized by Vinoba as the only relevant basis of political organisation. The other differences and divisions based on them are artificial. Therefore main function of the political system is to control relations among individuals and not among groups. In other words politics has to systematize the relations among individuals and not groups. The concept of state is to be based on these assumptions about social conditions. Natural capacities of the individuals may vary in every society. Therefore there cannot be any universal political theory applicable to all societies at all times. Political system must be based on needs and demands of the people.

According to Vinoba it is impossible to imagine a perfect or ideal political system. Rather he implies that no system can be perfect. Rule by all is treated as the best form of government. However, Vinoba is aware of the fact that it exists nowhere at present. The governments ruling on behalf of all members of society are actually rules by few or a tyranny by majority. Therefore Vinoba criticises all existing forms of political arrangements. Vinoba does not insist on the outward
form of the government. The government may get any form but essentially it must be oriented towards and accepted by the people. These criteria may change from time to time. Therefore it is impossible to talk about the ideal form of government. According to Vinoba people are not wedded to theories or forms of government. They are concerned only with life. Therefore the government may overtly take any form but its essence should be just.

The essential features of a just government are described by Vinoba in Swarajya-Shastra. In an ideal state powerful persons must use their power for the welfare of the weak. Members of the ideal state must be independent regarding fulfilment of their demands. Yet they must be co-operative with other societies. Sincere labour making optimum use of one's capacities should be valued equally by the society in both economic and social respects. In other words social status of individual should not be related to his/her wealth.

The institution of private property becomes influential in capitalist economic system. Capitalism is based on industrialism and the principle of centralisation emerging out of it. The ideal political system will not only negate capitalism, but will negate industrialism also. It would be a system comprising of completely decentralized and self-sufficient villages. Vinoba does not explicitly reject the existence of nation state but states that the central government will play a nominal role in the ideal political system.
government will be minimum. The nature of state depends on the nature of individuals who run it. Therefore it is necessary to control the work of state through Satyagraha. Satyagraha protects the rights of masses to control the work of state. Satyagraha will extend genuine co-operation to state; but it will also possess the potentials of opposition to state. It is necessary according to Vinoba to educate people in regard to non-cooperation and resistance for effective use of satyagraha. The right of non co-operation must have a permanent place in social life of the ideal political system. Satyagraha implies a nonviolent control of the activities of state. Nonviolence will be the central principle of political organisation in ideal political system. Vinoba even maintains the existence of a nonviolent nation state among all other nations believing in violence. The nonviolent nation will be protected by its belief in universal sympathy which is the essence of Satyagraha.

Understanding of Satyagraha

Vinoba's understanding of Satyagraha is related to the notion of universal love. Vinoba does not treat Satyagraha as nonviolent resistance; but nonviolent assistance in right thinking. Concept of Satyagraha is based on consensus and co-existence according to Vinoba. It does not possess any element of enmity. Therefore Satyagrahi revolution basically relies on change of heart.

Vinoba accepts the need to solve material problems;
basically of equal distribution of social wealth. However, the
solution must be moral-spiritual in nature. Vinoba insists on
redefining the notion of 'wealth' to express the value of physical
labour to be equally important with money power. A moral-
spiritual revolution is necessary to alter the meaning of wealth.
It applies to every aspect of social reality. According to
Gandhians only moral revolution can permanently change social
reality. Satyagraha has to work out moral revolution. Vinoba
talks about a 'triangular revolution', where he emphasises three
important aspects of moral revolution—change in material reality;
change in opinions and change of heart. Among these change
of heart can cause permanent change. Therefore, it is essential
to change the material conditions. Change of heart becomes the
only permissible technique within nonviolent framework. While
discussing the role of law in social change Vinoba states that
laws cannot initiate permanent change. Therefore, the rule of
law has a very limited significance in the entire nonviolent
framework. Satyagraha; by changing opinions and attitudes of
people must work for a lasting change in social realities. It
can provide the essential moral basis to any attempted
revolution.

Material revolution devoid of any moral vision; would
emphasise on the elements of conflict. The concept of class war
is a case in point according to Vinoba. Class divisions are
artificial. They can be permanently abolished only by changing
prevalent notions of wealth. 'Bhoodan' attempts to alter the
understanding of wealth by appealing to the landholders. It
assumes consensus and co-existence. Satyagraha must be based on consensus and not conflict. Vinoba believed that the movement of Bhoodan can initiate permanent change in ownership pattern because it has moral basis.\(^2\)

The fight against institution of state must also have moral basis. Throughout human history state has proved to be insufficient for human progress according to Vinoba.\(^2\) Real development of individual and society can take place only with abolition of state. However, abolition of state is itself not a sufficient condition for human progress. Rule of state must be replaced by rule of morality. Rule of morality is based on strict observance of nonviolence. Vinoba's nonviolent politics attributes minimum and nominal role to the state in social organisation. It can be realised with the help of Satyagraha. People must control the state by nonviolent Satyagrahi means. The external form of such control may vary but the substance would remain the same.\(^3\) Vinoba agrees that nonviolent politics needs training. It is an ongoing process where the individual continuously has to prepare himself to resist violence.\(^2\) According to Vinoba 'A life of non-violence means not only occasional sacrifice but perpetual sacrifice, and not merely sacrifice but joy in sacrifice.'\(^3\) Clearly such a system would be very hard to realize. Vinoba agrees that completely nonviolent social order cannot be established. However, he imagines of such social order where human being's lower or violent nature would be controlled by his higher nature.\(^3\)
An enduring nonviolent social order can be created through observance of noble vows according to the Gandhians. It emphasises the technique of change of heart to realise social change. Vinoba's Bhoodan movement also relied on the same technique to alter the pattern of social ownership of land. Although while talking about triangle of revolution', Vinoba emphasized the need to change material realities; he disapproves of the role of law in realising social change. Bhoodan celebrates the same notion and emphasises the technique of change of heart. The other Gandhian workers also emphasise on the same aspect when they talk about the way to bring about social change.

According to Dada Dharmadhikari social economic and political problems are basically spiritual in nature. Therefore they must be solved with the help of moral-spiritual means. It requires the change in values. Such a change can only alter the 'content' of human relations. Material revolution can at the most change the 'context' of human relations. Gandhi's Ahimsa helps in changing the content because it is based on consensus, and attempts to change the values. According to Vinoba political problem is about relations among individuals and not among groups. Social groups are based on artificial divisions according to him. Therefore political problem has to be tackled at the individual level. Moral revolution therefore aims at individual change of heart. Kaka Kalelkar states that we have to overcome
political, economic, social differences with the help of spiritual Samayyoga. For Dada Dharmadhikari practice of 'vows' at the personal level becomes the solution for political problems. Kaka Kalelkar emphasises role of public education for spreading the Satyagrahi values. These strategies of moral revolution essentially prove to be individualistic in nature. Change in social norms; change of heart; observance of vows, spread of values through public education - these are the only practico-political suggestions put forward by the later Gandhian thought to realise social change. That becomes a major limitation of their political thought. We have to see whether Satyagrahi Samajwad was able to overcome these limitations. However, before comparing Satyagrahi Samajwad with the thought of later Gandhians we have to take note of two other important aspects of Gandhism; developed by later Gandhians. They include Gandhian critique of industrialism and their understanding of tradition. These may be taken as the main aspects of economic and social thought of later Gandhians. The social-economic and political aspects of later Gandhian thought will be collectively compared with those of Satyagrahi Samajwad.

Gandhian Critique of Industrialism

The ideal of nonviolent social order in Gandhian framework extends to the economic sphere through its critique of industrialism and imagination of a society comprising of self-sufficient villages. Both Vinoba and Mashruwala mention decentralisation as an essential principle of Gandhian framework,
along with the principle of trusteeship and Varna system. Therefore, according to Vinoba economic ideal of society must be that of self-sufficient yet co-operative 'Gramrajyas.' The system of cooperation in Gramrajyas must not be complicated but simple. 'All those needs which we call primary requirements of life as well as most of what we call secondary requirements should be met by the people of a village from the village itself', according to Vinoba. The system of production would be based on small scale industries. Interdependence or co-operation among villages will remain at the level of exchange of goods created by these industries. Small scale industries would use simple technology and instruments of production. Use of complicated machinery increases dependence on technology. As a result of that villages may lose their self-sufficient character. Vinoba's notion of simple interdependence, not only denies complicated technology; but any kind of complex or hierarchical social system also. Vinoba implies to negate industrialism through the notion of simple interdependence.

The nonviolent economic ideal cannot be realised through achievement of socialist ideal according to Vinoba. Socialism denies the capitalist economic system. However both capitalism and socialism ultimately belong to the same category; because they use the framework of industrialism. Industrialism necessarily involves violence in it. While commenting on the relationship between Gandhi and Marx. Vinoba clearly states that socialism will not be able to solve capitalist problem because it remains within the industrial framework. Mashruwala also denies socia-
Kumarappa's Argument

Yet another noted Gandhian scholar J.C. Kumarappa developed a rigorous critique of industrialism in one of his important books titled as 'Economy of permanence.' It is a quest for a social order based on non-violence. Kumarappa denies capitalist economic system because it is productive of violence. He categorises capitalist system as predatory economy in which there is complete absence of altruistic values. Capitalist economy emphasises merely on rights and negates duties. The main characteristic of such a system, according to Kumarappa is profit without contribution.

The nonviolent social order on the other hand would be based on economy of service. It would be based on love and deep desire to serve without reward. Kumarappa emphasised the need for complete decentralisation of economic system; proper use of the natural resources and the use of simple technology. In his argument about economy of permanence Kumarappa mentions two important aspects of Gandhian critique of capitalism as well as industrialism. He emphasises proper use of the natural resources available for human society. Nonviolent social order would not exploit the nature for its own benefits. The members of such a society would live in accordance with nature. Industrial economy makes extravagant use of the natural resources. Besides, these resources are utilized for the benefits of very few persons who are rich. Valuation of any
product is related to money. Kumarappa completely rejected it. Capitalist economy is based on exploitation of human as well as natural resources according to him.

Secondly Kumarappa also emphasises the fact that capitalist economy doesn't leave any scope for expression of one's personality. Economy of permanence deals with the problem of 'alienation' in its own manner. According to Kumarappa human beings get distinguished from animals because they possess free will. Expression of one's free will therefore becomes a basic motive of human life. Industrial economy denies the chance to individuals. It creates standardization and negates variety. According to Kumarappa daily life of the people should be so regulated as to enable them to express their personality. It is possible through creative use of labour power by everybody. Physical labour becomes essential factor of a fruitful life. It opens up one's personality. It helps in realising a meaningful life. Kumarappa analyses several factors of work as routine and rest and progress and pleasure. For him all these constituents should remain together to realise meaningful life for individual. It would help in deriving pleasure from work and conclude the search for expression of one's personality. Kumarappa emphasises the dignity of labour which becomes a very important part of Gandhian economic and political thought. The framework of industrialism is denied because it negates essential dignity of labour and therefore of person.
While discussing the instances of nonviolent social order, Kumarappa mentions the life of Brahmins; under ancient Varnashramdharma as the only sacred life of propertyless people based on altruistic motives. The later Gandhian thinkers in general share the same belief. If decentralisation is the basic economic principle in Gandhism; belief in Varnashramdharma is yet another essential principle of Gandhism according to Mashruwala. Vinoba also proclaimed Varna system as originally a noble principle of social organisation. Kaka Kalelkar emphasises the need to revive Varna system in its pure form. According to him the social philosophy of Varnashramdharma worked for social stability and progress. The philosophy can be utilized for social organisation of existing society according to Kelelkar.

Varnashramdharma implied social division of labour according to Vinoba. It negated competitive spirit; which serves as the basis of conflict among human beings. These Gandhian thinkers rely on Gandhi's position on Varna system; while treating it as the basis of nonviolent social order. Gandhi himself explains that originally Varna has no idea of superiority or inferiority.

The meaning of Varna is incredibly simple according to Gandhi. 'It means following on the part of us all the hereditary and traditional calling of our forefathers, in so far as the traditional calling is not inconsistent with fundamental ethics and only for the purpose of one's own livelihood.' Gandhi reinterprets the meaning of Varna system. The unjust part of it is denied by
giving freedom to abandon Varna system if it is not ethical.\#1 Mashruwala and Vinoba do mention that Varna system included subtle levels of economic and social exploitation\#2 However, in general the Gandhian scholars celebrate Varna system as ideal and useful.

**Interpretation of Tradition**

Their interpretation of Varna system is related to their overall interpretation of tradition. At its cultural level the thought of later Gandhians identifies itself with the Hindu religious tradition. However, \#3 Gandhian framework reinterprets the religious terminology. Gandhi regarded himself as a Sanatani Hindu; but denied the authority of texts if they go against what one's conscience feels to be moral.\#4 Later Gandhian thinkers like Vinoba also attempt to reinterpret the Hindu tradition. Vinoba treats Gita as the central text of his political thought. He attempts to formulate his emancipatory argument through the various books on Gita.\#5 Vinoba's argument attempts to change the conventional message of Gita; by referring to the conflict presented in it as a conflict between the elements of justice and injustice.\#6 These insights are taken over from Gandhi himself. Vinoba develops his argument in favour of complete acceptance of nonviolence through the message of Gita. Gita's insistence on 'Nishkam Karmayoga' is interpreted to mean nonviolent social service without any expection of personal benefits. Vinoba expects to combine Karmamarga (the path of action) and Bhaktimarga (the path of devotion) to achieve the highest ideal
of Moksha. The combination can be realised through complete acceptance of nonviolence. Acceptance of nonviolence is related to performance of 'Swadharma' (one's own duty) by Vinoba. Observance of Swadharma is one of the basic principles of Gita's political philosophy. Performance of Swadharma implies action without any expectation of its fruit. Nonviolence implies the same according to Vinoba. The philosophy of nonviolence includes the message of Gita. Karmamarga and Bhaktimarga are combined in the experiments of Ahimsa according to Vinoba. Therefore, Gita becomes a major reference point for him.

Similarly the other Gandhians also use Gita as a major guiding text for their political thought. Following Gandhi these scholars attempt to attribute new meanings to the religious terms. Vinoba changes the meaning of the concept of 'Yadnya' (where traditionally offerings were made to various Gods for their blessings). For him Yadnya includes the process of compensation for the continuous utilization of natural resources. The process includes maintenance as well as creative production. Similar notion is utilized by Dada Dharmadhikari and Kaka Kalekar. Vinoba treats this process as a truly nonviolent revolution at the cultural level. Violent cultural revolution aims at demolition of established cultural symbols along with its content. The nonviolent cultural revolution, on the other hand, maintains symbols of the established culture. It attempts to alter the content represented by these symbols. The entire tradition of later Gandhian thinkers seems to be following the same process at
various levels. The most evident example is of course the use of 'Varnashramdharma' as the ideal social system, if practised in the original form. In short the later Gandhian interpretation of tradition is dominated by the use of Hindu religious; philosophical terminology. Among them only Vinoba studies other religious philosophies. However, his political thought mainly remains within the fold of Gita. Similarly Kaka Kalelkar talks about 'Sarvadharmasamabhava' (equality of all religions) but glorifies Hindu Dharma as Vishwadharma (Universal religion). The other religions basically have 'missionary' orientations according to Kaka Kalelkar. Hindu Dharma doesn't have these orientations and therefore it is always open in its thought. In fact Buddhism and Jainism were also developed within Hindu Dharma's fold according to Kalelkar. Hinduism represents the most important and valuable philosophical religious thought in India according to him.

The later Gandhian scholars interpret the tradition in a specific manner. Their understanding is dominated by Hindu religious; philosophical considerations. They attempt to retain the terminology even though its conventional meaning is changed. Their use of Hindu religious framework is not strategic. Still it is significant because it affects their political thought and practice to a large extent.

In the present chapter we aim at a comparison of the thought of later Gandhian workers with that of Satyagrahi Samajwad. The brief review of their political; economic and socio-
cultural ideas; presented above; would be useful in relating their ideas to Satyagrahi Samajwad.

Later Gandhians and Satyagrahi Samajwad

The basic difference between the thought of later Gandhians and Satyagrahi Samajwad can be located in their understanding of the thought systems of Gandhi and Marx. Gandhians treat Marxism as completely contradictory to Gandhism while Javdekar attempts to combine the insights of Gandhi and Marx. The basic difference in perspective towards Marxism influences Gandhian and Satyagrahi Samajwadi thought at various levels.

Vinoba and other Gandhians doom Marxism as a materialistic ideology. Therefore it is violent in essence according to them. Materialism leads to determinism in Marxism according to Vinoba. Satyagrahi Samajwad differentiates between Marxism and other crude varieties of materialism. Marxian materialism, based on dialectics, is not deterministic in nature according to Javdekar. It accommodates the notion of human free will according to Javdekar. Marxian materialism proves to be important because it explains true nature of social reality around us. It explains the fact that human free will has to operate within the constraints of material conditions. The other varieties of materialism uphold determinism as the law of nature. However, Marxism guarantees the role of human free will and therefore can be related to Gandhism according to Javdekar. Javdekar's
understanding of Marxism is more sophisticated than that of later Gandhians. Among the Gandhian scholars except Vinoba, no one realised theoretical potentials of Marxism. Gandhian workers like Mashruwala and Kalelkar had very crude and orthodox understanding of Marxism as based on conflict and division or sharing merely materialist concerns. Vinoba is aware of the fact that Marxism ultimately shares the same emancipatory ideal with Gandhism. However, as a materialistic ideology Marxism suffers with serious limitations according to him. Gandhians perceive the two ideologies of Gandhism and Marxism to be completely contradictory to each other. Gandhism utilises spiritual powers with individuals while Marxism relies on material considerations according to them. Javdekar was of the opinion that Marxism can accommodate elements of spirituality within it. In fact he attempted to combine Gandhism and Marxism with the same intention. Satyagrahi Samajwad believed that Marxism can be supplemented by Gandhism and its recognition to spirituality. According to Javdekar Marxism has a theoretical space available in it for accepting the idealist elements of Gandhism.

Gandhians cite major limitations of Marxism in the form of its acceptance of violence and the system of relative morality. Both limitations emerge out of the materialistic position Marxism takes. Javdekar agrees with Gandhians accepting the above mentioned two major limitations of Marxist thought. However, his position suggests that Marxism can overcome these limitations with the help of Gandhian thought. Gandhian notion of Satyagraha
includes use of nonviolent methods. These methods are based on a universal moral system according to Javdekar. If Marxism is supplemented with Satyagraha it can accept the position of nonviolent politics. Gandhism recognises a universal moral system; based on Satya; as the basis of emancipatory thought. Javdekar suggests that Marxian thought, if combined with Satyagraha would be able to recognise the universal moral system. Javdekar believes that Marxism possesses such potentials because of its dialectical method. In other words Javdekar continuously attempts to combine Gandhism and Marxism at the theoretical level. To achieve this he presents Marxism as different from other mechanistic varieties of materialism.}

**Awareness of Socialist Problematique**

Javdekar's position towards Marxism is different from the later Gandhians because of his awareness of socialist problematique. Javdekar is aware of the fact that moral ideal cannot be achieved without solving material problems. Gandhian workers emphasise that material struggles devoid of any moral content will be futile, Javdekar agrees with the position. However he is clear to state the necessity of resolving material issues if one wants to achieve the moral ideal. Marx's basic contribution according to Javdekar is to show the primacy of material struggles; as an essential step towards realisation of moral ideal. Therefore Javdekar insists that Gandhians should utilize their moral strength to lead material struggles. In one of his important articles Javdekar demands wholehearted support
of Gandhian workers to the socialist politics in India. He clarifies the fact that Gandhians cannot shun away from power politics. It is because Gandhian moral ideal of nonviolent social order cannot be realised without indulging in power politics.

Gandhian ideal of Moksha is related to social welfare and social service. Moksha has to be realised in material world. As an essential step towards Moksha one has to strive, not only at personal level but at collective level also. Therefore resolution of collective, material problems must become a primary concern for the seekers of Moksha. Javdekar insists the necessity to abolish private ownership of means of production and class divisions for realisation of Moksha.

The awareness of socialist problematic explains not only the necessity but urgency of material struggles. Material struggles are not only necessary but urgent. Therefore one has to engage oneself in material struggles as a primary concern of one's life. Socialism makes Javdekar aware of the institutional mechanisms of material reality. Socialism aims at altering the institutional patterns of social reality. It believes that these patterns act as constraints over exercise of free human will. The unjust institutional patterns limit the moral choices before the individual. Therefore moral revolution cannot be successful without altering institutional patterns. The Gandhian workers do not show any awareness of the problems posed by socialism. Vinoba states the necessity to fight out material struggles when
he mentions the three fold revolution including change in reality; change in opinion and change of heart. However, material struggles are to be fought with the help of moral means in his scheme. The other Gandhians follow the same scheme when they emphasise on the change in values to realise the ideal of nonviolent social order. For these thinkers political problems are basically moral-spiritual in nature. They do not discuss the contradictions within political institutions. For Vinoba the institutions are ultimately created by individuals. Therefore institutional contradictions can be resolved by enlightened human subjects. Satyagrahi Samajwad on the other hand recognises the need to resolve the institutional contradictions in a different way. The need emerges out of its awareness of the socialist problematique. It leads to several differences between the thought of later Gandhians at both theoretical as well as practico-political level.

Javdekar, in his writings, does not treat Gandhism and Marxism as contradictory but supplementary to each other. In fact Satyagrahi Samajwad continuously attempts to view Gandhism from a socialist perspective. On the one hand it attempts to develop Satyagraha as a corrective to shortcomings of socialism. On the other hand it formulates Gandhian argument in such a way to accommodate socialist ideal within it. Javdekar attempts to construct the political philosophy of Satyagraha on par with that of socialism. Therefore, at the theoretical level Javdekar talks about Satyagrahi interpretation of history; Satyagrahi
dialectics and Satyagrahi analysis of state. These efforts actually aim at combining the insights of Gandhi and Marx. Javdekar believed that such a combination; or synthesis between Gandhi and Marx would benefit both the ideologies. Marxism can do away with violence and notions of relative morality if it is supported by Gandhism. Gandhism on the other hand will become aware of the need to change material realities in order to create moral change. Javdekar believed that Gandhism emphasised the ideal aspect of human life more than the material and Marxism did the vice versa. If both these ideologies come together they can strike a perfect balance between idealism and materialism. Gandhian thinkers viewed these two aspects of life as completely contradictory to each other and can never come together according to them.

Ideal and the Practical

At political level Satyagrahi Samajwad becomes different from the thought of later Gandhians; because of its constant awareness of the practico-political problems. This awareness is also a result of Javdekar's understanding of the socialist problematique. Javdekar attempts to resolve the tension between immediate and the ultimate ideal. In fact the entire formulation of Satyagrahi Samajwad can be seen as an effort towards this effect. Javdekar's insistence on solution of the practico-political problems leads him to a different understanding of state and a different formulation of Satyagraha from that of the Gandhian Scholars. Javdekar shares the common ultimate ideal with
Gandhians. Therefore he treats Satyagraha as Sanatandharma. However, socialism is Yugadharma (duty at present) for him. It is because he attempts to relate practical problems with the ideal. Satyagrahi Samajwad attempts to identify the agencies of social change who would help in realising the ultimate ideal. Gandhians treat every individual as agency of social and more importantly moral change. At the theoretical level the argument remains consistent with the ideal of nonviolence. However, at the practico-political level it suggests no way to solve the problem.

Satyagrahi Samajwad attempts to do so through its specific interpretation of Satyagraha. It treats Satyagraha both as the highest personal ideal as well as a 'science of collective nonviolent resistance. Wholehearted acceptance of Satyagraha necessarily leads to its collective application according to Javdekar. Every Satyagrahi worker is necessarily related to power politics according to him. He is aware of the fact that practical-institutional politics is corrupt and based on violence. However Satyagraha cannot completely shun away from it. Gandhians view practical politics to be bad and completely rejected it. Instead of institutional alterations they believed in changing the norms. Vinoba mentions the need to exert Satyagrahi control over politics institutions. However, neither he nor the other Gandhians could develop Satyagraha as a collective weapon against social injustice. Satyagrahi Samajwad emphasises Satyagraha's ability of collective resistance. Javdekar
suggests ways in which Satyagraha can help in fighting out social injustice.

In Javdekar's scheme, Satyagraha has to support progressive legislation imposed by state. Gandhians completely negate the role of legal agency in exerting change. For them the legal agency represents external restraints over individual. It implies use of violence. Therefore, Vinoba is not ready to sanction any authority to law or state. State should play only 'nominal' role under the nonviolent social order according to him. Satyagrahi politics should not depend on state and should not be related to state according to Gandhian Scholars. Actually, except Vinoba; no other Gandhian Scholar discusses the institution of state and its role in his writings. That can be taken as a sign of overall absence of awareness of institutional contradictions. Vinoba's position does not assign any authority to state. Satyagrahi Samajwad ultimately aims at abolition of state. However, at the practical level it suggests utilization of state powers for desired social change. Satyagrahi Samajwadi position regarding state changes at the practico-political and theoretical level. To realise the ultimate ideal of abolition of state; practically one has to purify it; according to Javdekar. Purification of state is essential. State powers are to be used for altering the institutional patterns; especially the economic system. Javdekar recognises state as a very powerful institution in social relations. He is aware of the fact that state is always coercive. However, he is also aware of the fact that state power
has to be utilized to impose desired changes in the institutional patterns. Without these changes one will not be able to move towards the moral ideal. Therefore Javdekar suggests utilization of state power as the first step of material revolution. To make it morally relevant and to avoid misuse of state power; Satyagrahi Samajwd suggests that Satyagraha must exert constant moral control over state and society. Therefore, Satyagraha has to play an active role in collective politics.

Gandhians lack both perspectives. On the one hand they are not aware of the institutional; structural contradictions in social relations and the need to change those. They are also not aware of the crucial role played by the institution of state. Therefore their politics does not recognize the role of social groups or institutions. Gandhians do not foresee the urgency to deal with state; for furthering moral revolution. They are not able to develop collective role of Satyagrahi politics to fight against state. As a result their methods of change become individualistic in nature. In their scheme they attempt to minimize the power of state over society. However, they do not suggest any process to achieve it. This is because they could not comprehend the nature of state and its influence. Javdekar realizes that state power can be minimized only by fighting with it; or by changing its nature. Gandhians rely only on the moral change at individual level. These methods cannot prove to be useful to alter the unjust structural pattern of social relations. Later politics of Gandhians; including that of Bhoodan; can be seen as evidence
of this fact. Bhoodan movement aimed at abolition of the institution of private property. However, it could not alter the land holding pattern in Indian villages to any significant extent. Besides Bhoodan movement led by Vinoba is the only collective movement led by later Gandhian workers. The other Gandhians limited their experiments with Satyagraha to their own lives or to their own Ashrams.

Satyagrahi Samajwad is aware of socialist problematique. The position leads to its specific understanding of practico-political problems. It changes the perception of Satyagrahi Samajwad about state and Satyagraha; as a collective nonviolent weapon to fight with state. These can be seen as the most significant differences between the thought of later Gandhians and Satyagrahi Samajwad.

**Trusteeship and Decentralisation**

The other major area of difference between Javdekar and the later Gandhians; is related to economic thought of Gandhism. Javdekar accepted Gandhian principle of trusteeship as a noble economic principle. However, it is impractical according to Javdekar. Trusteeship can be practised only after changing the unjust economic system of capitalism according to him. These considerations regarding the principle of trusteeship can be easily related to his specific understanding of practico-political problems.
However, Javdekar's neglect of Gandhian critique of industrialism can be seen as a serious shortcoming of Satyagrahi Samajwad. Gandhian emphasis on minimization of needs is again seen by Javdekar as impractical. Everybody will not be able to practise it according to Javdekar. This can be related to his understanding of practical realities. Gandhian critique of industrialism is not limited to minimization of needs. It discusses the destruction of nature and loss of human self under industrial framework. Therefore Gandhi upholds dignity of physical labour. Gandhism refers to mechanization as destructive of creative potentials of human beings. It discusses capitalism as extension of industrialism and denies both. Satyagrahi Samajwad does not take any serious note of Gandhian critique of industrialism.

For Javdekar Gandhi's opposition was to the use of violence under industrial civilizations of Europe. Gandhi himself saw the industrial framework itself as violent. Gandhian scholars like Kumarappa have developed these insights. At this level also Kumarappa or other Gandhians do not suggest any methods to transform the present society into a completely decentralized society. Javdekar suggests the way out through establishment of decentralised Satyagrahi democracy, controlled by socialist state. However, these ideas do not compensate for Javdekar's neglect of Gandhian critique of industrialism. That can be treated as second major point of difference between Gandhians and Satyagrahi Samajwad. It also becomes a major limitation of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad.
Interpreting the Tradition

The only area in which Javdekar shares exactly similar views with Gandhians is regarding the interpretation of tradition. Both, the later Gandhian thought as well as Satyagrahi Samajwad use Hindu philosophical religious terminology while presenting their argument. At both levels the use is not strategic. Javdekar accepts Gandhian interpretation of Varna system like the other Gandhians. However, he relates it to the Marxist ideal of classless society. While commenting on Mashruwala's book on Gandhi and Marx; Javdekar clarifies the relationship between these two principles. According to Mashruwala Marxist ideal of classless society is not acceptable because it negates essential social division of labour. Javdekar shows how Mashruwala has wrongly interpreted the notion of classless society. In this discussion he relates the notion of class and Varna. According to Javdekar; Gandhi wanted to end the elements of exploitation in Varna system and retain the principles of division of labour. Marxist notion of abolition of classes also retains the principle of division of labour on equal basis; while negating its exploitative aspect. In this sense Gandhian Varnashramdharma can be related to the ideal of classless society according to Javdekar.

The concluding chapter of Aadhunik Bharat discusses class conflict in Indian society. Acharya Javdekar describes the conflict between Varnas as a kind of class conflict in India. However, the conflict could not end social inequality because
of material conditions in India. He mentions contribution of various currents of thought; which argued for upliftment and emancipation of Shudras. Javdekar mentions Lokayata (by Charvaka); Jainism and Buddhism as the main contributors to this mission. According to him after deterioration of Buddhism; Advaita Vedanta by Shankaracharya and Bhaktimarga of the Varkari Sampradaya led the conflict against Varnashramdharma. They adopted Satyagrahi methods for reforming society according to Javdekar. Earlier Buddha was condemned (by the Hindu religion) as Atheist and as a critic of Vedic Philosophy. Later on the same Hindu tradition regarded him as one of the Incarnations of God. This is seen as a major contribution of the Bhaktimargi Saints and Advaita Vedanta by Javdekar. However, Varna conflict remained within the bounds of the medieval age. It was not developed in modern age. Satyagrahi revolution is necessary to resolve the main conflict of modern period. The conflict is not related to Varna system and its problems. The need is to abolish the classes and create a society having a single class or equal economic status. Javdekar claims that ancient ideal of attainment of Brahmanya and present ideal of creating a classless society can be treated as similar in essence. The point to note here is that Javdekar continuously uses terminology of Varna system to define his ideal. In early stages of his life he supported the mobilisation of Brahmins. However, it may not be treated as essential part of his thought as later on he completely parted company with these ideas. However, his use of the specific terminology remains a very important part
of Javdekar's political thought. The terminology essentially links him to the Gandhian framework. Gandhians proclaim 'revival of original pure Varnashramadharma as their ideal. Javdekar uses the Gandhian terminology to a large extent while defining his own socialist idea.

The same is true of the use of religious framework of Hindu Dharma and its glorification. Acharya Javdekar uses several terms related to Vedic Philosophy to frame his Satyagrahi Samajwadi argument.

Satyagrahi Samajwad is related to the thought of later Gandhians through Javdekar's use of religious terminology. The understanding and interpretation of tradition by both these strands becomes problematic as it celebrates the symbols and terminology of dominant Hindu tradition. However, the issue is dealt with in a more detailed manner in the concluding part of the present chapter. We wish to discuss the relationship between later Gandhians; socialists and Satyagrahi Samajwad in this part. All these varieties of thought share some common aspects regarding their interpretation of tradition.

Javdekar relates himself to Gandhism not only through the use of religious terminology. Satyagrahi Samajwad treats Satyagrahi ideal as its ultimate ideal. However, its awareness of the socialist problematic compels Satyagrahi Samajwad to relate the contents of Gandhism with socialism. It continuously views Gandhism through socialist perspective. That makes Satyagrahi Samajwad significantly different from the thought of
For them Satyagrahi Samajwad would become socialist creed rather than Gandhian. However to understand exact relationship between Satyagrahi Samajwad, Gandhians and socialists; one has to compare Satyagrahi Samajwad with the socialist argument developed in India.

Development of the Socialist Formulation in India

The Bolshevik revolution in Russia inspired two political movements in India. The communist party of India was officially established in 1925. On the other hand, Congress Socialist Party (CSP) took shape within the Congress organisation in 1934. These political groups accepted socialist ideal. However, their politics always remained different from each other due to several reasons. The Communist Party of India worked mainly to realise the communist ideal on Indian soil. It was critical of the nationalist movement. The socialist groups on the other hand belonged to nationalist fold. Therefore socialism in India always played a supportive role to the national freedom movement. It accepted Marxist ideal broadly. However, it was to be developed to become suitable to Indian conditions. Socialism in India therefore accepted Gandhian insights in its ideological formulation.

Socialist movement in India developed through various stages. The first generation leaders of socialist groups received their political training during the freedom movement. They had an abstract ideal of egalitarian and just society before them. Socialist ideas helped in concretizing the ideal. Therefore the
socialist accepted Marxism as the basis of their political thought. However, actual practice of communism in Russia; especially under Stalin's regime; withheld them from complete acceptance of Marxism. These leaders also disapproved of the notion of dictatorship of the proletariat. According to them, individual liberty must be valued as the most important factor of any political thought. Gandhian strategy of nonviolence was seen as important in this respect. Therefore socialists attempted a combination of insights of Gandhi and Marx. During the freedom movement socialist groups mainly insisted on the economic ideal of socialism. In fact socialism itself was perceived as an economic thought by many socialist thinkers. The economic ideal was essentially to be realised in the national framework. They emphasised the role of nationalist, democratic politics; in achieving the socialist economic idea.

Post-independence socialist politics emerged mainly as a variety of Democratic Socialist thought. It was confined to electoral politics. During early years it attempted to emerge as a balancing force to Congress politics. However, the Congress itself under leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru officially accepted socialist ideal. Some of the socialist groups supported Nehruvian policies; while others opposed them as pseudo-socialist. They proclaimed the ideal of a decentralised, egalitarian society based on genuine democratic practices. Socialist forces were divided on the issue of political practise of the desired ideal. Socialist leaders like Jayaprakash Narayan finally accepted framework of Sarvodaya. Ashok Mehta and others joined the Congress camp.
Socialist parties experienced a number of splits over theoretical issues and political strategies. Finally socialism in India functioned as a variety of the Democratic Socialist ideas. Socialist leaders like Ram Manohar Lohia attempted to formulate an indigenous variety of the ideology. However, at the practico-political level it remained to be a centrist force along with the Congress. The concept of democratic politics finally led towards strategies of successful electoral politics. Socialist parties entered into electoral alliances with several political groups. The emancipatory content of the ideology was gradually lost in the process.

However the socialist formulations prove to be very important for the present study. Though socialist politics in contemporary India has lost its significance; originally it did provide important theoretical insights. It was a very important political project which combined insights of Gandhi and Marx. Secondly the socialist project emerged in India during the same period of Satyagrahi Samajwad. Therefore it becomes essential to compare the two. It is also important to note that the official socialist ideology never recognized the contribution of Satyagrahi Samajwad. The later socialists never attempted to develop the views of Acharya Javdekar. It becomes important to understand the reasons for this neglect of the socialist groups. On the other hand Javdekar regarded socialist parties as real practitioners of Satyagrahi Samajwadi politics. If practice of socialist ideology
The question is related to the status of Satyagrahi Samajwad as a variety of socialist formulations in India. It is important to see whether we can regard Satyagrahi Samajwad basically as a socialist version of thought? These questions may prove useful for theoretical location of Satyagrahi Samajwad.

Many socialist leaders have written extensively on the subject. However, the theoretical contribution mainly comes from Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia (1910-1967), Acharya Narendra Deva (1889-1956), and Jayprakash Narayan (1902-1979). Jayprakash's writings are important because his political thought developed through distinctive stages. Originally he proclaimed himself to be a staunch Marxist, later a socialist and finally a Sarvodaya activist. Narendra Deva also was earlier a Marxist and later accepted Democratic socialist views. Narendra Deva accepted Buddhism as an important factor of his thought. This also becomes a significant aspect to study. Along with these three; Sampurnanand's (1889-1967) political thought may also be referred to, because he developed a 'Vedanti Socialism in India.' The other socialist thinkers have not made major theoretical contribution.

Understanding Marxism

Socialist thought basically relates itself to the Marxist
ideas. However the socialists wanted to relate Marxism to Indian conditions. Therefore they attempted to reinterpret the fundamental Marxian premises. During the early stages of their lives both Narendra Deva and Jayprakash Narayan had accepted the fundamentals of Marxism. Narendra Deva looked forward to Marxism-Leninism as providing solutions to India's social, economic and political problems in early 1930s. However he did not accept the deterministic interpretation of Marxism. Marxism was not limited to mere economic ideal according to him. Marx was one of the greatest humanists according to Narendra Deva. Marx did not undermine the importance of mind in his materialist conception of history and was not necessarily opposed to spiritual values according to him. In fact Marxism treats both mind and matter to be equally important according to Deva. Jayprakash Narayan also approved the Marxist Materialistic interpretation of history and especially the analysis of existing capitalist economic system. In 1936, Jayprakash used a typical Marxist framework to explain the working of capitalist economy and the phenomenon of accumulation of wealth. However, both Jayprakash and Narendra Deva gradually changed their positions regarding the Marxist thought. Around 1942, the socialist group changed its approach towards Marxism and accepted a democratic socialist position. Earlier Narendra Deva advocated peasant struggles to be organized by the Indian socialists on the communist lines. He is not insistent on the use of constitutional, democratic means for these struggles. However, later on he explicitly states that Marxism must be related to democratic
politics. He claims that Marxism was never against democracy. 'Those who believe that Marx's teachings run counter to democracy are mistaken according to Deva.' Marx's communism presupposes complete democracy according to him. Therefore Deva advocates use of parliamentary politics to achieve the socialist goal; during the post independence period.

In 1936, Jayprakash Narayan stated that 'No group of idealists can build up socialism unless it has power in its hands.' However, after 1950s the only remedy according to him to create socialism is 'to create and develop forms of socialist living through the voluntary endeavour of people, rather than seek to establish socialism by the use of power of the state.' After accepting Sarvodaya ideology Jayprakash specifies limitations of all 'statist' ideologies including Marx's.

The gradual transfer of political ideas of these prominent socialist thinkers; representative of those of the entire socialist movement. This movement accepted Marxian theory (as well as practice to a large extent) in its initial formulations of political thought. However, later movement treated socialism as one of its goals; achieved through democratic; nonviolent politics. In this process the socialist movement looks upon socialist doctrine as economic thought. Marxian socialism provided appropriated economic ideal for them; which was to be supplemented by other socio-moral ideals.

The change is clearly reflected in Lohia's formulation. In fact Lohia's argument; as developed by him in 'Gandhi; Marx
and Socialism, becomes a central text to discuss socialist understanding of Marx as well as their attempt to combine Gandhi and Marx. The book becomes very important to understand Lohia's entire political thought. Among the socialist it was only Lohia who discussed theoretical relationship between Gandhi and Marx in a systematic way. Lohia's discussion of the relationship is important also because it leads us to his formulation of 'socialist doctrine' in India.

**Lohia on Marx and Gandhi**

In this entire argument regarding the relationship between Gandhi, Marx and socialism; Lohia initially acknowledges some important contributions of Marxism. The most important among them; according to Lohia; is Marx's objective denial of the lust for property. Marxist analysis of capitalist economic system is crucial in this respect for Lohia. In fact Lohia views Marxism essentially as a critique of capitalist economic system. In other words Lohia looks at Marxism mainly as an economic doctrine. Lohia's socialism borrows economic content from Marxism; which is to be supplemented by insights from other doctrines. Lohia differentiates between economic and general aims of society. 'Marxism was not able to properly relate the two according to Lohia. It emphasized on achievement of economic aims. Therefore Lohia essentially emphasizes on Marxist analysis of capitalist economic system.'

However, Marxist economics itself is inadequate according to Lohia as it is context specific. According to him Marxism
analyzed capitalism of the European countries. It confined itself to economic conflicts within a single nation state. In reality economic conflict has crossed boundaries of nation-states according to Lohia. The main economic conflict under capitalism is between imperial powers and the colonies according to Lohia. Imperialism is not only the last stage of capitalism as Lenin declared. It is an integral part of capitalist economy. That is the main reason why Marx's prediction about collapse of capitalism proved wrong. Marxism did not explain the phenomenon of imperialism as essentially related to capitalism. Capitalist countries could bear with the economic crisis due to imperial extensions. Imperialism helped in accommodation of working class in the middle strata of society in developed societies. It was managed with the help of economic surplus created through exploitation of colonies. Therefore the real economic conflict under capitalism is between imperial powers and third world societies according to Lohia. Marxism does not analyse the imperialist framework of capitalism and fails to become universal theory of economic liberation. The retarded economies of colonies faced increased level of poverty due to imperialism. Therefore Lohia advocates a revision of law of surplus value as well as of revolution.

According to Lohia communism thinks in terms of destroying capitalist relations of production only. The need for Asian countries is to destroy capitalist 'forces' of production along with them. Genuine socialism must destroy capitalist relations as well as the forces of production. It should at least
try to vastly remodel them. Lohia criticises Marxism because it limits itself to the alteration of pattern of ownership. The need is to change the pattern of production. At this point Lohia hints at an overall critique of industrialism. He declares that capitalism and communism belong to the same moral complex. The statement opens a possibility of relating Lohia's political thought to the Gandhians framework of thought - especially the critique of industrialism. However, Lohia finally adopts a different path through his concept of the 'Alpa Praman Yantra' (Small Scale Machine).

It is important to note that he emphasises the need to deny industrial framework in the struggle against capitalist system. These insights were later developed by him through his emphasis on economic decentralization. Lohia criticizes the Russian economic experiments after revolution as they aimed at centralisation of economic resources. The post-revolution Russia had accepted two objectives of socialisation and modernization. To achieve the objective of modernization it accepted the capitalist techniques of large-scale production. According to Lohia the two objectives finally can't be congruent with each other. Acceptance of modernisation compels Russia to remain within capitalist fold. Therefore, Lohia advocates equidistance from both capitalism and communism for any genuine; third world socialist theory.

It is important to note in brief that for Lohia the undemocratic practice of communism emerges out of its emphasis
on centralization and not necessarily out of its use of violent means. Some other socialist thinkers like Jayprakash criticised Dictatorship of the proletariat as opposed to democracy because it is rooted in violence. Some groups within the nationalist movement underlined the position on use of violent means as the main difference between Marxism and Indian socialism. Lohia himself mentions and negates the point. Use of violent means becomes a simple strategic question in communism. The use of violent or nonviolent means depends upon the actual circumstances under which socialist revolution would take place according to Lohia. Therefore the position regarding use of violent means cannot be a major point of difference between Marxism and socialism.

Marxism is seen as a Euro-centric doctrine by Lohia. Therefore it merely emphasises the problem of equal distribution of economic wealth. Third world societies face a two fold problem of sufficient production and equal distribution. 'Colonial masses are stabilized at the lowest caste of capitalism by imperial powers' according to Lohia. Socialism in third world societies has to part with capitalist economic relations as well as industrial methods of production which are common to both capitalism and communism.

Lohia's understanding and analysis of Marxism centres around economic thought. Major part of Marxists doctrine lies in stating and analysing the development of capitalism according to Lohia. Therefore his discussion of Marxism mainly takes place about these economic laws. Lohia also states that to
understand a creed, and more so Marxism, it would be better to think more of the method or analysis of the way to the ultimate than the ultimate itself. Because according to him the ultimate is the same in most doctrines as they are today. Therefore Lohia accepts the basic theoretical consensus between Gandhi and Marx or any other ideology which aims at emancipation. He is more interested in the methods of realisation of the emancipatory ideal. That is the main reason why he emphasises on the economic laws of Marxism. Lohia also discusses the theoretical issues like relation between the elements of materiality and spirituality or the validity of the materialistic interpretation of history. However, the Marxist laws of development of capitalist economy formulate crux of Marxism according to Lohia. His analysis of Marxism in this respect leads to three important conclusions. Lohia suggests that the Asian variety of socialism must try to overcome the limitations of Marxism by focussing on -

1. phenomenon of imperialism - which gets related to the nationalist movement in India as well as many other Asian countries;

2. changes in capitalist forces of production to be achieved through economic decentralisation;

3. congruent relationship between the general and the economic aims of the society.

Indian socialism has to develop new political strategies to achieve these aims according to Lohia.)
Lohia on Gandhi

From Marx Lohia gets important insights regarding economic aims of society. Through his understanding of Gandhi, Lohia attempts to develop general aims of the socialist society. Gandhi's most important contribution is the concept of Satyagraha or civil disobedience according to Lohia. Enabling the individual to resist oppression by himself and without any support (of organisation) is the greatest quality of Mahatma Gandhi's action and life according to Lohia. Gandhi vitalised the inner strength of individual to resist oppression and injustice. Civil disobedience becomes a priceless, matchless weapon for the modern individual according to Lohia. The most important fact is that civil disobedience can provide a solution to problem of simultaneous achievement of general and economic aims.

Both capitalism and communism believe in 'environmentalism' according to Lohia. These doctrines believe that changes in environment would automatically lead to individual good. Therefore these doctrines emphasise the achievement of economic aims. Civil disobedience would help socialism in avoiding the vice of environmentalism.

Democratic socialism, especially in the European countries, believes in the parliamentary politics, as sufficient to bring about social change. Lohia is well aware of limitations of parliamentary politics. In fact, shortcomings of parliamentary politics inevitably lead people towards belief in violent means according to Lohia.

Civil disobedience proves to be the only effective political
weapon to avoid defects of violent as well as parliamentary politics. According to Lohia violation of laws and challenging established authority are the only ways of effective change. Gandhian notion of civil disobedience provides an appropriate method of such effective social change.

Earlier varieties of socialism have over-emphasized changes in environment and under-emphasised the individual. Gandhism on the other hand has tended to overemphasize individual and under estimate environment. Socialism has to place equal importance on both individual and environment. Civil disobedience cannot be completely based on individual change of heart. Change of heart and change through laws or peaceful struggle are the two sides of same coin and both are equally important.

Gandhism, especially as interpreted by the later Gandhians tends to underestimate importance of the material. Therefore Gandhism gets reduced to the status of ceremonial remembrance. Gandhian followers mainly rely on the technique of change of heart. They try to make it effective in any social system; irrespective of the specific features of that system. This cannot be the appropriate use of Gandhian notion of Satyagraha according to Lohia. Gandhian Satyagraha has to be practically utilized for realising effective social change. For that it has to be developed as a practical political strategy rather than ideal philosophical version. Civil disobedience becomes a very useful political category for socialism. However, socialists have to use it
effectively to solve practico-political problems. In short, Lohia intends to make a strategic use of the category of civil disobedience, emphasizing its role in practical politics.

The other socialist thinkers also support Lohia's views on strategic use of civil disobedience. Gandhian notion of civil disobedience is useful in maintaining democratic nature of socialist struggle. Jayprakash Narayan emphasizes the fact that socialism must be achieved through peaceful means. Satyagraha is seen by Jayprakash as an important political technique for effective social change. He mentions Satyagraha as a contribution to the technology of revolution. Jayprakash as a Sarvodayi (in the later stage of his life) looks at Satyagraha as providing a total philosophy of life. However, as a socialist he looks at Satyagraha basically from a strategic point of view. Narendra Deva supports the same belief when he states the necessity of supporting Marxism with democratic techniques. According to Narendra Deva Marxism is very well compatible with democracy. Indian people must try to realise the socialist ideal through democratic means. According to Deva western democratic; parlimentary techniques must be blended with Gandhian techniques of nonviolence to achieve the desired social change.

The socialists look at Satyagraha as a very important and useful political category developed by Mahatma Gandhi. In this sense they accept the need to combine Gandhian thought with the socialist doctrine. However, they do not accept Satyagraha as a total political philosophy.
However Jayprakash Narayan mentions that Satyagraha is related to elements of spirituality in Gandhism. The spiritual, ethical dimension that Gandhism has introduced is itself a very important contribution of Gandhism according to Jayprakash. Lohia considers that too much emphasis on spiritual and ethical considerations makes the doctrine impractical. Achutrao Patwardhan also regards Gandhian ideal as beyond realisation because of its emphasis on ethical elements. Similarly the principle of economic decentralisation can be worthwhile if it is applied in a practical manner according to Lohia. However, Gandhian ideal of village republics remains to be an abstract ideal according to him. In general; Lohia thinks that Gandhian philosophy aims at 'ultimate' problems. Socialism should emphasize on practical problems instead. Socialism should try to combine ultimate and immediate; spiritual and material and general and economic aims according to Lohia. Socialism would utilize the elements of both Gandhian and Marxist thought. However, it will not accept any philosophy as the only guiding principle. Lohia declares himself as neither pro Gandhi or pro Marx; nor anti Gandhi or anti Marx. Lohia emphasizes the fact that socialism has to be a very open and independent ideology because it aims to solve the immediate, practical problems.

Ideal and the Practical

According to Lohia it is more important to actualise the ideal than idealising the actual. This position emphasises solution to practical problems. Lohia's theoretical argument of socialism continuously attempts to emphasize the urgency of practical
solutions. For him all ideologies share the same ultimate ideal. Therefore practical application of the ideal becomes more important. Socialism becomes an essentially open ideology which searches for its ultimate ideal through the immediate. Lohia's socialism tends to separate the ideal and the practical and still attempts to balance these two elements. Lohia's discussion of elements of materiality and spirituality and of interpretation of history can be sighted as a case to the point.

According to Lohia the modern world experiences a number of antinomies in the form of spiritual and material; present and future, religious and non religious, individual and social, bread and culture etc. Human mind has an attitude to confront and overcome these antinomies into a working unity. Political doctrines should also exhibit the same qualities according to Lohia. Instead of following any closed notion of materiality; it must attempt at a working unity of the two. He refers to the problems of primacy between the spirit and the matter. For Lohia the problem merely relates to the chronological sequence between the two. However, logically both mind and matter exist simultaneously. Dialectical materialism studies the relation between the environment and the consciousness. Marx said that men indeed make history but only within the environment within which they are born. Orthodox interpretation of dialectical materialism would negate any place to the human choice. However, the statement talks about a range of human choices available in a specific situation. It is of course limited by the
environment. However, the human beings have a plurality of choice to deal with a specific situation. Therefore both materiality and spirituality simultaneously exist and play equally important role. Political doctrine of socialism must accept importance of both. However, emphasis is decided by the context. Antinomies like materiality and spirituality or bread and culture actually presuppose a link, a continuous and related existence. However, the priorities will be decided by the context in which they work.

Lohia's ideas about history are also based on the same premises. Lohia negates linear progressive theories of history developed by the west. He believes in the circular thesis developed by eastern religious philosophies. This thesis believes that every thing has to pass through three stages of emergence, subsistence and decadence. However, human beings should strive to go beyond the wheel of history to achieve a balanced and stable stage of human life. For that the human society has to realise the relationship between present and future. According to Lohia every moment is no doubt a passing link in the great flux; but it is also an eternity in itself. Forgetful of the two fold character of the moment human being has raised the antinomies of the material and the spiritual. The dual nature of the reality leads to a better understanding of practical and ideal. Every act of individual must exemplify ideal and the practical aspects. Such awareness leads to understanding of the importance of future. Theories of history; based on the notion
of linear progress; always emphasise ultimate ideal and neglect practical. One has to fully utilise the practical to realise the ideal. Every act of individual must exhibit the awareness of its link with the eternal. Such acts can result in a practical realisation of the ultimate ideal.

Lohia's interpretation of history is related to the practico-political problem. Socialist doctrine has a historical task to search for such a practical ideology which shows awareness of the eternal and attempts to be congruent with it. The tension is expressed in various kinds of social antinomies mentioned above including general and economic aims of the society. At the practico-political level socialism has to operate in the realm of the 'immediate' but with an awareness of the 'ultimate'. Marx and Gandhi provide the ultimate; which is actually very similar to each other according to Lohia. Socialism has to concentrate on the practical realisation of the ideals. Therefore it uses some of the insights of Marx and Gandhi, and yet remains separate from these ideologies.

The same problem can be discussed in terms of the economic and the general aims of the society. Lohia differentiates between the economic and the general aims of the society. General aims represent the element of spirituality while the economic aims can be equated with the elements of materiality. In an example of Djilas and Vinoba; Lohia talks about context specific relevance of elements of materiality and spirituality. Both Djilas and Vinoba wish to have freedom from money. Vinoba's exercise is
dominated by preservation of general aims or elements of spirituality. He talks about disciplining the human wants. Djilas attempts to achieve freedom from money through creation of abundance; with the help of application of science. Vinoba's insistence on spirituality leads to an impossible; impractical ideal according to Lohia, because the 'modern' individual has become a slave of the tools. Therefore the general aims of society must be congruent with practical, economic aims according to Lohia.

Socialism attempts to balance ideal and practical. In this process the practical becomes more important than ideal. In fact ideal is to be realized through practical. Socialism in India develops its social-economic-political agenda mainly to solve practico-political problems.

The Socialist Agenda

The socialist agenda sets economic ideal as its most important aspect because socialism is perceived as an economic doctrine. The economic ideal for Indian socialism was set within the colonial framework. Lohia emphasizes on the role of imperialism as the basic cause of underdevelopment of Asian countries. Therefore Asian societies have a twofold economic ideal before them. They must get rid of imperialist framework. These socialities will have to develop independent and sustaintable forces of production to achieve it. Besides these countries also have to abolish the internal economic inequalities within their own society. It is necessary to alter the capitalist relations
of production to achieve this ideal.

At the theoretical level Lohia attempts to negate the entire industrial economy when he states necessity of charging the nature of capitalist forces of production along with relations of production. Lohia points out to three important qualities of modern civilization—revolutionary technology, rising standards and social equality. However, all of them have failed according to him. 'The tensions and emptiness of modern life seem difficult to overcome, whether under capitalism or communism, as the hunger for rising standards is their mother, and common to both,' states Lohia. Therefore socialist economic ideal has to go beyond these limits of modern civilization. It should provide a decent standard of living to everybody. However, it should try to end the struggle for more and more material acquisitions. Practical realisation of such an ideal would take place through application of socialists pattern of ownership as well as through decentralized economy. Socialism would have to devise a new mode of rationalization and a corresponding mode of ownership. This new mode is realised through the small scale machine, which aims at destruction of the capitalist relations as well as forces of production.

Small scale machine; imagined by Lohia; is not merely a break with technology but a device to accommodate economic and general aims of society in an appropriate manner. The machine will work on electricity or oil. It may be a maid-of-all work or as many kinds as possible. It will be available to
hamlet and town as much as to city. The machine will be built on the principle of immediacy in operation and output and will not require a large capitalist investment. Lohia looks at the machine as embodiment of the whole principle of decentralization; in space and time, so as to avoid complexity and achieve immediacy.

Small scale machine is to be supported with a socialist pattern of ownership of means of production. The immediacy in science and planning must be matched with immediacy in ownership and political control. Socialist pattern of ownership will not be adequate to achieve such economic ideal if it is based on centralisation. Socialism must abolish the institution of private property. However abolition of private property should not lead us to state control over the resources. Ownership of property by the state exclusively at the centre goes with mass production and is disastrous to both bread and freedom. Therefore resources should be owned by the village and the provinces along with the state institutions at the centre. However, the control will strictly be in the hands of the political institutions at various levels. Socialism must reject all doctrines of restricted capitalism and mixed economy. Socialism aims at complete decentralization of the economic resources. However, it does not allow the possession of private property. Property must be owned by the democratically formulated political institutions at various levels.
Lohia’s emphasis on economic decentralisation is related to the critique of modern-industrial economic relations. He talks about the small scale machine as an ideal technique to alter the capitalist relations as well as forces of production. However, at the practico-political level socialist doctrine is not ready to abolish the industrial framework completely. Lohia himself recognises the need of creation of 'abundance' to fulfill the economic needs of the people. Therefore large scale units of production will have a place in the socialist society. Narendra Deva prefers gradual decentralisation and transfer of ownership of the economic resources. Both Narendra Deva and Jayprakash Narayan deal with the land redistribution problem as a major economic issue for Indian socialists. Narendra Deva suggests a solution of mobilization of the peasants over the issue. Jayprakash Narayan prefers gradual transformation of Indian agriculture. According to him collectivisation of land should follow the transfer of ownership. However, he is also aware of the fact that co-operative collective farming may involve repression of majority. Therefore there should be a combination of repression and persuasion while changing the pattern of land ownership according to Jayprakash. Jayprakash Narayan later joined Sarvodaya movement. At this stage he preferred the philosophy of Bhoodan over any kind of interference of state for achieving the economic ideals. However, the socialist movement in general accepts the essential role of the agency of state for realising the economic changes. Due to this emphasis the main difference between western and Indian varieties of socialism remains in the form of degree of insistence on decentralization.
Lohia's theoretical critique of modernity and the industrial framework is not translated at the practico-political level. At the theoretical level he criticises both capitalism and communism as belonging to the same industrial framework. Both capitalism and communism fail to overcome the defects of modern civilization according to Lohia. Therefore socialism is expected to provide a third alternative for realising the emancipatory ideal. At the same time Lohia also emphasises the need to solve practical problems in the first instance rather than providing mere theoretical solution. Such insistence takes him towards the economic ideal of decentralisation to the most possible extent; within the industrial framework. Lohia is aware of both practico-political as well as ultimate; theoretical problems. However, he limits the socialist doctrine to the practico-political level. Therefore it is not able to translate Lohia's theoretical vision about industrialism in practice. Socialist doctrine in India was not able to relate theoretical and practico-political ideas on the economic front.

The Political Ideal

At the political level socialism aims at creation of a classless and castless society; with the help of democratic methods. Use of democratic methods is preferred because it is more congruent with the general aims of the society. The insistence on political decentralisation is also related to democratic principle and general aims of society. Lohia talks about 'Choukhamba Raj' (The state balanced by the four pillars
- in the form of four political units) as the appropriate form of political decentralisation. In this scheme political institutions will work at the four levels of village, district, province and the nation. These units will enjoy equal political powers under the socialist order. Political institutions will possess ownership of the economic resources in the respective areas. The state, as a centralized unit does not possess ownership of means of production. However, it will manage economic affairs at various levels. In this sense the state plays a very important role in socialist political organisation. Lohia mentions that state control of economic resources and planned economy does not convey the essence of socialism. However, at the practico-political level Indian socialists do confine their thought to some sort of a welfare state. Therefore the socialist position regarding state becomes a very important factor of their political thought. Rather the entire discussion of socialist political ideal centres around this issue. Communism aims at creating a classless, and stateless society. However, socialism aims at creation of a classless and casteless society with the help of the state. Socialist position assumes existence and the centrality of state.

Along with Lohia other socialists also emphasise role of state as main instrument in realizing the desired change. Jayprakash Narayan; states in 1936; that no group of idealists can build up socialism unless it has powers in its hand. During 1950s also Jayprakash maintains the same position while emphasizing on complete decentralisation of state power. Narendra Deva formulated the first policy statement of the Praja Socialist
Party. In this statement the role of state is not discussed in
detail. Deva only mentions the significant role of decentralised,
democratic state. According to Sampurnanand 'state is not nece-
ssarily an instrument of violence. It is always subjected to the
end for which it exists.' Therefore, state can be utilized to
realise the desired political ideal according to Sampurnanand.
Except Jayprakash no socialist thinker challenges the centrality
of state. In fact they assume its centrality to their political
thought. Therefore they assign a significant role to state in
realising the socialist ideal. The position may be related to
their concerns for the practical problems rather than the
ultimate; as formulated by Lohia.

State power is to be utilized for social change through
the agency of law. According to Lohia change through laws and
the change of heart are the two sides of the same coin. Change
of heart plays a very important role in socialist revolution
according to him. However, it must be associated with the change
through laws. Values or cultural aims cannot be changed
irrespective of the changes in social structure. However, change
of heart relates the economic changes with the general aims of
the society. Therefore the real class struggle will consist of
civil disobedience according to Lohia. 'Satyagraha and class
struggle are but two names for a single exercise in power,
reduction in the power of the evil and increasing the power of
the good.' Therefore the real exercise of class struggle consists
of civil disobedience or Satyagraha. The difference between
conventional class struggle and Satyagraha is not only related to the use of force. In fact the issue of use of force at the final instance of the socialist revolution, is a secondary question according to Lohia. The main question is about the basis.

**Caste System**

Indian socialism highlights the caste differences in Indian society and the need to end them; to realise the socialist ideal. This point also is mainly emphasised by Lohia in his argument. Abolition of caste system formulates a major theme in Lohia's political thought. He translated it into political programme through his strategy of mobilisation of the backward caste (Pichhade Jati Ki Niti). Lohia emphasised the need to fight with the caste system at the political level. Lohia sees the caste system as a means of social and cultural exploitation of Indian masses. Simultaneous achievement of economic and general aims before the society was declared as a distinguishing feature of socialist ideology by Lohia. Abolition of caste system was seen as a very important 'general' aim towards establishment of an egalitarian society. Caste system was seen by Lohia as the main obstacle in establishing social equality. Therefore socialist groups will have to undertake political programmes to minimize caste inequalities and also to abolish the caste system as a whole. Lohia's position becomes different from the earlier social reformers and activists working on caste problems because he clearly stated the need for political mobilization of the lower castes to end up social inequalities.
Strikingly, however, neither Lohia nor any other socialist thinker clearly condemns the Hindu religious and philosophical tradition as giving sanction to the caste system. It is surprising that Lohia does not recognise the ideology and philosophical basis of Hinduism to be responsible for the nature of the caste system in India. In his book on the nature of Hinduism Lohia mentions liberal and extremist philosophical trends as simultaneously present within Hinduism. There is a continuous conflict going on between the two according to Lohia. The liberal current of thought within Hinduism would be helpful in maintaining the unity of Indian nation. Lohia also glorifies Hindu philosophical consideration regarding the ultimate Truth in the form of 'Brahman'. It is a very significant aspect of Hinduism according to Lohia. Through these considerations Hinduism was able to relate any common individual's worldview with the most basic philosophical issue regarding the essence of the world. Lohia also celebrates Rama and Krishna as cultural symbols of Indian society. Among other socialists Narendra Deva accepted the insights of Buddhism in his political thought. He elaborated the philosophy of Buddhism in one of his very important books - 'Buddha Dharma Darshan'. However, the book does not comment on Buddhism, as a response to the exploitative nature of Hindu philosophical social system especially the Varnashramdharma. Narendra Deva does not mention Buddha's contribution in abolishing the caste system. Lohia talks about two prominent struggles fought by the Indian masses against the caste system. However, he also does not mention Buddha's contribution to these struggles. The point becomes important
because Buddha challenged the entire Hindu philosophy for providing the basis to the unjust caste system. Lohia and Narendra Deva condemn the caste system but do not open up the exploitative nature of entire Hindu philosophy. Jayprakash Narayan identifies the opiritrual elements of Hinduism as the basis of Indian way of thinking. Sampurnanand accepts the Vedic framework as the basis of his socialist thought. In his book on socialism; Sampurnanand argues how Vedic ideal of realisation of Brahman is similar to the socialist ideal. In short, while denying the caste system Indian socialists either directly or indirectly accept the mainstream; dominant Vedic framework as supportive of their own socio-cultural framework. This can be treated as a very important point of socialist cultural as well as political agenda. The point will be again referred to while comparing Satyagrahi Samajwad with the socialist formulation later in this chapter.

In its socio-economic-political thought socialism concentrates on solution to the practico-political problems before Indian society. Socialism is treated as an open ended thought system. It leads to a gap between theoretical and practical ideas of socialist thinkers. Indian socialism could not translate its theoretical considerations at practical; political level. Comparison between Satyagrahi Samajwad and the Socialist formulation in India, may open up some reasons for the inability of socialist politics to bridge the gap between theoretical and practico-political issues.
**Satyagrahi Samajwad and Socialist Formulation**

The comparison would discuss some important points regarding the relationship between Satyagrahi Samajwad and the socialist formulation in India. It will mainly concentrate on the political and cultural agendas of the two ideologies. Both ideologies share some obvious common concerns and therefore overtly become very similar to each other. However, their positions are significantly different regarding some crucial political issues. Satyagrahi Samajwad attempts a synthesis of the thoughts of Gandhi and Marx. Socialism claims itself to be an independent ideology which is neither anti or pro Marx and Gandhi. The expression is significant to denote the open ended states of the ideology as imagined by its supporters. Lohia wished that Indian socialism has to develop its own ideological insights (pertaining to the specific problems of Asian societies) though it borrows basic insight of Gandhi and Marx. In other words Indian socialism borrows only relevant elements from Gandhi and Marx to solve practical problems before Indian society. In this sense socialist formulation makes a strategic use of Gandhian as well as Marxist thought. This may prove to be a major shortcoming of the socialist ideology. It loses its theoretical rigour as it aims at strategic use of thought systems of Gandhi and Marx. satyagrahi Samajwad on the other hand accepts the ultimate ideal of Satyagraha. In the light of that ideal, it adopts socialist ideas to solve practico-political problems. Thus the entire exercise of Satyagrahi Samajwad attempts to relate the practico-political insights of socialism
with moral theoretical insights of satyagraha. Indian socialism does not accept any such theoretical basis.

Both Javdekar and Lohia share common concerns when they express the need to balance the ideal and the practical elements in politics. However socialist agenda neglects the ultimate, theoretical concerns to a large extent. Satyagrahi Samajwad, on the other hand, constantly attempts to relate practico-political and theoretical levels of thought and action. As a result of that Satyagrahi Samajwad becomes significantly different from the socialist formulation. Practico-political agenda of socialists and Satyagrahi Samajwad focus on several common issues. Lohia's insistence on economic and political decentralisation is similar with Javdekar's emphasis on decentralized socialist democracy.

In fact the socialist agenda may prove more effective at the practico-political level because it takes into consideration the practical realities, for example it identifies the social groups who would lead socialist revolution in the form of lower castes or women and emphasises on their political mobilization. Satyagrahi Samajwad on the other hand fails to relate its political agenda with the practical realities in India.

However socialism suffers due to its neglect towards ultimate-theoretical considerations. The point can be aptly discussed with the position of the two ideologies regarding the institution of state, Satyagrahi Samajwad accepts the Gandhian framework and the ideal of Ramrajya. Atmarajya imagines rule by internal moral restraints. At this stage; state as a form of external coercive machinery would be non-existent. Satyagrahi
Samajwad seeks at its theoretical level to end the state. To lead its politics towards this direction Satyagrahi Samajwad introduces external controls over state in the form of Yatis and moral-spiritual strength of each participating individual which is termed as 'Atmabal' by Javdekar. Javdekar recognises the need to externally control the state in order to further the nonviolent moral revolution. At the practico-political level; the agency of state would be helpful in solving the systemic injustices. However, Gandhian insights make Javdekar aware of the essentially exploitative nature of state and the need to fight against it. Therefore in Satyagrahi Samajwad practical strengthening of state is supplemented by moral politics of Satyagrahi workers to avoid any misuse of state power.

Socialist understanding of state does not include these insights. State is seen as the main agency of social change in socialist scheme. State is viewed as a neutral agency and not an essentially exploitative machinery. Economic decentralization and distributive justice is to be activated through state under socialism. Socialists do not find it necessary to externally control the state in order to avoid misuse of its power. The only solution suggested is that of political decentralisation. However political decentralisation would also take place with the help of the state. Such understanding of state makes Indian socialism a version of the ideology of 'welfare state'. Satyagrahi Samajwad remains significantly different from the socialist
formulation. It looks upon state as essential in initiating structural changes. To achieve this state has to be purified or enlightened by the socialist forces. Javdekar suggests that socialists must participate in power politics. They should capture the state to purify it. Such a state would be helpful in realising the desired change in the present socio-economic system. Socialists do find it necessary to enter power politics to initiate social reforms through state. However, they stop at this. Socialists do not recognise the limitations of power politics and the need to externally control it."

"Indian socialists view Satyagraha as a useful political technique rather than a life guiding principle. Their understand of nonviolence is pragmatic in the same sense. Satyagrahi Samajwad attributes a specific role to Satyagraha in exerting external control over the power politics. Satyagraha is treated as moral category. Therefore, it categorically advocates only nonviolent politics to reframe the socio-political structures. Socialist understanding of Satyagraha and nonviolence is strategic. It views Satyagraha as a useful; nonviolent technique for political struggles. It does not categorically deny the use of violent means. In this sense it also does not believe in Gandhian considerations regarding means and ends. Socialist understanding of Satyagraha remains to be strategic. Satyagrahi Samajwad on the other hand relates Satyagraha to its ultimate, moral-theoretical considerations. The point can be again related to Socialist neglect of the ultimate theoretical issues."
Satyagrahi Samajwad, Gandhians and Socialists

In the earlier parts of this chapter we compared the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad with those of the later Gandhians and socialists in India. These three formulations are regarded as very important exercises towards the development of emancipatory thought in India. A comparison among all the three varieties of thought would be helpful in estimating the emancipatory potentials and theoretical spaces available within them. This comparison would also open up some of the major issues which are discussed in the concluding chapter of this dissertation. The final chapter aims at critical assessment of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad.

The comparison will again focus on their position regarding the institution of state. The three ideologies differ significantly in this respect. For later Gandhians state represents violence and coercion against individual and therefore has to be opposed. However, their opposition to state implies non-participation in power politics. Later Gandhians suggest that Satyagrahi workers should independently work to change the established social norms. This can be achieved with the method of change of heart. Once the norms are changed state authority would automatically diminish and become nominal according to Gandhians. They categorically deny any authority of state. They even do not support use of law for desired social change. However, denial of the authority of state will be realized through withdrawal from the state-sphere according to later
Gandhians' scheme. They attempted to change the rules of civil society to deny the authority of state. In this scheme Gandhians adopt strategy of bypassing the state, Gandhi on the other hand imagined a continuous struggle against state to minimize violence in it. Satyagraha has to confront the state and try to change the nature of its authority. Satyagraha must attempt to provide a basis of consensus to the state authority. Later Gandhians undermine the aspect of confrontation with the state and merely with to do away with it through moral revolution. They could not take into account the structural contradictions in social relations. Therefore the moral revolution imagined by later Gandhians could not affect the structural patterns of our society. The thought remained invididualistic and limited. The actual political practice of later Gandhian workers in India became dependent on the state to a large extent. It was never able to lead any collective movement of confrontation with the state.

Socialists in India; deal with the state in a different manner. They attribute a neutral status to the state; to solve the problems of economic injustice. Although they borrow theoretical insights from Gandhi and Marx; they do not accept the radical understanding of state of either of these. In fact socialists never discuss the role of state in their writings. Socialists treat the state as a main agency of social change. Socialist policies would be realised through progressive legislation. For the purpose socialists wished to conquer political
power; mainly through electoral politics. This position practically reduces socialism to a version of the ideology of welfare state.

For socialists the state becomes main agency of change. For Gandhians state is the main obstacle in the process of human upliftment. Satyagrahi Samajwad assumes a different position regarding state. According to it physical, structural elements of change can be supported by enlightened, purified state. Therefore Javdekar recommends entry in power politics and becomes different from later Gandhians. On the other hand Satyagrahi Samajwad is also aware of the fact that moral elements of change will have to be introduced through Satyagraha alone. Therefore Satyagrahi Samajwad does not completely rely on power politics. Power politics will be supported by moral-spiritual force of 'Yatis' as well as of the ordinary individual in the form of 'Atmabal.'

The position of Satyagrahi Samajwad regarding state becomes significant. It exhibits a constant awareness of both the immediate and ultimate problems. The other two positions either emphasise ultimate or the immediate aspects of political problem and lose sight of the other. Satyagrahi Samajwad evidently goes beyond the limits of democratic socialism with its awareness of the ultimate ideal. It proves to be different from the later Gandhian thought with its awareness of the structural contradictions. Satyagrahi Samajwad emerges as a unique theoretical exercise on Javdekar's part; which offers specific interpretation of Gandhi and Marx.
Agencies of Social Change

However, Satyagrahi Samajwad fails to develop its own political practice in India. The same is true of later Gandhians. At this level Satyagrahi Samajwad can be related to later Gandhian thought. Socialist formulation remains distinct in this respect. One of the important reasons for inability of 'Satyagrahi Samajwad to develop its own political practice can be sought in its inability to identify the agencies of social change. The same problem is faced by later Gandhians. Gandhians do not recognise existence of social groups. Therefore every individual becomes the carrier of revolution as per their scheme. The position fails to identify any specific social agency of change. Javdekar does identify it in the form of 'Yatis'. However, he does not mention the social composition of group of Yatis. Yatis will be individuals practising complete nonviolence in their personal lives. However, he does not mention who these individuals will be and how will they be able to practise nonviolence when the structural patterns are not yet altered. This can be treated as a major shortcoming of the thought of later Gandhians as well as Satyagrahi Samajwad. Socialists on the other hand identify the economically poor classes and backward castes as leaders of socialist revolution.

However, all the three ideologies; including socialism share common viewpoint regarding their cultural politics. Their understanding of Indian tradition and their perspectives on Indian culture share common links. It proves to be a very significant
point of comparison among the three. It explains the reasons for their failure to develop consistent following. It also points towards major limitation of their cultural politics."

"As discussed earlier all the three ideologies; either directly or indirectly celebrate the Vedic framework of thought. They emphasise change in structural patterns of society through cultural-moral changes. However, the cultural-moral ideals are defined by these ideologies within the framework of dominant Vedic tradition. Gandhians uphold the Vedic framework as the ideological basis for the new community; realised through moral change. Javdekar goes along with them and celebrates the values of Vedic thought as essence of Indian culture. Satyagraha is also seen by Javdekar as a category emerging out of the Vedic framework. Socialists, while condemning the caste system as unjust; do not challenge the Vedic framework behind it. These thinkers never recognised the fact that Vedic discourse had contributed to a large extent in overall moral-economic decay of Indian society. Instead they chose to either glorify, justify or go along with it. They infact tried to find out favourable spaces within it for a just society. This can be treated as a common limitation of all the three ideologies. With this limitation their efforts of cultural politics; either without the help of state or with its support seriously suffer. However, this point will be again discussed in detail in the concluding chapter of this dissertation."

"As stated earlier, the present chapter helps in critically analysing the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad. Its comparison
with the other two ideologies focus on the issues of understanding of state and tradition. Their understanding of tradition is linked to their identification of social agencies and their cultural politics. Along with that it also discusses the key issues like understanding of Satyagraha; acceptance of the industrial framework and their perspective of nonviolent politics.

In this background the next chapter attempts critical assessment of Satyagrahi Samajwad at various levels. It will attempt to locate Satyagrahi Samajwad within the framework of emancipatory thought in India. The comparison would be helpful in such location of the ideology. While dealing with the status of Satyagrahi Samajwad the next chapter would come back to the understanding of state and tradition. The point becomes crucial because it touches upon the central political problem of relation between state and civil society. Understanding of state gets related to the most crucial problem before emancipatory ideologies. It points towards the priority to be given to the structural-material or cultural struggles. In this sense Satyagrahi Samajwad would be critically looked upon in the light of contemporary political theorisation in India. This may finally help in identifying the theoretical spaces for emancipation present within Satyagrahi Samajwad.
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