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The earlier chapters of this dissertation have described and discussed the argument of Satyagrahi Samajwad. In the background of this discussion the present chapter attempts a critical assessment of the ideology. Acharya Javdekar presents Satyagrahi Samajwad as a synthesis of the crucial insights of Gandhi and Marx. The synthesis looks for appropriate ideological tool to solve the problems before post-independence Indian society. In this sense it becomes a very important contribution towards the development of emancipatory ideas in post-independence period. The present chapter looks at the theoretical spaces available within the ideology to locate it within the context of emancipatory thought developed in India.

The present chapter will initially engage in critical assessment of the contents of the ideology. It will review Javdekar's understanding of Gandhi and Marx and the construction of Satyagrahi Samajwad based on it. Satyagraha is treated by Javdekar as the concept of Gandhian framework. Satyagrahi Samajwad could take shape because of Javdekar's specific interpretation of Satyagraha. Satyagraha is related on the one hand to the nationalist project from where it emerges; the other hand it is related to the essence of Indianness; that Javdekar searches through the elements of spirituality; the use of Dharma as universal moral order and the reconstructed Vedic framework used by Gandhi. Javdekar's understanding of Gandhian framework
sets the scope of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad at one level. The present chapter, critically looks at Javdekar's appropriation of Gadhian framework.

Javdekar's appropriation of Gandhian framework is supported by Javdekar's understanding of the socialist problematique posed by Marx. This awareness leads to a specific understanding of institution of state by Satyagrahi Samajwad. This can be treated as one of the most crucial aspects of the ideology. Satyagrahi Samajwad attains a very specific status within the framework of emancipatory ideas because of its understanding of state.

The perspective on state is a result of simultaneous awareness of Gandhian and socialist problematiques or what Javdekar termed as awareness of the immediate and 'the immediate and the ultimate.' He could differentiate between Sanatandharma and Yugadharma. However, he sees the Yugadharma in the light of Sanatandharma. In other words Satyagrahi Samajwad is constantly aware of both the immediate and the ultimate political problems. That leads to the exercise of synthesis of Gandhi and Marx on Javdekar's part. In this sense Javdekar's idea of synthesis also becomes a very crucial aspect of his thought.

Satyagrahi Samajwad operates to solve the political problems at both immediate and the ultimate levels. At the immediate level it sets the ideal of decentralised Satyagrahi democracy. Javdekar discusses the essential politics to realise
such a democracy in India. It is important to discuss this politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad. That would help us to look at the ideology as a contribution to the emancipatory formulations. This discussion would mainly include the political process that Javdekar imagines for establishment of the immediate ideal. It would discuss the role of social agencies identified by Javdekar to lead the process of change. The point would also refer to the kind of cultural politics that emerges out of Javdekar's political thought.

Javdekar's understanding of state and the cultural politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad become the two important issues for further analysis of Satyagrahi Samajwad and the theoretical spaces for emancipation available within it. These issues address crucial political problems of the present. They are related to the question of priority of structural-material and cultural-moral struggles, for formulating appropriate political strategies by the emancipatory movements. Satyagrahi Samajwad touches upon this crucial question in its formulation. The discussion of these issues would help in relating Satyagrahi Samajwad to the contemporary political theorisation in India. The present chapter thus engages in critical assessment of Satyagrahi Samajwad at various levels.

**Summary of the Earlier Chapters**

As stated earlier the assessment would take place in the background of the argument presented in the earlier chapters. A summary of the argument would be essential to make the
position clear. The earlier chapters present a review of the individual and the intellectual context in which Satyagrahi Samajwad emerges, the theoretical framework utilised by Javdekar to develop the ideology and the outline of the argument of Satyagrahi Samajwad. The fourth chapter compares Satyagrahi Samajwad with the formulations of later Gandhians and socialists in India.

The dissertation begins with a review of the historical context in which Satyagrahi Samajwad emerges. The dissertation undertakes study of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad. It does not extend its scope to the overall political thought of Acharya Javdekar. Therefore Javdekar's life and work; and his overall contribution is discussed in short in the first chapter itself. It serves as a background to the discussion of the ideology. The main part of the review of historical context in which Javdekar's thought took shape and its influence on him as well as on the argument of Satyagrahi Samajwad. It is stated that the nationalist project; in which Javdekar wholeheartedly participated; left a deep impact on his thought. It defined the task of nation-building for him. The historical context in which Javdekar worked; helped him in defining his nation. 'Adhunik Bharat'; the most prominent book by Javdekar; is discussed as a case point. The book writes a history of colonial India. While defining the nation Javdekar utilises the insights of Agarkar, Tilak, Gandhi and Marx. Marx comes as the last one of the influences. Javdekar mainly appropriates the insights of
Tilak and Gandhi to define the task before him. Tilak's influence is more profound in the initial stages. Javdekar relates both Agarkar and Gandhi to Tilak's politics to define the nation. Javdekar's nation is a modern nation celebrating the cultural superiority of the East. It is obvious that his concept of nation; as developed in Aadhunik Bharat; is largely influenced by the colonial; essentialist discourse. Javdekar celebrates the Vedic Philosophy as the essence of Indianess and treats Satyagraha as a category that emerged out of it. Aadhunik Bharat does not mention the contribution of Non-Brahmin or Ambedkar movements in Maharashtra. It neglects the overall critique of caste system and thus gets limited to orientalist framework. The point proves to be crucial in overall understanding of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad. It is argued in the present chapter that the influence of nationalist project on Javdekar sets major limits to Satyagrahi Samajwad.

The second chapter of the dissertation discusses the theoretical framework utilized by Javdekar in developing the ideology. The framework makes use of Gandhian and Marxian thought Systems. Satyagrahi Samajwad is developed as a synthesis of the two thoughts at various levels. To develop the argument Javdekar relies mainly on the Marxist analysis of the present capitalist system in the light of its materialistic interpretation of history. However, Marxian formulation suffered with certain limitations according to Javdekar. He identifies them in the form
of a system of relative morality and the use of violence. Gandhian concept of Satyagraha plays a corrective role towards these limitations of Marxism. Javdekar analyses the terms Satya, Ahimsa and Satyagraha in a specific manner to show how they can provide a sound moral basis to the ideology of change. Satyagraha is discussed by Javdekar as a moral-spiritual category. It is based on the elevated concept of Dharma; reinterpreted by Gandhi; as universal moral order. The ideals of 'Dharma' are incorporated in the Vedic philosophy also; if the Vedic philosophy is reinterpreted to suit to the present world. Both Tilak and Gandhi perform the task by relating the ideal of Moksha to social action. Satyagraha therefore is also rooted in the Vedic framework according to Javdekar. The philosophy of Gita (as interpreted by Tilak and Gandhi) helps in situating Satyagraha within the Vedic framework. The moral-spiritual category of Satyagraha; gets related to the material message of Marxism in Javdekar's Satyagrahi Samajwad. In this process; Javdekar opens up the possibilities within Marxist materialism to accommodate the elements of spiritualism. Thus Satyagrahi Samajwad attempts to synthesise material and the spiritual elements. The synthesis takes place at various levels and becomes a major point in Javdekar's political thought.

In the context of the theoretical framework; the third chapter of the dissertation presents outline of the argument of Satyagrahi Samajwad. The argument consists of the theoretical statement and politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad. Javdekar's understanding and interpretation of Gandhism utilises socialist
insights. The argument of Satyagrahi Samajwad reviews shortcomings of the ideology of Marxism. It attempts to overcome these with the help of Satyagraha. In this sense Satyagraha plays a corrective role in Javdekar's scheme. On the other hand Javdekar insists that Gandhism has to relate itself to the material-structural problems. He therefore attempts to develop 'Satyagrahi Krantishastra' (Satyagrahi Science of revolution) on the Marxist lines. Javdekar talks about Satyagrahi dialectics; Satyagrahi interpretation of history and a nonviolent class struggle. Satyagrahi Samajwad believes that the combination of essential insights of Gandhi and Marx would benefit both the ideologies to a large extent. Besides, it would develop an appropriate tool for achieving the immediate ideal of a decentralized society based on nonviolence and the ultimate ideal of Atmarajya-rule by autonomous individuals over themselves.

'Atmarajya' symbolises the end of state, as an external machinery of coercion over the individual. However, Satyagrahi Samajwad appropriates the state agency to function against the private coercion of the capitalist economic system. For that purpose state power has to be internally as well as externally controlled by nonviolent Satyagrahi workers. Javdekar imagines two separate groups of Satyagrahi workers in the form of weak and pure Satyagrahis. Satyagrahi Samajwad allows the weak Satyagrahi workers to participate in power politics. The pure Satyagrahis; or the Yatis; however, would remain outside the field of power politics and would try to increase the influence
of nonviolence in the overall social relations. These two agencies would rely on the spiritual strength or Atmabal within the individual.

Satyagrahi Samajwadi politics would initially result in formulation of a decentralized, socialist democracy based on nonviolence. State laws would play a crucial role at this stage both because of the imperfect human nature and the faulty social structure. On the economic front it would attempt equal distribution of social wealth. Javdekar does not completely approve of the ideal of self-sufficient villages imagined by Gandhi as a negation of the entire industrial framework. Javdekar does not fully share the Gandhian critique of industrialism. Therefore the socialist; Satyagrahi democracy would work within the industrial framework. However, the ownership of economic resources would be decentralized as far as possible. Satyagrahi democracy would uphold the noble values of Brahmanya. Javdekar believed that caste system in India has already ended and the need was to end the class-divisions. Satyagrahi democracy would thus be a classless society where every person would incorporate the noble values of Brahmanya within himself/herself. Javdekar does not specify any process of realisation of such democracy. However, he discusses and wholeheartedly approves of the Bhoodan movement initiated by Vinoba as the most important Satyagrahi experiment towards realisation of this ideal.

Javdekar in fact identified the Gandhian and the socialist workers as carriers or leaders of the Satyagrahi Samajwadi
revolution. He expected that Gandhians would play the role of pure Satyagrahis and should support the politics of socialist groups; who were identified as weak Satyagrahis by Javdekar. That is the initial reason why Satyagrahi Samajwad is compared in the fourth chapter with the formulations of later Gandhians and socialists in India. The comparison helps in the present exercise of critical assessment of the ideology. It discusses their understanding of Gandhi and Marx and their socio-political; economic ideals. This comparison also emphasises on the two crucial issues of understanding of state and of tradition. The three ideological formulations compared in the fourth chapter have different perspectives regarding the role of the institution of state. It is argued that socialists treat the state as being neutral. The socialist formulation relies on the agency of state to realise social and economic change. On the other hand later Gandhians attempted to bypass the state agency as they advocated complete withdrawal for themselves from the sphere of power politics. Satyagrahi Samajwad on the other hand has a distinctive perspective regarding the state. It is aware of the centrality of the institution of state. At the same time it uses both Gandhian and Marxian insights to treat the state as evil. Therefore its understanding of state becomes different from that of the socialists.

All these formulations share a common platform as far as their understanding of the tradition is concerned. It is argued that all of them celebrate the Vedic framework either directly
or directly. Gandhians search the ideal community through the Vedic discourse and Javdekar goes along with them. Socialists in India condemn the caste system but do not condemn the Vedic philosophy as providing the basis to the working of caste system. Such an understanding and use of tradition sets major limits to the cultural politics of these ideologies. These two issues raised by the fourth chapter set an agenda for the critical assessment of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad. The present chapter engages itself in such exercise in the background of the earlier discussion.

Critical Assessment of the Ideology

Satyagrahi Samajwad claims itself to be a synthesis of the thought of Gandhi and Marx. It is necessary to understand the exact nature of this synthesis postulated by Javdekar. The nature of synthesis depends on Javdekar's specific understanding and use of Gandhian and Marxist frameworks. Javdekar's series of four articles on Gandhi and Marx can be taken as the most elaborate exercise of this sort. Careful reading of the articles reveals the fact; that Satyagrahi Samajwad treats Gandhian framework as the final point of reference and attempts to accommodate the socialist problematique within it. On several occasions Javdekar metaphorically presents the relationship between Satyagraha and socialism as that of Sanatandharma and Yugadharma. Satyagraha is identified by Javdekar as the central term of Gandhian framework. It gets a corrective role towards
the socialist problematique. Javdekar's understanding of Gandhi and Marx proves to be distinctive. It is based on awareness of the wider relevance of Gandhian framework of Satyagraha and at the same time of the need to use it at the practico-political level. Therefore at one level Satyagrahi Samajwad attributes corrective role to Satyagraha; as far as the problems of violence and relative morality are concerned. On the other hand Javdekar defines and discusses Gandhism from a socialist perspective.\(^2\)

Javdekar's statement of Gandhism is an effort to view it from the socialist perspective. He argues for a Satyagrahi Krantishastra; with a specific set of laws of history; its own dialectics and its own variety of class struggle.\(^3\) Time and again Javdekar emphasises the need to resolve the class conflict with the help of Satyagraha. At the same time he treats the class conflict as a 'religious war' to re-emphasise Gandhian ideals of Satya and Ahimsa as positively contributing to the concept of class war.\(^4\) Satyagraha connotes the ultimate ideal for Satyagrahi Samajwad. The ideal is defined in terms of Atmarajya. However, the ideal of Atmarajya cannot be realised without favourable arrangement of social structures. The material conditions will not be favourable for the human beings to search for ethical-moral Satya; unless exploitation and coercion are done away with. Javdekar accepts the socialist ideal as it works to end the exploitation inherent in the capitalist system.\(^5\) In this sense establishment of socialist ideal becomes a precondition for realisation of Satyagrahi ideal according to Javdekar's scheme.
Marxism gains from Gandhi in its acceptance of Satyagrahi moral basis to its ideology. Similarly Gandhism gains from Marxism in recognising the necessity of changing material conditions for realising moral change. Therefore Javdekar states that every Satyagrahi worker has to accept socialist ideal; on the other hand socialism would be meaningful only if it is related to Satyagraha. Satyagrahi Samajwad emerges in the form of Gandhism seen through socialist perspective and socialism supplemented by Gandhian ideal of Satyagraha. Javdekar views this as a synthesis of the crucial elements within Gandhian and Marxist thought systems. The synthesis takes shape at various levels. For example Javdekar sees it as a synthesis of the elements of idealism and materialism. According to him Gandhism emphasises more on the spiritual elements of human life and Marxism emphasises the material. The need for Javdekar is to synthesise the elements properly to formulate the ideology of change. Javdekar's understanding of Marx and Gandhi and his formulation of Satyagrahi Samajwad is dominated by the exercise of synthesis. It is essential to analyse the idea of synthesis as utilised by Javdekar. This is attempted later on in detail. The nature of the ideology of Satyagrahi Samajwad; formulated out of synthesis of visions of Gandhi and Marx becomes distinctive. Satyagrahi Samajwad cannot be treated as a variety of democratic socialist formulations in India because it is dominated by the Gandhian framework. Secondly its understanding of the state institution is different from that of the democratic socialists. In fact Javdekar's perspective on state is a result
of his attempts to synthesise Gandhi and Marx. The thought of Satyagrahi Samajwad neither fits into the framework developed by later Gandhians; since Javdekar adopts an approach of constant confrontation with the institution of state. However, Javdekar himself adopts the Gandhian framework as the main point of reference for his ideological construction. While doing so he interprets the key term of Satyagraha in a novel manner.

**Satyagraha for Confrontation**

Satyagrahi Samajwad treats Satyagraha as the central concept of Gandhian thought. Javdekar makes it clear that Satyagraha cannot be restricted within the ideological constraints of Gandhism (if at all any such ideology exists). If Gandhism is what Gandhi said and did; Satyagraha goes beyond the limits of Gandhism according to Javdekar. Javdekar is fully aware of the 'open-ended' nature of Gandhian framework and utilises the same openness while relating Satyagraha to socialism.

Satyagraha is interpreted by Gandhians like Vinoba as 'assistance in right thinking.' Such understanding tends to undermine the crucial; confrontationist aspect of the notion of Satyagraha. Javdekar on the other hand emphasises the same when he talks about 'Satyagrahi Krantishastra'. As stated earlier such understanding of Satyagraha by Javdekar; is related to his awareness of the socialist problematique. He treats Satyagraha as a moral-spiritual category rooted in Indian cultural ethos.
However, the moral-spiritual nature of Satyagraha cannot be brought forth unless it engages itself in continuous struggle against material agonies. Satyagraha is a life guiding principle with its continuous search for Truth. At the same time Javdekar treats it as a political-ideological tool. The tool of Satyagraha is to be utilised for nonviolent struggles against material injustices. Fight against material injustices becomes a precondition for the search of Truth. If Satyagraha is to assist in the process of right thinking it must create material grounds for such a process to take place.

Javdekar's interpretation of Satyagraha emphasises the role of nonviolent politics in correcting the shortcomings of communist strategies. Javdekar's understanding of the problem of violence is against very specific. It goes against the orthodox understanding of Marxism as an essentially violent doctrine. Javdekar clearly states that due to historical limitations nonviolent options of socialist struggle were not available to Marx. 'Javdekar relates the problem of violence with the problem of relative morality in Marxism. However he does not condemn the entire doctrine for the use of relative morality. 'Satyagrahi Krantishastra' would be helpful in resolving these problems in Marxism according to Javdekar.

At this point Satyagrahi Samajwad assigns a corrective role to Satyagraha. At the same time it emphasises the need to accommodate the Marxist analysis of material situation within
Satyagraha. Satyagraha has to adopt a position of confrontation against material agonies. Javdekar does not limit the formulation only at abstract-theoretical level. He insists that Satyagraha must develop its own version of class struggle. Satyagraha has to engage in a struggle against the state (with the help of 'Shuddha' Satyagrahis) as well as the exploitative capitalist economic system (through Shabal Satyagrahis). This formulation of Satyagrahi politics incorporates the essential elements of Marxist politics; while seeking to remove its shortcomings. It is a related; still different issue to discuss Javdekar's exact strategies to realise this politics. These strategies may be imperfect as far as Indian reality is concerned. However, at theoretical level Javdekar's interpretation of Satyagraha succeeds in accepting the valid contents of Marxism within it.

At the same time it also preserves the essence of Gandhian framework. Gandhism explores the relationship between Satya and Ahimsa to relate the sectarian struggles of any variety with the ultimate moral considerations. The awareness of ultimate moral considerations; need not blunt one's urge to fight against material contradictions. Gandhism; and its use of Satyagraha was treated as class-collaborative; because of the nature of nationalist movement in India; as well as the use of Satyagraha by later Gandhian thinkers. Javdekar's understanding of Satyagraha emphasises on the revolutionary potentials of Satyagraha by relating it to socialism.
On the other hand it does not make a strategic use of the term like the Indian nationalist movement or the socialist groups. The socialists looked upon Satyagraha as a useful peaceful weapon in democratic politics. Javdekar regards Satyagraha as a life guiding principle. Satyagraha alone can work out the final moral revolution in society according to him. Satyagraha is treated here as a symbol of the ultimate moral consideration which Gandhism sought to establish. Javdekar's interpretation relates these with the practico-political struggles. This helps in maintaining the Gandhian continuum between the oppressor and the oppressed or the good and the evil. Satyagraha would lead the material struggles against capitalism. However, these struggles would not be only divisive in nature because they are nonviolent. The importance of nonviolence lies in its recognition to and awareness of ultimate moral considerations. Javdekar's interpretation of Satyagraha maintains this relationship; while making Satyagraha available for confrontation against state and class.

Nectar of Indian Civilisation

Javdekar situates Satyagraha within the Vedic framework of thought. Aadhunik Bharat describes Satyagraha as the nectar of Indian civilisation. The description proves to be crucial while analysing exact nature of Satyagrahi Samajwad. Javdekar reaches the notion of Satyagraha; through his links with Tilak; Gandhi; and their commentaries on Gita. He states how Satyagraha
helps in realising the ideal of Moksha within this world or to realise Brahman within the material world. Satyagraha is situated within the framework of 'Dharma' as interpreted by Gandhi. While discussing Dharma; Javdekar completely negates the existence of God and related theories. He understands Dharma as the universal moral order. Dharma is essentially related to the moral content of human life; which is to be utilised for the betterment of material life. Satyagraha is a category related to this religious framework. Gandhi's entire thought is essentially related to the enlightened religious framework according to Javdekar. He treats Gandhi as a religious revolutionary and Satyagraha as the fruit of the revolutionised religion. Javdekar's interpretation of Dharma and his placement of Satyagraha within the religious framework; establishes the influence of Gandhian framework on him.

The influence of Gandhi is supported by the nationalist project. Gandhian framework attempts what Vinoba terms as 'nonviolent cultural revolution;' which internally changes the cultural ethcc by reinterpreting traditional categories. Thus Gandhi redefines Dharma as the highest moral order. Javdekar utilises these insights while defining the essence of Satyagraha. At the same time he also becomes a part of the nationalist project which asigned a special role to Indian culture and religious traditions. These traditions were mainly equated with the Hindu religious traditions and Vedic framework by the nationalist movement. Establishment of the superiority of East
over the West was the main agenda before the nationalist movement. Javdekar shares the agenda with the nationalist leaders. Satyagraha not only becomes a religious; but a Vedic category now. In Javdekar's scheme alongwith a classless society; Satyagraha works to establish the noble virtues of 'Brahmnya'. He does not wish to establish superiority of Brahmin caste and makes it clear in one of his important articles. However, he differentiates the noble values of 'Brahmnya' as relevant to the present age. The use of Vedic terminology is not strategic in Javdekar. It becomes a very important part of his framework of thought. It is constructed out of two simultaneous influences on him, i.e. of Gandhi and Tilak. Both these strands share some common links as far as the use of tradition is concerned. Javdekar is keen to open up these links for his readers. He mainly establishes the centrality of Gita in both the strands of thought. The influence of Tilakite framework and nationalist project is so profound on Javdekar; that he is not able to see essential differences between the two positions. He constantly attempts to link the two. While formulating his notion of Satyagraha Gandhi borrows the insights from other religions apart from Hinduism. Javdekar on the other hand treats Satyagraha as a category developed out of the Vedic framework. He mentions that the Satyagraha philosophy seeks a synthesis of Vedanta and Ahimsa; upheld mainly by Buddhism. However, the synthesis takes place within Vedanti fold. Thus out of the dual influences of Gandhian framework and the nationalist project Satyagraha
is defined by Javdekar as the nectar of Indian civilization. The definition reemphasises the fact that Javdekar operates mainly within Gandhian framework.

Javdekar's understanding of Satyagraha appropriates the essential aspects of Gandhian framework of thought. It defines the moral destination; or the notion of good in the form of Satya and provides a concrete criterion of action in the form of Ahimsa at the practico-political level. Thus Javdekar's Satyagraha completely agrees with the Gandhian theory of 'means-end continuum.' At the same time Satyagrahi Samajwad emphasises on the collective and confrontationist role of Satyagraha through the concept of Satyagrahi Krantishastra. This emphasis minimizes the chances of neglect of contradictions; shying away from the material conflicts; in the name of nonviolence or spread of positive love. This can be treated as a very important aspect of Satyagrahi Samajwad. It makes the ideology different from democratic socialism; which views Satyagraha strategically and from that of official Gandhism developed by later Gandhians which completely neglects the fighting potentials of Satyagraha. Javdekar's understanding of Satyagraha presents a novel interpretation and appropriation of Gandhian framework.

Critique of Industrialism

Satyagrahi Samajwad operates mainly within Gandhian framework of thought. It presents a distinctive interpretation of the key concept of Satyagraha. It also locates Satyagraha within the religious-cultural framework, which is in accordance
with the Gandhian use of tradition. However, Javdekar distances himself from Gandhism in major respect when he ignores the Gandhian critique of industrialism. Gandhi negates the industrial society as based on violence. Industrial civilization is Satanic civilization for him. Javdekar does not understand and utilise the radicality of this position. He merely mentions that Gandhi criticised European civilisation for its use of violent means. It conveys the meaning that Satyagrahi politics and use of nonviolent means can make the European civilization and its ideals workable. Gandhi on the other hand treats the entire industrial framework as rooted in violence. Violence becomes an integral feature of industrialism according to Gandhi. Satyagrahi Samajwad is not able to appropriate and develop these insights.

Javdekar mentions the existence of big industries as necessary for economic development and proper distribution of economic justice. It is necessary to produce in abundance to satisfy the needs of entire nation according to Javdekar. Wealth and abundance cannot be produced without the help of big industries. Therefore the practico-political ideal of Satyagrahi Samajwad; in the form of decentralised Satyagrahi democracy. Suggests maximum possible economic decentralisation as essential to realise the socialist ideal. Satyagrahi Samajwad loses the essence of Gandhian opposition to the industrial framework at this point. Javdekar does not develop his economic argument in detail. The reasons for these loose ends in Satyagrahi Samajwad can be searched in various ways.
A prominent reason may be the fact that Javdekar is constantly aware of the practical problems. He accepts the Gandhian framework completely but constantly attempts to supplement it with socialist ideas. Socialism seeks economic justice through equal distribution of economic resources and fulfilment of every person's needs. The Gandhian concept of egalitarian society has an added dimension to it. This conception imagines limitations of material needs. Javdekar agrees with the socialist ideal but expresses doubts about the Gandhian ideal of limiting the needs. He believes that it is impossible to realise this ideal both because of imperfect human nature and social structure. Javdekar criticises the theory of trusteeship in the same vein. For him it is impractical to talk about curtailment of material needs. The position leads to acceptance of industrial framework as essential for satisfaction of material needs.

Secondly Javdekar's discussion of the industrial framework comes as a part of the actual politics of realisation of Satyagrahi Samajwad. Here Javdekar refers to the post-independence Indian society. As a part of the nationalist project Javdekar had trust in the emerging nation-state. His glorification of Nehru's leadership and policies may be sited as a case to the point. The glorification comes as that of the emerging post-colonial nation state. No doubt that he clearly criticises the Congress as upholding capitalist policies in the post-independence period. However, the focus now shifts to a hope of establishment of a
socialist state under the leadership of socialist forces in India. Javdekar may have hoped that at least this state would help in delivering economic justice through nationalisation and decentralisation. These practico-political considerations become more important than his theoretical critique of state; when he discusses the ideal economic structure. Gandhi rejects the authority of state as well as exploitative private economic system when he opposes the industrial framework in its entirety. It seems that at least at this point Javdekar does not entirely operate within the Gandhian framework.

The point may further become crucial in the overall assessment of Satyagrahi Samajwad, because it is related to the concept of development itself. Gandhian framework challenges industrialism; it sees the notion of development itself as unjust and exploitative. Javdekar does not share these insights even though he claims to be operating within the Gandhian framework. Satyagrahi Samajwad accepts the Gandhian; communitarian ideal which goes beyond the modern framework. At the same time the politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad remains within the rationalist, modernist framework. In fact there is an overall tension visible in Satyagrahi Samajwad to overcome these limits and go beyond the rationalist; modern discourse. Javdekar’s acceptance of industrial framework can be related to this issue as well. As discussed earlier it gets added dimensions of nationalist project and practical considerations.
Different from Democratic Socialism

Satyagrahi Samajwad relates itself to the democratic socialist politics in India. However, it remains to be different from the socialist strands in some crucial respects. Democratic socialism in India mainly adopts the position of the European varieties of democratic socialism. Javdekar was also influenced by the Western versions of democratic socialism in the earlier part of his life. However, he clearly states that constitutional methods always prove to be insufficient in realising the ideal of change. Indian varieties of democratic socialism mainly confined themselves to the constitutional politics. These forces expressed their faith in the working of bourgeois democracy and nationalism expounded by its constitution. It is important to note in this respect that Javdekar declares the existing democracy as capitalist; bourgeois democracy. Similarly he sees the Indian constitution as supporting the bourgeois values. In this sense his understanding of reality becomes different from that of Democratic Socialists.

Satyagrahi Samajwad seeks to synthesise the insights of Gandhi and Marx. On the other hand the socialist formulation treats itself as equidistant from both Gandhi and Marx. Lohia treats democratic socialism as essentially an open ended ideology. Socialism adopts some insights from both Gandhi and Marx; but does not claim loyalty to any of these systems. Lohia insists on the fact that the democratic socialist theory should develop
Independently to overcome the shortcomings of Gandhism and Marxism. Lohia further insists on the fact that socialism should concentrate more on practice rather than theory. These position makes socialist formulation devoid of the essential theoretical rigour. It is evident in their strategic use of Satyagraha and more importantly in their perspective towards the institution of state.

Socialism in India confines to the notion of neutrality of state agency in social conflicts. It seeks to establish politico-economic distributive justice through political and economic decentralisation. Decentralisation would be mainly achieved through state. Indian socialists; especially Lohia emphasised on political mobilization of backward castes and classes as the carriers of socialist revolution. However, the fruits of revolution would be distributed through state. To minimize the coercion inherent in state Lohia suggests the system of 'Choukhamba Raj' or the four pillar state. That means socialism mainly opposes centralisation of power. It does not agree with the Gandhian or the Marxist perspective on state as essentially coercive machinery. Rather the socialists award a neutral status and a positive role to the state agency. Therefore they mainly engage in power politics through elections. We need not discuss the actual politics of socialist groups in post-independence India at this moment; as it becomes an altogether different issue. The point to note is that it is inherent in the nature of socialist theory that socialist politics mainly confines to electoral politics. It is related to the socialist understanding of state.
The strategic use of the notion of Satyagrtaha by Socialists can also be related to the same issue.

Satyagrahi Samajwad shares the Gandhian/Marxist insights while formulating its position regarding state. It critically looks upon the state as a coercive machinery externally working on the individual. Therefore it constantly works to minimise state influence from the social life. Javdekar accepts the inevitability of state violence - mainly through laws. However, he suggests simultaneous movements for purification as well as abolition of state. Socialist state; in any ideal Satyagrahi democracy must be based on consensus. For that purpose socialist forces will have to occupy key positions of power. Socialists are treated here as weak Satyagrahis working within the framework of power politics. At this point Javdekar relates his ideology with the socialist forces in India. However, the politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad does not confine itself to power politics. It recognises the need to go beyond it to control and end violence inherent in the state. Satyagrahi Samajwad utilises the force of pure Satyagrahis or Yatis on the one hand and of Atmabal or Satyagraha on the other to control the state violence. Javdekar emphasises the fact that only Satyagraha can bring about the moral revolution in society. This position; though it recognises the inevitability of state for structural changes; does not give any decisive or positive role to the state. This becomes the most crucial point of difference between Satyagrahi Samajwad and Democratic socialism developed in India.
In the post-independence period Javdekar wholeheartedly justified the politics of socialist forces. He assigned them a crucial role even within the Satyagrahi Samajwadi framework. Unfortunately the socialist forces never engaged in a critical dialogue with Satyagrahi Samajwad. The reasons for this neglect of Satyagrahi Samajwad by the socialists may be manifold. One of the basic causes may be found in the fact that Javdekar wrote exclusively in Marathi. His writings were therefore not available outside Maharashtra. However, even in Maharashtra he was completely neglected by the socialist forces. Javdekar's use of Gandhian-Vedic, spiritual terminology and neglect of leaders like Phule and Ambedkar may have created some inhibitions in the minds of socialist activists. However, the main reason can be traced to absence of theoretical rigour within the socialist groups to grasp the exact nature of Satyagrahi Samajwad. The theoretical potentials of Satyagrahi Samajwad remained untapped because of its neglect by socialist groups in India.

**Centrality of State**

The most important area; where the emancipatory theoretical potentials of Satyagrahi Samajwad are revealed is of course its position regarding the institution of state. Javdekar's understanding of state is not only different from that of later Gandhians or socialists; but it presents a specific appropriation of the positions of Gandhi and Marx. As stated earlier it emerges out of a simultaneous awareness of Gandhian
and socialist problematiques. It becomes crucial because it touches upon the fundamental political problem, relevant for the contemporary emancipatory movements.

Satyagrahi Samajwad believes that state is unacceptable as it is based on coercion. It seeks to end the state and to establish Atmarajya. The bourgeois state exploits the poor classes within the capitalist system. The ideal socialist state; established under Satyagrahi democracy would help in changing the laws favouring capitalists. However, even the socialist state would not be able to lead the movement of 'real' moral change. Moral change is possible only through Satyagraha. It is to be initiated and led by pure Satyagrahis or Yatris. Satyagrahi Samajwad suggests a two fold struggle against state. At one level it aims at the purification of state. On the other hand it works to completely end the state. According to Javdekar the two struggles must be integrally related with each other and must be continuous.

As discussed earlier the position is completely different from democratic socialist notion of neutrality of state. It understands the state essentially as a coercive machinery. At the same time it recognises the centrality of state in social relations. State becomes a very powerful institution in society. Therefore it is inevitable to use the state for realising structural changes. This position makes Satyagrahi Samajwad different from the later Gandhian formulation; which bypasses state altogether from the social relations; while discussing the strategies of change. Satyagrahi Samajwad on the other hand realises the
fact that state cannot be avoided while leading the movements of emancipation. On the contrary; state power has to be utilised where necessary. At the same time Satyagrahi workers must constantly confront with the state. Inevitable presence of state is to be appropriated by Satyagrahi politics by using its power for desired social changes. Such a state presumes consensus among the subjects; which is implied by the process of purification of state. Consensus emerges as a result of the twin factors of Satya and Ahimsa - expressed in the form of Atmabal of every individual. At the same time state power would be externally controlled by pure Satyagrahi workers. They would initiate and lead the movement of moral change independent of the state influence. The movements for moral change imply constant confrontation and collective Satyagrahi struggles against unjust state actions. At both levels of utilisation of the state power and confrontation with it; Javdekar accepts and emphasises the centrality of state. This can be treated as a very crucial point under the present circumstances. Especially in the third world societies, power relations are not diffused as the post-structuralists assume but they get concentrated in the state. Thus state continues to remain the main object to fight with. The methods and strategies of combating the state may not be similar to those of Satyagrahi Samajwad. However, Satyagrahi Samajwad touches upon this crucial issue of centrality of state.

Yet another area where Satyagrahi Samajwad relates itself versus to the present scenario; is about the priority of cultural-moral/structural material struggles. Within the Marxist tradition the
issue is mainly discussed by Gramsci. The notion of hegemony developed by Gramsci emphasises the need of cultural struggles. For Gramsci the revolutionary party works to allow the working class to create a new society. The party helps in developing organic intellectuals and an alternative hegemony of the working class. Gramsci emphasised the priority of hegemonic conquer over the civil society for altering the complicated structure of state in advanced capitalist societies. Satyagrahi Samajwad in a way attempts to find out its own answer to the problem. Javedekar's strategy of a twofold struggle against state; implies simultaneous exercise of structural-material and cultural moral struggles. State potentials would be appropriated for initiating structural changes. At the same time moral-cultural struggle by the pure Satyagrahis would try to control the unjust elements within state. Within the Marxian framework the problem of priority between the two levels of struggle remain crucial and problematic because it does not categorically deny the use of violence. Satyagrahi Samajwad adopts the concrete criterion of Ahimsa in its politics. Nonviolence becomes the key term for simultaneous existence of structural and cultural struggles. Both these levels of struggle strictly follow the concrete criterion of nonviolence in theory and action. Javedekar's interpretation of Gandhian framework proves to be crucial in this respect also.

The position of Satyagrahi Samajwad regarding the institution of state can be related to the above mentioned important question relevant even for the contemporary movements of social change. It possesses some theoretical spaces which
can be related to the contemporary theorisation. However, actual politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad; as discussed by Javdekar suffers major limitations to the appropriation and utilisation of these theoretical spaces within Satyagrahi Samajwad. In fact, the actual cultural politics and the process of change imagined by Javdekar in his formulation of Satyagrahi Samajwad remains to be so problematic that it completely undermines the presence of emancipatory potentials within Satyagrahi Samajwad. We may begin the discussion by looking at Javdekar's understanding of tradition and politics based on it.

**Celebrating Dominant Traditions**

While discussing Satyagrahi Samajwad as celebrating the Gandhhian framework; we have seen how it treats Satyagraha as a moral; spiritual category. Satyagraha becomes the nectar of Indian civilisation. Indian civilisation mainly gets identified with the Hindu philosophical traditions in Javdekar's framework. The identification is a result of influence of the nationalist project on the one hand and the Gandhian project on the other.

Gandhism reinterprets tradition to suit the desired social change. Gandhi himself presents a critique of Hindu tradition when he declares himself as a Sanatani Hindu and yet denies to abide by the authority of Shastras; if their teachings are unacceptable to one's intellect.\(^{38}\) Gandhi accepted the authority of Hinduism but fully utilised his right to reform it from within. Gandhian use of the tradition was never merely strategic. Gandhi
was successful because of several reasons. As Bhiku Parekh rightly points out 'Gandhi succeeded not because his interpretation was universally accepted to be correct, but because it was plausible; the current social climate ripe for reform and, no less important, his own ascetic way of life gave him in the eyes of Hindus, including his adversaries, a traditionally based authority to interpret and challenge it.'

A slightly long quotation of Parekh is reproduced here with a specific purpose. Javdekar, no doubt, accepts the Gandhian interpretation of tradition to be correct, however the other factors mentioned above also add up to his acceptance of Gandhian interpretation of tradition. Javdekar does recognize Gandhi's traditionally based authority to interpret and challenge the tradition from within when he terms Gandhi as a religious revolutionary. Javdekar is also sure that the time is ripe for social reforms within Hinduism. He describes how the class struggle could not develop in India earlier due to historical limitations. It was essential to reform the Hindu society from within. Gandhi successfully engages himself in this task according to Javdekar. He himself accepts the Gandhian interpretation of tradition for developing the cultural politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad.

Obviously the limitations, which can be attributed to the Gandhian discourse, can also be applied to Satyagrahi Samajwad. Parekh mentions two such limitations. One is that Gandhi
challenged Hindu institutions and practices largely on the ground that they were 'corruptions' of original or pure Hinduism. It implies that the original Hinduism, however defined remains the final court of appeal for Gandhism. 'He could not therefore transcend Hinduism and subject it to a radical and searching critique.' Secondly Gandhi's discourse contained a tension according to Parekh; because of the use of idioms and mode of argument Therefore the Gandhian social legacy inherently remains ambiguous.42

This ambiguity is reflected in Javdekar's interpretation of tradition. He accommodates Gandhian visions mainly within the discourse of Neo-Vedanta, developed by earlier thinkers like Shankaracharya; Vivekananda; and Tilak.43 The insights adopted by Gandhi from other religious philosophies are undermined. Therefore Satyagraha emerges as a category belonging to Vedic framework in Javdekar's thought. Satyagraha reinterprets the ideal of Moksha. Real Satyagrahi worker has to strengthen the Atmabal within him/her. Atmabal is related to the noble virtues of Brahmanya in Javdekar's scheme. The use of such terms connotes the exact nature of ambiguity in Javdekar's thought as discussed by Parekh about Gandhi.

A more important aspect of Javdekar's interpretation of tradition is related to the use of the text of Bhagwadgita as a major point of reference. Bhagwadgita remains to be the guide for Javdekar throughout the process of his intellectual development. Tilak's interpretation of Gita in the form of
Nishkam Karmayoga attracted Javdekar initially. Later he related it with Gandhi's interpretation of Gita in Anaskatiyoga provides a concrete criterion of Ahimsa to judge one's selfless action. It is important to note that Javdekar appropriates Gandhian social legacy through these links. Gita proves as a crucial text in the process. Javdekar declares that Gita's social philosophy is outdated but its universal message remains valid. In this case also the use of idioms and mode of argument creates an inherent tension in Javdekar's interpretation of Gita.

Javdekar's interpretation of tradition has one more dimension of the influence of nationalist project on Javdekar. Nationalist project was engaged in establishment of cultural superiority of the East over the West. In fact Tilak's interpretation of Karmayogi Vedanta is dominated by the same idea. Javdekar also appropriates these insights to prove the superiority of spiritual East over material West. Gita does play a crucial role throughout the nationalist movement in this respect; as it propounds a philosophy of 'action.' Javdekar becomes a part of the process because of his active participation in the nationalist project. Alongwith Gandhian framework; the nationalist discourse also decides the nature of Javdekar's understanding of tradition. Both these aspects combined together; set certain major limitations to the politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad.
On the one hand the nationalist project essentialises and glorifies the nation as a unified single unit. In Javdekar's framework the nation consists of noble elements of spiritualism in the form of spiritual strength or Atmabala of the individual. It becomes the essence of Indianness. The spiritual elements are however also related to the Vedic framework of thought. Thus the Vedic framework of thought (with whatever interpretation of it) becomes the key element of nationhood. Such a concept of nationhood obviously excludes a large number of Indian citizens from it. Javdekar seems to be unaware of this exclusion. It is clearly reflected in his position regarding caste system. This becomes a crucial point in the overall assessment of the politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad.

**Neglect of Caste Exploitations**

The use of Gandhian framework compels Javdekar to adopt a specific position regarding 'Varnashramdharma'. Gandhian framework celebrates the noble and ideal Varnashramdharma in its pure and original form. Gandhi treats it as a system of division of labour. He reemphasises its value through his critique of the forms of labour within capitalism and the need to alter them by giving same dignity to every kind of labour. Later Gandhians appropriated the same insights; but with inherent ambiguity in it. They unconditionally celebrated the establishment of original Varnashramdharma without paying any attention to the problematic mode of argument.
Javdekar of course shares these insights. However, he seeks to establish a 'single-Varna' society under the Satyagrahi democracy. The ideal is adopted from that of socialism which ideally seeks to establish a classless society and practically to abolish the capitalist class. Javdekar taps the similarities between Varna and class. He makes different statements regarding the status of Varna system in present Indian society. Once he proclaims the ideal of establishing a single-Varna society. On yet another occasion Javdekar states the need to abolish the Shudra and Kshatriya Varnas altogether. When asked about the strategies of fight against Varna system Javdekar proclaims that Varna system in India has been already abolished and what remains to fight with is the class system. The statements can be taken as a result of essential ambiguity borrowed from Gandhian framework. They emerge also as a result of limitations imposed by the nationalist project on Javdekar's thought.

Satyagrahi Samajwad completely neglects the exploitative nature of the caste system and the support extended to it by the Hindu religious philosophies. There is no doubt that Javdekar was completely against the caste system at least in the mature phase of his political life. However, he does not show any awareness of the caste movements taking shape in his own time. Javdekar accepts the history of struggles against Varna system in Indian society. He also declares the social philosophy of Gita as completely outdated because it sanctions social inequalities.
In this connection he mentions the work by Buddha as challenging the social systems of inequality and dominance of Brahmins. However, throughout the discussion Javdekar does not categorically insist on the need to struggle against the caste system. The exploitative content of the caste system is never discussed and challenged by Javdekar.

On the other hand, he goes along with the other Gandhians in celebrating the Vedic discourse as a foundation for the ideal egalitarian community. During the same period social thinkers like Jyotirao Phule and B.R. Ambedkar identified the caste system as a prominent system of exploitation in Indian society. These thinkers presented a radical critique of Hinduism as justifying the caste system. Their politics thus goes beyond the scope of Hinduism and helps in an overall critique of its philosophy. As stated earlier Gandhian ideas face obvious limitations due to their final appeal to 'pure' Hinduism. Javdekar's own politics sets further limitations to its operation because it completely sidelines the caste issues.

The limitations apply not only to the politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad but that of later Gandhians and socialists also. None of these ideologies takes a note of the exploitative content of the caste system; provided by the philosophy of Hinduism. They either directly or indirectly celebrate the Vedic discourse in their thought. Later Gandhians face these limitations because of the inherent tension within Gandhian
legacy. The formulations of these thinkers make a case to prove the point how Gandhian legacy can be appropriated to celebrate the dominant Vedic discourse. Indian socialists expose the exploitative relations among castes. They even emphasise the need to mobilise backward castes as leaders of the socialist revolution. However, they do not present a radical critique of Hinduism. In other words, they could not practise the necessary cultural politics for mobilisation of backward castes. Satyagrahi Samajwad does not even mention the need to mobilise the backward castes to lead a Satyagrahi revolution. It completely neglects the relations of opposition between upper and the lower castes. These limitations emerge out of multiple reasons.

One of the reasons shared in common by later Gandhians and Satyagrahi Samajwad is in the nature of Gandhian framework. The position of Satyagrahi Samajwad also gets influenced by the nationalist project which emphasises the existence of nation as a unified entity. Yet another reason for Javdekar’s uncritical response to caste relations, may be sought in the typical orthodox position of Indian as well as outside Marxists; which treats ‘caste’ as a feudal entity — automatically diminishing with the opening up of capitalist forces of production. Here the influence is of the rationalist; modern project. However, the socialists do recognise caste system as unjust. Still they celebrate the ideology of Hinduism either directly or indirectly. The third limitation can be identified here; which serves to be common for democratic socialism and Satyagrahi Samajwad;
is in the essential; middle class nature of their politics. Such nature of politics causes the neglect towards links between exploitative nature of caste system and the Hindu religious philosophy. The reasons for Javdekar's neglect towards the caste system can be manifold. However, it definitely questions the viability of politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad.

**Cultural Politics and Caste Issues**

In the light of discussion of Gramsci's notion of hegemony cultural politics becomes a crucial factor of emancipatory theory and its political strategies. Of course, the two are necessarily related to each other. Any theoretical exercise of strategies of confrontation with state assumes political mobilisation. The theory of change related to the historical development of forces of production proves to be deterministic and simplistic (Even there Marx does assume the emergence of class-for-itself). Later Marxian tradition develops a sophisticated understanding of the state-civil society relations; and about the complicated nature of civil society. The capture of state assumes alterations in the nature of civil society. Every emancipatory theory elaborates on the strategies of altering the nature of civil society or of political mobilization. These strategies play a crucial role in scrutinising emancipatory potentials of any ideology. Cultural politics broadly encompasses the strategies of political mobilisation. More specifically it is related to the appropriation of existing / cultures for the achievement of emancipatory goal. Cultural politics operates at the collective level and continuously engages itself in a search for emancipatory spaces within cultural
relations. However, it is different from the notion of individual change of heart because it essentially operates at the collective level. Secondly, it does not declare civil society to be autonomous. It takes a cognizence of complicated relations between the state and civil society.

In this sense, politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad can be fruitful only if it relates itself to key cultural issues. It is obvious that any cultural politics in India has to take a note of the caste issues. If Satyagrahi Samajwad lacks the perspective its politics can not be sustained. At its theoretical level Satyagrahi Samajwad does contain emancipatory potentials. However, its politics inserts major limitations to these potentials at various levels. Javdekar's interpretation of tradition was a major case in point.

**Agencies of Change**

The main problem of politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad can be identified in the nature of agencies of change proposed by Javdekar. At its theoretical level Satyagrahi Samajwad develops a subtle formulation regarding simultaneous existence of structural and cultural struggles. However, the formulation proves to be problematic at the level of its implementation. Satyagrahi Samajwad does not elaborate on the actual political processes through which purification or end of state can be realised. Yatis, or pure Satyagrahis are regarded as the carriers of moral revolution. The weak Satyagrahis would lead the structural
changes. However, the social composition of Yatis or weak Satyagrahis is never discussed by Javdekar. He never clarifies the socio-economic status and profile of Yatis. They are the persons who can practise complete nonviolence in their personal lives. Yatis are the personified ideals of qualities of nonviolence according to Javdekar. If the systemical structural contradictions are taken into consideration; it is impossible for any person to rise above them and practise complete nonviolence. Satyagrahi Samajwad; at its theoretical level; recognises the fact. That is the main reason why it emphasises on achievement of socialism before realising moral change. How can Yatis achieve higher status when they remain within the structural contradictions? In fact, it is very much possible that only the upper class persons can afford to adopt and will strategically adopt complete nonviolence to blur the contradiction present within different social groups. The subaltern critique of Gandhian use of nonviolence as class-collaborative will apply here to Satyagrahi Samajwad. Javdekar on the one hand completely neglects the structural contradictions when he discusses the role of Yatis. He also defeats the theoretical logic of Satyagrahi Samajwad itself when he assigns a neutral role to Yatis. Thirdly if his discussion of Yatis is related to his neglect of caste system and celebration of noble ideals of 'Brahmanya'; it is very likely that the Yatis would emerge from the dominant classes. In this background the possibility of Yatis accepting confrontationist approach towards state remains distant.

The position regarding Yatis opens up the elitist nature
of politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad. It divides the society into Yatis and followers. Though the politics relies on Atmabal of every participating individual; Atmabal would be initiated by Yatis. The ordinary citizen has to follow Yatis as his/her ideal. It implies specialisation of task and control of social relations by a few individuals. It also implies the dichotomy between theory and action; as the Yatis will not participate in power politics. They are assigned the task of controlling the power relations. The theory-action dichotomy is a typical aspect of rationalist discourse. Javdekar's emphasis on the role of Yatis reveals the rationalist-elitist nature of politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad. Javdekar's own/personal role as a 'public educator' can also be come significant in this respect. Satyagrahi Samajwad does not abide by the notion of neutrality of State. It treats the state as an essentially coercive machinery. But in celebrating the role of Yatis; it shifts the neutral role from the state to Yatis. Instead of state; Yatis would become autonomous and neutral agencies of social change. This position also reinforces the elitist nature of Satyagrahi Samajwadi politics.

At the other level of political struggle; weak Satyagrahis are the leaders. Their position also remains to be problematic. Javdekar identifies the socialist forces in India as weak Satyagrahis. He does not take into account the crucial differences in the theoretical positions ofDemocratic socialism and Satyagrahi Samajwad; especially regarding the institution of state, while assigning such a role to the socialist groups. The belief in
socialist groups emerges out of specific political situation in the post-independence India. Javdekar hoped that the socialist forces would increase their strength in post-independence politics. They would take over the state and initiate socialist legislation. Under these circumstances it would be easy to lead the Satyagrahi struggles. At a broader level the hope can be interpreted as a belief in the notion of interventionsist nation-state emerging out of anti-imperialist struggles. This belief is a part of the nationalist discourse. Both these aspects combine in Satyagrahi Samajwad to assign a leading role to the socialists. If socialist position regarding state is taken into consideration; we may argue that Satyagrahi Samajwad also accepts the role of state in initiating changes to a large extent. At its theoretical level also, Satyagrahi Samajwad assigns a role to the state in case of structural changes. At the same time it specifies the need to gradually purify the state. However, the actual political process of purification of state is never made clear by Satyagrahi Samajwad. Its politics remains ambiguous regarding the issue of class-struggle.

**Satyagrahi Class Struggle**

At its theoretical level Satyagrahi Samajwad emphasises the elements of confrontation within Satyagraha. It states the ideal of establishment of a classless society. The need for class struggle is also emphasised. However, the process through which it can be realised is not made clear by Javdekar. At one level
the change in the capitalist relations of production would be initiated through legislation. However, legislation and state intervention would have a limited role to play according to Jandekar's own scheme. However, the alternative strategies of leading the class struggle are not discussed by Javdekar. His discussion of class struggle stops at the hope of capture of state institution by socialist forces in India. The role of Satyagraha in leading the class struggle is not at all discussed by Javdekar.

On the other hand the only Satyagrahi experiment that Javdekar mentions as an example of real Satyagrahi politics is of Bhoodan movement initiated by Vinoba. Javdekar makes a very positive assessment of the Bhoodan movement. He claims that Bhoodan would help in radically altering the patterns of ownership. The position neglects theoretical as well as political limitations of Bhoodan movement. Javdekar clearly states the limits of Gandhian notion of trusteeship. In doing so he elaborates the nature of sources of accumulation within capitalism. However, he ignores the same insights when he discusses the contribution of Bhoodan as an alternative to violent class struggle.

Bhoodan movement mainly relied on 'dan' or voluntary donations by the land-holders. Donations cannot be treated as worthwhile within capitalist economy where legitimate channels are available for possession of excess wealths. Besides emphasis on voluntary donations negates the elements of confrontation within Satyagrahi politics. It also neglects the existence of contradictory interests and its complicated nature under the capitalist system. The
politics of Bhoodan failed because of these theoretical limitations. Javdekar could not foresee these limitations because of the problematic political position of his own ideology. He searched for Satyagrahi alternative to the violent class struggle. Bhoodan was the possible Satyagrahi experiment in his scheme which could translate the theory of redistribution of economic resources into practice. Javdekar's assessment of Bhoodan has an inherent comment on the nature of politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad itself Satyagrahi Samajwad could not develop radical version of Satyagrahi politics mainly because it was not able to comprehend proper agencies of social change. Besides it neglects the complex nature of capitalist society and structural contradictions inherent within it. Therefore at its practico-political level Javdekar's ideas get reduced to a simplistic notion of Satyagrahi politics; which emphasises the moral role of non-violence in resolving conflicts.

Javdekar was aware of problems of strategic or simplistic use of Satyagraha. While analysing the nature of Indian national movement he accepts that the national movement never wholeheartedly accepted the philosophy of Satyagraha. The movement used it at strategic level. However, the influences on nationalist agenda on his own politics; limits the potentials within it.

**Nationalist Agenda**

The politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad takes shape within nationalist framework. The philosophy of Satyagraha developed
by Gandhism crosses the limits of nation-state. It celebrates communitarian ideal in the form of self-sufficient villages. Javdekar's ideal of Atmarajya too adopts these communication insights. However, the politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad takes shape within the nationalist framework. Therefore it does not appear to be different from democratic socialist politics to a large extent. For example it wholeheartedly supports the congress politics of 'nation-building' during the pre-independence period.

It would be interesting to note that Javdekar formulated a course on 'science of nation building' (Rashtrasanghatanshastra) for the students of social sciences at Tilak Maharashtra University. The establishment of Satyagrahi democracy works within the framework of nation-state. Javdekar discusses the politics of secular forces in India as helpful in creating a secular (modern) nationalism in India. He had a simplistic understanding of the Hindu-Muslim conflict. Javdekar's suggestions for resolution of this conflict do not reflect Satyagrahi insights within them. It works within the typical framework 'secularism' as derived by the modern discourse. This framework does not take into account the complicated nature of communal politics and treats religious fundamentalism as a feudal and therefore outdated phenomenon.

On the economic front Satyagrahi democracy emphasises the principle of decentralisation. It is implied that such decentralisation would work out under the control of a national; sovereign state. In this case the state would play prominent role in distributing economic resources equitably among the people. The principle of economic decentralisation accepts existence of
industrial framework and presumes the concepts of progress and development. Javdekar's discussion of politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad nowhere challenges these notions either directly or indirectly.

The discussion of politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad may be summarized by stating that it is not able to accommodate and translate the theoretical insights of Satyagrahi Samajwad at practico-political level. At its theoretical level Satyagrahi Samajwad shares the insights of Gandhism and presents a novel interpretation of Satyagraha. The politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad is unable to successfully utilise the interpretation. The politics remains to be rationalist, and within the framework of scientific discourse giving sanctity to the modern nation state.

The politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad faces limitations due to its historical context. It operates within the pre and post independence India. Javdekar's own class and caste position determines the limits of his politics during these two phases. His insistence on nation building; celebration of Vedic framework; strategies of peaceful resolution of conflict; notion of neutrality of state or Yatis can all be related to his historical social position. Similarly his efforts of 'synthesis' and the notion of synthesis can be explained extending the same logic. Some of Javdekar's contemporary communist activists from Maharashtra criticised Javdekar on the same ground. The politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad thus becomes a peculiar version of the middle class politics largely dominated by the colonial framework.
Towards Emancipation

However, Javdekar's efforts at formulation of 'synthesis' cannot be completely viewed as a part of the middle class politics in pre and post independence India. The politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad has its own historical limitations. However at its theoretical level the exercise of synthesis has its own strengths. The exercise of synthesis symbolises Javdekar's attempt to go beyond the historical limitation faced by his politics. The theoretical argument of synthesis of Gandhi and Marx reveals a basic tension between the rational discourse and the need to go beyond it. It symbolises the urge on part of Javdekar to cross the limits of rational lead; modern discourse and to accept the communitarian ideal implied in Gandhism. At the same time Javdekar is aware of the practico-political problems and the urgency to resolve them. These become the real inspirations behind his efforts synthesis. Javdekar is able to relate the emancipatory potentials of Gandhism and Marxism in a specific way through his exercise of synthesis. Gandhi's Satyagrahi politics gets a valuable dimension of Marxist analysis of structural contradictions within capitalist system. Gandhi's categorical use of nonviolence as a concrete criterion of action takes Marxism beyond the divisive; violent nature of its politics; which is a typical feature of modern discourse. Gandhi's politics of Satyagraha attempts to establish a continuum between the oppressor and the oppressed and proclaims the ideal of human dignity and equality in a wider context. Javdekar's efforts of
synthesis not only opens up these potentials but relates to the
two insights in a very subtle manner; reemphasising their
emancipatory potentials.

In the background of the contemporary political situation
in India as well as other third world societies; it is essential
to realise and develop the emancipatory potentials of Gandhian
and Marxist ideologies. Satyagrahi Samajwad discusses some of
the crucial issues in this respect. It contains some important
theoretical spaces within it; which can be developed to realise
the emancipatory potentials within it and the ideologies of
Gandhism and Marxism. For such exercise one has to go beyond
the historical limitations of the politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad.
The last part of the present chapter attempts such an exercise
in the light of contemporary political problems and theorisation
regarding them.

Critical assessment of Satyagrahi Samajwad brings to the
forefront some crucial political issues addressed by it. It may
not have been possible for Satyagrahi Samajwad to provide
satisfactory answers to these problems. However, its theoretical
formulation definitely directs towards their resolution. These
political issues prove to be relevant even for the contemporary
emancipatory movements. The importance of the thought of
Satyagrahi Samajwad gets underlined due to the relations it
shares with contemporary emancipatory thought.
At present the emancipatory political theorisation in India mainly utilises Gandhian and Marxist paradigms. Satyagrahi Samajwad attempts to relate the two in its own way. Exploiting some of the crucial issues discussed by Satyagrahi Samajwad; the emancipatory movements in India may further lead the critical dialogue between the two ideological systems.

The first among these issues is related to the relationship between Satyagraha and socialism. At its crude level Satyagraha is interpreted as use of nonviolent techniques for resolution of conflict. Even at this level violent politics has no role to play under the present circumstances. A more sophisticated understanding of Satyagraha interprets it differently. The two notions of Satya and Ahimsa included in it; symbolise criteria for political action. These criteria seek to negate violence at more subtle levels. The criteria are related to the theory of 'ends and means' and reject violence on ethical grounds. 'Gandhi conceived of his Satyagraha as an experiment for the introduction of truth and nonviolence into the practico-political field. It was meant to rupture the dichotomy between political expediency and moral/ethical principles' according to Pantham. Satyagraha denies violence on ethical grounds. At this level the violent politics of class struggle is completely marginalised in the contemporary political theorisation; even within the Marxist camp; for obvious reasons. The post-Marxist traditions of thought emphasise the need for genuine democratic struggles not based on violent class politics. In this sense the earlier objections of Indian Marxists against nonviolent politics do not hold.
These critiques mainly opposed the historical project of Gandhism, developed during the colonial experience in India. It is essential to go beyond this historical project to look for the emancipatory spaces available within Satyagraha. In this sense, the argument regarding ethical status of Satyagraha can be taken as starting point. However, the ethical essence of Satyagraha cannot prove itself unless it is able to solve the practico-political problems. In other words, Satyagraha must be able to translate its ethical position at the practical level by dealing successfully with the unjust political realities. It must find concrete ways to deal with concrete political problems; emerging out of structural and cultural contradictions. The interpretation of Satyagraha by Satyagrahi Samajwad essentially touches upon these needs. It emerges out of its awareness of the socialist problematique. Satyagrahi Samajwad constantly emphasises the need to relate Satyagraha to the solution of material problems. This can be the first area to be developed by the contemporary political thought.

A related issue in Satyagrahi Samajwad is its acceptance of the centrality of state. It recognises the all powerful nature of state and the need to do away with it. Political theorisations remain partial if they have limited/one sided perception of state. Socialists in India accept neutrality of state. Gandhians perceive state as machinery of coercion but do not engage in a struggle against it. They seek to bypass the state and independently attempt to alter the civil society. The politics
of Gandhians has clearly shown how these movements lose their political relevance and ultimately become state dependent, due to such position. Only the Marxist tradition has constantly addressed the issue of centrality of state in social relations. After the failure of Russian experiments of establishment of a socialist state; Marxist position regarding state has changed. The Marxist political strategies now emphasise the need for cultural struggles to alter the content of even socialist state. We will come back to this point later in our discussion. The point to note here is that Marxist tradition of thought emphasises the centrality of state in social relations. Satyagrahi Samajwad shares these insights with Marxism. It need to be assumed that its position on state is a direct outcome of its interaction with Marxism. Rather it emerges mainly out of Gandhian influences. However, the socialist problematique makes Javdekar aware of the role state in initiating structural changes, not because state is a neutral agency but because structural changes have to be implemented through use of power. At this level state power becomes 'relatively' neutral over the other power structures. Gandhian insights on the other hand invoke the need to control the 'relatively neutral state power structures' through Satyagraha.

The issue of centrality of state becomes crucial for the present political scene in one more respect. A dominant strand of thought in contemporary political theorisation sidelines the state as main agency where political power is concentrated.
As stated earlier the poststructuralists now argue about essentially 'diffused' nature of power relations. At the same time postmodern formulations oppose any 'closed' formulation of political problem and reject all metanarratives. These formulations not only oppose centrality of state in political formulations of any emancipatory formulation itself. The problem gets related to the discussion of Satyagrahi Samajwad and its understanding of Gandhism because there are efforts of appropriation of Gandhi as a post modern thinker because of the essentially open nature of categories of Satya and Ahimsa.

However Gandhian framework adopts the centrality of state. Gandhian formulation; as interpreted by Satyagrahi Samajwad emphasises the fact that state continues to be the main agency of exploitation in social relations. The state concentrates the political power to a large extent in it. Therefore every kind of oppositional politics will have to engage in a struggle against state. This position places Gandhism essentially outside and against the postmodern framework. The postmodern-poststructuralist formulations have made a very important contribution in opening up the subtle nature of power relations. However, their position regarding the essentially diffused nature of power relations; affect the status of oppositional politics of any sort. The diffused and all-encompassing nature of power relations end the possibility of anything beyond it.

Emancipatory politics; at this level; has to be 'strategic' in a specific sense. It has to identify some strategic locations of power where political struggle would be most intense. The
experience of Indian as well as other third world societies strengthens the point about centrality of state as the most powerful institution in social relations. Even in the post-liberalisation period, Indian state continues to dominate the social relations; perhaps in a more sophisticated and subtle manner. Thus it is important for all emancipatory movements to fight with the institutional sites of exploitation and injustice. By reinforcing the centrality of state, Satyagrahi Samajwad helps in the process.

Postmodern; opposition to such struggles emerges out of its against 'closed' narratives celebrated by these struggles. Postmodernism celebrates the principles of 'difference' and subjectivity and protests against all kinds of metanarratives. If the position is taken to its extreme it leads to complete absence of oppositional politics; celebrating political status quo. However, postmodern politics engages itself in a very important criticism against metanarratives. This criticism can be accommodated within Satyagrahi politics. In fact the essentially abstract, open and subjective nature of concepts like truth and nonviolence can be helpful in this respect. Gandhi constantly emphasises the open ended nature of his thought system. The concept of truth is essentially open and partial in nature. However, Gandhism recognises, the identity of 'subject' as a 'subject in community'. Therefore Gandhi suggests that every community can have its own truth. The essentially open nature of concept of truth is supplemented by the notion of community. The postmodernist
tradition of thought does not contain these insights. However any kind of oppositional politics has to recognise existence of communities as a common link among the individuals.

Gandhism does not belong to the framework of postmodernist thought because it assumes an ethical position; in the form of nonviolence. Nonviolence becomes a categorical rule of action for every Satyagrahi Worker. However, the concept of nonviolence remains essentially open in nature; completely recognising the 'other'. The concept also accepts essentially open nature of human conflicts and the constant existence of contradictions and opposition. Political theorisation in India will have to work on these lines to explore the emancipatory potentials in Gandhism.

Satyagraha moves away from the theory-action dichotomy; which is an integral part of the rational-scientific discourse. Gandhi's insistence on realisation of truth through constant and active participation; expands the scope of the 'political'. This is possible because Gandhi sees nonviolence as a concrete criterion of 'action'. It does not assume a theoretical 'consensus' on the part of rational actors but strives to work out such consensus through its constant efforts of resolution of conflicts. Yet it allows for the presence of contradictions and differences.

Coming back to the practico-political problems how can Satyagraha effectively work for resolution of conflicts? What would be the actual political process included in Satyagrahi
politics? Conventional understanding of Satyagraha emphasises the technique of 'change of heart'. It is obvious that the technique fails to initiate changes in the exploitative institutional patterns. Satyagraha has to engage itself in a fight against the state or institutions. Orthodox Marxist politics seeks to realise structural changes through socialist state itself. However, to make the socialist state workable; minimum atmosphere for its acceptance has to be created. To use the Marxist vocabulary - class - consciousness of the proletariat has to be raised. Satyagrahi politics demands the same. Satyagrahi Samajwad conceptualises simultaneous existence of material and cultural struggles. To make the state workable for desired changes; it has to be based on a kind of consensus among the people. The point is related to the prominence of cultural politics in resolution of conflicts. Both Gandhian and Marxist paradigms presuppose existence of strong acultural politics for resolution of structural changes.

How can it work in the contemporary Indian situation? The historical project of Satyagrahi Samajwad and its failure has some lessons to teach. At its theoretical level; Satyagrahi Samajwad possesses certain emancipatory potentials. However, it could not develop any viable politics. The main reason for its failure can be identified in the nature of its cultural politics. It adopts an uncritical approach towards tradition and celebrates the dominant cultural discourse of Vedic framework. Contemporary emancipatory movements will have to critically deal
with the tradition to conceptualise a strong cultural politics. The 'secular' discourse adopted by Indian movements of change faces major limitations as it essentialises the secular and communal identities and remains within the limits of rationality. Cultural politics of the emancipatory movements has to go beyond it. It has to search for emancipatory spaces within the tradition. Gandhian framework helps in this exercise to a large extent. However, the Gandhian legacy essentially remains ambiguous due to its final appeal to Hinduism. The emancipatory cultural politics must adopt a radical critique of exploitative systems within Hinduism and supported by its religious philosophy. At the same time it must be able to relate itself to the cultural ethos of social groups in India. The formulations of Phule and Ambedkar can be of great help in this respect. These systems of thought present a radical critique of Hinduism; and yet remain within the fold of indigenous theorisation. Ambedkar's understanding of the emancipatory potentials within Buddhism can provide further insights for development of a viable cultural politics.

The politics of Satyagrahi Samajwad suffers because it operates within the fold of dominant cultural politics. At its theoretical level it proves to be immensely crucial through its specific interpretation of Gandhi and Marx; especially of the Gandhian term of Satyagraha its perspective on the centrality of state and its emphasis on simultaneous struggles of change
at the cultural and material fronts.

Javdekar developed the argument of Satyagrahi Samajwad almost fifty years ago. It is obvious therefore that it would lack the sophistication achieved by contemporary political theorisation. Besides its politics gets limited by the nationalist agenda; Javdekar's own class position and his interpretation of tradition. However, the strength of Satyagrahi Samajwad lies in its subtle understanding of the political problem through its interpretation of Gandhian framework. This understanding develops Satyagraha as an ideology of emancipation. The strategies of emancipation in Satyagraha consist of constant and intense opposition to the state and simultaneous change in the civil society. These strategies of emancipation operate under definite ethical position which is essentially open in nature and recognises contradiction. Gandhi formulates these potentials of Satyagraha Satyagrahi Samajwad relates these potentials to the contemporary political problem discussed by socialism. These strengths of Satyagrahi Samajwad can be developed and utilised by the emancipatory thought in India; by avoiding the limitations of its politics and by supporting it with a radical cultural politics.
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