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CHAPTER - V

COMPARISON AND CRITICAL EVALUATION OF SARVODAYA AND TOTAL REVOLUTION

It shall be the purpose of this chapter to compare and critically evaluate the twin concepts of Sarvodaya and Total Revolution as expounded by JP. The second part will examine the Gandhian impact on JP in the formulation of Sarvodaya and Total Revolution.

(1)

Introduction

JP coming under the influence of Gandhi and Vinoba's ideas on Sarvodaya, developed deep attachment to the theory and concept of Sarvodaya as a powerful means to usher in a Sarvodaya society in consonance with values of freedom, justice and equality. The fundamental strategy of the Sarvodaya movement was based on revitalising the latent energies of the people through mass participation and mass action. JP reformulated his earlier Marxian views and observed "coercion, whether of the sword or law .... may succeed in changing the outward forms of society but cannot change man himself. Neither law nor sword can make
him kind, honest, true." Here the development of JP's intellect from an outward revolution to an inward revolution and from a societal revolution to an individual revolution was a new formulation based on his reading of Hindu scriptures. But, it must be noted that in respect of JP's means for the achievement of the objective of a just social order, his earlier ideas and present ideas represented two extremities, since he first had faith in the efficacy of violence and later he shifted to his belief in the 'transformation of the heart of the individuals.' For a number of reasons JP's ideal of a Servodaya society remained an ideal only, incapable of taking a concrete form through acceptance by the majority of the people the fundamental values of the movement. When JP realised that the Servodaya philosophy and practice would not be acceptable to the people of India largely because the conditions for its success were not properly worked out, he then came out with his revolutionary concept of Total Revolution as a way out of the difficult situation. Even while JP realised that Servodaya had not achieved much success yet as an ideal he was for it and hence he developed the concept of Total Revolution to give it a concrete shape in reality. In the event

Sarvodaya for JP became the ultimate end of the Indian society while Total Revolution was the means through which such a society could be brought into being. We have presented the argument in a rather bold fashion because we do not regard Total Revolution as a very different concept from Sarvodaya but as its logical extension. If Sarvodaya constituted the goal, Total Revolution could be regarded as a later concept specifying the strategy and tactics for the achievement of the Sarvodaya society. In our conception, therefore, Sarvodaya and Total Revolution were two faces of the same coin with the similar purpose of bringing about all round change in the Indian society. We do not see too much of a dichotomy between these two concepts of JP.

(ii)

Critical Evaluation of Sarvodaya and Total Revolution

JP's philosophy of life and thought has constantly undergone change depending upon the contextual situation. He thought deeply about the problems of the Indian society and came out with concepts, theories and ideas to solve these endemic problems. We are trying to argue that JP's thought process was all the time evolving in new directions to grapple with new realities in the Indian situation.
Hence, it was not surprising that many scholars see some kind of lack of clarity and confusion in JP's formulations. In our view the frequent shift characteristic of JP in the realm of ideas was an inevitable consequence of developing concepts and when not found suitable for solving problems were discarded and replaced by new concepts to tackle the new developments in the Indian society. In other words, JP's socio-political and economic thought was not characterised by dogmatism, but on the contrary he demonstrated a high degree of flexibility in his thought. This aspect of his thought appeared very surprising because JP at one time was under the influence of Marxian Socialism which was characterised by a high degree of dogmatism. Hence, JP's flexibility in thought was due to the greater influence of Gandhian thought than that of Marxian thought. Within such a framework we will make a comparative assessment of Servodaya and Total Revolution.

The Servodaya movement's self-image was that of an indigenous experiment in planned social change through a non-violent social revolution based on traditional Hindu values of service, sacrifice, freedom, etc. It was an Indian example of 'cultural management' on a large scale. It involved a conscious and deliberate choice of values with a view to mobilise mass support to transform the
existing social order. Sarvodaya was meant to bring freedom to the masses from the bondage of age old customs and traditions which the society had imposed on them. The Sarvodaya movement was not merely a reform movement but it called for a total revolution culminating in the establishment of an ideal society. One can see here that the transformation of Hinduism, which was being "disassociated from its traditional social structure of caste, kinship and village community, and is becoming associated with the state, political parties and organisations promoting Indian culture."3

JP was deeply concerned about the problem of reconstruction of Indian polity so that it would lead to the creation of a Sarvodaya society. In such a task he frequently made references to the political structure in


ancient India and the general atmosphere of religiosity which existed at that time.

On the other hand, JP evolved his concept of Total Revolution which was expected to transform the individual and social life in one remove through peaceful means. It was also expected to eliminate the ills of a stratified society steeped in custom and tradition through persuasion, non-cooperation and civil disobedience. In such a process the economy and polity would also undergo fundamental transformation. The objective was to humanise the individual and improve the quality of his life through a concerted programme of action. "Total Revolution, which is brought about by peaceful means, will embrace all aspects of individual and social life. It will, for instance, embrace the caste system, customs and manners, marriage, education, etc. Much of this can be done by education. But there may also be the need of civil disobedience and persuasion and non-cooperation. The economy and polity will have to go through a revolutionary change. In short, society as a whole or in the totality of all its social relations, institutions and processes will have to undergo a change ..... I am obviously speaking of the change that will improve the quality of life and make man more human."\(^4\)

---

Thus, we find that the basic objectives of *Sarvodaya* and *Total Revolution* were similar in the sense that they involved the improvement in the quality of life of the individual in particular and a total regeneration of the society as a whole. In the case of *Sarvodaya* the strategy and tactics hinged upon such qualities as love, compassion, selfless service, education by example, etc. while in the case of *Total Revolution* the emphasis was on direct action by the people through mass participation. In *Sarvodaya* the objective would be achieved through sincerity and hard-work without too much of publicity and without confrontation with the authority of the State. But in the case of *Total Revolution* a vigorous mass movement imbued with revolutionary zeal would use the technique of non-cooperation and civic disobedience and come in direct conflict with the authority of the State. Here the press, radio, public meetings, private discussions, etc. would be used as powerful means of propaganda to achieve the objectives of *Total Revolution*.

In *Sarvodaya* the objective was to persuade and convert the rural masses in particular and others by appealing to the noble sentiments in human beings. Here recourse was taken to ancient traditional values of self-sacrifice, generosity, love, compassion, etc. The whole
thrust was directed towards the creation of a moral man with moral responsibilities towards the rest of the society. On the other hand, in Total Revolution the objective was to remove the ills of the society by expounding values such as honesty, integrity, sincerity, etc. It was once again a moral revolution through the impact of public opinion generated through revolutionary activity. Sarvodaya harped upon a resuscitation of ancient Hindu values, while Total Revolution consistently emphasised modern values based on scientific secularism.

The Sarvodaya movement was mostly confined to the rural areas. The idea was to improve the socio-economic lot of the rural population who constituted the majority of India's population. Here the emphasis was on reaching the masses through Sarvodaya workers in a systematic manner. On the other hand, in respect of Total Revolution the emphasis was mostly on the population living in the urban areas. A pattern of linkage was developed between the classes and the masses in the urban area while the bulk of the Indian population was left untouched or were beyond the pale of Total Revolution. Hence, it may be argued that JP's Total Revolution as it operated was mostly confined to hardly 10% of the total population of India. In this context the word 'Total' in the concept Total Revolution lost much of its significance.
In terms of the structure of the Sarvodaya movement it may be argued that it was dependent upon *Bhoodan, Gramdan, Sampattidan* as intrinsic parts of Gram Swaraj. Here the strategy was to develop the village community as a self-contained unit representing the popular will at the grass roots level. On the other hand, Total Revolution was also a mass movement which was dependent upon the structure of people's committees for bringing about fundamental change. This also was a movement at the grass roots level which was mostly confined to the urban segments of the population. But in a wider sense, it could have been called a grass roots movement only if it had succeeded in bringing within its fold the vast majority of the Indian population living in rural areas.

From a philosophical perspective *Sarvodaya* was based on voluntary cooperation of the people. However,

---

5. In a pamphlet entitled *Sampattidan* JP wrote: "Sampattidan is a first step towards the realisation of Gandhiji's idea of trusteeship. It is not to be confused with charity or the ordinary contributions to various charitable funds. Sampattidan means the acceptance of a new outlook of life; namely, that every individual, however high or low in the economic scale, has a partial responsibility towards his fellowmen." *Sampattidan*, n.d., 1st and 2nd Instalment, Subject File, File No. 318, *JP Papers*, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi.
herein lay the fatal weakness of the **Sarvodaya** movement. It would be too much to expect the people to cooperate specially in respect of *Bhoodan, Gramdan, Sampattidan*, etc. On the other hand, Total Revolution certainly depended upon the people for its success. However, in terms of its technique it employed coercion through *Satyagraha, civil disobedience, morchas*, etc. against the established authority of the State. But, such coercion was based on soul force or moral force or on non-violence as in the case of **Sarvodaya**.

**Sarvodaya** has remained an utopian concept since in practice it was very difficult to realise its ideals. The basic defect with the **Sarvodaya** philosophy was that it had a lopsided conception of human nature. It was based on the assumption of goodness in human nature. It accepted the Lockean formulation of human nature as against the Hobbesian concept of human nature. We have not certainly argued that human nature confirms to the Hobbesian understanding of human nature. Nor do we deny the relevance of Lockean insight into human nature. We are only arguing that human nature was a peculiar blend of good and evil. This reality of human nature was not taken into account by the protagonists of the **Sarvodaya** philosophy. On the other hand, JP's concept of Total Revolution also remained
as an utopian concept but for a different reason. JP's Total Revolution lacked a permanent organisational framework which would create mass awakening not only in the urban areas but also in the rural areas.

*Sarvodaya* was based on the principle of decentralisation and devolution of power and authority to the people. Here the people were expected to come into their own by sharing large quantum of autonomy and freedom. Total Revolution was also based on the assumption of sovereign power vesting with the people. But JP was not very much in favour of parliamentary or constitutional Democracy where the representatives of the people exercised power in the name of the sovereign people. Hence, Total Revolution was dependent upon a participatory Democracy where the sovereign people would directly exercise powers. Therefore, in the case of both *Sarvodaya* and Total Revolution power was to be exercised from below, with power flowing from bottom to the top. In this sense *Sarvodaya* and Total Revolution made human beings the central concept in their objective of total transformation of the Indian society. In spite of this characteristic feature it may be pointed out that the *Sarvodaya* movement did reach the rural areas to a certain extent while Total Revolution in practice was an out and out an elitist movement.
Sarvodaya movement could not make much of an impact because of the moral and physical demands it made on the participants which in reality were very difficult to follow and hence not very attractive to the people. It required a total acceptance of simple life involving a complete renunciation of the material comforts of life. In addition to this, the policy of the national government at that time involved a commitment to a different economic and political model than what was prescribed by the Sarvodaya philosophy. The emphasis on planned economic development, the creation of a socialistic pattern of society, the drive towards massive industrialisation by a heavy reliance on science and technology, and dissemination of Western ideas of industrialisation and urbanisation have all left the Indians less willing to accept any philosophy that depended upon ancient Hindu religious values. The three pillars of governmental policy, namely, secularism, industrialisation and welfare state certainly did not advance the cause of Sarvodaya. Another major defect of the Sarvodaya movement was that it emphasised only one important aspect of the Indian heritage, namely, the relevance of Hindu traditions to the exclusion of the Muslim and other minority traditions. Obviously, Sarvodaya was directed towards only one segment of India's population while it completely eliminated the other. In addition to these drawbacks, the stress upon
voluntarism was a very serious and decisive flaw in the movement. It can be pointed out that the life history of a voluntary organisation or a mass social movement like Sarvodaya can be compared to an inverted U curve. This phenomenon can be explained in terms of initial mass enthusiasm because of the novelty of the approach resulting in a steep initial rise over a short period of time in the curve. This was the case with the Sarvodaya movement which witnessed a phenomenal rise in its initial years. This was followed by a secular decline in the curve matched by a lack of urgency in the achievement of the objectives of the movement. The Sarvodaya movement could not sustain mass enthusiasm and support over a long period of time because that would have required a lot of time and energy on the part of dedicated leaders as well as strikingly new approaches and innovations on a continuing basis.  

In respect of the Bhoodan programme which was a spectacular success in its early years, JP was aware that it eventually petered out since it degenerated into mere fulfilment of numerical targets rather than substantial achievement at the ground level. Thus, he felt that the Bhoodan programme failed to produce any impact at the ground level.  

national level. "Looking back I feel there were several mistakes committed by Vinoba and all of us who followed him. For instance, we accepted whatever kind of land, whether cultivable or uncultivable, that was donated by the land owners. This led to colossal self-deception on our part, sometimes knowingly, sometimes unknowingly. Another mistake made was we were satisfied with mere collection of dan patras and fulfilling targets fixed by Vinoba. The task of actual redistribution of the collected land was left over to a later date or delegated hopefully to the political parties, mainly the Congress, that had supported the movement, and to the government itself. Vinobaji and all of us who were working with him moved on to Gramdan, which involved the revolutionary principle — land belonged to the community and the individual farmer was entitled only to use it. Unfortunately, here also we were content with collecting dan patras. And after a certain target figure had been reached, Vinobaji moved on to other fields.

I have mentioned these two programmes, bhoodan and Gramdan, because I still believe that had Vinoba remained in the field and persisted in having the pledges (the dan patras) carried out at the ground level, a non-violent agrarian revolution would have been consummated, opening
the way for a total non-violent revolution. No doubt, many of us carried on with the programme (Grama dan), but with Vinoba in Wardha, the climate in the countryside rapidly reverted to its previous condition and the movement lost its momentum. 7

The question arose as to what would be the future of Sarvodaya. The answer to this question cannot provide much cause for optimism for the simple reason that with the passing away of JP who was the pivotal force, the Sarvodaya movement was destined to fade away gradually from the Indian scene. However, it could be revitalised provided the infrastructure of the movement could be rebuilt by a band of dedicated workers. The possible future course of action could be the development of the movement in the urban as well as rural sectors. This would involve the formation and operation of vigilant people's committees in the urban areas, a proper framework for a functional organisation of

7. Jayaprakash Narayan, *Towards Total Revolution: Total Revolution*, Vol.IV, Erahmanand, (ed.), pp. 190-191. Vasant Nargolkar also holds the same view: "Instead of using the novel, useful weapons of non-violent non-cooperation and Satyagraha invented and perfected by Gandhiji and thus trying to solve the land problem in India effectively, Vinobaji wasted his own energy and that of his followers and colleagues such as Jayaprakash Narayan, Dhirendra Mazumdar or Dada Dharmadhikari for over two decades in sticking just to the method of people's education (स्वाधीनता) through padyatras all over the country or through some intensive campaigns in Bihar." Vasant Nargolkar, "Vinobaji and Satyagraha", *Gandhi Marg*, March, 1981, p.666.
the agricultural landless and the rural poor for a non-violent struggle, and the establishment of Gandhi centres and Gandhi Bhavan's in schools, colleges and universities in the country. Sarvodaya hitherto depended upon the image of JP which it can no longer do so and consequently a powerful organisation will have to be built up with a network of branches at the national level organised downwards up to the village level.8

Sarovodaya will also have to be redefined in the context of modern changes that were taking place in India. It will have to stress not only the good of the individual but the prosperity of the entire ecological humanity. It will have to become a structure of such an organisation where each individual was aware that he did not live in isolation but as an individual actually participating in the society. It will also have to mean that each individual has the freedom to develop his or her personality by doing good to others in the society. Sarvodaya will also have to be planned for a society in which every individual has the chance to give back to the society more than what he has taken from it since his birth. A theory of social

obligation will have to constitute an important part of the Sarvodaya programme in the future. "Sarvodaya can no longer think in terms of individual awakening or prosperity, it has to include the good and prosperity of man-in-society as a whole. Another important thing is, it is now no longer enough to think in terms of the good of man or mankind alone, but the whole ecological set-up with man in the centre, has to be thought of in the Sarvodaya concept."

At this point a very legitimate question may be raised as to why Total Revolution in terms of its theory and practice has not succeeded in its objectives. Total Revolution was used as a theoretical justification for the Bihar movement which achieved only a limited measure of success. It may be pertinent to specify analytically and objectively some of the reasons for the failure of Total Revolution. It may be pointed out that Total Revolution lacked the adherence of a disciplined cadre which could spread its message through a sustained campaign of propaganda among the people of the country. This aspect of the requirement was very important since no movement can succeed unless those who are guiding it display a high sense of confidence in its eventual success. Unfortunately JP

did not have such a cadre of selfless workers who could provide the motive force for Total Revolution.

Another defect of Total Revolution was that it lacked a clear cut programme of action which could have given concrete shape to the desire of the masses or a new socio-economic and political order. In the absence of a programmatic commitment on the part of the masses the appeal of Total Revolution could only be ephemeral or transitory in nature. Any movement that lacked a specific programme would lack a sense of direction and the latent energy of the masses could only be frittered away in purposeless and ineffective action. It could also create confusion and uncertainty for all those engaged in such a movement whose objective was one of bringing about basic changes. R.C.Mujumdar has very rightly commented on the inadequacy of this aspect of the movement. "Here we are in great difficulty. For JP has not yet clearly formulated a definite and complete programme but has actually been fighting for a few specific objectives," 10

The Marxists also took umbrage with JP's concept of Total Revolution. In the first place, the Marxists could

not accept any revolution which did not involve revolutionary violence. To them JP's Total Revolution under Gandhi's humanistic and ethical influence was a pseudo-revolution that completely ignored the class structure of the Indian society. Probably, Marxists using their class conflict framework did not like JP's campaign to involve the people in the Total Revolution which included among others intellectuals, workers, peasants and also those belonging to the bourgeoisie class. They rejected JP's formulation of Total Revolution since they applied the classical Marxian framework for their analysis of his concept. ¹¹

JP talked about Total Revolution becoming a permanent revolution through non-violent means. He believed that the world was continuously changing and evolving in new directions. He also said there were two kinds of changes, namely, unconscious change and conscious change. Unconscious change was a change due to evolution of human societies to higher forms of culture and civilization. Conscious change referred to the material change consequent upon the development of a variety of tools of production. "In human society there is an automatic change as children

grow into adulthood and then into old age and so the cycle goes on revolving. When one generation hands over its culture to a new one, there is automatically a change. This you might call unconscious process of change in human society. But there is also a conscious change because everyone likes to better his condition. I believe that in the material sphere, particularly in the tools of production, changes are consciously and constantly sought to be brought about. At the other end of the spectrum, changes in customs, manners and beliefs are comparatively much slower. But there also changes are taking place both consciously and unconsciously.

"Those changes, conscious or unconscious, might be considered to make up the permanent revolution ....."¹²

However, it is our view that the type of unconscious and conscious change which JP visualised was not possible in the context of India as against the Western countries. In India the problems of mass poverty, rampant illiteracy and low level of political awareness was a great hindrance for a high level of unconscious and conscious change which JP was aiming at to bring about a permanent revolution.

Thus, it may be said that JP could not achieve the objectives of his Total Revolution. On the contrary, his place in history and modern Indian history was more as a symbol of protest against authoritarian rule and unhealthy socio-economic and political trends and less as the architect of a successful and viable alternative.\textsuperscript{13}

We have argued in this chapter that Sarvodaya and Total Revolution, the two pillars of JP's mass movements, initially proved successful in attracting the attention of the masses. However, with the passing away of JP and lack of elan among the workers involved in these movements, Sarvodaya and Total Revolution have remained merely as chimera without any possibility of their success in the foreseeable future.\textsuperscript{14}

(iii)

Gandhian Impact on JP in the Formulation of Sarvodaya and Total Revolution

It is our contention that Gandhian thought provided


a fundamental frame of reference for some of JP's important political ideas. Any critical evaluation of his twin concepts of *Sarvodaya* and Total Revolution cannot ignore this fact. JP's understanding of Gandhi was in terms of four important aspects of his political philosophy.

1. Conception of State,
2. Political and economic decentralisation,
3. Non-violent method,
4. Ethical values.

JP felt that Gandhi had developed an integrated philosophy of life in which social, political and economic aspects formed a spiritual whole. He felt that Gandhi's approach was holistic since it embraced a whole range of issues and problems. He said that "the essentials of Gandhian philosophy as related to society and its institutions seem to be centred around his concepts (a) human happiness and development, (b) the place of man in society and the relationship between the two." However, it did not mean that JP favoured "a mildest application of Gandhiji's idea but their dynamic and

---

revolutionary adoption." The question arose as to how JP moved closer to Gandhian thinking. One viewpoint could be that through Prabhavati Devi, JP was drawn towards Gandhi. The second reason could be that just as Gandhi had attracted millions of Indians through his charismatic leadership of the Indian national movement so also JP had great appreciation for his role in winning India's freedom. In the third place, JP himself was a great revolutionary with a broad universal perspective of men and matters which was responsible for his progress towards Gandhi's ideas. In the fourth place, JP who spent many years in jail before and after independence utilised this time for deep reflection and independent search which brought him closer to Gandhi and his way of thinking.

In terms of JP's concepts of Servodaya and Total Revolution it would be interesting to note how Gandhi's theory of State influenced JP in his thought process. Gandhi had developed a very scientific and consistent theory of State, wherein he held that the State was an instrument of coercion. In other words, he rejected the notion of a State based on the idea of force. Gandhi, in fact, advocated a minimum of State interference or almost

16. Ibid., pp. VI-VIII.
a Stateless society wherein the individual would be in a position to develop his personality according to his mental and physical endowments. Gandhi regarded the individual not as an isolated automaton but as an important unit of the society. In effect, he placed the individual and the society above the State. This particular idea was picked up by JP and used in his concepts of Sarvodaya and Total Revolution. JP regarded the individual as an important part of the total social system to bring about fundamental socio-economic and political changes in the society through Sarvodaya and Total Revolution. Like Gandhi, JP emphasised self-development through individual transformation leading to collective transformation of the society in the end.

Just as Gandhi was opposed totally to the use of force to initiate basic changes in society so also was the case with JP in his Gandhian phase. Of course, in his earlier Marxian phase, JP as a revolutionary was not averse to the use of revolutionary violence for demolishing a reactionary socio-political and economic order. Later under the impact of Gandhian ideas JP completely gave up the use of physical force for changing the status quo in the society. He became a votary of the liberal democratic
State, though he was not satisfied with some aspects of its theory, organisation and practice. However, in comparison with Gandhi, one got the feeling that JP did not have complete conviction in the efficacy of the non-violent method within the State. This explained why he turned a blind eye to the use of force or coercion in the Bihar and Gujarat movements which he launched to remove some of the obnoxious evils of the Indian society. One suspects that there was an element of expediency which made him sometimes to deviate slightly from the Gandhian ideal of non-violence. It may be stated that both JP and Gandhi were thinking in terms of dynamic human transformation beginning with the process of political transformation and culminating in comprehensive transformation in all aspects of life. In effect, it may be stated that to Gandhi non-violence was an article of faith, a political creed and a potent means of political action. But JP did not consider non-violence as a creed but adopted it out of practical necessity, rather more as a policy than less as a principle.


Gandhi in his movements was careful to ensure that the rank and file who participated in them were saturated with the spirit of non-violence. He elevated the non-violent principle to an ethical value. Gandhi's entire tactics and strategy for radical transformation of the society emerged from his basic premise of non-violent action. JP, on the other hand, also believed in mass movements involving mass participation but unlike Gandhi did not sufficiently educate disciplined cadres imbued with the spirit of non-violence.

JP in his concept of Sarvodaya assigned a basic role to the villages for the socio-economic regeneration of the society. This particular idea was a result of Gandhian influence which placed heavy emphasis on an all-round transformation of the people living in rural areas. But in terms of the comparative impact of Gandhi and JP on the rural areas it may be stated their framework has mostly remained dormant at the theoretical level. JP put forth his concept of Sarvodaya to transform the lives of the people in a fundamental sense, but the fact was that the practice of Sarvodaya in the lakhs of villages of India has not made much of an impact. On the other hand, Gandhi's emphasis on Ram raj through Gram Swaraj and his other ideas provided a practical basis for reordering rural life. But, unfortunately
after his death his ideas have not been put into practice in a systematic manner with the result the Gandhian objective of Gram Swaraj has remained only as an ideal.

Gandhi was of the firm opinion that there could not be true Swaraj unless there was complete political and economic decentralisation of power. JP used this concept of decentralisation of economic and political power in his concepts of Sarvodaya and Total Revolution by vesting power with the individual citizens who were at the base of the power pyramid. While Gandhi was clear in his mind on the nature and substance of political and economic decentralisation of power, JP was groping to work out the full details or mechanics of his concept of decentralised economic and political power.

The basic thrust of Gandhian ideas in the social, economic and political spheres was on the ethical nature of these problems. In Gandhi's scheme of thinking every issue was judged from the ethical principle. Hence, to him there could be no dichotomy between means and ends. He held the view that the ends would be pure to the extent the means were pure. On the other hand, JP in his concepts of Sarvodaya and Total Revolution exhibited the impact of

Gandhi's ethical principles. **Servodaya** and Total Revolution involved the moral transformation of individuals through a moral, humanistic and multi-dimensional revolution. Thus, it may be said that the Gandhian influence was very much evident in JP's formulation of **Servodaya** and Total Revolution. 20 These two concepts of JP failed to achieve the desired results because there was inconsistency in his theoretical postulates and the practical aspects. JP in the process of implementing **Servodaya** and Total Revolution did not work out all the mundane details like mass organisation, education of a disciplined cadre of men and women which were necessary conditions for the successful implementation of **Servodaya** and Total Revolution. It was, therefore, not surprising that **Servodaya** and Total Revolution have remained merely as humanistic concepts incapable of being put into practice in the near future.

(iv)

*Some Concluding Observations*

We have looked into the nature and substance of **Servodaya** and Total Revolution by making a comparative evaluation of their relevance and significance for the people of India.

In the first place, the concept of Sarvodaya was too philosophical, abstract and normative for the people of an underdeveloped country like India to internalise in their life-style. The Sarvodaya philosophy assumed that human beings could become ideal and create a society saturated by the values of good of all, selflessness, affection, cooperation, mutual harmony, etc. These values could arise only in an ideal society composed of ideal individuals. This utopian concept could not have much relevance to the conditions that were prevalent in Indian society today. We find that the value systems of our society have undergone considerable dilution in the face of immemorial poverty, selfishness of vested interests and lust for power. A movement like Sarvodaya can succeed only when the objective conditions were conducive for root and branch changes in a society. The same conclusion can be indicated in the case of the humanistic concept of Total Revolution of JP. Total Revolution like Sarvodaya was expected to revolutionise the social, political and economic order of the Indian society in a fundamental sense. JP's revolution did not succeed in achieving these goals because capturing power in terms of formal positions of authority was not its purpose. Nor did it seek a conventional political victory because it had nothing to do with party and electoral politics. The basic goal of JP's revolution
was to create an awakening in the masses. A new man and a new consciousness could be created through far-reaching changes in the social, political and economic life of the country. Unfortunately, JP did not succeed in the mission of his life through his double revolution of Servodaya and Total Revolution.

From a theoretical consideration Total Revolution could not succeed because JP was not able to clearly specify his goals. Movements can succeed and hold the attention of the masses and the rank and file membership only when there was clarity about the goals. One also got the feeling that his movement lacked a powerful economic ideology which could provide a focus to the hopes and aspirations of the masses for a better life in the future. Neither Servodaya nor Total Revolution could be good examples of a well-defined and rationally conceived ideology. We have also argued that these movements were failures because the psychological climate was not conducive to their success. The subjective and objective conditions in the society were powerful catalytic agents for the success or failure of the revolution. Psychologically speaking also, the revolutionary consciousness of the people has to be generated,
otherwise the movements would fizzle out as non-starters or as ultimate failures. Finally, the most important condition for the success or failure of JP's movements was the availability or non-availability of right type of leadership at all levels of the movement. As long as JP was alive he was the moving spirit behind these movements, though they suffered from setbacks and periodic forward thrusts depending upon the quality of JP's leadership at any given period. However, after JP's death Servodaya and Total kevolution have mostly remained as academic concepts in the domain of ideas rather than as revolutionary movements capable of reordering the entire fabric of the life of the Indian people.