CHAPTER - III
POLITICAL IDEAS OF J.P.
J.P. AND MAHATMA GANDHI:

J.P. had little regard for Mahatma Gandhi and his theories of non-violence. Even then, Mahatma Gandhi admired J.P’s self sacrifice. Some of the statements of Gandhi reflect his good character. J.P. was arrested in Jamshedpur in March 1940 by the British Government. One charges of trying to unpede the production of munitions and other supplies for the war he was Produced in D.C’s court at Singbum where he pleaded guilty and made a statement in the court justifying his action. J.P. sent a copy of statement to Mahatma Gandhi reacted to his arrest in the Harijan (dated 16/03/1940) and also published J.P’s statement in his weekly. In the estimate of Gandhiji he was an authority on socialism and not an ordinary worker. Being an authority on socialism he was a fine fisherty. What he did not know of western socialism nobody ebb in India. His capacity for suffering was tireless. He must not be arrested without proving the violence. J.P. himself said in the court that his patriotism and open thinking has been penalised by the British.

He had no notice against the government. He wanted to end imperialism and Nazism. The then India regarded both British Imperialism and German Nazism as enemies and evils. Both sides were prompted by selfish ends of conquest and domination, exploitation and oppression. What he wanted was the victory of freedom and democracy. Gandhiji treated his statement as a kind of intense humanitarianism. His epic escape from Hazaribagh Jail tried to attain the altitude of the youths to the spirit of the last fight for freedom during the Quite India movement won hero’s fame during 1942 and he organised the struggle for freedom. He and his friends sealed the high Prison walls and escaped in to the dark night through March and forest. He again imprisoned. In 1946, he was released, Mahatma Gandhi proposed his name for the presidentship of the congress but it was not relished by the working committee.
J.P.'s wife Prabhapati was a Gandhian although his husband believed to another party. They had no children. It is even said that Prabhapati was responsible for convesting, J.P. in to a Gandhian. After the death of Gandhiji became a Gandhian to the backbone through his emphasis on the moral and spiritual base of Democracy. If Nehru was the political heir to Gandhiji. Jayaprakashji was Gandhiji's moral and spiritual heir/successor. His work as a Gandhian is to be bound in Proper places in the body of this thesis. Mahatma treated Prabhapati as his own daughter when she was in the Ashram at Ahmedabad. When J.P. went to U.S.A. for studies. Their marriage was done according to Vedic rites in October 1920.

Summing up J.P.'s life was devoted to search for ushering just a social order where there is peace and prosperity. He made experiments with Marxist ideology, Democratic socialism, sarvodaya, reformation of dead dacoits and hostile Nagas and also with Janata Government. He could not find the befitting reply. In appearance he seems to be inconsistent, enigmatic and Visionary removed from the realities of practical life. He worked on a higher place which is beyond and above the comprehension of the common people. But in reality the common people did not understand him. He was a perfect soul beyond the knowledge of ordinary mortal.

**J.P. AND MARXISM**:

J.P. began his life as a Marxist and found in Nehru a Kindred Spirit. Gandhiji was a reformist rather than a Revolutionary in his observation. He was not satisfied with Gandhiji's technique of non-violence and social theories. However Gandhiji admired him and his sense of Sacrifice for the Nation. J.P. was an ideological opponent. He did not like the policy of the communist party of India and communism since freedom of thought and action or what
matter most. The regimentation that stalinist communism imposed went against him grain. So, he formed the Congress Socialist Party which Nehru’s welcomed as a progressive opposition in the Parliament and not as a conservative one. He is of the opinion that socialism can be achieved through Democracy. In 1953 a communist was elected to the Lok Sabha from Bengal. The soviet delegate in U.N. General Assembly in New York said that India is the only country where communism can come to power through Ballot Box. The attitude of Marxist in India during World War II teased him. He felt that the World War II was an imperialist war for culmination and exploitation while the Marxist reversed the gear and called, it the people’s war. However, natures play is subtle, the Imperialists and Marxists fought together against Germany and Japan. He threw himself with all his heart in to the movement and accepted Gandhiji’s call “Do or Die”.

The division of the World in to two hostile camps of communism and capitalism with former Soviet Russia and U.S.A. drew his attention. He holds that if freedom is allowed in communist Dictatorship in matter of expressing discus without any fear of reprisals, the people would throne out communism and not re-establish capitalism, but proceed to construct Democratic socialism. Neither Marx nor his followers in Russia can do justice to the average Peasants in economic relations. Twenty millions of peasant families were compelled to go at the risk of clater or banishment to Siberia, enter two lakhs of collective forms. A small minority with power cocreed such a vast majority of people in such total manner during the regime of Lenin.
Dialectical Materialism is the Philosophical base of communism. The communist takes this doctrine very seriously though this is not the case with top layer. In their belief Maxian Philosophy sanctions/enjoins every means for their end. However, there is no such warrant in Maxism, that Dialectical Materialism being the faith of human fulfillment can be equated with a religion of a "Totalitarian" date. The feeling of being an instrument for a noble cause would disappear, his self assurance would not arise.

The monolithic structure of communist dictatorship would be cracked. There was the doubt that freedom is curtailed in communist heart in and out of Russia. Some modification is necessary for resurrection of Dialectical Materialism and gives a new interpretation. J.P. is deadly against production of vast literature under party line. They are full of distortion of facts. He does not like the silencing of critics under the dictatorship. No one will dare criticise it "left deviation", "right deviation", "revisionism", counter revolutionary are bad enough in communist circles. Communist thought has become arroicated with single leadership, unchallengeable authority. At one time, stalin was invariably right and other deviationists were crushed and silenced. When Marxism is free from the fathers of stalinism, the world will know the exact degree of its distortion in Marxists Russia. Khruchev and later communist had broken with stalinism and later developments leads to the splitting of Soviet Russia within eighty years of its structure. J.P. acted as an apostle of peace, compassion, love, non-violence, human dignity and freedom.

It must be added in fearness to communism that it is the liberating force of underdeveloped countries and decolonism. For an underdeveloped country the communist experiment is inevitable in its progress. Further more Marx like Vivekananda, Mahatama Gandhi and J.P. worked selflessly to the
cause of teeming millions more particularly the lowest and the lost the Davidra
Narayanas. They were the redeemers and great human beings in the history
of mankind. He was a Marxist turned in to a socialist Democrat. As a Marxist
in earlier times he had viewed Sardar Patel as a reactionary and called him a
capitalist. Later he wrote articles in 1977 where in he acknowledged Sarda's
service to the integration of previously states. He further complemented Sardar
for the advice he gave to Nehru on Tibet. One many think that it is J.P's
inconsistency. It is a kind of courage of a high order to recount ones wrong
notions.

INFLUENCE OF GANDHI AND M.N. ROY:

Jayaprakash Narayan, the staunch votary of Bhoodan movement and
partyless democracy was considerably influenced by M.N. Roy which
expounding his new philosophy. He referred to the significant and seminal
contribution of the M.N. Roy to the body of thought with which I am dealingly.
So, his philosophy of Radical Humanism has influenced and is likely to
influence still more the Democratic socialism movement in India. But,
politically he was started as a revolutionary and last ended as a liberal
Humanist. During his early days of political life, he was a staunch critic of
Gandhiji.

As a student, J.P. was staying in America since 1922 to 1929 then he
came in contact with East European intellectuals and turned to Marxism. At
Wisconsin, he came in to contact with a strange group of students
particularly Americans, Polish, German, Russian, Dutch and French
students. He tried to understand the implications of Marxism. At "Madison,
Wisconsin, the home of La Follette progressivism then that in the company
of Jewish and European born fellow students I drank deep at the fountain of
Marxism”. At the same time, he was deeply influenced by the ‘Pungent’ writings of M.N. Roy. When he was staying in Wisconsin, he wrote the two books of M.N. Roy and completed his conversion to Marxism were the Aftermath almost of Non-cooperation and India in Transition⁴.

The influence of Roy’s writings was so far-reaching that he became almost converted to Marxism. J.P. Narayan was much impressed by the Marxian philosophy of revolution while under the spell of Marxism. It seemed to him a surer and quicker road to the freedom of a country and the emancipation of its masses than Gandhi’s technique of civil disobedience and non-cooperation. He realised that Marxism stood for equality and brotherhood the qualities without which freedom had no meaning. While under the influence of Marxism, he appeared to believed that Marx provided socialism with a programme and a philosophy more rooted in the objective facts that it encountered than any other alternative of which we had knowledge⁵.

As J.P. was very greatly influenced by M.N. Roy in his youth times. During their youth both J.P. and M.N. Roy was protagonist of Marxian, socialism and believed that socialism could be brought about only through revolutionary method. At that time they were critique of Gandhian philosophy of Non-violence and Trusteeship. After practising in Soviet Russia both came into under the influence of Gandhism⁶. J.P. made a lot of friends when he was at the Wisconsin University and those friends were not only the American but also Russian, Poles, Germans, Dutchmen and the french. One of the his most closes friend named Avron Landy a member of underground Communist Cell at the University. J.P. participated at the Cell meeting occasionally. Landly, one of his class friend introduced him before the audience like Manual Gamez’s a Marxist born leader of the American Communist Party and influenced that he was studied Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. More and above he read everything that Marx had written in English, including the volumes of the “Das Capital”.

J.P. digested that whole Books of Roy’s “Aftermath of Non-cooperation” and “India in Transition”. Thus he regards very greatly for M.N. Roy’s writings. But in the thirties, he had favoured the United Popular Front with the Communists, although he denounced the Popular Front with them and thereafter, he became one of the foremost critics of the authoritarian regimentation of Russia Communism in March 1940 at Ramgarh. As having of very near with Gandhiji physically as well as mentally and having studied Marxism very deeply, he acquired love for Democratic Socialism. So, he wanted to where in socialism through democratic means. He preferred to devote himself to “Sarvodaya” and the achievement of Gandhian ideals through the mission of Vinoba Bhave. Because of influence of Karl-Marx’s thinking, he wedded to the ideal of reconstruction of society and as influence of Gandhiji and he also upheld moral values.

Like Gandhi, Vinoba and Jayaprakash also very strongly believed that human freedom could be fully and wholly realized only in a stateless society. Although he was not sure whether the state would ever wither away completely. A Marxist, he never became a protagonist to Russia Communism and had deep moral revulsion against the atrocities of Russia Bolshevik party. Marx, Gandhi and J.P. all were ultimately for the extinction of the state as a coercive apparatus but their ideas differed in detail.
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Jayaprakash Narayan was the founder of the socialist movement as well as a staunch socialist. As already said, J.P. was a Marxist in the initial stages. He looked to Marxism for the solution of problems, relating to national self determination and socio-economics advancement. Jayaprakash narayan was a man who propounded both a “Socialist” and a “Nationalist”. He tried his best to win over both the communists and the congressmen for making a broad expansion of socialist front to fight imperialism.

For nearly twenty-four years, from 1930 to 1954 Jayaprakash Narayan worked as a socialist. He had been the foremost leader, Propagandist and spokesman of Indian socialism Mahatma Gandhi had accepted him to be the greatest Indian authority on socialism. Mahatma was the greatest humanist; Nehru was the world’s great statesman, Reformer like Narayan Datta Guru helped the Gandhian programme of social evils. He not only took the initiative in the formation of the Indian Socialist Party in 1934 but also showed a remarkable genius in popularizing the party and its programme. In 1934, Jayaprakash Narayan realized the socialism could be the real basis of India’s freedom. In a resolution submitted to the Rangrah, congress of 1940, he advocated collective ownership and control of all large-scale and heavy production. He moved that state should nationalize heavy transport, shipping, Mining and the heavy industries. As such, his earlier socialism showed an impact of the ideas’ of American and British socialist. Narayan considered socialism a complete theory of socio-economics reconstruction.

“It is must more than a theory of personal ethics”. Repudiating the idea of biological inequality of man, J.P. as a socialist and economic spheres was a function of the disproportionate control of the means of production.
So, he therefore, urged that society had to provide that kind of arrangement where the economic impediments that hindered the power and faculties of men were to be removed. As such, he stood for socialist and economic equality in life as against a psychological standardization. According to him, socialism is a theory and technique of widespread planing. Its aim is “Harmonious and well-balanced growth of the whole of society”.

As a socialist, he believed in the urgency of economic problems of the country and he therefore stressed the need for solving the economic problem first. To him there is no apparent inevitable connection between economic causation and cultural reality. Hence, Jayaprash Narayan pleaded for the eager maintenance of the conditions that were indispensable for the realization of equality of opportunities. Thus “economic minimum is a prime pre-condition for the resplendence of the fruit of culture”. Even as a socialist, he was not opposed to dominant values of Indian culture. Indian culture has exalted the ideal of the emancipation of the individual from the thraldom of the lower ego and acquisitiveness. To him sharing has been one of the most dominant ideals of Indian culture and hence it is ridiculous to condemn socialism as an importation from the west. To him socialism was always a way of life, but it represented a set of values to which he owed allegiance voluntarily and which he tried to put into practice in his lifetime.

It is became quite clear to him that socialism, ordinarily we meant that could not take mankind to the sublime goals of freedom, equality, brotherhood and peace. According to European thinkers, socialism could be established on the ruins of capitalism, after its being nature. While in Asia industrial capitalist development was in its infamy and Asian countries were over whiningly rural and agrarian community.
J.P. was persuaded to believe at Budha Gaya sarvodaya samelan in 1953 that unless socialism was transformed into sarvodaya the beacon-light of freedom, equality and brotherhood would remained beyond its reach. Hence, J.P. felt it was difficult to learn anything or take any guidance from their experiences. “The communists have no doubt been successful in the sense of capturing power precisely in background and rural communities, such as Russia and China. But the socialism” that they have built up in a far cry from the brotherhood of the equal and the free which to me is the essence of true socialism”. As a socialist, a political leader and as a thinker J.P. has been merciless in denouncing the dark and dismal deeds of national and international communism. Narayan has constantly tressed the elimination of the restraints, both mechanical and social that hamper agricultural productivity. This rural realism of his socialist ideology is of profound significance from the stand point of the evolution of his political philosophy.

According to J.P. Narayan, the principal features of communism are as given :- (1) The Nationalization of industry, (2) Commerce and Banking, (3) The Collectivization of Agriculture. But at the political and institutional levels communism spells the doom of civil liberties and forbids the formation of any challenging rival political association and its total control of the national economy and education lead to the ascendancy of a powerful controlling bureaucratic elite. Hence in the absence of feedback responses from the side of the people, communism may be stated to be “a case of arrested revolution”. J.P. condemned the neglect of values in the stalinism which had perversely transformed socialism in to “a crass Machiavellian code of conduct utterly devoid of any sense of right or wrong, good or evil”. He held bureaucratic centralization, lack of economic democracy and want of popular control over economic processes as being responsible for the emergence of Russian state capitalism.
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In 1935 J.P. founded the socialist party and in 1940 he denounced the communists. In 1942 he participated in our revolutionary movement. In 1946 he planned a mass revolution. In our modern time society, he is a socialist of the first order. He was tried to awaken the youth of India by telling them to remember the role which they played during Quit India Movement and gave them a call to re-unit themselves to perform that constructive duty. He has tried to shake the present democracy from its very foundations. His system of decentralization and Panchayati Raj and that the adopting democracy in its new form, if properly adopted, can bring a new outlook in India. In 1953, he initiated talks with Jawahar Lal Nehru regarding increased cooperation between the congress and the socialists. In 1954, he resigned from socialist party and then became a Jeevan Dani in Vinoba Bhave’s Bhoothan Movement.

Jayaprakash Narayan was under Marxian influence for a considerably long time but gradually he began to realize that the system did not guarantee individual liberty. With the passage of time he began to lose faith in Marxism but wanted to introduce socialist philosophy in congress organization. As a Jeevan Dani since then he is devoted to the cause of Bhoothan Movement and is struggling to establish a sarvodaya society. Jayaprakash Narayan wanted to study the working of socialist theory to acquired better understanding. For that he was advised by the Marxists of America to visit Russia. But his plan for visit to Russia could not materialize due to sudden illness of his mother. In 1934 Jayaprakash Narayan formed the congress socialist party for forcing the congress to adopt radical programme. By 1945 it because clear to the socialists within the congress that the leadership of the party was eager for power. Therefore in 1947 it was decided to work separately. From 1948 to 1951 Jayaprakash and Lohia worked hard to build the socialist party.
The defeat of the socialists in 1952 disillusioned Jayaprakash about the party polities. In 1957, J.P. left the socialists party and to joined the sarvodaya movement under the guidance of Vinobha Bhave. While keeping contact with the socialist movement in the world. Jayaprakash decided to give more time Bhooand work and other noble courses. In this connection, J.P. founded India, Pakistan conciliatory group in 1962 and worked successfully in bringing about the cease fire in Nagaland in 1964. J.P. felt that Marxism offered a solution for India’s social political and economic problems. The passion of Marx for social and economics justice particularly impressed Jayaprakash Narayan.

Jayaprakash Narayan had not forgotten Gandhiji, but as a Marxist he did not accept everything of Gandhiji’s polities and his strategy for action. He was committed to Marxist belief in violence, class-conflict and expansion of state power to impose socialism. So the only course open to him was to be in the congress party and work for socialist ideas. Negatively, his desire and expectations the communists in India were working under the guidance of the communist International. Hence it was clear to Jayaprakash that the socialist movement could not be carried under the communist party.

As a great champion of human freedom, Jayaprakash considered centralization of political and economic authority as a dangerous for establishing socialism. Jayaprakash thus wrote “Marx conceived of the socialist revolution as a historical process to be brought about by the proletariat which would naturally constitute the great majority of the population of a fully industrialized bourgeois nation”.

Jayaprakash wrote "The socialist movement in India must evolve its own picture of socialism in the light of Marxist". Laying down the objectives of socialism, Jayaprakash said "The objectives to socialism are elimination of exploitation and poverty, provision of equal opportunities to all for self-development, full development of the material and moral resources of society and utilization of these resources in accordance with the needs and wishes of society as a whole rather than in accordance with the dictated of profit; equitable appointment of national wealth and social, educational and other services between all who labour and serve the society......................... A system of social organizations that serves these ends is a socialist society". Giving a picture of socialist India of his views Jayaprakash said "My picture of socialist India is the picture of an economic and political democracy. In this democracy man will neither be slave of capitalism nor of a party or the state. Man will be free. He will have to serve society which will provide him with employment and the means of livelihood, but within limits he will be free to choose his vocation and station in life. He will be free to express his opinions and there will be opportunities for him to rise to his full moral stature".

Jayaprakash Narayan was eager to lay-down specific aim of the socialist movement in India as a guide for the socialist party. This was necessary as some leaders of the socialist party with orthodox belief in Marxism did not like change in Jayaprakash's ideas on socialism. Jayaprakash Narayan said at the Madras session of the party in 1950 "socialism is not merely anti-capitalism, nor statism. Nationalization of industry and collectivization of agriculture are important aspects of socialist economy, but in themselves they are not socialism". The aim of socialist movement, he said, "were not mere overthrow of capitalist order and establishment of a
party dictatorship, but the creation of a society of free and equal people, a society based on certain values of human and social life, values which could never be sacrificed in the name of theory of the party line”. According to him a socialist state must aspire to certain basic values; a decentralized state was essential to make socialism realistic from the political point of views; nationalizations of industry was not enough; decentralization of economic power was necessary; peaceful democratic means must be used to achieve the aim of a socialist society. As a result of the defeat of the - From Marxism to socialist party in the general elections which was held in the January 1952. Socialist leadership was losing its numerical strength, its influence politically and its elan psychologically.
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FOUNDING OF PRAJA - SOCIALIST PARTY:

Nehru was, not so sincere in adopting and implementing the objectives of socialism as Jayaprakash Narayan was and hence there was no chance for them to agree to each other’s view points. J.P. offered Nehru a 14 point programme as a basis for co-operation, the latter showed his helplessness to accept his suggestion and implement his proposals. In fact, Jayaprakash Narayan felt dissatisfied with Nehru’s, approach to the national problems and his way of working. Socialist party was defeated in the general elections, due to the virtue of unsuccessful in the general elections, the socialist leadership was losing its numerical strength, its influence politically and its elan psychologically. On the other hand, due to the misunderstanding within the Congress Party, some of the senior Congressmen had come out of the congress and formed the Kisan Mazdoor Praja party (K.M.P.P.) in 1951 with Acharya J.B. Kripalini as its leader. Under these circumstances, there was a negotiation between Jayaprakash Narayan and Kripalini and other disillusioned leaders of the K.M.P.P. in 1952 for a merger of socialist party - party with K.M.P.P. with a view to increasing their parliamentary geographic strength.

The merger of the socialist party with K.M.P.P. to form the Praja Socialist Party (P.S.P.) in 1952 was made possible though an agreement to deal with the ‘principle’ and to keep ideology out of the merger talks. Through merger, they hoped to create a party whose combine strength could achieve the opposition status which neither could satisfactorily attain done. The (K.M.P.P.) was interested in practical parliamentary activity and Gandhian village constructive work, thereby complementing the socialist party leadership’s interest in urban trade union, intellectual and agitation activities. Significantly, K.M.P.P. members were given most of the chairmanships and
honorary presiding officers in the new party (P.S.P.) while the former socialist party leaders retained control of the provincial party secretaryships. National and provincial executive committee - positions, as also the joint-national secretariat positions were shared equitably. But such a cohesion and demarcation of fields between K.M.P.P. and socialist party working under the banner of P.S.P., did not prove effective at all.

The poor performance of the party, made the socialist leadership think about the causes of its failures. The party came to the conclusion that unless socialist forces combined together it would be difficult for any single party to give a tough opposition to the congress. It was also realised that in the absence of a combined socialist forum, with strong foundations the communists with again ground in the country. The socialists now turned their face to Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party (K.M.P.P.) which had been founded by Acharya Kripalini and P.C. Joshi. Ultimately in 1952 both the parties decided to merge themselves and a new socialist party which known as (P.S.P.) Praja Socialist Party.

The Praja Socialist Party (P.S.P.) had officially taken place yet it was found that the working of the newly founded party was not smoothly done. The party was soon faced with internal differences. On the one hand were members who had leavings towards communism while on the other hand were many members who had love for Gandhian philosophy and ideology. Due to extreme and opposite thinking about the use of violent and nonviolent means for achieving ends, the working of the party became difficult and in 1953 the party decided at Allahabad that it should made electoral adjustments with other socialist parties to avoid there cornered contests. In the Gaya session of 1955, the party decided not to have any
electoral adjustments with the congress party, Communists and Hindu Sectarian Parties. In 1955 at the Avadi session, the Indian National Congress decided to adopt socialist programme. It decided to have socialist ownership of means of production, equitable distribution of wealth and to provide equality of opportunity to all. This programme appealed Ashok Mehata and J.P. whereas Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and Madhu Limaya thought that resolution was a pious thinking and they opposed the idea of co-operating with the congress. From 1956 to 1964, the socialists remained divided the Praja Socialist Party and Socialist Party of India.

In October 1959, the Praja Socialist Party adopted following 12 point programme for the abolition and its items were:

1) Accent of agricultural production.
2) Encouragement for increased agricultural production.
3) Maximum ceiling for holding lands.
4) Fixed prices for agricultural products.
5) Reduction of unemployment.
6) Raising of living standard for the Backward society.
7) Separation of judiciary from the executive.
8) Set up of anti-corruption.
9) Decentralisation of administration etc.

The Praja Socialist Party stressed on democratic decentralisation and its party also favoured socialist ownership of properly and not trusteeship. Due to formation of P.S.P. in 1952, Dr. Lohia pleaded for deep incorporation of Gandhian ideas in socialist thought. But Lohia was against the idea of a co-operation between P.S.P. and the congress on policy matter but on the contrary, J.P. and Ashoka Mehta were in favour of having an alliance with
the congress. Dr. Lohia, as a counter balance to it presented his “equidistant theory” and he asserted. Actually, Lohia did not like P.S.P. to have an alliance with the congress on policy matters.

**DR. BHAGAWAN DAS’S VIEWS ON SOCIALISM AND J.P.**

Dr. Bhagwan Das was one of the pioneers of the Indian socialist thoughts. His fundamental basic thoughts deal with the Indian social life—the theory of Karma, Caste system, Varna system and Several etc. He was also of the view that the Caste system should not be determined by birth but by the functions and the jobs. In other words, he was upholding the ancient concept of Ashram Vyavatha. He was one of those thinkers who upheld the social structure prescribed by Manu. He recognized the change in Manu’s social system because of the change of time and other social economic conditions but by and large he thought social system put forward by Manu was useful even in the modern conditions. Dr. Bhagwan Das on the basis of Manu, presented a comprehensive commentary on man and his functions. In short, it may be said that Dr. Bhagwan Das presented the old wine in the new bottle. He laid stress on the application of value of ancient India to the modern thought.

Dr. Bhagwan Das was an advocate of Verna Vyavastha. According to him, caste should not be determined on the basis of the function and the role an individual has to play in the society. He likes Gandhiji believed in Ashram Vyavastha, not in its degenerated form but in its original and healthy form. According to Gandhiji, he was the greatest Satyagrahi who kept himself away from the attraction of the world in all respects. He was one of the greatest educationalists and believe in higher ideals of vedic religion.
Dr. Bhagvan Das believed in morality in public life and personal behaviour. That is why he did not agree to the condition of the landlord to condone the outstanding house tax and water tax in order to get his house for the hostel of kashi-Vidyapath. Dr. Bhagwan Das was a philosopher administrator, who wanted to run administration according to his philosophical ideals and views. He knew that philosophy was the best method of finding the truth. He maintained that philosophy was not only an intellectual exercise or mental gymnastics but it was method for solving the problems of life. According to him, Manu had provided the best possible social philosophy for the problems of life. So, he wanted to run the social structure and organization according to the views of Manu. Bhagvan Das wanted complete freedom to be the ideal of the country. He was not prepared to accept the interpretation of sarvodaya and put his views before congress leaders. He discussed his views with Gandhiji also but the people would not liked (be wanted) his views.

But at the last moment, when the congress adopted the resolution for complete freedom, the truth of his ideas came to light what he was as a “Gyanvibhuties”. He devoted his life to the welfare of the society. In recognition services for the people, he was awarded the tittle of “Bharal Ratna” in the year of December 19985.

J.P. have ridiculed the Gandhiji’s the theory of trusteeship and his vision of Ramarajaya where of interests of both princes and paupers would be protected. He went to the extent of characterizing Gandhism as being “in an serious bog of timid economic analysis, good intentions and infection moralizing”. He regarded Gandhism as being well-intentioned and
ineffective but “dangerous” in its blind to pressing economic issues and as being “deceptive for the masses”. In this book, he also candidly proclaimed that the ancient Indian social philosophy could not afford any concrete insight for the solution of the complex problems of an industrial capitalist society. He condemned the Brahmin class for persistent opposition to social reform.

Dr. Bhagwan Das wanted to review the traditional stratification scheme of four fold Varnas and Ashramas as categorized by Manu. But Narayan regarded Vasishtha-Manu, Yanjanavalkya scheme as fossilized and incapable of solving the complicated problems of rampant economic exploitation. Bhagwan Das wished to have four basic divisions or guilds in society namely - (1) of the learned (2) of the executive (3) of the wealth-making and (4) of the labouring professions.

Narayan rightly felt that the distinction between the learned and executive professions could not be maintained in the tangled complexities of the present day world where executive positions do required specialized competence. He also stated that the clerical and manipulative cadres of the lower executive personal could be grouped with the labouring professions. Further more, Narayan was opposed to the semi-philosophical subjective machinery for implementing this ideal scheme of fourfold social stratification. Although Bhagvan Das prescribed was the speculative technic of the propaganda work of the “missionaries of Brahma who had received training in the esoteric method of Yogic contemplation and abstraction. To, J.P. Narayan, a votary at the shrine of materialistic delictual ideology, this was too tame introspective and passive a method to resolved the involved and intricate problems of an exploitationist society. J.P. showed impatience
with Bhagvan Das’s ideas although he gave credit to him for having given serious thought to providing an Indian solution to modern problems. He concluded by saying that Das had misunderstood. Some of the fundamental-tenets of historical materialism and J.P. Narayan, in full Marxist favour harped on the materialistic basis of all spiritual thoughts. It need not to be over emphasized that there has been a major and fundamental transition in the philosophical and sociological notions of J.P. Narayan as formulated in “why socialism” and “towards struggle”.

Bhagwan Das’s schemes of ancient socialism and social reconstruction are a plea for the revival of the functional “four-guild” system advocated in the ancient Hindu books. He wants to substitute classlessness by vocational classes. Thus Bhagvan Das claims to have given us the social philosophy of functional organismic Hindu socialism. But modern humanity has gone much farther than Manu in its quest of social justice and equality. On the other hand the modern intellectual would not agree to abide by the pronouncements of the scriptures and the ancient patriarchs. According to Bhagvan Das plea for reform of caste system of the vedic ideals of Varnas are also similarly analogues of Dayananda and Vivekananda anachronistic. But, against the modern craze for accumulation and speculation he wanted that property should be used for righteous purpose. Bhagwan Das strongly recommended for favour of the renaissance of the Hindu ideals of simplicity and control of the appetites.

Although, Bhagvan Das was an exponent of the revival of the old Varna system as ancient socialism but must not be concluded with the iniquities perpetrated in the modern caste system. Dr. Bhagvan Das wrote:

“The traditional ancient Indian answer ....... is that the state is for Man, the
Government is set up by the people, by society, to maintain law and order as its constituents function and to promote general welfare as its ministrant function, and that its constituent function is subservient to its ministrant function". According to ancient Indian thought the individual had freedom of philosophical opinions but the overwhelming dominance of social structure lift him slender opportunities for the exercise of freedom in social and political matters. But if the individual has to be accorded primary, it has to be also at economic, political and social levels. Because of this reasons, the ancient socialism of Dr. Bhagvan Das has nothing to offer and deeply influenced by the Augustinian conception of the kingdom of God on earth⁸.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

2. Dr. H.R. Mukhi, Modern Indian Political Thought, S.B.D. Publications, Nai Sarak, Delhi - 110006 (1992), P. - 206.
3. Ibid P.P. - 77-78.
6. Dr. V.P. Varma, Modern Indian Political Thought, Agra - 3 (1961), P.P. - 519.
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF J.P. AND MARXISM:

Comparatively, Marx and J.P. both are - Contradictory ways of aspects in the sense that former is mostly based on ways of violation, type and the latter is to conquer the hearts of all by “Bhakti” and non-violence.

Since the achievement of independence J.P. feels that his interpretation of Marxism was the correct one even though the Indian communist party were disappointing to him. According to him Communism leads to state capitalism; Socialism leads to Parliamentary-Politics based on Comprises and deals among insensitive bureaucracies. The goals of justice and equality are lip service of every Politician. At least, the people are abandoned.

Socialism, on the other hand, could not produce goods. If a nation will feed state can solve the problem of hunger and poverty, they minimise the significance individual as but a cog in machine for voting and polling. The state is the result of ordinary Political Proposes. Popular initiative and activity will be eliminated in such a position. He further contains that ruling congress Party talk of Ghandhi from its position of power at the center as a concession.

His ideology assumes of two (2) principles- (i) Loss of individualistic in the socialist progress of various Political parties (ii) moral and spiritual assent which people attach to the “Secular” laws and institutions makes this laws and institutions functional in society. He was against communal rhetoric of Jansangh and R.S.S. He did find satisfaction in Ghandian teaching concerning “Sarvodaya”.
ETHICAL MOVEMENTS:

J.P.'s movements are essentially ethical "Revolutions happen", he once told Minoo Masini, "Neither Lenin", nor Ghandhi, nor Mao made a Revolution; they merely gave a direction to the revolution and controlled it". Throughout his life he has been a leader in search of revolution. In his life revolution is eluding him although he was in search of it. In his career he has been after more than one revolution. After his return from U.S.A. he plunged himself towards the Socialist revolution. His final break with communism came after Ghandhi’s death. Again he opted for the revolution- a beautiful revolution different from the revolutions made by law.

By early 70's J.P. was ready to abandon Bhoodan and passive resistance for a more militant path. Real power lays in the hands of the police and army and the landlords. The movement under J.P. in Bihar began to be infiltrated by opportunistic politicians for whom toppling the congress government meant however remained in the hands of the middle-class students rather than workers and peasants. The court verdict unseating prime minister Indira Ghandhi prompted the government to arrest all leaders including J.P. and declare a state of emergency. He touched as the beautiful revolution as the earlier society is not sufficient. Vinoba could not approve of the political contest of J.P. movement in Bihar. When volunteer of a self styled Indira brigade fired upon a procession of J.P.’s supporters in Patna on 5th June 1974 Vinoba’s sole comment was “I leave it to God for his verdict. J.P. did not subscribe to such comment. The Anusasan Parva of Maharastra is link to the lifting of emergency in Vinoba’s opinion. This sums up the difference between Vinoba and J.P.. J.P. could not fit the concurrence of Vinoba in the struggle he had launched. Like Ghandhiji, he advocated spiritualization of politics and ethical socialism. Ethics first and politics/Economics afterwards to develop better people implies better world and good politics.
But in Gandhiji's lifetime his commitment to nonviolence was not total. Year after Gandhiji's death the disenchantment of J.P. with communism was complete. Everywhere in the colonies, the communists kept themselves aloof from the national movements wanting for the road to clear by others. It warranted his back-away from communism and the freedom fighters. For his freedom is something more than the expression/expulsion of the British. Free India to me meant socialist India and Swaraj mean the rule of the poor and down trodden. The famous Karachi declaration was vague and inadequate. He was instrumental for the emergence of the congress socialist party with such life minded persons like Dr. ram Manohar Lohia, M.R. Massani, Achyut Patwardhan, Ashok Mehta, and Acharya Narendra Deva. Unfortunately there was gati/jati to keep open for the communists to come in and forgives, a united front if so needed. Such type of unity led disastrous consequence for the congress socialist party.

In 1956 Narayan raised his voice against soviet intervention of Hungary Four Years, later when the Chinese forces over on Tibet, he came toward a champion of the people of Tibet and its Spirituals Head - the Dalai Lama. In 1971 he mobilized public opinion for the people of Bangladesh against Pakistan. He was President of the All-India Railwaymen’s Federation, All India posts and Telegraphs Employees Federation. He was one of the member of Naga Peach Millennium in the early Sixties. The failure of the communist regime in the former U.S.S.R. which demonstrates the Marxist failures is being realized by the world. In this context, the sarvodaya ideology or revolution based on nonviolence will stand in good stead for the suffering humanity. Marxism being a liberator of the suffering and workers downtrodden played a great role in counter acting the capitalist influence. It is not without its merits at the rising stage of an underdeveloped society. The intellectual of the world feel inclined to prefer J.P’s socialism and sarvodaya to the violent type of Revolution associated with names of Marx, Lenin and Stalin.
Socialism is a theory and technique of widespread learning. It aims at harmonious and balanced development of the total aspect of man. According to J.P. socialization of the means of production is the means of building socialism. It is impossible by the economic exploitation of the means. He pleaded for reduction of land revenue the limitation of expenditure and nationalization of societies the control of exploitation of masses can be achieved if the people can control the political and economic destiny. In 1934 J.P. fill that socialism could be the basis of India's freedom. It urged collective ownership, control of all large scale production nationalization of heavy transport, shipping, mining and heavy industries.

In his opinion there is no real opposite between socialism and values of Indian culture truth, Beauty and good will. Emancipation of the individual does not mean the immersion of petty satisfaction of the narrow self. Its love function has been an essential part of Indian culture.

Marxian approach is quite different from this. J.P. who stood for village recognitions, self sufficiency reforms. He holds cooperative farming, land belonging to the cultivator. He denounced the individualistic organization of agriculture. For him there is a close relation between culture and economic problem. Cultural creativism is an impossible conception what the satisfaction of basic economic needs. J.P. conceptualized a world community. It can do justice to the suppress sections of Asian and African people in the contest of devatation of militarism. The world after the cold war is still developed in to different power blocks'. The purpose of an individual in such role of world community. A psychological revolution is a necessity for biopolarising the power structures.
J.P’s. concepts of revolution was not based on concrete facts as was Marx's concepts. Therefore it was idealist in character. That’s why it facts in its objective meaning thereby it fails. He was an idealist. It did not take into consideration the basic problems for the persons for which it was launched, started. J.P. therefore appeared to start from idealistic plane. So higher idealistic not in directed his whole revolutionary thinking.

J.P. did not have a clear conception of human nature. He fails to analyses the real essence, characteristics of human nature. He himself regarded “Mind” “Soul” is idealistic aspects of man as conceptual his nature. That’s why his analysis of revolution is not synthetic, objective and logical. J.P. concept of revolution was not synthetic, not based on concrete facts as was Marx’s concept. Therefore it was idealist in character. Marx’s concepts of revolution is concept of alienation, not a materialist in potential. In the philosophical sense Marx’s conception that matter alone is reality because Marx concern is with living concrete human being but not a materialistic tradition.

Jayaprakashji believed in violent methods of revolution at first. But since 1974, this was not the only occasion when Indiraji had hit below the belt. According to Marx, human nature is consists of physical being and species being. Physical being is limited existence and species being is unlimited existence. Marx opens that man as species being transcends his physical, limited being and acquire and realizes the true humanity. Marx revolution is for man real concrete, human being. The man for which Marx’s analysis concern is the man as we find in capitalism. This man is alienated, separated from (1) The own achieving (2) The product of his achieving (3) The fellow being (4) The species nature.
The above separated alienated man is nothing but dejected, exploited, proletariat of capitalism. Thus the capitalism which is cause of denumanization, alienation, exploitation, objectical is a irrational systems. Therefore prophescal that an era of change must start after class struggle between worker and capitalist get thereafter. As class became start the revolution begun. Revolution tries to upside down the capitalist systems. It tries to put man into his real place i.e. his existence as man not as an object, dead etc. Marx philosophy has hitherto interpreted the world question is however to change it revolution helps in being the change⁶.

Marx faith in compulsion and himself introduced the seen of revolution any socialism or communism very clearly in the democratic socialism. His socialism lays great stress on economic rights. Marxist philosophy arouses as the spiritual weapon of the working classes in its struggle against the bourgeo groups. Marx who he is the founder of scientific communism, dialectical and his to real materialism as well as the leader and the teacher of the world proletariat groups. So he regarded as the father of the scientific socialism. Marx very extremely supported to most consistently revolutionary democratic ideas both in theory and practical. His starting point of spiritual evolution was Hegel’s philosophy. Marx for the first time disclosed the historic role of the proletariat and arrived at the conclusion of the inevitability of the social revolution and the need of uniting the working classes movement with a scientific world out look. Marxist philosophy is the most adequate method of cognition and transformation of the world. From the context of the view of Marxists, the development of practice and science in 19th to 20th centuries have convincingly proved the superiority of Marxism over all forms of idealism and metaphysical materialism. Marx’s teaching as the only form of the theoretical experience of the working class interests was stech in the fight against all sorts of unscientific, anti proletariats and petty-bourgeois currents⁷.
Marx's activities are characterized by partisanship and irreconcilability with any digress in from scientific theory. Being a revolutionary in science, Marx took place an active part in the liberation struggle of the proletariat. During the revolution period of 1848-49 in Germany he was at the fore-front of the political struggle. In 1872 he was exile to England and spended that time in writing of pamphlete and treatises on socialism and introduced the publication of "Das capital". According to him economic conditions determine being must eat and drink and obtain shelter and clothing before they can pursue politics, science, religion and art. Thus the stage of advancement of the production, distribution and exchange of goods and the organization of society resulting there form determine in the final analysis the political, social and cultural developments. Marx was the chief propounder of political and economic theory who produces alike the theory of the inevitable course of social development. He resolutely defended the proletarian i.e. common people stands in his capacity as chief editor of the New Rheisische Zieting which he founded.

After dissolving the communist league in 1852, he continued his activities in the proletarian movement working for the creation of the first International. He was active in his organization, followed closely the progress of the revolutionary movement in all countries and to the very last day of his life was in the think of contemporary events. This afforded him the indispensable material for the development of his theory. The experience of the bourgeois revolution of the 1848-49 in Europe was of the great importance for the development by Marx of the theory of socialist revolution and class struggle of the idea of dictatorship of the proletariat the tactics of the proletariat in the bourgeoisie revolution, the need for worker and peasant alliance.
The creation of Marx political economic system laid the scientific basis for communism but the philosophical importance of capital and of the extensive preparatory manuscripts of 1857-59 and 1861-63 is unequaled. In these works Marx comprehensively developed the major aspects and principles of Marxist philosophy the dialectical method the principles of unity of dialectics, logics and the theory of the knowledge and applied them in a brilliant form to the study of the capitalist system of economic relations. As a man of atheistic, millions of exploited workers revere him as God but the remaining common people who inhabitance in the world hated him and all those who use language and principles. But to the capitalists, he is SATAN incarnate. For his highness achievements of these, Marx is called truly the “father of Scientific Socialism”.

But Jayaprakash narayan like all young revolution arrives, were very much attracted towards Marxism, but when the Indian communists became subservient to Moscow and denounced Gandhiji as a “Lackey of Indian Bourgeoisie”. Jayaprakashji had a rude shock of life and servered all his connections with the communist thinking or the communist party.

In the beginning, the members of the communist party of India also the members of the congress socialist party but later on they had to leave it because J.P. and his colleagues thought that they were disrupting the movement that had to leave it because J.P. and his colleagues thought that they were disrupting the movement that had been built up under the banner of Congress socialist party. This thing also made him averse to collusion with the communists. Because of his knowledge of Indian life, influence of Gandhian ideology and the Indian way of thinking, J.P. also realized that Marxism or the concept of the Western socialism could not be applied to the Indian conditions.
On account of, J.P. and his colleagues developed the idea of "democratic socialism". Basically, J.P. was a democratic socialist and a firm believer in individual liberty. J.P. wanted to change the Indian society and usher in a new social order based on democracy and welfare of all the human beings. Because of influence of Karl Marx's thinking, he weaved to the ideal of reconstruction of society.

On the other hand, J.P. has suggested that the community and society should be reconstructed. Morality, Spiritual values and individual liberty shall form the basis of the reconstructed society of his concept and also he realized that in the present set up sometimes the minority rules the majority. J.P. himself not satisfied with the working of the political parties. So, he supported "partyless democracy". Jayaprakash Narayan did not believe in state ownership of the means of production, distribution, exchange and planning. He wanted replacement of 'Rajniti' by "Lokniti" and the polities by service.

As a Marxist, Jaya Prakash Narayan never became a protagonist of Russian communism. He had a deep moral revolution against the atrocities of Russian Bolshevik party. J.P. himself did not like the dictatorial regime in Soviet- Russian. According to him (J.P.) mentioned that self personal practical experience that in a society where it was possible for the people by democratic means to bring about social change it would be counter revolutionary to resort the violence, J.P. rejected "the theory of the dictatorship of a bureaucratic Oligarchy". Jaya Prakash Narayan felt that, Marxism offered a solution for India's social political and economic problems. The passion of Marx for social and economic justice particularly impressed Jaya Prakash. Actually, J.P. himself wanted to study the working of socialist theory to acquired better understanding. For that he was advised by the Marxists of America to visit Russia but could not materialize due to sudden illness of his mother.
As a Marxist J.P. did not accept every thing of Gandhiji’s politics and his strategy for action. He was committed to Marxist belief in violence class conflict and expansion of state power to impose socialism. Jayaprakash thus wrote “Marx conceived of the socialist revolution as a historical process to be brought about by the proletariat which would naturally constitute the great majority of the population of a fully industrialized bourgeois nation”.

Marx had Visualized that the proletariat would overthrown. Capitalism and Colonialism shall be challenged by the people. While the second hypothesis proved correct, the first did not. The working classes were influenced by comparative prosperity and social security; after having driven as cattle from their lands and occupations. During the last 80 years, the social security in the developed countries co-opted the working class into the Capitalist system. The Marxist contention that the middle classes will join the proletariat has been contradicted by history. The sections of skilled workers are part of the lower middle class. There is a big service sector and along with the independent professions. The Soviet system calling itself Marxist Crumbled like the play cards since it had suppressed solidarity, freedom and equality, the core of Marxist values.

The 21st Century Presents a Paradox for Marxist. J.P’s vision is not realized on account of corruption and power politics. Hundred thousands of persons protested against the machinations of the group of Eight (G. 8) eight developed countries and attempted to finish exploitation. A comparative austerity in living, an ethical code of behaviour which gives opportunity of equality to all sections will have to be adopted centralization of political and economic power will not sites by the humanity’s craving. Violence can be defeated only by non-violence and non-cooperation. That requires a revolution to create a moral and material force. Gandhiji and J.P. seek to promote the sense in these anger methods.
DECENTRALIZATION OF POLITICAL POWER:

The concept of decentralization is the basis of the social and political thought of the Jayaprakash Narayan. Jayaprakash Narayan concepts of decentralization is base on Gandhian thought. This decentralization is not limited to political field but goes to economic field as mainly. Decentralization of J.P. is mainly based on the concept of “Sarvodaya”. He advocates establishing of “Panchayat Raj”, “Village Panchayat”, Block Panchayats” etc. The existing system of the community development and the Panchayat Raj system has not been approved by Jayaprakash because of this he has seen their failure and corruption bred by these institutions. The basic thing is that Jayaprakash Narayan wanted was the involvement and participation of the people. However, J.P. himself supported the establishment of the institutions of Panchayat Raj system and their working. He wanted their working to be free from the influence of the political parties. To him, these institutions should be guided by a “Non-political autonomous body headed by a person who does not belong to the civil service.

Jayaprakash Narayan believes in decentralization of political as well as economic power. According to him centralization of political and economic power leads to Shrinkage of democracy. Thinking of Jayaprakashji even today, is basically a socialist. So, his socialism is based on democracy and peaceful means. Jayaprakash Narayan treated the Gram Sabhas as the basic units of the decentralized political system and wants the members of the Vidhan Sabha and Lok Sabha. Because of this, he also suggested an elaborate procedure. The political system that J.P. has advocated also requires a new economic system base on decentralization and power. He wants replacement of large scale industries by cottage industries and wants village units to be self-sufficient. He wants imbalances between production and consumption and employment to be avoided.
In this regard of decentralization, J.P. says that in his own words - "A decentralized economy must aim at relating full utilization of local and regional sources, human and material, to be satisfaction of local and regional means. For this, regional surveying and planning would be necessary. This would further assume that for production and consumption of different commodities, different areas would serve as economic units, so that there might be some industries that are village industries, some that are block area industries, others that are district, state or union industries.

This does not mean, however, that surplus from one area could not be exchanged for surpluses of other areas, but it does mean that by and large, for each type of industries the area concerned could be the Geographical Zone within which it would operate". His idea of a decentralized self-sufficient community life is based on ancient "Indian Thought". Now his idea of individual freedom has come to acquire higher plagues than his previous conviction about state ownership12.

J.P. think some of us are inclined to make the mistake that by merely setting up decentralized industries; Khadi and other Village industries. We have made full preparations for non-violence. He holds that if the economy is decentralized, there is less Violence; there is less concentration of wealth and less scope for exploitation of man by man13.
PARTILESS DEMOCRACY :-

J.P. himself realised that it benefits a powerful section of the society. It had bred Corruption favoritism, Partisan spirit and many other evils. He and his fellow Baba Vinaba Bhaba had criticised against the power and functioning of the parliamentary democracy. According to him democracy can be the Government of the people and for the people only, if people and the Government continues to be indirect and continuous contact. So, to him, the party system has failed to bring about such a close contact and Candidates should be selected not by parties but by peoples themselves. He though that the party incourages power politics which lead to all sorts of corruption and the ideal of village community has been created, there would be a greater possibility of having a partiless democracy for favour of this context, he deeply wanted to replacement of "Rajnity by Loknity" and the "Politics by Services". Actually, he wanted the ministers and the members of cabinet to be selected not on party lines but on the basis of marit, talent and the requirment of the country. He vary strongly idea of a "partyleless democracy" that thus talk of ideals, seems to be quite attractive but so far it has neither been sent into practice nor does it have basic clarity. The lauded discursive of panchayat system of Nepal and the Basic Democracy of Pakistan were have to failed by J.P. Narayan. But it cannot be said whether a Partileless democracy is really feasible at the state and the National level. If at all it can be sucessfull, it has to be proceeded by radical reformation and restructuring of the political system.

His ideas of partyless democracy as drew attention of present political set-up has degenerated democracy. It has made the institution of Government of the people, for the people, by the people a mere force. The system encourages party politics and divides the nation. So, he therefore feels that
the whole system should be changed. There should be a partyless democracy. He mainly suggested that these should be in each Village a Gram Mandal or a conference consisting of elected representatives, of the village one at least from each family. He has suggested, our cabinet should not be formed on the basis of party system but on the contrary there should be partyless cabinets which should enlist capable and intelligent persons from all political parties. J.P. hardly remains representative of the people whom he claims to represent. In his own words, as he mention that “the party system reduces the people to the position of sheep whose only function of sovereignty would be to choose periodically shepherds who should look after their welfare”. His tour of some foreign countries like England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Italy, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia convinced him of futility of party system. An appraisal of People’s Committees in Yugoslavia convinced him to prepare a thesis reconstruction of India polity in 1959. So, this let him to evolve the concept of partyless democracy. J.P. introduced four ways of Partyless Democracy as under the following - (a) In the villages people will nominate their representatives by consensus. They will form a Panchayat or Gram Mandal. (b) A Sarvodaya Samaj free from party politics will be established. Such a Samaj will comprise dedicated workers who will be wholly and solely devoted to the movement. (c) All the existing parties will be invited to cooperate and work unitedly for Sarvodaya. When through the concerted effect of all parties, all round revolution is complete and Sarvodaya is realised, all this parties will vanish. (d) Neutralisation of the parties in the legislatures is to take place before the achievement of goal of partyless democracy. To him Election through consensus particularly of provincial and the central Panchayats is not feasible. But at last stage he himself suggested that he is not opposed to party system as such views but he opposed to partisan spirit in the parties.
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