CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

In the preceding chapters, effort has been made to analyse and compare, at a considerable length, the political ideas of M.N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan in the perspective of their evolution and change. Conclusions pertaining to various themes have already been stated at the end of the preceding chapters. In this chapter, therefore, we propose to sum up the study with a view to ensuring compactness and compression. We can begin by eluding to a seminal characterization of the political ideas of both Roy and J.P., namely, inflicting faith in the cherished human ideals and a strong moral sensibility to human suffering.

It is in the context of this basic motivation that their journeys to the sphere of political ideas (from Revolutionary Nationalism to Marxism to Radical Humanism-Roy; and from Nationalism to Marxism to Total Revolution through Democratic Socialism and Sarvodaya-J.P.) which may well appear to a casual and perfunctory inquirer a zigzag and tortuous chart of unsteadiness and blind groping, can be understood in their causal perspective. There were clear beacons of light that remained glittering and unabashed throughout their lives and that constantly led them on to a higher and higher path of truth and freedom, resulting, apparently, into varied stances of thought and ideas.
The journeys are long enough but circuitous. The common factor is strong enough between Roy, a revolutionary and philosopher and J.P., a spiritualist and saint. Both were intellectuals of outstanding mould, both had a forceful urge to bring about social justice through engineered change; both had a strong vein of idealism and a concern for the downtrodden; both represented a queer mix of oriental and occidental brought about by the determinants of their Indian births and genes and very sound educational bases of and prolonged personal contact with the West. To illustrate the common traits of thought and action of Roy and J.P., we can not do better than to quote J.P. himself on this issue. He wrote: “It has been the matter of deep satisfaction to me that, after a middle period of difference, we had moved close together at the end just as I was close to him at the beginning .... Towards the end, both of us, each in his own way, had moved away from Marxism in the same direction and to the same goals”.

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

As an alternative to parliamentary democracy both presented their schemes of government based on the principles of decentralisation, individual freedom and popular participation. Good many of the features of these schemes proposed for India are similar. Roy suggested a pyramidal structure of Indian polity reared on the basis of an organised democracy composed of a country-wide network of People's Committees. Like Roy, J.P. also visualised a pyramidal structure of Indian polity based on a communitarian democracy composed of village communities as its basis. In Roy's organised democracy and J.P.'s communitarian democracy, there is no place for political parties. J.P., however, conceded the possibility of political parties being allowed to operate only as local fractions. There would be maximum decentralisation of power. People will actively participate in the administration and would be accorded a central place. There would be no centralised State. To Roy, the government would become co-terminous with society and to J.P., it would serve like a danger chain in a railway train.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Another major point of difference between Roy and J.P. was relating to 'spiritualism'. In an inaugural address at the All-India Radical Humanist Association Conference held in Calcutta on December 29, 1973, J.P. expressed his complete agreement with the Draft, except for one point. The point of disagreement was the statement in the second fundamental principle in the Draft, that "Humanism excludes supernaturalism and affirms that man with his increasing power over nature is the maker of his future". Disagreeing with the statement, J.P. said:
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"modern science, particularly modern psychology does definitely point to a reality beyond the human mind. Whatever the nature of the human spirit may be, it definitely seems to be a higher order than the mind. He viewed that reason alone would not enable man to shape a better future for himself. He referred with approval to Vinoba’s statement that "the age of Reason and Politics is over and new age of spirituality and science has dawned". He, however, added, "It may be discovered that what is called supernatural to-day is after all a part or an aspect of nature, but whose laws are different from those that are termed natural laws at present". Thus, whereas Roy was free from any mystical approaches and maintained a rational and scientific outlook at all levels of his thought, on the question of reconstruction of Indian polity, J.V. was drawn towards the concept of Dharma and spirituality, obviously under the impact of Gandhism, in which he found an example of synthetic, organic and communitarian organisation of Indian society.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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