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: infinishing 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.
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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
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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 Servodaya Movement. The Co-operative Socialism, advocated by Hoy, is considerably similar to that of J.P.'s People's Socialism (Servodaya) 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 Shattacharjea, "J.P. was far from an uncritical admirer of Gandhi's politics and strategy. He did not attend his prayer meetings, though Prabhavat 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 promises 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 party men 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 excitements, 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 periods, 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 have 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 realized 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 non-feasance 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 peripheral.
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:

3. Vide Chapter V, Footnote No. 212.
4. Ibid., Footnote No. 213.
"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.P. 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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5. Ibid., Footnote No. 214.
6. Ibid., Footnote No. 215.
7. Ibid., Footnote No. 216.
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 Gandhiji. 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 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 emphasised 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 visualised 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.
APPENDIX I

PRINCIPLES OF RADICAL DEMOCRACY

TWENTY-TWO THESSES

ONE

Man is the archetype of society; co-operative social relationships contribute to develop individual potentialities. But the development of the individual is the measure of social progress. Collectivity presupposes the existence of individuals. Except as the sum total of freedom and well-being, actually enjoyed by individuals, social liberation and progress are imaginary ideals, which are never attained. Well-being, if it is actual, is enjoyed by individuals. It is wrong to ascribe a collective ego to any form of human community (viz., nation, class, etc.), as that practice means sacrifice of the individual. Collective well-being is a function of the well-being of individuals.

TWO

Quest for freedom and search for truth constitute the basic urge of human progress. The quest for freedom is the continuation, on a higher level-of intelligence and emotion-of the biological struggle for existence. The search for truth is a corollary thereof. Increasing knowledge of nature enables man to be progressively free from the tyranny of natural phenomena and physical and social environments. Truth is the content of knowledge.

THREE

The purpose of all rational human endeavour, individual as well as collective, is attainment of freedom; in ever increasing measure. Freedom is progressive disappearance of all restrictions on the unfolding of the potentialities of individuals, as human beings; and not as cogs in the wheels of a mechanical social organism. The position of the individual, therefore, is the measure of the progressive and liberating significance of any collective effort or social organisation. The success of any collective endeavour is to be measured by the actual benefit for its constituent units.
FOUR

Rising out of the background of the law-governed physical nature, the human being is essentially rational. Reason being a biological property, it is not the antithesis of will. Intelligence and emotion can be reduced to a common biological denominator. Historical determinism, therefore, does not exclude freedom of the will. As a matter of fact, human will is the most powerful determining factor. Otherwise, there would be no room for revolutions in a rationally determined process of history. The rational and scientific concept of determinism is not to be confused with the teleological or religious doctrine of predestination.

FIVE

The economic interpretation of history is deduced from a wrong interpretation of Materialism. It implies dualism, whereas Materialism is a monistic philosophy. History is a determined process; but there are more than one causative factors. Human will is one of them, and it cannot always be referred directly to any economic incentive.

SIX

Ideation is a physiological process resulting from the awareness of environments. But once they are formed, ideas exist by themselves, governed by their own laws. The dynamics of ideas runs parallel to the process of social evolution, the two influencing each other mutually. But in no particular point of the process of the integral human evolution, can a direct causal relation be established between historical events and the movements of ideas (‘Idea’ is here used in the common philosophical sense of ideology or system of ideas). Cultural patterns and ethical values are not mere ideological super-structures of established economic relations. They are also historically determined by the logic of the history of ideas.

SEVEN

For creating a new world of freedom, revolution must go beyond an economic reorganisation of society. Freedom does not necessarily follow from the capture of political power in the name of oppressed and exploited classes and abolition of private property in the means of production.
EIGHT

Communism or Socialism may conceivably be the means for the attainment of the goal of freedom. How far it can serve that purpose, must be judged by experience. A political system and an economic experiment which subordinate the man of flesh and blood to an imaginary collective ego; be it the nation or a class; cannot possibly be the suitable means for the attainment of the goal of freedom. On the one hand, it is absurd to argue that negation of freedom will lead to freedom; and, on the other hand, it is not freedom to sacrifice the individual at the altar of an imaginary collective ego. Any social philosophy or scheme of social reconstruction which does not recognise the sovereignty of the individual, and dismisses the ideal of freedom as an empty abstraction, can have no more than a very limited progressive and revolutionary significance.

NINE

The State being the political organisation of society, its withering away under Communism is a utopia which has been exploded by experience. Planned economy on the basis of socialised industries presupposes a powerful political machinery. Democratic control of that machinery alone can guarantee freedom under the new order. Planning of production for use is possible on the basis of political democracy and individual freedom.

TEN

State ownership and planned economy do not by themselves end exploitation of labour; nor do they necessarily lead to an equal distribution of wealth. Economic democracy is no more possible in the absence of political democracy than the latter is in the absence of the former.

ELEVEN

Dictatorship tends to perpetuate itself. Planned economy under political dictatorship disregards individual freedom on the plea of efficiency, collective effort and social progress. Consequently, a higher form of democracy in the socialist society, as it is conceived at present, becomes an impossibility. Dictatorship defeats its professed end.
The defects of formal parliamentary democracy have also been exposed in experience. They result from the delegation of power. To make democracy effective, power must always remain vested in the people; and there must be ways and means for the people to wield the sovereign power effectively, not periodically, but from day to day. Atomised individual citizens are powerless for all practical purposes, and most of the time. They have no means to exercise their sovereignty and to wield a standing control of the State machinery.


delved in the people, and there

TWO

Liberalism is falsified or parodied under formal parliamentary democracy. The doctrine of laissez faire only provides the legal sanction to the exploitation of men by man. The concept of economic man negativates the liberating doctrine of individualism. The economic man is bound to be a slave or a slave - holder. This vulgar concept must be replaced by the reality of an instinctively rational being who is moral because he is rational. Morality is an appeal to conscience; and conscience is the instinctive awareness of, and reaction to, environments. It is a mechanistic biological function on the level of consciousness. Therefore, it is rational.

FOURTEEN

The alternative to parliamentary democracy is not dictatorship; it is organised democracy in the place of formal democracy of powerless atomised individual citizens. The parliament should be the apex of a pyramidal structure of the state reared on the base of an organised democracy composed of a countrywide network of People's Committees. The political organisation of society (the State) will be coincident with the entire society; and consequently the State will be under a standing democratic control.

FIFTEEN

The function of a revolutionary and liberating social philosophy is to lay emphasis on the basic fact of history that man is the maker of his world - man as a thinking being, and he can be so only as an individual. The brain is a means of production; and produces the most revolutionary commodity. Revolutions presuppose iconoclastic ideas. An increasingly large number of men, conscious of their creative power; motivated by the indomitable will to remake the world; moved by the adventure of ideas; and fired with the ideal of
a free society of free men can create the conditions under which democracy will be possible.

SIXTEEN

The method and programme of social revolution must be based on a reassertion of the basic principle of social progress. A social renaissance can come only through determined and widespread endeavour to educate the people as regards the principles of freedom and rational co-operative living. The people will be organised into effective democratic bodies to build up the socio-political foundation of the post-revolutionary order. Social revolution requires in rapidly increasing number men of the new renaissance, and a rapidly expanding system of People's Committees, and an organic co-ordination of both. The programme of revolution will similarly be based on the principles of freedom, reason and social harmony. It will mean elimination of every form of monopoly and vested interest in the regulation of social life.

SEVENTEEN

Radical democracy presupposes economic reorganisation of society so as to eliminate the possibility of exploitation of man by man. Progressive satisfaction of material necessities is the precondition for the individual members of society unfolding their intellectual and other finer human potentialities. An economic reorganisation, such as will guarantee a progressively rising standard of living, is the foundation of the Radical Democratic State. Economic liberation of the masses is an essential condition for their advancing towards the goal of freedom.

EIGHTEEN

The economy of the new social order will be based on production for use and distribution with reference to human needs. Its political organisation excludes delegation of power which, in practice, deprives the people of effective power; it will be based on the direct participation of the entire adult population through the People's Committees. Its culture will be based on universal dissemination of knowledge and on minimum control and maximum scope for, and incentive to, scientific and creative activities. The new society, being founded on reason and science, will necessarily be planned, but it will be planning with the freedom of the individual as its main purpose. The new society will be democratic - politically, economically as well as culturally. Consequently, it will be democracy which can defend itself.
The ideal of Radical Democracy will be attained through the collective efforts of spiritually free men united in the determination of creating a world of freedom. They will function as the guides, friends and philosophers of the people rather than as their would-be rulers. Consistently with the goal of freedom, their political practice will be rational and therefore ethical. Their efforts will be reinforced by the growth of the people's will to freedom. Ultimately, the Radical Democratic State will rise with the support of enlightened public opinion as well as intelligent action of the people. Realising that freedom is inconsistent with concentration of power, Radical democrats will aim at the widest diffusion of power.

In the last analysis, education of the citizen is the condition for such a reorganisation of society as will be conducive to common progress and prosperity without encroaching upon the freedom of the individual. The People's Committees will be the schools for the political and civic education of the citizen. The structure and function of the Radical Democratic State will enable detached individuals to come to the forefront of public affairs. Manned with such individuals, the State machinery will cease to be the instrument in the hands of any particular class to coerce others. Only spiritually free individuals in power can smash all chains of slavery and usher in freedom for all.

Radicalism integrates science into social organisation and reconciles individuality with collective life; it gives to freedom a moral-intellectual as well as a social content; it offers a comprehensive theory of social progress in which both the dialectics of economic determinism and dynamics of ideas find their due recognition and it deduces from the same a method and a programme of social revolution in our time.

Radicalism starts from the dictum that "man is the measure of everything" (Plutarch) or "man is the root of mankind" (Marx) and advocates reconstruction of the world as a commonwealth and fraternity of free men, by the collective endeavour of spiritually emancipated moral men.
The ideal of Radical Democracy will be attained through the collective efforts of spiritually free men united in a political party with the determination of creating a world of freedom. The members of the party will function as the guides, friends and philosophers of the people rather than as their would-be rulers. Consistently with the goal of freedom, the political practice of the party will be rational and therefore ethical. The party will grow with the growth of the people's will to freedom, and come to power with the support of enlightened public opinion as well as intelligent action of the people. Realising that freedom is inconsistent with concentration of power, its aim will be the widest diffusion of power. Its success in attaining political power will only be a stage in that process, and by the logic of its own existence, the party will utilise political power for its further diffusion until the State becomes coterminus with the entire society.

In the last analysis, education of the citizen is the condition for such a reorganisation of society as will be conducive to common progress and prosperity without encroaching upon the freedom of individual. The Radical Democratic State will be the school for the political and civic education of the citizen. Its structure and function will enable detached individuals to come to the forefront of public affairs. Manned with such individuals, the State machinery will cease to be the instrument in the hands of any particular class to coerce others. Only spiritually free individuals in power can smash all chains of slavery and usher in freedom for all.
APPENDIX II

CONSTITUTION OF FREE INDIA - A DRAFT (1945)
by H.N. Roy

CHAPTER I
THE DECLARATION OF RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

Article 1. This Constitution is promulgated with the purpose of establishing the following rights, and enforcing the following fundamental principles of democratic freedom:

(a) The supreme sovereignty belongs to the entire people, and shall be exercised directly through the control of the executive as well as the legislative functions of the State, by elected representatives of the people.

(b) The people have the inalienable right to alter and modify the political organisation of society.

(c) The right of revolt against tyranny and oppression is sacred.

(d) Autonomous Indian Provinces, formed as far as possible on the basis of linguistic and cultural homogeneity and freely agreeing to unite in a federation, shall form the Federal Union of India.

(e) All territorial units in India, including those that remain out of the Federal Union, shall have a uniformly democratic Constitution.

(f) The State being the political organisation of society, it shall in all cases be identical with the entire people.

(g) The land as well as the underground riches are collectively property of the people.

(h) Promotion of the productivity of labour through the introduction of modern mechanical means of production, is a responsibility of the State.

(i) Basic industries and the credit system shall be subject to State control.

(j) The State shall start large-scale industries under collective ownership.
(k) Cultivators are entitled to hold land, without any disability, subject to the payment of a unitary land tax to be fixed by law.

(l) The Government shall promote large-scale co-operative agriculture through the supply of modern machinery and cheap credit.

(m) An irreducible standard of living for all labouring in fields, factories, mines, transport, offices and schools, shall be guaranteed by minimum wages fixed by law.

(n) Adequate remunorative employment or relief is a right of citizenship.

(o) Nobody shall labour for more than eight hours a day, for six days a week, and every worker shall be entitled to one month's leave with full pay every year, and women workers to three months' maternity leave with full pay.

(p) There shall be statutory provision of social security for the old, sick and incapacitated.

(q) Education for all children up to the age of fourteen shall be free, compulsory and secular.

(r) The promotion of public health and sanitation shall be a charge on public revenue.

(s) The freedom of press and speech is guaranteed to all but the enemies of the people.

(t) The right of association for the purpose of safeguarding and amelioration of economic conditions and the political status of workers, employees and peasants shall be guaranteed.

(u) All citizens of the Federal Union of India are guaranteed inviolability of the person. No person shall be placed under arrest except on order by legally constituted Court.

(v) The inviolability of the homes of citizens and privacy of correspondence are protected by law.

(w) Individual citizens will have full freedom of worship.

(x) There shall be identical rights and responsibilities of citizenship for men and women.

(y) The rights of minorities shall be protected by proportional representation through separate electorates on all elected public bodies.
CHAPTER II

THE SOURCE OF AUTHORITY

Article 2. All authority emanates from the people.

Article 3. The foundation of the State is organised democracy.

Article 4. The sovereign democratic power expresses itself through local People's Committees in villages, towns and cities.

Article 5. The People's Committees will be elected every year by all the men and women of the respective localities who have attained the age of eighteen years.

Article 6. The number of the members of a People's Committee will be one-fiftieth of the total number of voters in the locality.

Article 7. The territorial delimitation and population basis of the People's Committees will be fixed by law under this Constitution.

Article 8. The functions of the People's Committees are:
(a) to help and enable citizens to exercise their sovereign right, individually as well collectively;
(b) to make democratic power effective.

Article 9. In discharge of their sovereign democratic right, the People's Committees will perform the following functions in the respective Provincial Governments and (in the case of the Federal Provinces) in the Federal Government:

(a) Nominate candidates to seek election to the Federal Assembly and to the Provincial People's Councils.

(b) Give constant expression to the will of the people for the guidance of their representatives in the federal Assembly and the respective Provincial People's Councils.

(c) Discuss and express opinion on proposed legislations by the Federal Assembly and the respective Provincial People's Council.
(d) Recommended the recall of the representatives of the particular constituency, either in the Federal Assembly or in the respective Provincial People's Council, on the ground that the representative has failed to act according to the mandate of his constituents.

(e) Recommended the recall of the Governor General and/or of the respective Provincial Governor.

(f) Initiate legislation by the Federal Assembly and/or respective Provincial People's Council.

(g) Demand a referendum on any legislative or executive measure either of the Federal or the respective Provincial Government.

CHAPTER III

THE FEDERAL UNION: FORM AND STRUCTURE

Article 10. This Constitution extends to the whole territory hitherto covered by the British Indian Empire and the Feudatory States within the geographical boundaries of India.

Article 11. Provinces delimited by the Provisional Government on the basis of linguistic and cultural homogeneity, and in accordance with administrative convenience, will constitute a Federal State which will be called the Federal Union of India:

Provided that no Province which desires to remain outside the Federal Union shall be a constituent unit thereof.

Article 12. Before the Federal Union of India is constituted, the Provincial People's Councils elected in the Provinces under the provisions of this Constitution shall have the right to entertain a proposal that the Province concerned may keep out of the proposed Federal Union.

If the proposal is passed by a majority of the Provincial People's Council, it shall be submitted to a referendum of the adult population of the Province.

The referendum will be ordered and conducted by the Provincial Government set up in the Province according to the provisions of this Constitution.

The proposal must be supported by a majority of voters in the Province in order to be effective.
Article 13. Provinces which remain out of the Federal Union of India shall be governed by all the provisions of this Constitution in so far as they do not relate exclusively to the Federal structure.

Article 14. Any of the Provinces which remain out of the Federal Union may constitute themselves into another Federation.

Article 15. The Federal Union of India will conclude a treaty of co-operation and mutual assistance with the Provinces remaining outside the Union, or with their separate Federation as the case may be, on matters of mutual interest including customs, currency and railway administration.

Article 16. The Federal Union of India will be a member of the larger Federation known as the British Commonwealth provided that it will be called the Indo-British Commonwealth of Free Peoples.

Article 17. The condition of India's membership of the Indo-British Commonwealth will be stipulated in a treaty, provided that the membership shall be consistent with the provisions of this Constitution.

Article 18. All the component units of the Federal Union of India shall be uniformly democratic according to the principles declared in Chapter I of this Constitution.

Every component unit of the Federal Union shall also establish the Rights of Citizenship proclaimed in Chapter I of this Constitution.

Article 19. After the Federal Union of India is constituted, the constituent units of the Federation shall retain the inherent right to secede from the Union.

The proposal of secession must be submitted to a referendum by the established Government of the Province, and shall be effective if it receives the sanction of a majority of all the voters in the Province.

Article 20. Within the jurisdiction of the Federal Union of India, the Supreme People's Council will be the depository of all State power.

The Supreme People's Council will be composed of the Governor General (to be elected as hereinafter prescribed), the Council of State and the Federal Assembly.
CHAPTER IV

THE FEDERAL UNION : THE FEDERAL ASSEMBLY

Article 21. The Federal Assembly will be composed of the deputies of the people of the Federal Union.

Article 22. There shall be one deputy for every 500,000 inhabitants.

In the case of cities and towns having populations of more than 1,000,000, the proportion shall be one deputy for 250,000 inhabitants.

Such cities and towns will be enumerated at the time of fixing constituencies.

Article 23. All men and women who have attained the age of eighteen years are entitled to vote in the election of deputies to the Federal Assembly.

Article 24. Every voter is entitled to seek election to the Federal Assembly.

Article 25. The deputies to the Federal Assembly shall be elected according to the following procedure:

(a) Each group of voters under the jurisdiction of a local People's Committee will choose electors at the ratio of one elector for one hundred voters.

(b) The electors of one constituency will meet to elect the deputy or deputies to the Federal Assembly.

(c) The candidate for election may or may not be one of the electors.

(d) If an elector offers himself for election, he will be entitled to vote for himself.

(e) The People's Committees will function as the election machinery of the State. They will prepare electoral rolls. All official announcements regarding the election shall be made through the People's Committees.

(f) The Federal Government shall bear the expenses of the electors for attending the meetings to elect deputies to the Federal Assembly.
(g) The dates fixed for election, primary as well as final, shall be public holidays. Wages for those days shall be paid in full.

More detailed electoral rules will be formed by the Provisional Government.

Article 26. The Federal Assembly will be elected every four years.

Article 27. Members of the Federal Assembly shall receive salaries.

Article 28. The federal Assembly shall meet within three months of the election of deputies.

Not more than six months shall elapse between two sessions of the Federal Assembly.

Article 29. The Federal Assembly may be dissolved before the expiry of its normal term by the Governor-General, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister.

Article 30. The Governor-General may not order dissolution on the recommendation of the Prime Minister; but in that case, he shall refer the dispute to the People's Committees in the Federal Union, stating his reasons for not acting according to the recommendation of the Prime Minister.

Article 31. A majority verdict of the People's Committees each casting one vote, shall settle the dispute.

Article 32. The Governor-General has the right to dissolve the Federal Assembly on his own initiative provided that a majority of the People's Committees in the Union will support dissolution.

Article 33. A new Federal Assembly shall be elected within ninety days after the dissolution of the old Assembly. But the interval shall never be less than that of sixty days.

CHAPTER V

THE FEDERAL UNION & THE COUNCIL OF STATE

Article 34. The members of the Council of State will be appointed by the Provincial Governments of the federating Provinces.
Article 35. The number of members shall be equal for all Provinces.

Article 36. The members of the Council of State shall be chosen according to the following procedure:

(a) The following professional groups will nominate panels of ten names belonging to each profession: engineers, economists, scientists, medical men, jurists, historians.

The Provincial Governments will appoint two out of each panel as members of the Council of State.

(b) The Provincial Governments will further appoint two persons from among those who have made outstanding contributions to modern thought in philosophy or the social sciences.

(c) In addition, the Provincial Governments will appoint three civil servants as members of the Council of State.

Article 37. Members of the professional groups who are remuneratively connected with any commercial or industrial concern, except as salaries employees will not be eligible to membership of the Council of State.

Preference will be given to those engaged in teaching.

Article 38. The Provincial Governments shall not have power to cancel the appointment of any member of the Council of State.

Article 39. The members of the Council of State will be appointed for six years, and be eligible for reappointment.

Article 40. The Council of State will have a panel of presidents composed of one representative of each professional group.

Article 41. The Council of State will be in session simultaneously with the Federal Assembly.

Article 42. The Council of State may meet when the Federal Assembly will not be in session to advise the Council of Ministers on urgent political, economic or administrative questions.

Article 43. The power of planning the development of the different branches of society (economic, health, education and culture) is vested in the Council of State.
CHAPTER VI
THE FEDERAL UNION : THE SUPREME PEOPLE’S COUNCIL

Article 44. The Council of State and the Federal Assembly will meet in joint sessions with Governor-General as the Supreme People’s Council.

Article 45. The sessions of the Supreme People’s Council will be convened by the Governor-General.

Article 46. As the highest organ of State authority, the Supreme People’s Council will give the final sanction to all legislative as well executive acts of Government.

CHAPTER VII
THE FEDERAL UNION : THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Article 47. The Governor-General will be elected for five years by the entire electorate of the Federal Union composed of all the men and women who have attained the age of eighteen years.

Article 48. Every citizen of the Federal Union who has attained the age of thirty years is eligible for election as the Governor-General.

Article 49. The Governor-General will preside over all the joint sessions of Council of the State and the Federal Assembly meeting as the Supreme People’s Council.

Article 50. The Governor-General will sign and place his seal on all legislation after they have received the final sanction of the Supreme People’s Council.

Article 51. The Governor-General will order dissolution of the Federal Assembly and election of a new Assembly according to the provisions of this Constitution.

CHAPTER VIII
THE FEDERAL UNION : THE ORGANS OF LEGISLATIVE POWER

Article 52. The legislative power of the Federal Union is vested in the Federal Assembly.
Article 53. There shall be no division of jurisdiction.

Article 54. The Federal Assembly has the power to legislate on all matters.

Legislations enacted by the Federal Assembly and ratified by the Supreme People’s Council shall be binding for the federated Provinces.

Article 55. Legislation enacted by the Federal Assembly shall be submitted for endorsement of Provincial Legislatures (Provincial People’s Councils) of the federated Provinces.

Article 56. The Legislations by the Federal Assembly concerning the following subjects shall not require endorsement of the Provincial Legislatures:

- Defence
- Foreign Relations
- Foreign Trade
- Customs
- Currency
- Posts and Telegraph
- Railway Administration
- Ports and Maritime Shipping
- Air-navigation

Article 57. Provincial People’s Councils of federated Provinces have the right to object to an Act of the Federal Assembly, provided that the particular legislation will not relate to any of the federal subjects enumerated in the preceding article.

The objected legislation shall be referred to the local People’s Committees in the objecting Province.

A favourable verdict of the People’s Committees shall overrule the objection.

If the referendum supports the objection, the dispute between the Province and the Centre shall be submitted to a Federal Referendum through the People’s Committees.

Pending the Referendum, the law should be in operation in the whole of the Federal Union.

In case of the Federal Referendum favouring the objection, the disputed legislation shall lapse.

In the contrary case, the objecting Provincial Legislature shall endorse the Act of the Federal Assembly.

Article 58. Legislations will be proposed by

(a) The Council of Ministers; and

(b) Non-official members of the Federal Assembly.
Provided that legislation relating to or involving taxation or the expenditure of Federal revenues shall be initiated only by the Council of Ministers.

**Article 59.** All proposed legislations shall be first submitted for the consideration of the Council of State.

Disapproval of the Council of State shall not prevent the Council of Ministers from introducing any Bill in the Federal Assembly.

But in that case, the view of the Council of State will be stated by one of its members to the session of the Federal Assembly.

**Article 60.** Disapproval of the Council of State will be no bar for the Federal Assembly to enact a legislation.

**Article 61.** No legislation enacted by the Federal Assembly shall be signed by the Governor-General and put into operation unless it is ratified by the Supreme People’s Council.

**Article 62.** The Supreme People’s Council will have the right to veto any Provincial legislation in the Federal Union on the ground that it is repugnant to the Federal Constitution or contradicts any particular Federal law.

Either on the advice of the Council of Ministers or on his own initiative, the Governor-General will recommend the vetoing of a Provincial legislation.

The Provincial Government concerned will have the right to appeal to the Supreme Federal Court against the veto.

**Article 63.** In case of conflict between a Federal law and a Provincial law, the former shall prevail.

**CHAPTER IX**

**THE FEDERAL UNION : THE ORGANS OF EXECUTIVE POWER**

**Article 64.** The Governor-General is the chief executive of the Federal Union of India.

**Article 65.** The Government of the Federal Union will be carried on by a Council of Ministers.
Article 66. The Council of Ministers shall in all matters be responsible to the Supreme People's Council.

Article 67. The Governor-General will charge some members of the Federal Assembly to form the Government. The member so charged will select from other members of the Federal Assembly his colleagues to compose the Council of Ministers. He will be called the Prime Minister.

Article 68. The Council of Ministers will remain in office so long as it will enjoy the confidence of the Supreme People's Council.

Article 69. Either Chamber of the Supreme People's Council may pass a vote of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers. But the Government shall not resign unless the vote of no-confidence is endorsed by the Supreme People's Council.

Article 70. The responsibility of the Council of Ministers is collective.

Article 71. No member of the Council of State shall be a member of the Council of Ministers.

Article 72. The different departments of the Government will be under the vigilance of Standing Committees of the Supreme People's Council.

Each Standing Committee will be composed of 11 members of the Federal Assembly and 8 members of the Council of State, in the latter case, one representing each professional group.

Each Standing Committee will elect a Secretary who shall be chosen from the members belonging to the Council of State.

The Secretary will be the Convenor of the Standing Committee.

The Standing-Committee will be presided over by the Minister in charge of the respective Department of the Government.

Article 73. Federal laws shall be carried into execution by the Provincial Government in the Federal Union, under the directions of the Federal Executive, unless the latter provides otherwise.
CHAPTER X

THE PROVINCES

Article 74. All the Provinces, federated or otherwise, are fully autonomous, provided that they shall be uniformly democratic according to the provisions of this Constitution.

Article 75. In the case of Provinces forming the Federal Union of India, the unrestricted nature of their autonomy expresses itself in the unreserved right of secession.

Article 76. The highest authority in the Province is the Provincial People's Council composed of the Governor and Deputies of the People.

Article 77. There shall be no division of power. Both the legislative and executive powers shall be vested in the Provincial People's Councils.

Article 78. Each province will have a Governor, who will be the chief executive of the Province.

Article 79. The Governor of the Province will be elected by all the men and women inhabitants, who have attained the age of eighteen years.

Article 80. The Governor will hold office for five years. Every citizen of the Province who has attained the age of thirty years is eligible for election as Governor.

Article 81. The Deputies to the Provincial People's Council will be elected directly by the men and women inhabitants of the Province who have attained the age of eighteen years.

Article 82. The ratio between the number of Deputies and the population of the province will be one to 100,000. In towns and cities with populations over 25,000 the ratio will be one to 50,000.

Article 83. The Deputies to the Provincial People's Council shall be elected according to the following procedure:

(a) The People's Committees will function as the election machinery of the Province. They will prepare electoral roll. All official announcements shall be made through the People's Committees.

(b) Every voter is entitled to seek election to the Provincial People's Council from any constituency.
(c) The dates fixed for election shall be public holidays. Wages for these days shall be paid in full.

**Article 64.** The Deputies of the Provincial People's Council will be elected every four years.

**Article 65.** The Deputies of the Provincial People's Council shall receive salaries.

**Article 66.** The Provincial People's Council shall meet within three months of the election of Deputies.

No more than six months shall intervene between two sessions of the Council.

**Article 67.** The Provincial People's Council has the right to legislate on all subjects; except (in the case of federated provinces) those reserved for the Federal Assembly.

**Article 68.** Provincial law shall be according to the spirit and letter of this Constitution.

**Article 69.** The right of proposing legislation belongs to:
(a) The Governor;
(b) Provincial Council of Ministers; and
(c) Other members of the Provincial People's Council.

Provided that legislation involving taxation or the expenditure of Government revenues can be initiated only by the Provincial Council of Ministers.

**Article 70.** Local People's Committees representing one-third of the total number of voters in the Province will have the right to demand that an Act of the Provincial Legislature be referred to the citizens.

In that case, the Governor shall submit the particular legislation to a general Referendum.

The result of the Referendum shall be decisive.

Pending the Referendum, the disputed law shall not be put into force.

**Article 71.** The Governor shall sign and promulgate all laws made by the Provincial People's Council.

**Article 72.** A Provincial Council of Ministers will be formed by a member of the Provincial People's Council, who will be charged to do so by the Governor.
Article 93. All the members of the Provincial Council of Ministers shall be sitting members of the Provincial People's Council.

Article 94. The Council of Ministers shall be responsible to the Provincial People's Council.

The responsibility is collective.

Article 95. The Council of Ministers shall resign on the Provincial People's Council passing a vote of no-confidence by a seventy per cent majority.

Article 96. On a vote of no-confidence being carried by a smaller majority, the Governor may or may not accept the resignation of the Council of Ministers.

Article 97. The Governor may dissolve the Provincial People's Council before the expiry of its normal term.

(a) if no Council of Ministers can command a majority; and
(b) on the demand of local People's Committees representing a majority of the Provincial electorate.

Article 98. The Provincial People's Council will elect Standing Committees to keep vigilance on the functioning of the various departments of the Provincial Government.

Each Standing Committee will be composed of fifteen members of the Provincial People's Council.

Each Standing Committee will elect a President from among its members.

The Minister in charge of the respective Department shall attend meetings of the Standing Committee whenever required and supply all necessary information.

Article 99. All proposed legislations shall be placed by the Council of Ministers before the respective Standing Committees for their consideration and recommendation.

Article 100. People's Committees in a particular electoral district of the Provincial People's Council representing 25 per cent of the total number of voters have the right to demand the recall of the Deputy from that constituency.

The Governor shall submit the demand to Referendum of the entire electorate of the constituency.
The Deputy shall resign if the demand for his recall is supported by a simple majority of the electorate.

The vacant seat in the Provincial People's Council shall be filled up within sixty days.

If the demand for recall fails to secure a majority, no second demand for recall shall be entertained against the same deputy for a period of 12 months.

Article 101. Forty per cent of the members of the Provincial People's Council have the right to demand the recall of the Governor.

The Governor shall submit the demand to a general referendum.

The Governor shall resign if the demand for his recall is supported by a simple majority of the Provincial electorate.

On the demand for recall failing to secure a majority another demand for recall cannot be entertained within a period of twelve months.

Article 102. Within the Federal Union of India, any dispute between two or more federated provinces, failing outside the jurisdiction of the Supreme Federal Court, will be referred to the Supreme People's Council of the Federal Union, whose verdict shall be binding for all parties concerned.

CHAPTER XV

THE ECONOMIC ORGANISATION OF SOCIETY

Article 103. This Constitution is promulgated with the object of reorganising the economic life of the country, so as to guarantee to every citizen all the material requirements for a civilised existence, and also adequate leisure for cultivating the finer aspects of life.

Article 104. Economically the Federal Union of India and every non-federated Province is a Co-operative Commonwealth.

Article 105. Goods will be produced primarily for satisfying the requirements of the people.
Article 106. The entire production, agricultural as well as industrial, shall be planned with that purpose.

Article 107. To plan production and regulate distribution are functions of the State.

Article 108. There shall be a Statutory Planning Authority in the Federal Union of India, and in the non-federated Provinces.

Article 109. The Planning Authority will be constituted by the Provincial People's Council in the Federal Union.

The Planning Authority will be composed of experts and representatives of State enterprises, industrial and agricultural.

The State Bank will be represented on the Planning Authority.

Persons concerned with private industrial enterprises, except as salaried employees, shall not be eligible to appointment on the Planning Authority.

Article 110. The Planning Authority in Federal Union will be directly subordinated to the Council of State and function under its advice and general supervision.

Article 111. The Federal and Provincial Governments are entitled to raise loans to finance the economic development.

Article 112. The Federal and Provincial Governments are entitled to make budgetary provisions for extending credit to industrial and collective agricultural enterprises.

Article 113. Industrial and agricultural enterprises financed by the State shall be collective property of the people.

The net income from these enterprises shall be treated as public revenue and as such included in the budget.

Article 114. The State Bank will control the entire credit system of the State.

Article 115. The ownership of land, underground riches and railways is hereby transferred to the people.

Article 116. The Federal Government or, in the case of a non-federated Province, the Provincial Government, shall
complete the transaction within one year by paying fair compensation to the previous private owners, whether individual or corporate.

The compensation shall be estimated at seven times the net average yearly income.

The compensation shall be paid in three per cent self-redeeming bonus of the State Bank, payable for forty years.

Where, however, the private ownership was vested in religious or charitable institutions, the compensation shall correspond to the net average income received hitherto.

Compensation bonds are not negotiable. They shall be deposited with the State Bank and serve as covering for its credit and/or the currency notes issued by it.

**Article 117.** The freedom of enterprise, individual as well as corporate, is guaranteed subject to the principle that the purpose of production is to satisfy the requirements of the people.

**Article 118.** In planning the economic life of society with the aforesaid object, the State has the right to fix the maximum and minimum return on private investment; the prices of goods produced or exchanged; the remuneration and working conditions of wage-earners and salaried employees; and to take over private enterprises under State ownership by paying fair compensation to the owners thereof.

**CHAPTER XII**

**THE JUDICIARY**

**Article 119.** The highest judicial authority in the Federal Union of India shall be the Supreme Federal Court.

The Supreme Federal Court will consist of the Chief Justice of India and four or more federal judges.

**Article 120.** The Chief Justice of India will be appointed by the Governor-General. The other federal judges will be appointed by the Governor-General in consultation with the Chief Justice.
Article 121. The Chief Justice of India and the federal judges shall serve till they attain the age of sixty-five, unless they resign earlier.

They cannot be dismissed except with the previous sanction of the Supreme People's Council.

Article 122. The original jurisdiction of the Supreme Federal Court shall consist of:

(a) Disputes between the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments of the federated provinces, or between the latter inter se, concerning their legal or constitutional rights.

(b) References made by the Federal Government or the Provincial Government of a federated Province regarding the interpretation of the Constitution.

Article 123. The Supreme Federal Court shall hear appeals from the decisions of the Provincial High Courts of federated provinces in civil and criminal cases, provided the cases involve legal questions of special or general interest.

The Supreme Federal Court will make rules defining the condition for the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction.

Article 124. There shall be Provincial High Courts in all Indian Provinces.

There shall be highest judicial authority in non-federated Provinces.

Article 125. The Provincial High Court shall consist of a Chief Justice and six or more judges.

The Chief Justice and judges shall be appointed by the Provincial Governor.

Article 126. The Chief Justice and judges of the Provincial High Court will serve till they attain the age of sixty-five unless they resign earlier.

They cannot be dismissed except with the previous sanction of the Provincial People's Council.
CHAPTER XIII
LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

Article 127. In addition to all the rights and responsibilities specified in this Constitution, the local People's Committees will also perform the function of local self-government in their respective jurisdiction.

Article 128. The functions of local self-government are:
(a) Sanitation and public health;
(b) Education primary and secondary (up to matriculation);
(c) Building and maintaining roads and public parks;
(d) Promotion of the organisation of producers' and consumer's co-operative societies;
(e) Maintenance of public order (local police administration);
(f) Administration of law in cases of petty crime.

Article 129. The organs of local self-government will perform these functions on behalf of the Provincial Government and/or on its own initiative.

Article 130. As organs of local self-government the People's Committees will have the right to collect taxes subject to the approval of the Provincial Government.

Article 131. There will be sub-divisional and district People's Committees to perform the function of local self-government.

Article 132. The sub-divisional People's Committee will be composed of delegates from each local People's Committee in the sub-division.

Article 133. The sub-divisional officer will be the Chairman of the sub-divisional People's Committee which, in addition to its function of local self-government, will advise and help him in the discharge of all his duties.

Article 134. The district People's Committee will be composed of five delegates from each sub-divisional People's Committee.
**Article 135.** The District Officer will be the Chairman of the District People's Committee which, in addition to the function of local self-government, will advise and help him in the discharge of all his duties.

**Article 136.** The sub-divisional and district People's Committees will be organs of local self-government.

They shall not supersede the sovereign status of the local People's Committees, which are the primary organs of democratic authority and power.

**Article 137.** The sovereign right of controlling the entire state machinery, according to the provisions of this Constitution, is vested exclusively in the local People's Committees.