In this thesis, an effort has been made to discuss, analyse and clarify J.P.'s changing political ideas and thoughts. In the conclusion it will be useful to assess how far his ideas proved practicable to tackle the problems of his society.

In the thesis light has also been thrown upon the ideas of Gandhiji, Vinoba Bhave and M.N. Roy for the further clarification of his concepts. J.P. went on evolving his political thinking as he jumped from one phase to another. Jayaprakash Narayan had ever been in crusade for a new political faith not for any personal or trivial reason, but for the cause of individual freedom and human progress. As a seeker of truth, he always keep his mind open and remained susceptible to any political system or ideology provided in it he could perceive a greater possibility of the attainment of the desires of human values. Thus he judged every political system on the basis of its feasibility and moral propriety in Indian conditions.

What we are more concerned herewith is J.P.'s political ideas. These ideas underwent frequent changes from a broadly Marxist framework to a neo-Gandhian perspective. He was always groping for ways and means for a more viable strategy to tackle the ills of society.

J.P.'s major concern was with creating a new social and economic order. Whereas earlier he felt that State was the major agency for development and
socialist transformation he was repulsed by the regimentation and absence of human freedom which statism led to. In the same way by starting his career as a Marxist, like J.P., M.N. Roy also changed his views by seeing the adoption of methods of violence and coercion in Russia. Both came to realize 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 thus critical of the basic tenets of Marxist. Thus after discarding Marxism they came under the influence of Gandhism. They, therefore, looked for alternative course of social transformation by decentralization of power, decentralization of economy and people’s voluntary action.

J.P., rejected centralized economy for its excessive emphasis on industrialization and urbanization. As against it he was for decentralized economy based on small machine and labour intensive industry. According to him the remedy to all these ills lay in a “massive programme of rural industrialization”. Moreover, he felt that urbanization that follows industrialization created conditions of dehumanization. The alternative was going back to the villages. It is certainly an important question whether going back to the village would be an answer to the challenges of the present society. He did not seem to take care that in the modern world of science and technology, it may be wrong to deny ourselves the advantages of using it for speedy development. Even development of rural industry would require the
development of basic industry. Moreover in the world we live, whether we like it or not defence preparedness is essential to freedom and that cannot be ensured without massive industrialization.

No doubt centralized planning had its defects but the correct position was not of discarding it altogether but to suggest correctives so that the distortions which come from it could be checked. It was doubtful whether for action against these distortions, decentralization of power and rural industrialization was the real answer. J.P. seemed to have forgotten that in this modern age despite the various defects of state power and planning, complete rejection of this path could not ensure development and creation of a just social and economic order particularly in underdeveloped countries. Surprisingly in his scheme of re-organisation of the economic order in a society ridden by hunger and oppression he asked for voluntary limitation of wants. He felt that the evil lay in the mad pursuit of unlimited material progress. One may agree with him that materialism was not the answer to all what man needed. But one does not knowhow this advice could be a corrective to the present day inequality and exploitation. Such moral answer may be a poor solace to the hungry and oppressed. On the other hand this comes handy to those who would like to fatten on the continuous impoverishment of the millions of poor and dumb. Both thus based their new organized polity on the principles of political decentralization. But political decentralization, it seems has hardly been in keeping with the tradition and political ethos of India. Neither Roy nor J.P.
appears to have shown any comprehension of the possible risks of decentralization and, therefore, none of them has paid any attention to devising any mechanisms of ensuring against a misuse of the principles of decentralization. Although they talked about recall as an effective check on elected representatives, none of them has ever tried to pursue or elaborate the idea. Thus the whole structure with its widespread decentralization is to be slow, lethargic and unrealistic. J.P’s scheme of governance by committees is not only too idealistic but also risky. Both seemed to have forgotten in spite of the defects of centralized planning in the modern world of science or technology need of the hour is centralized planning.

While he was for decentralization of power and rural industrialization, writing in his Prison Diary he appeared to agree, however, that large scale modern technology should not be discarded. Interestingly he also observed that the ownership pattern of large enterprises should remain capitalist within certain restraints. Not only that, he also recommended giving of incentives to the private sector to produce, develop and grow and that unnecessary restraints should be removed. Perhaps it was not clear to J.P. that incentives to the private sector and development of capitalism without effective measures of social controls for distributive justice would complicate the very problems he wanted to resolve. And social control leads to more state power which again was not to his liking. There were inherent contradictions in his thought.
As for his concept of state was concerned he was for the lessening of the functions of the State and put more emphasis on the voluntary action of the people. It seemed apparently logical that the voluntary action of the people would lead to reducing the powers of the State. He took State as a system of power and an instrument of coercion. But State was not an independent agency. In fact, it is a tool, it is an agency which served the ruling classes. So long as ruling classes remained in privileged position, they would certainly use the State agency more and more for their purpose. No voluntary action of the people could lead to lessening the functions of the State. The State is certainly on institution of coercive power, but precisely because of that it can also be used for social transformation. Reducing its functions cannot be helpful to the deprived sections of society. As against State action by the people to bring about socialism. It is not understandable how through the voluntary action of the people Socialism could be brought about.

As for their concept of State was concerned both gave Central place to the individual in their political philosophy. They criticized various systems-political, social and economic, etc., which atomized the individual and eroded his liberties. Thus to both individual and his freedom constituted the basic concern of their life. Both were averse to every political system which lack individual freedom. Thus once a great admirer of Soviet Russia, both became its strong critique, because of want of individual freedom in the system. Both were great champions of individual liberty and there had always been an inner
urge for freedom in them in the whole of their life. For them individual was an end and all the other associations, institutions and organizations were the means. Both considered man as an innately moral and good and sought to infuse the spirit of self-reliance in the individual. To them freedom as an objective could only be realized by moral means. To them without freedom man was not a human being in a real sense. It was only through freedom that the individual achieves his perfection. Thus both also criticized welfare state because they were in favour of giving least responsibilities to the state so that their individual freedom could not be crushed. Due to their overriding concern for the individual freedom they had not justified the adoption of undesirable means. Thus both remained staunch supporters of individual freedom. Even when M.N. Roy was no more in this world, J.P. remained confirmed to the concept of individual freedom. J.P. in his Total Revolution phase, was primarily committed to the preservation of the humanist value of liberty. His philosophy of a total revolution is deeply and thoroughly committed to resuscitate the rights and liberties of the individuals. Thus, throughout his journey from Nationalism to Marxism to Total Revolution throughout Democratic Socialism and Sarvodaya individual freedom had guided the course of his life-thought and action.

J.P’s and M.N. Roy’s revulsion against the corruption and faction fighting in political parties, crude tactics of individuals, their attempt to arouse sectarian, caste and other feelings for selfish personal ends is very correct.
Most of the people feel disgusted with the degenerate power politics. They also criticized parliamentary democracy as it failed to create the necessary strength and initiative among the people to manage their affairs. Money played an important role. The voters were helpless and a small minority ruled in its own selfish interests. They, therefore, wanted this system to be replaced by an utopian scheme of “Partyless Democracy” in which he felt there would be the fullest possible scope for the individual to participate in the management of his affairs, without the intervention of political parties.

As an alternative to parliamentary democracy, both presented their schemes of government based on the principles of decentralization, 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 countrywide network of people’s committees. Like Roy, J.P., also visualized a pyramidal structure of Indian society based on a Communitarian Democracy composed of village communities as its basis. So far as J.P.’s concept of Partyless Democracy he derived this idea from M.N. Roy’s writings but tried to present it in the garb of Gandhism. A lot is common between Roy’s People’s Committee and J.P.’s village community. In their new democracies, both gave full sovereign rights to the individuals including the right to recall their representatives. Both emphasized on economic decentralization which to them was a precondition for effective political decentralization. Both agreed that the
new democracies, which they envisaged, cannot be built in a day or two. There would also be a transition period during which conditions would be created to introduce new democracies. For the success of the democracy both gave maximum importance to education.

No doubt, parliamentary democracy had its weaknesses, but the answer to that was not a highly impracticable idea of democracy without political parties. The emphasis ought to have been on devising such ways and methods by which the ills of the system could be corrected. 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 but also indispensable in certain ways. Roy and J.P. both talked about the election of small local people's committees and of village community respectively. But it is apparent that whether Roy or J.P. 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 overemphasized. 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 seemed to have ignored the fact that democracy after all was a system of management of power and if there would be no political parties there would be other competing groups. In that case caste
groups, religious and sectarian groups would proliferate. It would not conflicting groups of narrow selfish loyalties. Both of them appear to have simplified the problem of political parties and dealt with it in a superficial manner.

During the last days, however, he not only used political parties in the battle against authoritarianism, but also felt that Janata Party's coming to power meant the beginning of total revolution. Perhaps he had realized the inevitability of political parties in democratic systems. The most significant was his scheme of Total Revolution. It was a very vague though interesting utopian scheme. Every concept must be well defined before it could be applied to any situation. To this day there has been no clear definition of the concept of Total Revolution. In one of the rallies J.P. plainly confessed that he had not yet formulated his concept and ideas and expressed his inability to explain the concept saying that even Mahatma Gandhi could not define his method of struggle for independence. Achyutanand Prasad observed that "The plea is highly mendacious". Gandhi had categorically declared that the struggle was to make the Britishers Quit India and that by swaraj he meant parliamentary democracy. Prasad explained further that J.P. after a year of his exercises in "disruptions" himself claimed that he could not say what he meant by "Total Revolution". However, within one year of Janata Party rule he felt the necessity of calling upon his people to continue the effort. He was highly disillusioned, frail in health and in no capacity to lead his people. He, however,
believed in replacing the whole centralized structure by people's bodies at all
levels-more so at the ground level.

Any one who talked of a revolution, must first of all spell out the
fundamental basis and reasons for the rottenness of the system which one
wanted to destroy and then proceed to construct the picture of that social
system which would be free from all those identified elements which plagued
the present society. J.P. was on sound ground for his moral revulsion against
the abhorrence for the existing order; but he never tried to scientifically analyse
the fundamental reason for injustice, exploitation, corruption and all-round
degeneration. He, therefore, wanted to bring about a revolution without exactly
identifying the fundamental basis of the existing relations which essentially
needed to be attacked and destroyed. It is rather simplistic to believe that you
could bring a revolution only by enthusing the people and students without first
identifying what fundamental change was required. He hoped to bring a
revolution without confronting the basic structure of social relations. All his
problems and vagueness came from his good wishes and passion untampered
by scientific reasoning and hard task which revolution-making involved.

As for J.P's methodology and techniques for bringing about "Total
Revolution" were concerned it is clear that he rejected violent methods arguing
that these methods could not lead to the achievement of declared goals.
Ghanshyam Shah while reviewing J.P's Total Revolution raised an important
question: how was J.P. sure that nonviolent methods would achieve the declared goals. Whereas J.P. believed that violent methods would ultimately lead to a violent society, where was the guarantee that “nonviolent” movement would succeed in building a “non-violent and also “a just social order”. J.P’s argument that nonviolent methods could be quicker does not seem to be convincing. At one time during 1975 he talked of class struggle. Two years later, however, he said that was out of question in India for as he argued, there was no owning in class having means of production. One does not know whether in that case all the ills of society were created by God or only because of people’s pursuit of material needs, or was it just the creation of dishonest politicians. It clearly amounted to evading the basic issues.

Similarly at one time discussing the role of the weaker sections in his “Total Revolution” he advised the weaker sections to organize themselves to claim their rights and privileges which have been imparted to them by law. Ghanshyam Shah questioned, “What should the poor people do, if their claims are not accepted and implemented by the privileges class?” And further, what should they do, if the privileged class used violence against those who claimed their rights in an organized manner? The answer of J.P. was once again doctrinaire but unconvincing:

The movement losses all validity as soon as the parties or the landless people indulge in violence. There might be violence, from the side of the
landlords or the administration. But the parties and the people concerned must face violence with order and discipline. Nor can the right to use violence in self-defence be invoked in a Satyagraha of this kind.

Sen Sukomal while talking about his method of class struggle maintained that his “Total Revolution” was not directed against the class rule of the bourgeoisie, as he did not believe in “class rule” itself or the “class division of the society”. Thus obviously he wanted a “Total Revolution” without confronting the coercive apparatus of the State and its class character. He once said in the language of Lenin that, “It is the great delusion, the greatest self-deception and a deception of the people, to attempt by means of this State apparatus to carry out such of deception when he succeeded in installing Janata Party in power. Sen Sukomal aptly commented that “What J.P. spelt out about his Total Revolution was nothing but another variety of reformism?” He, thus likened it to “English Fabianism” or to an earlier “Utopian Owenism”.

J.P. selected youth as a vehicle of revolution. But which youth, the employed landless labourer or the sons of the landlords or the R.S.S. brigades. Youth was not a homogeneous group as such. In fact the youth which supported the movement were the same which wanted reservation of job for higher castes, more privileges for themselves rather then changing the basic structure of society. Ghanshyam Shah commented that J.P. selected students as the agency of revolution because they fitted well in the class-collaboration
theory of Sarvodaya. “What was the character of the student community?” This was a pertinent question to ask. To this Shah replied that these students leaders were certainly those who were not concerned with the social ills of the society. Rather they were more concerned with their material comforts. That is why students later on joined colleges against the advice of J.P. and were least concerned with the unjust socio-economic and political system. J.P. seemed to be aware of this. He had thus observed:

I find that the young people have great enthusiasm, I doubt whether they have the staying power or stamina to carry on a long-drawn struggle. This is one weakness. Therefore, I have said that the closure of higher educational institutions need not last even an year.

Further elaborating his point he maintained:

It is not in the nature of the student community. It is a flowing river. Those who are students today are not the students tomorrow. The new ones who come to take the place of the old ones do not have same kind of spirit, enthusiasm and the same attitude. Broadly speaking the student movement is not a dead force but not very effective at the present movement.

But the surprising thing was that in spite of his awareness he built all his hopes on students for his revolution. The other force he relied upon was the people’s power. But which people? Were all the people, the exploiters and the exploited, the powerful and the powerless, in the same category? He would
have most likely said “no” to it—but without clarifying things further. One also failed to understand how he wished to organize the people and to create the revolutionary consciousness among the people necessary for revolution? He had not time and perhaps no mind to think over these questions. Radhakanta Barik observed rightly that this movement only made people aware of the ills of the existing system without creating revolutionary fervor in them. The Sarvodaya workers and their supporters banked upon Janata, i.e., the people, to bring about a revolution. Ghanshyam Shah raised an important question, who was this Janata? Shah was right in maintaining that in reality their Janata was only confined to urban upper and middle class, landlords and neo-rich farmers. To them revolution was a slogan, in fact they were not sincere in their efforts to bring about over-all transformation in the society. Rather they wanted some changes not in the system or for the cause of poor and down-trodden but for facilities for themselves. These were the people who later on were against the reservation of seats in Bihar in favour of the backward class. One is surprised that J.P. should have made this section as the main revolutionary force.

Madhu Limaye, otherwise an admirer of J.P., was on the other hand doubtful about the efficacy of J.P’s views regarding social transformation in the society by the people’s action. He was right in his assertion that in spite of the fact that state had its coercive power and could become an unfettered tyranny, the use of state power was, in the ultimate consideration, an important ingredient in bringing about social revolution. One could not resolve things by
ignoring the issue of State power. A most difficult problem that J.P. had to face was about the organization of the movement. His movement was organizationally weak at all levels. J.D. Sethi in an article “J.P. and His Revolution” pointed out that there was a lack of training of the movement’s activists. One of the conditions of the success of a revolution should be the training of those who were supposed to lead the revolution. J.P., however, did not seriously consider the necessity, let alone make a provision for it.

J.P. was a political thinker and activist. He expected from Janata Leaders, in all his utter simplicity, that they would bring about revolution in the country. The result was not unexpected. It was a dismal failure. Janardan Thakur quipped “Alas, J.P. was so simple that he did not even known his men”. The Janata Party did not consider itself to be a “child of revolution”. For them it was just a change of government. J.P. felt so sorry that Morarji had not given “an inspiring lead to the country”. One has nothing but pity for one who expected Morarji Desai to bring about a revolution of J.P’s dreams.

On June 5, 1978, poor J.P. lamented while celebrating “Total Revolution” day, “The caravan of the Total Revolution has come to a halt”. He regretted that the Janata Government had also adopted the same style of working as that of the Congress. Therefore, on June 17 he once again appealed to the youth to organize along with the people to start the second phase of Total Revolution. But a revolution does not come by wishing nor does it come by
simple passion or even preparedness to lay down one’s life for it. Revolution is a question of politics. It would be naïve to talk of revolution, without putting politics in command. J.P., however, thought of putting morality in command and escaping politics.

In this way he generated new thoughts and ideas among Indian scholars. He had searched for the ideology which would solve the problems of the society in a moral and peaceful way. His views on socialism, sorvodaya and total revolution bear testimony to his humanitarian goals. He was an internatiolist who always thought in terms of world community. He was a selfless dedicated revolutionary that mother India has ever produced. This great man, great philosopher and selfless great dedicated leader passed away on 8\textsuperscript{th} October, 1979.

\textit{The Indian express} wrote of him ‘Not since Mahatma Gandhi has a single individual without power of office exerted as much as influence on India’.