Chapter-IV

The Revolutionary Search of Jayaprakash Narayan
and the Way Out

In the history of the Socialist movement in India, Jayaprakash Narayan (JP) (1902-1979) was both an evolutionary as well as revolutionary personality and sometimes misunderstood as being an inconsistent or an opportunist modern political thinker of India. In fact, he was a dedicated social scientist with some empirical bias and he always wanted to work out a synthesis between the empirical findings and the ideal way of thinking. In order to understand JP correctly, it is therefore necessary to go through his entire published works so that one could find the unifying thread which binds his socio-political philosophy completely. In addition to this, a love for the ideals of socialism and a longing to build India of his dream on a socialistic pattern ran like a thread throughout his life and thought. A radical thinker and a life-long political activist, JP and his theory of Total Revolution would be relevant for India in the coming days also. His socio-political thinking was principally based on the ideas of Western Liberalism which in his later days expressed itself towards his firm conviction on political democracy along with individual freedom of the Indian people. A pathfinder of the socialist movement in India, JP was a genuine democrat, an adherent of the parliamentary system, free elections, a free press and freedom of speech, political parties and above all constitutional safeguards for individual rights. Moreover, socialism was deeply rooted in his theory of building a new India and to achieve this goal he essentially stressed on social and economic equality for all. At the same time, Gandhism also aided towards formation of the basic roots of his social, economic and political approach and he also drew inspiration from the Bhagvad Gita. To him, like Gandhi, it was the supreme book of ultimate human guidance for the overall spiritual evolution of man. In this context, it could be said that, the Gita prescribes three parts for the soul’s total union with God which were: (1) Karmayoga—the way of action; (2) Jnanayoga—the way of knowledge; and (3) the Bhaktiyoga—the way of love. During his long political journey, he frequently changed his political views, because most of the times he found them inadequate to meet the challenges of the time. In this context, we could say that since 1947, JP and Lohia applied their energies and common sense in order to create an alternative power- centre compare to the then existence of the Congress in India. In this case, Lohia’s political line was ‘spade-prison-vote’ and by this slogan, he meant spade or constructive work among the people of India; prison or building up mass power through movements and agitation; and, lastly, vote or fighting elections in order to come into the corridors of power. On the other hand, unlike Lohia, JP was somewhat unenthusiastic to prison and vote in the initial stage of his political thinking and particularly after the 1952 General Election. He completely switched over from his political line and deeply involved himself with constructive work under the influence of Vinoba Bhave. During this epoch-making hour, his sole commitment was on building up a strong movement all over India rather than organized a political party. In fact, JP held
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that a party was basically an instrument for fighting elections and therefore a tool for capturing state power, whereas a movement goes beyond this ‘insignificant’ objective. In addition to this, critics argue that his illustrious political career appeared to have followed almost all along a tortuous path that finally terminated into a blind alley. Interestingly enough, in the pre-independence period, he entered the political arena as a true Marxist, and branded Gandhi as a ‘bourgeois reformist of India.’

Later on, in the middle half of his political life, he claimed to discover the theory of democratic socialism and regarded it as the panacea to all prevailing social, political and economic problems within the country. In the passage of time, after the attainment of India’s independence, he continuously put his faith over the dynamics of democratic socialism and in those days his opinion about Gandhi was somehow predominantly different than before and felt that in the post-independence period, ‘socialism in this country should have to be brought only by following Marxian and Gandhian principles.’

It was Gandhi who first demonstrated the power of any successful mass national movement within the country and JP was very much willing to follow this path. Subsequently, in the early 1950s, major ideological differences cropped up within the then Socialist Party which ultimately made JP decide to withdraw completely from the Indian socialist movement, or rather from the orbit of active politics. In fact, in the mid-1950s, he devoted his whole time to popular use the concept of bhoodan (Jeevandan) sarvodaya movement throughout the country. He earnestly believed that it alone could provide a way towards ending the dire miseries of the people of India. Furthermore, this pathbreaking ideological drift did not stop here. He went a step further to reject the dominant party system of India, including Parliamentary democracy.

As for research methodology in modern political science, this chapter briefly represents a critical socio-political study of JP. In fact, if we look at the four successive phases of his life, then we could observe that over the years, he expounded his four theories i.e. Marxism (1929- 1939), Democratic Socialism (1940-1956), Party less Democracy based on Sarvodaya (1957-1968) and finally Total Revolution (1969-1979). In every phase he had launched and conducted his movements on the basis of an unsystematic theory which he would formulate at that time. In his long period of social and political activities, he came into contact with a number of people who greatly inspired him to evolve his philosophy for a better nation. Interestingly enough, he always chose to remain far away from the bastion of power and yet, the concept of power broadly engaged his attention. In addition to this, he theorized and worked for finding out the fountain source of power in the Indian context which, according to him, would be capable of transforming the overall political and socio-economic life of his countrymen. In fact, his social and political ideas were largely interwoven and to a social researcher, it is hardly possible to treat them separately. Also as a political activist he was only interested in overhauling the socio-economic and political demography of India and in his long journey for finding answers, he was in constant search for an adequate socio-political theory. Consequently, JP theorized his whole findings, and wanted to apply his formulation into practice. Interestingly enough, what he learned from the practice, he again utilized in his theorizations. However, all his theorizations and efforts for practical implementation of his ideas for the development of India were directed towards holding
up several beacon lights i.e. the incessant values of freedom, equality, justice, brotherhood, etc.\textsuperscript{4}

The social and political philosophy of JP was mainly based on humanity and a random solution towards the problem in hand. Rammanohar Lohia, a great adherent of JP, though time and again, criticized him on many grounds. He differed with JP on ideology and implementation of programmes on the Indian societal platform. Besides this, in the pre 1950s, there were major differences between Lohia and JP regarding the future course of action of the Socialist Party in India and for that in those problematic hours, Lohia maintained a safe distance from JP. Interestingly enough, in the last phase of his eventful life, Lohia realised his ‘mistakes’ and in an article titled \textit{JP’s Plea for Reconstruction of Indian Polity}, published in the \textit{Radical Humanist}, in 1961, he irrefutably expressed his reverence for JP for his epoch-making contribution towards the nation building process. Again in an article titled \textit{Is JP an Escapist}, published in \textit{The Indian Nation}, Sachchidanand wrote that on 5 June 1974, J.P’s declaration for the popular Bihar movement whose ultimate aim was nothing less than a Total Revolution in 1975.\textsuperscript{5} In that article Sachchidanand also mentioned that, in that time JP also conveyed his ideas on party system and Parliamentary democracy under the umbrella of democratic socialism. In the 1970s, JP became somewhat ideologically disjointed and the emerging socio-political realities in India propelled him to conclude that the Bhoodan-Sarvodaya movement, in any given context, could become irrelevant.\textsuperscript{6} It could be said that, Schchidanand had pointed out in his meticulous article that, in the 1950s, JP was mostly driven by ethics and morality and in the 1970s, under Aristotelian term; he was practically influenced by the realist politic of the nation. One could understand his discontent with the existing political system of India. His constant search for an alternative power-system within India gradually convinced him that the Westminster Model of Parliamentary Democracy could not work successfully in the then Indian situation. Moreover, as an alternative power-centre, he always endeavoured to form a new path within this complex Indian society to build a viable, egalitarian and democratic system. However, the alternative means he suggested under Gandhian influence along with his own thoughts and plans such as his concept of Total Revolution, met with severe setbacks within the nation. In fact, his ideas for the betterment of the nation were not devised logically, were neither integrated nor formed a rational, workable and enduring set of alternatives. In an article titled \textit{How JP Helped Indian Revolution from Abroad}, Sachin Roy viewed JP from another angle and wrote that ‘he was born ahead of his time.’ He was also of the view that the concept of Total Revolution was perfectly logical. In the post-Gandhian era JP had picked up the threads of unity where Gandhi left them and philosophically he was nearer to Gandhi than any other prominent Indian leaders of his time,\textsuperscript{7} Roy wrote.

In fact, like Gandhi, JP’s life-story also seemed to be an interminable experiment of quest after truth. Hence, his frequent change of ideologies from being a hard-core Nationalist to a staunch Marxist, then to a Democratic Socialist- Sarvodayite, and finally a Total Revolutionary. This should not be interpreted as a means of ideological opportunities, rather, thoroughly as a quest after truth like a scientific soul. This chapter is not meant to defend or debunk J.P with an academic sense, whether he was a man of
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destiny, or whether his concept of total revolution could provide a key path towards the ultimate solution of the country’s grave problem of bread and peace. In this chapter an attempt has only been made to understand the man and his various socio-politic ideas and to try to look at him in the right perspective and thereby to record of one of the most disruptive periods of post-independence Indian political history and movements.

In the passage of India’s colourful socialist history, JP’s withdrawal from the socialist movement, of which he was one of the prime movers, JP was variously described as of confused convictions whose political life was full of inconsistencies, and a romantic, wishful thinker, who had no understanding of the existing realities of the Indian soil. In an article titled *Legacy of JP* and published in *Janata*, in 1980, Bimla Prasad wrote that, “though JP at times acted confusedly and romantically, he at the same time he possessed a rational mind with full of firm convictions and was set on a pedestal at the fairly advanced age of 72 to be acclaimed nationwide as ‘the Second Liberal [the fist being Gandhi] of the country in 1977.” In that same article Bimla Prasad, also mentioned that to countless Indians, in those time, he became very much the *Lokanayak*, who by and large, played the title role on the national stage and the country got the chance to witness a great youth movement after the proclamation of the Emergency in June 1975. In fact, JP being a radical Gandhite, JP gladly adopted Gandhian ideals of truth, and non-violence both in his personal as well as his public life. In addition to this, he had immense faith on truth and non-violence though he had also expressed his doubts on the question of Gandhian *Satyagraha* as a truthful struggle.

In the post-independence period, JP helped all the non-Congress opposition parties to unite so that they could create a viable alternative and initiate a true democracy in India. The main motto of *Sampurna Kranti* was that it wished to help all the opposition parties of India to unite together with JP at the head of the leadership against the then Congress Party. Moreover, such a new party would fly a Gandhian banner and act with Gandhian flavour. After the 1967 elections, Lohia turned his attention to build United Fronts in order to create a national alternative to the then Congress within the country. It could be said that, though he became successful at the state level, JP was not very exuberant over such an initiative. On the national level, however, a decade later, in March 1977, JP recognised the need for an urgent united opposition party all over India. Consequently, the Janata Party came up in the post-Emergency period but JP did not formally associate himself with it and the new party was a mixture comprising all the opposition groups of various political forces of India, including the Jana Sangh. In fact, JP now inculcated Lohia’s previous idea of creating a powerful alternative to the Congress at the national level and it would be totally unfair to say that JP’s Total Revolution did not try to build people’s power. The call for Total Revolution fully endorsed the Gandhian principle. Moreover, JP never sacrificed truth, non-violence and ethics-morality for the sake of people’s power in India. Subsequently, to achieve this goal, he expounded a programme of forming a people’s Government or *Janata Sarkar* in its entirety, in which units would be set up at all levels to take over the functions of the Government. In his idea of Communitarian democracy, JP tried to establish people’s committees and people’s candidates who would be totally responsible to their community rather than to any political party. In his theory of Communitarian system, JP
propounded that the people would be chosen by their community so that they could easily win elections. Besides this, he also mentioned that voters’ councils would act as a watchdog. According to him, this was an exercise towards a people based party less democracy in India.\(^9\) Later on, in the late 1970s, he realized that the emergence of Janata Party not committed to a specific ideology in the post-Emergency period was a combination of several factors, such as personal prejudices, caste and personality equations, etc. In fact, the Janata party was a loose coalition of disparate groups and individuals of diverse interests which led the party to weaken day by day. Subsequently, JP felt heartbroken and lamented that Janata Party could not work constructively within the nation as a strong non-Congress body and failed to act as a pioneer role for showing a new roadmap to the then other political parties of India. In fact, during that time he criticized the Janata government for ‘treading the same old beaten track which ultimately led the then Congress Government to its failure.’\(^10\)

In the post-independence scenario, JP made a major contribution to spread Gandhian ideas within the nation and he was also a loyalist of Vinoba Bhave for his pathbreaking contribution to the Bhoomidan (Jeevandan) movement within the country. Basically, JP was a social scientist and a moralist- spiritualist and like Gandhi, he came to believe, more clearly after 1970, that the character of a political system was largely determined by wider social and cultural surroundings which had to be improved qualitatively for a national regeneration. Understandably, he laid overwhelming stress not only on morality not merely in a sterile, puritanical and restrictive sense, but in terms of a rugged personal integrity, a certain correspondence between thought and deed, and, finally, with a strong sense of public accountability. In fact, in his theory building process we could see that it was an ideal of morality entirely rooted in compassion and tolerance under Gandhian principles which were severely inseparable from freedom.

One of the missions of JP was to fulfil all unfinished tasks of Gandhi and he tried to combine in himself the social dynamism of Marxism and the spiritual humanism of Gandhism. According to him, Communism without individual freedom was just as Democracy without Economic Equality. To him, Communism germinated a social order which would free man from alienation but in due course it would yield to mere regimentation. He also appreciated that, since its inception, it had fought for deconstruction of the power-structure and concentrated on decentralization of power and wealth equitably to every citizen of a nation. In fact, this pursuit for freedom of the common man was the nucleus of JP’s personality which later characterized all three seasons of his social and political life and they are as follows:

(i) As a militant fighter for national independence;
(ii) As a democrat;
(iii) As a non-violent revolutionary or radical Gandhian.\(^11\)

JP preferred studying social science especially Marxism, because according to him it provided him with some clues for inspiration and techniques for the concept of revolution. At the same time, he felt that the Marxian technique of revolution offered a better and quicker way to freedom than the Gandhian way of Civil Disobedience vis-à-
vis Non-cooperation. He was also convinced that Marx was ‘one of the greatest minds produced by the human race and a pathfinder in sociology.’\(^{12}\) JP’s ideas constituted a most valuable legacy capable of immensely illuminating the path of all those who may be interested in safeguarding democracy and rebuilding our social order on the basis of the ideals of freedom, equality and peace. JP’s profound concern for freedom and morality made him an implacable opponent of totalitarianism in all its forms, including Communism and Fascism. It could be said that, while growing out of his earlier commitment to Marxism, he retained a deep concern for all kinds of injustice and inequality existing in the then Indian society. In fact, JP was a man of action and in this connection, all his ideas grew out of his practical experiences and perceptions, first as a fighter for India’s freedom, then as a leader of the Indian socialist movement and above all as a champion of a non-violent social revolution on Gandhian lines. In the 1970s, he was convinced that, state intervention was becoming increasingly wider in all areas of social life and to overcome this problem, he said that the remedy laid in the Gandhian ideal of a system which proclaimed minimised government and maximised community initiative. Ultimately he became inclined towards companionship with the Bhoodan and Sarvodaya movements. Subsequently, his quest for an Indian form of democracy, ensuring freedom without atomising and alienating the individual, drew him to the ideal of a living ‘Communitarian Society’ on the village-panchayat pattern, functioning within the framework of a ‘Party less Democracy.’\(^{13}\) Before analysing his socio-politic ideas as a whole, it is essential to sketch his political life which was in the nature of a quest for a new social order enshrining freedom, equality and peace. In fact, this quest took him first to Gandhi, then to Marx and again back to Gandhi and, finally, resulted in a synthesis completely based on not only on the most important ideas of both Gandhi and Marx, but also on the principles of Western Democracy. Like a true democrat, he developed abhorrence for the state authority, and reached the conclusion that Gandhian influence would not lead the Indian Government to change its course of action in the coming days and that the state would move accordingly on its repressive way. And that remained the major rationale behind his call for Total Revolution within the country and thereby he tried to bring out a complete change of the then structure and system of Indian polity.\(^{14}\)

The present chapter is an overall attempt to study the multi-dimensional and epoch-making personality of JP in the context of his frequently changed political faiths and concepts. It also strives to understand properly and compactly his unflinching faith over the cherished human ideals and above all his moral sensibility to human sufferings that ran as undercurrent of his changing political ideas. JP spent much of his time and energy in order to strengthen the foundations of Parliamentary Democracy in India, and while considering it not as an ideal political system, he wanted to transform it into a successful participatory democracy. While JP was aware that the above mentioned ideal was somewhat utopian and might never be attained within the Indian societal periphery, keeping this view in the backdrop, he suggested ways and means for strengthening the institution of Panchayati Raj in India and wanted to give real power to people to run the administration of the areas entrusted to their care. Pragmatically speaking, JP was yet another Indian political leader who carried the legacy of Gandhi by keeping himself away from the state power for the sake of strengthening people’s power (Lokshakti) and
his life was a selfless expression aimed at fortifying people’s power in India, so that it could keep a check on the unbridled State power. In fact, after Gandhi he was the only people who expounded and propagated this entire philosophy with utmost firmness and sacrifice with the concept of gram swaraj (village-self-rule) under Gandhian influence and led overall emphasis on decentralised economic development of India.

In the history of modern Indian political thought, JP was a seeker after the truth of life and in his venture his thirst for human welfare, he came under the impact of several ideologies, viz., Marxism, Socialism, Gandhism, and Sarvodaya and to achieve that truth led several social movements of India. At the same time, he felt that a particular movement not only needed the demands of truth and justice but also a constructive popular mass action and for that the welfare of the common people constituted the compendium of all his philosophies and life exercises. It could be said that an anatomy of this concept would reveal that his Total Revolution was the logical culmination of Gandhi’s concept of village self-rule and for that JP in his book Political Trends, published in 1951, wrote that, “Gandhi’s non-violence was not just a plea for law and order or a cover for the status quo, but a revolutionary philosophy. It is indeed a philosophy of a total revolution, because it embraces personal and social ethics and values of life as much as economic, political and social institutions and process.”

In fact, JP throughout his long political career served the country without any desire for any return, which put him on a lofty pedestal of moral authority. The purpose of this chapter is to highlight the major social and political ideas of Jayaprakash Narayan and its relevance in the present century. This chapter also ends with JP’s outlook regarding India’s foreign policy and his prime ideological differences with Narendra Deva and Rammanohar Lohia.

Jayaprakash Narayan as a Nationalist and Marxian Socialist

JP started his political career as a believer in Hindu ideology and the influence of Gita was decisive on his young mind, which continued till the end of his life. Subsequently, the Gita philosophy transformed JP into a disciplined mind and helped him to overcome the effects of good and bad actions of life. Like Gandhi, he was greatly influenced by the various scriptures of Gita, and according to him, it was this spirit of the Bhagavad Gita, which mostly inspired his young mind. At the same time, he also pointed out that the sacred book unquestionably shaped the future course of his conduct. In his book, Ideological Problems of Socialism, published in 1953, he wrote that, “Patriotism is no longer enough; we want something higher, wider and nobler. I am a lover of my country, proud of her past, eagerly looking forward to an equally splendid future of her…” In fact, he was not a narrow nationalist and he always regarded the whole of humanity as one unifying bond. He also discussed this idea in his book, The Evolution towards Sarvodaya, published in 1957, where he wrote that, “Denial of freedom to a people whether in Indonesia or in Israel, makes me take up their cause with the same fervour with which I fought for India’s freedom. What are we interested in world affairs for? We seek no domination over any country. We do not wish to interfere in the affairs of any country, domestic or other. Our main stake in world affairs is peace, to see that there is racial equality and that people who are still subjugated should be free.” In that
book, like a true internationalist, he hoped that one day India would emerge as a peace-loving nation ending all its regional conflicts and hegemonic rule and mentioned that, “For the rest we do not desire to interfere in world affairs and we do not desire that other people should interfere in our affairs. If, however, there is interference, whether military, political or economic, we shall resist it.”

He always kept his faith on the supreme power of the masses and like Marx; he always believed that ‘to make a society well-balanced there must remain the scope of equality in all walks of life’. JP had a strong faith on the people’s power which ultimately led him to call for an overall change within the Indian society on the basis of a mass revolution. Like Marx and Gandhi, he always believed that a mass revolution would be successful when its leaders came spontaneously from the masses to guide the revolution fruitfully. As for Total Revolution, we find that in his Sampurna Kranti, there were no prominent leaders to carry out the revolution within the country; rather the movements were productively conducted by the youth force of our country. Razi Ahmad, a prominent Sarvodaya leader, in an article titled Marxism Not Suitable for India, published in Janata, in 1971, wrote that ‘JP provided a new direction-dimension to the cause of the social movements in India after Gandhi’. In that article Razi also opined that in his call for Total Revolution, JP not only restored his faith over popular mass movements on the basis of scrupulous leadership, he went for the reformulation and reappraisal of some of the great Gandhian principles on Indian soil also.

Moreover, his faith in man was equalled by his faith on the question of ability towards every nation to make its own worthy contribution for the progress of the whole mankind. JP in his book New Dynamics of Social Change published in 1956 briefly discussed his belief in a natural progression of mankind on the basis of human goodness and further wrote about, “Faith in progress, in a cause, in ideals, in human goodness and in human destiny.” In this book, he also provided a new concept named ‘Citizen of the World’ where every individual would be treated as liberal and they possess a world-mind full of rationality and wrote that, “Are they not nearly allied to faith in providence? He wrote that he was intensely proud to be called a citizen of the world, I perhaps, feel greater honour to be called a ‘Citizen of the World’, I am for ideals of One World, my fight is for human freedom everywhere within the world from every sort of turmoil, I am for deification of the dignity of man. I always make effort to see man with a wide vision and broad outlook…” During his quest of his colourful political journey, JP never subscribed to the doctrine that the end should justify the means. Furthermore, in another book, titled Why Total Revolution, published in 1974, he argued that a worthy end should have worthy means leading up to it. In fact, JP was quite right in his own observation, when he reiterated that he always believed on the prime necessity of a good ethical doctrine along with practical politics in order to develop a society on the basis of constructivism and wellness. In that book, he also inscribed that for the means which were not good often defeated the end and simultaneously raised new problems and difficulties. However, in his Inaugural Address at the 10th Triennial Conference at Gandhigram on December 21-27, 1960, JP told his socialist party-workers, both in India and abroad, that this principle of right meant leading up to right results should be adopted in international relations also. In fact, JP had a passionate faith in democracy which always coloured his thoughts, actions and ideas and at the same time, he firmly reiterated that democracy could not work successfully in India without the goodwill of
the people and their active co-operation. Consequently, in the mid 1960s, this idea led him to formulate his idea on Democratic Socialism based on scientific values and morality. While explaining his inclination towards Marxian philosophy, influenced by the spirit of Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and other socialist movements around the globe, he entered the arena of active nationalist movements in India as a core Marxist. Before briefly analysing the major political and social ideas of JP, it is thereby necessary to highlight his active involvement with the Indian nationalist movements. It is also necessary to highlight that JP entered the Indian freedom movement basically as a Marxist; subsequently, over the years, he changed his inner conviction over the Marxian philosophy as a whole and came closer to Gandhi and Vinoba Bhave for their tireless innovative initiatives towards the betterment of the country from the grass root level and at the fag end of his life, JP called for a Total Revolution in the country.

The quest for the relevance of the Marxist approach to the then Indian politics became more important, because one of the dominating aspects of the Indian concept of politics and power proceeded along this line of thinking, especially in the 20th century when the British Raj was at the helm of political affairs. Subsequently, this specific state of affairs productively gave rise towards the then nationalist movements within the country, the product of the pressure exerted in opposition to British interests in its entirety. Reasonably enough, the nationalist movements against the British were a spontaneous call the Indian masses for their free evolution as an independent individual. During that time, socialism emerged as an integrated philosophy of social and economic reconstruction from untiring nationwide nationalist movements. Saul Rose in his book titled *Socialism in Southern Asia*, published in 1959, stated that, ‘In Southern Asia, the socialist movement, has generally emerged as a part of the national independence movement.’ In that book, he also mentioned that, the vigorous growth of socialist thought in India took place in a background which was theoretically different from Western socialism. He further added that “Socialism in India grew not only as a plan for social and economic reconstruction but also as an ideology for getting free from the shackles of British imperialism. Moreover, it was the Russian Revolution of 1917 which made socialism a word to conjure with.” If we look at the socio-political context of the Indian nationalist movement, we could find that the victory of the socialist revolution and thereafter the establishment of a complete socialist state in the Soviet Union, more particularly, its planned economic development aroused keen interest in the Marxist literature among a section of forward-looking radical nationalists of India. In fact, radical nationalist groups started thinking in terms of a socialist revolution to get rid of the country of its dire misery and exploitation from the British and they evolved a new approach to the then unending socio-economic problems of India. Interestingly enough, moulded with such an ideological philosophy, JP joined this group and started his political career as a Marxist.

In JP’s quest for effectual contribution to the Indian nationalist movement, Gandhi played a major role before JP’s revolutionary leanings came into the limelight. Gandhi’s non-violent and non-cooperation movements had swept India like a strange uplifting hurricane. It is needless to mention here, JP soared up with this changed wind of a great idea as contained in the philosophy of *Satyagraha* (attachment of truth) and
non-violence. In this context, coincidentally, Gandhi’s first non-violent movement was launched in Bihar, the state JP came from at Champaran in 1917, which shook the entire British rule for the first time and Gandhi’s method of using the moral force against an oppressor remained in JP’s mind as a novel experience. He was fully overwhelmed and influenced by the method to mobilize the Indian masses against the British Raj. Moreover, Gandhi’s simplicity and instant identification with the Indian masses also made him a great follower of Gandhi. Before JP became a follower of Gandhi, his overall faith in Marxism had begun. While studying at the University of Wisconsin, he came in close contact with some Marxist students and at the same time, was a voracious reader of Marxist literature over the years this turned him into a hardcore Marxist. Minoo Masani in his book Is JP the Answer?, published in 1975, wrote that, “During his stay in the United States, he (JP) had come under the influence of Jay Love Stone and had, for all practical purposes, become a Communist ...strangely enough, it was in the land of resilient and successful capitalism, in the United States of America, which was his home from 1922 to 1929, that he became a convert to Marxism, or more precisely, to Soviet Communism, as it was then. It was at Madison, Wisconsin, that in the company of Jewish and European born fellow students, he drank deep at the fountain of Marxism.”

JP returned to India as an ardent Marxist and during that time, championed the cause of both Marxism and nationalism as a whole for India’s path of development. Gandhi had an immense effect on JP through speeches and writings, and also through his personal example of self-dedication-conduct to the extent of self-abnegation, an idea which JP wholeheartedly cherished under the deep influence of the Bhagavad Gita. Interestingly enough, during that time, he also had no mean attraction for the terrorist philosophy, which Gandhi had no links. At the same time, the stories of heroic actions, performed by the young Bengali terrorists against the British administration by the guerrilla method, used to fill him with great excitement. He had no steady connection with the radicals because he did not have faith in terrorist ideology. At the same time, he paid rich tributes for their overall contribution towards India’s liberation struggle. But, JP had never been convinced of the methods of the Bengal terrorist groups. He finally decided to follow the Gandhian way, mainly the technique of peaceful revolution and the application of morality and mass action.

During that time, the socio-political atmosphere of the country entered a new phase. The First World War was over. Earlier Annie Besant had been arrested in 1917 by the British for conducting the Home Rule movement within the country for self-rule. Eventually, the tide of great nationalism emerged like an erupting volcano within the country and it shook badly the British power in India. JP had taken an active part in the Home Rule Movement and decided to fight against the British for the cause of the Indian national movement. Lokmanya Tilak was then active on the socio-political arena. His later commentary on the Karma Yoga, as propounded in the Gita, was highly original. All these made JP feel a natural attraction towards this dynamic personality. Tilak mostly drew inspiration from the Gita, and also mentioned that India would not become a great nation through negativism and slothfulness, but rather through a dynamic willingness and the sheer application of morality. In his book Gita –Rahasya: A Philosophical Inquiry into the Secret of the Teaching of the Gita, published in 1917, Tilak wrote that,
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“No one can expect the Providence to protest one who sits with folded arms and throws his burden on others. God does not help the indolent. You must be doing all that you can to lift yourself up, and then only you may rely on the Almighty to help you.”

Subsequently, the Rowlatt Bills were passed in 1919, which aroused a vehement opposition throughout the country. Later on, various incidents such as the Jallianwallah Bagh tragedy, followed by the Martial law in the then Punjab greatly motivated the tide of the Indian national movement as a whole. As a sign of protest towards the British, Gandhi unleashed his first Non-Cooperation Movement (1920-'21) and JP could not remain unaffected by the movement. However JP then could not become a whole-hearted non-co-operator because of Gandhi’s great stress on the moral and spiritual side of his movement. Years later, JP in his book *Socialism to Sarvodaya*, published in 1956, wrote that, “Freedom became one of the beacon-lights of his life and remained so ever since. Freedom, with the passing of the years, transcended the mere freedom of my country and embraced freedom of the mass everywhere and from every sort of trammel—above all it meant freedom of the human personality, freedom of the mind, freedom of the spirit.”

JP had received the beacon for freedom undoubtedly from Gandhi and the other lights came him from Marx, i.e., in the United States, where he was a student from 1922 to 1929, and had worked in fields and factories to meet his expenses and the experience led him to preserve both these ideals. Reasonably, at first the swing was towards Marxism as a whole, which was rather the dominant strand in the ideology of the Congress Socialist Party (CSP); founded in 1934, with JP as its Organising Secretary. JP’s ideological assumptions around that time came out clearly in his first serious writing, *Why Socialism?*, published in 1936. In its first chapter entitled *Foundations of Socialism*, he wrote that, “Though in the past different schools of socialism existed, the impact of the world crisis and the rise of fascism there had led to a growing unity in socialist through and it was now possible to say that there was at that time only one type, one theory of socialism—Marxism.”

In that same book, he further asserted that, “Although differences continued among socialists regarding the tactics for changing the capitalist society into a socialist one, till then only the Communists had indicated their theory on this point by their great and remarkable success in Russia.”

Subsequently, JP was primarily motivated by sheer patriotism, and the determination and enthusiasm to fight against the British rule in order to win political freedom for the country. It was the single factor towards his major decision to join the Non-Cooperation Movement under the Gandhian banner and become a total non-co-operator. In 1922, events took a strange turn. The movement led by Gandhi was drifted into a wrong direction and severely went against the core philosophy of Gandhi. As a result, Gandhi immediately called off his Non-Cooperation Movement, and thought that the country was not yet ready for a non-violent struggle. JP did not wholeheartedly agreed with Gandhi’s decision because during that time, the movement was very much able to turn into a popular mass movement against the British within the country with great support coming from the middle class Indians. All these sudden happenings impelled JP to reassess and refocus his ideas, and finally he was drawn to the eventful struggle for ‘total independence’.
In fact, JP’s entire political life was a quest for social revolution and, according to him; nothing was allowed to come in the way of this quest. In the history of Indian political and social movements, few other lives could be found inspiring like JP’s. His quest for social revolution in order to change the mindset of the people showed an absolute freedom not only from any craving for office and power, but also from the hold of dogmas and the fear of being dubbed inconsistent. Minoo Masani in his book Bliss Was It In that Dawn, published in 1977, he mentioned that, it was through Abram Landy, a so-called member of the American Communist Party, that JP came to know the works of M.N. Roy (1886-1954). In that book Masani wrote, ‘Marxism seemed to provide not only the key to independence, but to social equality and even personal liberty.’ Simultaneously, it appears that at this time his social concern for India included ‘independence of India, social equality and personal liberty.’ In 1929, the Comintern instructed Communist Parties all over the world “that they should not only keep out of such movement (struggle for independence) but denounce them as benefiting only the bourgeoisie…” and this call of the Comintern was not at all acceptable to JP, since during that time, his primary goal was sheer independence for the country moulded with the Gandhian way of thinking. In these crucial hours, the Communists all over the globe were primarily being dictated by the then Soviet Communist Party. This trend was not favourably looked upon by JP. His resentment about Comintern’s policy was clearly reflected, when in December, 1936, on CSP’s leading journal entitled Congress Socialist, he wrote: “Independence cannot be separated from its content. Therefore to put socialism and independence in watertight compartments, to deny that any relation exists between them is to weaken the fight for independence itself. No one says that our immediate fight is for socialism and yet socialism is the warp and woof of the immediate fight. It colours it, it gives it direction, and provides it with an edge of idealism.” At the same time, he even disagreed with the tactics followed by Gandhi especially on the manufacture of salt or picketing the liquor shops. It is a fact that, the only idea of Gandhi, which he seems to have accepted in the 1930s, was the doctrine of non-violence and its effective use on Indian society. Moreover, he also adhered to popular mass struggles of India along with peasant struggles under the Gandhian line of thinking, which had to be completely non-violent, probably for tactical reasons.

However consistent he was with his commitment to non-violent mass struggles under the Gandhian banner as the means for achieving India’s independence and he vehemently opposed the then Congress method of mere ‘constitutionalism’ for the country. In fact, a majority of the members of the then Congress Party, led by Jawaharlal Nehru, was ready to contest General Elections to the Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces under the 1935 Government of India Act. In 1929, a resolution for provincial legislative elections was unanimously passed in the Faizpur session of the Congress Party where it stated that, “the Congress has entered the legislature not to co-operate with the new Constitution or the British Government but to combat the Act and the policy underlying within its fold. This Act and Policy is intended to tighten the hold of British imperialism in India and to continue to tread the same old path like the exploitation of the Indian people. In this connection, the Congress adheres to its general and basic policy of non co-operation with the apparatus of British
imperialism except in so far as circumstances may require a variation.”

However, in December 1929, Gandhi failed to make Lord Irwin, the then Viceroy of Britain, grant full Dominion Status to India in terms with the Calcutta Congress Resolution. Eventually, the stage was then set for a bigger struggle for national freedom. In that same month, the meeting of the Working Committee (Wardha), JP was introduced to Jawaharlal Nehru by Gandhi\(^41\) and that introduction was further augmented at the Lahore Session of the Congress Party, Nehru and JP was brought together by Gandhi. In that session Nehru, as the then Congress President, appointed JP as a Chief Secretary in the Labour Department of the Congress. On 12 March 1930, Gandhi embarked on his Satyagraha movement named ‘Dandi March’ from Sabarmati, Gujarat, and planned for a long Salt Satyagraha movement, as a part of his prolonged programme against the British Raj launched on 6\(^{th}\) April, 1930.\(^42\) Later on, the Satyagraha movement of Gandhi electrified the whole nation with a great vigour and subsequently, the nationalist upsurge of the Indian people was at its peak. Gandhi was summoned by the then Viceroy, Lord Irwin, for talks in February 1931. Before the talks, the Congress leaders met at Karachi where JP was the convenor. Following this, Gandhi went to London to attend the Second Round Table Conference. Ironically enough, it did not go off well in accordance with the previous plan, and Gandhi had to return home with an empty hand.\(^43\) Immediately after, the Congress Working Committee agreed to meet in Bombay to decide upon the future course of action, but this initiative failed to materialize, on account of Willington, the then Viceroy, who had made elaborate arrangements to scuttle the session.\(^44\) The Congress was declared an illegal body and within a week, all its principal leaders were put in different prisons of the country. Later, JP immediately opened a secret office of the Congress in Bombay and started working for both the reorganisation of the All India Congress Committee and the Satyagraha Movement under Gandhian leadership.\(^45\)

Ideologically, during his stay abroad, JP had drifted towards the Soviet form of Communist model for his country. Study of Marxist literature, had practically convinced him that the Marxian method of revolution was surer and quicker than the method of Gandhi.\(^46\) Subsequently, the success of Lenin in the then Soviet Union confirmed his deep conviction about the superiority of the Communist methods for bringing about a total revolution within the country. Ironically enough, JP returned to India with a firm belief that Marxism was the only way in order to achieve freedom in the country. At the same time, JP also believed that to establish an egalitarian society in India, it had to follow the Marxian method of multiple techniques, which was unfortunately unsuitable in the then Indian scenario. At that time, nationalist feelings ran very high in him with the Indian National Congress (INC) spearheading the struggle for complete independence under the Gandhian principle of full swaraj. During that time, the Communist Party of India (CPI) was busy in denouncing the Indian national movement and Gandhi, instead of involving itself with the freedom struggle.\(^47\) JP decided to join the Congress led independence struggle rather than the Communist line as followed by the CPI.
Before analysing the idea of JP’s integrated approach to men and the then socio-political events at the beginning of his prolonged career in Indian politics, it is important to highlight briefly the then major political events which, by and large, thoroughly influenced JP’s future political line of thinking. The concept of Democratic Socialism, unlike Communism, appeared rather late on the Indian political scene. In the 1930s, when the countrywide civil disobedience movement under Gandhian leadership was in full progress, he could not participate in it wholeheartedly as he had to take care of his family. Later on, in 1931, after the signing of the Gandhi-Irwin pact, the Congress could function openly. Earlier it had been banned temporarily within the country following the failure of Second Round Table Conference. Jawaharlal Nehru entrusted JP with the task of writing the history of the civil disobedience movement, on account of mass arrests of all senior leaders of the Congress in January 1932. This meant that JP had assumed more responsibilities and a vital role to play within the party as the acting General Secretary of the Congress. Unfortunately, he was arrested in Madras on September 7, 1932 and was detained there. However, in 1933, JP got quite disillusioned with Gandhian tactics and the then old weaker policies of the Congress. Gandhi’s non-violent campaigns, fasts and civil disobedience movement did not yield quick and satisfactory results. Moreover, several Congressmen were eager to join the provincial Legislatures, proposed to be formed under the Government of India Act of 1935. All these infuriated JP and in protest he resigned from the Congress Working Committee (CWC). At the same time, he also realized that only Gandhi and the Congress Party had a strong hold over the masses. Hence, as a wise political scientist, he decided to stay on in the Congress Party and continued to work for the reorientation of the Indian freedom movement.

**Formation of Congress Socialist Party and its Different Facets**

After the failure of the civil disobedience movement under the leadership of Gandhi in 1932, there remained a clear evidence of exhaustion in the then ranks of the Congress leadership, generally because of was sudden the decision of withdrawal of the movement. They were mainly confused and puzzled about Gandhi’s leadership. Subsequently, in January, 1933, a measure of Gandhi’s own restlessness, was evident in his resignation letter submitted to the then Congress Party and in this letter he wrote that, “among other things, that a very large body of the Congress intelligentsia was tired of my methods and views, and the programme based upon them, I strongly feel that my presence in the Congress is a hindrance rather than a help to the natural growth of the Congress; I reasonably consider that instead of remaining the most democratic and representative organization, it is partly dominated by my personality; and that in it there remains no free play of reason.” At the same time, there evolved two distinct groups in the then Congress Party. The first group undoubtedly preferred moderate constitutional politics and methods and the second group, numerically small, keenly felt the radical need for a ‘Left-centre’ re-orientation towards the Indian freedom struggle. Foremost among the latter group they were Narendra Deva, Rammanohar Lohia, Yusuf Meherally, Achyut Patwardhan, Minoo Masani, Asoka Mehta, S.M. Joshi, N.G. Goray, M.L. Dantwala, and above all Jayaparakash Narayan. Interestingly enough, in the quest for the formation of the Congress Socialist Party (CSP) along with the question of giving an
organised expression of radical–extremist tendencies within the ambit of the national struggle was discussed among the above mentioned socialist leaders while they were held in the Nasik central jail, for active participation in the civil disobedience movement. This prison became the birthplace of the CSP, with JP acting the part of its midwife. In fact, Ashok Mehta, in his illustrious article entitled *Studies in Socialism—Gandhi and Vinoba* published in *Janata*, in 1958, wrote that “the Marxist JP had been persuaded by M.N. Roy’s overpowering writing of those days...to believe that Gandhiji was against the social revolution, and would at a moment of crisis hasten to uphold the system of exploitation and inequality.”

Subsequently, the Congress Socialist Party came into existence on May 17, 1934 with Acharya Narendra Deva as President and JP as General Secretary. In 1936, in his first book entitled *Why Socialism?*, JP as the chief doctrinaire of the new party, elaborated his social ideas which rapidly found ideological expression in his socio-political thinking. If we go through that book then we could easily find that, at that time JP’s idea of socialism was clearly biased towards Marxism and, simultaneously, he believed that there could be only one type of socialism, namely Marxian Socialism. In this book, he elaborated his views on the meaning and implications of socialism within the Indian societal periphery along with his analysis of society and the cause of inequality. All these clearly reflected his bias towards Marxism. He, in the same book, also favoured the nationalization of the key industries vis-à-vis a vital role of the State on the question of economic field, including state controlled planning under strong Marxian influence. Finally, as a true believer in Marxian socialism, he thereby chose the abolition of private ownership as the means of production and the introduction of social ownership in its place.

As for policy formulation in the then CSP, JP was the prime moving force behind its proclamation as a Marxist party. Later on, Minoo Masani, his long time friend and associate, in his book entitled *JP: Mission Partly Accomplished*, published in 1977, wrote that, “the important issue about the character of the Congress Socialist Party whether it was a Marxist Party and thereby the question of its relations with the Communist Party... were discussed in private sessions of the Executive Committee. After considerable resistance on the part of Yusuf Meherally, I and others, Jayaprakash managed to persuade the executive that ours was a Marxist Party.”

JP wrote a pamphlet elaborating the policy and programme of the CSP, entitled *Congress Socialist Party: Constitution, Programme and Resolutions*. It was published in 1936, JP wrote: “The immediate task is to develop the national movement into a real anti-imperialist movement, aiming at freedom both from foreign power and the native system of exploitation. For that it is necessary to wean the anti-imperialist elements in the Congress away from their bourgeois leadership, and bring them under the leadership of revolutionary socialism. The party’s own programme must be Marxist ...Marxism alone can guide the anti-imperialist forces to their ultimate destiny. Party members must, therefore, fully understand the technique of revolution, the theory and practice of class struggle, the nature of the state and the process leading to a socialist society.”

Interestingly enough, during this period, JP also worked for the unification of the Socialists and the Communists within the fold of CSP. His initial attempts were badly shattered by the wrong attitude of the then Communist Party of India (CPI). However, by
1936, there was a change of strategy-tactical line on the part of the CPI and subsequently, it began to support the Indian freedom struggle. This change of attitude enormously encouraged JP and, consequently, he succeeded in including the Communists in the fold of Congress Socialist Party, in spite of stark opposition from several prominent members of the party. In other words, though JP had to compromise with Gandhi and the Congress for the actualization of the Indian freedom struggle, simultaneously, till 1940, at the intellectual level, he remained a convinced Marxist. During that period, JP played a very important role in the formulation of this kind of Marxist programmes within the party, primarily because he all along had been schooled in both orthodox Marxism as well as Gandhian technique of peaceful revolution for the cause of national freedom. In this way he was a combination of both a socialist and a nationalist as well. During that time, Narendra Deva was looking for a compromise between Marx and Buddha and Lohia was working to find out a synthesis of Gandhi and Marx. Ironically, at that juncture, JP was both a socialist and a nationalist. He tried his best to win over both the Bolsheviks and the Congressmen in order to create a broad socialist forum to fight against imperialism within the country. In particular, he wanted to win over the Communists towards his views of ideological unity and, subsequently, expressed his wish to work together. In January 1936, at the Meerut Session of the then CSP, the Party proclaimed itself as a Marxist Party, and simultaneously invited the Bolsheviks to join its ranks. Later on, JP in his book *Towards Struggle*, edited by Yusuf Meherally, published in 1946, while reminiscing his colourful Nasik days in the history of Indian freedom struggle once told Masani: “Talking of Nasik, Minoo, let me say that the Nasik days were the happiest days I have yet spent in prison, and I cherish clearly the friendship I made there.”

In the quest for the reorientation of the socialist movement in India, JP felt the need for a powerful socialist forum within the country, which could accommodate people with Marxist ideology and also contribute towards the enrichment of the freedom struggle. It is needless to mention here that, since 1920, the so called Communists had been active on a small scale, but the Communist Party of India was formally established at a conference held in Kanpur in 1925. After the establishment of the CPI, important leaders of the Party, viz. Shripad Amrit Dange, Shaukat Usmani, Muzzaffar Ahmed and others, were sentenced to four years in jail in connection with the Kanpur Conspiracy case. In 1925, these leaders were not present in the First Communist Conference, but they were undoubtedly the prime protagonists of Marxism in India. In fact, the Communist Party of India was previously founded in October 1920 itself at Tashkent by M.N. Roy and Abani Mukherjee. Following this, the Kanpur Conspiracy Case was lodged against the Bolsheviks primarily because they were considered Bolshevik agents and infiltrators against British interests within the country. Later on, in 1929, came Meerut Conspiracy Case in which 2 persons, including the above mentioned leaders, were prosecuted for insurrection against the British emperor and M.N. Roy was the principal accused in this case. In fact, between 1929 and 1930, at the Sixth Congress of the Communist International all the nationalists and democratic socialists were dubbed as ‘social fascist.’ Against such a backdrop, JP and some other like-minded persons felt the urgent need for a socialist forum within the country. During that period, they were of
the opinion that the Congress Party’s policies and the Gandhian formula were appallingly inadequate to change the overall destiny of the oppressed and the disadvantaged of India. During that time, with the sole objective organizing people’s power, JP went round the country and secretly propagated socialism as a means to develop the nation building process. In later years, JP in his book entitled *A Plea for Reconstruction of Indian Polity*, published in 1959, mentioned that for the formation of the CSP, he read voraciously in the Nasik Central jail. He thoroughly read Chamberlain’s *Russia’s Iron Age*, Arthur Salter’s *Recovery*, Beatrice and Sydney Webb’s writings on *Fabian Socialism* and above all *The Russian Plan* by Masha Gessen. Through these books, JP realized that the seeds for the formation of the Socialist Party in India were actually planted at the Nasik central jail. Interestingly enough, in May 1933, when Gandhi suddenly suspended the Civil Disobedience Movement, Subhas Chandra Bose and Vithulbhai Patel in a written statement issued from Europe refused to accept Gandhi’s leadership. At the same time, Nehru was also under great influence of the Left ideology and shortly after his sojourn from Russia, he openly started supporting socialism as an integrated idea. His attitude amply evident from the various speeches he wrote from time to time as the Congress President during that time. Moreover, between 1933 and 1934, his proclivity for Marxism was also manifested through his personal letters from the Indian prison written to his only daughter, Indira. During that period, between July 1933 and February 1934, like JP, Nehru clearly expressed his serious disagreement with Gandhi when he was out of jail for a brief period. However, in spite of ideological and leadership differences between them, he never preferred to dissociate himself completely from Gandhi and did not support the proposal to form the Socialist Party outside the Congress banner. Later on, JP again became active to give a fillip to the formation of a Socialist Forum all over the country. Moreover, after his release from the Nasik central jail in 1933, at an AICC meeting at Pune, he laid greater emphasis on the urgent need to achieve social justice and egalitarianism through the principle of Marxian socialism. Subsequently, in that political gathering, JP and his socialist supporters decided that the new Party’s name would be ‘Anushelan’ and its ideology would be ‘scientific socialism.’ In his book *Swaraj for the People*, published in 1961, JP mentioned that in the policy planning of the CSP, materialistic interpretation of history, class struggle and above all the theory of surplus value were incorporated in their doctrine of scientific socialism. In this book, JP also stated that, though the CSP was formed within the Congress fold, most of its founder leaders were somehow opposed to the old Congress leadership. In another book, entitled *The Challenges after Nehru* published in 1964, JP cautioned the then Congress socialists against the ensuing danger of fascism around the globe and therein he also mentioned that during that time, the primary goal of the CSP was to enrol general members of the Congress Party into the CSP provided that they were not members of any communal organisation or any such other organisation whose policy did not match with the principles of the CSP. The CSP, since its inception had aimed at complete independence along with the establishment of a socialist order within the country. After the new party was formed, it was decided to make it a full cadre based party and subsequently, the general membership of the party was closed to all who were not member of the Congress. JP was appointed as the organising Secretary at the Patna
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Conference in 1934. After this new assignment, JP undertook an extensive tour of the whole country to popularize his party and initiated the formation of various branches in different parts of India. In building up the CSP as a political party its founder tried to popularize the party by opening branches in different parts of the country. As the organising secretary, JP in his report to the Patna Conference of the CSP refuted the charges that the party was trying to wreck the Congress from within and damaging the Indian liberation movement. He also replied to the criticism that it was wrong to form a party while remaining fully in the Congress. In his book entitled *Nation Building in India* edited by Brahmanand and published in 1964, he briefly discussed the future objectives of the party and highlighted the fact that the ‘Congress’ and ‘Socialism’ were two terms symbiotic in nature and not visibly antagonistic. He argued that without dismantling imperialism, socialism would remain a mere hypothesis. JP had realized that the Congress was the only organisation-platform on which the mass struggle against British imperialism could be launched. He was critical of the Communist system functioning under the dictum of the Soviet Comintern and that there was no clear manual towards policy formulation of the then CPI in India. For instance, there was no concept of the post of President on the pattern of the Communist parties all over the world. In his book entitled *Democratic Socialism: Our Ideal and Our method*, published in 1965, he reiterated that the CSP was essentially a party of the youths within the country. He also mentioned that, apart from Acharya Narendra Deva and Lohia, brilliant leaders like Achyut Patwardhan, Minoo Masani, Yusuf Meherally, Asoka Mehta, Seth Damodar Swaroop, Mohanlal Gautam, Munshi Ahmad Din and Shivnath Banerjee etc. had also joined the new outfit.

It is amply clear that in terms of thought and ideology, the Congress Socialist Party could not be deemed as homogenous group as it had avowed Marxist leaders like JP and Narendra Deva, populists like Lohia, Social Democrats like Masani, Asoka Mehta and, finally, Gandhians like Achyut Patwardhan. Interestingly enough, between the 1930s and the 1940s, the personality and thought-orientation of JP clearly made an invisible impact on the policies and programmes of the CSP. Narendra Deva, too, had unfounded faith in JP and in every policy decision of the CSP, he always solicited his advice. He can be mentioned at this that in an article entitled *Socialism Unattainable through Legislation*, published in *Bhoodan*, in 1953, Narendra Deva wrote that, “On some occasions when JP was in jail and the party workers approached me for my opinion regarding the future structure or policy of the party my reply would be, let Jayaprakash be released from the jail. It is he who has to run the party.”

Many Congress leaders did not react positively towards the formation of the CSP. In the passage of time, Gandhi welcomed the emergence of a socialist front within the Congress. At the same time, he also expressed scepticism over its programmes and future course of action. For, according to him, the CSP was established without taking into consideration the then existing Indian conditions. In a letter written to Narendra Deva from Varanasi on 2 August 1934, Gandhi also objected to the nomenclature of the party and mentioned, “In my opinion until you seek permission to make this party an organ of the Congress organisation, it will be wrong to call it Congress Socialist Party. But it will be fully proper to call it an All India Socialist Party of the Congressmen. I am
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sure you will realise the significance of this differences.” However, the then Congress President, Jawaharlal Nehru welcomed the establishment of the socialist group within the country. In a letter to Minoo Masani from Allahabad dated 19 December 1933, he stated that, “The time had come when the country should think on this issue and strengthen its grip on the real economic problems staring in the face of the nation.” Interestingly enough, although Subhas Chandra Bose was not a founder member of the CSP, in his Presidential address at the Tripuri Congress held in 1936, he clearly mentioned that, “he wholeheartedly subscribed to the general principles and policies of the CSP.”

In its quest for popularity within the nation, on various occasions, the CSP drew public attention towards some of the burning problems prevailing within the country which undoubtedly forced the Congress to deliberate on these issues. These included subjects like major reforms in the agriculture sector, problems of the industrial labour, future of the Princely States and above all non-Gandhian methods of struggle and the task of mobilizing the people. The socialists developed intimate relations with the Kisan Sabha in various provinces of India, especially in Bihar and Andhra Pradesh. Moreover, in Bihar the socialists were very active in organizing and conducting the Kisan Sabha and, this organization played a distinguished role in augmenting the freedom struggle, under the leadership of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati. The prime objective was for zamindari abolition and building up a class struggle. In a Conference of the Bihar Pradesh Kisan Sabha at Hajipur in November, 1935, JP greatly moulded the character of the peasant movement which ultimately led him to be very active in the Kisan Sabha programmes. He also developed very cordial and close relationship with Sahajanand. JP as a Marxist JP gave profoundly primacy to the various peasants and labour movements in the country and wanted to modify the Marxist ideology in accordance with the existing Indian realities. JP also felt that the ground reality of any national movement could not be strong enough unless the people joined it in large numbers. Consequently, like Vinoba Bhabe, JP laid greater emphasis on co-operative and collective farming. During that time, like Marx, he was convinced that there could be no personal ownership of the natural resources and that this personal ownership was the root cause of all social disparities and discrimination in India. In his quest for Total Revolution in the post-Emergency period, this idea primarily shaped his socio-political philosophy.

The Third Annual Conference of the All India CSP was held at Faizpur between 23 and 24 December 1936. It remained a historic conference of the CSP regarding its policy formulation and the ideological disagreement with the CPI. In this conference, JP was unanimously elected as the Chairman of the party. The first item taken up for discussion was the ‘Thesis of the Party’ with a looming Second World War in the background. The CPI severely opposed this policy prepared by JP. It labelled the CSP a ‘counter-revolutionary’ party. In that conference, Subhas Bose’s Forward Bloc and the Congress were castigated as lackeys of the British imperialism. At the end of this meeting, the CSP adopted its future party programmes and objectives, which was largely taken from JP’s thesis and they were as follows:
1. Transfer of all power to the producing masses;

2. Development of economic life of the country to be planned and controlled by the state;

3. State monopoly of foreign trade;

4. Redistribution of land to peasants;

5. Liquidation of debts owned by peasants and workers;

6. No discrimination between the sexes by the State;

7. Adult franchise on functional basis.79

In 1936 again JP’s book *Why Socialism?*, he highlighted the special features of socialism for the Indian soil; there appeared a sensational text for the then political leaders of India. JP sent a copy to Gandhi for his insightful observation. In reply, on 12 March, 1936, Gandhi in a letter wrote that, “I read your book carefully and I liked it, although the attack on me which it carries betrays considerable ignorance regarding me. That can be removed but I am enchanted with your study. After these preliminaries I may say that I find in it no remedy for our problem.”80 Following this, moulded with this JP outlook of socialism, the Congress Executive in 1936 at its Lucknow meeting, surprisingly inducted three socialist leaders, such as Narendra Deva, JP and Achyut Patwardhan into their newly formed committee. This decision of the Congress was appreciated by Masani, the General Secretary of the CSP and on 24 December 1936, he wrote, “I feel the decision has justified itself. It has enabled the party to play its part in developing the United Front inside the Congress and at the same time it has not had the slightest effect in curtailing our independence as a party or our freedom to raise the vital issues on which we disagree with the Right wing leadership.”81

Meanwhile, Nehru’s visit to Great Britain in that period reinforced the Congress image as an essentially Left wing organisation. During this visit, Nehru interacted with various Left personalities such as Leonard Woolf (Secretary of the Colonial Sub-Committee of the Labour Party), Stafford Cripps, Harold Laski, George Catlin and some other members of the Labour Left,82 and convinced them, that the only way to help the Indians was to support the Congress and other left forces within the country. Consequently, during that time, the news of the popularity of the Indian socialists spread to England.

**Congress Socialist Party: The Dialectics between Communist and Socialist**

In the seventh Comintern Congress held in 1935, all the Communist Parties were directed to form a United Front with the nationalist forces and thereby work jointly. This declaration steadily brought about a sudden change in the overall attitude of the Communists in India. Meanwhile, the CPI was banned on 23 July 1934.83 JP was unequivocally in favour of inducting them into the fold of the CSP, but many of the so-called Indian socialists were deadly against this proposal. In the 1936 Conference of the CSP held at Meerut, under the Chairpersonship of Kamladevi Chattopadhyaya, everyone
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opposed JP’s proposal except Narendra Deva who supported JP’s independent political stand. And at least, momentarily the CSP’s door was kept open for the Communists. JP trusted the Communists downrightly and initiated actions to get some of them into prominent in the CSP. Although many Communists joined the CSP, but, they did not discard their old organisation and secretly kept in touch with them. Later on, a secret document was discovered which divulged their undisclosed conspiracy to capture power within the CSP as early as possible and also to control and wreck it from within.

Following this, and with the onset of the Second World War in 1939, the Communists were unanimously expelled from the CSP at the Ramgarh Session held in 1940. JP had realised this Communist conspiracy much later, but he did not oppose the motion. In his Politics of Consensus, published in 1968, JP sought to clarify his ideological stand on Left unity. He wrote, ‘We do not want to attack the Communists in relation and we do not undermine the Communist Party, but we cannot allow them to break our party like this.’ In its quest for gaining popularity in the Indian national domain, the CSP effectively worked as a pressure group inside the then Congress party and provided a new direction to the nation’s polity. B.R. Nanda in his book entitled Socialism in India, published in 1972, wrote, “The CSP could not have its own way on several important issues; nevertheless it succeeded in giving to a limited extent, a radical orientation to overall Congress policies. On the rejection of the federal part of the Act of 1935, the release of the political détentes, the introduction of agrarian reforms or the resignation of the Congress ministries in 1939, the socialists’ pressure within the Congress organisation doubtlessly made some contribution to the final result. The Second World War and the breach with the Government brought the Congress Socialists nearer to Gandhi and the Congress leadership. The bitter dose of repression in 1942 and the process of political re-education provided by the conduct of the other Left groups during the War, according to Narendra Deva, led a shift in the posture of the Congress Socialists between 1934 and 1941. Gandhism which the socialists had rejected contemptuously in the thirties struck to them as more relevant in the forties and the fifties, not only for a political reason but also for the cause of social revolution within India.”

On March 7, 1940, JP was arrested at Jamshedpur for leading a strong protest against the war effort and during that time he, along with Lohia, organized secretly a number of political campaigns to awaken the political consciousness of the common masses throughout the country. Unfortunately, in 1941, he had to pass almost nine months in the Chaivbasa and Hazaribagh jails. Consequently, as a sign of protest throughout the country, the Searchlight and the Indian Nation both published from Patna, strongly protested against his unlawful arrest. In the same year, Gandhi in an article entitled On Words to People’s Democracy, published in The Radical Humanist, firmly argued, “The arrest of JP is unfortunate. He is no ordinary worker. He is an authority on socialism. It may be said that what he does not know of Western Socialism, nobody else in India does. He is a fine fighter. He has forsaken all for the sake of the deliverance of his country. His industry is tireless. His capacity for suffering is not to be excelled… When sons of the motherland like JP and Lohia are rotting behind the prison-bars, how on earth can I rest at ease?”

JP continued his political activities though he was lodged in Hazaribagh jail. His letters and write ups were smuggled out and handed over to different. He urged them to keep alive the flow of revolution. Some of his articles and secret drafts of the CSP were
Changes in JP’s socio-political thinking continued to be evident from time to time. In 1940, after his release from prison, change in attitude about Marxism was noticed. His intellectual fervour for scientific Marxism also declined. There were several reasons:

1. Though JP trusted the Indian Communists and allowed them to enter the CSP and the AICC, they betrayed him;
2. He was annoyed with Soviet Russia for trying to interfere in the affairs of India through the CPI;
3. When he heard of the state trials of prominent Soviet Communist leaders like Kamenev, Zinoviev, Radek, Rykov and Bukharin, he began to seriously questioned the basic postulates of Marxism;
4. JP did not renounce Marxism but only questioned its philosophy and its implications.
5. He adopted the non-violent method of Satyagraha while continuing to preach violence.

In 1942, JP was arrested again and detained again without trial, first in Bombay and then at the Deoli jail in Rajputana, in connection with the Quit India movement. In Deoli, he went on a hunger-strike till death. The Government shifted him to the Hazaribagh jail. And it was from here that he and five others escaped, on November 8, 1942. JP immediately went underground and organized a number of guerrilla activities against the British administration. He was rearrested again on September 10, 1943, and was kept in solitary confinement at the Lahore jail where he was continuously harassed by the authorities through interrogation.

**JP’s Quest for New Horizons: Quit India Movement and its Aftermath**

Although JP did not fully renounce Marxism in the 1940s, he began to question the basic postulates of Marxism and thereby called his philosophy ‘Democratic Socialism’. In fact, from 1940 onwards JP’s economic and political ideas were a mixture of Marxism and Gandhism and, consequently, in his book entitled An Outline Picture of Swaraj published in 1959, he outlined an inkling of this new direction. In this book, he emphasised the moral and intellectual development of a human being not merely by his material growth. He also highlighted the basic necessities for an individual’s objective straightforwardness. In that same book, he also talked about individual freedom and equal rights in order to make a just society and at the same time, called for a system of collective ownership, control and the nationalization of certain sectors under Marxian influence. In another book entitled My Picture of Socialism, written in 1946, where JP declared that he was still a Marxist while he continued to talk about economic and political democracy for the Indian society in order to safeguard the public democracy under which every man would be free and enjoy equality. In a nutshell, thus from the beginning of the 1940s’, JP was gradually moving closer to Gandhi.
Several factors and ideological forces were responsible for this gradual change in his attitude towards Gandhi.

1. When communal conflicts broke out, Gandhi and JP saw eye to eye; they did not want religious distinctions to come into politics;

2. Both of them were against India’s participation in World War II, though for different reasons—Gandhi because of his adherence to non-violence and JP because of his anti-imperialistic attitude;

3. Both were disillusioned with the then Congress leaders who were ready to compromise with the British for the sake of mere political power;

4. Gandhi had been adopting a friendly attitude towards JP right from the thirties, even when the latter was criticizing his idea of ethical policies;

5. Moreover, the close relationship between Gandhi and Prabhavati, JP’s wife, also helped this process. All these factors led JP closer to Gandhi while he was simultaneously drifting away from scientific Marxism for the reasons enumerated earlier.93

In the history of the freedom movement in India, JP became extremely popular just before India achieved independence and stood as a symbol of resistance and robust hope. At the same time, he did not have any say in the final settlement with the British and, in contrary, he repeatedly urged for a strong mass revolutionary struggle instead of any compromise with the British administration. This alienated him from the then Congress Party. In February 1947, the CSP was rechristened ‘Socialist Party’ though it did not abrogate its linkages from the Congress completely. Interestingly enough, just then, Gandhi too felt estranged from the moderate Congress leaders and moved closer to the socialists in the CSP.

However, JP and other socialist leaders were of the firm convictions that in order to carry a strong movement within the country Gandhi could never be sidelined and the badge of the Congress was also essential for the success of any movement. JP worked sedulously for the unity of the Congress because he realised that during that time the Congress was the most effective organisation to fight against British imperialism. This led many Congressmen to allege that the Socialist Front cringed before Gandhism. JP clarified that the Socialist Party had not been set up as a rival of the Congress Party; rather it was formed within the Congress to bolster the nationalist movement within the country and also to give proper orientation to it.94 JP was also totally averse to India’s participation in the war. On 31 December, 1941, he issued his famous War Circular No. 2, where he outlined the future policy of the CSP and laid down that, “The war is an important war and Indians cannot fight for Britain in order that Britain holds their country more firmly down. Not even a free India would have anything to do with an imperialist war except to use it to destroy British imperialism elsewhere.”95 Gandhi also opposed the war effort of the British, but his opposition stemmed mainly from his belief in non-violence, where as for JP, it was particularly a matter of anti-imperialism in outlook.
As the positions of the Allied powers began to get feeble in Southeast Asia fearing Japan’s entry into the war, Britain sent foreign troops to India apprehending Japanese aggression. During those whirlwind hours, village after village were displaced to settle the British army personal and, subsequently, the common people as well as leaders were subjected to untold miseries and injustice. Many were put behind the bars. Against that backdrop, Gandhi announced his programme of ‘individual Satyagraha’ which in due course started on 16 October 1940.

JP was arrested for an anti-war speech in Patna and while in prison he prepared a draft on the future Indian social policy and delivered it to Gandhi who put the draft before the Congress Executive. The Congress Executive did not endorse the proposal citing many weaknesses. Later on, Gandhi published it in Harijan Bandhu entitled Shri Jayaprakash’s Picture. In his draft proposal, JP proposed overall reconstruction of the entire village life, such as land to the tiller, encouragement to the small scale industries, communal ownership of the communal production and equal rights for every citizen. Therein, he also deciphered that an independent India must work for cordial relations in every walks of life and steady unity between peoples of various countries, total disarmament and above all peaceful settlement of international disputes and conflicts. Finally, he stressed the importance of social justice and people’s sanction and support for the protection of the community system in the domain of Indian democracy.

At that time, the Indian political situation in India was simmering and simultaneously the Congress distrust of the British gradually increased. It became clear that the British Government had no intention to grant India independence. Nearly 30,000 Congressmen courted arrest during 1940-41 for individual civil disobedience movement. But by the end of 1941, it came to a sudden halt. From the very beginning of this movement, JP had doubts about its quick success and was of the opinion that individual civil disobedience could not satisfy the revolutionary spirit of the youth within the country, and in the later years, his assessment turned out to be true.

Meanwhile, controversy continued to rage within the Congress regarding the overall approach towards the World War. The All India Congress Committee met at Allahabad in May 1942. The main proposal was prepared by Gandhi which was far more radical in nature than the one prepared by Jawaharlal Nehru. Nehru, Lohia and Narendra Deva agreed that the probable end of the British rule at this critical juncture would certainly lead to India’s total subjugation by Japan. JP opined that it was an imperialist war and that they should not align with anyone. Later, Narendra Deva also disapproved of Nehru’s doctrine and in the Allahabad meet, JP, J.B. Kripalani, Rajendra Prasad, Lohia and Vallabhbhai Patel voted in favour of Gandhi’s proposal. As against such severe reservation of the socialist leaders, the AICC industriously requested Gandhi to start a non-violent non-cooperation movement throughout the country. Afterwards all the efforts of co-operation with the Government went unreciprocated. During that time, the Secretary of State for India, Leopold Ameri, criticized the Congress as a Hindu party which intended to act against the interest of the whole nation in order to apply the method of ‘divide and rule.'
Later on, Sir Stafford Cripps came to India on 23 March 1942, as a British government representative. But the Congress leaders’ talks with Cripps remained unfruitful and following this, on 2 April, 1942, the Congress Executive passed its own resolution rejecting the Cripps’ proposal. Finally, on 8 August 1942, in the Bombay session of the Congress the ‘Quit India’ resolution was adopted and from therein, the Congress called upon the people to launch a massive non-violent mass movement throughout the country on the widest scale possible and at this point of time, Gandhi floated his emotive slogan of ‘do or die’ and cautioned the people that in case of sudden arrest of all the prominent Congress leaders, everyone participating in the movement, must lead himself by the power of the inner mind. Alongside, with the use of two simple words, Gandhi immediately asked the British to pack up and go, so that India could mobilise her full strength against a possible Japanese invasion of India. Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and other prominent Congress leaders were arrested and in November, 1942, on the night of Diwali, JP escaped from Hazaribagh jail with five comrades by scaling down the prison walls. Unfortunately, during the August Revolution, labourers were misled by the Communists and peasants were badly crushed by the British Government. The anti-national propaganda by the British Government agencies circulated the impression that the independence movement had started to subside throughout the country and was gradually turning into a futile exercise. Against such false propaganda of the British Government, JP issued a statement that the August Revolution not a total failure. It could not advance partly for lack of full knowledge about it nationwide and partly due to the absence of a proper central organisation of the revolutionary forces in the country. Such was the purport of circular issued by JP where he argued that, “Revolution was invariably the resultant of a tide in the affairs of man.” Although, he confessed that the August Revolution was somewhat impeded, it would not fail to catch its own history throughout the globe.

On 1st January 1943, JP announced that his new programmes of mass revolution throughout the country would be launched from 26 January. At the end of February, he urged in an open letter to peasants, to students and freedom fighters of the country to fight till their last breath in this last struggle of independence. In his book entitled A Dynamic Movement, published in 1953, JP included three letters and candidly explained his future objectives. In these letters, he wrote, “A revolution is not only a destructive process; it is at the same time a great constructive force. No revolution could succeed if it only sought to destroy... Our objective can, therefore, be nothing but victory. There can be no halfway house. There is no compromise between the slogans ‘Quit India’ and ‘National Government’... Either we win or we lose and lose we shall not.” At the same time, JP emphasised the need to throw out the British Government through the means of violence within the nation, and also cautioned that it must not lead to anyone’s unnecessary killing and total bloodshed. Besides this, he also wrote an inspiring letter to the American soldiers fighting the Second World War. In this letter, he wrote, ‘I have learnt patriotism from your country. What are you people doing this time? You have such a glorious tradition of fighting for independence. We are also fighting for the independence of our country.” All these activities of JP, during that time made him the
sole guiding spirit of the country and he emerged as a legendary hero of the anti-imperialist revolution, and the whole nation declared him as the supreme leader of the movement. Moreover, Gandhi praised for his indomitable courage, sacrifice and boundless patriotism. In September 1942, JP went to Nepal and established a guerrilla underground headquarters near the river Kosi, known as ‘Azad Darta’, which was organised mainly for paralysing the machinery of the then British Government. However, in Nepal, the blueprint of the Freedom Brigade was widely circulated and elicited a good response. Following this, in May 1943, JP tried to establish a strong link with the Azad Hind Army led by Subhas Chandra Bose, which entrenched itself well in Burma. Unfortunately, his plan did not materialise on 18 September, 1943, JP was arrested at Amritsar in connection with his anti-British propaganda throughout the nation and he was kept confined in the Lahore Fort where JP was subjected to inhuman torture. During that time, JP wrote a letter to the then Chief Justice of the Lahore High Court. He told the judge that he was neither a member of the Congress Working Committee nor was he in the past an escapist. He also declared: ‘I am particularly anxious to correct this information as I do not wish the Working Committee of the AICC to be in any manner associated with my recent activities and views.’ However, JP did not escape the brutalities perpetrated on him by the Lahore police. Lohia also had to suffer the same fate. In January 1945, both of them were transferred to Agra jail due to this action was taken only after angry public reaction verging almost to an explosion.

In March 1946, the British Cabinet Mission came to India for negotiations with Indian leaders and also to draw up a plan of self-governance for the country. Gandhi made it clear to the Cabinet Mission that unless both Lohia and JP were unconditionally released from jail, the talks would not commence. Later on, both were released unconditionally from the Agra jail on 11 April 1946. By then JP and Lohia had become quite popular throughout the country and were known as the heroes of the August Revolution.

In the Vicinity of Socialist Movement: The Socio-Economic Objectives and Programmes

In the history of the freedom movement of India, 1946 remained the most critical year as well as eventful. In April 1946, JP was released from Agra jail and he immediately declared Congress ideologies as unacceptable on several counts. During that time, as a result of the negotiations the Cabinet Mission and with prominent leaders like Gandhi, Moulana Azad and Jinnah (leader of the Muslim League), the Princes of the native states and various other representatives of different cross-sections of the people and it was decided to form a national ministry instantaneously at the centre. This accord was reached in April 1946. At that time to encourage the national sentiment of the Indian people, as he put it, JP set up ‘Social Study Centres’ in different parts of the country and many important personalities such as Phanishwar Nath Renu, Bhaktmal joined the organization. JP also organised a different kind of political gathering to spread the flavour of Indian socialism and talked about a ‘Second Revolution’ in his various speeches and writings. He did not hide reservations about the Cabinet Mission. In an interview given to the Associated Press, where he expressed his views on the
plans of Cabinet Mission and further, he said: ‘If the present negotiations with the Cabinet Mission breaks down, another struggle cannot be avoided... I would take all steps to be fully prepared this time.’ The failure of the Civil Disobedience Movement, the collapse of Round Table Conferences had given certain rise to an atmosphere of disappointment and despondency in India. Many young Congressmen were then noticed to strongly favour a militant policy and, simultaneously, many became influenced by Marxian thoughts. These newly born Left-wing elements within the Congress, although nationalist in character, started to question the effectiveness of the Gandhian methods of struggle as well as the old-moderate Congress policy. It was also felt by them that ‘the growing communalism in the country was both the cause and the effect for the failure of the Civil Disobedience Movement and the time now has come to create a new mass movement for the final struggle for independence.’ While endorsing this line of political thinking, JP categorically asserted that, ‘the Congress is plainly dominated only by upper class interests and its moderate leaders are uncompromisingly opposed to admit any shortcomings of the party and its future objectives. So, the time has come to aim at the overall economic emancipation of the masses within the country.’

Thomas A Rusch, in his book entitled Role of the Congress Socialist Party in the Indian National Congress: 1931-1942, published in 1955, mentioned that, during that time, the dearth of a strong policy of the then Congress Party as already stated above, led JP to view Indian politics from a class perspective. In that book, Rusch also opined that most of the Congress Socialists being ideologically driven by scientific Marxism preferred to think in terms of mass economic appeal and simultaneously, they also ‘wanted the Congress to organize the masses into class organisations for ‘class struggle’ and eventual revolution under the umbrella of socialism.’

It is important to mention here once again that the CSP in its formative years accepted Marxian techniques to usher a social revolution within the country. JP was the forerunner for the adoption of this technique. Although, the CSP was formed in 1934, the real picture of the party emerged in January 1936, when it adopted the techniques of Marxism as its guiding force in its Second Conference in Meerut. Afterwards, Marxism was officially accepted as the prime agenda of the CSP and it envisioned that the Marxian technique of movement alone could develop the national movement into a real anti-imperialist movement—a movement aiming at freedom from foreign power along with the native system of exploitation.

The socialist struggle in India, JP always championed the cause of both Socialism and Marxism for the well being of the nation and he put emphasis only one theory of socialism i.e., Marxism. In his book entitled Socialism, Sarvodaya and Democracy, published in 1964, he discussed the nature and scope of socialism for Indian soil and wrote that, “The greatest part of the difference between various groups of socialists were based not only on the nature and definition of socialism, but also on the method and tactics of changing the present capitalist society into a socialist one. It requires no explanation to comment that I am talking about the Marxian method of social change within the country.”
On 16 May 1946, Nehru took charge as the Congress President and subsequently, the Viceroy invited him to form the interim Government. Two months later, the AICC convened a meeting in Bombay in order to think over the future prospect of the Cabinet Mission’s plan. Effectively, the Congress was ready to participate in the then Constituent Assembly as proposed by the Mission, but, JP opposed the Congress’s move as its members were to be elected indirectly by the Provincial State Assemblies and not directly by the common people. Later on, the socialist voted against the proposal, and during that time, under the 1935 Act, only 15 percent of the total people had the supreme right to vote in the elections of the Provincial Assemblies. So, JP was of the firm view that the Constituent Assembly was not representative in character, because, 85 percent of the people did not have any role in it. As a result, a disillusioned JP made a categorical announcement that the members of the Socialist Party would not contest the ensuing elections for the Constituent Assembly and felt that the British Cabinet Mission had come not to deliver freedom to India, rather to act as a mediator between the Congress and the Muslim League, respectively. He told the AICC, solemnly that the Congress must prepare the nation for another struggle.

For the success of any socialist revolution in India, both JP and the other Congress Socialists were convinced that there existed an inherent dichotomous contradiction between the land-owning and the capitalist classes on one hand, and the vast masses of the people on the other. At the same time, they also felt it was really necessary to bring this conflict at grass root level. With this objective in view, the Congress Socialists, therefore, were mainly eager to organise the workers and peasants into one fold and, simultaneously, convert the Congress gradually into an effective organization for the common masses within the country. Unlike Nehru, the socialists had hardly any faith on the parliamentary method. They believed that legislature was a platform for propagating their real objectives. G.S. Bhargava, in his book JP’s Jail Life, published in 1977, clearly opined that, “during that time, the political strategy advocated by the Congress Socialists were very much positive and clear cut. It stood for a massive freedom struggle including no-tax campaigns, occupation of landlord’s surplus land by the farmers and strikes by industrial workers to generate a revolutionary situation in which power could be seized from the British.” In the same book, he further enumerated that, “The ideological flavour of the CSP was fully based on Lenin’s ideas contained in his famous work ‘State and Revolution: the Marxist Theory of the State and the Tasks of the Proletariat in the Revolution.’

In fact, during that time, by and large, a great deal of ideological change occurred in the mind of JP in terms of the development for a future socialist revolution within the country and in order to achieve this goal, he always talked of a ‘Second Revolution’ and his perception of it was quite different from other socialist leaders in the then CSP. In his Presidential speech at the Seventh Annual Conference of the Socialist Party, held at Nasik, between March 19 and 21, 1948 he sounded very optimistic and said that, ‘In this struggle we shall not be arrested, rather we shall arrest. The collector, the commissioner, the Governor, the Viceroy etc. everyone will be arrested.’ Later on, socialist leader Shishir Kumar in his article entitled JP: Steering Wheel of the Indian Socialism, published in Mankind, in 1963, he wrote that, “JP embarked on its full preparation. In
Chapter-IV: The Revolutionary Search of Jayaprakash Narayan and the Way Out

Nepal, the soldiers of Azad Dasta were collecting arms for an armed struggle. JP did not think of the Gandhian Satyagraha then. He wanted to combine the freedom struggle as well as the class struggle within the country.”

In that article, he also conclusively wrote that, “There is hardly any scope to doubt that the Congress Socialists discarded the politics of petitions and prayers and ultimately decided to tread the path of socialist revolution. The purpose of a socialist revolution is to build up a socialist society. But the task of building up a new society is not an easygoing process.”

Echoing this view JP, in his book entitled Three Basic Problems of Free India, published in 1962, wrote, “In the history of class-struggle, every exploiting class has always defended to the last existing relations of production i.e., the existing property relations. It has been possible to defend them and their class-interest as it is the possessor of state power.”

However, another important reason why JP came under Gandhi’s influence was his attitude towards Class War which the Congress Socialists had highlighted in their policies and programme since the inception of the CSP. Later on, in his book entitled Problem of the Country and Gramdan (translated in English), published in 1968, JP tried to differentiate his ideas from Gandhi’s in the then socio-political context and wrote that, “with the impact of Gandhism, the ideological stand changes when I clearly say that the course of true socialism is not Class Warfare as is falsely described.”

In his book entitled Lok Swarajya (translated in English), published in 1974, JP mentioned that since 1940, in different platforms of the Socialist Party within India. He had tirelessly described his socio-political philosophy as democratic socialism and categorically propounded during this period that he was also influenced by Western Democratic values. Later, Brahmanand in his book entitled Towards Total Revolution: India and Her Problems, Vol.III, reiterated that JP’s effective gradual inclination towards Gandhism was detectable in his theory building process more particularly after 1948. In that book, he further mentioned that, “…going to clarify the technique of struggle for bringing about socialism in India, JP unequivocally suggested the democratic method”. Brahmanand in the same book, also tried to illustrate the then Indian socio-political condition which impelled JP, to ponder over the method of democratic socialism in order to provide an efficient formula to usher a socialist revolution in its truest form and further wrote that, “to him, democratic method did not merely mean taking resort to parliamentary or constitutional method but also non-violent mass movements which might be unconstitutional but peaceful.”

According to Brahmanand, JP under Gandhian influence indubitably was for relentless struggles within the country under the socialist flavour and at the same time, as a technique of struggle he unquestionably prescribed Satyagraha—a Gandhian technique of struggle. Finally, in the same book, in conclusive note about JP and his socialist struggles, Brahmanand argued that, “in an attempt to re-interpret socialism to India, the Congress Socialist (then renamed Socialists) finally titled towards Gandhi. During that time, JP was far more categorical to assert that the first aspect of Gandhism that must interest the socialist was its moral or ethical basis, its repeated insistence on decent value for an ideal Indian society.”

From the brief outline given above on the evolution of JP’s thought process, it can be said that JP was essentially a social revolutionary as also a devoted nationalist. That looking glass his ideological position seems to be far more understandable. Unlike
Gandhi, for the success of the Indian national struggle, he did not take any rigid stand especially on non-violence but rather preferred to use violent methods, if necessary. Though his faith in Marxism was on the wane, he did not fully lose hope even in 1946. In fact, Gandhian values became apparent in JP’s socio-political thinking in the late forties, more particularly after the assassination of Gandhi and while explaining the cause of the major influence of Gandhi over him, JP honestly confessed that, “The presence of Gandhiji in our midst was a powerful guarantee of civil liberties and people’s freedom in India. In his absence, the dangers of authoritarianism and totalitarianism have severely grown up.”

In the post-Gandhian era, the most striking feature on JP’s thought process remained that he was finally convinced that politics must not be dominated by the mere pursuit of power. Moreover, in the absence of Gandhi in India’s socio-political context, since 1948, JP for the first time raised the issue of ethics in politics and also emphasized the importance of adhering to the Gandhian ideal of the purity of the means. In the research method of social science, this is utterly important so far as his methodology of social revolution is concerned. Before India’s independence, the CSP was primarily pre-occupied with the struggle for self-determination. After independence, their primary concern switched over to building up a Socialist State under Marxian guidelines and for this task of rebuilding the nation; they felt the urgent need to redefine their objectives and social policies. Before India’s independence, a severe ideological crisis had gripped the CSP for the sole adoption of Marxism as a strong parameter. In 1937, in an important CSP party meet; JP provided a thesis on the necessity of Marxism. But this failed to adequately impress the other socialist veterans in the party. S. Das Gupta, in his book entitled Total Revolution - A Symposium, published in 1978, has briefly discussed the then social and oral account of that particular period in Indian history and elaborated that, “under these circumstances, rethinking amongst the Indian socialists was bound to be there, even in terms of the dialectics of Socialism.” Moreover, S.Das Gupta further wrote that, “It was evident that in the early part of the 1940s, JP was ideologically prepared to accept non-violence as a creed. From it appears that though he did not renounce Marxism at this stage, his faith in Marxism was diminishing. At the same time, JP was aware of the possibility of the resistance by the exploiting class and for this reasons, he pleaded for the use of the coercive arm of the state. As the matter has already been discussed in the previous paragraph, it needs no elaboration. Suffice to say that JP subscribed to the ‘Marxist thesis of Seizure of State power’. Besides, he was convinced that the socialist relies in other words, on the forces of class struggle in society and endeavours to organize the oppressed and exploited for the overall destruction of the present basis of society and, simultaneously, the creation of a new one, whereupon he will build the new society.”

Meanwhile, on 12 July 1946, JP made a Press statement against the so-called Congress decision to participate in the Constituent Assembly. Later on, in his book entitled A Survey of Socialism, published in 1981, he candidly wrote that, “The Constituent Assembly was the creation of the British and it could never bring us the freedom that India had been fighting for years. The British Cabinet Mission had not come to deliver freedom to India, but to play the mediator between the Congress and the
League. The Constituent Assembly, as shaped by the British Government, was not the outcome of the strength of the Indian people.”\textsuperscript{138} JP had suggested to the AICC at that time that the Congress must prepare the country towards another struggle for independence and on 23 November, 1946 at the AICC meeting held in Meerut, while moving a resolution on the Congress manifesto, JP uttered that “the Committee members of the Constituent Assembly were competent enough to decide the overall shape of Swaraj in the light of the current manifesto of the Congress Party. For Swaraj cannot be real for the common masses unless it makes possible the achievement of a society in which democracy extends from the political to the social and economic spheres, and in which there would be no opportunity for privileged classes to exploit the bulk of the people, nor for gross inequalities such as exists at present. Such a society would ensure individual liberty, equality of opportunity and the fullest scope for every citizen for development of his personality.”\textsuperscript{139} JP’s proposal was rejected by the Congress leadership and the rejection frustrated him severely. He resigned from the Congress Working Committee in 1946.

In February 1947, the CSP, at its Kanpur Session, immediately decided to drop the word ‘Congress’ from the Party’s title in order to assume a new identity and emerged as an independent Socialist Party within India.\textsuperscript{140} This stand of the CSP was not endorsed by Gandhi. He stood against the Socialist leaders going out of the Congress. He also requested the socialists not to commit split among them. The Congress had accepted the socialist political programme of the CSP in its ‘Quit India’ resolution of 1942 and had also placed the socialist economic goals in its 1946 election manifesto.\textsuperscript{141} The Congress had as well accepted and accommodated the Socialist leaders by adopting some of their objective ideas for Congress reorganisation and at the same time offered them a minority status in the Congress Working Committee, the Constituent Assembly and above all Nehru’s Provisional Cabinet. This compromising Congress outlook had led socialist leaders like JP and Narendra Deva to negotiate and reconcile, and further delayed the Socialist withdrawal from the Congress for achieving acceptance of their total programme with a hope of an effective position within the Congress leadership.\textsuperscript{142} Inspired by this outlook of the Congress leadership, JP, in his Employees’ Unions speech in 1946 at Nasik, threw the gauntlet to the Indian people to fight against the British Government. In the Nasik conference, he gave a call “to cripple the administration totally, as in 1942, by a complete industrial strike in order to form an independent government. To make India a free country, you would barge into the secretariats and also take control of the offices and put British Government officials behind bars. I am convinced that the flame of revolution would raze the edifice of imperialism to the ground. Furthermore, I oppose the idea of making the right to property a fundamental right. This is a pointer of my vision.”\textsuperscript{143}

In fact, apart from all this above mentioned issues plaguing the nation during that time, JP always gave primacy to the problem of Hindu-Muslim unity in India, and for that the country’s vivisection on Hindu-Muslim accord was not at all acceptable to him and he fostered the hope that the national leaders would not accept independence at the cost of partition of the country. He was never opposed to the right of self-determination and considered it as an inherent right of a community or a nationality. In his book
entitled *History of Socialism*, published in 1939, he said that this right should be taken recourse to only if the experiment in joint nationhood badly failed within the country and mentioned that, “... the Congress would have no difficulty in guaranteeing this right to the federating units in India, provided there was a genuine desire to stand as a united nation and to preserve national unity to the utmost extent possible. The Congress would do this precisely in the hope and belief that the experiment in united nationhood would soon remove suspicion and cement the bonds that naturally exists among all sections of the Indian people.” Gandhi, like JP; subsequently held the same opinion about the possible partition of the country and mentioned that the Congress must not support it under any circumstances and firmly declared that the British have to quit India without any stipulated condition and argued that, “if the partition of the country is at all to take place it may be done after they leave. He suggested that the Viceroy should invite Jinnah to form a Muslim League Government. The Congress should bolster it if he works in the interest of all the people of the country.”

The Congress Working Committee ignored Gandhi’s views and finally accepted the Cabinet Mission’s plan. Later on, in the last phase of freedom struggle in India, the country saw in 1946, communal conflagration engulfing Bihar and the other areas. After Gandhi’s assassination in 1948 JP formed ‘Indo-Pak Reconciliation Committee’ because, he fervently felt that the mutual development of the two neighbouring countries were directly proportional to their own cordial relations. Similarly, on the Kashmir issue, he held a view different from other socialist leaders in the country. Initially, on Kashmir he favoured a plebiscite but gradually his approach changed. Later on, in 1964, while addressing at the Annual Conference of the West Bengal Gandhi Memorial Trust, where he reiterated, “the Partition had not solved a single problem. When Gandhi propounded the concept of ‘Basic Democracy’ in which he supported total decentralization of power and unity amongst developing nations, I was all praise for it. I say that the concept of basic democracy is coterminous with sarvodaya.” In 1948, at the Nasik Conference, the Congress resolution of banning political parties within the Congress forced the Socialists finally to break away from the former.

To JP and other Socialist leaders of the CSP, the real meaning of Swaraj was not simply the ending of colonial rule from the country, but the emancipation of the common masses from exploitation and abject injustice. K C Jena, in his book entitled *Contributions of JP to Political Philosophy*, where he briefly mentioned that since 1948, the initial performance of the Congress Governments offered little hope towards an overall radical social and economic programme in the country, which led the socialists finally into breaking away from the old Party. In the same book, he further wrote, “the Congress Socialists also gave a lead to those who were rapidly losing faith in so-called Congress national policies. The situation has not improved since 1947; on the contrary, it has given a serious setback to the process of radical social change within the nation.”

In 1948, the Socialist Party last save by-election in the country due to the manoeuvrings of the Congress and also lack of proper political awakening among the common masses. As a result, the Socialist Party from 1948 to 1951 concentrated on the task of re-building and re-modernizing the Party. In 1949, a severe food crisis hit
India especially in the village areas and during that time JP toured the whole nation and witnessed the dire misery of the people. He vehemently criticised the then Congress government’s policy. This event frustrated JP severely and as a result, he tried to find out an alternative way to give relief to the common masses of India. The changing mindset of JP was immediately reflected in the Annual Session of the Socialist Party held at Madras in June 1950. In this meeting, internal conflicts already started fomenting within the Party with reference to its political stand towards USA or Soviet Union and China became clear. Lohia strongly maintained the view that ‘the Party must not take sides either with America or with the Communist countries like Soviet Russia and China.’ As this disagreement on the above mentioned issue flared up into a major rift, Narendra Deva and Lohia preferred to stay away from the Madras Session. Later on, in the Madras Session JP took the Chairmanship of the meeting and presented a thesis synthesizing both Karl Marx and Gandhi on democratic socialism and he expressed his personal belief which ultimately stirred the participants into a soul-searching process. In the same Madras meeting, he also read a paper on ‘Democratic Socialism’, which, more or less affirmed the Party’s commitment to ‘democratic’ as opposed to ‘totalitarian’ socialism. The speech created an impression that JP ultimately wanted to bridge the gap between Marx and Gandhi by adopting the methodology of Satyagraha. Moreover, in this meeting, the majority opinion of the Party was in favour of JP and Lohia, who stood for Democratic Socialism and wholeheartedly supported the touch of Gandhian colour into the Socialist movement of India. In 1951, while reiterating his political commitment towards Gandhi, JP at a public meeting held in Gujarat said, “Gandhi was social revolutionary of an exceptionally original kind, and he has made contributions to social thought and the methodology of social change that constitutes imperishable contributions to human progress and civilization.” It can be said that signs of Gandhi’s influence on JP’s socio-political thinking had been there since the late 1940s, after which his views gradually shifted towards Gandhi’s ideas of social reconstruction in India. In 1951-52, as Independent India remained busy to prepare for its First General Elections, major ideological differences and bickering among the CSP leaders made an adverse effect on the prospects of the Socialist Party in the General Elections. In the post election period, while assessing the miserable defeat of the CSP, it was identified by them that the major cause for the defeat of the party candidates in different parts of India was its Marxian expression. As a result in the coming years, the overall strength of the CSP went down considerably, with differences among party leaders on various ideological and policy matters and also the adoption of some socialist programmes by the then Congress Party.

In the post-independence period, a qualitative change seems to have taken place in JP after the assassination of Gandhi in 1948. In 1949, with the renunciation of dialectical materialism, JP gave a new orientation and thrust to the ideology and policies of the Socialist Party. Under JP’s constant ideological influence, the CSP, over the years moved from being a predominantly Leninist oriented Party it moved more towards Gandhian ideas. In August 1952, JP met Vinoba Bhave and became influenced by his Gramdan Movement and in 1954, he joined this movement and became a jeevandani and
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thereby renounced party and power politics and finally served as one of the leading spokesmen of the Bhoomdan movement for 20 long years.

However, in the history of Sampurna Kranti in India, JP’s finest hour had come on January 8, 1974 and in the subsequent years. He called upon the nation to fight against corruption along with the steep erosion of moral values. It was an essential part of his call for Total Revolution in India.\textsuperscript{156} According to JP, the main idea of Total Revolution aims at bringing about a complete change in the then structure and system of the Indian social policy and society. Subsequently, in his Prison Diary published in 1977, he tried to elucidate the multiple aims of his ‘Total Revolution’ ideas, in order to remove all the ills which prevailed during that time in the Indian societal structure.

Impact of Gandhi on Jayaprakash Narayan: Faith in ‘Lokniti’

Although a strong believer in Marxism, JP never became a protagonist of Russian Communism and developed a deep moral revulsion against the prevailing atrocities of Russian Bolshevik Party. Pragmatically speaking, in the 1930s, he often favoured an United Popular Front with the Communists in India but, in 1940, he denounced then strongly, and became one of the foremost critics of the authoritarian regimentation as followed by the then Russian Communists.\textsuperscript{157} The changing mindset of JP towards the Russian Communists and the seclusion policy followed by the Communists staying away from the national movements in various colonial countries throughout the globe, which appeared to JP contrary to Marxist theory generally and specifically towards the famous ‘Colonial Policy’ as enunciated by Lenin.\textsuperscript{158} He also did not like the dictatorial regime in the then Soviet Russia and gradually ideologically started drifting from them. All this major reasons made him ideologically differ with the then Communist leaders of India. Naturally, in the passage of time, JP kept himself away from the CPI and simultaneously joined the ranks of soldiers of freedom fighters under the sole leadership of Gandhi. But, Marxism left its own imprints in his mind and he could not commit himself wholeheartedly to the then Congress policy and action, in spite of the famous Karachi Declaration of 1931.\textsuperscript{159} He never totally endorsed the Karachi Resolution, which appeared to him quite inadequate and felt that the Congress failed to provide a constructive programme to the common masses with a socialist fervour suited for the country’s overall development and for the fight for total independence in a more pragmatic revolutionary way. In his book entitled Socialist Unity and the Congress Socialist Party, published in 1941, JP briefly discussed that he was a complete Gandhian and later on, while building his theory of revolution suited for the Indian soil, he slowly drifted towards accepting Gandhi’s ideology as his life philosophy. He also deciphered in this book that under Gandhi and Vinoba’s constant influence, he had unwavering faith in the integrity of lokniti.\textsuperscript{160} Gandhi, like M.N.Roy, always stood for total strengthening of people’s power in India as he was of the view that the state alone was not entirely capable of bringing about any meaningful change in society and therefore, after the dawn of Independence, he immediately suggested to transform the Congress into a ‘Loksevak Sangh’.

JP in his book To All Fighter for Freedom, published in 1946, argued that he was greatly influenced by reading the book of Roy entitled India’s Problems and Its Solution
(1923) and honestly confessed that he had wanted to keep himself away from direct power- politics within the nation from the beginning. In this book, he also highlighted that he never liked the formation of the Constituent Assembly under Nehru’s prime leadership and never contested any elections in his whole life. In the same book, in a conclusive note, he wrote that, “There have been many big revolutions in the world. There was revolution in France, there was revolution in Russia, America became independent, that was also a revolution, and revolution took place in China. All these revolutions of the world were successful, but what happened after that? It is to be noted that in every revolution the biggest leader of the revolution occupied the highest position of his country; he took the reins of the Government in his hand. Everyone assumed power in order to accomplish the aims of revolution, to achieve the aims of change, to build up a new society. The movement for the Indian independence was the noblest mass movement. It was not politics, i.e., State politics; rather it was lokniti, i.e., people’s politics.”

Although, JP was highly moulded with many aspects of Gandhian philosophy, being a Marxist follower, he did not like Gandhi’s criticism of violent means for ushering revolution in the country. Rather he was for dismantling the British administration by violent means through guerrilla warfare. In a book, entitled Inside the Lahore Fort, published in 1959, JP mentioned that during the pre-independence period, he maintained a Jail Diary to write down his secret plans and advice for the socialist party workers in India. While synthesizing his ideology with Marx and Gandhi, in the same book, he classified Gandhi’s policies on nation building and wholeheartedly believed that Gandhi had done the greatest service towards the nation by teaching the method of civil- disobedience to the country-people. In another book, entitled A picture of Sarvodaya Social Order, published in 1961, JP illustrated that during the pre-independence period, he swayed slowly with fascination for non-violence under Gandhian line of thinking and expressed that the Bolshevik revolution and the subsequent events in the then world history had left a permanent impression on his ideology. In this book, he also highlighted that under the impact of the Gandhian revolution, he had realised that the purity of means was an essential prerequisite for attaining a pious aim within Indian society. JP’s conviction regarding Gandhi was also reflected in his report as the General Secretary at the Sixth National Conference of the Socialist Party, held in Madras in 1948. Here he reiterated that, “unless the means is pure, socialism cannot be realised. There are many things that Gandhi taught us. But the greatest thing he taught us was that means are ends, that evil means can never lead to good ends and that fair ends require fair means... but good means will enable us to reach the goal of a good society, which is socialism.”

In his book The Need to Rethink on India’s Problem, published in 1964, JP opined on the question of Muslim League that Jinnah was a traitor and added that, “It is necessary to grasp clearly that the League is in league with Britain. Mr Jinnah is a deliberate traitor to his country, a Mir Jafar of the present day... Let Muslims remember that it is not the sons of Mir Jafar who rule Bengal today but the dirty kin of Clive. Mr. Jinnah no doubt considers himself a very clever person, but for all his conceit and bohemian attitudes, history will show him to have been made a historic fool... Therefore, Mr. Jinnah shrieks his demand for Pakistan in the face of Gandhi. But poor Gandhi is not in possession of Jinnah’s sacred homelands.”
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After Gandhi’s assassination in 1948, JP’s changing mindset of his earlier political philosophy shocked all his loyalists. Being a believer in Marxism, he was uttered the urgent need of spiritual revivalism. This metamorphosis in his thinking was clearly reflected at the Nasik Conference of the Socialist Party, in 1948 where he uttered that, “when in a statement the other day. I talked of the need of spiritual regeneration; some of you might have thought perhaps that I had been so deeply shaken by recent happenings that I was trying to escape from the hard realities of life. I have no knowledge of matters spiritual, if the term is understood in a religious or metaphysical sense.”

In the post-independence period, as a Gandhite, JP wanted a free India, where the kernel of the social structure must consist of not only equity and justness but also on the method of morality and integrity. JP in his book From Socialism to Sarvodaya, published in 1959, wrote that Erich Fromm had a significant impact on the shaping of his mental make-up and mentioned that he was immensely impressed by Fromm’s book ‘Fear of Freedom’, when he read this book in Lahore Jail during the pre-independence period. Reading this book, JP propounded the concept of Human Socialism under the influence of Western Liberalism, which eventually placed man at the centre of attraction. Unlike M.N.Roy, JP called it ‘Democratic Socialism’ with slight alterations from Scientific Marxism, and wanted to evolve it as an indigenous ideology. I shall now briefly discuss the main ideological content of Jayaprakash Narayan’s socio-political thought.

Marxist Way of Reconstruction and Marxism Re-examined

In 1929, JP returned to India from the U.S.A. as a confirmed Marxist and did not join the then Communist Party of India. During that time, he saw the Communist Party as a follower of the Comintern instructions and as an orthodox Marxist; he admired Russia for her achievements in order to build up a socialist revolution in the country. Simultaneously, he believed that the Indian Communists must be brought back to the proper course in order to adjust with Indian the then socio-political scenario. It was natural that under the spell of Marxism, JP would be deeply impressed by the Marxian philosophy of Revolution and its various dynamics. His Marxist fervour made him see Marxism as a surer and quicker road towards the freedom of a country along with the emancipation from the thraldom of uncountable misery and wretchedness of the people. The thrilling triumph of Lenin in the then Soviet Union seemed to him to establish beyond doubt the supremacy of the Marxian way to revolution. Later on, in his book entitled Planning India’s Future, published in 1960, he declared that Marxism stood for overall equality and brotherhood in the country. He interpreted the word ‘freedom’ in a clinical sense and gradually showed his inclination towards Marxism and added: “Freedom must include freedom from exploitation, from hunger, from poverty. What were the major reasons behind my early experiences with Marxism, which laid the foundations in the subconscious mind during that period? But the latent sympathy certainly was there, and it was awakened and brought to the surface of conscious living by the idea of Marxism. At that time I was not very certain about Gandhi’s stand on the vital question of equality which captivated me as much as the ideal of freedom.”
In yet another book entitled Humanist Approach to Politics, published in 1958, explained that he had been in the quest for a new political faith, not only for any personal reason, but also for the cause of individual freedom and human progress in the context of the then Indian socio-political scenario. As a believer in Scientific Marxism, he judged every political system on the basis of its adequate feasibility- viability means along with moral propriety in Indian conditions. In 1957, he wrote a book entitled The Evolution towards Sarvodaya. Here he briefly mentioned that he did not seem to be sorry for frequently changing his political faith from time to time, because it always provided him with a better and more objective outlook necessary for the Indian condition. In this book, while explaining his inclination towards Marxism as a flourishing idea, he mentioned that his knowledge of the then Marxist literature was wide and profound, which prompted him to understand deeper implications of this philosophy. As a believer in the Marxist theory of Revolution, he had gone through most of the writings of M.N. Roy and therefore, like Roy, he looked to Marxism for an answer towards the then problems of national self-determination and socio-economic advancement of India.

Before analysing JP’s belief on Marxism, it is important to highlight briefly the Socialist—Communist ideological differences evolved within the CSP, followed by the Ramgarah Conference, where severe mutual political suspicions emerged between the Socialist and the Communist leaders and eventually the latter were expelled the latter from the Party in 1940. This occurrence left a deep impression on JP’s mind and sensibilities and subsequently, created a great revulsion in his entire thought-process towards the ways and methods of Communism practised in India during that time. Later on, in his book entitled Ideological Problems of Socialism, published in 1953, JP briefly elaborated his ideological confluences with Gandhi and Marx along with the effect of the indigenous ideas to develop the country. He also mentioned that during that time, the impact of Gandhism was profoundly created a deep-rooted impact on him. As a Marxist, JP realised that the conditions prevailing in India were different compared to Russia or other Communist or Socialist countries around the globe.

Later on, in his book entitled Lok Swarajya (translated in English), published in 1974, he meticulously discussed the major rationale behind his Marxian predisposition and wrote: “My fundamental sympathy for Marx arose from his belief that a relentless passion for social and economic justice was the driving force in Marx’s life as it was in my own. Marx transformed the fears of the workers into hopes and therefore translated their effort from interest in political mechanisms to interest in social foundations. The experience of poverty and suffering reinforced my faith in the noble purpose of Marx, which aimed at the emancipation of the people.” In the same book, JP also forthrightly confessed that he was Marxist and a social democrat. In the pages of world history, since 1928, the paralysing effects of the great depression became more and more evident throughout the globe and consequently, he seemed to move closer to the Marxist position that a violent revolution in such a condition would be essential, and felt that the Gandhian technique of peaceful revolution through persuasion and non-cooperation would not be much effective and successful, because Marxism provided socialism with a programme along with a philosophy rooted more in the objective facts rather than Gandhism.
In another book entitled *The Concept of Lok Sakti*, published in 1970, JP opined that he remained a Marxist till 1940 and the final parting from Marxism, however, came in 1952, when he went on a three week fast at Poona. While explaining his dissociation from the ideology of Marxism, in the same book he wrote, “My final break with Marxism, though not with politics, had come during the three weeks fast at Poona (1952). It was then that a long process of questioning started by the Russian purges came to an end and it because clear that materialism as a philosophical outlook could not provide any basis for ethical conduct and any incentive for goodness.”

He further confessed that as a socialist, he was immensely inspired by Marxism, and was never a doctrinaire Marxist. He had lost faith in Communist ideology since the latter had converted Marxism into a mere dogma. Subsequently, he felt that Marxism in India would have to be applied - practised creatively and not dogmatically and wrote, “Today, with a vastly developed store of human knowledge and vastly greater experience and observation of capitalist society, we are in a position to make far greater approximations to the truth than Marx.”

Later on, in an article entitled *Problem of National Reconstruction* published in *Janata*, in 1959, he wrote: “Communism: there was one party rule—without freedom to organise any rival political associations—no civil liberties and total control of national economy, education, agriculture, press etc. I am against the system of Statism or State capitalism and I believe that there should be dispersal of ownership at various levels, so that an economic dictatorship does not arise.”

In the same article, he further mentioned: “Marx had himself clearly conceived two ways, that is, peaceful and violent for achieving socialism. Which of the two ways should be adopted would depend on the conditions prevailing in a particular country.” In fact, in the quest for his political journey, JP regarded Marxism as an unprincipled philosophy, because according to him, “it believed in the principle that the end should justify the means. In Marxism any means are good means provided they serve the ends of the social revolution. Thus, Marxism as a philosophy action is amoral.”

Furthermore, JP in another book entitled *To My Communist Friends*, published in 1956, effectively questioned the Marxian prophecy and wrote: “In the ideal society, that is Stateless society, the State would wither away… in place of the State withering away, it had become more powerful and totalitarian in Russia.” While reiterating his own understanding of Marxism, at the Nasik Conference of the Socialist Party held in March 19-21, 1948, he said: “The experience of totalitarian countries, whether Fascist or Communist, has shown that if the State is looked upon as the sole agent of social reconstruction, we get nothing but a regimented society in which the State is all powerful and the individual is made a cog in a vast inhuman machine. In this Conference, JP also disparaged Marxism as it was practised in the then Soviet Russia and vehemently criticized each and every aspect of Marxian philosophy before propounding his idea of Democratic Socialism. Democratic ideology stood practically distorted in the then Soviet Russia, and was to him sporadic, piecemeal and less comprehensive.”

Like JP, Narendra Deva in an article entitled *Mr. Nehru Blunders*, published in *Janata*, in 1956, criticized Marxism from the standpoint of international Communism,
JP, on the other hand, wanted to relate it with the then Indian situation. Like Narendra Deva, at the third All-India Conference of the Radical Democratic Party, held in Bombay from December 26-29, 1946, JP warned the Indian socialists to learn a lesson from the experience. In this Conference, he said: “Marxism could not be practised in India in the same manner as in Russia. There remained deep and far-reaching differences in regard to the circumstances, ethos, culture and tradition of these two countries. I appeal to the Indian Communists, to declare their independence of Moscow and to choose their own road towards socialism. Gandhism is not only an alternative to Marxism but a much superior and suitable replacement ideology for India.” While explaining his ideological shift from Marxism to Democratic Socialism in a book entitled Swaraj for the People, published in 1961, JP mentioned that since the beginning of his long political journey, he was basically committed to the cause of social revolution and where Marxism appeared to him as the only guiding philosophy to achieve this end and for that he principally accepted the Soviet model for the experiment of Marxism in India. Unfortunately, since the late 1940s, the case because different as he ceased to accept the Soviet model for the application of Socialism in India and deciphered that the incidents of purges and trials under Stalin’s regime had only strengthened his doubts about the Soviet experiment. JP in another book entitled Educational Ideas and Problems of Peace, published in 1965, also categorically expressed: “I did not give up my faith in Marxism, and gradually inclined towards Gandhism and some of the Western values of Democracy. The result of all this was my preference to use the phrase Democratic Socialism rather than Marxism. This evolutionary process constituted one of the cardinal aspects of my concept of power and politics under the Marxian line of thinking.”

Socialism with an Indian Face: Jayaprakash Views on People’s Socialism

In the history of the Indian socialist movement, JP worked as a socialist follower from 1930 to 1954. During that time, he was the foremost leader, propagandist and spokesman of Indian socialism. In an article entitled Kranti Ke Adhunik Prayog (translated in English), published in Janata in 1941, Gandhi accepted JP as the greatest source of authority on Indian socialism. In this article Gandhi expressed that, “He not only took the initiative in the formation of the Indian Socialist Party in 1934, but also showed a remarkable genius in popularizing the party and its various programmes.” In another article entitled Relevance of JP to Our Time, published in Janata, in 1970, M.L.Sen, the then Chairman of the Radical Humanist Association (Bihar Unit), wrote: “In 1940, JP was of the view that even if Marxism was not renounced, violence and dictatorship could not be accepted as the inevitable conditions for the success of socialism. He was aware of the evil effects of dictatorship of the then Soviet regime but his faith in Marxist ideology did not disappear. Though his faith in Marxism remained intact, he, at the same time, held the view that Soviet planning was based on over-centralization and suppression of individual freedom.” However, Erich Fromm’s The Fear of Freedom strongly influenced JP and in this respect, he particularly welcomed Fromm’s prescription of democratic socialism for safeguarding and honouring human values, where he placed the individual at the centre of attraction, in order to yield the
fruits of socialism in India. Later on, in his book entitled *Dimension for Double Revolution*, published in 1970, JP wrote: “While working for the total establishment of a socialist society in India, due attention must be paid not only to the material aspect of life, but also to the human aspect. I also emphasize that there could be no socialism without the proper flow of democracy and I want such a society where the cherished human values would be duly honoured.”

While building his own vision of Indian socialism, JP regarded this philosophy as a complete theory of socio-economic reconstruction. According to him “socialism is a theory and technique of widespread planning. It involves a technological reconstruction of the total aspects of society. Between 1929 and 1946, I was an ardent believer in Marxian socialism. But at no stage, I was attracted towards the Indian or the Russian Communist and at that time, regarded socialism as an economic principle.”

In another book entitled *The Objective of Socialism: What the Socialist Party Strives For* (Speech delivered at the Kanpur Socialist Party Conference, 1947), published in 1962, he discussed that the aim of socialism should be to eradicate the economic inequality prevailing in Indian society and emphasized to stop concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. In this book, while talking about his own idea about the trajectory of Indian socialism, he wrote: “There would be social ownership of the means of production. This is my picture of socialism; It is a society, in which all are workers—a classless society. It is a society, in which human labour is not subject to exploitation with interest of private property, in which all wealth is truly national—in which there are no unearned incomes and no large economic disparities in which human life and progress are planned and where all live for all.”

In this same book, he said that it was in 1934 that he realized socialism could be the real basis of India’s freedom and highlighted the resolution submitted in the Ramgarh Congress held in 1940, where he advocated for collective ownership and total control of all large-scale and heavy production and emphasized that the state should nationalize heavy transport, shipping, mining and the heavy industries. This conviction on socialism by JP showed impact of the imported ideas of American and British socialists.

Later, JP, in another book entitled *Is Violence an Alternative?*, published in 1973, expressed his bitter-sweet experience of working with the then Communists in the CSP as well as the role and impact of the Soviet Union, which had a lifelong effect on his mind. Moreover, he also said in this book that such facts and incidents led him to question, for the first time, some of the basic postulates of Marxism and at the end he wrote: “The most striking feature was that still my faith in Marxism remained intact and unbroken and I myself claimed to be a Marxist.” Finally, while clarifying his moral philosophy of Democratic Socialism, JP in the same book, wrote: “Socialism which Marx pictured was the socialism which we are trying to describe by the term democratic socialism. Only that socialism can bring about, the emancipation of toilers and no other.”

Like Marx, JP believed that “Material forces affect the individual and social institutions and dialectical materialism provided the basis of a socialist’s inquiry into the causes of inequality.” Later on, in a book entitled *Communitarian Society and...*
Panchayati Raj (ed. by Brahmanand), published in 1970, he re-examined the basic postulates of Marxism and their practical application by the so-called Communists in India. In the post-independence period, like a true Gandhite, and on the basis of his personal experiences about Marxism in practice, where he felt that in a society it was possible for the people to bring about social change in Indian society by democratic means, and, simultaneously, it would be counter-revolutionary to resort to violence. In the same book, he further mentioned that socialism could not exist, nor be created, in the absence of democratic freedom and as a logical corollary, he rejected the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which in effect meant ‘the dictatorship of a bureaucratic oligarchy.’

While substantiating his viewpoint and recapitulating his old impressions about Marxism and the Soviet Union, JP, in another book, published in 1956, entitled From Socialism to Savodaya, wrote: “…the home of Communism; The Russian revolution had started as a people’s revolution that had the active support of the broad masses of Czarist Russia, but Lenin converted it into a minority revolution when he forcibly dissolved the Constituent Assembly in which he was in a small minority and seized power with the help of rebel soldiers and the urban working class. The subsequent miscarriage of the revolution and distortion of socialism to my mind was the direct result of a forcible seizure of power by a minority.”

In 1936 JP, in another book, titled Why Socialism?, methodically analysed the class organisation in Indian society and wrote: “The Indian bourgeois could not lead the anti-imperialist movement. I state that, they had always been in league with and compromise with British imperialism”. On the need to popularize the socialist movement and experimenting with the mass forces in India, he wrote that, “The masses are the only classes in India, which are uncompromising anti-imperialist. They alone stand for the complete independence of the country. Others either openly ridicule and oppose the idea or only pay lip-service to it.” Thus, as a core Marxist, JP stood for overall social and economic equality in Indian society and reiterated that “socialism to me is also a theory and technique of comprehensive planning for the betterment of the country. It involves a technological re-construction and re-enactment of the total aspects of society. Its aims are the harmonious and well balanced growth of the whole society.” At the same pace, JP strongly criticized the inadequacy and failure of the Karachi Congress of 1931 ‘Resolution on Fundamental Rights.’ JP, like M.N.Roy stood for the reduction of land revenue, the limitation of consumption expenditure and nationalization of all the industries in Indian society and this viewpoint was evident through a book entitled From Behind the Prison Bars in Independent India, published in 1976, where he wrote: “The most important economic and social task in India, according to me, was to eliminate the rural land heartless exploitation of the masses. This could be achieved only if the people control their economic and political affairs.”

According to JP, “socialism is not opposed to the dominant values, which have been cherished in the Indian culture.” Consequently, he stood for village reorganization and restructuring and being a Marxist follower, he believed that socialism was impossible without democracy. Like Narendra Deva, JP mentioned that “the ideology of democratic socialism is the combination of economic and political democracy. But my ideological stand differed from a Marxist, in the sense that Marx
failed to make a class approach to the core issue. Lenin also made it clear many times that the reorganization of the society on a socialist basis requires workers’ revolution. To Lenin, nothing could be more democratic than that.”

Pragmatically speaking, in the post-independence period, JP clearly deviated from his earlier Marxist stand, and also asserted that violence and dictatorship could not be expected in order to usher socialism in India. JP concluded in favour of democratic methods and at the same breath, realized the complete need for economic decentralization under Gandhian influence. As a true Gandhian, he also felt that the means must be morally consistent with the ends and interpreted socialism in the context of Indian needs and the impact of dominant values in the then Indian culture. While reiterating his arguments in favour of dominant values of Indian culture, in a book published in 1936, titled First Things First, JP wrote: “As a socialist, I believe in the urgency of economic problems of the country, and therefore, stress the need for solving the rampant economic problems of the country first. I am not opposed to dominant values of Indian culture. I suppose, the organized economic doctrines of socialism have been formulated in the West, but its fundamental idealism is a part of Indian culture also. In fact, socialism for me was always a way of life. It represents a set of values to which I owe allegiance voluntarily, and which I tried to put into practice in my lifetime.”

Furthermore, in another article entitled, The Transition to Socialism, published in Janata, in 1962, JP continued to describe his theme as democratic socialism and also talked of democratic methods in order to establish a socialist society within India. In this article, he also mentioned that the greater the freedom, the higher would be the level of socialism. This outlook of JP was clearly reflected in his report as General Secretary at the Patna Conference of the Socialist Party, held in 1963 he stated in the report that, “Marxism was itself a confluence of three streams of ideas, that is, Classical Economics of Britain, Revolutionary Socialism of France and Philosophy of Germany. Consequently, I plead to combine the Marxian thought with the thought and practice of Gandhi and want to achieve a synthesis of their own.”

In the post-independence period, immediately after the General Election, held in 1952, the Kirshok Mazdoor Praja Party (KMPP) led by J.B. Kriplani and the Socialist Party merged completely together and finally came into existence as Praja Socialist Party (PSP). Following this, in 1953, Nehru wrote a personal letter to JP for basic cooperation between the Congress and the newly emerged PSP in the fields of national reconstruction and development of India. During that time, a change in JP’s mindset was evident as reflected in his outlook towards Gandhi and he wholeheartedly pleaded for ethical politics and moral conduct in the then party-politics of India. In fact, from 1952 onwards, he stood fully and firmly for Gandhism and persuaded others to believe that unless socialism was completely transformed and altered into Sarvodaya, the beacon-lights of freedom, equality and brotherhood, would remain beyond reach.

Jayaprakash Narayan Views on Sarvodaya and Bhoodan-Gramdan

Jayaprakash Narayan, during his long political career especially put emphasis on a number of issues which were mainly related to the Indian socio-political problem. For instance, JP in his book entitled The Decade Ahead, published in 1970, wrote: “Though
the urge for freedom was among the most fundamental of the human urges, it became the possession of the prosperous few in a society afflicted by inequality. Under such circumstances of inequality, freedom assumed the most crucial form of licence for those who possessed it for exploiting the poverty-stricken masses. National freedom must be the cumulative reflection of the freedom of its individual citizens and not merely that of a few; thus a social situation, in the form of inequality, was no heaven for freedom… that the welfare of the masses was Gandhi’s first concern. But I too reject Gandhism as being yet another exercise in reformism, bearing no relevance at all to the existent pattern of social relationship.”

If one can evaluate JP’s idea of socialism, it is clearly evident that this concept has direct links with his idea of Sarvodaya. According to him, socialism was a pattern of social relationship embedded in an underdeveloped society, where equality was its pivotal foundation along with the value system. Like Roy, he wanted to ensure freedom for all in an Indian society, because that would put an end to all the prevailing exploitation of man by man. Under the influence of Sarvodaya Socialism, JP felt that socialism was rather a social situation in which each shared his own individual freedom with all. During the days of Gramdan movement under Vinoba’s leadership throughout India, he held that Marxism, with its sole emphasis on a scientific approach towards the question of socialist transformation in India, was the most adequate means among all the socialist ideologies circulating in the then Indian socio-political scenario and, simultaneously, it could be worked out in varying social situations without disturbing their prior respective designs. Against such background, in a book published in 1972, entitled The Principles of Radical Democracy, he elaborated on his transformation from Marxism to Sarvodaya-Socialism and illustrated the basic postulates of Marxism as practised in India. In this book, while explaining his arguments, he wrote: “… a self-realization-introspection seemed to have dawned upon me later in my political career, that the Marxist perspective, with its all exclusive stress on mere capitalism as the only vice and the class struggle as the only dynamic of history, was so narrow that the multi-veracity of India’s social processes could not be grasped though it. Subsequently, it was my entire hostility to mere centralism, which both Marxism and Democracy alike promoted, that underlay my exclusive search for an alternative socialist ideology equipped for then India soil. I deliberately asserted that the strategy for making a relativity of socialism was particularly suited to the conditions of life in India. Underlying my plea for forming socialism in what I called the communitarian mould was my fundamental conviction. Communitarianism and collectivism, that socialism practically was built for, constituted the focal point of the beginning and the concluding end, respectively, of one and the same spectrum of relationship.”

Furthermore, in the same book while defining the moral order of socialism for the Indian soil, he enumerated that “socialism is a moral order of life and it calls for morally compelled involvement of the individuals in the social process.”

His constant ideological search for an alternative to Marxism and Democracy as the fundamental strategies for socialist transformation in India eventually landed him into the fold of the Sarvodaya movement under Vinoba’s leadership. During that time, he seized upon the Sarvodaya programme for making the village the epicentre of the social processes in India. Sarvodaya movement had won his formal respect for its commitment
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to human values and moral upgradation of individual conduct. While substantiating his shift from one ideology to another, in an address delivered at the All-India Radical Humanist Association Conference held in Calcutta on December 29, 1955, he said: “I find myself in total agreement with its strategy—villageisation, that is, for giving value-orientation to the social processes. Now, I am in agreement with the logic underlying the Sarvodaya movement, that there is no alternative to villageisation, if the end sought is the harnessing of the inborn sociality of man.” Moreover, in 1951, while placing his argument in favour of Sarvodaya, JP mentioned that, “Sarvodaya was not a crankish creed, but it was the first attempt to re-establish a new social order—a classless and casteless society in Indian societal periphery. Sarvodaya is an ideology, complete in it, but in my hands it is only the decisive first step to the collectivization of the social processes. A re-looks at the place of the village in the Sarvodaya system on one hand and in my idea of Communitarianism on the other, will suffice to reveal the far distance between Communitarianism and Sarvodaya.”

On the question of his quest for a hypothesis in the methodology of social science it will be wrong to judge Narayan a socialist-turned-Sarvodayist. While was a practising Sarvodayist, his ideology regarding value-commitments did not end with the uplift-of-all Sarvodayaist, rather it extended much beyond to reach the method of collectivism. In his Sarvodaya phase, JP completely broke away from the method of scientific Marxism and moulded with the Sarvodaya philosophy under Vinoba’s stewardship. As a Sarvodayist, he attempted to reinterpret the basic questions of individual behaviour in the Indian socio-political scenario which he intended to exhibit in the realm of politics basically from an ethical point of view. Besides, JP as a Sarvodaya leader in the Gramdan-Jeevandan movement felt this method was an integrated view of life under the supreme impact of spirituality. This methodology ultimately led him towards an integrated shape of the utmost task of social and economic reconstruction in India which both Socialists as well as Communists till then neglected. During this sarvodaya phase, JP attended the BodhGaya Sarvodaya Conference in 1954 where he declared his decision to dedicate his whole life for the cause of Sarvodaya and Bhooman and branded this philosophy as People’s Socialism.

Describing his interpretation of the concept of sarvodaya, in a book entitled Studies in Socialism, published in 1958, he mentioned that, “A village is a republic under sarvodaya—an oceanic circle as Gandhi had called it, but under communitarianism it forms only a part of the square to the pyramidal structure of organized life”. In the same book, he further highlighted that, “It is not a system in itself as it is with the Gandhian Sarvodayist but only a sub-system to an overall collectivist social process. I see in it a useful ideology that can be built into a socialist process as a guarantee against centralism. Sarvodaya is an ideology that cannot be reconciled to socialism. Underlying sarvodaya villagism, as conceived by Gandhi and worked out by Vinoba Bhave and others, is the idea that the de-impersonalization of the whole social processes alone can ensure a pre-requisite scope for spiritual self-realization to man.” Consequently, he expounded the primary contents of ‘Sarvodaya Plan’ and suggested to the then Congress party to accept the proposal and implement it in the Indian society under the umbrella of socialism and mentioned that Socialism was not just a Sarvodaya Plan and to him
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Bhoodan was the first step towards a Total Revolution-social, political and economic. This argument of JP was substantiated by an article entitled *J.P. - A Spiritual Humanist*, published in *Janata*, in 1980, where Surendra Mohan wrote: “The ideal that the Sarvodaya Plan sets out to achieve is that of a non-violent, non-exploitative-co-operative society in India, which shall not be based on caste or class and in which there shall be adequate equal opportunity for all.”

Following this metamorphosis or shift from his earlier political ideas from 1957 onwards, JP completely disassociated himself from the ambit of active party politics and exclusively advocated for People’s Socialism instead of State Socialism. In an article published in *Janata*, in 1959, he wrote that, “I sought to build up from below, on the model of the ancient Indian village order—village self-government (Gram Raj).” In addition to this, in his two pamphlets entitled *A Plea for Reconstruction of Indian Polity* and *Swaraj for the People*, he clearly outlined his picture of village self-government and wrote: “All the communities from bottom to top would be organically inter-related and independent in their spheres. In this much awaited communitarian society; there would be a progressive decrease in the functions and powers from the bottom level to the top. And there would be utmost scope for the people’s power. This type of communitarian polity, according to me, only could guarantee the participating democracy in India.”

As a believer in non-party-politics, while giving a complete Gandhian outlook to his socialist party, JP got gradually disillusioned with the party system itself and wrote: “With my gradual disillusionment with dialectical materialism, I have so far pointed out the basic shortcoming of Marxian and Western Socialism. Since Marxism as well as non-Marxian types of socialism had failed, the only way out was Gandhian Socialism.”

Pragmatically speaking, the poor performance of the Socialist Party in the General Elections of 1952 and the constant intra-party squabbles aggravated his disillusionment with the contemporary party system of India. During that time, Vinoba Bhave had launched his *bhoodan-gramdan-jeevandan* movement and it attracted JP’s deep interest and his desire to participate in the movement. At first, JP was mostly critical, but gradually changed his attitude due to its steady growth. He further made it clear that he was attracted towards *sarvodaya*, because it was based on the principle of ‘lok-niti’ and ‘lok-hita’. Moreover, the *sarvodaya* period in the evolution of JP’s thought lasted from 1957 to 1968. If one goes through his writings exclusively during this period, then it would be manifested that an ideological shift of emphasis had occurred in his thought process which was complete transformation from State Socialism to *Sarvodaya*. In the post-independence era, Gandhi got no time to provide a practical demonstration of his non-violent technique for restabilising and reconstructing of Indian society. In his book entitled *Dash kid Samasayyen Aur Gramdan* (translated in English), published in 1968, JP wrote: “In a brilliant extension and development of Gandhi’s work in the post-Gandhian era, I remark that Vinobaji demonstrated that there was such a method—the method of *Sarvodaya*.” In this book, JP also discussed that, “Vinoba’s *Bhoodan* movement is the Sarvodaya method of bringing up social transformation in a non-violent way—a Gandhian experiment of accomplishing social revolution.”

Later on, JP in an article titled *Concept of Nationhood, National Unity and Secularism*, published in *Everyman’s* (New Delhi) in 1959, wrote: “The experiment of Vinoba, I observed, of
trying to bring about a complete social revolution without party was pregnant with great possibilities, and its success was likely to revolutionize politics.”

In this article, he further enumerated that, “The Bhooman movement had undoubtedly a spiritual and ethical basis. I believed that one could find in Bhooman a bold application of Gandhi’s theory of trusteeship.” Finally, he added: “Both trusteeship and Bhooman are based on the belief that when an individual has more than his proportionate portion, he becomes a trustee of that portion for God’s people. Vinoba has wholeheartedly made the Bhooman Programme of conversion a phased programme and had tried to give it a radical character of mass moral revolution. I feel that the practical form of the egalitarian society in India would be manifested through the practice of the Bhooman experiment. The other spur of the Sarvodaya method of social revolution, I believe, is to devise a programme of self-help and self-government through which men might learn to run their own affairs and, inspired by the new ideas and values embedded in Sarvodaya. As a ‘Jeevandani’, I have explained succinctly my whole approach to the Bhooman movement. Being fed up with the constant state restraining authorities; I turned to Sarvodaya fully with a view to finding out a sure way out of the present state of affairs and establishing a real socialism.”

In this way, JP slowly and steadily inclined towards more of people’s voluntary socialism and less of state-enforced socialism, in order to establish real socialism in India under ‘Sarvodaya’.

Jayaprakash Narayan’s Concept of Communitarian Polity and Partyless Democracy

JP in his book entitled Studies in Socialism-Proletariat plus Philosophy, published in 1958; he briefly questioned the efficacy and relevance of the existing party system in the then India scenario. In this book, JP explained that the ideological process on ‘Communitarian Polity’ was started since 1953 onwards, and by 1957, he had already rejected the system completely from his mind, on account of its inadequacy for the progress of the nation-building process. He rejected the Parliamentary System of India based on party politics on the following grounds:

1. Through the principle of individual vote the individual became atomised and the State became the arithmetical sum of individuals;
2. A party came to power with only minority support where there were more than two parties;
3. The people were intensely subjected to manipulative mass media and thus they were often unduly influenced;
4. Political parties indulged in half-truths and outright lies and the real interest of the country was forgotten;
5. There were no proper link between the Government and the individual voter;
6. Elections were expensive.

Though these arguments, JP wanted to get rid of the existing party system itself and wanted to substitute it with a partyless or participating democracy. JP had a fully worked-out and intellectually coherent conception of ‘Democracy’ and simultaneously
recognized its values for the smooth functioning of the Government. In his book entitled *Small Community and Total Revolution*, published in 1980, while discussing the motto of the partyless democracy, he enumerated that, “But it cannot, be understood without the awareness that what embodies the two cardinal aspects of my socio-political thought: my recoil from ‘Statism’, grounded my reading from the Soviet experience, and simultaneously my constant drive to find an immediately effective political means for a real transformation of the people’s conditions in India which in the long run helped me to land up with the idea of participating democracy.”

Moreover, in this book, he briefly discussed the nature and scope of a participating democracy for an Indian soil and wrote: “My democratic theory, whose scope far exceeds the range of its critics, is logically a theory of decentralised power under Gandhian monologue. Given my legitimate disgust with the existing political corruption in India and misgovernment which has characterised independent India’s rule by the Congress, it is equally logically a theory of ‘Party less’ administration. For me, ‘party’ was synonymous, on one hand, with the bureaucratic elitism of the Soviet Union and, on the other with corrupt place-seeking in India; and these two responses was expressed by me, with the full banality of cold war rhetoric, In 1952, in a Sarvodaya conference held in Gujarat, I mentioned that, in the kingdom of dialectical materialism, fear makes men conform, and the Party takes the place of God.”

His antipathy towards the then party system of India also reflected in a book titled *Dynamics of Socialist Ideals*, published in 1954, where he wrote: “Certainly, as far as the Indian experience is concerned, my uneasiness with the party system is comprehensible and logical. If by ‘party’ is meant the organised and principled expression of ideologically coherent socio-political interests and policies, it is arguable that post independence ruling-class India has never had a party at all, only agglomerations.”

However, in JP’s conception of a ‘partyless democracy’ ‘partylessness’ was not really the principal feature. Like Rousseau, subsequently, JP in his book entitled *Socialism in India: What It Means*, published in 1971, wrote: “I counter-posed formal representative democracy with what I sometimes called people’s democracy, a term characteristically borrowed from a Communist origin, but distinct from communist usage.” Moreover, while discussing the objective and trajectory of the concept of Participating Democracy in India, JP wrote: “It denoted my sense that the former type of democracy, in its exclusion (except at times of elections) of true participation by the people and of accountability to them of their ‘representatives’, is largely an illusion. I plainly believed that ‘government by consent... is not an adequate enough concept.”

While reiterating his viewpoint on Participating Democracy, in another article titled *My Plea for Reconstruction of Indian Polity*, published in *Radical Humanist*, in 1972, he wrote: “Instead, as I put it in 1961 in my little book *Swaraj for the People*, brought as near the people as possible under the fold of Participating Democracy.” In the same article, he further mentioned that, “It was this latter idea which made me dangerous to entrenched power and vested interests. The people, I argued, had been left out of the democratic way of life. They had no stake in a representative democracy even though they had the vote, and though *Swaraj* came, it had not come to them, but only to the very thin layer of the educated middle class. It is not the abstract virtues of democracy that so
excite us, but the concrete fruits of democracy in terms of the people’s welfare.” In this way, JP, through his theory of a democratic model sought to rediscover and exemplify the exact meaning of popular will in Indian society, and thus logically bypassed the politics of state, party and function, in order to search for an elusive principle based on real democracy.

In 1972, JP suddenly during the Bihar movement demanded a partyless democracy and mentioned that his idea of Total Revolution was essentially well connected with his earlier ideas of partyless democracy. This outlook became amply clear, through a lecture delivered by him in 1974, titled *On National Integration*, where he said: “In my theory of Total Revolution there will be sufficient flow of people’s power everywhere in tune with the demand of participating democracy and there will be pre-selection of candidates not by any political parties but by active people’s committees, for the accountability of the elected electors, and for the right of the latter to recall the former. Furthermore, undercutting the forms and norms of bourgeois liberal democracy, I struggled in Rousseauist terms towards a ‘new convention’, and the future embodiment of the idea of the ‘general will’ in the proposition that all elections should be determined as far as possible by common consensus.”

According to JP, democracy meant more and more social and economic justice, equal opportunity and above all industrial democracy apart from political rights and people’s participation in government. At the same time, JP was very particular about moral principles and value systems. The idea of democratization was a prerequisite idea for JP’s concept of a new society. JP was of the view that democracy in India must be built on the traditions of ancient India and the concept of dharma should be re-interpreted to suit contemporary needs. The new polity must be founded on the principle of self-government; i.e., self-sufficient, agro-industrial, urban-rural, local communities etc. JP aimed at building up such a society through the means of Sarvodaya movement. However, after about 20 years in it, he became completely disillusioned and dissatisfied with its primary operation and function. In his Inaugural Address at the Fifth Conference of the International Peace Research Association, held at Varanasi, from 5-8 January, 1974, he mentioned that, “The disillusionment began with my experiences, in 1970, at Musahari Village in Muzzafarpur district of Bihar. Vinoba Bhave separated politics from the rest of his efforts to transform society and thus made a basic departure from Gandhi.” In this Conference, he also said that, “Bhave also moved on to Gramdan from Bhoodan. These defects shattered my hopes of achieving goal through the Sarovdaya movement. Once I was convinced that the movement was incapable of bringing about a non-violent revolution, I began to re-look for a new way.” Besides this, while justifying his loosing faith in Vinoba Bhave’s Bhoodan movement, JP in a book titled *Three Basic Problems of Free India*, published in 1974, firmly said: “The Indian freedom movement was a people’s movement par excellence. It was not rajniti, politics of the state, but lokniti, politics of the people.” Thus for JP, the period from 1954 to 1974, which was known as the phase of Bhoodan and Sarvodaya, under the guidance of Vinoba Bhave, was an withered experience and he virtually retired from the ambit of active politics. However, great human issues continued to stir him into action.
That was, perhaps, the fundamental reason that in 1974, he gave a call for Total Revolution in the country.

Jayaprakash Narayan’s Idea of Total Revolution or *Sampoorna Kranti*: Its Moral Filament

According to JP, all political systems were based on force or consent. A system relies exclusively on force only when it loses consent. However, in 1974-75, the then Indian political system entered into a deep crisis. During that time, the political movement exclusively led by Jayaprakash Narayan raised many burning issues, such as corruption, governmental performance, citizens’ rights, representation and recall, youth power etc. However, the movement did not productively accomplish something in order to introduce any fundamental change in the Indian political system. For JP, in the contemporary circumstances in the Indian socio-political strata, the common masses could not take an independent political stand of their own because they were predominantly illiterate. As a result, the JP movement in Bihar (and in the country at large) sought to stir up the masses to give them an ideological thrust to enlighten and guide as well as to control the whole movement under Gandhian spirit.

As a believer in the Marxian theory of ‘Revolution’, JP felt that all socio-political movements had the same logic and momentum and also presumed that they might assume different forms but retain the same content-order. JP in his book titled *Participating and Communitarian Democracy* published in 1967, categorically mentioned that, “Political movements are two types—those which are characterized by gradual development and those which are conjectural or spontaneous. The political movement led by me in Bihar was a movement that partook of both these types.”

In another book entitled *People’s Committee-Instrument of Total Revolution*, published in 1980, he briefly discussed the meaning and concept of ‘Total Revolution’ and further wrote: “The political slogan used by those participating in the movement—viz. ‘Total Revolution’—was vague, though catchy. Every concept must be well defined before it can be applied to any specific situation. To this day there has been no clear definition of the concept of a Total Revolution, especially of the social content of it, and mine was no exception to that. Democracy has a definite social meaning. There can be no democracy, for instance, under feudalism. The Bihar movement emerged at a particular historical point—i.e. at a point where the pattern of proper social development was in jeopardy. This movement drew popular crowds at places. The movement partly helped in creating confusion in the country. I, who assumed the political leadership of the movement, was no politician intent on achieving a political aim of my own. All the same, I played a dominant role in the movement, a role similar to that of a political party.”

In the same book while discussing the basic objective and major function of a political party, he emphatically pointed out that, “One of the functions of a political party is to mediate between the State and the civil society. From this standpoint it is clear that my movement did not succeed in creating consciousness among the masses for the establishment of any drastically different social and political system.” Subsequently, in the same book, while providing a conclusion, he optimistically mentioned that, “It only aroused the people against the ills of the existing system. But it failed to put across to them the
blueprint of another consistent and viable alternative. But it is a fact that some of the ideas floated by the political elite involved in the movement were later borrowed by the ruling elite. These ideas included the idea of non-ideological politics and the concept of youth power for political purposes.\textsuperscript{241}

While building his theory with reference to his idea of ‘Total Revolution’, JP completely believed that for the reconstruction of the socio-economic structure in Indian society, practice of self-discipline and the establishment of self-government in the country, which he often called as ‘participating democracy’, remained an essential component in order to form a balance society based on the principle of equality. Pragmatically speaking, this conviction of JP gradually became more and more firm over the years and this had been the prime rationale behind his call of ‘Total Revolution’. Later on, while explaining his ideological shift towards the idea of Total revolution, JP in a book titled My Idea of Total Revolution, published in 1978, wrote: “It was in the last months of 1973 when I was at Paunar where I felt an inner urge to give such a call to the people. My faith in the power of the people and through them in the philosophy and action of ‘Total Revolution’ was further strengthened by the subsequent events in Gujarat, where a powerful student led movement to disband the State Legislature fortunately came up in 1974.”\textsuperscript{242}

In the same book, while exploring the major impact of ‘Total Revolution’ on the then Indian political scenario, he further wrote: “As my call for ‘Total Revolution’ forebode a death-nell for the then Government, the latter imposed an emergency on the country in the last week of June, 1975.”\textsuperscript{243} Following this explanation, in 1977, in another book titled Prison Diary, JP outlined the major objectives and trajectories of this movement and further wrote: “The struggle for freedom was not fought simply for national independence. The establishment of democracy in free India was also an important goal of the struggle. It was in view of this goal that the Constituent Assembly had drawn up a Constitution for democratic India and adopted it on the 26th November, 1949 on behalf of the whole Indian people. Because the spirit of the Constitution was much abused and real democracy seemed to be in great danger particularly during the past few years in India that the call for ‘Total Revolution’ was given to the nation.”\textsuperscript{244}

According to JP, the fundamental idea of ‘Total Revolution’ aimed at bringing about a complete change in the present structure and system of the Indian society. It may be regarded as a considerable development towards the philosophy of Sarvodaya. Phillip Spratt in an article entitled Roy, JP and Nehru, published in The Radical Humanist, explained the swift transition of JP’s political ideas and wrote that, “JP’s idea of Socialism, gradually developed into the philosophy of ‘Total Revolution’, is not only a system of social and economic reconstruction of the Indian society, but it is also a philosophy of moral and spiritual rebirth of the Indian people.”\textsuperscript{245}

**Total Revolution: Origin and its Impact on Indian Societal Scenario**

In the 1950s, JP joined the Bhoodan movement and laid overwhelming stress on it and in 1969, in an article titled The Political Philosophy of Total Revolution, published in Janata, he for the first time while drawing the picture of Sampooran Kranti, used the
term ‘Total Revolution’ to describe the primary objective of this Revolution in the post-
Sarvodaya movement in India. In this article, while referring towards the objective of
Bhoodan and Gramdan Movement in India, he observed: “Gandhi’s non-violence was
not just a plea for law and order, or a cover for the status quo, but a revolutionary
philosophy. Like the Gandhian idea of revolution, it is indeed a philosophy of a Total
Revolution, because it embraces personal and social ethics and values of life as much as
economic, political and social institutions and process. All this, however, does not negate
the fact that the term ‘Total Revolution’ became a recurrent theme of my speeches and
writings only in 1974 and it is only since then that it has taken its place in Indian political
vocabulary.”

JP’s ‘Total Revolution’ was a ‘combination of seven revolutions—social,
economic, political, cultural, ideological or intellectual, educational and spiritual.’
According to him, the Cultural Revolution may include Educational and Ideological
revolution. Likewise, Social Revolution in the Marxian context covers Economic and
Political Revolution and even more than that. Dayanath Singh in an article entitled
JP- From Socialism to Total Revolution, published in Janata in 1972, wrote that,
“Economic revolution as enunciated by JP may be split up into industrial, agricultural,
technological revolutions etc. Similarly, intellectual revolution may be split up into
two—scientific and philosophical and so on and so forth.”

In 1973, the constant deterioration of public morality within the Indian societal
periphery prompted him to write a long article titled Dynamics of My Revolution,
published in The Radical Humanist, where he wrote: “In the early 1970s, this
purposeful search for a new way became most urgent because of the so-called
explosive situation in the country which was marked by serious erosions such as a
stagnant and inflationary economy, a debasement of the moral fibre of society, irrational
socio-cultural practice and above all an irrelevant educational system. One of the defects
of the existing political system, I suppose, was its philosophy of favouring the educated
and the economic elite.” In the same article, while criticising the existing electoral
practices in India, he further wrote: “The existing electoral system was another major
defect, according to me and all these factors completely disillusioned my notion
regarding Indian politics and by 1973, I began to feel that electoral politics were no more
relevant for India.” Therefore, in a nutshell, he clearly enumerated that the prime
reason behind his writing of the Prison Diary and confessed that, “Following the erosion
of democracy and the subsequent growth of authoritarianism in the country, in 1975, I
wrote my Prison Diary.”

Like Gandhi and M.N.Roy, JP viewed freedom as a comprehensive concept which effortlessly stood above all the prevailing ideologies and
systems in India and he discovered that the then economic condition of the country
remained in a bad shape and the recurring industrial policies and programmes could not
bring about a genuine socialism, instead these only created a regimented State
Capitalism which completely thrived on corruption and inefficiency. To JP, the
dismal state of the educational system was another area of concern and he felt an urgent
need for radical changes towards the contemporary educational system in India. In fact,
in 1975, the major reason behind the birth of the Bihar Movement was the defective
educational system and the widespread unemployment of the educated class in the
JP therefore thought that the then social conditions of the masses were in a dismal state and through a process of exclusion, he could build the framework of ‘Total Revolution’ and he felt that it was the only way to meet adequately the needs of India in order to solve its unbridled socio-economic problems.

According to JP, the Western or the Russian or the Chinese models of ‘Socialism and Development’ were totally unsuitable for India, and would not be applicable to the Indian soil. During that time, he also regarded the political path of Vinoba Bhave was adequately unsatisfactory and until 1969, JP was mostly opposed to large-scale use of Satyagraha methods. Since the 1970s onwards, he began to speak about the urgent need for a large-scale use of Satyagraha to make his revolutionary ideas successful. While explaining his unwillingness to accept Vinoba Bhave’s ways of political movement, JP in an article titled Some Aspects of Socialist Thought and Total Revolution published in Voluntary Action (New Delhi), in 1974, explained his viewpoint and wrote: “the gram swarajya movement which was based on the principles of persuasion and education did not work well. I, therefore, came to the conclusion that the gram swarajya approach was not the right one. Instead, I wanted the struggle approach.”

In the same article, he also added that, “besides, I declared in one my article ‘Face to Face’ (1965) that if democracy was defective and violence offered no solution, then the only way out was to go back to Gandhi. I wanted the people to ask themselves how they could bring about ‘Total Revolution’ through Gandhian techniques. Hence, I once again felt the supreme need for the people to follow Gandhi to save the country from its prevailing socio-economic crisis.”

Meanwhile, in October, 1972, JP like a romantic traveller was in quest for a constant search of a new way and eventually announced his intention to withdraw from all public and social activities for one year. Between 1973 and early 1974, these insights were made public through several of his actions-statements. At the same time, he started news weekly, titled Everyman’s, to propagate and advocate his ideas and views. In this weekly magazine, he wrote regularly why his outlook and approach were utterly different from the so-called Sarvodaya approach under Vinoba’s line of thinking to promote his ideas he called for a moral regeneration and appealed to every Indian citizen, to be aware of the absolute need for it and to be ready to act. On 11 December, 1973, JP wrote an open letter to the youth of Paunar, Bihar where he appealed to them to launch a new movement, which he called ‘Youth for Democracy.’

On 29 December, 1973, in his Presidential speech at the All India Conference of the Radical Humanist Association held in Bombay he called for the need of the construction of an alternative type - structure of democracy and requested the Indian youth to participate in that movement. In the same address, he further proposed an alternative plan which he termed as ‘People’s Democracy.’ JP was also convinced at that time ‘the people of the country were psychologically ready for a overall change in social policy.’ While explaining this new concept, JP in his book Prison Diary, wrote: “I saw a new method through the power of the youth and the people. Hence, I declared: Let the people take up this responsibility, let them give battle. Let there be a people’s struggle.” While analysing the major rationale behind JP’s ideological shift from his
earlier viewpoint, R.A. Prasad in a book titled Socialist Thought in Modern India, published in 1974, observed that: “Thus at one time JP thought that the fundamental problems of human life and society could be solved through Communism. Later, he opted for socialism to achieve the same goal. When socialism too proved inadequate, he hoped that the Gandhian approach based on the concept of Sarvodaya and as interpreted and developed by Vinoba Bhave, would deliver the much needed good. But, when that too proved inadequate to save India from its dismal state, he looked for a new way. That search led him into the final phase of his socio-political philosophy when he called for ‘Total Revolution’ and spearheaded the Bihar movement to realize it.”

To summarise then, it can be said that the concept of ‘Total Revolution’ has had both Marxist and Gandhian origins and is indeed as old as the concept of a social revolution. In his final political journey, JP developed the concept of ‘Total Revolution’ on the basis of a synthesis not merely of the Marxist and Gandhian concepts of social revolution but also of the principles of Western Democracy. In fact, JP’s concept of ‘Total Revolution’ is also remarkable for its significant contribution towards the methodology of a non-violent social revolution under the umbrella of Gandhism. Thus, all through the way of development of his socio-political thought from Marxism to Democratic Socialism and Sarvodaya to Total Revolution, JP remained an ardent advocate for all-round development of the individual and the society as a whole. JP changed his ideological ideas from time to time in the light of contemporary socio-political experiences within the country and at the same time, believed in scientific socialism and its evolutionary nature. JP began his ideological journey by analysing the then Indian society from the Marxian viewpoint and, finally, he was satisfied with the Gandhian flavour to construct his overall socio-political ideas. Like Gandhi and Roy, JP unquestionably agreed that the equality-liberty-rights were the basic postulates for the establishment of a socialist society in India and for this he eventually advocated the concept of Democratic Socialism and Gandhian Spiritual Means. In fact, in his theory of ‘Total Revolution’, JP’s overall emphasis was on human values.

**Jayaprakash Narayan’s Views on Indian Foreign Policy and International Peace-Amity**

Having dealt with the multifarious ideas of JP on Socialism, Gandhism, Marxism, Democracy, Individual, Freedom, State and Revolution in on discussion it is also necessary to look at his vision particularly of India’s foreign policy along with International Peace –Amity. In the second and third chapter, we have discussed in details the various multi-coloured viewpoint of Rammanohar Lohia and Acharya Narendra Deva especially on Indian foreign policy formulations and South and Southeast Asian policy, in the context of the then neighbourhood policies. The main mottos of their foreign policy agenda were to establish an amicable relation with the neighbouring countries and also to discover new vistas and avenues to implant bilateral relations with these countries. Both Narendra Deva and Lohia explicitly explained their outlook with reference to various aspects of Indian foreign policy. Among them, Narendra Deva particularly emphasized on collectivism and mutual benefits and confidence building measures between the neighbouring countries of Asia. Lohia in the end of 1930s as a
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Secretary of Foreign Affairs Department of the then Congress party, mainly drew upon the much needed original postulates of India’s foreign policy ranging from economic decentralization under Gandhian principles, Sapatanga Theory, Equidistance Theory, Four Pillar State, Policy of Third Block, Mutual Development, and most importantly, a strong neighbourhood policy based on mutual trust and bilateral trade policies. Lohia’s ideas and viewpoints on the main international problems, i.e., World War II, Pakistan dispute, Chinese aggression, on the various means to settle international disputes, on India’s foreign policy and, most importantly, on world community constitutes the basic contents of his foreign policy ideas. Unlike Lohia and Narendra Deva, JP did not express much on India’s foreign policy issues, although he was a great advocate of world unity for cultural salvation of mankind at large and had studied colonial history of the Third world nations widely. He believed that the struggle for national freedom also had an international dimension and at the same time, criticized the idea of fascism and parochial nationalism. JP, time and again, gave a serious thought to the ongoing problem of war and peace. His new humanistic outlook offered a precise remedy to the problems of international relations. It was basically cosmopolitan in outlook and envisaged the establishment of a world federation to ensure world peace. Being an ardent revolutionary nationalist, JP vehemently criticized nationalism for breeding racial hatred and to him; the idea of nationalism divided the world into small national boundaries. He prescribed that to avoid wars in future and to maintain world peace, national ambitions and interests should be forsaken at any cost. JP felt that the Indian freedom struggle could not be isolated from international struggle against imperialism. Like an internationalist, he further held that national freedom would not mean freedom of the entire community and that the ideal of national states was contrary to the principle of world government. Like Roy, he appealed to the Indian nationalists to participate in a spirit of cosmopolitanism and asked them to shun the attitude of nationalist exclusiveness because India could not develop within the framework of a mere nationalist state. His idea was further reflected in a book titled The Dual Revolution, published in 1959, where he categorically stated: “The modern world is such that all the nationalist States believing them to be independent are in reality inter-dependent, and what happens in far away parts of the world has its repercussions in every other country.”

266 JP conceived of a commonwealth of freedom and women, free from the boundaries of nationalist states and believed in the co-operative fellowships of common man. His internationalist outlook paved the way towards the ideal of a commonwealth and fraternity of freedom. Like Lohia and Narendra Deva, JP also supported the ideal of internationalism, because it would end the international economic competition. According to him, if the nation states were dissolved and an organic unity of the international society was accepted, the rampant poverty and widespread unemployment might be removed from the entire world. He fervently pleaded for cosmopolitan humanism, which was the only hope for world peace. He observed: “No effort, however, bombastic and expensive, on the governmental level can take the world out of the present impasse. The hope lies in human endeavour; the cultural; sanction of national States must be progressively withheld by a growing number of individual men and women in each country outgrowing the tribal mentality and cultivating the spirit of cosmopolitan Humanism. That is the only hope.”

267 Besides nationalism, fascism, according to JP, constitutes another big hurdle in the way of world
peace and unity and he was so averse to the idea of Indian nationalism that on the question of Kashmir, he held the view that it might prove disastrous for the peace process of the sub-continent.\textsuperscript{268} For him, the national spirit was the main reason for war between India and Pakistan and he also upheld the right of self-determination for the people of Kashmir. His peace-loving idea on Kashmir issue further reflected in an article titled \textit{India and War}, published in \textit{Janata} in 1978, where he wrote: “The State of Jammu and Kashmir is easily capable of partition. It was never...I feel united geographically, demographically and economically... And according to me, a partition of the State on the basis of the principles which governed the partition of the sub-continent, giving, as things stand, Jammu to India and Kashmir Valley to Pakistan, would under the circumstances be the best solution of the problem. The solution will also be in accord with the known wishes of the overwhelming majority of the population in each area.”\textsuperscript{269} He regarded Nehru as the standard bearer of Congress nationalism and believed that the so-called Congress policies of nationalism would land India in the camp of fascism.

However, JP considered the World War II as an international civil war - a war between democracy and totalitarianism and had wanted the then Indian government to give an unconditional support to the British resistance to Fascism in World War II. As an ardent advocate of individual freedom, he branded Russian Communism dangerous for human civilization and considered American democracy as a lesser evil. JP never favoured the use of military forces as a means to check the expansion of Communism and to him; the military forces would destroy democracy in its gradual process. He, therefore, criticized the mould of American foreign policy, which limitless stressed on military potential to check the growth of Communism. JP believed that if every country was allowed to choose its form of government without interference from outside, world peace would remain intact and undisturbed. He felt that the aggressive-belligerent foreign policy of the U.S.A., created an immense tension in the world and expressed his soft corner however trivial, for the then Soviet Union foreign policy under Stalin and in the post-Stalin period.\textsuperscript{270} JP criticized both the power blocs, that is, American and Russian, and while exhorting to the developing countries, non-involvement in this bloc rivalry, like Lohia, he proposed the creation of a powerful Third Force independently. He was totally against war or brute force as a means to solving the international disputes and attached great importance to the objective of world peace and brotherhood. In a draft resolution submitted to the Ramgarh Congress of 1940, JP had advocated for peace, disarmament, amicable settlement of disputes and friendly relations between the countries and wrote: “The free Indian nation shall work for peace between nations and total rejection of armaments and for the method of peaceful settlement of national disputes through some international authority freely established. It will endeavour particularly to live on friendly terms with its neighbours whether they are great powers or small nations, and shall covet no foreign territory.”\textsuperscript{271} JP felt Gandhi’s philosophy of \textit{Sarvodaya} was for creating the foundation of a peaceful life and to spread mutual trust and security within nations. Like Roy, he regarded a dual revolution--social revolution together with human revolution only could be the guarantee for international peace. He was a staunch critic of colonialism and imperialism and in the 1950s’, as an alternative to the ‘Western World’ and the ‘Communist World’, JP and Nehru, respectively,
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encouraged the growth of a ‘Non-aligned World’. During the 1960s’, JP and his Gandhian colleagues developed the concept of a ‘Fourth World’ – a peace making world made up of individual negotiations and marchers, a voluntary peace brigade, and nations small enough and sufficiently politically decentralized to resist the slide into violence and authoritarianism, which was overwhelming the other three worlds.\(^{272}\) JP urged immediate and effective steps towards general disarmament, self-determination for small nations i.e., Tibet and Taiwan, and an effective international instrument to assure the defence of weak and backward nations, the institution of an unarmed World Peace Guard. Subsequently, in 1975, he warned the non-aligned and socialist countries and the intellectual and the people of Western countries that the days of imperialism were not over. In JP’s view, the Western world and the Communist as well as the Socialist countries had failed to remove colonial exploitation and violence-generating competition from the world and denounced the imperialistic colours of both the Capitalist and Communist countries. In 1950, JP condemned and disapproved the then American aggression in Korea and in 1961; he criticized the Indian government for marching troops in Goa. In 1962, JP was very much worried over the problem of a border conflict between India and China and advocated non-violent means to face the Chinese aggression and, simultaneously, preached renunciation of war and army to settle the dispute by pacific means. According to JP, in a war, both soldiers and civilian people die and death leads to more and more deaths and ultimately complete annihilation. Therefore, he emphasized non-violent methods to meet the Chinese aggression. To JP, all war was a crime against humanity and in 1965, in his Convocation Address at Mysore University; he told the audience that “peace concerns me because I am convinced that war solves no problem… I know as you know that even after the most devastating war, peace has to be made… War, my dear friends, is not the permanent condition of man; that is peace.”\(^{273}\)

Similarly, in May 1971, JP, deeply distressed at the massacre in the then East Pakistan and undertook a tour of the principal capitals of the world to generate public opinion and awaken international conscience against the massive killings of the people in that part of the world. According to him, the Bengalis of Pakistan were fighting for the same issues and values, that is, democracy and self-determination, for which India fought her battle for freedom and advocated recognition of Bangladesh immediately. In various newspapers, on 16 June 1971 published from Bangladesh Sheikh Mujibur Rehman appealed to the freedom fighters of the whole world to support their liberation movement as well as their cause for independence. JP was moved by this appeal and toured all over the globe in support of the Bangladesh liberation movement. Not only that, he immediately extended his support to the Sheikh in a statement issued from New Delhi on the same day and said: “First of all, I must express my deep admiration for the extraordinary leadership that the Sheikh has given to the people of Bangladesh. It would be hard to find another example in all history of a leader who had succeeded in uniting his people behind him in the total manner that Mujibur Rehman has done…Let me make it clear that just as I believe in the territorial sovereignty of my country, I do not wish to see the break-up of Pakistan. The responsibilities of pushing him beyond his self-imposed limit would be entirely upon the civil and military powers in West Pakistan. Let
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us hope that they would be wise enough not to push him that far.” His statement bears ample testimony to the fact that initially he was not for the division of Pakistan and gradually he was forced to change his outlook when the atrocities of the army in Bangladesh reached the limits of barbarity. In another statement issued from his native village, Sitabdiara, dated on 27 June, 1971, he lambasted Pakistan’s regimented policy and wrote: “…President Yahya Khan has ordered what is euphemistically called a stringent martial law but what in reality is a military subjugation of a whole people… The position of the Government of India is no doubt a delicate one. But what is happening in Pakistan is surely not that country’s internal matter alone.” In this way, his worldwide tour helped create a strong public opinion in favour of Bangladesh and influenced the Indira Gandhi government to intervene in the matter and JP convinced the Committee of UN Nations’ about the legitimacy of the demand for a separate state of Bangladesh. In December, the same year India got directly involved in war with Pakistan and both JP and Vinoba supported the war. Moreover, when Bangladesh was liberated, JP extolled Indira Gandhi for her political strategy and maturity. Simultaneously, he also expressed the hope that it would signal a new era in Indo-Pak relations and forgetting old hostilities the two countries would live in peace. He had also written a personal letter to Mujibur Rehman, in which, he advised Mujib to follow the footsteps of Gandhi. He criticized the United Nations for its failure in restraining the great powers’ struggle for domination and stressed the need to rediscover a healthier space for safeguarding human liberty, security and independence of nations. JP was no doubt a great advocate of international peace and friendly relations amongst the countries. He felt that there were hurdles on the path of world peace and reacted promptly to the issues involving violence and suppression. He always condemned the big powers for intervening in the affairs of the small countries and criticized the race for armament which was the potential instrument for the annihilation of the world. Likewise, JP also played a very prominent role for the common people of Nepal who were severely struggling against the Monarchy for the cause of their independence and exhibited greater pragmatism and objectivity in his outlook regarding the basic structure and formulation of India’s foreign policy.

Besides this, JP’s successive efforts for breathing life into the powerful ambit of democracy and people’s power to achieve peace and amity were not confined within the national boundary. He always stood for the smooth functioning of democracy in different parts of the world as well. He powerfully raised his voice whenever there was an attack on democracy anywhere in the world and effectively conceived of a peaceful world whose exclusive hallmark would be fraternity and peace. Endowed with a world vision not bound by geographical frontiers and time, his relentless work and approach gave him international exposure and for this, he became intimate with several top-notch progressive leaders of the world. A champion of freedom and democracy, JP spoke up whenever there was an onslaught on the independence and human rights of other countries. In 1950, China sent its army to Tibet so surreptitiously that other countries hardly got any inkling about it. During that time, he carried his world campaign in favour of small states like Tibet and kept pressuring the Indian government headed by Nehru. Unfortunately, Nehru did not accept his advice and as a reaction of it, JP observed: “By freeing Tibet the people of China would also free themselves. It might be
useful to remind the Chinese of these pregnant words of Marx: ‘Person which enslaves others forgoes its own chains’….I should like to divide the question into two parts: political and human. It is the second aspect of the question that has aroused worldwide sympathy and indignation...”

In 1956, JP vehemently opposed the Russian invasion of Hungary and as a reaction to these events, he wrote that “Though the Communist movement and the Communist revolution are considered anti-imperialistic, the imperialist face of the Communism has not changed even after 50 years and as a strong ferocious animal eats weak animals similarly the law of the jungle is in vogue in the Communist countries.”

Following this event, he made short world tours, with a mission to awaken anti-imperialist sentiment and sparked the vision of socialism, doctrine of a nuclear free zone, peace and amicability under the Gandhian ideological dictum, and so on. In 1962, JP went to Kenya as the Co-Chairman of the World Peace Brigade to take part in a high-voltage meeting. There he developed effective personal rapport with several African leaders including the President of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, Hastings Banda and Kenneth Kaunda etc. It was decided at that meeting to organize a peaceful freedom march from Tanzania to Rhodesia and in this way; he addressed many political meetings and effectively mobilized funds for the general people participating in the freedom march. He had also close relations with the socialists leaders of Israel and the then Prime Minister Ben-Gurion was his personal friend. He was very much impressed with the land bondage of Israel and wanted to introduce the model of an Israeli village into the Indian set up. Being a socialist leader, JP also maintained friendly relations with many important leaders of the US and the Germany. For example, the US President, Jimmy Carter, had profound respect for JP and in 1977, during his visit to New Delhi, he met JP and expressed his loyalty towards the latter’s life and political philosophy.

As regards to India-China relations, JP took the initiative for peace even during the India-China war. It is not that he wanted to stop war at the cost of the nation’s sovereignty or self-respect, rather he clarified that peace and non-violence could never be achieved by attacking the independence of any country. He wanted India to oppose China’s belligerent policy on the strength of moral values. For this co-operative outlook on various so-called international issues, he was mainly influenced by Gandhi and utopian Socialists. Moreover, in order to resolve the ongoing dispute with China, he suggested that if that country needed Aksai Chin for its use, the region could be leased to it for civil use. The Indian flag would fly there and China could not make any use of it for military purpose.

Conclusion

Having analysed the overall socio-political ideas of Jayaprakash Narayan, it is clear to us that he continued to attract the attention of scholars, political scientists and social activities and tried to live in the midst of the people, especially in difficult times such as the Indian freedom struggle and partition. He was not an author in the modern academic sense and better known as a mass political leader in the absence of Mahatma Gandhi. His writings, running into more than one hundred volumes, contain a wide range of views mostly on different socio-political issues and although he led a simple life and
was rudimentarily committed to moral and political values, his relentless experiments with truth and changing ideological currents may not have lent his personal writings a propositional form. There are multifarious works which represents him from different ideological perspectives such as Marxism, Liberalism, Feminism or Human Rights; and there are also studies comparing him with other modern political philosophers like Marx or Mill; as well as expositions of his views on themes such as moral and political philosophy, religion, women, communalism etc. There are numerical analyses, which studies the relevance of JP to the then Indian political scenario and to the contemporary world, whose prime aim was to develop his socio-political thoughts and provide a structural basis for his abstract standpoints, for de-contextualization of varied contexts, for explaining the meaning of his intervention, for exposing the limitations and, most importantly, the inconsistencies in his personal writings.

While there is a rich variety of scholarly works on JP, some of them radically different in interpretation from others, many of them run parallel to his thinking and have not resulted in an insightful debate. That is why; there is an urgent need to provide a platform from where different interpretations of JP can be brought together through a resourceful debate. There remains a stated desire to forge more equitable social and economic relationships in rural areas, such as land reforms, the regulation of rural usury and minor irrigation projects etc. In this connection, JP sought to build up Gandhi’s world reputation by claiming that India’s socio-political dynamism was undoubtedly stimulated by morality rather than considerable state investment such as small-scale agriculture, support for the Khadi and village industries programme, Gandhian education-ashrams and above all the ethical basis of Sarvodaya.

The JP movement, which became a particularly notable example of Gandhian-style activism in post-independence India, was inaugurated by JP in 1973 against the rampant corruption of the then Indira Gandhi government and in this respect, like Roy, to curb the menace of corruption, he immediately decided to emphasise on civil resistance programmes over moral appeals. The momentous aim of the Total Revolution was to follow the old Gandhian path for the deployment of political discontent to drive forward a new wider movement for all-round social, economic and cultural change in the then Indian society. Consequently, JP’s followers in the sarvodaya movement were in the forefront. The movement was the strongest in various parts of India such as Bihar, and Uttar Pradesh, mainly in Allahabad. Attempts were made to move towards a Gandhian-style polity, known as Janata Sarkar (People’s Government). Subsequently, after the dramatic elections of March 1977, which brought an abrupt end to the Emergency, JP, appeared to be vindicated throughout the country and stood as the tallest leader, with ways open for more active state support for the Gandhian programme at every societal level.

JP was unique among all the contemporary political leaders in many respects and in the post-independence period, his political career was primarily influenced by the prevailing socio-political realities of India. He had moved away from actual politics, partly because of his loss of faith in the then Indian political parties, on account of their short policies and frivolous actions. His deep sincere nature naturally attracted more
constructive channels like the Bhoodan movement under the leadership of Vinoba Bhave to settling of the socio-economic problems of landless peasants to help them to become productive citizens of the land. Like Gandhi, JP held an abiding faith on the scope of human nature and steadily believed in people’s power and without it, it was impossible for him to work among the common Indian masses. Consequently, in 1974-75, his almost dramatic emergence into a wider and pulsating arena eventually opened a new chapter in India’s socio-political history. Through his socialist philosophy, JP hoped to bring about a complete overhaul of the then Indian society and for him freedom and responsibility were the two basic impulses. Like Gandhi, he regarded man more important than political ideology or philosophy. That is why, he launched his resurrected movement and it undoubtedly received a deep and passionate response all over India. It was JP who played the key role to bring together different political parties and finally form an alternative force. This was indeed a positive contribution by a visionary to the practical politics of the day. Above all, he was an idealist, a creative thinker but with a strong sense of history and an innate urge for pragmatic action. For this, his Prison Diary reveals his spiritual pilgrimage with anguish and anxiety as to how India has to plan her future prospect. Furthermore, his Diary exemplifies a superior blend of action and meditation. Therefore, in a nutshell, under Gandhian ideological influences, JP believed in the dynamics of the inner conscience of man and this idea had been reflected in a book titled Face to Face, written by him in March 1977, where he said: “...my vision is of a free, progressive and Gandhian India. The India of my dream is a community. It is a community in which individuals are valued for their humanity.”278
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