

MA in Political Science (under CBCS)

POL-05-I-1026

GAUHATI UNIVERSITY Institute of Distance and Open Learning



Semester- I



Paper - II
Political Thought in Modern India

GOPINATH BARDOLOI NAGAR
Guwahati - 781014 (Assam)

GAUHATI UNIVERSITY
Institute of Distance and Open Learning

POL-05-I-1026

M.A. First Semester
(under CBCS)

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Paper: POL-05-I-1026
POLITICAL THOUGHT IN MODERN INDIA



Contents:

Block I : Reformist and Liberal Constitutionalism

- Unit 1: Origins of reformist ideas and liberalism in modern period
- Unit 2: Raja Ram Mohan Roy: Social Reform
- Unit 3: Raja Ram Mohan Roy: Political ideas
- Unit 4: Dadabhai Naoroji: Economic Critique of Colonialism
- Unit 5: Pandita Ramabai: Social Reform and Women's issues

Block II : Nationalism and Liberation

- Unit 1: Gandhi: Critique of Modern Civilisation, Satyagraha
- Unit 2: Gandhi: Swaraj, Religion and Politics
- Unit 3: Nehru: Socialism, Secularism
- Unit 4: Nehru: Parliamentary Democracy
- Unit 5: B.R.Ambedkar: Caste and Untouchability, Constitutional Democracy, Social Justice

Block III : Contending Perspectives on Nationalism

- Unit 1: Aurobindo Ghose: Philosophical and Spiritual Foundations
- Unit 2: Aurobindo Ghose: Nationalism
- Unit 3: Savarkar: Social Ideas, Theory of Hindutva
- Unit 4: M.A. Jinnah: Two Nation Theory
- Unit 5: Religious nationalism

Block IV: Marxist and Socialist Discourse

- Unit 1: Features of Marxist and Socialist Discourse in India
- Unit 2: M.N.Roy: Radical Humanism, Critique of Marxism
- Unit 3: Rammanohar Lohia: Caste, Class Democracy
- Unit 4: Jai Prakash Narayan: Critique of Parliamentary Democracy
- Unit 5: Jai Prakash Narayan: Total Revolution

Contributors:

Dr. Barnali Deka	Block: I (Unit- 4)
Dr. Chayanika Sarma Asst. Prof. GUIDOL	Block: II (Units- 1 & 3)
Dr. Barnalee Choudhury Asst. Prof. GUIDOL	Block: II (Units- 2 & 4)
Ajanta Sarma	Block: II (Unit- 5)
Anubhab Sarmah	Block: III (Units- 3 & 4)
Bondita Borbora	Block: IV (Units- 2, 3 & 4)

Course Coordination:

Prof. Dandadhar Sarma	Director, IDOL, Gauhati University
Dr. Dhruba Pratim Sarma	Associate Prof. Dept. of Political Science Gauhati University

Cover Page Designing:

Bhaskar Jyoti Goswami	IDOL, Gauhati University
-----------------------	--------------------------

ISBN:

August, 2021

© Copyright by IDOL, Gauhati University. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise.
Published on behalf of Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University by the Director, and printed at Gauhati University Press, Guwahati-781014.

Unit-4

Dadabhai Naoroji: Economic critique of colonialism

Contents:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.4 Naoroji's Economic Critique of Colonialism**
- 1.4 The Drain Theory
- 1.5 Dadabhai Naoroji's political nationalism and Self-rule or Swaraj:
- 1.8 Summing up
- 1.9 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction

Dadabhai Naoroji was an Indian social political leader and one of the foremost patriarchs of Indian nationalism. He was born on September 4, 1825 in Bombay Presidency. As a fighter for Indian causes he took the initiative to establish India's first political association, the Bombay Association in 1853. Educated at Elphinstone College, Bombay, he was appointed as professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in the same college in 1854. Dadabhai Naoroji, the leading nationalist was the founder member of Indian National Congress, established in 1885. He was the first Indian to be elected as a member of British House of Commons in 1892 from Central Finsbury to represent the cause of India in England. Known as the 'Grand Old Man of India', Naoroji became popular as a professor, businessman, administrator, member of British Parliament and President of Indian National Congress (three times in 1886, 1893 and 1906). This great political figure and a spokesman for Indian nationalism died on June 30, 1917.

1.2 Objectives

This unit is an attempt to analyze the economic and political ideas of Dadabhai Naoroji. After reading this unit you will be able to-

- *explain* his views on economic nationalism
- *discuss* his critical views on colonialism

- *explain* his drain theory
- *discuss* his ideas of political nationalism.

1.3 Naoroji: Economic Critique of Colonialism:

Dadabhai Naoroji was a critique of British economic policy in India. In his famous thesis, “Poverty and Un-British Rule in India”, he presented ‘a vivid, authentic and critical account of the poverty in India and the reasons behind its occurrence.’ Although Naoroji was influenced by liberalism and an admirer of western political values, he soon realized that British rulers were not interested to fulfill the aspirations of Indian people. ‘Because of his western education, Naoroji had become an admirer of those rationalist principles which the British political philosophers had evolved from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries. These implied that a government is not entitled to govern simply because it wields immense power. Its right to govern the people is based on the fact that it protects their life, liberty and property and enhances their happiness; that is why people owe their affectionate loyalty to the government.’ (Gaubha, 2021). However, Naoroji believed that an alien rule is not preferable. As the condition for self-rule was not present in India he expected that British rule with their intense love of liberty, nobility of soul transform India into a modern state. “But a closer analysis of the situation revealed that the British government had not cared to fulfill its obligation. It had set aside all the promises that it had made to the subjects of its colony. It was engaged in the blatant exploitation of the natural and human resources of India. This had led the colossal drain of India’s resources to England” (Gaubha, 2021).

Stop To Consider

Liberalism

Liberalism is a political philosophy which insists on ‘liberty’ of individual as the first and foremost goal of public policy. It promotes freedom of individual from all restraints. It believes in non-interference of state in the life of individual and upholds the principle of free-market economy. The basic philosophy of liberalism is to protect individual’s right to life, liberty and property by the state. As a political ideology it was evolved in the seventeenth century in the west to protect the natural rights of people. The core principles of liberalism can be found in the writings of John Locke, Adam Smith, J. S. Mill, Jeremy Bentham, T.H. Green, Hobhouse, Laski, Spencer, Hayek, Nozick, Friedman and many others.

Naoroji's nationalism was guided by the economic explanation of the colonial exploitation of Indian resources under British rule. Colonialism was responsible for all miseries and poverty of Indian People. The foreign rule imposed heavy political and economic burden for India with huge public debt and expenses for running the colonial administration both in India and England. For this reason Naoroji pledged for the check of drainage of wealth from India for which in his view Indian's were deprived of natural rights. It can be better understood by analyzing his drain theory which became the symbol of Indian nationalism.

Stop To Consider

Nationalism

Nationalism implies an ideology that believes in a sentiment of an individual's attachment to his nation. It is a doctrine which involves the criterion for the determination of the unit of population proper to enjoy a government exclusively of its own, for the legitimate exercise of power in the state and for the right organization of a society of states. Briefly, the doctrine holds that the humanity is naturally divided into nations, that nations are known by certain characteristics which can be ascertained, and that the only legitimate type of government is national self-government.

SAQ

Why did Dadabhai Naoroji admire the British political tradition?

Check Your Progress:

1. How many times Dadabhai Naoroji was the President of Indian National Congress?
2. In which year Dadabhai Naoroji was elected as a member of British Parliament?
3. Write true or false.
 - a. Dadabhai Naoroji opposed liberal political tradition
 - b. Dadabhai Naoroji demanded for the check of drainage of resources from India to England.

1.4 The Drain Theory:

In his “Poverty and Un-British Rule in India”, published in 1901, Dadabhai Naoroji spoke about the wealth drain with statistical analysis. Naoroji launched a campaign against the drain which he regarded as the fundamental evil of British rule in India. In the 19th century the drain of wealth from India to England took the form of unreturned surplus of export over import. ‘The drain of India’s economic assets retarded the growth of capital formation in the country and led its ever-growing poverty’ (Naoroji, 1901).

Naoroji spoke about ‘two types of drain of India’s resources- a) Economic drain and b) Moral drain. Economic drain implied that a huge amount of money earned by the British Government in India was forcibly transferred to England. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, this amount was estimated to be ranging between £ 30 million and £ 40 million a year.’ (Gaubha, 2021). This vast amount of wealth were taken away from India in different forms-

1. Pensions to British officers,
2. Payments to the war office for the maintenance of British troops in India,
3. Expenses of Government of India in England and
4. Earnings send by British professional classes from India.

This drain of India was financially a destructive process. (Varma, 1992). Heavy taxation was imposed upon the Indians to serve the interest of the colonizers. ‘It virtually neutralized the margin for saving which could under the normal functioning of the economic process, have been retained in the country for the purpose of capital formation. But the capitalization of profits and surplus was not allowed in the country. Without capital accumulation it was impossible to foster the industrial development of the country.’ (Varma, 1992).

Stop To Consider

The statement on drain

“This drain consists of two elements- first, that arising from the remittances by European officials of their savings and for their expenditure in England for their various want both there and in India; from pensions and salaries paid in England; and from government expenditure in England and India. And the second, that arising from similar remittances by non-official Europeans. As the drain prevents India from making any capital, the British by bringing back the capital which they have drained from India itself, secure almost a monopoly of all trade and important industries, and thereby further exploit and drain India, the source of the evil being the official drain.

Dadabhai Naoroji (1901)

‘The moral drain implied that all appointments to higher positions in the Indian administration were reserved for the British nationals. Indians could at best become clerks, coolies and labours whose income was hardly enough to make both ends meet, not to speak of attaining a reasonable standard of living! Under these circumstances, there was little opportunity for Indians to have money accumulation or capital formation. In the absence of indigenous capital and industry, Indians had no chance to have any share in prosperity. Then the British who gained valuable experiences in the course of their career as administrators and professional experts were lost as they returned to England after their retirement.’ (Gaubha, 2021).

In his view the ‘devastating British policy of economic and moral drain was draining away the life-blood of India in a continuous stream and the public debt of the country had been constantly widening. Thus the policy of Britain was indeed blood-sucking.’ (Varma, 1992). The exploitation and destruction of the heart of India was carried out under the ‘attractive phraseology’ of ‘civilization, progress and what not’ by the Britishers. (Naoroji, 1901). Moreover ‘the policy of England in India was not only to drain India of her capital but to initiate a policy whereby this same capital would be utilized for the process of further drain. This complicated process of exploitation was bound to lead to the total economic ruin of the country.’ (Varma, 1992).

Stop To Consider

“All experiences and knowledge of statesmanship, or administration or legislation, of high scientific and learned professions, are drained away to England when the persons possessing them give up their service and retire to England.”

Dadabhai Naoroji (1901)

Opposing the drain of Indian resources, Dadabhai Naoroji argued this as injustice to India and it is against the maxims of political economy. In his view, ‘India solely needs the aid of foreign capital; but it is English capital that she needs, and not the English invasion to come also and to eat up both capital and produce’. (Naoroji). The cruel exploitation of India’s resources had subjected millions of people to starvation, famines, disease and death. The British rulers had imposed tax on a thing of common use like salt, and this was responsible for making common man’s life miserable. The opium trade was also poisoning bulk of people. (Gaubha, 2021).

Dadabhai Naoroji criticizing the British colonial policy pleaded that the inhabitants of the country should be helped in preparing themselves for developing her resources. He wanted India

to be free from all the miseries and poverty. In early period, Naoroji was an admirer of British political tradition based on the notion of justice and liberty. But he was against the system of administration run by the Britishers in India which was destructive and exploitative. He acknowledged the British contributions regarding western education, administration, railways, telegraphs, hospitals etc. However the final outcome of this rule compelled him to write that ‘the present system of government is destructive and despotic to the Indians and un-British and suicidal to Britain.’ (Naoroji, 1901). He wanted to check the drain and end the ‘bleeding’. So he expressed that once the drain was ended India could become a civilized and advanced nation with the help of British modern administration and that would be beneficial for both Britain and India. He wrote, “if it were British rule and not un-British rule which governed us, England would be benefited ten times more than it is”. (Naoroji, 1985).

SAQ

What is drainage of wealth?

1.5 Dadabhai Naoroji’s political nationalism and Self-rule or Swaraj:

As a result of his discontentment to the un-British rule in India, Dadabhai Naoroji insisted on granting ‘Swaraj’ or self-rule to India. He expected that England would honestly, honourably, conscientiously and faithfully fulfill the promises and pledges that she had made to India. (Varma, 1992). But after years of reconciling effort and persuasion of British authorities, he was disappointed from lack of any reform on the part of British rulers’. (Islahi, 1995). He realized that without the acquisition of the right of self government India could not be saved from the miseries and poverty. He warned that a despotic and autocratic government could not continue as the ‘evil system of government’ was leading to bankruptcy and ruin. (Naoroji, 1985). It was evident from his speeches in different Congress sessions where he asserted that, ‘Without self-government the Indians can never get rid of their present drain, and consequent impoverishment, misery and destruction.’ (Naoroji, 1985). Thus he transformed his ideas from economic nationalism to political nationalism without which the former cannot be achieved. He wanted the Britishers to allow India to run her own administration under their superior control and guidance.

In 1906 Congress session at Calcutta, Naoroji declared that 'Swaraj' must be the goal of Indian National Congress. The main political association which led the anti-colonial movement in India aroused the feeling of nationalism among the Indians under the leadership of Dadabhai Naoroji. In the Calcutta session Naoroji 'stressed three important rights of Indian people. The first was the right to the increasing appointment of Indians in the public services and the placing of all departmental administration in their hands. The second was the right to increasing representation of Indians so that India may have legislative assemblies on the model of self-governing colonies. The third was the right to just financial relations between India and Great Britain.' (Varma, 1992). Naoroji advised the Indians to agitate through petitions and meetings against unjust rule, to achieve the goal of self-rule. He had still faith on British conscience and hoped that India would be granted 'responsible self-government in the shortest possible period'.

Naoroji also emphasized on education of people as it generates in the mind of them a consciousness of right. He urged for the concept of natural rights of people. In his view Indian people must enjoy the right to self-rule. He expected that 'spread of education and the accumulation of administrative experiences would hasten the process of attainment of Swaraj. Hence he demanded free and compulsory primary education and free higher education of every kind'.(Varma, 1992).

Check Your Progress:

1. Write a few lines on Dadabhai Naoroji's economic drain and moral drain.
2. Comment on Dadabhai Naoroji as an economic critique on colonialism.
3. Explain Dadabhai Naoroji's drain theory.
4. Write down of Dadabhai Naoroji's political ideas of self rule.

1.6 Summing Up:

Dadabhai Naoroji was a pioneering nationalist who shaped the Indian nationalist movement against colonialism. Being an economic critique of colonialism, Naoroji developed his drainage of wealth theory. His speeches in British Parliament Congress sessions and various meetings reflects his experiences and evolving thought regarding the political and economic circumstances of despotic colonial policies in India. His economic explanation of India's miserable condition and poverty through drain theory, his efforts to speak out for India's causes representing India in British parliament and the radical transformation of his thinking from pro-British outlook to win

Swaraj show his wholehearted engagement to fight for Indians throughout his life. He was the person who laid down the economic foundation of Indian politics. This great patriot, having full faith on British liberal principles did not hesitate to criticize the exploitative nature of British policies in India in a non-violent, peaceful way, guided by moral principles.

1.7 References and Suggested Readings:

1. Ganguli B.N., '*Dadabhai Naoroji and the Drain Theory*', The Journal of Asian Studies, Cambridge University Press, Aug.1967
 2. . Gauba, O. P., '*Indian Political Thought*', published by National Paperbacks, New Delhi-110002, 2021
 3. Varma, V. P., '*Modern Indian Political Thought*', published by Lakshmi Narain Agarwal Educational Publishers, Agra-3, 1992.
 4. Zaidi, Moin A., '*Dadabhai Naoroji, Speeches and Writings*', New Delhi, Indian Institute of Applied Political Research, 1985, Vol. 1.
-

UNIT: 1

GANDHI: CRITIQUE OF MODERN CIVILISATION, SATYAGRAHA

Contents:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Sociological Ideas of Gandhi
- 1.4 Critique of Modern Civilisation
- 1.4 Gandhi's View on Satyagraha
- 1.6 Gandhi on Ahimsa
- 1.7 Summing up
- 1.8 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction:

In this block we are discussing the modern Indian political thinkers and Mahatma Gandhi is an integral part of modern Indian political scenario. Mahatma Gandhi is the pre-eminent leader of Indian Independence Movement. He has been described as a prophet, a mystic, a saint, a religious devotee, a moral preacher, a social reformer and a non-violent revolutionary. Mahatma Gandhi is not a theorist but a man of action and he is the pioneer of Satyagraha movement. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi is commonly known as Mahatma Gandhi or the 'Great Soul' around the world. He is also popularly known as 'Bapu' in India. He is officially honoured in India as the 'Father of the Nation'. His birthday 2nd October is celebrated as 'Gandhi Jayanti', a national holiday in India. It is celebrated worldwide as the International Day of Non-Violence. As a practitioner of ahimsa his aim is to speak the truth and ignite the spirit in others.

This unit makes an attempt to deal with the sociological ideas of Gandhi's political thought. It will mainly analyze his views on women, untouchability, family etc. He believes that men and women are essentially endowed with the same spirit and therefore they should be treated as equals. According to him, untouchability is a social evil and he wants to remove it from the society. This unit will further try to explain Gandhi's philosophy of economic reconstruction. Gandhi advocates trusteeship, decentralization of economic activities, labour intensive technology, and gives first priority to rural India. This unit will also deal with Gandhi's views on Sarvodaya.

1.2 Objectives:

Mahatma Gandhi is the product of Indian culture and civilization and connected with the saintly traditions of India. After reading this unit you will be able to

- understand the sociological ideas of Gandhi
- explain Gandhi's philosophy of economic reconstruction
- analyze Gandhi's views on Sarvodaya

1.3 Sociological Ideas of Gandhi:

Before discussing Gandhi's political ideas it is pertinent to know that Gandhi does not start any 'ism'. He simply expresses his views on political, social, economic and religious matters according to the need of the occasion and political situation. But it can definitely be said that he has a peculiar philosophy of life and on the basis of the philosophy he tries to solve national and international problems. Hinduism, Jainism and Buddhism have coloured his thoughts and shaped his actions. His views on women, casteism, prostitution etc. help in shaping his political ideas. In this section we will discuss these sociological ideas. Gandhi on Women Apart from being one of the greatest leaders of Indian nationalism, Mahatma Gandhi is noted as a major social and political reformer. He started a crusade for improving the degrading position of women in India. He wanted to eradicate all the social evils of the society and as a part of the project, he tried to develop the conditions of Indian women. Before Gandhi, many reformers dealt with this issue. But Gandhi's approach was different from the rest of the reformers.

Before discussing Gandhi's role in improving the position of Indian women, let us discuss the condition of women during that time. The evils like child marriage, dowry system, the Purdah System etc. were the striking features of the then Indian society. The Purdah system prevented the Indian women from going out of their houses alone. They had to be accompanied by their male guardians. The society regarded the women as inferior to the male members. Moreover, the percentage of women with basic education was minimal. It was because of these degrading and deplorable situations faced by the Indian women that Gandhi started a reform movement to eradicate all these evils from the society.

Stop To Consider:

Life sketch of Mahatma Gandhi: Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi better known as Mahatma Gandhi was born on 2 nd October 1869 in Porbandar, a coastal town in Gujarat, India. His father Karamchand Gandhi was a Diwan (Prime Minister) of Porbandar state. In May 1883, 13 year old Mohandas was married to 14 year old KasturbaiMakhanji. At his middle school in Porbandar and high school in Rajkot, Gandhi was an average student. His family wanted him to become a barrister. On 4th September, 1888 Gandhi went to London to study law at the University of London. Gandhi was called to the bar on June 10, 1891and left London for India on June 12, 1891. After coming to India, he associated himself actively in the struggle of India against British imperialism which ultimately led to India's independence. On 30th January 1948, Gandhi was shot while he was walking to a platform from which he was to

address a prayer meeting. We should remember here that Gandhi never disrespected the tradition of the country, but he felt that some traditions can act as a barrier from the development of women. It is evident from the following quotation of Gandhi.

It is good to swim in the waters of tradition, but to sink in them is suicide

(M K Gandhi, Navajivan, 28th June)

It needs to be mentioned here that Gandhi took a new approach to the study of problems of Indian women. He considers the women capable of occupying the same platform with men. Again, to him, a woman is the embodiment of virtues like knowledge, humanity, tolerance, sacrifice and faith. But for the proper development of these virtues women need education. He never accepts the view that women are the weaker sex. In contrast, he feels that women have strong and equal mental abilities like men. In this context, he cites the example of Sita, Draupadi etc. He therefore believes that women should be given equal right to freedom. We have already learnt that, according to Gandhi, women play an important role in the political, economic and social emancipation of the country. Gandhi believes that women are more capable than men to carry a non-violent crusade. He guides the Indian women to shoulder critical responsibilities in India's struggle for freedom. Under his guidance women take part in various activities like organising public meetings, picketing of shops, selling khadi etc. They also face the atrocities of the police and are put behind bars. Gradually they become an important part of Indian National Movement and this definitely helps in improving their position. Hence it can be said that Mahatma Gandhi is certainly one of the greatest advocates of women's liberty. Throughout his life, he has worked hard and led reform movements for the cause of the women. He helped them in boosting their morale and self-esteem. It is evident from the fact that he engages women leaders in many nationalistic endeavours.

Stop To Consider:

Major Works of Mahatma Gandhi The major Works of Mahatma Gandhi are as follows

- My Experiments with Truth- It is his autobiography which covers his life till 1920. Gandhi does not deal with the 1920 post period as it is well known to the people. Besides he feels that his experiments in this period are yet to yield definite conclusions. He has written this book at the request of Swami Anand. My Experiments with Truth appears in the weekly 'Navajivan' during 1925-28. This book is marked with Gandhi's humility and truthfulness. He wants to tell the world the story of his experiments with truth. In 1999, the book is designated as one of the "100 Most Important Spiritual Books of the 20th Century" by Harper Collins publishers.
- Hind Swaraj- It is the title of the first complete writing of Mahatma Gandhi. It literally means 'self rule in India'. This small book of about 30000 words is written in November 1909. In Hind Swaraj Gandhi points out that the real enemy is not the British political domination but the modern Western civilization which is luring India into its stranglehold. He believes that the Indians educated in western style particularly lawyers, doctors, teachers and industrialists are undermining India's ancient heritage by insidiously spreading modern ways. Gandhi criticizes railways as they spread plague and produce famine by encouraging the export of food grains. Here he opines swaraj or self-rule as a state of life which can only

exist when Indians follow their traditional civilization free from the corruption of modern civilization. Hence the reading of Gandhi's works will give you an idea of his major concerns and socio-economic and political ideas. Gandhi's idea of Individual Gandhi believes that the individuals constitute an important part of the society. Therefore, he opines that the happiness of the whole society is based on the happiness of the individuals. According to him, if the individuals consciously submit their wills and voluntarily contribute their possession to the society, it will automatically lead to social welfare. He also argues that, in return, the society shall guarantee the maximum development of the individuals' personality. Gandhi believes that an individual should exercise five rules in his lifetime- truthfulness, brahmacharya, non-violence, non- stealing and non- hoarding. An individual's character is to be built on the foundation of these disciplines.

Check Your Progress:

1. Discuss Gandhi as a supporter of emancipation of women.
2. Why does Gandhi advocate the use of Khadi?
3. Discuss the five rules advocated by Gandhi for the individuals.

Gandhi on Family:

Gandhi views the family is a divine and consecrated institution. He has suggested that the conjugal relation should be based on true friendship and equality. He never supports the view that husband is superior in a conjugal relation. In a family, he believes that the children should be devoted to the parents and there should not be any discrimination between the sons and daughters. Both should have equal right to inheritance. He is in favour of self-reliant children and for that he suggests that they should be given proper education. They should be taught the value of honest livelihood. Moreover, he has also said that they should not be made slaves of ancestral property.

SAQ:

Do you think that equality between husband and wife brings prosperity in the family? Explain. (80 words)

.....

.....

.....

Devdasis and Prostitutes We have already learnt that Gandhi is a pioneer of the development of the status and position of women. While dealing with the issues of status of Indian women, he also considers the issues like prostitution and devdasi. According to him, the devdasi system denotes the use of young girls for the pleasure of the priests in the name of God. For him, it is a crime. He argues that the existence of the institution of prostitution is a shame

both for the society as well as man. Gandhi believes that the term devdasi is an indirect expression of prostitution. He considers it as a serious offence in the society.

Gandhi on Untouchability: Gandhi was dead against the concept of untouchability. He was a believer in Varnashrama system. Varnashrama implies for the division according to one's own profession. But in course of time this Varnashrama system had been replaced by the rigid caste system and he was not in support of this rigidity. He considers untouchability as a social offence and he was not at all happy with the conditions where they were made to stay in. Various restrictions were put against them like denial of entry to the temples, denial of taking water from the village well etc. He calls the untouchables by the name harijans meaning people of God. He also created the Harijan Sevak Sangha to fight for the removal of this social evil. And for this, he even stayed in colonies meant for the untouchables and fought for their cause.

1.4 Gandhi's Views on Satyagraha:

Gandhi propounded his idea of Satyagraha in his political philosophy. Satyagraha is a natural outcome of the supreme concept of truth. It is initially related to the concept of non-violence. Satyagraha means the exercise of purest soul source against all injustice and exploitation. He opines that evil should be resisted through satyagraha, the moral weapon based on love and soul which is superior to physical source. Satyagraha literally means holding fast to truth. It also means a technique of resisting all that is evil, unjust, impure or untrue by love, self suffering, and self purification and by appealing to the soul of the opponent. Gandhi stood for the practice of satyagraha in domestic and social relationships before its adoption in the political sphere. For Gandhi, satyagraha has certain techniques which may be termed as forms also-

- Non Co Operation-according to him, people can put an end to the injustice by withdrawing cooperation from the government and paralyzing it. Gandhi feels that oppression and exploitation are possible if the people co-operate with it. Even the most despotic government cannot survive without the consent of the governed which is forcibly procured by the despot. But as the subject cease to fear the despotic force, the despot's power is gone. Non cooperation may manifest itself in the forms of hartal, social ostracism, or social boycott and picketing.
- Hartal means stopping the business as a mark of protest against the policy of the ruler. Its object is to strike the imagination of the people and government. Gandhiji insisted that such hartal should be voluntary and non- violent. Those are not to be frequent.
- Picketing or blocking the path of a person who wants to do a particular thing is another form of non co-operation. In case of picketing also no force is to be used. Only the persuasive methods are to be employed. Picketing should avoid coercion, intimidation, discourtesy, hunger-strike etc.
- Another form of non- cooperation is social ostracism or social boycott. It is to boycott those who defy the public opinion. This is to be resorted only in exceptional cases and with restraint.

- Civil Disobedience- the participants in the civil disobedience movement declare their intention to disobey the cruel and unjust laws and suffer the necessary punishment for doing so. They carry on their struggle till the laws are replaced by just laws. It must be sincere, respectful and restrained.

According to Gandhi, it must rest on the well understood principles and exercised only by a selected few. Gandhi regards civil disobedience as a complete effective and bloodless substitute of armed rebellion. Civil disobedience may be of two types namely assertive and defensive. Assertive disobedience implies the disregard of laws retain to revenue and others. Defensive disobedience implies the formation of volunteer force for peaceful purposes like organising meeting, discussion etc.

Stop to Consider:

Gandhi on Nationalism and Internationalism:

Gandhiji stood for a world of people and wanted to build harmony between nationalism and internationalism. The doctrine of swadharma and swadeshi is the basis of Gandhian nationalism. He was against the nationalism based on violence and aggressive ideas. He relates his nationalism with internationalism. His nationalism was not restricted to India but to humanity at large. He was of the view that one must be a good nationalist in order to become a true internationalist.

- Hijrat- hijrat implies voluntary exiles from permanent place of residence. It means that if a person feels that he cannot undertake Satyagraha against the injustice of the oppressor, he should leave his own place. This is done by those who feel oppressed and cannot live without loss of self-respect in a particular place or lack of strength to defend himself violently.
- Fasting- fasting implies readiness on the part of the satyagrahi to suffer with a view to appeal to the heart of the wrong doer. Fasting can be resorted to only by a person who possesses spiritual fitness, purity of mind, discipline, humanity and faith. He favours it only as a last resort when all other techniques fail. It is not meant for all occasions except rare occasions.
- Strike- strike is the voluntary purificatory suffering undertaken to convert the opponent. The strikers are required to put forward their demands in clear terms. The demands are not to be unjust. In short, the various techniques of satyagraha indicate the individuals abiding the right of opposition to coercive authority. Gandhi has laid down some principles to be observed in the satyagraha. These are behaviour, truth, non-violence, non- stealing, non-possession and celibacy. A satyagrahi should not harbor anger. Satyagraha also depends upon the stage of the moral development of the satyagrahi. Satyagraha aims to secure progress and social justice. The satyagrahi must have humanity and self-respect. Satyagraha is a struggle for righteousness.

Distinction between Satyagraha and Passive Resistance: The concept of Satyagraha differs from passive resistance. Passive resistance is supposed to be a weapon of the weak and is characterized by hatred. It can also manifest itself in violence. Under passive resistance, violence is abjured on account of weakness and passive resistance registered to embrace its opponents into submission. Sometimes passive resistance can lead to the use of violent

methods. Satyagraha is based on spiritual force and stands for vindication of truth. It is a courage of dying without killing. In the Satyagraha, there is no place for cowardice. Satyagraha emphasizes the eternal strength. It is a moral weapon based on the superiority of spiritual force over physical force. In Satyagraha there is no room for effective and determined opposition to injustice and tyranny.

Stop To Consider: Gandhi on State Gandhi's ideas on state are relevant to understand his political philosophy. He is opposed to the present state because it was based on force and centralization of authority leading to negation of individual freedom. According to him, the state is only one of the means to secure the welfare of all. There is nothing sacred about the actions of the state. His views are apparent in the following lines: "Let no one commit the mistake of thinking that Ramrajya means a rule of Hindus. My Ram is another name for Khuda or God. I want Khuda Raj which is the same thing as the Kingdom of God on Earth." Obviously Gandhi's desire for an ideal society where everybody follows a code of righteous living and meeting all their essential needs is exemplified here. Gandhiji's state is a non-violent democratic state where social life will remain self-regulated. In his state the powers are to be decentralized and equality prevails in every sphere of life.

1.5 As a Critique of Modern Civilisation:

Gandhi's Views on Westernization Gandhi's views on westernization are based on his practical experience. He has stayed and studied in England for a long time and this has helped in shaping his ideas regarding westernization. His visit to South Africa has also influenced him to a great extent. He has pointed out both the positive as well as negative aspects of westernization. He is influenced by the rich literature of the western society. He also borrows the concepts like liberty and democracy from the western society. According to him, the brightest feature of western society is that it is free from some degrading evils like child marriage, caste system, orthodoxy, superstitions, etc. Western culture treats both man and woman as equals. He also likes the scientific temperament of the western society.

Pointing out the negative aspects of westernization, Gandhi says that the western society is running after wealth which is too dangerous. He also does not like their approach towards the issue of racism. According to Gandhi the western society does not pay any attention to the moral education of the children. Therefore, we can say that though he is critical of the western civilization, he does not forget to mention about the positive aspects of westernization. Gandhi has accepted the doctrine of equal distribution. He opposes the exploitation of poor by the rich. In order to solve the problem of economic inequality he advocates the concept of economic equality. He put forwards his scheme of trusteeship for economic equality. According to him, all persons should be supplied with the necessities to satisfy their natural needs. He subscribes to the Marxian formula 'to each according to his needs'.

Again, he does not support the confiscation of properties of the rich. He wants them to earn more but after satisfying their needs the balance must be held by them as trusteeship of the people. Gandhi advises the government to fix the amount the rich can keep to themselves and the rest as the trustee of the people. Gandhi says that the brilliant people should use their

brilliance to earn more. But they should not keep to themselves anything more than what is necessary. He advocates for the transformation of the capitalist order of the society into an egalitarian society. Gandhi makes it clear that if the rich by themselves do not accept this offer of trusteeship, the government may be forced to pass a law by which their properties can be confiscated.

SAQ:

Examine Gandhi's views on confiscation of property. (60 words)

.....
.....

Again, Gandhi does not favour large scale industrialization and mechanization. He always gives man more importance than machines. He is an advocate of cottage industries. He believes that poverty of people can be less only if they are given work for their spare time so that they can earn. He advocates a reconciliation of large and small scale industries and nationalization of key industries. He opposes to the introduction of the labour saving machines. His view is that the problem of India is to find employment for those who had no work to do and not to restore unemployment as a result of the introduction of the machinery to do the work previously done by the workers. Gandhi accepts some basic industry on large scale like mines, cement, electricity etc. He also encourages big industrialists and big farmers with the expectation that they will develop the attitude of trusteeship. Gandhi puts emphasis on the ethical aspect of economic problems. He does not draw a distinction between economics and ethics. Gandhi believes that the economics which hurts the moral well-being of an individual or nation is immoral. He feels that it is wrong to measure the value of an industry by the dividends it pays to shareholders. Rather it should be measured by its effect on the bodies, souls and spirits of the people employed in it.

Gandhi emphasises plain living. He believes that it helps in cutting down the wants and ensuring self-reliance. Gandhi distinguishes between standard of living and standard of life. He opines that standard of living implies the material and physical standard of food, clothes and housing. A higher standard of life on the other hand, denotes that along with these material advancements, the cultural and spiritual values and qualities should also be adopted. We have learnt that Gandhiji provides us with original ideas regarding economics. He popularizes a unique way of thinking in the field of economics. His idea regarding economic system of the country is the most practicable alternative system against the prevailing economic system. Here we can refer to the village based economy of China and Israel, the small scale industry based economy of Japan which are close to the Gandhian model of economy.

Check Your Progress:

1. Why did Gandhi consider untouchability a social evil?
2. Mention the measures suggested by Gandhi to tackle the problem of Unemployment.
3. Write true or false
 - a. Gandhi favoured large scale industrialization and mechanization.
 - b. Gandhi draw a distinction between economics and ethics.

Stop To Consider:

Gandhi on Religion and Politics: Gandhi wants spiritualization of politics. He does not want to separate religion from politics. He feels that there is no politics without religion. His religion is a dynamic force. Hence the incorporation of religion in politics means a progressive movement towards justice and truth because a religious man will never tolerate any kind of exploitation or oppression. According to him, there must be unity between the inner and outer life of a man. Although he wants to strengthen religious basis of politics, yet, he will not tolerate any privilege to any particular group or discrimination against any group on the basis of religion. 1.6 Gandhi on Ahimsa The core of Gandhi's political thought is non-violence or ahimsa. According to Gandhi non-violence or ahimsa, the heart of all religion is the truth itself. It means avoiding injury to anything. According to him, the function of the state should be based on the principles of ahimsa. (Non-violence is a powerful instrument.)

Gandhi supports non- violence for the following reasons

- Non-violence is held to be superior to violence, as it is an expression of love leading to acceptance of punishment upon oneself rather than imposing it upon the opponents.
- Non-violence appeals to conscience.
- It is a spiritual force relating to soul and not a physical force.
- Adherence to non-violence is sometimes held to be a commandment of religious faith.

Gandhi refers to three levels of non-violence. The highest form is the enlightened non-violence of resourcefulness or the non-violence of the brave. People adopt this kind of non-violence not by painful necessity but by inner conviction based on moral considerations. This type of non-violence is not only confined to political sphere but pervades every sphere of life. It is the non-violence without any mental reservation. It is that kind of non-violence which can move mountains and transform life. The second kind of non-violence is adopted as a measure of expediency and sound policy in some spheres of life. This kind of non-violence is the non-violence of the weak or the passive, i.e. non-violence of the helpless. People use this kind of non-violence because of weakness rather than moral conviction. However, it is not as effective as the non-violence of the brave. It is not based on any conviction but on expediency and consequently permits the use of violence where necessary. The third kind of

non-violence is the passive violence of the coward and the effeminate. A coward runs away from danger instead of facing it. It is unnatural and dishonourable. This non-violence of the coward is actually the violence in suspension or inactive violence. If a choice has to be made between violence and cowardice, Gandhi's preference will be violence. To him, vengeance is superior to passive and helpless submission. According to Gandhi, non-violence presupposes the ability, though not the willingness to strike. Non-violence is the quality of the brave and strong and is not possible without fearlessness. There is nothing like failure in non-violence as there is nothing like success in violence. It is essential to understand the implications of non-violence as Gandhi understood them. It is the creed to which he rendered life-long service.

The Implications are:-

- The people who do not believe in God of love cannot be benefited by non-violence.
- Non-violence can be used for the safeguard of one's self respect and sense of honour. But it cannot always be used in the context of the possession of land or money.
- Truth and ahimsa are two sides of a smooth unstamped metallic disc and are so intertwined that it is difficult to separate them. Gandhi puts more emphasis on truth than on ahimsa because he believes that truth exists beyond and unconditioned by space and time, but ahimsa exists on the part of all finite beings. Ahimsa divorced from truth will be demoralizing. Gandhiji is prepared to sacrifice ahimsa for the sake of truth and not vice versa.

Stop to consider:

Gandhiji on Sarvodaya:

Mahatma Gandhi translates John Ruskin's tract on political economy 'Unto The Last' and named it as 'Sarvodaya'. It is published in the year 1908. The word sarvodaya is a combination of two words 'sarva' and 'uday'. It denotes upliftment of all. It also denotes 'good of all', 'service to all', 'welfare of all' etc. Gandhi's sarvodaya presupposes the socio-economic development of all. The base of this philosophy is commonness i.e. what is done for all. Gandhi's sarvodaya follows the policy of self-sacrifice. He opines that every individual should be ready as well as willing to sacrifice the happiness of his own for the sake of others. Gandhi's sarvodaya again puts emphasis on the development of the villages. He argues that the villages should be given priority while giving aids as these villages form the keystone of Indian democracy. Sarvodaya believes in the principle of equality. Gandhi opines that in sarvodaya raj there should not be any rich or poor, high or low, privileged or unprivileged persons.

1.7 Summing Up:

In this unit, we have learnt the sociological foundations of Gandhi's political thought. He wants to make the women capable of sharing the same platform with men. Mahatma Gandhi's urge to make the people of India wear khadi garments is not only a call to create self-reliance but also a call to prove the unity of India. He wants to eradicate the social evils like untouchability, the institution of devdasi, prostitution etc. We have also learnt that

Gandhi is a crusader who advocates economic reform. For him the means are as important as the aims. The means must be nonviolent, ethical, and truthful in all economic spheres and Gandhi provides the new economic system with these means. He advocates trusteeship, decentralization of economic activities, labour intensive technology, and rural India is his first priority. He advocates the development of the rural economy with the development of agriculture and village industries. Here, you have also learnt Gandhi's concept of Sarvodaya which means upliftment of all. In the next unit of this block, we will be dealing with Jawaharlal Nehru.

SAQ:

Do you think non-violence can be used as an instrument of conflict resolution in present day politics? (60 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.8 References and Suggested Readings:

Rao, C.N. Shankar. Sociology: Principles of Sociology with an Introduction to Social Thought. New Delhi: S. Chand and Company Ltd., 2006

Agarwal, R.C. Constitutional Development and National Movement of India: Freedom Movement, Acts and Indian Constitution. New Delhi: S. Chand and Company Ltd., 2002
Gupta,

R.C. Great Political Thinkers: East and West. Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, 2000

UNIT: 2

GANDHI: SWARAJ, RELIGION AND POLITICS

Contents:

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Objectives
- 2.3 Gandhi's view on Swaraj
- 2.4 Gandhi's view on Religion and Politics
- 2.5 Summing up
- 2.6 References and Suggested Readings

2.1 Introduction:

In the previous unit of this block we have learnt some of the important ideas of Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhi as we call him 'Father of the Nation' has made all efforts to make us free from the British Rule. He was the leader of one of the widespread democratic upsurge of twentieth century against colonial power. In the previous unit we have also learnt that freedom movement of India led by Mahatma Gandhi followed non-violent methods. Satyagraha is one such technique of non-violence resistance. The major goal of his movement was overthrowing the colonial power. But at the same time Gandhi was keen on establishing Poorna Swaraj or complete freedom in India which has much broader connotations than freedom from colonial Power. In this unit we shall attempt to discuss Gandhi's view on Swaraj and also his ideas of Religion and Politics.

2.2 Objectives:

As we all know Gandhi adopted an unique way of struggling against Colonial power by following non-violent methods and techniques. After reading this unit you will be able to:

Discuss Gandhi's views on Swaraj

Analyse Gandhi's ideas on Religion and Politics.

2.3 Gandhi's view on Swaraj:

Now in this section let us try to understand the concept of *Swaraj* as conceived by Mahatma Gandhi. In common sense, *Swaraj* means self-rule. However, Gandhi used the term in a wider sense. According to him Swaraj means an integrated revolution that encompasses all spheres of life. In the words of M. K. Gandhi, "at the individual level swaraj is vitally connected with

the capacity for dispassionate self-assessment, ceaseless self-purification and growing swadeshi or self-reliance.”(M.K. Gandhi, 1928).

In Political terms swaraj means self-government, which does not necessarily means the good government because Gandhi believed that self-government may not always be the good government. Again, swaraj also denotes the struggle /effort to be independent of any kind of government control be it foreign or national. Thus, swaraj stands for sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority.

While discussing the concept of Swaraj put forwarded by Gandhi, we must remember that it has economic connotations too. In the economic sense, poornaswaraj stands for complete economic freedom of all sections particularly the labour class. Thus for Gandhi, swaraj is much broader than freedom from all restraints, “it is self-rule, self-restraint and could be equated with moksha or salvation”. (ibid).

Gandhi has also discussed extensively how to realise Swaraj. He urged people to have work tirelessly for attaining Swaraj as it would not come from outside. According to him, Swaraj is the fruit of patience, perseverance, ceaseless toil, courage and intelligent appreciation of the environment. (ibid) Further, Gandhi urged them swaraj means vast organising ability, penetration into the villages solely for the services of the villagers; in other words; it means national education i.e, education of the masses. He said, “Real swaraj will come, not by the acquisition of authority but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when it is abused. In other words, swaraj is to be attained by education the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority.

According to Gandhi, the precondition for establishing Swaraj is political independence. In india, to establish Swaraj Gandhi work through an organisation called Indian National Congress. However, at times there were differences of opinion between Gandhi and other leaders like Nehru. Gandhi formulated a development model to be adopted by India known as Hind Swaraj. However, Nehru dismissed it by saying unreal which can never be attained. Gandhi’s idea of Swaraj is different from the literal meaning of the term because he visualised an india where democracy and equality prevails. Gandhi was repeatedly saying that India’s problem lies not only with foreign domination. Hence freedom from British Rule would not solve all the evils existing in the country. To remove the evils existing in the society, Gandhi wanted internal cleansing through self-motivation. Therefore, he believed Swaraj must be built from below which may eliminate all kinds of domination, oppression, discrimination through the use of non-violence. For attaining the goals of Swaraj, there is need of economic regeneration of rural india. He emphasised on the revival of Khadi industries and othe village industries for that. To establish swaraj in this sense Gandhi founded voluntary organisations like The All India Spinners Association (AISA), All India Village Industries Association(AIVIA), the HarijanSewakSangh etc.

SAQ:

How Gandhi's idea of Swaraj can solve many problems of contemporary Indian Society? (80 words).

.....

.....

.....

.....

Stop to Consider:

Gandhi's Philosophy on Economic Reconstruction:

By now we all know that Gandhi is a social, economic and political reformer. He is the only political and social thinker who is capable to present a complete economic theory. He has his original explanation about important concepts and terminologies of Economics. He explains that economy does not mean the exploitation of the unlimited use of the resources available in the country. Economy meant the total living of a country that has got the right to survive with co-existence. His economic ideas which cover all the problems that effect our social life are influenced by Ruskin, Tolstoy, Ramkrishna Paramhansa and Swami Vivekananda. Again, Gandhiji wants the economic emancipation of Indian people. He is an advocate of Swadeshi and he advises the boycott of foreign goods, foreign companies and foreign capital to maximum possible extent. This boycott is not politically motivated. It is purely for the economic betterment of our country. Swadeshi avoids economic dependence on external market forces. He appeals the people of India to use home- made goods rather than foreign goods. According to Gandhi, the hand weaving of dresses and development of handicrafts will be a panacea for India's poverty, economic backwardness and unemployment. He feels that all members of a village community must prioritize local goods and services. The villages must build a strong economic base to satisfy most of its needs. He advices the people of India to purchase the rural products only. Every village community of free India should have its own carpenters, shoemakers, potters, builders, mechanics, farmers, engineers, weavers, teachers, bankers, merchants, traders, musicians, artists, and priests. Gandhi is not an extremist. Being a practical thinker, he accepts the foreign economic relation for unavoidable useful things which cannot be produced in the country. Gandhi is well aware that the boycott of foreign goods will adversely affect British industry. Therefore, he applies his economic philosophy as a part of his strategy against colonial rule. He is not against industrial revolution, but he creates a framework keeping in mind the economic condition of India under alien rule.

2.4 Gandhi's view on Religion and Politics:

Gandhi wanted spiritualization of politics. He does not want to separate religion from politics rather he wanted a synthesis of two. He feels that there is no politics without religion because politics devoid of religion is a death trap as it kills the soul. His religion is a dynamic force.

Here we must remember that, Gandhi's religion is not about going to temple or Mosque or Gurudwara. It is based on morality and humanity. Hence the incorporation of religion in politics means a progressive movement towards justice and truth because a man of religion will never tolerate any kind of exploitation or oppression. According to him, there must be unity between the inner and outer life of a man. Although he wants to strengthen religious basis of politics, yet, he will not tolerate any privilege to any particular group or discrimination against any group on the basis of religion.

Gandhi primarily based all his social and political doctrines on the religious and spiritual views of human life. He, however, does not preach any particular religion. His religion was the service of the community as he strongly believed that there is no religion apart from human activity. Further, he believed that God lives even in the smallest atom and there to love God is to love His creation. Religion is thus a passion for love. Here, we must remember that, though Gandhi did not name any religion, he was nurtured in the tradition of Hinduism. Following the belief of Hinduism Gandhi said that, "Truth is God and there is no other God than Truth." He further states that the Truth can be realised through love and Ahimsa.

For Gandhi, Religion is welfare oriented and therefore mixing religion with politics would bring welfare of all. In the words of Gandhi, "I don't accept a politics without religion, polity is a servant of religion, a polity without religion leads to doom as it kills the soul". Thus Gandhi challenged many thinkers by incorporating morality and spiritualism in politics. He believed it can serve all the people of the society and thus its Nobel ritual. Hence, we can say that the chief aim of Gandhiji's Polity was to establish political morality where truth, non-violence and love can reduce the problems in the society.

While discussing the concept of religion and morality, Gandhi was very much influenced by Buddha and Jesus. Religion through morality ultimately establishes a moral polity. Further, he believed that "polity without religion is a phenomenon of great worries". Only a polity with religion can do service to its people. A polity without religion becomes a medium for a few people to satisfy their selfish interests. Such representatives by ignoring the interest of the common people fulfil their own interests. In such a situation polity becomes dirty as the public welfare is neglected there.

To establish a stable polity therefore, Gandhi emphasised on having an ethical basis of politics. Here, religion has a bigger role to play. But we must remember that, by religion, he does not refer to the so-called religions the common people understand. Gandhi's religion, thus also talked about rights and responsibilities. Hence, he urges people not to be selfish and to serve all to serve God. Selfishness may result in violence which creates disturbance and instability in the polity. The aim of a polity should be to follow humanity and morality and for that religion must be brought into politics. Then only spiritualisation may take place and self-government can be attained in the truest sense of the term.

Check Your Progress:

1. Discuss critically Gandhi's idea of Swaraj.
2. Define the concept of PoornaSwaraj advocated by Gandhi.
3. Gandhi's concept of Swaraj has political significance only. (Write True or False).
4. Write a note on Gandhi's view on Religion and Politics.

2.5 Summing Up:

After reading this unit we are now in apposition to analyse Gandhi's view of Swaraj. We have learnt how his concept of Swaraj is different from other leaders of India. During freedom movement Gandhi was putting all efforts to break all the shackles that suppressed the larger section of Indian society. In fact, His swaraj has gone much beyond political interpretation. It has socio-economic implications as well. From this unit we have learnt that though Swaraj aims at establishing self-rule for all the classes of the society, its main emphasis was on to uplift the poorer and downtrodden sections of the society. As pointed out earlier Gandhi's concept of swaraj is a comprehensive one and encapsulates the individual human person and life in a holistic framework. It visualises the progressive liberation of all from all oppressive structures and therefore can be equated with salvation. Reading of this unit has also helped you to comprehend Gandhi's idea of religion and Politics. You have learnt that, Gandhi has put forward a revolutionary idea by establishing a close relationship between Religion and Politics. For him, spiritualisation of politics can bring welfare to the masses. It would help to establish a just society where rights of every individual would be ensured.

2.6 References and Suggested Readings:

Agarwal, R.C. Constitutional Development and National Movement of India: Freedom Movement, Acts and Indian Constitution. New Delhi: S. Chand and Company Ltd., 2002
Gupta,

R.C. Great Political Thinkers: East and West. Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, 2000

RajniKothari, "Masses Classes and the state " in New Social Movements in the South Empowering the people, ed. PonnaWignaraja, Visataar Publications, New Delhi, 1993.

M. K. Gandhi, Young India, June 28, 1928, p. 772.

Links:

<https://www.mkgandhi.org/articles/swaraj.htm>

https://www.mkgandhi.org/articles/religion_polity.htm

UNIT: 3

NEHRU: SOCIALISM, SECULARISM

Contents:

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Objectives
- 3.3 Nehru as an Architect of Modern India
- 3.4 Nehru's Ideas on Socialism
- 3.5 Nehru on Secularism
- 3.6 Summing Up
- 3.7 References and Suggested Readings

3.1 Introduction:

Among the modern Indian political thinkers the name of Jawaharlal Nehru deserves special mention. Jawaharlal Nehru is regarded as the architect of modern India. He is a leading figure in Indian Independence Movement and is elected as the first Prime Minister of independent India. He is one of the founders of Non-Alignment Movement. He is also referred to as Pandit Nehru and among the children he is known as Chacha Nehru. Nehru, the creator of modern India is a renowned political thinker as well as a statesman. Jawaharlal Nehru is a revolutionary, internationalist, A democrat, A socialist, A pacifist and an individualist. He is a free thinker and emerges as a man of action who does not indulge in political speculation. He has certain basic conviction and ideology. Nehru believes in anti- fascist ideology and fights against totalitarianism. He believes in human values and the dignity of the individual including civil liberty. The influence of Gandhi can be traced in Nehru. This unit will make an attempt to deal with the ideas of Nehru. We shall discuss Nehru as the architect of modern India. His ideas on non- alignment, secularism, nationalization of industries, mixed economy, nationalism, internationalism etc. help him contributing towards building a modern India. He never tries to build up political theories but his political ideas can be found in his writings like Glimpses of World History, Discovery of India, and An Autobiography. We shall also discuss his ideas on democracy and socialism.

3.2 Objectives:

The objective of this unit is to explain the main features of Nehru's views. After reading this unit you will be able to

- examine Nehru as the architect of modern India
- explain his ideas on democracy
- analyze his ideas on socialism

3.3 Nehru as an Architect of Modern India:

Jawaharlal Nehru is one of the greatest figures of our generation, an outstanding statesman whose service to the cause of human freedom is unforgettable. Nehru can rightly be called the architect of modern India. He is of the firm opinion that without economic and social freedom, political freedom has little or no meaning. Constitution is relevant to him only as an instrument of social change. Nehru is very clear in his vision that modern India shall radiate scientific temper, which includes freedom from every form of fundamentalism and respect for universal values of human dignity. He carefully handles India's domestic situation in the years immediately after the independence. One of the major contributions of Nehru towards modern India is the making of Indian foreign policy. In fact, Nehru determines India's international profile to a great degree in the post-independence years. Nehru is regarded as the architect of modern India from shaping the nation-building process in India.

Let us now discuss some of the ideas put forwarded by Nehru.

Panchasheel:

Nehru's concept of panchasheel is also a contribution towards building modern India. The Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence or Panchsheel are a series of agreements between the People's Republic of China and India. It is first put forth by India at the start of negotiations that takes place in Delhi from December 1953 to April 1954 between the Delegation of the PRC Government and the Delegation of the Indian Government on the relations between the two countries with respect to disputed territory. Later, the Five Principles are formally written into the preface to the "Agreement Between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India on Trade and Co-Operation between the PRC and India" concluded between the two sides. Since June 1954, the Five Principles have been adopted in many other international documents. As norms of relations between nations, they have become widely recognized and accepted throughout the region. The main objective of panchasheel is to ensure that newly independent nations will not have the same aggressive relationship they once share with the colonizers. The five principles or the panchasheel are

- Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty
- Mutual non-aggression against anyone.
- Mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs
- Equality and mutual benefit

Peaceful co-existence

Nationalization of Industries: To ensure state control over key industries Nehru advocates nationalization of industries. This concept also helps him in building modern India. To him, the most important objective is to increase production and nationalization is only a means to achieve that end. He does not wish to go for nationalization without considering its consequences. He does not regard socialism as synonymous with nationalism. He does not accept the idea that a general scheme of nationalization will bring greater equalization. He is in favour of the rapid industrialization of India so that she can be relieved of pressure on land, combat poverty and raise her standards of living, her defence and variety of other purposes.

Nehru advocated a socialist model for the economy of India i.e. no taxation for Indian farmers, minimum wage and benefits for blue-collar workers, and the nationalization of heavy industries such as steel, aviation, shipping, electricity and mining. An extensive network of public work and industrialization campaign result in the construction of major dams, irrigation canals, roads, and thermal and hydroelectric power stations.

Nehru on Nationalism: Nehru is a great nationalist though he does not provide any theory of nationalism. He believes in fundamental unity of India despite numerous diversities. He treats nationalism as a positive as well as negative force. The radical arrogant behaviour of the British ruler towards the Indians shapes his ideas on nationalism. He blames the British government for poverty and exploitation in India. Again, nationalism is a living force in the history of modern India. As the British keeps in their hands all the initiatives and controls the mechanism and they take all the decisions, he thinks that nationalism in India is very important for the people of India. Nehru opines that the feeling of nationalism will make the people realize that they belong to a nation called India and it will help in bringing national unity among the people of India. It is worth mentioning here that Nehru is cautious against any narrow mindedness in the name of nationalism. By now we have learnt that Nehru is not a narrow nationalist. Nehru is convinced that differences in language cannot stop the growth of nationalism in India. He does not believe in things like Hindu nationalism or Muslim nationalism. According to him, there is only Indian nationalism.

Nehru on Internationalism: Nehru is also an internationalist. Though he is a great nationalist, he does not advocate an aggressive attitude towards internationalism. He is of the view that true nationalism does not conflict with internationalism. His nationalism is mixed with a strong internationalist outlook. He believes that the different nations of the world shall maintain a relation of peaceful co existence and co-operation. But most importantly, Nehru does not want internationalism at the cost of nationalism

Stop To Consider :

Major Works of Nehru:

The Discovery of India: This book is written by Jawaharlal Nehru during his imprisonment in 1942-1946 at Ahmednagar in the Ahmednagar Fort. He is imprisoned for taking part in the Quit India Movement along with other Indian leaders. He uses the time of his imprisonment to write down his thoughts on Indian history, philosophy and culture from the viewpoint of a liberal Indian fighting for the independence of his country. In this book Nehru argues that India is a historic nation with a right to sovereignty. He also examines the impact of various people starting from the arrival of the Aryans to the British government on Indian culture. In this book he also analyses the incorporation of various people and culture into Indian society. This book also analyses the philosophy of Indian life.

Glimpses of World History: Jawaharlal Nehru has written this book in the year 1934. It is the collection of 196 letters on world history written from various prisons in British India from 1930 to 1933. He has written these letters to his young daughter Indira to introduce her to world history. The first letter is the birthday gift to Indira from him. It is the only gift he can afford in jail. This book contains the history of humankind from 6000 BC to the time of writing of the book. It covers the rise and fall of great empires and civilizations from Greece

and Rome to China and West Asia; great figures such as Ashoka and Genghis Khan, Gandhi and Lenin; topics like wars and revolutions, democracies and dictatorships. He does not like the way history is taught in school as it is confined to the history of a single country. He wants his young daughter to know what people do and why they do. He is well aware that it is possible only through knowing the history of the whole world. The New York Times describes it as one of the most remarkable books ever written.

An Autobiography or Towards Freedom (1936): This book is an autobiographical book. He has written this book while staying in prison. He begins the book describing how his ancestors have to flee Kashmir and goes on to tell about his own life. His entire life history, from the time before his father is born seems to have led him naturally to where he is. As a child he seems quiet, observing, and thoughtful. As a (very tall) grownup, he is still thoughtful. One sees his admiration for humble people and his aversion to any form of violence early in the book.

This section is designed to help you comprehend Nehru's works as well as aims to provide an insight into his socio-economic and political ideas.

3.4 Nehru on Secularism:

Secularism is a distinct contribution of Nehru to Indian political thought. He is the chief architect of Indian secularism. Nehru defines secularism in dual sense. Firstly, by secularism he means keeping the state, politics and education separate from religion. He has no attraction for religion as the basis of social and political state. Religion, according to him is a private matter for the individual. India is a country of many religions. He feels that it must not be controlled by any particular religion. Secondly, he defines secularism in terms of showing equal respect for all faiths and providing equal opportunities for their followers. According to him, secularism means grant of equal status to all religion. He feels that through secularism all religion will be equal in order. He opposes the grant of any special privileges to any religion. He regards secularism as an essential condition for democracy. He lays his foundation of strong secular state. The secularism of Nehru implies the neutrality of the state in religious matters. According to him, secularism is a mental attitude on the part of various committees which can bring harmony and fraternity towards one another. His concept of secularism also implies the existence of a uniform civil code for the people of India. His commitment to secularism is unsurpassed and all-pervasive. He helps secularism acquire deep roots among the Indian people. He is of the view that secularism means giving full protection to the minorities and removing their fears. But at the same time he is opposed to minority communalism. He also argues most convincingly that secularism has to be the sole basis for national unity in a multi-religious society.

Stop To Consider:

Life sketch of Jawaharlal Nehru Jawaharlal Nehru is born in Allahabad on 14th November 1889 to a wealthy Indian barrister and politician Motilal Nehru. He is educated in Britain at the Independent Boy's School, Harrow School and Trinity College, Cambridge. During his time in Britain, he is known as Joe Nehru. Nehru becomes a leader of the left wing of the

Indian National Congress and the Congress President under the mentorship of Mahatma Gandhi. He is a key player in the long struggle for Indian independence. He is eventually recognized as Gandhi's political heir. He is elected as the first Prime Minister of India in 1947. He remains in power till 1964. As one of the founders of the Non-Alignment Movement, he is an important figure in the international politics of the post-war era. He is also referred to as 'Pandit Nehru'. He died on 27th May 1964. Nehru and the Non-Alignment Movement Nehru's concept of non-alignment has earned him the reputation of the architect of modern India. Along with Tito, Nasser and Sukarno he has founded the non-alignment movement. During his time, the world is divided into two power blocs. The newly independent and non-colonized nations are pressurized from both the blocs to join them. But Nehru along with Tito, Nasser and Sukarno stay out of the power bloc politics. Nehru is in favour of an issue-based alliance. He does not favour alliances based on political and economic dogmas. The main principle of non-alignment movement is the preservation of India's freedom of action internationally through refusal to align India with any bloc or alliance particularly those led by the United States or the Soviet Union. Nehru believes that the newly independent states in Asia and Africa have the rights not to join either the Soviet or the capitalist power blocs. Nehru does not consider the non-aligned policy to be neutral but he believes that it allows the nations to accept aid and maintain good relations with nations from both power blocks

Nehru as an Individualist:

Like a modern thinker the whole philosophy of Jawaharlal Nehru revolves around the individual. He attaches great importance to the all round development of the individuals in the society. Nehru argues that without the satisfaction of essential economic needs individual development is not possible. He believes that the welfare of the individual can be properly realised only in a democracy. Democracy is a means to an end, the end being the good life of the individual. He considers the individual more important than the society. He insists that individual shall try to promote the larger interest of the community as a whole while developing himself. But he never believes in the sacrifice of the spirit of individual freedom at the altar of the state. He believes in various freedoms of man inside the state. His faith in individual freedom and civil liberty is fundamental. Mixed Economy Another notable contribution of Nehru towards building modern India is his concept of mixed economy. Though Nehru is a socialist he favours a type of socialism different from most of the socialist thinkers. Nehru reconciles his socialism with the concept of mixed economy. This implies combination of state or public enterprise in certain fields with private enterprise in other fields. In his socialism Nehru rejects the state owned concept of mixed economy. Nehru argues that India with her limited resources and underdeveloped economy cannot adopt the system of complete state controlled economy and also free enterprise method. Therefore, he favours the idea of mixed economy as the best method because this will lead to equitable distribution of wealth in the country and proper utilization of the wealth. Nehru favours state control of industries, which are concerned with defense production as well as the basic heavy industries. He is conscious of the fact that India, a state with a shattered economy and limited technical and financial resources is not in a position to take over the existing industrial concerns. He feels it desirable to permit the private enterprise to continue in the fields where it is operative and to utilize the resources of the state for the development of the state.

However, Nehru is in favour of limiting the scope of private sector, though he fully realizes the important role the private sector can play in the development of the country's economy. He favours its continuance with governmental control and to work in co- operation with the public sector. The private sector must be guided by a social purpose and must subordinate its self- interest to common welfare. Thus the mixed economy gives the consideration in extension of public sector on social ends. The idea of mixed economy emphasized by Nehru is of a flexible nature and can adapt itself according to the changing conditions. Thus, Nehru has to reconcile himself with the concept of mixed economy because of the economic conditions of the country, particularly India's underdeveloped economy. His main concern is the concept for India's economic development. Though various thinkers criticize the concept, Nehru has to compromise with the concept of mixed economy in the socialist pattern of society as it is not applicable in the Indian situation.

Check Your Progress:

1. What is the meaning of non- alignment?
2. What are the five principles of Panchasheel?
3. Analyze Nehru as an individualist and secularist.
4. Discuss briefly the economic ideas of Nehru.

Stop To Consider:

Nehru on Women: Jawaharlal Nehru is said to be one of the greatest advocates of the rights of women in India. He plays a significant role in improving the socio- economic condition of the women. He makes every effort to raise their status socially, economically, politically and educationally to make them at par with men. He believes that a country is judged by the condition of women. Nehru forces the women of India to come out of their seclusion. He turns the 'dolls' into valiant soldiers to fight the battle for freedom. In the Karachi Congress, Nehru introduces the concept of 'equal obligations' along with 'equal rights'. He tries to remove the 'sex disabilities'. He introduces the local programmes of self-defence and self-sufficiency to help the women to take part in the national movement. With the dawn of independence, the upliftment of women becomes the special responsibility of the government. Jawaharlal Nehru enacts laws to guarantee practical universal suffrage to the women population of the country. These laws aim to secure the social freedoms of Indian women. Under the Prime- Ministership of Nehru, female legal rights are increased. The greatest achievements of Nehru are the female education and passing of Hindu Code Bill.

SAQ:

1. Is there any relevance of non-aligned policy in contemporary politics? Give reasons in support of your answer. (20+80 words)

.....
.....

3.5 Nehru's Ideas on Socialism:

Nehru is born in an aristocratic family and possesses purely bourgeoisie outlook till 1920. Only in the summer of 1920, he is involved in a peasant movement in Oudh which provides a new turn to his thinking. During this peasant movement in Oudh Nehru stays with the peasants for three days. This period brings him in close contact with the peasants and provides him an opportunity to look at their miserable plight from close quarters. The impacts of this change in Nehru's ideologies greatly contributes to the development of his faith in socialism in the later stages. It ultimately leads Nehru to become a socialist. In 1929, after a visit to Russia, Nehru is greatly influenced by the socialist thought of Russia. He is firmly convinced that without social freedom and socialist pattern of society neither the state nor the country or the individual can develop much. Nehru is opposed to capitalism as it leads to exploitation of one man by another, one group by another, and one country by another. According to Nehru the only alternative is socialism. Socialism appeals to him as a philosophy of life. It is the only key to the solution of the world's problems in India. According to him, establishment of a classless society shall be our main aim. Ideologically, Nehru's socialism is given concrete form at the Avadi session of the congress in January 1955. The state will have to initiate large scale power and transport projects, it will have overall control of resources, maintain strategic controls, prevent the development of cartels and the like. Nehru is deeply moved by what he has seen in China. He is impressed by the energy and discipline of Chinese workers under the direction of an efficient centralized government, which gives China terrifying strength. He admires the effective use of China's huge labour force in large scale construction projects such as dams and hopes to emulate this in India. Nehru feels that the socialism is the only solution to India's problems as well as world problems. For him, socialism is more important than economic doctrine. He considers socialism necessary not only for India but for the entire world.

Stop To Consider:

Nehru on Caste: Jawaharlal Nehru is a highly educated man. His western education acts as a catalyst to make him oppose the evils of all pervasive caste system. He undertakes corrective measures by changing existing Indian legal laws. He enacts legal procedures to make caste discrimination illegible and punishable by law. He also aspires for the equality of the Indian populace. He actively promotes and brings the system of reservation in the Indian job sector. A certain percentage of government jobs are reserved for persons born into Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. This is done to ensure the participation of the less privileged Indian population to the mainstream. Nehru is keen on retaining the Indian character of socialism. His approach to socialism is pragmatic and he opposes to define socialism in precise and rigid terms. The socialism of Nehru is not only based on his social ideal of human relations based on individual liberty but also on his concept of social justice. He believes that the problems of India's mass poverty and economic stagnation can be solved only through the adoption of economic planning on socialist basis. He puts emphasis on planning, economic growth and socialist pattern. He is in favour of equality of opportunity for all individuals, minimization of inequalities of income and wealth and prevention of the concentration of economic power.

Nehru tries to evolve a socialist philosophy. In order to achieve a classless society, he emphasizes the need for total transformation of social life through democratic methods. He wants to bring socialism through gradual and non-violent methods. He also gives importance to economic planning but rejects the concept of state owned economy. He advocates the concept of mixed economy in his socialism. He assures a place for the private sector in his socialism. His socialist society is not totalitarian in nature. He does not subordinate the individual to the state. He also gives place to rival industries and KhadiUdyog in his scheme of economic reconstruction. The socialism of Nehru is particularized by three distinguishing characteristics. He is a democratic socialist and his socialism is based on respect for individual worth and dignity. He also provides freedom of enterprise, conscience and mind and the possession of private property on a restricted scale. Nehru does not find any inherent contradictions between socialism and individualism.

He gives more importance on production than on distribution. The removal of poverty and the establishment of equal opportunities are the main essence of socialism. Nehru wants to organise socialism in a way that it suits the condition of each country. He continuously tries to bring changes keeping in view the fabric of Indian society. Nehru opines that socialist society and cooperative society are similar in kind. All of us know that in a cooperative society each individual gives his best as well as find full scope for his own development. Nehru said that we are accustomed to an acquisitive society. But the profit motive of this society should be ended as soon as possible. But this is not a very easy task. The vested interest in the acquisitive society will always act as a barrier. These interests are active during the freedom struggle also. This gives a false impression of democracy without active participation by the masses. But the changing model envisaged by Nehru will definitely benefit the masses. But it should be noted here that there is a large gap between his theory and practice. Yet we must not forget that he is the one who carries the socialist vision to millions and makes socialism a part of their consciousness.

Nehru opines that in Indian condition socialist transformation is a process and not an event. Socialism in India, according to him, is not a clearly predefined, pre-laid-out scheme. Socialism is a process which is expected to go on being defined, stage by stage, as the process advanced. Socialist transformation is viewed in terms of a series of reforms. Nehru describes these reforms as ‘surgical operations’. Therefore, socialist transformation, according to him, consists of a series of ‘surgical operations’ performed through the due process of law by a democratic legislature. Moreover, one aspect of Nehru’s approach to socialism deserves to be stressed. As an impact of Gandhi’s influence, he emphasises the importance of means with that of ends in building a socialist India. He believes that wrong means will not lead to right results. He condemns violence as a mean and emphasises using non-violent means. He is of the view that existing class struggle can be resolved through non-violent means and rule of law.

SAQ:

Discuss Nehru’s views on socialism in India. (80 words)

.....
.....

3.6 Summing Up:

After analyzing the unit, you have learnt that Jawaharlal Nehru is one of the greatest political leaders of India as well as the socio economic reformer. He is rightly said to be the architect of modern India. He has proposed some ideas which earn him the reputation as the architect of modern India. These ideas include his views on non-alignment, panchasheel, individualism etc. He is said to be the founder of non-aligned movement. He opines that this non-align policy helps India in getting aids from the power blocs. He also put forward his ideas on mixed economy. He suggests the nationalization of big industries. He also adopts a secular outlook. He does not support religion as the basis of state. We have also learnt that though he is born into an aristocratic family, he puts forward some socialist ideas. He wants to retain the Indian character of socialism. Nehru's socialism is marked by two essences i.e. the removal of poverty and establishment of equal opportunity. He believes in democratic means to bring about socialism in the country. In the next unit we shall discuss the ideas of B.R. Ambedkar.

3.7 References and Suggested Readings:

Agarwal, R.C. Constitutional Development and National Movement of India: Freedom Movement, Acts and Indian Constitution; S. Chand and Company Ltd. New Delhi, 2002.

Gupta, R.C. Great Political Thinkers: East and West; Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Agra, 2001.

Links

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jawaharlal_Nehru

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Five_Principles_of_Peaceful_Coexistence

<http://www.amazon.com/Glimpses-World-History-Jawaharlal-Nehru/dp/0143031058>

* * *

UNIT: 4

NEHRU: PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

Contents:

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Objectives
- 4.3 Nehru's view on Democracy
- 4.4 Nehru's Ideas on State
- 4.5 Summing Up
- 4.6 References and Suggested Readings

4.1 Introduction:

Nehru is considered as one of the modern thinkers and his thinking combines the ideas of East and West. His ideas were also influenced by Mahatma Gandhi. He was a statesman who seek welfare of the mankind. He was a strong believer of democracy.

Nehru has made a constant effort, since he had come to power, to seek peaceful solutions for international disputes. He was predisposed by nature, training and reflections to these courses, but regarded them also as being imposed upon him by the legacy of Gandhi. Nehru's idea of democracy was liberal but classical. In the previous unit we have already discussed some of the important ideas of Nehru. In this unit we shall discuss at length Nehru's idea on Democracy.

4.2 Objectives:

Nehru was a dynamic leader. He wanted India to keep her doors open to new ideas and new knowledge. Nehru's outlook was broad and he did not hold the idea that the end justifies the means. He believed in inclusiveness and therefore advocated democratic principles and ideas in a highly diverse country like India. After reading this unit you will be able to:

Nehru's view on Democracy

Nehru's Ideas on State

Thus, we see Nehru put utmost emphasis on the opinion of every individual constitution the society. Again, Nehru had special likings for the children and he considered them the future of the society. As they grow up they would be the citizens of the country whose opinion and participation in the political process can change the course of a nation. For establishing a healthy democracy also, the children of today might have a strong role to play in the future. From this point of view, one can come to the conclusion that Nehru was in favour of a participatory form of democracy.

4.3: Nehru's view on Democracy:

In the previous unit we have learnt about Nehru's idea of socialism. Here we must mention that his idea of democracy has a close connection with his idea of socialism. For him, political democracy has to be fused with economic democracy. In his words, "political democracy by itself is not enough except that it may be used to obtain a gradually increasing measure of economic democracy, equality and the spread of good things of life to others and removal of gross inequalities." He opposes the idea of the elite democratic school thinkers including Giovanni Sartori, Joseph Schumpeter who propose that in a democratic system the leaders have the singular aim to obtain the authority by securing voted by competitive means. According to Nehru, the aim of achieving power is to provide service for the people. Thus, he supports Gandhian views of ethical use of power.

Nehru is a democrat in the true sense of the term. As we all know democracy believes in the right of all and it counts the voice of all. Nehru was a firm believer of equality of all in all spheres of life and therefore to him, democracy is the best form of government. Many thinkers believe that Nehru is the main person behind India's adoption of Constitutional democracy. He believed in Mill's idea that democracy in practice does not mean the suppressing of the voice of the minority by a majority by its voice strength. Nehru believed that democracy would succeed in India and he was ready to resist the imposition of any other concept or practice here.

He considered democracy to be the best form of government as it required participation of all. India society which is diverse and heterogeneous only democracy can address to its problems. Moreover, it would reduce discrimination on the basis of race, caste, religion, gender, etc. Nehru advocated these ideas since the time of freedom movement. In the Objective Resolution of the Constituent Assembly, Nehru presented many ideas which were later incorporated in the Preamble as well as in different parts of the Indian Constitution. Some of those ideas expressed by Nehru were, the ideals of justice, social, economic and political, equality of status, of opportunity and before the law; freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, vocation, association etc. which provided the ground for the democratic practice in India.

He is ready to accept political democracy in the hope that it will lead to social democracy. He is clear in his mind that political democracy is only the way to the goal and not the final objective. We have already learnt that Nehru is a great individualist. He has great faith in individual and this has naturally led to his faith in democracy. He criticizes the authoritarian system as it hampers individual liberty and does not provide adequate opportunity to the individual for his development. He shows preference for the democracy which promotes human dignity. Nehru's concept of democracy is different from the western concept of democracy. His democracy does not imply a system in which certain freedoms are made available to the people.

To him, democracy is a way of life and a basis for social structure. According to Nehru, democracy is a mental approach applied to our political and economic problems. Nehru offers different interpretations of democracy at different times. Firstly, he defines democracy in terms of freedom. According to him, freedom is vital to the realization of human values.

Nehru is of the view that if an individual is denied freedom it will automatically go against democracy. Therefore, he favours grant of freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, vocation, association and action to all. He also argues that individual freedom shall be balanced with social freedom. Again Nehru defines democracy in terms of certain governmental institutions and procedures. He lays emphasis on the principle of popular sovereignty, elections, adult franchise etc.

He realizes the importance of political parties and considers majority rule as an integral part of democracy. He also wants a constitutional guarantee for the protection of cultural and religious rights of the minorities. He feels that the government must use its power for the betterment of the people. Leadership constitutes a very important role in democracy. Nehru is of the view that without civil liberties there cannot be social progress. Nehru's democracy implies the existence of social and economic equality amongst the members of the society. He is of the opinion that true democracy can flourish only in an equal society. He argues that a system where the social and economic equalities are absent cannot be regarded as democracy. According to him, political democracy is the only means to attain the goal of an economic and social structure which can ensure freedom, equality and social justice to all.

Nehru's idea of democracy and humanism were shaped by both Indian and Western thinking. In his words, "For I do believe that ultimately it is the individual that counts.but the idea appeals to me without belief, the old Hindu idea that if there is any divine essence in the world every individual possessed a bit of it and he can develop it. Therefore, no individual is trivial. Every individual has an importance and he should be given full opportunities to develop material opportunities naturally, food, clothing, education, housing, health etc." at the same time, he was very much influenced by western liberalism which expressed itself in his firm devotion to political democracy and individual freedom.

Nehru, as a staunch supporter of democracy, favoured parliamentary system, free elections, a free press, freedom of speech, of religion and assembly, political parties and constitutional safeguards for individual rights. For Nehru true essence of democracy is participation of all and decentralisation of power. He believes that democracy is very much rooted in Indian society as it practiced Panchayat system where in political matters everyone has a vote and in economic matters everyone has equal opportunities. Moreover, there was no distinction between man and woman. As the nation builder he advocated democracy to be practised in real sense in India, where the diversities and hierarchies can be minimised and equality could be established.

Stop To Consider:

Nehru on Education:

Jawaharlal Nehru is well aware of the need of proper intellectual development of the Indian populace. He understands the importance of proper and healthy intellectual development to run the Indian states. He tries to imply the winning combination of western scientific prowess and Indian civilization wisdom. Nehru is well aware that Indian republic can re-establish its existence in the world scenario only through the intellectual power of its citizens. He emphasises on the teaching of science and its application in practical field. The teaching of vocational science attracts him. The Indian Institute of Technology or IITS are established

during his Prime Ministership. The Indian Institutes of Technology are now regarded as the premier scientific institutes of higher technological learning throughout the world. All India Institute of Medical Sciences and the Indian Institutes of Management are also established during his time. Nehru also initiates the construction and functioning of a number of schools to educate the rural populace. Primary education is provided free of cost. The trump card of Nehru is the scheme of providing free meals to the students of government schools. He understands the importance of food to attract students. Majority of rural population survives on one meal a day. The food acts as a magnet for the impoverished hungry child. The family of the prospective student is also happy with the subsequent tangible cost savings. Jawaharlal Nehru also establishes vocational schools for adults. Adult education centers are created both in rural and urban areas. Higher technical schools are also established.

4.4 Nehru' Ideas on State:

According to Nehru, the state is not an end in itself but only a means to an end, and that end is to serve man. Political liberty is intended to give economic and social freedom to individuals. Nehru condemns the Machiavellian concept of state governing the people and keeping them down. According to him, the duty of the state is to protect the individual from foreign attack and internal disorder. It is to provide the citizens with opportunity of progress, education, health for the development of man. Consequently, for Nehru some kind of coercion is inevitable. It is not possible to reject violence altogether. However, violence must be used with reason. Nehru has faith in good government and preferred local self-government. He believes in welfare state and self-government at village level.

Again Nehru visualizes democracy as a way of self-discipline and a scheme of values and moral standards. He defines democracy in terms of social self-discipline and tolerance. According to Nehru, democracy means a dynamic society giving full opportunities to the individuals for their development. Above all, to Nehru, democracy implies solution of all problems through peaceful methods like discussions, negotiations, conciliations and persuasion. Thus we can say that Nehru's democracy aims at the multifarious development of the individuals. However, he is well aware of the fact that democracy cannot work successfully and achieve its aims and ideals without the goodwill and the cooperation of the people. He accepts the truth that democracy cannot go against people.

According to him, democracy is the best form of government because it preserves the highest human values. To him, democracy in practice does not mean the stifling of the voice of minority by a majority through its sheer voting strength. According to him, democracy means tolerance not merely of those who agree with us, but of those who do not agree with us. He believes that the method of democracy is discussion, argument, persuasion and ultimate decision and acceptance of that decision may go against our grain. He does not object to demonstrations, but he has no liking for violence, resulting from them. In fact, parliamentary democracy demands many virtues. It demands, of course, ability and devotion to work. But it also demands co-operation, of self discipline, of restraint.

Nehru argues that in a democracy the party should be a mass party. It shall be constantly in touch with the people. Moreover, it shall reflect the aspirations of the masses and also struggle to end social and economic justice. Though there are some changes in the party

system in India, but still it has not come up to the expectation of Nehru. But we can hope that the mass consciousness that is developing in India will help in achieving this goal. Nehru has fought three general elections on the basis of universal adult franchise and secret ballot and made elections the norm, not an exception. Nehru uses his popularity and personal power to reinforce the democratic process. He has promoted internal democracy and open debate within the Congress Party. He also helps to create an institutional structure which is democratic and in which power is diffused. He regular tour sharing his ideas with the people, trying to educate them in the ways of rational and democratic thinking. When he was asked what his legacy to India will be, he replies, “hopefully it is four hundred million people capable of governing themselves.” (Jawaharlal Nehru- A Biography by S Gopal, volume 3, London, 1984, p. 170).

Nehru is of the view that democracy will enable the people to mobilise themselves and to exert pressure from below to achieve social justice and equality. It will also help in reducing economic inequality. If the political party does not implement the popular mandate it will get swept away. He has placed emphasis on elections, besides community development projects, Panchayati raj, cooperatives and decentralisation of all kinds of power. Nehru feels that to ensure the unity of a diverse society like India's, democracy is essential. He opines that no amount of force or coercion can hold India together. In ‘India today’ he opines in 1960, ‘any reversal of democratic methods might lead to disruption and violence.’

Check Your Progress:

1. What are the freedoms that Nehru grants in a democracy?
2. How does Nehru define democracy in terms of self-discipline?
3. Critically discuss Nehru's idea of Parliamentary Democracy.

4.5 Summing Up:

Nehru conceptualised democracy in the Western liberal framework where the elections were to be held after a regular interval. This unit has discussed Nehru's view of democracy at length. After reading this unit you have learnt that Nehru is a democrat in the true sense of the term. He offers different interpretations of democracy at different times. He defines democracy in terms of freedom, leadership and also in terms of certain governmental institutions and procedures. You have also learnt that he emphasises the need of co-operation of people for the successful working of democracy.

4.6 References and Suggested Readings:

Agarwal, R.C. Constitutional Development and National Movement of India: Freedom Movement, Acts and Indian Constitution; S. Chand and Company Ltd. New Delhi, 2002.

Gupta, R.C. Great Political Thinkers: East and West; Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Agra, 2001.

Srivastava, V. K, Nehru's Views about Democracy, Mainstream, Vol LIV No 47, Delhi, November 12, 2016

Links:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jawaharlal_Nehru

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Five_Principles_of_Peaceful_Coexistence

<http://www.amazon.com/Glimpses-World-History-Jawaharlal-Nehru/dp/0143031058>

UNIT: 5

B.R.AMBEDKAR: CASTE AND UNTOUCHABILITY, CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRACY, SOCIAL JUSTICE CONTENTS

Contents:

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Objectives
- 5.3 Ambedkar as a Critic of Hindu Society
- 5.4 Ambedkar's Views on Caste System
- 5.5 Ambedkar's Views on Untouchability
- 5.6 Ambedkar's Movement against Caste System and Untouchability (Hindu Social Order)
- 5.7 Comparison between Gandhi and Ambedkar
- 5.8 Ambedkar's Views on Education
- 5.9 Ambedkar's View on Language Policy
- 5.10 Ambedkar's View on Democracy
- 5.11 Summing up
- 5.12 References and Suggested Readings

5.1 Introduction:

Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar also known as Babasaheb held a prominent position among the twentieth century leaders of India. Ambedkar took upon himself the task of fighting for religious, social and economic equality in the Indian society. He was widely read in history, culture and religion. He realized that distortion of religion and misinterpretation of history and culture does more harm to Indian social life than foreign invasions and dominations. In this unit we shall discuss Ambedkar as a critic of the Hindu society. We shall also deal with his criticism of the Varna system, Caste system, and Untouchability. Our attempt here is to offer you a comparative study of the views of Gandhi and Ambedkar. Our discussion shall also include Ambedkar's efforts for removal of Untouchability and the restrictions of caste system. Moreover, this unit also attempts to deal with Ambedkar's views on education, language policy and democracy.

5.2 Objectives:

Ambedkar is known as a jurist, a political leader, philosopher, anthropologist, historian, Buddhist activist and a revolutionary thinker. As a reformer and critic of Indian Hindu

society, Ambedkar has made efforts to establish social justice and worked for the liberation of the untouchables. After reading this unit you will be able to

- analyse Ambedkar as a critic of the Hindu society and the Caste system
- discuss Ambedkar's criticism of Untouchability
- explain Ambedkar's views on Education and Language policy
- attempt a comparative study of Gandhi and Ambedkar
- analyse Ambedkar's efforts for removal of Untouchability and restrictions of caste system
- elaborate Ambedkar's views on Democracy and Parliamentary Democracy

5.3 Ambedkar as a Critic of Hindu Society:

In this section we shall discuss Ambedkar as a critic of the Hindu society which suffers from number of inherent contradictions and is steeped in various social evils during the time of Ambedkar. It is known to us that the Hindu culture is based on the high ideals of non-violence, tolerance, love and humanitarian services but there are several problems within the Hindu society. B.R. Ambedkar studies the Hindu social system objectively and dispassionately. The ideals of freedom, equality and justice cannot be realized in practical social life. According to Ambedkar, the gap between theoretical ideals and practical life existing in Hindu society is the main cause of its weakness and consequent subjugation for centuries. The Hindus never resemble a society which is an organized system of individuals with a purpose. Ambedkar criticizes the Hindu society on the following grounds:

- **Caste system:** A society is composed of social, economic and intellectual classes. An individual in a society is always a member of a class. The most unfortunate characteristic of the Hindu society is that classes develop into a caste. Ambedkar has realized that social stratification of occupations by caste system is basically a pernicious development. In Hindu society, social rules subordinate natural powers and inclinations of individuals.
- **Denial of equality:** Ambedkar is of firm belief that the Hindu social order does not recognize the principle of equality. It is given to believe that men differ from birth. Thus, Hindu social order is based on graded inequality and the principle of fixity of occupation, regardless of a person's ability and quality. Hindu social order denies individual freedom. By denying the right of education, resentment and use of arms, the social and economic status of lower castes is fixed. He further states that class consciousness and class conflict has been the basis in Hindu society. Rigid rules of marriage, eating and social customs prohibit Hindus to grow as a harmonious community. The religion of Hindus prohibits them to lead a free social life based on social interchange. The Hindu social life is based on Varna (class) system that recognizes four varnas and later the class of untouchables is added to them. Though Hinduism is a liberal religion, yet it gives sanction to complete segregation of a class known as untouchables. Therefore, Ambedkar is of the view that it amounts to the fact that untouchables are not human beings and not fit for social association.
- **Against Chaturvarnas:** According to Ambedkar, with the growth of caste system, Hinduism ceases to be a missionary religion. The varna system becomes more and more rigid and

hierarchical. Ambedkar opines, “there cannot be more degrading system of social organisation than chaturvarna. It is a system which deadens, paralyses and cripples people from helpful activity”. Thus, Ambedkar opines that Hinduism is based on the principle of graded inequality.

- Atrocities against untouchables: Ambedkar has said, “Hindu law declared that the untouchable was not a person, Hinduism refused to regard him as a human being fit for comradeship”. The people belonging to untouchable category cannot be touched by touchables, an untouchable patient cannot be treated by the doctors of higher caste. There are various other restrictions on untouchables. To elaborate, they are not allowed to enter into temples and fetch water from common well. The society imposes various restrictions even on their eating and wearing of clean clothes. To summarize Ambedkar’s views on Hindu society, we can say that the Hindu society is based on inequality which has denied social justice to a large section of population. Consequently, such principles deprive a large number of population belonging to the untouchable category and lower caste from the measure of equal privileges.

Stop To Consider:

Life Sketch of Ambedkar:

B.R Ambedkar also known as Babasaheb was born on 14th April, 1891 in a Mahar community, an untouchable caste of Maharashtra. He was the last child of his parents Ramji and Bhimabai. His father and grandfather served in the army. But the stigma attached to the members of Mahar community continued to influence their position in the caste-ridden society of Maharashtra. The Mahars were treated as untouchables by the Hindus. Being a member of the Mahar community, B.R Ambedkar had a bitter taste of discriminatory treatment early in life. During his early school career he got to know that being born in a particular community could make all the difference in one’s status in society. He and his brother had to carry bags from their home to sit in the class. They were denied facilities of drinking water, games and mixing up with other children. Even teachers would not check their notebooks for fear of pollution. Thus, the seeds of discontentment about Hindu social system were sowed in the life of Ambedkar. Ambedkar started his education first at Satara. He passed his B.A from the prestigious Elphinstone College, Bombay with distinction. The assistance and encouragement from the Maharaja of Baroda in the form of scholarship played a great role in Ambedkar’s life. Again with the scholarship of Maharaja of Baroda he passed M.A and finished his PhD from Columbia University, U.S.A. In 1917, Ambedkar joined the Baroda State Service but did not get respectable treatment because he belonged to the untouchable community. He left Baroda for Bombay where he first started business and then joined as a professor of Political Economy in Sydenham College, Bombay. He earned good reputation as a teacher, however very often he felt insulted as he was ill treated by his colleagues from high caste in the college. Thus he resigned from his job and resumed his studies in Law and Economics in London. He died on 6 December 1956. The Major works of Ambedkar are as follows: Problem of Rupees Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India, Castes in India, Small Holdings and their Remedies.

SAQ:

Elaborate Ambedkar's views on Chaturvarnas and Untouchability. (80 words)

.....

.....

.....

5.4 Ambedkar's Views on Caste System:

As a member of a lower caste or untouchable family, Ambedkar has personally experienced discriminatory treatment from upper caste. Thus, the seeds of discontentment about the Hindu social order and the caste system are sown very early in the life of Ambedkar. He observes that the caste system stands as a major obstacle against an egalitarian society. Ambedkar studies the Hindu Social System objectively and opines that Hindus never appear as a society; they are always a system of castes. He states that "Hindu society as such does not exist. It is a collection of castes, each caste is conscious of its existence. It is not even a federation." Thus, according to him, the Hindu social system suffers from inherent contradictions due to the caste system. Caste system provides for social stratification. We all know that the division of people into classes is very common in all societies of the world. Ambedkar also believes that society is always composed of classes. An individual in a society is always a member of a class. This is a universal fact and early Hindu Society is no exception to this rule. In the Hindu society, the chaturvana (four caste system) system becomes the base of caste system. According to Ambedkar, this system has ruined the Hindus in general and the Untouchables in particular. The origin of this system is traced back to the Purusha Sukta of the Rigveda, the arch text of Hindus. Ambedkar treats the chaturvarna system as a social idea that is invested by Manu with a degree of divinity and in fallibility. The caste system as depicted in the Hindu religious texts, does not only divide the social order into four unequal, hierarchically organized and ritually graded occupational groups, but also makes these divisions permanent and immutable. Ambedkar also believes that in the beginning there is only one caste but later on classes become caste through initiation and excommunication. Ambedkar realizes that social stratification of occupations brought by caste system is a pernicious development of Hindu society. Ambedkar has bitterly criticized the caste system of the Hindus. Let us now discuss the grounds on which the caste system is criticized by Ambedkar:

- The caste system is based on four *varnas* that have resulted in inequality and disunity among the Hindus.
- Caste system has given rise to Untouchability and the untouchables have to face various humiliations and oppressions from the high caste Hindus.
- Caste system has made the Hindu society weak compared to other religions or societies.
- Caste system, rigid rules of marriage, eating and social customs have prohibited the Hindus to develop into a homogeneous community.
- As a result of Caste system, Hindu religion has ceased to be a missionary religion.
- Caste system is used as a weapon by the orthodox Hindus to persecute the reformers of the society.

- Caste system paralyses and cripples the people from cooperative and helpful activities.
- Caste system has created divisions among the Hindu society as it is based on the principle of graded inequality.
- Due to the caste system, it is impossible to establish a just social order in the Hindu community.
- The caste system is the main cause of the weakness and subjugation of the Hindu society for centuries. Hence, it is evident from the above discussion that Ambedkar believes that Hindu social society is not based on the principle of equality and fraternity. It is based on graded inequality as it is based on the principle of fixity of occupation regardless of a person's ability to perform other occupation. Ambedkar suggests that the internal contradictions within the Hindu society can be solved only by annihilating the caste system of the Hindus. Throughout his life Ambedkar wages a relentless struggle against the caste system and untouchability of the Hindu society to build a new social order based on freedom, equality and justice in social, religious and political life of the people.

SAQ:

Do you think Ambedkar's criticism of caste system can be justified? Give reasons in support of your argument (20+80 words)

.....
.....

Check Your Progress:

1. Fill in the blanks

a) According to Ambedkar caste is.....

b) Chaturvarna system divides the Hindu social order into..... unequal, hierarchically organized groups.

2. State the reasons behind Ambedkar's view of Hindu society as based on graded inequality.

3. Why is it impossible to establish a just social order among the Hindu community?

5.5 Ambedkar's Views on Untouchability:

The above section has made us familiar with Ambedkar's criticism on the caste system. The caste system of Hindu social order is closely linked with the system of untouchability which is regarded as one of the worst social evils of the Hindu society. In this section we shall discuss Ambedkar's view on Untouchability. It is already clear to us that the Hindu social order is based on fourvarnas or classes – Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras. In the Hindu society, each class develops into a caste and every individual is entitled to the rights

and privileges attached to the class he belongs. Ambedkar analyzes that after sometime, a fourth class develops in Hinduism i.e., the Untouchables. Hinduism sanctions the complete segregation of the Untouchable class. They are shunned by Hindus as they are considered to be impure and polluted. The Untouchables are not treated as human beings and are not regarded fit for social association. A permanent division is created between the so-called Touchables and Untouchables. The higher castes in Hindu society enjoy all the rights and privileges and in the name of code of conduct they have the freedom to ill-treat a section of the society i.e. Untouchables. The untouchables are given a condition of life in which their thinking habits and general conduct cannot be improved. The upper castes forfeit their civic life and the untouchables are forced to live a suppressed life. They are declared unfit for social association and denied all social rights. The society imposes restrictions on the eating and wearing of clean clothes on the untouchables. They are not allowed to use the village wells, go to the schools and enter the temples. Outcaste patients are not treated by the doctors from the higher caste. Religious segregation of a particular class has forced millions of untouchables to convert to Islam and Christianity to free themselves from the shackles of humiliation and oppression.

Stop To Consider:

Ambedkar and The Partition of India :Between 1941 and 1945, Ambedkar published a number of books and pamphlets, including Thoughts on Pakistan, in which he criticizes the Muslim League's demand for a separate Muslim state of Pakistan but considered its concession if Muslims demanded so as expedient. In the book entitled Thoughts on Pakistan, Ambedkar writes a sub-chapter titled 'If Muslims truly and deeply desire Pakistan, their choice ought to be accepted'. He writes that if the Muslims are bent on Pakistan, then it must be conceded to them. He asks whether Muslims in the army can be trusted to defend India. To answer the question-In the event of Muslims invasion of India or in the case of a Muslim rebellion, with whom will the Indian Muslims in the army side? he concludes that, in the interests of the safety of India, Pakistan should be acceded to in keeping with the demand of the Muslims. According to Ambedkar, the Hindu assumption that though Hindus and Muslims are two nations, they can live together under one state, is nothing but an empty sermon, a mad project, to which no sane man will ever agree.

5.6 Ambedkar's Movement against Casteism and Untouchability (Hindu Social Order):

After discussing Ambedkar's criticism of the Hindu society, the caste system and Untouchability, now we will discuss Ambedkar's efforts for removal of casteism and Untouchability in this section. He is of the view that there is Untouchability because there is caste system. Thus he launches a powerful movement for the restoration of civic rights to the untouchables and giving them equal rights at par with other castes. The movement for the rights of the untouchables and for the eradication of caste system is started in two phases----

- Firstly- In the form of petition and protest.
 - Secondly- In the form of direct action to use wells, schools, buses and railways etc.
- Ambedkar's movement against Casteism and Untouchability can be described as

humanitarian struggle. Ambedkar believes that caste system and untouchability are parts of social system based on some principles. Without destroying the caste system, untouchability cannot be reviewed. Thus Ambedkar stresses the necessity of eradicating the ideas of highness and lowness on the basis of caste. He asks his followers to fight against the isolation of civil life without fear. The leaders of Satyasodhak movement of Maharashtra have given Ambedkar full support in his struggle for the rights of the depressed classes. Through Satyagraha, he has led his followers to assert their rights over common drinking water and right to worship in temples. The demands for safeguarding the interest of the untouchables inform Ambedkar's career. In 1919, when Montague Reforms are being formulated, Ambedkar demands separate electorates and reservation of seats for depressed classes in proportion to their population. In the first conference of Untouchables, in March 1927, at Bombay, Ambedkar has called upon the Untouchables to fight for their rights, give up dirty habits and rise to manhood. During that time, the Satyashodhak Movement is taking place in Maharashtra and the leaders offers full support to Ambedkar in his struggle for the rights of the depressed class.

Ambedkar becomes the first President of The All India Depressed Classes Association on August 1930, where he demands the safeguard of depressed and downtrodden untouchables in the constitution and pleads for their representation in official committees. As a member of the State Committee appointed by the Bombay Government in 1930 to find out educational, social and economic condition of the depressed classes, Ambedkar recommends scholarship for students of depressed classes, their recruitment in police and army as well as their greater involvement in social and cultural activities. Political activities are prominent part of Ambedkar's movement against Casteism and Untouchability. He is not impressed by Gandhiji's word Harijan as a replacement for untouchables. His views with suspicion the formation of the HarijanSevak Sangha by Gandhiji for removal of untouchability as it is entirely managed by caste Hindus and the Sangha works as an organ of the Congress party. Ambedkar maintains that its aim is to secure support of the depressed classes. Thus Ambedkar forms the SamataSainik Dal for the upliftment of the Untouchables and asked the Untouchables to adopt Buddhism to free themselves from the shackles of discrimination followed in Hinduism. Ambedkar feels that concerted action to secure political and economic rights for people ignored for centuries is necessary to give them a better future. He attacks the British Government for not initiating constitutional measures to improve the lot of Untouchables.

In political front Ambedkar demands a separate electorate and reservation of seats for the depressed classes in proportion to their population. He has succeeded in securing separate electorate for the depressed classes through the Communal Award in 1932. However, Gandhiji's protest and fast unto death made Ambedkar sign the Poona Pact in 1932 on behalf of the depressed classes and accept a joint electorate with the Hindus ensuring seats for the depressed classes. The pact is later embodied in the Government of India Act 1935. In 1942, Dr Ambedkar was included in the Executive Council of the Viceroy and as a labour member he works hard to give workers their due rights and to provide social security to the labour class. In securing reservation of seats for members of the depressed classes, Ambedkar makes use of his position in raising the standard of life of the labourers. He worked hard for establishing better relations between labour and management and thus ensuring industrial peace through suitable law. He asserts that the problems of the Untouchables cannot be

solved unless radical changes are introduced in the social system and unless the caste system is annihilated. Ambedkar pleads for making the public services more responsive to the needs of the Untouchables and insists on recruitment of more members of the Untouchable community in the higher posts. Through his writings and speeches, he makes the people conscious of the political, economic and social problems of the Untouchables and focuses the need of paying special attention to the amelioration of the condition of the Untouchables. Influenced by the ideas of Ambedkar, the new constitution of independent India, not only assures equality, reservation of seats and special privileges for the depressed classes but also takes definite steps to abolish untouchability and make its practice in any form an offence punishable under law.

SAQ:

Elaborate the humanitarian struggle and political activities of Ambedkar aimed to safeguard the depressed classes. (80 words)

.....

.....

.....

5.7 Comparison between Gandhi and Ambedkar:

After discussing Ambedkar's ideas, we can easily make out that Ambedkar differs from Gandhi in various matters. Gandhi and Ambedkar are the two prominent personalities of India who devote their life for the upliftment of the depressed classes and eradication of Untouchability. They are the symbol of revolt against caste-conscious oppression within the Hindu society. Gandhi and Ambedkar live for service and not for glory and in this section we will attempt a comparative study of Gandhi and Ambedkar. Both Gandhi and Ambedkar share the similar interest of uplifting the untouchables from the shackles of oppression and domination. Gandhi and Ambedkar want to eradicate untouchability and thereby uniting all castes into one oceanic unity. Both the personalities are able to command respectful obedience from millions of people. They are able to reach tremendous height in Indian politics and Indian society. They want to remove the economic disparity that exists in the society as both firmly believe that unless the economic disparity is removed, there can be neither social justice nor the downtrodden will rise in life.

After the Poona Pact, Gandhi and Ambedkar have intensified their efforts to eradicate untouchability. Gandhi has softened people's heart and Ambedkar awakened self-respect and interest in politics among the untouchables. Gandhiji's work, in fact complements Ambedkar's work and vice-versa. Thus both Gandhi and Ambedkar can be rightly regarded as saviours for untouchables as they share similar interests. Though we have found that both Gandhi and Ambedkar share similar interests in terms of improving the fate of the untouchables, their approaches for the removal of untouchability are dramatically different. They have chosen different paths, strategies and ideologies.

Now let us discuss the grounds of their difference-----

- A. **Views on Untouchability:** Gandhi feels that he is the natural guardian of untouchables while Ambedkar opines that he is the natural leader of the untouchables. Gandhi firmly believes that Untouchability can be removed by change of hearts in the Hindus initiated by moral pressure but Ambedkar believes that Untouchability can be removed by giving them safeguards and political and legal rights.
- B. **Views On Caste System:** Mahatma Gandhi's views on caste system are quite different from those of Ambedkar. Interpreting Hinduism Gandhiji said that, "Caste has nothing to do with religion. It is a custom whose origin we do not know and do not need to know for the satisfaction of my spiritual hunger. But I do know that it is harmful to both spiritual and national growth.....". Ambedkar totally disagrees with Gandhiji's view. According to Ambedkar in Hindu society, class (varnas) develops into castes and the caste system develops various sub-castes. But according to Gandhi, caste system has nothing to do with religious and Varna system. It is harmful for both spiritual & national growths. But according to Ambedkar caste system has completely ruined the Hindu society. Gandhi represents the masses of India, Ambedkar represents the depressed classes of India. Gandhi wants to reform, end injustice without abolishing caste system. But, Ambedkar demands rebellion for the annihilation of the caste system itself. Gandhi wants to eradicate shudrahood & untouchability and not the caste system as a whole. Efforts of Gandhi and Ambedkar for upliftment of Untouchables. In 1932, under the patronage of Gandhi, The All India Anti- Untouchability League was formed, which is later named as "HarijanSevak Sangha". But Ambedkar is not impressed by this movement as it excluded the leaders of the depressed classes as the members of the governing body and did not concentrate on the economic, social and educational development of the depressed classes. Ambedkar thus forms SamataSainik Dal (Social Equality Army) for the upliftment of the depressed classes. SamataSainik Dal emphasizes the development of the depressed classes by granting scholarship for the students of depressed classes and reservation system for their upliftment in every stage of their life.
- C. **Views on Separate Electorate:** Ambedkar also differs from Gandhi on the question of separate electorate and reservation of seats for the depressed classes. He opines that there is no link between the Hindus and the depressed classes. Each has distinct and separate identity. He thus achieves separate electorate for the untouchables through the Communal Award in 1932. But Gandhi believes that untouchability is a stigma of the Hindu society as whole and it must be eradicated. Separate Electorate will make it a permanent feature giving rise to serious problem of human relationship. His decision to fast till death leads to the signing of Poona Pact between Gandhi and Ambedkar. But Ambedkar feels that Poona Pact is against the interest of the depressed classes.
- D. **Views on Varna System:** Ambedkar is full of criticism for the Hindu society as a whole and wants to eradicate the varna system and he does not favour Gandhi calling the untouchables as Harijans. But Gandhiji is not against the varna system. He opines that varna system has nothing to do with caste. In fact he wants to revert the original varna system. He said that the law of varna teaches us that each one of us can earn our bread by following our ancestral calling. He only wants to abolish untouchability but not at the cost of offending the castes Hindus.

On the otherhandAmbedkar believes that varna system has given rise to caste system and the reorganization of Hindus on the basis of varna system can prove harmful as it will have degrading effect on the mass by denying them opportunity to acquire knowledge. Religious sanction behind the caste and the varna system must be destroyed. Thus we have seen that both Ambedkar and Gandhi criticize each other but at the same time each is conscious of others necessary place in any final solution of the problems of the untouchables. Though their paths are different their ultimate aim is quite similar. Because of the efforts of Ambedkar and Gandhi, the constitution of independent India not only abolishes Untouchability but also makes its practice in form punishable by law.

SAQ:

Analyse how Ambedkar differs from Gandhi. (80 words)

.....

.....

.....

.....

Check Your Progress:

1. Fill in the Blanks:

- a)The fourth class that develops in the Hindu society is
- b) The first president of All India Depressed Classes Association is.....
- c) The Poona Pact was signed in.....between.....

2. Write a brief note on Ambedkar's movement against Untouchability.

3. What is Ambedkar's view on separate electorate?

5.8Ambedkar on Education:

Like any social reformer Dr.Ambedkar believes that for the reconstruction of society on the principles of equality and justice education is the necessary precondition. Now Let us study Ambedkar's ideas on Education. He studies the development of education in Indian society and finds that right to education is restricted to higher castes during the rule of Peshwas in Maharashtra and even during the earlier period of British Raj. Ambedkar takes upon himself to fight for the education of masses without discrimination of caste and sex. Ambedkar's attempt for spreading education can be highlighted as follows

- As a nominative member of Bombay Legislative Council in February, 1927 Ambedkar takes active part and pleads for greater attention toward education.
- Ambedkar has founded the people's Education Society, and starts colleges at Bombay and Aurangabad.

- He pleads with the government that providing equal education opportunities to all without discrimination is the responsibility of the government.
- He pleads that boys and girls should get different education suited to their temperament.
- Taking active part in the discussion on Bombay University Act and Primary Education Amendment bill, he contributes his views in the reform of education.
- Ambedkar stresses on the need to cut the cost of education in all possible ways and greater possible extent so that it can reach everyone. Therefore, Ambedkar is of the view that education is something to be brought within the reach of everyone and should be made cheap in all possible ways.

Stop To Consider:

Ambedkar as an Architect of India's Constitution With India's independence on August 15, 1947, the new Congress-led government invited Ambedkar to serve as the nation's first law minister. On August 29 of 1947, Ambedkar was appointed Chairman of the Constitution Drafting Committee, charged by the Assembly to write free India's new Constitution. Ambedkar won great praise from his colleagues and contemporary observers for his drafting work. In this task Ambedkar's study of sangha practice among early Buddhists and his extensive reading in Buddhist scriptures were to come to his aid. Sangha practice incorporated voting by ballot, rules of debate and precedence and the use of agendas, committees and proposals to conduct business. Sangha practice itself was modelled on the oligarchic system of governance followed by tribal republics of ancient India such as the Shakyas and the Lichchavis. Thus, although Ambedkar used Western models to give his Constitution shape, its spirit was Indian and, indeed, tribal. The draft prepared by Ambedkar provided constitutional guarantees and protections for a wide range of civil liberties for individual citizens, including freedom of religion, the abolition of untouchability and the outlawing of all forms of discrimination. Ambedkar argued for extensive economic and social rights for women, and also won the Assembly's support for introducing a system of reservations of jobs in the civil services, schools and colleges for members of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes, a system akin to affirmative action. India's lawmakers hoped to eradicate the socio-economic inequalities and lack of opportunities for India's depressed classes through this measure, which had been originally envisioned as temporary on a need basis. The Constitution was adopted on November 26, 1949 by the Constituent Assembly.

5.9 Ambedkar on Language Policy:

We all know that India is a multilingual country. Ambedkar clearly understands that India being a multilingual country has the possibility of problem for the unity of the country on account of regional pressures and pulls. When the idea of linguistic states is taken he favours it for two reasons. Firstly, he thinks that it will facilitate functioning of democracy in the country. Secondly, linguistic states will help in the removal of racial and cultural tension. Ambedkar said, "In seeking to create linguistic

states, India is treading the right road. It is the road which all states have followed. In case of other linguistic states they have been so from the very beginning. In India, she has to put herself in the reverse gear to reach the goal. But the road she proposes to travel is a well tried road.” According to Ambedkar, in the enthusiasm to accept the idea of linguistic states, India commit the grave blunder of giving official status to regional language. For this reason, he warned that with regional languages the states could aspire for independent nationality and thus pose a threat to the national unity. To avoid this possibility in future Ambedkar suggested that it should be laid down in the constitution that regional languages shall never be accepted as official languages of the states. Hindi must be declared as the official language of the nation. So long as Hindi does not become fit for this status English should continue as the only official language.

Again, Ambedkar believed that those who lived in India should be Indians first and Indians last. This is the only way to keep India a united country. The idea of linguistic states with regional languages as their official language was contrary to this basic principle. He is of the view that one language can unite while two languages can divide the people of India. He emphatically said that any Indian who refused to accept this idea has no right to call himself an Indian. He might be hundred percent Tamil or Gujarati but could not be an Indian in real sense. Ambedkar said that Indian politics, already under the great influence of castes, is suffering from lack of unity of interest. The evil consequences of this are sure to be sharpened with linguistic states which we have created. The country is bound to move to disintegration if suitable amendment in our Constitution is not made and a national consensus on one official language is not accepted and enforced.

SAQ:

Discuss Ambedkar’s ideas on Education and Language policy. (80 words)

.....

.....

.....

5.10 Ambedkar on Democracy:

Ambedkar, on the basis of his extensive study and knowledge of the evolution of human society and social institutions, is convinced that democracy is the only form of government which ensures liberty and equality in the society and he has discussed elaborately on democracy. Democracy is the form of government in which people rule themselves through their elected representatives. It ensures equality, liberty, fraternity and justice to all section of the people without discrimination and give due importance to public opinion. Democracy is universally accepted as the best form of government and it not just a form of Government but has become a way of life. Hence, according to Ambedkar we should have a government where the men in power, not be afraid to amend the social and economic code of life will give their undivided allegiance to the best interest of the country. Notion of Democratic Society Ambedkar said, “Democracy is more than a government. It is a form of the organization of society.

There are two essential conditions which characterize a democratically constituted society:

- Absence of stratification of society into classes
- A social habit on the part of individuals and groups which are ready for continuous readjustment or recognition of reciprocity of interests.”

He opines that a real democratic government is not possible without form and structure of democratic society. If the social milieu is undemocratic, the government is bound to be undemocratic. According to Ambedkar even a democratic government will not be able to do anything if Indian society remain divided into classes and sub classes as each individual in such society will place class interest above everything and there will be no justice and fair play in the functioning of the government. Apart from being a government of the people and by the people, democracy must also be a government for the people. It requires a democratic attitude of mind and proper socialization. Thus, Ambedkar is of the view that democracy is more than a social system. It is an attitude of mind, a philosophy of life. Need of Fraternity Impressed by French Revolution, Ambedkar opines that in democracy equality and liberty ensured by the constitution cannot be considered sufficient. Without fraternity equality destroys liberty and liberty destroys equality. Fraternity implies true religious spirit which is the basic of any democratic system.

Conditions for a Democratic System:

Ambedkar clearly outlines the conditions for a democratic system. These conditions are as follows----

- In a democracy, those who are in place of authority must seek mandate to rule after every five years.
- In a democracy, there is a necessity of a strong opposition.
- In a democracy, there should be equality for all in the eyes of law.
- In a democracy, there should be observance of constitutional morality. In the larger interest of the country, the party in power must resist temptation.
- In the name of democracy, there should be no tyranny of the majority over the minority. Parliamentary form of Democracy There are different forms of democracy prevalent in different countries of all these Ambedkar feels that parliamentary democracy of the British type will be the best for India. Ambedkar says that parliamentary democracy has three traits
 - a. Negation of hereditary rule.
 - b. Laws applicable to public life have public approval.
 - c. Rulers cannot stay in power without the confidence of the people.

Ambedkar says that, “In Parliamentary democracy, there is the legislature to express the voice of the people; there is the executive who is subordinate to the legislature and bound to obey the legislature. Over and above the legislature there is the judiciary to control both and keep them both in prescribed bounds. Parliamentary democracy has all the marks of a popular Government.”

Conditions for Parliamentary Democracy: Ambedkar knows that parliamentary democracy can fail as there can be discontent and dissatisfaction in such a system. In spite of constitutional assurance of equality and liberty, the parliamentary system cannot succeed without social and economic democracy. According to Ambedkar, “Democracy is another name of equality. Parliamentary democracy developed passion for liberty.”

SAQ:

Elaborate Ambedkar’s notion and conditions for a democratic society. (80 words)

.....

.....

.....

5.11 Summing Up:

After reading this unit, we come to the conclusion that B.R Ambedkar has made valuable contribution to the social and political thinking. He strongly denounces the outrageous attitude of the Brahmanical Hinduism towards the Untouchables and works for the liberation of the untouchables from the oppressions of the High caste Hindus. Ambedkar is successful in focusing the attention of the Hindus on the tension generating social problems and the need for resolving the same in the interest of the Hindu society as well as the political system. Because of the efforts of Ambedkar Indian Constitution makes special provisions for the upliftment of the backward classes. Reading of this unit will help you to make a comparison between Gandhi and Ambedkar. This unit will also enrich your knowledge on education, language policy and democracy. Through his writings and speeches he makes the people conscious of the political, economic and social problems of the untouchables and impressed the need of paying special attention to the amelioration of the condition of the untouchables. As the chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Constitution for free India, he made provisions for the members of the Schedule caste community to develop itself with constitutional guarantee of equality of opportunities. The influence of his idea is evident from the fact that the new constitution not only assured equality to all citizens but took definite steps to abolish untouchability and made its practice in any form an offence punishable under law. Dr D.R Javahar has rightly described Ambedkar as a social humanist. Ambedkar was a great optimist . He had faith in man’s capacity to distinguish between right and wrong, true and false.

5.12 References and Suggested Readings:

- Gupta , R.C. Great Political Thinkers East and West Educational Publishers, 2006
- Roy, Ramashary. Gandhi and Ambedkar. New Delhi: Shipra Publications Pvt. Ltd, 2006
- Ambedkar, B.R. Writings and Speeches. Bombay Education Dept. MaharastraGovt, 1982
- Michael, S.M. Untouchable, Dalits in Modern India. Lynne Rienner Publishers,1999

Unit: 3
V.D. Savarkar

Contents:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Early Political Life
- 1.4 Savarkar's interpretation of History
- 1.5 Cultural Nationalism
- 1.6 Savarkar's view on Hindutva
- 1.7 Summing Up
- 1.8 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction:

Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, an ardent nationalist, revolutionary and a politician was born in Bhagur, near Nasik, on 28 May 1883. Widely known as 'Veer' Savarkar, he gained a great fame as an ardent Hindu nationalist who developed the political ideology of 'Hindutva'. He was a leading figure in Indian National Movement and the Hindu Mahasabha. From his childhood Savarkar was inspired by the revolutionaries Wasudeo Balwant Phadke and Chapekar brothers, who had taken revolutionary measures against the British. He was also inspired by Lokamanya Tilak's strong nationalism and political ideas. Tilak's belief in Hindu identity and Hindu Sangathan immensely influenced Savarkar political thought. V.D Savarkar represented an unconventional strand of political thought in India in contrast to political theories propounded by the leaders of mainstream nationalist movement. V.D Savarkar propounded the theory of cultural nationalism in contrast to the theory of territorial nationalism propounded by the leaders of the mainstream nationalist movement. The uniqueness of his personality and thinking can be estimated from the fact that while one school of thought calls him an 'ardent nationalist, heroic revolutionary and terrorist', the other considers him as 'an angry, resentful, vengeful, violent and intolerant prophet'. However it must be admitted that V.D Savarkar won immortal fame by his daring and assertive nationalistic political ideas in the early

decades of twentieth century. Being an ardent Hindu nationalist, Savarkar believes that the real traits of India could be restored only by reviving India's glorious past and re-establishing what he called 'Hindu Rastra'. Savarkar's political philosophy revolves round the ideological foundation of homogeneity of Hindu population living in a particular tract of land and creation of nation based on the culture of the majority. Savarkar's nationalistic ideas have deep influence of the values of Hindu religion and culture and aspiration of reviving the glorious legacies left by the great Maratha rulers like Shivaji.

Stop to Consider:

Life Sketch of V.D Savarkar:

Vinayak Damodar Savarkar in the Marathi Chitpavan Brahmin Hindu family of Damodar and Radhabai Savarkar. Savarkar began his political activities from a very young age. He and his brother founded a secret society called Abhinav Bharat Society. During his stay in United Kingdom he involved himself with organizations like India House and the Free India Society. His book "The Indian War of Independence" about the Indian Rebellion of 1857 was banned by the British Colonial Government. In 1910, Savarkar was arrested for his connections with the revolutionary group India House. On the voyage back to India, Savarkar staged an attempt to escape and seek asylum in France while the ship was docked in the port of Marseilles. But the French port officials handed him back to the British government. Savarkar was sentenced to two life terms of imprisonment for fifty years. He was moved to Cellular Jail in Andaman and Nicobar Island. As a president of Hindu Mahasabha, Savarkar endorsed the idea of India as a Hindu Rashtra. Savarkar was a revolutionary and he endorsed the militarization of Hindus in order to liberate the country and protect the Hindus. There were two phases in the ideological development of Savarkar. In the first phase of his life, he was influenced by the philosophy of Italian nationalist Joseph Mazzini and supported the concept of composite Indian Nationalism like that of nationalism of Aurobindo and Tilak. During this period religion played an important role in the philosophy of Savarkar but it did not exclude any religious community from it. In the second phase of his life after 1922-23, Savarkar became ardent supporter of Hindu nationalism and began to

advocate Hindutva. Savarkar articulated the spirit of the popular slogan ‘Hindi Hindu Hindustan’.

1.2 Objectives:

This unit is an attempt to study the socio- political ideas of V.D Savarkar with special reference to his view on “Hindutva”. After reading this unit you will be able to

- Explain his view on nationalism and religion
- Analyse Savarkar’s interpretation of History
- Understand his idea of cultural nationalism
- Explain his idea on Hindutva

1.3 Early Political life:

Born in a traditional Barhmin family in Maharastra, Savarkar had profound adoration for the cultural and philosophical achievements of Hindus. Savarkar being an ardent nationalist from his childhood, he was anguished at the brutalities of the British rule in India which not only suppressed and exploited the Indians but also devalued the pious and glorious religious- cultural traditions of the Hindus in the country. Hence Savarkar developed deep nationalistic feeling to fight for the independence of the country and to work for the cause of the Hindus. Savarkar’s nationalist activities earned him the ire of British and he was expelled from Ferguson College, Poona. With the recommendation of Lokmanya Tilak, he was offered scholarship to study in London by Shyamji Krishna Verma, the leader of Indian revolutionists in Europe. From 1906 to 1910, he studied in England and also carried on revolutionary activities. In England, Savarkar came into contact with the other revolutionists like Madame Cama, Lala Har Dayal and Madan Lal Dhingra. Savarkar’s stay in England and his interactions with the revolutionists apparently helped him in deeper understanding of the history and nationalism. However Savarkar was arrested and sentenced to 50 years of imprisonment at Andamans. After spending rigorous life of more than a decade in Kala Pani, he was brought from Andamans in 1923 and interned in Ratnagiri. He was released from the internment on 10th May, 1937. During the periods of his solitary confinement he carried out his intellectual explorations.

Savarkar was a rebel and radical nationalist. He did not subscribe to the Gandhian philosophy of non- violence and satyagraha. On the contrary he supported rebellious mode of struggle for India's independence. As he wrote,

“..so long as that divine age has not arrived, so long as the highly auspicious end remains only in the lines of saintly poets and in the prophecies of divinely inspired, and so long as... the human mind has to be busy eradicating sinful and aggressive tendencies, so long rebellion , bloodshed and revenge cannot be purely sinful.”

Hence, instead of joining the Congress party to fight for the independence, Savarkar joined the Tilakite Democratic Swaraj Party based on the ideology of radical swaraj as advocated by Lokmanya Tilak. However he was not contented with this party's activities and later he joined Hindu Mahasabha. Savarkar became the president of Hindu Mahasabha and retained his position till 1945. During his presidency Hindu Mahasabha gained much popularity on the Hindu society where he extensively emphasised on his ideas on the Hindu Rastra as presented in his publication 'Hindutva'. In his book Hindutva he claims that Hindu thought “has exhausted the very possibilities of human speculation as to the nature of the unknown”.

Stop to Consider:

There are five philosophical dimensions of Savarkar. These are:

1. **Utilitarianism:** Savarkar's strategic agnosticism is deeply rooted in his utilitarian outlook. Savarkar was a staunch follower of the Utilitarianism school of England. Since he studied Herbert Spencer, he internalised utilitarianism as his leading ethical principle.
2. **Rationalism and Positivism:** To propagate his social and political philosophy, Savarkar used rationality as his benchmark. That is why he was sceptical of anything that is devoid of logical explanation and observable facts.
3. **Humanism and Universalism:** Savarkar's thinking was based on humanitarian values and a belief structure founded upon a faith in science, equality and liberty and not on charity of religious considerations.
4. **Pragmatism:** Savarkar was pragmatist in his approach. Savarkar identified a deep contradiction between the fatalism found in religious or philosophical

doctrines and the need for action or practical advice for the progress of Indian society.

5. **Realism:** Savarkar was a realist. For him human conduct had to adapt to the need and necessity of the time and could not remain same ever. His version of realism is his firm belief in the maxim 'Might is right' as the leading principle in International Politics.

SAQ:

Elucidate Savarkar as a revolutionary nationalist. Give reasons in support of your answer (20+60 words)

.....

.....

.....

1.4 Savarkar's Interpretation of Indian History:

In Savarkar's interpretation of Indian history there is an intense and passionate glorification of vedic Hinduism. Savarkar believes that India, which he preferred to call as 'Hindustan', belongs to Hindus and her forcible occupation by Non- Hindus was an act of aggression which must be resented and repulsed by all Hindus of the country. His glorification of Hindutva and nationalist interpretation of history could be found in his 'Hindu Pad Padshahi', published in 1925 where he glorified the rise of Maratha power in Maharastra. Savarkar also praised the governance of Maratha, as confirming the system of governance as envisaged in the religious scriptures of the Hindus.

There have been six glorious epochs in Indian history.

1. The Maurya Empire founded under the leadership of Chandragupta and Chanakya was the first. Chandragupta was hailed as a "super Alexander" because by his own efforts unaided by any heritage "he founded an Indian empire mightier even than that of Alexander himself".
2. The second epoch was the one manifested in the triumphs of Pushyamitra, the destroyer of the Greek power in India.

3. Vikramaditya , the annihilator of the might of the Sakas manifested the political and cultural resplendence of the third glorious epoch.
4. Yashodharma of Malwa, defeated the Huns at Mandasore and captured the powerful and cruel Hun leader Mihiragula. His regime constitutes the fourth glorious epoch of Indian history.
5. The fifth glorious epoch was the foundation of Maratha power as a powerful counter blast to the might of Islamic forces in India. Aggression against the enemy and not merely defence was the policy of the Maratha leaders.
6. The sixth glorious epoch is the period of successful repulsion of the British power in India and liberation of the country from the shackles of an alien imperialism.

Savarkar was one of the earliest exponents of the view that the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 was the first war of Indian independence. According to him the revolt of 1857 was inspired by the noble ideas of “Swadharma and Swaraj”.

1.5 Cultural Nationalism:

Savarkar was a man of action, a nationalist who devoted all his energies to the realization of Hindu nationalism, whose fundamental dimensions were unity of the people, their modernization and their militarization. He was a supporter of cultural Nationalism who believes in identity formation as the essence of nationalism and India had received such identity from the Hindu religion. This identity was evolved over a long period of time. Savarkar was of the opinion that despite having outward differences, the Hindus were internally bound together by cultural, religious, social, linguistic and historical affinities. It shaped the Hindus into a homogenous and organic nation. According to Savarkar it was cultural, racial and religious unity that plays an important role in the formation of a nation. While defining nation, Savarkar wrote that nation meant a political community which had occupied a contiguous and adequate territory and developed independent national identity. This community was internally organised and was bound together by cultural and racial affinities. Hindus had developed close affinities with the land bound by Himalayas to the Indian Ocean and the Indus River. Hindus considered India as their fatherland and holy land. On the basis of this definition he held that the Hindus had become a nation because they

possessed all the characteristics of becoming a nation. It is to be mentioned that Savarkar excluded those people who do not consider India as their holy land because their sacred religious places were not situated in India. He excluded Muslims and Christians from the Indian nation because they did not consider India as their holy land because their sacred religious places were situated outside India. Savarkar believes that Hindu nationalism stood for the unity of the Hindus and to strengthen the nationalism the common affinities of being a Hindu should be used. Based on the common affinities of history, culture, geography, the Hindu society should be united.

Savarkar was a rebel. Apart from Hindu Mahasabha, Savarkar was on the only all India leader who launched an intense propaganda for the militarization of the Hindus and for the industrialization of the country with pure patriotic and political objects during the Second World War. For Savarkar, the independence of India was 'the independence of our people, our race, and our nation'. Thus, Indian Swarajya, as far as the Hindu nation is concerned, involves the political independence of Hindu nation.

1.6 Savarkar's view on Hindutva:

During his imprisonment, Savarkar extensively dedicated his intellectual exploration towards Hindu cultural and political nationalism, and the later phase of his life remained dedicated to this cause. Savarkar in his treatise "Hindutva: Who is a Hindu?" promotes a farsighted new vision of Hindu social and political consciousness. Savarkar began describing a Hindu as a patriotic inhabitant of Bharatvarsha, venturing beyond a religious identity. He proclaimed that a Hindu could be any one who considered this land of Bharatvarsha, from Indus to the Seas, as his fatherland as well as his holy land that would be the cradle land of his religion. Further he envisaged three fundamental bonds that would conjoin the Hindus as a common entity, namely, rashtra (territory), jati (race) and samskriti (culture). The territorial bond or rastra is a primary requirement. A Hindu is one who feels attachment to the geographical region extending from the Sindhu River to the Brahmaputra and from the Himalayas to the Cape Comorin. Secondly, he talks about the racial or blood bond or the Jati. A Hindu is one who inherits the blood of the race

“whose first and discernible source could be traced to the Himalayan altitudes of the Vedic Saptasindhu. In his Hindutva Savarkar writes:

“No people in the world can more justly claim to get recognized as a racial unit than the Hindus and perhaps the Jews. A Hindu marrying a Moslem may lose his caste but not his Hindutva. A Hindu believing in any theoretical or philosophical or social system, orthodox or heterodox, provided it is unquestionably indigenous and founded by a Hindu, may lose his sect but not his Hindutva- his Hinduness- because the most important essential which determines it is the inheritance of the Hindu blood. Therefore, all those who love the land that stretches from Sindhu to Sindhu, from Indus to Seas, as their fatherland and consequently claim to inherit the blood of the race that has evolved, by incorporation and adaptation, from the ancient Saptasindhu, can be said to possess two of the most essential requisites of Hindutva”.

Thirdly, savarkar talked about Samskriti as criterion of being a Hindu. A Hindu is one who feels pride in the Hindu culture and civilization. The Hindu culture and civilization is represented in common historical memories of achievement and failure, in common artistic, literary and juristic creations and in common rituals or festivals or other media of collective expression. Thus, Muslims and Christians who have been converts from Hinduism cannot claim to be Hindus because they do not subscribe to Hindu culture.

He also emphasised the need for patriotic and social unity of all Hindu communities and considered Hinduism, Jainism, Sikhism and Buddhism as one and the same. Savarkar favoured intermarriages between all sections of Hindus. He outlined his vision of a Hindu Rashtra as “Akhand Bharat” (United India), supposedly stretching across the entire Indian subcontinent. According to Savarkar the concept of Hindutva is much broader and more comprehensive than Hinduism. Hinduism has a theological connotation but Hindutva goes beyond religious connotation and rituals of Hindus. Hindutva covers social, moral, political and economic aspects as well. Hindutva connotes an organic socio- political body bind together by three bonds of Rastra, Jati and Samskriti with the essential elements of Nationalism.

Savarkar accepted the cultural and organic solidarity of the Hindu nation and believed in the cultural superiority of Hinduism. He said:

“Let Hinduism concern itself with the salvation of life after death, the concept of God, and the universe....But so far as the materialistic secular aspect is concerned, the Hindus are a nation bound by a common culture, a common history, a common language, a common country and a common religion.”

Savarkar also talked about Hindu Rashtra. To Savarkar, the cultural, racial and religious unity of the people is the fundamental criteria for formation of a Hindu Rashtra. As the Hindus consisted of all these characteristics, they undoubtedly constituted a nation in the nature of a Hindu Rashtra. According to Savarkar in such a Hindu Rashtra the minorities will be given some degree of freedom and right to participation in the affairs of the state provided they accept a position of non-aggression to the interests and rights of Hindus. As he stated:

“...we shall ever guarantee protection to the religion, culture and language of the minorities for themselves, but we shall no longer tolerate any aggression on their part on the equal liberty of the Hindus to guard their religion, culture and language as well. If non- Hindu minorities are to be protected, they surely the Hindu majority also must be protected against any aggressive minority in India.”

Savarkar, thus, opposed the demand of Muslims for the grant of separate electorate in India. He did not believe in the policy of appeasement. He had full confidence that Swaraj could be achieved without the collaboration of the Muslims.

Check Your Progress:

- 1 Discuss the main features of Hindu nationalism of V.D Savarkar.
- 2 Analyse Savarkar's interpretation of History.
- 3 Analyse Savarkar's view on Cultural nationalism.
- 4 Elucidate Savarkar's view on Hindutva.

SAQ:

What was the concept of independence of India for Savarkar? Elucidate the role of Savarkar in the freedom struggle of India. (20+80 words)

.....

.....

.....

1.7 Summing Up:

Savarkar was a staunch Hindu solidarist, who interpreted a broader idea of Hinduism in the form of Hindutva or Hindu solidarity. He had an open and rebellious mind who believed that Hindutva is far more than organic socio-political unity. It is a programme of action. The distinction made by Savarkar between Hinduism and Hindutva brought a new perception in Indian political thought. Savarkar comprehends the essential elements of political, social, educational, economic and cultural connotation with the idea of Hindutva while Hinduism is by and large a theological idea. However the life of Savarkar had been controversial one and has drawn criticism also. His approach to politics- protection of Hindu interest has been criticised as one dimensional. He has been alleged of providing the intellectual input for the present day right wing extremism in the country. Despite of the controversy the fact cannot be denied that his intellectual explorations have provided a new impetus to the political thought in India. His interpretation of the revolt of 1857 as India's first war of independence shows the depth of his vision and intellectual capability. Savarkar was a great rationalist who although a staunch Hindu nationalist have the guts to openly confront the illogical and irrational practices and customs within Hinduism. For instance, Savarkar found the cast system as oppressive and inhuman and supported intermarriages between all sections of Hindus. To conclude, Savarkar's proficiency as an erudite theorist could be found from the distinction made by him between Hinduism and Hindutva which has remained a hallmark of Indian civilization.

1.8 References and Suggested Readings:

1. Varma, V.P. Modern Indian Political Thought. Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Educational Publisher, 2008
2. Chakrabarty, Bidyut and Pandey, Rajendra Kumar. Modern Indian Political Thought: Text and Context. Sage, 2009
3. Singh, M.P and Roy, Himangshu. Indian Political Thought: Themes and Thinkers. Pearson, 2011
4. Wolf, Siegfried O. Vinayak Damodar Savarkar's 'Strategic Agnosticism': A Compilation of his Socio- Political Philosophy and Worldview. Working Paper, South Asian Institute, Department of Political Science, Hiedelberg University, January 2010.

Unit: 4

Mohammad Ali Jinnah

Contents:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Early Political Career of Jinnah
- 1.4 Jinnah's Fourteen Points
- 1.5 Two Nation Theory
- 1.6 Summing up
- 1.7 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction:

Mohammad Ali Jinnah once said “I am a nationalist first, a nationalist second, a nationalist last”. As a Governor General of Pakistan Jinnah said “I still consider myself to be an Indian”. From being an Indian nationalist to the architect of Pakistan, Mohammad Ali Jinnah is one of the most controversial figures in modern Indian history. During initial part of his life Jinnah was a staunch secularist, advocating Hindu- Muslim unity who vehemently opposed the oppressive and divisive policies of the British Government. But it was also Jinnah who after 1937 propounded the Two Nation Theory who held that Hindus and Muslims were two separate nations and they cannot live together leading to the formation of Pakistan. Jinnah's journey from a messiah of Hindu- Muslim unity to the architect of a separate nation based on religion calls for analyses of his political ideas and his place in Indian history. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the architect of the state of Pakistan was born in Karachi on 25 December 1876 to Mithibai and Jinnabhai Poonja. He was an erudite lawyer and acquired the fame as a great statesman. Jinnah was one of the many luminaries of Indian Freedom Struggle and he was critical of Gandhi's leadership in the national freedom movement. His ideologies had an overwhelming influence on some section of his respective

communities which later played a vital role in formation of the state of Pakistan. Jinnah served as the leader of the All India Muslim League from 1913 until the inception of Pakistan on 14 August 1947, and then as the first Governor General of the Dominion of Pakistan. He is known in Pakistan as ‘Quaid-i-Azam’ (Great Leader) and ‘Baba-i-Qaum’ (Father of the Nation). This unit attempts to make the learner understand the political ideologies of Jinnah and his ‘Two Nation Theory’.

Stop To Consider:

Life Sketch of Mohammad Ali Jinnah

Mohammad Ali Jinnah was born at Wazir Mansion near Karachi to Jinnabhai Poonja and Mithibai, a wealthy merchant family. Jinnah’s family was from Gujarati Khoja Shi’a Muslim background, though Jinnah later followed the Twelver Shia’s teachings. Jinnah’s parents were native Gujarati speakers. But interestingly Jinnah was more fluent in English rather than in Gujarati and Urdu. In Karachi, Jinnah attended the Christian Missionary Society High School and the Sindh- Madrasa- Tul- Islam. He was matriculated from Bombay University. From his childhood, Jinnah was a person of etiquette and mannerism. When he was young, Jinnah used to discourage other children from playing in the dust, urging them to keep themselves clean and tidy and play cricket instead of marbles. Jinnah was impeccable when it comes to his dressing. After his higher education in England, Jinnah joined The Honourable Society of Lincoln’s Inn as an aspiring barrister. During his stay in England Jinnah was influenced by 19th Century British liberals like Bentham, Mill, Spencer and Comte. Jinnah was a proficient lawyer. He gained fame for handling the 1908 “Caucus Case” at the behest of Sir Pherozeshah Mehta. Jinnah was a member in the moderate group in the Congress advocating Hindu- Muslim unity. He was inspired by the leaders like Dadabhai Naoriji, Gopal Krishna Gokhale.

1.2 Objectives:

This unit is an attempt to study the political ideas of Mohammad Ali Jinnah with special reference to the ‘Two-Nation Theory’. After reading this unit you will be able to

- Explain his views on nationalism and religion
- Analyse Jinnah’s transformation from a secular nationalist to architect of Pakistan
- Understand Jinnah’s 14 points
- Explain Jinnah’s ‘Two- Nation Theory’

1.3 Early Political Career:

Jinnah was a nationalist in the early days. Jinnah’s nationalism and secularism was influenced by the liberal and secular ideas of John Morley. John Stuart Mill’s greatest disciple, John Morley remained Jinnah idol. Jinnah was also influenced by western liberal thinkers like Burke and Mill. Moreover, Jinnah’s early thoughts were greatly inspired by personalities like Dadabhai Naoriji, Pherozeshah Mehta and Gopal Krishna Gokhale.

In 1906, he worked as private secretary to Dadabhai Naoriji presiding over Congress session. He helped draft the presidential address that talked of ‘Swaraj’ for the first time. As a liberal nationalist Jinnah was a fierce critic of the British rule in India. He strongly defended individual rights and liberties. He advocated nation’s right to self determination. Commenting on discriminatory and racist attitude of the British, Jinnah told his sister: “If Dadabhai (Dadabhai Nauroji) was black, I was darker, and if this was the mentality of British politicians, then we would never get a fair deal from them. From that day I have been an uncompromising enemy of all forms of colour bar and racial prejudice”.

In 1904, Jinnah attended the Congress session in Bombay, where he met Gopal Krishna Gokhale for the first time. Jinnah considered Gokhale as his mentor and had the greatest respect and admiration for Gokhale. Gokhale

had high hopes from Jinnah as an ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity. He had won great applause when he defended and saved Lokamanya Tilak in the second sedition case of 1916. He also defended Tilak in the early stage of the sedition case of 1908. Jinnah argued that it was not sedition for an Indian to demand freedom and self-government in his own country. In April, 1912, Jinnah supported the Elementary Education Bill initiated by Gokhale.

The Indian Council Act 1909 or Morley- Minto Reforms created a separate electorate for Muslims and under a system of weightage, enabled the Muslims to obtain more seats in the various councils than their population in the country. First Jinnah had been opposed to communal electorates and at the 1910 Allahabad Congress, he condemned its extension to the local bodies. But in 1917 he declared that separate electorate was a matter of interest to the Muslims who by this method alone could be roused from their mental lethargy.

In 1906, the All India Muslim League started and its first session met at Dacca in December 1906 under the presidency of Aga Khan. On March 22, 1913, at Lucknow session the All India Muslim League adopted a new constitution and invited Jinnah to join the league. In 1913, Jinnah joined the Muslim League while continuing to be in the Congress. He however made it clear that his loyalty to Muslim cause would in no way be an obstacle to the interest of the nation. Jinnah was such a figure of Hindu-Muslim unity that Sarojini Naidu wrote her book on Jinnah, 'Mohammad Ali Jinnah: An Ambassador of Unity' where she emphasised that Jinnah's ambition was to follow in the footsteps of Gokhale.

Gokhale's demise in early 1915 followed by that of Pherozeshah Mehta left Jinnah as the Spokesman for moderate camp. When the Home Rule League of Tilak and Besant was founded in April and September 1916, Jinnah did not join them. But after internment of Besant, Jinnah joined the Bombay Home Rule League. A Congress liberal, Mazhar-ul-Haq, was presiding over the Muslim League. Jinnah took the responsibility of getting all these groups together to obtain consensus on the agreements that he had drawn. The object was "national unity which has brought Hindus and Muslims together,

involving brotherly service for the common course". The Muslim League and the All India Congress Committee resolved to make a joint demand for Representative Government in India. In October 1916, Jinnah presided over the sixteenth Bombay Provincial Conference at Ahmedabad where he pleaded for firm unity between the Hindus and the Muslims. He also presided at the Lucknow session of the All India Muslim League in December 1916, and pleaded for Hindu Muslim unity. Jinnah had been the signatory to the memorandum of the nineteen and at Lucknow he supported the Congress-League scheme. Jinnah supported the necessity of communal electorates for raising the consciousness of the Muslims. In the session of the League and the Congress the Lucknow pact was agreed upon whereby separate electorates were recognised, and in Muslim minority provinces, the Muslims were guaranteed a proportion of seats in the provincial legislative council larger than what their numbers entitled them to.

However, the beginning of Non-Cooperation movement made Jinnah felt that he did not belong to Congress. Gandhi after returning to India from South Africa had become a widely respected leader and influential personality in the Congress. Gandhi's 'Satyagraha' against British gained broad support from not only Hindu community but also attracted many muslims of the Khalifat faction. Jinnah criticised Gandhi's Khalifat advocacy, which he saw as an endorsement of religious zealotry. Jinnah could not accept Gandhi's new approach and opposed the main resolution on Non-Cooperation at the Nagpur Congress in 1920. Jinnah had been a believer in constitutional methods of action and hence he could not support the radical policy of Congress which took to non-violent direct action under Gandhi's leadership. In 1920, at the special Calcutta session and then at Nagpur, Gandhi took control of the Congress Party and restructured it. Jinnah felt humiliated and left the Congress party. In a speech at Poona delivered on February 19, 1921, Jinnah said that in place of Gandhian programme of Non-Cooperation, Khadi etc., he wanted a 'political' programme.

Jinnah was opposed to the Nehru Report of 1928. In opposition to the Nehru Report, Jinnah put forward his 'Fourteen Points'. He was alarmed by the

Congress policy of Muslim mass contact formulated after 1937 election. In 1939 he put forward the claim of Muslim league for fifty-fifty share of political power between 'Muslim India' and 'Non-Muslim' India. On 22 December 1939, the All India Muslim League led by Jinnah observed the 'Day of Deliverance' as a mark of relief that the Congress regime has at last ceased to function after the Congress ministries had resigned in seven provinces. Jinnah believed that democracy would mean Hindu Raj over unwilling Muslims, Untouchables, Jews, Parsees and Christians. Hence, Jinnah raised the slogan of 'Congress tyranny' and 'Hindu domination'. He claimed the All India Muslim League to be the sole representative of the Muslims of India.

In the March 1940, at the Lahore session of the Muslim League, Jinnah formulated his doctrine of 'Two Nations'.

SAQ:

Elucidate Jinnah as Secular and Nationalist in the early phase of his life. Give reasons in support of your answer (20+60 words)

.....

.....

.....

1.4 Jinnah's Fourteen Points:

Mohammad Ali Jinnah submitted a proposition of 14 points as a constitutional reform plan to protect the political rights of Muslims in Independent India. Jinnah's 14 points covered the interest of the Muslims and it paved the way for Jinnah parting away from the Congress. After Jinnah's return from England in 1929, the Muslim League organized a session under his presidential leadership where he addressed 14 points as a constitutional reform plan of Muslims. These points came to be known as Jinnah's 14 points. These points are:

1. The form of the past constitution should be federal with the residuary powers vested in the provinces.
2. All cabinets at central or local level should have at least 1/3 Muslim representation.
3. All legislatures in the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the definite principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every province without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or even equality.
4. In the Central Legislature, Muslim representation shall not be less than one third.
5. Representation of communal groups shall continue to be by means of separate electorate as at present, provided it shall be open to any community at any time to abandon its separate electorate in favour of a joint electorate.
6. Any territorial distribution that might at any time be necessary shall not in any way affect the Muslim majority.
7. Full religious freedom, i.e., freedom of belief, worship and observance, propaganda, association, and education shall be guaranteed to all communities.
8. No bill or resolution or any part, thereof, shall be passed in any legislature or any other elected body if three fourths of the members of any community or in the alternative, such other method is devised as may be found feasible and practicable to deal with such cases.
9. Sindh should be separated from the Bombay Presidency.
10. Reforms should be introduced in the North West Frontier Province and Balochistan on equal footing as in the other provinces.
11. Provisions should be made in the constitution giving Muslims an adequate share along with the other Indians in all the services of the state and in local self governing bodies, having due regard to the requirement of efficiency.
12. The Constitution should embody adequate safeguards for the protection of Muslim culture and for the protection and promotion of Muslim education, language, religion, personal laws and Muslim

charitable institution and for their due share in the grants-in-aid, given by the state and by local self- governing bodies.

13. No cabinet, either central or provincial, should be formed without there being a proportion of at least one- third Muslim ministers.
14. No change shall be made in the constitution by the Central Legislature except with the concurrence of the state's contribution of the Indian Federation.

Jinnah's fourteen points faced fierce condemnation from the Congress. Hindus unanimously disregarded Jinnah's suggestion while the Congress party straight away rejected the demands made in it. Jawaharlal Nehru referred Jinnah's points as 'Jinnah's ridiculous 14 points'. However, Jinnah's 14 points played a major role in the emergence of Pakistan.

1.5 The 'Two Nation Theory':

Jinnah started off as a staunch secularist advocating Hindu- Muslim unity, however towards later part Jinnah turned into foe of Hindu social system and the Congress. He propounded the two-nation theory, which held that Hindus and Muslims were two separate nations who could not live together. His journey from the messenger of Hindu- Muslim unity to the propounder of two- nation theory made him one of the most controversial figures in modern Indian history. However the germination of Two Nation Theory could be found much before Jinnah. The late 19th century witnessed the evolution of this theory. Sir Sayed Ahmad Khan, a Muslim modernist and reformer started the movement of self- awakening and identity of the Muslims. He established the Aligarh Muslim University and the university was one of the centres where the idea of Pakistan evolved. Moreover, the poet and philosopher Muhammad Iqbal's presidential address to Muslim League on December 29, 1930 at Allahabad is considered as the first articulation of Two Nation Theory. In a vague manner Muhammad Iqbal stated:

“I would like to see the Punjab, The North- West Frontier Province, Sindh and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state, self government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North- Western Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny, at least of North- West India”.

A clear shape to an idea of Pakistan was given by Rahmat Ali, who coined the word Pakistan. Jinnah translated the two- nation theory into political reality of a nation state. Jinnah believed that Muslims of the subcontinent were separate and distinct nations from Hindus and wanted a constitutional arrangement based on equal share of power between the Congress and the Muslim League, while Congress, representing the Hindus and the Muslim League representing the Muslims. The Congress insisted on the unity of the nation and refuses to share power at British India’s unitary centre. Jinnah opposed the Congress stand and paved the way for two nation theory and subsequently partition of India. At annual session of the League at Patna, Jinnah opposed the Congress intransigencies and considered it, ‘a misfortune of our country, indeed it is a tragedy, that the High Command of the Congress is determined, absolutely determined, to crush all other communities and culture in this country, and to establish Hindu Raj’. He further stated, ‘I say that Muslims and the Muslim League have only one ally, and that ally is the Muslim nation’.

Jinnah believed that the democratic system based on the concept of a homogenous nation such as England is definitely not applicable to heterogeneous countries such as India. In 1944, in course of Gandhi-Jinnah talks, Jinnah vigorously stuck to the view that Muslims are a nation. Jinnah argued that the Muslims of the subcontinent were separate and a distinct nation from the Hindus. He wanted a constitutional arrangement based on equitable sharing of power between the Congress and the Muslim League, representing Hindus and Muslim respectively. While the Congress insisted on the unity of the nation and refused to share power at British India’s unitary centre. It paved the way for articulation of two-nation theory by Jinnah. In his article in Time and Tide in January 1940, Jinnah argued that the Muslim League was opposed to the domination of Hindu Majority over

Muslim and other minorities. He opposed any federal arrangement which may result in domination of the majority community over the minority community under the disguise of parliamentary democracy. He showed an uncompromising stand and insisted that partition was the only practical solution to the Hindu-Muslim difference.

In 1940 Jinnah presided over the second session of the Lahore Muslim League and was instrumental in passing the famous resolution which called for a separate Muslim homeland. In his address Jinnah showed disagreement with Gandhi on the question of the possibility for securing the rights of minorities in Independent India. According to Jinnah the Congress was dominated by the Hindus and was incapable of responding to Muslim concerns. Hence, the Muslim League is the sole organization to look after the Muslims in colonial India. Jinnah feared that the Constituent Assembly would be dominated by Hindus and there would be no space for Muslims to express their social, political, economic issues and grievances. Besides, Muslims would constitute a minority in India and this would lead to a situation where they will not get equal voice and their rights would be restrained. Jinnah stated that Hindus and Muslims belonged to two different religious philosophies, different customs and traditions and no inter-marriage. Hence, he considered religion as the basis of nation and he envisaged Pakistan as a secular sovereign state where all religion would be treated equally. Jinnah also believed that there are familiar principles between Islam and democracy. He argued that democracy is in consonance with Islamic principles. Although he did not advocate an orthodox Islamic state but he believed that Islam would provide an ethical value to the modern democratic structure of the state.

Check Your Progress:

1. Comment on Jinnah's 14 Points as constitutional reform plan of the Muslims.
2. Why Jinnah is considered as architect of Pakistan?
3. Explain Jinnah's view on Muslim as a Nation.
4. Critically analyse Jinnah's Two- Nation Theory.

SAQ:

Why Jinnah left Congress? Elucidate role of Jinnah in partition of India. Give reasons in support of your answer. (20+80 words)

.....

.....

.....

1.6 Summing Up:

Jinnah's journey and transformation from "the best ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity" to that of an advocate for separate homeland for Muslims is the result of the contradictions and perplexity of Indian nationalism. Jinnah grew suspicious of the Hindu social system and the Congress that the majority Hindus would subdue the religious minority Muslims. Jinnah represented the aspirations and interest of the Muslim elites. His main concern was to protect the interests of the upper middle classes and capitalist classes of Muslim community. Jinnah's conceptualization of nationalism and democracy was based on the ideology of the bourgeoisie. Moreover Jinnah's two- nation theory also suffers from theoretical fallacy. After partition the country was torn apart triggering riots, mass casualties and displacement in the name of religion. While majority of Muslims decided to stay with India, the emergence of Bangladesh in 1971 further falsified the two- nation theory.

1.7 References and suggested readings:

1. Varma, V.P. Modern Indian Political Thought. Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Educational Publisher, 2008
2. Singh, M.P and Roy, Himanshu. Indian Political Thought- Themes and Thinkers. Pearson, 2011
3. Singh, Akash and Mohapatra, Silika (ed.). Indian Political Thought- A Reader. Routledge, 2010

UNIT: 2

MANAVENDRA NATH ROY

Contents:

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Objectives
- 2.3 From Revolutionary to Radical Humanism
- 2.4 M. N. Roy's Radical Humanism
 - 2.4.1 Ideas about Nature of Man
 - 2.4.2 Views on Individual Freedom
 - 2.4.3 Ideas about Materialism
 - 2.4.4 Views about History
 - 2.4.5 Views on Democracy
 - 2.4.6 Criticism of M. N. Roy's Radical Humanism
- 2.5 Critique of Marxism
 - 2.5.1 Impact of Marxism on Roy's Philosophy
 - 2.5.2 M. N. Roy's Criticism on Marxism
- 2.6 Summing Up
- 2.7 References and Suggested Readings

2.1 Introduction

The origin of the communist movement in India basically took place after Bolshevik Revolution of November 1917. Among those prominent leaders who got inspiration from Russia and took initiative in the growth of communism in India, Manavendra Nath Roy was the most successful. He is known as the "Father of Indian Communism".

Manavendra Nath Roy (1886-1954), who is a scholarly thinker of modern India is most popularly known for his concept of Radical Humanism or New Humanism which is a great contribution to modern Indian political thought. He was one of the extremists in the freedom struggle of India for quite some time under the influence of communism, but later on he changed his ideology and fought for India's independence even from the platform of Indian National Congress. His notion towards India's problem was quite different and unique from others. In this unit, you will come to know how Roy had changed his ideology from revolutionary to radical humanism as well as the basic principles of his radical philosophy. This unit will also help you to understand M. N. Roy's critical analysis of Marxism.

2.2 Objectives

M. N. Roy is mostly known for his revolutionary role in Indian national movement and his great contribution towards the development of the concept of Radical Humanism or New Humanism. After going through this unit, you will be able to

- know M. N. Roy's revolutionary role in Indian freedom struggle
- analyze Roy's contribution towards the growth of communism in India
- examine Roy's transition from Marxism to Radicalism and from Radicalism to Radical Humanism
- analyze critically Roy's idea of Radical Humanism and the basic principles of it
- examine the impact of Marxism on Roy's philosophy
- describe Roy's criticism of Marxism

2.3 From Revolutionary to Radical Humanism

M. N. Roy started his political journey as a revolutionary nationalist from his school days. When Bengal had been undergoing the tremendous agitation of Swadeshi period, Roy received his political illumination and began his revolutionary activities. He was inspired by the political ideas of Bipin Chandra Pal, Aurobindo Ghose and Surendranath Banerjee as well as got motivation from the life of sacrifice and sufferings of V. D. Savarkar.

Stop to Consider

Life Sketch of M. N. Roy

M. N. Roy was born on February 6, 1886 in a village in 24 – Paraganas district in Bengal into a family of priests. His early name was Narendra Nath Bhattacharya. Roy was greatly influenced by the ideas and personality of Swami Vivekananda, Bankim Chandra, Swami Ramtirtha and Swami Dayananda Saraswati. It was after the partition of Bengal, Roy started his revolutionary journey and took active part in the Swadeshi Movement. He also worked with *Yugantar* and *Anusilan Samiti* – two revolutionary organisations operating in colonial Bengal. He was imprisoned several times by British government for his involvement in militant activities against British rule in India. He changed his name from Narendra Nath Bhattacharya to Manavendra Nath Roy in 1916 when he was in San Francisco, California.

Creativity was the biggest weapon of Roy. He wrote many important books, edited and contributed articles in various journals. Some of his important books are: *Scientific Politics* (1942), *New Orientation* (1946), *Beyond Communism* (1947), *India in Transition* (1922), *India's Problem and Its Solution* (1922), *One Year of Non-cooperation* (1923), *The Future of Indian Politics* (1926), *Historical Role of Islam* (1939), *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in China* (1946), *New Humanism: A Manifesto* (1947), *Beyond Communism* (1947), *Materialism: An Outline of the History of Scientific Thought* (1951), *Reason, Romanticism and Revolution* (1952) etc. Roy died in Dehradun on January 25, 1954.

In 1910, Roy was sentenced to imprisonment in connection with the Howrah Conspiracy Case. During the First World War, the German revolutionaries along with the Indian revolutionaries in Berlin came to the conclusion that one of the effective means of checking British resistance was to create internal troubles in British India. They therefore decided to smuggle arms and ammunitions to India to help the Indian revolutionaries. M. N. Roy went to Java in search of arms but got disappointed because the ship carrying arms did not reach Java. In 1915 he again went to Java to receive arms for Indian revolutionaries but again failed in his mission. Roy was again arrested in 1915 because of his connection with a political dacoity in Calcutta.¹ In the same year he visited Dutch Indies and later went to Japan, China, U.S.A., Mexico, Germany and Russia. In late 1915, he met Indian revolutionaries and Indian students in San Francisco who were working there for Indian freedom struggle. There, he also came in contact and worked in collaboration with Lala Lajpat Rai. Roy changed his name from Narendra Nath Bhattacharya to Manavendra Nath Roy during that period. He already had started to study Marxist literature when he was in New York.

In Mexico, he founded the first Communist Party outside Russia and became its Secretary General. It was at this stage Roy came in contact with Borodin, a Russian favourite of Lenin, who introduced Roy to Hegelian Dialectical Ontology. After Bolshevik revolution he was invited to Russia by V. I. Lenin. Roy reached at Russia in the beginning of 1920 and became the advisor of Bolshevik Party on colonial problems. There, he attended the Second Congress of the Communist International and had a difference of opinion with Lenin. Roy prepared a different thesis from that of Lenin and revealed the drawbacks of resolutions sponsored by Lenin. Roy's views were more realistic and even Lenin was highly impressed by his analysis. In 1922, Roy made a sociological study of contemporary India and stated his views in his book *India in Transition*. He predicted that the future Indian nation was going to be shaped by the 'inexorable evolution' of the progressive forces latent in Indian society. The Indian transition was a consequence of the movement of social forces which were struggling for the replacement of the old bankrupt decadent socio-economic structure.² In 1922 Roy went to Berlin to organise Indian revolutionaries there. There he started his journal the *Vanguard of Indian Independence*. For the spread of communism in India, Roy believed that, there should be a separate Communist Party of India which would have an independent role. He also pleaded to form People's Party with a revolutionary character, though he was not successful in his mission. In 1922 his book *India's Problem and Its Solution* was published where Roy criticised the medievalism and conservatism of Gandhian social ideology. He suggested that revolutionary people's party would stimulate dissatisfaction against the existing political and economic system of the country. It would also intensify discontent in those places where it did exist. In 1923, Roy published another book *One Year of Non-cooperation from Ahmedabad to Gaya* where he praised the saintly personality of Mahatma Gandhi. He acknowledged the sacrifice and efforts of Gandhi to mobilise common people from 1919 to 1922. At the same time Roy also mentioned a number of shortcomings of Gandhism i.e. lack of economic programme in Gandhism, inclusion of all sections of Indians-exploiters and exploited, vacillation of Gandhism etc.

¹ Varma, V. P. *Modern Indian Political Thought*. P. 482

² M. N. Roy, *India in Transition*, pp. 84-85

SAQ

Discuss M. N. Roy's contribution towards the expansion of communism around the world.

.....

.....

.....

Gradually M. N. Roy got dissatisfied with communist organisation and in 1928, he even did not attend the Sixth Congress of the Communist International. In 1930, Roy came back to India and attended the Karachi Session of the Indian National Congress. In July 1931, he was arrested in connection with the Kanpur Conspiracy Case and imprisoned for 6 years. After his release in 1936 he became a member of the Indian National Congress. He wished to form Indian National Congress on revolutionary basis. Differences arose between Roy and officially dominant groups of Congress during the period of World War II. Indian National Congress wanted to boycott war efforts by Indians for British government; but Roy was of the view that England was fighting war against Nazism and Fascism and hence every Indian should help British government by contributing money and material to stop the spread of Nazism in the world. He also condemned Gandhism. Roy left Indian National Congress in 1940 and then founded a separate party known as Radical Democratic Party. In 1944, he formed Indian Federation of Labour. In 1948, Roy dissolved his Radical Democratic Party and in its place founded Indian Renaissance Movement. He was elected as the vice president of "International Humanist and Ethical Association" in Amsterdam. Thus Roy transformed himself from Marxism to Radicalism and from Radicalism to new scientific humanism. Roy's political journey—from revolutionary to Radical Humanism—allowed him to conceptualise radicalism in different perspectives.

He believed that political independence is not the ultimate solution to solve the problem of poverty and to attain development. Rather he had deep faith on individual's freedom. He was very critical of all those theories and perspectives which did not take individual as the focal point of analysis. According to him, state and society should come later and individual first in all social, political and economic arrangements. Hence, individual freedom should not in any way be hampered either by religious dogmas or like concepts such as dialectical materialism. M. N. Roy was a great rationalist and judged everything by the yardstick of reason and rationality.

Check your Progress:

1. Fill in the blanks:
 - a) In 1916, Roy changed his name from _____ to Manavendra Nath Roy.
 - b) M. N. Roy founded Radical Democratic Party in _____.
2. In which country Roy founded the first Communist Party outside Russia?
3. Write a short note on Indian Communism.

2.4 M. N. Roy's Radical Humanism

Although M. N. Roy was under the great influence of Marxism in the first half of his life, but later on he realised that communism provided no solution to individual liberty. His faith on individual freedom started to increase and in the last years of his life (1947-1954) Roy developed his own philosophy what he called as 'Radical Humanism' or 'New Humanism'. He claimed that his notion of radical humanism is distinct from the humanist versions of other thinkers. Prior to M. N. Roy, there were also humanist trends in the writings of Protagoras, Erasmus, More, Buchanan and Herder.¹ According to Roy, though the humanists of 19th century emphasised on man and individual liberty, but they could not get away from the erroneous belief of subordinating man to some super-natural forces and super-natural powers. For Roy, the advancement of science is a factor for the liberation of creative energies of individuals, because science has emancipated man from the dominance of superstitions and trans-terrestrial fears. Roy explained 'New Humanism' as a 'philosophy of freedom based on modern scientific knowledge'. Regarding the basic principles of new humanism of M. N. Roy, we can summarise his philosophy like follows:

2.4.1 Ideas about Nature of Man

M. N. Roy believes the notion of evolution of man. Man is the product of physical universe as well as an integral part of it. Because of his emergence from this physical harmonious universe, man is rational by nature. Everything in man that deals with biological evolution is thus distinguishable and noticeable. As soul or atman cannot be noticed and traced, there is no such thing like soul or atman, to radical humanists. In the philosophy of radical humanism, there is no place for supernatural things or factors like soul and God whose existence cannot be scientifically proved. Any person, who thinks that God has created the world and everything is determined by fate or God's will, can never become a radical humanist. The religious ideas, supernatural and superhuman powers are worthless to a radical humanist.

M. N. Roy believed that man is rational by instinct and above all other living beings. Rationalism is the most essential and basic standard of human being. Each individual has the thinking capacity. Roy believed that the advancement of science has enhanced the creative energies of man and liberated him from the dominance of superstitions and trans-terrestrial fears. According to him, humanist ethics is built on the foundations of this natural rationality of man and conscience is the spontaneous effect of rationality. Thus, reason is not an innate metaphysical entity but is an emergent in the process of biological evolution.² Man is an ensemble of social relations and hence morality springs as an answer to man's search for social harmony and beneficent social accommodation. Man is governed by laws inherent in the physical universe. It is the rationality of man which discovers these natural laws by making themselves familiar with the law governed character of this universe.

¹ Varma, V. P. *Modern Indian Political Thought*. P. 498

² Varma, V. P. *Modern Indian Political Thought*. P. 499

2.4.2 Views on Individual Freedom

M. N. Roy was a great lover of individual freedom. For him, individual is an end in itself and every other organisation in the society was simply means to an end. He kept individual freedom above everything else. Roy subordinated everything, even religion, morality or other supernatural powers, to individual freedom. Society is the creation of man. Roy argues that human beings derive all their virtues and abilities from their creative achievements in unscrambling the mysteries and partial conquest of nature. If man can move out of the circumference of nature, then how can he be subordinated to something supernatural and man-made creation which itself is very enough to be undone time and again. He believed that individual had always been struggling for protection and preservation of their freedom. He was categorical in propounding that 'Radicalism thinks in terms neither of nation nor class; its concern is man; it conceives freedom as freedom of the individual'. Individual will not attain full freedom unless the society is organised on rational basis. The more rationality ensures greater freedom for individual.

2.4.3 Ideas about Materialism

M. N. Roy essentially believed in the basic doctrine of historical materialism as propounded by Karl Marx but he differed from Marx in details. Roy considered that Marxian doctrine of materialism was dogmatic and unscientific and neglected the creative role of human subject. He took the idea of scientific method of Marx in his philosophy of radical humanism, but explained it in a different way. 'Matter' was real and independent to him and he revised the whole concept of matter with the latest scientific knowledge. Roy believed that 'matter' is not made up of hard and massy stone like atoms as in traditional 'mechanical materialism'. He said that there was no difference between organic and inorganic matter. All living bodies were created out of certain chemical matters and their combination resulted in the creation of other matters. Mind was the product of matter at high stage of development. Hence, there is a close relationship between mind and matter. Our bodies, our sense organs, the brain, the nerve system, the cognitive apparatus; all have grown out of the background of inanimate matter.

2.4.4 Views about History

According to M. N. Roy, human history is nothing else but a record of struggle for freedom. History is the witness that people had always been struggling either for their political, social or economic freedom. Hence they created society to attain freedom as well as state for peace and security. Roy also criticised Karl Marx's notion of history as a dialectical process governed by the economic forces only. Apart from economic there were many more other factors and forces of individual's life which also determined the course of history. Social, political, cultural as well as ideological factors also played important role in the process of history. He believed that history was not only study of an economic aspect of life but something broader and wider.

SAQ:

How M. N. Roy's materialist philosophy was different from Karl Marx?

.....

.....

.....

.....

2.4.5 Views on Democracy

M. N. Roy was not satisfied with the present form of democracy. According to him, the current democracy fails to protect individual freedom and sacrifices individual freedom for the interest of collective freedom. Roy desired that the individual in society should be able to enjoy economic adequacy and security as well as live in a social psychological atmosphere that would be free from any kind of cultural regimentation. It will help in the development of individual's rationality and potentialities. Roy pleaded for an organised democracy based on decentralisation. Individual liberty is possible only in a proper democratic set up.

Stop to Consider:

M. N. Roy's concept of Organised Democracy:

M. N. Roy was opposed to parliamentary democracy based on party system. In this regard, he was very similar to Jaya Prakash Narayan. According to Roy, parliamentary democracy could not ensure individual freedom and brought regimentation in political life. In its place, he proposed the concept of organised democracy based on decentralisation and partyless system. Ultimate sovereignty was to be vested in the hands of people. The whole structure of the system will be based on local democracies. But for success of organised democracy, Roy felt that certain pre-requisites were essential. He said that first and foremost, the people should be made educated to realise their responsibilities. Also, people should have high moral character and high standard of intelligence. Until and unless people attain high moral and intellectual standards, there should be elective as well as selective democracy in the initial stages. Roy also prepared a draft constitution which was to be a model of his organised democracy.

2.4.6 Criticism of M. N. Roy's Radical Humanism

A critical evaluation of M.N. Roy's philosophy of Radical Humanism reveals certain drawbacks of his ideas relating to humanism.

Although Roy condemned Marxism on several grounds and identified himself as a radical humanist yet he could not totally get rid of Marxism. He denounced Marx's notion of dialectical materialism without giving any satisfactory alternative to it. Because he failed to give any logical reason as to how the matter was capable of producing living bodies.

It is said that M. N. Roy's philosophy of radical humanism is entirely based on the concept of rationalism. According to him, man is rational by nature and everything should be decided by reason. But unfortunately he has failed to clearly and precisely define the term 'reason'.

Critics claim that M. N. Roy's radical humanism was not something new. Prior to Roy, many political thinkers in both East and West had talked about the cause of individual freedom. Roy only tried to give a new outlook by freeing human beings from all other social compulsions. But in reality, no one can deny the role of marriage and society in individual's life.

Likewise, M. N. Roy also condemned religion as a hindrance towards individual's freedom and development. But critics are of the view that religion is a part of human life and it plays a very crucial role in our cultural and intellectual development.

Roy also failed to narrate precisely how human urge for freedom will not result in clashes. Because while struggling for individual freedom there is bound to have its impact on collective freedom resulting clashes among individuals.

Check your Progress:

1. Write 'True' or 'False'.
 - a) A true radical humanist believes that the world is created by God.
 - b) M. N. Roy was in favour of partyless democracy.
 - c) M. N. Roy subordinated individual freedom to society.
2. 'Radicalism thinks in terms neither of nation nor class; its concern is man; it conceives freedom as freedom of the individual' – Discuss.
3. Critically analyse M. N. Roy's notion of Radical Humanism.

2.5 Critique of Marxism

M. N. Roy was a born revolutionary. When he was in USA he came under the influence of Marxism and became a known person in the Marxist world. Like other revolutionaries, Roy was also highly impressed by the doctrines of Karl Marx. He even began to think that the only solution to existing Indian problems lay in Marxism. Roy was the first Indian who founded communist party outside Russia for the first time. In Mexico, the Mexican Communist Party was founded by M. N. Roy in 1917. First it was named as Socialist Workers' Party and in 1919 the party was renamed as the Mexican Communist Party. It was because of Roy's interest in Marxism, he became very close to Lenin and other eminent communist leaders of the world. But slowly Roy got frustrated with the subtle characteristics of the Marxian philosophy.

2.5.1 Impact of Marxism on Roy's Philosophy:

No doubt Roy accepted and applied some principles of Marxism in his new humanism. Like Marx, Roy was also a thorough going materialist. Regarding materialism, Roy stated that “it represents the knowledge of nature as it really exists, knowledge acquired through the contemplation, observation and investigation of the phenomenon of nature itself... It simply maintain that the origin of everything that really exists is matter, that there does not exist anything, but matter, all other appearances being transformations of matter, and these transformations are governed necessarily by laws inherent in nature.” According to Roy, matter is real and independent. All living bodies were created out of chemical matters and mind was the product of matter at a high stage of development. He applied scientific method of Marx in his radical humanism. Similarly, M. N. Roy also believed that all knowledge had its roots in the physical universe. According to him, sensations and perceptions are the sources of knowledge. Like Marx, Roy also criticised the capitalist system of economy and he was of the view that industry should be controlled by people themselves.

Even though Roy was highly impressed by Karl Marx's ideas, differences arose between Roy and Stalin and Roy lost his faith in Marxism. He realised that communism cannot provide any solution to worldly problems. The genesis of the concept of New Humanism lies in the frustration of Roy with the subtle characteristics of the Marxian philosophy.

SAQ:

“Like Marx, M. N. Roy was a staunch materialist” – do you believe it? Give arguments in favour of your answer.

.....

.....

.....

Stop to Consider:

“Marx's proposition that consciousness is determined by materialist metaphysics being placed on a sound scientific foundation. His subsequent thought, particularly sociological, however, did not move in the direction indicated by the significant point of departure. Marxism, on the whole, is not true to its philosophical tradition. In sociology, it vulgarizes materialism to the extent of denying that basic moral values transcend space and time. With the impersonal concept of the forces of production, it introduces teleology in history, crassly contradicting its own belief that man is the maker of his destiny. The economic determinism of its historiology blasts the foundation of human freedom, because it precludes the possibility of man ever becoming free as an individual. Yet, contemporary sociological thinking has been considerably influenced by the fallacious and erroneous doctrines of Marxism which do not logically follow from his philosophy.”

----- M. N. Roy (*Reason, Romanticism and Revolution* Vol. II, pp. 216-217)

2.5.2 M. N. Roy's Criticism on Marxism

M. N. Roy provided a thorough criticism on Marxism.

First, Roy condemned Marx for his denial of individual liberty. According to him, there was no place for individual liberty in Marxism. Marx did not pay adequate attention to the worth and significance of the empirical individual. As Roy had noticed that there was complete regimentation in communism where party bosses expected the masses to act according to their instructions. Hence, he demanded for revolt against fatalism implicit in the prophetic sociology of Marx. Under the influence of Hegel's theory of moral positivism, Marx had rejected the liberal concept of individualism and marginalised the role of individual as well as the concept of freedom.

Secondly, Roy was of the view that Marxian notion of materialism was dogmatic and unscientific. Roy said that the movement through thesis and antithesis is a characteristic of logical argumentation. But it is not acceptable that matter and forces of production move dialectically. To quote Roy, "The dialectical materialism of Marx, therefore, is materialist only in name; dialectics being its corner-stone, it is essentially an idealistic system. No wonder that it disowned the heritage of the eighteenth century scientific naturalism and fought against the humanist materialism of Feuerbach and his followers."

Thirdly, M. N. Roy criticised Marxism for its overemphasis on the economic interpretation of the history to the substantive. History cannot be interpreted only with reference to materialistic objectivism. Marx had neglected the intelligence of human beings and their cumulative actions while interpreting history. It means that in the Marxist philosophy of history the role of ideas was minimized. Roy stated that in the history of mankind we find that there were several activities apart from economic, wherein people found satisfaction. Roy said, "History does not follow the Marxian pattern of dialectics, but is a movement from homogeneous masses to the evolution of distinct individualistic experimenting in various forms of harmonisation between themselves."

Fourthly, Roy criticised Karl Marx for his prophecy about disappearance of middle class. According to Roy, if we study history we find that the middle classes emerged as a powerful factor that had been influencing in moulding national policies and programmes. Even, the number of middle class increases with the expansion of the economic process.

Fifthly, M. N. Roy criticised Marxism for its weak ethical foundation because of its dogmatic and relativistic nature. Marx believed that in the process of struggle man changes his own nature. In other words, Marx was of the opinion that there is nothing stable in human nature. But according to Roy, Marx never acknowledged the eighteenth century materialism which opined that human nature is constant. In opposition to Marxism, Roy believed that there is something stable and permanent in human nature which is the basis of duties and rights. Moral consciousness or morality is not the product of economic forces. If a man is subordinated to the overwhelming dominance of the forces of production it will neutralize his autonomy and creativity. Roy emphasised on humanist ethics that gives importance to sovereignty of individual and beliefs in freedom and justice. Thus, Roy believed that there is something stable in ethical values which were neglected by Marxism.

Sixthly, Roy was also critical about the notion of class struggle. Of course, there had been different social classes in history. But along with social struggle and conflict between them, there had certainly been operative a social cohesive bond.

Lastly, Roy believed that there is an element of voluntaristic romanticism in revolutions. As revolutions are collective representations of emotions heightened to a pitch, the idea of revolution exalts human efforts to remake the world. Revolutionary romanticism is contradictory to the concept of dialectical materialism of Marx.

Thus, M. N. Roy criticised several notions of Marxism, though he did not enter into the technicalities of Marxian economics. After he got dissatisfied with Marxism as well as the activities of the leaders of Communist Party, Roy made the final move of propounding a theory rooted in integral scientific humanism which he called as the 'New Humanism' or 'Radical Humanism'.

Check your Progress:

1. Write 'True' or 'False'.
 - a) M. N. Roy developed his idea of Radical Humanism because of his frustration with Marxism.
 - b) M. N. Roy was in favour of capitalist system of economy.
 - c) M. N. Roy supported Karl Marx's theory of class struggle.
2. Write two similarities between Marxism and M. N. Roy's Radical Humanism.
3. How did Roy attack Marxism? And why? Discuss in details.

2.6 Summing Up:

After going through this unit, now you have come to know that there are two distinctive phases of M. N. Roy's life and his philosophy. First was the revolutionary period and the second one was the period of radical humanism. As a militant activist from his school days Roy played a very active role in the freedom struggle of India. His love for Marxism was so deep rooted that he was the first Indian who founded communist party outside Russia. He was the torch bearer of Indian communism and was a renowned personality in the Marxist world. If he wished he could have take the chance to secure a high position in the Marxist world. You are now in a position to analyse why Roy changed his ideology in the later period of his life and became a pronounced critic of Marxism as well as communist theory and practice.

This unit is also helpful for you to know about the most important contribution of Roy i.e. Radical Humanism. His political views are founded on reason and morality, not on any dogmas. He emphasised on the primacy of freedom, knowledge and truth. So he wanted the state to be free from religion and other supernatural ideas. Roy believed that matter was real and independent he reanalysed the whole concept of matter with the latest scientific knowledge. After reading this unit, you can now have an idea about Roy's idea of organised democracy. He believed in partyless system and made a draft constitution as a model of his organised democracy.

2.7 References and Suggested Readings:

Chakrabarty, Bidyut & Pandey, Rajendra Kumar. *Modern Indian Political Thought – Text and Context*. Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2009

Gauba, O. P. *Indian Political Thought*. Mayur Paperbacks, New Delhi, 2015

Jayapalan, N. *Indian Political Thinkers- Modern Indian Political Thought*. Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 2000

Mehta, V. R. *Foundations of Indian Political Thought-An Interpretation*. Manohar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 1992

Varma, V. P. *Modern Indian Political Thought*. Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Educational Publishers, Agra, 1961

UNIT: 3

RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: CASTE, CLASS AND DEMOCRACY

Contents:

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Objectives
- 3.3 Political Journey of Ram Manohar Lohia
- 3.4 Ram Manohar Lohia's views on Caste and Class
 - 3.4.1 Lohia's Cyclical Theory of History
 - 3.4.2 Oscillation between class and caste
 - 3.4.3 Criticism
- 3.5 Ram Manohar Lohia's views on Democracy
 - 3.5.1 Four Pillar State
- 3.6 Summing Up
- 3.7 References and Suggested Readings

3.1 Introduction

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia (1910-1967) was a well known political thinker of Modern India and the founder of the Socialist Party of India. He played an important role in the independence movement of India and had to go to jail several times. He was a prominent leader and is regarded as the most original thinker of the socialist movement in India. Ram Manohar Lohia fought against inequalities and injustices throughout his life. He raised his voice for common people and strived for liberation from oppression and exploitation. He was an advocate of internationalism and pleaded for true international unity. In this unit, we will discuss about Ram Manohar Lohia's political journey as a socialist leader, the cyclical theory of history as well as Lohia's ideas on caste and class, Lohia's views on democracy and economic decentralisation etc.

3.2 Objectives

This unit is an attempt to make you familiarise with political, social and economic thought of Ram Manohar Lohia. After going through this unit you will be able to

- define Lohia's contribution to the socialist movement in India
- examine the cyclical theory of history put forwarded by Lohia
- know his ideas on caste and class
- examine Lohia's views on democracy
- describe how Lohia fought to bring about political and social change in India.

3.3 Political Journey of Ram Manohar Lohia

Lohia was one of the founders of Congress Socialist Party. In 1936, he was given the responsibility as the secretary of the foreign department of the Congress on the recommendation of Jawaharlal Nehru. He was also the editor of the periodical 'Congress Socialist'. In 1938, he was included in the executive committee of the Congress Socialist Party and he began to develop his own political ideas. He criticised the Gandhian leadership of the Congress as well as the communists who were in CSP. During the period from 1938 to 1946, Lohia was actively involved in the freedom struggle of India and he was imprisoned several times. Lohia, along with other leaders of Congress Socialist Party was not happy with the way in which the Congress leaders dealt with communal situation in India after independence. The Congress Socialist Party removed the prefix 'Congress' from its name and became independent Socialist Party. In 1952, when Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party merged with Socialist Party, the party emerged as Praja Socialist Party. Unhappy with the new party Ram Manohar Lohia led a split from it and formed Socialist Party in 1955. He was elected to Lok Sabha in the by election in 1963. He reported to parliament about the widespread problem of starvation among agricultural labourers and raised his voice for the improvement of the condition of poor people of India.

Stop to Consider

Life Sketch of Ram Manohar Lohia

Ram Manohar Lohia was born on March 23, 1910 in a middle class Marwari family at Akbarpur in Uttar Pradesh. Lohia's father, Heera Lal, was a teacher as well as businessman by profession and was a nationalist by spirit. Lohia came into contact with the freedom struggle of India early in his life through the influence of his father. As his father was very much impressed by Mahatma Gandhi's thought, Lohia also got attracted to Gandhi's ideas from his early age. Though he did not accept blindly every notion of Gandhi, but Gandhian thought had a great impact on his social, economic and political ideas. Ram Manohar Lohia even left the school to join non-cooperation movement of Gandhi. Lohia got his education in Bombay and Calcutta. He went to Germany after his graduation and attended Frederick William University (today's Humboldt University of Berlin, Germany) and got his Ph.D. When he was in Germany, he witnessed the rise of Hitler and Nazi chauvinistic racism. The climate of Germany on the one hand and political ideas of social democracy on the other shaped him as a thorough democrat and a believer of civil liberties. After coming back from Germany, Lohia associated himself with the nationalist politics of India and basically with the activities of the newly formed Congress Socialist Party.

Lohia believed that neither communism nor European tradition of socialism is relevant in the existing socio-economic realities in the third world countries. Because Marx did not sufficiently take into account the peculiar and specific conditions of the third world. Lohia was of the view that in order to succeed Indian socialism must develop on its own lines. He was a great advocate of freedom and individual liberty. Lohia was deeply influenced by

different ideas of Karl Marx though he was not a blind follower of Marx. Lohia's ideas and thinking on socialist thought and movement came to be influenced by Gandhian teachings and techniques. Gandhi's concept of 'Satyagraha' had a strong impact on Lohia's thought. He advocated for the attainment of socialist ideals through Satyagraha. Lohia was very inspired by Gandhi's ideas of small machine technology as well as decentralisation of power.

Lohia was known as the champion of social justice. He vigorously worked for the emancipation of the suppressed sections of Indian society. He was also a great internationalist. He criticised Nehru's Non-alignment policy. Ram Manohar Lohia believed that India should have solid friends abroad. He also emphasised on formation of world parliament.

Some of the significant works of Ram Manohar Lohia are "Aspects of Socialist Party" (1952), "Fragments of a World Mind" (1953), "Wheel of History" (1955), "Will to Power" (1956), "Towards the Destruction of Castes and Classes" (1958), "Guilty Men of India's Partition" (1960), "Marx, Gandhi and Socialism" (1963), "India, China and Northern Frontiers" (1963), "The Caste System" (1964) etc.

SAQ:

Why did Ram Manohar Lohia oppose to communism and European tradition of socialism? Give two arguments.

.....

.....

.....

3.4 Ram Manohar Lohia's views on Caste and Class

Ram Manohar Lohia wanted to free individual from all kinds of ignorance, backwardness, superstitions and unfairness. He constantly opposed to any kind of despotism and coercion in society. Lohia rejected Marx's theory of class struggle, because it projects European history as the history of mankind. He stated that Indian Marxists were always inclined to view Indian society in terms of class structure. But the true fact was that Indian society is basically a caste-ridden society. Here, the Marxian notion of class structure cannot be established, as said by Lohia.

According to Lohia, the problems of Asian nations must be analysed from different perspective. In this region, civilisation had emerged after centuries of old despotism and feudalism. He said that the combination of rigid dogmas and political conventions results in narrow-mindedness as well as communalism. Very often terror becomes the part of politics in this region because of absence of any stable democratic system. In such a situation, the

development of bureaucracy and technocracy gives rise to a new class of leadership which start to play with the sentiments of common people. So, Lohia suggested that socialists in Asia need to develop an original social philosophy that could deal with all these distinctive problems of Asian nations. He opined that caste structure in Indian society was a legacy of feudalism; so, in order to pave the way for the emergence of class structure it is necessary to smash caste structure at first.

3.4.1 Lohia's Cyclical Theory of History

Ram Manohar Lohia made a distinction between class and caste in his famous book “**Wheel of History**”. According to Lohia, history moves like a cycle. The entire human history is nothing but an internal oscillation between class and caste and an external shift of power and prosperity from one region to another. This internal oscillation and external shift are inter-related to each other. Lohia stated that the ingredients of a total historical situation at any time were class and caste on the inside and a rise or decline in power on outside. A society went up to power and prosperity only as long as it kept improving its technical and organisational ability in one critical dimension. After a point, the society hit the limits of one dimensional growth, became stagnant and fell into the trap of rigidity of caste system. Then the global centre of power and prosperity shifted to another society. In this context, Lohia mentioned about a third aspect of life i.e. physical and cultural approximation, in order to put an end to the external struggle among nations and the internal struggle among classes. He was of the view that higher physical and cultural intermingling of races, civilization and societies as well as reduction of social inequality could lead us towards unity of mankind through conscious and intelligent designing. The new civilization would attempt to overcome class, caste and regional shift.

3.4.2 Oscillation between Class and Caste

According to Ram Manohar Lohia, class is mobile caste and caste is immobile class. While the idea of caste represents the evil forces of conservatism, ancient affinities; the idea of class is the beholder of the virtues of dynamism and social mobilisation in society. However, the true fact is that these two forces keep on changing sides resulting in caste fragmenting into classes and classes occasionally metamorphosing into castes. Caste is a rigid system. He argued that caste restricts opportunity and restricted opportunity constricts ability. This constricted ability again restricts opportunity. Thus, there is slow swing between caste and class. Lohia said that there had always been a tussle between caste and class. Lohia observed that since class is a dynamic force, a society which is at the centre of the world is characterised by class division. On the other hand, a society which has lagged behind in its struggle for supremacy in the external world develops caste system.

Lohia considered the rise of Buddhism as a movement opposed to the caste system and a shift from caste to class. Under the impact of it, there was some loosening in castes which was accompanied by political strength, economic prosperity, improvement in agriculture, upward mobility in the case of artisans and traders and growth in national income. Lohia pleaded for internal approximation between different groups, classes and castes in society.

Ram Manohar Lohia was against caste hierarchy. He believed that the empowerment of all deprived and underprivileged sections of the society including Shudras as well as Dalits is necessary in order to attain progress. Lohia observed that caste system has stratified Indian society. In order to remove it the backward castes and groups should be given preferential opportunities for two or three or four decades, if necessary. He also pleaded that preference should be given to backward casts and classes in matters of land distribution, employment and educational sector. Lohia believed in social revolution for uplifting the conditions of the backward castes and classes and thus to abolish it. He argued that without destroying the caste system, Indian society cannot be reconstructed. For abolishing caste system on both social and political aspect, he emphasised on to create awareness and to change the mental attitude of the people. So, he pleaded for free and compulsory education specially for scheduled castes, tribes and other poorer sections of the society. Lohia put forward the idea of “roti and beti” which means that people would have to eat together and allow marriage of their daughters with other castes in order to break the caste barriers.

Stop to Consider

Sapta Kranti or Seven Revolutions

Ram Manohar Lohia came with the idea of *Sapta Kranti* or Seven Revolutions to introduce a new sense of dynamism in Indian social system. According to him, these seven revolutions require independent revolution. The attainment of one does not necessarily lead to the attainment of others. These seven revolutions are for:

- Equality between man and woman
- Abolition of inequalities based on skin/colour
- Abolition of inequality based on caste system
- National freedom or against foreign enslavement
- Economic equality and planned production
- Protecting the privacy of individual life from all unjust encroachments
- Satyagraha and against weapons

Lohia was an advocate of equality, social justice and individual freedom. He wanted to have an egalitarian society where all individuals would get equal opportunities to develop their capabilities and potentialities. Individual liberty could not be achieved in the absence of equality. By equality, he not only meant economic equality but also spiritual equality coming from innate feeling of the individuals that they all are equal in the society. Lohia also demanded for immediate replacement of English language by Hindi and other regional languages in public institutions. He felt that in the garb of English language a tiny minority section of the society had been imposing their domination over more than 95 percent population of India.

3.4.3 Criticism

Lohia was against the caste system and he advocated for empowerment of lower caste in the national mainstream and emphasised on reservation for lower castes in various sector in order to bring them up. Critics point out that his style of working led to the strengthening of caste structure itself. Lohia's notion about caste is also criticised on the ground that it promoted an attitude of caste-based pride, contrary to its original goal. Again, Lohia's efforts to mobilize backward castes and classes to uproot the Congress rule, led to the coalition between socialists of various shades with certain communal elements which caused communal tension in India.

Check Your Progress

1. Write a short note on the role of Ram Manohar Lohia on the formation of Socialist Party.
2. How did Ram Manohar Lohia differentiate between caste and class?
3. Do you think that the socialist ideas of Ram Manohar Lohia would be able to establish social equity in Indian society? Give arguments in favour of your answer?
4. Write 'True' or 'False'.
 - a) Ram Manohar Lohia was not satisfied with the formation of Praja Socialist Party in 1952.
 - b) According to Ram Manohar Lohia, caste is a dynamic force.

3.5 Ram Manohar Lohia's views on Democracy

Ram Manohar Lohia was opposed to both capitalism and communism. According to him, none of these were suitable for India. Since capitalism is based on the idea of profit, it leads unemployment, selfishness and war which are opposed to social equity and prosperity. Likewise, communism depends upon social ownership of the means of production and alerts only the capitalist relations of production. Lohia stated that "Capitalism cannot even fulfil its primary function of providing capital to mankind...Communism inherits from capitalism its technique of production; it only seeks to smash the capitalist relations of production. Communism claims to be the continuator and developer of capitalist technology, when capitalism is no longer able to do so." He said that the contemporary world was in the grip of capitalism as well as communism that resulted in poverty, war and fear. He also said that the European socialism were irrelevant in the existing socio-economic realities of India. During that period, he observed that, European socialism was mainly bound by ethnocentric considerations that took into account the interest of the European countries only. Hence, he put forwarded his idea of new socialism. He sought to establish a socialist society in India after independence. Lohia said that the pace of socialism will have to be changed according

to changing circumstances. Regarding socialism, Lohia said that it was the best way to achieve equality and prosperity. In this regard he praised Gandhiji's some ideas and actions that may act as a filter through which socialist ideas would flow. He emphasised on greater incorporation of Gandhian ideology to socialist thought though he was not a blind follower of Gandhi. Lohia wanted to combine socialist principles with Gandhian ideas like satyagraha, end and means principle, small machine technology and political decentralisation. The core of socialism envisioned by Lohia drew its spirit and substance from the Gandhian principles of socioeconomic and political reconstruction of the Indian society.

Stop to Consider

Lohia's New Socialism

Ram Manohar Lohia pleaded for a just social order based on equality, decentralisation and individual dignity where individual will be free from ignorance, injustice, backwardness as well as all kinds of prejudices. In respect of the creation of a new human civilization, he rejected both capitalism and communism. Lohia also criticised European socialism for its dogmatic and doctrinaire nature. He firmly believed that if socialism were to lead Indian people to development and prosperity, it must be framed in Indian context. He imagined socialism as 'New Civilisation' that we can also term as new socialism. Lohia emphasised on to give socialism a global outlook. In association with Acharya Narendra Dev, Jaya Prakash Narayan, Ashok Mehta and other contemporary socialist leaders, Lohia developed his own socialistic ideology. His idea of socialism mainly aimed at establishing a free and decentralized society by eliminating centralised power. Lohia cited his original thesis of socialism in the Pachmarhi Conference of socialists in May, 1952. He put forward a six point plan for his New Socialism. These are:

- Maximum attainable equality, towards which nationalization of economy may be one essential step;
- A decent standard of living throughout the world, and not increasing standard of living within national frontiers;
- A world parliament and government elected on adult franchise with beginning, towards a world government and world army;
- Collective and individual practice of civil disobedience so that the unarmed and helpless little man may acquire the habit to resist tyranny and exploitation civilly;
- Four-pillar state – the village, the district, the province and the centre;
- Evolution of technology, which would be consistent with these aims and processes.

Lohia had faith in democracy as government of people, but he opposed the tendency of democracy to lead on elitism. In India, there is so much of poverty and caste distinction.

Therefore, Lohia stated that, if such type of democracy based on elitism prevails in India, it would increase the power of the upper class and it would have no meaning for common people. He was in favour of guaranteeing basic fundamental freedoms of the people so that the basic needs of each and every citizen would be fulfilled. Democracy must be constructed in such a way that nobody remains without securing the basic minimum needs of life. Like Laski, Lohia also believed that political democracy has no meaning without economic democracy. Increased production and effective distribution are very important for the success of democracy. According to Lohia, within the framework of social democracy, it is possible to achieve both India's freedom as well as the need to provide bread for all.

Rammanohar Lohia said that the form of democracy prevailing in west was not suitable for solving problems in India. People's participation in the political process and widespread decentralisation are important requisites in a true democratic system. Only creation of a parliament in a country does not mean that it is a democratic country. Democratic values must be adopted as a way life. So, Lohia stated that every Indian citizen must play active role in public life so that they can raise their voice against any kind of injustice that they face. He realised that we must ensure maximum participation of citizens in governance through the mechanism of decentralisation. It thus stakes democracy from the elite to the masses.

According to Lohia, as far as possible, the total affairs of a country have to be cut up in small and yet smaller quantities in order to ensure common people's participation in the economic, political and administrative process of a country. Sovereign power must not reside alone in centre and federating units. His notion of decentralised socialism emphasised on things like small machine, cooperative labour, village government and decentralised planning.

SAQ:

How was the idea of New Socialism of Ram Manohar Lohia different from European Socialism?

.....

.....

.....

3.5.1 Four Pillar State

Ram Manohar Lohia proposed to replace parliamentary democracy by a decentralised democratic system. He named his proposed state as **"Four Pillar State"** also called the **"Chaukhamba Model"** where he made an attempt to synthesize two opposite concepts i.e. centralisation and decentralisation. In his four pillar state, functional federalism will be at four levels, namely - the village, the mandal (the district), the province and the central government. According to Lohia, district magistracy will be abolished in this system, because

it represents centralisation of power. All these four autonomous organs will be equipped with equal authority in the process of legislation and execution of policies and will be linked to each other. Lohia's four pillar state is the manifestation of decentralisation of political and administrative power and based on immediacy in democracy. It is only through decentralization, a truly non-violent society can be achieved. Lohia said that socialism in Asia must increasingly become the doctrine of maximum attainable equality through redivision of land and social ownership over industry. Its political structure must arise out of the decentralised state and it must seek its technological framework in the small machine.¹ Lohia also emphasised on operationalisation of the concept of "permanent civil disobedience" in his model state which would act as a perpetual remedy against any kind of unfairness. The core of his Chaukhamba model was his views on socialism and emphasis on economic, political and legislative decentralisation. As a true internationalist, he modified his idea of four pillar state to include world government in it as fifth pillar. He even established World Development Council and made an effort to create world government to maintain peace throughout the world.

Stop to Consider

"Democracy can bring warmth to the blood of the common man only when constitutional theory starts practising the state of four limbs, the village, the district, the province and the centre. Organically covered by the flesh and blood of equalities; this constitutional selection of the four-pillar state can infuse democracy with joy..... The central limb of the state must have power enough to maintain the integrity and unity of the state and the rest of it must be fragmented."

– Ram Manohar Lohia, ("Fragments of a World Mind" 1953)

In his four pillar democratic system, Lohia provided a structure and a way in which sovereign power is to be diffused and each little community is to be so organised that they could live the way of life that they choose. Lohia was of the view that economic planning must be done at the grassroots upwards. Collective control over the means of production is necessary. Because while there will be check on increase in private property, the collective property on the whole will also increased. Therefore, according to Lohia, a decentralised economy would be more efficient as it would be based on willing participation of the workers. In the words of K. G. Pillai, "Lohia hoped that only through such a decentralisation in planning, decision-making, giving freedom to small communities the country can rise above the issues of regionalism and fractionalism."

Lohia said that no precise list of federal or state or district or village or concurrent subjects could be drawn up. He argued that experience and time and perhaps the next Constituent Assembly of India could make precise allocations. But he was of the view that one fourth of

¹ M. Arumngam: *Socialist Thought in India – The contribution of Rammanohar Lohia*. Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, 1978, p-113

all governmental and plan expenditure should be through village, district and city panchayats. In his four pillar state the armed forces might be under the control of centre, the armed police under province, but all other police might be controlled by district and village. Industries like railway or iron and steel might be controlled by the centre, but the small and cottage industry of the future might be under district and village. As far as possible, the nationalised sector like agriculture, industry and other property will be possessed and administered by village, district and city panchayats. The post of collector must be abolished and in its place various bodies in district will work on matters like revenue. Lohia was very sympathetic towards the poor Indian farmers. He felt that the conditions of poor farmers can be uplifted only with the abolition of land revenue on unprofitable holdings. Price fixing might be a central subject, but the structure of agriculture and the ratio of capital and labour in it might be left to the choice of the district and the village. The district, village and city panchayats will work on policies and welfare functions.

Rammanohar Lohia believed that his four pillar state would meet the requirements of socialism as well as of democracy. He was in favour of cottage industries and was against European model of development based on large scale industries. He wanted to develop technology which would be amiable and beneficial to Indian economy and environment. That is why he emphasised on to develop small unit machine that would suite Indian needs and environment. In this regard, Lohia was very much inspired by Gandhi's condemnation against heavy industrialisation. From Asian perspective, Lohia put forwarded the concept of 'small unit machine' as an alternative to capitalist and communist mode of rationalisation. According to him, requirement of less capital and maximum utilisation of labour power is possible through incorporation of small machines. Moreover, when small machinery will be available, people at grassroots level will have the opportunity to involve themselves with the processing and manufacture of raw materials available in their locality. According to him, the principle of small unit machine will lead India towards economic development as well as modernisation and prosperity. He was of the view that economic decentralization along with political and administrative decentralisation, may be brought about through maximum utilization of small machines. Lohia did not refuse the importance of heavy industry. He said, "This is not to deny altogether the heavier machine in steel works or in river-training projects, but emphasis must heavily rest on the small unit machine."

Stop to Consider

Thirteen Point Plan

In a paper entitled *The Farmer in India* Ram Manohar Lohia formulated a Thirteen Point Plan to end the rampant poverty in India. These are:

1. Lowering of prices on the basis of parity between agricultural and industrial prices.
2. Austerity and sacrifice to be shared by all so that no income or salary exceeds Rs. 1000 a month.

3. Industrialisation with the help of small-unit machines, the invention and manufacture of which to be promoted by the state.
 4. Any factory running below capacity to be taken over by the state, and immediate nationalisation of basic industries.
 5. Anti-corruption commissioners in every state and at the centre with departments independent of the government.
 6. Land to the tiller and redivision of lands – $12\frac{1}{2}$ acres minimum and 30 acres maximum. Correction of wrong entries in Patwaris' registers.
 7. Cultivation of 1 crore acres of new land by a state-recruited food army.
 8. Decentralisation of administration and of economy so as to achieve the four-pillar state. Repeal of discriminatory laws including the criminal tribes Act.
 9. Housing programmes and other economic activity to provide full employment.
 10. Establishment of polytechnic schools and people's high schools and centres for youth and women for cultural activities.
 11. Immediate adult franchise elections in unrepresented areas, that is, merged states and unions.
 12. Pursuit of a positive policy of world peace through promoting full freedom and right for all nations; social and economic equality among people and between nations, and a peace bloc which can dictate truce to warring power blocs.
 13. Volunteer bands for agriculture, irrigation, road making and the like.
- (*Fragments of a World Mind*, pp. 79-80).

Source: Varma. V. P. *Modern Indian Political Thought*. Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Educational Publishers, Agra, 1961, pp. 539-540

Lohia wanted reformation in the judicial system so that common man can have justice at minimum cost. He also suggested constituting a committee to reconsider the existing laws and to provide remedial measures to remove the undemocratic elements from those laws. He wanted single High Court and single Public Service Commission for two or three states so that the number of courts and public service commission's could be reduced and their jurisdiction could be expanded for more efficiency.

Check Your Progress

1. How did Ram Manohar Lohia apply the concept of decentralisation in his Four Pillar State? Discuss.
2. Do you think that Gandhi's ideas had a great reflection on Ram Manohar Lohia's notion of democracy? Give arguments in favour of your answer.
3. Ram Manohar Lohia's concept of democracy has still its relevance in contemporary India. Justify it.
4. Write 'True' or 'False'.
 - a) Ram Manoha was a supporter of western democracy.
 - b) Lohia's Four Pillar State was an attempt to synthesize the opposed concepts of centralisation and decentralisation.

3.6 Summing Up

After going through this unit, now you have come to know that Ram Manohar Lohia was more original in his ideas as compared to other socialist thinkers of his time. You can realise how Lohia had challenged capitalism as well as Eurocentric socialist assumptions and tried to find out an alternative to solve socio-economic problems of south Asian nations. While dealing with any problems, he emphasised on the need of original thinking and initiative on the part of Asian socialists. You have also learnt from this unit that Lohia was a true Marxist as well as a great socialist. Gandhian thought had a great impact on him from early age and on his ideas. So he always gave emphasis to Gandhi's ideas and advocated that Gandhism alone could provide the suitable base for socialism in India.

After reading this unit, you have also come to know how Lohia had made distinction between caste and class and analysed history through his cyclical theory. Lohia opposed the caste system and was in favour of giving preferential treatment to the people belonging to lower or scheduled caste. He was against all kinds of inequality and discrimination based on gender, colour, birth etc. So, he put forward the idea of *Sapta Kranti* to fight against inequality and injustice. Now, you are familiar with all these ideas.

This unit is helpful for you to understand that Lohia was essentially a man of action and of vision. He always kept himself aware about the latest developments in the world of ideas and thoughts. Lohia championed the idea of "Democratic Socialism" and was a social democrat in true sense. In order to achieve true socialism, he put forward his concept of Four Pillar State. you have also come to know how Lohia made his four pillar state a structure as well as a way so that each little community living in it can choose the life that they want. Lohia also emphasised on to reform Indian economy in order to remove poverty and to uplift the socio-economic conditions of poorer and farmers of India.

3.7 References and Suggested Readings

Chakrabarty, Bidyut & Pandey, Rajendra Kumar. *Modern Indian Political Thought – Text and Context*. Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2009

Gauba, O. P. *Indian Political Thought*. Mayur Paperbacks, New Delhi, 2015

Jayapalan, N. *Indian Political Thinkers- Modern Indian Political Thought*. Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 2000

Kumar, Kamal. *Appraisal of Socio-Economic and Political Thoughts of Rammanohar Lohia in Contemporary India*. Published in *journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*. Vol. 27, No. 1, 2021 P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903 (<https://cibg.org.au>)

M. Arumngam. *Socialist Thought in India – The contribution of Rammanohar Lohia*. Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, 1978

Mehta, V. R. *Foundations of Indian Political Thought-An Interpretation*. Manohar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 1992
Varma, V. P. *Modern Indian Political Thought*. Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Educational Publishers, Agra, 1961

UNIT: 4

JAYA PRAKASH NARAYAN (Critique of Parliamentary Democracy)

Contents:

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Objectives

4.3 Political Journey of Jaya Prakash Narayan

4.4 Jaya Prakash Narayan as a True Democrat

4.5 Critique of Parliamentary Democracy

4.5.1 Jaya Prakash Narayan's Concept of Participating Democracy

4.5.2 Critical Analysis

4.6 Summing Up

4.7 References and Suggested Readings

4.1 Introduction

Jaya Prakash Narayan (1902-1979) was a leading socialist of modern India. He played an important role in the formation of Congress Socialist Party, a left wing group within the Congress party, in 1934. Before that, he founded Bihar Congress Socialist Party. Though J. P. Narayan began his political life as a Gandhian disciple, but later he came in contact with left wing intellectuals in U.S.A. and went under the influence of Marxism. He played an active role in the Quit India Movement in 1942 and was imprisoned several times for his involvement in India's struggle for independence. He Slowly J. P. Narayan started to lose his faith in Marxism because of its denial of individual liberty. He also became a great critic of communism. He tried to bring reform in Indian society through non-violent and peaceful methods. He realised that unless socialism was transferred into Sarvodaya, people could not enjoy freedom, equality and brotherhood. He also wanted to have more co-operations between the congress and the socialists. After his failure to bring reform in Socialist party, he completely broke away from communism. J. P. Narayan became a follower of Gandhism and worked in close association with Vinoba Bhave. As a passionate lover of individual freedom throughout his life, he wanted to build India on the basis of Sarvodaya thoughts. He was a great critic of the parliamentary democratic set up. Instead of it, he wanted to have a partyless

democracy in India. In this unit, you will come to know about J. P. Narayan's political journey as well as his critique of parliamentary democracy.

4.2 Objectives

J. P. Narayan is mostly known for his immense effort to bring reform in Indian political system. After going through this unit, you will be able to

- know J. P. Narayan's role in Indian freedom struggle
- examine his contribution towards the growth of socialist movement in India
- analyse J. P. Narayan's political journey from Marxism to a true follower of Gandhism
- evaluate J. P. Narayan's criticism against parliamentary democracy
- explore his suggestions to bring reform in the present day democratic set up.

4.3 Political Journey of Jaya Prakash Narayan

Jaya Prakash Narayan was a great socialist as well as a true nationalist. He started his political journey as a Gandhian Non-cooperator and a disciple of Bhagavad Gita. When he went to the U.S.A. in 1922, he came under the influence of Marxism and some socialists intellectuals of East Europe. He was also impressed by the writings of M. N. Roy basically his book *India in Transition*. After he came back from the U. S. A., Jaya Prakash Narayan discovered that truth is a relative concept and no single theory could hold true to all times and circumstances. He started to re-examine his faith in Marxism in the context of then India. He began to lose his faith in Marxism because of its denial of individual freedom and party regimentation. J. P. Narayan founded Congress Socialist Party in 1934 and involved the communists too. When he found that the communists were not very sincere to the socialist dogmas, he turned them out. In 1940, at Ramgarh, J. P. Narayan openly denounced the Popular Front of Communists and became a great critic of the authoritarian regimentation of Russian Communism. He was actively involved in Quit India Movement and imprisoned for 4 years. Jaya Prakash managed to escape from Hazari Bagh Central Jail and organised underground struggle against British rule, but he got arrested again. He was opposed to Cabinet Mission Plan. After released from jail, Jaya Prakash along with other socialist leaders planned for mass revolt. He also tried to convince the national leaders that the social base of the independence movement needed to be broadened so that more workers and peasants could actively participate in it. He dreamt of a Socialist India where political and economic democracy would be established in true sense of the term; where people would be free to express their opinion; where all sections of the society would get opportunities to develop themselves to their full moral stature. In 1946, he formulated Thirteen Point Scheme of constructive work for Gramraj where Jaya Prakash emphasised on making each and every village of India self governing and self sufficient unit.

Stop to Consider

Life Sketch of J. P. Narayan

J. P. Narayan was born on October 11, 1902 in a progressive middle class family in Sitabdiara village in Bihar. After attending primary school in his village, he went to Patna for further education. During that period, political questions concerning India's struggle for independence stuck his mind and became a spirited nationalist. His growing interest in Bhagavad Gita as well as the influence of Mahatma Gandhi had made him a swadeshi in his thought and action. He was highly impressed by Gandhian non-violent weapons like Satyagraha. He even left his studies at Patna College just before examination being influenced by Maulana abul Kalam Azad's speech to give up English education. Then he joined the Bihar Vidyapeeth, a college run by the Congress. In 1922, J. P. went to the U.S.A. for higher education. There he did different kind of work like mechanic at garage and at slaughterhouse, washed dishes, worked at factory to his education fee. He got Master Degree in Sociology. In the U.S.A., J. P. came in contact with many socialists and was influenced by Marxist philosophy. But later he lost his faith in Marxian ideology. He played a very important role in the growth of socialist movement in India. He was an active leader in Quit India Movement. There has been major transition in the political and philosophical notion of J.P. in different stages of his life. His life and philosophy can be analysed from different perspective i.e. as a great nationalist, democratic socialist, lover of individual freedom, phase of Sarvodaya and reconstruction of Indian polity, phase of total revolution etc.

Some of the major works of J. P. Narayan are 'Why Socialism' (1936), 'Towards Struggle' (1946), 'In the Lahore Fort' (1970), 'A Plea for the Reconstruction of Indian Polity' (1959), 'From Socialism to Sarvodaya' (1959), and 'Swaraj for the People' (1961).

Jaya Prakash was popularly referred to as "Lok Nayak" that means the people's leader.

In 1953, Jaya Prakash proposed to Jawaharlal Nehru for more co-operations between Congress and the socialists, though he failed. He, along with some socialists, prepared Fourteen Point Scheme suggesting reform in Indian administration, reform in Indian economic system as well as constitutional amendment. Jaya Prakash Narayan tried to build the socialist ideology to highlight constantly on national struggle for independence against imperialism and on social revolution. He pleaded for reconstruction of Indian polity based on inner swaraj and realised that unless socialism was transformed into Sarvodaya, people could not be ensured freedom, equality and brotherhood. Mahatma Gandhi considered him as the greatest Indian authority on Socialism. Jaya Prakash resigned from Socialist Party (during that period, it was known as Praja Socialist Party) in 1954 and devoted himself to the Sarvodaya Movement of Vinoba Bhave.

Gandhi's death had a profound impact on the transformation of Jaya Prakash Narayan's political and social thought and turned him from socialist to sarvodaya. He wanted to build up Indian democratic set up according to Sarvodaya thought. He urged for decentralisation of power. Jaya Prakash appreciated the techniques of Bhoodan Movement regarding it as fair and effective alternative to Communist revolution. He joined Bhoodan Movement and

worked closely with Vinobaji. Jaya Prakash criticised the parliamentary democracy of India and wanted to reform it. During this phase, he basically tried to remove the defects of modern democracies. He believed in people's self rule to do away with the defects and failures of western democracy.

Stop to Consider

Sarvodaya Movement

The term "Sarvodaya" is basically a compound of two Sanskrit words "Sarva" that means all and "Udaya" that means uplift. So, Sarvodaya means uplift of all. The term "Sarvodaya" was first used by Mahatma Gandhi as the title of his Gujarati translated book of John Ruskin's *Unto This Last*. Gandhi used the term as the ideal of his own political philosophy. Gandhi was of the view that the good of the individual is contained in the good of all and a lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's. The Sarvodaya Movement had the target to transform each and every village of India into a self supporting and self dependent unit and thus to establish a network of such village communities. It believed in decentralisation of power and replacement of Rajniti by Lokniti.

After Gandhi's death, his disciples continued working to promote Sarvodaya Society that Gandhi dreamt. A Sarvodaya Samaj was established after Gandhi's assassination under the leadership of Vinoba Bhave with an aim to establish a classless society. It would be based on truth and non-violence. The society of such imagination found its expression in Bhoodan Movement led by Acharya Vinoba Bhave. This movement was against the improper distribution of land and was an appeal to the landlords to donate some land to the landless cultivators. Other Sarvodaya workers were Jaya Prakash Narayan, Dada Dharmadhikari, Ravishankar Maharaj, Dharendra Mazumdar, Shankarrao Deo who were closely associated with Vinobaji and aimed at establishing a coercive free society.

Jaya Prakash Narayan is popularly known for his concept of Total Revolution too, which he conferred in the last phase of his life. It was towards the end of 1973, he realised that it was the youth of the country who could take initiative to reconstruct the socio-economic structure of Indian society. He formulated a scheme of seven fold revolutions - social, economic, political, cultural, ideological, educational and spiritual. Jaya Prakash wanted the revolutionaries to proceed with courage and discipline without resorting to violence at any stage. He even had to go to jail during the emergency period in 1975.

SAQ

Do you think that Jaya Prakash Narayan was the pioneer in the growth of Socialist thought in India? Discuss.

.....

.....

.....

.....

4.4 Jaya Prakash Narayan as a True Democrat

Jaya Prakash Narayan was a passionate lover of individual freedom. His love for freedom makes him a true democrat. His democratic judgments were based on Sarvodaya philosophy. Jaya Prakash always believed in inner swaraj. All the time when he became leader of the Congress Socialist Party, the Praja Socialist Party and the Sarvodaya movement, his main concern was how to make India independent and help to establish a social, economic and political democracy. He was against the policy of centralisation in political and economic system. So, he was not satisfied with the present democratic set up of India and wanted to reform it throughout his whole life. Jaya Prakash placed moral and spiritual values above everything else. According to him, “Unless the moral and spiritual qualities of the people are appropriate the best constitutions and political systems would not make democracy work.” By democracy, he talked about self government of the people.

Jaya Prakash suggested some qualities so that accuracy of democracy can be ensured. These are:

- concern for truth,
- hatred for violence,
- love of liberty and courage to resist oppression,
- the spirit of co-operation,
- toleration for opinions of others,
- the sense of responsibility,
- belief in human quality and
- ability to lead a simple life.

Jaya Prakash believed that a democracy must have spiritual basis. When people practising democracy would believe in truth and non-violence, then only the spirituality could be achieved. People must be ready to face all oppressions with courage and confidence. He said that in an adequate form of democracy, the people who are conscious and aware of their own responsibilities should be satisfied.

Jaya Prakash wanted to establish both political and economic democracy. These two could not be separated from each other, he believed. So he said, “In this democracy, man will neither be a slave to capitalism nor to a party or the state. Man will be free.” Jaya Prakash pleaded for participatory democracy through decentralisation of authority. In his book *Swaraj for the People*, he wrote, “What I have in mind is what Gandhiji often used to emphasize namely, that as you proceed from the bottom level of government to the top, each higher level should have less and less functions and powers.” Panchayati Raj System was the foundation of Jaya Prakash’s views on democracy. He believed that this system would make the government available at the door step of the people and every individual would be able to participate in it. He said that power should be vested in the hands of people and only that much power need to be transferred to the higher levels of authority which would have been unavoidably required.

He always wanted that the representatives should always give importance to people’s interest rather than on their own interest. In March 1977, Jayaprakash Narayan led all Janata Party M.Ps to the Samadhi of Gandhiji and asked them to follow the Gandhian path of serving the nation and its people without any selfish motive. This effort showed his deep concern for democracy and service.

Check Your Progress

1. Write two main principles envisioned for the Sarvodaya society.
2. What do you mean by “Inner Swaraj”?
3. Write “True” or “False”.
 - a) Jaya Prakash was a thoroughgoing Marxist.
 - b) Jaya Prakash gave importance to moral values for proper working of democracy.
 - c) Jaya Prakash was opposed to Quit India Movement.
4. Briefly discuss Jaya Prakash Narayan’s transformation from socialism to sarvodaya.
5. Analyse Jaya Prakash Narayan’s political thought as a true democrat.

4.5 Critique of Parliamentary Democracy

Jaya Prakash Narayan was a great critic of parliamentary democracy. He felt that the present democratic system is highly defective. He studied the structure and functioning of democratic government of various European countries as well as of Indian democratic system after the implementation of the new constitution. After independence, majority of Indian had the positive faith on the adoption of the constitution that it would result into translating the high aspirations of national movement. But Jaya Prakash and some others got disappointed with the working of the democratic polity in India. He found that one basic defect of the

democratic structure in most European countries and India was the increasing concentration of powers at the higher levels of government. As a true democrat, he always believed that power should be vested in the hands of people only. The higher authority should be given only that much power what would have been unavoidably needed. He has written and given speeches several times about the limitations of parliamentary democracy.

Firstly, Jaya Prakash Narayan stated that the most serious defect of present parliamentary democracy is its highly centralised nature. The government becomes so strong that people cannot take any active part in the functioning of democratic institutions. Jaya Prakash was of the view that people could cast vote only at the time of election. Powers were actually concentrated in the hands of a small, dominant group. The people were ruled much in the same manner and by same kind as the British used to do during colonial period.

Secondly, according to Jaya Prakash, in the present parliamentary system of democracy, the authority started from the above that made its base very narrow. It is like an inverted pyramid that stands on its head and wants that it should made to stand on its base. He always believed that in a true democratic set up, the authority should be started from down below.

Thirdly, Jaya Prakash had no faith in written constitution, division of powers etc. He said that it would hardly be able to guarantee freedom to the people. These are meaningless until and unless moral values and spiritual qualities develop in the public.

Fourthly, Jaya Prakash criticised the role of the political party in the present parliamentary democracy. Political parties got engaged with corrupt and undemocratic practices in order to come to power as well as to retain in power. He rejected parliamentary system of democracy in India based on party politics. Moreover, the control of the party leader is so rigid that it again results in centralisation in party system too. Jaya Prakash stated that those who could speak well dominated politics and managed to come to power irrespective of all considerations whether they were sincere about their duty or not.

Fifthly, Jaya Prakash was of the view that along with the political party the election system was another defect in the present democratic set up. Election was wastage of time and money for him. He stated that it creates rifts within the ranks of political parties as well as rivalry between competing elites. Political parties use some sensitive issues like casteism and communalism in order to win in the election.

Stop to Consider

Jaya Praksh Narayan's Rejection of Party System

His arguments in favour of his rejection of party system are:

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

Jaya Prakash Narayan, *Towards Revolution*, Everyman's Vol.XXVII, No.XIV, March-April, 1969, p.144.

Sixthly, Jaya Prakash also pointed out the defects in legislative assemblies in parliamentary democracy. According to him, in actual practice, it is the minority that rules over the majority. From his practical experience Jaya Prakash stated that in any constituency so many candidates contest in the election and that candidate who gets more votes than his other opponents wins the election though he may not get more than fifty percent of the total votes. Likewise, the majority party in the legislature may not have got majority of the total votes polled in the election. Even in the cabinet meetings it was seen that only a few powerful ministers took the decisions as experienced by Jaya Prakash. That is why he said that the present day legislative system resulted in the rule of minority over the majority.

Lastly, according to Jaya Prakash, the western parliamentary democracy sought to combine political liberalism with capitalist economy as well as some features of welfare state. This type of democracy was undoubtedly unfit to implement true socialism. Western democracy, he felt, ignored the organic nature of the society and in this society, greed led to conflict and bureaucratic oligarchy. He was of the view that dominance of private corporations and bureaucracy led to the centralisation of power. Bureaucracy has grown very powerful and overburdened with more than enough work. Jaya Prakash noticed oppression in every form of bureaucratic administration.

Thus Jaya Prakash was very disappointed with the centralizing tendency of parliamentary system of democracy and felt that it could not have been the best of models of government for India. He wanted the reformation and reconstruction of Indian political institutions to make them more democratic and put forward the idea of communitarian democracy or participating democracy.

Stop to Consider

Jaya Prakash's views of Indian Democracy

A basic flaw discovered by Jaya Prakash in the democratic structure prevailing in India after independence was increasing concentration of powers at the higher levels of government. According to him, the politics of party and power had corrupted Indian democracy and defeated its basic values of human freedom, equality and cooperation. Regarding Indian democracy, Jaya Prakash said, "Parties backed by financial organisations and the means of propaganda could impose themselves on the people, how people's rule became in effect party rule, how party rule in turn, became the rule of a caucus of coterie; how democracy was reduced to mere casting of votes; how even this right of vote was restricted severely by the system of powerful parties, setting up their candidates from whom alone, for all practical purposes the voters had to make their choice; how even this limited choice, was made unreal by the fact that the issues posed before the electorate were by and large incomprehensible to it." By renouncing the corrupting agents of democracy, *i.e.* party-politics and power-politics, he sought to realize the dream of withering away of the state, which both Marx and Gandhi had visualised long back. He advocated for Sarvodaya democracy based on non-violence. This kind of system would not need any police and army for protection and would not consist merely of formal institutions. It would replace centralization of power, the majority principle as well as the existing party system by welfare society, decision by consensus of opinion and partyless democracy etc. He also advocated that if the people felt that their representatives had proved incompetent, they would have the right to ask for their explanation and recall them. It was a supreme democratic right, he believed. He believed that the constitution of free India had failed to include this right in its ambit. So, he proposed a system for India based on partyless democracy, which would involve greater political consciousness, social and economic equality, faith in purity of means, indirect election, nonviolent dispositions, etc. He also extended the idea of organization of the local bodies free from party politics.

SAQ:

"Jaya Prakash Narayan was a true democrat" – Give two reasons in support of this statement.

.....

.....

.....

.....

4.5.1 Jaya Prakash Narayan's Concept of Participating Democracy

Jaya Prakash Narayan called for the replacement of the present parliamentary democracy of India with what he called as “Communitarian Democracy” or participating democracy based on decentralisation of power. As he realised that the party politics had been destroying the very roots of democracy. So he felt that the whole system should be changed. There would be a partyless democracy and decentralisation of authority. He adopted the idea of participating democracy from Yugoslavia. He saw that in Yugoslavia, the people's committees managed the local affairs and enjoyed enormous powers. Jaya Prakash observed that it was the only country in Europe where maximum participating democracy as well as maximum participating socialism could be found. So, he took the idea of participating democracy and wrote his book 'A Plea for the Reconstruction of Indian Polity' in 1959. In this book, he explained his concept of participating democracy or communitarian democracy.

The notion of communitarian democracy as advocated by Jaya Prakash was much different from parliamentary democracy. He suggested that co-operation and co-sharing would be the core values of communitarian democracy so that the interest of all individuals could be articulated in the decision making of the country. Therefore, he emphasised on moral and ethical qualities of democracy and for he was of the view that moral regeneration should be brought about by different means like service, sacrifice and love of voluntary workers. Jaya Prakash mentioned some methods to introduce communitarian Democracy.

First, he pleaded for a decentralised, participatory and grass root oriented political order that we can see in the panchayati raj system as existing in the country since ancient period. He tried to broaden the base of local level of government in order to ensure active and more participation of people in the decision making. He called it as “swaraj from below”. He recommended five levels of decentralised polity i.e. village level, block level, district level, provincial level and central level. At each level, there would be selection of members through community consensus instead of election and the principle of majority would be replaced by unanimity. It would help to keep the political system free from party politics. The Gram Sabha, to be formed at village level, would act as the backbone of grass roots democracy. In such a decentralised and federal structure only, the true spirit of democratic governance could be inculcated to the masses.

Another method of communitarian democracy, according to Jaya Prakash Narayan, was reconstruction of economic system. He was opposed to the exploitative and competitive economic structure as prevailing in capitalist system. He pleaded for decentralised as well as village oriented planning system in India. Jaya Prakash argued that at village level development plans should be planned with increasing consolidation at block and district levels. The provincial and central levels should provide only technical and logistical support to formulate and execute such planning at village level.

Jaya Prakash Narayan also wanted to have a Sarvodaya society in order to execute his concept of participating democracy. The Sarvodaya society would be free from party politics and all people would dedicate themselves to the service of the society. He expected all the

political parties to co-operate in the establishment of Sarvodaya society. There would be no possibility of class struggle in Sarvodaya society as it believes in brotherhood. Like Gandhi and Vinobaji, Jaya Prakash also emphasised on rational theory of social good and harmony. He was of the view that Sarvodaya society would bring dynamic changes to Indian democracy through truth, love and non-violence.

Stop to Consider

Jaya Prakash Narayan's views on Panchayati Raj

Jaya Prakash opined that introduction of Panchayati Raj system is the only way to realise participating or communitarian democracy. He emphasised on reviving and reinvigorating the panchayati raj system or what he called as '*swaraj from below*'. Jaya Prakash suggested five levels of decentralised polity consisting of village, block, district, provincial and central levels. He proposed that the basic and lowest unit of political organisation would be the Gram Sabha (village assembly) consisting of all the adults of the village. They will meet once in a month to discuss about the village matters. The members of Gram Sabha will choose the members of Gram Panchayat, which shall be the executive organ of Gram Sabha. In similar pattern, the members of Gram Panchayat will select members of Panchayat Samiti. The Panchayat Samiti would be the middle level of panchayati raj, located at the administrative unit of block. Finally, the apex of the panchayati raj was conceptualised in terms of District Panchayat or Zila Parishad. The members of Panchayat Samitis would choose the members of Zila Parishad. After District Panchayat, there would be Provincial Panchayat and then Central Panchayat. Jaya Prakash also highlighted that difficulties may arise in the establishment of such a system. So, he laid down some conditions to overcome any difficulties. He suggested that people should be given proper education. Political parties should not interfere in the activities of various institutions of Panchayati Raj. Effective powers and real authorities as well as financial autonomy should be given to these institutions. The village authorities should have control over civil servants working under their jurisdiction.

Jaya Prakash considered that economic decentralisation is equally important along with political decentralisation for the effectiveness of Panchayati Raj System. He emphasised on small machine and labour intensive economy for full utilisation of local and regional resources. Village industries must be integrated with village agriculture.

Jaya Prakash's concept of participatory democracy was based on the excellence of the political and economic institutions of ancient India. In order to reconstruct Indian polity he also emphasised on concepts like individual freedom, social collaboration, gramdan, administrative efficiency, free from any kind of oppression as well as free from any differences based on caste, creed and religion.

SAQ:

Do you think that Jaya Prakash Narayan's concept of participating democracy can reduce political violence in India? Give two arguments in favour of your answer.

.....

.....

.....

.....

4.5.2 Critical Analysis

The political and social ideas of Jaya Prakash Narayan as well as his contribution towards India are undoubtedly praiseworthy. However, his scheme for the reconstruction of Indian polity has been criticised by some scholars. Critics are of the view that Jaya Prakash's idea to reform the political system is based on imagination only and regard him as utopian. His idea of partyless democracy is criticised on the ground that the method of consensus or indirect nomination for choosing members for provincial and central legislature is not workable in a vast country like India. Another criticism against Jaya Prakash's notion of participating democracy is that it is not easy to persuade all the political parties with different political ideologies to cease party belongingness and to work together in the establishment of Sarvodaya samaj. Even if they work together, there will be no end to their differences. Critics also find that in partyless democracy, there will be no contact between the common people and the members of the provincial or central legislatures. Moreover, the disproportionate focus on Panchayati raj as the nucleus of the post-independent Indian polity appears absurd for others.

Check Your Progress

1. Write "True" or "False".
 - a) Jaya Prakash Narayan was in favour of capitalist economy.
 - b) According to Jaya Prakash the Panchayat Samiti would be the middle level of panchayati raj in his partyless democratic system.
 - c) Jaya Prakash's participating democracy was based on decentralisation of both political and economic power.
2. Evaluate Jaya Prakash Narayan's political thought as a critic of parliamentary democracy.
3. Critically analyse Jaya Prakash Narayan's concept of partyless democracy.
4. How did Jaya Prakash Narayan want to bring reform in Indian democratic system? Discuss.

4.6 Summing Up

After going through this unit, now you have come to know that Jaya Prakash Narayan was a indomitable personality as well as a heroic leader of India. During his student life, the philosophy of Bhagavad Gita and Gandhiji's ideas influenced him a lot. When he was in U.S.A. he came under the influence of Marxism, but that did not last long. He lost his faith on Marxism because of its denial of individual liberty.

You have also come to know about the role played by Jaya Prakash during freedom struggle of India, specially in Quit India Movement. He had even go to jail for his active participation in the movement. He was the main figure behind the formation of Congress Socialist Party in India and was involved with it till his resignation in 1954. After that Jaya Prakash closely worked with Vinoba Bhave in the Sarvodaya Movement. Throughout his life, he tirelessly worked for the salvation of the people and even suffered a lot. He always believed in individual freedom and tried to establish a society where people would be free from any kind of oppression and exploitation.

After reading this unit, you are now able to know why Jaya Prakash criticised the parliamentary democratic system and was not satisfied with the present form of Indian democracy. He was always against centralisation of power and authority. That is why he wanted that the party system should be abolished. He emphasised on radical ideological programmes for the reconstruction of political, economic as well as social structure of the country and proposed the concept of Sarvodaya Samaj.

4.7 References and Suggested Readings

Chakrabarty, Bidyut & Pandey, Rajendra Kumar. *Modern Indian Political Thought – Text and Context*. Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2009

Gauba, O. P. *Indian Political Thought*. Mayur Paperbacks, New Delhi, 2015

Jayapalan, N. *Indian Political Thinkers- Modern Indian Political Thought*. Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 2000

Loknayak Jayaprakash Narayan published by Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, July 2002

Ratna, Anurag. *Sarvodaya Democracy*. Published in *Social Alternatives* Vol.8 No.4, 1990

Shah, Ghanashyam. *Ideology of Jayaprakash Narayan*. Published in *Economic and Political Weekly* Mar. 3, 1979, Vol. 14, No. 9 (Mar. 3, 1979), pp. 511-514 (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4367393>)

Varma, V. P. *Modern Indian Political Thought*. Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Educational Publishers, Agra, 1961

Unit: 5
JAYA PRAKASH NARAYAN
(Total Revolution)

Contents:

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Objectives
- 5.3 The Concept of Total Revolution
- 5.3 The Concept of Total Revolution
- 5.4 Causes of Jaya Prakash Narayan's Total Revolution
 - 5.4.1 Jaya Prakash Narayan and Bihar Movement
- 5.5 Jaya Prakash Narayan's Concept of Total Revolution
 - 5.5.1 Seven Fold Revolutions
 - 5.5.2 Total Revolution – An Assessment
- 5.6 Summing Up
- 5.7 References & Suggested Readings

5.1 Introduction

In the previous unit of this block, we have already discussed about Jaya Prakash Narayan's journey from socialism to sarvodaya and his struggle to bring reform in India both in pre-independence and post-independence period. Dissatisfying with the present form of parliamentary democratic system in India, he projected communitarian or participating democracy to carry out sarvodaya based socialist programme. Jaya Prakash pleaded for decentralisation of political, administrative, economic as well as of judicial powers. Throughout his life, he worked for socio-economic reconstruction of India.

In the later period of his life, Jaya Prakash Narayan suggested the idea of Total Revolution, specially during Bihar Movement. He called for mass upsurge against the widespread corruption and centralisation prevailing in Indian democracy. Jaya Prakash wanted the youth of the country to protest without using any violent means. By the term "Total Revolution", he meant a new kind of evolution to bring change not only in the government, but also in the

society and in individual. Jaya Prakash's journey from Marxism to Gandhism resulted in Total Revolution. He was highly impressed by Gandhi's thought on socio-economic problems and the techniques through which Gandhi wanted to bring reform in the contemporary socio-economic and political reality. Like Gandhi, Jaya Prakash also adopted moral values, decentralisation of economic and political power as well as non-violent methods to achieve the goals of total revolution. In this unit, you will come to know about the concept of Total Revolution as well as Jaya Prakash Narayan's mode of action that propelled the movement.

5.2 Objectives

Jaya Prakash Narayan remained outside electoral politics for the whole life and worked as a social activist for reconstruction of Indian democracy. In the later years of his life he even led the youths of the country despite his ill health. After reading this unit you will be able to

- conceptualise the terms "Revolution" and "Total Revolution"
- explore the causes of total revolution
- know the role of Jaya Prakash Narayan in the Gujarat Movement and Bihar Movement
- analyse various plans and programmes formulated by Jaya Prakash for total development and socio-political and economic reconstruction of India.
- assess the success and failure of Jaya Prakash Narayan's total revolution.

5.3 The Concept of Total Revolution

By the term "Revolution", we mean a radical change in the established order through organised movement. A revolt is a challenge to political authority. A section or sections of society launch an organised struggle to overthrow not only an established government and regime but also the socio-economic structure which sustains it, and replace the structure with an alternative social order. The Greek philosopher Aristotle linked revolution to the desire for equality and honour. According to Plato, revolutions occur when institutions, such as the Church or the State, fail to instil a system of values and a code of ethics in the society that prevent upheaval. Some thinkers define revolution as a structural and institutional transformation in the existing social relationship and institutional bases of the society. According to Wilbert E. More, "Revolution is a type of change which engages a considerable portion of the population and results in change in the structure of government". Thus, by revolutionary change, we may mean any element of change –may it be a change in the dominant values of the community or its social structure, institutional, leadership or elite component, or legal or violent change.

The concept of Total Revolution was a further extension of Gandhian thought on social change. Gandhi believed that in order to bring change in the society, an individual must, first of all, change himself. By social change, Gandhi meant far-reaching and novel changes in the entire social organisation. The concept of total revolution was for the first time evolved by

Gandhian disciple Vinoba Bhave during the 1960s. Vinoba's main objective was to articulate his desire for the need of a comprehensive movement in the country which would transform all the aspects of life in order to 'mould a new man ... to change human life and create a new world'.

He saw common man suffering from the maladies of unemployment, corruption and price-rise because of corrupted and authoritarian regime. He saw that power was being concentrated in Prime Minister's hand. He wrote a letter to the then Prime Minister Indira Gandhi questioning about fundamental rights of the citizen and independence of judiciary. He also wrote about corruption in administrative and political life. He wrote letters to all members of parliament, but he did not receive any response. Jaya Prakash became more and more determined on his belief that for reconstruction of the socio-economic structure of Indian society, there was no alternative rather than the practice of self discipline and the establishment of participating democracy. It was towards the end of 1973 at Paunar ashram of Vinoba Bhave that he felt an inner urge to give such a call to the people.

Jaya Prakash was very inspired by the peaceful revolution in Muzaffarpur, a stronghold of Naxalites in Bihar, and re-settlement of the Chambal Valley dacoits. Jaya Prakash's faith on the power of the people basically the students further strengthened by the Nav Nirman Andolan of Gujarat that resulted in dissolution of the elected government of the state. He realised that only the youth of the country could take up the work of bringing about total revolution in the country. Thus he finally arrived at his idea of total revolution. On June 5, 1974, Jaya Prakash raised his famous slogan ***Sampoorna Kranti*** (Total Revolution), in a speech at a huge rally in Gandhi Maidan in Patna. His speech titled *Towards Total Revolution* reflected his political passions. After the very beginning, he clarified that their struggle was not a movement, but a total revolution, because of which the protestors had to make sacrifice, undergo sufferings, face lathis and bullets, and had to go to jails.

Nav Nirman Andolan reached a peak point in Gujarat in 1974. Students' protests in Bihar had also started under the leadership of Jaya Prakash Narayan. Jaya Prakash incorporated various elements from different philosophy in his total revolution. He combined the revolutionary ethos of Marxism with the inclusive approach of Gandhism for transforming the society. According to Jaya Prakash, the Gandhian method of passive resistance or Satyagraha would be the instruments of social change in total revolution. The concept of total revolution was an effort to bring into existence the Gandhian humanist version of an ideal society. It has been pertinently observed in a recent study that Jaya Prakash's Total Revolution was a continuation of the preceding movement for non-violent revolution through Bhoodan and Gramdan. He himself said, "There is hardly any difference between Sarvodaya and Total Revolution. If there is any, then Sarvodaya is the goal and Total Revolution the means. Total Revolution is basic change in all aspects of life. There cannot be Sarvodaya without this".

Stop to Consider

The Nav Nirman Andolan

The Nav Nirman Andolan was a protest in Gujarat against corruption in politics and misgovernance of the Congress government. It was led by the students and middle class people who first raised their voice against increased price of food and Congress government's false promise to remove poverty from India. In 1971, India defeated Pakistan and Indira Gandhi was re-elected as the Prime Minister with her slogan "Gareebi Hatao". But soon people realised that the slogan "gareebi Hatao" was changed to "Gareeb Hatao" as the government did not give any importance to the miseries of common people basically what they had to face after the 1972 famines in Gujarat. The movement started when the students of L.D. College of Engineering, Ahmedabad went on a strike as a protest against increased mess charge of food. The middle class people and industry labourers also joined with them and they formed Nav Nirman Yuvak Samiti. The opposition parties like Bharatiya Jana Sangh, Congress (O), SP, CPI (M) also supported the agitators. There were allegations of corruption against Chimanbhai Patel, the Chief Minister of Gujarat. They called for bandhs and dharnas demanding the resignation of the Gujarat ministry. It also resulted in violent activities between police force and common people. The government resigned and the President's rule was imposed on February 9, 1974. Jayaprakash Narayan visited Ahmedabad and admired the students for their effort. He even asked them not to stop their protest until their demands were fulfilled. Morarji Desai also started hunger strike on March 11, 1974 demanding the dissolution of the Assembly. Under immense pressure from students' community supported by opposition parties, the government got frightened and dissolved the Assembly on March 15, 1974. Fresh election was held in Gujarat in 1975 where the Congress was defeated. Thus the Nav Nirman Andolan inspired other movements in the country in later period.

SAQ

Define Revolution with example (Write within 20-25 words).

.....

.....

.....

5.4 Causes of Jaya Prakash Narayan's Total Revolution

Though the idea of total revolution was the last intellectual contribution of Jaya Prakash, but one can find the roots of it in various plans, programmes and proposals prepared by him since his days began as the founder of Congress Socialist Party. In 1934, when Jaya Prakash was in

Socialist party, he formulated *Fifteen point programme* of All India Congress Socialist Party that clearly indicated his progressive and reformative mind. He firmly stood for the reduction of land revenue, the limitation of expenditure as well as the nationalisation of industries. Likewise, the *Thirteen Point Programme* formulated by Jaya Prakash in 1946 was also a reflection of his constructive ideas for Gramraj. In 1953, Jaya Prakash and other socialist leaders prepared a *Fourteen Point Scheme* to serve as the basis of cooperation between the Congress and Praja Socialist Party. In this scheme also, he emphasised on establishing economic equality, progressive development of state trading, elimination of all restraints that hampered agricultural productivity and also on amendment of the constitution to bring necessary reforms. During the Sarvodaya phase, Jaya Prakash got more involved with Vinoba and pleaded for a Sarvodaya Samaj to be based on truth and non-violence. He emphasised on the reconstruction of Indian polity and economy through increasing decentralisation of power for the realisation of inner swaraj as well as improvement in the character of the individuals comprising it.

Jaya Prakash's call for Total Revolution was a result of his dissatisfaction with the defects of the ongoing political, economic as well as social system of India. Some of them were:

- Jaya Prakash Narayan was not satisfied with the parliamentary form of democratic system in India and the party politics. Centralisation of power had resulted in the plentiful growth in the power of bureaucracy and people had hardly enjoyed the right to take part in the decision making. He was of the view that Indian democracy should be transformed into people's democracy and power should be in the hands of people in true sense.
- Jaya Prakash was opposed to the conservative caste system rampant in Indian society. He recommended the members of Chhatra Yuva Sangharsh Vahini to take lead to organise the Harizans and the other weaker sections of the society. He also pleaded for social change and reforms in social structure.
- Jaya Prakash was not satisfied with the condition of the Indian women in post-independence period. He witnessed lower literary rate among women, the sufferings and pain of women because of problems like dowry and untouchability. He wanted that the youth should protest and initiate struggle against such evils and women should have enjoy equal rights and freedom in the society.
- Even though Zamindari system had been abolished and measures had been taken for land reform, but still the living conditions of the small and marginalised landowners and agricultural labourers were not improved. The villages were still in the grab of higher castes and rich landlords. Jaya Prakash realised that even the Bhoodan movement failed to improve the condition of the poor and landless labourers and the agrarian unrest in Bihar. The zaminders and landowners distributed land to landless peasants. But later it was known that most of those donated lands were either government land that which later fell under the Zamindari Abolition Act or land that could not be used for cultivation or disputed land. Jaya Prakash got frustrated with these kind of fraudulent ways of Zaminders and landowners. So, he was sympathised with cause of Naxalite Movement and in 1969 at a conference in Delhi, he said, " I have ever sympathy for the Naxalite people. They are violent people.

But I have every sympathy for them because they are doing something for the poor ... Thousands of sharecroppers are being evicted because the landlords have the right to resume the land; because these poor people do not have even chit to prove that the land was in their cultivating possession. They cannot prove it in a court law. Do you think that mere mantras of shanty to save the situation ... What India needs today on the political agenda is non-violent social revolution. Otherwise violence will grow.”

Stop to Consider:

“The movement of 1974 was not started to throw Indiraji out of power. I saw a distant dream beyond this movement. It gave me the vision of such a revolution that could have changed the society completely. The slogan of revolution was Total Revolution. It was about changing the whole life - all aspects of life of both man and the society i.e. the system of marriage, the caste relations, politics, economy have to be changed and that was the urge in it.³³ Again, he wrote, "This is a golden opportunity for changing the entire moral climate of the country and bringing about amoral revolution... It is idle to expect that the politicians and administrators will be reformed while the society remains as it is. The dishonesty that has permeated politics has percolated from the top into the entire social order. This disease is not confined to Bihar only.”

-----**Jaya Prakash Narayan** *Total Revolution*, pp.16-17

- Jaya Prakash was dissatisfied to see the corrupt practices in politics and in administration. According to him, one of the main causes of underdevelopment in India was the widespread corruption in the political and administrative system. Jaya Prakash came to know about black marketing, hoarding and profiteering in the food grain distribution system. He said, “We have had enough bitter experience of the kind of controls imposed by the government We will catch hold of the whole sellers and the mill-owners if they are found to be indulging in corrupt practices.” He aimed at uprooting of corruption from political and social system in India.
- Jaya Prakash criticised higher techniques in production, heavy industrialisation, globalisation and technological encroachment. According to him, these were of no use for common people. On the contrary, these would increase state capitalism leading to corruption, wastage as well as inefficiency in administration. It would also create and increase the number of unemployment in the country as the general people had no role in public enterprise except as workers and consumers. The gap between rich and poor had been increasing day by day.
- Jaya Prakash wanted revolutionary changes in education system of India. He was of the view that the education system remained basically the same as it was under the

British rule. The purpose of education should be to produce and organise people for the nation. So, he wished for abolition of job oriented degree education. Rather he emphasised on introducing special, vocational and professional education in the country. Jaya Prakash stated that involvement of students in movement for social change was also an educational process. It strengthens their commitment and devotion towards the society.

At first, Jaya Prakash Narayan tried to make the people conscious about their situations and then he appealed to the leaders of political parties. But he did not get any positive response from them. Then he started to believe that only a powerful revolution could bring about changes in India and for that the youth of the country needed to be organised. He also prepared some plan and techniques for the revolution to save democracy.

5.4.1 Jaya Prakash Narayan and Bihar Movement

Earlier in 1974, Jaya Prakash became the leader of students' movement in Bihar that gradually transformed into a popular movement known as Bihar Movement. Though the movement started in March, 1974, but it was only a result of certain developments and events in different parts of rural and urban Bihar. It was a fight against government corruption, increasing price, unemployment, caste discrimination etc. In Bihar, it was seen that caste ruled roost in the state and even the parties were identified on the basis of caste. The dalit peasants demanded the urge for equity, respect for their women, payment of minimum wages, an end to the beggar system, implementation of the Land Ceiling Act, redistribution of land and the water bodies for agricultural purposes in favour of marginal farmers. The Bihar Chhatra Sangharsh Samiti (BCSS), a committee of non-communist students, was the central organisation of the movement.

On March 16, 1974, the Bihar Chhatra Navjawan Sangharsh Morcha (BCNSM) organised processions at several places like Patna, Muzaffarpur, Begusarai, Sahebganj, Motihari against increased price. Their slogan was "Bihar bhi Gujarat Banega" means the situation of Bihar was also going to be like Gujarat where the Nav Nirman Andolan was at peak point during that time. They became aggressive when the government did not respond to their demands, and organised militant struggle. On March 18, several hundred students gathered near Raj Bhavan and the State Assembly preventing the Governor from attending the assembly. It resulted in direct clash between police and the protestors.

Jaya Prakash had already raised his hope on students' community basically from students' agitation in Gujarat. He addressed the youth of the country at Kanpur in 1974 and said, "The country is fast heading towards a new revolution. There is another 1942 movement in sight to change the course of history". It was during the movement, Jaya Prakash called for peaceful total revolution. On June 5, 1974 Jaya Prakash gave speech at Patna rally to organize a protest at the Bihar Legislative Assembly. It resulted in the arrest of 1600 agitators and 65 student leaders by July 1, 1974. Although the rally wanted the dissolution of Bihar Assembly, their main aim was to achieve that freedom for which thousands of the country's youths made sacrifices. Jaya Prakash said, "Educational institutions are corrupt. Thousands of youths face a bleak future. Unemployment goes on increasing. The poor gets less and less work. Land ceiling laws are passed, but the number of landless people is increasing. Small farmers have

lost their lands.” In order to succeed in achieving the goals of total revolution, Jaya Prakash formed “Chhatra Yuva Sangharsha Vahini” with some fully trained and devoted workers. The Bihar movement turned into a mass demonstration in 1974 and people demanded for immediate changes in the political, social and educational systems. At that time, Jaya Prakash also asked people of Bihar as well as of India to have unity among themselves in order to bring full transformation in Indian political framework.

The movement used non-violent methods like dharna, *gherao*, silent protests, demonstrations, processions in order to bring down the state government. Throughout the first half of 1975, Jaya Prakash travelled all over India to mobilize masses against Congress. He was able to capture people’s sentiments through anti-corruption speeches. The most important occurrence was that almost all the opposition parties came under a common cause of “anti-Congress” despite their differences in ideologies.

On 25th June 1975, JP announced a nationwide movement demanding Indira Gandhi’s resignation because she was found guilty by Allahabad High Court for violating electoral laws in 1971 general election campaign. Opposition parties led by J.P. Narayana organised a massive demonstration in Ram Leela grounds on 25 June 1975 for resignation of Indira Gandhi. He announced a nationwide satyagraha for her resignation and asked the military, police and government employees to disregard unconstitutional and illegal orders. Indira Gandhi declared emergency on the midnight of June 25, 1975 and on 26th June, Jaya Prakash was arrested.

Check Your Progress:

1. Write “True” or “False”.
 - a) The phase “Sampoorna Kranti” was related to Nav Nirman Andolan.
 - b) The main objective of total revolution was to remove Indira Gandhi from power.
 - c) Jaya Prakash Narayan was sympathetic towards the cause of Naxalite Movement.
2. What do you mean by Jaya Prakash Narayan’s concept of Total Revolution?
3. Write two reasons behind the students’ movement in Bihar.
4. What are the main causes of Total Revolution? Discuss
5. Write a note on Nav Nirman Andolan.

5.5 Jaya Prakash Narayan’s Concept of Total Revolution

According to Jaya Prakash Narayan, *Total Revolution* or *Sampoorna Kranti* was a combination of seven revolutions, the main aim of which was to bring about a transformation in the existing society in accordance with the Sarvodaya ideals. These seven revolutions were: social, political, economic, cultural, educational, spiritual and ideological or intellectual. To quote Jaya Prakash, “I have been saying that total revolution is a combination of seven revolutions – social, economic, political, cultural, ideological or intellectual,

educational and spiritual. This number may be increased or decreased. For instance, the cultural revolution may include educational and ideological revolutions..... Economic revolution may be split up into industrial, agricultural, technological revolutions etc. Similarly, intellectual revolution may be split up into two – scientific and philosophical. Even spiritual revolution can be viewed as made up of the moral and spiritual or it can be looked upon as part of the cultural and so on.” The idea of total revolution reflected Jaya Prakash’s commitment towards socialist and humanistic ideals.

5.5.1 Seven Fold Revolutions

Though Jaya Prakash had mentioned about seven revolutions, but he was of the view that the number may be increased or decreased as per demands of the social structure in a political system. However, we can summarise his idea of seven revolutions as follows:

- **Economic Revolution:** According to Jaya Prakash, emphasis should be given on reduction of grossly disproportionate inequalities in the economic system. Economic revolution includes curbing price rise and inflation, full employment, improvement in agriculture and agricultural labourers and increasing the wages of the industrial workers. He pleaded for self governing rural based industry. Jaya Prakash suggested that the small rural industries would manufacture goods for domestic use. The planning should be at grass root level and the concept of social ownership might be applied to the large industrial establishments.
- **Political Revolution:** Jaya Prakash was determined on reforming the existing democratic system in India. He wrote that “corruption is eating into the vitals of our political life. It is disturbing development, undermining the administration and making of mockery of all laws and regulations. It is eroding people’s faith and exhausting their proverbial patience.” He wanted a system where people can vote in an incorruptible manner with their free conscience. Jaya Prakash said that there would be no political parties. The People’s Committees would set up candidates for election rather than imposed by the central or state parliamentary boards. Political officeholders would be in their duty for minimum two years and all incumbents of high posts in legislature, government, universities and private sector should declare their assets periodically. According to Jaya Prakash, the legislators who betray the trust of the voters should be recalled and government process should be based on discussions of and deliberations upon issues, demands and policies. He wanted the army and the police not to obey unconstitutional and illegal orders of the government.
- **Social Revolution:** According to Jaya Prakash Narayan, unjustified and irrational customs, conventions and practices must be removed from society. He considered caste as the symbol of vocational rigidity and social stratification. So he said that encouragement to inter-caste marriages should be provided. Moreover, there should be only one caste – the human caste. Jaya Prakash emphasised on abolition of all kinds of discrimination from the society. He also laid out plan for creating consciousness among people about various social evils such as dowry system, caste conflicts, communalism and untouchability. One of the important objectives of Jaya Prakash’s total revolution was to change the society as well as individual’s outlook

towards the society. He asked the workers of the country to prepare themselves for the long struggle for achieving the objectives of Sampurna Kranti. Jaya Prakash and Sarvodaya workers envisaged a Sarvodaya society that would be non-exploitative, casteless and classless in nature.

- **Cultural Revolution:** According to Jaya Prakash, the aesthetic and ethical values of culture should be imbibed by the people. He emphasised on cultural assimilation and was of the view that people were to be taught to respect the culture of others.
- **Educational Revolution:** Jaya Prakash proposed that educational planning should be linked with economic planning. He always pleaded for vocational education instead of job oriented degree course. Jaya Prakash witnessed worst forms of nepotism and corruption in the universities. He was of the view that the universities should become pure centres of teaching, training and research and act as motivational centre for promoting mental growth and development. Education should aim at humanization of science and promoting non-violence. Education must create awareness among the submerged and weaker sections of the society.
- **Spiritual or Moral Revolution:** Jaya Prakash was of the view that primordial, conceptual, existential and valuational truth was to be encouraged in place of antinomian dialectics, wrangling and semantic victories. Emphasis should be given to promote moral values like love, affection, respect, good will, magnanimity etc. Co-operation was to be encouraged. Jaya Prakash stated that some prescriptive moral ideals and standards may be deemed to be almost absolute and universally applicable to promote good life throughout the world. Moral values and faith in our own culture must be restored in the society and people must be made both scientific and spiritual. He emphasised on moral and ethical values of both end and means. He believed that unless the moral and spiritual qualities of the people are appropriately developed, democracy cannot function in the right direction.
- **Ideological or Intellectual Revolution:** Jaya Prakash asserted that a strong opposition, powerful public opinion, free and bold press, intellectual and moral pressure from academics and trade unions were all important to make Indian democracy a vibrant and successful one. He also recommended people to rethink their views and attitudes toward India's democratic functioning.

Stop to Consider:

Techniques of Total Revolution:

Jaya Prakash Narayan clearly mentioned that the method to achieve the goals of total revolution would be non-violence. He wanted the youths and other protestors to proceed with courage and discipline. He asked them not to resort to violence at any stage, so that the government could not find out any legitimate excuse for violently curbing their efforts. The Satyagraha techniques that Jaya Prakash and other revolutionaries used to achieve the goals of total revolution were: persuasion, non-cooperation, civil disobedience, strikes etc. They also used the method of direct takeover and running of enterprises. Jaya Prakash laid emphasis on mobilisation of student and youth power as the authentic revolutionary force and regarded it as the basis of total revolution. He said that total revolution has to be peacefully brought about without impairing the democratic structure of society and affecting the democratic way of life of the people. To quote Jaya Prakash, “There must also be people's direct action. This action would almost certainly comprise, among other forms, civil disobedience, peaceful resistance, non-cooperation - in short, satyagraha in its widest sense. One of the unstated implications of such a satyagraha would be self-change: that is to say, those wanting to change must also change themselves before launching any kind of action.”

SAQ:

What is Seven Fold Revolutions?

.....

.....

.....

5.5.2 Total Revolution – An Assessment

The total revolution phase of Jaya Prakash's life had clearly revealed his charismatic personality and re-established him as a great leader. The revolution created turmoil in Indian politics and challenges for the ruling Congress party to continue their regime. But in its operationalisation, it was observed that the practitioners were not so much clear about the idea of total revolution as advocated by Jaya Prakash. It cannot be denied that under the leadership of Jaya Prakash large student's movements occurred in different parts of the country. But the public perceived that the only objective of total revolution was to subdue all state power at the hands of the people. Likewise, few people tried to take alternative method of some sort of violent activities; but Jaya Prakash was determined in his idea that total revolution could be brought only with peaceful and non-violent techniques on the part of the people.

Jaya Prakash was successful in uniting all the opposition parties having different ideologies to defeat Congress. He had such a hypnotic effect on the political scene that under his guidance and leadership Congress (O), Jana Sangh, Swatantra Party and other socialists merged to form Janata Party and defeated Congress in the next general election in 1977. When Janata Party formed the government, Jaya Prakash was hopeful that the new government would bring change in socio-economic and political structure of India. But he got frustrated to see that the party leaders started to pursue their political ambitions and were attracted towards the corrupting influence of power. So, critics regard Jaya Prakash as dreamer and idealist whose conceptual interventions in the context of total revolution are more theoretical than practical.

In the context of Bihar movement, Ghanshyam Shah mentioned that the groups, classes or interests which dominated the Congress programmes once were the same that supported the movement. So, how can then one expect the movement to bring 'total revolution'? Moreover, question also arises about the inefficiency of the Sarvodaya ideology that guided the total revolution of Jaya Prakash Narayan. Because people have experienced that the working of the Sarvodaya movement of the last twenty five years had not produced any revolutionary changes in society.

Critics are of the view that the revolution hardly had any programme with concrete objectives. Most of the programmes were mobilising programmes to create a tempo for the movement. Therefore, the revolutionaries did not get involved with other programmes. Students were the vanguard of this revolution. As the students were not earning by themselves during that period, so it is obvious that they did not have any hostility against class system. The student leaders who basically came from upper and middle classes were more concerned for jobs, better prospects in life. Therefore, they joined colleges in spite of Jaya Prakash's plea to boycott examinations and educational institutions. They hardly felt that the socio-economic and political systems were unjust. Moreover, the leaders from opposition parties were more concerned about their own interest rather than the objectives of total revolution. They wanted more benefits by bringing about changes in the system. To them, 'Total Revolution' was another slogan like 'Garibee Hatao' to campaign against Congress Party and Indira Gandhi and thus to win in the next election. The Sarvodaya workers who were truly worried about the reconstruction of Indian structure were not interested in election as well as in political power. On the other hand, the political parties who would form government in future were not interested in the broad objectives of total revolution.

Check Your Progress:

1. When was the Janata Party formed?
2. When was the national emergency declared by Indira Gandhi?
3. Write “True” or “False”
 - a) Total Revolution was the combination of seven revolutions proposed by Jaya Prakash Narayan.
 - b) The opposition parties used the term “Total Revolution” as their anti-Congress slogan.
 - c) The Congress Party won the general election in 1977 and formed the government.
4. Mention two techniques of Total Revolution.
5. What were the main components of Total Revolution? Discuss.
6. What were the drawbacks of total revolution led by Jaya Prakash Narayan? Discuss in brief.

5.6 Summing Up

After reading this unit, now you have come to know about the heroic role played by Jaya Prakash Narayan during 1970s. His whole life was a message of struggle for independence and justice. He witnessed that people are still deprived from their dues and from freedom to take part in decision making even after we got independence. He was not satisfied with the socio-economic, education, moral and political illness existing in Indian society. Therefore, Jaya Prakash felt the necessity to call the people of the country for a peaceful protest to bring reform in Indian democratic system and in the society. He launched the idea of “Total Revolution” or “Sampoorna Kranti” against corruption, manipulation, exploitation, social discrimination, unemployment and rise of authoritarianism in Indian democracy.

After going through this unit, you are now able to understand how and why Jaya Prakash launched total revolution throughout the country. He used different techniques of satyagraha and asked other revolutionaries not to use any violent means at any cost. Though he was not totally succeed to bring transformation to Indian polity and society, but he was successful to intimidate the ruling party and the government. It was only because of his guidance and leadership almost all opposition parties merged to form one party despite having different ideologies. No doubt, Jaya Prakash Narayan was a selfless and dedicated revolutionary activist and a true humanitarian democrat. During the Janata regime after emergency period, he could have easily secured a top position. Despite public demand for his leadership, he made it clear that power was not his goal. After his death Vinoba Bhave said, “Jaya Prakash considered himself only a *Lok-sevak* or servant of the people”.

5.7 References & Suggested Readings

Chakrabarty, Bidyut & Pandey, Rajendra Kumar. *Modern Indian Political Thought – Text and Context*. Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2009

Gauba, O. P. *Indian Political Thought*. Mayur Paperbacks, New Delhi, 2015

Jayapalan, N. *Indian Political Thinkers- Modern Indian Political Thought*. Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 2000

Loknayak Jayaprakash Narayan published by Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, July 2002

Nayak, Rajesh Kumar & Kumar, Manish. *Total Revolution: Concept and Reality in Bihar*. Published in *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*. 2009-2010, Vol. 70 (2009-2010), pp. 1144-1154 (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/44147758>)

Shah, Ghanashyam. *Revolution, Reform, or Protest? A Study of the Bihar Movement: I*. Published in *Economic and Political Weekly* Apr. 9, 1977, Vol. 12, No. 15 (Apr. 9, 1977), pp. 605-614 (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4365482>)

Varma, V. P. *Modern Indian Political Thought*. Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Educational Publishers, Agra, 1961
