Since the triumph of the industrial revolution and the capitalist method of production at the turn of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, the fragmentation of man through the division of labour, mechanization, exploitation and commerce had become the fundamental European experience. The longing for unity with one's own self, with nature, from which man had been alienated, was common to all those who entertained humanist feelings and ideas. Although socialist ideas had started to sprout in France in a rudimentary form, it was only after the entry of Karl Marx and Engels in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century that the doctrines of historical materialism and socialism could be built on a scientific and systematic manner. In Paris, Marx met the young Frederick Engles, the son of a manufacturer from the Rhineland then working in London. Through Engles, Marx gained an insight into the social conditions prevailing in the most advanced industrial country, the home of industrial revolution.

It was in Paris that Marx saw the\textsuperscript{1} proletariat for whom he built virtually a philosophical edifice. Marx viewed the wretched figure of mal-

\textsuperscript{1}Erns Fischer, \textit{Marx in His Own Words}, New York, 1970, p. 19.
nourished poverty-stricken proletarian as the quintessence of dehumanization, the extreme of everything the contemporary writers felt to be the denial and mockery of the nature of man. Marx believed that the proletariat was forced by its very poverty to liberate, itself from inhuman conditions, by the proletariat who forced by its very poverty to liberate overturning those conditions at their base, and that, by liberating itself, it would become the liberator of mankind².

While writing a preface to his famous work, ‘A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy’, Marx wrote:

“In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of the society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their

development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or what is but a legal expression for same thing with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces, these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation, the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed ....” This was the philosophy of history or historical materialism which Karl Marx had proposed. It is from the understanding of this new philosophy of history that further ideas of class antagonism, class struggle and social revolution had emanated³.

In modern times whether it is democratic socialism or communism derive its inspiration from the Marxian theories, though liberty, equality and fraternity were essentially French revolutionary ideas. In many countries of western Europe, socialist parties which believed in parliamentary democracy had emerged in the 20th century. Many of these socialist groups were active both before and after the world wars ⁴. Just like the Communist

International, a Socialist International was also founded and it was functioning successfully.

While communism which emerged in the Soviet Union under Lenin and Stalin turned into one Party dictatorship, the socialists emphasized on civil rights democracy and non-violent transformation to end exploitation and inequality in the society. The socialists always resisted the appropriation of surplus or the exploitation in the society, which widened the gap between the haves and have-nots. Over the centuries, the emphasis on equality and civil rights could be noticed, whether it was the Magna Carta, Bill of Rights, the American Declaration of independence or the French Revolutionary slogan of ‘Liberty, Equality and Fraternity’.

The term ‘socialism’ was perhaps first used by Robert Owen. He was a witness to the inhuman practices in the new factory system in England, France and other countries. Long hours of work, stretching to 16 to 17 hours, with no leisure, no holidays, no protection against accidents and the lowest remuneration made the industrial working class the wretched of the earth. Robert Owen wanted to have workers co-operative societies and stated that the workers should have a share in the factories. He practiced what he preached. He established model factories in England and allowed the

---

workers’ participation in the management as well as a share in the profit for them. Unfortunately, he could neither convert the other industrialists or the government to his revolutionary ideas. In 1827, the word ‘socialist’ was used\textsuperscript{6} in the co-operative magazine to designate his followers.

In France, Saint Simon and Fourier had developed similar ideas and used the term ‘socialists’. All these reformers had strong views against private capital, which they believed, had led to exploitation of the workers. However none of these people had any idea of class struggle or class antagonism which Karl Marx had advocated later. It was an era of laissez-faire\textsuperscript{7} which emphasized on non-interference by the state and the unbridled private capitalist initiative for making the wealth of nations, as emphasized by Adam Smith. Hence, it was very difficult task to fight against the existing\textsuperscript{8} order without the support of the state system. Hence, people like Saint Simon, Fourier and Robert Owen were dubbed as Utopian socialists by Jerome Blanqui and later by Marx and Engels in the \textbf{Communist Manifesto}.

From the days of Karl Marx, the term ‘socialism’ assumed a new form. According to him, “the history of hitherto existing society is the

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., p. 10.
history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild master and journeyman—in a word, oppressor and the oppressed”.

According to Marx, material conditions in the 19th century were ripe for a qualitative change from capitalism to socialism. The Communist Manifesto and the capital exposed the novel idea of revolutionary transformation through class struggle. “… the steady intensification of the wrath of the working class – A class which grows more numerous and is disciplined, unified and organized by the very mechanism of the capitalist means of production. At length, the mass of misery and hatred against militant and class conscious to turn upon their oppressors. The new society is incompatible with capitalist husk. When it burst, the death knell of capitalist private property sounds, the expropriators are expropriated”.

Unfortunately as predicted by Marx, the revolutionary upsurge did not take place in any of the advanced industrialized countries of Western Europe. And it did take place in Russia in 1917 which was predominantly an agricultural country with limited industrialization. The poor peasants and the factory workers of Russia organized a revolution and captured power.

---

9 David Mclellan, Karl Marx Selected Writings, New York, 1988, p 222.
Unfortunately, in the Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the proletariat became essentially a dictatorship of the party apparatus. The Soviet Union under Lenin and Stalin encouraged anti-imperial struggles and revolutions in other countries through the Communist International. This was the beginning of the cleavage between the communists and the democratic socialists.

The democratic socialists bid farewell to Marxian philosophy at that juncture. They were much attracted to the idea of non-violence and cooperation than violence of conflict. They also gave too much importance to individual freedom and personal right even after assuming power. The Indian Socialists like the Fabians and the British Labour Party, gave importance to evolutionary method and stood for slow change by working through parliament. The history of Indian socialism begins with the renaissance movement of the 19th century when Rajaram Mohan Roy visited England. There he met Robert Owen, the Socialist leader, and exchanged ideas\textsuperscript{11}. Dadabai Naoroji, ‘the grand old man of India’ and the moderate leader, sought the support of British Socialists in his political crusades for the liberalization of British rule in India. He came into contact with socialist thoughts through Hyndman with whom he had developed a friendship. Socialists in Britain criticized British imperialism and said that imperialism

was bound to lead to exploitation. Indians who were struggling to end British rule in India also traced the poverty of the people due to British imperialism and exploitation. The attack of the Indian nationalists on British imperialism was in a sense as same as the socialistic attack. This criticism gradually led some Indian nationalists to a vague socialistic approach. Dadabhai Naoroji in 1901\textsuperscript{12} declared before a British audience that, “You have been regularly draining and bleeding us of millions of money. These millions do not go to make you any better off; they go in to the pockets of the capitalists”. Dadabhai attributed the poverty of India primarily to the drain of the wealth of India to Britain. Yet Dadabhai was by no means a Socialist.

Lala Lajpath Roy and Bipan Chandra Pal and many other leaders were also attracted by the Soviet experiment of ‘Socialism’. Bipan Chandra Pal wrote “Socialism in the highest and truest sense of the term and not merely what it is understood to mean by the followers of Marx are the rudimentary concepts of our social and political philosophy”\textsuperscript{13}. And it is in this context that Pal used the term ‘Hindu Socialism’\textsuperscript{14} in 1930 when Rabindranath Tagore went to Russia he said that he had come on a pilgrimage. What

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 28
impressed Tagore most in Russia was the absence of luxury, the spread of education and the devotion of workers. At that time the Communists in Russia were in a hurry to create a new social order and for this they had established a dictatorship. But Tagore was not prepared to support dictatorial rule in any sphere or in any country. He was distressed by the excess of the Russian experiment, its scant regard for individualism, its great belief in violence as means of social transformation\(^\text{15}\). Therefore he cautioned his countrymen against accepting Marxism as a dogma or the absolute truth\(^\text{16}\). Subhas Chandra Bose, who opted militarism against British Empire, also believed in socialistic concept. Bose said that an Indian form of Socialism would have to be devised which would be in harmony with Indian history and tradition. Subhas used to say that socialism in India did not derive its birth from the books of Karl Marx but from Swami Vivekananda’s gospel for the upliftment of the poor or *Daridra Narayana*\(^\text{17}\).

Vivekananda was one of the first thinkers in India who offered a sociologically realistic interpretation of Indian history. Behind cataclysmic turmoil of political perturbations he sought to find out the running strand of

\(^\text{15}\) Dutt, R.P. *India Today* (London, 1940), p. 376.
\(^\text{17}\) *Selected Speeches of Subhas Chandra Bose*, Delhi, 1962, p. 32.
social conflicts\textsuperscript{18}. Once he declared, “I am a socialist not because I think it is a perfect system but half a loaf is better than no bread”\textsuperscript{19}. He can be considered as a Socialist in two senses. First, he had the historical vision to realise that in Indian history there has been the dominance of the two upper castes – the Brahmanas and the Kshatriyas. While the latter perpetrated political and economic exploitation of the poor sections, the former enchained the masses with new complicated ceremonies and rituals. He denounced caste oppressions and refused to recognise any social barrier between man and man. Secondly, Vivekananda was a socialist because he championed the concept of equal chance for all the inhabitants of the country. This concept of equal chances is definitely in the Socialist direction and he entertained an egalitarian approach\textsuperscript{20} in social matters. Vivekananda wanted to raise the lower strata of society by the advocacy of this theory. It reminds one of the concepts of equality of opportunity. He came to the conclusion that the next historical phase of human civilization would be dominated by the toiling classes. He wrote prophetically: “Yet a time will come when there will be the rising of the Shudra class, with their shudrahood that is to say not like that as at present when the shudras are

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 381.  
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
becoming great by acquiring the characteristic qualities of *Vysyas* or *Kshatriyas*, but by remaining *Shudras*”

Jawaharlal Nehru, the Young Turk of the Indian Politics, visited Moscow in 1927 to attend the 10th anniversary celebrations of the Russian Revolution and that made him an admirer of the Soviet Union. He was born in the midst of wealth and prosperity. His family was so pronounced that Jawaharlal Nehru in later life said, “I am a typical bourgeoisie brought up in bourgeois surroundings with all the early prejudice that this training has given me”\(^{22}\). During the course of his visit he came into contact with many ardent communists. He was impressed by the progress in education, female emancipation and improvement in the lot of the peasants that had been affected in Russia. As a result of this visit Nehru also developed a firm conviction that the Soviet Union was a great champion of anti-imperialism and that Russia and India had a common interest in opposing British imperialism\(^{23}\). Nehru was more attracted to the planned economy and social progress. He believed that in a country of arrested economic growth such as India planning was essential for social progress. He further stated, “I am all for tractors and big machinery and I am convinced” wrote Nehru “that the

---


rapid industrialization of India is essential to relieve the pressure on the land, to combat poverty and to raise standards of living for defence and a variety of other purposes. Planning is necessary today in all countries of arrested growth like China and India which have strong traditions of their own”\textsuperscript{24}.

In 1928, Nehru wrote the book ‘\textit{Soviet Russia}’ in which he explained the progress achieved by Soviet Union in the field of education, female emancipation and improvement in the lot of peasants. In this book he stated that the Russian experiment was of great interest to Indians because conditions there were not dissimilar from conditions in India. Both were\textsuperscript{25} vast agricultural countries and both had to face poverty and illiteracy. If Russia could find a way to solve the problem of poverty and illiteracy, that was bound to help India. As a result of this visit to Russia Nehru also developed a firm conviction that the Soviet Union was a great champion of anti-imperialism and that Russia and India had a common interest in opposing British imperialism\textsuperscript{26}. In 1933 Nehru wrote to his daughter explaining what he understood by Socialism. “Socialism I have told you is of many kinds. There is general agreement, however, that it aims at the control by the state of the means of production – that is land and mines and

\textsuperscript{24} Jawaharlal Nehru, \textit{Discovery of India} (Calcutta, 1948), p. 448.
\textsuperscript{25} Jawaharlal Nehru, \textit{Soviet Russia} (Bombay, 1929), p. 17.
\textsuperscript{26} Jawaharlal Nehru, n. 27, p. 242.
factories and the like, and he means of distributions, like Railways etc., and also banks and similar institutions. The idea is that the individuals should not be allowed to exploit any of these methods or institutions or the labour of others to their own personal advantages”

27

In ‘Whither India’, written in 1933, Nehru again spoke of his belief in socialism and stated that the Indian struggle was linked with the world struggle against capitalism and imperialism28. Nehru said that an ideology of social revolution was necessary. Nehru felt that a purely nationalist ideology, which has no economic or social content, could not fit in with the needs of the modern world. Indian Socialist had to be imbued and graded by a progressive ideology of social revolution, only then could India take an effective part in the socialist struggle as well as the economic and social struggle for freedom which was being waged throughout the world. Nehru made it clear that he felt that the only key to the solution of the world’s problem and of India’s problem lay in socialism. “When I use the word, I do so not in a vague humanitarian way but in the scientific economic sense. Socialism is however something more than an economic doctrine, it is a philosophy of life and as such also it appeals to me. I see no way of ending the poverty, the vast unemployment, the degradation and the subjection of

the Indian people except through socialism. That involves vast and
revolutionary changes in our political and social structure, the ending of
vested interests in land and industry as well as the feudal and autocratic
Indian states systems. That means the ending of private property except in a
restricted sense, and the replacement of the present profit system by a higher
ideal of co-operative service. It means ultimately a change in our instincts,
habits and desires. In short, it means a new civilization, radically different
from the present capital order\textsuperscript{29}.

In Lahore session of the Indian National Congress, Nehru reiterated,
“I must frankly confess that I am a Socialist and a republican, and no
believer in King and Princes, or in the order which produces the modern
kings of industry who have greater power over the lives and fortunes of men
than even kings of old and whose methods as predatory as those of the old
feudal aristocracy\textsuperscript{30}. Even though, Nehru stressed Socialism and supported
socialists he was reluctant to identify himself with any group\textsuperscript{31}.

In 1929, Jawaharlal Nehru in addition to being the President of the
INC was also elected President of the Trade Union Congress. Nehru said
that he would seek to utilize his special position to bring those two

\textsuperscript{29} Jawaharlal Nehru’s Speeches, 1935-37, (New Delhi, 1958), pp. 4-14.

\textsuperscript{30} Jawaharlal Nehru, Eighteen Months in India, (Allahabad, 1938), pp. 34-35.

\textsuperscript{31} Letter to Jawaharlal Nehru from Jayaprakash dated 23.11.1938, NMM&I, New Delhi.
organizations closer to each other to make the Indian National Congress more socialist and more proletarian and to induce organized labour to join the national struggle. INC at its Karachi session of 1931 passed a resolution on fundamentals rights and economic policy which stated, “the state shall own or control key industries and services, mineral resources, railways, waterways, shipping and other means of public transport”.

After being elected as Congress president in 1936 Nehru had included three prominent socialists in the Congress Working Committee. Nehru believed that socialism was bound to come to India as indeed throughout the world, and almost the only points in dispute are the pace and the methods of advance to its full realization. Poverty and inequality could not be ended except through socialism, though in achieving socialism India may evolve her own methods and may adapt the ideal to the genius of her race. However, these resolutions on fundamental rights and economic policy of the Congress and measures of Nehru did not satisfy the Socialists who were in the Congress. They wanted not merely the nationalization of the key industries but also the nationalization of the essential means of production.

32 Jawaharlal Nehru, n. 35, pp. 34-35.
After independence the question arose whether Nehru who led the government would fully implement the socialist policies which he has so long advocated. In 1948 the industrial policy and the economic policy was announced which stood for mixed economy. The industrial policy contained no revolutionary programme and was welcomed by the business community, but denounced by the leftists as a retreat from socialism. The policy represented a compromise between the policies of Patel and Nehru. However, the policy which Nehru followed after independence was not a policy of rigid socialism but none the less it laid great emphasis on economic planning. By 1955 Nehru persuaded the Congress to accept at its Avadi session that its goal should be the establishment of a socialist pattern of society. At the same time in 1958 Nehru said, “I do not want state socialism of that extreme kind in which the state is all powerful and governs practically all activities. My idea of socialism is that every individual in the state should have equal opportunity for progress”\textsuperscript{35}. Nehru also insisted that planning in India must be implemented within the frame work of political democracy and should not lead to totalitarianism. Nehru would to introduce socialism without violence and without dictatorship. He said, “I believed more and more in socialism, more and more even in some parts of

communism, not the action, but the theory part of it, a communist societies should be peaceful. Whether the two can be synchronized or not it is difficult to say. But I am deeply convinced that the methods in some communist society, that are too much coercion and suffering, are not the right methods.”

But Nehru was not a Socialist in its pure sense. He considered life and reality to be too complex and complicated to be capable of being confined within the four corners of a rigid theory. According to Narendra Deva, Nehru did not believe in any particularism. He believes in some of the fundamental principles of scientific socialism yet he is not prepared to swear by everything taught by Marx and Lenin. He does not subscribe to any rigid ideology. He considers himself free to examine the claims of every system of ideas and he was always revising his ideas in the light of new experiences gained. However, Nehru’s policies and attitude attracted many Socialists even after independence. Even Jayaparakash wavered a while, when Nehru invited him to join the Central Cabinet. Asoka Mehta, another apostle of socialism, accepted some honourable post under Nehru.

---

36 Tiber Mende, *Conversations with Nehru*, (Bombay, 1956), pp. 31-32.
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The greatest apostle of Indian Socialism was Jayaprakash Narayan. It was while studying at the University of Wisconsin that he came in close contact with some Communist students as well as Marxist literature and became a convert to Marxism. Jayaprakash Narayan wrote “Marxism provided another beacon of light for me equality and brotherhood. Freedom was not enough, it must mean freedom for all – even the lowest – and this freedom must include freedom from exploitation, from hunger and from poverty.” He remained in USA for seven years working in fields, factories, restaurants, and stayed there while studying and took the Masters’ degree in Sociology, After obtaining his degree he returned to India in the year 1929 with full of Marxian ideology in his mind. While he reached here the national struggle was going on. But Jayaprakash Narayan was shocked by the attitude of Indian Communists who not only kept away from the struggle but denounced the Congress leaders as agents of the busheoisies. This was mainly the result of the new policy towards nationalist struggles in colonial countries adopted in 1928 by the Communist International to which the communist party of India was affiliated. In accordance with the policies of the 6th Congress of the Comintern, fight against Gandhi and Indian

41 Birnal Prasad, n. 44, p. 171.
National Congress became the accepted programme of the Comintern as well as that of the CPI. M.N. Roy asserted that “bourgeoisie and democratic nationalist movements” were not worthy of Comintern support because they were not revolutionary and also because the nationalist bourgeoisie was likely to compromise with imperialism in return for some economic and political concessions to their class. Thus during the thirty’s the Indian Socialist movement was marked by the dominating influence of Marxism. The CSP which was formed in 1934 was Marxian in its inspiration. A statement on the nature and the policy of the party declared, “Marxism alone can guide the anti-imperialist forces to their ultimate destiny”. Party members must therefore fully understand the technique of revolution. The theory and practice of class struggle, the nature of the state, and the process leading to the Socialist Society.

The communists were advised to concentrate on building their own organizations and keep away from nationalist organizations. Neither Jayaprakash’s nationalism nor his Marxism could stomach this and he

---

43 Lakhanpal, n. 38, p. 144.
considered the communist line as a perverted application of Marxism to the Indian situation. He became convinced that the socialist movement in India could not be built under the CPI or with the guidance of the Comintern. Therefore Jayaprakash combined the movement for socialism and the struggle for national freedom completely under Indian leadership. Jayaprakash on his arrival to India came in touch with Gandhi as well as Jawaharlal Nehru. As per the request of Nehru he accepted the post of the Chief of the Labour Research Department of Indian National Congress.

During this period Gandhi was leading the freedom struggle on non-violent lines. In February 1922 Gandhi all of a sudden announced the withdrawal of the non-cooperation movement when the nation stood on the verge of a popular revolt. For Gandhi, the Chauri Chaura incident was as he wrote to Jawaharlal Nehru, “the last straw I assure you that if the thing (civil disobedience) had not been suspended we would have been leading not a non-violent struggle, the movement had unconsciously drifted from the right path.” Gandhi adopted such a similar policy and suspended the civil disobedience movement in 1931. The extremist elements blamed Gandhi for

---

44 Birnal Prasxad, n. 44, p. 173.
pondering to form a government. Since that day many of them permanently lost faith in Gandhi and his techniques of non-violent struggle. They observed that, “If India will not have freedom conquered by violent means she will have to go without it”\(^47\).

A group of radicals felt unhappy with the weak and watery reform of Gandhi. They questioned the emphasis on ‘Swaraj’ without a socio-economic dimension\(^48\). Gandhi’s decision in 1933 to suspend the Satyagraha movement and concentrate instead on constructive work embittered many Congressmen against him and they viewed the withdrawal as proof of the failure of non-violent methods to achieve independence\(^49\).

The idea of CSP was really conceived in the Nasik Road Central Prison by Congressmen of Socialist and militant nationalists bend, who were in the prison in connection with the CDM\(^50\). His associates in the jail were Minoo Masani, Asoka Mehta, Achyut Patwardhan, N.G. Goray and M.L. Dantawala. They discussed the drawbacks of civil resistance movement, the growth of constitutionalism and the anti-national role of the CPL. They concluded that in order to avoid the errors of the Communists and to have a greater influence on the direction of the freedom struggle it was essential to

\(^48\) Sumit Sarkar, n. 50, p. 227.
\(^50\) Nanda, B.R., n. 47, p. 11.
form a socialist organization within the Congress. Jayaprakash Narayan initiated the movement mainly because he could not digest the negative attitude of the Communist towards freedom struggle. Acharya Narendra Deva, Ramamanohar Lohia, Yusuf Meherally and S.M. Joshi were closely associated with Jayaprakash in the formation of CSP. The foundation of the CSP was laid at Patna in May 1934 when a meeting of the AICC was held there. A few months later the AICSP was officially launched at a conference in Bombay on October 21-22, 1934 in which Sampurnnanand presided. The Socialists had decided to form a party within the Congress and not as an independent organization because they believed that the Congress, despite its defects, symbolized the great national movement against British imperialism. Even though they disagreed with Gandhian method of agitation they recognized his dynamic leadership and mass support. The Socialist cherished the idea of equality but they did not go along with the Communist because they did not like to ally with an anti-national group. The membership of the party was to be open only to the members of the Congress and non-communalists.

The ideology of the CSP was a blend of Marxism, democratic socialism of the British Labour Party and Socialism tinged with Gandhism, with different leaders espousing each of the three ideological trends. But their object was to resuscitate and reinvigorate the Congress to rid it of its defeatist mentality and to draw into it the mass of workers and peasants.\(^54\) Jayaprakash and Acharya Narendra Deva were the main exponents of the Marxist philosophy. However, in the year 1940s Jayaprakash came increasingly under the influence of Gandhi and moved away from Marxism to Gandhian Socialism. M.R. Masani, Asoka Mehta and Purushotam Trikamdas belonged to the Fabian Socialist trend. Later Masani gave leadership in the formation of the Rightist Swatantra Party. Achyut Patwardhan and Lohia were the more ‘Gandhian’ leaders in the party.

The most important window to Jayaprakash’s mind is provided by his well known work, *Why Socialism?* The object of the CSP, as laid down in its constitution are achievement of complete independence in the sense of separation from British empire and the establishment of a Socialist society.\(^55\) The party resolution stated that the party would work for the establishment of a 15 point programme, which included social activities, agitations and administrative measures for transfer of power to the producing masses,

development of the economic life of the country to be planned and controlled by the state, socialization of key and principal industries and state monopoly of foreign trade. The organization of co-operatives for production and distribution, credit to the un-socialized sector of economic life, elimination of princes and landlords and all other classes of exploiters without compensation, redistribution of land to peasant and encouragement and promotion of co-operative and collective farming by the state are some other principles. They also insisted on liquidation of debts owed by peasants and workers and recognition of the right to work or maintenance by the State. “To everyone according to him and everyone to his capacity” to be the basis ultimately of distribution and production of economic goods. Discrimination based on religion, caste, sex etc., should be discarded. They gave much importance to adult franchise in the democratic process. They also stood for the repudiation of the public debt of India\textsuperscript{56}.

On this ideological background CSP worked inside the Congress systematically. In 1938 CSP scored an important victory within the Congress when they succeeded in getting Subhas Chandra Bose elected as Congress President\textsuperscript{57}. When the II World War broke out, both the Congress and the CSP had opposed war preparations and British effort to involve

\textsuperscript{57} Sumit Sarkar, n. 50, p. 72.
Indians in them. The Socialists felt the war was an excellent opportunity to start a mass struggle against the British to demand complete independence. But CWC passed a resolution that if Great Britain would allow the formation of a National Government in India, it would enable the Congress to throw its full weight in the efforts for an effective organization of the defence of the country. “A slave can have no obligation to defend his slavery. His only obligation is to destroy his bondage, I hope we shall know how to defend ourselves when we have achieved our freedom” ⁵⁸. The Socialists campaigned against Indian involvement in the war and as a result, CSP leaders including Jayaprakash Narayan were arrested. While Quit India Movement was going on Jayaprakash was in the Hazaribagh Jail. With the help of some of his trusted comrades he, together with five other prisoners, managed to scale the prison walls on Diwali night, 8 November, 1942. This daring feat, the news of which soon reached all parts of the country, at once made him a hero in the eyes of the Indian people⁵⁹.

The CPI had been banned by the British government in July 1934. In 1936 the Communist Party decided that its members should join the Congress and attempts to give a revolutionary direction and that they should

⁵⁹ Birnal Prasad (Ed.), n. 44, p. 182.
also co-operate with the CSP\textsuperscript{60}. Within a short period they infiltrated into the Socialist Kisan Sabha, trade unions and student union and started acquiring important positions in them. In the CSP conference at Lahore the Communist tried to capture the party by proposing an alternative list of the national executive members. Jayaprakash Narayan realised the game of the Communists, and the Congress Socialist leaders rallied together to defeat them. In 1938 Masani found a secret communist circular, which indicated the details about the infiltration tactics for capturing the CSP\textsuperscript{61}. Jayaprakash Narayana felt something drastic would have to be done about the Communist double dealings, but a few months later he had second thoughts and felt the Socialist should make another serious attempt at unity. Number of leaders desired to expel the Communist from the party but Jayaprakash Narayan decided to give another chance. On this occasion, M.R. Masani bid farewell from the party with protest\textsuperscript{62}. But the role played by the Communists in the World War II and their anti-national attitude forced Jayaprakash Narayan to change his attitude towards the Communists. Moreover disturbing accounts of the Russian dictatorship made them increasingly critical of the Russian experiment. When the communists declared war openly on the CSP the party was formed to expose them.

\textsuperscript{60} Sankar Ghosh, n. 33, p. 313.
Jayaprakash Narayan himself convinced that the Indian Communists were the sworn enemy of the Congress Socialists. This decision was taken at the Ramgarh Conference in 1940. But by that time one third to half of the party in Bengal and Punjab, and the greater part of the party organization in Travancore, Cochin, Andhra and Madras were absorbed by the Communists. However during the Quit India Movement Congress Socialists played a daring role and became the beloved of the people. Jayaprakash played his role in the Socialist Party even after Independence. But after the second general elections held in 1957 he decided to end his sleeping membership of the PSP. By now he had lost complete faith in party and power politics and realised that while such politics might provide a path to power, it could not help in laying the foundation of the new society for which he had so long toiled and intended to toil in future also. The power oriented politics of the post independent period forced him to retreat from politics and he found solace in Sarvodaya movement. He once again came to the forefront of Indian politics to fight against the anti-democratic forces in 1975. Jayaprakash Narayan has no comparison in Indian politics. He was the embodiment of simplicity and sincerity.

63 Ibid., n. 67.
64 n. 44, p. 217.
The ideological scenario of Indian Socialism will not be complete without a discussion of Ram Manohar Lohia. Lohia as both a theoretician of the Socialist Party and a leader of the Socialist movement. He tried to accommodate and assimilate some of the most important contributions of Gandhi on the theory and methodology of socialism. He developed his own frame of reference and accepted only as much of Gandhism or Marxism that fitted into the frame. He held the Mahatma in high esteem and yet like Max he was wedded to revolution in thought, word and deed. It can therefore be rightly concluded that Lohia was a Gandhian among revolutionaries and revolutionary among Gandhians. Lohia pursued political activities in a spirit of absolute dedication and self abnegation. He strongly felt that socialism in India could only be built on the solid foundations of nationalism. He was essentially a man of the revolution, a leader of the masses, having nothing to do with the people living in ivory towers.

He agreed with a few fundamental principles preached and practiced by Mahatma Gandhi. He maintained that the Socialist programme for the progress of the society should have purity of means, Satyagraha and the devolution of economic and political power. He thus emphasized the philosophy of his socialism in two ‘big’ words that is equality and
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prosperity. He stated that our state should be organized on a four-pillar basis – the village level, the district level, the provincial level and the central level\(^\text{66}\). The state, he argued, should not become a ‘totalitarian monster’.

Lohia insisted on a six point programme for the achievement of Socialist pattern of society which includes, land to the tiller by immediate decree, land army for uncultivated tracts, industrialization through small unit machines, re-division of land with the minimum of 20 bighas and a cow per family, parity between agriculture and industrial prices, and the four pillar state\(^\text{67}\).  

Lohia had suggested to the government a week before independence to issue a proclamation abolishing landlordism. For solving the food problem he suggested cultivation of uncultivated land by the food army recruited by the government\(^\text{68}\). That will provide job for considerable number of people who were living in towns and villages without means of livelihood. He believed that to feed the hungry millions of India that is the only way. He believed in a four pillar state. In this four pillar state an attempt is made to synthesize the opposed concepts of centralization and


\(^{67}\) Prakash Shastri, n. 70, pp. 87-98.  

\(^{68}\) Ibid.
decentralization. In this system, the village, the district, the province and the central government all retain importance and are integrated in a system of functional federalism. The cohesive bond is provided by the performance of functions. The four pillar state implies the abolition of district magistracy which represents a notorious concentration of political power. In this system the district, village and city panchayats are to take charge of policies as well as welfare functions. The four pillar state is obviously not a mere executive arrangement. It is a way of life and to all spheres of human activity, for instance, production, ownership, administration, planning, education and the like. The four pillar state provides a structure and way.

After the World War II, Nehru asked Lohia to become the general secretary of the Congress Party. Lohia placed three conditions before Nehru, which however were not acceptable to the latter. One, the Congress president should not be a member of the Government to be put up by the British, two, the member of the CWC should not be a minister, and three, the Congress organization should be able to criticize its own government in a friendly manner, Lohia never showed any desire or passion for power.
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In February 1947, Lohia was selected as Chairman of the CSP. He was a great upholder of Hindu-Muslim unity. He vehemently opposed the partition of the country. He believed that the communal disturbances are results of the propaganda and activities carried on by anti-national and reactionary elements in the country and encouraged by the British imperialism to checkmate the national and progressive forces. When India was on the threshold of a new era of political and social changes, inevitably these forces took advantage of the general backwardness of the people and tried to misdirect the mass discontent which has gathered phenomenal dimensions during the war years by setting one group against the other. The grim and ghastly tragedies recently enacted in this country are the result of the alliance between British imperialism and the vested interest in both communities sailing under the false banner of religious faith. When communal riots broke out in India, Lohia went to the riot stricken areas one after another and risked his life in the streets of Calcutta to save the Muslim brothers. He was with Mahatma Gandhi during his fast at Calcutta and accompanied him at Naokhali.

Lohia was influenced by the socio-economic philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi who exercised the deepest influence over the value pattern and
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thought process of Lohia. To Lohia, Gandhi was the first in World History to be a revolutionary of the inner world and ways of conduct. Lohia propagated the ideal of noble vision and hated immoral means for the achievement of political goal. Lohia accepts the technique of struggle and philosophical frame work of Gandhism, but its approach to socio-economic problem especially its theory of trusteeship is not acceptable to him. Gandhi wanted that the rich should become the trustees of their surplus wealth for the good of society. In case the rich would not become the willing trustees, sathyagraha was to be resorted against the holders of wealth. Lohia rejected Gandhian theory of trusteeship. He repeatedly asked Gandhi to give up his theory of trusteeship or at least mix it up with the abolition of private ownership of capital, for there is something extremely difficult in this voluntary abnegation. Regarding the Gandhian phrase ‘change of heart’, Lohia says that, first we have to organize those who are poor and exploited. Then they will be strengthened and then along with that they always try to change the heart of the rich people. But if we try to change the heart of the rich people through speeches and meetings and talking in the air, nothing will come out. The talk of detachment to property has been going on for five thousand years. We cannot improve upon it. We have to give them
new ideas and instill enthusiasm to enable them to stand on their feet and fight.

Lohia always talked about equality between men and women. Women’s socio-economic status should be raised in our society so that, she should feel herself as an equal partner in schemes of societal development. They should be provided opportunities like men in our society.

He stood for the replacement of the English language which he argued hindered out mental faculties. It should be replaced by Hindi and the administration should be run in accordance with the languages of the people. He propagated compulsory education for every child, male and female. He was in favour of adequate reservation for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, Backward Castes including Adivasis as well as women. They should enjoy better socio-economic status and the feeling of inferiority complex if any, should be removed from their mind. “The caste system must now depart from India. It is our biggest problem. if the stumbling block of caste system is abolished, it would generate a might into Indian nationalism which by itself would become a menace to the British rule”\textsuperscript{74}. Hence, the Socialist party passed a resolution about the destruction of caste. It stated, “The Socialist Party views the caste system in India as the biggest cause of the

\textsuperscript{74} Pravaham, dated 18.5.1952.
present material and spiritual degeneration of the country"\textsuperscript{75}. Lohia defines a revolutionary in the Indian context, as one who wages an all out attack on the basic premises of the caste system in India because on that basis the Savarnas have established their hegemony over the vast population of the backward sections of the society that include all the Shudras and untouchables and tribals of India\textsuperscript{76}. Regarding the role of caste he says ‘caste restricts opportunity, restricted opportunity, restrict ability, restricted ability further restrict opportunity’. Where caste prevails, opportunity and ability are restricted to ever narrowing circles of the people\textsuperscript{77}. Thus, if we are eager to bring about any social transformation, the caste system must be made to forget the ruthless onslaught.

Ram Manohar Lohia was a leader who always stood to protect the right of the people. He said, “It is not necessary for people suffering from starvation to depend on Parliament or to wait expectantly for another general election. They have priceless, matchless weapon of civil disobedience in their hands. When injustice and oppression go beyond bearable bounds, when constitutional methods have proved incapable of achieving redress, it should be open for the people to violate unjust laws, and wrongs and

\textsuperscript{75} Mankind, Vol. 3, 11 June 1959.
\textsuperscript{76} Prakash Shasstri, n. 70, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{77} Ram Manohar Lohia, Marx, Gandhi and Socialism, (Hyderabad, 1960), p. 33.
injustice that are inflicted upon them. To violate laws, to court imprisonment, to invite punishment by authority even to the extent of death is the only satisfactory way of effecting change. In any case, this is specific contribution to political action which Gandhiji made.”  

Gandhi was the guiding force in Indian politics since 1920s. He imbibed fully the environment of the Indian situation and social realities. According to him “we have no right to talk of socialism, as long as there is hunger, unemployment and the distribution between high and low amongst us and around us.” For Gandhi, Socialism was a mode of personal conduct and a form of social service, and was neither a gospel for the expropriation of the rich nor a programme for the socialization of the means of production. According to Gandhi, socialism is a beautiful word and in socialism all the members of the society are equal, none low, and none high. In the individual’s body the head is not high because it is (at) the top, nor are the soles of the feet low because they touch the earth. Even as members of the individual’s body are equal so are the members of society. Therefore under Gandhian Socialism there was room for both the rich and poor. The prince and the peasant will not be equal said Gandhi, by cutting off the prince’s
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head nor can the process of cutting off equalize the employer and the employed\textsuperscript{80}.

Thus, Gandhian ideology also had found an important place in forming the principles of Indian Socialists.

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid.