

Chapter V

NEHRU, AMBEDKAR AND JAYAPRAKASH – A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THEIR VIEWS ON SOCIAL JUSTICE AND ECONOMIC EQUALITY – POINTS OF CONVERGENCE AS WELL AS DEPARTURES – REASONS THEREOF AND IMPACT ON THE SOCIETY AT LARGE

Any comparative assessment of leadership and personal attributes of epoch making thinkers in India invites many problems. The first of these is the problem relating to objective assessment of the contribution of the leader at a particular point of time. The reasons are many and varied in a situation where the nation struggles for independence, it is very difficult to isolate one leader from the rest and assess his contribution. This is true in all similar situations, not only in India but also all over the world. Moreover, in any freedom struggle movement there are many currents and cross-currents of events, forces, dynamics and trends which go and mix up inextricably and a proper separation is neither possible, nor desirable. It is not desirable because in separating each stream, there might be chances of marginalizing one and glorifying the other. Moreover, each leader has its own perception about the needs of the country and his ideological positions are responsible in formulating his own ideas about the course of events.

This is the problem in making comparisons or comparative assessment of the leaders under the present study. While

explaining Nehru, one may confront many questions which call for proper answers before assessing Nehru's ideas on social justice and economic equality. Born in a very rich family, with western education, Nehru had the advantage of looking at social, economic and political issues from a broader perspective. It had its own disadvantage too. It is said that Nehru, as he did not hail from the poor family, had no grass-root level base either in theory or in practice. But to accept such a position is to underestimate Nehru's vision of Indian society. After all a visionary like Nehru cannot be considered to be a product of any particular dogma or principle. A thorough rationalist in his ideas, Nehru tried to situate the Indian social problems in a broader perspective, so as to make it relevant for the rest of the world. This international outlook made Nehru truly global.

So far as Nehru's vision for the world community is concerned, it may be pointed out that his ideas were best examples of a blending between Orientalism and Occidentalism. This was possible because of his long association with the liberal western education which was developed on the foundations of Indian social thinking. As a child, Jawaharlal was very much influenced by his mother who was out and out Indian in thinking and practices. During this formative period, Nehru could gather ideas from Indian scriptures and mythologies. But because of his mother's liberal thinking Nehru did not develop any conservatism even during his childhood. At a later stage, completing his education at Harrow, and getting into barristership, he came into contact with the Fabian society. This association can be seen as a turning point in Nehru's political life also. His preference for socialism and

internationalism can be seen as results of this association. This is a peculiar situation which cannot be found either in Jayaprakash's thought process or rational thinking of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar.

From another point of view, this phenomenon of Nehru can be linked up with his vision for a global community free from any discrimination. In other words Nehru offers the finest example of a leader whose concept of nationalism did never stand in the way to internationalism. To him nationalism is complementary to and not antagonistic with internationalism. Here, a line of reference can be made to Tagore's concept of nationalism in which he could say that, nationalism conceived of in a narrow sphere, may prove to be a menace to civilization.

This is infact the feature of a great missionary whose ideas admit of no limitations, thus artificially created. This also negates the belief that because of his rich pedigree, he could not come down to the masses. Infact the case was a reverse one. His acceptability among the masses was proverbial. His charismatic leadership enabled him to penetrate into the hearts of millions of the Indian masses.

An examination of Nehru's leadership quality will show that he could surpass many of his contemporaries during and after the freedom struggle movement. Needless to mention that he had to contest, with the ideas of orthodox nationalism, religious fundamentalism and dogmatic casteism. Because of his power of assimilation, he could reshape all these into one very much suited to the emerging new liberated Indian society. As a statesman and

the first PM of India he had to shoulder the responsibility of transforming an infant state into a modern vibrant polity.

Historically speaking, the newly liberated state in India had to undertake dual functions – state building and nation building. Along with this there was the need for removing poverty after taking appropriate economic measures through national planning. Nehru's role in this regard can be equated with any mythological figures who by the exercise of his over whelming power and authority can remove all obstacles from the path of development. It may sound rather exaggeration when one says that modern India is the handiwork of Nehru. The state was in its infancy, the economy was shattered and the society was fragmented, both vertically and horizontally. Moreover there was the problem of having a heterogeneous society within a liberal framework. To any theoretical understanding, this may appear to be a paradox. But, because of Nehru's stewardship and the over arching influence of Mahatma Gandhi, the country could steer clear of all these complexities at a critical juncture of India's liberation movement.

Nehru's role in the making of the constitution deserves special mentioning. A close look into the debates that took place in the constituent Assembly will reveal that in almost all important policy formulations, Nehru had a very clear position. The drafting of Part III & IV, dealing with Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles is an example of reconciliation between not only of economic and social rights, but also of individual liberty and social control. Of course, this is not intended to marginalize the roles of other makers of the constitution, notably, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar.

As a leader of the masses he could communicate with the general people in the language they understand. This is something unique for a person who had such a western education and a high scholarship. Perhaps, for this reason of communicative skill he was very much liked by his political mentor, Gandhiji. His way of treating his colleagues was also exemplary. The works by his outstanding colleagues like Maulana Azad and others bear testimony to this. There had been occasions when controversy took place with regard to some policy issues having far reaching consequences. By his maneuvering skill Nehru could carry the decision with him to its final form.

Dr. Ambedkar's thoughts may not have been always consistent, nor could they fully solve the problems he discovered. But, some of his ideas stand out which have their own stand in the history of making Indian society an egalitarian one. His ideas were unique and bold which flowed from the mind of a versatile genius. First, was his service to those section of people who were the children of the lesser Gods – the Dalits. He waged a relentless struggle for the upliftment of these untouchables, in social, economic and political spheres; second, was his challenge to the Hindu society which were bound by the orthodox brahmanic superiority; third, was his search and discovery for an alternative to Hinduism, where he renounced Hinduism, embracing Buddhism; fourth, was his economic policies or ideas, which came

under state socialism, which he skillfully placed in the constituent Assembly and fifth, was his theory of Dalit Liberation.

The Dalit Movement created a political upheaval, more than any other social movements in India. Ambedkar's theory of Dalit liberation contained within its fold, matters like upholding power, interpretation of reservations, not only in the social and economic spheres, but also in the political sphere. He had made a deep study of various political parties, striking for power. One of his unforgettable words regarding his concern for the Dalit upliftment was – 'we must become a ruling community'.¹ A man of practical politics, he gave much emphasis to the strategies of political status of the Dalits. He sought to solve the problems of the untouchables, within the nation itself. He never opted for a separate territory for the untouchables, or a separate homeland for them. The Dalits for that matter did not have anything in common – language, culture, nor a geographic location. What they had in common was only economic discrimination.

Fighting for their economic upliftment, he also designs a separate section on the protection of the scheduled castes, describing their treatment by the upper caste Hindus. He argued for their separate electorates, separate village settlements etc.... He argued "so long as the present arrangement continues, it is impossible for the untouchables either to free themselves from the yoke of the Hindus or to get rid of their untouchability. It is a close knit association of the untouchables with the Hindus living in the same village which mark them out as untouchables ... it is the system of the village plus the Ghetto which perpetuates untouchability and the untouchables therefore demand that the

nexus should be broken and the untouchables who are as a matter of fact socially separate should be made separate geographically and territorially also and be settled into separate villages exclusively of untouchables".² Ambedkar was disappointed both with Nehru and Gandhi. He pointed out that the Indian socialists were unfaithful to their ideals, and that this was mainly because of the upper caste factor. They were unwilling to lend their eyes or ears to the presence and the voice of the Dalits. The neglect of caste was the main factor from which Ambedkar distinguished himself from the socialists. His political career was so much busy in finding the solutions of Dalit upliftment.

He founded the Scheduled Caste Federation in 1942. This organization represented the Dalits, but on an all-India set up. It focused on the separate village settlements and separate electorates. Ambedkar supported the various peasant movements, though there were tensions between the Dalit peasants and caste Hindu peasants. He supported anti-rent campaigns against landlords, anti-revenue campaigns. His proposals for collective forms and nationalization of land came to be the major programmes for his agricultural policies. Amidst these struggles there was the demand for a united Maharashtra. Though Ambedkar had developed a strong criticism against the Maharashtrian Brahman Congress leaders, he was enthusiastic about this movement mostly because of its strong anti-congress front. This was the period when the Scheduled Caste Federation transformed itself into a new organization, the Republican Party of India. This party now focused on working as a platform of all exploited communities in India, besides the Dalits. Thus the Dalits

could see that they lead all the exploited sections of the Indian masses. His major objective was to give the Dalits a place to stand with self respect and dignity. His other objective was to dismantle the Hindu social order, which was divided between high class Hindus and the low caste Hindus, regarding their social status and their respectable jobs; where usually a low caste was assigned dirty and low jobs.

Dr. Ambedkar in his scheme of social, economic and political transformation, tried very hard to transform the traditional Hindu order, replacing it by the dynamism of change. He was aware of the fact that to deal with the orthodox nature of the Hindu society, it was necessary to stimulate change, which could come only from the outside, with the help of modern ideas and institutions.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar is perhaps one of those front ranking leaders who had in his mind to build a modern India where people belonging to all sections would enjoy equal status in their economic position and social advertisement. That is why it is not always correct to suggest that Ambedkar represented only the Dalit ethos in India. It will be wrong to conceive the idea that being a representative of the untouchable community; Ambedkar was naturally influenced by the sufferings of the community he belonged to. This will be undoubtedly a narrow estimation of a man of his stature. What is required is to assess his political ideas in the light of modern India's expectations – secularism, democracy, social equality and economic emancipation.

Philosophically speaking, such a multi-faceted personality demands an objective assessment by situating the person in the context of social imperatives and economic demands of the time. It may not be out of place here to suggest that no political idea, however pragmatic that might be, cannot emerge out of vacuum. Great personalities only work as the mouthpiece of the popular ethos of that period, herein lies the importance of Ambedkar.

Again, there is an opinion that present day phenomenon of Dalitisation of Indian politics owes much to Ambedkarian philosophy. Again, such a position suffers from a limitation of its own. Dalitisation or for that matter, Dalit assertion will be there in a society where the social cleavages are not only prominent but also ill-formulated in nature.

The emergence of Ambedkar during those fateful years of India's freedom struggle movement brought to the surface a number of questions which demanded their immediate solution. It is not simple to suggest that what Ambedkar tried to do was to reconstruct the thought process of the Indian society at that time. Ambedkar had to focus on two important issues like social justice and economic inequality. Rightly he had chosen these areas become various interpretations were forwarded by people of difference sections of the community.

What Ambedkar wanted to achieve was a 'just social order'. This very value loaded concept appears to be at the centre of Ambedkar's own construction of logic for social advertisement and economic emancipation. Again his ideas were to a great extent moulded by his own preference for 'just' order in society,

economy and polity. The entire process for secularization of the social, economic and political process can be considered to be a logical conclusion of his concept of just order.

One may notice that his ideas were not mechanical nor were borrowed from the west. These were indigenous and rooted into the very fabric of the Indian society. There are critics who hold the view that because of Ambedkar's attachment with western values and western education, he sought to inject the concept of secularism in his political ideas. That appears to be too narrow a logical construction. Ambedkar's adoption of Buddhism and rejection of orthodox Hinduism is a testimony to the fact that he had a total grasp of India's history, religion and cultural life. That was perhaps the reason that he could develop a sound mental and logical argument either for accepting or rejecting any creed, no matter whether it was Indian or western.

On the basis of his philosophical position he identified a number of goals that India should try to achieve. These may be summarized as follows.³

A close look at the goals suggested by Ambedkar one may find that on the surface there was nothing new in it; but given the conditions of Ambedkar's attitudinal formation were made, these were of profound implications. His concept of 'just' society was based on his preference for a humane society with an alternative face. If one considers this as a 'paradigm' of Ambedkar's philosophical position, one may well conclude that it was a new paradigm very much relevant and suitable for social reconstruction at a particular point of time. This is not to mean that Ambedkar

was out and out of social reformer only but he was a man with great vision and social reconstruction formed only a meager part of it.

Closely following this, come questions of Ambedkar's theoretical and ideological positions with regard to some of the foundations of his thought process, some of these questions may be formulated in this way –

1. What have been the meanings of freedom, rights and justice in Ambedkar's thought and action?
2. What are the cultural and historical roots of these conceptions in Ambedkar's thought.
3. Did Ambedkar have an implicit theory of colonial state?
4. How did Ambedkar view the complexity and contradiction in the nationalist movement?
5. Did Ambedkar have a theory of relationship black and white the state and religion?
6. How did Ambedkar conceive the issues of women's operation and gender justice?
7. How did Ambedkar view the problematic issue of minority rights in general?

These are source of the important issues which call for an indepth analysis in assessing Ambedkar's position in Indian rationalist history. Although out and out a believer in non-violence Ambedkar did not follow the philosophical position of Mahatma Gandhi. He was very much a believer of freedom and justice as derived from the liberal version and tradition. The concept of

human rights has been pre-eminently found a place in his theoretical as well as practical course of action. He was very much concerned about the destitution, deprivation and disadvantage meted out to the socially disadvantaged group of people. This perception about the artificially created social inequalities helped him in a bigger way formulate his construction about man, his position and the impact of environment on him.

Such a holistic concept of Ambedkar accorded a special position as a relentless fighter against injustice and all other related ills. His position in this regard marked a definite departure from the established notion of state and civil society. Interestingly, he addressed the civil society instead of the state in handling these issues. To him rights cannot put any restriction on the power and authority of the state. On the contrary they act as a kind of legal entitlements of the members of a civil society. In other words, rights in his view can put a check on the nature and character of an interventionist state. The purpose of Ambedkar was to suggest that state should have a power coupled with duty to which the rights of the depressed classes correspond.

A few words about Ambedkar's ideas on negative liberties will be helpful. State should have the power and obligation to create conditions which can remove hindrances from the path of enjoyment of liberty by the members of the depressed classes. He was of the opinion that concepts like 'equality before the law', 'equal protection of law' and 'the Rule of Law' can work as a mechanism to curtail state power for the enhancement of popular sovereignty.

Besides this, Ambedkar was very much keen in solving the theoretical problem between the concepts of rights and basic needs. In one sense he was very much inclined towards the protection of basic rights become, to him, in a society which is in egalitarian in nature, rights cannot have any theoretical or operational value. This perhaps may be the reason why Ambedkar did not develop a theory of representation in General. Rather, he was in favour of according weightage to the disadvantaged minority communities. To him this minority – majority syndrome is purely artificial and based on numerical strength without taking into the real needs of the communities concern. In a situation where there are wide disparities in social, economic and political positions, such numerical understanding may fail to project the real problem. That is why he was in favour of a situation where reality, instead of philosophical or theoretical conjecture shall be the guidelines for addressing the needs of the particular community.

In this context Ambedkar's views on nationalism and nation building seem to be relevant. As said earlier Ambedkar's privacy concern was to see that a man is fully liberated and is inspired by a sense of belongingness – to the community, to the society and to the nation as a whole. To him, nationalism was more than a sentiment – it is a feeling of generated out of a sense of spontaneous attachment with one's own society, community and above all, in general terms, humanity. To Ambedkar: 'A nation is a living soul, a spiritual principle. There are two things. One is the common possession of a rich heritage of memories, the other is the actual consent, the desire to hire together, the will to preserve

together, the will to preserve worthily, the undivided heritage which has been hoarded down".⁴

In explaining the concept of nationalism one can find his preference for peaceful co-existence of all communities and in the creation of an international situation where people across the globe can live in harmony. To him, nationalism is a dynamic concept and it should not be seen in the context of any time specificity or situation – specificity. It is element, transcendental, and assimilative in character.

There is a section of opinion that his concept of nationalism excludes a large section, particularly the Muslim community as in his scheme no specific reference has been made to this community. But, to take such a position, would mean narrowing down Ambedkar's broad view of community and communal harmony. It is true that Ambedkar included religion within his philosophical notion of nationalism. This might help one in understanding his reason for leaving orthodox Hinduism and embracing more liberal Buddhism. He extensively quoted from Edmund Burke in support of his position on religion. In his opinion : "I agree with Burke when he says that religion is the foundation of the society, the basis on which all governments rest and earn their sanction....The nineteenth century European thought about nationality and nationalism centered around the concept of religion and culture. Mill and Mazzini developed a theory of nationalism on the basis of religion and culture".⁵

Another important point which deserves consideration is that Ambedkar did not have full faith in the leadership of the Indian

National Congress as the true vanguard for people's movement. To him congress was basically composed of high caste Hindus and moneyed traders. Secondly, congress in its struggle for freedom movement did not attach a importance to religion, the way Ambedkar wanted. His observation in this regard is worth noting. During the freedom struggle the congress platform under the garb of national integration has done a great job for the governing classes. The governing class his aware of the fact that the political campaign based on class ideology or class conflict will toll its death knell. It knows that the most effective way of sidetracking the servile classes and fooling them is to play upon the sentiments of nationalism and national unity. It clings to the congress because it realizes that the congress is the only platform that can effectively safeguard the interests of the governing class. For if there is any platform which despite all talk of conflict between rich and poor, Brahmin and non-Brahmin, landlords and tenants, creditor and debater can still talk of and preach nationalism and national unity, that is what the governing class wants, as it is on this the safety of this class depends, but it prevents any other ideology inconsistent with the nationalism being preached from its platform.⁶

Closely following this, comes his ideas on liberal democracy. To him, an individual is an end. In himself and he has certain inalienable rights which must be guaranteed through legal sanctions. In order to protect individual's position, he wanted to restrict the authorities of the state in interfering with individual rights and privileges. It suggests that, Ambedkar did not view democracy as a mere form of government – it was a way of life.

This concept, he borrowed from the western philosophical world. The four pillars of his democratic notion were, liberty, equality, fraternity and natural rights – the ideas mostly came from the French Revolution

Ambedkar considered the Constituent Assembly to be the appropriate forum for enhancing his ideas on man and society. His efforts to make constitutional guarantees for individual rights are the best examples of the society he was stemming at through his relentless struggle against orthodoxy, dogmatism and conservatism of all kinds.

Jayaprakash Narain has been correctly described as one of the multi-dimensional and epoch making personalities who symbolize the spirit of one India based on equality and fraternity. Like Gandhi, he believed that the character of the nation largely determines the course of the history of a particular country. Infact JP, as he was popularly known, wanted to move with the people which earned for him the name Loknayak. He tried to create a social and cultural environment free from want, exploitation, discrimination and marginalization of the people. It was his firm connection that any kind of disparity that confronts a community is artificially created for the purpose of excluding a section from the mainstream concept.

If one looks at the transition in JP's thoughts and movements, one may notice some important turning points in his entire political career. Basically, a believer in Gandhian ideals of Sarvodaya, he did not hesitate to embrace Marxism because, to him, there is no fundamental difference of spirit and intent both in

Marxism and Gandhian ideals in so far as both aim at social transformation and eradication of social ills.

Right from the beginning, JP had been in search of a right path through which he could achieve his goal. This justifies so many 'shifts' in his thought process. A person of his caliber cannot change his ideological positions without there being valid reasons.

One may recall the days when JP along with Nehru and others sought to establish a socialist order and for that reason, the congress socialist party (CSP) was formed. He was convinced that only through socialism two of his basic ideas can be fulfilled; establishment of a just society and minimization of the role of the state in determining the destiny of the people. But his closeness with Gandhian ideals did not allow him to completely abandon Gandhi's ideas.

A kind of conflictual situation can be noticed in JP's thought process – a dilemma which he wanted to solve by making reference to other ideological positions. It will be wrong to suggest that JP was primarily a nationalist thinker and not an internationalist. His ideas on social reconstruction based on Bhoodan movement are an example of his attempt at reconciliation between India social needs and the creation of an egalitarian society.

JP should be considered more a social activist than a political theoretician. At the fag end of his wife, his call for Total Revolution should be considered a culminating point of his ideas and actions. He did not hesitate to raise his voice against the authoritarian rule during national emergency. He gave a call to the

students in Bihar and other parts of the country to protest against this despotic rule. The formation of the 'Chhatra Sangharash Samiti' became a vehicle for launching vigorous demonstrations against the despotic rule as proclaimed through the emergency.

JP had in mind that a revolution is necessary for a total change of the social relations, economic structures and political configurations. His concept of total revolution should be seen from that perspective. It was not a revolution of the Marxian type nor a change exclusively on Gandhian principles. As the name signifies it was a 'total' revolution aimed at overhauling the society, economy and polity.

In the entire construction of JP's logic, individual formed the centre of any discussion. He stood for individual liberty and equality for all irrespective of his social position, economic background or political affiliation. His call for total Revolution was the outcome of his thought that the system of present governance would not be able to change the lot of the people.

JP, as is found, was in constant search for the ideals he stood for and for that reason he had to struggle with himself. On the issue of a proper method for the achievement of his ideals he had confronted with Nehru and Patel on many issues. One may also notice that he had agreements on many points with Dr. Rammonohar Lohia and both of them stood unitedly for regenerating the socialist party to achieve equity and goals for a socio-economic revolution.

Right from the beginning JP was guided by the philosophy of 'development for all' and in that respect, he put emphasis on

'lokniti' than 'rajniti'. He was all for the participation of the people because the ideals of liberty, equality and justice could be achieved only in a governing system where the people can identify their needs and they could suggest appropriate measures to fulfill those needs.

In its broader meaning, Sarvodaya to JP, was a socialism for all. He considered Sarvodaya as a universal theory and in that process the game of politics will be substituted by the principle of participation of all for social reconstruction. In the extended version of Sarvodaya he tried to link it up with democratic system where political parties would not have any place. It would be a 'partyless' democracy and people would choose their own representatives who would be responsible to the people. In this process power and politics should not be given any space to raise their heads.

This position may sound rather highly philosophical with no operative values. But JP chalked out a methodology of his own for the achievement of his goal. He stressed on the decentralization of authority and in his concept of 'Swaraj for the people, he pleaded for people's participation' in the government procedures. The basis for his idea of participating democracy was the successful working of the village panchayats. This is in conformity with Gandhi's concept of village reconstruction through democratic functioning at the grass root level.

About JP it is said that he had been a leader who did never run after any political or governmental position. He had enough scope within the congress party and also in the governmental

machinery to occupy a position where from he could influence the process of decision making. But, as a true disciple of Gandhi, he preferred not to be with the administrative machinery but with the people at large. This does not mean that he did not have any managerial skill which was needed to become a successful administrator. The entire process of his upbringing and later on his academic excellence prove that he had all the qualities necessary to become a man in the administration.

But as said, he was, ideologically very close to Gandhi and like Gandhi, he believed that it was the people and the people's forum which can put forward popular demands and aspirations of the nation as a whole.

This nationalist feeling in JP prompted him to look for a proper avenue through which he could implement Gandhian ideas and ideals. On many occasions he was seen asking himself what should be the appropriate course in the process towards upliftment of the people. This thrust in him led him to think in a manner totally different from the conventional path. He was in a constant search for an appropriate and just course suited to the task of social and economic regeneration of the nation.

Within the congress socialist party, JP had an overarching influence over his colleagues. There had been occasions for disagreements or setbacks but on a number of times he was supported by no other than Dr. Rammonohar Lohia. His socialist bias helped him take a wider view of socialism as a way of life. That is why he could say that Sarvodaya was nothing but people's socialism, through which people can take part in the process of

social transformation. He also held that democracy as a form of good governance cannot exist or function in a social condition where there are wide differences among the people either in the status or their location in the society.

It is seen that scholars have sought to divide JP's ideological shifts into three phases – Marxian Socialist phase (1945-1946), Democratic Socialist phase (1946-1954) and the Gandhian phase. The last phase of his life can again be sub-divided into two: Pure Gandhian phase and non-Gandhian pro-people activist phase. It should be kept in mind that no water tight compartmentalization is possible for a social activist like JP as each of these phases has its impact on the subsequent phase. So, for understanding JP, it will be rather convenient if one takes a holistic or integrative approach, rather than segmented or piece meal one.

His inclination towards Marx was the outcome of his desire for economic justice. Like Marx he also believed that the development of the society depends on the proper distribution of economic power. A capitalist society cannot provide either liberty or economic security as the basic philosophy of such a society is exploitations by the property owners. He summed up the philosophy of Marx as a system of social reconstruction to combat inequalities both in social and economic fields. It is interesting to note that he had a strong conviction in the theory of Dialectical Materialism and agreed with Marx regarding the material forces in the society. His book on "from Socialism to Sarvodaya" is a testimony to this trend.

He analysed Marxism and Gandhism on the context of their philosophical and ideological factors. He held the view that so far as the end was concerned there was no difference between these two philosophies. He equated Gandhi's concept of 'Rama Rajya' with that of Marx's ideas on communism in so far as both aimed at establishing social justice and economic equality for all in the society. But inwardly, JP did not accept any form of dictatorial regime – be it a communist or a non-communist one. This drove him to conclude that while initially the Russian revolution was a revolution of the masses, ultimately it established a rule by the few. That is why, to him Asia must find its own way to socialism and method for industrialization. In a word, he wanted to have a sober form of the application of Marxian principles.

The entire life of JP is a story for the search for an action rather than of a theory for the establishment of equality and justice. That may be the reason for his acceptance as well as rejection of many of the philosophical currents like Marxism, Gandhism, Socialism and Sarvodaya. Like Gandhi, he was all for a change of heart of the individual. The Bhoodan Movement attracted him most because in such a movement he could assess the state of mind of the people who gave away excess lands to the landless people. It was a sense of abdication on the part of a people who possessed land, because by nature, all men are possessive by temperament.

Thus, JP's philosophy and ideas can be analysed from three aspects – (a) Moral aspect; (b) Ethical aspect; (c) Operative aspect. JP is the finest example of a person who believed in what is called 'praxis' – a happy blending of ideas and actions. ⁷

Notes and References

1. K. C. Yadav, **From Periphery to the Centre Stage**, New Delhi, P. 137.
2. B. R. Ambedkar, **States and Minorities : What are their Rights and how to secure them in the constitution of Free India**, 1947.
3. K. C. Yadav, **From Periphery to the Centre Stage**, New Delhi, pp. 176 – 177.
4. B. R. Ambedkar, **Pakistan or Partition of India**, Bombay, 1949, p. 13.
5. F. H. Bennur, **Ambedkar and Religion, Mainstream**, Vol. XXVII, No. 26. 23rd April, 1988, p. 23.
6. B. R. Ambedkar, **What Congress and Gandhi Have Done to the Untouchables**, Bombay, 1945, p. 112.
7. (i) Upendra Baxi, **The Recovery of Fire: Nehru and Legitimation of Power in India**, Economic and Political Weekly, XXV (2), 13th January 1990, pp. 107-112.
(ii) Paul Brass, **The Politics of India Since Independence**, New Delhi, Orient Longman.
(iii) A. R. Desai, **India's Path of Development, A Marxist Approach**, Bombay, Popular Prakashan.
(iv) Sarvapalli Gopal, 'The Formative Ideology of Jawaharlal Nehru' in K. N. Panikkar, ed,

National and Left Movements in India, New Delhi, Vikash.

- (v) Sarvapalli Gopal, **Jawaharlal Nehru: A Biography**, Vol. III, New Delhi, OUP.
- (vi) P. C. Joshi, '**Gandhi and Nehru: The Challenge of a New Society**', in B. R. Nanda et. al., 1979.
- (vii) B. K. Nehru, '**Western Democracy and the Third World**', in Morris Johes, **Western Democracy and the Third World**, London: Third World Foundation.
- (viii) Bikhu Parekh, **Nehru and National Philosophy of India**, Economic and Political Weekly, XXVI(1 and 2), 5-12 January, pp. 35 – 48.