

CHAPTER - V

Ideological Position of Rammanohar Lohia

I. Introduction

Ideologically, Rammanohar Lohia belongs to the Socialist Group, within the Congress Socialist Party, tempered by Gandhian ideology. But it is not proper to identify him completely as a Gandhian. In his own words "it is silly to be a Gandhian or Marxist" and "anti Gandhian or anti-Marxist". Further he said, "..... I am neither anti-Marx nor pro-Marx, and that equally applies to my attitude towards Mahatma Gandhi".¹

Lohia, in fact, was a free thinker with the ultimate aim of national freedom and upliftment of the downtrodden of the society. Thus, nationalism and socialism are the two basic tenets of Lohia's thought. Lohia came into direct politics only after his return from Germany in 1933, where he was acquainted with Marxian ideology, Social democratic ideas and the Nazist regime of tyranny. His intelligence and talents were widely recognised all over the country and he brushed aside all the tempting offers to devote himself to the national movement.

In the national scene, Gandhian leadership of the Congress and the failure of the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1930 - 32 created an atmosphere for the formation of the Congress Socialist Party within the Congress, so as to remain within the main stream of national movement. Lohia, in this situation found himself shortly with the leaders of the Nasik Group and attended the first All India Conference of the Socialists at Patna, on 17th May, 1934. Lohia was included in the committee to draft a constitution and programme for the C.S.P under the presidentship of Acharya Narendra Deva. The C.S.P. from the very beginning was not a homogeneous party, but opposite elements were united there for nationalism and personal friendship, but ideologically they were divided into different vague tendencies.²

The socialists, thus united, believed that independence should precede the establishment of the socialist state, and this belief led them to remain within the Congress. To quote C. P. Bhambri, "Ever since their birth as a separate party, the

Socialists have been making efforts to have a programme and an ideology distinct from those of both the Congress and the Communists. Indianization of socialism has been another crucial issue with the socialists".³

In this background Lohia entered into direct politics with his anti-imperialist, anti-violent, nationalist attitude. From the very beginning, he was aware of the conditions of India as well as other third world countries, which was not same as the European countries. European countries were the central point of attention in Marxism, for which Lohia wanted to fit the basic tenets of Marxism with the Indian soil and to synthesise Gandhian techniques with Marxism. As such, he propagated socialism which is rooted in the Indian soil, with some unique original thinking of his own. He became an original theorist and leader of the socialist movement in India.

Lohia was the first editor of the weekly entitled, 'Congress Socialist' published from Calcutta in 1934. Through the columns of this magazine, Lohia brought out many scholarly articles and editorials on cultural problems, and also criticised some of the Gandhian programmes which reveal his original ideas. In 1936, Lohia was placed in-charge of the newly formed foreign department of the National Congress by Nehru. "With his command over three European languages and vast contacts abroad, Dr. Lohia was eminently suited for the post", says G.S. Bhargava. Lohia also "organised and developed fraternal relations between the Congress and the progressive forces in the different countries of Europe, established a separate branch to look after the interests of Indian overseas, especially, in the dominions and to coordinate their struggle".⁴

Lohia published a few pamphlets and articles, under the auspices of the foreign department, such as, "Fight For Civil Liberties", "Indians in Foreign Land", "The Foreign Policies of the Indian National Congress and British Labour Party" which express his original thinking and scholarly attitude.⁽⁵⁾ During this time, he developed his idea of Third Camp for India, in the context of Soviet and American blocs.

Lohia was critical about the applicability of Marxism in India and in other Asian countries, and throughout his life he wanted to take the truths of both Marxism and Gandhism for the betterment of India. To him, Gandhi was the greatest invention of the twentieth century. He sought to combine socialism with Gandhian ideas of Satyagraha, ends and means principles, small machine

technology and political decentralisation. To him, Satyagraha was much more superior to any other methods, either constitutional or revolutionary. He wanted to incorporate Gandhian techniques in the Indian socialist movement. He also wanted democracy and national freedom alongwith equality should constitute the goals of Indian socialism, which again, was to be achieved only by Gandhian techniques. Thus, Lohia, unlike Jaya Prakash, from the very beginning of his political career, started as a Gandhian leader. A careful and thorough analysis of his ideas and thought will also reveal this Gandhian Leaning of Lohia.⁽⁶⁾

Lohia's ideas and thought on socialism were scattered through his writings in the 'Congress Socialist' and from the office of the Foreign Department of the Congress including several speeches and writings both before and after independence. He developed an independent outlook, free from any dogmatic bindings and also independent from both capitalism and communism. To him socialism was a broad tendency starting from the human mind to the material realization of the society.

The study of Lohia's leadership starts from 1934 and since then he worked as a member and leader of various parties, first in the CSP upto 1948, then in the Socialist Party upto 1952, then in the Praja Socialist Party (herein after PSP) upto 1955, again in Socialist Party upto 1964 and then in the Samyukta Socialist Party. The first period was marked by nationalist idea of freedom struggle of the country and cooperation with the congress, with the hope of changing its ideology and organising the masses, peasants and Labourers both within and outside the Congress. During the Socialist Party period, it was opened to the masses and emphasised on the peaceful non-violent methods which was opposed by the Marxist-Leninists. The other periods were of 'Great indecision'.⁷

The CSP as said earlier, was a 'convenient home' for most intellectuals of the time, the views of the CSP do not, necessarily, represent the views of Lohia or Jaya Prakash, since, the object of the Party was Marxian Socialism which was best expressed in the Meerut and Faizpur their of 1936.⁽⁸⁾ For this reason, to understand the leadership of Lohia, we have to analyse his ideas and views as expressed by him from time to time.

II. The doctrinal foundation of socialism

Lohia was quite aware of the conditions of the Third World countries, specially, of India, whose economy was predominantly agrarian, with a little indigenous capital, and the society, in general, was full of conservatism, communalism and fragmentation of several groups, castes and classes. In this condition, Lohia emphasised the need of an independent doctrine of socialism so that Indian society must develop on its own. Lohia identified five basic characteristics of the Asian countries,

- 1 "Politics based on religion, caste or race".
- 2 "The prevalence of Government by repression or terror and opposite politics by armed rebellion or assassination".
- 3 "The rise of a new middle class of bureaucrats and politicians with expensive European habits".
- 4 "The unquestioned leadership of phrase makers and stage actors whose deeds are negligible", and
- 5 "The absence of a social philosophy and comprehensive policies and programmes".⁹

Therefore, Lohia thought that the new creed suitable for India could not be developed on the borrowed ideas. To him, "socialism is a newer doctrine than capitalism or communism there must be adequate doctrinal foundation of consistent logic Socialism must ever be a doctrine that grows but it must also ever seek the principle that holds its various limbs together. Socialism should cease to live on borrowed breath....."¹⁰

Lohia's model, therefore, is distinct from the dogmatic socialism of European brand. European socialism, to him, lacked a world outlook. He said, "European socialists are so much taken up with the problems of the moment, the statistical evidence and requirements of their own nations, that they miss the complete view and the world view".¹¹

Lohia was opposed to both capitalism and communism. Capitalism based on profit motive, he said, encourages separatist tendencies leading to unemployment, crises and wars while "..... communism claims to be the

continuator and developer of capitalist technology, when capitalism is no longer able to do so,"¹² and as such it is a doctrine of deceit, lies, tyranny, decay of culture assisting capitalism.¹³ To him, both "Capitalism and communism are but two parts of the single complex of existing civilization", capitalism depends upon free enterprise and communism on social ownership of the means of production.¹⁴ Again to Lohia, "Communism wants to move history backwards and to repair the ravage of capitalism by imitating its ways of mass production. That cannot be done. Socialism must know how to move history forward".¹⁵ It is thus, socialism alone possesses the vigour and integrity to combat the peculiar characteristics of underdeveloped countries and to work for the material and moral development of the mankind. But the European model of socialism is irrelevant in the existing socio-economic conditions of Asian countries and hence Western model should not be followed in toto. In this respect, Lohia developed his theory of socialism, as a new civilization, which would arise in the backward regions and might ultimately cover the entire world. Lohia's faith on freedom, democracy, individual liberty and dignity are the basic tenets of his socialism.

III. Marxism and Lohia

Lohia is neither a Marxist or a anti Marxist but he thought both Marxism and Gandhism had great contributions to be followed, and befitted to the particular situation of a country. He wanted to synthesize the ideas of Marxism and Gandhism and stood in a mid-way with his own independent philosophy of socialism. As a result, he did not accept all the Marxian ideas uncritically, rather his aim was to recover the truths of Marxism and demolish its untruths.

Lohia praised Marx as basically a democrat because he strengthened the political democracy by establishing an economic system based on equality and abolishing the hierarchical social structure. To him, Marx never explicitly supported the anti-democratic methods of force and violence, which was applied by Lenin, the revisionist.¹⁶

Lohia also appreciated Marx's criticism on private property which is the outcome of theft or robbery. But at the same time, Lohia was critical to accept the Marxian concept of class struggle, interpretation of history and capitalist society and the theory of surplus value. He thought that some of the fundamental

formulations are incomplete or half truth and hence these deserve further analysis for completion.¹⁷

Marxian interpretation of history, to Lohia, is also incomplete. According to Marx, the "Capitalist chain will break at its strongest point" which has proved to be wrong since, it was Russia and China, where the production forces were least developed that Socialist Revolution took place to break the capitalist chain, not in Germany or England, as was prophesied by Marx.¹⁸ Lohia has pointed out two different but universal phenomena i.e. "..... internal struggle among classes and external struggle among nations", which determine the rise and fall of nations along with other forces and factors. Every human society face this internal movement between classes or castes and external pressure from outside. "Today Europe, together with the later appendages of the U.S.A. and Japan, sits like a Brahmin on the peaks of history, tomorrow the pariahs might re-occupy these peaks and displace their present occupants".¹⁹

Marxian theory of capitalist development is based on the theory of surplus value, i.e. the difference between what actually a labour gets and what he produces, which is consumed by the capitalist. Lohia said that it is an abstract doctrine, since, surplus value cannot be calculated, because, "..... Labour has been either imperial or colonial and there have been vast divergencies in their values", and the surplus value including the entire profits "..... is derived mainly from the colonial farms, fields and mines".⁽²⁰⁾ Again "Surplus value, wherever it appears and to the extent that it does so, is the difference between the actual earnings of labour and the per worker world production of the time". Considering this, Lohia said, "we will have to consider a new the law of surplus value, the contradictions of capitalism, and law regarding revolution and therefore our entire strategy and tactics will also have to be revised because the strategy and tactics of Marxism are the inevitable outcome of this law of capitalist development".²¹

Lohia had hailed the Communist Russia but he disliked the use of violence, totalitarianism, regimentation of power, ruthless suppression of individual freedoms and the wide range of contradictory applications of Marxism.²² He had high appreciation about Soviet economy and its 'Socialist democracy', prior to the outbreak of the second world war. In his article, 'International Landmark's, published in Congress Socialist, on 26th December, 1936, he hailed the introduction of socialist democracy in Russia, which was "...built upon the

principle of complete economic freedom and therefore the abolition of classes".²³ This appreciation, however, did not last long, particularly, the non-aggression pact of Stalin with Hitler and the Indian Communists' declaration of 'peoples' war' disappointed and shocked him. In his article, 'Economics After Marx', written during 1942 - 43, the period of open rebellion against British rule, he expressed his dissatisfaction and wanted to recover the truths in Marxism and demolish its untruths.²⁴ Lohia tried in it to expose the weaknesses of the then existing economic theories in order to justify the significance of a new approach applicable particularly to India and Asian backward countries in general. To Lohia, the development of the world capitalist centres and the underdeveloped two thirds of the world, was the outcome of the same historical process of capitalism and imperialism which are twins, born and matured together. Capitalism is not possible without imperialism. As such the undeveloped countries of Asia and Africa are the result of European capitalism and imperialism in order to extend and perpetuate their economic power and market for their products and political power. European countries developed their productive apparatus by exploiting these countries and using them as sources of raw-materials for their industries and for other purposes.²⁵

Thus to Lohia, blind following of Marxism cannot constitute the basic of Indian socialism. "Even in Russia, Marx was not enough, it had to be supplemented with Leninism, Stalinism etc. In China, it was supplemented with Maoism, while in India, Communists think Marxism is enough".²⁶ To him, Capitalism, Marxism, Communism and Gandhism in their existing form is not acceptable. To quote him, "I dislike the whole doctrine of communism with its poisonous teeth which had further degenerated into Stalinism, and if communism would include decentralisation of economic and political power, if it included the use of good means, then of course, I would consider it a kindred doctrine alongside of socialism."²⁷

His thorough and careful study of Marxian literature along with other European Texts, and his close contact with Gandhi, after his return from Germany, formulated his independent theory of socialism. Lohia came to the conclusion that Marx did not take into account the peculiar and specific conditions of the Asian and Third World countries in formulating his theories and hence, India alongwith other Asian countries should have to follow an independent line. Lohia had good faith in democracy, freedom and equality, but he opposed the tendency

of democracy leading to elitism. He wanted that the fundamentals of socialism should be clarified and democracy along with national freedom should constitute the goal of Indian socialism. In this respect he pleaded for Gandhian methods, because, he thought, Gandhism alone could provide the proper base for socialism in India.

IV. Gandhism and Lohia

Gandhi's ideas and techniques had a strong impact on Lohia. But he did not completely follow the Gandhian ideas unquestioningly. He considered many of the Gandhian ideas to be inadequate and at the same time, he identified some important contributions of Gandhi, such as, ethical basis, satyagraha, the idea of decentralization, ends and means principle, small machine technology, simplicity of living, to be valuable.

Lohia agreed with Gandhi that morality and politics are correlated and insisted on the good moral character of leaders in political parties. He also held that ends and means are two sides of the same coin, since, both of them go together. He said, "It is not possible to achieve the victory of truth through falsehood, of health through murder, of one world through the sacrifice of national freedom, of democracy through dictatorship".²⁸ Immoral means cannot produce noble vision; rather it generates chain reactions of immorality destroying the ultimate goal. He believed that true ideal of socialist world could only be achieved through Gandhian method, which is based on truth.

Democratic socialism is based on peaceful method. Again justice and equality are the two tenets of democratic socialism. But traditionally, Lohia said, the achievement of equality and justice has been linked with the threat of power and the use of weapon, but Lohia wanted to combat the injustice and inequality without using force or weapons. Here, he admits the Gandhian method of Satyagraha and civil disobedience to be of good use. Gandhi used Satyagraha with the spirit of truth and believed in God. But Lohia did not think it necessary to believe in God to be a Satyagrahi. However, Lohia was deeply impressed by this technique of Satyagraha and "..... has given it an aspect of permanent applicability".²⁹

Lohia considered Satyagraha as a powerful alternative to both constitutional and violent struggle, and wanted the people to come forward for peaceful

resistance of injustice. To quote him, "Socialism must ever denounce the advocacy and organisation of violence, and it must strive to achieve such a basis of peaceful struggle as will lead increased individual initiative and responsibility and not a concentration of power".³⁰ He was hopeful enough that numerous countries would exercise peaceful method and civil disobedience successfully, including the peoples living under communism. He said, "Callousness and brutality whether on the part of the government or the people must go. Instead must awake a world mind which holds violence in contempt and revulsion but which also knows how to resist injustice non-violently".³¹ By Satyagraha Lohia meant to change the heart of opponents and then to remove the fear from the hearts of the Satyagrahis by giving them much courage and strength. Satyagraha, he said would be based on non-violence and hence one must know the limitations imposed by truth and non-violence.

Lohia regarded Satyagraha as peaceful class struggle, and said, "..... a genuine class struggle in civil disobedience", though, "A fancy opposition has been allowed to grow between Satyagraha and class struggle. There is in fact no such opposition..."³² This Satyagraha is applicable in every aspect of life in day to day activities starting from family, friend and relations, institutional, economic and political matters. Lohia was of the opinion that increase in the number of Satyagrahis, spontaneously in a nation, will minimize the scope of injustice, by their organisational resistance of the same. He insisted on the peaceful resistance of injustice. To him, "the choice is" between, "Satyagraha or Bullet", and the choice between "Ballot or Bullet is a wicked presentation made by capitalism and communism."³³ However, Lohia believed that Satyagraha as a weapon, will prevail as long as injustice and oppression will prevail. Lohia incorporated the idea of love and anger with Satyagraha. To him, "..... communism is a doctrine of hate, Sarvodaya has hitherto been an inadequate doctrine of love". And hence he wanted to combine love and anger for better attainment of justice, and said, "Only when love and anger, love for all and anger against injustice, find a combined expression through a revolution, will humanity be able to make the next onward move".³⁴

Lohia along with Gandhi, prescribed decentralization of power. Lohia systematised Gandhi's idea of village self-rule and Panchayati Raj. But Lohia was not fully satisfied with the present meaning of federalism which divides power between a centre and the federating units. He argued that local self

government, in the present arrangements, are also empowered with some powers which are not derived from the constitution, rather these units have to depend on the state and Central Governments which is a drawback of the system. This arrangement, according to him, seems to be a conferment of power from the top and they are not a part of the organic law.³⁵ Lohia, like Gandhi, was ".....convinced that so long as the masses do not involve themselves in the process of changing the political, administrative, economic, educational and cultural modes and institutions, socialism would remain an empty slogan, a myth and a sterile dream".³⁶ Lohia, for this reason recommended a Four Pillared structure of a state based on self-rule, and division of powers into four pillars - the village, the district, the province, and the centre and all would derive their respective powers directly from the constitution of the country. "The idea behind underlying the four-pillar state is not that of the self sufficient village but of the intelligent and vital village".³⁷

With such similarities of thought with Gandhi, Lohia, however, did not totally follow the Gandhian approach. To him, Gandhian method is also inadequate like that of Marx. He, naturally, found some contradictions in Gandhian approach. He rejected the Gandhian theory of Trusteeship and was in disagreement with Gandhi about his inclusion of religion in analysing socio-economic problems such as caste system.³⁸ Gandhiji's demand of confiscation of private property without compensation and termination of land ownership was, according to Lohia, also full of contradictions, and not practicable at all. Gandhiji's claim that the rich should become the trustees of their surplus wealth for the benefit and wellbeing of the society, and his belief in the 'change of heart' was severely criticised by Lohia. He wrote, "American capitalism has produced trustees but all these does not change the character of capitalism".³⁹

Regarding the change of heart of the rich, Lohia emphasised the need for organising the poor and exploited first, so that they should be strengthened and only then the change of the heart of the rich may be taken into consideration. "But if we try to change the heart of the rich people through speeches and meetings and talking in 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".⁴⁰

Gandhiji's socialism was a code of personal conduct and was not free from his religious beliefs. All his ideas of socialism including his patriotism and humanitarian outlook had a touch of spiritualism, which Lohia did not like. Lohia pointed out that Gandhi has over emphasized the individual and thought in terms of personal salvation and by improving the individual internally, morally and spiritually, he wanted to change the environment later. Gandhi thus stressed on morality, while, socialism, basically, "seeks to improve the external environment to enable the individual to improve himself". Lohia, on the other hand, stands in between the two and said, "If a logical system of thought were to be devised, equal emphasis would have to be laid on both, for man is both end and means, and while he may enact virtues which do not change, he has also got to be an instrument of better future".⁴¹

Thus, Lohia has tried to synthesize the Marxian approach to the Gandhian model. His objectives remained Marxian in nature while the choosed approach was Gandhian. In fact, Gandhian socialism began with moral regeneration of individual and his approach is individualistic based on Indian tradition and religion. As such, Lohia thought this as inadequate like Marxism. He, therefore, wanted that, "instead of seeking to elaborate a new doctrine of Gandhism, if some of the ideas from Gandhi's life and action are woven into a consistent cloth of socialism a new civilization may emerge and mankind may hope for an age of peace and decency".⁴² In fact, Lohia wanted to radicalize Gandhism. He called himself to be 'heretic Gandhian'⁽⁴³⁾ and accepts the technique of struggle and some of his philosophical framework, but developed an independent indigenous model of socialism, a new civilization and a world Parliament.

V. Lohia's vision of a new socialist civilization

As a socialist, Lohia belonged neither purely to the Marxist bloc or the Gandhian bloc. Rather, he, being in the midway of the two blocs, synthesised the Marxian ideology with Gadhian techniques. In doing so, he was mainly concerned with the peculiar socio-economic conditions, specially of India and Asian countries, more particularly, the third world countries, where poverty, unemployment, and caste or class division were the main obstacles in the way of socialist transformation. And this understanding led him to give some original theories of socialism which were not done by any other socialists including

Narendra Deva and Jayaprakash Narayan. For this reason, Lohia's model is entirely different and novel.

To him, communism or capitalism would not universally be valid for creating a new civilization, since both capitalism and communism were two parts of the single complex of existing civilization. He thought that communism represents economic democracy while capitalism preserves political democracy of individuals. To him, socialism wants to join these two in a single outlook. But he was aware that "this grafting of one on the other is full of peril to the future of socialism, for it encourages the disastrous belief that economic democracy prevails under communism and political democracy under capitalism and all that needs to be done is to join them".⁴⁴ Hence he dreamt of a new civilization for the development of man's total personality through outward activity and inward poise. Lohia was mainly concerned with equality, freedom, individual dignity and abolition of conflict of caste and race, for which he visualised a socialist order to achieve approximation of the human race and overcoming of class and castes and regional shifts. He, at the same time, wanted comparatively equal production of all over the world, which would help in bringing the entire world within its fold. Again, Lohia was a profound nationalist and his desire was to free the country from the foreign domination. He wanted to develop an independent socialistic model since he found inconsistencies both in the Marxian model and the European Socialist model. In his article, 'Economics after Marx', Lohia described the inadequacy of the Marxian analysis of capitalist development, which, according to him, was centred only on the European countries and naturally that is not fitted to India and other underdeveloped countries. He also explained the 'Twin Origin of Capitalism and Imperialism', which has divided the world into a small European Capitalist centre and underdeveloped two-thirds of the world to perpetuate their economic and political power. He saw the "..... Indian economic retardation as a factor in the development of capitalism in West Europe".⁴⁵ Lohia analysed the economic retardation of India as the result of British Capitalism, and explained how the British capitalism, for its own purposes of new markets and places of investment, was compelled to take the form of imperialism and he concluded that Capitalism and imperialism were of joint origin and development.

To understand Lohia's model of new socialist civilization, it would be better to analyse his concept of Equal Irrelevance of both Communism and Capitalism,

and the concept of Third Camp, which would help to understand his national and international outlook on the basis of which his model was prepared. His concept of Third Camp was based on his principle of Equal Irrelevance of Capitalism and Communism. His aim was to save the underdeveloped countries from the grips of the conflicting international power blocs, struggling for dominance or expansion. Lohia, in 1938, for the first time used this term 'Third Camp' to express his attitude towards the World War II⁴⁶ He did not agree to support the Allies or the Axis in the Second World War, rather wanted to organise the movements for national independence and other elements supporting peace, democracy and colonial freedom. He was of the opinion that victory of any of the power blocs would not lead any improvement or emancipation of the mankind. Therefore, he stressed the position of independence of the two blocs - The Atlantic or the Soviet bloc, by creating a "Third Camp of active neutrality and try to expand the area of this Third Camp as far as possible".⁴⁷ He also stressed the need for mutual cooperation and assistance among the developing countries - "fighting for freedom, peace and progress of the oppressed millions in the World".⁴⁸ After independence, Lohia further attempted to broaden its implications, when he was the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, in July, 1950. He said, "who are the natural constituents of the Third Camp? Socialists, newly liberated peoples, anti-imperialist movements and all liberals as want progress and world authority".⁴⁹ For its success as a real force in the world, he said that the constituent units "should join together in mutual assistance pacts. Their domestic programme should be socialism. Internationally, they should abstain in all unfortunate cases where only the Atlantic and Soviet camps were clashing and no peaceful choice existed".⁵⁰

He further said that "I do not want this to seem like a bloc of Asian people, for it is far wider. Considerable sections in almost every country would respond at once, and ultimately I believe the world will accept these terms".⁽⁵¹⁾ He suggested constructive work and programme for this Third Camp - such as anti-imperialist movements, projects for reconstruction and world peace ad world food pool.

VI. Theory of Equal Irrelevance

Lohia keeping in his mind the problems of Asia and other underdeveloped countries of the world and more particularly of the Indian soil, he formulated

his theory of Equal Irrelevance of both capitalism and communism. He took a different path criticising both capitalism and communism. He indicated with sufficient ground that contradictions in both capitalism and Communism could not be overlooked. In doing so, he also kept in his mind about the vast population in the underdeveloped countries and scarcity of capital production and declared equal irrelevance of both capitalism and communism to these backward countries. He identified the gross differences between the developed and underdeveloped countries and said that Capitalism and Communism might solve the problems of Europe and America but both of them at the same time equally irrelevant to and incapable of solving the problems of the rest of the world, where two-thirds of the mankind reside.

First, he tried to prove the inadequacy and irrelevance of Capitalism saying that capitalist integration held good for one-third of the mankind though could not avoid periodic crises and wars, clash and contradiction between the owners of concentrated capital and proletariat. He said, "This contradiction has, like a knife, cut the world into two: peoples living upwards of forty degrees north of the equator have at least acquired bodily comfort while the much vaster numbers of others are submerged in misery, but the whole world bleeds. Capitalism imposed the peace of death on Asia and elsewhere, caused their population to grow and their economic apparatus to decay."⁵²

Lohia also described the density of population in both the developed and underdeveloped countries and said that in the developed countries productive apparatus was also developed, while in underdeveloped countries it was woefully meagre. In comparing this, he pointed out that the productive apparatus in average for the coloured people was Rs. 150.00 worth of tools per person, while Rs. 5000.00 to Rs. 8000.00 worth of tools per person among the white and pink people, and concludes saying, "To provide such enormous populations the tolls of agriculture and industry as would bring them on a level with European and the U.S. is an impossible task for capitalism and its private property or mass production."⁵³

Lohia further said that capitalism was meaningless to the millions coloured people, as, "The task of capital formation over two-thirds of the world is far too colossal for private capital to accomplish. Capitalism cannot even fulfil its primary function providing capital to mankind."⁵⁴ Capitalism, according to him,

has produced poverty for the millions of coloured people and hence it is not relevant for the underdeveloped countries.

Lohia, similarly pointed out the ineffectiveness of communism to fulfil the hopes of these underdeveloped countries, and declared that communism is equally irrelevant.

Lohia explained that communism wants to relieve the people from the curse of private property by social ownership of the means of production, ultimately aiming at a stateless society. But in doing so, Lohia elucidated that a centralised party and centralised state is required to establish the stateless society. But according to him, at the same time, "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. What capitalist technology has meant to two-thirds of the world has not been digested in communist theory. There are paltry forces of production and huge populations. Communist rationalisation of these economics or a hot house nurturing of productive forces is impossible except through mass murder unknown to history and then too, almost impossible".⁵⁵

Lohia thus feared that communist process of modernisation could lead masses of population to be thrown out of their jobs. Similarly, he further said, "..... modernisation of agriculture would throw tens of crores of people out of work" and they would not also be absorbed in modern industries due to an unachievable capital.⁵⁶

He further said, that "communism would indeed know how to abolish unemployment by concealing it under the guise of under-employment, a practice which it has followed in Europe and which is all too familiar in the underdeveloped two-thirds of the world. But it will not be able to conceal that a few more Calcuttas and Kanpurs it may build rest on the dry bones of tens of millions dying in the numerous hemlets and towns of the country".⁵⁷ Lohia, thus thought Marxism to be basically an "European doctrine which not only claims superiority but has proved to be powerful weapon of Europe against Asia".⁵⁸ Marxism, in Asia, on the other hand, "had been a source of deep discord and tremendous violence, unleashing civil wars in China, Korea, Vietnam, Malaya, Burma, the Phillipines and a near civil war in Indonesia".⁵⁹ Lohia thought that communism

had little to offer to Asia, full of internal incoherence of plural societies, high density of population and low capital equipments which were the basic features of all the under-developed countries. To him, "Communism can provide neither bread nor freedom to two-thirds of the world", and he came to the conclusion that both "capitalism and communism share a certain community of economic aims in so far as the latter inherits the former's process and forces of production and alters only its relations..... and seeks to reproduce its forces".⁶⁰ Lohia was of the opinion that socialism could be able to alter both the forces of production and the capitalist relations of production. To him, both capitalism and communism represented by United States of America and Soviet Russia, respectively, ".....are unable to slay the twin demons of poverty and war and what they say or do only serves to heighten their demonic equality. They have enveloped the world with fear and hate".⁶¹

Lohia, therefore, argued that both capitalism and communism were equally irrelevant to the venture into a new civilization. To Lohia, "Theory of equal irrelevance is the decision of the traveller on a new road, who refuses to be tempted by the two other roads that go round and round and lead nowhere".⁶² To him, both capitalism and communism were two parts of a single complex of prevailing civilization, and hence he said, "Adherents of the Atlantic as well as the Soviet camps are deeply hurt by the theory of equal irrelevance. They are correct in diagnosing the virus of the opponent but are singularly blind to their own. Concealment of such viruses denotes grave peril to mankind. There is no need to keep quiet over the suppression and tyrannies of communism, the disaster of its economic aims when applied to the underdeveloped areas and the barren cruelty that it represents".⁶³

Within this ideological foundation, Lohia wanted to build up his socialism as a new Civilization, and in India he envisaged, that must ceaselessly try to build up a third system maintaining this theory of Equal irrelevance between the two camps. Regarding appropriate forms of actions to realise this doctrine, Lohia suggested, ".....the democratic process of the vote when successful and to resort to insurrectionary action at least in speech", and it "must have power and organisation enough so that it can use them in the service of whatever action may be deemed appropriate at the time".⁶⁴ Along with these, organisation and education of people, resistance to injustice by means of Satyagraha or class-

struggle, abolition of caste system and subjection of women, decentralisation of power etc. are the main suggested forms of action for building his new civilization.

VII. Lohia's Model of Socialism

Lohia was critical to both Marxism and Gandhism, though he preferred the Gandhian non-violent methods in obtaining the goals of socialism. His ideas were based on his experience of Indian and other Third-World countries' social and economic conditions, which is predominantly backward, agriculture based, with high density of population, unemployment and poor capital. And in this situation, Lohia explained how both capitalism and communism were irrelevant to these countries and suggested an independent line of socialism. This socialism was different from communism, which he explained by a 'handy formula', that "communism is equal to socialism, minus democracy, plus centralisation, plus civil war, plus Russia".⁶⁶

"Capitalism", on the other hand, Lohia said, "imposed the peace of death on Asia and elsewhere, caused their population to grow and their economic apparatus to decay".⁶⁷ Again he said, Capitalism, ".....increasingly reducing man to the status and work of halfman, half-horse, for in India and elsewhere, horse carriages are dying out for want of returns and being replaced by men who pull men".⁶⁸ Naturally, Lohia thought that it was not desirable for these underdeveloped countries to imitate the affluent societies of the west. To him mere imitation would not produce good result for the under developed countries. To him, "To turn a peasant of India, Java or China into a worker, a cultivator into a tractor-driver or to provide a factory worker of these areas with the concentrated capital of modern technology may or may not be a high endeavour, but its achievements is impossible and it shall stay a barren and cruel effort".⁶⁹

He, therefore, suggested a new mode of economic rationalization and appropriate form of organisation and social control, along with destruction of private property and the socialization of the means of production, and that too, by non-violent means, for the achievement of his goal of new socialism. Lohia was quite aware about the fact that unless the doctrinal foundation of socialism was secured, and unless it acquired a clear image and become recognizable, its features would be of no use at all.⁷⁰ His socialism was based on equality,

decentralisation of power, individual dignity and without having any faith in the automatic development of socialism.

His new socialism was thought of comprising 'several basic characteristics, such as;

- (a) Maximum attainable equality for which nationalization of economy may be one necessary step,
- (b) a decent standard of living throughout the world,
- (c) Small scale technology (according to capital accumulative capacity),
- (d) decentralisation of power with a structure of 'Four Pillar State',
- (e) Social ownership of the means of production,
- (f) The idea of world Parliament and World Government based on collective and individual practice of civil disobedience to resist tyranny and exploitation.⁷¹

He was fully concerned in formulating this theory about the freedom and prosperity of individual and resistance of violence for which he suggested three modes of action, i.e.. 'Spade, vote and prison'.⁷² to be followed by the Socialist Party. Alongwith these, he suggested a broad programme of India's reconstruction through agrarian revolution, upliftment of the backward and weaker sections of the society, maintenance of communal harmony, inclusion of Indian Language in official use and with a vast international outlook/programme. But all these do not mean that Lohia was only a theoretician, but at the same time, he was a man of action, a great rebel and nationalist fighter who counted a good number of arrests both before and after independence.⁷³

Krishnanath has mentioned about "Lohia's many sided and varied contribution to socialism", under the following broad heads : philosophy, History, Politics, Social policy, Economics, and culture.⁷⁴

VIII. Lohia's Ideas of Equality

The entire thought of Lohia was directed towards the attainment of equality, Justice, and dignity of individual. To him, socialism itself is a doctrine of equality. Equality and prosperity are the other names of socialism. Lohia pointed out that

equality as an abstract conception, ".....can only mean an atmosphere, an emotion, and perhaps also a wish that are arrangements political, social or economic, shall be equal as between one individual and another The essential point is that equality is an atmosphere, an emotion, a wish, or a dream".⁷⁵ Lohia during his whole life opposed the curtailment of liberty especially civil liberty. To quote Prasad, "Lohia was pitched against injustices of all kinds, and in particular, the social and economic inequality or injustice was his main target. He consistently opposed the caste distinction and untouchability in society".⁷⁶ Lohia was aware of the fact that Liberty could not be attained in the absence of equality. He aspired equality to exist in all walks of life and wanted to wipe out all kinds of injustice and inequalities from the society and for this reason, he wanted to attain the maximum equalitarian standards in the fields of income and expenditure. He wanted that socialism must have strong roots in equality. To him equality was as ".....high an aim of life as truth or beauty ".....".⁷⁷ He also was aware about the destructive nature of the caste system prevailing in India, and hold the view that so long this caste system could not be abolished, equality in real sense could not be established. Without the abolition of caste system, democracy and socialism could not function properly and the principle of equality would naturally remain out of reach. For this reason he explained the 'principle of immediacy', implying the maximum and immediate attainability relevant to the current situation in relationship to the ideal.⁷⁸ According to Lohia, injustice and inequality are the general pictures throughout the world "but Afro-Asian countries are more afflicted than the Euro-American states." He, therefore, wanted to establish a society based on justice and equality in every walk of life.⁷⁹ He wanted equality not only within a society between man and man but also among the nations. To him, inequality disunites men and leads nations to "Strife and armed conflict". In his opinion, "the twentieth century is suffering from the worst form of inequality"⁸⁰. He mentioned about 'Sapta Kranti' or Seven revolutions which was taking place throughout the world against seven types of injustices and inequalities. These are,

1. revolution for equality between man and woman,
2. for establishment of equality in political, economic and spiritual spheres based on skin colour,
3. for establishment of equality between groups or castes with special opportunities to the backwards.

4. for establishment of national freedom and world democratic rule,
5. for establishment of economic equality and planned production against private capital.
6. for protection of individual privacy against all undue collective encroachments, and
7. for disarmament and for Satyagraha.⁸¹

Equality is an abstract term, which does not mean equality in food, dress or housing as applicable in prison, Lohia, however, agreed that absolute equality is an impossible and some "..... measure of inequality is bound to exist but basic needs of life must be fulfilled."⁸²

Lohia was well concerned about the inequality between sexes prevalent in all societies including Soviet Russia and United States, for which he thought that women should be brought equally with men in every aspects of life and activities. According to him, "Man has expected of woman two contradictory things : that she should be bright, intelligent, beautiful, and that she should be wholly his."⁸³ But to him it was impossible unless she or he were independent. Lohia said "A socialist movement without the active participation of women is life a wedding without the bride they are also the chief support of a movement for peaceful resistance."⁸⁴

Lohia, however, analysed equality from a different historical, and socio-economic aspects and following Chandradeo Prasad, he used the term 'equality' to denote four different tendencies-inward and outward equality, which should move together, and other two being material and spiritual equality. "Material equality must mean the outward approximation among nations as well as inward approximation within the nation. Spiritual equality must mean outward kinship as much as it means inward equanimity," and for concretization of the idea of equality all the four types should always go parallel.⁸⁵

Lohia also fought against the inequality in colour, both within the society and outside it. The white races of Europe have always in advantageous position and likewise upper castes in India got preference; in fact, "the fair colour has captured peoples' imagination". Caste system has stratified the Indian Society and hence he pleaded for the upliftment of the lower and backward classes. "To Lohia, caste is ossified class and class is mobile caste. An oscillation between caste and class has been a law of history."⁸⁶ Lohia regarded castes and classes as

social forces arising from motivational patterns of society. To quote V.P. Varma, "He believed that in history there is a tussel between crystallized castes and loosely cohesive classes. Class represents a dynamic force of social mobilization and caste represents conservative forces of stagnation, inertia and prescriptive right. All human history has been an internal movement between castes loosen into classes and classes crystallized into castes,"⁸⁷ In his own words, "caste restricts opportunity. Restricted opportunity constricts ability. Constricted ability further restricts opportunity."⁸⁸

According to Lohia, national freedom and abolition of foreign rule was not only in political sphere, but he also thought that even after political independence, economic exploitation may remain equally in its various forms, creating inequality among nations. So he wanted to remove the "hidden imperialism" of all kinds from the national states for making a world of peace and equals. Economic inequality in the underdeveloped countries is a common feature, which, according to him, should be minimized and production should be increased. Lohia pointed out the differences of income and expenditure in India in comparison to other developed countries, and thus, inequality in the economic field were the main causes of misery and filth of most of the mankind.⁸⁹

For the protection of dignity of individual, privacy was required, for which Lohia pleaded for abolition of organisational compulsion and recognition of freedom and privacy, which he thought to be most essential for the development of personality. Weapon, according to Lohia, were contrary to mankind and protection of its equality. Therefore, he pleaded for abolition of armaments which create injustice and inequality. He pleaded to combat injustice and inequality with nonviolent civil disobedience, which ".... could be reasonably expected to act as a good deterrent against foreign invasion."⁹⁰

Both Lohia and Gandhi had a clear idea of India's different caste system which creates obstacles in the way to equality. But for maintenance or establishment of equality like Gandhi, Lohia also did not follow the Marxian model. Lohia rightly thought that mad application of Marxism in India was not possible as the "..... experiments of nationalisation in India has given worst results In the so called mixed economy, both private and public sectors have badly degenerated copying each other's evils. Similarly, the theory of class struggle

cannot be worked in India without eradication of caste system." ⁹¹ He also suggested different local factors to be studied carefully before applying Marxism in India. Within this consideration, Lohia suggested eleven point programmes or measures for bringing equality in the society :

- " (1) Primary education should be of uniform standard and type and the expenditure on schools and the salaries of the teacher should be uniform. All privileged schools for primary education should be closed down.
- (2) Uneconomic holdings should be exempted from taxes and land revenue. It is quite possible that as a result land taxes and land revenue might be replaced by agricultural income-tax.
- (3) A 5 to 7 year plan should be drawn up to provide irrigation water to all agricultural land. This water should be provided either free or at such minimum cost or credit that every peasant may use it for his land.
- (4) English as a medium, should be removed from all sectors of public life.
- (5) No person should be allowed to spend more than one thousand rupees per month.
- (6) There should be one class for all passengers in the railways for the coming two decades.
- (7) For the coming twenty years, all the capacity of the automobile industry should be utilised for the manufacture of buses, tractors, or taxis and the manufacture of cars, for private use must stop.
- (8) Price fluctuations of any one crop should not exceed more than 20% and the selling price of an essential industrial commodity should not be more than one and half times its cost.
- (9) 60% preferential opportunity should be given to the backward communities, i.e, the Adivasis, harijans, women and the backward castes among the Hindus and non-Hindus. Obviously, this principle of preferential opportunity does not apply to such vocations as require special skill e.g. surgery, but executive or legislative functions cannot be counted as such.

(10) Ownership of more than two houses should be nationalised.

(11) Effective distribution of land control over its price." ⁹²

Lohia was mainly concerned with the establishment of equality among men and in doing so, though he wanted to establish some universal principles, his main thrust remained the people of India and the Indian Society.

IX. Social Ownership

Lohia accepted the Marxian analysis of private property, which he thought to be the root cause of economic inequality not only within the state but it also brings war between different states. This private property leads economic exploitation in various forms, for which Lohia pleaded for social ownership of all means of production, abolishing private ownership. In this respect, he referred to the religious scriptures which advocate the philosophy of non-attachment of property. However, Lohia, said, "private property must, of course go, except such as does not occasion employment of one person by another," ⁹³ and people may ".... have his own house, a typewriter, a television and also a farm without employing labour and heavy machinery." ⁹⁴ He further said that "ownership of property by the state exclusively at the centre goes with mass production and is disastrous both for bread and freedom. Property of appropriate types must be owned by the village and the province as much as by the centre and by co-operatives. Socialism must irrevocably reject all doctrines of restricted capitalism and mixed economy." ⁹⁵ Lohia thus rejected the idea of mixed economy, which helps private ownership in some spheres, which according to him, is contrary to the idea of socialism.

X. Small-scale Technology

Lohia carefully analysed the situation of India and underdeveloped countries which is basically over-populated with minimum capital in comparison to those of developed countries. For the development of India and other underdeveloped countries, Lohia advocated for a decentralised economy based on the resuscitation of cottage industries. He urged the use of small machines which could utilize labour power with even small capital investment. The large-scale industries, Lohia said may produce, ".... a few more Culcuttas and Kanpurs, it may build rest on the dry bones of tens of millions dying in the numerous hamlets

and towns of the country." ⁹⁶ But it would not be able to form capital for the two-thirds of the world. For this reason, he said, "A new mode of rationalization and a corresponding mode of ownership will have to be devised. The small-unit machine run by electricity or oil is the answer. Only a few such machines exist, many more will have to be invented. This machine will not only solve the economic problem of the under-developed world; it will also enable a new exploration and achievement of the general aims of society." ⁹⁷

Lohia, thus suggested small-machine technology, which would not need high capital investment but employ much more unemployed people. These small-machine units need not be concentrated but would reach into the villages and towns where sufficient raw-materials of various types, available, and be utilized. Lohia, further said that these small machines would not necessarily be less efficient and advocacy of such small machines would not mean total rejection of mass production where it would be inescapable. ⁹⁸ Lohia actually suggested for the under-developed countries, like India, development of equipments which would be both labour intensive and capital saving, and at the same time efficient to compete with the existing market. He hoped that "on the basis of investment assumptions made earlier with regard to five-year plans, rationalization carried out through such machines may well provide employment to ten, instead of one million persons annually." ⁹⁹ Lohia was concerned mainly with the problems of unemployment and low capital capacity of the underdeveloped countries, for which he insisted on the employment based on small machine and small capital investment.

XI. Four Pillar State : Decentralization of Power

Lohia, unlike the Communists and the anarchists, considered the existence of the state as inevitable, because, ".... human awareness postulates liberty, liberty involves equality and equality demands the state."¹⁰⁰ So state is an essential component of Lohia's model alongwith liberty, equality and dignity of individual. But Lohia was opposed to the centralised political system, totalitarian state authority and suppression of individual rights including economic centralization. As such, Lohia accepted the "political aims of capitalism -individual freedom, democracy, human rights, constitutional methods and world peace; alongwith economic aims of Marxism-socialisation of all the means of production, abolition

of private property and cession of the oppression and exploitation of man by man." ¹⁰¹

Like Gandhi, Lohia advocated decentralisation of power which, according to him, would infuse new life into administrative limbs, and allow maximum opportunity for the expression of individual needs and experience. He upheld the view that the decentralisation, based on his concept of Four-Pillar State, should be a sure safeguard against the political centralisation, authoritarianism and a guarantee for the practice of real democracy. He suggested the decentralisation of power, as a Four-Pillar State-consisting of village, the Mandal (the district), the Province and the central government. All these 'Pillars' of democracy must have their importance and work in a system of functional federalism. To quote him, "The Four-Pillar state implies the abolition of district magistracy, which represents a notorious concentration of political power. Further more, the district village and city panchayats are to take charge of policies as well as welfare functions." ¹⁰²

Lohia was a strong exponent of decentralised socialism and wanted the participation of common man in the affairs of the country, so that power may not reside alone in centre and the federating units. He wanted to diffuse the same all over the regions where men live. He wanted the Four-Pillars to be recognised as equal majesty and dignity. This is more or less close to his idea of economic decentralisation through small-machine units all over the country and has been extended to the political counterpart, the leviathan state, that must disappear and the 'four pillar' state would take over its place.

According to him, "The four Pillar State is both a legislative as well as an executive arrangements", ¹⁰³ with the power of production, ownership, administration, planning, education and the like. Lohia also clarified this idea saying that, "Several departments, which are at present run by the state Governments for example, those for co-operative societies, rural and agricultural development, a substantial part of irrigation, seeds, revenue collecting and the like, may be transferred to the village and the district. The post of the collector may be abolished and all his functions may be distributed among various bodies in the district." ¹⁰⁴ He also insisted on the principle of election instead of nomination system, and this, he hoped, would encourage the people in public works and democratise and purify the administration, and as

such it would be "..... possible to have a Government of the community, by the community, for the community."¹⁰⁴

Lohia wanted to bring harmony in the Socialist integration of its economic and general aim and to enrich his doctrine of socialism by Gandhiji's ideas. He was ".....clear in his mind that super-imposition of non-violence on socialism or democracy on socialism would be infructuous".¹⁰⁵ In this respect the expression of Mr. Yashiki Hoshino, a Japanese Socialist leader, is important, when he wrote to Lohia, "I knew that Gandhiji had emphatically taught us decentralisation of power. But you are a leader of the Socialist Party so I rather expected that you would express us centralistic ideas. But contrary to my expectations I found that you were a developed successor of Gandhism rather than its antagonist with the European formalistic socialism".¹⁰⁶

Lohia also stated that a master campaign of literacy can also be easily undertaken only in this four pillar state, which, no doubt, would be free from landed and capitalist relationship and ultimately would clear up the entire administrations.

Following Gandhi, Lohia was also of the opinion that decentralised polity would provide full scope for the development of the capabilities and potentialities of the individuals and suggested powers and authority should be dispersed and decentralised among villages, districts and provinces. Such ideas of Lohia also prove his Gandhian leaning that the true ideal of socialism could be achieved only through the Gandhian methods.

XII. Lohia's Idea of a Decent Standard of Living

Lohia's socialism is distinctive in the sense that it was aimed to be fitted into the Indian environment and requirements. Modern civilization is based on science and technology, resulting new inventions of personal happiness and comfort. Human nature, in all over the world is bound with emotional attitudes of rising their standard of living, with the desire of a comfortable home and atmosphere. Lohia, keeping in mind, this human nature and the real condition of India suggested a decent standard of living instead of even increasing standard of living following affluent societies. Because, according to Lohia, the acquisition of standard of living is closely related with the consumption capacity

of the individual or individual income, which is in average very low in India as in other underdeveloped countries. "The modern man is moved by identical objects of increasing national output through mass production and a beautiful home, and wants these ambitions to be placed within the reach of the all, primarily within the national frontiers".¹⁰⁷ Lohia, being fully aware about the poverty and vast population of India, ".....stressed on an economy in which the capital intensity per worker would not be raised upto the American or Russian standards nor would it remain at the low level of India but would rise up sufficiently so as to enable the Indian to live decently".¹⁰⁸

Without following the standards of other countries and hankering after the luxury of the citizens of the developed countries, Lohia emphasised that India should stand "own its on legs" to solve her problems. By this decent standard of living, Lohia wanted to emphasise the change of attitude, since, rising standard of living involves individual income. Lohia, thus explained that the "present level of consumption gets priority in the decent standard of living whereas in the increased standard of living a purely capitalistic attitude of competitive consumption is found".¹⁰⁹ Hence, Lohia rejected the idea of increasing standard of living, and said, "indoctrination into the demand for ever rising standard of living within national frontiers is patently wrong. It leads to frustration when not realised, as in England. Its thunder is stolen by the capitalist, as in the U.S. and it does not answer the Americans' need for peace of mind".¹¹⁰ Lohia, therefore, thought of socialist doctrine which would thrive not alone on misery but also in conditions of comfort and comparative luxury. He discussed in details the nature of the Socialist Parties of European countries and of the United States, which have brought their people up on the 'desire for an ever-increasing standard of living' and suggested that, "They should now venturesomely ask their peoples to help achieve a decent standard of living for everyone in the world, even at the cost of some sacrifice in their own standards. Their peoples will understand..... indoctrination into the demand for ever-rising standards of living within national frontiers is patently wrong. It leads to frustration when not realized....."¹¹¹ and as such, the sharing of what they possess would help in securing international progress and peace, through this decent standard of living. He expected that socialism in Asia and all over the world must increasingly accept this idea "of maximum attainable equality through redistribution of land and social ownership over industry. Its political structure must arise out of the

decentralised state"..... based on small machine technology and "Such a socialism would incline men to seek a decent standard of living instead of enslaving themselves to a desire for an ever-increasing standard of living. They will then be able to attempt a civilisation of peace within and action without".¹¹²

XIII. Lohia's Concept of World Parliament and World Government

Lohia wanted to establish a society of free and equals based on permanent peace. For the establishment of peace throughout the world and to promote economic development, he pleaded for a World Parliament to be composed of on the basis of adult franchise and be reposed with the collective conscience of mankind. This organisation should confine itself relating to the matters of war and peace, with a minimum economic object, and this, according to him, would bring equality among nations and combat tyranny of one nation on another, and "Government of the people, by the people and for the people will be possible for the first time on earth when government of the commune by the commune for the commune on the one hand and Government of mankind by mankind for mankind on the other are brought into existence".¹¹³

Lohia wanted this World Government or the World Political Society to be formed by means of freedom not for any fear of danger but for a given task to be undertaken, in common, i.e., the conquest of freedom. To him, peace could only come through this World Government. To quote Lohia, "Peace can come only via a World Government, and this can come only via a new world views. All those who desire a World Government must aspire to achieve a world view of equality and against class or caste or regional inequalities".¹¹⁴

This world Government, said Lohia, would look and take initiative to help the developing countries to produce faster, and would act an "..... international Pool of capital resources and shall take from each country according to its capacity and give to each according to its need".¹¹⁵ The developing countries would benefit by getting what they need and the developed nations would be helped to conserve their achieved creations and this ".....creation and conservation will be joined together".¹¹⁶ According to him, without a common endeavour of both the developed and underdeveloped nations, no permanent equality or peace could be achieved in the world. He called this as an international

brigade of reconstruction, which in his own words, ".....will throw together men and women of all nationalities into a common effort of reconstruction and peace. National qualities may melt into one another and excess may be cured. From the white world's activity may be shed its strife; from the dark world's poise its sloth. Activity may wed poise, The youth from Africa, America, China, Europe, India, Russia and other lands and continents working together on projects of well-being may create a temper for peace such as the tortured world of today cannot imagine..... this cultural approximation of various races may well prove to be one sure way to pluck the prize of peace the doctrine of coexistence with approximation enforced by a higher world conscience may enable them to coexist, cure their excesses and approximate".¹¹⁷

Lohia was a seeker of freedom, equality and peace-world peace. He thought that without the establishment of peace throughout the world, freedom and equality would become meaningless within a national frontier. He did not believe that the United Nations could be able to maintain peace in the world in its present form of organisation. He argued for the revision of the Charter in this way, ".....the United Nations must be revised in three specific directions so as to end restrictive membership, permanent seats on the security council and the right of veto".¹¹⁸

Thus, for the sake of equality and restoration of peace, Lohia wanted to replace the United Nations by a World Parliament to be formed on the basis of the principles of universality and equality. He visualised this World Parliament to be of two Houses, "It has to be build on the basis of adult franchise for a lower House, and equal number of representatives from among the nations for an upper House",¹¹⁹ but he did not prescribe any detailed functions of the two houses. In fact, equality of man was his main concern and his endeavour against imperialism, colonialism, capitalism has been expressed here in this concept of World Parliament and World Government that would function on mutual assistance and living together.

XIV. Concept of World Development Authority

Lohia's concept of World Government to act as an international pool of capital resource in the world, was further enriched by his concept of World Development Authority, Two way traffic and the theory of total efficiency.

To remove inequalities of economic resources and unjust distribution of wealth, Lohia suggested the formation of the World Development Authority, in which rich countries would contribute the most and take the least.

Lohia was well aware about the world economic position, where some capitalist countries, having sufficient concentrated capital enjoy superior position all over the world while the Asian and other underdeveloped countries suffer from paucity of capital with vast population which according him, should be minimized. Unless and until this gross inequalities of capital resources could be minimized equality in real sense, could not be established. For this reason, he suggested the formation of the World Development Authority which, "could then dispense capital resources, and machinery and skill to all under developed territories ranging from Missourie Valley in the U.S. to practically all of Asia and Africa. The countries that give most would need least, but the give and take must be universally spread so as to symbolize the union of the human race".¹²⁰

To Lohia, political equality was closely related with economic equality and this again, he argued, to be successful only when maximum equalization of the world resources could be done. The World Development Authority, to him, was the means of such equalization of the world resources. Thus, Lohia wanted equality not only within a state but also among the states, on the basis of which a new civilization could be formed based on real equality.

XV. Concept of Two Way Traffic

Lohia, being well conscious about the development of science and technology in industry and about its result in the nature of economic relations in the world, put forward his theory of Two-way-Traffic. Lohia was dissatisfied with the system of economic aid and technical assistance programme of the United Nations and the big powers which according to him, was an one-way traffic,¹²¹ since, it was not only humiliating and dangerous but also inadequate to meet the requirements of the receiving countries. This system of ".....aid definitely corrupts the backward countries and invariably maintains in power the forces of status quo".¹²² Lohia, therefore wanted to change the production system of the retarded people to bring their production at par with the advanced economies of the world, without which, he thought, poverty, rivalries and wars

could not be abolished and the quest of equality would remain beyond reach. For the development of the whole world, he suggested that the developed countries should come forward to help the underdeveloped countries to create minimum wealth in their own way, otherwise, the achieved wealth of the super states, would be impossible to conserve. To Lohia, "To conserve in Europe-America is to create in Africa-Asia".¹²³

Lohia was too worried about the prevalent system of aid and assistance by the developed countries, to the backward countries, which he thought to be harmful in the economic development of the recipient countries, as their economy would be fully dependent on the developed countries and the possibility of indigenous capital and economic growth would be hampered. The result of such foreign aid of one way traffic system, according to Lohia, ".....blessing both the giver and the taker, the petty arrogance of the giver of small charities and corroding jealousy of the taker of pilfered goods will continue to pollute the entire arrangement".¹²⁴ Again to Lohia, such one way system of assistance 'results not in approximation but in imposition', for which, he suggested that there should be voluntary exchange of technological skills and economic aid between the rich and the backward countries through the World Development Authority on the basis of approximation and not in imposition. This system of mutual exchange between the rich and the poor countries for restoration of achieved wealth and creation of wealth respectively, according to Lohia, is the Two way-Traffic system. For the better and even development of the economic structures of the states, this system of two-way traffic should be followed in the world economy, said Lohia. To him "In place of the one way programme of international technical assistance, what the world needs is a two-way traffic in which there is no giver, no taker, where two or more human groups simultaneously learn from and teach one another".¹²⁵

Lohia, thus, visualised a world economic system based on mutual exchange rather than on one-sided aid or assistance in the form of charities, for the development of a new world order based on equality both within the state and among the states.

XVI. Theory of Total Efficiency

Lohia categorically analysed the causes of fall of the civilisations and came to the conclusion that it was due to "...the practice of partial efficiency in the name of total efficiency" that civilizations fall. He argued that the practice of limited efficiency in specific direction by almost every society or civilization, was the main cause of failure of civilization. Further, the practice of maximum efficiency in the name of total efficiency, leads civilization to decline, since, it becomes unable to combat with the internal and external requirements. For this reason, to create a new civilization, Lohia suggested for total efficiency, instead of partial or maximum efficiency. To him, the practice of maximum efficiency is a part of total efficiency and said, "The root cause of all the factors in the fall of civilizations lies in the character of internal as well as external motions of a society that has reached maximum efficiency and can go no further and must, like the monstrous reptiles of nature, fall under its own weight or outside pressure".¹²⁶ Lohia, suggested, willed approximation without the use of force or conquest "through intelligent design try to achieve a multi-coloured harmony of the human race", without causing subjugation of one nation by another.¹²⁷

Lohia, thus suggested a new civilization to be based on total efficiency, keeping in mind the cause of failure of the previous civilizations which were based on partial or maximum efficiency, which, again, was neither full efficiency nor was acceptable to whole world or individual. He said "In order to attain total efficiency, civilization would have to be valid for the whole of mankind and the whole individual. On both these counts, previous civilizations have failed to develop".¹²⁸ Lohia categorically explained the two civilizations led by Atlantic bloc and Soviet bloc, the capitalist and the communist civilizations, both with the hope of establishing civilization on their own principles of competition and equality based on abolition of exploitation, respectively, but failed as either of these two doctrines were fully concerned with total efficiency in respect of the whole mankind or whole individual. As such, neither communism or capitalism is acceptable to the whole mankind, since both of these two doctrines are mainly concerned to serve the driving urges of their own civilizations within their own national frontiers. Both capitalism and communism share some common economic aims, since, communism inherits the capitalist process and forces of production, altering only its relations. According to Lohia, "Mr. Ford and Mr. Stalin share each other's attitudes on mass production and efficiency The

new world must go beyond them both, beyond capitalism and beyond communism, if for no other reason than that the techniques of mass-production are inapplicable to two-thirds of the world. Communism alters alone the capitalist relations of production and seeks to reproduce its forces; socialism must alter them both".¹²⁹

Lohia, thus visualised a new civilization based on the principle of the equalization of world resources and mutual exchange of technological and other aids, among all nations, not on charity. But mutual exchange of their products would reach to the men all over the world, and thus equality, between man and man and among nations, dignity of individual and states should be maintained and peace would automatically take place all over the world, presently full of tension, wars, and mutual distrust.

Lohia's model of new civilization was based on the attainment of world peace for which he thought that the Congress of the Socialist International would ceaselessly work for the attainment of threefold aims, viz, "to remove the sources of conflicts within each nation ".....obtaining social justice by means of Democratic Socialism, to promote "equality of opportunity and national independence", world's wealth should be redistributed, and "to unite the peoples of the free world within a single community based on democracy and social justice".¹³⁰

Lohia's endeavour to establish a new social order based on peace, democracy and social justice, however, was not an automatic result of social or political evolution, for which he suggested some specific duties and functions of the Socialist Party to follow for the establishment of new world, which are as follows:

The socialist Party shall :

- (i) abstain from involvement in the disputes between the Russian and American camps, at the same time assuring the United Nations that Socialist India would in no event assist an aggressor;
- (ii) strengthen the United Nations and its various agencies in all such efforts as might lead to a world of freedom, equality and peace;
- (iii) endeavour to work for the collective security of that region in the world which keeps out of alliances of the Atlantic and Soviet Camps, in particular the belt that stretches from Indonesia to Egypt;

- (iv) strive for friendly relations with all peoples and governments;
- (v) support freedom movements of the yet unfree peoples, in particular those of Africa, and attempt to keep them away from alliances with either camp;
- (vi) seek to revise all treaties and agreements and Charters which have set up on international caste system of rich and powerful nations on the one hand, and of weak and poor nations on the other, and thus establish the principle of equality for all nations;
- (vii) assist in all efforts to join the human race together, politically in a World Parliament, and economically through agencies such as a World Development Corporation and World Food Pool, so as to ensure that every human being, no matter what his country, is, assured of a decent standard of living;
- (viii) extend its support to socialist movements all the world over and to all other popular movements which are striving to combat hunger and war with the weapons of socialism and democracy".¹³¹

Lohia's vision of new civilization was fully concerned with world peace, democracy and socialism based on true equality of all people, irrespective of caste, sex, colour or geographical location. Thus, he became not only a socialist but also a great humanist with a vast knowledge and vision of a new civilization of peace, freedom and equality.

XVII. Lohia's Programme of Reconstruction of India

Lohia, considering the nature of the Indian problem of underdevelopment, suggested a broad programme of Reconstruction of India. In suggesting so, he was well aware about the nature of Indian agriculture, density of population, unemployment, the problem of caste and class and the paucity of capital. The measures to be followed by the Indian people and her Government, for reconstruction, are, according to Dr. V.K. Arora, of four kinds ;

- "(a) The Agrarian Revolution,
- (b) Restrictions on Expenditure and Consumptions,
- (c) The Socio-cultural Approximation of the masses; and
- (d) The 'Third Camp' in World Politics".¹³²

Along with these he also suggested decentralisation of powers based on his concept of 'four-Pillar state' and parity between agricultural and industrial prices. Lohia wanted the peasants to be equipped with organisation and help in building up the new Indian civilisation. "Farmers and land workers have also struggled against evils arising out of ejection, bad harvest, unjust prices, low wages and halted land reforms",¹³³ for which Lohia emphasised the need for organising the peasants of the country and to increase the production utilising the unused lands throughout the country. Lohia was quite aware about the nature and problem of unemployment in India, which according to him, was of two-kinds; — "There are peoples who are completely idle; there are others who have not sufficient work to do, even though employed. Utilisation of idle hours will perhaps be the greatest objective of successful government".¹³⁴ For this reason, he suggested one hour voluntary service every day, in addition to the normal works. He put forward the example of Yugoslavia, whose reconstruction has been done on such voluntary efforts. He calculated that, "if the 4 crores of adults in the country volunteered an hour's labour every day, the tasks accomplished would equal those which the Government of India gets done by a year's budget. Thus, without raising any new taxes, government's budget can be doubled, which would be impossible otherwise."¹³⁵ Lohia, was well aware about the ineffectiveness of traditional ordinary known methods for reconstruction of the country and suggested such novel idea of one hour's voluntary service, which according to him was only possible through socialism, and as such, a sense of communal ownership with achievement of immediate results, could be established.

Lohia, in the Policy Commission of the Praja Socialist Party during November 23-30, 1953, suggested a unique and novel plan of strategy for agrarian reconstruction. This suggestion included, 'reclamation of waste land', 'land to the tiller', Equitable distribution of land with the minimum of 20 bighas per family, organisation of Bhoosena or Food Army and parity between agricultural and industrial prices. Lohia was aware of the fact that in India more than 30% land were not utilised for cultivation and suggested the reclamation of waste land. To destroy the monopoly of landlords, he suggested 'land to the tiller' by immediate decree, on the basis of equitable distribution of land for proper and maximum production. In this respect he was guided by two main aims of improvement of the existing system of cultivation and extension of new farming

land. He suggested the formation of Bhoo Sena or Food Army or Land Army, citing the example of Britain, where nearly four million acres of new land were brought under cultivation in 1942. In India, he hoped, that this army could be able to bring about 100 million acres of new lands under plough, without damaging the necessity of forests and conditions of soil and climate.¹³⁶ This Food Army, according to him was to be clothed and housed by the state with a modest salary, and would take the initiative in bringing more and more new lands under cultivation. This would naturally, help in combating the food problem as well as unemployment of the country and increase the national capital by increasing enthusiasm to other villages and introduction of dynamic elements in the social structure and agricultural economy of our people.¹³⁷ Lohia held the view that on 15th August, 1947, with the hoisting of our National Flag of wheel-tri-colour, "The skeleton of political freedom came but the flesh and blood of economic freedom did not", for which poverty and inequality, unemployment became natural in our land, and he suggested that, "within a year or two of the inception of food army, India will become self-sufficient in food. Again, the spectre of retrenchment and unemployment that hangs over vast number in towns and villages can be laid low by their recruitment into the food army".¹³⁸

Alongwith these, Lohia suggested industrialisation through small-unit Machines and small and medium schemes of irrigation to avoid large investment but to avail large employment scope. In his article 'The Farmer in India', Lohia formulated a Thirteen Point Plan to end the rampant poverty in our country:

1. Minimization of prices on the parity of industrial and agricultural price-basis.
2. Sacrifice to limit the income or salary exceeding Rs. 1000/- per month.
3. Industrialisation through small-scale machines, to be promoted by the state,
4. immediate nationalisation of basic industries and factories running below the capacity, to be undertaken by the state.
5. Independent anti-corruption commissioners to be formed in every state and at the centre.

6. Redivision of lands-12½ acres minimum and 30 acres maximum, and land to the tiller and correction of wrong entries in Patwaris' registers.
7. cultivation of new lands, at least, one crore acres, by the food army.
8. Economic activities including housing programmes to provide full employment.
9. To make success of the idea of four pillar state, decentralisation of administration and of economy.
10. Establishment of Polytechnic schools and high schools and other centres of youth cultural activities.
11. Election on the basis of adult franchise in unrepresented newly merged states and unions.
12. Adoption of positive policy of world peace maintaining full freedom of all nations, economic equality between nations and among peoples.
13. Volunteer groups for agriculture, irrigation, road works etc.¹³⁹

Lohia's plan of reconstruction was accompanied by destruction. Construction of good for the betterment of all and destruction of bad - abolition of castism, nepotism and conflict among the poor classes to be resolved by good constructive idea and methods.

Lohia's novel idea in his agrarian reconstruction, probably lies, in his suggestion of restrictions, on expenditure and consumption. Lohia pointed out that income and expenditure in our country varies from 19 paise (three annas) a day to Rs. 30,000/- a day which indicate a gross inequality in living standard. A large number of masses have to live in starvation while a small group of politicians and big businessmen enjoy luxurious life with modernised facilities. For abolishing these disparities, Lohia suggested alongwith nationalization of key industries, imposition of ceilings on economic holdings, a progressive taxation policy, the difference between income and expenditure should be minimized. To him, "the lowest and highest income or expenditure in this country must keep within the limits of 1 to 10 and no unreasonable allowance or provisions should be allowed to defeat this policy of achieving maximum equality attainable in the present context".¹⁴⁰ He also wanted the abolition of

facilities of ex-rulers and princes, Zamindars etc. He wanted to restrict the upper limit of expenditure at Rs. 1500/- per month, which is, no doubt, a noble addition to the socialist thought of income and expenditure limit, so long existed.¹⁴¹

XVIII . Socio-Cultural Approximation of the Masses

Lohia identified the prevalent caste system to be the main cause of India's degeneration in all respects including economic and spiritual. According to him, the caste system crushes the human spirit and individual freedom of low castes. For this reason, he suggested special opportunity to be provided to the backward classes. He argued that preferential opportunities should be provided to the scheduled castes and other backward sections of the society. Lohia pointed out that the backward class consists of Women, Harijans, Sudras, Adivasis, depressed Muslims, who constitute 90% of the Indian population,¹⁴² and according to him, 90% of the ruling class belong to the High caste who constitute only 10% of the total population. High caste, English education and wealth are the main criteria of India's ruling class.¹⁴³ Therefore, Lohia suggested that preference should be given to these backward class in the matters of land distribution, employment, and educational opportunities.

Lohia was also aware about the communal disturbances and deterioration of the communal situation in the country. The death toll of thousands of lives as a result of communal riots and huge loss of property and untold miseries of the poor sections of both the communities, influenced him to think over the matter for maintaining communal harmony. He thought, there was no easy solution "and that merely repressive or retaliatory methods or appeals to the good sentiments of the hostile communities will not be enough to stop the deterioration or to eradicate the virus of communalism".¹⁴⁴ He stressed the need for educating the toiling masses in the ideology of democratic socialism which would bring them to come out of the communal viruses and religious bigotry. Lohia also emphasised the importance of cultural and personal contacts among them. He understood that without a proper Hindu-Muslim amity our existence as a nation would be threatened.

He suggested cultural inter change to bring the two communities closer to each other and advised the political parties not to exploit the Muslims for

their political purposes.¹⁴⁵ He also suggested intercommunity marriage and dinner and a realistic policy towards Pakistan since the problem of Hindu Muslim amity has become a problem of inter-state relationship. He wanted a confederation with Pakistan on the basis of shared culture and said "If the freedom movement had not remained essentially a movement of the upper castes it might have brought together the masses of the Hindu and Muslim communities and partition might have been avoided".¹⁴⁶ Lohia asked both the communities to leave the communal sentiments and accept the truth and as to quote Madhu Limaye, "He asked the Muslims to look upon Gazni, Ghori and Babar as foreign aggressors, he invited the Hindus to regard Raziya, Shershah, Rahim and Jaisi as blood of their blood, their revered ancestors. Only then he felt, harmony would be established between Hindus and Muslims of this land".¹⁴⁷

XIX. Lohia's Ideas on Education Policy and Indian Educational Reforms

Lohia's programme of reconstruction of India includes a sound system of education for the people to overcome the conflicts in the society, including the superstitions, prevalent in the society. Lohia suggested free, compulsory and uniform education in India. He thought that Indian education policy, following the British model, needs a thorough change of the entire education system. The present system is not at all able to fulfil the requirements of the people. The education system should be completely overhauled and reconstructed. He was of the opinion that education is the most important factor in developing a nation, through spreading literacy and imparting efficient education for all. In his own words, "There is nothing more important than educational and training programmes, an arm of the party which has been so sadly neglected hitherto".¹⁴⁸ He indicated that the main defect of our education system was due to the prevalence of foreign language, i.e. English, which he urged to be replaced by Indian language. He argued that unless and until the peasants, workers and middle class and poors are brought under the education system, no state can improve. He cited the example of Germany and Sweden which ".....have been developed by workers and peasants who have never been to technical colleges or universities, but have off and on been to polytechnics. The people's Universities of these countries also deserve mention".¹⁴⁹ He, therefore, felt the need of opening polytechnics and peoples Universities for the benefit of the peasants,

workers, poors and the downtrodden of the society. He suggested a uniform pattern of primary education through the medium of mother tongue, and education upto the Middle Standard should be free and compulsory and educational facilities should be provided free or cheap at higher stages, particularly to scheduled castes, Tribes and other poorer sections of the society. Free or cheap residential facilities should also be provided to these poorer sections.¹⁵⁰ Lohia was dissatisfied with the education policy of India, which was a continuation of the British Policy, even after the independence. To him education must be able to equip people to solve socio-economic problems of the country. Social disintegration accompanied by centralisation of political power, was the tragic phenomena of our country which could be removed only through a good education policy rooted in the Indian soil. Lohia emphasised on the eradication of ignorance, illiteracy and superstitions from the society, of which a proper education policy with the task of spreading literacy and imparting proper ideas to the masses was necessary.

His most revolutionary suggestion in this respect was that, "Children of Bhangi, Brahmin, Kurmi, Kisan, Prime Minister and President should go to the same school and get the same education" which according to him, "is the first necessary reform for India without which nothing can be done".¹⁵¹ Along with this Lohia proposed that the Primary and Secondary schools must be brought under the control of Municipal or local boards. He also emphasised on the technical and vocational education. To combat the problem of unemployment he suggested the opening of more technical institutes and vocational courses to be introduced along with expansion of agricultural studies. He also emphasised the need for education in the field of social medicine. "The poor are broken down with the worry of disease and the expense of treatment. Government must take up this work , even if with small beginnings. It is also necessary to check the increase in population".¹⁵² Lohia felt the urgent need of the scientific development of the country, which was possible only through a rational and uniform education system. To him the prevalent education system was conducive neither to research nor to technical accomplishment. He, therefore suggested that the scope of Higher education and advanced research should get top priority.

This exclusive system of education suggested by Lohia, is no doubt, fully relevant to the development of a nation like India. It is undoubtedly, what India presently needs, even in this 21st century.

XX. Removal of English

As a part of his educational reforms, Lohia suggested the removal of English, the foreign language, which was out of reach of the general masses of India. Following Gandhi, Lohia was also clear about the fact that political liberation also requires mental and cultural liberation, and pleaded for removal of English as official Language, by Indian language, preferably by Hindi. During independence, English was introduced temporarily for 15 years to be replaced by Hindi and other regional languages, but by the Official Language Act of 1963 and its Amendment Act of 1967, it became a long term policy. To Lohia, replacement of English by state language was "The basic prerequisite for healthy growth of democracy and for reducing socio-economic inequalities."¹⁵³

Lohia understood that so long English should remain the official language of medium of administration and education, higher posts in Government offices and industries should automatically remain reserved for one per cent English knowing people and the remaining 99% people without English knowledge and who hardly earn 19 paise per day, would remain in hunger, unemployed and backward. The labour movement also would remain under the control of the English-knowing minority class and "A Prabhakar More will not be able to lead the Hind Mazdoor Panchayat, nor will a Gulabrao Ganacharya head the AITUC".¹⁵⁴

Lohia, for this reason, started his "Angrezi Hatao Andolan" in 1952, when the ruling Congress and government spokesmen, including some of the opposition parties other than the socialists, was campaigning systematically for retaining English, which was to them only rich language and source of all knowledge, research and progress. Lohia said, "This movement should be based on research and spread of truth. The spreading of truth and facts is the basic need of modern life. But unfortunately truth has become dumb and falsehood talkative, in our times. One to the stranglehold of the mass media a propaganda by the government, big business and newspaper barons, truth and facts have been buried. To come out of this suffocating situation on the language issue Angrezi Hatao Andolan is a step in the right direction."¹⁵⁵

Lohia said that Indian languages are very rich and sound. Indian people should be acquainted with the Indian languages. And it is possible if the regional languages are used in governmental business. He was not an enemy of English

language, but he wanted to develop the Indian languages. He suggested that the socialist party should create public opinion and agitate for :

- " (1) Use of Hindi and Indian languages as medium of administration and education. English may be taught as an optional language like French, Russian etc.
- (2) The proceedings of Parliament, Assemblies etc. must be conducted in Hindi or any one of the Indian languages.
- (3) Public Service Commission examination must be in Hindi or any other Indian language.
- (4) English should not be used for public purposes.¹⁵⁶

English, according to Lohia is not the peoples' language in India, rather, it is an "instrument of minority rule and exploitation, which a minority of 40 or 50 lakh ruling-class Indians are using in order to perpetuate their domination over 40 crores "¹⁵⁷

Lohia, thus, did not want to banish English from the Indian soil, but what he wanted was to abolish the dominating tendencies of English-knowing people, who constitute the elite class in the society. From his deep concern for equality, Lohia wanted to abolish this domination of elitism, led by English-education, and for this he wanted to substitute English by Indian languages so that all the people of Indian society could get the benefit of education and take part in all aspects of the state, including administration.

XXI. Himalayan Policy

Lohia's vast knowledge about the whole of India including her neighbouring zones has been reflected in his book *India, China and Northern Frontiers*, where he analysed his Himalayan Policy and stated, "Neither the snows nor the unscalable heights of the Himalayas can now do sentry duty for India old concepts of foreign and defence policies must change India must evolve a Himalayan Policy, which is both strategic and moral..."¹⁵⁸ He said that Himalayas has two divisions - one Indian and the other fraternal India. Indian Himalaya consists of Indian region including the states of Sikkim and Bhutan, while the fraternal Himalaya consists of the areas of Tibet and Nepal, one third

of whose population is of Indian. The history, cultural aspects, language, religious scripts, way of life, understanding and will of the people of this region show that Tibet has been with India rather than with China. It was unrealistic, rather dangerous, for India to accept the suzerainty of China over Tibet. He "discovered that a village, Mansar, situated some seventy miles north of the Mansarovar Lake (The Mac Mohan Line) gave land revenue to India and its population and other settlement statistics formed part of the Indian census till 1941. This proves that India's frontier lay beyond the line of Kailash-Mansarovar and Sindhu-Brahmaputra and that some other Indian ruler gifted all these territory to Tibet for administration and kept the village of Mansar as a symbol of sovereignty. Further more, no people ever built stories which made its primary gods and goddesses like Siva and Parvati on Kailash resident in a foreign land." ¹⁵⁹

To Lohia, China's suzerainty over Tibet and India's silence, rather support it, was "the first blunder in the whole series of Himalayan disaster", because it has made open the entire Himalayan frontier, which is a great threat to the security of India.

But Nehru, in the name of peace, supported the China's view and suzerainty over Tibet which later on 1962, proved to be short-sighted and defective, on the occasion of Sino-Indian conflict. And this is, no doubt, presently, a great problem in Indian boarder lines with China. Lohia, however, said about its solution, that "contentment to the body and anchor to the mind of those 80 million people alone can provide security to India," and gave some one-party, but non-controversial suggestions :

" A. The division of the people in India into Aryan, Dravidian, and Mangolian should irrevocably be ended ... European scholars have invented these lies to disintegrate India. The Chinese are making use of this lie in order to wean away the emotional layalties of more than one crores of people of the Himalayan India by telling them that they are both brothers or the Mongolian race.

B. In frontiers between India and a Sovereign Tibet may and should have been the Mac Mohan line and that between China and India should be the Manasarovar and East-flowing Brahmaputra and in fact 30 to 40 miles further north, where the land shows a steep fall.... India should ... make it clear that if China chose to make Tibet Sovereign they will not lay claim to Kailash or similar areas.

- C. Such names as Mount Everest or NEFA must be immediately abandoned and in their place the name of Sargamatha or Sagarmatha which have been prevalent throughout the ages as native names of the Everest and Uravasium for NEFA must be put to immediate use.
- D. An integrated economic and population planning for Himalayan India must be put into operation and resources of all India in money as well as in men must be utilized in order particularly to make this whole area lush with orchards.
- E. Responsible government must be introduced in Bhutan, Sikkim and Urvasium, and the peoples of these lands must be enabled to send representatives to the India Parliament,"¹⁶⁰

It is now out of question, how these areas have become a constant areas of tension in not only Indian politics but also in the world politics as a whole.

Lohia's ideas of Indian foreign policy were grounded on his assessment of the interests of the country with the object of preserving freedom of the newly independent countries, with close channels of co-operation with them. He was well aware about the danger of Communist China as an aggressive power, for which he formulated his "Himalayan Policy to preserve the independence of India's neighbours" and he did not overlook the "threat that communist China could present to the non-communist countries of South and South-East Asia. when he talked of Asia Lohia thought mainly of that part of it which had been influenced by Indian civilisation; it was 'Greater India' that was central to his idea of Asia." ¹⁶¹

XXII. Confederation with Pakistan

Lohia, with this view of Asian unity in his mind, suggested a confederation with Pakistan. This idea of confederation is a part of his idea of Hindu-Muslim amity, According to Lohia, partition of India into India and Pakistan, did not solve the problem of Hindu-Muslim amity, and hence the reunion of India-Pakistan at any cost is necessary. To him, it was not important to be a federation or a confederation - where both the states will maintain their separate existence but there will be a common citizenship. Further, it should be made sure that

either the president or the Prime Minister should be a Pakistani, and if they like, their separate administration may remain intact.¹⁶²

To materialise this, he suggested opening of more channels of communications in positive sense, liberalisation of entry and travel between the two countries, resumption of Indo-Pak trade on a permanent basis, means of communications should highlight the positive aspects of various steps leading to a meaningful mutual relations, and frequent free cultural exchanges between the two countries.¹⁶³

Lohia, however, did not recommend a long-term policy of appeasement towards Pakistan. "when the Hindu minorities of East Bengal were being oppressed he demanded police action, and he was opposed to any concessions over Kashmir or Kutch." Lohia was quite clear about the settlement of disputes with Pakistan on the basis of a sub-continental outlook, without allowing any other outside power to interfere in it and "if Pakistan introduced others into the conflicts of the sub-continent India had to resist both Pakistan and these interested friends."¹⁶⁴

Lohia vehemently opposed the partition of India and even after the partition he remained firmly committed to the goal of a confederation. To him, Muslims of India including Pakistan had greater affinity with the Hindus and the Hindus, similarly were related closely with the Muslims. For this, he urged, "to achieve the common nationhood and secular democracy of Hindus and Muslims is equally a necessity of the Indian Republic."¹⁶⁵

Thus Lohia wanted the Hindu-Muslim amity of both India and Pakistan for the greater interest of the sub-continent, which presently, has become a source of permanent conflict. Lohia's denial of a third power in resolving the conflict between India and Pakistan is relevant even today.

XXIII. Lohia's Leadership : Situating Lohia in the Proper Perspective

Lohia, thus, has contributed a lot in the theoretical content of socialism, on the basis of his vast knowledge of Indian society, and other backward countries of Asia. Lohia was also a great nationalist, with the aim of establishing socialism and nationalism in India. He stressed the need for establishing 'Peoples' Raj',

abolishing the distinction of caste, creed or colour. He was not only concerned with India but the whole mankind and its equality was in his mind. He formulated some immediate tasks to be undertaken by the government and people for making socialism a reality. At the same time, he formulated a broad foreign policy for the same purpose. He played an important role in shaping the emerging foreign policy of the Congress. "It was in the office of the A.I.C.C. in 1939 that he first formulated his idea of a Third Camp in international affairs at a time when the Congress was faced with the dilemma of how to support the British Government in its war effort and at the same time, achieve Indian independence".¹⁶⁶

Lohia was opposed to India's participation in the war. To him, it appeared that both the blocs were preparing for waging an imperial war for their own interests but the poor countries would derive no benefit out of it. When war actually became inevitable, Lohia suggested four point programme - to oppose military recruitment, to organise movement in the princely states, to organise the porters against loading and unloading the war materials and to refuse payment of war taxes and contribute to the war loans.¹⁶⁷ He thus pleaded for a Third Camp for India to remain out of both the blocs.

In fact, the war was between fascism and imperialism, and both fascism and imperialism are equally dangerous to democracy, socialism and national liberation. Dr. Lohia, for this reason, suggested his idea of Third Camp and clearly announced "I am both an anti-imperialist and a socialist. I know it is absurd to say this. A socialist must also be an anti-imperialist. And yet it is necessary for me to claim may two faiths separately, for now-a-day there are socialists who are suppressing the struggle against imperialism"¹⁶⁸ His great dissatisfaction with both the socialist camp led by Soviet Russia and the democratic imperialist camp led by United States of America and Britain, led him to advocate the policy of a Third Camp for India.

During 1948-'55, "Lohia was the principal spokesman of the socialists on foreign affairs and played a principal part in the formation of the Asian Socialist Conference".¹⁶⁹ Lohia realised the need of a separate forum of Asian socialists. Indian Socialists took the advantage of contacting with the socialists of Indonesia, Burma, and other Asian countries who took part in the Asian Relations Conference, held in New Delhi, in 1947. Narendra Deva elaborating this idea said, "The Socialist Parties of such Asian countries as are today fighting

for their independence must assemble together. It will give mutual encouragement and strength to one another. The interests of the parties in such a convention will not be mutually contradictory nor will anyone of these parties be able to suppress other parties. Only such elements should be called to this conference whose interests and objects are similar, who share a common ideology, and who are prepared to accord one another the status of equality".¹⁷⁰

Lohia took the main initiative in materializing the idea of Asian Socialist Conference, and he tried almost six years and travelled to Egypt, Lebanon, Israel, Burma, Indonesia and other countries, and said that after independence of these countries, the world is confronted with the hostility of democratic and socialist blocs - replacement of imperialism and fascism and categorically rejected the idea of joining the either blocs and pronounced equal irrelevance of both the blocs and urged to maintain a Third Camp. His utmost efforts were succeeded in reaching an agreement on 25th March, 1952 with the Burmese and Indonesian Socialists to form the Asian Socialist Conference and declared the following joint statement :

"Socialism and socialist movement started in the western world as a logical consequence and opponent of capitalism;

"Capitalism based on the profit motive gave birth to imperialism and colonialism. It has not been able to provide the means for the emancipation of the masses. It is a form of the exploitation of man by man.

"Cominform Communism denies in practice dignity and equality of man.

"Its views and convictions cannot be separated from the position of Soviet Russia, which it regards as its bulwark. Cominformists are essentially, merely the vanguards, observers and informers of Soviet Russia.

"In the cominform countries there exists a dictatorship of the cominform partis, employing methods of terror of the secret police, which is also felt in the sphere of production.

"For these reasons, the Asian Socialist Parties reject both capitalism and cominform communism".¹⁷¹

The statement further affirmed the Asian Socialists' belief in "planned production for use of society and not for profit of a few", "Social justice",

"nationalised" and "cooperative" sectors of economy, "democratic rights of the people", permission to "opposition political parties" to operate freely, a "democratic administrative machinery as opposed to bureaucratic administrative machinery" and "international cooperation and peace based on justice".¹⁷²

This statement categorically indicates the bitterness of the Asian Socialists against Soviet Russia and its local instruments, and emphasised the need for complete emancipation of the broad Asian masses.

The first Asian Socialist Conference was held in Rangoon on January 6-15, 1953. However, Lohia did not attend the same. He attended the Hyderabad (August/1953) and Kalaw (Burma - May/1954) meetings of the Bureau of the Asian Socialist Conference. At Kalaw, the conflict in outlook came to the open and Lohia was in difference of opinion with U. Kyaw Nyein, the treasurer of the Asian Socialist Conference and Chairman of the Anti-Colonial Bureau. Lohia clearly warned the Asian Socialists to remain aloof from both the capitalism and Soviet socialism though he agreed with U. Kyaw Nyein that Soviet imperialism was ruthless and blatant, but he denied any comparison, which ultimately lead to a choice of lesser evil. He said, there should be no such choice or preference, rather the Asian Socialists must equally reject both these two types - Soviet and democratic imperialism and said, "Socialists (of Asia) may also remember that only to the extent that they intensify their struggle against Capitalism will it be possible for them to combat communism."¹⁷³

The result of such debate and difference of opinion was the split in the Indian Socialist Party and the Kalaw meeting was the last of the Asian Socialist Conference, attended by Dr. Lohia. Here, the basic character of Lohia, i.e. rigidity and uncompromising attitude have become clear, which throughout his political career led him to shift from one organisation to another. But his ultimate concern remained the same, the upliftment of the downtrodden and the poorer section of the society, based on equality and human dignity.

To quote Prem Bhasin, "..... the words he (Lohia) had spoken at Kalaw are as true and relevant today, in national as well as international sphere, as they were when they were spoken."¹⁷⁴

Lohia, thus, did not remain confined to any national boundary rather fought throughout his life for the upliftment of the downtrodden of the world. He, "....

was always concerned with the miseries, agonies and travails of the downtrodden in this country and who also showed the way, through which the common men could come out of his morass."¹⁷⁵

As a nationalist leader and anti-imperialist, Lohia started his activities since his school days, by organising strike on the death of Tilak and joining the non-cooperation movement leaving school. However, his real political activities started only after his return from Berlin and joining Congress Socialist Party in 1934. During the Second World War, Lohia disagreed with the Congress leadership on the question of assisting the Allies. He was in favour of launching an all round fight against the British for independence and thought that was the magnificent opportunity to free India. Such an anti-British role of Lohia forced him imprisonment for several times. To quote G.S. Bhargava, " He has perhaps the highest number of jail sentences to his credit."¹⁷⁶

R.A. Prasad has mentioned that the number of arrests Lohia courted in his life may " wonder even a veteran anarchist had courted as many arrests as Lohia did. Arrests for not less than twenty times in a period of thirty years by the British, Portuguese, Nepalese and the Indian Governments...." ¹⁷⁷ He was not afraid of the agony of jail life but he was worried about "..... the tyrannical ways of the curtailment of liberty, especially civil liberty, that tormented him." ¹⁷⁸ Such was his belief on liberty that agony of jail life could not prevent him from his mission.

During Quit India movement, when all prominent leaders of the Congress were either arrested or were underground, "Dr. Lohia played a great part. He was the instrument and the inspiration behind the underground radio which functioned from Bombay." ¹⁷⁹ He, in fact, established underground radio transmitting stations at Bombay and Calcutta from where he led the struggle during this time. "His secret bulletins and open letters to Governor General Linlithgow and the U.P. Governor. Hallet have become classics. After 15 months of underground struggle he was caught and detained in Lahore jail," which to him, was a "Torture Camp" about which he wrote a letter to Prof. Laski in England.¹⁸⁰ He also participated with Jaya Prakash Narayan in his 'Azad Dasta', a guerilla force to combat the British Imperialism.¹⁸¹

As a leader of the Congress Socialist Party, Lohia played an important role in formulating its plans and programmes alongwith Narendra Deva and Jaya

Prakash Narayan. He helped and participated in the Goan's agitation for freedom and Nepalese struggle against Ranas. "His Goa liberation movement, not withstanding the lack of support from the Congress, reached a climax of popularity rarely touched by non-Gandhian struggles. He succeeded in submerging the linguistic and religious diversities among the Goans for liberation from foreign yoke".¹⁸² Again, "Lohia championed their cause (Nepalese and Goans). He visited Goa, defied Portuguese law, courted arrest, and thus taught the Goans the Gandhian technique of fighting the alien rulers. It was largely due to his efforts that the 'Nepali National Congress' could be formed and the autocracy of the Ranas was smashed in Nepal".¹⁸³ His influence and activities were so much effective in Goa that "18 June, 1946, the date of his arrest is celebrated as the liberation day in Goa".¹⁸⁴

This was Lohia, who never hesitated in initiating the moves for the troubles of the people, anywhere in the country or outside, taking the risk of imprisonment or other punishment, which according to G.S. Bhargava was "the natural gift of a stormy petrel" in him.

Lohia, thus, was a great patriotic leader with clear conception of ideologies, including Marxism, Gandhism, Capitalism, imperialism and with an open mind of regenerating the poor people including workers, peasants and backward sections of the society. He had good ideas of Indian history, culture and socio-economic conditions of India and all other underdeveloped countries of Asia on the basis of which he formulated his ideas of new civilization. As a socialist leader, his theoretical contribution to socialism is also remarkable. He visualised a new civilization based on human rights, equality of man and women, irrespective of caste, class or colour and with a sound positive theory of both internal reconstruction and external fraternal relation with neighbouring countries. This civilization, he wanted to be based on small-scale technology and agrarian reformation, based on redistribution of land and increasing the cultivable land, increasing the standard of the people of villages and backward classes, modernization of administrative system, with reasonable ceiling of income and expenditure, abolition of inhuman caste-system and with a broad outlook of extending support to improve the downtrodden both economically, socially and educationally. Such was his broad outlook, with a vast knowledge of international political atmosphere as well as an in-depth knowledge of the Indian society in general. Lohia was the first and probably the only Indian socialist who contributed

a lot to the theoretical content of socialism, with an in-depth analysis of Marxism, Capitalism, Communism and Gandhism. He, though shared the views of dialectics of Marx, but wanted to fit the same in the particular situation of India and third world countries with the basic idea of Gandhian techniques of non-violent civil disobedience. He not only remained as a theoretical socialist but he actively participated to materialise his thinking both in the pre-and after independence period.

He wanted feudalism to be abolished throughout the country including Sikkim and ceaselessly worked for the establishment of democracy in its true sense of the term, both economic and political. He started his political career as a Congress Socialist but formed new parties one after another. In 1946, he was offered the Secretaryship of the National Congress. But his ideas of freedom and equality, forced him to place some conditions, which included that neither the Congress President should become the Prime Minister nor any member of its working committee, a union or state minister and the Congress organisation should have the right to criticise its own government,¹⁸⁵ which was not acceptable by the then Congress leadership. Recently, the demand of 'one man one post' in the Congress, is probably another modified form of what Lohia demanded.

Ultimately, the Socialists came out of the Congress and formed the Socialist Party in 1948.

Nehru was regarded as a leader of the Congress Socialists. Lohia also admitted this. But afterwards, particularly, after independence, Lohia became the main critique of Nehru and his Government. Nehru was the exponent of the thought that in India, only planned mixed economy could be fruitful than the other two streams of thought prevalent in India, i.e. the Marxian approach of community control of means of production under proletarian leadership, and the other, by changing the heart of the people, the Gandhian model of socio-economic equality. Acharya Narendra Deva was the chief exponent of the first category and Jayprakash Narayan in his early life was its supporter, though later he changed his views and became Gandhian in changing the heart of the people for the establishment of a better society. But Lohia was, from the very beginning of his political career, convinced of the irrelevance of both Marxian approach and extreme Gandhian model not only in this country but in Asian countries as a whole, since the main characteristics of this region 'is too many people, too

little land and too few forces of production' with a small capital. Regarding change of heart, he said that it implies love but love alone is not sufficient for socio-economic transformation, it also requires anger. Love for all and anger against injustice, jointly can bring success in the development of human society. Regarding mixed economy, he was of the opinion that the existence of private property is never in accordance with the socialist principles since, private property is the source of all economic inequalities in the society. And hence, he said, "socialism must irrevocably reject all doctrines of restricted capitalism and mixed economy."¹⁸⁶

While Nehru, including some other socialists emphasised on the need of foreign aid for capital formation and increase of production, Lohia insisted on the equality of consumption, imposing ceiling on income and expenditure, with the idea that foreign aid is a diplomacy of the developed countries to perpetuate their vested interests in the guise of aid. He, therefore, insisted on restrictions of consumption, which, according to him, would lead to indigenous capital formation.

Regarding foreign policy, Lohia suggested some specific guidelines, formation of Indo-Pak confederation, a positive relation with China-both of cooperation and confrontation where necessary, and his stand of third camp is nothing but an alternative to non-alignments. He thought that India was never non-aligned at all. Lohia, in the early thirties formulated his independent foreign policy and " ... the two basic concepts of non-alignment and equal irrelevance had been worked out by him as early as 1938-39."¹⁸⁷

Lohia was much closer, in outlook, to Gandhi than Nehru. Nehru was in support of heavy machine technology and industrialisation, while Lohia, like Gandhi insisted on small-unit machine for absorbing the huge unemployed people of the country. Nehru was an internationalist with the influences of Fabian ideology and British Labour Party, and on the other hand, Lohia formulated his ideas mainly based on the conditions of the people surrounding him. But Lohia was not a narrow nationalist at all, he had also broad interest on mankind as a whole. He wanted to emancipate the poor, the downtrodden, the weaker section of the society and through their development, he wanted to establish a real society of equals all over the world. To quote Dr. V.K. Arora, "He is not in the company of those Indian Socialists who often talk airily about human freedom, equality

and man's future without concretising their meaning in terms of the actual conditions in which millions of their country men, poor, backward and illiterate, live."¹⁸⁸

Lohia, thus, was a true leader of the poor and downtrodden, their upliftment and establishment of equality was his main aim. His motto was, to quote Madhu Limaye, "Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam," "all human race was his family".¹⁸⁹ His method was peaceful Gandhian method but was not a blind follower of Gandhi. He criticised both Gandhism and Marxism and wanted to make a synthesis between these two, for which Usha Mehta has rightly remarked, " ... Lohia was a Gandhian among revolutionaries and a revolutionary among Gandhians."¹⁹⁰

Lohia, as a parliamentarian also established his able leadership qualities. In 1963, he was elected to the Lok Sabha from Farrukhabad constituency and from the very beginning of his life as a parliamentarian, he became the most impressive and uncompromising critic of governmental policy. Before him, Parliament did not see such an unrelenting opponent of the ruling party for which he became the unofficial leader of the opposition in the Lok Sabha.¹⁹¹

Notes and References

1. Lohia's Speech at Panchamari, May, 1952, in Rammonohar Lohia - *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism*, Navahind, Hyderabad, 1963, p - 364.
2. Madhu Limaye-**Evolution of Socialist Policy**, Hyderabad, 1952, P - 1,
Also, John Patrick Haitcox - **Communism and Nationalism in India**,
Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1971, *Pibid*.p - 219. and
Thomas A. Rusch - **Dynamics of Socialist leadership in India** in Richard
L. Part & Irene Tinker (ed.) - **Leadership and Political Institutions in
India**, Oxford University Press, 1960, Indian Reprint -p - 189.

Also - Sibnarayan Ray - **Socialism in India** - in S.P. Aiyar & R. Srinivasan
(ed.) - **Studies in Indian Democracy** - Allied Publishers Pvt. Ltd. 1965.
PP - 43 - 49.
3. C.P. Bhambri - **Political Process in India**, 1947 - 1991, Vikas Publishing
House Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, P - 59.
4. G.S. Bhargava-**Leaders of the Left**-Meherally Book Club, Bombay, 1951,
P-41.
5. K. Gopinathan Pillai - **Political Philosophy of Rammonohar Lohia :
Alternative Development Perceptions**, Deep & Deep Publication - New
Delhi, 1994, p.64.
6. Prakash C. Shastri - **Socialist Thought in India - With Special
Reference to Lohia's Quest for Indigenous Socialism** - Print well
Publishers, Jaipur 1985, pp.4-6.
7. Lohia classified this span of time as follows : from 1934 to 47 - 48, the
period of 'Spice Ages or 'Ginger Age', from 1947 - 48 to '51 the period of
'Big Noise', from 1951 to '55, the period of 'Great Indecisions and the
period beyond 1956 as of 'Revolutionary Socialism" - Ramanohar Lohia-
Samajvadi Andolan Ka Itihas, Hyderabad, 1969, pp.1-3, cited in *Karuna
Kaushik - Russian Revolution (1917) & Indian Nationalism, Studies
of Lajpat Rai, Subhas Chandra Bose and Rammonohar Lohia* -
Chanakya Publications, Delhi - 1984 pp.219 & 150.
8. Karuna Kaushik-*Ibid*. pp.156 - 157.

9. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, Navahind, Hyderabad, 1963, p.297.
10. Rammanohar Lohia - **The Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism**, Speech at Panchamari, May, 1952, in Rammanohar Lohia - **Aspects of Socialist Policy** A Socialist Party Publication, Bombay, 1952, p.33.
11. Rammanohar Lohia - **Fragments of a World Mind**, Maitrayani, Calcutta, 1951, p.11.
12. Rammonohar Lohia - **Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism** *op.cit.* p.36.
13. *Ibid.* p.44.
14. *Ibid.* pp.49,34,35.
15. *Ibid.* p. 40.
16. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism** - *op.cit.* p.111.
17. *Ibid.* p.31 & p.365.
Also - Prakash ChandraShastri - **Socialist Thought in India - with special reference to Lohia's Quest for Indigenous Socialism**, Printwell Publisher, Jaipur, 1985, pp.80 - 81.
18. Rammanohar Lohia - **Wheel of History**, Navahind, Hyderabad, 1955.
Reprint 1963, P - 17.
19. Dr. V.K. Arora - **Rammanohar Lohia And Socialism in India**, Deep & Deep Publications, New Delhi - 1984, P - 51,
Also - Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi, and Socialism**, *op.cit.* p.258.
20. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, *op.cit.* p.17.
Also - Dr.V.K. Arora - *Ibid.* p.53.
21. Rammonohar Lohia - *Ibid.* p.25 & p.101
Also quoted in Dr. V.K. Arora - *Ibid.* p.53.
22. Rammanohar Lohia - *Ibid.* p.1
23. Rammanohar Lohia - *Congress Foreign Policy* - in Anandabazar Patrika, Dec./27, 1936, P - 25. quoted in Karuna Kaushik - *op. cit.* p.159.
24. Dr. V.K. Arora - *op.cit.* p.46.
Also, Karuna Kaushik - *op.cit.* p.159.

25. Chitrita Chaudhari, **Rammanohar Lohia and the Indian Socialist Thought**, Minerva Associates Pub. Pvt. Ltd. Calcutta, 1993. p.107.
26. Dr. Nanak Chand Mehrotra - **The Indian Socialist Thinking - From Dayananda to J.P.**, M.N. Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 1986.p.178.
27. Rammanohar Lohia - **Interval During Politics** - Hyderabad, NavaHind Publication 1963 - P - 284, quoted in Chandradeo Prasad - **Political Ideas of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia**, Janaki Prakashan, Patna & Delhi, 1989, p.111.
28. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, *op. cit.* p.123. also, Also - Lohia, - **Gandhi and Socialism**, Mankind, vol. 4, March, 1960, p.44.
30. Lohia - **Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism**, in Rammanohar Lohia, **Aspects of Socialist Policy** A Socialist Party Publication, Bombay, 1952, P - 58.
31. *Ibid.* p.57.
32. *Ibid.* p.57.
33. *Ibid.* pp.60.
34. *Ibid.* p.72.
35. Rammanohar Lohia - **Fragments of a World Mind**, Maitrayani, Calcutta, 1951, p.70
36. Dr. V.K. Arora - *op cit.* p.57.
37. Rammanohar Lohia - **Fragments of a World Mind**, Maitrayani, Calcutta, 1951, p.70.
38. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, *op. cit.* p.119.
39. *Ibid*, p.99.
40. Rammanohar Lohia - **Samajvadi Andolan Ka Itihas** (Hindi), Hyderabad, 1969, pp.58-59, quoted in Dr. V.K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.58.
41. *Ibid.* p.137 in Dr. V.K. Arora-*Ibid.* p.59.
42. Dr. V.K. Arora, *Ibid.* p.59.

43. "Nowadays Gandhism is expressing itself into its two shoots, Governmental and monastic. The Governmental wing is in majority today and its leader is Nehru. The Leader of monastic wing is Vinoba Bhave. But there is also a Third Wing, the heretic Gandhians, - that is, persons like me", - says Rammanohar Lohia in-Sarkari, Mathi Aur Kujat Gandhivadi, Hyderabad, 1963, p.1, quoted in Dr. V.K. Arora, *op. cit.* p-62.

Prakash C. Shastri, on the other hand, has mentioned that Jawaharlal Nehru was 'the Political successor' to Mahatma Gandhi, while Vinoba Bhave was known as the "Spiritual Successor" to Mahatma.

Prakash C. Shastri - *op. cit.* p.82.

44. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, *op. cit.* p.324.
Also, Lohia - **Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism in his Aspects of Socialist Policy**, *op. cit.* p.33.
45. M. Arumugam - **Socialist Thought in India - The contribution of Rammanohar Lohia**. Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, 1978.p.73.
46. Rammanohar Lohia - **India, China and Northern Frontiers** - Navahind, Hyderabad, 1963, pp.152 - 153.
47. Dr. V.K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.116.
48. *Ibid.*
49. Mankind - vol. x : 6 (Nov. 1966) P - 20. quoted in Dr. V.K. Arora- *op. cit.* p.117.
50. Harris Wofford (Jr.), **Dr. Lohia and America Meet** - Madras, Snehalata Rama Reddy - Madras, 1961, pp - 51 - 52. quoted in Dr. V.K. Arora. *op. cit.* p.117.
51. *Ibid.* p.52.
52. Rammanohar Lohia - **Antagonism in Capitalism** - in his - **Aspects of Socialist Policy**, A Socialist Party Publications, Bombay, 1952 - p.34.
53. *Ibid.* p.35.
54. *Ibid.* p.35.
55. Rammanohar Lohia - **Limitations of Communism** - in his **Aspects of Socialist Policy** - *op. cit.* p.36.

56. *Ibid.* p.36.
57. *Ibid.* p.37
58. Jagdish Jashi - **Marx and Lohia : The socialist Path**, in Janata -Dr. Lohia Death Anniversary Number, vol. XXVII, No. 38 & 39, October, 15, 1972, p.13.
59. Gopal Krishna - **Rammanohar Lohia : An Appreciation** - Economic and Political Weekly, Special number, July, 1968, p.1109.
60. Rammanohar Lohia - **Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism, in his Aspects of Socialist Policy** - *op. cit.* pp.39 - 40.
61. *Ibid.* p.46
62. *Ibid.* p.47.
63. *Ibid.* p.47
64. *Ibid.* p.53
65. According to Lohia, " A fancy opposition has ben allowed to grow between Satyagraha and class struggle. There is in fact no such opposition and genuine class struggle is civil disobedience" - *Ibid.* p.57.
66. G.S. Bhargava - *op. cit.* 43.
Also, Rammanohar Lohia - **Fragments of a World Mind**, p.8, quoted in Dr. N.C. Mehrotra - **Indian Socialist Thinking - From Dayananda to J.P.** *op. cit.* p.179.

Also, Rammanohar Lohia - **Foreign Policy**, Aligarh, Dwadash Shreni Private Ltd. 1963, P - 49, quoted in - Chandradeo Prasad - **Political Ideas of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia**, Janaki Prakashan, Patna, 1989, P - 114
67. Rammanohar Lohia - **Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism**, *op. cit.* p.34.
68. *Ibid.* p.40
69. *Ibid.* p.36.
70. *Ibid.* p.67.
71. Dr. N. C. Mehrotra - **Indian Socialist Thinking** etc. *op. cit.* p.183,
Also Dr. V.K. Arora - *op. cit.* p. 64.
72. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, *op. cit.* p.347.

73. R.A. Prasad - **Socialist Thought in Modern India**, Meenakshi Prakashan, Meerut, 1974, p.130.
74. Krishnanath - **Conserving A Clut of Lohiaism** - in Janata, Dr. Lohia Death Anniversary Number vol. xxviii, No. 38 & 39, 1972, p. 10.
75. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism** - *op. cit.* p.227.
76. R.A. Prasad, *op. cit.* p.130.
77. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, *op. cit.* p.222
78. Dr. V.K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.65.
79. Chandradeo Prasad - *op. cit.* p.79.
80. Dr. V. K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.65.
81. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, *op. cit.* p.531.
Also, C. Prasad - *op. cit.* p.80
Also, Dr. V.K. Arora- *op. cit.* p. 65
82. Chandradeo Prasad - *op. cit.* p.80.
83. Dr. V.K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.66
84. Rammanohar Lohia - **Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism** -*op. cit.* p.61.
85. Chandradeo Prasad, *op. cit.* pp.92 - 93.
86. Dr. V.K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.67.
87. V. P. Varma - **Modern Indian Political Thought**. Educational Publishers, Agra, 1980. p.529.
88. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, *op. cit.* p.- xxxiii.
89. *Ibid.*p. xxxvii.
90. Dr. V.K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.69.
91. Jagdish Joshi - **Marx and Lohia - The Socialist Path**, in Janata - Dr. Lohia Death Anniversary Number, *op. cit.* p.14.
92. Rammanohar Lohia - '**Equality and Prosperity**', published in Mankind, vol.x, No. 7. December, 1966, pp. 4-5, quoted in Chandradeo Prasad, *op. cit.* pp. -103-104.
93. Rammanohar Lohia - **Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism**, *op. cit.* p. 38.
94. Dr. V. K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.71.

95. Rammanohar Lohia - **Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism** - *op. cit.* p.38.
96. *Ibid.* p.37.
97. *Ibid.* pp.37-38.
98. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism** - *op. cit.* p.110
99. *Ibid.* p.326.
100. Chandradeo Prasad, *op. cit.* p.106.
101. *Ibid.* p.113
102. Rammanohar Lohia - **Will to Power and other writings** - Hyderabad, Navahind Publications, 1956, p-137, quoted in V.P. Varma, *op. cit.* p. 529.
103. Dr. V.K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.75.
Also, M. Arumugam - *op. cit.* p.114
104. M. Arumugam - *op. cit.* P - 113.
105. *Ibid*, p.113.
106. Produced in Janata, Vol. VI, No. 36, October, 7, 1951, quoted in M. Arumugam, *op. cit.* p.13.
107. Dr. V.K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.77.
108. Karuna Kaushik - **Russian Revolution (1917) & Indian Nationalism - Studies of Lajpat Rai Subhas Chandra Bose and Rammanohar Lohia**, Chanakya Publications, Delhi - 1984, p.164.
109. Dr. V.K. Arora *op. cit.* pp.77 - 78.
110. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, *op. cit.* p.339.
Also - quoted in Dr. V.K. Arora - *op. cit.* p.78.
111. S.R. Bakshi - **Rammanohar Lohia - His Political Ideology** (Indian Freedom Fighters Series - 29), Anmol Publications, New Delhi, 1992, p.21.
112. *Ibid.* p.162.
113. Rammanohar Lohia - **Wheel of History**, P - 61, quoted in Dr. V.K. Arora, *op. cit.* p.79.
114. Rammanohar Lohia - **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism** - *op. cit.* p.287.

115. Rammanohar Lohia - **Wheel of History**, p.62, quoted in Dr. V.K. Arora, *op. cit.* p.79.
116. Rammanohar Lohia - **Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism**, in his **Aspects of Socialist Policy**, *op. cit.* p.49.
117. *Ibid.* p.49.
118. Rammanohar Lohia - **Will to Power and other Writings**, Hyderabad, Navahind Publications, 1950, P - 80.
119. Harris Wofford, Jr. - **Lohia and America Meet**, Madras, Snehalata Ram Reedy, p-144, quoted in Chandradeo Prasad, *op. cit.* p.217.
120. Rammanohar Lohia - **Wheel of History**, Hyderabad, Navahind, Prakashan, 1963, p. 62.
121. *Ibid.* p.64.
122. Chandradeo Prasad, *op. cit.* p.224.
123. Rammanohar Lohia - **Wheel of History**, *op. cit.* p.63.
Also, quoted in Chandradeo Prasad, *op. cit.* p.225.
124. *Ibid.*
125. *Ibid.* p.64.
126. Rammanohar Lohia - **Wheel of History**, *op. cit.* pp. 46-47.
Also cited in Chandradeo Prasad. *op. cit.* pp.241-242.
127. *Ibid.* p.55.
128. *Ibid.* p.78.
129. Rammanohar Lohia — **The Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism** in his **Aspects of Socialist Policy**, *op. cit.* pp. 39-40.
Also in his **Marx, Gandhi and Socialism**, *op. cit.* p.328.
130. P.S.P. Office Publication in 'Janata' August, 12, 1951. Quated in Chandradeo Prasad, *op. cit.* p.248.
131. Rammanohar Lohia — **Marx Gandhi and Socialism**, *op. cit.* pp.244-245.
Also qoted in Chandradeo Prasad, *op. cit.* p.249-250.
132. Dr. V. K. Arora — *op. cit.* p.91.
133. S. R. Bakshi — *op. cit.* p.52.

134. *Ibid*, p. 78.
135. *Ibid*.
136. *Ibid*. p. 55.
137. Rammanohar Lohia — **Fragments of a World Mind**, Maitrayani, Calcutta, 1951. p. 59.
Also in S.R. Bakshi. *op. cit.* pp.53 & 56.
138. S.R. Bakshi - *op. cit.* pp. 53 & 56.
139. Rammanohar Lohia — **Fragments of a World Mind** - *op. cit.* pp. 79.80.
Also - cited in V.P. Varma — **Modern Indian Political Thought**, Agra, 1980, pp. 5229-530.
Also in S.R. Bakshi. *op. cit.* pp.76-77.
140. Dr. V. K. Arora. *op. cit.* p.97.
141. Rammanohar Lohia — **The Caste System**, Hyderabad, Navahind Prakashan, 1964, p. 116.
142. Dr. V. K. Arora — *op. cit.* p.101.
143. *Ibid*.
144. S.R. Bakshi — *op. cit.* p.49.
145. Rammanohar Lohia — **India, China and Northern Frontiers**, Navahind Prakashan, Hyderabad, 1963. p.44.
146. Gopal Krishna — **Rammanohar Lohia : An Appreciation**, Economic and Political Weekly, Spl. No. July 1968, p. 1111.
147. Madhu Limaye — **A Tribute To Rammanohar Lohia** — in M. Arumugam, *op. cit.* p. XV.
148. Rammanohar Lohia — **The Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism** - *op. cit.* pp.61-62.
149. S.R. Bakshi — *op. cit.* p.80.
150. Rammanohar Lohia — **Marx, Gandhi and Socialim**, *op. cit.* p.504.
151. *Ibid*. p.504.
152. S. R. Bakshi — *op. cit.* pp.80-81.

153. Tulsi Boda — **Dr. Lohia - Angrezi Hatao**, in Janata, Dr. Lohia Death Anniversary Number, *op. cit.* p.21.
154. *Ibid*, p. 21.
155. *Ibid*,
156. *Ibid*, p. 22.
157. Rammanohar Lohia — **Language**, Hyderabad, Navahind Prakashan, 1966, p.44, quoted in Dr.V.K. Arora. *op. cit.* p. 105.
158. Rammanohar Lohia — **India, China and Northern Frontiers**, Navahind Prakashan, Hyderabad, 1963, pp.4-5.
Also quoted in Dr. V. K. Arora. *op. cit.* p.118.
159. *Ibid.* p. 212.
160. *Ibid.* pp. 24-26.
Quoted in Dr. V. K. Arora, *op. cit.* pp. 119-120.
161. Article by Gopal Krishna — **Rammanhoar Lohia. An Appreciation**, *op. cit.* p.1111. EPW.
162. Rammanhoar Lohia — **Kutch, Confederation or War - Mankind**, May, 1968,p. 38, cited in Dr.V.K. Arora. *op. cit.* p.122.
163. *Ibid.*
164. Gopal Krishna — *op. cit.* p.1111.
165. *Ibid.*
166. Hari Kishore Singh — **The Rise and Secession of The Congress Socialist Party of India 1934-48**, *op. cit.* p.131.
167. R. A. Prasad - *op. cit.* p.127.
168. Congress Socialist, 2.4.1938, quoted in Prem Bhasin — **Dr. Lohia and Asian Socialism**, Janata, Dr. Lohia Death Anniversary Number, Vol. XXVII. No. 38 & 39. Oct. 15, 1972, p. 9.
169. Hari Kishore Singh, *op. cit.* p.132.
170. Quoted in Prem Bhasin — *op. cit.* p.9.
171. *Ibid.* p.11.

172. *Ibid.* p.11.
173. *Ibid.* p.12.
174. *Ibid.* p.12.
175. Prakash C. Shastri — **Socialist Thought in India — with special Reference to Lohia's Quest for Indigenous Socialism.** Print well Publishers, Jaipur, 1985. p. 95..
176. G.S. Bhargava — **Leaders of the Left, *op. cit.*** p.41.
177. R.A. Prasad, *op. cit.* p.130.
178. *Ibid,* p.130.
179. G.S. Bhargava, *op. cit.* p.42.
180. *Ibid.* p.42.
181. S.P. Sen. *op. cit.* p.415.
182. G.S. Bhargava. *op. cit.* p.42.
183. Dr. V.K. Arora, *op. cit.* p.19.
184. Madhu Limaye — **A Tribute To Rammanohar Lohia** — in M. Arumugam. *op. cit.* p.xi.
185. S.P. Sen, *op. cit.* p.415.
Also, S.R. Bakshi. *op. cit.* p.179.
186. Rammanohar Lohia — **The Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism, *op. cit.*** p.38.
187. Prem Bhasin — *op. cit.* p.9.
188. Dr. V. K. Arora. *op. cit.* p.81.
189. Madhu limaye — **A Tribute to Rammanohar Lohia. *op. cit.*** p.XV.
190. Usha Mehta — **Marx; Gandhi and Lohia**, a paper presented to the All India Political Science Association, quoted in Prakash C. Shastri-*op. cit.* p.94.
191. Gopal Krishna — *op. cit.* p.113.