

CHAPTER - VI

Concluding Observations : an assessment of the leadership qualities of J.P. and Lohia in a Comparative Perspective.

Socialist movement and leadership in a colonial country like India, is undoubtedly, different from that of an independent country, since, a colonial country and its people, think first to secure the political independence putting aside the socio-economic changes and naturally, the nationalist leaders take the advantage of getting the support of the people in comparison to those of the socialist leaders. Indian socialists had also to face the same problem before independence, beside their weakness of ideological differences or personality clashes. Indian Socialists, could not tackle this problem successfully, for which, when they came out of the Congress after independence, their miserable support-base became clear in the first general election to the Parliament, where they could not get a quarter number of seats, they expected, To quote Bruno Lasker, " The Socialism of the region (Asia and the Pacific) likewise, is not quite of the same color as was that in Europe a century ago. Its diverse forms in Asia, it is true, share a faith embracing all humanity, but its dynamic derives in the main from aspirations to freedom from oppression within the framework of distinct and separate economic and social pattern.... " ¹ So, India, as an Asian country can not be free from this general trend.

Socialist leadership in India was the creation of the socio-economic and political situation of the country during the period between the First and Second World Wars, with immediate causes behind it, the "three leadership failures associated with the Second and Third Civil Disobedience Movements of 1930 - 34,"² i.e., the failure of the Gandhian Congress leaders to fulfil the demand of the situation, failure of the then left wing nationalists like Subhas Bose, Nehru and others to organise an alternate united leadership against the failed congress leadership, and the anti-nationalist role of the Communist Party of India, alienating themselves from the nationalist movement. Naturally, Socialist Leadership, from the Platform of the Congress Socialist Party, as was formed in 1934, became necessary for the situation to provide satisfaction to the aroused people of the country. Gandhiji, here played a dual role behind the emergence

of the Socialist Leadership in India. First, his unparalleled mass-attracting personality gave the Civil disobedience movements of 1930 - 34, almost a nature of mass movement all over the country, placing before them the hope of a new society of free from colonial rule, creating spontaneous participation of students and general people to the fold of national struggle, and Secondly, his sudden suspension of such a mass uprisal created frustration among them including the young intellectual freedom fighters with some suspicion about the real will and effectiveness of the Gandhian leadership too, which ultimately compelled the young group to chalk out a plan, sitting inside the Nasik jail, the result of which was the formation of the Congress Socialist Party to work within the Congress. As such, Socialist Leadership emerged in India.

The Socialist Leadership from the very beginning, was unanimous at least on the point of national freedom, which they thought could not be possible, remaining outside the Congress, the only national organisation. This led them to remain within the fold of the Congress, mainly with two objectives in mind; (1) to change the Congress policies as far as possible to the Socialist line by giving it a broad mass contact, and (2) to gain control gradually, over the Congress, under "Composite Leadership," displacing the right-wing leaders, by the left wing or failing that to split the Congress, preferably after independence.³

The nature of the core leadership of the C.S.P. was predominantly middle class. A survey in Bombay showed that out of 469 active members of Bombay, only 136 were industrial workers, almost all the rest were middle class, including 109 office workers, 47 businessmen and 68 were in professions. Asoka Mehta observed this leadership to overwhelmingly middle class or through education have become 'middle classish'.⁴ Thomas A. Rusch has described this leadership, to be "highly educated, young (average age of thirty in the 1930's) North Indian Congressmen, predominantly of urban, middle class professions, many of whom gave up families or marriage in favour of professional politics."⁵

These leaders were ideologically though not clearly defined, divided into several groups - Marxian, Gandhian, Democratic Socialists, British Labour Party type Socialists, Fabian Socialist, Kautskyites, Stalinists, Leninists, Trotskyites, Rosa Luxemburgite and so on.⁶ However, for the attainment of Independence and Socio-economic goals, they were united in a common platform, the C.S.P., though differences of opinion were not totally overcome, particularly, in respect

of their policy towards the left unity, means and methods of attaining the goals, attitude towards the Communists and the Soviet Union, regarding joining the Congress Working Committee, joining the Ministry in 1937 with the Congress, and so on. Sampurnanand differed with Jayaprakash Narayan and Patwardhan regarding CSP's joining the Congress Ministry in 1937, which led Sampurnanand to resign from the Party. M.N.Roy also did not cooperate with the C.S.P. for long; rather instructed his followers to disrupt it.⁷ These disagreements, in subsequent period, became the sources of conflict among the leaders. For the sake of unity, the core leadership had articulated an attitude not to discuss any controversial matter, which also remained to be a source of controversy for the later days. The nature of decision making was also very peculiar, in the sense that mainly the then top leaders, basically, those of 'Nasik Group', took the decisive role. However, some members occasionally acted to revise the official policies, outside the forum, and J.P. in most cases acted even against majority views of National Executive or took unilateral decisions.⁸ Naturally, personality of the leaders played an important role both of cohesion and conflict which ultimately divided the socialist movement itself. However, the C.S.P. remained at least, theoretically, to be a Marxist oriented party which was clearly reflected in the Presidential address of Narendra Deva in the first conference of the Party at Patna.⁹

Regarding its first object of changing the congress policies and attitude, it was to some extent successful in many cases, such as, the Faizpur Agrarian Programme and the Election Manifesto in 1936. C.S.P. leaders also succeeded in occupying important posts in the Indian National Congress, including in the Working Committee, the highest body, for several years, Nehru and Bose were elected presidents of the Congress and as a result of their joint efforts, they also succeeded in controlling labour and Trade Union fronts. In the August Movement of 1942, the C.S.P. played an important role, which was even recorded by the secret government reports.¹⁰

Another important feature of the C.S.P. was its restricted membership, precondition being the membership of the Congress. For this, it could not give a broader mass base, and it could never grow as a mass movement and remained confined only with the intellectual sections of the Society, which, even today is almost of same nature.

Failure of the United Front Policy with the C.P.I. about which J.P. and Narendra Deva took the main initiative even in the face of opposition from Lohia, Madhu Limaye, Patwardhan and others, brought forward the conflict among the leaders. Ultimately, within a very short time of one year it was proved that J.P.'s assessment was totally wrong, and CPI had already disrupted their organisational base in many places including that of labour and trade union fronts, student fronts, which caused a great loss to the C.S.P. This was also expressed by the secret Government reports including that of D.I.B. reports.¹¹

In fact, the Communist Party of India was guided and directed by the Third Communist International, and though Lenin re-evaluated his theory of imperialism by linking the national independence movements with the cause of proletarian revolution,¹² the Indian Communists continued their old policy of denunciation of the national movement and its leaders including Gandhiji, thereby choosing the road of political isolation. However, the appeal of Marxism was in no way affected, rather considerable radicalisation of the younger cadres of the congress was going on. As such, the formation of the Congress Socialist Party, on the basis of Marxian line, but with a difference from the Communist line, became inevitable, as a protest and revolt against the political line of the Third Communist International and the CPI that was pursued in India.

It is clear from the situational context that the period under study was sufficiently ripe for accepting the socialist ideas under the able Socialist leadership. In the words of Dev Dutt,¹³ it was the 'seed time' of Socialism, since young India had considerable interest to it as an alternative source of inspiration, and no doubt, if it could have been properly nourished and directed to the right path by our socialist leaders, today, it might have flourished in its full form.

In this situation Jayaprakash Narayan and Rammanohar Lohia appeared as socialist leaders and though ideologically they belonged to two separate categories, they worked jointly first from the CSP platform and then from the Socialist Party and Praja Socialist Party until J.P. withdrew himself from party politics. As said earlier, ideological differences were kept aside for attaining their main objectives of national independence and socio economic regeneration of the country, However, their thinking, perceptions, attitudes and styles of leadership was not same for which differences of opinion on important issues, sometimes reached the extreme. But they worked together for a long time.

J. P. started his political career as an ardent Marxist, no doubt, with difference with the C.P.I. and shifted to democratic socialism, then to Sarvodaya philosophy and ultimately called for Total Revolution. Before his conversion to Marxism in United States, during his studies, in fact, he was too much attracted towards Gandhiji, his technique of non-violence and Civil Disobedience alongwith his simplicity and dedication for the cause of the country. This was during the period between 1914 and 1922, before his move to America. His marriage with Prabhavati Devi, as a result of which he got close contact with his father-in-law, Brijkishore Babu, an established Congress leader, and also with some other prominent leaders of that time, forced him to feel an inner urge to serve for the country. The urge led him during his college days, to take part in the non-cooperation movement. His living style, particularly at America, where he had to work hard for earning his own expenses, automatically led him to be sympathetic towards the workers, and the downtrodden, which further took a final shape by reading Marxian literature. These two things, the early attraction towards Gandhian techniques of non-violence and the Marxian teaching alongwith his personal experience about the workers and the common people, remained undimmed throughout his life. This acted as a central thread throughout his life, connecting all his activities, thinking and frequent change of his views. He has himself admitted that his ideas have gone through a long process of evolution, and his frequent changes of views and fields of activities were due to the pursuit of a single goal, and the search for a single truth, namely, how to make India independent and help establish a real political and economic democracy. To analyse or understand J.P. and his leadership as a punier of Indian Socialists, one has to keep in mind the above fact of his single goal. For the attainment of his goal, he did not mind even to compromise with his ideology, which was proved during 1947 when he acted just like an experienced guerilla commander.

J.P. was a born revolutionary, who, throughout his life, struggled for the attainment of his goals against innumerable obstacles. "It is a romantic and thrilling story, tinged with his personal heroism and daring he commands all the essential qualities of a real Socialist Leader",¹⁴ remarked some scholars.

In fact, J.P. had all the essential qualities of a leader - he had adaptability, flexibility of mind, peoples support, with good theoretical base. With the capacity of understanding public sentiments, he could guide the peoples' demands. He had also human feelings love for the poor, the common people, the country, and

had clear self-image with sufficient sensitiveness about the dynamics of the Indian society. All these qualities rolled in one, made him to be a rear personality and as such a real socialist leader.

J.P. started as a Marxian socialist and the C.S.P. under his able leadership took the path of scientific socialism, certainly on the basis of Indian situation and context. In his own words, "The socialist movement in India must evolve its own picture of socialism in the light of Marxist thought of conditions of this country and our historical background there is no room for dogmatism or fundamentalism in Marxist thought".¹⁵ This implies his basic nature of adaptability, and not to be inclined to any dogma. During his Marxian phase, he did not even hesitate to use violence for the achievement of his goals through Azad Dasta. But however, he categorically advised his 'dastas' that killing and terrorism were in no way a part of this programme, and use of arms was permitted only for self defence of Azads Gandhiji, though, was the author of the August Revolution, J.P. became the greatest hero of it. He became moving spirit of the revolution, flying "from province to province, now in Punjab Bengal United Provinces, changing disguises and aliases almost every week", and the Government "put a price of Rs. 10000/- on his head", and his name became a 'mantram' to his loyal band.¹⁶ His escape from the Hazaribag jail, one of the best guarded jails in India, alongwith some other trusted comrades on the Diwali night of 8th November, 1942, during which almost all Congress leaders were either in the jail or underground, brought new nationalist spirit among the young freedom fighters. But at last on 19th September, 1943 he was rearrested and kept in the notorious Lahore Fort, as state prisoner, along with Lohia. His mass-support was so much that, "As rumours of torture trickled out of the jail, millions felt vicariously the pain that their Indian Socialist Scarlet Pimpernel and twentieth century Shivaji underwent at the hands of the not too tender hearted authorities as a penance for his audacity, daring, courage and cuteness".¹⁷ This personal image and support of the people, is only comparable to Gandhi, and naturally, J.P. became a real leader of the people.

His perception of the demand of the situation and the people, and sensitiveness about the dynamics of the society compelled him to change his outlook and activities from one ideological phase to another. When it became clear to him that Socialism could not exist without democratic freedom and if in a society, democratic means could be adopted as a means of social change,

then it would be a counter revolutionary to resort to violence. From this perception and the events of Soviet Russia converted him to be a democratic socialist and to adopt Gandhian means but his ultimate aim remained the same-freedom, both Political and socio-economic. He understood the demands of the people that they were eager for freedom in real sense of the term, which implied "freedom from exploitation, from hunger, from poverty", and pursued the democratic means of peaceful social change, which was much more evident in his later activities and belief in revolution by consent, for which he called for Total Revolution. This greatness of his mind to adjust and adapt to the situation and need and demand of the people compelled him, without any hesitation, even to vehemently criticise the Soviet dictatorship of the Party, curtailment of 'formal' freedom and equality there, including concentration of power both political and economic, leading to a totalitarian state. During this time, he expressed the view that Lohia was correct in formulating his theory of 'equal irrelevance,' and said, "Lohia has correctly pointed out the irrelevance of both the capitalist and the Communist systems to the situation in two-thirds of the world".¹⁸

This practical outlook and greatness of his mind was visible all throughout his life, for which there is a possibility of thinking his ideology to be full of contradictions.¹⁹ In a casual inquiry there may appear contradictions such as, during his Marxian attachment, he vehemently criticised Gandhism, which, in his opinion, was a mixture of 'timid economic analysis, good intentions and ineffective moralizing', that was being used as a "Cloak for reaction and conservatism", and that sought to impart legitimacy to a system, of "large-scale, organised theft and violence" perpetrated by the capitalist class.²⁰ To the intensely socialist mind of Jaya Prakash, who, in the 1920's, had been one of the most ardent and passionate admirer of M.N. Roy, and had sought to radicalise the Congress, Gandhi was a "reformist". This aversion to Gandhian ideas of non-violence and trusteeship gradually gave way to a deep commitment to Gandhian philosophy, and by the 1940's he adopted the Gandhian way which continued to influence his outlook and thought till the end. His differences with the C.P.I. and his ideological alienation from Soviet Russia, the failure of 'United front' strategy and some other events and experiences, had hastened the process of what he fondly called "ideological re-education" which brought home to him the need for democracy and decentralisation and the realisation that the means must be morally consistent with the ends. His search for the real political and

economic democracy taken him to several ideological and political paths which were apparently conflicting. He had finally found the end of the journey in a dynamic and revolutionary adaptation of Gandhian ideas, so lovingly characterised by him as 'total revolution'. The so-called 'phases' in the evolution of his social and political ideas were, thus were temporary digressions and wanderings caused by situational realities. His basically Gandhian orientation never left him, and Gandhiji's influence on his life and teachings was too deep and substantial to forsake, not-withstanding his initial attachment to Marxian Socialism.²¹

A careful analysis, as such, reveals that there was no conflict or contradiction; rather his searching mind always wanted a better and surer path to reach the truth — not for his own purification or salvation, but the total regeneration of the humanity both from internal and external. This searching mind led him to give off party politics and call for Sarvodaya, to be a 'Jivandani', an active partner of Bhave in his Bhoodan and Gramdan movements. The situation after independence, particularly, in the seventies convinced him that without moral regeneration, material prosperity could not be able to bring peace and equality. The all-round degradation, corruption, poverty, unemployment, at the other side, concentration of power in the hands of few, including those in political power, forced him to call for Total Revolution, a combination of seven revolutions. This, no doubt, implies that his ideas were preoccupied with morality, for which he could be categorised as an idealist leader.

It is beyond doubt, that his leadership was of superior quality which was proved in several occasions, such as, during the August Movement of 1942, Sarvodaya movement, Bhoodan Campaign. The magic of his leadership resulted in the transformation of the hearts of hundreds of dreadful docaits. All these exhibit his dynamic nature and lofty personality as a true and successful leader. Again, even after his resignation from the Party Politics, he did not totally overlook the call of the situation, sufferings of the people who needed his leadership and launched movement in 1974 for fighting against corruption — which ultimately ended with the establishment of the first Janata Government at the centre in 1977, with Morarji Desai as its Prime Minister. But people and their sufferings did not leave him, for which during the Janata regime too, he did not remain idle about the communal problems, Corruptions, atrocities on Harijans, for which he wanted the inclusion of a provision in the constitution of India, the "right to recall" people's representatives in the event of failure, and he

personally met and requested the Prime Minister for all these along with the request for the creation of a second line of leadership to replace the unwilling senior leaders. During this time, physically he became too weak, due mainly to the inhuman tortures during his long period of detention and mentally too he was totally upset, by the activities of the self-created government, which ultimately caused his utmost frustration.

Though he is categorised as an idealist, as a true socialist, he was very much practical. He was the originator of the idea of 'United Front' with the C.P.I. mainly for two purposes, — one, for obtaining national freedom, since, C.P.I. was supposed to change their line with the changing line of Comintern, and second, for socio-economic emancipation, which was not possible under the Congress, basically a bourgeoisie organisation and backed by capitalists. It failed totally not for his own fault but due to the betrayal of the C.P.I.. Otherwise, his thinking was radical and if all the leftists could have been organised under this idea, the history of India probably would have been written in a separate way.

J.P. had a good personal relation with Nehru, which, sometimes created misunderstanding among other socialists. After the Avadi session of the Congress (1955) where the Congress declared its objectives to be socialistic, J.P. alongwith Mehta, was eager to cooperate with the congress, through a coalition with P.S.P. Asoka Mehta, in his "Political Compulsion of Backward Economy" argued for such cooperation to broaden the base of the government and to strengthen the fight for freedom, democracy and other socio-economic regeneration. In fact, the C.S.P. left the Congress in 1948, with the hope of creating a strong opposition and alternative to the Congress, which the Socialist Party and later the Praja Socialist Party totally failed. Naturally, the alternative was to cooperate with the Congress to change its programme and attitude and policies as far as possible. With this intention, J.P. wanted to cooperate with the Congress. But Lohia and others opposed this stand, which ultimately ended with a clear division of opinion among the P.S.P. leaders, and ultimately J.P. resigned from Party politics to join Sarvodaya movement.

His leadership style was democratic with individualistic tendencies. He had behind him a spontaneous public support. He was compared with Netaji Subhas Bose, as to quote from Tribune, "Jayaprakash has for many come to posses

a glamour second only to that of Netaji. Both made a firm unshakable resolve to turn the war situation into an opportunity to strike for India's liberation. Both persisted heroically in their endeavour when to others all seemed futile", Nataji escaped out of India, J.P. escaped from Prison.²²

The individualistic tendencies in J.P. led him to be unpredictable throughout his life and it was completely under his discretion-when and how to start a movement with what object, and was also uncertain when he would get a much better and surer path or ideology which would lead him to change his path and pattern of leadership. As such, he was attracted to democratic socialism from Marxism, then to Sarvodaya ideology, then turned to follow Vinoba Bhave and called for total revolution, leaving all party politics. But again, he came back to lead the people in 1974 considering the then prevailing situation. However, he denied that he had come back to party politics and the arena of election. He said, "for me the election is just another battleground....." but the aim of his ongoing struggle was not merely a change of the government but a total social change, which was not possible through party politics or election and, "It is not political parties with which we are identifying ourselves but with the people struggling against a corrupt, oppressive and incompetent regime and an iniquitous social order".²³

His intension was not to be a leader but to serve the people, for which he categorically said that it was 'Rajniti', the politics of state and power from which he resigned and not from 'Lokniti', the politics of people, which he was following.

Regarding his political ideology, he said that the task of Marxism is to alter the world and since he was trying to alter the world, certainly by other means, he might be accepted as a better Marxist. He was, in fact, a true lover of people, their freedom, equality, dignity-related to the development of humanity for which he fought against the moral degeneration as well as corruption caused by material prosperity. Naturally, his idea of socialism was completely different, neither Marxian, nor completely Gandhian or democratic brand of socialism, rather a new socialism-the peoples socialism through participating democracy. Naturally, his leadership style also remained unparallel and a class by itself.

As compared to Marxism, J.P. said that ultimate aim of Marx was the establishment of a society of equals-casteless, classless society where state and party should have no necessity-Peoples would govern themselves. His picture

of Sarvodaya and Communitarian Society also aimed at party-less, classless, caste-less society, with a very minimum necessity of state. Therefore, he did not find in his activities and thinking any deviation or shifting from one ideology to another, rather has changed the path for attaining the same - with the same object in his mind. In fact, J.P. had sufficient faith in the people and his search was for "the creation of a just and egalitarian society where man would be the measure of every thing".²⁴

J.P. could not organise a hierarchical order or structure, which is most necessary for the success of a leader, and could not build up the second line of leaders to take up the initiative in discharging the unfinished works left by him. The reason, it seems, was due to his distrust in the Party and Power, which necessitates the hierarchical order or a second line of leaders to follow the leader and help in continuing the attained position, which again indirectly implies the leader's aspiration to remain and function as a leader. But since J.P. had no such personal aspiration either as a leader or as a power holder, he did not think it necessary to organise such hierarchical structure or series of dependable leaders below him. He, rather, believed in the power of the people, and thought of mass leadership, instead of individual leadership, for which he would always remain, as before, in the hearts of the people as a loknayak. Herein lies the greatness and speciality of J.P. as a Socialist leader.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia played an important role in the development of Indian Socialism both as a Socialist leader and as an original socialist theoretician. To quote Jagadish Joshi, "Amongst all the philosophers and interpreters of socialism, only two will stand the test of time and history-Karl Marx and Lohia, one occidental and the other oriental, the one belonging to the tribe of the conquerors, the European, the other from the coloured world, the most exploited part of the earth", with clear distinction due to historical and geographical conditions of the areas from where they came, as the practice of Lenin differs greatly what Marx said even in basically European conditions, due to historical and geographical circumstances.²⁵

In fact, Lohia was the only Indian Socialist leader who had a vast theoretical concept about Marxism, Communism, Western Socialism, Capitalism — its development and implications and also about the conditions of the Asian countries, basically agrarian which needed, "an integral socialist philosophy with

spontaneity and dynamism of its own—a philosophy which did not have to live on borrowed ideas".²⁶ Lohia visualised socialism from an independent outlook and wanted to give it a world face. His Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism is its best proof. According to him Marx was based on European industrial societies and not the Asian agrarian societies, which are full of manpower, unemployed, half-employed but with a small capital power. From this understanding of the realities of Asian and third world countries in general and India in particular, he developed his independent socialism. Herein lies his originality. Alongwith this, he originated some important ideas and theories for the development of these underdeveloped countries, which are unique and even today relevant.

Lohia, before starting his political career, equipped himself well academically and became well conversant with the Marxian and socialist trends including the affects of capitalist developmental chain, and dedicated himself into the political activities. He felt that Indian Socialism could only be built successfully on the solid foundation of nationalism. His philosophy of socialism was built up on equality and prosperity, for the attainment of which, he contributed a lot in the field of socialist theory and led the Indian socialist movement from a different angle. Unlike J.P., he continued his whole political life on the single line where he started, with certainly some adjustment with the need of the situation, without any major ideological shift.

Lohia started as a synthesiser of Marxism and Gandhism, since he found many things to be taken both from these ideologies and wanted to achieve his goal by democratic Gandhian means, though did not accept everything, Gandhiji said. He explained his famous theory of equal irrelevance of both Communism and Capitalism, considering the special situation and economic conditions of India and other Asian countries, at the same time he felt the need of organising the Asian countries for their own interest, which was formulated in his ideas of Asian Socialist Conference. His idea of socialism was to some extent different from the contemporary socialists of both India and outside, since he argued for maximum attainable equality and egalitarian standard even by imposing restrictions on income and expenditure, while the contemporary socialists meant equality of opportunity by which certain levelling process was to be maintained. At the same time he insisted on Gandhian methods of Satyagraha, purity of means and devolution of power, both economic and political, should be the basis of achieving the goal of new socialist civilization. His ideas of reconstruction of

Indian economy including the rural areas, idea of Food Army, his language policy, broad outlook towards Pakistan, China and other Asian countries, no doubt even today are equally relevant. His idea of one hour service everyday, for the country was formulated to form indigenous capital, which he calculated, one years such service would form capital equal to one years budget amount of the government of India. He, as such wanted to make the country economically sound without waiting for foreign aid which to him was a diplomacy of the developed countries to exploit the underdeveloped countries. His idea of love and anger, construction and destruction, Himalaya Policy, Equidistance theory etc. proves his high original intellectual talent.

Further, it was Lohia, who worked out the basic concept of non-alignment as early as 1938-39.²⁷ However, he was in favour of Third Camp, for which, he criticised the Nehru's policy of Non-alignment, the procedure of its application.

To quote Madhu Limaye, "Lohia was an original thinker, a unique leader and a rebel but he was not an ivory tower philosopher. He was essentially a man of action and a great political strategist."²⁸ Lohia, in fact was a passionate, fearless, reckless freedom fighter, who fought not only for India but also for Goa, Nepal, the neighbouring people, but his basic ideology remained Gandhian method - Satyagraha, alongwith which he added the ideas of 'Ghera Dalo' 'Gherao', 'Picketing', 'Bandh'. He taught the people of Goa and Nepal how peaceful method could be effective even against a tyrannical regime.

As a Socialist leader too, his originality, brilliant conceptual ideas are well reckoned even today. His firmness, deep knowledge of the life of the downtrodden and destitutes, whose average per capita income was less than three Annas, which has not yet been changed in many areas, made him unique even in his short tenure in the Parliament. Lohia, in the Lok Sabha, in describing the pitiable condition of Indian women, once said that the main problem of the women was the shortage of latrines, over which all members burst into laughter. But Lohia's firmness and deep feeling for them, kept him calm and replied, "Friends, I know you will laugh away this grave problem. There are two reasons for it — first you all a minor, secondly, you are not women".²⁹

This rigidity and uncompromising attitude was the main character of his leadership. "He had never hesitated to turn away from any group or organisation that had foreshaken the path he had chalked out, even if he had been instrumental

in bringing it about and nurturing it with his own life blood".³⁰ On the issue of P.S.P. - Congress cooperation, initiated by J.P. and Asoka Mehta, on the ground of 'Political compulsion of a Backward Economy', Lohia vehemently opposed, which led a clear division of opinion among the top leaders of PSP — Lohia, Mehta, Kripalani, J.P., and others, ultimately ended by a Policy Commission appointed in the Betul convention(1953), which rejected Asoka Mehta's thesis, but this ideological and strategical differences could not regain.

Again, on the issue of Police firing on demonstrators by Socialist Government led by P. Thanu Pillai of Travancore Cochin, Lohia demanded the resignation of the Chief Minister for a judicial enquiry, which was declined by him and majority of the National Executive was in favour of the Ministry, resulting in a clear division both in the Executive and in the Party Convention at Nagpur Nov. 1954, where, Lohia, Madhu Limaye and Mahadeo Singh declined to serve on the Executive.³¹

This situation deteriorated severely after the Avadi Session of the Congress, January, 1955, where the Congress declared its objectives to be "the establishment of a socialist pattern of society", which to Madhu Limaye was "a colossal fraud on the electorate". Mehta thought that Congress was coming closer to them (socialists), while Limaye accused Mehta of instigating a collaborationist faction in the Bombay P.S.P., which, naturally, Mehta denied. On the other hand, the Bombay P.S.P. group supported Mehta and described Limaye's view as "ill conceived, mischievous and flippant". Lohia supported Limaye and condemned Mehta's view as "paralysed socialism", which ultimately led suspension of Limaye followed by Lohia.³² And Lohia alongwith his followers moved to form a new Party — Socialist Party, (December, 1955).

This process of leadership conflict and split continued for a long time, and became a normal feature. Lohia had all the qualities of a successful leader, but his rigidity and uncompromising attitude became a great problem. According to Gopal Krishna, Lohia was "acknowledged as the most lively and thoughtful" Leader, who "impressed by the quality of his intelligence, his imagination, his passion for equality and hatred of the inequities of Indian Society".³³ Among his followers he inspired devotion and hatred for personal ambitions. Lohia was an uncompromising non-conformist with sufficient sensation for the people, with the spirit that if the socialist could come to power, he, probably, would remain

However, in his later days, he showed some flexibility — change or adjustment of his ideology with the demand of the situation, for which, after the suspension of Asoka Mehta from the P.S.P. for his joining the post of Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, Lohia took the initiative for merger of P.S.P. and S.P. into the Samyukta Socialist Party (S.S.P.) in January, 1965. The election result of 1962 both in Lok Sabha and State Assemblies, which was not at all satisfactory, brought forward the necessity of forming a platform of anti-Congress Parties to fight jointly against the Congress. He argued that Congress was increasingly declining its position among the masses and if non-congress electoral front could be organised the Congress would no more remain in power. The Election Manifesto of the S.S.P. (1967) vehemently criticised the Congress for its falsehood and dishonesty. In the Election of 1967 Lohia's assumptions were proved to be correct and S.S.P. emerged as one of the leading opposition Parties. Lohia remained as the defacto leader of the S.S.P. until his death in 1967.³⁵

Thus the entire socialist movement in India is full of leadership conflicts and Lohia played an important role in this process of splits and emergence of new parties. To quote G.S. Bhargava, the "biggest weakness in Lohia is his incapacity to contain himself within the bounds of Party discipline. His individualism brooks no checks or mandates. Secondly, he lacks adaptability and the knack to build up a team or organise a body. He is also wanting in patience and perseverance, for example, he founded the Congress Socialist, the organ of the Congress Socialist Party, as a periodical of high intellectual and political standard but after three months got bored with it and left it. Perhaps, the best course to give him full freedom, rather than chain his mind and limbs and choke his talent. Even as an individual, his contribution to the new India, will not be insignificant".³⁶

Leadership style of Lohia, thus, was individualistic and was less flexible but with sound theoretical base. He had good image, love for the people, the downtrodden, for the country as a whole, he was too much sensitive about the dynamics of the society and also had sufficient capacity to guide the peoples demand but his individualistic attitude and non-compromising mentality debarred him to remain and work within a disciplined party organisation, for which he could not build up any second line of leaders, and any concrete mass - support

base for the party. His leadership style remained some sort of self-styled leader, however, with a basic consistency with the ultimate aim of equality and prosperity.

Leadership, as said earlier, is a complex phenomenon - an interpersonal relationship — relationship between who lead and who are led. Naturally, the style of leadership depends upon the nature, character, mentality, situational context and overall on the perceptive capability and adaptability of the leader. Since, human nature, is much more complex, it is natural that leadership style should vary from leader to leader and that has actually happened in case of Indian socialist leadership. However, leadership conflict and factional division is a common feature in all political parties. The Samyukta Socialist Party of India and the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (L.S.S.P) in Ceylon, according to Paul R. Brass, have taken pride for their inner party controversies.³⁷ Even the communist parties of the present day have to face such conflict and controversies.

J.P. and Lohia, both emerged as socialist leaders from the same situational context with some different family, social and intellectual background. Though both of them had foreign degrees their perception of the situation and their ways of thinking differ in many respects. As a result, their leadership style and leader-follower relations also took different shape although they worked from the same platforms of the Congress Socialist Party, the Socialist Party and the Praja Socialist Party for a long time, and expressed their different views and different styles of leadership. J.P. started as a Marxist leader and influenced the C.S.P. to adopt Marxian line but ultimately resigned from party politics and joined with Vinoba Bhave, as a 'Jivandani'. Lohia, on the other hand, started from the very beginning with clear ideological conception that India alongwith other Asian countries should follow an independent line of Socialism based on the situations and conditions prevailing there, for which he synthesised Marxism and Gandhism and retained the Gandhian methods of peaceful non-cooperation for attaining his goal of socialism, the new civilization. He also followed the parliamentary method of election and became a member of the Lok Sabha, where as to J.P. election was another battlefield, which only could change the Government, not the whole socio-political and mental structure of the society, for which he called for Total Revolution — a combination of seven revolutions. In fact, this total revolution of J.P. had many similarities with Lohia's 'Sapta

Kranti' — seven revolutions, against injustice, inequality, tyranny, castism, economic exploitation, collective encroachment of individual freedom and against arms and weapons.

Other than these, there are so many points where both of them expressed both similar and antagonistic views. Both of them, in general, have discarded the use of violence and argued for peaceful method. However, during August revolution of 1942, both of them, to some extent, supported use of arms, J.P. went to the extent of Guerilla warfare. Both of them worked and inspired the nationalist movement from underground, Lohia established underground radio transmission centres. Both of them were ardent nationalists and wanted to utilize the second world war period to fight and achieve independence, without involving India in the war, which was between imperialists. Both of them had good number of imprisonment in their credit including in the 'Torture Camp' of Lahore Fort and were treated as state prisoners. Gandhian techniques of non violence, Satyagraha attracted both of them except the initial period of Marxian leaning of J.P.. Purity of means, decentralisation of power-both economic and political, and aversion to Communism and Soviet Russia, were the other points of their agreement. However, J.P. initially supported Russia but when he became clear about the real picture inside Russia, full of party dictatorship, concentration of power, he also alienated from Russia.

Regarding United Front Policy, Lohia was in opposition with J.P., when in the mid thirties J.P. formulated this policy with C.P.I. and subsequently J.P.'s policy proved to be a great loss to the C.S.P. But later to combat with the dictatorial regime of the congress, Lohia took the initiative in forming an anti-congress forum to fight the 4th general election, of 1967, where the policy became successful, and Congress lost about eight State Assemblies.

All these imply that basically there was very little difference between them, and the difference which was, was the creation of the leadership style-J.P. throughout his life, searched a much better and surer path for which he believed in mass leadership and thought all political parties, institutions to be centre of powers and source of all corruption. To quote him, "Except for the few carpet baggers,' independence has turned into dust in the mouth of the people democracy should have been the most cherished ideal of free India. But the liberties of the people are today far more at the mercy of the government than

even under British rule. The citizen is less independent totalitarianism is gathering force." ³⁸ On the other hand, Lohia being an intellectual and original theoretician, wanted, always, his views and approaches to be accepted by all, otherwise he was ready to split. As such, a self-styled leadership developed in him. According to Gopal Krishna, Lohia was " an exceedingly egoistic person who could not work with colleagues. He thought of himself as a prophet." ³⁹ However, Lohia, had good respect for J.P. to whom, before the final breach in the Socialist movement, he wrote, " The priests of Devghar have now closed the register of my family, and they had done so at Mathura a long time back. My path is different There is an emotional bond between you and the country. You alone can be the nation's leader and can further the cause of Socialism." ⁴⁰

In fact, Lohia was a disciplined Socialist leader and original theoretician with sound original ideas, for which he could not tolerate imposition of anything upon him, or any deviation from his ideology. This factor led him always to talk his own experiences or ideas, not the wishes or views, or demands of the people. However, he was well concerned about the people, their wishes and demands while J.P. always used to speak in the peoples language, their wishes, their demands, for which J.P. became a 'Loknayak', close to the heart of the people. On the other hand, Lohia's lack of compromise and his personal ego and individualistic nature made him to be more normative than practical, which ultimately led him to grow differences of opinion even among his nearest colleagues like J.P., ultimately resulting split in the party. J.P. as a leader had a practical free mind with much accommodative tendencies, for which he could easily change his path with the change of situation, need of the people and demand of the time. He could easily modify his Socialist Path only remaining the ultimate aim of emancipation of the people, the downtrodden, intact. Thus, starting as an ardent Marxist, he shifted his path according to the situational context of India and outside, came to be an exponent of party less democracy, leaving party politics, became Jeevandani and practised the process of heart transformation, successfully. Again the socio-political situation of early seventies, forced him to respond to the people's need and take the great initiative in organising anti-Congress platform to counter the dictatorial regime of the Congress under the leadership of Smt. Indira Gandhi and succeeded in forming the Janata Party, which ultimately formed the first non-Congress government at the centre, supposed to be protege of Jayaprakash Narayan. But he himself remained out of

party politics like Mahatma Gandhi. This was the adaptability and practical attitude of J.P.'s leadership, which led him to the status of 'Loknayak' rather than a Prime Minister or other power-holder.

But Lohia, on the other hand, took part in the election, and was elected as a member of the Lok Sabha and his clear ideological foundation and broad outlook of the Indian led world political atmosphere alongwith his high power of expression led him to be the unofficial leader of the opposition in the Lok Sabha. His clear vast knowledge, clear logical analysis and criticism of the government policies made him to be a successful parliamentarian. But as a leader of the Socialist Party and of the people he could not reach the rank of J.P. who remained and would remain in the heart of the people. Probably, this was due to the family and social background from which they came to the political arena. J.P. was born and brought up in the political and social atmosphere of Bihar, the most backward both economically and intellectually, which helped J.P. to remain with the common people of the grass-root. Their problems and day to day sufferings attracted him so much that for the removal of those maladies, he was ready even to sacrifice his ideas or ideological stand, and only on this consideration of the upliftment of the people he was forced to shift from one path to another. Thus his whole life became a quest - quest for better and much surer path for attaining his goal. Herein lies the main difference of these two leaders.

On the other hand, the self-styled leadership of Lohia, on the basis of his sound and rigid ideological footings, he preferred much more his own ideology, that is, the means or method than to the attainment of his goal. While J.P. sought to the attainment of his ultimate aim at any cost even at the extent of sacrificing his ideology and he did not find any contradiction in such changing attitude of his own, Lohia remained confined within his own ideological commitments and whenever he found any hindrance on it, he did not agree to compromise, which led him to change political parties, one after another.

This leadership conflict is also present in the present day socialist parties, which are divided and sub-divided into several regional and local groups without any strong base or mass support in all India basis. Paul R. Brass has mentioned that "Socialists strength has been more evenly dispersed, less regionally concentrated But the socialists do not have any regional bastions The

socialist parties, have generally declined in all India popular support"

"Lohia", in fact, as mentioned by Usha Mehta, " was a Gandhian among revolutionaries and a revolutionary among Gandhians,"⁴¹ while J.P. had an " inclination to anarchism at the philosophical level."⁴²

But Lohia's revolutionary zeal was never confined within any geographical or political boundary, or it was not 'any suddenly grown up emotional feelings', rather was deep-rooted in the inner urge of his mind, for which he never compromised his ideas and revolutionary feelings, either with foreign rulers or the Indian rulers after Independence. Such was the inner urge of his revolutionary zeal that he could easily refuse the offer to join the ministry led by Nehru. He never thought of capturing power or holding any office of power and wanted restrictions to be imposed on the leaders of party organisation to join ministry—either central or provincial.

J.P., though has some inclination of philosophical anarchism, his ultimate aim remained the same — the upliftment of the people—the downtrodden, for which he declined to remain in any rigid philosophical or ideological bindings. This feeling for the common people, forced him to change or shift his ideological position—one after another, for getting much more quicker and surer path for attaining his goals, to the extent of resigning from party politics.

Both these leaders, thus attempted throughout their lives, to synthesise the prevailing ideologies, including Marxism, Gandhism with the prevailing socio-economic and political conditions of the then India, with the aim of upliftment of the people and humanity as a whole.

Notes and References

1. Bruno Lasker - **Freedom of Person in Asia and the Pacific** - in Pacific Affairs - June, 1951, Vol. XXIV No. 2, P - 143
2. Thomas A. Rusch - *op. cit.* P - 188.
3. *Ibid.* pp - 190 - 191.
4. M. Weiner - **Party Politics in India**, Princeton, 1957. Quoted in Saul Rose - **Socialism in Southern Asia** -Oxford University Press, London, 1958 - p.39.
5. Thomas A. Rusch *op.cit.* p.189.
6. L.P. Sinha - **Ideological Foundation of the Congress Socialist Party 1934- 39**, in the Proceedings of a Seminar on Socialism in India, *op. cit.* p. 274
7. A.C. Bose - **The Socialists in Indian National Congress** - In the Proceedings of a Seminar etc. *op. cit.* p.169.
8. Thomas A. Rusch. *op. cit.* p. 192.
9. Acharya Narendra Deva - **Socialism and National Revolution.** *op. cit.* p.24.
10. Home Department File No. **3/33/1940 (1) Political** - Extract from a Strictly Secret U.P. Report. dated, 20 - 1 - 1941, which explained the CSP'S target to launch a mass struggle against the government.
11. Government Home Department **File No. 4/7 (44) Political**, Govt. of India, explained how CPI could able to exploit the student field, Also, DIB note on Communism in India, in File No. **7/7/39**, Home Deptt, Political, explained the Communist infiltration to capture the CSP.
12. Julius Braunthal - **History of the International**, 1864 - 1914, 1966, Pp 34 - 52.Quoted in M.A. Rumugam - **Socialist Thought in India**, *op. cit.* pp - 127-128.
13. Dev Dutt - **Socialism and National Movement** - in the Proceedings of a Seminar etc. *op. cit.* p.206.

14. Bhawani Choudhuri and Debranjana Chakraborty - **Leftist Leaders of India**. Calcutta Book House, Calcutta, 1947. p.21.
15. Jaya Prakash Narayan - **Socialism, Sarvodaya and Democracy**, *op. cit.* p. 41.
16. D.B. Dhanapala - **Eminent Indians** - *op. cit.* p.149.
17. *Ibid.* p.150
18. Jaya Prakash Narayan - **Towards Total Revolution** - Vol. 2. *op. cit.* p.219.
19. Bhola Chatterje in his book - **Conflict in J. P.'s Politics** identified such conflicts. *op. cit.*
20. Jayaprakash Narayan - **Why Socialism?** Benaras, Congress Socialist Party, 1936, pp. 84-88, 89 - 93.
21. Jayaprakash Narayan - in the 'foreward' to his **Towards Total Revolution** Search for an ideology, edited by Brahmamand, vol. I *op. cit.* pp VII - X.
22. Quoted in S. R. Bakshi - **Jayaprakash Narayan - His socialistic ideology**, Indian Freedom Fighter series -21, Anmol Publications, New Delhi, 1952, pp.239 - 240
23. Jayaprakash Narayan - **Towards Total Revolution**. Vol. 4. *op. cit.* p.137.
24. Bhola Chatterje - *op. cit.* p.318.
25. Jagadish Joshi - **Marx and Lohia : The Socialist Path** - Janata, Dr. Lohia Death Anniversary Number, Vol. XXVII No. 38 & 39, 1972 (oct.), p.13.
26. Dr. V.K. Arora, *op. cit.* p.164.
27. Prem Bhasin . **Dr. Lohia and Asian Socialism** - Janata, Dr. Lohia Death Anniversary Number, *op. cit.* p.9
28. Quoted in Prakash Chandra - **Modern Indian Political Thought**, Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. 1998. p.105.
29. **The Statesman, 16th August, 1990 Article "Of Lohia & Rural Development."**
30. Prem Bhasin, *op. cit.* p.12.

31. Saul Rose - **Socialism in Southern Asia**, Oxford University Press - London, 1959, p. 47.
32. *Ibid*, pp - 48 - 49.
33. Gopal Krishna - **Rammonohar Lohia : An Appreciation**, Economic and Political Weekly - July 1968 (Spl.No.). p.1105.
34. *Ibid*, P. 1107.
35. Paul R. Brass - **Political Parties of the Radical Left in South Asian Politics** - in Paul R. Brass and Marcus F. Franda - (ed) **Radical Politics in South Asia** - The MIT Press, Cambridge - England - 1973. p.19.
36. G.S. Bhargava, *op. cit.* p.44.
37. Paul R. Brass, *op. cit.* p.19.
38. Quoted in Bhola Chatterje, *op. cit.* p. 97.
39. Gopal Krishna, *op. cit.* p.1114.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 1114.
41. Usha Mehta - **Marx, Gandhi and Lohia** - a paper presented to the All Indian Political Science Association - quoted in Prakash C. Shastri- **Socialist Thought in India, with Special Reference to Lohia's Quest for Indigenous Socialism** - Printwell Publishers, Jaipur, 1985. p.94.
42. Bhola Chatterje, *op. cit.* p.317.