

CHAPTER - I

I. Introduction

Socialism, as a distinct political movement, emerged in India as a sort of rationalist revolt against both Gandhism and Communism. The Indian Socialists emerged as a social force fundamentally different from the organic process of Gandhiji's movement. The Bolshevic Revolution in Russia and its success attracted the young Indian intellectuals towards Marxism and socialist ideas. The formation of the Communist Party of India in the early twenties as well as the organisations of the peasants and workers gave a new fillip to intellectual thinking in a new direction. Marxism had a strong impact upon their thought and action. The main stream of socialist movement was primarily the Congress Socialist Party formed in 1934, and the Socialist Party of India after its secession from the Congress in 1948. Socialist leadership arose within the Indian National Congress in response to what the socialists felt were the leadership failures associated with the Second and Third Civil Disobedience movements of 1930-34¹, the inability of the 'Left Wing' nationalists, like Subhas Bose, Jawaharlal Nehru and others to organise a united leadership able and willing to challenge the Gandhians and the moderates for control of the Congress, alienation of the Communist party Leaders from the nationalist movement, and the failure of the Gandhian nationalist to achieve the goal of independence.

Under the circumstances, the socialist movement and socialist leadership arose in India with a hope among the young intellectuals and the peasants and workers organisations to lead them in a new direction for achieving both freedom of the country and socio-economic emancipation of the people from the bondages of inequalities that was prevalent in the society for a longtime.

Socialist leadership in Indian means, in a linear sequence or development, the leaders of the Congress Socialist Party (1934-48), the Socialist Party (1948-1952), the Praja Socialist Party (1952-64), the Sanyukta Socialist Party (1964-71) and the later factions and groups. Each of these party names indicates an important phase in the development of the leadership. However, the word 'Socialist' implies a good number of groups, parties and individuals during

both pre-and post independence period, who either accepted the Marxian interpretation of history or modified the same with some Gandhian or other Western Socialist ideas, with a variety of opinions regarding the methods for the realization of a Socialist society. Thus, the Congress Socialists, the Communists, the Royists, other smaller local or regional groups and individuals like Bose, Nehru, M. N. Roy and a host of others may come under this expression. But our concern here, is only with the Congress Socialist leaders, more particularly Jayaprakash Narayan and Rammanohar Lohia, and the later parties to which these congress socialist leaders were either associated or organised by themselves. In the present study, the origin, growth, character and direction of socialist leadership mainly in the first two phases, namely, the C.S.P. and Socialist Party phases, have been discussed with reference to the social characteristics, the historical circumstances and the situational context in which the leadership emerged, the historical process of which the leaders were products, the socio-economic background and personal qualities of these two leaders under study, their ideological differences and cultural disparities, their intellectual contributions to the development of a coherent body of socialist thought in India in the context and perspective of the national and left movements in India during the period of struggle against imperialism and colonialism, the traits and basic assumptions of their political behaviour before and after independence, their successes or failures in pioneering a genuine socialist movement in India. However, it is a hard task to remain within a watertight compartment of time bound period, in finding and assessing the leadership of these two pioneers under study, since, after the period of 1952, both of them developed important phases of their thought and action, without mentioning of which, the study will remain incomplete. Hence, we have to cross the time bound period of 1952, and assess the contributions of both these leaders till they were alive.

In India, like any other colonial country, the socialist movement and its leadership is different in various respect, since, the people and most of the nationalist leaders and their parties in a colonial country seek their political independence first and think that through political freedom other social and economic regenerations would automatically find its course. Radical improvement would take place only after political independence is won. Naturally, the socialists had to face dual problems of both organising the people

in their favour and the political protest from the purely nationalist leaders, as it was found throughout the Indian struggle of independence. In fact, socialist ideas and leadership emerged in the Indian soil since early twenties, during the period of the national Congress coming under the leadership of Gandhi. But for good number of years, it could not gather and make any significant impact on the Indian political atmosphere. Only after the failure of the Congress and the Gandhian Leadership in connection with the Non-Cooperation movement, a wave of rethinking both about the congress creed and its leadership began to grow both within the congress and outside it. At the same time, the alienation of the Communist Party of India from the nationalist movement brought forward the necessity of a new line of thought and a new leadership to accommodate the aspirations of the people roused throughout the country as a result of the non-cooperation movements. The dissatisfied young congress leaders who were arrested and put in Nasik Central Jail, got the scope of free discussion among themselves and to chalk out a programme for a new party with the twin objectives of freedom of the country and socio-economic reorientation. As such, the Congress Socialist party became the core of the socialist leadership in India.

Several persons, apart from Nehru, Bose and others, constituted the heart of the leadership in the socialist movement through most of its phases. The most prominent of them were Jayaprakash Narayan, Acharya Narendra Deva, Rammanohar Lohia, Asoka Mehta, M.R. Masani, Achyut Patwardhan, Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya, Purshottam Tricomdas, Yusuf Meherally and others. Ideologically, they could be divided into three amorphous and overlapping categories : (i) Leaders of Marxian persuasion, (ii) the leaders of the Social Democracy of the British Labour Party type, (iii) Leaders of Democratic Socialism, tempered by Gandhian concept of decentralisation and the use of non-violent techniques for national movement. The outstanding exponents of the first category were Narayan and Deva apart from Nehru; of the second, Masani and Mehta, and of the third, Patwardhan and Lohia². Among them, there was no clearly defined ideology, but an uneasy compromise between the Marxists and the non-Marxists. Doctrinal differences were compromised in the interest of unity, but there were acute disagreements on organisational and tactical questions. The core leadership tried to create left wing unity among such disparate elements as Nehru, Bose, the Communist

Party, the Royists and others. The alliance was somewhat successful in influencing the congress resolutions which promised some radical land reforms, nationalization of selected industries, progressive labour legislations, reorganisation of the Congress for greater mass-contact and proportional representation of the left wing. Their combined efforts succeeded in 1939 in electing Bose as the Congress President against right wing opposition. However, this left wing unity failed to create the programmatic or organisational cohesion necessary to achieve the socialist objectives which included :

- (i) Influencing Congress policies in the directions of creating a united front of peasants, workers and the middle class dedicated to achieving independence through the marging of class struggles with nationalist efforts ;
- (ii) Promising radical agrarian and socio-political changes;
- (iii) Waging an uncompromising mass-direct action, initially non-violent, but destined eventually to armed overthrow of British colonial authority.

The core leadership also hoped to gain control of the Congress under a 'composite leadership' theory which presumed gradual displacement of retiring right-wing leaders by the left-wing, or failing that, to split the congress³.

It is widely admitted that leadership is the most strategic factor not only in politics but any human group behaviour. The study of the leadership in its broad connotation is inclusive of the studies of leaders, their behaviour in terms of functions and their impact in the context of leadership style. It is an abstract term, and in its concrete form, manifests itself in the total process of the rise of a leader, the influences he wields on his followers, and the ways by which he not only ensures and gathers power around him and seeks to ascend still further, but also tries to perpetuate his achieved position. To remain in his achieved position, a leader has to depend on trusted followers to maintain contacts and keep his image among the people at the lower level because, as a leader successfully goes up the ladder of the hierarchy, there is the possibility of loosing his original and base contacts at the lower level and as such, a hierarchial structure of leadership develops from the lower level to the district,

state and centre points. Another interesting point is that the leaders require not only to maintain relations or contact with the followers but also links with different leaders at various levels with hierarchy of the socio-political structure for retaining their position in the political setup. Such linkages have become much more important in the changing pattern of democracy, which has become participatory in nature in its developmental strategy.⁴ It may be conceived as a mutual interaction between those who lead and those who are led. It is essentially a process of struggle to get recognised by performing or executing certain characteristics, depending upon situational context, and by struggling to clear the way up the ladder. A leader is a product of a particular historical process, who initiates certain forces to bring about changes. Various facets of leadership studies are available in the literature of political ideas, mainly psychologically oriented studies, socio-economic factors, situational factors, the greatman theory and so on. However, there is presently an awareness and understanding that leaders should be set against the historical development that throw them into prominence, as has to be determined what role they play and how they act in certain given historical circumstances. It is not by analysing personal qualities alone, but by linking leadership study with a proper analysis of the production relations in a given society, that a meaningful analysis could be made.

In this context the socialist leadership has to be analysed from the historical background, in which it emerged and the personalities of the leaders that make them to be placed in the height of a leader in the then political situation which was under the control of the charismatic leadership of Gandhiji. In fact, the emergence of Gandhiji in the Congress leadership is distinct in style and content in comparison to the earlier leadership style which mainly adopted the method of petitioning and entering the legislatures for greater representation to Indians within the framework of the British empire⁵ and naturally the leadership came mainly from the highly educated intellectuals and was confined to the presidency cities only, giving more stress only on the British Govt., conceding the demands of the Indian people than on mass movement. But Gandhiji changed the situation by taking the whole nation into the vortex of an action-oriented programme, changing both the recruitment pattern of leadership and the relationship between the leader and the followers. Gandhiji, not in the capacity of his occupation or a position in an organisation,

but by virtue of his personal qualities and action oriented programme that he occupied the position of a leader of being loved, respected and followed by a large mass not with the hope of getting any rewards or punishment, but as he gave a psychic satisfaction of achieving freedom. And interestingly, in this situation of undisputed leadership of Gandhiji, the socialist leadership emerged in India, which no doubt, requires a thorough indepth study of the situational context and leadership style in a comparative perspective.

II. Objectives of the Present Study

Keeping in mind the above facts, the present study seeks to trace the socio-economic background, historical forces, intellectual foundation, main currents of thinking and the leadership qualities of Jayaprakash Narayan and Rammanohar Lohia of the Socialist thought and movement of India in the pre-independence and post-independence periods. It seeks to project, in particular, the specific contributions of Narayan, and Lohia, in the development of socialist ideas in India and in the furtherance of the socialist movement, interactions among themselves and with the leaders of the Congress Party, the Communist Party and other organisations, their role in the national movement and their influences on the course and directions of the progressive left movement in India. It also seeks to study the leadership aspects outlined above and the success and failure of the above leaders, and to correlate these to the present-day scattered democratic socialist leadership both within and outside the Congress Party.

III. Theoretical Framework : Leadership-meaning and nature

Socialist leadership in India means, in a linear sequence or development the leaders of the Congress Socialist Party, the Socialist Party, the Praja Socialist Party, the Sanyukta Socialist Party and the later factions and groups. Each of these party names indicate an important phase in the development of the leadership⁶.

Regarding leadership, there is no single definition accepted by all. It is generally admitted that leadership is the most strategic factor not only in politics but in any human group behaviour. In its broad connotation, the study of leadership is inclusive of studies of leaders, their behaviour in terms of functions

and their impact in the context of the leadership styles. Therefore, before going to study the socialist movement in general and Indian socialist leadership in particular, it is no doubt, necessary to have a clear discussion about leadership itself-what does it actually mean? What are the qualities to be a leader? And what are the conditions for a successful leadership?

It is now widely accepted in modern democratic societies that the nature of the political process and its decision making process need to be judged in the light of the emergence of the leadership positions and its interactions with the society. It is natural of having sharp difference of opinion about the attitude, purposes and the style of leadership among the leaders but the fact remains to be discussed is how on different circumstances such conflicting leadership operates. Social and economic condition of a country also constitute the basic framework for the study of leadership and its changing pattern.

The social condition of India is that there is “..... an increasing discrepancy between the normative order with its egalitarian values based on human dignity and freedom and wide spread poverty, illiteracy and inequality...”⁷ and this condition of underdevelopment is the general nature of developing countries of Asia in which new patterns of leadership are emerging. Again, within this condition of underdevelopment too, “... the character of national and local leadership has changed in significant way”⁸. These backward countries are characterised by mass poverty, illiteracy and disease which have become major obstacles to economic growth and development of human prosperity. Economic and social freedom, thus, became the main strategic point to the national leaders and leaders were considered most necessary for the smooth transition from the traditional to the modern social order to disseminate the new values of modernization.⁹

The nature of leadership has been changing with the modern changing system of transport, developed technology, industrialization and also with the influence of western education system. The old system of caste-hierarchies has changed “to a relatively open system governed by secular law”¹⁰ The new forces has reduced the influence of wealth, family status as leadership determinants and put forward education and political identification as of new significance for the same.

Another change has occurred with the spread of democratic ideas, i.e. the

leader-follower relationship. A national leader has a very little scope to contact directly with his followers in the village or grass-root level. He has to depend on some other local or provincial leaders who would act as the mediator between the national leader and the masses. Thus the question of party hierarchy or inter-relation of several group leaders arise and in modern times, in most cases, success or effectiveness of a leader depends upon this inter-relation. To quote the report on leadership of the I.C.S.S.R., "Thus we can view an intricate network of linkages connecting leaders at the highest national level with other leaders at the inter-mediate state level or district level, and even with those at the local level. These linkages have become very important because of the participatory nature of democracy and the proliferation of local institutions in the context of development strategy that the country adopted"¹¹. Due to this complexity, the definition and nature of leadership is required to be analysed.

'Leadership' may be defined, as interpersonal influence, exercised in situation and directed through the communication process, towards the attainment of a specified goal or goals. "Leadership always involves attempts on the part of a leader (influence) to affect (influence) the behaviour of a follower (influence) or followers in situations"¹². In this sense, i.e. as a 'process of function', leadership is applicable to all interpersonal relationships-religious, social, economic or political. But the fact is that social scientists are shifting their focus on theoretical orientation of leadership. Thus we find the trait approach-focusing on the leader himself to the virtual exclusion of other variables, the situationist approach-focusing attention on the leadership qualities to be determined to a large extent by the demand of the situation in which he has to function and the follower-oriented approach, "... variously been discussed and evaluated by a number of authors, including Stogdill, Jenkins, Gouldner and Stanford."¹³ On the other hand, Ronald A. Heifetz has analysed the prevailing theories as the great-man theory, situationalist, the contingency theory and the transaction theory. According to him, the greatman theory analyse that the history is the story of greatman and their impact on society ("women were not considered for greatness"). It is also called trait approach which defines leadership as the 'ability to lead' or a set of personal traits.¹⁴ These personal traits or psychological and physical attributes of a leader were presumed to differentiate the leader from other members of the society.

As a reaction to the greatman theory, the "... situationists argued that

history is much more than the effects of these men on their time". Herbert Spencer also "suggested that the times produce the person and not the other way around".¹⁵ In fact, situationists were not interested in leadership qualities or traits. Thus the great leaders of America, "— Jefferson, Washington, Adams.... Benjamin Franklin is (Sic) attributed not to a demographic fluke but to the extraordinary times in which these men lived."¹⁶ In fact, what a person does as a leader at large depends upon the characteristics of the situation.

In the mid fifties onwards, theorists began to synthesise the trait approach with the situationist view, though they could not "... negate the idea that individual 'make' history it did suggest that different situations demand different personalities."¹⁷ Contingency theory is as such a synthetic approach, which states that appropriate leadership style is contingent on the situational requirements, sometimes it requires, autocratic leadership and sometimes participative or democratic leadership or behaviour.

This study was expanded into the leader-follower relations i.e. "The transactives by which an individual gains influence and sustains it overtime."¹⁸ This is a reciprocal process, both leaders and followers influence each other. The leader earns influence by adjusting the various expectations of his followers. This approach focuses how influence is gained and maintained. Leadership, infact, involves adaptive problems and authority which again involves self images and moral codes.

D. Searing has stressed the importance of social background approach in the study of leadership. Social background of leader attitude and their orientation pattern is also relevant in this study because some background characteristics are more relevant while some attitudes are more strongly related and the relative importance of the relation between background and attitude varies from situation to situation or one system to another.¹⁹

But these approaches do not provide adequate theoretical framework for the study of leadership, because, "leadership exists with reference to the social organisation of a particular community and is also heavily influenced by the social climate and the system of values prevailing in that community."²⁰ Hence, the performance of the leadership functions are dependent also on the nature of the social organisation, its value system along with the type of task, character and qualities of the group and its members and their relations. Thus leadership

is a complex social phenomenon and its better analysis depends not only on one approach, but on the character of the total culture in which the group exists. Leadership, to quote Cecil A. Gibbs, is “both a function of the social situation and a function of personality as well as a function of these two in interaction.”²¹ Leadership is a relationship between person or persons exercising influence and one or more persons submitting to him or them and this relationship can best be studied within the framework of the group process.²²

Leader is a person who has to play a variety of roles, such as, as a planner and policy maker, as an executive, as an educator, as a spokesman, as an expert, as a protector and also as a mediator and all these roles²³ are greatly influenced by the “... factors like the nature of the group, its history and tradition and the very nature of the task itself.”²⁴ In other words, leadership may be described as an activity-the activity of citizen from any walk of life-mobilizing people to do something. Tucker described this from the analytical point of view and said, “In the final analysis, the strength of leadership as an influencing relation rest upon its effectiveness as activity.”²⁵ Thus a leader is allowed to function from multiple positions in a social structure, and can use a variety of abilities depending on the situational and cultural demands of the time. Many people, having personal qualities or traits do not exercise leadership, on the other hand, people exercise plenty of leadership everyday without 'being leaders'. This also leads to view leadership in terms of adaptive work which “consists of learning required to address conflicts..... or to diminish the gap between the values people stand for and the reality they face. Adaptive work requires a change in values, beliefs and behaviour.”²⁶ Further, in selecting adaptive work, it requires to mobilize people to face, rather than avoid tough realities and conflicts. Again to quote Ronald A. Heifetz, “The hardest and most valuable task of leadership may be advancing goals and designing strategy that promote adaptive work.”²⁷ Leadership, thus, has to allow and work for the values of various cultures and organizations which again requires influence and authority to be the primary factors in doing so. But at the same time, getting that work done or evolution of values is the essence of leadership. In modern democratic societies, we have several values - such as, liberty, equality, human welfare, justice, community development etc. for which the adaptive work is a tough to leadership.

Whatever role a leader may play, the assessment of its effectiveness is

difficult because the leadership role is determined by several factors and also due to the shifting and dynamic nature of the leadership role. However, it is agreed that the effectiveness of leadership role "... should be assessed in relation to the attainment of goal/ goals".²⁸

Leaders in all spheres of life can be, following M.A. Ayyangar, classified under three broad heads - born leaders with superior skill and ability, acquired leadership on consent or by the use of force and the leadership that have thrust upon them,²⁹ and in all spheres, "Leadership is a process not a person, involving the leader, the followers and their situations."³⁰

The advent of democratic ideas have changed the pattern of leadership in all political systems and changed the hereditary rulers/monarchs into leadership by choice of the people.³¹ Thus a leader must lead his folk and get others to follow him. On the basis of their followers, T.G.P. Spear has mentioned about five types of leaders :

- (a) The natural leader who has willing followers.
- (b) The charismatic leader where power rises from the deep of personality and "...arouses in his followers a sense of fulfilment, a feeling of joy in service."
- (c) The rational leader, who "... is neither worshipped nor followed faithfully rather he is obeyed and acquiesced in."
- (d) The leader of consensus by persuasion, which "suits static rather than dynamic conditions, and is apt to find itself out of place in tense situations."
- (e) Finally, the leadership of force which appears on force and depends on force. This is "a short-cut type of leadership" that looks to radical solutions without counting the cost.³²

Whatever may be the type of leadership, it must have some qualities to get public support and the quality to make the ideas or ways of thinking to be accepted. Thus leaders must have some psychological attributes-ability, skill and tact, honesty and high moral character with sufficient interest in common with his followers and the ability to dedicate himself to the tasks of helping his followers. According to M.A. Ayyangar, "The essential qualities of

leadership are : magnanimity, courage, selflessness, truth, honesty, spirit of service and sacrifice.”³³ Such personal qualities can easily attract others to place him in the height of leadership, as Mahatma Gandhi was. Gandhiji's simplicity, love for the people, including the poor and Harijans, his truthfulness, sacrifice, service to the cause are the main attractions of his leadership.

Situation is another factor in the analysis of leadership. Hero of a war may cease to be a leader during peace time. The case of Churchill of Britain is an example in this respect. Heroism or previous exhibition of courage and ability may make one a leader during crises or war. But a true leader must have the ability to undertake the social or economic reconstruction of a society in normal situations too. Again to quote Ayyangar, “it is, therefore, necessary to prepare competent leaders to run the civil administration, plan and guide social and economic reconstruction and also to take care of the country in times of crises.”³⁴

In a backward democratic society like India, leadership has another specific function i.e. to remove the 'psychological lag' and to convince the people about the need for change, and also to convince to accept the change. Leadership in this sense, is not only to be “representative, of their followers, but... also be interpretative of their wishes, opinions, feelings and well being.”³⁵

IV. Marxian view on leadership

Marxists, however, developed a rather complex idea on leadership. Marx analysed the leadership in capitalist societies dealing with political and intellectual leaders among whom some are evaluated as heroes, others as villains and others as buffoons. All these categories are described “...as creatures of the material conditions and the social system within which they function and as exponents of diverse classes”.³⁶

Marx and Engles stated that all greatmen are made by circumstances. “Every social epoch needs its great men and when it does not find them it invents them.”³⁷ According to Marx and Engels all leaders are replaceable. All greatmen are the outstanding representatives of the spirit of their time or their class and they advance the course of history by their deeds or thoughts. To them, in the communist society all social differences between leader and followers and between men would disappear and a spontaneous self-governed

community would develop, in which all would participate equally. Everyone is equal and hence is competent to lead or decide questions of public interest. To them, bureaucracy is the institutional expression of political leadership and is separate from human community which again is alienated manifestations of the community. Everyman would be given opportunity to join the leadership cadre and they discarded the notion that training is required for governing the community. Engels in his article 'On Authority' developed the idea of leaderless communist society though he admitted that management of industry would still require some sort of leadership in the form of planning and coordination of effort but workers would still forfeit their freedom.³⁸

Both Marx and Engels praised the spontaneous heroism, wisdom and leadership of nameless activities in the proletarian revolution, but they remained ambivalent as they again mentioned that the only genuine revolutions are those without leaders. Marx believed that most leaders lead the workers astray. Engels went further when he said that so long the leaders remain prominent, the revolutionary class is not ready for its historic role.³⁹

Any rigid deterministic approach, is not acceptable in the analysis of leadership. This general notion is also applicable in the analysis of leadership made by Marx and Engels. The later Marxists like, Lenin, Kautsky, Plekhanov, Mao and a host of others have tried to suit this idea as fitted according to the situation. Lenin argued for the leadership of the Communist Party (comprising the proletariat), "capable of leading the new order and of organizing it, and to be teacher, director and leader of all who work and are exploited."⁴⁰ Lenin defined the leadership task as repository of consciousness with the mission to educate the proletariat by means of propaganda and agitation for winning the revolution. In this sense he called leadership as 'General staff' of the proletarian revolution, "which would mobilize the masses for action, map their strategy, and lead them to victory."⁴¹ Thus, to Lenin, leadership has to perform the educational work and the revolutionary action through an organisation, i.e. a party to be created with a complex hierarchical structure. This conception is somehow close to bureaucratic leadership. Lenin, hence, advocated the theory of party dominance and of leadership within the party which has again been equated with the idea of democratic centralism in its various manifestations. Leadership, thus, is not wholly arbitrary. Rather it develops according to the inherent necessities. This is again evident from Lenin's distinction between

strategy and tactics, as the latter is increasingly seen as the “art of political leadership” involving the adaptation of the broad strategy.⁴²

Kautsky also developed the idea of elitism and advocated the existence of bourgeois intellectuals and the workers in which it is implicit that the former lead and the latter follow. He said, “A class can rule but not govern, for a class is a formless mass, while only an organisation can govern.”⁴³

Infact, presently, Marxism itself has been reshaping with the idea of 'national Marxism'⁴⁴ depending on the necessity of the particular situation of a nation which again leads the idea of leadership to be moving along different routes. As a result Marxism itself has taken various shapes like, Leninism, Maoism, Titoism, Castroism etc., each centering around the ideas of a particular leader. Naturally, the earlier Marxian doctrines of the leaderless community has now somehow changed and the emphasis on leadership is now being given. Now it is well accepted that leaders are not only power holders but also power spenders and power makers⁴⁵ and in this sense of power function, leaders perform three types of functions :

- (i) Initiating or innovating, by which a leader inspires the followers in overthrowing the capitalist regime and establishing new regime.
- (ii) Maintaining function of a leader implies upholding of the established order.
- (iii) Protecting function of leadership implies or provides security for the followers in all respects of life, beliefs, values and interests.

These functions or styles, naturally, imply the charismatic leadership referring to the psychological aspects of some leaders. It is now also accepted “that leaders respond to environmental factors even as they shape the political environment in which they operate”.⁴⁶ Thus a close interlink exists between the leader and the socio-economic situation expressed in the production relations at a particular time. Both environmental factors and personality or traits are individually not sufficient enough to study the leadership. The complex structure of production relations, the role of individual leader with his specific qualities have become relevant in leadership studies. To quote Plekhanov, “Influential individuals can change the individual features of events and some of their particular consequences, but they cannot change their general trend, which is determined by other factors.”⁴⁷

It is now accepted that the leadership theory of the Marxian variety has reassessed the importance of individual leadership, to some extent. The exercise of power, influence, command, authority and control are closely associated with the idea and definition of leadership. It is a group process, a study of personality and its effects, a form of persuasion and an instrument of goal achievements.

In short, "leadership may be conceived of as a mutual interaction between those who lead and those who are led".⁴⁸ Leadership is a complex phenomenon and leadership study needs a linkage between the followers and their relationship patterns with the study of leaders. Naturally, no single approach like the trait approach, situational approach, group-follower oriented approach or the Greatman theory is sufficient to analyse the nature of leadership in modern complex and rapidly changing society. As a result, the ideas of Plato and Machiavelli have been changed to a large extent. Plato insisted on the Philosopher kind of leadership and said, "until philosophers are kings or the kings and princes of the world have the spirit and power of philosophy and political greatness and wisdom meet in one, and those commoner natures who pursue either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities, will never have rest from their evils - no, nor the human race, and then only our state have a possibility of life and behold the light of the day."⁴⁹ while Machiavelli, on the other hand, had a different model in his mind and said, "So, as a prince is forced to know how to act like a beast, he should learn from the fox and the lion, because, the lion is defenceless against traps and a fox is defenceless against wolves. Therefore, one must be a fox in order to recognise traps and a lion to frighten off wolves so it follows that a prudent ruler cannot, and should not honour his word when it places him at a disadvantage If all men were good, this precept would not be good, but because men are wretched creatures who would not keep their word to you, you need not keep your word to them".⁵⁰ Plato had in his mind about the betterment of the people, how the people could live better in a society, while Machiavelli insisted on the success of a leader and prescribed for the same.

The criterion of a good or successful leader, is thus not only the personal traits but the institution, persons, and processes as a whole constitute the same, because all men including the occasional greatmen, are merely responding to their environment. They are benefitted both from the objective events and the

140417 16 MAR 201

Sanjivani
Library
Bhatnagar

works of others. Leadership is thus, “Largely a teaching process beginning with the parental nurturing of children, that creative leadership is closely related to conflict and crisis or atleast to debate and dialogue, and that above all transforming leadership carries grave but not always recognised moral implications”.⁵¹

According to Stogdill, “The qualities, characteristics and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demand of the situation.....”.⁵² and as a result along with personal qualities of a leader, the whole character of the group and society he leads, is required to be analysed. This is equally relevant in all the styles of institutional leadership or dictatorial leadership or democratic leadership analysis. Since, leadership involves the situation, context and personal qualities, the style or type of leadership is not uniform in all places and times. This style differs depending on the temper of the leader or leaders and the organisational patterns of authority. These styles, have further taken different shapes due to the difference of opinion among the analysts. However, these styles may be classified under following categories:

- (i) Laissezfaire leadership, which depends on autonomous abilities and orientation of the members for the attainment of goals.
- (ii) Democratic leadership which rests on the production of group motivations for the attainment of goals. It promotes responsible participation by other group members and restores and maintains co-operative inter-personal relations within the group. It is also called creative leadership. This style of leadership seeks to conciliate two objectives - of optimal attainment of group goals and limited external controls on the individual. In other words, it lays emphasis on mutual understanding and active participation by members in the leadership functions.
- (iii) Authoritarian style of leadership rests on direct dictation and enforcement by the leader to be followed by the members for the attainment of goals. It centralizes all powers and functions in one individual and does not seek to evoke the maximum involvement of other members. Such “..... leaders resort to the rule of paternalism - benevolent, whenever possible, but compulsive and ruthless, if necessary.” Further it creates an atmosphere of “membership suspicion of their leaders' intention as well as leadership distrust of the members'

loyalty,” resulting the compliance of several group norms, strict and formal rules of conduct to be obeyed by the members.

(iv) Autocratic leadership empowers the leader with an unlimited and absolute control over all activities of the members in course of goal attainment.⁵³

However, presently, these leadership styles are categorised into two broad categories for analytical purposes - the democratic and the authoritarian styles. Certainly, there is a close relationship between the style of command or leadership and the pattern of authority with a constant flow of inter-influence from both sides which causes variations of style of leadership, even within the same organisational setup. This is the most important aspect of leadership study, to find out this changing style of leadership within same setup or otherwise.

Undoubtedly, the democratic style has been found to be the most successful. However, such categorisation is only the over simplification of facts. Difficulty arises when applied or put into the broader situations of political party or a larger aggregate of peoples.⁵⁴ The rise and role of a particular leader or personality, of course, characterises him within a particular socio-economic foundation of a country, which again determines the national character of its people as a whole. The nature of political and socio-economic conditions are so complex and intense that it is not an easy task to determine or distinguish a clear area where one ends and the other begins. Naturally, the style of leadership is a complex and critical phenomenon. Therefore, the psychoanalysis of mental setup of a leader as well as the socio-economic background is equally relevant to the analysis of leadership styles. Further, this theoretical study of leadership style, certainly, can not be totally applicable or followed in toto, in all political set-up for which variations of leadership style, depending on the situational context and psychological and intellectual foundation of a particular leader is obvious. Within the same category of either democratic or autocratic style, variations in leadership styles may be found depending on the adaptive capabilities, self image or moral codes of the leader himself and the sensitiveness of the leader to the dynamics of the society and his followers. Along with these, organised hierarchical structure of the leadership pattern and interpretativeness of the wishes, opinions and well-being of the people also influence the leadership style in a society.

Further, a true leader must be well-aware about the situation as “a real leader is one who retains his following even when out of power.”⁵⁵ A true leader has to lead and play several roles in the society and his success or effectiveness depends on the success or attainment of goals. The degree in which the leader succeeds in the attainment of specified goals is the measure of effectiveness of leadership. The important thing, in this respect, for a leader, is to be socially sensitive to relevant dynamics of the followers including their needs, feelings and motivations. “This implies that the effective leader is skilful in ignoring or discarding irrelevant and incorrect perceptions”.⁵⁶ This needs some attributes of leader's personality for the effectiveness of his leadership. These are perceptual capacities, action capacities and action flexibility.

In fact, leadership is the myth of lone-warrior-which needs an organised hierarchical structure of leadership to confer power in exchange for being relieved of problems. So the successful leader has to manage himself to sustain the personal stresses. Ronald A. Heifetz has given seven practical suggestions to develop personal skills; These are to: “(1) Get on the balcony, (2) distinguish self from role, (3) Externalize the conflict, (4) Use partners, (5) Listen, using oneself as data, (6) find a sanctuary and (7) preserve a sense of purpose.” By getting, on balcony, he wanted to mean that since leadership is both active and reflective one has to alternate between participating and observing which Walt Whitman described as “both in and out of the game”. By self distinction, he suggested not to be misled by his emotions. By externalizing the conflict, it implies, “making the distinction” between role and self, “enables one to externalize the conflict, thereby focusing attention on the issue and giving the conflict back to its rightful owners.” By partner, it is implied that leadership can not be exercised alone, “The lone warrior model of leadership is heroic suicide”. Listening, using oneself as data means not to react automatically but to observe others and to express strategically and not reactively.⁵⁷

By finding a sanctuary means, “listening to oneself requires a place where one can hear oneself think.” One needs a sanctuary to restore one's sense of purpose and regain courage and heart. Finally, by preserving a sense of purpose, he implies, “practice of leadership requires, perhaps first and foremost, a sense of purpose - the capacity to find the values that make risk-taking meaningful”. The sense of purpose can enable one to step back and review the situation.⁵⁸

Leadership is an abstract term, and in its concrete form manifests itself in the total process of the rise of a leader, the influence he wields on his followers, and the ways by which he not only ensures and gathers power around him and seeks to ascend still further, but also tries to perpetuate his achieved position. It is essentially a process of struggle to get recognised by performing or executing certain characteristics, depending upon situational context, and by struggling to clear the way up the ladder. A leader is a product of a particular historical process, who initiates certain forces to bring about changes.

Presently, there is an awareness and understanding that leaders should be set against the historical developments that throw them into prominence, and has to be determined what role they play and how they act in certain given historical circumstances. It is not by analysing personal qualities alone, but by linking leadership study with a proper analysis of the production relation in a given society, that a meaningful analysis could be done. It will not be an exaggeration to quote James MacGregor Burns that, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth."⁵⁹

Therefore, we have to analyse the nature of the Indian polity, the background of the socialist movement in India, the intellectual foundations of the leaders for better understanding of the socialist leadership in India, in general, and the role of Jayaprakash Narayan and Rammanohar Lohia, as socialist leaders, in particular.

V. Socialism — Meaning and Implications

In the contemporary world, the term "Socialism" entails so much controversy that it is quite difficult to give a definition to be accepted by all. This word is very much talked about and debated and since its first use in early nineteenth Century, countless countries and individuals have come to claim themselves as socialist for which its variety has become so many that it is very difficult to give a definite description of it.⁶⁰ It is not easy to give a precise and complete definition of socialism, as to quote Alexander Gray, "which will embrace all socialists and exclude all non-socialists."⁶¹

Socialism, in its present form, originated in the late eighteenth Century and early nineteenth century as a protest against the prevailing factory system which creates gulf of difference between the rich and the poor. Also, the

Industrial Revolution and its impact upon the production system including technology oriented civilization which led to the rise of a new working class, created the atmosphere to develop new ideas of socialism. The impact of French Revolution with its emphasis on liberty, equality and fraternity are the political counterparts of socialism. Socialism stands for freedom, equality, brotherhood, social justice, classless society which again can negatively be described as to oppose oppression, exploitation, inequality, injustice, poverty, misery. In other words, socialism is opposed to the capitalist concept of private enterprise and seeks to replace by a system of common or public ownership of the means of production.⁶²

In 1827, the term 'socialism' was first used in its modern sense, in the Cooperative Magazine, an Owenite publication to denote tendencies opposed to liberal individualism.⁶³ According to Cole, the word 'Social' was in contrast with the word 'individual' and as such socialists were those who in opposition to the prevailing stress on the claim of the individual, emphasised the social elements in human relations and sought to bring the social question to the front.⁶⁴

Asoka Mehta stressed and said that the vast developments caused by the two great revolutions - The French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution, “... overturned many established institutions and ideas and cleared the ground for political and social experiments ... refining tools and techniques and clearing vast opportunities and complexities in industry and in agriculture .. From this vast charming, socialism emerged.”⁶⁵

In fact, socialism was developed as a protest against capitalism as well as exploitation of the labourer under the factory system. It opposed the prevailing individualist order with its laissez-faire attitude and its ruthlessness, as a result of which, social and economic questions came to the forefront in comparison to political problems. Socialism, thus was a revolt against capitalism and a protest against poverty. Equality became the main issue. The new factory system created a new proletariat and its poverty became an important issue. But at the same time, “.. socialism, from the start, stood for something else, not merely an improvement in the conditions of the working class but a new social order.”⁶⁶ In socialism, important cultural, political, intellectual and ideological trends come together. As a result, it has become

the leading ideology of our age for which “.... divergent views on the right emphasis and order of priorities”⁶⁷ have arisen. However, it is more or less accepted by all that socialism, as a distinct political ideology emerged for the establishment of a new social order - a society of equals with the hope of minimizing the gulf differences existed in various groups in society, since unequal distribution of wealth is the source of all misery. To quote Ebenstein, “socialism is a protest against social injustice. Socialism as an effective organised political movement is the product of the industrial revolution.”⁶⁸

Socialism also connotes some fundamental tendencies - such as Egalitarianism, dominant notion of which is equality. Morality is another tendency denoting social justice, peace, cooperation and brotherhood. Rationalism is its another tendency, representing the principle of Enlightenment in socialism, implying individual happiness, reason, knowledge, efficiency in production, the rational and purposeful organisation of human society for progress. Libertarianism, is another tendency demanding freedom in the sense of total absence of restraints — external and internal.⁶⁹

VI. Early Socialism

In the 18th and 19th centuries, liberalism brought the idea of adult franchise, the rule of law, capitalism etc. Alongwith these, freedom and equality became indivisible. These guarantees were soon found inadequate, especially for economic inequality, the product of economic transformation, associated with the industrial revolution. The need for large scale investment led to the ownership of the means of production to be concentrated in relatively few hands while the remaining majority people became the exploited wage-earners. Thus, instead of economic equality, the new system created by the technological development, led to its opposite. Thus liberalism itself “...was faced with the dilemma opposed by the development of an apparent contradiction between freedom and equality which had not been generally anticipated”.⁷⁰ Early socialism sought to resolve this dilemma, replacing capitalism by some form of workers ownership or control of industry. The early socialists were convinced that the profit motive, left undisturbed by government action, could not produce universal happiness, as the capitalists claimed.⁷¹ The early socialists, starting from Babeuf, held that the levelling up of economic disparities was an imperative need for the establishment of liberty, equality and fraternity. In the

18th and 19th centuries all the Pre-Marxian socialists-utopians, Saint Simonians, Fourierists, Owenites — realised, in different degrees, that capitalism created inequality and exploitation. They regarded the question of social equality as the most important of all. They indicated about the inequalities and the gulf between rich and poor. They rejected a social order based on competitive struggle between man and man for the means of living. Utopians, desired the establishment of fraternity and equality among all men. They insisted that unequal distribution of wealth and power was the origin of misery and these they wanted to be changed into a society where men would no longer be divided into masters and servants, rather would work on a cooperative basis for the common good. Thus, early socialism was to mean collective organisation of men's affairs on a cooperative basis to establish happiness and welfare of all, as against competitive patterns of behaviours.⁷²

Babeuf, a French Philosopher, believed in the equal natural rights of all. His main aim was equality for which he believed in the universal right to education and in the necessity of abolishing both richness and poverty in the interest of human happiness, which, according to him, consists in equality.⁷³ Saint Simon wanted to eradicate the maladies of capitalist system by subordinating private enterprise to the councils of experts, who would maintain the harmony of economy as a whole. He expressed more clearly the fundamental principles of socialism such as exploitation of man by man, the need of emancipation of workers, the suppression of surplus value etc. “Present efforts towards a planned economy may be said to have a Saint-Simonian character.”⁷⁴

Fourier, a liberal cooperative socialist, wanted to build up a healthy economic life, substituting capitalism by spontaneous cooperative associations. Proudhon, on the other hand, considered freedom and justice as the main criteria of socialism and urged the elimination of exploitation, the source of which was not merely on the concentration of capital but also in the division of labour. He “advocated the organisation of a national cooperative bank which would be able to give gratuitous credit to all producers”, and thus liberating them from the bondage of capital.⁷⁵ Robert Owen sought to reform capitalism through state supported trade unionism, the cooperative movement and formal education. He also proposed that the workers should be organised into self-supporting, self-sufficing 'villages of cooperation' and should live in communal

harmony. His socialism was essentially in cooperation for community living, voluntary action and not through legislation. The state, he urged, should provide the principles of self government, decentralization and association.⁷⁶

Louis Blanc also was aware about the meladies of competition and monopoly capital for which he advocated “... productive associations of working men provided with necessary capital by the state, which would, however not be the administrator or the proprietor of these workshops but only make the laws regulating them.”⁷⁷

Thus, in short, early socialism advocated the philosophy of liberalism, and “... sought to restore the liberalist identity between freedom and equality though the replacement of capitalism by a system of broad based productive associations and cooperatives and a liberatarian political system in which state would aid and generally regulate the economic system without exercising too much control over it.”⁷⁸ The early socialists, who, in short, believe in learning to live cooperatively and creatively with their neighbours were also believers in free associations wherein the human personality would have full scope for development. They were the pre-cursors of personalism, self-government and federalism. According to Asoka Mehta, utopianism is fundamentally what was recently called, “A quest for community”.

This early socialism, in short, stressed on the economic problems of the society rather than on the law of nature. They emphasised on the better understanding of the classes and class cooperation rather than class struggle. It was not a socialist movement as such, rather an intellectual movement bound to the traditional moral and religious values. Moreover, in comparison with the later Marxian socialism, it was not backed by any “Philosophy of history” and naturally it was pragmatic and experimental in character. Further, it believed in peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism, without having any sociology, international programme and class struggle, and hence it is often branded as utopian socialism.⁷⁹

Early socialism, before the advent of Marx, can be summed up and categorised into three small but distinct streams of socialism, found in the early 19th century. They are : (1) French socialist ideas propogated mainly by Rousseau, Babeuf, Saint Simon, Fourier, Proudhon and so on. The main idea of this stream was that in the original condition of nature, all men were free

and equal having all things in common. Saint Simon preached that all the instruments of production including land and capital should be rewarded in proportion to one's service. To quote Saint Simon, "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his merit,"⁸⁰ should be the basic principle.

(2) English ideas of socialism were propagated mainly by Robert Owen, William Thomas, Hodgskin, John Gray, John F. Bray and others. This group mainly known as Owenite, advocated a liberal societal outlook based on human rationality which could be explored by education. They also advocated cooperative movements for the progress of society. England may be considered as the birth place of modern socialism, since first industrial development, class contradiction as a result of new economic order, and a link between democracy and socialism, may be said to have emerged there.⁸¹

(3) German Socialist tendency, propagated by Karl Marlo, K.J. Rodbertus, Ferdinand Lasselle-preached the ideas of collective property, cooperative production, communal distribution and control of population for the removal of economic evils of the society and advocated for equality of all men. Lasselle established the German Social Democracy in 1863 with the hope of eliminating social inequalities.⁸²

All the three groups rejected the *laissez-faire* in favour of a social system where the rewards of the new industrial order could be shared by all. They sought to restore the liberalist identity of freedom and equality but could not gather any revolutionary organizational activity.

However, it may be mentioned that we have in the above categories only the groups and sects emerged during the 18th and 19th centuries. Before that, there is also some evidence of socialist outlook prevailing in earlier societies, starting from the writings of Plato, who advocated a scheme of aristocratic communism⁸³, confined only to consumption. Besides this, Thomas More's utopia, Manu's socialistic order of 'Varnashrama Dharma', Islamic ideology of equality of human rights, teachings of Christian fathers etc. are also ideas in this respect. But these are not socialism in the real sense of the term, as we understand today.

VII. Marxian Socialism

Karl Marx, a German Philosopher, but exiled from Germany, explained a scientific theory of socialism and shed its utopian dreams. Marx, being influenced by Hegelian philosophy, explained the society and its development from a new angle with a different meaning to it. He applied the Hegelian concept of Dialectic to the exploitation of the dynamics of human society, which is composed of two opposite classes and their respective interests. He argued that the abolition of poverty can only be ascertained through the abolition of classes. 'Communist Manifesto' of 1848 is the basis of scientific socialism. Marxian socialism stands not only for setting up utopias but to offer a criticism of existing social and political conditions with the suggestion of struggle for realisation of the classless society. He suggested a revolutionary method of upsetting the existing society of unequals.

According to Marx, the history of human society is a continuous process of social development which again is the "history of class struggle" between oppressed and oppressor. Every society and its class structure is based on a definite system of production, which ultimately determines the socio-economic pattern of that society. With Marx socialism assumed a militant form with new outlook of economic interpretation of history, class struggle, dialectic, theory of surplus value, dictatorship of the proletariat. Marxian socialism gave emphasis on the importance of the economic factors in explaining the progress in the society. Marx, for the first time, "... spoke in details of the stages through which it must evolve...", along with the picture of his desired society and in this sense, his socialism is termed as scientific.⁸⁴ Marx indicated the dominant structure of class relations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat which indicated that the proletariat, since, possessed nothing except its own labour power, was economically dependent upon the bourgeoisie. This again led the bourgeoisie class to extract surplus value, "... the origin of an entirely new category of income-capitalists' profit".⁸⁵ This contradiction between these two classes would ultimately lead the proletariat eventually to rise in revolution and establish a socialist society by overthrowing the bourgeoisie. For such an uprising of the proletariat, Marx, indicated several characteristics of the capitalist society which would lead the proletariat, the 'universal class' to abolish all class contradictions. These are the cooperative form of labour involving division of function which required cooperation and organisation to produce

a finished product. This ultimately would lead them increasing unity and class identification by the industrial proletariat. The advance forces of production, i.e., scientific nature of production and inquiry would be a guidance for them to liberate rather than enslaved mankind.⁸⁶ Again, Marx declared that capitalist society would be “characterised by the incessant accumulation of capital... accompanied by increasingly fierce economic competition”⁸⁷ and, thus, the size of the working class would become larger. As a result, “This increasing polarisation between the working class and the bourgeoisie would lead to a point” where “contradiction between the antagonistic classes would reach on extreme level”, and social revolution would be inevitable.⁸⁷

Marx gave a real picture of society and its development from the economic viewpoint and explained how property is concentrated in the hands of few, who, using the state machinery, continuously exploit the poor. This exploitation creates two opposing classes - the have and the have nots, among whom a continuous struggle exists until the establishment of a socialist society under the leadership of proletariat. According to the Marxist doctrine, the transfer of the means of production to public ownership under the leadership of the working class, is the essential content of socialist revolution. By materialistic interpretation of history Marx explained the development of society through different stages characterised and dominated by different modes of production. Eric Hobsbawm has argued that “the general theory of historical materialism requires only that there should be a succession of modes of production, though not necessarily any particular modes, and perhaps not in any particular predetermined order.”⁸⁸ Marx also explained how capitalism would eventually die, since, it was a stage in the social development. Exploitation of the labouring classes by the capitalist has been explained by his theory of surplus value. Thus with Marx, socialism entered into an altogether new phase by introducing a broad humanistic sociology, overcoming all religious overtones and by giving a new meaning to the human society. He regarded religion as positively harmful to society. To quote J. Bandopadhyaya, Marx “..... developed a broad humanist sociology and prescribed a revolutionary method of upsetting the existing order of society he contended the dictatorship of the proletariat, which would eliminate the capitalist class and lead to the eventual disappearance of the state.”⁸⁹

Lenin opined that Marxism “required supplementation and extension”⁹⁰ for its practice and use in a particular state, declaring Marxism as a general or universal theory and most progressive and revolutionary, and accepting the five types of production relations, namely - Primitive communism, slave society, feudalism, capitalism and socialism. However, after Marx, with the development of the idea of “national Marxism”⁹¹ socialism, having regional colourings with typical characteristics emerged, as syndicalism in France, Fabianism, Guild Socialism in Britain and Democratic Socialism propagated by the Labour Party in Great Britain, Bolshevism in Soviet Union. Alongwith these some other individualistic attitude have also grown-namely, leninism, Stalinism, Khrushchevism, Titoism, Maoism, Cartroism, Neo Marxism and the like, depending on the situation of the society and personal outlook, of practical use of the same. However, there are some fundamental doctrines, on which all are united. As Coker remarks, “they agree in certain of their theoretical assumptions and also in their general aims; all seek to secure, through some substantial limitation on the private ownership of property, a fairer and practically more satisfactory apportionment of wealth and economic opportunity”.⁹²

VIII. Democratic Socialism

Democratic Socialism is based on the principles of economic equality and political freedom of the individual. Like communism, democratic socialism also began as a protest against the injustices created by the industrial revolution in Europe. The ruthless dictatorship of a Communist Party in Soviet Union, sacrificed the inalienable socialist principles of individual freedom and political equality, developed a growing alienation between the socialist parties in Europe and the Soviet Union.⁹³ As a result, the socialist parties started on an independent line of their own based on democratic principle. To the democratic socialists, democracy and democratic institutions are the political expressions of freedom and equality. “Democracy is at the same time means and end. It is the means of the struggle for socialism...”⁹⁴ Only through democratic institutions and within a democratic framework freedom and equality can find their fullest expression.

Democratic socialists though reject the deterministic approach to historical and social phenomena and deny the possibility of explaining such phenomena

with a single law or single factor, yet they derive some inspiration from Marx. Socialists accept the Marxian sociology of capitalist exploitation, capital concentration, but categorically deny the dialectical materialism and the view of armed revolution.⁹⁵ Democratic socialists, thus insist on the importance of the individual and the protection of their rights, economic and political equality and these can be protected by collective decisions and responsibility, which naturally give priority to government social services. They also believe that this aim can not be achieved overnight but through years to change the economic and social order in the desired direction. They believe in going step by step working through the parliament and peaceful constitutional methods of reform. According to them, it is essential to prepare the people intellectually and emotionally for the new social order.

The moderate brand of this thought is represented by the British Labour Party. And in India socialism has taken a peculiar form with its indigenous values mixed up with Gandhian brand, Western Democratic Socialism and also Marxian Socialism represented by several groups and fractions under the banner of different political Parties. This peculiar synthesis of the Indian variety of democratic socialism is due to the fact that most of those who propagated this variety, were Marxists in the beginning and they retained some of the basic tenets of Marxism, and afterwards they shifted to the Gandhian techniques of non-violence and civil disobedience. They visualised the building up of a socialist society through the employment of democratic means, by capturing power by democratic process and socialism under a democratic Government. All these are nothing but the traces of Western Democratic Socialism. However, unlike Western Democratic Socialist, the Indian Socialists included extra-parliamentary methods alongwith parliamentary means for attaining their goal. These extra-parliamentary methods include civil-resistance, satyagraha and non-cooperation. Indian socialism, thus, advocates social change, emphasising on democracy notwithstanding, rather than purely a reformist creed like the Western Democratic Socialism.

IX. Research questions

Given the broad objective of the study outlined above, following research questions were formulated to be probed:

1. How were the major spokesmen understudy, attracted to the socialist ideas and movement?
2. To what extent did they accept the existing socialist ideas?
3. What were the processes, they adopted to utilize those ideas in the Indian nationalist movement and socio-economic system of India ?
4. How far were they influenced by the Marxist-Socialist ideas and how far they were Marxists at the beginning?
5. How and to what extent did they propagate and enrich the socialist ideas and movement in India?
6. What was their individual role in the development of socialist ideas and movement in India ?
7. What were the factors of their failure or success, if any, in this respect?
8. What contribution did they make to the theory building on socialist movement in India.?

X. Overview of the Existing Literature

Studies of political leaders, like, Gandhi, Nehru, Jayaprakash, Rammanohar Lohia, and others have attracted both general and scholarly attention of both Indian and foreign authors. There is a plathora of literature on political leaders and political parties in India. The available literature on political leaders are mostly following the conventional biographical style. Scientific studies on leadership, more particularly, on socialist leadership in our country are very few and the majority of the works are narratives with an admixture of personal eulogy.

Another aspect of the existing literature, is that a little attention has so far been given to the study of Indian socialist parties, though there are a good number of scholarly literatures available on party politics in India. This aspect

has also been noticed and mentioned by the Survey report of the ICSSR on Research on Political Parties, stating that, "Socialist parties should provide a fascinating subject for students of Indian Politics. It is rather surprising that research literature either by Indian authors or by foreigners is conspicuous by its absence"⁹⁶ Naturally, the study of socialist leadership has got little attention. However, a good number of literature on 'leadership', is available, which "would fill many libraries", if assembled in one place.⁹⁷ But this general picture is not equally same in case of India, in the study of socialist or leftist leaders. In fact, the study of party leaders and leadership, in a serious and scientific manner, got attention of the social scientists in India, only in the middle of the twentieth century.⁹⁸ Again, this interest of study remained general in nature, in studying the party leaders, not socialist leaders as such. To quote the survey report of the ICSSR, again, "Most biographical works on leaders in India... are studies of leaders emphasising their birth, their strength, and the way they made their decisions from sociological or psychological angles. But unless the followers and their relationship patterns are linked with the study of leaders, they can not constitute leadership studies."⁹⁹ This is the actual picture of the studies on Indian leadership, including socialist leadership.

However, some serious attempts have been made by some scholars, both of India and foreign countries, to study the communist, socialist and leftist movements in India. In this category, Overstreet and Windmiller¹⁰⁰ have made a competent study on the communist party and movement in India. Among others, Muzaffar Ahmed,¹⁰¹ M.R. Masani,¹⁰² Shashi Bairathi¹⁰³, N.E. Balaram,¹⁰⁴ M. R. Dandavate,¹⁰⁵ P.D. Debanandan and M.M. Thomas,¹⁰⁶ Shibdas Ghosh,¹⁰⁷ P.J. Haitcox,¹⁰⁸ Madhu Limaye,¹⁰⁹ S. R. Mohandas,¹¹⁰ Soumendranath Tagore,¹¹¹ Philip Spratt,¹¹² have contributed a lot in studying the development of communism and communist movement in India, and indicating the various aspects of communist thought and movement in India. In the field of communist thought and movement in India, these are of immense value.

Some other eminent authors, like, Ilyas Ahmad,¹¹³ Prem Bhashin,¹¹⁴ Brij Narain,¹¹⁵ Narendra Deva,¹¹⁶ Edatata Narayanan,¹¹⁷ Kamala Gadre,¹¹⁸ Pramita Ghosh,¹¹⁹ Sankar Ghosh,¹²⁰ Sohail Jawaid,¹²¹ M.R. Masani,¹²² Asoka Mehta,¹²³ B.R. Nanda,¹²⁴ L.P. Sinha,¹²⁵ P.L. Lakhnupal,¹²⁶ Girja Shankar,¹²⁷ Asim Kumar Choudhury,¹²⁸ R.A. Prasad,¹²⁹ Satyabrata Rai Chowdhuri,¹³⁰ M.R. Pai,¹³¹ K.N.

Panikkar,¹³² Devidatta Pant,¹³³ Saul Rose,¹³⁴ Sampurnanand,¹³⁵ S.G. Sardesai,¹³⁶ Harikishore Singh,¹³⁷ Soumendranath Tagore¹³⁸ and a host of others, have contributed a lot in studying the socialist thought and movement in India, including the study of the Congress Socialist Party, its formation and development with a close analysis of its relation with the National Congress and freedom movement in India. Some of them have also analysed the Praja Socialist Party with critical evaluation and interrelations with the Communist party and movement in India.

On the other hand, there are also some serious scholarly attempts by some eminent authors, who have made valuable contributions to the study of India leaders in general, mainly based on the contributions of some leaders putting together. They are G.S. Bhargava,¹³⁹ D.B. Dhanapala,¹⁴⁰ Bhawani Choudhuri and Debaranjan Chakraborty,¹⁴¹ L.N. Sarin,¹⁴² Yusuf Meherally,¹⁴³ P.D. Tandon,¹⁴⁴ A. Appadorai,¹⁴⁵ D.R. Bali,¹⁴⁸ Prakash Chandra,¹⁴⁹ Pantham and Deutsch¹⁵⁰ and a host of others. These authors have contributed a lot in assessing the contributions of some eminent Indian leaders taking together and compiling their contributions.

Another group of eminent authors has made much contributions in assessing the qualities and contributions of individual leaders or thinkers of India, which includes all leaders-socialist, nationalist, leftist or others. These studies are individualist in nature. Though some sort of comparative study has been attempted by some, in general, these are studies of individual contributions in socio-economic or political fields. This includes the study of Gandhi, Nehru, Jayaprakash, Rammanohar Lohia, and others. In this category, contributions relevant to our study have been made mainly by B.N. Ahuja,¹⁵¹ S.R. Bakshi,¹⁵² Bholu Chatterje¹⁵³, Chitrita Chaudhuri,¹⁵⁴ Ramchandra Gupta,¹⁵⁵ Chandradeo Prasad,¹⁵⁶ Prakash C. Shastri,¹⁵⁷ N.C. Mehrotra,¹⁵⁸ Allan and Wendy Scarfe,¹⁵⁹ Karuna Kaushik,¹⁶⁰ M. Arumugam,¹⁶¹ Dr. V.K. Arora,¹⁶² and others. Studies on the contributions of Gandhi and Nehru have been made by many scholars, among whom, Tendulkar,¹⁶³ Nirmal Kr. Bose and P.H. Patwardhan,¹⁶⁴ B.R. Nanda,¹⁶⁵ B.K. Ahlwwailia,¹⁶⁶ C.P. Bhambri,¹⁶⁷ Pradip Bose,¹⁶⁸ Michael Brecher,¹⁶⁹ M.N. Das,¹⁷⁰ Vishnu Dutt,¹⁷¹ Michael Edward,¹⁷² Sarvepalli Gopal,¹⁷³ R.K. Karanjia,¹⁷⁴ J.B. Kripalani,¹⁷⁵ Dorothy Norman¹⁷⁶ are a few. Atindranath Bose,¹⁷⁷ has made a valuable contribution on Swami Vivekananda, while M.N. Choudhury¹⁷⁸ and others have contributions in

assessing the ideas of Subhas Bose. G.P. Bhattacharjee¹⁷⁹ has studied the contribution of M.N. Roy in the development of communist and Marxist ideas in India.

L.P. Vidharthi (ed.)¹⁸⁰ B.N. Pandey (ed.)¹⁸¹ have made valuable contribution in assessing the nature and various facets of Indian leadership in general, while Abraham Franci¹⁸² has analysed in details, the dynamics of village leadership in India.

All these studies are, undoubtedly, valuable analysis of various aspects of socialist, communist, leftist and nationalist movements and contributions of individual leaders or thinkers of India. But none of these can be categorised as the study of socialist leadership in India, in real sense of the term. Because, leadership study needs a linkage between the followers and thier relationship pattern with the study of leaders and thier contributions. V.B. Singh,¹⁸³ in his Thesis "Political Elitism in a Developing Polity : A Study of Indian Party Leaders", has categorised the existing literatures into several heads, which also do not reveal the existance of a genuine socialist leadership oriented study. According to him, some of the literatures exclusively dealt with Indian Parliamentarians, others with state legislative leaders or local leaders of local government or local party organisations, while other with empirical studies based on nature and recruitment pattern of leadership. But none of these works can be categorised exclusively as socialist leadership study in its real sense.

Presently, some attempts are being made by some eminent authors, as said earlier, to deal with a particular leader or thinker and to assess his contributions, such as, Gandhi, Nehru, Jayaprakash Narayan, Rammanohar Lohia, Subhas Bose, and others. All these are no doubt, valuable in assessing the contributions of individual leaders in their specific fields, but the study of socialist leadership in a comparative perspective, taking into account the specific situation of the Indian society, is almost negligible. And naturally, there is a big research gap in this area of study.

The "Proceedings of a Seminar on socialism in India -1919-1939," compiled by the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi, 1970, contains very valuable contributions by eminent authors on various aspects of socialist thought and Movement in india. But none of these studies could be placed in the category of leadership study.

The secret Files of the Government of India, Home Department, Political, kept in the National Archives of India, New Delhi, also contain valuable original source-materials in the field of communist, socialist-leftist movements and activities of individual leaders, like Jayaprakash Narayan, Nehru, Lohia and others, in India and abroad, alongwith Governmental measures taken. The Files of 1923 onwards, especially, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1940, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946 are of immense value for investigating the socialist-leftist movements and leadership studies.

However, we have to keep in mind that in the developed countries, Marxism emerged first as an intellectual force before it gathered strength as a political force. In the colonial countries like India, on the other hand, its emergence as political force preceded its emergence as an intellectual force. In a colonial country, the struggle for political freedom draws the primary attention of the people. And hence, paucity of authoritative source materials on communism and socialism in India is understandable. And as such, the leadership oriented study is much more difficult, since most of the works available on leaders are some how a political biography of the individual leader collected and compiled. A historical account or flattering of any individual leader does not constitute the leadership study to understand the socialist movement in general and socialist leadership in particular.

The socialist movement in India started as a group within the National Congress though the individual leaders were identified even in early 20's of the twentieth century. They have played significant role in the formulation of the socialist and liberal ideas by the congress. They also took initiative in rousing the people against the British Imperialism as against the indigenous capitalists and their oppressions. It was during this period, particularly after the emergence of the socialist group within the Congress that various workers, peasants and labour organisations were formed with their respective demands to be fulfilled, which was previously overlooked. So, without a complete leadership oriented study of this movement, the proper understanding of the development of socialism in India, as a new creed, different both from western socialism and communism, is not possible.

The word 'socialist' is much wider than it has been used in this present study, since, it includes the Congress Socialists, the Communists, the Royists,

other smaller local or regional groups and individuals like, Bose, Nehru, M.N. Roy, Gandhi and a host of others, who somehow accepted the Marxist interpretation of history as valid or modified the same with Gandhian or western socialist ideas with a methodological variety in realizing the socialist society. But we have dealt here mainly with the Congress Socialists and its later groups after its secession from the congress in 1948, particularly two leaders of it, Jayaprakash Narayan and Rammanohar Lohia. Because, political parties and other individual leaders, like Bose, Nehru, Gandhi and others, have been undertaken and discussed in details by several scholars in various ways both individually and comparatively. It is also a fact that some of the Congress socialist leaders including Narayan and Lohia have been analysed individually, and their multidimensional contributions have also been assessed individually, but no such leadership oriented study in a comparative style has been undertaken. As such, a good number of works are available on Lohia and Narayan, their political biography or contributions, but none of these could be categorised as leadership studies.

XI. Significance of the Study

This area, hence, still remains undiscovered and an attempt has been made to explore this area with specific study of socialist leadership in India, especially, the leadership of Narayan and Lohia. Thus, the present study, by filling the research gap, makes a modest attempt at bridging the gap that is apparent in the theoretical knowledge on socialist movement and socialist leadership in India and thus contributes to the theory building on socialist movement and socialist leadership in India. Herein lies the significance of the study.

XII. Methodology

Given the objective of the study and the research questions formulated to be probed as per the objective of the study, the present study is basically exploratory in nature. As such, the research design appropriate for exploratory type research has been followed. As the objective of exploratory type research is to explore and get deep insight of the phenomenon under study, the present study sought to get insight into the nature, contents and style of socialist

leadership in India in general and those of Jayaprakash Narayan and Rammanohar Lohia in particular. As such, the essential techniques of exploratory research design have been applied in collecting relevant informations, namely, the extensive review of existing literature-both primary and secondary, analysis of experiences of different personalities on the socialist leadership in general and that of Jayaprakash Narayan and Rammanohar Lohia in particular and the identification and analysis of insight stimulating cases that could justify and substantiate the findings on the leadership pattern of Jayaprakash Narayan and Rammonohar Lohia in particular.

As such, in completing the present study I have depended mainly on the published and unpublished primary sources, like Archival data, original writings of Jawaharlal Nehru, Mahatma Gandhi, Jayaprakash Narayan, Rammanohar Lohia, Acharya Narendra Deva, Yusuf Meherally, Asoka Mehta, M.R. Masani, Subhas Chandra Bose, M.N. Roy and others. Writings of early socialists, like Vivekananda, and others have also been consulted. Personal memoirs, diaries, government and other records, party documents, (like those of Congress, C.P.I., C.S.P., P.S.P. and other), biographical writing, and other relevant documents have also been consulted. The whole range of literature on the general works on communism and socialism have also been studied. The British Government memoranda, notes, documents, and Files, found in the National Archives of India, National Library and others have also been consulted. Theoretical literature on leadership studies and on socialism in general have also been taken into account.

However, the study, besides, being predominantly exploratory in nature, is also descriptive and analytical. Hence, care has been taken to analyse and portray accurately the different facets of socialist leadership in India, particularly those as found in Jayaprakash Narayan and Rammonohar Lohia. But as per the nature and objective of the study, it is also normative in character. Based on the exploratory and descriptive data the conclusions that have been proposed to be drawn are undoubtedly normative, but these normatively drawn conclusions are expected to put new insight on the theoretical exercise of socialist leadership, and for that matter, socialist movement in India.

Notes and References

1. Thomas A. Rusch — **Dynamics of Socialist leadership in India** in Richard L. Park and Irene Tinker (ed), **Leadership and Political Institutions in India**. Oxford University Press, 1960, Indian Reprint, p.188.
2. *Ibid*, p.189
 Also, Madhu Limaye — **Evolution of Socialist Policy**, Chetana Prakashan Ltd., Hyderabad, 1952, pp.1-2.
 Also, Shashi Bairathi — **Communism and Nationalism in India**, Anamika Prakashan, Delhi, 1987, p. 139.
 Also, M.R. Masani — **The Communist Party of India, A short History**, edited by K.M. Munshi and R.R. Diwakar, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1967, p. 38.
3. Thomas A. Rusch, *op.cit.* p. 191.
4. G. Ram Reddy and K. Seshadri — **Studies in Leadership - A Trend Report**, in A survey of Research in Political Science- Political System, Vol. one, ICSSR, Allied Publishers Private Ltd., New Delhi, 1979, p. 107 & 105.
5. *Ibid*,p. 109.
6. Thomas A. Rusch — **Dynamics of Socialist Leadership in India, Op.cit.** p.188.
7. Alfred De Souza-(ed) — **The Politics of Change and Leadership Development**, Manohar Publication, New Delhi, 1978, P-xviii (introduce).
8. Tinker, H. — **Reorientation; Studies on Asia in Transition**, Bombay, Oxford University Press, 1965, p.10.
 Quoted in Alfred De Souza (ed.), *Ibid*, p.15.
9. Alfred De Souza (ed.) *Ibid*, p.1.
10. Hans Nagpaul — **Leadership : A Frame of Refernce**, in L.P. Vidhyarthi (ed.) — **Leadership in India**, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1967, p. 64.

11. Ram Reddy and K. Seshadri — **Studies of Leadership**, A Trend Report, in Political Science, Vol. one, A survey of Research in Political Science, I.C.S.S.R., New Delhi, Allied Publishers Pvt. Ltd. 1979, pp.104-105.
12. Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschter and Fred Massarik — **Leadership and Organisation — A Behavioural Science Approach**, Mc Graw Hill Book Co. 1961, New York, p-24.
13. *Ibid*, p.23.
14. Ronald A. Heifetz — **Leadership without Easy Answers**, Universal Book Traders, Delhi, 1st Indian Reprint, 1996, p.16 & p. 281.
15. *Ibid*, p-16.
16. *Ibid*, p.17.
Hegel also opined that, “The greatman is he who perceives the needs of his time and who succeeds in translating them into political action. The greatman does not create the conditions ... of the contrary he is created by them ... greatman are the necessary products of historical moments.” quoted in Leon Dion — **The concept of Political Leadership : An Analysis**, Canadian Journal of Political Sciene, Vol. 1, March, 1968, No.1, p.6.
17. *Ibid*, p.17.
18. *Ibid*, p.17
19. Lewis J. Edinger and Donald Searing — **Social Background of Elite Analysis : A Methodological Inquiry**, The Americal Political Science Review, Vol. LXI, June, 1967, No.2 ppp.430,431,444.
20. Hans Nagpaul - *op.cit.* pp.59-60.
21. Cecil A. Gibbs — **The Principles and Traits of Leadership** - quoted in Leon Dion - **The Concept of Political Leadership : An Analysis** - *op.cit.* p.4.
22. *Ibid*, p.3.
23. Joseph R. Gusfield described this as a 'role-set' theory. Joseph R. Gusfield — **Functional Areas of Leadership in Social Movements**, in L.P. Vidhyarthi (ed.) *op. cit.* p.22.

24. Hans Nagpaul, *op.cit.* p.61.
25. Tucker - Politics of Leadership, p. 25, Quoted in Ronald A. Heifetz - *op.cit.* p.287.
26. Ronald A. Heifetz, *op.cit.* p.22.
27. *Ibid*, p.23.
28. Hans Nagpaul, *op.cit.* p.63.
29. M.A. Ayyangar — **Tribal and Rural Leadership in India**, in L.P. Vidhyarthi-*op.cit.* p.81. “Shakespeare said, Some are born great, some achieve greatness and some have greatness thrust upon them” — K. Seshadri : *Studies in Marxism and Political Science*, Peoples Publishing House, New Delhi, 1977.
30. B.N. Pandey (ed.) — **Leadership in South Asia**, Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1977, P-xii (introduction).
31. Nirmal Kumar Bose — **Changing character of Leadership in India**, In this article, Sri Bose has vividly discussed this changing pattern of leadership even in the Gram Panchayat level, in L.P. Vidhyarthi (ed.) *op.cit.* p.91.
32. T.G.P. Spear — **Patterns of British Leadership in British India** — in B.N. Pandey (ed.) *op.cit.*, pp.21-23.
33. M.A. Ayyangar — *op.cit.* p.87.
34. *Ibid*,p. 82.
35. B. Ballabh — **Leadership in a Democratic Society**, in L.P. Vidhyarthi (ed.) *op.cit.* p.97.
36. Alfred G. Meyer — **Historical Development of the Communist Theory of Leadership**, in R. Barry Farrell (ed.) — **Political Leadership in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union**, North Western University, London, 1970, p.6.
37. Shlomo Avineri — **The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx**, Cambridge, 1968, p. 189. quoted in Alfred G, Meyer — *Ibid*,p.6.

38. Friedrich Engels — **On Authority**, in Karl Marx and F. Engels — **Selected Works**, Vol. I., Moscow, Foreign Language Publishing House, 1955, pp. 635-636.
39. Alfred G. Meyer, *op.cit.* p.9.
40. V.I.Lenin — Works, Vol. XXV — Moscow, 1930, p.416, quoted in Carl J. Friedrich - **The Theory of Political Leadership-Issue of Totalitarianism**, in R. Barry Farrell (ed.) *op.cit.* p. 18.
41. Alfred G. Meyer - *op.cit.* p.14.
42. Carl J. Friedrich - *op.cit.* p.25.
43. Karl Kautsky — **The Dictatorship of the Proletariat**, London p.31. Quoted in Alfred G. Meyer, *op.cit.*, p.12.
44. Andras Hegedus — **Marxist Theories of Leadership : A Marxist Approach** - in R. Barry Farrell - *op.cit.* p.28.
45. Karl W. Deutsch — **The Nerves of Government**, New York, Chapter 7, 1963, quoted in Carl J. Friedrich - *op.cit.* p.19.
46. Carl. J. Friedrich — *op. cit.* p. 24.
Friedrich in this article analysed these three functions in details.
47. G.V. Plekhanav — **The Role of the Individual in History**, Moscow, 1946, p.41. Quoted in Kandadai Seshadri — **Studies in Marxism and Political Science**, Peoples Publishing House, New Delhi, 1977, p. 139.
48. G. Ram Reddy and K. Seshadri — Studies of Leadership - A Trend Report, in A survey of Research in Political Science, (Chapter 5), Vol. I - Political System, I.C.S.S.R., New Delhi, Allied Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1979, p.99.
49. Plato — **Republic**, Book V, quoted in Barbara Kellerman (ed.) **Leadership - Multidisciplinary Perspectives** - Prentice Hall, I.N.C., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, U.S.A., 1984, p. 84.
50. Machiavelli — **The Prince**, Primates and Political Authority, The American Political Science Review, December, 1976, p.1110. Quoted in Barbara Kellerman (ed.) *op.cit.* p.84.

51. Barbara Kellerman (ed.), *Ibid*, p.vii .
52. Ralph M. Stogdill — **Personal Factors Associated with Leadership** : A survey of the Literature, Journal of Pshychology, Vol. 25, p.63, January, 1948, quoted in Robert Tannenbaum and others - *op.cit.* p.23.
53. Leon Dion - The concept of Political Leadership : An Analysis — in Canadian Jouunal of Political Science, Vol.I. March, 1968, No. I, pp. 14-17.
54. Kandadai Seshadri — *op.cit.* p.145.
55. Dagmar Bernstorff— **Political Leadership in Andhra Pradesh - 1956-1973**, in B.N. Pandey (ed.) *op.cit.* p-XI (introduction).
56. Robert Tannenbaum and others, *op.cit.* p. 42.
57. Ronald A. Heifetz, a renouned Pshychiatrist, a skilled musician and also a teachers, has suggested these purely on his practical experiences and empirical research. He described in details “The job of leadership and strategies” and “to surmount its obstacles and sustain its pain” — these are his suggestions. Ronald A. Heifetz - *op.cit.* pp. 252-274.
58. *Ibid.*
59. Barbara Kellerman (ed.) *op.cit.* p-ix.
60. James A Gould and Willis H. Truitt — **Political Ideologies**, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1973, p-247.
61. Alexander Gray — **They Socialist Tradition : Moses to Lenin** — Bombay, 1963, p. 487.
62. R. N. Burki — **Socialism**, London, J.M. Dent and Sons, London, 1975- p.9.
63. Oscar Jaszi — **Socialism** - in Edwin R.A. Seligman (editor in chief) (ed.) Encyclopaedia of social sciences, Vol. 13 & 14 The Macmillan Company MCMXL, New York, 1948, p. 188.
64. G.D.H. Cole — **Socialist Thought**, the Forerunner, Vol. I,1789-1850, New York, MacMillan & Co., p.2.

65. Asoka Mehta — **Studies in Asian Socialism**, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1959, p.17.
66. George Lichtheim — **A Short History of Socialism**, London, Weidenfeld and Wilcolson, 1970, p. 36.
67. C.A.R. Crossland — **The History and Tenents of Democratic Socialism**, in James A. Gould and Willis H. Truitt — **Political Idologies**, *op.cit.* p. 253.
68. W. Ebenstein — **Today's Isms**, Prentice Hall INC, New Jersey, 1973, p.211.
69. R.N. Berki — *op. cit.* pp. 23-28.
70. J. Bandopadhyaya — **Concept of Socialism**, in Proceedings of a Seminer on Socialism in India, 1919-1939, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi, 1970, pp.44-45.
71. Giles Radice — **Democratic Socialism : A short Survey**, Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., London, 1965, pp. 5-6.
72. G.D.H. Cole — *op.cit.* pp. 4-5.
73. Asoka Mehta — *op.cit.* p. 30.
74. Oscar Jaszi — *op.cit.* p. 194.
75. *Ibid*, pp. 194-195.
76. W. Ebenstein — *op.cit.* pp. 212-215.
77. Oscar Jaszi — *op.cit.* p. 195.
78. J. Bandopadhyaya *op.cit.* p. 46.
79. *Ibid*, p. 46.
80. James A. Gould and Willis H. Truitt — *op.cit.* p. 247
Also, in Oscar Jaszi — *op. cit.* p. 189.
81. Sohail Jawaid — **Growth of Socialism in India**, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, 1980, p.4.
82. *Ibid*, p-5.
83. Oscar Jaszi — *op. cit.* p. 190.

84. C.E.M. Joad — **Introduction to Modern Political Theory**, Oxford University Press, 1982, p.41.
85. Nick Knight and Colin Mackerras — Introduction : **Marx and Europe, Marxism in Asia.** in **Marxism in Asia** - by Colin Mackerras & Nick Knight - Select Book Service Syndicate, 1986, New Delhi, p.3.
86. *Ibid.* pp.3-4.
87. *Ibid.* p.4.
88. Eric Hobsbawn — **Introduction to Karl Marx, Pre-Capitalist Economic Formation** - Lawrence and Wishart - 1964, pp.19-20. quoted in Nick Knight and colin Mackerras - *Ibid.* p. 8.
89. J. Bandopadhyaya — **Socialism - A Review.** in Janata, Socialism Number, Vol. XIX, No. I & 2, Republic Day, 1964, p. 13.
90. James A. Gould and W.H. Truitt - *op.cit.* p.3.
91. Andras Hegedus — **Marxist Theories of Leadership : A Marxist Approach** in R. Barry Farrell (ed.) **Political Leadership in Eastern Europe and Soviet Union** - London, 1970. p. 28.
92. F.W. Coker — **Recent Political Thought**, New York, 1960. p. 37.
In this respect, Oscar Jaszi's Statement regarding socialism, Communism and Collecticism, is also applicable here, where he listed the following common characteristics : “.. first, a condemnation of existing political and social order as unjust; second, an advocacy of a new order consistent with moral values; Third, a belief that this ideal is realizable; fourth, a conviction that the immorality of the established order is traceable not to a fixed world order or to the unchanging nature of man but to corrupt institution; fifth, a program of action leading to the ideal through a fundamental remoulding of human nature or of institutions or both; and sixth, a revolutionary will to carry out this programme.” Oscar Jaszi - **Socialism** - *op.cit.* p.188.
93. J. Bandopaddyaya - **Socialism-A Review**-Janata - *op.cit.* p. 31
94. Giles Radice — **Democratic Socialism A short Survey** - longmans, Green & Co. Ltd. London, 1965. p. 67.

95. J. Bandopadhyaya — **Debt to Marx** in Janata Vol. XIX, No.3 February, 9, 1964, p.5.
96. A Survey of Research on Political Parties, by ICSSR, N-3, Vol. one, 1970, New Delhi, p.78.
Quoted in R.C. Tyagi — **The Ideology, Policies and Programms of the Samyukta Socialist Party, 1964-71. Thesis Meerut University, 1983.**
97. C.C. Browne and Thomas S. Cohn (ed.) **The Study of Leadership**, Illinois, The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1958, p.1.
98. V.B. Sing — **Political Elites in A Developing Polity : A study of Indian Party Leaders**, Thesis, South Gujrat University, 1979.
99. A. Survey of Research in Political Science, **Political System**, Vol. one, ICSSR, New Delhi, 1979, Allied Publishers Private Ltd., Chapt. 5, p. 99.
100. Overstreet, G.D. and M. Windmiller — **Communism in India**, University of California Press, Baerkeley, 1959.
101. Mazaffar Ahmed — **Communist Party of India - Years of Formation 1921-33**, Calcutta, 1959, and
— **Myself and the Community Party of India 1920-1929**, National Book Agency, Calcutta-1970.
102. M.R. Masani — **The Communisit Party of India - A short History**, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1967.
103. Shashi Bairathi — **Communism and Nationalism in India**, A Study of Inter - Relationship, 1919-1947, Anamika Prakashan, Delhi, 1987.
104. N. E. Balaram — **A Short History of the Communist Party of India**, Prabhath Book House, Trivandrum, 1967.
105. M. R. Dandavate — **Three Decades of Indian Communism**, Praja Socialist Party Publication, Bombay.
Also — **Evolution of Socialist Policies and Perspective : 1934-64**, Lokmitra Publication, Bombay, 1964.

106. P.D. Devanandan and Thomas, M.M. (eds) — **Communism and Social Revolution in India : A Christian Interpretation**, YMCA, Publishing House, Calcutta, 1953.
107. Shibdas Ghosh — **A Critique of Communist Movement in India**, Socialist Unity centre, Calcutta, 1940.
108. John Patrick Haithcox — **Communism and Nationalism in India**, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1971.
109. Madhu Limaye — **Communist Party : Facts and Fiction**, Chetna Prakashan, Hyderabad, 1951.
— **Indian Communist Today**, Book Centre Ltd., Bombay, 1955.
— **Evolutin of Socialist Policy**, Chetana Prakashan Ltd., Hyderabad, 1952.
110. S.R. Mohandas — **Communist Activities in India — 1925-50**, (2nd edition), Bombay, 1951.
111. Soumendranath Tagore — **Historical Development of the Communist Movement in India**, Red Front Press, Calcutta, 1944.
— **Congress Socialism**, (2nd Edition) Ganavani Pub. House, Calcutta, 1946.
112. Philip Spratt — **Communism in India**, Janata Press, New Delhi, 1952.
113. Ilyas Ahmad — **Trends in Socialist Thought and Movement**, India Press, Allahabad, 1937.
114. Prem Bhasin — **Socialism in India**, Young Asia Publications, New Delhi, 1968.
115. Brij Narain — **Indian Socialism**, Atma Ram and Sons, Lahore, 1937.
116. Acharya Narendra Deva — **Socialism and the National Revolution**, edited by Yusuf Meherally, Padma Publication, Bombay, 1946.
117. Edatata Narayanan — **Praja Socialism : Monopoly's Pawn**, People's Publishing House, Bombay, 1952.
118. Kamala Gadre — **Indian way to Socialism**, VIR Publishing House, New Delhi, 1966.

119. Pramita Ghosh — **Meerut Conspiracy Case & the Left Wing in India**, Papyrus, Calcutta, 1978.
120. Sankar Ghosh — **Socialism and Communism in India**, Allied Publishers, Bombay, 1971.
121. Sohail Jawaid — **Growth of Socialism in India**, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, 1980.
122. M.R. Masani — **The Communist Party of India - A Short History**, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1967.
123. Asoka Mehta — **Democratic Socialism**, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1963.
— **Socialism and Gandhism**, Congress Socialist Publication, Bombay, 1935.
124. B.R. Nanda — **Socialism in India**, Vikas Publications, New Delhi, 1972.
125. L.P. Sinha — **The Left Wing in India : A Study of Communist Strategy and Tactics**, Associated Pub. House, New Delhi, 1968.
126. P.L. Lakhanpal — **History of the Congress Socialist Party**, National Publishers and Stationers, Lahore, 1946.
127. Girja Shankar — **Socialist Trends in Indian National Movement (A Study of the Congress Socialist Party)**. Twenty First Century Publication-1987, Meerut.
128. Asim Kumar Choudhury — **Socialist Movement in India, (The Congress Socialist Party) 1934-1947**. Progressive Publishers, Calcutta, 1980.
129. Rai Akhilendra Prasad — **Socialist Thought in Modern India**, Meenakshi Prakashan, Delhi, 1974.
130. Satyabrata Rai Chowdhuri — **Leftist Movement in India, 1917-1947**, Minerva, Calcutta, 1976.
131. M.R. Pai (ed.) **Socialism in India : A Commentary**, A Collection of Forum of Free Enterprise Publication, Bombay, 1967.

132. K.N. Panikkar (ed.) — **National and Left Movements in India**, Vikas Publishing House Ltd., New Delhi, 1980.
133. Devidatta Pant — **Socialism : Its Embryonic Development in India**, Lohore, 1920.
134. Saul Rose — **Socialism in Southern Asia**, Oxford University Press, London, 1954.
135. Sampurnanand — **Indian Socialism**, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
136. S.G. Sardesai — **India's Path to Socialism**, Communist Party Publication, New Age Printing Press, New Delhi, 1966.
137. Harikishore Singh — **A History of Praja Socialist Party, 1934-59**, Narendra Prakashan, Lucknow, 1959.
138. Soumendranath Tagore — **Historical Development of the Communist Movement in India**, Red Front Press, Calcutta, 1944.
139. G.S. Bhargava — **Leaders of the Left**, Meherally Book Club, Bombay, 1951.
140. D.B. Dhanapala — **Eminent Indians**, Nalanda Publications, Bombay, 1947.
141. Bhawani Choudhuri and Debaranjana Chakraborty — **Leflist Leaders of India**, Calcutta Book House, Calcutta, 1947.
142. L.N. Sarin — **Studies in Indian Leaders**, Atma Ram and Sons, Delhi, 1963.
143. Yusuf Meherally — **Leaders of India**, Padma Publications Ltd., Bombay, 1942.
144. P.D. Tandon — **Leaders of Modern India**, Vora & Co., Bombay, 1955.
145. A. Appadorai — **Indian Political Thinking, From Naoroji to Nehru**, Oxford University Press, 1971.
146. K.P. Karunakaran — **Indian Politics From Dadabhai Naoroji to Gandhi**, Gitanjali Prakashan, New Delhi, 1975.

147. N.C. Mehrotra — **Indian Socialist Thinking -From Dayananda to J.P.**, M.N. Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 1986.
148. D.R. Bali — **Modern Indian Thought, From Rammohun Roy to Jayaprakash Narayan**, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, 1989 (Reprint).
149. Prakash Chandra — **Modern Indian Political Thought**, Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1998.
150. Pantham & Deutsch (ed.) — **Political Thought in Modern India**, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1986.
151. B.N. Ahuja — “**J.P.**” : **India's Revolutionary Number one**, Varma Pub. Co., Lahore, 1947.
152. S.R. Bakshi — **Rammanohar Lohia - His Political Ideology**, Anmol Publication, New Delhi, 1992.
— **Jaya Prakash Narayan - His Socialist Ideology**, Anmol Publications, New Delhi, 1992.
153. Bholu Chatterje — **Conflict in J.P.'s Politics**, Aukur Publishing House, New Delhi, 1984.
154. Chitrita Chaudhuri — **Rammanohar Lohia and the Indian Socialist Thought**, Minerva, Calcutta, 1993.
155. Ram Chandra Gupta — **J.P. - From Marxism To Total Revolution**, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1981.
156. Chandradeo Prasad — **Political Ideas of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia**, Janaki Prakashan, New Delhi, 1989.
157. Prakash C. Shastri — **Socialist Thought in India, with Special Reference to Lohia's Quest for Indigenous Socialism**, Printwell Publishers, Jaipur, 1985.
158. N.C. Mehrotra — **Lohia : A Study**, Atma Ram and Sons, New Delhi, 1978.
159. Allan and Wendy Scarfe — **J.P. His Biography**, Orient Longman, New Delhi, 1977 (Reprint).

160. Karuna Kaushik — **Russian Revolution (1917) & Indian Nationalism** - Studies of Lajpat Rai, Subhas Chandra Bose and Rammanohar Lohia. Chanakya Publication, Delhi, 1984.
161. M. Arumugam — **Socialist Thought in India : The Contribution of Rammanohar Lohia**, Sterling Publishers, New Delhi, 1978.
162. Dr. V. K. Arora — **Rammanohar Lohia and Socialism in India**, Deep and Deep Publication, New Delhi, 1984.
163. G.D. Tendulkar — **Mahatma - Life of Mohandas Karamchadn Gandhi**, Vol. 1-VIII, Bombay, 1953.
164. Nirmal Kumar Bose and P.H. Patwardhan - **Gandhi in Indian Politics**, Lalwani Publishing House, Bombay, 1967.
165. B.R. Nanda — **Mahatma Gandhi : A Biography**, George Allen & Unwin Ltd. London, 1958.
166. B.K. Ahlwwailia — **Jawaharlal Nehru** - Newman Group of Publication, New Delhi, 1978.
167. C.P. Bhambri — **Nehru and Socialist Movement in India, 1919-39**, in the Proceedings of a Seminar on Socialism in India, NMML. New Delhi, 1970.
168. Pradip Bose — **Indian Socialism Through the Eyes of Jawahar, Subhas and Indira**, Netaji Subhas Insititue of Social Studies, Calcutta, 1973.
169. Michael Brecher — **Nehru - A Political Biography**, Oxford University Press, London, 1959.
170. M.N. Das — **Political Philosophy of Nehru**, George Allen and Unwith Ltd. London, 1961.
171. Vishnu Dutt — **Gandhi, Nehru and the Challenge**, Abhinav Publications, New Delhi, 1979.
172. Michael Edward — **Nehru, Jawaharlal (A Political Biography)**, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi, 1971.

173. Sarvepalli Gopal — **Jawaharlal Nehru A Biography**, Vol. Oxford University Press, London, 1976.
174. R.K. Karanjia — **The Mind of Mr. Nehru**, George Allen and Unwin Ltd. London, 1960.
175. J.B. Kripalani — **Gandhi : His Life and Thought**, Publication Division, Govt. of India, New Delhi, 1970.
176. Dorothy Norman — **Nehru : The First Sixty Years**, Vol. I & II, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1965.
177. Atindranath Bose — **Swami Vivekananda, The First Socialist of India**, Article-Janata, XII (I), January, 1938.
178. M.N. Choudhury — **Subhas Chandra and Socialism**, Calcutta, 1965.
179. G.P. Bhattacharjee — **Evolution of Political Philosophy of M.N. Roy**, The Minerva Associates, Calcutta, 1971.
180. L.P. Vidharthi (ed.) — **Leadership in India**, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1967.
181. B.N. Pandey (ed.) **Leadership in Sout Asia**, Vikas Publishing House, Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1977.
182. Abraham Franci — **Dynamics of Leadership in Village India**, International Publications, Allahabad, 1974.
183. V.B. Singh — op.cit..