
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

GoogleTM books

<https://books.google.com>



JQ
298
P7
N36

UC-NRLF



\$B 581 832

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
MICHIGAN



J.P.-Lohia Talks
a flashback

A Praja Socialist Publication

A 1

Harain, Jai Prakash

J.P.-Lohia Talks
a flashback

A Praja Socialist Publication

Published by :
PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY,
Central Office, 18 Windsor Place, New Delhi.

PREFACE

J.P.'s recent effort to effect a unification of the PSP and the SP demonstrates, if anything, that only a genuine desire for it can secure unification. It also demonstrates that, otherwise, any approach for unity is merely an opportunity for the designing and the unscrupulous to distort facts, misinterpret events and attempt political piracy.

The Praja Socialist Party presents here a review of the J.P.-Lohia talks in the sequence of their occurrence. Except for the addition of emphasis and modification of sub-titles to highlight issues which barred further progress in the talks, no changes have been made in the press reports arranged chronologically in this pamphlet.

The Praja Socialist Party hopes that this documentation will help the public, as well as the members of the PSP and the SP, obtain an insight into the attitudes which conduce to unity and those that deepen the cleavage.

The Prelude

New Delhi, July 3. It is reliably learnt that during the last few weeks two prominent leaders of the PSP and the Lohia Party have been exchanging correspondence in order to explore the possibilities of mutual cooperation amongst the two parties in future.

This correspondence, it is expected, will be kept before the National Executive of the PSP in its next meeting for consideration. *Hindustan Samachar*

4-7-57

Free Press Journal,

Madhu Limaye says Differences are Fundamental : Dandawate Welcomes Unity

Bombay, Friday. Shri Madhu Limaye, leader of the Socialist Party, denied here today reports appearing in a section of the press that there was a move to bring about a merger of the Socialist and the Praja Socialist Party.

"As far as we are concerned we have not made any approach to the PSP for merger. Our differences are fundamental," Shri Limaye said.

He, however, said that the PSP leader, Shri Jayaprakash

Narayan had publicly stated that he would personally make an attempt to reconcile the differences between the two parties.

Shri M. R. Dandawate, Secretary of the Bombay PSP, said: "I shall be the happiest man if all the democratic socialists come together in India."

6-7-57,

Free Press Journal.

J. P. and Lohia to Meet

Lucknow, July 9. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, top leaders of rival wings of the Indian Socialist movement, are likely to meet here next week to explore a move for reunion between the Praja-Socialist Party and the Socialist Party.

For two decades Mr. Narayan and Dr Lohia were close political associates in the Indian Socialist Party until in 1954 it split into two parts; the present PSP and the Socialist Party.

An informal meeting between these two socialist leaders has been tentatively fixed for July 15 here. Dr Lohia is expected to arrive here on July 14.

They are known to have exchanged personal letters for the first time in several years on the subject of unity in Socialist ranks. Both are said to subscribe to the view that a reunion between the two wings of the Socialist movement will be a healthy political move if it is based on a sincere desire to learn from past mistakes.

As for their programmes, the two parties do not differ very much. Differences are mainly on emphasis and deviations by individual leaders. Although the PSP never ceased regretting the breakaway of Dr Lohia's followers, the results of the second general elections are stated to have induced a serious desire for unity in the ranks of both the parties.

Dr Lohia has openly castigated his followers for not adhering strictly to the high standards of conduct set by the party for electioneering. The performance of Socialists in two satyagrahas in Bihar and UP did not fulfil Dr Lohia's expectations although UP unit gave a better account of itself. On the other hand the breach cost the PSP a large number of sure seats in the elections. Both lost heavily to the Communist Party. Although Mr Narayan has abjured partisan politics, he is believed to set great store by the present unity move initiated by some common friends.

10-7-57

Times of India, Bombay,

J. P. Confirms Meeting with Lohia

Nagpur, July 11. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, Praja Socialist Leader, today declined to say "anything at the moment" on his forthcoming meeting with Dr Rammanohar Lohia, Socialist Leader, at Lucknow on July 15.

He, however, confirmed that he took the initiative and wrote letter to Dr Lohia a month ago in this matter.

"I do not wish to say anything more at this stage and when the occasion comes I will say whatever I want to," Shri Narayan added.

The Praja Socialist Leader arrived here this evening 'en route' to Patna from where he would proceed to Lucknow.

12-7-57

Free Press Journal

Socialist Circles Not Optimistic

Bombay, July 11. The meeting between Mr. J. P. Narayan and Dr Rammanohar Lohia scheduled to be held in Lucknow by the middle of this month, is not likely to be anything but "Meeting of old friends who have not met for long".

Socialist Party sources here were not optimistic about the talks leading to the ultimate merger of the Praja Socialist Party and the Socialist Party.

Dr Lohia, who is now in the city, refused to comment on reports about the merger move.

A party spokesman said the differences between the two parties were fundamental and not just procedural. He felt that the Praja Socialists would have to undergo ideological reorientation before seeking merger.

"There is no question of the Socialist Party merging with the PSP in the present circumstances," he said.

12.7.1957.

Statesman

PSP National Executive Welcomes Talks

New Delhi, July 12. The National executive of the PSP... is understood to have welcomed the forthcoming meetings between Mr Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr Ram Manohar Lohia.

But it was made clear that Mr Narayan, who is only an ordinary member of the party, was not meeting Dr. Lohia on any directive from the Party.

13.7.1957.

National Herald.

CHAPTER II

The Talks Begin

J. P. And Lohia Meet

Programmes and Policies to be Discussed by Representatives of Both Parties, says J. P.

His Party will not Change its Policies, says Lohia.

Lucknow, Monday. The chances of having a single party of socialism in India were bright, according to Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, who had a two and half hour talk with Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia here this morning. Dr. Lohia, when asked about the outcome of the the talks, said he would rather keep quiet, but he was "hopeful" about it, according to sources of the Socialist Party.

Mr. Narayan said after the meeting : "I was very happy to meet Dr. Lohia after such a long time. We met as old friends and had a very cordial talk together. We talked about many things, including the possibility of a single party of socialism in India. This should not be taken to mean the usual things like merger. I feel much satisfied with the talks that I had with Dr. Lohia."

Mr. Narayan said that he would meet the leaders of the PSP, though he would not meet the national executive. He

said that he would give a report of his talks with Dr. Lohia to these leaders.

Mr. Narayan said that details of programmes and policies could be discussed when the representatives of two parties met for further negotiations.

Referring to a possible alliance of the Socialist and the Praja Socialist Parties, Dr. Lohia said at a public meeting in the evening that those who wanted to be friendly with the Socialist Party had to share its trials and suffering. He said that his party would not change its policy, programme and constitution.

The meeting between the two leaders took place at the residence of Mr. Gopal Narain Saxena, chairman of the Socialist Party.

Mr. Narayan met Mr. Triloki Singh in the evening before leaving for Patna.

It is understood that correspondence between Mr. Narayan and Dr. Lohia, which led to their meeting, will be continued.

16.7.'57.

National Herald.

J. P. Writes to PSP Chairman

Sarvodaya Ashram,
Tiril,
Ranchi.
23th July 1957.

My dear Ganga Babu,

I had given you an account of the talk I had with Dr. Lohia the other day after my return from Lucknow. I am now sending this written report as desired by you. I hope the

National Executive will consider it soon and take proper action. I am sending a copy of this report to Dr. Lohia as well. He will correct any mis-statement that may have crept into my account. I will forward to you any amendment made by him, although I do hope that there will be no occasion for any amendment to this report.

The talk continued for about two-and-half hours. No one else was present. Many points and topics were touched by us during the talk. I need not report on all of them. Here I will confine myself to giving a substance of the points relating to the question of Socialist Unity. It is not necessary that I should give a chronological account of the talk. I have therefore tried to group together all relevant points and give a coherent account in this report.

Dr. Lohia also is of the view that it would be a good thing if one single Party of Democratic Socialism could be formed. In this connection, however, he would lay greatest emphasis on three points : first, the constitution of the new Party; secondly, its fundamental principles or policy, and thirdly, its programme. He would like to make the constitution, Policy and Programme of the Socialist Party the basis of the new Party in all these three respects. I asked him if there was no scope for change in these enunciations. His reply was that while he would not exactly say so yet he would not like any change in the basic principles and factors involved. On other points, for instance, the name, the flag and the election symbol of the new Party, he had no particular insistence. On my own, however, I suggested that the name "Socialist Party" would no doubt be better. He thereupon remarked that he liked the PSP flag. In regard to the Election symbol he had no particular insistence, although I expressed my opinion about it, i. e. the HUT would in any case be better than the Banyan Tree. In this manner you will see that "Socialist Unity" would depend only on the Constitution, the Policy and the Programme (of the new Party). This is as it should be, although, I, for one, still believe that Democratic Socialists can differ even on questions of basic principles. The written Policy Statement and such like documents, in fact, do not

have as much significance or importance for me as the will and the desire to work together.

You will have noticed from what I have said above that Dr. Lohia does not approach the question of Socialist Unity from the viewpoint of a merger between the PSP and S P. I have come to like his viewpoint. His contention was that instead of simply merging the two parties together it would be better if the two parties decided to form a single Party of Socialism after mutual consultation and discussion. After having arrived at a decision in regard to the name, the constitution and the policy of the Party, membership of that Party should be enrolled anew on that basis. In order to guarantee that this work is carried on honestly a central committee enjoying the confidence of all should be appointed. After the enrolment of membership has concluded, Party elections should be held according to the constitution agreed to. Till such time as the new Party thus comes into being the PSP and the S. P. should both carry on their activities and their respective committees should also continue to function.

At the conclusion of the talks I asked him about the next step that should in his opinion be taken. He suggested that I should first talk to the PSP and then get in touch with him again if I found the PSP willing to talk further on the issue concerned. The S. P. would then elect its representatives to carry on talks with representatives of the PSP. I am personally of the opinion that this should not be unduly delayed. I think the general public has reacted favourably to our talks and a new hope has arisen in the minds of those who are opposed to the Congress and who love the cause of Democratic Socialism. Therefore, I hope the National Executive will take a decision on this issue without delay.

Yours affectionately;
Jayaprakash Narayan.

PSP Central Office Circulates JP's Report

August 7, 1957.

All Provincial Secretaries.

Dear Friends :

Re : Proposal For Socialist Unity

I am sending herewith the copy of a letter sent by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan to the Chairman, Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha. I have to request you to consult the members of your executive and other leading party workers on the suggestions made by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and to send us detailed report of the opinions expressed.

The National Executive is meeting on 31st August and 1st September and your report should be with us by 27th August.

It is also recommended that you should elicit the views and reactions of party workers at the District and constituency levels.

With greetings,

Yours fraternally,
Prem Bhasin
Joint Secretary

Lohia Clarifies Stand

Socialist Party,
Hyderabad.
31st July 1957

Dear Jayaprakash,

I have received your letter just now. It is necessary to clarify certain matters.

1. The Constitution, policy and programme of the Socialist Party will continue. The conference of the delegates alone can make changes needed in them. All the rules and sub-rules which have been made for the organization must also be understood as included in the constitution. You might remember that I had said that no vacuum should be there. Therefore continuity regarding these is necessary. I had also said that if there is any programme which may not be correct, not to speak of the policy, that also has to be followed. For the changes which you or any one else is able to convince me as necessary I will also try, as much as you, to get that done. But not earlier than the conference of the delegates.

2. Regarding the committees I had thought that the committees of the Socialist Party will continue till the Conference of the delegates. A mixed committee may be formed for the enrolment of members and for the purpose of proper election. I had said further that if there are other ways, then let both the committees search for them. The real unity may not come out of the way which you have suggested.

3. The flag and if needed even the election symbol of the Praja Socialist Party may continue. They may become the flag and the election symbol of the Socialist Party.

4. Certain talks have started regarding you. Those can be completed only after other matters are decided. But that also is a necessary part.

5. The necessary changes regarding the flag etc. can be done by the present representatives of the Socialist Party.

Yours,
Rammanohar

[This was circulated by the PSP Central office on August 10, 1957,—Ed.]

Socialists Review J.P.-Lohia Talks

HYDERABAD. Aug. 2—The National Committee of the Socialist Party commenced its three-day session here today. The Committee has before it a report from Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia on his recent talks with Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan as also their correspondence on the likelihood of a single Socialist Party being formed in the country or in the alternative greater cooperation between the PSP and Socialist Party.

In the absence of Mr. Gopal Narain Saxena, Chairman of the Party, who is in a UP Jail, Mr. Dalsrinagar Dube of UP presided over the meeting.

Dr. Lohia was also absent.

A party source said that the "J.P.-Lohia talks" were still in a 'nebulous stage' and it was 'too premature' to think in terms of a merger, inasmuch as the fundamental differences between the PSP and Dr. Lohia-led party were still there on the questions of 1) internal democracy, 2) radical politics and 3) equal irrelevance to the Congress and the Communist parties within the country and to either of the blocs in foreign affairs. It was on these issues that Dr. Lohia and several of his supporters had broken off from the PSP and founded the Socialist Party about two years ago.

The Socialist Party spokesman emphasised that there could be no compromise on these issues and recalled how the PSP leadership had driven out Dr. Lohia without even affording an opportunity to explain his point of view to the rank and file by suspending him and others and dissolving the subordinate committees. However, further talks between Dr. Lohia and Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan or representatives of the two parties were not ruled out.

It is learnt, however, that there is considerable anxiety on the part of both the P.S.P. and Socialist Party leadership over the growing strength of the Communist Party as was evidenced in the last general elections. This common concern,

it was explained, prompted the two leaders to explore possibilities of maximum cooperation between the PSP and Socialist Party for furthering the Socialist movement in the country.

The National Committee of the Socialist Party may give some suggestions in the form of an 'aide-memoire' to Dr. Lohia to enable him to hold further talks with Mr. Jayaprakash Narain. It is learnt that Dr. Lohia himself did not express any definite opinion to the Committee on this question and left the same to the National Committee.

Today's Committee meeting was attended among others, by Mr. Madhu Limaye, Mr. P.V.G. Raju M.P., Mr. B.S. Mahadev Singh, Mr. Keshav Gore, Mr. M. Govinda Reddy and Mr. S.K. Saxena.

8.8.1957

The Daily News, Hyderabad

PSP Calls Meeting of National Executive

August 7, 1957

All Members of the National Executive

Dear Friends:

Re: Meeting Of The National Executive

To consider the proposal for Socialist Unity which have emerged out of the talks between Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, a meeting of the National Executive will be held on 31st August and 1st September. These dates have been fixed after consultation with Shri Jayaprakash Narayan who will attend the meeting.

The venue of the meeting has not been finalised. You will be informed of it in a fortnight by letter if possible, otherwise, through a press announcement.

An immediate acknowledgement is requested.

With greetings,

Yours faithfully,
Prem Bhasin
Joint Secretary.

No Sacrifice of PSP's Policy Statement Says Mukut Beharilal

LUCKNOW, Aug. 15.—Mr. Mukut Behari Lal, chairman of the U.P. Praja-Socialist Party, has opposed Dr. Lohia's terms for the merger of the P.S.P. and the Socialist Party.

In a statement issued yesterday Mr. Lal says the unification of the two parties must be on the basis of the constitution and the policy statement of the P.S.P. prepared under the guidance of the late Acharya Narendra Deva, which outlines the fundamental principles of democratic socialism and presents a blueprint of socialist society and culture.

Mr. Lal says the statement of principles passed by the Socialist Party at its recent Hyderabad session can bear no comparison with the policy statement of the P.S.P.

He adds: "The Hyderabad statement suffers from inadequacy, inaccuracy, contradictions and lot of confusion. It will surely be a great betrayal of the socialist cause if in the name of the socialist unity the Policy Statement of the P.-S.P. is sacrificed at the altar of the Hyderabad statement of principles. Members of the P.S.P. cannot be a party to such betrayal.

"The P.S.P. is the parent body and can surely claim priority over the Socialist Party which is its offshoot. Besides, the Socialist Party cannot claim effective functioning in a large part of the country and the dissolution of party units of the P.S.P. will create a void in many States and districts".

Dr. Lohia Accuses PSP Of "Barter And Horse-Deals"

CALCUTTA, Aug. 15.—Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia is reported to have told a "closed-door" meeting of the Bengal Socialist Party here yesterday that the unification of the Praja Socialist Party and the Socialist Party "appeared rather difficult but not impossible." He said the difficulty arose out of "false questions of prestige."

The Praja-Socialist Party, Dr. Lohia said, was hesitating to accept the policy and programmes of his party and as such, was turning the unification of the Socialist movement into "a plaything of dangerous barter and horse-deals." Dr. Lohia added, he was prepared to accept "the right thing, in spite of whatever loss of face might be caused by it." That was why he had recommended to his party the acceptance of the P.S.P. flag. In like manner, he expected the P.-S.P. to think of the constitution, policy and programme of the Socialist Party, and to accept them on their merits.

Dr. Lohia, however, thought the unification of the Socialist movement in the country was not impossible. He said he pinned his faith on the growing realization that the Congress Party was "cracking up and would meet its doom in the course of five years and at such a juncture an alternative organization would take its place." A single socialist organization must be speedily built up to take the place of the Congress. Dr. Lohia said his party was prepared to "undertake any sacrifice to achieve this end," but sacrifice of principle and programme would hardly serve any purpose.

16.8.57

Hindustan Times

Mr. Triloki Singh On PSP Stand

Mr. Triloki Singh, General Secretary of the Praja Socialist Party, said on Friday that the PSP stood for "certain definite objectives based on well-defined principles" and any re-

view or revision of its policy could be done only democratically.

He was commenting on Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia's reported statement in which he described the PSP's attitude to a unification of the Socialist Party and the PSP as being based on a "false sense of prestige."

Mr. Singh said that representatives of the two parties had not yet met and there had been "no talks whatsoever meriting the description as 'plaything of dangerous barter and horse-deals'."

The PSP, Mr. Singh said, consisted of the old Socialist Party, the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party, Forward Bloc, sections from the RSP, Bolshevik-Leninist and other parties and efforts to enlist the support of Socialist Democratic and progressive parties and elements had continued all through.

He said, "It is common knowledge how the efforts made by the PSP to have an electoral adjustment with the Socialist Party were spurned by the latter during the general elections.

"It needs to be remembered that in the past differences arose between the PSP and Dr. Lohia not so much on principles and policies as on methods of functioning. Until there is requisite understanding on these matters, it is premature to talk of unity and even less useful to throw about blame on the plea that one or the other is prestige obsessed." ...P.T.I.

17.8.57

The Times of India, Delhi.

PSP Must Show Sincere Repentance Says Madhu Limaye

BOMAY, August 16 : Mr. Madhu Limaye, a prominent leader of the Socialist Party, said here yesterday that unless the PSP "unambiguously" accepted the constitution, policy and programme of the Socialist Party, his party would not even

convene the National Committee to consider the re-unification question.

He was commenting on the recent statements of Mr. Triloki Singh, General Secretary, PSP and Mr. Mukut Behari Lal, Chairman, Uttar Pradesh Branch of the P.S.P. on Narayan-Lohia talks and the reported conditions laid down by Dr. Lohia for the merger of the two parties.

Mr. Lal had said that while the PSP would welcome the consolidation of democratic socialist forces in the country it could not agree to Dr. Lohia's terms for the unification of the PSP and the Socialist Party.

"Perhaps they", Mr. Limaye said," have forgotten that it was Mr. J.P. Narayan who first approached Dr. Lohia on their behalf with a proposal for reunification."

The Socialist Party thought, he added, that the door of unity should not be barred if the PSP showed sincere repentance for their past sins by signifying acceptance of our constitution, policy and programme." ...P.T.I

20.8.57

The Times of India, Delhi.

J. P. Writes To Lohia Again

Calcutta,
12-8-1957.

Dear Rammanohar :

I received your letter of 31st July, 5 or 6 days ago at Patna. I was not able to acknowledge it earlier as I have been constantly on tour ever since. I had intended to write to you a reply from here. When I reached here yesterday I came to know from Prabhudyalji that you were also here. Today's meeting was then fixed over the telephone. I am writing this letter before meeting you and will hand it over to you personally.

I am sorry I could not understand properly all that you told me at Lucknow. The clarification you have made in your letter of 31st July have been sent to Gangababu.

I expressed the desire to meet you and came to Lucknow for it. I am afraid a wrong interpretation has been put on it. I, for one, have no objection to kneel down before you, or any one else, if that can lead to some good. But if this has led to an impression that the PSP ever entertained any such idea then the *mistake* should be corrected. I cannot think of any reason why the PSP should kneel down or surrender before the SP or any other Party. I do not know of any contingency that could lead her to such a pass. When I went to Lucknow to meet you I had not gone there as a representative of the P.S.P. I had a feeling that the cause of Democratic Socialism and of Indian Democracy would be served better if the PSP and the SP could join their forces together in any way. I did not reach this conclusion all of a sudden, either. Long before the elections, and shortly after you and your friends went out of the PSP, I had publicly given expression to the view that the two parties should work or at least contest the General Elections together. But it did not happen. Anyhow, after the General Elections I had a feeling that a favourable atmosphere for unity between the two parties had come into being. I discussed this with some friends and decided on my own responsibility to initiate talks with you. A day or two before I met you at Lucknow I saw a Press report emanating from Delhi to the effect that the PSP National Executive had welcomed my proposed talks with you, although it had made clear that I was not meeting you at the instance of the National Executive. That much was enough for me. Even when I met you at Lucknow I had this very impression about the attitude of the National Executive. The facts, however, were different. You have been getting confidential information from all quarters. Perhaps you know it already. The National Executive had sent Trilokibabu to Lucknow in advance particularly to acquaint me with their views before I met you. He did meet me but did not tell me anything.

Well, let that be. I still firmly hold the opinion that there should be unity among Democratic Socialists. If I can be of any use in this task I will consider myself fortunate. I have no right to speak on behalf of the PSP. But I am confident that the PSP will perhaps not reject a thing which I myself may regard as proper and correct.

Not a merger between the two parties but the creation of a new Party which should include members from both sides—I had liked the idea of yours. From what I understood to be your idea at Lucknow regarding the method to bring this about I had become hopeful. But your letter of 31st July gave me the impression that I could not grasp your idea properly or correctly. I hope that I will be able to fully understand them today. I will write to Gangabadu after. Just now I would like to say only this: whatever the method suggested to bring about a single united Party, any insulting condition or behaviour directed against any one of the two parties will make the creation of a single united Party impossible. Apart from this, the basic factors relate to the Policy Programme and Constitution. We can make some progress in the direction of unity only if there is agreement on those points. How far there can be agreement on these points can be ascertained only when representatives of the two parties sit down together. I do not expect that there will be any great divergence.

At the end I will refer to my own position. It really hurts me to find that in spite of my repeated declarations people do not seem to believe in what I say. It is an instance of the atmosphere of mutual distrust prevailing in the country today. Anyhow, I want once again to state very explicitly that I do not intend at all to return to power and partisan politics. I wish Democratic Socialism well even from where I am today. That is all.

Yours, affectionately,
Jayaprakash.

J. P. Advises Cancellation of Meeting of National Executive

Gaya,
August 18, 1957.

Dear Gangababu :

I could not find time to write to you, and in particular to draft a report on the talks. That is why I did not write earlier.

I have today sent the following telegram to Central Office :

**"PLEASE CANCEL CALCUTTA MEETING
NATIONAL EXECUTIVE LETTER FOLLOWS".**

Due to the postponement of my Jamshedpur programme I reached Calcutta on 11th August. I came to know from Prabhudyalji that very day that Dr. Lohia was also in Calcutta. I met him the next day, i. e. on the 12th. Before going to meet him I had drafted a letter which I handed over to him when we met. A copy of the letter is enclosed. I met him again on the 13th. I began to think, after the talks were over, and kept on thinking for sometime, about the next step. I had come to the definite conclusion yesterday that a meeting of the National Executive to discuss in particular the question of unity would be useless. I could not send the telegram yesterday as I was rather busy and because it was a holiday yesterday. I have sent the telegram today.

I am enclosing a brief report of our talks. I am sending a copy of this report to Lohia. A copy of the covering letter to him is also being enclosed.

More when we meet. I will be in Patna on September 8. Hope you are keeping well. Both of us are alright. Surendra had an attack of Malaria at Calcutta. He is alright now.

Yours affectionately,
Jayaprakash.

P. S.: I have taken another decision about which I want to inform you. I had referred to it when I met Party workers the other day at Patna. I am freeing myself from membership of the Party. As a matter of fact constitutionally I am not a Party member even today. I have, therefore, decided not to interfere in any way in Party affairs on my own. If ever I consider it necessary to criticise any action of the Party openly I will do it. I will give advice when asked or even on my own, publicly or in private.

One result of this will be that I will not in future do anything on my own in regard to the question of unity.

PPS. I wrote this letter at Ranchi. It was typed after I reached Gaya a short while ago.

J. P.

18.8.57

J. P.'s Report On Calcutta Talks

I reached Calcutta on August 11, in connection with Anugra Memorial. By chance Dr. Lohia also happened to be there at that time. I met Lohiaji at his residence on the 12th and 13th. The talks were held in an atmosphere of cordiality.

The report on Lucknow talks which I had sent to Ganga-babu and Dr. Lohia suffered from a few inaccuracies due to the fact that I had not properly and adequately grasped Lohiaji's ideas. These were clarified by Dr. Lohia in his letter of 31st July. These points were clarified further in our talks on the 12th and 13th.

The first point that was clarified was that in order to create One Party of Socialism the PSP should accept in

toto, and as they are, the present Constitution, Policy and Programme of the SP. Amendments, if any, in these could only be made at the Conference of delegates. But there is no need to have any prior talk in connection with the proposed amendments between the PSP and the SP.

The second point to be clarified was that in the interim period, when membership of the new Party will be enrolled, only one out of the two parties, the PSP and the SP, will continue to function, and that all activities during this interim period would be carried on the basis of the Constitution, etc. of that Party. Which of the two parties will continue to function can be decided by mutual talks that might be held in this connection.

Other points contained in my report on Lucknow talks do not need any modification in the light of our talks at Calcutta. I have given deep consideration to the picture of unity or that of the creation of One new Party, as it emerged out of our Calcutta talks. I conveyed to Doctor Saheb my opinion and misgivings in this regard. I do not think that it is possible to bring the two parties together and create One Party of Socialism in this manner. It is clear that this attempt to bring about unity has failed. But my humble opinion is that this failure should not lead to an increase in mutual bitterness. Even if the unity has not come about, the two parties should come closer to each other and establish a tradition of working together on issues on which they may be in agreement with each other.

At the end I would like to submit that I had undertaken this attempt at unity on my own responsibility. Although I am sorry that it has failed, yet I am not sorry that the attempt was made. Rather I am glad. I do not intend to make any fresh move in this direction on my own. But if the PSP or the SP may wish at any time to make use of my services to bring about Socialist unity I will always be most happy to be of any help in this cause.

Jayaprakash Narayan

J. P. On Lohia's Stand

Gaya,
Aug. 20, 1957.

Dear Rammanohar :

After talking to you at Calcutta I had been thinking about what to do next. From Calcutta I had gone to Ranchi. After a great deal of thinking I sent a telegram to the Central Office of the PSP not to hold the proposed Calcutta meeting of the National Executive. After the clarification you made at Calcutta about the method of bringing about one united Party I lost all hope for the time being that it can come about.

A copy of the report of our Calcutta Talks that I am sending to Gangababu is enclosed. I do not think it is necessary to add to what I have said in that report. In spite of that, however, I will like to say something on the published reports of the talks you have given to workers of the SP. It is just possible that press reports are incorrect, as so often happens to us. Still I want to make one thing clear. If I or the PSP do not accept your Constitution, Policy and Programme in toto and as they are today it is not out of any considerations of prestige or loss of face. Everyone has the right to consider what is good and what is bad. It is just possible that what I consider to be good may be otherwise from your point of view. This is also possible that we may be able to convince you of the justness of our standpoint after a discussion, or that you may be able to convince us of the justness of your viewpoint after such a discussion. Or, may be, we might come to the conclusion that although we continue to differ we may yet agree to work together. I am saying this only as a matter of argument. Otherwise, you know, I do not at all intend to return to Party Politics. It appears to me most natural and easy that those who agree that they should get together to form a new party should sit down together without imposing any pre-condition or insistence, and try to find out by mutual exchange of

views how far they can agree. Anyhow, this chapter is closed now, and I do not have to do anything more in this connection. It will always be my ardent and sincere wish that one united party of Democratic Socialism comes into being, and if anyone, at any time, seeks my assistance in this task I will always be prepared to give it to him to the best of my ability and strength. But I do not intend to make any fresh move in this direction on my own. I am sorry that the attempt I made has failed. But there has been one major gain to me out of this : I have had an opportunity once again to establish a unison of hearts with you. It was decided at Calcutta that we would meet on the 16th, 17th and 18th near about Hyderabad. It will be better if you could confirm this programme soon.

Till August 27, my address will be : C/o Shri. Banibihari-prasad Bhup, Durga Kothi, Buniyadganj, Gaya. From August 28 to 30th, it will be : C/o Shri Harishankar Vora, Dhanbad, Bihar.

Yours affectionately,
Jayaprakash Narayan

PSP-Socialist Unity Talks Break Down

MADRAS, August 22. Shri Asoka Mehta, Praja Socialist Party leader, told pressmen here today, that the merger talks between his party and Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia's Socialist Party had broken down.

Shri Mehta who arrived here today from Vijayawada in connection with the sittings of the Food Enquiry Committee said : "There was too much of bargaining and horse-trading on the part of Dr. Lohia which led to the breakdown."

Shri Asoka Mehta criticised what he called the "character assassination" campaign of Dr. Lohia. He said there were bound to be differences of opinion among party men in all

political organisations, but these should not be used as instrument to split an organisation or create discord among the members of a party.

Shri Mehta in this connection said the Socialist Party during the general elections had made a propaganda to the effect that the Praja Socialist Party was getting money from the United States of America and also spread rumours that he (Shri Mehta) had rejoined the Congress. All these were aimed at bringing disunity among his partymen, Shri Asoka Mehta said...PTI

23.8.57.

Free Press Journal Bombay

No Socialist Unity Until Dr. Lohia Agrees To Function Democratically

—Asoka Mehta

COIMBATORE, Aug. 25: Mr. Asoka Mehta, Praja Socialist Party leader said here today he completely shared Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan's desire that the PSP and the Socialist Party should come together and he had advocated close cooperation between the two parties and their unification almost from the morrow of their split.

Mr. Asoka Mehta said he was of the opinion that the party split came about not on the question of people or policy but on differences on methods of functioning. He was commenting on Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan's statement yesterday at Gaya that Mr. Jaya Prakash would like the two parties to come near together even if the possibility of forming a single party had for the present faded away.

Mr. Asoka Mehta said that 'until Dr. Lohia and his colleagues agreed to function democratically, union would be only a prelude to disunity'.

Mr. Asoka Mehta was on his way from Bangalore to

Trivandrum in connection with the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee meeting.

Mr. Asoka Mehta further said that for about five years now he was usually in the minority inside the party. Even then he had never found any difficulty from his other colleagues in the party for functioning freely and propagating his point of view and therefore he urged upon Dr. Lohia to realise that the traditional method of functioning which Mr. Jaya Prakash and Mr. Lohia with many of the founders of the Socialist movement jointly developed was the only one that would foster real socialist unity in the country.

Mr. Asoka Mehta contended that it was his duty to 'set the record straight' by pointing out where the responsibility lay. He added that he had no desire to offer any comments on the talks that Mr. Jaya Prakash had in his personal capacity with Dr. Lohia. The unique position that Mr. Jaya Prakash occupied in the country fully entitled him to make such efforts and he hoped that he would continue his efforts so that they might yield the desired effect'.

27.8.57

Indian Nation, Patna.

Goray Urges One Party of All Socialist Forces

NEW DELHI, Aug. 21.—Mr. N. G. Goray, MP, PSP leader, yesterday suggested that all parties and groups, "other than communist" "professing unshakable loyalty to the twin ideas of democracy and socialism" should explore the possibility of merging themselves into a single party of democratic socialism.

In a statement, he said: "The need for democratic socialist forces in the country to pool their strength and to provide the nation with an alternative to the Congress is so urgent that in spite of the fact that the talks between Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr. Lohia have proved infructuous,

others will have to come forward and take up the thread."

Mr. Goray said that there was a "pressure from below" demanding that the divisions and sub-divisions in the ranks of democratic socialism be abolished and a single party be formed. This was now becoming irresistible. "Such a party need have no hard and fast dogma or a set of unalterable doctrines, its programme should be simple, direct and close correspondence with the immediate needs and urges of the people in the urban as well as in the rural areas. I have no doubt that if such a party were to be formed, the next five years should yield results that will go a long way in dispelling the present mood of apathy from among the people. The only question is whether the leaders of the various democratic socialist parties realise what they owe to the people and whether they have enough originality, modesty, responsiveness and freedom from dogma to meet together and face the problems boldly and frankly."

29.8.57

National Herald, Lucknow

The Aftermath

P.S.P. Socialist Party Merger

LOHIA'S STATEMENT

CALCUTTA, Aug. 30.—Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, Socialist leader, said here yesterday that he wanted “an effective intervention or no intervention at all” by Mr. J.P. Narayan on the issue of merger of his party and the P.S.P.

Dr. Lohia said Mr. Narayan should not have initiated a process which he was not prepared to see through.

He told a meeting that in spite of “all hurt caused” to him by these talks, there was “one good thing that I and Mr. Narayan are on talking terms again.”

Another good result might also come out if sections of the P.S.P. membership could free themselves from their present leadership and begin to see things in their right perspective.

Dr. Lohia said the Socialist Party with the policy, programme and constitution of its own was capable of ushering in radical socialism in the country.

He referred to the statements of the P.S.P. leaders and a recent resolution of the U.P. P.S.P. calling upon its members

to "fraternize with the socialists and to persuade them to give up my demands concerning constitution, policy and programme of the party." He urged his partymen to open a counter-campaign of persuading "the more active and militant section of the P.S.P., to consider issues irrespective of considerations of passing members" and to join the Socialist Party.

In Hyderabad, Mr. Ranganath, General Secretary of the Socialist Party, stated that there was no question of the representatives of the Socialist and Praja-Socialist Parties meeting unless the P.S.P. expressed its views clearly on the basic matters of constitution, principles and programmes of the Socialist Party. Negotiations would not be desirable unless that took place.

31.8.57

Hindustan Times, New Delhi

• J.P.'s Unity Efforts Thwarted by P.S.P. Leaders Says Dr. Lohia

Hyderabad (Dn) Sept. 1

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, Socialist Party leader, said here in an interview today that other leaders of the PSP had check-mated Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan's recent efforts at Socialist unification.

Portions of the letters, which Mr. Jayaprakash had written to him and which bore this out, said Dr. Lohia, had not yet been published. He promised to release them within this week.

Asked if the programme for the two leaders to meet in Hyderabad during the middle of this month still stood, Dr. Lohia replied in the affirmative.

Referring to the resignation of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan from the PSP, Dr. Lohia said he was surprised he stayed so long in that Party. "It is true he was the driving force behind my expulsion from the PSP but I bear him no grudge on that account and must say that he is a mass man. I had hoped that he would be able to persuade substantial sections of the PSP to his view. But the Praja Socialist Party obviously proved too obstinate and paralysed even for him."

"Of course", he added, " the initial blame was on him (Jayaprakash Narayan) when in 1951 he advocated co-operation and coalition with the Congress Party. But, he is after all a mass man and has, therefore, changed his outlook. Smaller leaders of the PSP made theories out of the temporary situation, such as political compulsions of a backward economy."

"I hope that a large section of the PSP which is by temperament and training revolutionary, will cast aside the spell of these reactionary theories. This is the time for them to leave the sinking ship when the best oarsman has left it. They must now seek to fulfill their socialist destiny through the Socialist Party."

Basic Differences

Asked to explain the basic differences and why the Socialist Party insisted on the PSP accepting the Socialist Party Constitution, policy and programmes, Dr. Lohia said the Socialist Party was inspired by the "will to power", while the PSP was actuated by the "half hearted will to office."

The PSP is ever willing to hit out in all directions for opportunities of individual position, even when they do not help to achieve any radical changes in society. The Socialist Party wants "power" and nothing less, so that it can change society in a revolutionary way. That is why it cannot compromise on its policies and programmes, Dr. Lohia said.

2-9-57

Indian Express.

Lohia Baffled At J.P.'s Attitude

HYDERABAD, September 7: Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, Socialist leader, told a party meeting yesterday that he had not understood why at all Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan opened talks with him on socialist unity, and the way the talks ended had baffled him.

Addressing a joint meeting of the members of the Socialist Party of Hyderabad and Secunderabad at the central office, Dr. Lohia gave the background of the recent negotiations. He said both he and Mr. Narayan agreed that the Congress was likely to face a crisis in the next three or four years because of its inability to solve the many pressing problems. 'Groupism' within the Congress Party had grown to a breaking point.

Perhaps, said Dr. Lohia, this was at the back of the mind of Mr. Narayan when he sought to strengthen the socialist movement. But strong sections within the PSP, who thought in terms of co-operation with the Congress, opposed the unity move as the Socialist Party had as its cardinal principle the equal irrelevance of both communism and Congress.

Dr. Lohia said politics in the country was in a mess. There was no emphasis on organization. Leaders functioned arbitrarily totally ignoring party rules and party men. He wanted the Socialist Party to avoid this.

He advised his party men to be prepared not only for the struggle, but also to face the situation when power came in their hands. In this connection, Dr. Lohia said the Congress, during the days of its struggle, had neglected this aspect, with the result that today the party had put in power persons who joined the party after it had succeeded in its freedom fight. The result was that those who talked of the socialist pattern did not measure up to those standards.

Mr. Madhu Limaye, Socialist leader from Bombay, explained why the Bombay section of the SP had opposed the merger of two socialist parties.

The meeting considered a draft resolution on the Lohia-Narayan talks, but postponed a vote till tomorrow.

The resolution expressed the opinion that the policy statement of the party, adopted at the foundation conference, should not be departed from. Although socialist unity was desirable and should be attempted, it should not be at the sacrifice of the accepted principles of the Socialist Party.

Should genuine elements of the PSP think it proper to join the Socialist Party, they would be assured of socialist fraternity and comradeship—P.T.I.

7-9-57.

*Hindustan Times,
(Evening News)*

Prof. Mukut Behari Lal Denies Lohia's Accusations

LUCKNOW, September 5 : Prof. Mukut Behari Lal, Chairman, Praja Socialist Party (Uttar Pradesh) has issued the following statement to the press.

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia is hardly justified in holding leaders of the Praja Socialist Party responsible for checkmating Shri Jaiprakash Narain's efforts at Socialist unification. A meeting of the National Executive of the Praja Socialist Party was scheduled to meet on the 31st August with a view to considering terms of unification. It was also to be attended by Shri Jaiprakash Narain. But when he was definitely told by Dr. Lohia in the second week of August that in order to create one party of Socialism the Praja Socialist Party should accept in toto, and as they are, the present constitution, policy and programme of the Socialist Party he lost all hope for bringing about one united Party and asked the Chairman of the Praja Socialist Party to cancel the meeting of the National Executive. This clearly indicates that Dr. Lohia was responsible for Shri Jaiprakash Narain's decision "not to do anything more in this connection."

The Praja Socialist Party maintains that "non-violent class struggles such as Satyagrah and strikes are also a necessary method of Democratic action" and require socialist workers "to organise peaceful resistance against injustice, to guide the struggles of oppressed humanity and to suffer with them in their suffering." But it is not prepared to endorse the theory of permanent civil disobedience, as propounded in the Statement of Principles of the Socialist Party. In this statement while passing reference is made of collective resistance of government and non-Governmental injustices, stress is laid on individual civil resistance. It demands that "socialist in ever increasing number should cultivate the habit of civil resistance against all suppression of tyranny" and maintains that "in terms not only of present obligations but also of the future of human civilization the worth of a political party will be judged by the extent to which it assists in the growth of such civil resisting individuals".

The members of the Praja Socialist Party feel convinced that civil resistance will lose all its significance if all political parties start competition in individual civil resistance conditions of race for civil resistance among different parties are hardly conducive to produce proper climate for the growth of democracy and socialism.

Civil resistance of ultra nationalist issues such as the removal of the statues and renaming of Madras State as Tamilnad are positively harmful to socialist cause as they tend to distract public attention from burning economic issues tend to divert socialist energy to matters which are not of much importance for socialism.

8.9.57.

Amrit Bazar Patrika, Allahabad.

SP To Approach P. S. P. Ranks For Merger

The leader of the Socialist group in Parliament, Mr. P. V. G. Raju, indicated in New Delhi on Sunday that his party proposed to approach the rank and file of the P. S. P.

directly with a view to securing the unity of democratic Socialist forces in the country.

He was addressing a press conference called primarily to "correct a wrong impression" and "accuse" a section of the P. S. P. leadership for "stalling" the recent J. P.-Lohia talks in regard to the formation of a single Socialist Party.

Mr. Raju said that except for this section of "intransigent" Praja Socialist leadership, whose thinking was "closely orientated to Congress politics" the rank and file of the P. S. P. clearly favoured the formation of a strong, united Socialist Party.

The Socialist leader hinted that in deciding upon a policy of "direct approach" they had been encouraged by the fact that some P. S. P. leaders on the State level had recently come over to the Socialist camp. These included two M. L. As. in Uttar Pradesh and two Party leaders in Andhra.

Mr. Raju regretted that non-publication of the full text of the letters exchanged between Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan and Dr. Lohia had created a "wrong impression" in the minds of the people. He was confident that once the full facts were known, the P. S. P. rank and file would realise that there was no longer any bar to their uniting with other democratic Socialists.

The "intransigent" section of the P. S. P. leadership, he said, was opposed to the "unity move" even before Mr. Narayan and Dr. Lohia had met at Lucknow. This was clear from an "unpublished portion" of Mr. Narayan's letter of August 12 to Dr. Lohia.

Mr. Narayan had said : "A day or two before I met you at Lucknow I saw a press report emanating from Delhi to the effect that the P. S. P. National Executive had welcomed my proposed talks with you, although it had made clear that I was not meeting you at the instance of the National Executive."

"That much was enough for me," added Mr. Narayan. "Even when I met you at Lucknow I had this very impression about the attitude of the National Executive. The facts, however, were different. Perhaps you know it already. The National Executive had sent Triloki Babu to Lucknow in advance particularly to acquaint me with their views before I met you. He did meet me but did not tell me anything."

Mr. Raju drew pointed attention to the last two sentences. He said it was significant that the General Secretary of the P. S. P., Mr. Triloki Singh, did not convey to Mr. Narayan the fact that a section of the P. S. P. Executive, including Mr. Asoka Mehta, was opposed to the "unity move" from the outset.

Asked if this was to suggest that the General Secretary Mr. Triloki Singh, was himself in favour of the "unity move" Mr. Raju smiled broadly to reply: "It is not for me to comment."

The Socialist leader expressed satisfaction at the forthcoming talks between Mr. Narayan and Dr. Lohia in Hyderabad about September 16. This, he felt, would help them in their continuing efforts to bring about unity among the democratic Socialist forces.

9.9.57

Times of India, Delhi.

No Chance Of Socialist Unity In Near Future

**MR. TRILOKI SINGH BLAMES
DR. LOHIA**

LUCKNOW, September 9. There was no chance of the PSP and the Socialist Party uniting in the near future, said Mr. Triloki Singh, General Secretary of the PSP, here today.

The torrent of vilification which Dr. Lohia had released against the Praja Socialist leadership precluded any effort being made soon for reuniting the socialist ranks, he added.

Neither the National Conference nor the National Executive of the PSP would consider the unity terms offered by Dr. Lohia. Mr. Singh rebutted Dr. Lohia's charge that the PSP leadership had "checkmated" Mr. J. P. Narayan's unity move. The meeting of the PSP National Executive called in Calcutta on August 31 to consider Dr. Lohia's terms had to be cancelled at the request of Mr. Narayan as he was convinced that the move was doomed to failure.

The letters exchanged by the two leaders indicated that if anything frustrated the move initially, it was their misunderstanding of each other.

Dr. Lohia had insisted in his letter to Mr. J. P. Narayan of July 31 that the PSP should accept the policy, the programme and the constitution of the S. P. in toto. "This condition must have led Mr. Narayan to despair of the possibility of the talks succeeding," Mr. Triloki Singh said.

Vilifications

Referring to what the PSP leader described as Dr. Lohia's effort to "calumniate" the Praja Socialist leadership, Mr. Triloki Singh said that he did not wish to return the compliments. For howsoever hard he might try, he could not descend to the depths of the vilification indulged in by Dr. Lohia. "The country has not seen a greater vilifier," said Mr. Singh. Dr. Lohia's PSP-phobia was so intense that he was ever ready to believe any allegation preferred against the PSP. Some months ago, Dr. Lohia had gleefully supported the charge that the PSP received "American money." Now he was pillorying the so-called pro-Congress, pro-Communist elements in the PSP.

Mr. Singh challenged Dr. Lohia to produce a single case in support of his allegation that the PSP had compromised with the Congress at district, state or national level. There could be no greater evidence of the PSP's strong anti-Congress stand than the PSP's electoral adjustments with Communists during the last elections, the PSP's General Secretary added.

Dr. Lohia's estimate of Praja Socialists appeared to have changed since he left the Party three years ago. Not long ago he called them paralytic and rotten. Now he had discovered that a majority of the Praja Socialists were revolutionaries by temperament and training.

He ridiculed Dr. Lohia's offer to retire from politics, provided the PSP accepted the policy, programme and constitution of the Socialist Party. None could take this dramatic gesture seriously least of all for deciding the policy and programme of a party. The PSP did not decide fundamentals by arranging negotiations between individuals. Only the National Conference could take decisions on them, Mr. Triloki Singh said.

10.9.57.

Times of India, Delhi.

P. S. P. Leader Repudiates Dr. Lohia's Statement

NO 'DOMINANT GROUP' FOR ALLIANCE WITH CONGRESS

SURAT, Sept. 12 : Mr. Ishwarlal Desai, member of the National Executive of the P. S. P., yesterday repudiated Dr. Lohia's statement that there existed a "dominant group within the P. S. P. advocating co-operation with the Congress Party".

In a statement issued yesterday, the Praja Socialist Leader of Gujerat said that the existence of such a group as alleged by Dr. Lohia was only a "figment of his imagination."

It was true, Mr. Desai said, that Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan had held talks with Prime Minister Nehru four years ago on the question of collaboration between the Praja Socialists and the Congress Party. But the talks, as was well known, floundered on certain "fundamental demands" of the Praja Socialist Party. It did not now behove Dr. Lohia to recur to this "favourite" allegation of collaboration.

The Praja Socialists, the statement said, no less than other Democratic Socialists in the country were eager to bring about unification of the Socialist and Praja Socialist parties. But such unification should be born of mutual respect and appreciation of each other's view points and "Dr. Lohia's is not the way to bring it about," the statement added.

The statement said that Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan, who had "of his own accord" started the recent unification talks with Dr. Lohia, had to abandon his efforts on account of "impossible" conditions laid down by Dr. Lohia.

"If the recent Jaya Prakash Lohia talks failed, it should only mean that the situation is not yet ripe for Socialist Unity", the statement said.

This should not have been an occasion to fire a broadside of abuses against the Praja Socialist Party. All members of P. S. P., including Mr. Asoka Mehta, were pleased at the effort to bring about unity in the Socialist movement. At the same time, they had their misgivings whether the time was ripe for the same. That was because till almost the eve of the negotiations, Dr. Lohia's futile vituperative attacks against the PSP were continuing, the statement added.

13.9.57.

Indian Nation, Patna,

Socialist Unity Dr. Lohia's Note

Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and I met in Lucknow on 15th July. A second meeting took place in Calcutty on 12th August. This meeting was unplanned and took place on a telephonic message from Jayaprakash Narayan that he was also in town and would like to meet me. This was followed by a third meeting on 13th August. The first meeting left me with the conclusion that the unification of the Praja Socialist Party with the Socialist Party was more than probable. The second meeting took place on a note of possible failure of the attempt. The third meeting left me with the impression that unification was more than possible, almost probable. In fact, I was not quite convinced about the breakdown of the talks, until Mr. Narayan himself publicly said so round about the 26th of August, around which time I also received a letter from him intimating a

possible failure. When public statements of the break-down of these talks were being made from quarters other than those of Mr. Narayan, I read them with caution, half believing and half unbelieving. It has been a strange feature of these talks that news of their breakdown should be made public by non-participants and that one of the two who held the talks should be unaware of their break-down until such public communications.

The sequence of my reactions is borne out by the correspondence. From Mr. Narayan's own version of the Lucknow talks, a notable fact, consisting the basis of unification, stands out. He says : "Thus, you will see that socialist unity depends alone on the constitution, policy and programme and that is also right, although I personally believe that democratic socialists may differ even on fundamental issues. The written policy etc., has not that much of importance for me as the will and impulsion to act together". I do not wish to argue here about Mr. Narayan's opinion on written policies. But this makes quite clear that the constitution, policy and programme of the Socialist Party were acceptable to him. That opinion was some kind of a reassurance to those who might feel disinclined to agree with this or that aspect of socialist policy. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan could not have been more emphatic than when he said that socialist unity would depend upon the Socialist Party's constitution, policy and programme. He also declared categorically that this was right. He was not only intimating my requirement to the P. S. P., but was associating himself with it. There has been a little debate about whether he had wanted a total acceptance of this basis or was also desiring some alterations. He letter is clear also on this issue. He says of me: "He would like to make the constitution, policy and programme of the Socialist Party the foundation of the new party. I asked him if a changes could be effected to which he replied negatively, but said he would like no change with regard to foundational matters". This version does not wholly understand or convey my viewpoint. But, in a fundamental respect, it goes further than I would like to. It says in effect that the new party must base itself in all essentials on the policy, programme and constitution of the Socialist Party, and no change in respect of them could be contemplated. I had corrected him when I wrote to him : "You may remember that I have told you that there should be no vacuum. Therefore, there should be continuity in these three matters. I had said that even if there is a wrong programme, not to talk of policy, it would be best to proceed on its acceptance. Whatever changes you or another would convince me are necessary, I would try to have them effected with an effort such as your own. But not before a delegates' conference". I am prepared even for basic alterations should they be considered necessary. Even from one conference to another, the Socialist Party has basically altered and improved its international aim. But all such changes should be done at delegates' conferences. Otherwise, the bog of unprincipled politics is right there in front of us. In any event, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan was quite clear from the beginning that the constitution, principles and programme of the Socialist Party would have to

be accepted totally and without reserve in all essentials and he had communicated this as clearly to the P. S. P. I have therefore been wholly unable to understand the subsequent furore on these issues.

I would sustain the written word with a small bit from our talk. I had asked him on 12th August to call off the talks as they had run into troubled waters, and also in view of the fact that he was not inclined to practise politics directly. He did not want to break the talks off. When we met again on 13th August, he pressed me to help him to find a way out. I told him to suggest to the P. S. P. to examine the constitution, policy and programme of the Socialist Party and to note such alterations, if any, as they would like to make in regard to details and to forward them to the Socialist Party. When Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan told me that he had not read the socialist policy, he also said that it must be good as I had drafted it and there should be no difficulty in accepting it. We had separated on this somewhat hopeful note after our third meeting.

The other issue relates to the interim structure of the party, when the Praja Socialists come in and before delegates conference elect the new executives. I have always left this issue for final disposal to the representatives of the two parties. I have of course some opinions on the matter which I expressed to Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and have also repeated them in my letter. On 13th August we have also talked of various possibilities that arose in this connection. My own view is opposed to ad hoc committees and to double authorities even over a short period. Even here, the problem did not appear impossible either to Mr. Narayan or to me when we separated on 13th of August.

Some persons have thought as though the Bengal and Bombay situations into which the P. S. P. has manoeuvred itself proved too stubborn for the success of these talks. That is not so. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan told me clearly that the Bombay situation could be satisfactorily settled by allowing the Maharashtra P. S. P., who had got into an opportunistic situation with many elements, including the Communists, to obtain "friendly divorce" from the Socialist Party as it would emerge after the unification. He also said that the Bengal situation of opportunist leftist consolidation was unofficial and that it would automatically disappear after the unification. Mr Narayan and such opinion as he represents were thus willing to correct their earlier and most disastrous error. But something of a very peculiar kind seems to have happened. While such elements in the P. S. P. as have got into opportunistic alliances with the Communist were only nervous at the possible outcome of the talks, the self-advertised anti-Communists in that Party got into a dither. These were frightened at what appeared to them the other dreaded outcome of socialist unification. Let us remember that these so called anti-Communist elements in the P. S. P. are also pro-government. Their pro-governmentalism is now proved to be stronger than their anti-communism. If the P. S. P. had unified with the Socialist Party, there would have been two outcomes. All opportunistic

alliances with the Communists would have come to an end. Also, all obstacles to struggle and civil disobedience against government and injustice and exploitation would have been theoretically set aside. This second outcome appeared so distasteful to the anti-Communist and pro-government elements in the P.S.P. that they have been prepared to come to terms with pro-Communist opportunism. Only that anti-communism is genuine, which is also anti-injustice and anti-exploitation and anti the government which promotes injustice and exploitation. The rest is fraud.

Some inkling as to why these talks failed may be had from the letter of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan of 12th August. It says: "A day or two before the Lucknow meeting I saw a report from Delhi in the newspapers that the P. S. P. Executive had liked my meeting you, although it also made clear that I was not meeting you on the direction of the Executive. That was enough for me. When I met you in Lucknow I kept on thinking so about the attitude of the Executive. But the reality was different. You get to know the secrets of all sides. Perhaps you have known. The Executive had specially sent Triloki Babu to Lucknow in hurry so that he would tell me of its opinion before I met you. He met me but did not tell me anything". This portion of Mr. Narayan's letter leaves nothing in this connection that needs to be cleared up. There is only one thing which needs to be cleared up. It arises out of Mr. Narayan's letter of 12th August. It says: "I do not possess the right to speak on behalf of the P. S. P. But I am confident that what I consider to be proper, the P. S. P. would perhaps not reject". Why has he ultimately not considered it proper to push through what he himself initiated? Even Mr. Narayan may find it difficult to answer this question. A man is not sure of his own motives, particularly if he is pulled in different directions. To examine his motives would be a hazardous undertaking for others. All that we can do is to describe the background and the situation of these talks, which I will do from time to time

What separated the Socialist Party and the Praja Party ? In large measure, the causes of the separation continue. Let this be definitely understood that we did not leave the Praja Socialist Party. I and hundreds of other colleagues were expelled from it. We had continued in the Party in spite of successive reverses and intrigues. We were innocent enough to imagine that, as our opinions were held by an overwhelming majority, it was only a matter of time when that should express itself in the vote in spite of intrigues of the leadership. But we were expelled before that could happen. It has been a great failure of our propaganda that this point has not been brought home to the people of India. Most outsiders and newspapers keep on saying that we left the Praja Socialist Party because our opinion did not win. That is a complete untruth. This untruth has been sedulously propagated in order to show us up as party breakers or as a group that did not know how to live in a minority. Actually those who expelled us are the party breakers.

I suppose that the ultimate reason that will prevail against this lie will be the successive strengthening of the Socialist Party against the Praja Party. This will have taught a lesson to all political parties in India. They will not deal with their members as though there were cabbage. Already greater internal democracy is in evidence within political parties of the country. Such small success as we have had in the building up of the Socialist Party has scared all leaderships of all political parties into giving greater freedom of speech to their members. Even members of the Praja Party, who today enjoy a little free speech, should be grateful to us for this privilege, for, without our experience, they too would have been cast out like us and many hundreds before us. I will revert to this subject later. It is important to remember that we did not leave the Praja Socialist Party, but that we were expelled from it. The Socialist Party is not the achievement of a truculent minority, but of an expelled minority. Some would even say that it is the achievement of a majority that was first manoeuvred into becoming a minority and then expelled.

To come back to the origins of this separation. I will not tract them chronologically. I will first talk of the two most outstanding issues which engaged the Party and the public mind immediately before our expulsions. One revolved around the police firing in Travancore-Cochin by a Praja Socialist government. The other revolved around the irrigation struggle in U.P. The two issues were intertwined in time as well as in import. There is not much need to dilate upon the firing issue at this distance of time. If the Praja Socialist Party had at that time withdrawn its government and laid down a definitive policy on police firing, it would have served the country well. In a continuing disintegration of public life in the country, a party of upright standards would have forcefully revealed itself to tens of millions. The Socialist Party would have become the conscience of India. Also, it would not have acquired this honour at the expense of administrative realism. The recommended policy permitted the administration to open fire in the event of armed insurrection and also in the event of murder by rebellious crowds. Not a word of repentance has come from those little men who led the socialist movement at that time and who snatched away from its most triumphant victory in the service of the people, as though they were snakes in the sleeve. Why they did so, they or others would tell. I am a little tired of examining people's motives. I may only recall that the price of this great ignominy, that is, the government of Travancore Cochin did not exist for every much longer after the firing.

The irrigation struggle in U. P. brought in its wake the active possibility of a national and massive struggle against injustice and exploitation. A coincidence of various factors made the end of the irrigation struggle the starting point of a nation-wide enthusiasm in socialist circles. This enthusiasm was tending to infect the common people. The Praja Socialist leadership looked with disfavour upon this development. Even while the U. P. struggle was on they had continually talked of its fizzling out. This habit of talking of "fizzling out" is characteristic of all weak-kneed people, and they

exist also in the Socialist Party and so I would not condemn over much the Praja Socialist Party leadership. But a leadership ought to be made of sterner stuff. It should not start a fight in a hurry. It should be slow, painfully slow, in starting a fight. But once having started a fight, it should not easily give up and should know how to hold its breath. Additionally, the Praja Socialist leadership appeared pained that the irrigation struggle should have come to such a victorious close. That seemed to foil its plan of inaction or its habit of inertia. It had to kill the generated enthusiasm. The victorious close of the U.P. struggle in September 1954 had opened out the inescapable prospect of a nation-wide struggle in the summer of 1955 or a few months later. To some that appeared as a glory, to others as a frightening portent. These frightened paralytics set about the task of killing people's enthusiasm.

I may here recall that while we were still in the Praja Socialist Party and when I was being jailed in far away Manipur in May 1955 and was in for a great deal of distress and suffering, these frightened little men were publicly and nationally resolving to denounce me and to warn me. I have never before talked of this savage stab in the back. The men who did it all themselves were my comrades and colleagues of life-time. What did they get out of this savage denial of a friendship? Was it only in keeping with their national plan not to let the people go beyond a certain degree of action or did they get more concrete assurances in exchange for this foul behaviour? It has hurt me considerably to write of this episode even at this considerable distance of time. My pride has so far held me from talking of it. The basic thing must once again be brought out. The prospect of a national struggle against the Congress government appeared so frightening to the Praja Socialist leadership that it preferred to scatter away the gains and enthusiasm of the irrigation struggle in U. P.

This question of struggle against the government and the related question of association with the government in order to reform it takes us back to the earlier episode of coalition negotiations with the Congress Party and the Betul Conference. That was the first occasion when the differences within the socialist movement of India came out forcefully into the open. There were naturally enough prior reasons that were operating underground for a long time. I will come to that later. But the first public expression of conflict within the socialist movement took place over the issue of coalition with the ruling party. There is again no need to talk of that issue at any length. While some smaller protagonists of the co-operationist or coalitionist idea within the Praja Party still hold to it, the more outstanding protagonists have in the meanwhile made full circle and gone to the extent of adjustments or co-operation with the Communists against the Congress Party in the last general election. No further proof of the totally unstable character of the Praja leadership would be necessary, also of its unprincipled opportunism.

I may here refer to a characteristic and a foul trick of Praja leader-

ship which first manifested itself at the Betul Conference. During the debate, some Praja leaders made a spectacular intervention by submitting their resignations. They made use of this trick in a fouler manner and with deadlier effect at the Nagpur Conference on police firing. Speaker after speaker from their side told the delegates that the Executive had decided to resign, but the question was whether their exit was to be honourable. The Chairman concluded his speech on an appeal to the delegates that they should not split the Party by defeating the official motion, in other words, threatened to split the party if their policy was not accepted.

The main question here is whether the socialist movement in India can stand on its own legs without aids and crutches either to the left or to the right. At Betul, in the beginning of 1953, it sought for aids and crutches to the right from the Congress Party. During the general elections of 1957, such sections as had stayed back with the Praja Party sought for aid and crutches from the left from the Communist Party and in fact in all directions from right and left and top and bottom. There has been no satisfactory explanation for this behaviour. Some have said that this was a survival election for the Praja Socialist Party. A party that buys its existence at such great cost and principles does not deserve to exist. I have an additional explanation to offer. A party that has lost all confidence in itself, that has no enduring visions nor long range policies to follow and that must like a parasite seek its nourishment outside of itself must necessarily behave like the Praja Socialist Party, lean right and left on the Congress Party in '53 and on the Communist Party in '57.

Increase of Communist strength is continuously used as an argument to reunite the Socialist and the Praja Socialist Parties even at the cost of principle and policy. Those who use this argument do not know the source of Communist strength nor how to stem it or stop it. In the first place let us be clear about what enabled the Communists to retain their parliamentary strength. The largest single cause of the retention of Communist parliamentary strength was the Praja Socialist Party. But for it, the Communists would at least have been halved in their legislative numbers. It is also true that but for the Communists, the Praja Socialist Party would have been cut down to perhaps one-third or less of its former size.

The lame and the halt supported each other to acquire added parliamentary strength. Mass strength is however the ultimate decider. In this, the Praja Socialists have lost heavily. Aside of opening out the prospect of Communist rule in Bengal, the Praja Socialists have helped the Communist Party to acquire the seats of Calcutta, Kanpur, Gwalior, Bhopal, Indore, Bombay and Coimbatore. All these cities have returned Communists to represent them in Parliament. This would not in most cases have been possible if the Praja Socialists had not actively campaigned for Communist candidates. This may mean a mill-stone round the necks of the Indian people and the guilt of it will lie squarely on the Praja Socialist Party. All those who desire a strong and united socialist movement, primarily as a

counter weight to the Communist Party, should ponder this development during the last general elections. The Praja Socialist Party was so unprincipled and crazed for its own survival that it was prepared to assist the Communist Party into supreme positions at strategic points.

There has been much talk of approaches made by the P. S. P. to the Socialist Party for electoral arrangements during the last general elections. Such approaches were never made. If newspaper kite-flying is an approach, on which a subsequent argument could be erected, all politics would become puerile. There never was any written approach. One may recollect how the P. S. P. had used precisely this argument in connection with kite-flying approaches of the Communist Party with regard to a coalition government in Travancore-Cochin. Furthermore the P. S. P. had at that time been answered through public pronouncements that the electoral policy of the Socialist Party was an automatic invitation to all other parties, if they were genuinely anti-government, to step down from its constituencies. The Socialist Party had laid down such stiff conditions for itself that it was contesting no more than 340 seats.

The way to stem the Communist advance does not lie in unprincipled unification, in the bringing together of people who hold different principles or no principles at all. Communist victory in Kerala is a pointer. Alone they did it. Unprincipled politics over a long number of years had so irritated the people that they were prepared to experiment with a Communist government. Time there was when socialists of India were so disgusted by or frightened at Communist successes that they were prepared to react into emotional and unstable situations. The Socialist Party is an inheritor of the wisdom drawn from that experience. It faces the Communist threat with a serene spirit. Its anti-communism is therefore the stronger. It wants to do its duty without sacrificing its principles. If communism must hold sway over India, it knows that that also will be a passing evil like British rule or Congress mal-administration. It is therefore unwilling to let its mind be clouded by the neurosis of fright or disgust. It has the patience to look decades ahead and, I hope, it will in course of time acquire patience to look centuries ahead.

Most foreign observers have made the mistake of setting the Socialist Party into the established European pattern. Undoubtedly the Socialist Party began as the left wing of the socialist movement in the country. All such left wings have in Europe tended to veer towards Soviet Russia and their native Communist parties. They have therefore adopted pro-Soviet foreign policies and pro-Communist native policies of united front. On both these counts the Socialist Party has departed completely from the European usage. In fact, the Praja Socialists as the right wing of the movement have adopted united front policies, although we have not yet seen their way to adopt pro-Soviet foreign policies. Their developments have appeared bewildering to all foreign observers, who have not yet sensed the peculiarity of

the Indian socialist situation, its freedom from European dogma and experience.

While the Socialist Party is now serenely anti-Communist, it has also learnt that the theory of equal irrelevance had not earlier been practised correctly. The socialist movement of India was for a long time tied-up with the socialist and trade-union movements of Europe and Asia. I accept my own principal guilt in the matter, as far as Asian movements are concerned and part guilt in connection with the European socialist movements, though none at all concerning trade-union movements. These various allegedly socialist movements in the world and their accessory, the Praja Socialists in India, have heaped infamy on socialism. They have turned the current doctrine of socialism into the creed of the bully and the coward, bully to the Algerian and coward to the American, bully to the Kenyan and coward against the Russian guided missile. If this should be held as a description not applicable to Asian socialism, let it be stated once for all that socialism has reached the last limits of inanity in Asia. European socialism was at least revolutionary in the nineteenth century, and in the beginning of the twentieth, revolutionary for the limited internal purposes of its own people, but Asian socialism has never been revolutionary. Asian socialists have as individuals played revolutionary roles in the national movements for freedom, but, as socialist parties, they have been woefully inane. The current creed of socialism is the doctrine of the bully and the coward or the inane. An incidental benefit of the separate existence of the Socialist Party is that the socialist movement of India is no longer in preferential affiliation to the European movements. If the Communist Parties and movements and their affiliates in all the world are evil, so are the traditional socialist parties and their movements. If the traditional socialist parties have some good in them, so have the Communist parties. To the Socialist Party in India, the communist and socialist movements outside of its national frontiers are equally good or equally evil. If it will have any connection with them, it will do so with both of them non-preferentially. Unless the world socialist movement undergoes a complete change in objectives and methods and makes an open declaration to that effect, the Socialist Party of India will treat it in the same way as it will treat any other foreign movement. It will be happy to have friendly relations with all those outside India, liberals, communists, socialists and all others who according to it further its international objectives, but it will have preferential relations with none.

So will a new, unburdened and creative socialism be built up in India and all the world. The question must be squarely faced why India's socialism stood for a long time, and still does in so far as the Praja are supposedly socialist, on tottering legs between the Congress and the Communist parties. It had no fighting qualities. It did not respect principles. Can the unification of a socialist movement that has become aware of its earlier defects and another that still wallows in them stem the Communist advance? Impossible. Only that socialist movement can resist communism

successfully, whose doctrine is superior to it and combines fighting qualities with peaceable methods.

Before I go into the question of what made the Praja Socialist Party so lacking in principles and fighting qualities, and what were the underground conflicts even before Betul 1953, I must make it clear that I never called the Praja Socialists collaborationists of one or the other type. I have always called them paralytics. This word was deliberately chosen. These gentlemen stand on the tottering less. They may either lean on the Congress or on the Communists according to what the situation appears to them. I have been foully misinterpreted on this score. Some Praja Socialists have continually complained that I have prophesied and propagated about their entry into one or another party. This I have never done. I am not concerned with the small men and their individual futures. It is true that some other members of my Party have sometimes made such forecasts. But I have never done so. In fact, I once told a Praja Socialist leader that he was too paralysed to join the Congress Party which he later repeated in his own speeches as his opinion. Some Praja Socialist leaders have of course been deserting into the Congress or the Communist Party. To a certain extent, the Praja Socialist Party today and the socialist movement as a whole in the past have been waiting rooms for transit passengers between the Congress and the Communist Parties. India's newspapers rarely print my opinions without distortion. But they seem to take evident pleasure in printing criticism or condemnation of opinions which I am supposed to shold according to other persons. Let me once again repeat that I have right from the beginning called the Praja Socialists a paralysed body.

Behind conflicts that came out into open, whether at Betul or at Nagpur, was the main issue of what an organisation ought to be. In fact, this problem of organisation has been the chief source of the weakness that erupts in the lack of principles or in fighting qualities. The socialist movement of India has never been a disciplined organisation; it was much more a collection of individuals. These individuals varied in the extent of their personal following and influence, some more powerful, others less. There never were any steady aims which an organisation could follow. Responsibilities were individualistic. Most of the work lay in speech-making or in intrigue and summit politics. All bottom politics, of steady change in behaviour and thoughts, of thousands who form the hard core of an organisation, there has been but little in the socialist movement. Committee meetings except at the National or the state level take place irregularly, if at all. There is no attempt to enforce the constitution at the level of the unit, the constituency or even the district. Active members and legislators and the like do not pay their dues regularly. The financial functioning of offices depend upon the skill and resourcefulness of particular office-bearers and not on the responsible awareness of members as a whole. Truth has been at a discount. In such a situation of organisational looseness, deceit and selfish pursuits have held the day. Inertia except in the sphere of

top manouevres and speech-making has been widely prevalent. There has been almost no attempt at a person-to-person and a door-to-door approach in the socialist movement, no direct and intimate mass contact; at the individual level, nor of attending to grievances, which require constructive or agitational work short of civil disobedience. There has similarly been little effort at training more active members into the right doctrine. Such an organisation of socialism was at best and at times spectacular; it could not consolidate itself nor had it any deep educational value. This organisation was tyrannical in the realm of free speech and the story of its numerous expulsions or resignations is particularly revealing, but it was loose in the realm of action.

The Socialist Party may legitimately be expected to have inherited the wisdom of all such experience. It has done so in almost all respects except one. The Socialist Party may rightly make a bold claim for itself that it will not repeat some follies of the earlier socialist movement. While the earlier socialist movement could only stand on tottering legs, and little respect for principles and so steadily losing its fighting qualities, the Socialist Party may reasonably be sure of the future on these three scores. The Socialist Party will be a fighting party. The Socialist Party will stand on its own legs and seek no supports either to the left or to the right. The Socialist Party will in basic substance learn to respect its principles and resolutions. Only a partisan will deny the improvements that have been effected in these spheres. But the problem of organisation and with that the problem of the training and dependability of cadres has not yet been successfully talked. I am certain that herein lies our main difficulty. The Socialist Party must lick this problem of organisation. In the alternative the looseness of organisation and the prevalence of inertia, deceit or individualism and groupism will lick it.

I am continuously being accused of character assassination and abusing. This accusation is a lie. I have often invited such accusers to produce proofs. They have never done so. I have produced several proofs of how they have tried to assassinate my character and abuse me. In fact, the worst character assassination is precisely that which is being used against me that I am a character assassin or a dictator. Everything that I say or do is immediately sought to be enveloped in an atmosphere of calumny.

It is impossible for me to chase every lie that people spread about me nor is that consistent with my self-respect. I must at the outset make a clear distinction between three different categories of speech, the written word, the publicly spoken word and private conversation. In mature politics, the written word is the only evidence and the publicly spoken word may by admitted as a second best. Private conversation can at most be used as an illustration of something which has to be proved in other ways. It should never be used as evidence. Unfortunately, Indian politics specialises in the use of private conversation for purposes of a political argument. First, the private conversation of some persons is colourful while that of others

is dull and slow poisoning is certainly more dangerous than a little colourful spices. Secondly, admission of private conversation as evidence always gives an unscrupulous accuser an opportunity to intrigue and to lie. Those who cannot lie are often at a disadvantage.

I have only to list the total lies that have been spread about me, that I have refused to meet people when they have made a formal and serious request to meet me, that I asked Narendradevi to become Chairman of the P.S.P., that I wanted our legislators to throw cats at Mr. Nehru, that I told Kripalaniji that I would talk to him at the point of a pistol. Two recent examples of such lies are notable. One is that I habitually walked out of the executive meeting of the P.S.P. There was one occasion when I did so and that was when I had refused to attend that particular meeting and the Chairman had brought me on a false assurance of wanting to seek a way out and when the Committee tried to behave as though I was in the dock and they the judges. This was on the issue of police firing in Travancore-Cochin. The question may still be asked why a majority of the P.S.P. national executive should have combined against me or kept quiet. I have no answer except that their policies on police firings and people's struggles were opportunistic and unprincipled, a fact which has later been proved. The second example relates to my assertions concerning the alleged flow of foreign money to the P.S.P. I would once again invite people to read my assertions. I had invited Mrs. Indira Nehru-Gandhi as much as the P.S.P. to clear up this matter once for all, for I had said that frivolous accusations concerning foreign money in politics were as bad as the acceptance of it. I had in this connection mentioned the fact about the American socialist leader Norman Thomas, who told me in New York that a Bombay socialist leader had asked him to arrange for monetary assistance. Norman Thomas may not have been telling the truth, that is another matter. That is why I had used this and other illustrations for a definitive probe into the matter, so that the whole foul thing of foreign money and accusations concerning it may be cleared up. Every decent person ought to have been grateful to me for this stand. But the P.S.P. leadership saw in this an opportunity further to culminate against me rather than to explore or counter an argument. Their quarrel was with Mrs. Indira Nehru-Gandhi. But they were cowardly enough to retire against a stronger foe, when her father Prime Minister Nehru ended the whole controversy on the equivocal note that whether or not the P.S.P. received foreign money, the matter should not be raised during an election. The Congress Party as well as the opposition parties like the P.S.P. thrive on such equivocations and double-talk. I have also not been answered on the argument concerning the availability of government money and possibilities of patronage to P.S.P. leaders at that time.

I sometimes wonder how such calumny should be possible against a single person, when it is so entirely baseless. I produce a possible explanation. If I were on talking terms with Mr. Nehru, who dominates the intellectual scene in India, such calumnies would either not be made or no

newspaper would care to print them. The strength of my accusers lies not in themselves but in the fact that they are on the right side of ruling opinion in the country and I wholly on the wrong side. Furthermore, I have opened a full-scale offensive on the basis of age-old Indian society, which brings me into conflict with all influence and vested interests and the Party of which I am a member, not to talk of me, has not yet acquired the moral or organisational strength to vindicate its opinion. This is not to say that we should go slow or that we should not struggle or that we should become less outspoken in our condemnation of evil. This is only to warn the unwary to beware of the atmosphere around them and not to succumb to it. The surrounding atmosphere is sometimes so powerful that even members of the Socialist Party, who have otherwise accepted revolutionary aims, succumb to its indirect influences. This is so particularly in the case of estimates of persons. British rule had known how to create such aura around their loyalists that freedom fighters often judged of eminence and scholarship in its light and would condemn the more radical patriots, not necessarily the violent ones, on the basis of the atmosphere that the British sought to create about them. Ruling classes of all lands and climes use this weapon. They create subtle atmosphere around persons.

I have been accused of undemocratic functioning and of being a dictator. I sometimes think that I am India's best democrat and I wonder how this charge can be levelled against me and sometimes successfully. In this case, I have been the victim of dictatorship, I and hundreds of my other colleagues had been unceremoniously thrown out of an organisation that we had sought to build up with our labours, and the tyrants go about in the false apparel of democracy and successfully accuse us of being dictators. I have sought long for an explanation of this perversity. I believe I have got it.

Discipline has traditionally been understood in our country as controlled speech and uncontrolled action. As there has been precious little action in Indian politics except such as flowed out of the initiative of Mahatma Gandhi, people have been free to do as they like or, which is better, not to do anything at all. Most of India's political fare has consisted of speech making. There has therefore been a desire to co-ordinate speeches, to adjust them one to another, that is, to have the main leader or the main leaders call the tune. Uncontrolled speech without action or within a field of inertia would have been unbearable. Democratic discipline is however the reverse of it. It consists of free speech and controlled action. That is precisely the aim that men like me are trying to achieve in this country. But such an aim goes completely counter to prevalent practices. Even one's own colleagues are sometimes unable to comprehend it, or go along with it. When inertia has become habitual, controlled action is a pain. I have however come to the definite conclusion that the worse traitor is not he who secretly sides with the foe or goes over to him but he who is slack and inert and fails to carry out his bit in the total scheme of responsibility. He may be a good talker. He may be a loyal and faithful member. And yet he is a traitor who

does not bestir himself to organise and to consolidate and, doubly so, if he is elected to an office. To this inertia is sometimes added the selfish pursuit of small pleasures and small influence. Such uncontrolled action whether due to inertia or whether due to pursuit of policies other than those decided is widely prevalent in the country. Men are not very particular about controls, at least internal party controls over their speech. They are annoyed when the party seeks to control their action.

Allied with this phenomenon is the other one of the formation of a caste of leaders against the rest of the members of the people. The district leaders want to be supported by the State leaders and they in their turn by the national leaders. Whenever a break occurs in this chain of mutual support, there is an outcry or at least deep underground rumblings. The theory is that leaders must stick together and respect each other's spheres and therefore condone each other's offences. A leader who would want all leaders to conform to the constitution and to act to policies would in such a situation be denied and decried. I and others like me are suffering this experience not only from foe but also from friend.

Some people complain that we went very fast after Madhu Limaye's expulsion from the P.S.P. and that we should have sought more docile remedies at an all-India conference. Although I do not know how we went too fast or too far, I understand this argument to mean that we should have submitted to all executive fiat and sought our remedy only at the national conference. Some of these persons have also hesitantly wondered if even after my own expulsion and also hundreds of other active members, a remedy should not have been sought at the national conference before which there should have been a docile quiet. How naive! I am quite clear in my mind if I had been one whit less firm than I actually was on the Limaye issue, a great spirit of docility would have spread even over such ranks as are today within the Socialist Party and expressing their fighting qualities. There would not have been much of democracy or socialism left within the socialist movement of India. I have learnt so much of organisation during the last 3-4 years as I was unable to do in the earlier years. I have not lost faith in the spontaneity of man's will and ideas. That of course is the spring from which all else flows. But, even when the spring does not cease to flow, a wrong dam may obstruct it or divert it into futility. Wrong dams are built by pursuit of wrong principles of organisation such as that present duty may remain undone for the sake of a future gain or that those who make themselves responsible for awakening spontaneous urges may rid themselves of the responsibility to organise. An aware person is alert in all directions. I had never carefully examined as to why there should have been such numerous expulsions from the P.S.P. even before they took us on, or why one after another of its notable personalities like Aruna Asaf Ali, Patwardhan, Ramnandan Mishra, should have left or been chased out. This would be an interesting chapter to explore in the history of India's socialist movement. I do not wish to enquire into the comparative merit of the chasers and the chased. Some of

the chased were better and some worse than their chasers. The point is not their comparative merit, but the disease of organisation, which led to such successive expulsions not in the interest of controlled action but in that of controlled speech. I now understand the need of discipline in the sphere of controlled action but I am more than ever convinced that speech should be wholly free. It is true that undisciplined persons, who are useless or even dangerous for the socialist organisation, often make use of freedom of speech to cloud issues. That may be vastly irritating, but effort should always be made to distinguish between the two.

An argument based on the cult of personality has been brought into appraisal of the talks that I had with Mr. Narayan. Some persons, a very few belonging to my own party, had drawn a parallel between these talks and those between Mr. Narayan and Mr. Nehru held some years ago. If I could object to those talks then, how could I hold these talks now? My critics are forgetting that I have all along been acting as a controlled or a limited personality, also during these talks. I did not take upon myself the responsibility or the power to depart from the principles and programmes of my party. In fact, I have said nothing or done nothing which would require the convening of a members' conference except in relation to the Flag. I have also made it clear that any change in the present Flag could only be made by members' National Conference, that is, the authority that adopted it could alone alter it. The earlier talks with which parallel is sought to be drawn departed from established policies and programmes. It is easy enough to talk of arguments that are internationally in the air. Mr. Khrushchev has made this argument famous and everybody uses it out of place and out of turn. Let it also be understood that an attack on the cult of personality without proper understanding may build up a monster of collective leadership, precisely the kind and type of combine of leaders that I was talking about. In place of one Stalin, there are 9 Khrushchevs and who knows that these may be elbowing each other in order that one may emerge out of them as the Leader. I will not have these 9 Khrushchevs, nor even 90 Khrushcheves, for all of them must subordinate themselves to the discipline of controlled action and to the constitution, principles and programmes of the Party. Let us all become controlled personalities. Khrushchev has raised a wrong issue, which is in keeping with his evil requirements. He has raised the issue as though it lay between personality cult and collective leadership. That is a false and dangerous issue. Collective leadership has to be controlled just as much, if not more, as the big leader or a hero. Amidst the prevailing politics of inertia and deceit, it becomes doubly necessary that leadership at the State, the district or even at the constituency level is controlled just as much as at the national level. I know that a very small drama, however significant, arising out of this internal organisational problem of the Socialist Party has been enacted within the larger drama of talks between me and Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. We should not be frightened. I have said before that we shall either lick this organisational problem or be licked by it. The Socialist Party will be a disciplined and purposeful organisation, whose units adjust and co-operate.

in the total scheme of responsibility. It shall not be a collection of speech-making or intriguing individuals.

Such Praja Socialists, as have accused me of undemocratic functioning, have also stated that there are no differences in principle or policy between them and the Socialist Party. If that is so, let them announce their acceptance of the constitution, principles and programmes of the Socialist Party. They have narrowed down the issue as between them and me, as a wholly personal issue. I am willing to give them complete satisfaction on this score. I will gladly step out of the Socialist Party and therefore out of Indian politics. I am saying this in earnest, for I have always had other occupations as diverting as that of politics. I am grimly serious in posing before the Praja Socialist an alternative. I step out of the socialist movement, for, according to them, I am the only anti-democrat, and they should accept the constitution, policy and programme of the Socialist Party. Or, they must be branded as foul liars and calumniators to whom a political argument has no value, truth or validity apart from its rhetorical advantage.

The question may be asked why I was willing to bring into the Socialist fold the Praja Socialist Party which I have in the past held and still hold to be a foul party. My thought and reasoning are simple. Most leaders of the Praja Socialist Party are individualistic, unprincipled and venal. They will again accuse me of character assassination, and I have mentioned no name. I have often wondered what political character these gentlemen have which I could assassinate and I am not concerned with their private character. I will however permit myself a little luxury, the first one of its kind and I hope I shall never do it again. I have never wished to talk of the persons of the Praja Socialist leaders, although that would be most legitimate and even necessary politics, for one may recall that the acceptance of the gift of a motor car by the British and Socialist Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald had led to a most acrimonious several-hour debate. One Praja Socialist leader is in the Lok Sabha at the discretion and during the pleasure of the Congress Party. Another Praja Socialist leader was undisciplined enough to contest the Congress Party while he was a member of it and now tries to subvert the policies of the Praja Socialist Party and act for the government. I will not talk of numerous other Praja Socialist leaders who have sacrificed their principles for the sake of legislative or parliamentary seat. All this was an aside. I come to the principal argument as to why I was willing to bring these people into the socialist fold. My answer, I repeat, is simple. If the Praja Socialist Party had accepted the constitution, policy and programmes of the Socialist Party, it would have theoretically abandoned its present character. All those coming in would have been dyed with the socialist hue. There would nevertheless have been a practical difficulty. Some new comers would have adopted these policies and programmes for outward speech and would have tried to subvert them through action or the absence of it. I believe that the Socialist Party would have found a way to tame them or to get

rid of them. In any case, that is not a very big risk, at least it is a calculated risk. Of the present Praja Socialist Party, around 50% are militants by training and temperament and they have been rendered paralytic by a foul leadership and some hesitancy in their character. In a similar manner, around 10 to 15% of the Socialist Party are paralytic by training and temperament and, by virtue of their inertia and deceit, they should have belonged to the present Praja Socialist Party. What then is to be done? The main problem is to secure this 50% and more of the Praja Socialist Party and to hope that of the rest in the Praja Socialist Party and the small numbers of the Socialist Party a substantial number would change into better persons. A top unification would hasten this process. It may be accomplished in a matter of weeks. The present process of converting Praja Socialist members individually may take a much longer time. But the basis of the top unification is of paramount importance. That is why I stuck like a leach to the constitution, policy and programmes of the Socialist Party. I knew that we would have been down into the bog of unprincipled politics if we had let go all our stakes. For the rest, let my partymen remember that elasticity is the characteristic of life and rigidity that of death, but elasticity within limits. So long as we do not desert the field of principles nor step down into the mire of expediency and preferment, we would do well to be elastic. Friend and foe alike have often misunderstood me. I have never rejected a serious and formal request for a meeting. I have tried not to be rigid, vengeful or individualistic. I have tried always to act like a controlled personality, servant of the constitution and of the principles and policy, but willing to explore possibilities in the realm of their application. If the present talks will have helped substantial sections of the Praja Socialist Party to see the light, they will have at least served a secondary purpose.

I kept quiet upto 13th of August and spoke no word apart from emphasising the irremovability of the constitution, policy and programme of the Socialist Party. Spokesmen of the P.S.P., more often anonymous, were having a field day. They were as usual putting out mischievous reports that I had accepted this or that of the P.S.P., that my own party was fed up with me, that my terms were suicidal for the P.S.P., but also that unification was certain. Cartoons kept on portraying me as a drowning man or as one who was moving in a circle in a jungle and there was always a P.S.P. man near about wanting to save me. All this amused me. It was the usual Praja trick. But there was also a risk in it. My own party comrades were beginning to get jittery and disheartened and their faith was being strained. I ran this risk for the sake of the unification and also in the belief that members of the Socialist Party will have at the end of it received an education in patient self-confidence.

Two possible approaches now present themselves. One is that marked out by a resolution of the Praja Socialist Party. This approach is in members of both parties trying to understand each other and to effect a unification even outside of the constitution, principles and programmes of

the Socialist Party. The other is to detach the more active elements of the Praja Socialist Party and to persuade them into Socialist Party. This approach would be facilitated if the Socialist Party further rids itself of inertia and individualism and, while giving increasing expression to its fighting qualities, it tackles the organisational problems so as to achieve controlled action. There would be no harm if the Socialist Party, at such of its levels as wish to discuss this subject, ponders this question and passes resolutions on it. Let there be no obstruction to free debate in our ranks, to the expression of opinions wholly contrary to mine or those of anybody else. Members of the Party must be free to express opinions of any kind and every legally-constituted unit should be free to adopt resolutions of its choice.

Hyderabad
7-9-1957.

Rammanohar Lohia
(*Mankind*, October 1957)

Lohia's Final Letter to J.P.

Calcutta,
30th August 1957.

Dear Jayaprakash,

I don't have to write much except to say that this thing should have been started only after full consideration. **Those of your men who had come to see me before 15th July clearly knew that the policy, constitution and programme alone of the Socialist Party would continue. In our first meeting you had accepted this.** You went so far as to say that though the policy of the Praja Socialist Party sailed in the name of Acharya Narendra Dev, it had in reality been written by some one else, that it was a broth of some kind and did not contain a single original idea. But on 12th August you had already drawn back, and that sounded the alarm for me. I am not interested in what passed between you and your other colleagues. That is why I had told you to break off the talks. But on 13th August you were again hopeful. This kind of hesitation is not good.

You have talked of kneeling in one of your letters. Allow me to give you a piece of advice in this connection. You should not go by the gossip that you come to hear from time to time.

As a matter of fact you should not base your attitude on any passing thing but should base it on stable direction and principles.

As far as I am concerned the programme of 16th stands. Do come. It is possible that matters between the Praja Socialist leaders and us may be further strained and there may be some talk about you also. But this should not influence your decision to come to Hyderabad.

Our letters have been published without reference to me. I hope you would not object to my office publishing them. It would be good if the letters exchanged in 1954 were also included in them.

Regards to Prabha.

Your,
Rammanohar.

P.S:—The situation today is bad and the next 2-3-years are going to be worse. This matter had come up in our conversation, and I would like to reemphasise it.

October 1957.

(*Mankind*)

J.P.'s Reply

Topachanchi,
Dt. Dhanbad,
1-9-1957.

Dear Rammanohar,

I am extremely sorry that I have become the cause of a fresh controversy between the PSP and S. P. It is true that I should have started this thing after full consideration. I had considered also and had felt that the two parties should unite. It was also my impression that people from both sides desired

the formation of a single party. I thought my intervention would help to bridge the gulf. But this was not to be.

From your previous letter it seems that you think that after my talks with you I had discussions with the PSP people and then changed my view. Please do not think so. That would be an injustice to me. I had prepared the report of our conversation at Lucknow according to my understanding of it. I had based my hopes on that. But from your subsequent letter I learnt that I had not properly understood your point of view. These things were further clarified at Calcutta. I had met Gangababu after our talks at Lucknow. But I did not meet any PSP leader after Calcutta.

I often hear about kneeling down etc. That makes me sad momentarily but has no permanent effect on me. If it were otherwise I would not have come to see you.

At Lucknow I thought that you would put emphasis on the Constitution, Policy and Programme of the S.P. and that it would form the basis of mutual discussions. I was prepared for that and am prepared even now. It is true that I told you about the policy of the PSP on the same lines as you have mentioned in your letter. But I did not say that I would accept the S. P. policy as it is nor that the PSP would do so. I had told you also that I had not read your policy. I thought and think even now that when the two parties sat down together for discussion taking the S.P. Constitution etc. as the basis, no great divergency would be discovered. Well, this could not be and I would ever be sorry for it. Now we must see to it that this does not lead to increase in mutual bitterness.

Where am I to reach on the 16th, Hyderabad or somewhere else ? Hope you are in good health.

Yours affectionately.
Jayaprakash Narayan.

October 1957.

(Mankind)

Ganga Babu Denies P. S. P. Leaders Influenced J. P.

September 13, 1957.

While releasing the text of correspondence between him and Shri Jayaprakash Narayan on the failure of Socialist Unity Talks, Shri. Ganga Sharan Sinha M. P., Chairman of the Praja Socialist Party, observed that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan had at no time accepted the Constitution, Policy and Programme of the Socialist Party as the basis of Socialist Unity. He further pointed out that the Praja Socialist Party or any of its members had no hand in failure of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's efforts for Socialist Unity. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan had initiated the talks on his own and in his personal capacity. He terminated the talks, again on his own, when he felt convinced that continuation of the talks on the basis of the terms proposed by Dr. Lohia would serve no purpose. In reaching that conclusion he was not influenced by any member of the P. S. P. The decision was due to the insistence of Dr. Lohia on the prior acceptance by the PSP of the Constitution, Policy and Programme of the Socialist Party and without even a previous talk between representatives of the two parties on changes, if any. Shri. Jayaprakash Narayan had made this clear in his letter of 12th August to Dr. Lohia wherein he said :-

"Just now I would like to say only this : Whatever the method suggested to bring about a single united Party, any insulting condition or behaviour directed against any one of the two parties will make the creation of a single united Party impossible."

In his letter dated August 20, 1957 to Dr. Lohia he also indicated what he considered to be the proper way of negotiating for Unity :

"It appears to me most natural and easy that those who agree that they should get together to form a new party should sit down together without imposing any pre-condition or insistence, and try to find out by mutual exchange of views how far they can agree".

But Dr. Lohia did not agree with Shri. Jayaprakash Narayan's suggestion.

Shri. Ganga Sharan Sinha, who was making his first press statement on the question of Socialist Unity, further said that: "I had so far refrained from participating in the controversy because I did not want to add to the confusion and create bitterness between the workers of the two parties. The Central Office of the Praja Socialist Party had released the full correspondence between Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr. Lohia on the one hand and between Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and myself on the other. While doing this, not a word was omitted or deleted. It was done without any comment and with the only purpose of placing all facts before the public. I have, however, been constrained to go to the press now because Dr. Lohia has chosen to distort facts and level baseless charges against the Praja Socialist Party and its prominent members. But before going to the press I thought it advisable and proper to check up my facts and interpretation of events with Shri. Jayaprakash Narayan who alone is in a position to say precisely what led to breakdown of the talks."

Shri. Ganga Sharan Sinha said that he wished to declare categorically that the PSP nor its National Executive ever stood against Socialist Unity. "We shall welcome and support any process of creating Unity that is carried out in a democratic manner and with understanding and dignity."

Letter from Shri. Ganga Sharan Sinha to Shri. Jayaprakash Narayan

Patna,
10. 9. 1957.

Dear Jayaprakashji :

Various press statements and speeches on the attempt made by you to bring together the Praja Socialist Party and the Socialist Party and what subsequently led you to

give up the attempt have not only sought to spread misunderstandings as also to level all sorts of charges and accusations against the Praja Socialist Party and its prominent members. Although I have been pressed by friends and press correspondents I have not till now said anything nor issued a statement in this regard. In spite of the fact that in your letter of 20th August to Dr. Lohia you had clearly stated that :

“After the clarification you made at Calcutta about the method of bringing about one united party, I lost all hopes for the time being that it can come about.”

and in spite of the fact that in your last report to me and to Dr. Lohia you had stated that :

“I have given deep consideration to the picture of unity or that of the creation of one new Party as it emerged out of our Calcutta talks. I conveyed to Doctor Saheb my opinions and misgivings in this regard. I do not think that it is possible to bring the two parties together and create ONE party of Socialism in this manner. It is clear that this attempt at bringing about unity has failed.”

misleading statements are being made. It therefore, becomes necessary to place relevant true facts clearly before the public.

I want that whatever I say should be clear and true. That is why I want to broadly refer to and acquaint you before-hand with such points as concern you and which I want to state, so that I do not make any wrong statement. I want to say the following main things which concern you :

1. The attempt at unity made by you was done so at your own instance, on your own responsibility and in your individual capacity.
2. After your visit to Lucknow and talks with Dr. Lohia there you had advised me to convene a meeting of the

National Executive of the PSP and to place this matter and your report before it. I convened the meeting of the National Executive as advised by you.

3. There is a great difference between the report you sent to us on the Lucknow talks and the clarifications made by Dr. Lohia in his letter of 31st July to you. Regarding this what you say is that since the question is as to what Dr. Lohia said therefore, whatever Dr. Lohia says in this regard should be taken as correct and it should be supposed that it was you who failed to understand correctly the points made and terms laid by Dr. Lohia.
4. After your talks with Dr. Lohia at Lucknow and from what you understood to be his terms you had a feeling that unity talks could be initiated on the basis of those terms. But, Dr. Lohia's letter of 31st July and the subsequent clarifications made by him during your talks with him at Calcutta on August 12 & 13, you came to the conclusion that unity could not take place on the basis of the terms proposed by Dr. Lohia nor would it be of any use to continue the unity talks on those terms. After this you, entirely on your own, reached the conclusion that this attempt at unity had failed and that it was no longer necessary to convene a meeting of the National Executive of the PSP to consider the issue. You advised me so. And in accordance with your advice the meeting of the National Executive of the PSP was cancelled. It is thus clear that the Praja Socialist Party or any one of its members had no hand, in any way, in the termination of this effort at unity by you. After the clarification by Dr. Lohia of his terms, you thought it useless to continue the effort and so put an end to it.
5. Your decision to withdraw from partisan politics and to terminate your membership of the PSP was taken at least a year ago and you have not been a regular member of the Party since last year. This decision of yours

has thus no connection whatsoever with these unity talks because this decision was taken so long ago that there was no talk of making an attempt at unity at that time.

If you consider what I have written above to be correct kindly state so clearly. If you find anything in it which may be incorrect, even then please point it out clearly.

Yours,
Ganga Sharan

Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's Reply

Hajipur,
10.9.1957

Dear Gangababu :

Jagdishbabu has brought your letter of today's date. I am writing this letter at this time of night as you are leaving Patna tomorrow morning.

I have been greatly pained to find that a useless controversy has arisen between the PSP and the SP. The five points concerning me as stated in your letter are absolutely correct. You must have seen my last statement from Calcutta. I have myself said these very things in that statement. It is good that you have not participated in the controversy so far. But it will be proper for you to make the clarification now.

Now we meet at Mysore.

Yours affectionately,
Jayaprakash

Unification Talks With P. S. P.

SOCIALIST EXECUTIVE UPHOLDS LOHIA'S STAND

Hyderabad, Sept. 24.—The National Committee of the Socialist Party meeting at Gandhipet, 12 miles from here, yesterday considered the socialist unity talks held between Dr. Lohia and Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan and the correspondence that passed between them.

The Committee adopted a resolution expressing gratification that the policy, constitution and programme of the party were never once jeopardised during these talks.

It said that these constituted the base of the party's existence and only a delegates' conference would be entitled to make changes. **To have turned the policy, constitution and Programmes into a basis for discussion with representatives of the P. S. P. would have opened the floodgates of "unprincipled and opportunist politics."** Principles retained their value only as long as they were not considered alterable for temporary gains of passing strength and acted as a guide for the long range purpose of social reconstruction.

The committee said it was pleased with the exertions of Dr. Lohia for the achievement of unification and expansion of the socialist movement, "The issue never has been between unification and separation : it has always been and still is unification with principles and unification without them."

The resolution said the Committee wished to make it clear that the effort initiated by Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan to unify the P. S. P. with the Socialist Party through negotiations at the top had ended. It invited all such sections of the P. S. P. as still remained radical and militant to join the Socialist Party.

The resolution added : "The National Committee would welcome any effort to unify radical and potentially socialist parties, large or small, with the Socialist Party, but always so

that the policy, constitution and programmes of the party are kept intact. The need to achieve a large united and broad-based party of socialism, which will be able to combat the Congress Governments in their continuing encroachments on people's bread and culture, is great. Equally great is the need that this party should stand on the firm ground of long-range principles so that it is not converted into an instrument of opportunist intrigues and personal preferment or shadow-boxing opposition. The socialist party invites the people of India and more particularly its radical sections to give deep thought to both these needs and in consequences to help build the socialist party."—P. T. I.

25.9.57

—*Tribune*

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

23 Jun '61 EMC	NOV 26 1965 8
	REC'D
	DEC 26 '65 - 1 PM
AUG 17 1961	LOAN DEPT.
13 Dec '61 SS	
DEC 13 1961	
24 Apr '62 r p	
REC'D LD	
APR 11 1962	

LD 21A-50m-12,'60
(B6221s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

Stockton, Calif.



