

**A TRIBUTE**

**to**

**MADHU LIMAYE**

**BIRTH CENTENARY CELEBRATIONS**

**with**

**complements**

**from**

**Ravela Somayya**

**Mobile : 8121898440**



AMARENDRA DHANESHWAR (Born in 1951) is a freelance journalist, media person and a classical vocalist, based in Bombay. Dhaneshwar was closely associated with Limaye and the socialist movement. Dhaneshwar has written the script and scored music for 'Nirantar Yoddhaa', the 58 minutes long documentary on Madhu Limaye produced by 'Doordarshan'.

“Her fearlessness, her public spirit, her contempt for convention and her indifference to the opinion of the majority have always seemed good to me and have impressed themselves as worthy of imitation”, wrote Bertrand Russell about his grandmother in his autobiography. Many of my generation would zealously apply this quote to describe Madhu Limaye. His burning idealism, his dedication to the cause, his concern for the common man, his sharp and analytical mind were some of the attributes which made a deep impression on our minds.

During the 1967 election Limaye was brutally assaulted by the hired goons of the Congress Party. He was seriously wounded in this attack. I remember that the Samyukta Socialist Party, to which Limaye then belonged, had organised a mass meeting at Shivaji Park to condemn the dastardly attack on Limaye. Limaye, wrapped in bandages all over his body, made a dramatic appearance in that meeting and made a speech which was extremely evocative. This was my first encounter with Madhu Limaye, the fiery socialist leader.

I had read about Limaye's astonishing feats in the Parliament. With his mastery of procedure and his passion for justice, he could demolish the arguments of the Treasury Benches. I had savored the appreciative newsletters by leading Parliamentary correspondents who raved about Limaye's ability to silence the brute majority of the ruling party. Naturally, I was following his career with a lot of genuine interest. I was drawn towards the Socialist Movement when I was an impressionable collegian. I was recruited by Samajvadi Yuvak Sabha which was the youth wing of the Praja Socialist Party. It was the year 1970-71. As usual, the Socialist Movement had suffered a split with two parties in opposite political alliances. The PSP was with Indira Gandhi and the SSP was with the Grand Alliance. Both factions were severally mauled in the general election held in 1971. This compelled the two socialist

parties to work in unison. A formal merger was worked out in August 1971. By now, the Bangladesh liberation struggle was in full swing. The socialists had demanded instant recognition of the provisional government of the Awami League and Mukti Bahini. A conference focusing on that demand was held by the newly unified Socialist Party at the Chhabildas High School which was addressed by several leaders including Limaye. It was his speech which made a distinct impression on my mind. It was a pre-war situation for India. However, Limaye laid emphasis on the right to criticize the government even in such a situation. He referred to Anurin Bevan's scathing criticism of Churchill during war-time. Limaye did not want the socialists to forget their oppositionist role.

At a time when the entire spectrum of the political opinion as well as the Press had been under the spell of Indira Gandhi, Limaye's uncompromising oppositionist stance was strikingly different. I had never met Limaye in person. Whatever I had known about him was through the newspapers. I had not even read any of his writings till then. But after having heard these two strongly-worded and forcefully delivered speeches I began to feel that here was a real dissenter which India badly needed. This is how I began to respond to the dissenting traits of Madhu Limaye.

As a student I had been an ardent fan of Bertrand Russell whose writings on atheism and essence of democracy had overwhelmed me. "Democracy works best when its adherents have the skeptical optimism of the scientist". This motto of Russell was engraved permanently on one's mind. Therefore, I began to develop affinity for the implacable dissenter called Madhu Limaye. To harbour any affection for Limaye was looked upon as an unpardonable offence in the Praja Socialist circles. The first major split occurred in the socialist movement in 1955, when the Kerala coalition government in which the undivided Socialist Party was a partner opened fire on an unarmed mob. Dr. Lohia and his followers formed their own party. Limaye was an active participant in the whole controversy. Perhaps he was the only prominent leader in Maharashtra who sided with Lohia at that time. His peer group was totally under the tutelage of S. M. Joshi and N. G. Goray. Limaye who valued his own opinions was never interested in remaining in the good books of these party bosses. Due to his persistent 'disobedience' he was viewed with disfavour by the socialist establishment in Maharashtra. In 1971, unification of the two parties had already taken place. Yet the old hatreds and

prejudices continued. Some of my seniors in the PSP had tried to inject a bias in my mind against Limaye. “He is really hankering for a seat in parliament”. (Having lost the Monghyr seat in the 1971 general election, he was not an MP in 1971.) Limaye is jealous of Nath Pai was their constant refrain. This was nothing but an attempt at indoctrination which was not totally unsuccessful. Since I was repeatedly told that Limaye was standoffish I did not dare to go near him. In May 1973, he won the Banka bye election and again began to dominate the proceedings of the Lok Sabha. Leonid Brezhnev, the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party and its real boss was on an official visit to India. Those were the days of ‘Hindi Russi Bhai Bhai’. The twenty-year friendship treaty was fresh in the minds of the people. Indira Gandhi’s foreign policy pleased the Soviets. It was a time when Indira was branded a progressive by the leftists. Limaye met Brezhnev and told him in no uncertain terms that socialists would strongly oppose one party rule in India. Again, the relentless dissenter was at work. Limaye had won plaudits for trapping the Congress in the Pondicherry license scandal by initiating a breach of privilege motion against George Fernandes’ ‘Pratipaksha’, a Hindi weekly. The Indira wave of 1971 was already ebbing away. I wanted to do an article on the license scandal in the party mouthpiece so I went to interview him. That was my first personal interaction with him. The earlier indoctrination had lost its effect.

Limaye was a strong personality and had a resoluteness which revealed itself as days wore on. With the imposition of the Emergency there was virtual panic in the Sangh Parivaar camp. Deoras, the Sangh dictator (Sarsanghchaalak), wrote letters to Indira Gandhi and tried to ingratiate himself with her. Sangh Parivaar wearing a false anti-Emergency mask was misleading the democratic opposition. Behind the curtain, it was seeking some sort of accommodation with the Emergency regime of Indira Gandhi. Limaye has thoroughly exposed this in his book *‘Janata Party Experiment’* by producing documentary proof. Like Jayaprakash Narayan (JP) and Morarji Desai, Limaye took an uncompromising position upholding democracy and refused to give any quarter to the Emergency regime. Our hearts swelled with pride when Limaye resigned his seat as an MP (Member of the Lok Sabha) in protest against the immoral extension of the term of the fifth Lok Sabha.

It was drilled into my ears by the PSP seniors that Limaye always thirsted for MPship. However, the evidence was to the contrary. Limaye's insistence on principled politics appealed to young socialists like me. The Janata Party was brought into existence by merging the erstwhile Socialist Party with other non-socialist parties.

Did that mean a good-bye to socialist idealism? Are we supposed to jettison our baggage of socialist ideals? Such questions bothered us. Our ideology was not inimical to the Janata Party. In fact, it was complementary. Whereas, in the case of the Sangh Parivaar, their ideology was antithetical to the creed of the Janata Party. It was Limaye who voiced our anxieties and concerns with admirable restraint as a General Secretary of the Janata Party. Therefore, there was no question of disagreeing with his position on dual membership.

Limaye himself never employed terms like the left or the right. His political thought had long outgrown such constricting terminology. Yet it must be conceded that those who have been with the leftist current or political parties have an affinity for 'ideology'. Notwithstanding the Marxist condemnation of socialists as part of the bourgeoisie, the fact remains that the Socialist Movement in India was an ideological movement. Ideological movements and parties are not necessarily constantly engaged in ideological politics. They do indulge and engage in non-ideological politics. In the Socialist Party as well as a socialist member of the Janata Party, Limaye always took an ideological position on issues. He advocated his stand with a great degree of clarity and moral force. This he did till 1982 with distinction. "One may disagree with him; one may oppose him; but one cannot ignore him". Such was the unique position which he held in the context of Indian politics.

Limaye was always guided by his conscience which he fiercely asserted. To him, nothing was above one's conscience. His PSP colleagues denounced this as a highly individualistic trait. "He does not believe in collective decision-making process", they would often complain. I used to argue with him on this point and he would explode: "Collective decision-making should not become an excuse for inaction. This is what people tend to

do. I cannot wait indefinitely for the majority to arrive at a particular decision like resigning the Lok Sabha seat. I value my conscience above anything else”.

The opinion-making class was highly antagonised by his active role in the disintegration of the Morarji Government. But that was not the first occasion when he was swimming against the current. He always showed the guts to navigate against the tide. As an active political leader or even as an intellectual. Insiders know how he tried to save the Janata (Party) Government and experiment. Nanaji Deshmukh, one of the key figures involved in the Janata drama has given Limaye a clean chit. Limaye sided with Charan Singh in the internal squabble of the Janata Party which provoked a strong criticism. In reality the dilemma that Limaye faced was faced by every ideological activist engaged in non-ideological politics. Those who remained in the R.S.S. dominated Janata Party deliberately obfuscated the issue and sought to put a moral construction on their action which was as ridiculous as it was reprehensible.

The Sangh politics of the last 15 years has vindicated Limaye. It would have been correct on his part to form a socialist party in 1979 instead of joining the Charan Singh party. But he lacked the requisite political will and stamina. Hence, the decision to continue in non-ideological party. It was only here that Limaye disappointed his followers like me. He did not stretch his ideological position to its logical conclusion.

Since 1982-83, he quit active politics. Apparently on health grounds which of course were valid. But it also needs to be understood that he was finding himself to be out of tune with the prevalent political environment. He had no drive to remain in a non-ideological political party. His retirement was a big loss to the political field but proved to be a boon to the academic field. From 1982 to his sudden death in January 1995, he wrote extensively on many topics and issues. His writing had a tremendous sweep. Civilisation, history, political history, social policy, foreign policy, constitutional questions, analysis of historical figures constituted the core of his scholarly works. What he wrote ran into over 15,000 printed pages. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was so amazed by Harold Laski's speed of writing books that he said his reading pace lagged behind Laski's writing pace. This analogy could aptly fit Limaye.

This was possibly the most creative phase of his life and I was lucky to be in his vicinity during those days. Limaye had spent five decades in public life. His memory was photographic and his erudition was vast. He had an insightful approach to all questions. All these factors invested his writing with a unique richness. It is wrong to believe that he was an egotist. Once, when I paid a compliment to him on his astonishing memory, he politely accepted the same but added that his memory was 'selective'. "I do not remember telephone numbers".

It was a by sheer accident that he began 'writing'. Having sustained severe injuries during the Goa Liberation struggle, and also thereafter, he had become a victim of arthritis which had damaged his fingers. Therefore, he was dependent upon stenographic help for over twenty-five years. However, by chance he scribbled a note on a thin paper with an ink (fountain) pen. The experiment went on for a day or two. He discovered to his greatest delight that he was no longer a slave to the stenographer.

Due to a hemorrhage in the eye, he lost most of the sight of his left eye. Still, he soldiered on. He could visualize so many aspects of a subject that it was a real intellectual treat to read him. I distinctly remember an incident. He was asked to contribute a paper on the functioning of the cabinet government system. What emerged out of this exercise was a 375 page-long book on the subject. Similarly, when he set about dwelling upon the theme of Communist-Socialist Interaction in India for George Fernandes' felicitation volume, he ended up penning a 400 page-long volume, one of the most authoritative ones, on the subject.

His Spartan lifestyle and Gandhian austerity set an example which was as unique as it was inspiring. A study of his voluminous writing reveals that Limaye has thought deeply over religion. If one analyses the socialist response to religion, one gets a variety of answers. Secularism is the foundation of socialism. The material and secular issues confronting the society will have to be tackled on the same plane. Poverty, unemployment, hunger, are all rooted in causes which are secular, non-religious. Therefore, the answers also lie in the secular environment. This is the fundamental belief of the socialists of all hues. This dictates a socialist's attitude to religion. Since

the socialist has no faith in a non-material world, his approach to religion is either indifferent or aggressively adversarial. Possibly as an angry socialist youth, Limaye took a similar position. But as he transformed himself into a thinker, his attitude seems to have undergone a transformation. According to him, even in the Western society, secularisation is a recent phenomenon. It has evolved over the last two centuries. Societies in the far east have always been free from excessive religiosity.

For example, in Japan, religion was merely a set of moral and ethical values. However, the Hindu world and the Islamic world are in the firm clutches of religion. It was anticipated that with the onset of industrialisation and Westernisation, societies falling under the Hindu or the Islamic spheres would become progressively secular. But that was not to be.

Limaye cites the theories propounded by Engels, Marx and Bruno Baur and disputes their conclusion that with the coming into existence of socialism man will be free from the spell of religion. "Once there is a rational arrangement of human relations and end to exploitation, Man will no longer need the palliative in the form of religion", said Marx who also called religion the opium of the masses.

Limaye always sought to marry theory with practice. He strove to connect ideology to the practical reality. According to him, ideology did not exist in a vacuum. What happened in East Europe? he asked. There existed a 'rational' organization of the forces of production. On the contrary, in the West market forces dominated. Yet religion continues to hold sway even in planned economies and societies. For well over forty years these societies were under communist rule. Communism did its best in order to exterminate the opium of religion. East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland were under the influence of Western Christianity and civilisation. Conversely, Slovenia, Croatia and the erstwhile Yugoslavia were under the influence of the Greek Orthodox Christianity. Limaye believed that the Western Christianity has been conducive to the evolution of Democracy. Therefore, Communism could not exterminate democratic traditions which were deep-rooted. The Greek Orthodox Church did not provide the right environment for democracy

to prosper. Hence, before the advent of Communism or after its demise, democracy could not take strong roots in these countries.

Limaye was fond of using the term 'creative tension' which he applied to relations between human beings as well as organisations and institutions. For instance, the Janata emerged victorious after defeating authoritarian forces represented by Indira Gandhi. Limaye was appointed General Secretary of the Janata Party. Indira Gandhi had systematically destroyed the Congress Party by making it subservient to the Government. As the General Secretary and as an intellectual Limaye strongly believed that the party needed to have an autonomous existence. It should retain the freedom to criticise the Government, if necessary. There need not be an undue discordance between the two. But the party should not act as mere 'yes man' of the Government. If some amount of 'creative tension' exists between the two it would do both of them a lot of good.

Limaye perceived this kind of creative tension between the Church and the state, the libertarian and the egalitarian spirit, the need for an ordered state and the demand for freedom, robust individualism and the welfare state as being some of the conflicting forces which have been prevalent in the Western society for the last three centuries. Limaye sees creative tension among them. Bloody wars and civil wars were fought which caused untold misery. Yet, these conflicts and tensions were solved every time on a higher plane and the Western society made progress through such conflicts and their resolutions. Russia, on the contrary, was under Communist rule which was ruthlessly implemented. Yet, it could not extirpate the opium called religion. Now, this erstwhile communist power is caught in the pincer of Orthodox Christianity and Islam. Russia has a dark future. Limaye who never loses sight of reality disputes the Communist contention that "religion embodies false consciousness. It is this false consciousness which is shaping history", giving rise to new nationalistic and political aspirations.

Limaye quotes the example of Ireland. Northern Ireland has Protestant domination and the Southern Ireland has Catholic majority. Can one call the conflict born of such consciousness 'false'? asks Limaye. Turkey has captured the Muslim dominated provinces of Cyprus. What happened to

Palestine? The history of the last 1,800 years was wiped out and the Jews scattered all over the world assembled to forge a nation state called Israel. Lebanon, the beautiful nation state on the Mediterranean Sea was set up by striking a balance between Christians and Muslims. Religion has played havoc with this nation. After all, it was the force of religion which brought about the partition of India.

While giving a materialistic interpretation of history, Marx and Marxists have accomplished feats of intellectual acrobatics which yields very little. For Marx, forces of production were the foundation and everything else was a superstructure. Therefore, as per the Marxist analysis, caste consciousness or religious consciousness cannot become the dominant force but a secondary force standing on the base provided by the forces of production. Limaye, with his sharp analytical faculties has demolished this Marxist formulation. By dubbing religion or caste as parts of the superstructure distortions creep in, Limaye contends. Islam was born in Arabia in a particular socio-economic context which had a certain production and distribution pattern. But now it has spread all over the world and become a major world religion. It has absorbed a variety of production relations and modes of production. This applies to Christianity as well.

Therefore, Limaye argues, there is something in religion which allows it to transcend the mode of production. That something is the inner urge which cannot be dismissed with contempt as false consciousness which reveals Limaye's mature approach to religion. The Marxist interpretation of religion is of little value in regions like South or West Asia. In the Muslim world, despite industrial progress or growth of capitalism, the stranglehold of religion remains intact. Those who settle abroad for the sake of earning a livelihood have to suffer racial discrimination and adverse competition. They strictly adhere to their religious identity. Limaye repeatedly stresses the point that this consciousness is independent of the forces of production. In the non-Western societies, due to poverty and starvation, there is a strong sense of insecurity which seeks refuge in religion.

Limaye's thrust is at the important place that religion occupies in human affairs. If socialism is to succeed in South Asia, it would be suicidal to

directly attack the religious beliefs, Limaye warns. The line of demarcation between religion and culture is indeed hazy. Marxists in India have so far desisted from attacking the religious beliefs of Muslims. Even Hindus are now being pampered. In the name of safeguarding culture, Marxists in West Bengal have given a sanction to the Durga Pooja. Socialists would do well to oppose intolerance and extremism instead of opposing religion itself, cautions Limaye.

Anti-religion or purely pro-rationalist position does not help much to solve the problem. The pace at which these rationalist values are propagated is painfully slow. Sometimes the purely rationalist position is counterproductive too. Limaye wants socialists to befriend the liberals among Christians and Muslims. With their active assistance mutual understanding could be promoted and peaceful co-existence could be attempted. Capitalism, Communism, Liberalism, Western style Socialism or a Consumerist Society cannot really liberate the human being. Particularly for the third world these dogmas hold little relevance. In India traditional monotheistic religions as well as communally aggressive forces like the Akali Dal or the R.S.S. (Sangh Parivaar) have generated intolerance and hatred. When on a higher plane, religion accords due respect to other faiths. It also helps to keep in check the materialistic greed of the human beings. Limaye, striking an altogether different note makes a bold appeal to socialists to make use of religion in order to realise the social, economic and spiritual equality which is the 'sine qua non' of socialism.

There is one current of opinion or school of thought which holds that people with ability shape the history. Those endowed with extraordinary intellect and power mould the history as well as time. On the contrary, there are those who believe that external forces shape the history and the individual is merely a subordinate instrument.

Marx, Spengler and Toynbee sought to give social and economic interpretation of history. According to them the individual is of little consequence. In society, a specific necessity arises which gives rise to the leadership. A particular society needs a certain leadership for a certain task. The rise of such leadership is independent of the will of any individuals.

What is the role of the individual in the process of history? How does this evolve in a developing society? In a stagnant society like India what form does it assume? Do great men mould the history or are they mere pawns in the hands of circumstances?

This was a subject close to Limaye's heart and he thought deeply over it. He complained that the approach of Marx, Engels and Toynbee was deterministic. Would the October Revolution have taken place without Lenin? Would it have given a different turn to world history? Limaye quotes Trotsky to prove his point. Trotsky was a Marxist who had faith in historical materialism. Yet, he has acknowledged the contribution of Lenin, the individual. Limaye calls Lenin a world leader or a world historical individual. It is stupid to formulate laws of history, he states. "One cannot raise them to the status of laws as they are applicable to Physics, Space Science or Geology. They cannot even withstand the tests of biological laws", Limaye forcefully argues.

Forces of extremely complex nature come into play in giving shape to the history. Factors born of clash of individual wills deeply influence it. Leadership does not emerge in a vacuum. Nor does it unfold as per the script written by the circumstances. Marx forwards the thesis that the individuals perform their roles in the context of favourable circumstances which is disputed by Limaye, the diehard rationalist. "There is a vast space between these two phenomena". Using a picturesque phrase Limaye calls it a 'twilight zone'. It is in this twilight zone that great individuals can accomplish a lot. In a developing and a healthy society there is a better scope for self-determination. Therefore, such societies are conducive to the emergence of great individuals. The decadence that plagued the Indian society was so wide and far flung that no single power could emerge which could defeat the aggressors and unite the nation. While the Western society was full of vitality, our society was in a de-vitalised state. Hence, the quality of leadership was bound to have obvious limitations.

Limaye classifies world historical individuals performing historical roles into two categories. Those doing political cum military work; and those doing religious cum philosophical work. Julius Caesar, Napoleon and Lenin

belong to the first group. The other group includes Buddha and Christ. Their work was much more spectacular but it belonged to the spiritual sphere. There is only one personality which could combine the two spheres within himself. It was none other than Prophet Mohammed who founded a religion and also a state.

The societies, in which the possibilities of development have flowered, throw up a leadership which becomes world leadership in the ultimate analysis. On the contrary, in a stagnant society like India, a similar leader merely turns into a national figure. As per Limaye's formulation Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhash Chandra Bose were great individuals who became national figures. But they could not bring resurgence into this moribund society. Their achievements do not acquire a worldwide significance, which Gandhi's mission could gain. Perhaps he is the only Indian who transcends the boundaries of a nation in this respect.

Violence has posed a serious threat to the entire world which can be met only through Gandhian non-violence. In the land of its birth, non-violence is on a decline. However, if it succeeds and other nations derive an impetus from it, Gandhi would turn into a world historical figure.

In a vital society, leadership can confront any crisis and give a direction. But one cannot predict and formulate a law regarding its inevitable emergence. Britain was a vital society for well over four centuries. She threw up leaders of the calibre of Cromwell, Pitt (Chatham), Robert Peel, Gladstone, Disraeli, Lloyd George and Churchill. However, after the Second World War decadence set in which explains the absence of leadership of that calibre. A decadent culture or society cannot give rise to such leadership. Even if it does, it cannot influence world history. Religious leaders, however, form an exception.

The concept of the 'state' has been discussed at length in the Communist literature. The state in a capitalist society is a handmaiden of capitalism. When the inevitable confrontation occurs between the two antagonistic forces, capital and labour, the state unleashes its oppression against labour. Marx had predicted the rise of the dictatorship of the

proletariat in a post revolution communist society. According to him this was to be a temporary phase and the state was destined to wither away in the long run. For Marx it was a pet dream. "The state will exist not for exercising power but purely for administration of things. What is the state after all? It embodies instruments of oppression". The communists who swore by Marx as well as democratic socialists who draw inspiration from Marx have imbibed this concept of the state in their minds which is why they have an inherent abhorrence for this institution.

Interestingly enough, the communists and socialists in India, even after they have become a part of the state, retain this hatred at the theoretical level. Limaye had a distinctive approach to the state with particular reference to India. He began articulating it after quitting active politics.

As a democrat, Limaye, instead of condemning the state, strongly supported it. Communists (the main Communist Parties) in India, on a practical level, did not believe in revolution or a violent overthrow of the government. However, on a theoretical level they still adhered to these concepts. Limaye did not believe in this dichotomy. Therefore, he carried forward the logic of the ordered state. The ordered state in India is the result of the indefatigable efforts of Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel, he always acknowledged.

An ordered state provides a foundation for a stable society. In the absence of such an ordered state it is impossible for citizens to live. "Our country is becoming ungovernable", he remarked to me with a touch of sadness and anxiety in his voice. What was strikingly different about his approach was his staunch belief that such a state was necessary not only for the propertied class but also for the toiling masses. It is they who are in the maximum need of protection by the state, which is facing danger from several quarters. Hindutva enthusiasts who give a commitment to protect the mosque and brazenly destroy the same. Terrorists and extortionists who hold the common citizen to ransom, politicians who are cahoots with criminals; all such elements pose a serious threat to the ordered state. We must put an end to this anarchy and enthrone the Constitution and the rule of law.

A true democrat is a satyagrahi. Limaye was sentenced for 12 years of imprisonment for participating in the Goa satyagraha. Satyagrahi does not beg for mercy or recognize illegitimate authority. Hence, Limaye did not appeal before the Portuguese Military Tribunal against his imprisonment, the Tribunal which he refused to recognise. Many of his comrades fell prey to the temptation. Limaye reconciled his faith in satyagraha with his faith in the need to have an ordered state which was his unique contribution. Many Gandhian activists or even socialists tend towards anarchism which Limaye scrupulously avoided.

As a committed social thinker, Limaye was worried about the growing penetration of politics by religion. The Hindu society has nursed a grievance against the successive Congress governments for having 'appeased' the Muslim minority. The grievance may have little foundation as such but it has taken a root at least among the upper crust of the Hindu society. In reality, the situation is exactly opposite. In terms of educational opportunities, jobs, Muslims are lagging far behind. However, the Hindu upper castes are in no mood to listen. They have been seized with a fear, a certain inferiority complex which has impaired its capacity to think rationally. Limaye accepts this harsh reality.

Maulavis and Mullahs, on their part have instilled consternation among the Muslim masses. Limaye points out that after the end of the Second World War, for about two decades, there existed a kind of pro-secular or pro-tolerance wave in the Muslim world. However, it was too short-lived. Particularly after the severe drubbing received during the six-day Arab-Israel conflict of 1967, the nineteen-day Yom Kippur War in 1973, and after the Khomeini led Islamic revolution in Iran, the earlier pro-tolerance trend literally evaporated. This was bound to have repercussions on Indian Muslims.

In the first decade after independence, Nehru was at the height of his popularity. Even then he could not push through reforms in the Muslim personal law. There was no question of others even making an attempt in this direction. The situation was ripe for communal elements among the Muslims to exploit which blocked the passage of reform legislation.

“Communalism induces aggression against other faiths. Introspection and inner search provide a path away from vengeance”. The present wave of fundamentalism could only be countered through tolerance and cultivation of a rational spirit all round, he claimed.

The majority nurses a feeling of deliberate discrimination out of the conviction, however ill-founded, that the minority is being pampered. As it gets entrenched, a highly inflammable mixture of hatred, envy and vengefulness is formed. The corpses long buried in the grave of history are disinterred. Limaye warns every community to desist from this tendency. Each religion and civilization, has revealed different facets of cruelty and destructiveness while dealing with others.

Under the Roman Empire, Christians and Jews were persecuted. When Christianity gained the status of official state religion, they persecuted others. Persian Sassanids tortured people of other faiths. The Turks did not launch aggressive war campaign tempted only by the lure of gold and wealth. They wanted to emerge as Ghazis, which is a fact ignored by Marxist historians. Limaye recounts the innumerable instances of destruction of religious places of people of other faiths by zealots of all communities. “It would be patently unhistorical to read only materialistic consideration behind their destructive thrust”, cautions Limaye. Islam is supposed to be a religion of peace. Yet, its history is soaked in blood. In the history of Islam, the blood of the faithful and the innocent has been shed. The brotherhood does exist in Islam, but it is restricted only to the faithful, a fact to which Limaye draws attention.

In Hinduism, there were currents of religious thought which granted the right of existence to all schools and opinions. Yet, there existed a tendency to suppress the currents going against the mainstream. Jains were persecuted by the Shaivaites. Why venture into this past now? Limaye asks a sensible question of his fellow Indians.

The Hindutva enthusiasts have been talking of setting right the historical wrongs. “This will not only be counterproductive but suicidal”, warns Limaye. While the hierarchical nature of the Hindu society is a matter of great

shame, there is no gainsaying the fact that a tolerance does exist on a wider level in the Hindu religious thought. In the matters pertaining to faith, Islam is fiercely intolerant which cannot be disputed. Still, there is a certain kind of brotherhood and egalitarian spirit which pervades the faith which Limaye appreciates.

Limaye detested shallow interpretation of earth-shaking events like the 1947 partition of the sub-continent or the age-old Hindu-Muslim conflict. This conflict has a thousand-years old history. "It is the most destructive discord which has split the sub-continent. If it is allowed to simmer it will ruin both the nations", he once told me in a fit of despair.

He perceived a fundamental antagonism between Semitic faiths and Hinduism, which originated in India. "This has been going on for centuries together. Semitic religions are comparatively more intolerant than the Hindu religion", he wrote. He wanted Judaism, Christianity and Islam to cultivate tolerance and Hindu religion and its satellite faiths like Jainism, Buddhism and Sikhism which gave a sanction to social hierarchy which, in turn, enthroned inequality to cultivate an egalitarian spirit. Brahmins did not hesitate to unleash violence against Buddhists and Jains who preached different doctrines. They gave a go-bye to the tenet of tolerance expounded in their religion. Limaye wanted to put an end to the unwelcome features of both the Semitic and the Hindu traditions and took a balanced view. In a moving passage he sets forth his eclectic philosophy. "

Limaye's analysis of the colonial exploitation and its connection with the Industrial Revolution in Britain is of seminal nature. The British imperialists expropriated India's raw materials during the five decades from 1780 to 1830 which was the direct cause for the pauperisation of India. This process was unraveled by Indian intellectuals like Dadabhai Navaraji, Mahadeo Govind Ranade, Ramesh Chandra Dutt as well as sympathetic British writers like William Digby, who took this view. Marx articulated his philosophy in terms of forces of production and relations of production. As the economy makes a transition from feudalism to capitalism, the developed forces of production overthrow the suffocating relations of production, said Marx. Forces of production under capitalism keep developing at a rapid pace. In any equal

competition an industry based on the feudal technique will not be able to survive the onslaught of the capitalist forces of production according to Marx. Marx applied this so-called law to the colonial India and pronounced his verdict that her industry was bound to face defeat and extinction at the hands of the vibrant and resilient British capitalism.

Limaye vehemently disputes and convincingly refutes the Marxian thesis. "Imperialism is the last stage of capitalism", declared die-hard Marxists. It was Lenin who enunciated this theoretical proposition after digesting the formulations of Hobson and Hilferding. Limaye, drawing upon India's experience stated that imperialism was not the last but the first stage of capitalism. Britain extorted wealth from India by threatening use of the state power. This process began in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. This wealth was utilized by the British capitalism deployed as its own capital. It was the unpardonable loot of India which was the direct cause of the industrial revolution in Britain. Limaye sees a historical sequence of events here. First it was the advanced science and technology which made its entry. Then came the advanced weaponry and superior war equipment with which domination was ruthlessly imposed. Then followed the economic exploitation of the cruelest kind which in turn facilitated transfer of enormous wealth and raw materials to Britain. All thus expropriated resources were used for the historic industrial revolution which is supposed to have dawned in Britain in 1848.

Limaye's thesis is that the so-called industrial revolution has its roots in the relentless exploitation by the colonial power. For this purpose, extra-economic factors like political power and superior navy were harnessed by Britain which explodes the Marxian doctrine which lays undue emphasis on the economic factor. Marx had discussed the concept of surplus which he attributes to the exploitation of workers. Marx cites surplus as the main factor leading to the accumulation of capital. Limaye finds this analysis of the process of capital formation to be grossly inadequate. The direct link that he establishes between the process of capital formation in Britain and the progressive and deliberate pauperisation of India is of great significance.

Limaye's entire ideological edifice stood on the foundation of secular nationalism propounded by the freedom movement. To him it was a basic

article of faith. The setting of the Indian National Congress in 1885 was a major milestone and one of the most significant events in the history of the country. For the first time, people belonging to different faiths assembled in Bombay not for a religious discourse or a ritual but for a specific political purpose. They were highly educated and hailed from Hindu, Parsee, Christian and Mohammedan communities respectively. What brought them together was a secular political consciousness, which was a theme close to Limaye's heart. Nationalism, national spirit and consciousness engaged his attention throughout his career. Limaye, in his voluminous writing on the subject demonstrates the confused thinking of some of the great nationalist leaders which resulted in creating a terminological fog which raised obstacles in the path of the evolution of a secular identity. Limaye rightly points out that there is no equivalent of the word 'nation' in Indian languages which added to the confusion. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan used the term 'Quam' in four different ways. Once he called Muslims a Quam. Then, he referred to the Bengalis as a Quam. Sometimes his Quam concept included both Hindus and Muslims. In Eastern India one often hears the expression Udiya (Oriya) Nation or Bengali Nation. What Maharashtrians mean by the word Rashtriya is Jatiyo in the Eastern Indian languages. The end result is national consciousness gets often mixed up with narrow concepts.

Limaye loved to explain how different strands and layers of Indian nationalism were made up. The modern concept of nationalism did not originate in Asia. It emerged in the Western culture and gathered strength in the post-mediaeval era. England was the first powerful nation-state. Unity was achieved by the French after they won the hundred-day war under the leadership of Joan of Arc. The concept of nation-state gained respectability in the 18<sup>th</sup> century after the American War of Independence and the French Revolution. As the 19th century progressed Greece, Italy and Germany were drawn into the vortex of nationalism. Its arrival in India, thus was through a circuitous route. Everyone was inspired by this ideal of nationalism in India in his own way. To some, Indian nationalism was equivalent to the consolidation of the Bengali speaking people. For some it was nothing but the glory of the Maratha power. For others, nationalism was synonymous with Hindutva or Islam.

Many Bengali intellectuals and leaders including Raja Rammohan Roy looked upon the British as angels who liberated Bengal from the tyranny the Mughal rule. When Prasannakumar Tagore was asked to choose between the British and the indigenous rulers, Tagore unhesitatingly opted for the British because to him self-rule was a euphemism for a Muslim rule. Muslims in the Punjab thought on similar lines. They thanked the British for delivering them from the oppressive Sikh rulers. Dalits and Shudras who faced excessive discrimination and torture during the Peshwa rule in Maharashtra too thanked the British.

What does one mean by nation-state? Is it a geographical concept? Do people staying within particular boundaries, inhabiting a particular land constitute a nation despite their religious or linguistic dissimilarities? India is inhabited by people professing different faiths, belonging to different castes and speaking different languages. It was the leaders from the Parsee community who first formulated the idea of the nation-state which was closest to the concept as it emerged in Europe. This was Limaye's most subtle observation. Dadabhai Navaraji and Pherozshah Mehta were the leaders of the Parsee community. In the field of education, commerce and industry, Parsees were far ahead of their compatriots. They were and still have been a numerically insignificant minority but the entire community was extremely enlightened. It was the Parsee community leaders who first preached a purely territorial and non-denominational kind of nationalism.

Leaders of the Hindus or Muslims showed this maturity much later. They were fiercely nationalistic in spirit but their nationalism was restricted to the narrow categories like the caste, community or linguistic group. Limaye emphatically adds that not a single non-Parsee leader could enunciate Indian nationalism in the correct way in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Dr. Annie Besant and Bipin Chandra Pal talked of nationalism which encompassed all. Besant was a theosophist who believed in the essential unity of all religions. There is an element of mysticism and spiritualism in theosophy, which finds expression even in its concept of nationalism. Bipin Chandra Pal too expounded an all-embracing nationalism which contained a streak of mysticism. Lokmanya Tilak's nationalism evolved with years. Limaye

aptly calls this confusion the birth pangs of Indian nationalism. At a particular stage, Sir Syed Ahmed's idea of Indian nationalism was very broad and it presumed a peaceful co-existence of Hindus and Muslims. He called India the motherland of Hindus and Muslims. "We have dissolved our identities to such an extent that we have invented a new language called Urdu which is truly composite". The same Syed gave up his liberal position and adopted a communal stance for which apart from he himself, leaders of the majority community are also to blame, says Limaye.

From a liberal view to the intensely communal viewpoint was the process of transformation in case of many leaders of other communities as well. Mohammed Ali Jinnah, Mohammed Iqbal, Vinayak Damodar Savarkar fell into the same category. Limaye makes an extremely pertinent observation regarding the fear complex of the Muslim leadership. "All Muslim leaders including Syed Ahmed were exponents of territorial nationalism. But with the expansion of the limited franchise the representative institutions began to develop. This changed the perception of Muslims leaders. Indians began to get civilian and military jobs. The Muslims began to develop a fear complex which fostered a separatist feeling which forced a partition of the country". Though the partition has created a three-way division of the country the issue still stands unresolved.

There are three faces of socialism - Communism, Western Socialism and the Third World Socialism. Is the socialism as it is reflected in these three types adequate to deal with the problems confronting the mankind? Taking the experience of the last eight decades into account, Limaye is forthright in saying that socialism is inadequate to solve the problems that face the contemporary world. The defeat of Communist states has prompted some intellectuals to celebrate the 'event'. Those who mix up religion with politics have been tempted to trumpet it as their own victory which Limaye calls highly immature.

No social thought or action plan can hold validity for all times. It is bound by geographical and temporal limitations. One has to make suitable changes in it, update it to meet the new requirements. The capitalism as it prevails today is much different from what it was when it emerged in the 19th

century. There is a vast difference in the contours of this phenomenon at its inception and its present state. If capitalism can incorporate a number of changes and if it can constantly renew itself then how can socialism remain static?

If there is an end to misery the world over and all problems simply vanish into the thin air then socialism can afford to remain unchanged. But this is far from the reality. One has to constantly reexamine one's ideological premises in the light of new events and in changing contexts, Limaye stressed. One cannot bind socialism to a particular mode of ownership and distribution. In no country in the entire world a capitalism based on totally free enterprise exists. Socialism, according to Limaye, is not a concept restricted to a particular pattern of ownership of the forces of production; it is a much deeper concept. A change in the pattern of the ownership of the forces of production does not impair the eternal values that socialism propagates.

Limaye calls socialism a humanitarian philosophy. It means social and economic justice. It swears by eradication of casteism, dignity of labour and equality of opportunity to all. Socialism aims to liberate women; preach religious tolerance and is opposed to apartheid. It seeks to battle fanaticism of every kind and vehemently condemns exploitation of one nation or a society by another nation or society. It abhors war mongering and violence. It is ever prepared to launch a struggle through peaceful means for ensuring rightful gains that are due to all and sundry. Socialism has faith in adult franchise which is the cardinal principle of representative democracy. People have a right to vote out a government that they do not like and elect the government of their choice. One party rule is repugnant to socialism. The civil liberties which are a legacy of a liberal tradition are considered priceless under socialism.

Limaye is emphatic that social justice and equality of opportunity to all are the prime motivations behind the socialist philosophy. The only way one can rejuvenate the philosophy and the movement inspired by it is by setting a limit to man's acquisitive instinct. Environmental neglect ultimately leads to injustice against the poor. Socialism cannot afford to exploit the natural resources in a manner that was adopted by capitalism during its

heyday. Socialism not only seeks to establish harmonious relations between different faiths, ethnic groups and nations. It also intends to establish a rapport between man and nature. Accordingly, a redefinition of socialism is called for.

Socialism in India will be inadequate if it only pays attention to the economic aspect to the exclusion of other angles. National integration and social consolidation are also equally important to the Indian version of socialism. Indian languages should enjoy an equal status and all Indians should speak a common language. He rated Sanskrit very high and thought it was the most suitable for being made into a national language. He was, of course, as aware as he was critical of the hierarchical environment around Sanskrit. The only way to integrate the Indian society was to abolish castes altogether.

Socialism believes in the supremacy of reason and rationality. Eradication of superstition and irrationality through the cultivation of a scientific spirit is central to Limaye's socialism. For socialists, democracy is an article of faith. By democracy Limaye does not mean the democracy of the erstwhile 'moderates'.

It is not restricted to humble petitions and legislative work. The Gandhian principle of non-violence is totally in tune with Limaye's concept of socialism. Strikes, non-co-operation, satyagraha, organisation network and constructive work are various facets of Limaye's socialism. Limaye was an aesthete, an avid listener of classical music and dance. His father was a music teacher and his elder brother too taught music. "Why didn't you learn music? You appreciate it so much". I once asked him. He gave a philosophical reply. "There is an inherent conflict between ethics and aesthetics. I joined politics because of my commitment to ethics". This, in a way, sums up his life and the saga of his struggles.

**Setting the Record Straight**  
**Madhu Limaye - his personality, political career and contribution**  
**A dispassionate, ring-side, view by his son**

**Making of mass leaders and individual geniuses**

Each individual responds to opportunities and adversities of life in a unique manner. Why different individuals respond differently to similar situations is a phenomenon yet to be fully understood. Early influences and circumstances in life, from childhood to early adulthood, influence the development of personality and moral make up of an individual to a great extent. Experiences in later life certainly impact further evolution of the personality, but for most part, what one is likely to become gets shaped by the time the person reaches early twenties. This way some people may grow up to become leaders of people and others may not.

The ultimate test of mass leadership is how powerfully and enduringly a leader can influence actions of large masses of people. In casting this spell upon the masses, the leader's personal ambition, sense of self-importance and personal destiny as "the carrier of a vision or mission" play a very important role.

There is hardly a leader in human history, in the realm of politics, religion, war or business, who has been able to move large masses or organizations towards sustained action and success, without a burning personal ambition or deep belief in his own "personal role in history in the chosen realm," whether the ambition and belief are more noble and altruistic or are more self serving. On the other hand, the impulse behind pursuit of individual achievements in scientific, philosophical, technical or artistic fields is driven by natural gifts, coupled with resolve and efforts to drive one's own self, in a focused, disciplined and sustained manner, in the quest of unending excellence. Most geniuses in human history, particularly in the above-mentioned fields, share these common traits.

Therefore, this type of uncompromising and idealistic strain in an individual, not sufficiently backed by a sense of personal destiny in history and desire to carry people, makes most of the geniuses or near geniuses, often

unsuited to leadership and practical considerations of mass action, while they may make brilliant contribution individually. Persons who want to lead people and those who want to personally excel in the field of their choice, are both needed and found in society. Both types are required for their unique contribution because they play diverse and yet complementary societal roles. Societies, nations and organizations “in ascendance”, find suitable complementary and supplementary roles for such individuals so they can leverage their strengths to achieve great results together.

These two broad impulses and personas are not mutually exclusive. They are predominant drives and pre-dispositions in an individual that enable the person to do his or her best. However, while they are not mutually exclusive, in most people, one of the two carries much greater influence on what and how that individual thinks and acts.

There is another interesting feature of the evolution of human mind that underlies the effectiveness of mass leaders. This is based on the construction of the human brain, and consequently, on how we human beings feel, think and act. The human brain can be broadly viewed as being made up of two parts, the old small brain or “limbic system”, and the new enlarged brain or “neo-cortex”. Our limbic system essentially shares features with all ancient creatures from fishes to reptiles. This is the *seat of emotion and action*. The *flight or fight* response, which the entire animal kingdom shares with each other, resides here. And as we know, at the basic level, these instinctive responses have high survival value, and hence, significant evolutionary value.

Basic emotions, both positive and negative, from love, trust, faith, caring, passion, curiosity, altruism to fear, insecurity, jealousy, dominance, anger, hatred, lust, greed, xenophobia, are all drivers of action. They reside in the ancient limbic system, and are rarely, if at all, given to logic, reason, analysis, facts and rationality. The rational and creative, newly acquired neo-cortex or large brain, which is the seat of morality, human intelligence, creativity and resourcefulness, which really can tell each of us what is the correct course of action, why and how, has limited ability to rouse the emotional drivers of the limbic system. And worse still, it has virtually no

control once the emotion driving *limbic system* takes charge of thoughts, emotions and actions of people. Any act of mass hysteria, senseless violence or extreme intolerance proves this beyond question.

It is the unique capability of human beings that many of us can, for most part, let reason and rationality guide our thoughts, govern our emotions and drive our actions.

Given this curious nature of the human mind, all mass leaders, to be effective, must possess and put to use their ability to engage and rouse human emotions to drive action. The leaders, who, in history, have made enduring positive contribution, have first of all, appealed more to the positive and noble emotions of their followers, while the leaders who have wrought destruction and cruelty upon multitudes have essentially fanned and harnessed base emotions of the masses to their self-serving purpose. Either way, their reliance on rationality is often less pronounced.

To sum up, an individual, whose actions are driven more by reason, facts and logic, and one who is very idealistic and pursues relentless uncompromising personal excellence, finds it an uphill struggle to effectively lead the masses, because he or she is not adept at or is distinctly uncomfortable at essentially appealing to and manipulating human emotions, often in exclusion to logic, rationality and facts. To top it all, if that person, due to early influences and circumstances in his life, is not filled with personal ambition and sense of historical destiny that we touched upon earlier, then, he never has the inner drive to persist in building mass support, while seeking practical compromises and manipulating circumstances and people to achieve his or her goals as a mass leader. That individual, however great may be his or her abilities and will, is unlikely to possess the charisma, mass appeal or ability to harness people's emotions that a successful and effective leader of the masses possesses in abundance.

Madhu Limaye was this type of leader and socio-political activist - very idealistic, very logical and rational, with great sense of fairness and justice, a near genius in terms his intellectual prowess – in breadth and depth of his knowledge, his unending scholarship, his almost photographic memory, his

extremely hard working, disciplined nature and a very strong uncompromising will. But in the final analysis he deeply believed that he was a “servant” of the down trodden people and this nation, rather than the “master” of his own destiny and this country’s fortunes. To use title of one Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia’s books and thesis contained therein, Madhu Limaye did not possess abundance of “Will to Power.” He was more beholden to his own conscience and convictions than anything else.

With this fundamental make-up, while he was probably the best in class in his generation and may be in generations to come, Madhu Limaye could possibly never have become a mass leader to gather enormous personal following and adulation, and who could hold unquestioned ascendancy in his party and the larger Socialist Movement in India. Nor was he ever passionately devoted to seeking and holding an office. It is ironical that a person, who was most concerned about the well being of the masses, would never be foremost in the minds of the people of our country as their chosen leader.

I will try to explore why and what made my father, Madhu Limaye, the way he was, and therefore, in that light understand what he could achieve and what he could not, in his long career of public service and politics, spanning over 55 years, which began when he was of a tender age of 15 – 16 years in Pune and which ended with his last breath, on the night of 8<sup>th</sup> January, 1995 in Delhi.

### **Evolution of my father’s (Madhu Limaye’s) personality, his political career and his contribution**

*Now on, in this article, I have referred to my father as **Bhai**, which is what I called him. This term in Marathi is equivalent of the term “comrade”. Bhai was the term extensively used by Communists and Socialists as well as by journalists in public sphere in Maharashtra as a substitute to the word ‘comrade’. My maternal uncles and aunts affectionately addressed my father as Bhai, which I picked up as a child and continued to use. On the other hand, my father’s siblings and cousins mostly called him by his given name, Madhu, which in the eyes of a little boy, was not an appropriate way to address his father. In most places I have referred to my mother as Aai.*

Bhai was third among nine siblings, five brothers and four sisters including him. By the time he was born on 1<sup>st</sup> May, 1922, the financial circumstances and emotional environment of his immediate family had become precarious. His father was a school teacher. English language & literature and Hindustani classical music were the subjects of my grandfather's expertise and passionate interest, which he taught at school. Bhai's elder brother Manohar and his younger sister Indu shared their father's passion and became exponents and teachers of Hindustani classical vocal music. So, in a way, Bhai's abiding love for music was a form of family inheritance and shared tradition.

Around the time Bhai was born, after having taught for over 13 years in his alma mater, New English School of Pune, Bhai's father developed some serious differences with the school authorities and quit his job. He was essentially a shy and sensitive type of person, and consequently, he did not quite recover from this life changing event. Thereafter, for the rest of his life, Bhai's father did not really hold a steady job or provide regular, consistent financial support to his immediate family. This not only created immense and long-standing financial difficulties for his family, but also made my grandfather very melancholy and permanently depressive. This was one everlasting gloomy aspect of Bhai's early childhood and adolescence (from 1922 – 1938/39), until he left home in service of the nation and its people.

Within meagre available resources, the Limaye household was ably managed by Bhai's mother, who received financial assistance from her brothers, particularly her eldest brother who was called Bapu, her father, and sporadically from Bhai's paternal uncles. My grandmother suffered from near deafness resulting out of after effects of malarial medication, and she also was not much educated herself, given the era she was born and lived in. But despite these personal difficulties, she was most passionate about education and learning. Bhai and his siblings learnt to read and write from their mother. She managed to instill a life long thirst for knowledge and education in most of her children.

After the initial years of infancy and childhood, from the age of five (1927) until the age of eleven (1933), that is, for most of his later childhood, Bhai stayed with his maternal grandfather and maternal uncles, first in Pune, and then for a short while, in Mumbai. Although his uncles, aunts and grandfather did not ever discriminate, Bhai was deprived the security of parental love, guidance and encouragement, which makes a child feel that he is someone special or gifted, and helps to develop confidence and instill a sense of purpose and ambition in him. Bhai's young and impressionable mind inevitably registered the fact that he was beneficiary of the largesse of his extended maternal family. The fact that among his immediate and extended family he had relatively darker complexion and a slightly blunt nose deprived him the pleasure of being considered a "cute or good-looking child." Bhai was also sickly and asthmatic. All these factors together made him believe his was pretty ordinary.

There were few other events and factors during Bhai's childhood, that is, until his matriculation, which made a lasting impact on him. The first one helped him to get into better physical shape and overcome his sickliness and bronchial asthma, until it recurred during his second incarceration under the British rule in the course of the "Quit India Movement," and then, continued to afflict him for the rest of his life, and eventually was the immediate cause of his death. This was a few years' friendship with a fellow school student in Saraswati Mandir in Pune, who was called Dada. Dada Bhoir encouraged and coached Bhai to learn physical exercises, and to play Indian outdoor sports like Kabaddi, Kho-Kho, and football. Despite later recurrence of asthma, the short stint of exercises and sports helped Bhai's physical development and endurance a great deal.

The second factor to have impacted Bhai deeply was the tyranny of religious rituals & practices observed and caste discrimination practiced by his conservative maternal grandfather. These turned Bhai permanently against traditional Hindu religion and the pernicious "caste system" practiced by the Hindu society. At the same time, his grandfather's rituals introduced him to the Sanskrit language.

There was a third set of events that made a lasting impression on Bhai. They occurred in the early 1930s, while he lived in Mumbai for a short period, with his maternal uncle. Here Bhai witnessed brave non-violent struggle for freedom from the British imperialism, by patriotic men and women under the Congress leadership. He also witnessed riots between the two dominant religious communities – Hindus and Muslims. The former began kindling the spirit of patriotism and admiration for the non-violent freedom fighters and their courageous ways, and the latter began sensitizing him to the negative and destructive aspect of traditional religion, and more particularly, effects of religious intolerance and religious conflicts on civil society.

In 1933, when Bhai was eleven, his father decided to bring him to Pune from Mumbai and continue his education there. Bhai's return to a Pune School (Saraswati Mandir) was quite short lived. Under the District School Board rules, he was two years underage in relation to the class he was placed in, and thus, he was never formally enrolled during two years of his stay in Saraswati Mandir School. Incidentally, a similar episode of being underage, and therefore, being demoted instead of being promoted to the next class occurred during early years of my primary schooling. Bhai, who had endured the anxiety and uncertainty of this situation, engaged with education authorities to ensure that I did not have to face the consequences that he had faced, and I was eventually promoted to be with my old classmates.

This situation at Saraswati Mandir (School) eventually led to events that made my grandfather take Bhai out of the school by the time Bhai was thirteen. My grandfather decided to teach Bhai himself and to get him to appear for matriculation (secondary school) examination as an external student, which was then conducted by the University of Bombay.

For once, my grandfather showed strong resolve and sense of purpose to obtain permission from the University for Bhai's candidature as an external student. When he conceived the idea, the matriculation examination that he wanted Bhai to appear for was nearly one and half – two years away, and a lot of preparation was needed to ensure success. Eventually, in 1936, Bombay University sent a letter accepting Bhai's candidature as an external student for the matriculation examination. My grandfather's decision to take his son out

of school and prepare him for matriculation examination under his own tutelage as an external student, instead of pushing the son down a couple of classes and making him go through regular school, met with severe criticism and doom's day predictions from both sides of Bhai's family. Everyone ridiculed the idea, but my grandfather stuck to his decision, and the son, who had faced ongoing uncertainty about his school education, was in sympathy with his father's decision.

This highly risky step was in many ways the first transformational opportunity and real challenge for Bhai. While there were many prophets of doom, one of my grandfather's well to do cousin sister, called Taputai, promised to provide financial assistance for Bhai's entire college education until BA, if he were to pass matriculation examination at the first attempt.

Bhai's father taught him English for about an hour and a half every day. His elder brother, my uncle, Manohar, who then lived in Satara with their paternal uncle, taught Bhai Mathematics for a few hours every day, during his summer vacation. During this period, my uncle Manohar, who was absolutely crazy about music, also introduced Bhai to the nuances as well as theoretical underpinning of Hindustani classical music, the ragas and taals. Apart from this relatively meagre formal academic instruction, Bhai had to prepare himself for all other subjects. This compelled him to become intellectually self-reliant.

Absence of regular, full-day, school or full-time tutoring at home, left Bhai with a lot of free time. He was very keen to pass matriculation at the first attempt and enter the enticing world of college education. However, the school text books and curriculum could not really consume all his free hours. So, Bhai enrolled himself as a member of Pune's Public Library called *Pune Nagar Vaachanaalaya*.

The books, magazines, journals and newspapers in the Library opened a completely new world to Bhai. He became a voracious and eclectic reader. The sympathetic and indulgent library staff supported his passion for reading. Books not only provided Bhai a vast vista of knowledge, they helped his intellectual and emotional development. They helped raise his socio-political

consciousness, provided him new insights and enthroned in him love for unending learning and deep study of subjects. Books also created deep sense of aesthetic appreciation.

Bhai often mused that had “duty to serve the country and its people (ethics)” not beckoned him so strongly, he would have given into his love for aesthetics and would have pursued a career in literature, theatre, art or music, which would have meant pursuing individual excellence.

I believe that Bhai’s persona was really more suited to these pursuits. Although he did not write literary pieces, the quality, variety and quantity of output of his writings during the last 12–13 years of his life, after he retired from active politics, can strongly support this argument. Five letters that he wrote to me (which were compiled and published as a book in Marathi, under the title *Laadkyaa Popataas*, and later translated into Hindi, Konkani and English) during his 19-month long incarceration in Goa (1955-57) in the course of Goa Liberation Movement are also a testimony to his literary imagination and his ability to be one with children. Apart from providing him an avenue of intellectual development, probably well ahead of his years, books provided Bhai an unalloyed joy which did not require anyone’s generosity.

At this juncture, most of his reading, though on a wide range of subjects, was more restricted to Marathi. This voracious reading habit helped develop his near photographic memory, sharp comprehension and also built his reliance on self-learning, which served him very well throughout his career, and in fact, became a hallmark of his style of functioning. Nothing that Bhai spoke or wrote on public affairs was ever off the cuff or based on unsubstantiated opinion. It was always backed by facts, based on vast knowledge and deep study of differing viewpoints. It also helped Bhai to master the art of learning very diverse and new subjects quickly, so that in a short time he could hold his ground on those subjects with those formally educated and steeped in those subjects for years such as lawyers and jurists, economists, sociologists, historians, foreign relations experts and academicians. These qualities made Bhai’s arguments and opinions quite unassailable. Many legal/court cases, including ‘habeas corpus writ petition’

cases against his unlawful detention that he successfully argued in the Supreme Court throughout his life, are a testimony to this ability.

To digress a little, I have an interesting memory about Bhai's photographic memory and sharp comprehension. In 1982-83, I had accompanied him to the US where he was to undergo coronary artery bypass graft surgery, which was then not at all common place in India like it is now. Unfortunately, due to Bhai's very weak asthma afflicted lungs, doctors in the US eventually decided against this surgery that would have required him to be put under general anaesthesia for several hours. One of my younger paternal uncles (Mohan Limaye) was then teaching at University of Texas at Austin. So, we stayed with him for a couple of months in Austin. During that rare period when we spent so much time together, my father, my uncle and I had many freewheeling discussions on varied topics.

Once I was discussing aspects of the US foreign policy with Bhai, and the discussion veered around views and opinions of a brilliant American career diplomat, George F. Kennan. I had read Kennan's books a couple of years back, and therefore, when we had a difference of opinion on the viewpoint Kennan had articulated about basis for realism which should govern the US foreign policy in his book *Realities of American Foreign Policy*, I was very vehement that my interpretation was correct. But Bhai was emphatic that his understanding was correct. I asked Bhai when he had read that book. He said he had read it sometime towards the end of 1954, which was almost 30 years back. I said I am sure your memory is playing tricks with you. Bhai said he was quite sure of what he was saying. He told me that Kennan's viewpoint was best articulated in a paragraph that began towards the bottom of page 257 and continued overleaf. I was totally incredulous at his being so precise. So, with utter disbelief in what Bhai had said, I went the next day with my uncle to the University Library to look for the book. I found the book and when I looked at page 257, there was the paragraph staring at me, and what Bhai was telling me was what was captured in that and the next few paragraphs. He was correct and I was wrong on what Kennan had said.

Throughout his life and career, particularly during his long prison sentences, whether under the British rule, the Portuguese rule in Goa or

under the Congress rule in independent India, particularly during the Emergency in 1975-77, within the constraints of prison regulations, Bhai continued his life long studentship through books, under the aegis of what he fondly called *Mahatma Gandhi University of Satyagrahis*. With the company of books, the length of his imprisonment period could never affect his spirit and resolve to fight for the causes that he did all his life.

The two-year stint during 1935-37 as an external student deprived Bhai of company of regular schoolmates and friends. Three of his siblings with whom he could have bonded most easily, were his elder brother Manohar, his elder sister Kusum and the sister immediately younger to him, Suman. But Manohar lived with his elder paternal uncle in Satara and only came home during vacations, Kusum was married off early and Suman stayed with Bhai's his younger paternal uncle's family.

Around the time he was ready to appear for his matriculation examination, Bhai's personality was a unique mix. He was a shy, reserved and lonesome adolescent, buffeted by uncertainty about his future, who would not easily share his troubles with anyone. Although Bhai was very close to his mother, my grandmother had enough troubles of her own for him to feel comfortable about burdening her with his worries and anxieties. All these factors and events led Bhai away from being an extraverted, pushy and confident person. He did not develop a burning ambition or sense of personal destiny. In fact, all his public life which involved interacting with thousands of people, Bhai did not develop the skill and desire to form frivolous friendships or engage in small talk. He remained sensitive, intense and private person, who formed many strong and lifelong friendships, but slowly. His confidence and assertiveness were based not on a sense of personal sense of importance but arose out of deep knowledge and strong convictions.

The first significant and life changing success that Bhai tasted was when he passed the matriculation examination with good marks at the first attempt, despite all the doom's day predictions. My grandparents were overjoyed. My grandaunt, Taputai, made good her promise about supporting Bhai's college education, and that opened the doors to new opportunities.

The period of two-three years in Fergusson College in Pune virtually transformed Bhai's personality and life. He himself likened this phase of his life of being transformed from a "caterpillar into a butterfly". Unlike his school days, now he made quite a few new friends, young men and women, many of them remained his life long friends. Awakening of his socio-political awareness was the most important aspect of this phase in his life.

Congress Socialist Leader Achyut Patwardhan's speech in his college on "War on the Horizon" was one such landmark moment. Achyutrao's analysis about likelihood of the war between Nazi Germany and imperial Britain and other countries, and India being dragged into it against her interests and wishes, and the need to resist this attempt made a strong impression on Bhai. The other factors occurred along side his studies. Bhai's history professor, Prof. Kelavala, encouraged him to extend his reading to English newspapers, journals and books and to begin conversing in English. He also asked Bhai to prepare two research papers and present them before History Association of the Fergusson College.

The first paper was on the *Impact of the ancient Hellenic (Greek) Civilization on Europe*, and the other was a *Critique of the features of the Government of India Act, 1935*. The first paper got Bhai to purposefully study a subject in depth, beyond the requirements of examinations or for pure pleasure. Earlier, during his preparation for his matriculation examination, Bhai had formed a habit of making extensive notes while reading. This method came handy while preparing this study of the ancient Hellenic Civilization. Bhai persisted lifelong with this habit of taking summary notes in his own words about a book that he was reading, and the action of taking notes helped sharpen his comprehension and virtually "etch" on to his memory the matter he had read, as I have described above. The writing of these two papers also introduced Bhai to the art of critical and analytical writing. It was during this period that Bhai developed an abiding love for world history and things classical or of antiquity, and for Greek plays (tragedies), Hellenic architecture and sculpture in particular. Presenting this paper before a small audience provided Bhai his first opportunity and challenge of public speaking. Successful presentation of this project, which won good applause both from faculty and fellow students, gave Bhai's self-confidence an immense boost.

Preparation for the second paper on the Government of India Act proved to be totally life changing. Apart from theoretical library research on the subject to get familiar with evolution of political institutions under the British rule, Prof. Kelavala had also suggested to Bhai that he should meet local political leaders. One of the first leaders Bhai went to meet and interview on this topic was Socialist Leader Shridhar Mahadev alias S. M. Joshi. SM, as he was fondly called, introduced Bhai to the world of idealism, patriotism and public service involving sacrifice. His example drew Bhai into India's freedom struggle and the nascent Socialist Movement in India. Soon SM became Bhai's mentor, guide and inspirational father figure, which he had missed all along. SM introduced Bhai to the Socialist Study Circle and to the Congress Socialist Party. At the study circle Bhai met some of his closest life-time friends and comrades, the most important among them being Keshav alias Bandu Gore, Vinayak Kulkarni and V. N. alias Anna Sane.

Apart from affection, praise and encouragement, SM gave Bhai opportunity to shoulder organizational responsibility and to participate in "office" work and correspondence. He assigned to Bhai projects which involved meeting with people and conducting "field studies" to back up library research on topics of public importance. He also pushed Bhai to make a few public speeches. Bhai's association with SM gave him the opportunity to get introduced to many important political leaders of the Socialist Movement as well as some senior Congress leaders of Maharashtra.

SM's steadfast and growing confidence in Bhai's abilities, judgment and character, made this young man, who hitherto had received little recognition, for the first time in life feel really special. Bhai developed the skill of collective organizational functioning and learnt to conduct grass roots level public contact and education of party cadres. It was as if an "ugly duckling" began to realize that he was actually a "swan". Soon, at the age of 16-17 years, at SM's prompting and support, Bhai was made Pune Congress Socialist Party's Office Secretary.

Initially SM, and later Yusuf Meherally, Pandurang S. Sane alias Sane Guruji, Acharya Narendra Deva, and above all, Jayaprakash Narayan (JP), and

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia pushed shy, self-effacing and un-ambitious Bhai to the forefront, giving him prominence and providing him diverse opportunities to develop new skills as well as to use them in public sphere. This inspired and emboldened Bhai, who was temperamentally little suited to public life. Had these leaders not reposed so much faith in Bhai and made opportunities available to him, in public affairs Bhai may have remained content to be a grass roots level activist. In the late 1940s and early 1950s it was JP, who suggested Bhai's name for many important party positions at the national level within the Socialist Party, and in the late 1950s and early 1960s, Dr. Lohia's insistence persuaded Bhai to contest for elections.

The first contest in the second General Elections in 1957 for Maharashtra Legislative Assembly, led to Bhai's unfortunate terrible defeat where he lost the security deposit, but the second electoral contest, through a bye-election in late 1964 in Monghyr/Munger in Bihar got Bhai elected to the Lok Sabha, which gave him an opportunity to become one of the most effective Parliamentarians in India. More of this later.

The initial years of grass roots political work in the Socialist Movement and participation in study circles not only fired up Bhai's idealism, it strengthened his grasp of ideological issues. The public contact and studies of issues created in him a lifelong concern and deep empathy for the lot of the poor and socially downtrodden masses, and wedded him to secular democratic Socialism, coupled with Gandhian values of simplicity, public service and non-violent, courageous civil disobedience.

As I have mentioned earlier, Bhai's silent rebellion against traditional Hindu religious practices in his maternal grandfather's family, eventually led to his aversion towards fanaticism and blind faith prescribed by all religions. He became a rationalist, Socialist and atheist, or at least an agnostic. However, thanks to his love for literature, particularly for poetry and philosophy of Tukaram and Kabir, he also appreciated the possible benevolent scope of religion and faith in helping people to cope with inevitable strands of sorrow and failures in human life, in controlling the craving for material things and in developing stoicism, while facing adversities of life. Early in his youth, Bhai decided that horrible caste discrimination was the greatest evil of Hinduism,

while Hinduism's open metaphysical–philosophical system and tolerance for other viewpoints was its greatest beauty and strength. While he discerned that fanaticism and intolerance to dissent were main evils of both Islam and Christianity, he appreciated social egalitarianism of the brotherhood of Islam and compassion and charity preached by Jesus Christ, as beauty and strength of both these religions respectively. Bhai also came to see the value of “this-worldliness (as against other-worldliness of Hinduism), and sense of community responsibility” that these congregational Semitic religions preached and sponsored.

Another important intellectual facet of Bhai's personality, which developed in these formative years, was his ability to arrive at independent positions and opinions through study and analytical thinking, and to voice them and defend them in discussions. Consequently, he became a “dissenting voice”, often the sole dissenter. He also developed sympathetic intellectual appreciation for honest opinions, ideology and objectives of those who differed from him. For instance, in those pre-independence days, he could appreciate Dr. B. R. alias Babasaheb Ambedkar's insistence of demanding special political privileges for the “untouchables/depressed classes” as a matter of right, before securing their support and participation in India's freedom struggle, rather than accepting the Gandhian route of banishing the debilitating and humiliating social evil of untouchability through changing the hearts of people. In discussion and debate with his young comrades, he could articulate justification in Mohammed Ali Jinnah's position about power sharing with Muslims, in the wake of Congress Party's insistence on onerous conditions being laid down before the Muslim League, as a price for the limited power sharing opportunity that had been provided by the provincial elections in 1937, under the Government of India Act, 1935.

In 1939, Bhai and many of his friends, now active in the Socialist Movement, decided that they wanted to devote their life to political struggle for freedom and Socialist Movement for upliftment of the downtrodden masses. He and many of his young friends became full time party workers. Bhai was assigned Khandesh (Jalgaon and Dhule Districts) as his area of party work. Until nearly 1948, apart from two long periods of his incarceration under the British rule, first for conducting anti-war campaign in 1940 and later

for actively participating in the underground freedom struggle during the 1942 Quit India Movement, Bhai continued to work in Khandesh. During his first prison sentence in Dhule Jail (Juvenile Ward), Bhai met saintly Sane Guruji and drew him away from Communism into the fold of democratic Socialism. Sane Guruji and Bhai became very close until Sane Guruji's untimely suicidal death in 1950.

In March – April of 1947, in a small town called Amalner located in Jalgaon District (Khandesh), Bhai was invited to conduct a study circle by some women students. Bhai met my mother, Champa Gupte, in the course this two-week long series of lectures. At that age, both my parents were quite shy. As both of them often told me, they did not speak a word with each other or even exchange any meaningful glances. However, when around four years later, Bhai wrote a letter to my mother proposing to her, she was delighted at this unexpected turn of events. My mother's CKP (Kayastha) family was a well to do, somewhat conservative and far from adventurous family. However, no one, including my maternal grandparents, objected to this inter-caste alliance. Undoubtedly, they warned my mother of the life of hardships, economic difficulties, sacrifice and uncertainties that she should be prepared to face. And all these challenges she certainly got by a sack-full during all her marital life. Both Bhai and Aai (my mother) realized that for most part, she would have to take up the burden of running the household, and therefore, needed to take up a permanent and secure job to enable Bhai to continue to participate full-time in political work.

When Bhai proposed to her in 1951, Aai was pursuing her MA degree in Marathi and Sanskrit language and literature at Amalner. So, they decided to wait until Aai completed her MA and could get qualified to take up a teaching job, preferably in a college. Eventually, they got married on 15<sup>th</sup> May 1952. Their marital relationship was the most important foundation on which Bhai could build his life long dedication to public service. It was the most important enabler and emotional anchor for the rest of his life. For my mother, their relationship and Bhai's work provided a larger sense of purpose in life. Until she retired, for most part, my mother was professor at National College in Mumbai. She ran the house, pretty much raised me single handedly and continued to support Bhai's family until my uncles completed their education.

Bhai always said that without my mother's financial and emotional support he would have found it very difficult to lead totally principled and ideological political life. He may have altogether withdrawn from politics earlier.

I often think the years 1939 to 1954, particularly from early 1947 to 1954, were probably among the most hope filled days of Bhai's life. Yes, there were certainly many traumatic events that took place during this period (mentioned below) that did not leave the joy unalloyed, but in sum, there was more room for hope and happiness.

While participation in the Socialist Movement and freedom struggle, particularly the Quit India Movement, was a source of pride and purpose for Bhai, deaths caused by derailment of trains like Punjab Mail that Bhai had participated in engineering, was traumatic when he secretly witnessed the misery of the victims. This set Bhai permanently against the use of violence as a means of political struggle and made him life long adherent of Gandhian principle of non-violent resistance.

Ordeal of fasts in Rajkot by Gandhiji, in Pandharpur by Sane Guruji and in Pune by JP (after Socialist Party's relatively poor showing in 1952 General Elections), were moments of great anxiety. These events also permanently turned Bhai away from the use of "fasts as a moral force" in public life. He looked upon them as emotional blackmail. He never resorted to fasts to achieve any political results.

The joy of achieving independence was severely marred by the cataclysmic event of partition of the country, and inhuman Hindu/Sikh and Muslim riots, leading to mass slaughter and mass migration, soon followed by Gandhiji's assassination. Untimely deaths of young comrades like Dadu Patil and leaders like Yusuf Meherally and Sane Guruji (suicide) too were emotionally very painful. Bhai, who was very close to Sane Guruji, had struggled for many years to help him overcome his severe chronic depression. So Sane Guruji's death through an overdose of sleeping pills, on 11<sup>th</sup> June 1950, was not only losing a great emotional anchor of ten long eventful years, but Sane Guruji's action also gave Bhai a great sense of personal failure. As it is, constant emotional appeal that Bhai had to make to Sane Guruji was

inimical to his nature, and his failure to make emotional appeal work probably shook Bhai's faith in playing on emotions even further.

There was another worrying aspect that began developing during this period 1947 – 1954. Even before the Socialists split from the (Indian National Congress Party in 1948 (earlier, the Socialists were an adjunct of the Congress called Congress Socialist Party), there was disquieting realization for Bhai that there was much less harmony and camaraderie between the top leaders of the Socialist Movement than was necessary in such an idealistic environment. This presaged the disunity and eventual destruction of ideological Socialist Movement, which commenced in 1955. This disharmony among socialist leaders surfaced and developed into a significant disrupter after the relatively poor (and in the eyes of the Socialist leaders unexpected) showing of the Socialist Party in India's first General Elections as a universal adult franchise-based mass democracy in 1952. It was very severely aggravated and came to the boil following the events after Congress Party's Avadi Resolution in 1955 professing socialism, and police firing on unarmed agitators in Travancore–Cochin by the Socialist led coalition government of Pattam Thanu Pillai in Kerala, which led to the split in the Party.

Having said this, at personal level, 1947 – 54, were years of many happy developments besides his marriage. In 1948, Bhai was first projected within the Socialist Party at the national level as a promising young leader. At the founding national conference of Socialist Party in 1948, at the young age of 26, Bhai was appointed a Joint Secretary of the Party, and earlier in 1947, he was sent to Antwerp (Belgium) as the sole fraternal delegate of India's Socialist Party to the International Socialist Conference. In 1953, he was sent as Secretary of the Asian Socialist Bureau to Rangoon. In all the three above events JP played a major role. Finally, in July 1954, I, my parents' only child, was born to complete the family.

Until the split in Praja Socialist Party in 1955 (PSP which had been formed in 1953 through the merger of Acharya J. B. Kripalani's Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party/KMPP and Socialist Party), Bhai was the centre of adulation amongst the rank-and-file party workers as well as leaders, young and old. Until the split, which led to permanent parting of ways between JP and Lohia,

Bhai was the “blue eyed boy” of the Socialist Party. After the acrimonious split in the PSP, many of his old friends and comrades, particularly in Maharashtra, including his earliest mentor and leader, SM Joshi became his vehement detractors. Three subsequent attempts of the Socialists to unite, first in 1960s to form Samyukta Socialist Party (SSP), then in 1971 after electoral defeat of the Grand Alliance in the parliamentary general elections to form Socialist Party, and finally, in 1977 to merge in a larger and divergent mass under the banner of Janata Party, after the grand electoral victory in 1977 against Indira Gandhi’s Emergency restoring normal democracy, did not really bring merger of hearts. The SP/SSP and PSP factions remained quite polarized and antagonistic in all these three merged entities. When Janata Party Split in 1979, leaders and activists of the erstwhile PSP faction, were amongst the bitterest and most vociferous critics of Bhai, who held him largely responsible for splitting the Janata Party and bringing down Morarji Desai’s Government, which eventually led to the dissolution of Lok Sabha and elections in 1980, and to the return of Indira Gandhi to power.

The first split in the Socialist Movement in 1955, which was triggered by unjust disciplinary actions against Bhai and Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, for upholding the official Socialist Party’s political line against towing the line of “cooperation with the Congress Party,” and for demanding accountability by a government, woke Bhai up to the bitter realities and rivalries in political life, which he had hitherto not experienced. This bitter parting of ways with dear friends and comrades of years, particularly with beloved JP (who had already begun moving away into Sarvodaya) and SM was emotionally very trying. The aftermath of the split and political developments in the following years, brought home to Bhai and perhaps to Dr. Lohia that they were at heart and in reality, not mass leaders of JP’s style and stature.

I certainly think that the break-up in the Socialist Movement so early in India’s post-independence democratic existence and permanent parting of ways between the Party’s two tallest leaders, charismatic JP and intellectually brilliant but maverick Dr. Lohia, forever destroyed the prospects of ideological and effective socialist alternative before the people of India. Certainly, on both sides of the Socialist divide, there were dedicated and brilliant leaders who made their mark in parliament and outside later, but Indian socialists had

forever missed the bus in terms of impacting the destiny of India for its betterment.

Bhai did realize that Lohia and he may begin new strategic and policy initiatives. They may provide intellectual insights and new theoretical underpinning to help unravel a situation. They may start mass political action and not remain arm-chair revolutionaries, preaching to others and remaining on the sidelines. But both of them, for their own respective reasons, were not mass leaders of the standing and popularity of JP or SM in their own spheres.

Dr. Lohia and Bhai were not just intellectuals and political philosophers. They were all their lives men of action, but more in the manner of gladiators or commandos. Both of them were at their best, dueling individually against their rivals in larger public interest, when they were unencumbered by the task of carrying others, whether those others were their own party comrades, political allies or the mass electorate.

Lohia was probably intellectually more audacious and original, but Bhai brought greater intellectual vigour and rigour while developing the ideas to their fullest. Both Dr. Lohia and Bhai had the openness to question the validity of their ideas and doctrine, their own analyses, views and conclusions in the face of new facts and evidence; possibly Bhai possessed this quality in greater measure. Dr. Lohia had far greater sense of personal destiny, charisma and a kind of cult following that Bhai did not possess nor develop. Dr. Lohia had a sense of grand strategy. But in addition to the sharp sense of strategy, Bhai had cultivated greater discipline, industry, stamina and perseverance. Lohia often tended to personal acrimony and hostility in his interactions with rivals, which in my opinion, often overwhelmed his great charm and ability to keep people together. Bhai developed and deployed better tactical sense, superior negotiating skills and ability to get into details and possessed greater politeness, which made him effective in difficult inner-party and inter-party situations. Bhai was totally free of a sense of jealousy and personal acrimony, and all his life made good friends among his political opponents in the Congress or elsewhere, with whom on political issues he was strongly opposed.

In the Socialist Movement, apart from Dr. Lohia, Acharya Narendra Deva, Minoo Masani, Asoka Mehta and N. G. alias Nanasaheb Goray, all of them Bhai's seniors, were of similar intellectual inclination and scholastic temper. But Acharyaji soon died and Minoo Masani and Asoka Mehta drifted away from the socialist movement, the former to form Swatantra Party and the latter to go into the Congress. Other than JP, none of them had real mass appeal. Most of Bhai's contemporaries were less intellectually inclined, and tragically, the future generations of socialist leaders and activists were even less inclined to scholarship and study. Number of books and articles that both Dr. Lohia and Bhai wrote lend credence to this claim. Bhai tried hard to cultivate this habit of study in his younger comrades, but excepting a few protégés, hardly anyone followed his example of deep study and cultivating mastery over parliamentary and legislative procedure.

Apart from his massive intellect and urge for action, Dr. Lohia had his own charisma and cult following. He had entered public life to serve the down trodden. He did not ever seek any wealth or office for himself. But like all human beings, Dr. Lohia too had his failings. He lacked patience, perseverance and discipline. He was truly a "restless spirit," more comfortable in agitational mode and starting something new. He was too prone to being dramatic and polemical than persuasive, particularly in his speech. While he possessed most engaging charm and treated both a prince and pauper, men and women, young and old, with equal courtesy, dignity and affection, in debate he could be extremely abrasive, on the verge of being personal. He often took extreme positions rather than practical ones. He had little patience for working out compromises, which would win substance. And the worst part was he could accept defeat with ill grace and was not above flattery. His taking defeat with ill grace was surprising, because Dr. Lohia strongly advocated fighting for important lost causes, which in Hindi he picturesquely called "*niraashaa kaa kartavya.*"

Some of these qualities of Dr. Lohia had unfortunate consequences. His style made people of moderate temperament and opinion, whether within the Socialist Movement or outside, quite uncomfortable and at times downright hostile to him. His actions could be easily misunderstood and deliberately distorted. He provided an easy target to his detractors,

particularly the anglicized intellectuals and the English media, who could unfairly depict him as a crank. The worst part was that his cult followers, during his life time and thereafter, tried to ape his style or only resorted to agitational tactics or took rigid ideological positions that flew in the face of facts, logic or public sentiment. While Dr. Lohia for all his combativeness was an extremely well read, brilliant intellectual, most of his cult followers relied on the use of “vocal cords and lung power,” rather than on honing and using their “grey matter”.

Many readers, particularly Dr. Lohia’s followers and admirers, may feel offended at my seemingly unkind assessment of Dr. Lohia and his “cult followers”, and may think I speak out of turn and with prejudice against him. The fact is contrary. Dr. Lohia and I were very close since I was a little baby. Whenever he visited Mumbai, he stayed with us. We flew kites, played marbles. We were extremely fond of each other and I was utterly devastated when he died tragically out of post-surgical complications in 1967. It is ironical that Delhi’s Willingdon Hospital, where Dr. Lohia died, probably due to gross negligence (he developed septicemia after undergoing prostate gland surgery), is named after him.

The reason for my seemingly harsh, but I would submit, objective and accurate critique of Dr. Lohia, is that Dr. Lohia’s failings had profound impact on the future of not only the Socialist Movement in India, but on “ideological politics” in India.

After the split in PSP, soon after celebrating my first birthday on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 1955, Bhai went to participate in Goa Liberation Movement, which had been originally started in June 1946 by Dr. Lohia to resist and overthrow the despotic Portuguese rule of Goa. It had now been strongly revived. This was a difficult decision, fraught with consequences. But as usual, my mother was supportive of Bhai’s decision. Bhai and his team of satyagrahis were severely beaten up by the police. There were rumours (in fact reports in a Marathi newspaper) that Bhai had died due to the police assault in their custody. Those were terrible moments for my mother, who was barely 27 with a one-year-old child. Like a true satyagrahi, Bhai refused to defend himself against the charges saying that since he did not recognize Portuguese authority over

Goa, there was no question of recognizing the military tribunal's authority to try him for seeking to peacefully oust the Portuguese from Goa. He was sentenced to 12 years of imprisonment.

However, after nineteen months of incarceration, he and many other detainees in Goa, were released under a general amnesty that the Portuguese Prime Minister (a virtual dictator) Antonio de Oliveira Salazar declared in early 1957 at the behest of Pope Pius XII. Although I had accompanied my mother a couple of times to visit Bhai in the prison in Goa, when Bhai returned, he was quite a stranger to me. For a few days, I did not want him around (maybe this was a little child's way of protesting what he perceived as an act of abandonment by his father), but soon Bhai won me over with his charm, and for the rest of his life, we were very close. Although we spent much less time together, I was more inclined to Bhai's viewpoints than my Aai's.

While Bhai was in Portuguese prison in Goa, Dr. Lohia founded and launched Socialist Party, which had broken away from PSP. This phase, from 1955 to 1963, was an attempt of building and running the Party on the basis of most pristine principles. The focus was on building a cadre-based party of the masses, with lots of organizational, educational and constructive work, coupled with peaceful agitation on public issues and against injustice and participation in elections (in Hindi Dr. Lohia called it *Phaavadaa, Jail Aur Vote Kee Rajneeti*). Elections were to be contested, but candidates were to be offered for election only in those constituencies where the party had organizational strength in terms of enrolled party workers - I think the norm laid down was that enrolled party workers should be at least 1% of the total registered voters in that constituency - and contesting without any electoral alliance.

During this period, *Samyukta Maharashtra* movement had also got underway. This was a pan-political party movement, under the aegis of "Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti," demanding creation of Maharashtra State as a linguistically demarcated state, with Mumbai as its capital city, apart from other demands. Linguistic ordering of states after independence was part of the pre-independence manifesto of the Congress Party itself, apart from that being an agenda of the socialists. However, in the wake of the searing

experience of partition, Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and other senior Congress leaders turned away from this promise, fearing that creating states based on language may cause greater fissiparous tendencies. Eventually, after a lot of agitation, violence, state suppression and acrimony, linguistic states were created, but with will grace and too late.

When Bhai was released from Goa prison, he was accorded a hero's welcome back in Mumbai. Soon the second general elections were due. Dr. Lohia prevailed upon Bhai to contest in the 1957 general elections, which included parliament as well as state assembly elections. Bhai became Socialist Party's candidate from Bandra-Khar Assembly Constituency in Mumbai. Then, we lived in Khar. Socialist Party was a constituent of Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti and had actively participated in the movement. However, since the party's policy was of "going it alone" in the elections, Bhai contested on the Socialist Party rather than on "Samiti" ticket.

Samiti leadership was more than willing to offer Bhai support and endorsement, provided he would have contested as their panelist. In pursuance of party's policy, this accommodation was not possible. This seeming obduracy infuriated Samiti. To the Samiti leadership, this amounted to hypocrisy and duplicity. After having participated in the movement to set up a separate camp was totally unacceptable to them. Samiti also feared that this would split the non-Congress vote, and help the Congress win the seat. All these points were valid. But the Socialists would not yield. Samiti leadership could have been graceful and at least let Bhai, a hero of Goa Liberation Movement, contest as a Socialist Party candidate without offering any candidate from their side, if not their active support. If accommodation with principles was not possible for the Socialists, the idea of getting Bhai to contest could have been dropped by the Socialist Party. But having built support for the party in Bandra-Khar constituency, the party was not prepared to shy away from the first election after its formation.

As a result, Samiti leaders and workers became furious. All their anger exploded against Bhai and Aai. The vituperative campaign, particularly in the Marathi press, was more against Bhai than the Congress. During Bhai's imprisonment in Goa, my mother had been politically very active and had,

with other party workers, helped build good base and a vast circle of friends in Bandra-Khar area. All this while teaching in the college, supplementing her income with tuitions and single handedly raising me. As could have been expected, Bhai lost his security deposit. Aai was very heart broken. Bhai too was sorely disappointed. But the unintended result of the rejection by his home state and city of residence of his candidature was that Bhai became more of a national leader rather than leader from Maharashtra, representing the state.

Bhai's opportunity to represent people in a legislature came after seven years, in the form of bye-election in the last quarter of calendar year 1964. After the fateful 1957 election, Bhai contested six elections to the Lok Sabha; two bye-elections (in 1964 and 1973) and four general elections (in 1967, 1971, 1977 and 1980) from distant Bihar and never from his home state of Maharashtra. For the first three elections, his constituency was Monghyr/Munger, and on the latter three occasions it was an adjoining constituency, Banka. While Bhai lost 1971 and 1980 general elections, he was elected to the Lok Sabha four times, a relatively small first victory in 1964 and three resounding victories in 1967, 1973 and 1977. The unfortunate part is that although he won four times, he could ever get a single full five-year term. His last election, in 1980, was in a way similar to 1957 election. In 1980, he was unjustly stigmatized as breaker and wrecker of Janata Party. This was coupled with strong local caste hostilities. Common people reliant on agriculture were apathetic due to poor monsoon causing near famine the previous year. For Bhai, Aai and me, this election campaign was most heart wrenching. There was no evidence of idealism anywhere, including among many party workers and local leaders. It was the most expensive election that Bhai ever contested. I suspect, the 1980 election spend would have been pretty close to all previous election campaigns put together. In all earlier campaigns the extent of spend was miniscule. In today's age of expensive elections, it is hard to imagine that Bhai had fought six and won four Lok Sabha elections on a shoe string budget. During the course of the 1980 campaign, one-night Bhai told me, that whether he won or lost, this was the last election he would personally contest. The mercenary approach all round him repelled and pained him no end.

The first term during which Bhai earned his place as an outstanding opposition member of parliament lasted a little over two years, the next term was of around four years, the third was little over three years, since he resigned with effect from 18<sup>th</sup> March 1976, in protest against the immoral extension of the 5<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha's five-year term by Indira Gandhi in 1976 abusing the Emergency provisions (only Sharad Yadav resigned with Bhai, drawing inspiration from him). The fourth and last term was less than three years. Thus, instead full 20 years that four victories in normal general elections would have given an MP, Bhai was a member only for these twelve years, of which one year (1975-76) was spent under Emergency detention, and the last nearly two and half - three years were spent as General Secretary of Janata Party, and then, after the split of the Janata Party, as General Secretary of Lok Dal, both short lived ruling parties.

After 1977 victory, Bhai chose party position over a ministerial position, primarily to work towards strengthening the new party, which had many disparate constituents. Being a senior party office bearer, during his last term, Bhai had to assume very inactive role as a parliamentarian. He spoke on the floor of the house on very few occasions. But even then, his effectiveness in that forum was unsurpassed.

Twice it was to oppose his own party government's proposed legislative actions. This was when he had to oppose the anti-defection, (rather anti-dissent), bill that Morarji Bhai's Government sought to introduce without any inner-party debate, and against Bhai's admonishment that the bill in its current form was draconian and anti-democratic. Bhai spoke for barely 10-15 minutes on the floor of the Lok Sabha, and the government was forced to hastily withdraw the bill. One other time, it was to prevent the Janata Party Government from reneging from their election pledge to repeal MISA and Preventive Detention. Bhai's intervention on the floor of the house compelled the government to reconsider its stand. Eventually, both these enactments were repealed.

Finally, when Minister of Home Affairs, Charan Singh and his Ministry could not bring Indira Gandhi to books for the Emergency excesses, it was eventually Bhai's 'privilege motion' on the "Maruti" affair that led to Indira

Gandhi being punished. She was detained/imprisoned for a day and her membership of the Lok Sabha was struck down. While Bhai was in favour of the first, he was opposed to striking down her membership from practical and ethical point of view. He thought this was a vengeful act and amounted to disrespecting the will of the people, who had elected her from Chikamagloor. He also rightly thought that this would make a “martyr” of Indiraji. He was right. Indira Gandhi was soon returned to the Lok Sabha by the people of Medak with a big margin.

As his son, I would like to proudly assert that probably there has been no other 20<sup>th</sup> century parliamentarian, in India or in any other democracy, who contributed so much as a private opposition member. We will look at his contribution in Lok Sabha further on in this article. I would be surprised if I am proved wrong on this seemingly tall claim!!

The outcome of Bhai’s defeat in the 1957 elections was that for the next few years, Bhai and his other socialist comrades, particularly George Fernandes, focused on trade union work. While the impact of this was more restricted to Mumbai, the achievements of the Socialist trade unions, in successfully espousing the cause of workers, were remarkable. After the period of 1948-52, this was probably one rare phase, when Indian socialists, rather those based in Mumbai, demonstrated outstanding collective leadership, leveraging each other’s strengths. George Fernandes, V. N. (Anna) Sane, Bal Dandavate (Prof. Madhu Dandavate’s younger brother, who had stayed with Dr. Lohia led Socialist Party, while Madhu Dandavate was with PSP), Narayan Phenany, Prabhakar More, Jagannath Jadhav, Babu Mumbarkar, S. B. (Dada) Naik, Mrinal Gore, P. B. (Baburao) Samant, Tulsi Boda, and many other party comrades conducted many political and trade union agitations and won significant victories, particularly for Mumbai’s Municipal Workers and BEST workers.

It was during this phase, when George Fernandes, who could bring Mumbai to a halt (Mumbai bandh), became really powerful trade union leader and mass leader. Work and victories during these years set him up for his “giant killing” act of defeating a powerful senior Congress leader S. K. Patil in

the 1967 general elections to become a member of the 4<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha, and thereafter, to become active and prominent on the national political scene.

The events of 1953-57 affected Bhai significantly. From being the most universally accepted young leader in the socialist circles he was unnecessarily looked upon as a rival and competitor, by many leaders, his seniors and contemporaries, both within his faction of the party as well as in PSP. Of course, his old friendships, with those who joined the Lohia led Socialist Party retained old warmth, but thereafter, close relationships that Bhai developed within his own party circles were mostly with his young comrades, whom he continuously guided and supported. He played the role of a mentor to many young leaders like Mohan Singh, Mukhtar Anees, Raj Kumar Jain, etc., in the manner SM, JP and Lohia had played in providing him opportunities and pushing him to the forefront.

The other outcome of 1957 electoral defeat personally for Bhai was that when he finally entered the legislative arena in his early 40s, he did so directly at the national level – in the Lok Sabha being sent in by Bihar. In any case, Bhai's mental universe was not parochial or provincial. Now representing another state took him completely away from parochial Maharashtrian interests. The fact that parochial and provincial sentiment had led to his unfair, but resounding electoral defeat, turned him further away from provincial considerations. Being in the national legislature gave him all-India perspective and all-India prominence and recognition once he started functioning effectively in Parliament. From 1964 onwards, Bhai ceased to be identified with Maharashtra and its local politics, not only from his own stand point but also in the eyes of the people of Maharashtra.

Mumbai's humid climate did not agree with Bhai's health. He suffered from asthma a lot more in Mumbai than in the dry climate of Delhi or Bihar. Hence, even after his retirement or withdrawal from active party politics in 1983, Bhai continued to live in Delhi, until his death in January, 1995. So effectively it was us - his wife, son, home and old friends and comrades that periodically brought him to Mumbai after being elected a member of parliament.

While Bhai was a staunch and relentless opponent in an adversarial role, there was no personal animosity or jealousy in him. He was always appreciative of fine qualities in others. He could give dispassionate and correct advice even to his opponents. Often Bhai was accused of having personal hatred towards Nehru-Gandhi family. This is completely incorrect. When Indira Gandhi was faced with Bhai's *privilege motion* about excesses during the Emergency mentioned above, through her confidantes, she sought Bhai's advice on whether she should apologize to the houses of Parliament. Bhai sent Indira Gandhi a message that if her motive for tendering apology was to seek leniency, rather than a tendering a genuine heartfelt apology for the excesses of Emergency, she should not apologize, since the mood within Janata Party and its allies was unforgiving and she would not achieve that end. Later, on Sanjay Gandhi's death in an air crash and upon Indiraji's tragic assassination, he wrote very sensitive condolence letters to Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi respectively, and in the latter letter, he urged Rajiv Gandhi take lead and to stop organized attacks on the Sikh community as an act of vendetta.

From 1955 onwards, until he retired from active politics, despite being averse to and above intrigue and power struggle, Bhai had to cope with internal conflicts, intrigue and rivalry foisted upon him by some of his party colleagues. This was more so after Dr. Lohia's death, who died suddenly, and had not declared any heir to his intellectual and ideological legacy. Bhai's ideological and intellectual leadership was constantly resisted and questioned by many fellow leaders like Raj Narain and Karpoori Thakur, well versed in power politics, when it did not suit their purpose, and by colleagues like Kishen Patnaik, who were unwilling to change their ideological positions even a little bit, in the face of reality. Bhai's political sagacity, foresight or courageous principled stand on issues was often of little avail. Resigning from the membership of the immorally extended Lok Sabha was one such stark instance, where no one else other than Sharad Yadav followed, and this when many of these prominent leaders (MPs) were in prison and were in no position to function as MPs in the Lok Sabha.

I came to observe that progressively Bhai somewhat despaired of convincing people, even his comrades, to act on principles that militated

against their short-term personal interests. Eventually, he decided that he would follow his convictions and conscience, whether others supported him or not. Although this situation saddened him deeply, public praise or party support or public wrath and party apathy on such issues of principles, never deterred him from acting in accordance with his principles and conscience.

After his withdrawal from active party politics, many leaders (from among his erstwhile comrades and from other parties) came to consult him, confer with him and seek his advice. I remember an instance. Once when I was visiting Delhi, Devi Lal had visited Bhai, and the discussion involved his supporting and promoting interests of his son Om Prakash Chautala. In his characteristic frank manner, Bhai told Devi Lal that if on one hand Devi Lal criticized dynastic tendencies of Nehru-Gandhi family and other prominent families in the Congress, he should set an example by not espousing the cause of his son. Devi Lal nodded sagely and mumbled that there was a point in what Bhai suggested. After he left, Bhai smiled at me ruefully and said, like him almost everyone who comes to confer with me, want me to support them and give them “rational and ideological underpinning and affirmation” for justifying whatever they are bent on doing to seek their personal purpose. If I offer a bitter pill like I just did, this advice is going to be totally ignored. That is exactly what happened in this case.

In my younger days, having been exposed to politics all the while since I was a baby, I was very interested in politics. Bhai told me, if you want to enter full-time active politics, I will withdraw from active politics and not promote your cause at all. There are enough and more sons and daughters riding on their parents’ positions and influence, doing more than enough damage to this country. I love you dearly but I refuse to be “blind” in the manner of a Dhritarashtra. If you want to pursue principled ideological politics, prepare to make yourself to be worthy, prepare for hardships, failures and disappointments all your life and start from grass roots, without any support from me, other than using me to test your views and ideas, as a sounding board. Mercifully I had enough sense to realize that Bhai’s being in politics was in greater interest of the country than my dabbling in politics. I also knew that if with his fine qualities, discipline and persistence Bhai was able to have such limited influence in the direction of promoting principled politics, I was

likely to be a dismal failure. In any case, demonstration of unrestrained and unabashed lust for power during the formation of Janata Party Government in Delhi in the spring-summer of 1977, and the searing experience of utterly mercenary 1980 Lok Sabha election campaign in Banka, cured me of all my desire to get into politics.

Coming back to the earlier theme, apart from “go it alone” policy in relation to electoral alliances and “not offering candidates,” unless there was adequate party organization in a constituency, there were a few other important principle-based policies that Lohia led Socialist Party followed during the eight-year period - 1955-63. No candidate of Socialist Party was allowed to contest from more than one constituency. No candidate who had been defeated in direct election to Lok Sabha, Legislative Assembly, etc., could offer himself for indirect election to the Rajya Sabha or a Legislative Council, until the end of that term of Lok Sabha or Assembly, that is, effectively for 5 years. There was to be unfettered freedom of speech within the party, but restricted freedom for individual action. And finally, there was recourse to election through secret ballot to elect the National Executive, State Executives and Office Bearers of the Party, in place of earlier practice of building consensus within the Party to select these top functionaries.

Unfortunately, many of these policies did not work. Aspirations and greed of leaders, even in a political party imbued with sense of ideology and working for the downtrodden, overtook principles. Leaders from southern parts of India such as Mulka Govind Reddy and P. V. G. Raju violated the rules of about not seeking indirect elections after losing direct elections. Dr. Lohia was uncompromising and took disciplinary action against them. This led to the exit of large factions of leaders and workers led by these two leaders in the South, permanently weakening Socialist Party in Andhra and Karnataka. As in 1957 elections, even in 1962, Jawaharlal Nehru’s and Congress Party’s ascendancy stayed intact. The entire opposition did pretty badly and Socialist Party was even worse off.

After facing two successive electoral defeats, Socialists in general, and Dr. Lohia particular were despondent. India’s humiliating defeat in 1962 border war with China, incensed Dr. Lohia. He was now even more convinced

that his old hero, Jawaharlal and his old alma mater, the Congress Party, did not deserve to continue their misrule of India in perpetuity. In his mind, there was urgency to break this deadlock and defeat the Congress, beginning with bye-elections, by hook or by crook. But at this juncture no “ideological” alternative could be presented. Socialist Party was not a force to reckon with nor was PSP much better off. The two factions were still bitterly opposed to each other, as is normally the case in any internecine conflict, family feud or civil war. This desperate situation, emanating from fundamental weakness of the ideologically based parties, Socialists and Communists (both weakened by splits – the Communists split in 1964), led to a new political formulation.

One alternative before Dr. Lohia was to persist with principled party building activity for the next ten-fifteen years. The other alternative was to relook at some of the principles and review those which were not being very helpful, and then build the party on less rigid lines. However, Dr. Lohia thought of another strategy altogether, which later on came to be known as “Non-Congressism.” In my view, this strategy which became successful in ending the unbroken Congress rule, has however been most destructive of any ideological or principled politics in India. More and more of coalition politics, unprincipled alliances and defections that we have seen in the last 45 years, can be largely attributed to the strategy that Dr. Lohia launched in 1963. This new policy and strategy of getting together all non-Congress parties irrespective of their ideological colour was a complete about turn from eight hard years of principled, almost puritanical, go it alone politics.

The Congress Party had won more than two thirds seats in the Lok Sabha in three successive general elections (1952, 1957 & 1962) on the basis of plurality of votes rather than majority of the valid polled votes. Just 41% to 44% of popular votes (support) had given the Congress such disproportionate gains in these three elections. This was clearly because 56% to 59% of the remaining opposition vote was split between candidates of multiple opposition parties. Dr. Lohia feared that as long as this situation persisted, Nehru and the Congress would continue to win even with further weakened electoral base. Now Dr. Lohia sought to combine the “entire opposition” against the Congress.

Bhai was totally opposed to this new strategy of indiscriminate alliances. He rightly thought that this strategy was not based on strength, but arose only out of weakness and desperation. He was utterly convinced that it would soon lead to total destruction of politics based on principles, ideology and programmes. In its stead, rank opportunism and lusty power seeking would be enthroned. He was also convinced that this development would move the focus of party workers and leaders away from long-term constructive and agitational work to electoral and summit politics, pure and simple. He strongly opposed Dr. Lohia's new policy initiative. As a mark of his protest, which he had communicated before to Lohia, he resigned from the National Executive of the Socialist Party and did not attend the party's Calcutta Conference. Comrades like George Fernandes, who were in agreement with Bhai, tried to resist the move. But Dr. Lohia was adamant and they could not prevail upon him or majority of their other party comrades, who smelt a break-through with this new strategy.

Soon after the Calcutta Conference, Dr. Lohia rushed to Mumbai to persuade Bhai to accept the new policy that he had proposed. He valued Bhai too much to ignore his viewpoint and to alienate him. As usual he stayed with us. For the next 3-4 days Bhai and he endlessly debated the issue. The house was ringing with this discussion. I was a precocious and politically interested child of eight. As I have mentioned earlier, Dr. Lohia was like a friend to me. So, I remember having echoed Bhai's thoughts and asked Dr. Lohia why should this policy of working with those opposed to Socialist Party's policy be good. Dr. Lohia did not dismiss my question, but he did not answer it directly. He told me if I listened to the discussion carefully, I would get to know. While Bhai argued about the highly destructive potential of Non-Congressism, Dr. Lohia argued that it was a temporary expedient, necessary to break the frozen situation and to bring about fluidity in the political scenario. Soon after defeating the Congress, there would be a realignment of forces, during which they could bring together all democratic, secular and progressive forces on the basis of ideology and programme, Dr. Lohia asserted. Bhai argued that while he agreed that the Congress misrule was doing immense harm to the country and that it was necessary to oust Congress from power soon, this strategy would be irreversible. He said that it was like opening the proverbial Pandora's Box. Once party leaders and workers saw this easy way out, it

would be fond hope that anyone would want to go back to principled and ideological politics.

If we look at 45 years of political trends, it is clear that Bhai's analysis and viewpoint have proven to be prophetic. Now you can't even get a whiff of ideological politics. It is all expediency to win power. But to be fair to Dr. Lohia, it was not that he was oblivious to this imminent danger. But out of frustration of repeated electoral defeats and failure to run a principled party without problems Lohia sought this expedient. He felt that unless they could show some progress, some forward movement, it would be difficult to "keep the flock together and in high morale". Dr. Lohia was willing to take the risk. Soon Bhai realized that out of his intense disappointment and anger at Jawaharlal, his old hero, and the Congress, Dr. Lohia had absolutely set his heart on the new strategy. He would not budge an inch. On the other hand, in the given political situation, Bhai did not have any better and quicker alternative to offer that could produce the desired results with near certainty, which could have changed Dr. Lohia's mind. It was a virtual stand-off.

Bhai was in turmoil. This was probably the first time Bhai had to really act against his intellectual conviction, his principles and conscience. It was like Caesar crossing the Rubicon. As he had seen it, there would be no going back. He could either stick to his decision, refuse to respond to Lohia's plea to at least give the new policy a try for a short period or break-up with him. And it clearly looked that there would be a break since Dr. Lohia was absolutely decided upon this course and majority in the party seemed to be with him on this. The other course was to go with Dr. Lohia against his own judgment and conscience. There wasn't a third choice.

Eventually Bhai decided to go with Dr. Lohia. In fact, a few years later, at Dr. Lohia's behest, at Kota Conference of SSP in 1966, he fully developed and articulated the strategy or policy of Non-Congressism. Once he embraced Non-Congressism, Bhai relentlessly and most skillfully pushed this programme within the constraints of the situation. Bhai persisted with this strategy not only until Dr. Lohia was alive, but long after his death, until Bhai himself retired from active politics, but certainly until Rajiv Gandhi's assassination.

With Rajiv Gandhi's death, and reluctance of Sonia, Priyanka and Rahul to immediately enter active politics in its wake, it appeared that the "Nehru-Gandhi Dynasty" had suffered an eclipse, may be a permanent change and reversal of fortunes. This situation created a dim possibility for the Congress Party to reform and rejuvenate itself, and begin to function as a Party with internal democracy. Even at that stage, the Congress Party was the only truly national party. These factors, combined with utterly unscrupulous and strident actions of the "Sangh Parivaar", made Bhai take a somewhat conciliatory stance or position towards the Congress. In fact, his last article, which was published on the morning after his death, Bhai had exhorted Congressmen to cleanse and revive their party in the national interest, and he had also appealed to the "Sangh Parivaar" to follow the tolerant, eclectic tradition of Hindu philosophy, rather than to continue on the destructive path of intolerance and hatred.

When I reflect on the reasons why Bhai eventually agreed to embrace Dr. Lohia's policy of Non-Congressism against his own well considered judgment and conscience, I realize the reasons were both practical and emotional. Not only did Bhai have immense respect for Dr. Lohia's many fine qualities, he also had great affection for him. Bhai was also keenly aware that Dr. Lohia's personality was such that if he were to politically break with Dr. Lohia on an issue of such paramount importance and so close to Lohia's heart, Dr. Lohia would, in all probability, completely sever personal relations with Bhai forever, regardless of however much pain it would have caused both of them. After the searing and heart-breaking experience of 1953-57, which led to painful and acrimonious parting with old friends and comrades of 15-20 years past, including parting with people like SM and JP, Bhai did not want to inflict upon himself the risk of another emotional trauma.

On the practical level, Bhai was keenly aware of his personal limitations as a mass leader. After the split in PSP and JP going into Bhoodaan and Sarvodaya, Dr. Lohia was the only "messiah" or prophet that secular, democratic, socialism had in India. He had, in ample measure, dynamism, charisma, courage, selflessness, audacity and intellectual prowess required to take the socialist movement forward. Bhai also could not have been sure of how many of his comrades would stand up with him against Dr. Lohia and his

new policy. The experience of the past eight years of adherence to principles was not uniformly good and the new policy certainly showed an easier way to power to the leaders and cadres. It clearly brought in the badly needed ray of hope for early change in political and electoral fortunes. Based on these considerations, the majority of the delegates had already endorsed Dr. Lohia's line at the Calcutta Meeting. In politics numbers count!! If only a few comrades – leaders and cadres – were to join Bhai, and this was the most likely prospect, their little group would be of no political significance and have no future. In 1963, Bhai was already 41 years old. From the age of 15-16, he had spent 25 years of his life in selfless political work. Although he had wider interests and a multi-faceted personality, he had chosen the path of political action rather than anything else. As he often said, he had chosen to pursue "ethics" over "aesthetics," or "shreyas" – duty over "preyas" – the things he loved. It was difficult for him to revisit this choice. Bhai also had a burning faith that democratic socialism would be the saviour of our nation that had suffered misfortunes for long.

Bhai also was keenly aware that just as Dr. Lohia and JP had complementary and supplementary strengths that had the potential to make them a formidable political combination, Dr. Lohia and Bhai as well as Bhai and George Fernandes also had complementary and supplementary strengths. These could serve the socialist movement and the cause of national upliftment better if they stayed together. Dr. Lohia needed and valued Bhai and Bhai valued and needed Dr. Lohia. Thus, to break-up with Dr. Lohia and snuff out the possibility of effective joint political action was not wise.

I think the final factor that weighed on Bhai's decision to relent and go with Dr. Lohia's strategy of Non-Congressism was the debt of gratitude. In 1955, when an unjust disciplinary action had been taken against Bhai by the Mumbai Praja Socialist Party on the issue of criticizing the move of cooperation with the Congress, it was Dr. Lohia who had rallied around and supported Bhai, even though it was one of the factors that led to the party split. It was ironic that relations with the Congress (now the exact opposite of cooperation) had come to haunt them. Bhai felt he could not desert Dr. Lohia. So, he fell in line.

One can only speculate what would have happened if Bhai had refused to budge and in his usual characteristic manner stood his ground. Would Dr. Lohia have relented and changed his mind about the new strategy? If yes, how soon? Or would he have “walked out” on Bhai forever? What would have happened in either case? Would either of these developments have helped the country and the socialist movement or hurt or would they have been irrelevant? These questions remain!!

With informal inauguration of Non-Congressism, coupled with Nehru’s and the Congress Party’s tarnished image after the 1962 winter debacle, in 1963, the fortunes of opposition parties started to change. Acharya J. B. Kripalani, Minoo Masani, Dr. Lohia and Bhai, all entered the third Lok Sabha during 1963-64, through bye-election victories. Their entry, particularly Dr. Lohia’s entry changed the tenor of opposition functioning, which hitherto had caused little discomfiture to the Congress. Until Lohia’s entry, if I am not mistaken, in eleven years, Nehru’s Congress Government never had to face a single *No Confidence Motion*. All this changed almost overnight with the entry of these people. Now the formidable opposition talent, some of which was already present but had been more dormant and milder now augmented by these four, mounted relentless attack on the government’s misdeeds. First, it was Jawaharlal Nehru’s Government, then Lal Bahadur Shastri’s Government, and finally Indira Gandhi’s Government that has to face virtually a daily ordeal. Sometimes these were concerted attacks. But more often than not they were individually mounted. Of course, by the time Bhai got elected in November of 1964, Jawaharlal Nehru was no more. He had passed away earlier in May, 1964. Bhai therefore did not get an opportunity to duel with the tallest leader of post-independence India.

Dr. Lohia and Maniram Bagri in the Lok Sabha and Raj Narain in the Rajya Sabha often resorted to walk-outs and acrimonious tactics, which enabled the presiding authorities, particularly Speaker of the Lok Sabha, Sardar Hukum Singh, to silence them or suspend them or expunge those parts of the proceedings in which they had spoken. For an initial period of 7-8 months, Bhai tended to fly in formation with his leader Dr. Lohia and other member comrades like Maniram Bagri. But he found that this was not

effective, and Hukum Singh could effectively thwart them and the press was unsympathetic to their tactics and their cause.

So, he decided to break away from these ineffective tactics and fully use his habits of industry, deep study, investigative skills, public contact and above all mastery over the Constitution of India and the Rules of Parliamentary Practices and Procedures. He more or less permanently broke away from the methods of his other strident comrades and rarely walked-out of the house or boycotted the proceedings or made noisy scenes. He certainly used his powerful resonant voice and chaste Hindi to capture attention. He also started mobilizing combined efforts with other opposition leaders.

In the next year or so, that is, by 1966 Monsoon Session, despite Speaker Hukum Singh's patently partisan autocratic ways, Bhai established his complete ascendancy in the Lok Sabha. Misdemeanours of many Congress ministers from C. Subramaniam to Sachin Choudhary, many bureaucrats, industrialists and businessmen were exposed. Innumerable matters of public interest were debated. Parliament soon moved from being a sterile sanctum of polite debate into "a mirror reflecting the concerns of common people". Press was full of coverage of happenings in the Lok Sabha and Akashvani's daily bulletin "Today in Parliament" became as exciting as listening to running commentary of a keenly fought cricket or hockey match. Dr. Lohia, Bhai and their other SSP comrades spoke in Hindi rather than English. Unlike these days, then the media reported what effective parliamentarians did and revealed. Now media first raises issues and parliamentarians echo them on the floor of the house.

Bhai virtually used every parliamentary method and technique available in the book (many which had hardly been used in the preceding 13-14 years) – Starred Questions (during the Question Hour), Unstarred Questions, Calling Attention Notices (during the Zero Hour), Short Notice Questions, Censure Motions, No Confidence Motions, Privilege Motions, Adjournment Motions, Half-An-Hour Discussions, Cut Motions, Points of Order, Debates and Amendments to Government's Bills and Budgetary Demands, Private Members' Bills, use of various Parliamentary Committees (like Public Accounts Committee and Public Undertakings Committee and their

Reports) – to telling effect. He was never wrong on facts, law and procedure. From 1966 onwards, no Speaker including Hukum Singh was able to thwart him or curb his devastating effectiveness.

There were senior members like H. V. Kamath, who were very well versed in law and parliamentary procedure, and there were better orators than Bhai like Prakash Veer Shasrti and Atal Behari Vajpayee in Hindi and Hiren Mukherjee and Nath Pai in English. But in the midst of many luminaries, he was the most lethal, the most inventive, the most knowledgeable and well prepared and the most intrepid and quick footed. Unlike many of his other contemporaries, he raised and spoke on a very wide variety of issues. His supplementary questions during the Question Hour used to totally baffle even the most well prepared and well-versed ministers. His ability to investigate in depth and verify facts before raising an issue or launching an attack made it virtually impossible for any minister to give wishy-washy replies or obfuscate facts. He literally worked 17-18 hours a day during the session and a few weeks before the session and kept two to three of his stenographers busy. I remember during one winter session I was in Delhi. For a short session like the winter session, he had prepared and submitted over 500 Starred Questions alone. Even his charismatic leader, Dr. Lohia, was eclipsed as far as Bhai's parliamentary performance was concerned.

Bhai's stellar parliamentary performance quickly shattered the remaining credibility of the Congress Government at the centre. This combined with effective working of tactics of Non-Congressism line, were among the important factors that contributed to the stunning upsets in the 1967 General Elections. Although the Congress Party did not lose at the centre, her majority was considerably reduced. In many important states the Congress Governments were ousted to be replaced by opposition's coalition governments called Samyukta Vidhayak Dal (SVD) Governments.

While the 1967 General Elections were landmark elections politically, for Bhai and Aai, they were more than eventful. During the campaign in his own constituency, there was a murderous assault mounted on Bhai by hired goons. He had a *miraculous* hair breadth escape. While it could never be proved, the name of Congress Party and the Congress Leader Baliram Bhagat

(who was Speaker of the Lok Sabha during the Emergency) were repeatedly mentioned by people. The village where Bhai was assaulted (I think it was called Moholi–Shakarpur) was where Bhagat’s in-laws lived. This was a planned assault with a view to kill Bhai, pure and simple. It was not as if during a political rally or meeting, cadres and supporters of two opposing parties had started feuding, which had escalated into a bloody fight. The hired goons were waiting in an isolated place on a difficult terrain, where the jeep in which Bhai was traveling would have to inevitably slow down. Somehow before anyone could get killed, people from the nearby village rushed to the rescue of the ambushed party. However, what also may have contributed to the goons from doing their job quickly was spirited and courageous stand that Bhai and his local comrades like Ramdev Yadav took. They stood outside the jeep trying to reason with their attackers, without attempting to run away, or plead for mercy. It helped a great deal that the assault on this party was mounted with sticks and clubs (lathis). In today’s lawless times in Bihar, had guns and explosive dynamites been used, Bhai and his comrades would have been dead in no time.

Bhai and his injured comrades were rushed to the Civil Hospital in Monghyr City. Once more like Goa in 1955, twelve years ago, rumours were rife that Bhai had been killed. The atmosphere had become explosive. People were ready to respond with violence and seek vengeance against the most likely suspect – the Congress Party leaders and workers. However, Aai who was campaigning for my father, stepped out with the police and went all round Monghyr City and other parts of the constituency assuring people that Bhai was not in danger, and that the best way to answer this dastardly act was to comprehensively defeat the Congress in the Elections.

My mother’s calm and courageous advice worked. Not only did people calm down, they resolved to trounce the Congress at the polls. Bhai, who was laid up in the hospital with cracked ribs, badly hurt back, right arm and right knee, for rest of the campaign could do no more. But just as in 1985 elections, in the wake of Indiraji’s assassination, people of India gave Rajiv Gandhi and the Congress Party huge sympathy vote helping them win more than 48% votes and more than three fourth seats in the Lok Sabha, which Rajiv’s mother and his iconic grandfather themselves had never achieved – happened in the

Monghyr Sub-Division. Not only Bhai himself won with a huge margin of over 97,000 votes, his 6 SSP comrades in all six assembly constituencies of his Lok Sabha constituency/seat won. Not only that, SSP won 3 out the 4 Lok Sabha seats and 20 of the 22 Assembly seats of the Monghyr Sub-Division.

My mother's role in this election was spectacular. A few days prior to this incident, Aai had accidentally hurt her left foot – the nail of her big toe had come off and tendons and ligaments of the left ankle had suffered a tear. But with her bandaged left foot, she campaigned relentlessly, day and night in the entire of Monghyr Lok Sabha constituency and some adjoining assembly segments as well. I was all along back in Mumbai, away from these dramatic events, anxiously worrying about Bhai's health and his electoral prospects.

While many of Dr. Lohia's party comrades and other opposition leaders won handsomely in their Lok Sabha and Assembly constituencies, this architect of "Non-Congressism" himself barely scraped through. If I remember right, Lohia's margin of victory in Farrukhabad Lok Sabha constituency was not even 500 votes. And his rivals in the Congress Party never let him forget that.

But Dr. Lohia's real woes were just beginning. The ill effects of non-ideological alliances (although SVD had a common minimum programme) came to haunt Dr. Lohia and everybody else, right away. In 1967, the opposition had only won its first big, but partial, victory. But the politics of opportunism and lust for power started asserting almost immediately in virtually all opposition parties that constituted SVD. In the SSP itself, crisis over Bindeshwari Prasad Mandal erupted. B. P. Mandal, who had been elected to the Lok Sabha, wanted to become a minister in the Bihar SVD Government in violation of clearly laid down party policy. Dr. Lohia's and SP/SSP's laudable "*Pichhda Jaati Neeti*," (caste policy of giving special privileges to backward and oppressed castes like reservation) too found distorted implementation. Out of petty caste loyalties, leaders and cadres within SSP started pushing claims of less deserving candidates from SSP as well as other coalition partners for ministerial posts and other positions of office over their decidedly more able and experienced colleagues. Self-seeking caste loyalties and alliances transcending party and ideology lines began becoming rampant.

An interesting and unusual feature of most of these SVD Governments was that Chief Ministers of virtually all these SVD Governments (West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, etc.) were not the legislative party leaders of the largest constituent party of the coalition government in that legislature, but leaders of parliamentary parties which had been formed by the defection from the Congress, either a few months before the election or after the election. Hitherto defections and splits had afflicted the opposition, whose members had joined the Congress. Now for the first time, the predominant flow of the defectors was from the Congress. Another outcome of the 1967 elections was that many new regional parties, including DMK, achieved very significant success. From now on, regional parties would progressively become an important force in Indian politics. Eventually, in a short period of couple of years, virtually all SVD Governments collapsed, as a result of incessant inner-party or intra-party conflicts and rivalries, inter-party tussles, and above all, due to self-seeking defections. This was the beginning of *“aayaa ram gayaa ram”* game.

In 1967, Bhai had been elected the leader of SSP Parliamentary Party. In the atmosphere of growing ugly competition for office, in a vein attempt at injecting some spirit of self-abnegation and sacrifice, Bhai stepped aside from this position in favour of Rabi Ray, who then, became the SSP parliamentary party leader. Progressively, such instances would become rare. But even then, this action of Bhai's did not inspire any such spirit in others.

The Congress had not been defeated at the Centre, though it had been considerably weakened. In the early days of post-1967 electoral debacle, there was widespread disenchantment within the Congress Party at all levels against its leadership. So, Dr. Lohia made one more indirect attempt to shake up and dislodge the Congress from the centre. This was a pretty audacious and ambitious plan. He and Bhai made a concerted effort to bring together the entire opposition, both at the Centre and in the states, behind a combined opposition presidential candidate, Supreme Court Justice K. Subba Rao. Justice Subba Rao was chosen as the Opposition's presidential nominee against the official Congress candidate Dr. Zakir Hussain. The combined strength of the opposition at the centre and in the states in the entire Presidential Electoral College was insufficient to win the presidential election, but Dr. Lohia and Bhai

thought that if they could bring the entire opposition together, they could induce a split in the Congress. Such a split was to occur in the next presidential election, in 1969, during which Indira Gandhi induced rebellion against her own Congress Party's official presidential nominee, Neelam Sanjeeva Reddy, by exhorting her party colleagues to exercise their conscience vote in favour of the then Vice President, V. V. Giri, who had offered himself as an independent candidate. While Indira Gandhi's plan worked in her favour in 1969, in 1967, the opposition ranks, including those within SSP, did not pull their full weight behind Justice Subba Rao, and they certainly could not engineer any split or conscience vote in Subba Rao's favour. Consequently, this plan failed and Dr. Zakir Hussain got elected as the President of India.

Dr. Lohia was extremely upset at the demonstration of rampant opportunism and disunity in the opposition in the course of formation and running of the SVD Governments and the presidential election. He had probably not expected that his new policy would start bearing bitter fruits so quickly. He found himself pretty helpless against this opportunist behaviour in his own party. However, Dr. Lohia was not fated to review or alter his policy of Non-Congressism or to see its ultimate success in ousting the Congress from the seat of power at the Centre. That was to happen 10 years later, during the 1977 elections. As mentioned earlier, Dr. Lohia died on 12<sup>th</sup> October, 1967.

Bhai had experienced the loss of some very close associates and friends like Sane Guruji and Keshav Gore before. But Dr. Lohia's unfortunate untimely death was not only a great emotional loss; it influenced developments within the party as well as it impacted political developments outside the party. In the Socialist Party (SP) as well as in the Samyukta Socialist Party (SSP), for the 12-year period, from 1955 to 1967, Dr. Lohia was the supreme leader. He carried considerable clout and authority within the party. Not that there were no challenges to his position. Mulka Govind Reddy and P. V. G. Raju had revolted and walked out of the party against Lohia's insistence on following the principled party policies. Raj Narain had subverted the party policy and had got himself elected to the Rajya Sabha from UP, after having lost direct election, without waiting for five years. In 1967, B. P. Mandal (made famous later by the Mandal Commission on the subject of Reservation) flouted Dr. Lohia's dictates and party policy. But on the whole, most party leaders and

cadres would fall in line with the strategy, policies and dictates of Dr. Lohia. Not that there was no free debate or disagreements within the party. But Dr. Lohia, with assistance of Bhai and some other colleagues would be able to convince the dissenters and prevail upon them to fall in line. If no logic and arguments worked, the force of Dr. Lohia's personality and will worked.

His sudden death, without establishing a clear line of succession, created a perpetual power struggle and intrigue within SSP. After Lohia's death, in my opinion, Bhai was the party's "best bet" to carry its mantle, particularly in formulation and execution of strategy and policies. But unfortunately, Bhai had an incomplete or fractured mandate within the party. First of all, in his own State of Maharashtra he had not cultivated any base. Comrades of PSP faction that had merged with SP to form SSP a few years earlier, or the other PSP comrades who joined in to form Socialist Party (SP) later in 1971, were never gladly willing to accept Bhai's primacy. Provincial warlords like Karpoori Thakur and Raj Narain had their own agendas and dictatorial or devious style of functioning that promoted personal loyalties, and militated against accepting Bhai's ideological and policy leadership.

Bhai's closest associate from Mumbai, George Fernandes, who had more recently emerged as a promising national leader (from mid 1960s), with all his gifts and capabilities as a mass leader, was no longer reliable and consistent. He progressively tended to fly in any which direction that suited him personally or caught his momentary fancy. For instance, by 1968-69, George Fernandes, instead of concentrating his energies on honing his skills to become an effective parliamentarian, started speaking disparagingly about efficacy of the Lok Sabha as an institution and made statements about the possibility of his resigning from its membership. All this while he was still fighting the election petition filed by S. K. Patil against his election!! To be fair to George, over the last 35-40 years, his overall parliamentary performance has been good. But such nonchalant statements were either irresponsible or hypocritical or both. For it is a fact, that from 1971 onwards, George has not let go of a single opportunity to contest Lok Sabha elections. In this, he has the august company of Atal Behari Vajpayee, who also has time and again made statements about futility of parliamentary institutions and about giving up its membership, but has unceasingly sought its membership.

To sum up, for the next 15-16 years, from 1967 to 1983, and then on until his death in January 1995, Bhai's role and his effectiveness were severely circumscribed by the fact the he had no instrument or organization to bring about appropriate socio-economic or political changes or enforce norms of principled politics that the country sorely needed. He was compelled to practice, to the best of his ability, non-ideological summit politics of expediency. From time to time, he participated in agitational and constructive politics, but throughout these years, he did not have enough right cards to play the best hand for his party or for his country. It was fighting a lost battle as far as ideological and principled politics was concerned.

In 1971 snap poll, Bhai lost the election to the Lok Sabha despite his continued outstanding parliamentary performance. His defeat was neither caused by the "Indira Wave," which was not at all evident in Monghyr, nor by the alleged magic of "invisible Russian ink." Absence of public upsurge or strong support in favour of the opposition (Grand Alliance) and caste supported, hooligan backed, large scale rigging/booth capturing by candidates belonging to the two dominant castes – Yadavs and Rajputs – in Monghyr led to his defeat. Cohorts of D. P. Yadav, the official Congress candidate who won, and the Congress spurned independent Rajput candidate, Raja of Giddhaur, indulged in widespread booth capturing that ensured that not only Bhai's supporters could not vote, but both these candidates got the benefit of "bulk votes." The same two dominant castes' combination, Rajput – Yadav, engineered widespread booth capturing in 1980 election. This coupled with public apathy, on the verge of hostility, also ensured Bhai's defeat in 1980. This time the winner was Rajput Congress candidate, Chandrashekar Singh, who had been defeated by Bhai by a huge margin in 1977. While the 1971 defeat was by a smaller margin, I think about 22,000 votes, the margin of defeat in 1980 was much larger, over 120,000 votes.

While there were to be no more contests after 1980 defeat, the situation after 1971 was different. Two years after the 1971 elections, despite the spectacular victory over Pakistan in 1971 war that led to liberation and creation of independent Bangladesh, Indira Gandhi's popularity began to wane. In 1973, there was a bye-election to be held in the Lok Sabha

constituency adjoining Monghyr/Munger called Banka. Party workers from Monghyr and Banka, who were smarting under Bhai's unfair defeat in 1971, took a vow to redress the wrong. They implored Bhai to contest the election. Bhai wanted to personally take stock and assess the situation. By 1973, JP, who had move away for party politics for nearly 16-17 years, started taking active interest in the political developments. On his way back from Banka, Bhai met JP and Prabhavatiji (JP's wife) in Patna. Both of them implored Bhai to contest in Banka. JP told Bhai that it was important for him to get elected to the Lok Sabha. JP was also confident that the public mood now was very different. Bhai decided to contest this bye-election.

However, another unsavoury episode of internecine conflict was to take place. After 1971 electoral defeat there was once more soul searching among all the old socialists, and they decided to get together. This soon bore fruit - SSP and PSP merged to form Socialist Party. However, soon thereafter two SSP stalwarts, Karpoori Thakur and Raj Narain quit the Socialist Party with their followers, considerably weakening the party in the all-important states of UP and Bihar. Eventually, both of them joined Charan Singh's Bharatiya Kranti Dal (BKD)!! Although Bhai's candidature as Socialist Party candidate had been announced, Karpoori Thakur suggested to Raj Narain, who had contested and lost against Indira Gandhi in Rae Bareli in 1971, to offer himself as a candidate in Banka.

Raj Narain's election petition against Indira Gandhi, which everyone had dismissed as a "ridiculous" measure, was eventually instrumental in the subsequent upheaval, when in June 1975 Justice Jag Mohan Sinha of the Allahabad High Court set aside Indira Gandhi's election on the grounds of irregularities violative of the election law. This in turn motivated Indira Gandhi to declare Emergency, suspend democracy and imprison her opponents for 19-20 months. But all that was to transpire much later.

Although Karpoori Thakur and Raj Narain both knew about Bhai's candidature in Banka and were aware of general public sentiment in Bhai's favour, they decided that Raj Narain should contest. This was ironical because Bhai had always supported Karpooriji's legitimate claims. He had proposed Karpooriji's name for Chairmanship of SSP in 1969 and had backed his

candidature for Chief Ministership of Bihar in 1970. But Kapooriji resented Bhai's influence in Bihar politics, which put fetters on his attempts to act arbitrarily and to cut to size his other rivals within the Bihar SSP. Raj Narain considered himself Dr. Lohia's true heir. He also had a bone to pick with Bhai. As mentioned earlier, after losing in 1962 elections, Raj Narain had connived to get himself elected to the Rajya Sabha. Bhai was the first one to protest when Raj Narain filed his papers. Dr. Lohia was upset, but could not prevail upon Raj Narain to refrain from this act. Instead of taking action against Raj Narain as he had against Mulka and PVG Raju, he let Raj Narain placate him into inaction. Bhai strongly criticized Dr. Lohia for his soft-pedaling and what amounted to double standards. This protest of Bhai, which led nowhere, had infuriated Raj Narain. So Karpoori Thakur and Raj Narain, against pleas of other party leaders and cadres, decided to make this a prestige issue and a means to test who was the "bigger leader". People of Banka were focused on getting Bhai back into parliament. Bhai won a resounding victory. Raj Narain, the Congress (I) candidate and all other candidates, except the CPI candidate lost their security deposits. While Bhai was saddened by these actions, he never bore any grudge against Raj Narain or Kapooriji. He recognized their value as leaders with mass base.

Bhai's return to the Lok Sabha once more recommenced Indiraji's and her government's vows. The demoralized and numerically reduced opposition now was once more galvanized into fiery action. In a manner of speaking, 1973 was like the return of 1963-64. Bhai, Jyotirmoy Basu and other opposition MPs began unearthing and exposing numerous scandals and misdeeds of the government. Steel barter scandal, Pondicherry License case, Maruti affair - there were endless issues about corruption in high places, wrong policies and ineffective implementation of policies. The Congress Party, where inner-party democracy had completely given way to sycophancy, also started facing significant factionalism in the states. Every now and then, leaders of one faction would run to the *high command* to unseat the "ruling" faction. Congress began to feel real heat. This was also the period of far greater concerted floor coordination and combined action by the opposition in Parliament.

Outside the parliament, the political climate began undergoing a big change, particularly, from 1974 onwards. Bihar movement launched by JP to cleanse public life and make people's representatives accountable, Nav Nirman Movement in Gujarat, and the first ever successful all-India Railwaymen's Union's Strike led by George Fernandes and his comrades, and more such events, were all leading towards significant weakening of public support and moral authority of Indiraji's government.

Once more talks of closer cooperation, in fact, of forming a loosely strung "Federal Party," came up. But even the middle of road opposition parties, including Socialists were not ready for it yet. Searing experience of "Emergency" was required for many disparate elements to come together to form the short-lived Janata Party. As is well known, the Allahabad High Court decision of unseating Indira Gandhi, led to Indira Gandhi imposing anti-democratic, draconian Emergency that put for nineteen-twenty months, political action on hold.

Bhai had the foresight to assess this possibility well ahead of the Emergency actually being imposed. He had attempted to caution people against the likely abuse of the Emergency Provisions contained in the Constitution of India by Indira Gandhi. Bhai, in an article in February/March 1975 issues of JP's Everyman's Weekly, had predicted this.

I want to illustrate on how many political and Constitutional issues Bhai's position was correct. However, the unfortunate fact is that more often than not his view did not find enough support. In many of these instances, he was the "sole voice", articulating this.

I have just illustrated his prophecy about Emergency. I have discussed his views on evils and dangers of Non-Congressism and his disagreement with Dr. Lohia. We have already touched upon Bhai's and Dr. Lohia's opposition to Asoka Mehta's thesis about "compulsions of the backward economy" as a justification for cooperating with the Congress, which led to the split among socialists. The Nehruvian promise of cooperation with socialists and Congress being wedded to progressive socialism, as conceived by the socialists, proved to be a mere mirage.

Bhai was always alive to the dangers of doctrine of supremacy of any of the three institutions - legislature, (elected) executive and judiciary. He was strongly opposed to the “doctrine of parliamentary supremacy” as advocated by Nath Pai and famous jurist H. M. Seervai, which sought to bestow upon parliament very wide powers of constitutional amendments. He always believed that each constitutional entity (Union Government, State Governments, etc.) and each constitutional office (Prime Minister, President, Cabinet, etc.) has a specific and limited role to play, and there must exist a balance of power between each institution. They should not attempt to aggrandize themselves at the cost of each other, but at the same time they should act independently to keep a check on each other. Bhai consistently opposed the partisan abuse of President’s Rule by the executive. The danger of the doctrine of parliamentary supremacy was brought home, when Indira Gandhi used her majority to enact self-serving constitutional amendments during the Emergency.

Bhai was also opposed to judicial activism and unnecessary attempts of the judiciary to thwart legislative enactments or normal policy making & implementation function of the executive or the actions of the judiciary taking upon itself the function of law making. He was also very wary of judicial preaching on matters of social change and social reform. The current judicial interpretation which states that the Parliament cannot alter the “basic structure of the Constitution” is very limited and self-serving in that it considers only judiciary’s powers of review of legislative and executive action as the basic structure of our Constitution, and has been silent on all others aspects that really form the basic structure of our Constitutional edifice. Bhai’s fears about judicial preaching on social issues came true when in response to Chief Justice Y. V. Chandrachud’s Obiter Dicta in the Shah Banu case on the desirability to enact a “common civil code” as part of the Directive Principles, Rajiv Gandhi got passed the Muslim Women’s (Protection of Rights on Divorce) Act, 1986. This enactment provoked strong response among the conservative Muslims, and pushed them away from the mainstream opinion, without having any beneficial effect on the lot of the Muslim women or in the direction of social reform within Muslim community.

During the Emergency, many opposition leaders likened Indira Gandhi to dictators like Stalin and never believed that she would ever declare elections. When the elections were announced, many, including George Fernandes, wanted to boycott the elections, believing that Indiraji would rig the polls. Bhai believed that Indira Gandhi was certainly authoritarian, but she was not from the same mould as any of these dictators. She craved legitimacy and genuinely believed that Indian people endorsed her policies and wanted her to lead them, and therefore, would seek their mandate sooner or later. When this talk of boycotting 1977 elections began in serious vein, Bhai sent out emphatic messages that anyone who claimed to have faith in democracy had no business asking for elections and then boycotting them. Even though in 1971 elections, he had personally been a victim of rigging and booth capturing, he firmly believed that in our country, it was not possible for anyone to rig elections across any single state let alone the whole country. He repeatedly urged all the opposition leaders held in detention and those outside that they should prepare to give a combined contest against the Congress and not entertain thoughts of a boycott. The results of the sagacity of this advice were for all to see.

For decades, Bhai had been at the forefront at exposing pernicious duplicity of the “Sangh Parivaar,” which was at the core of the issue of “dual membership” during the Janata Party days. Last 25 years of Politics of BJP and Sangh Parivaar has clearly and unequivocally demonstrated where their loyalties always were.

Bhai had argued about the futility and dangers of Rajiv’s ill-thought-out Assam and Punjab accords. Many people hailed these accords. Although the situation returned to normalcy in Punjab, even now the Assam situation has not found any resolution; more importantly many substantive terms of both these accords remain unimplemented and are un-implementable.

On the question of defections, Bhai had all along suggested measures that cut at the root of this evil. His focus was not on throttling honest dissent but allowing conscience vote. If all legislators had to vote according to their party whip, what was the point of any debate? There was no question of facts, logic and arguments changing any opinions!! Bhai wanted to ensure that the

all-important motivation of all defectors, longing for power (whether ministerial berths or any other office of profit) should be denied to the defectors and that the political parties who allowed defectors into their fold should be derecognized by the Election Commission. However, what Indiraji, Morarjibhai or Rajiv Gandhi (who eventually had the bill passed unanimously in both houses of parliament in one day) really wanted was to crush dissent, rather than make unprincipled defections difficult. When praises were sung of this anti-defection, rather in reality the anti-dissent, law by one and all as heralding of new era of honest politics, Bhai's was the sole voice of dissent. Events of the last 20 years have proved Bhai absolutely right. The evil of defections has taken "bulk form", without abating. On the other hand, honest dissent and voting based on principles and personal convictions have been completely extinguished. Now no one dares to vote against their party whip any more, even on the issues where the party is acting against its own avowed ideology or its election manifesto & promises and even on the issues that would not inevitably defeat their party's government.

During the Janata Party days there were several instances, when Bhai's advice was spurned by his other party colleagues. In the Euphoria of Indira Gandhi's defeat and formation of the Janata Party Government in 1977, Morarjibhai and some other senior Janata leaders began making statements about "principled" stand that they would take and not allow any further defections from the Congress. Bhai, who was opposed to defections in principle, wanted to be more pragmatic. He advised his colleagues to refrain from these statements. He argued that while in the Lok Sabha the Janata Party was in a dominant position with a comfortable majority, Janata Party and its allies together did not have even a working majority in the Rajya Sabha. He recognized that unless the Congress was weakened through splits and defections, Janata Party would find it very difficult to get any of its legislative programme passed through the Rajya Sabha. Bhai's advice was not heeded to. Soon Janata euphoria died down. There were no moves from the Congress into Janata Party, and the Government faced serious difficulties in the Rajya Sabha.

In the Assembly Elections that followed the parliamentary polls, Bhai had advised his colleagues in the Janata Party that they should have electoral

alliances or adjustments with CPI (M) & the Left Front in West Bengal, with DMK in Tamil Nadu and with Shaikh Abdullah's National Congress in Jammu & Kashmir and not attempt to go alone. Janata leaders failed to realize that after ousting Indira Gandhi and restoring democracy, they were now on a level playing field, and no unusual public upsurge and sympathy backed them. The political ground realities in each state would now come into play. Bhai's advice was disregarded. Janata Party went alone in these states and was trounced in each of them.

When Atal Behari Vajpayee was External Affairs Minister in Morarjibhai's Government, he was keen to "quickly normalize and improve relations" with the People's Republic of China, just as he had attempted to do so with Pakistan. He was resolved to visit China towards this end. At that juncture, China's relationship with two of India's long-standing South East Asian allies – Vietnam and Kampuchean regime supported by Vietnam – was hostile. Bhai had estimated that China might do something adventurous to punish Vietnam, and it would not be prudent for India's External Affairs Minister to visit China to make moves towards normalization. He advised Morarjibhai and Atalji, that if they wanted to take this forward, at best the visit at Foreign Secretary level should be first attempted. Atalji did not pay any heed to Bhai's advice. He went to China. While he was in China, without as much as courtesy to inform him even after launching the attack, China launched a punitive expedition against Vietnam, India's long-standing ally, (which eventually failed badly), and Morarjibhai had to hastily recall Atalji.

Bhai had advised Charan Singh's Government to face the house, but he chose not to. When Charan Singh and his cabinet, without facing the confidence vote before the Lok Sabha and proving their majority before the house, advised the President, Neelam Sanjeeva Reddy, to dissolve the Lok Sabha and hold fresh elections, Janata Party leaders and many members of the intelligentsia and legal profession severely castigated the President for adhering to the advice of his Cabinet. They accused him of acting unconstitutionally. Bhai strongly defended the President's action. He said that instead of allowing political parties to embark on the game of intrigue and unprincipled attempts to cobble together a majority, the President was absolutely right in going back to the ultimate sovereign in a democracy, that

is, to the people, the electorate. The election results conclusively proved that contrary to their tall claims Janata Party (which then included the former Jan Sangh as well) and its allies did not have the people's mandate, nor did Lok Dal and its allies.

I can cite many more instances where Bhai's insightful analysis and conclusions, although proved to be correct later, were ignored by his party colleagues and allies. Egos and personal ambitions determined responses of most leaders. Everything was getting reduced to summit and electoral politics. After accusing Indira Gandhi and other Congress leaders of dynastic and undemocratic tendencies, leaders of Lok Dal, whose General Secretary Bhai was, were proving to be no different. It was a matter of time that Bhai would move away from active party politics. He was tired of "being even remotely answerable" for unprincipled or ill-conceived action of his colleagues and allies.

Again, there was talk of reviving the Socialist Party and bringing all the Socialists together, but Bhai knew that this programme was a non-starter, and he certainly did not have the ability, the stamina, the will, and above all mass following necessary to get this venture off the ground. Socialists of the former PSP faction, who were mostly in the fragmented Janata Party, were never fully prepared to accept his lead. His colleagues like Raj Narain and Karpoori Thakur, who had mass base in important states of UP and Bihar, continued to have their own agenda and could not be relied on, but the worst part was that even some of Bhai's closest friends and comrades of the old SP/SSP days, particularly George Fernandes, whom Bhai had mentored and supported for years, were now fully engaged in the power game. After joining Morarjibhai's Government, George has come under his influence. So much so that when the Janata Party was on the verge of splitting, and Morarji Government was to face a "No Confidence Motion", against Bhai's sound advice, George passionately defended the Government. Eventually, the next day, he quit the Government and Janata Party to join hands with Charan Singh to form Lok Dal. This, I think, was the last act of discipleship and camaraderie that George did. During the years to follow, particularly after Bhai's retirement, they drifted apart. Some of Bhai's other dearest friends and comrades, particularly from Mumbai and Maharashtra, also followed Bhai's pleas to join the Lok Dal, but

more for the old times sake. The local situation in Maharashtra, particularly among the urban and middle-class segments, was such that break-up of Janata Party had taken the proportion of a cardinal, unforgivable sin.

Eventually, the inevitable happened. When in the winter of 1982, Bhai realized that his health could not be restored he decided that enough was enough. Now he would not participate in active politics. He would become a political commentator and writer.

In the following years, his health got worse; he suffered a retinal haemorrhage in one eye, weakening his vision. His other ailments, including the old foe – bronchial asthma – got worse. Progressively he traveled less and attended fewer engagements. However, despite his gradually failing health, for the next 12 years, he played the role of a writer and an incisive and impartial commentator in full measure, and he wrote prolifically. He gave disinterested advice to whoever sought it. Now without any fear or favour, he could speak his mind and express his views. While developments during the 1980s and 1990s deeply saddened Bhai and made him extremely anxious about the fate of the “ordered state” of India, now he was not beholden to support any ideology, any party or any group of individuals.

During the last 7–8 years of my father’s life, my mother who had retired from National College, moved to Delhi. Thereafter, Bhai and Aai were together all the time. They were virtually inseparable and devotedly looked after each other. There was a glow of happy companionship around them. My mother collaborated in Bhai’s extensive writing and publishing. She assisted him in the all important but burdensome activities that precede publication of a book - from proof reading, to checking references to preparing indexes.

When Bhai died after short hospitalization from a very severe asthmatic spasm, my mother was not with him when he was taken to Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital. It was a rare instance when Aai was not with him as she had come to Pune for a niece’s wedding and had stopped over in Mumbai for a few days. After his death, she always regretted the fact that on that fateful night, when the fatally severe spasm began, she was not by his side to take him immediately to the hospital.

While Bhai wrote extensively on many subjects, one theme that he constantly researched, thought about and explored was what makes leaders effective. He believed that in making of a leader, nature and nurture both played a role. In making them effective and helping them shape the destiny, he believed the environment or to use a Marxist phrase “objective conditions” played as much role as the individual leader’s (and collective leadership’s) capabilities and motivation. If the environment was conducive their impact was greater and often on a wider canvass. If not, then, their impact was much circumscribed.

This was absolutely true about Bhai himself. Had he been blessed with a stronger political organization to work with, had he more comrades who had complementary strengths of mass leadership, and yet, had they heeded his advice and views, they would have made a great collective impact. Probably one opportunity that Indian Socialists had to make the positive impact was for all the stalwart leaders, particularly for JP and Lohia to have stayed and worked together. But that was not to be. Having said that, it cannot be denied that the credit (or discredit) of creating an environment of “coalition politics” which has come to characterize the political scenario of the last four decades, is directly attributable to Lohia’s and Bhai’s eventual collaboration on working the strategy of Non-Congressism.

The following two letters that Bhai wrote to Indira Gandhi and JP respectively during his detention during the Emergency in 1976 provide wonderful insight into Bhai’s character and help us understand what made him tick.

#### Letter to Indira Gandhi from Jail

Madhu Limaye  
MP

Narsingarh Sub-Jail,  
Dist. Rajgadh  
Malwa, M.P.

8<sup>th</sup> January, 1976

Dear Mrs. Gandhi,

Perhaps it is useless to write this letter. You have probably made up your mind. But if per chance you have not taken a final decision, I would urge upon you not to extend the term of the Lok Sabha. Without obtaining the consent of the people it would be improper to extend the term. Apart from being an unethical act it is also a fraud on the Constitution. You said at Chandigarh that if the elections were held now, the Congress would win. Maybe you are right. But that is not the point at issue.

If elections are abolished or parliamentary terms extended, the cult of bullet will begin to rule the people's heart. I therefore request you not to force the people into adopting violence.

*I would like to tell you respectfully that if you proceed to execute your immoral plan I shall resign from Lok Sabha with effect from 18<sup>th</sup> March, 1976. Civil disobedience is a much more potent weapon than parliamentary struggle and immoral membership of Lok Sabha.* (I have added the emphasis)

Yours sincerely,

Madhu Limaye

{As indicated in the above letter, Bhai resigned his membership of the Lok Sabha with effect from 18<sup>th</sup> March, 1976 sending his letter of resignation to Shri. Baliram Bhagat, Speaker of the Lok Sabha. Sharad Yadav was the only MP, who inspired by Bhai's example, also resigned his membership of the Lok Sabha.}

Letter to Jayaprakash Narayan from Jail

Central Prison

Bhopal  
Madhya Pradesh  
8<sup>th</sup> December, 1976

Dear JP,

I wonder whether you received my birthday greetings which I sent to you from Narsingarh Jail. I have been transferred to Bhopal for medical treatment. I am better now. There was nothing serious about my illness.

Your self-appointed advisers want you to withdraw something that you had never started. If they have the courage of their conviction, why do they not act in the name of their own party? They can rescind the June Resolution on their own responsibility.

*These people seem to think that civil disobedience is a gift from the rulers and can be practiced only with their permission. But to us it is an inalienable right. It ceases to be the universal weapon that it is if it cannot be used to fight tyranny.*

The lights are going out in the parochial states of Hindustan: Bangladesh, Bharat and Pakistan. Whether they will be completely extinguished, I cannot say. *But does this fact absolve us from our responsibility to bear witness to our faith? You have become the symbol of freedom in our age. Let that symbol stand no matter how dimly its light is today seen by our people.*

I send you these words of Thomas Jefferson, written when a similar gloom had settled over the similarly young American republic, *for they convey so well my feelings and, I trust, of many others who are content to languish and, if need be, to die in captivity.*

*"To preserve the freedom of human mind then and freedom of press, every spirit should be ready to devote itself to martyrdom, for as long as we may think as we will, and speak as we think, the conditions of man will proceed in improvement."* (I have added the emphasis)

I hope you are a little better now.

With good wishes,

Yours affectionately,

Madhu Limaye

{The reference to the self-appointed advisers is to people of Jan Sangh and RSS/Sangh Parivaar, who had apologized to Indira Gandhi, and they were looking for ways to make their peace and seek release from prison.

The Jefferson quotation was from memory. As the incident of 1982 that I have narrated earlier, here is one more example of Bhai's photographic memory.}

To sum up, in the final analysis, Bhai was what his three young friends, Amarendra Dhaneshwar, Jayant Dharmadhikari and Anant Kamerkar have characterized him as in the one hour long documentary film that they made on him – Nirantar Yoddhaa – a Relentless Fearless Crusader or Warrior. Bhai was surely worried about the fate of India and its multitudes until his last breath, but he had the satisfaction of having given his fullest devotion to all the causes dear to his heart.

\*\*\*\*\*

Aniruddha Limaye

## **Short Political Biography of Shri Madhu Limaye**

*(Madhu Limaye was one of the most distinguished personalities of modern India who played a pivotal role in the freedom movement and later in the liberation of Goa from the Portuguese. He was a committed socialist, a distinguished parliamentarian, Champion of the civil liberties, a prolific writer and dedicated to the cause of the common man of the country. He was a dynamic leader of the democratic socialist movement and always stood by his ideology throughout his life. The virtues of simplicity, austerity, high moral attitude and Gandhian philosophy of peace and non-violence had a great impact on him, which he followed and practice and earned a place of distinction among the galaxy of leaders. As a socialist stalwart he guided the socialist movement in the country during different phases).*

### **Parti-1 (1922-1947)**

Madhu Limaye son of Shri Ramchandra Mahadev Limaye was born on 1, May 1922 at Poona in Maharashtra. Limaye had his Middle School education from Robert Money School, Bombay and Saraswati Mandir Poona. A brilliant student, Limaye completed his Fifth, Sixth and Seventh standard in just one year. Denied permission to appear for the Matriculation examination at the age of 13.

The interruption in formal schooling provided him with an opportunity to read books on history, freedom movement in various countries and biographies of great personalities. After having his school education, Madhu Limaye enrolled for higher education at the Fergusson College, Poona in 1937 and opted World history, Indian Administration, English and Sanskrit as subject ideas. It was during this period that Limaye was attracted towards the socialist ideas. He, thus, started participating in the student movements and became an active member of the All India Students Federation. Since then Limaye's journey to free the humanity from the bondage of colonialism, deprivation and injustice began.

## **Freedom Fighter**

Madhu Limaye entered into the politics at the very tender age when he joined a May Day procession on his 15<sup>th</sup> birthday in Poona in 1937. This procession was attacked violently by **RSS** volunteers. Leaders of this procession Senapati Bapat and SM Joshi injured in this attack badly. This was the first date of Madhu Limaye with politics of struggle and resistance. After this baptism, Madhu came in close contact of SM Joshi, N G Goray and Pandurang S. Sane *alias* Sane Guru ji and attracted drastically towards national movement and socialist ideology along with his other contemporaries V.N. *alias* Anna Sane, Keshav *alias* (Bandu) Gorey, Gangadhar Ogle, Madhav Limaye and Vinayak Kulkarni and joined their study circle. On 31<sup>st</sup> December 1938 this group decided to be the full time worker of Indian National Congress and the CSP. SM Joshi was the General Secretary of the Poona District Congress Committee as well as Secretary of the Provincial Congress Socialist Party. In 1939, SM, appointed Madhu Limaye, the district General Secretary of The Poona Congress Socialist Party (CSP) at the age of 17. Young Madhu Limaye organised CSP in Poona with devotion. Same year two renowned socialist leaders Jayparakash Narayan and Dr Rammanohar Lohia visited Poona and were impressed with the skills of Madhu Limaye.

In 1939, when the Second World War broke out, he thought that this was an opportunity to free the country from the colonial rule. In October, 1940, Madhu Limaye started campaigning against war and was arrested for his anti war speeches and put up in Dhuliya jail of Khandesh region almost for one year. He was released in September, 1941 and undertook the task of organizing *Rashtra Sewa Dal* and youth camps in different part of Maharashtra. In August 1942, AICC held its conference in Bombay, where Mahatma Gandhi gave the call of '*Quit India*'. This was the first time when Madhu Limaye saw Gandhiji from close quarter. Many senior leaders of the Congress party including Gandhiji were arrested. Madhu went underground along with some of his colleagues and played key role in underground resistance movement along with Achuyt Patwardhan and Aruna Asif Ali. He established a printing press and

started '*Krantikari*' a Marathi journal edited by Achyut Patwardhan and SM Joshi. At that time he was staying a place called '*Mushak Mahal*' in front of Bombay Central station. It was raided by police on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 1943, and Sane Guruji, N G Goray, Shribhau Limaye and Madhav Limaye got arrested but SM Joshi and Madhu Limaye escaped. After the raid at '*Mushak Mahal*' socialist changed their hide out and shifted to a new place called '*Huddle House*'. In September 1943, Madhu was arrested from this place along with SM Joshi and Vinayak Kulkarni. He was arrested under the Defence of India Rules (DIR) and was detained without trial in the Jails of Worli, Yervada and Visapur till July 1945. During his detention, the British Government tried its best to extract the secrets of the underground activities from him, but Limaye remained tight-lipped despite severe atrocities committed by the police on him.

### **In Socialist Movement**

Madhu Limaye was associated with the Indian National Congress, and the Congress Socialist Party almost for one decade, 1938—48. He attended the CSP's Kanpur Conference in February, 1947, where the prefix 'Congress' was removed from the Socialist Party. Limaye was in the forefront of the reorganizing the Socialist Party and was given responsibility of the Khandesh region. He successfully mobilised trade union workers and brought the peasants and the youth into the socialist fold.

### **Part II (15<sup>TH</sup> August 1947 to 1964)**

In 1947, from August till November he was active in Khandesh and has given some account in the last pages of his autobiography.

On 21<sup>ST</sup> November, 1947, he left for Europe and attended Socialist International's Antwerp (Belgium) conference as a sole delegate of Indian Socialist Movement. He was in Europe for almost five months. Visited England, France, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland and Italy. His report on the Socialist International conference and his letters to JP, Lohia and other leaders can be a good reference.

Elected to the National Executive, of the Socialist Party at Nasik Conference, March, 1948. He was the Secretary, Parliamentary Sub-

Committee, Socialist Party under the chairmanship of Dr Lohia (1948-49).Elected as the Joint Secretary of the Socialist Party at its Patna Conference in 1949, and was also the Secretary, Foreign Affairs Committee of the Socialist Party under the chairmanship of Dr Lohia (1949-50).Elected again as the Joint Secretary of the Socialist Party at its Madras Conference in 1950, and was also Member Foreign Affairs Committee of the Socialist Party (1950-52)

Madhu Limaye married Professor Champa Gupte on 15 May 1952.She proved a great source of inspiration and support to him, both in his personal and public life. Champa Gupte *nee* Limaye was a strong woman with an abiding faith in the principles and ideals of socialism and stood by Limaye all through in his struggles and travails. They infect, complemented each other in all their endeavors.

Elected again as the Joint Secretary of the Socialist Party at its Pachmarhi (M.P) Conference in 1952, and was also Member Foreign Affairs Committee of the Socialist Party (1952-53).In early 1953 on JPs behest Joined Asian Socialist Bureau at Rangoon, as Secretary.

Madhu Limye also got elected, Joint Secretary, Praja Socialist Party at its first Conference held at Allahabad, 1953-54, after the merger of SP and KMPP, but later on first suspended and then expelled from PSP in 1955 for raising some ideological issues.

As one of the most dynamic leaders of the Socialist Movement, Madhu Limaye strove ceaselessly to translate the socialist ideals into national ethos. His contribution in shaping the destiny of modern India is indeed tremendous. After serving Congress Socialist Party, Socialist Party and Praja Socialist Party, he joined Socialist Party founded in 1955 by his mentor Dr RM Lohia but could not attend the Foundation Conference of the Socialist Party since he was arrested in Goa for its liberation.

### **Goa Liberation Movement**

Madhu Limaye participated in the Goa Liberation Movement, in mid fifties, which was launched in 1946. A staunch critic of colonialism, Limaye led a mass *Satyagraha* in 1955 and entered Goa on 25/26<sup>th</sup> July. At Pedne, the Portuguese police attacked the *satyagrahis* violently, resulting in some deaths and injuries on a large scale. Madhu Limaye was beaten up brutally. He was kept in police custody for five months. In December 1955, the Portuguese Military Tribunal sentenced him 12 years imprisonment. But, he neither offered any defence nor appealed against the heavy sentence. Once he wrote '*It was in Goa that I have realized how profoundly Gandhiji has transformed my life, how deeply he has shaped my personality and will.*' During the Goa Liberation Movement, he spent over 19 months in Portuguese captivity. During captivity he wrote a book 'Goa Liberation Movement and Madhu Limaye' as a prison diary. The book was published in 1996 on the occasion of golden jubilee of the launch of the Goa movement in 1946.

After his release from the Portuguese custody on 25<sup>th</sup> February, 1957, he continued to mobilise the masses and sought support from different sections and urged the Government of India to take firm steps towards the liberation of Goa. After this mass Satyagraha Government of India was compelled to take military action and liberated Goa from the Portuguese rule. Goa was ultimately liberated in December 1961 and become an integral part of India.

He contested 1957 General Elections from Bandra but got defeated. He mobilise Trade unions and workers along with George Fernandes in Bombay and it was great success (1957-58).

### **Leader of the Socialist Movement**

Madhu Limaye was elected the Chairman of the Socialist Party at its National Conference held at Sherghati (Gaya) in April, 1958. During his Chairmanship, great efforts were made in strengthening the organization by adopting specific policies and concrete action plan. His belief in socialism was not dogmatic or doctrinaire, but was a way of life. To him,

unless the hierarchical social order was destroyed, social justice would be a distant dream for a large section of the society. Madhu Limaye played a vital role at Benaras Conference in 1959, where the Socialist Party, under his Chairmanship, adopted a resolution on providing special opportunities for the backward sections of the society.

### **Parti-III (1964-82)**

(Merger of SP-PSP and formation of SSP. Elected to Parliament. Contribution to the Parliament and for civil liberties. Split in SSP., general elections of 1967. Formation of SVD governments 1967. Death of Dr Lohia 1967. 1971 general elections lost Lok Sabha seat. Unification of SSP-PSP in 1971 and split again in 1972. Banka by-election 1973 entered in Lok Sabha 3<sup>rd</sup> time. Emergency, arrest and formation of Janata Party and split. (*Janata Party experiment: An insider's account of opposition politics, 1975-1977. Vol. I & II*). Formation of Janata Party (S), Lok Dal and Lok Dal (K) in 1982. Retirement from active politics).

After the merger of SP-PSP in 1964, he contested Munghyer (Bihar) Lok Sabha by-election as the candidate of unified SSP and became the Chairman of its Parliamentary Board. SSP splintered at Banaras on 1<sup>st</sup> February 1965 and PSP was revived. Madhu Limaye was Leader of the Samyukta Socialist Party Parliamentary party in Fourth Lok Sabha, 1967. He also wrote a booklet 'Why Samyukta Socialist'.

### **A Distinguished Parliamentarian**

A parliamentarian *par excellence*, Madhu Limaye was elected four times to Lok Sabha from 1964 to 1979. He is known for his deep understanding of various subjects, through knowledge of Rules of Procedure and effective use of parliamentary devices. He was an encyclopedia of the Indian Constitution and his speeches in Parliament on constitutional matters are a milestone and not only reflected erudition, maturity and understanding but also demonstrated his concern and commitment for the cause of common man. Whenever he rose to speak, members across the party line listened to him with rapt attention. According to Madhu Limaye,

*“Parliament was not a substitute for mass and popular movements but an additional instrument of public service and a platform for airing public grievances. It should be used as an instrument for reflecting the hopes and inspirations of the common man.”* He raised important issues before the house by effectively deploying his vast knowledge. He will be remembered as an outstanding parliamentarian who enriched debates and proceeding of the house in his inimitable style.

### **Champion of the Civil Liberties/Court cases**

Madhu Limaye has been a fighter for civil liberties all his life. He confronted Judiciary many times and himself argued his cases from lower courts to High Courts and in the Supreme Court and was invariably successful. In 1955, when Madhu Limaye led a mass *Satyagrah* in Goa against the Portuguese authorities and was kept in police custody for five months without trial and later the Portuguese Military Tribunal sentenced him 12 years imprisonment, he neither offered any defence nor appealed against the heavy sentence since according to him it was a liberation movement but later on he challenged illegal detentions in free India every time he was arrested.

In 1959, when he was Chairman of the Socialist Party and the Punjab unit of his party launched a movement against price rise traveled to various district of the state and on 7<sup>th</sup> January 1959, when he was sitting in the district party office of Hisar, he was arrested by the police without any warrant. He filed a *Habeas Corps* against his arrest in Punjab High Court under 226 of the IPC against his arrest. The High Court accepted his writ against his illegal detention and released him on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 1959.

Second time he was arrested on 5<sup>th</sup> November 1968 at Lakhisarai railway station under his parliamentary constituency in Mungeyr for the violation of article 144 and of railway law 122. Madhu Limaye challenged his arrest in the Supreme Court and Court declared his arrest illegal and set him free immediately on 18<sup>th</sup> December 1968. There is a long list of his court case where he challenged the arrest made by administration and police to help the ruling party to crush its political opponents or protest against its anti people policies. He strongly disapproved the unconstitutional

methods adopted by the government to curtail the civil liberties of the citizens.

In the late sixties, unconstitutional controversies occupied the centre stage of national debate. Madhu Limaye protested vehemently on these issues and wrote letters to the then President V .V. Giri and a Judge of the Supreme Court, Justice K.S. Hegde on constitution and conventions and later on discussed these issues in his books *Limits to Authority, New Constitutional amendments: death-knell of popular liberties. Parliament, Judiciary, and Parties - an Electrocardiogram of Politics* in detail.

### **Foreign Policy and International Relations Expert**

Limaye was a firm believer in the principles of Non-alignment. To him, the concept of Non-alignment was deep-rooted within the framework of freedom struggle, the basis of which has been anti-colonialism, freedom for all people, disarmament, protection of economic interests of the developing countries and world peace.

He wanted to inject a new content and dimension to the non-aligned movement to make it more people oriented. He felt that the movement must articulate economic and social aspirations of the down-trodden people. He held the view that India must take a firm stand in the so-called North-South confrontation, since that was an extension of the struggle of the colonial peoples against political and economic imperialism.

The policy of non-alignment must work against the imperialistic hegemony of any of the blocs. At the same time, he felt, it should not act as a deterrent to bilateral relations between and other countries. He asserted that the independence of India's foreign policy should be ensured at all costs and that it should aim at safeguarding our political, economic and strategic interests in the long run. He was of the opinion that along with political independence, countries must also be freed from economic exploitation. Non-alignment should also create an enabling atmosphere where the industrially developed nations contribute for the economic

growth of the erstwhile colonies. Then alone the policy of non-alignment would become meaningful.

On the nuclear issue, he always emphasized that unless all nuclear powers agree to total disarmament, including destruction of the accumulated nuclear arsenals, India should make no compromise in the matter of its own nuclear development. In this respect, he believed that India must develop its own nuclear technology as early as possible to become self-reliant. In the event of an impending threat to India's security due to the crisis in Bangladesh in 1971, Limaye lent his unstinted support to the then government of India. In fact, he persuaded Jayaprakash Narayan to take the lead in mobilizing world opinion in favour of the liberation of Bangladesh, which was primarily the responsibility of the Government of India. But a true nationalist like Limaye did not sit idle in the moment of national crisis. He also toured various countries to garner international support for the liberation of Bangladesh.

During his illustrious public life spanning over four decades, Limaye visited a number of countries across the globe. He was also the Secretary of the Asian Socialist Bureau, having its headquarter at Rangoon. As an observer delegate, he attended a meeting of the Council of the Socialist International in Paris, in 1953. He also accompanied Dr. Lohia on several foreign tours. He attended the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebration of the Russian Revolution at Moscow in 1967 along with S.M. Joshi.

His visits to various countries provided him immense exposure on the dynamics of international relations. His knowledge on international issues, interactions with eminent thinkers like Harold Laski and other famous personalities helped him to form a sound base of Indian foreign policy which is of immense relevance even today.

### **His ideas on Socialism & Secularism**

Madhu Limaye's entire ideological edifice was built on secular nationalism. He had an uncompromising stance on India's secular credentials. With a strong belief in the spirit of tolerance, which forms the

essence of India's composite and plural culture, he firmly stood for the preservation of secular foundations of the Constitution.

### **His Democratic Values**

With a firm belief in democracy and democratic values, Limaye fought relentlessly to protect the parliamentary sovereignty. Through his writings, speeches and actions he sought to protect democratic heritage in more ways than one. Being firmly committed to the healthy democratic ethos and conventions, he always stood by his principles and never compromised his values during turbulent political situations. His protest from jail against the extension of the term of fifth Lok Sabha bears testimony to this.

Madhu, played an active part in the JP movement and in the effort to create a united opposition party, 1974-77. He was detained under MISA from July 1975 to February 1977 in various Madhya Pradesh Jails. He resigned in protest, from membership of the fifth Lok Sabha, on immoral extension of its term by Smt. Indira Gandhi through abuse of constitutional provisions about emergency along with his young Comrade Sharad Yadav. He was active in the formation of the Janata Party and the coalition that gained power at the Centre following the emergency. He was elected General Secretary of the Janata Party, on his 55<sup>th</sup> birthday on 1 May 1977. But he was also blamed for the collapse of the Morarji Desai led Janata coalition government, by insisting that no member of the Janata party could simultaneously be a member of an alternative social or political organisation. This attack on *dual membership* was directed specifically at members of the Janata party who had been members of the Jan Sangh and continued to be members of the right-wing *Rashtriya Swayamsewak Sangh*, *RSS*, the Jan Sangh's ideological parent. The issue led to fall of Janata government in 1979, and the destruction of the Janata Party. Later he joined Charan Singh camp and became General Secretary, of his Janata Party (S) and Lok Dal, 1979-82. In 1982 he breaks away with Lok Dal and formed Lok Dal (K). Madhu Limaye retired from the active politics in 1982.

### **Part-4 (1982-95)**

(After his retirement from active politics, Madhu Limaye wrote more than 100 books in English, Hindi and Marathi and contributed more than 1000 articles in various periodicals, journals and newspapers).

### **Prolific Writer**

Like his performance on the floor of Lok Sabha, his writings are also logical and incisive, fearless and forthright, backed by facts and historical perspective. Though he remained aloof from active politics since 1982, he continued to voice his concern on issues pertaining to the social, political and economic development of the nation through his numerous writings.

His scholarly attributes are well reflected in his works, which cover a varied range of subjects of constitutional and parliamentary relevance and of national importance. The national and international issues that had been raised by Madhu Limaye in his writings are bound to provide enough food for thought. Madhu Limaye would ever be remembered by the countrymen for his brilliant ideas, which have great relevance for generations to come. Some of his works include, *India Polity in Transition*, *India and the World*, *Birth of Non- Congressism*, *Communist Party: Facts and Fiction* and *Evolution of Socialist Party*. His writings are reflective of his deep understanding of the numerous issues confronting the Indian society during different phases of History. His works also give an insight into the prevailing socio-economic and political situation and the views of the socialist leaders of his time.

For his commendable contribution in the freedom movement, Limaye was conferred the *Sanman* and offered pension by the Government of India. But, he did not accept that *Sanman* and the pension and similar benefits offered to him in recognition of his contribution to the Goa Liberation Movement. He had not even accepted the pension scheme provided to the members of the Parliament. As a committed socialist, Limaye had demonstrated the spirit of selfless sacrifice which will be remembered for all times to come.

### **Last Phase**

Retired from active politics in 1982 after the formation of Lok Dal (K) .In retirement, through the 1980s, he continued to write; he was especially caustic on Constitutional issues, where he set himself the task of defending the Constitution in the media against those who would seek to modify it to centralize power, or to replace the Westminster system with a Presidential one, fearing a 'slow slide to despotism.

Madhu Limaye passed away on 8 January 1995 in New Delhi at the age of 72 after a brief illness. He was suffering from acute bronchial asthma. Madhu Limaye will be remembered by generations to come for his relentless struggle to protect civil liberties and championing, the cause of social justice. As an astute parliamentarian, he belonged to exclusive genre of members who always used to come to the house after doing painstaking research and homework. A man of utmost integrity, Madhu Limaye always acted with conviction. He has set an example of highest moral and ethical norms in public life. In his passing away the country has lost a true patriot, nationalist, renowned thinker, socialist leader and a distinguished parliamentarian.

Madhu Limaye wrote more than 100 books in English, Hindi and Marathi and contributed more than 1000 articles in various periodicals, journals and newspapers.

### **BOOKS & ARTICLES BY MADHU LIMAYE**

Tito's revolt against Stalin, by Madhu Limaye. Published by Chetna Prakashan for Socialist Party, Bombay, 1949-16 pages.

Communist Party: facts and fiction, by Madhu Limaye. Chetana Prakashan, 1951-100 pages.

The Barren Path: a reply to Aruna Asaf Ali, by Madhu Limaye, Socialist Party (India). 1951-12 pages.

'Foreign Policy: Some Points For Discussion', by Madhu Limaye, Pamphlet issued on the eve of the Special Convention of the Socialist Party at Pachmarhi M.P. 1952.

Report of the special convention held at Pachmarhi, Madhya Pradesh, 23rd to 27th May 1952. Socialist Party (India).  
Compiled and Edited by Madhav Gokhale .Published by Madhu Limaye, 1952-206 pages.

The Merger: how and why. Praja Socialist Party. Published by Madhu Limaye for the Praja Socialist Party, 1952-47 pages.

Where is the Left going? by Madhu Limaye. Socialist party, 1952-17 pages.

Evolution of socialist policy, by Madhu Limaye. Chetana Parkashan, 1952-33 pages.

Report on Kashmir, by Sadiq Ali, Madhu Limaye. Praja Socialist Party, 1954-38 pages.

Indian communism today, by Madhu Limaye. Book Centre. 1954-23 pages.

Betrayal of the P & T Men and other Central Govt. Employees, by Madhu Limaye. Bombay: Socialist Publications, 1957-11 pages.

Indian Politics Today, by Madhu Limaye (The pamphlet was issued on the eve of the Third General Election, 1962). Socialist Party Publication.

The Sino-Indian war; its historical and international background and pre-conditions of victory, by Madhu Limaye. Published by Himmat Jhaveri, 1962-62 pages.

Draft Programme and Political Line, by Madhu Limaye. (Presented at the First National Conference of the Samyukta Socialist Party held from 29-

31 January, 1965, Varanasi) (New Delhi: Samyukta Socialist Party, 1965-26 pages).

Why Samyukta socialist? by Madhu Limaye. Popular Prakashan, 1968-66 pages.

Politics of transition, by Madhu Limaye. Published by Vasant Helekar, Bombay. 1969-109 pages.

Triple alliance and price loot: spotlight on the suppression of Tariff Commission Reports. N.P. 1972-11 pages. (SUPPRESSION OF TARIFF REPORTS Consumer Fleeced, **Triple Alliance** Makes Billions PROFITABILITY IN 1971-72, shared the unprecedented **loot**. Shri Madhu **Limaye** raised this question in the Lok Sabha on the last day of the budget session).

Lok Sabha poll : a challenge, by Madhu Limaye. New Delhi: Shyamal Basu. 1979-27 pages.

Future of Hindustan: the Bangladesh War and its aftermath, by Madhu Limaye. Samajwadi Sahitya Vibhag Prakashan. 1993-36 pages.

Constitution and conventions : letter to President Giri and Justice Hegde, by Madhu Limaye. Ashok Printing Press, 1995-11 pages.

The New Constitutional Amendments: Death-Knell of Popular Liberties, by Madhu Limaye. Allied Publishers Private Ltd., New Delhi, 1977-33 pages.

India and the world, by Madhu Limaye. New Literature, 1979-58 pages.

Politics after freedom, by Madhu Limaye. Atma Ram, 1982-464 pages. A socialist leader's survey of the post-1947 Indian political scene.

Problems of India's foreign policy, by Madhu Limaye, Nanak Chand Mehrotra. Atma Ram, 1984-320 pages.

Prime movers: role of the individual in history, by Madhu Limaye. Radiant Publishers, 1985-448 pages.

The age of hope: phases of the socialist movement, by Madhu Limaye, Nanak Chand Mehrotra. Atma Ram, 1986-527 pages. Socialist movements in India, 1947-1975. Articles.

President vs. Prime Minister, by Madhu Limaye. Janata Party, Bombay Regional Committee, 1987-82 pages. On the question of Mail Intercept Bill; includes excerpts of documents exchanged between Rajiv Gandhi and Giani Zail Singh.

President Vs. Prime Minister. Bombay: A Janata Party Publication, 1987-60 pages.

Contemporary Indian politics, by Madhu Limaye. Radiant Publishers, 1987-467 pages.

Birth of non-Congressism: opposition politics, 1947-1975, by Madhu Limaye. B.R. Pub. Corp., 1988-602 pages.

Musings on current problems and past events, by Madhu Limaye. B.R. Pub. Corp., 01-Sep-1988-349 pages. Articles chiefly on 20th century Indian political conditions.

Indian national movement: its ideological and socio-economic dimensions, by Madhu Limaye. Radiant Publishers, 1989-452 pages.

Cabinet government in India, by Madhu Limaye. Radiant Publishers, 1989-346 pages.

Indian polity in transition, by Madhu Limaye. Radiant Publishers, 1990-254 pages.

Socialist communist interaction in India, by Madhu Limaye. Ajanta Publications (India), 1991-393 pages. Festschrift honoring his Comrade George Fernandes, born 1930, politician and former union minister of India, on his 60th birthday.

Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, a historical partnership, 1916-1948, Volume 2 of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, a Historic Partnership, 1916-1948, by Madhu Limaye, Publisher B.R. Pub. Corp., 1989-510 pages.

Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru: A Historic Partnership, by Madhu Limaye. B. R. Publishing Corporation, 01-Jan-1990.

Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru: A Historic Partnership, 1916-1931. Volume 1, of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, a historical partnership, 1916-1948, by Madhu Limaye. Publisher B.R. Pub. Corp, 1991-411 pages.

Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru: A Historic Partnership, 1932-1942. Volume 2, of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, a historical partnership, 1916-1948, by Madhu Limaye. Publisher B.R. Pub. Corp, 1989-510 pages.

Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru: A Historic Partnership, 1942-1946. Volume 3, of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, a historical partnership, 1916-1948, by Madhu Limaye. Publisher B.R. Pub. Corp, 1990-355 pages.

Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru: A Historic Partnership 1916-1948 (Vol. I-Vol. IV). Freedom Movement (Phase-III), 1992.

Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru: A Historic Partnership, 1916-1948 :Volume 4 of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, a Historical Partnership, by Madhu Limaye. Publisher B.R. Pub. Corp., 1992-1624 pages.

Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru: A Historic Partnership (1947-1948): Volume 4 of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru : a historic partnership; (1916-1948) by Madhu Limaye. Publisher BR Publ. Co., 1991-411 pages.

Decline of a political system: Indian politics at the crossroads, by Madhu Limaye. Wheeler Publishing, 01-May-1992-234, pages. Collection Of Essays of Madhu Limaye, Offers A Bird's Eye View of Indian Politics And Analyses The Controversies And Concerns That Claimed Public Attention In The Twilight Years Of The Last Century. Part I Politics, 3 Chapters-Part II President's Powers 3 Chapters, Part III Speaker, Defection Law And Reforms-5 Chapters, Part IV Soviet Development And India-2 Chapters, Part V RSS Family Organizations-Religion And Politics 6 Chapters. Very Slightly Shop soiled.

A Self Liquidating Reservation Scheme: A step to social Justice, by Madhu Limaye on Supreme Court Decision on Backward Class Reservation, New Delhi, 1992-30 pages.

Parliament, judiciary, and parties: an electrocardiogram of politics, by Madhu Limaye. Ajanta Publications, 1994-225 pages.

Religious bigotry: a threat to ordered state, by Madhu Limaye. Ajanta Publications, 1994-191 pages. Articles, chiefly on communalism in the light of Indian religious perspective.

Documentary History of the Janata Party, 3 volumes, by Madhu Limaye. Advent Books, 1993

Janata Party Experiment: An insider's account of opposition politics, 1975-77 (Vol. I&II) by Madhu Limaye. B.R. Pub. Corp., 1994. Destructive Faction Struggle in the Janata Party The Janata Party was not an integrated party. Nor was it a cadre-based party. Only two elements in it subscribed to a definite ideology: the Socialists and the Jan Sangh.

Janata Party Experiment: An insider's account of opposition politics, 1975-77. Volume 1 of Janata Party Experiment, by Madhu Limaye. Publisher B.R. Pub. Corp., 1994-592 pages.

Janata Party Experiment: An insider's account of opposition politics, 1977-80. Volume 2 of Janata Party Experiment, by Madhu Limaye. Publisher B.R. Pub. Corp., 1994-163 pages.

The August struggle: an appraisal of Quit India movement, by Madhu Limaye. Sindhu Publication, 1993-47 pages.

Limits of authority: political controversies and religious conflicts in contemporary India, by Madhu Limaye. Shipra Publications, 1994-254 pages.

Manu, Gandhi, and Ambedkar and other essays, by Madhu Limaye. Gyan Pub. House, 1995-180 pages. Articles on sociology, religion, culture, current affairs, etc. A set of articles of topical interest by Madhu Limaye in five parts on subjects: conflict between Dr. Ambedkar and Gandhi, Gatt and Politics Current constitutional, parliamentary and political controversies,

Last writings, by Madhu Limaye. B.R. Pub. Corp., 01-Dec-1996-142 pages.

Goa liberation movement and Madhu Limaye, by Madhu Limaye. B.R. Pub. Corp. 1996-151 pages. Prison diary of Madhu Limaye during 1955-57 in Goa Jail; published on the occasion of the Golden Jubilee of Goa Liberation Movement on 18th June 1996. The headlines in the Marathi daily Lokamanya said, "Death of Madhu Limaye under imprisonment in Goa?" There had been no news from Madhuji after they had crossed the Goa border on the night of 25th July. Numerous telegrams were sent but..

Goa liberation movement and Madhu Limaye, by Champa Limaye. Delhi: B.R. Publishing, 1996-151 pages.

Galaxy of the Indian socialist leaders, by Madhu Limaye. B.R. Pub. Corp., 2000-392 pages. Contribution of some of the significant socialist leaders on contemporary history of Indian freedom struggle and post 1947 socialist movement in India.

Madhu Limaye on famous personalities, by Madhu Limaye. B.R. Pub. Corp. 2002-181 pages. On the politicians, chiefly from India, and their role in post-1947 India.

Madhu Limaye in Parliament: A commemorative volume (A Monograph on Madhu Limaye, containing many of his important speeches in Lok Sabha, Published by Lok Sabha Secretariat - Parliament of India).Lok Sabha Secretariat, 2008-664 pages. Collected speeches of the parliamentarian brought out by the Lok Sabha Secretariat on his birth anniversary.

### **Books In Hindi**

Kamyūnist Pārṭī sac aur jhūṭ,(Communist Party, Sach Aur Jhoot) by Madhu Limaye.1953-96 pages. Ideological disputes.

Socialist Party, Tritya Rashtriya Sammelan, Varanasi :Adhyakshiya Bhashan, Madhu Limaye.Hyderabad: Commercial Printing Press, 1959-33 pages.

Chekoslovakia par Rusi ka balatkar : Lok Sabha men, 23.8.1968, ko diya hua bhashan, by Madhu Limaye. Published by Pannalal Surana, Bombay.2005-7 pages.

Chaukhamba rajya : ek rooprekha, by Madhu Limaye. Calcutta: Samta Prakashan, 1973-26 pages.

Apatkal : samvaidhanik adhinayakvaad ka prashast path, by Madhu Limaye.New Delhi: Samta Prakashan, 1975-20 pages.

Marksavada aura Gandhivada, by Madhu Limaye. Pallavana Parakasana Delhi. 1981-74 pages.

Samasyāem aura vikalpa, by Madhu Limaye. 1982-172 pages. Articles on politics and government in India.

Svatantratā āndolana kī vichāradhāra, by Madhu Limaye. Delhi: Pallavan Prakashan, 1983-155 pages. Articles on the Indian freedom struggle.

Dr.Ambedkar ek chintan, by Madhu Limaye.Mumbai: Rachana Prakashan, 1986.128 pages.

Rāshṭrapati banāma Pradhānamantrī, by Madhu Limaye.Pratipaksha Samatā Prakāśana. 1987-83 pages. On the relationship between the president and the prime minister as envisaged in the Indian Constitution.

Baba Saheb Dr Ambedkar: Ek Chintan, by Madhu Limaye.Atmaram and Sons.1991-128 pages. Political and social views of Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar, 1892-1956, statesman and social reformer.

August Kranti ka bahuayami paridrishya, by Madhu Limaye.New Delhi:Samajvadi Vicharmala, 1992-52 pages.

Dharam aur rajneeti, by Madhu Limaye. Samta Trust, Bhopal.1992-94 Pages.

Rajneeti Ki Shatranj - VP se PV Tak, Bharatiya Rajneeti Ka Naya Mod, by Madhu Limaye. Bhopal: Samata Trust, 1992-100 pages.

Saradāra Paṭela, suvyavasthita rājya ke praṇetā: Madhu Limaye.1993-79 pages.Contribution of Vallabhbai Patel, 1875-1950, freedom fighter and nationalist to the Indian freedom struggle, a study; translated from original in English.

Mahatma Gandhi rashtrapita kyon kahlate hain, by Madhu Limaye.New Delhi: Samajvadi Vicharmala, 1993-12 pages.

Rashtriyata ke dushman : sankird va bikaou Hindu aur dharmandh Musalman, by Madhu Limaye. New Delhi: Samajvadi Vicharmala, 1993-24 pages.

Bhartiya rajniti ka sankat, by Madhu Limaye. 1995. Contemporary Indian politics.

Bharateeya rajneeti ke antarvirodh, by Madhu Limaye. Delhi: Saransh Prakashan, 1996-191 pages.

Ātmakathā, by Madhu Limaye, Sulabha Kore. Bhāratīya Prakāśana Saṁsthāna, 1998-506 pages. Autobiography of an Indian politician.

Nyāyālayā Main Madhū Limaye, by Y. D. Phadke. 2000-100 pages. On Madhu Limaye, Indian politician, defending himself in courts during his trial by the then British Government.

Nyayalaya mein Madhu Limaye. New Delhi: Madhu Limaye Smriti Nyas, 2002-120 pages.

Loksabha chunaov : ek chunauti, by Madhu Limaye. New Delhi: Pragatisheel Janvicharak Manch, 1977-28 pages.

Samasyayen aur vikalp, by Madhu Limaye. New Delhi: Samta Pustak Mala, 1982-173 pages.

Sankramankaleen rajneeti, by Madhu Limaye. Lucknow: Rammanohar Lohia Smarak Samiti, 1986-211 pages.

Parivartan : samajik arthik evam rajnetik, by Madhu Limaye. Kotta: Samta Vichar Manch, 1987-27 pages.

Sangh parivar ki lachar bodhikta, by Madhu Limaye. New Delhi: Samjwadi Vicharmala, 1993-30 pages.

Sarvajanic jeevan mein naitikta ka lop, by Madhu Limaye. New Delhi: Samajvadi Vicharmala, 1993-15 pages.

Samajvad : kal, aaj wa udhya, by Madhu Limaye. Pune: Dyanamic Publishers, 1996-45 pages.

Atmakatha, by Madhu Limaye. Mumbai: Ashar Prakashan, 1996-456 pages.

Sauhard, by Madhu Limaye. Edited by Champa Limaye. Delhi: Medha Books, 2003-144 pages.

Aarakshan Ki Neeti, by Madhu Limaye.

Ayodhya - Vote Bank Ki Vidhwansak Rajneeti, by Madhu Limaye.

Communist Party: Kathni Aur Karni, by Madhu Limaye.

### **Books In Marathi**

Communist Zaheernamyanchi shanbhar varshe, by Madhu Limaye. Mumbai. Sadhana Prakashan, 1950-31 pages.

Ajchen Bharateeya rajkaran va samajvadi paksh, by Madhu Limaye. Mumbai: Samajvadi Pakshachen Prakashan, 1957. (Xeroxed) 20p.

Dr. Ambedkar : Ek Chintan, by Madhu Limaye (Translated from Hindi by Amrendra. Nandu Dhaneshwar, Bombay, Rachana Prakashan 1986)

Karmayōgi Da Rāmamanōhar lōhiyā, by Madhu Limaye, Ji Suramauli. pratulaku, Ji. Yam. Añjayya, 1997-16 pages.

Peca rājakārañātale, by Madhu Limaye. Granthālī, 1998-224 pages.

Ajchen Bharateeya rajkaran va samajvadi paksh

Bharateeya rajkaran : kothe challe aahi, by Madhu Limaye.1982-16 pages.

Bharatiya rajkaran kute chalate ahe

Pashantar bandi? navhe, aniyantrit nitishahichi nandi! by Madhu Limaye.Pune: Gopal Mokashi, 1985-40pages.

Ladkya popatas, by Madhu Limaye.Mumbai: Popular Book Depot, 1961. 32 pages.

Ātmakathā, by Madhu Limaye, Sulabha Kore.Bhāratīya Prakāśana Samsthāna, 1998-506 pages.Autobiography of an Indian politician.

Trimantri Yojna  
Swatantraya Chalvalichi Vichardhara  
Communist Paksachey Antrang  
Samajwad Kaal, Aaj Vva Udyā  
Chaukhamba Rajya  
Rashtrapita

### **BOOKS ON MADHU LIMAYE**

Goa liberation movement and Madhu Limaye, by Champa Limaye. Delhi: B.R. Publishing, 1996-151 pages.

Shri Madhu Limaye, by Champa Limaye. Delhi: Samajvadi Sahitya Sansthan, 2003-168 pages.

Vedhak vyakti-vedhak prasang. Edited by Champa Limaye. Mumbai: Rachana Prakashan, 1988. 180 pages.

Madhu Limaye, jīvana aura rājanīti, by Vinoda Prasāda Siṃha, Premasiṃha.1996-458 pages.Contributed articles, reminiscences by various friends and associates on the life and works of Madhu Limaye, politician and socialist; some articles have been translated from Marathi.

Nyāyālayāta Madhū Limaye, by Y. D. Phadke. 2000-100 pages. On Madhu Limaye, Indian politician, defending himself in courts during his trial by the then British Government.

Shri Madhu Limaye-Ek Jeevni by Prakash Bandrey.

Women: power and progress, by Champā Limaye. B.R. Pub. Corp., 01-Dec-1999-230 pages.

Madhu Limaye on Famous Personalities. Edited by Champa Limaye. Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation, 2002-181 pages.

Contents: Foreword. Preface. 1. Mahatma Gandhiji: the dynamics of change. 2. Sardar Patel: protagonist of an ordered state. 3. Homage to Jawaharlal Nehru. 4. Rajendra Babu vs. Rajaji: attitude of Nehru. 5. Rajendra Prasad's reactions and views. 6. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan was a true Satyagrahi. 7. Jinnah as social reformer. 8. Morarji Desai: a strong willed personality. 9. Charan Singh : Product of a fractured social order. 10. Sanjiva Reddy excelled as speaker. 11. Indira Gandhi as I knew her (Indira Gandhi's Mohini Attam). 12. Four chapters of political life. 13. Shri Abasaheb Kulkarni: a loving friend. 14. Jagannathrao Joshi: a co-prisoner's tribute. 15. New light on a great reformer. 16. Pandita Ramabai Saraswati – an obscure page. 17. Futile attempt to reconcile Gandhiji and Subhas Bose. 18. Marx and Engels: German nationalists, western Chauvinists or universalists? 19. Germany must absorb Slav nations. 20. Western Europe must unite against Russia. 21. For Marx, Engels the world meant the west. 22. Lenin against Leninism. 23. Price for going slow. Index.

"This book Madhu Limaye on Famous Personalities contains a collection of articles exploring certain unknown facets of these famous personalities. The first article conveys the manner in which Gandhiji transformed political activism in India. The article on Sardar Patel communicates the core belief of the Sardar in an "ordered state" and his efforts towards establishing it in India.

One article reviews affinities and differences between Mahatmaji and Netaji Subhas Bose, while another article pays homage to Jawaharlal Nehru, Mahatmaji's heir apparent. Two articles are about Rajen Babu. One describes how he adroitly defeated Jawaharlal's attempts to deny him the post of "the president of our republic", and the other about his contribution as well as his attempts to define the role and responsibilities of the 'President of India'.

There are articles that deal with little known aspects of certain famous persons like Mohammed Ali Jinnah, Pandita Ramabai and Mahadev Govind Ranade.

One section deals with obituaries or pen sketches of eminent persons like Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Morarji Desai, Indira Gandhi, and about Madhuji's personal relations with many of them despite his political differences with them.

Finally, one section of articles throws light on biases and limitations held by Marx and Engels. Two articles deal with developments in the Soviet Union in the years during which Mikhail Gorbachev made to transform the Soviet Union, and yet, preserve its essential unity.

The common thread that runs through these articles are Madhuji's scholarship, his deep knowledge of social reform movement and freedom movement in India, his extensive knowledge of current affairs, his deep study of views and writings of Marx and Engels, and last but the least, his ability to be objective and to view developments and personalities from a different and unusual perspective.

The book should make an interesting reading for students and keen observers of politics."

Dear Popat, by Madhu Limaye. Letters to his son Aniruddha from Goa prison mentioned in his book 'Goa liberation movement and Madhu Limaye. Also published in Marathi as Ladkya Popatas.(To Dear Popat) Dear Tiny Tiny Pats, Our motherland became an independent country 14

years ago. The rule of the White British came to an end and the rule by our own people began. But Goa, although a part of our country remain slave.....

Title : Dear Popat

Author : Madhu Limaye

Illustrated by : Keerti Ramchandran

Publisher : National Book Trust

The beautiful day which dawned with India's freedom - 15th August 1947, unfortunately did not bring the same for the smallest but probably the most beautiful state of our country - Goa, which continued its struggle under the oppressive regime of Portuguese, for many more years after 1947.

Madhu Limaye, a freedom fighter, initiated a Satyagraha movement against Portuguese Government in 1955. For his protest, he was beaten mercilessly and was sentenced to a twelve year imprisonment. From the Fort Aguada Jail, he started writing letters to his 1 year old son - Popat (Aniruddh) - his way of filling the loneliness of his days by steering his mind and thoughts to the memory lanes of his family and his beloved son. He attempted to bridge the gap that physical distance had brought between a father and a son by sending a capsule of his affection regularly in written form.

The affectionate letters that he wrote to Popat must have been Popat's prized possessions throughout his life and now for us to savour the loving words of a father to his son. I simply enjoyed the diverse and disjoint topics, finding their mention in his letters - the way a child's attention moves from one thing to another - jerkily but enthusiastically.

In some letters he mentions about the fireflies coming through the window of his room and the conversation he had with them, the birds and animals which are being coaxed by him to convey his messages to his dear son Popat but they just eat the treat he offers and do not obey him. Sometimes he talks about mother sea and his son, who are engaged in a

game of hide and seek and other times he describes about the huge ocean waves crashing against the rocks near the prison.

Besides being in captivity, Limaye and his small group of friends, enjoyed and celebrated all special festivals and occasions including Popat's birthday and his father getting the special treatment of not doing any chores that day and just basking in the sweet memories of Popat.

Madhu Limaye has written some very profound pieces but he has neatly managed to bring his writing style to a very comfortable level where his son could understand the written matter when his mother read these letters to him. One thing which I liked the most is the tone of third person narrative which Limaye has used in most of his letters, the way children talk about themselves and while addressing others. Using words like Bho-bho for a dog, miao for a cat, chiu-tai for a sparrow, zhook-zhook for a train etc. lends an extra personal touch to the letters and make the reading very interesting.

### **ARTICLES BY MADHU LIMAYE**

VK Krishna Menon's Marathon Speech on Kashmir at the Security Council. Madhu Limaye offers a bird's eye-view of Indian Politics and with extraordinary brilliance he analyses the controversies.

'Significance of Yugoslav-Soviet Conflict' by Madhu Limaye, in Janata on June 5, 12, 26 & July 3, 1949.

'New Order in Asia', Janata, by Madhu Limaye. 26 February 1950.

"India and China" by Madhu Limaye. Janata 7 January, 1951.

Statement by Asoka Mehta and Madhu Limaye, Janata, 25 July 1951.

"India's Mediation in Korea", by Madhu Limaye. Janata, 14th December, 1952.

'Issues Before the First Asian Socialist Conference,' by Madhu Limaye. Janata, Jan. 4, 1953.

Madhu Limaye's statement on the formation of PSP Government in Travancore-Cochin(Kerala). Janata, 4th March, 1954.

'On PSP's International Policy,' by Madhu Limaye. Janata, 18th April, 1954.

"Peaceful Coexistence plus Something", by Madhu Limaye. Janata, 8th August, 1954.

Indian Communists : The New Phase, by Madhu Limaye. Pacific Affairs, Vol. XXIV, No. 1, (March 1951).Pacific Affairs, September 1954.

"Chinese Aggression and India's Reaction", by Madhu Limaye, United Asia, 1959.

Lessons of Central Government Employees' Strike: by Madhu Limaye, Mainstream-VII (6): October 12, 1968.

"Bangla Desh, India and the world Community", by Madhu Limaye, Janata 26 (J), Republic Day, 1972.

'Four-Pillar State: An Outline' by Madhu Limaye. (Janata; September 2, 1973).

Madhu Limaye's speech at the World Peace Council on Vietnam, March 6, 1979, Mainstream, March 10, 1979.

Sardar Patel's optimism, by Madhu Limaye. Patriot 17th September, 1984.

What is RSS? Article by Madhu Limaye describes What RSS is.

Madhu Limaye also wrote many articles in Sadhana, A Marathi weekly publication. Sadhana is a Socialist Marathi weekly publication that was established by Pandurang Sadashiv Sane Sane Guruji , a leader of Rashtra Seva Dal.

(Compiled by Qurban Ali)

Qurban Ali is a TV Journalist and can be contacted on [qurban100@gmail.com](mailto:qurban100@gmail.com)