



*Journal of Advances and
Scholarly Researches in
Allied Education*

*Vol. IX, Issue No. XVIII,
April-2015, ISSN 2230-7540*

INDIAN SOCIALIST IDEOLOGY IN INDIAN CONSTITUTION

AN
INTERNATIONALLY
INDEXED PEER
REVIEWED &
REFEREED JOURNAL

Indian Socialist Ideology in Indian Constitution

Amreen Hasan^{1*} Dr. Ambika Bansal²

¹ Research Scholar, Shri Venkateshwara University, Gajraula

² Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts, Shri Venkateshwara University, Gajraula, Amroha (UP)

Abstract – The socialism is recognized as Indian political system's cherished goal. Socialism emphasizes people's welfare, seeks to give people equality, and seeks to eliminate the exploitation of one class by the other, and ensures economic and political equality for everyone. This fundamental constitutional concept has been added to give equality and fraternity to the economic content of justice and to affirm the resolve of non-discrimination on the grounds of religion. Socio-economic justice is the pillar of socialism. For this reason, in Part 4 of our Constitution, the framers of our Constitution have prescribed these fundamental principles in the form of the directive principle of state policy to establish a welfare state based on the principles of socialism. All of us need to safeguard the holy spirit of socialism enshrined in our constitution, so that we can achieve all round progress with peace and harmony.

Keywords: Socialism, Ideology, Conservatism, Principles

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

Like liberalism and conservatism, in the eighteenth century and even earlier, socialism was a development of the nineteenth century, with its roots. It grew with industrialization and urbanization, a process that began in the 1750s in Britain and spread over the early part of the 1800s to Western Europe. This process created the modern factory system (which in the industrialized West is only now beginning to disappear) and generated new industrial and manufacturing classes and elites, and the modern industrial working class, most important for socialism. Trade unions emerged from this working class, building societies, cooperatives, all influenced by socialism, the working class ideology.

After the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 in Russia, Karl Marx, Robert Owen, Henri de Saint Simon and Vladimir Lenin were the famous scholar of Socialism and paving the socialism. Socialism is government forms in which people have common and collective ownership, but government owns factories and the public has equal shares. And Govt was generally elected by democratic system. And according to their abilities, people participate in means of production. According to the contribution in production, everyone receives the share. Feudalism and capitalism force people to compete, but socialism assumes that all people are cooperative, but only when they realize that cooperation is best for their interest. Only when he wants to fulfill his social needs do human beings show cooperation. Socialism ensures a level playing field between resources and services. The peoples thus

have equal access to health care and education. Basically, socialism provides framework for the improvement of society as a whole and focuses on society as a whole. In socialist society all people have equal class and no elite class, middle class and lower middle class. Everyone works according to their interest as if an individual wants to be a dancer, no one says to do work in the factory because socialites society prefers what they want to be the human desire. Socialism's main objective reduces the gap between rich and poor but does not eliminate that gap altogether.

No county today has a pure socialist form of government. State has a hybrid socialist form of administration.

THE SPREAD OF MARXISM DURING 1880S

Starting in the 1880s, Friedrich Engels made a special effort to popularize Marx's theories, especially among the growing worker reading public. As for the general theories of Marx, this was not an easy task because, apart from intellectuals, few people could easily grasp the meanings of his analysis of capitalist development. To make those views more accessible, Engels set himself the task of defending Marxian theories against the would-be critics of Marx.

In Anti-Dühring and several of his better known works, Engels tried to expand his lifelong collaborator's views by emphasizing that Marxism was not merely a revolutionary theory, but a scientific worldview that revealed the complexities of society.

By arguing in this way, Engels hoped not only to discredit rival views of socialism but also to show the continued relevance of the theories of Marx. However, from a doctrinal standpoint, Engels' most enduring legacy to socialism was his materialist conception of history. More so than Marx, Engels saw the socialism march as an inexorable historical process that could be predicted with near mathematical certainty by correctly reading the "objective laws" that governed the evolution of both the natural world and society. Hence, he suggested a view of socialist development that linked it to a general change process that could be measured and read through empirical investigations.

SOCIALISM AT THE END OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

During the mid-1980s socialists across Europe began to question their long-standing commitment to socialization policies, such as social welfare and public ownership (nationalization), partly in response to the electoral successes of their ideological opponents on the right. And while a small core of purists refused to abandon the transformative aims of their doctrine, the vast majority of socialists elected to office in this period believed that by adopting the principles and practices of neoliberalism, social justice and equality could best be achieved.

As a result, the notion of what it meant to be a socialist underwent substantial revision, with some critics arguing that socialist "credit card" precapitalist values made them indistinguishable from their liberal and conservative rivals. Those belonging to the generation of Socialists referred to here are widely known as social democrats in the early twenty-first century, a label that refers to their commitment to both parliamentary democracy and the principles of market socialism. According to this mixed-economy model, the government should play a role in overseeing the ownership of certain companies (e.g., utilities and public transportation) but would allow market forces to determine the allocation of their goods and services. While the Social Democrats insist that their policies are aimed at implementing the classic socialist ideals of social justice and economic equality for all, they do not subscribe to the age-old socialist conviction that the state should function as the sole vehicle for achieving these much-wanted objectives.

SOCIALISM IN INDIA

Some sentimental and humanitarian ideals regarding human fraternity, solidarity and spiritual equality are found in the Rig-Veda and the Buddhist scriptures, especially the Dhammapada but socialism as a philosophy of social and economic reconstruction is developed and popularized in India solely because of the impact of the West. In India, the growth of socialist thought is almost absolutely a twentieth-century phenomenon, unlike in the West, where pre-eminent socialist thinkers flourished in the 19th century.

There is mention of the Russian Nihilists in the articles of Bal Gangadhar Tilak written in the Kesari in 1908. But they are mentioned as a terrorist group or anarchist group. There is no evidence that Tilak had any knowledge of the ideas of eminent Nihilistic philosophers such as Pisarev, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolubov.

Lala Lajpat Rai may have been the first Indian writer to write about Bolshevism and Socialism, but his attitude toward Bolshevism is unsympathetic. M. 1921–23. N. Roy wrote his *India in Transition* and *Indian Problem*, engaging in a bitter critique of the Indian National Congress' bourgeois domination. He wrote as a confirmed Marxist, claiming that Lajpat Rai was 'a bourgeois politician without socialism's sympathy.

In the early twenties, M. N. Roy and Virendra Chattopadhyaya were the two Indians who had a keen interest in Communism. C. R. Das referred to the great event of the Russian Revolution of 1917 in his Presidential speech at the Gaya Congress (1922), but he showed no sympathy for it. Nevertheless, without being a Socialist, Das helped build a Trade Union movement in India.

In the field of Indian Socialism, Jaya Prakash Narayan was the best known and recognized personality. It was his important contribution to join the Indian socialist movement in the great struggle for national freedom which was being fought under the Indian National Congress banner. Narendra Deva and Jaya Prakash Narayan attempted to orient the socialist ideology toward the emancipation of the masses from imperialist political rule and native feudal thrall. As a result, they underlined the socialist philosophy as a war-cry on two fronts—the struggle for national liberation and social revolution. In the context of India's immense poverty and decadent agricultural society, Narayan has stressed eliminating the restraints, both mechanical and social, that hamper the productivity of agriculture.

Dr Ram Manohar Lohia contributed significantly to the progress of India's socialist movement. He had been a fiery socialist thought propagandist in India and pleaded for a greater incorporation of Gandhian ideas into socialist thinking. Ram Manohar Lohia had done vigorous thinking as a socialist intellectual.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF SOCIALISM

Although most critics have argued that the term 'socialist' can only be applied to the critiques of capitalist society, in Plato and even Moses, some have seen the genesis of socialism. Others saw radical socialism in the statements made in the 1380s by the leaders of peasant revolts in England, or in the 1520s in Germany. There may even be a plausible case for the origins of British socialism found in Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), or in the mid-seventeenth-century activities of Gerrard Winstanley and the Diggers. For our purposes, however, it can be said that modern

socialism originated in the early 19th century as a response to two major historical events, the French Revolution (1789) and the industrial revolution from the mid 18th century onwards.

The French Revolution overturned the existing political order and brought to the forefront of political discourse concepts such as human rights and values such as equality and fraternity. That was the perceived threat from British radicalism to the established order that it had been ruthlessly suppressed by the authorities during and after the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars (1792–1815). Radical ideas, however, remained to fertilize socialism development in Britain. As we have observed, the industrial revolution has produced new economic and social structures—a new system of classes-based on capitalism. These structures have nullified the values that the French Revolution espoused in practice. For the vast majority of the population, industrialisation was characterized by injustice, inequality, suffering and degradation. Early socialists tried to confront this state of affairs and turn it to good.

IMPACT OF SOCIALISM

The Socialist Party of Congress, following Independence, became committed to the ideal of democratic socialism. Ashok Mehta wrote a book entitled Democratic Socialism in which he dismissed State idealistic theory and totalitarianism. Like Laski and Barker, he preached the notion of plural state, and felt that socialism was not anti-cultural. He stated that the planned economics of Russian Communism tends to centralization. But democratic socialism is committed to cultural pluralism and certain absolute concepts and criteria of ethics. In 1964, a resolution was passed by the All India Congress Committee at Bhubaneswar in which they emphasized democratic socialism.

It is true that the two most famous names in the history of socialism, Karl Marx and Lenin, were materialists. Marx had written his doctoral dissertation on the difference between Democritus' materialistic philosophy and Epicurus, submitted to the University of Jena. Lenin was an atheistic militant. Also in India we have various schools of thought such as idealism, materialism, and atheism. Buddhism, Jainism, the Mimamsa, and the Samkhya are atheistic.

Recognized exponents of anti-Vedas were Kautsa and Charvaka (Brihaspati). But I do not think that socialism, in the primary sense of a philosophy of economic organization wherein ownership of the means of production is prevented from being transformed into a source of obtaining power over others, and wherein control of the means of production is divested from private owners and given to the state, is necessarily and logically attached to any one particular system of metaphysics, whether it is idealistic or materialistic.

True, a militant atheist like Lenin denounced Bogdanov, Bazarov, Lunacharsky and Yushkevitch's attempts to incorporate idealistic elements into Marxism, but in India we find that there have been agnostic atheistic and idealistic socialism champions. An agnostic was Jawaharlal Nehru and an atheist was Lohia.

But Dr. Sapranand has been a confirmed believer in both Vedanta's teachings and Yoga. Therefore, it is possible to accept an idealistic approach in the field of metaphysics and cosmology, while at the same time maintaining that private capitalism is an unfair institution and, therefore, sponsoring the socialist alternative. However, there is no reason to denounce Western socialism as a social and economic philosophy on the ground that it is based on materialistic ontology. Socialism has been defined and interpreted in different ways. Durkheim made a distinction between the ancient transcendental communism and the modern mechanistic socialism that developed as a counterpoise to the evils generated by industrialisation in the post-industrial revolution era. In modern socialism, the key concept was the socialization of the means of production. Socialisation and nationalization are sometimes used interchangeably. But it needs to make a distinction.

IDEOLOGY

"An ideology is a set of ideas by which men argue, explain and justify the aims and means of organized social action, regardless of whether such action aims at preserving, amending, eradicating or rebuilding a given social order" (Seliger, 1976, p. 14).

That is the definition found by Andrew Heywood, Andrew Vincent and Michael Freeden in what are now the classic works on English ideologies. All of those books are built in the same way. They lay down in the singular a definition of ideology before characterizing a set of plural ideologies. It defines ideology; it is not the separate ideologies. Ideologies are complicated (Freeden, 1996, p. 13; Heywood, 1998, pp. 17–9; Vincent, 1992, p. 18). They are not 'hermetically sealed thinking systems' (Heywood, 1998, p. 13). They are 'modular structures, which often display a highly fluid morphology' (Freeden, 1996, p. 88). They are 'complex internally, mixed and overlapping' (Vincent, 1992, p. 19). Thus, "to divide ideologies into prefabricated categories called socialism or liberalism is to fly in the face of evidence" (Freeden, 1996, pp. 87-8).

LIBERALISM

"Liberalism is the mistake of subjecting to human judgments those revealed doctrines which are beyond or independent of it in their nature, and of claiming to determine for intrinsic reasons the truth and value of the propositions which are based on the

existing authority of the Divine Word merely for their reception" (Newman, 1890, p. 288).

That is not a political principle in itself, of course, although it can be found in politics. More recently, Jeremy Waldron (1987, p. 127), while acknowledging that 'we are unlikely to find any single cluster of theoretical and practical proposals that could be regarded as the core or essence of ideology,' claimed that, politically speaking, liberalism 'remains on a certain view of justifying social arrangements.' This view is that all must be 'capable of becoming acceptable to every last person' (Waldron, 1987, p. 128).

Thus, '[a] social and political order is illegitimate unless it is rooted in the consent of all those who have to live under it: these people's consent or consent is a condition for it being morally permissible to enforce that order against them' (Waldron, 1987, p. 140).

In other words, if the suggestion that any political order should be ordered according to the most basic debt owed is an ideology, then the liberal claims that this debt is owed to himself. Liberalism's pure thought is that only the self has infinite credit: everything else is an instrument of that credit, and is in debt with respect to that credit. Of course, it's necessary to say that this is too simple by itself. If taken simply, certain older definitions of liberalism sound like definitions of anarchism.

Harold Laski (1936, pp. 14-5) believed that liberalism is 'not a clear-cut body of doctrine,' but he nevertheless defined it by saying that the liberal seeks to 'indicate the individual's right to shape his own destiny, irrespective of any authority that might seek to limit his potential.'

L. T. Hobhouse (1911, p. 123) was just as cautious: although he listed many 'elements' of liberalism and expressed reluctance to prioritize any of them, he nevertheless placed the 'heart' of liberalism in the belief that 'society can safely be founded on the self-directing power of individuality.' Neither Laski nor Hobhouse deemed himself an anarchist. These quotations however indicate that what Hegel would have called the abstract concept of liberalism seems to be anarchism.

CONSERVATISM

Conservatism further extends that criterion. While liberalism offers the self — whatever it is — as a criterion of judgment, and while socialism offers an extension of this criterion so that it includes the social — whatever it is — as a criterion of judgment, conservatism assumes that both are too abstract. As we have seen, to some extent the socialist agrees with this, but remains committed to the idea of fulfilling what he considers the historic task of liberalism. The conservative goes further and says that the self-constituted criterion of social as well as historical

existence means that there is no historical task—only the need not to break away from history, as liberals and even socialists seem to require us to do. We have a debt both to the dead, and to the living.

Wagh thought that 'men cannot live together without rules,' but that 'there is no form of God-ordained government that is better than any other.' Against socialism, he maintained that the inequalities of wealth and position are inevitable and that the advantages of their elimination are therefore meaningless to discuss (Wagh, 1939, pp. 16-7). As Nietzsche saw them, the Conservative tends to see liberalism and socialism, philosophically as relics of Christianity, and historically as episodes in the decline of Christianity (Nietzsche, 1968, pp. 401 and 411). But, unlike Nietzsche, as Joseph de Maistre (1994, p. 41) put it, the conservative insists that 'institutions are strong and enduring to the extent that they are deified, so to speak. What 'deified' means is of course a question that the non-religious conservative sometimes finds difficult to answer. It is necessary to emphasize the oddity of conservatism.

Conservatism accepts the enlightened view that we need a criterion, but extends the criterion to such an extent that it offers an almost total restoration instead of offering an almost complete transformation. It agrees with socialism that emancipation should not only be that of an abstract individual, but it places such emphasis on the debt to the past that it renders impossible any kind of utopian or scientific socialism. That's a big issue for the conservative. A few years ago, Burke (1999, pp. 112-3) wrote, 'I should be ashamed of overloading a matter, so capable of supporting itself, with the then unnecessary support of any argument.' The conservative generally distrusts arguments, because argument simplifies what should not be simplified. This is why usually conservative argument takes the form of negation, or reaction. The conservative questions rebuttals against the positive assertions of liberals and socialists, and otherwise defends what he can in silence. Yet in rational terms conservatism is the enlightened form of discovery that enlightenment is an error that leaves the world in all the nakedness and loneliness of metaphysical abstraction "stripped of all relationships" (Burke, 1999, p. 93). Its criterion is the complete, albeit contradictory, one that we owe to ourselves as constituted by their existence not only in society but also in history.

NEW ECONOMIC POLICY

India began economic management in 1990-91 to put the economy on an appropriate path (at the moment when the Soviet Union disintegrated even after some fundamental structural changes). New techno-economic paradigms have internationalized the product process by enhancing the speed of commodity production,' which in fact decipher the concept of competitiveness on the world market. The most interesting thing about the Western countries' analysis of reform programmers in India is their critique

of a slower pace compared to the changes taking place in other parts of the globe, particularly in the field of production and transactions, but Western media not only misinterpreted the ramification, but also turned their faces from the reality of agglomeration crises. Structural reforms as the condition for the assurance of so-called financial aid have had no significant advantage in touching the primary human values. Restructuring was initiated in the form of industrial policy reforms, reforms of the public sector, agricultural reforms, reforms of trade and exchange rates, and reforms in regulatory acts, e. g. MRTP, with FERA.

As a phenomenon, capital investment has its own ingredients, like basic economic infrastructure, market potential and maximum profitability. Do factors such as— unequal international division of labor, wide disparities in wages, labor costs between developed and developing countries, and a wide technological gap between developed and developing worlds, make it possible for the state to wilt at once? This is what denationalization means, in which capital should play a predominant role in individual value determination. The success of privatization and liberalization that is supposed to be achievable by recomposing commodity production structures and allocating value depends on the microeconomic efficiency.

Nonetheless, if we think in terms of a classless society or concept of welfare, the collapse of socialism (planned and controlled economies) should not end our social imagination. Socialism's failure was of accomplishment and not of faith. It is still noble vision that can help to wipe out the world's poverty and oppression. It is good that we have gone through painful experience of how socialism has resulted in statism; it is also good that we are moving towards a new vision of capitalism, based on market driven forces, in which public policy is needed instead of central planning or licensing-quota allow raj. However, care must be taken that India's democratic path of transforming its controlled economy cannot become the victim of an authoritarian path, endangering national unity and political legitimacy, because the trend of globalization contains the seeds of 16th-century imperialism vis-à-vis the capitalist world economy that the West, China, Japan, etc. are following after the collapse.

CONCLUSION

As it stands, one can make substantial progress towards realizing social justice and socialism within the limits of the Indian Constitution. Articles 14, 15 and 17 which have ensured legal, social, racial and religious equality are tremendous milestones, if seen in the context of the earlier Indian tradition of despotism and ecclesiasticism. The Indian Dharma-Shastra's blatantly preach the gradation of a particular person's punishment according to the Varna. They do not have any concept of the rule of law. Hence, it must be recognized from the Indian historical perspective that the Indian High Courts and the Supreme Court have

played a monumental role in safeguarding citizens' legal and social equality. The judgments handed down by the higher courts that safeguard freedom and equality are important charters for the realization of legal and social freedom in India. That trend needs to be reinforced in the interests of democratic socialism.

REFERENCES

- Freedman, M. (1996). *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Heywood, A. (1998) *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*, 2nd edn. London: Macmillan.
- Hobhouse, L. T. (1911) *Liberalism*. London: Williams & Norgate.
- Karl Marx, *Collected Works*, Moscow Publication, 1950, pp. 23
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Laski, H. J. (1936) *The Rise of European Liberalism: An Essay in Interpretation*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Newman, J. H. (1890) *Apologia Pro Vita Sua, Being a History of His Religious Opinions*. London: Longmans, Green.
- Owen, Robert. *A New View of Society; and Report to the County of Lanark*. Edited by V. A. C. Gatrell. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1970.
- Seliger, M. (1976) *Ideology and Politics*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Vincent, A. (1992) *Modern Political Ideologies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Waldron, J. (1987) 'Theoretical Foundations of Liberalism', *Philosophical Quarterly*, 37, pp. 127–50.

Corresponding Author

Amreen Hasan*

Research Scholar, Shri Venkateshwara University,
Gajraula