The Academic
International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 4 | Issue 10 | October 2026
ISSN: 2583-973X (Online), SJIF IF(2026): 5.6
Website: www.theacademic.in

The Political Philosophy of Shyama Prasad Mookerjee

Swati Sharma

Research Scholar, History and Archaeological Department, Dr. Shakuntala Misra National Rehabilitation University. ss_hisphd2021@dsmnru.ac.in

DOI : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24416585

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Received: 28-10-2026

Accepted: 03-11-2026

Published: 20-11-2026

Keywords:

culture, nationalism, Hindu Mahasabha, Bhartiya Jana Sangh, national integration

ABSTRACT

Shyama Prasad Mookerjee's thoughts and ideas became politically consequential when he treated culture as a public, constitutional and institutional question. He did not confine identity to private belief. In his political vocabulary, national cohesion depended on shared allegiance, equal civic standing and a historical consciousness capable of binding diverse regions. Through the study in this paper an attempt has been made to understand the framework that helps explain both the appeal and the controversy surrounding his politics. An analysis of his supporters has been done who read and understand his political philosophy as a defence of national unity, however his critics have argued that, because it developed through Hindu nationalist organisations, it risked identifying Indian culture too closely with the symbols and historical memory of the Hindu majority. A serious study must examine the political record itself rather than resolving this debate through labels. This work aims towards exploring the legacy, sacrifice and Dr. Mookerjee's commitment in the political freedom and prosperity of the future progress of India.

Introduction

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee (1901-1953) who lived a brief life of fifty-two years, devoted fourteen years of his life to politics. His stature as statesman stands tall and he had a deep understanding of Indian political

Disclaimer: The opinions, interpretations, conclusions, recommendations, analyses, and statements expressed in this research article are solely those of the author(s) and do not reflect the views, policies, or positions of the Publisher, Chief Editor, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or their affiliated institutions. The author(s) are solely responsible for ensuring the originality, authenticity, and integrity of the manuscript and for ensuring that it is free from plagiarism, AI-generated content, copyright infringement, data falsification, and any other form of academic misconduct.

need. Dr. Mookerjee embarked as a high-flying figure in the political landscape of India during the chaotic years of Indian National Movement. During his days in active politics, Dr. Mookerjee was drawn towards the Hindu Mahasabha, which he used as an instrument for the service of the country. Initially aligned with the Indian National Congress, Mookerjee's political journey took a considerable turn when he alienated himself from the party over ideological differences, established him as a staunch advocate of unity and integrity of India. in 1951, he founded the Bhartiya Jana Sangh (BJS), a political party which later gave birth to Bhartiya Janata Party (BJP) which was rooted in the principles of Hindu nationalism, social conservation and economic self-reliance. The Treasury benches in the Parliament admired his perspectives regarding Indian government and positive reception on issues brought in the Parliament. He emerged as a strong opponent of the then government for the cause of better and developing India. His guiding principles and political approach were so admirable that they earned him the title 'Lion of the Parliament'. The most commendable and memorable political struggle by Dr. Mookerjee was his resistance against the Special Status granted to Jammu and Kashmir under Article 370 of the Indian Constitution. He viewed it as a hindrance to the full integration of India. In this regard, Dr. Mookerjee visited J&K to protest and tragically, this proved to be his last journey as he passed away there under mysterious circumstances.

Political Journey of Shyama Prasad Mookerjee

His legislative career shows an early preference for institutional action. As a representative connected with the University of Calcutta, he learned parliamentary procedure before he became a mass political leader. This experience affected his later style. Even when he used sharp political language, he repeatedly returned to budgets, constitutional provisions, administrative responsibility and legislative scrutiny. His speeches in independent India often combined ideological disagreement with detailed institutional argument. This parliamentary habit separated him from forms of anti-system politics that viewed constitutional debate as merely decorative. Mookerjee wanted political opposition to organise itself inside the new democratic structure and to test the government through public debate (Kashyap, 1990).

The Bengal coalition of the early 1940s provides a useful example. Mookerjee worked as Finance Minister under Fazlul Huq in a ministry created against the background of intense conflict between major political formations. The arrangement complicates any simple claim that he refused cooperation across religious lines. At the same time, his wider work in the Hindu Mahasabha during this period clearly located him in a political movement that sought to organise Hindus as a political community. These two facts existed together. The coalition experience demonstrated his capacity for practical cooperation, while the Mahasabha supplied an ideological vocabulary of Hindu consolidation. Historians therefore differ not over whether

these features existed, but over which one should receive greater interpretive weight (Chatterji, 2010; Chatterjee, 2020).

The question of Bengal's future in 1947 brought this tension into its clearest form. The proposal for a sovereign or united Bengal outside the ordinary partition framework attracted support from leaders who feared that division would damage the province's economy and composite social life. Mookerjee opposed a settlement that might place Hindu-majority western districts within a Muslim-majority sovereign Bengal or Pakistan. He consequently supported partition of the province once the partition of India appeared unavoidable. His argument was shaped by communal violence and distrust of League rule, but it also reflected a territorial principle: political boundaries, in his reasoning, had to provide security to populations that feared permanent subordination. Scholars have interpreted this stance in sharply different ways, from protection of Bengali Hindus to a majoritarian reworking of territorial nationalism (Chatterjee, 2020). The disagreement itself is part of his historical legacy.

After independence, Mookerjee's participation in Nehru's Cabinet demonstrated that his political nationalism did not prevent cooperation with leaders committed to a different secular and constitutional vision. He took charge of Industry and Supply, a portfolio central to reconstruction. Cabinet correspondence shows substantive disagreements over industrial policy, labour, small industry and state intervention, yet it also shows continuing consultation. Nehru urged him to give stronger attention to cottage and small-scale industry and discussed machine tools, steel and industrial controls with him (Nehru, 1949a, 1949b). These records reveal a government in which ideological differences were negotiated through policy rather than immediately translated into institutional rupture.

The rupture came in 1950. Mookerjee resigned from the Cabinet during the negotiations that produced the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, an agreement intended to protect minorities in India and Pakistan after severe communal violence and population movement in Bengal. Mookerjee believed the government's approach did not adequately address the insecurity of Hindus in East Pakistan and the refugee crisis in West Bengal. Nehru, by contrast, viewed the agreement as necessary to restore confidence, protect minorities on both sides and reduce the danger of escalating conflict. Their exchange is important because it shows competing ethical and strategic priorities. Mookerjee placed greater emphasis on the experience and security claims of displaced and threatened Hindus; Nehru stressed bilateral guarantees, restraint and the wider national consequences of communal confrontation (Nehru, 1950a, 1950b).

This disagreement became part of Mookerjee's broader critique of Congress dominance. He argued that democracy required an organised opposition capable of challenging the government on constitutional,

economic and national questions. The formation of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh in October 1951 must therefore be read in two ways at once. Institutionally, it contributed to the development of competitive party politics in the first years of the Republic. Ideologically, it created a durable political vehicle for Hindu nationalist ideas and for a conception of Indian nationhood that placed strong emphasis on cultural unity. Studies of the Jana Sangh's origins show that Mookerjee worked with activists linked to the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh while seeking a party that would operate through elections and parliamentary democracy (Graham, 1990; Jaffrelot, 1996).

The Jana Sangh's early political language reflected Mookerjee's attempt to convert cultural nationalism into a modern party programme. National unity was placed beside economic development, refugee rehabilitation, administrative integrity and democratic opposition. The party did not define itself merely as a religious association. Yet the historical and civilisational vocabulary through which it imagined the nation emerged from Hindu nationalist networks. This is why scholars continue to debate whether Mookerjee's idea of cultural nationalism can be interpreted as inclusive civic patriotism enriched by civilisational memory, or whether its political structure privileged the culture of the majority. The documentary record supports the existence of both universal and particular elements. His rhetoric could speak of equal citizenship and one political nation while also treating Hindu consolidation as a necessary historical task.

Mookerjee's intervention in the First Amendment debates also illustrates his constitutional style. He objected to restrictions that he believed could weaken civil liberties and the freedom of political criticism. His role in these debates has often been cited to demonstrate his concern for opposition rights and freedom of speech. That record should be understood in context. The early Republic faced conflicts over public order, land reform, press freedom and the scope of judicial review. Mookerjee's criticism placed him among those who feared that a government with an overwhelming legislative majority might reduce space for dissent. His constitutionalism therefore included a procedural dimension: the nation required not only cultural unity but also institutional disagreement. Political cohesion, in this view, should not mean the absence of opposition (Kashyap, 1990).

His strongest late political campaign concerned Jammu and Kashmir. In a Lok Sabha debate in June 1952, Mookerjee questioned whether a state within the Union should possess constitutional arrangements that, in his view, created the impression of a separate sovereignty. He argued that fundamental rights, judicial authority and national institutions should operate more uniformly. The language of integration was central to his case. Yet the opposing position, represented by Nehru and the government, emphasised the exceptional historical circumstances of accession, the international dispute over Kashmir and the need to

preserve political confidence within the state. The difference was therefore not simply between unity and disunity. It involved competing strategies for achieving and sustaining unity under difficult constitutional conditions (Kashyap, 1990; Nehru, 1953a).

The Jammu agitation sharpened these differences. Mookerjee supported the Praja Parishad's demand for closer constitutional integration and opposed the permit system that restricted entry into Jammu and Kashmir. In May 1953 he informed Sheikh Abdullah that he intended to visit Jammu and that he wished to understand conditions and explore the possibility of a peaceful settlement. He deliberately did not obtain a permit. Nehru's correspondence with Home Minister K. N. Katju shows that the government expected his arrest if he entered without permission (Nehru, 1953c). His detention and death weeks later transformed a constitutional dispute into a powerful political memory. In later nationalist narratives, his death became a symbol of sacrifice for integration. Parliamentary records also show contemporary demands for inquiry and questions about medical care, detention and governmental responsibility (West Bengal Legislative Assembly, 1953).

The political meaning of this episode changed over time. For the Jana Sangh and later the Bharatiya Janata Party, Mookerjee became an important historical reference in arguments against Jammu and Kashmir's special constitutional arrangements. For critics, the movement represented an assimilationist approach that did not give sufficient weight to federal asymmetry and regional autonomy. A scholarly chapter should record both interpretations and avoid converting subsequent political success into proof that one side of the historical debate was inherently correct. What can be said with confidence is that Mookerjee helped make constitutional integration a long-term issue in Hindu nationalist politics, and that the issue remained politically significant long after his death (Jaffrelot, 1996; Graham, 1990).

Political Thoughts and Philosophy of Dr. Mookerjee

The political philosophy of Shyama Prasad Mookerjee contained a strong idea of citizenship. He repeatedly objected to arrangements that he believed produced different civic standards for citizens on the basis of region or community. This concern appeared in his arguments over refugees, minority protection, Kashmir and constitutional rights. Yet the universal language of equal citizenship sat beside a politics that frequently spoke from the standpoint of Hindu vulnerability. The coexistence of these registers makes his thought historically important. It shows how claims of equality can emerge from experiences of group insecurity, and how a movement can move between universal constitutional principles and community-specific mobilisation. Neither dimension should be erased if the aim is to understand rather than memorialise.

Another political feature was his belief in strong national coordination. Partition, refugee flows and the Kashmir dispute convinced him that the Union needed sufficient authority to protect territorial integrity and ensure uniform civic rights. He was therefore sceptical of arrangements that seemed to him to create semi-sovereign spaces within India. Yet he did not reject provincial life or regional cultures. His educational career in Bengal had made him a defender of Bengali language and cultural institutions. His preferred political architecture can thus be described as cultural regionalism within political nationalism: regional languages and traditions should flourish, but political sovereignty should remain clearly located in the Indian Union. This principle helps explain why he could be both a Bengali cultural advocate and an opponent of strong constitutional exceptionalism for Kashmir.

His understanding of democracy was similarly layered. He accepted electoral competition, parliamentary debate and constitutional government as the legitimate arena of political change. At the same time, he believed that democracy required a moral and cultural basis deeper than procedure. Citizens needed a sense of shared belonging, public duty and historical connection. Without that basis, he feared that electoral politics might fragment into communal, regional or sectional bargaining. This concern is common in many nationalist traditions, but Mookerjee gave it a specifically Indian cultural form. He sought to create a national public culture that would make political competition possible without dissolving political unity. Whether his own preferred cultural vocabulary could adequately represent India's religious plurality remains the central normative question surrounding his thought.

His critics have argued that cultural nationalism of this kind can turn the majority's historical memory into the implicit standard of national belonging. They point to his leadership in the Hindu Mahasabha and the institutional lineage of the Jana Sangh. Supportive interpretations respond that Mookerjee's party politics operated within democratic structures and that he frequently used the language of citizenship rather than theological rule. Both observations are historically grounded. The resulting tension should not be resolved by treating one set of evidence as inauthentic. His political philosophy was not a secular nationalism in the Nehruvian sense, but neither was it a programme for clerical government. It was a culturally majoritarian form of nationalism that sought democratic and constitutional expression. That distinction allows a more precise assessment than either praise or denunciation alone (Graham, 1990; Jaffrelot, 1996).

Mookerjee's approach to minority questions reveals the complexity of his political language. He frequently argued that a democratic state should not create permanent political privileges or disabilities on religious grounds. Yet he also believed that formal equality could become inadequate when a community faced violence, displacement or administrative discrimination. His response to the East Bengal refugee crisis drew

heavily on the latter concern. This produced a recurring tension between equal individual citizenship and group-based political protection. The tension was not unique to him; partition forced nearly every major leader to confront it. Mookerjee's distinctive answer was to resist separate political arrangements while demanding strong state protection for communities he believed were vulnerable. The effectiveness and fairness of that approach remain matters of historical debate.

Conclusion

The political manifestation of Mookerjee's cultural philosophy can therefore be summarised through four linked ideas. First, he viewed national culture as a source of political cohesion. Second, he believed political institutions had to protect equal citizenship and national sovereignty. Third, he regarded organised opposition as necessary to democratic health. Fourth, he treated cultural confidence, security and state capacity as mutually reinforcing. The limits of this framework became visible wherever India's pluralism required negotiation between common citizenship and differentiated historical arrangements. His career is valuable precisely because it places these unresolved questions in a single political life. His relationship with Nehru is particularly useful for understanding his political philosophy because the two leaders agreed on several institutional ends while disagreeing sharply about means and cultural premises. Both wanted a strong India, industrial development, parliamentary government and social stability. Their differences concerned the meaning of secularism, the treatment of communal insecurity, the balance between accommodation and integration, and the proper limits of differentiated constitutional arrangements. Their correspondence is therefore more revealing than later partisan caricatures in which one figure represents national unity and the other its opposite. The archival record shows rival conceptions of national unity operating within the same constitutional order (Nehru, 1950a, 1953a).

References

Chatterjee, C. (2020). *Syama Prasad Mookerjee: The Hindu dissent and the partition of Bengal, 1932-1947*. Routledge.

Chatterji, P. K. (2010). *Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee and Indian politics: An account of an outstanding political leader*. Foundation Books.

Graham, B. D. (1990). *Hindu nationalism and Indian politics: The origins and development of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh*. Cambridge University Press.

Jaffrelot, C. (1996). *The Hindu nationalist movement and Indian politics: 1925 to the 1990s*. Hurst.

Kashyap, S. C. (1990). *Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee* (Eminent Parliamentarians Monograph Series, Vol. 3). Lok Sabha Secretariat.

Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India. (2019). *The Constitution (Application to Jammu and Kashmir) Order, 2019 (C.O. 272)*.

Mookerjee, S. P. (1944). Education in British India. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 233*(1), 30-38. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271624423300107

Nehru, J. (1948, March 5). *To Syama Prasad Mookerjee*. The Nehru Archive.

Nehru, J. (1949a, September 22). *To Syama Prasad Mookerjee*. The Nehru Archive.

Nehru, J. (1949b, September 30). *To Syama Prasad Mookerjee*. The Nehru Archive.

Nehru, J. (1949c, January 24). *Economic policy: Speech at the Central Advisory Council of Industries*. The Nehru Archive.

Nehru, J. (1950a, April 6). *To Syama Prasad Mookerjee*. The Nehru Archive.

Nehru, J. (1950b, April 9). *To Syama Prasad Mookerjee*. The Nehru Archive.

Nehru, J. (1953a, February 5). *To Syama Prasad Mookerjee*. The Nehru Archive.

Nehru, J. (1953b, February 10). *To Syama Prasad Mookerjee*. The Nehru Archive.

Nehru, J. (1953c, May 8). *To K. N. Katju*. The Nehru Archive.

Supreme Court of India. (2023, December 11). *In Re: Article 370 of the Constitution*, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1099 of 2019.

University of Calcutta. (n.d.). *Vice-Chancellors*. University of Calcutta.

West Bengal Legislative Assembly. (1953, November 27). *Resolution: Death of Dr. Shyamaprasad Mookerjee*.