

CHAPTER - VII

Summary of Findings, and Concluding observations

A. Summary of Findings:

The foregoing discussion in this study conclusively proves that the concepts of nationalism and internationalism, <sup>deve-</sup>as /  
loped by Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru, need to be analysed in the proper historical context, taking into account the impact of certain socio-economic and political factors. In fact, an indepth study of these phenomena called for a close examination of the proper setting — social, economic and political. It is equally fascinating to note that all the three thinkers under study sought to explain it from a broader perspective. Mention must be made of Gandhi and Nehru who were guided not only by conceptual considerations, but also by <sup>their</sup> practical application. To both of them, the concepts became tools for achieving the desired national goal — the independence of India. Thus, one can reasonably argue that the notions of nationalism and internationalism in the Indian context have their teleological implications. Initially, these may appear to be the end-product of a long political process, that is, the national freedom movement. But this may be a simplistic way of looking at the problem. The ideas of nationalism and internationalism, viewed from teleological perspective, offer new insights into the mental make-up, political affiliations, social commitments, individual value-preferences, and, above all, social awareness of the persons responsible for rendering services to the nation at a very critical juncture of Indian history.

With this end in view, the present study has sought to answer some of the most relevant questions, posed at the outset, relating to the concepts of nationalism and internationalism, as viewed by Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru.

With regard to the basic foundations of nationalism and internationalism and their mutual interaction, it may be mentioned that the problem should be analysed from its historical perspective and the same has been attempted in the chapter on conceptual framework and in the context of Indian nationalism.

The ideal of nationalism initially emerged in Europe, in the last quarter of the 18th century France, and from there engulfed the whole of Europe and it also turned to be a force behind the resurgence of Afro-Asian Nationalism. There is no agreed view about the concepts of nationalism, and internationalism. Though the concepts reveal structural variation and their history shows so many transformations, yet some sort of uniformity is also visible in their genesis and growth. One of the basic foundation of nationalism is that men are identified first and foremost, by nation to which people render their fervent devotion. The disintegration of the older form of social system and the emergence of 'bourgeoisie' and the 'common men' were commonly responsible for the formation of a nation. As a movement, it has undergone transformation from an 'elite' movement to

'bourgeois', and from that to 'mass-movement'. These exhibit the fact that behind formation, and growth, there has been uniformity and everywhere the increasing role of social, economic and political factors is also marked. Ideologically, nationalism found company in 'democracy' and despite its deterioration to 'fascism' and 'nazism', conscious and consistent attempts were always made to establish linkage with 'democracy', 'secularism' and 'socialism'. Nationalism reveals some broad general characteristics as an ideal for unity, independence and welfare of the people.

Internationalism comes as a composite of several functionally specific orders, such as, military, diplomatic, legal, economic and moral. The collapse of feudal order led to the legitimisation of an international order due to the existence of sovereign states. The emergence of imperialism led to extra-national expansionism, resulting into colonisation of Afro-Asian countries which necessitated collapse of colonial system. As an ideal, internationalism like nationalism, is associated with a high level of social, cultural, political and economic integration processes and not the least, by the impact of Industrial Revolution and scientific technological advancement. It came as an ideal of supra-national society based on the ideology of democracy, secularism, humanism, socialism ~~and~~ and communism wherein in the thrust remained on freedom and self-determination. Institutional manifestations, in the shape of the League of Nations, the

United Nations Organisation, other governmental and non-governmental organisations are mushrooming the world scene. Like nationalism, internationalism has been prey to certain lapses which led to the outbreak of the two world wars. In order to cure the world society, pluralists plead for moral, economic and political changes within the state for improved inter-action among the states. Federalists advance the plea for global organisational set-up, in order to secure collective co-existence without sacrificing fundamental individual rights. The fact remains there is irresistible pressure towards international co-operation and integration on global level and the ideal of attainment of the goal of 'security', 'welfare' and justice of the people, is the essence of internationalism.

In the Indian perspective, nationalism has been identified to a greater extent, in the shape of identification of the state with people. The same has been explained in the chapter on Indian nationalism. Here we place in brief, in the context of national movement, ideology of nationalism in India.

Indian national movement came in general, as a living part of the world movement and, in particular, as a part of the Afro-Asian movement, against colonial rule. Indian nationalism, in course of time, found identification of state with people since it was state-nation and not the nation-state in the strictest sense of the term. The modern-state and the nation-state are

co-extensive in modernisation and development. As a movement, nationalism in India acquired the mass character under the leadership of Gandhi. The important aspect of Indian reality was that there always existed antagonism between the ruler and the ruled. This led to the birth, growth and fulfillment of Indian nationalism. Ideologically, nationalism is inconceivable without democracy and, in case of India, collective grievance of the people were ventilated at a higher level. Liberty, equality and fraternity were the catchwords. Indian nationalism reflected all these and at the later stage included secularism and socialism. Thus perfect identification with people is observed.

Nationalism was at a particular period of history associated with democracy, but with the change of time it got interlocked with imperialism. An attempt has been made to explain the same in the chapter on conceptual framework, as well as in the views of Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru.

In short, it can be stated that mostly, nationalism, initially, flourished in <sup>the</sup> industrialised countries and their national production, national wealth and the national resources were produced and handled by <sup>the</sup> big business and industries. Their search for more and more profit led to the search of new market. The world became too small for the high ambition of these imperialist power. Narrow spirit of nationalism was whipped up in every western country and Europe became an armed

camp. There was strong competition in industry, trade and armaments. Owing to scientific and technological advancement, the whole structure under industrial capitalism bred frictions between nation and nation, class and class and man and man. The three decades, from 1884 to 1914, became the period of imperialism, which can be safely regarded as the preparatory for the catastrophes that came during the inter-war period and the Second World War. Everywhere, a section of people protested against this ruthless oppression. This new phenomenon of alliance between people and capital divided the world into master and slave, higher and lower breeds, coloured and white. Racialism, became a powerful imperialistic policy which created a race of aristocrats against nation of citizens, German race-thinking was implanted during the Napoleonic wars. The 'survival of the fittest' also helped racism and totalitarian forms of governments were established on the basis of race and bureaucracy. Nationalism also manifested through nazism, fascism, and other varieties of totalitarianism between the two world wars and even thereafter. Thus, imperialism and nationalism were strongly interlocked. But when Napoleon tried to unite Europe under the French flag, that led either to the full awakening of the conquered people's national consciousness, and, to consequent rebellion against the conquerer, or to tyranny. The same happened to the Afro-Asian countries where it was imperialism which was mainly responsible as a force behind the resurgence of the liberation movement of Afro-Asian countries,

Indian liberation movement also fell under this category.

Discussing the basic characteristics of the anti-colonial varieties of nationalism in general, and its impact on Indian nationalism, we may place them in brief as follows:

The basic characteristics of the anti-colonial variety of nationalism were more or less uniform. Indian national movement also emerged as the part of the Afro-Asian movement. The growth of the Third World nationalism, a global movement, was in response to colonisation of Afro-Asian nations. Mainly it was anti-colonial in character. From another perspective, it can be mentioned that nationalism in the third world had two principal features : a drive to throw off the ascendancy of the western power in its negative phase; and, to adopt their system with the deliberate choice without any pressure, in its positive phase. The central feature of this brand of nationalism was to raise voice against economic exploitation, coercion and racial discrimination being practised in almost all the colonies. The external factors also played <sup>a</sup> quite significant role in the emergence, growth and fulfillment of national goal as to the third world nationalism. And these influences were Euro-centric. In the war of liberation from colonial yoke, culturally and socially discreet groups of people joined together, in the hope, to accomplish certain objectives of unity, integrity and development. Indian national movement also emerged as the anti-colonial variety of nationalism. As a part of

the Afro-Asian movement it took anti-colonial and anti-racial character. It also followed democratic, secular and egalitarian manifestations of the western nationalism. The whole movement was to achieve national independence, welfare and unity of the people. From another perspective, the nature of Indian nationalism can be taken as synthetic. India did not retain everything that was native nor discarded everything that was foreign.

The factors responsible for the emergence, growth and subsequent consolidation of Indian nationalism constitute an independent chapter of the study on Indian nationalism. A brief resume is attempted here.

Indian nationalism emerged as a result of action and interaction of numerous subjective and objective factors which developed under the British rule and the impact of world forces. It came as a defence-mechanism against the foreign rule. The emergence of Indian nationalism has a long historical background. Indian Renaissance of the 19th century, mainly in the second half, paved the way for its growth. The social, economic, political and cultural factors also accelerated the pace of the nationalist movement. The process of the ideological growth of Indian nationalism culminated in the formation of the Indian National Congress. In the first stage the intelligentsia constituted the front rank leadership, which was later on joined and supported by the bourgeois and feudal lords. In the final

stage of nationalist movement, the workers and the peasants joined it. Indian national movement gathered momentum with the partition of Bengal in the truest sense of the term, and widened with the participation of the peasants and labours. The impact of the world events such as, Japan's victory over Russia, the First World War, Russian Revolution, the formation of the League of Nations, and the major events in between the two world wars, and finally, the outbreak of the Second World War, accelerated the momentum of Indian national movement.

It would not be off the track to mention here that the sociological foundation of Tagore's political thought and the socio-political and cultural dimensions of his nationalism have been detailed in the chapter on Tagore's ideas of nationalism. However, a brief resume, to this effect, would suffice in highlighting the desired views.

Tagore had the perfect knowledge of the fact that India had ceased to be politically and culturally creative. Love of the country was not the characteristic of the Tagore's age. Tagore felt the urgent need of providing national identity and in this regard, he addressed political leaders, landlords and the educated youth to respond to the demand of the nation. Politically, he believed that Britishers failed to make India their home, not learned the language of the people and discriminated the Indians racially. Undemocratic behaviour and racial discrimination found in Tagore a vehement critic of British rule in India.

He wrote a great deal, on social and political questions. He was the source of inspiration to the leaders, intellectuals and even to the simple unlettered countrymen. He paid serious attention to the Hindu-Muslim problem and suggested secularism as the only way to solve this problem. In economy, his spheres of action included such measures which stood for the interest of the downtrodden.

Tagore's concept of internationalism in general, and the concept of the 'great federation of man' in particular, forms the core of his ideas on nationalism and internationalism. His thinking on internationalism reflects his humanist, universalist and internationalist views. His onslaught on nationalism forms the core of his internationalism. He advocated that every nation should behave like a member of the world family, constituting world federation. So he supported the liberation of all the nations. 'Man' continued, in his account, not for the satisfaction of his material needs but in order to strive with all his might for the revelation of the 'universal man' in the world of men. So what was true of an individual was also true in the society and what was true for a society was equally true for a nation. Thus Tagore produced integrated humanism with a plan of 'the great federation of man' in his nationalistic discourse.

In regard to Gandhi's attempts at spiritualisation of politics and their impact on nationalism and internationalism, a detailed analysis has been attempted in his social ideas on

Nationalism and internationalism.

In short, it can be pointed out that Gandhi was a moral purist and as such produced a thorough and a whole-sale application of the criteriology of good. To him, even the colonial encounter, between England and India was between good and bad. Non-violence became both the end and means of social change. His God lived in humanity and Indians were in helpless condition under the British rule. So to serve the countrymen was nationalism, and the only prayer to God. The freedom of India could never be a menace for the world. He favoured democracy but was of the opinion that only through the means of non-violence that could be achieved. He tried to arouse the social consciousness so that the people could solve their difficulties by themselves. Gandhi created the machinery for the Congress, won the masses for it, with fund to carry on agitation. His moral interpretation of politics helped him to rid the Hindu society of the heinous crime against the outcastes. He was a man of religion but he asserted that he did not know any religion apart from human activity. To him, this helped him to be a universalist and an internationalist. He rightly understood that it was not possible to separate religion here from politics. In his religion, God appeared in 'work and wage'. God could be visible through the 'Poor' so to serve poor was worship. As an ideology, secularism was supported by Gandhi. He opposed state aid to religion. He was totally opposed to partition and sacrificed his life for the

cause of Hindu Muslim unity.

His economic doctrine was that of the investment in the human capital. Work performed in the service of others, was 'bread-labour'. Man is the micro-unit of this socio-economic system, totally depending on morality and ethics. This applied to humanity at large. His concept of economic freedom was partly economic, partly moral and partly spiritual - a deeply national ideology. His economic programme reflected his commitment to the cause of poverty alleviation. He opposed state control over economy and favoured decentralisation - a democratic approach. Trusteeship and Sarvodaya formed the base of ideological foundations of Gandhian political economy-committed to the task of unprivileged humanity. Acceptance of 'Ahimsa' as an 'end' and a means, in all social, political, economic affairs of individual, society and nation formed the base of Gandhian political philosophy. It was purity of means which formed the bedrock of Gandhian nationalism and internationalism. All his movements - social, political and economic-were guided by this principle.

Man is the central figure, in Gandhi's political analysis, in both nationalism and internationalism. His approach was individual-moral. To him, Indian freedom never meant suffering for another country. He held, time and again, internationalism is possible only when nationalism is a fact. -Because nationalism is no evil, it is narrowness, selfishness, exclusiveness which is evil. He was not a regionalist, favouring Africa

for Africans or Asia for Asiatics and, as such, was totally opposed to regionalism. Gandhi provided the compact philosophy which was equally valid for the individual, the nation and also for the world society and this was based on the method of non-violence. He was opposed to imperialism, fascism and nazism to a greater extent, and even to liberal democracy. Gandhi strongly condemned war and appealed everyone for peace. An ardent advocate of international co-operation and collaboration, Gandhi also favoured federation of independent nations. He wanted that economic equality be established and exploitation of one nation by the other be stopped and suggested realist measures for the disarmament. His suggestion to the states not to use force could be pre-supposed as real steps towards internationalism. If the civilization is not to disintegrate the premises of Gandhi have immediate relevance, no matter, it be termed as spiritualisation of politics. The most crucial theoretical foundation of his entire strategy of winning swaraj for India.

Gandhi challenged the foundations of modern civilization in the 'Hind Swaraj' (Indian Home Rule). On the surface, it is indeed a critique of modern civilization, a civilisation only in a name. The emphasis is not so much on the elements of culture, rather, more forcefully to the moral failure. So to him, colonial encounter was not between England and India or between the East and the West but between good and bad.

It is a moral failure on the part of Indians that

led to the conquest of India. It is not because of the lack of modernity or presence of backwardness but for the reasons that Indians were subduced to the glitter of modern civilization. As long as, Indians continue to harbour the illusions of the modern civilization they will remain a subject nation. To Gandhi, it is not the physical presence of English which makes India a subject nation, rather, it is the modern civilization which has subjected it. His account proceeds with an indictment of modern civilization, as it has emerged in the west and is being imported to India. Modern civilization has released the forces of unbridled competition and there by bring upon the society the evils of poverty. The driving social urge is the craving for excessive consumption. On this basis, he advances his thought on nationalism and holds that there is no way in which any process of industrialisation can avoid the creation of exploitative and inhumane relations of exchange between the town and the country. He prescribed 'Khadi' as the only sound economic proposition for India. To him, mechanisation is good only when the hands are too few. He proposed the theory of 'trusteeship' and 'Sarvodaya' to redress the poverty of the Indians. On political front, he criticises the liberal democracy of the West on the ground that the parliament, the government and the political parties worked for the interest of a group and not for the common men. Hence the disease is the same. On the international level, he finds imperialism subordinating morality and exploiting the nations

which is directly related to organisation of social production and its purposes. Thus what is prescribed for India is equally applicable outside the thematic of nationalism and also not within the bounds of post-enlightenment thought. However, one should take into account the fact that he was mainly concerned with the political movement of the liberation of the country.

The basic postulate of Gandhian idea is that nationalism is the logical step to internationalism, and the same is being recorded in brief.

Gandhi's political philosophy is totally based on individual <sup>and</sup> moral analysis. Love of man, and not hatred, is the motive force behind his conception of nationalism and internationalism. Love of man impelled Gandhi to be both a nationalist and internationalist. Gandhi's view on religion also helped him to believe that all religions helped to extend notion of international brotherhood. According to Gandhi, India was doomed unless reconstituted, on the basis of new moral and political principles. His 'Swadeshi' taught him that by being born in it, and having inherited Indian culture, India had prior claim to his service. If he worked primarily for his countrymen, it was because he was born among them and because their suffering and humiliation supplied the necessary incentives to his moral sensibility and his political crusade. Gandhi repeatedly claimed that a man could serve both his country and the world, serve his

neighbours as well as humanity. He categorically held freedom for India did not mean sufferings for another country. As a political concept, nationalism came to him as the basis for internationalism. As a practical politician, he could link independence of India to the furtherance of the cause of humanity. He was quite aware of the fact that 'the world has shrunk to a pinhead' and even the slightest movement on one spot effected the whole. So he was not preaching an abstract internationalism. Gandhi analysed nationalism in its truest perspective when he observed that nationalism was not an evil; it was narrowness, selfishness<sup>and</sup> exclusiveness which were<sup>the</sup> evils. He continued that the profit at the expense of other nations became the order of international society. So, if he could keep India out of this narrowness, selfishness and exclusiveness, only then, he would be able and justified in serving humanity. He tried hard to keep India away from narrow, exclusive concept of nationalism. That is why, Gandhi declared time and again, that it is impossible to be internationalist since only a good nationalist could become a true internationalist. Gandhi never supported 'regionalism' and was not in favour of Africa for Africans or Asia for Asiatics. To him, there was no impassable barrier between the East and the West. He believed due to technological advancement imperialist design emerged in Europe and that led to colonisation of Afro-Asian countries which also practised radical discrimination and economic exploitation. To him, imperialism subordinated both

morality and politics to the cause of profit maximisation. His method rested on purity of means where both morality and politics were merged. So what was bad for an individual was equally bad for the nation. He criticised liberal democracy, imperialism, fascism and nazism, condemned war, favoured formation of international organisation, was an apostle of peace, talked of disarmament. His philosophical analysis provided directive principles for world federation based on co-operation, principles of equality, non-violence, sacrifice and humanitarian ethics.

Thus Gandhi held, it is impossible to be internationalist without being a nationalist and internationalism is possible only when nationalism is a fact.

Nehru's ideology of internationalism is as powerful as his views on nationalism. His nationalism is equal to internationalism. He emphasised that greater stress should be given on the synthesis. He did not retain everything that was Indian nor discarded everything that was from abroad. Nehru emerged as an actor in the political drama and participated in the struggle for freedom. Indian nationalism found in him, a contributor for its ideology. Nehru was quite aware of the fact that 'nationalistic outlook filled the minds of Indians' so long India was not free from colonial rule. He took note of the fact that the changes that were being brought by the inventions and the development of science had already integrated the world. His reading of world history and understanding of imperialism further helped him to

think in terms of interdependence of nations. Two rival political and economic system the imperialist and fascist on one side, and the socialist and the nationalist on the others, further, found in Nehru an urge to opt for socialism. All these led Nehru to conclude whether it was nationalism or economy no country could lead an isolated life. In this global perspective, Nehru analysed and formulated his views on Indian nationalism, synthesising what he deemed to be the best for India.

Tagore, like Nehru, also supported a synthesis between the East and the West. His world view was moulded by English liberalism in the formative period of his life, his direct contact with the modern world, the English people and their mighty literature, and frequent visits to other countries. On the other hand, his philosophy of nationalism and internationalism was equally influenced by his family and the Indian background. Tagore's humanism condemned the lust for power and profit and advised the Western countries to eliminate their ills. To Tagore, there was no boundary wall between the East and the West. He warned the East not to reject the West but to learn from them their achievements in science and technology.

Nehru rejected the 'assimilative - integral religious approach' on the grounds given below:

Nehru did not regard nationalism as religious faith rather he believed that it emerged at a certain stage of histori-

cal development. He knew the history of Western nationalism, its origin, growth and consolidation. He was influenced by the western conceptualisation of secularism and believed that secularism never meant disregard to religion, rather it meant, a state where freedom of religion and conscience would be guaranteed. His ideology of nationalism was essentially secular and for a country like India where people of different religions lived it was a must. Nehru explained that it was due to the lack of the ideology of secularism, that in India, communalism spread and only the political reactionaries took to communalism. It is Nehru's contribution that he included both socialism and democracy into the concept of secularism. To him, communalism was an economic problem, and partly a middle class problem and communal leaders were only to obstruct the political advance of freedom movement. To him, both the Hindu Mahasabha leaders and the Muslim League leaders were opposed to progressive economic movement and, as such, represented a small upper class reactionary group against the radical tendencies.

Britain started enslaving Indians spiritually with the spread of christianity. In response to this action struggle for liberation from christianity started. One such attempt was made by Dayananda ~~ax~~ in defence of the native religion. He set himself to the task of reforming and reviving the religion of Hinduism with a call to 'Back to Vedas'. In Vivekananda's opinion, religion had to be the principle and leading force in implementing all social changes in India. If any one wanted to

Speak of politics he must speak through the language of religion. Aurobindo, a Vedantist, is of the view that philosophy is the search for the fundamental truth and it is religion that communicates truth to the soul of man. A religion that is not the expression of philosophic truth degenerates into superstition. So he wanted to reorient the traditional Vedanta making it worldly .

Nehru, throughout his career, carried on a relentless struggle against narrow concept of nationalism. He was a whole hearted admirer of the scientific, rational and humane outlook. Nehru's nationalism was composite where there was no place to religious fundamentalism and obscurantism.

Nehru's 'reconciliatory approach' to internationalism is found, to a greater extent, in conformity with his ideas on nationalism.

Nehru's internationalism is the record of the outstanding events of the world and analysis of the main ideologies. His vast knowledge of history, philosophy and world economy helped him advance his understanding of International society. The universal character of the laws of historical development, integration of the world economy, the Industrial and Mechanical Revolutions, all taken together, helped Nehru to view and judge the Indian problems in/global perspective. Nehru understood well that

the country was yet to be free and as such nationalism filled Indian minds. He also thought that his primary loyalty was to Indian national freedom but he was sternly against narrow nationalism and very critical of self-assertion which turned into chauvinism, aggressiveness and hostilities towards other nation. He did not like that type of nationalism where the people were to withdraw into the shell of its own history and tradition and in this respect wanted that India should maintain contact with others so that she could increase her fund of knowledge. He blamed those countries where nationalism became imperialist, fascist and oppressive.

However, Nehru held, in case of Afro-Asian countries, their war of liberation was qualitatively better and appeared democratic and progressive. Nehru was an internationalist, because he believed that it was the demand of the situation. He also knew that nationalism would remain the outstanding urge till some measure of political freedom was achieved.

Being an Indian, he felt the full weight of imperialism, so he was naturally against imperialism, Indians were discriminated racially so he was anti-racialist. There was no political and economic freedom under the British rule so Nehru opted for democracy and socialism. What he wanted in India, he also thought others should get that. Thus Nehru's ideology of nationalism and internationalism was the same and exercised reconciliatory approach to internationalism.

C O N C L U S I O N :

A comprehensive study of the Indian version of nationalism and internationalism, involving their very nature, constitutes the core area of any study of this type. It is important to note that the rise and the growth of these two ideas and for that matter, nationalist movement, was the product of the very imperial system that had two important and integrally connected factors - the reinforcement of imperialism at different stages of its evolution and the accentuation of the desire for self-government. This nationalist movement took an organised form in 1885 with establishment of the Indian National Congress which subsequently became the embodiment of India's political hopes and aspirations.

Since the Indian experience of nationalism and internationalism is closely linked up with the domination under a foreign rule and the struggle aiming at its overthrow, it signified a common political consciousness and a sense of patriotism among the people. The writings of Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru are sufficient indications of this urge. At this stage a number of factors responsible for the emergence of their ideas, may be identified as socio-cultural renaissance, impact of the western culture, economic discontent, repressive policy of the oppressive rule, racial discrimination and external situation.

Thus, it may be said that the history of the develop-

ment of ideas like nationalism and internationalism, in the Indian context, is a record of the advancing consciousness and the mass-based struggle that started with a few Westernised intelligentsia, having faith in the British justice and fair play, ultimately leading to a struggle for independence.

The present study, while taking into account its different aspects, has attempted to highlight the contributions made by the leading political thinkers during the period. A survey from the socio-economic and political perspective will show the different stages, as a stage when it was a movement by the Western intellectuals (1885-1905), as an era of extremist middle class movement (1905-20), and an era of mass movement led by Gandhi (1920-48) for a meaningful and complete study of the contribution of Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru. The concepts of nationalism and internationalism, as developed by these three thinkers, have been examined in their proper historical setting, political environment, cultural and ideological influences and individual orientation.

B. Concluding Observations:

Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru were three outstanding and dominating figures of the twentieth century India. They not only inspired millions of Indians by their actions, but also provided ideas of lasting benefit to humanity. Neither of them was narrowly national. Their message was for the world. They were motive forces in their common task of regenerating their people. They were outstanding personalities not only in India but also for the world during the first half of the present century. The historical context of their philosophy was constituted by two elements: British colonialism and Indian renaissance. However, they were brought up in different ways and in different cultural milieu. Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru had developed their world views in their different ways. As a result, a comparative analysis of these three thinker on different dimensions of nationalism and internationalism has been a curiosity among students of Indian nationalism.

One of the implicit objectives of the study has been to ascertain to what extent the views of Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru on national and international questions are congruent with one another. As those three thinkers had profound impact on the ideological moorings of the national movement in India, and as earlier discussions reveal that though all of them had in their minds the cherished goal of self-determination or Swaraj, there

were differences among them in their perceptions and views on nationalism and internationalism. As nationalism reflected a high level of social, cultural, political, and not the least, economic integration, justice demands a comparative analysis of Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru on these aspects of nationalism. Further, as all of these thinkers developed their ideas in the midst of the grim struggle for national freedom against the foreign domination, their views on democracy, secularism and egalitarianism have been compared and contrasted to assess their ideology of nationalism. These views, coupled with their assessment of humanism, socialism and communism, are expected to delineate to what extent they were internationalists and what were the similarities and differences among these thinkers on internationalism.

*the above*  
From *the above* analysis, it may be concluded safely that :

(1) Both Tagore and Gandhi were more Indian than Western in their world-outlook. However, Gandhi was basically a man of concentrated and ceaseless activity, whereas Tagore was primarily a man of thought. Nehru, on the other hand, was influenced more by the Western culture than Indian in most of his basic ideas. However, Nehru was fully aware of the reality of the Indian social matrix.

(2) Tagore and Gandhi affirmed the supreme necessity of a moral regeneration for the attainment of political ends. In 'prayaschitta' (Atonement), Tagore anticipated Gandhi's non-

violent civil disobedience and no-tax campaign. However, Tagore criticised the concept of passive resistance by saying that it was a force which was not necessarily moral in itself; it could be used against truth as well as for it. Unlike Gandhi and Tagore, Nehru's views reflected the post-enlightenment rationalist and positivist thought of Europe.

(3) Gandhi and Tagore were of the opinion that selfishness and narrowness were the root causes of many modern evils. However, when Gandhiji advocated the improvement of this condition from within people Tagore advocated the improvement from without. Nehru on the other hand, was in favour of modernisation, but his modernisation was modified modernisation. Nehru differed with Gandhi on non-violence, but he had all admiration for moral and ethical side of the non-violence.

(4) Gandhi believed in democracy of the masses, on the other hand, Nehru was a believer in democracy for the masses. On the other hand, Tagore was the aristocratic artist, a "turned democrat with proletarian sympathies." If Gandhi was the prophet of long-suffering martyrdom for the sake of justice, Tagore stood for temperate living based on fortitude and moderation.

(5) Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru stood for the secular concept of nationalism. However, there is a considerable amount of religion in Gandhi's approach and ideas. He tried to resolve Hindu - Muslim conflict within the frame of reference of religion rather

than with a militant secularist frame, thought and action. Tagore developed his religions on the basis of "divinity of man" and "humanity of God". In this approach there was no room for communalism, sectarianism and conservatism. Tagore's philosophy of secularism was based on his notion that Hindus and Muslims should not believe in isolationism since creation depended on the perpetual harmony. Nehru was a liberal in his outlook, though he was conscious of the role of religion in a feudal society. Agnosticism and the absence of any transforming religious experience had strengthened his secularism. Nehru's secularism has a material cloak. Gandhi was building nationalism on the basis of harmonious co-existence and reconciliation, rather than on assimilation and amalgamation and fusion.

On the question of economics, Gandhian economics is not a branch of positive economics which merely attempts to predict economic events on the simple premise that citizens try to maximise their net material gain subject to the relevant constraints. It is, rather, a variant of normative economics which proposes an ideal economic order. Gandhi did not believe in the autonomy of economic laws. "True economics never militates against the highest ethical standard, just as all true ethics to be worth its name must at the same time be also good economics". Gandhi's advocacy of a rural civilisation was consistent with his unified outlook, where ethics was interchangeable with economics. Tagore ascribed decisive significance to economic

self-sufficiency; because India was plagued by famine and starvation. Tagore emphasised the village as the primary unit and the shut-anchor for any effort at constructive nationalism to succeed in India. Nehru, on the other hand, was deeply involved with socialism as an economic theory of state ownership and control of the basic means of production and distribution. To him, socialism was the economic technique for the liberation of the masses from the industrial and agrarian feudal lords and oligarchs. Nehru supported industrialisation, but Gandhi opposed it. However, at a later stage, Nehru tried to reconcile his views on economy in the shape of mixed-economy where the merits of both socialism and capitalism were synthesized.

Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru also differed in their views on international questions and issues. Gandhi was a prophet with a universal message. His utterance that "my love, therefore, of nationalism, or my idea of nationalism, is that my country may be free so that the human races may live" is a pointer that Gandhi was not a nationalist in the usual sense of the term. Tagore, on the other hand, was a champion of the people and not of the nation. Tagore clamoured for the release of cosmopolitan humanism, and endeavoured nationalism as organised gregariousness and mechanical gluttony. He echoed that "nationalism is a menace to civilisation". Nehru prescribed some kind of fusion between the concept of nationalism and the new ideals of proletarianism and internationalism. He was very much averse to narrow, egoistic and expansionist nationalism.