

CHAPTER - VI

Nehru's Ideas on Nationalism and Internationalism

I

Nehru's Ideas on Nationalism

I N T R O D U C T I O N

Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964), emerged both as a leader and an ideologue in the freedom struggle of India. He developed understanding of the major ideologies of the world, and in that perspective, tried to shape his political thinking in order to select the most suitable for India. His main contribution lay in the fact that instead of formulating any new ideology, he tried to reconcile the merits of the ideologies he preferred. His analysis further reflects that his method was historical and his understanding of the world as well as of the Indian history helped him to formulate his ideas on nationalism.

Nehru emerged on the political scene, when the country was fighting for its independence and the dominant political ideology was naturally that ^{of} nationalism. Nehru echoed the same when he held, 'We have not solved yet the problem of political freedom and the nationalist outlook filled our mind. ⁽¹⁾ He was perfectly aware of the fact that India was being exploited under the colonial rule. So he recognised the major role of nationalism and developed his own ideas.

Nehru sought to interpret the essence of the ideology of colonialism and nationalism, prevailing in India. He found that though the Indian National Congress was leading the

freedom movement, it was ideologically under the leadership of the liberals. They stood for liberalism and always favoured and admired the British system before the advent of Gandhi as the leader of the national movement. He observed, 'what is surprising is that some people continue to suffer that delusion even after the stirring events and changes of the twentieth century.⁽²⁾ His account differed from that of the liberals as he pointed out that there was three-fold occupation of India -- military, civil and commercial and no question of compromise or co-operation with the British rulers could arise. British government, according to him, had not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom, but had based itself on the exploitation of the masses. This reflects that Nehru did not believe either in liberalism or in the liberal attitude of the Congress leaders. He sided with non-liberal Gandhi.

Analysing from ^{the} historical perspective, Nehru found that after one century and a half of British rule in India, both British and Indians were as apart as ever. Indians failed to develop rapport with them because the British practised racial discrimination and always kept a distance from the natives. Nehru observed that it could not be denied that the British established the rule of law, efficient administration, parliamentary government. All these fostered the pace of the growth of nationalism in India. He recognised this reality but also pointed out that these British features were not evident in India. All these led to the origin, growth and consolidation of

nationalist movement in India.

Nehru emphasised the role of socio-economic factors in his analysis of Indian nationalism. He identified three periods of British rule in India ; the early period which came to an end in the late 18th century when merchant adventures traded and plundered indiscriminately; the second period, covering the 19th century, when India became a source of raw materials for British industries and market for British manufactured goods; and the third period which was one of capital investment in Indian industry and which had started actively from the First World War. (3) Entry of British Commodities into the Indian market ruined the local cottage industry, making these workers unemployed. British government further imposed tax upon import of machines to prevent the building of factories in India.

British rule in India, according to Nehru, created landlords and strengthened feudalism. The most typical feature of British rule in India was its interaction with the most reactionary elements, such as feudal lords, zaminders and communal extremists. In other words, British rule sided with political, social and religious reactionaries. So Nehru mentioned that the very purpose of British rule was to create vested interests which, being of their own making, would rely upon them and become their supporters in India. (4) Nehru was always clear in perceiving that whatever the British were going to do in India, their only motive was to serve their own selfish interests. So Nehru mentioned that

in later years, when that unity allied itself to nationalism and challenged alien rule, we witnessed the deliberate promotion of disunity and sectarianism, formidable obstacles to our future progress. (5) Nehru was particularly scathing about the role and function of bureaucracy under British rule. The bureaucracy, he pointed out, used crude police methods, engaged British personnel for the top posts and exploited the nation.

Nehru took account of India's strength and weakness from the long Indian history and found in it layer after layer of thought of unbroken continuity. He found that from the days of Mohenjo-Daro, India had maintained contact with the Iranians and the Greeks, the Chinese, the Arabs and others. India influenced them, and was influenced as well by them. He observed that we might say the first great cultural synthesis and fusion took place between the incoming Aryans and the Dravidians. (6) According to Nehru, each incursion of foreign elements met successfully a process of absorption, which was also a process of rejuvenation, because a new bloom of culture arose out of its background and the essential basis remained the same. Nehru continued that the process of absorption and rejuvenation continued till the British subjugated India. He prided in India's special heritage.

However, his ideas of nationalism did not allow him to find permanent location in only India's past heritage. To him, the burden of the past was not always good, so he wanted to inherit all that humanity had achieved, because Indian heritage was

not exclusive. To him, inheritance was all that humanity has achieved, during tens of thousands of years. In his words, 'for none is exclusive and all are common to the race of man'.⁽⁷⁾ Thus, Nehru undertook his voyage to ascertain what model of nationalism would suit India. He was convinced, unlike the revivalists, that India must break with much of her past and not allow it to dominate the present.

This prompted Nehru to take stock of the developments of the ideology of nationalism in the European continent. Nehru explained that democracy and nationalism emerged as contemporary ideologies in the last quarter of the 18th century France when it stood for the ideas of unity, democracy and culture. However, he pointed out that the deterioration started when European nationalism found ally in aggression, racialism, intolerance and discrimination. He also explained the arrival of fascism and nazism degenerating nationalism into its worst phase. Nehru described the multiple facets of nationalism such as its heterogeneity, its inner contradictions, shift from democratic to reactionary positions, and the loss of its salient features.

Nehru was critical of national self-assertion which turned into Chauvinism, aggressiveness and hostilities towards other nations. He also analysed from class perspective, and pointed out that nationalism hid everything under the cover of the antagonistic feeling. The opportunists and the reactionaries took the shelter in the name of the people's movement. According to Nehru,

'nationalism hides a host of differences under the cover of anti-
feeling against the imperialists'.⁽⁸⁾ In the changed world of
imperialism, Nehru recommended linkage of nationalism with so-
cialism. His account of national movement of colonies and
dependent countries was qualitatively different because they
were fighting imperialism. In such countries, in the words of
Nehru, "it seemed clear to me that nationalism would remain the
outstanding urge, till some measure of political freedom was
attained."⁽⁹⁾

In his 'Glimpses of World History', Nehru under-
took a classification of imperialism built on various forms of
exploitation on solid historical - materialist bases and pointed
out that the new imperialism was qualitatively different from the
old one. The new empires, hungry for raw materials and markets,
as a child of the industrial and mechanical revolutions, had
captured Afro-Asian countries as their colonies. So he explai-
ned, Indian freedom movement was against British imperialism and
not against the British as such. Herein lies the difference be-
tween Nehru and other Congress leaders. Nehru was one of the
first representatives of the national liberation movement in the
Afro-Asian countries who turned his attention to the emergence of
new forms of imperialist exploitation which were not directly
linked to colonial domination.⁽¹⁰⁾ To Nehru, freedom movement in
India was part and parcel of the world-wide struggle that was
going on between imperialism and socialism. He also took into

account the Afro-Asian movements of national liberation and found them progressive. He criticised those votaries of the western nationalism, who were engaged in replacing democratic values by introduction of nazism and fascism. Thus, it was anti-imperialist nationalism which found support in Nehru. He blamed those imperialist powers who had colonised Afro-Asian countries and were exploiting them. He was intensely internationalist in his account of nationalism.

He was fully aware of the fact that British imperialism was remodelling its method of exploitation. So he held that Britain might permit us to have large measure of political liberty but this would be worth little if she held economic domination over us. ⁽¹¹⁾ He clearly mentioned that 'there were some countries independent but they have not do anything which displaced the real material in the wall street.' ⁽¹²⁾

Thus, Nehru was one of the first representatives of the national liberation movement in the Afro-Asian countries, who turned his attention to the emergence of a new form of imperialist exploitation which were not directly linked to colonial domination. His visit to Europe, and participation in the Anti-Imperialist Conference, helped him to formulate an anti-imperial interpretation of the world politics and to judge the Afro-Asian movement in that perspective. National freedom became the true base of internationalism. Democracy, Socialism and Secularism became the ideals of both nationalism and internatio-

nalism.

He integrated the concept of internationalism in his ideas on nationalism. He never tried to place Indian nationalism in a narrow perspective, nor took nazism and fascism as friendly ideologies, because they were against the British. On the other hand, he cooperated in the struggle against nazism and fascism when the integrity of the nations fighting for democracy was itself in question. (13)

As on the international plane, so in national politics, Nehru always championed individual freedom, the cause of democracy, and was a strong critique of authoritarianism, capitalism and a strong supporter of socialism. His ideas on nationalism and internationalism were based on these ideologies. To Nehru, nationalism stood as an important ideology. Explaining the outcome of the Second World War, Nehru found that every country that was involved in the War became tremendously nationalistic, forgetting their internationalism. He mentioned, even the country with a proletariat bias allowed nationalism to grow as a dominant passion. This happened, according to Nehru, in spite of the development of internationalism in the world. As Nehru put it, 'so, I suppose, one of the problems of today and tomorrow is how to fit in these two conceptions - nationalism and internationalism.' (14) Thus his ideas on nationalism reflected through his support to democracy, secularism and socialism and hence deserved separate and elaborate discussion in order to examine his views on nationalism.

A. Nehru's ideas on Democracy:

Nehru, with his updated knowledge of the major political ideas and ideologies of the world, analysed democracy in its historical perspective. Having a scientific, rational and human outlook, he maintained permanent contact with the West. In his views on democracy, he was deeply influenced by his world outlook and tried to reconcile the same in the Indian context. He always tried to enrich and improve his views on democracy till the last. For that, Nehru made a detailed study of democracy, its origin, growth and consolidation. Democratic movement, in the shape of freedom movement in India, also helped Nehru to shape his views on democracy. To Nehru, democracy was totally dependant on the consent of the people. He warned that in India, any attempt to discard democratic methods, would lead to disruption. The right to self-determination of the nation as well as the freedom of the individual occupied prominence in his analysis of democracy.

Historical background of Democracy:

Nehru looked upon democracy as a relatively new concept. He explained that parliamentary democracy was the product of the past two hundred years, and had also undergone a long struggle for its survival and growth. However, it became popular in the 18th and the 19th century Europe. In the words of Nehru, "democracy has been the great ideal of the 19th century, so much

so that the century might also be called the century of democracy⁽¹⁵⁾. In the twenties and the thirties, he came to the conclusion that political democracy was meaningless if it did not lead to economic and social democracy. To him, parliamentary democracy was to be widened so as to include economic equality. He mentioned that "this is the great revolution through which we are all passing, the revolution to ensure economic equality, and thus to give democracy its full meaning, and to bring ourselves in line with the advance of science and technology."⁽¹⁶⁾ Nehru always took political democracy as a means of solving social problems. In 1936, he mentioned that political democracy was only the way to the goal and was not the final objective. During India's independence movement, Nehru always insisted on complementing political democracy with social democracy. Martyshin held ^{that} "Nehru's main criterion of democracy was the degree in which political democracy by itself was the guarantee of social and economic democracy."⁽¹⁷⁾

Nehru as an advocate of popular sovereignty:

Besides the economic aspect of genuine democracy, he also made a thorough study of its political content. Nehru regarded the democratic system as a practical realisation of the doctrine of national sovereignty or sovereignty of the people. Nehru was always for the people. To him, "in a democratic country, one has to take the vast masses of the people into confidence. One has to produce a sensation in them that they are partners in the vast undertaking a running a nation, partners

in industry. This is the essence of democracy."

Peaceful method:

Nehru singled out tolerance as the salient feature of democracy. This tolerance, according to Nehru, demanded self-discipline and the adoption of peaceful method. Nehru took democracy as an attempt at the solution of problems by peaceful methods. If it is not peaceful, it is not democracy. On an international plane, Nehru regarded peace to be a primary condition for the success of democracy. Nehru believed that war put an end to the human values that democracy cherished so only a solution achieved through peaceful means was desirable. As early as 1923, addressing the U.P. Congress at Banaras, Nehru emphasised that salvation of India, and indeed of the whole world, would come through non-violent, non-cooperation. (19) He reflected the same spirit, when he termed terrorism as an outworn and profitless method and held, that terrorism usually represents the infancy of revolutionary life in a country. That state passes, and with it passes terrorism as an important phenomenon'. (20) The use of peaceful method remained an essential ingredient of Nehru's democracy.

Fundamental Rights and Freedoms:

Nehru gave the highest priority to the provision of fundamental rights and freedoms. Like Laski, he also believed that a state should be known by the system of rights.

that it maintained, because, the well-being of the citizens could be achieved only through them. A perfect individual could live only under the perfect state. So, Nehru proposed, so long as there was no perfect state and perfect individuals, the edifice of freedom could not be constructed.

Democracy as a dominant ideology of the world:

On the other hand, he believed that British imperialism and British authoritarianism were the manifestations of the end of British democracy. During the Second World War, British propaganda in favour of democracy was nothing but a hoax. Taking the world scenario into account, Nehru explained that "the war goes on for democracy and the Atlantic Charter and Four Freedoms." (21) But British rule in India was reactionary; the British did not bother to share the burden of the Indian people. So, democracy of the world had no meaning for Indians who were under an undemocratic British rule. Though individual Englishmen, educationists, orientalist and journalists played an important role in bringing western culture to India, that reached only a small section of the Indians. Even persons, who were earlier sympathetic to the British, turned against them for the overdose of exploitation in the form of racialism and economic oppression.

According to Nehru, there could be no difference between racialism, as practised by British in India, and the nazi theory of the Herrenvolk. To Nehru, "the idea of master race is inherent in imperialism. There was no subterfuge about it; it

was proclaimed in unambiguous language by those in authority in India" (22) What Nehru emphasised was that a democratic country could not rule undemocratically even in another country.

Criticism of British Rule in India:

Nehru mentioned that the British administration needed clerks and the like in its civil and military establishment. Thus began the process of the Indianisation in the administrative machinery in its subordinate rank. The policy of balance and counterpoise was deliberately advanced in the Indian army and was so arranged as to prevent any sentiment of national unity. Every attempt was made to isolate the army from the people. Inherent contradictions, Nehru mentioned, having brought about the political unification of the country, the British government tried to disrupt that unity by weakening of nationalist elements, by giving greater importance to the Indian States, by encouraging fissiparous tendencies by quisling classes afraid of change. In the words of Nehru, "all this was a natural, understandable policy for a foreign imperialist power to pursue, and its a little naive to be surprised at it, harmful from Indian national point of view though it was. But the fact that it was so must be remembered." (23) Out of this policy arose those important elements which were created and encouraged to disagree and disrupt, and are now called upon to agree among themselves. British rule in India tried to divide the country, disrupt the unity with

the help of the reactionary sections of Indian population. Nehru analysed the success of the Quit India Movement, and held that it was no longer possible to endure and live under foreign autocratic rule. All other questions became secondary." (24) The Second World War was both a restraining and a releasing factor. As the War developed, it became clearer that the western democracies were fighting for no change, but for the perpetuation of the old order. For Mr. Churchill, it was a war of restoration, while President Roosevelt spoke in terms of greater promise. All pervading autocracy and authoritarianism of the British Government in India, and the widespread suppression of the most ordinary civil rights and liberty, had reached their furthest limits during the War. (25)

Nehru became very critical of the double standard of the British rule. Since England was propagating that her war aim was restoration of democracy but she was adopting draconian measures in India. So he mentioned, "I wanted to keep as far away from England as possible But if I, with all my associations with England and the English, could feel that way, what of others who had lacked those contacts." (26) In short, it may be held that Nehru was all for political liberation of India, and his account of British rule clearly proved that his account of democracy was quite meticulous and relevant to the times.

Nehru and the Freedom Movement:

To Nehru, India's desire to control her affairs and

to acquire lost dignity, to get rid of alien domination, was the form of democracy which any country under foreign rule would like to establish. Nehru condemned racial discrimination of Indians who were treated like pariah in South Africa, as an inferior being in Kenya. In India, their lot was no better. Nehru observed that they did so because that was apparently easier to do so." (27) To Nehru, the chief link between England and the Dominion is one of sentiment. It is here that Nehru superseded others, in his claim for full independence of the country. In 1927, at the Madras Congress, the Independence Resolution was passed. However, the same was opposed by Gandhi. Gandhi was not present in the meeting when the resolution was passed but later on, he objected and finally allowed the Independence Resolution not to be implemented. In a letter to Gandhi, dated 11 Jan. 1928, (28) Nehru protested that Gandhi described the independence resolution as 'hastily conceived and thoughtlessly passed.' Nehru pointed out how the country had discussed and considered this question for years, and personally, he discussed it with so many members of the Working Committee. The same was discussed for more than three hours in a Subject-Committee and ultimately it was passed unanimously. Nehru held, "after prolonged and careful thought, a demand for independence and all this implies has come to mean a very great deal for me and I attach more importance to it than to almost anything else." (29) The Madras Session was marked by the difference between Nehru and Gandhi over the issue of complete independence. The radical resolution reflected the impatience

and the discontent of the nationalist youth in the Congress. But this was kept within the bounds of decency and decorum. As General Secretary of the Congress, and Chief spokesman for the radicals and the youth, Nehru was now in great demand as a spokesman for various platforms and fora. To Nehru, acceptance of 'Dominian Status' was a retrograde step and would prove a costly futile experiment. According to Nehru, acceptance of dominion proposal would be succubing to the psychology of imperialism. He firmly rejected the Dominion Status formula. The controversy over 'Dominian Status' also revealed the differences between Motilal and Jawaharlal Nehru. The great debate over 'dominion status vs. complete independence' caused a split within the Party at the Annual Congress Session at Calcutta (1928). Jawaharlal Nehru and Subash Bose fought for complete independence. Bose's amendment was rejected by 1350 to 937 votes. However, it revealed that "the strength and support of the Left led by Bose and Jawaharlal Nehru was considerable despite the Mahatma's magnetism and friendly persuasion".
(30)

An important landmark was achieved at the Lahore Session of the Indian National Congress in 1929, when Nehru was elected the Congress President. He had the distinction of presiding over the historic Congress Session which had adopted the objective of complete independence. "The radicals, the youth, the urban intelligentsia, the working class, and the masses
(31)
acclaimed him as national hero. Nehru played an important

role in drafting the resolution on 'Fundamental Rights' at the Karachi Congress. Nehru's participation in the freedom movement clearly highlights his commitment to complete independence when so many leaders including Gandhi and Motilal, were found lacking. He participated in the freedom movement and led it, was party to the enactment of Independence Resolution in the Madras Congress in 1927, repeated the same in 1928 in the Calcutta Congress, and finally in his presidentship at the Lahore Congress in 1929, the Congress, resolved for full independence. He disagreed with his father over dominion status and opted for the complete independence. His appraisal of British rule in India is a rich chapter for the study of democracy.

Nehru was also concerned with the problems of other countries. On ^{the} European soil, Italy, Spain, Poland, Yugoslavia, Greece, Bulgaria, Portugal, Hungary and Austria underwent transformations to dictatorial forms of government. Dictatorship also sprang up outside Europe, particularly in Turkey. Nehru believed that all these dictatorships were the direct opposites of democracy. Nehru pointed out that "democracy means equality, and democracy could only flourish in an equal society." (32) Therefore, he proposed, India should have such democracy which included freedom, equality and well being of the people. Frank Moraes was right when he mentioned that Nehru continually had a feeling of growing up 'dynamic', and

'dynamism' was among his favourite words.

His views on democracy reflected liberal, humanitarian, and egalitarian features. He started with the liberal outlook adding to it 'social content', but not ignoring individual freedom and rights. Thereafter, it was Gandhian 'purity of means' which enriched his democratic conception. Till the last, he retained the Marxist influence in the shape of 'egalitarian' outlook. On the international scene, he advocated peace and democracy for all the nations. He was against the degeneration and deterioration of democracy anywhere in the world. Right to self-determination of India was however the most important ideology before him. In a practical sense, nationalism was the vital ideology as India's right to independence, along with the right to independence of all the colonial peoples. It was the democratic content of Indian nationalism which was appreciated throughout the world. But it was Nehru's credit, unlike many a leader of the Third World, that he resisted all efforts to chain democracy. A free press and an independent judiciary were constantly defended by him.

Evaluation of Nehru's ideas on democracy:

While evaluating Nehru's views on democracy, it appears that on democracy his stand changed. In the 1920s and the 1930s, he assimilated the principal ideas of Marxism regarding the class - character of the state in his political

thinking. In all his assessment, he was guided by the conception of a ruling class which "controlled the state power". Nehru, then supported the criticism made by Marx and Engels on liberty, equality and fraternity, the classic principles of liberal democracy. In 1928, he re-iterated that all power in the world belonged to the rich and only Russia was an exception. In his "Glimpses of World History", he mentioned that in Russia, "there is no exploitation of the workers or any other class for the benefit of another." (34) He further held, "but in a properly organised and free country, the state is the people" (35) that meant he bestowed an important role to the state in promoting the welfare of the people.

B. Nehru's Ideas on Secularism:

The Hindu, Muslim and the British, the three cultural strands, pervaded 'Ananda Bhawan' during Nehru's formative years. Nehru imbibed some of the classics of Hindu mythology and stories of 1857 from the Munsif Mubarak Ali. 'It was this composite environment that shaped his later attitude to the Muslim and the communal problems in general.' (36) His education in the West revealed in him the Western rationalist, making him alien in his own society, a Hindu out of tune with Hinduism, "a queer mixture of the East and the West". Thus, the broad secular outlook was the legacy of his home in Allahabad.

Jawaharlal Nehru's own ideas on religion were

vague, and his tutor Brooks, a determined theosophist, had therefore, little difficulty in influencing his pupil in his own way. Furthermore, Jawaharlal Nehru wrote, 'my father was not exactly a religious man but he respected the Hindu religion since he had been brought up in it.'⁽³⁷⁾ Later on, while in jail, Nehru found Reinhold Neibuhr's "Moral Man and Immoral Society", especially invigorating, since it reinforced many of his own views on religion. Catholicism, Hinduism and Islam provided a safe anchorage from doubt and conflict, and assurance for future life, while protestanism failed to register it either. 'Nehru's views on religion approximated most to Taoism, the first pacifist known to the world'. Nehru remained against religious dogma and doctrine, and, publicly denounced the habit of certain Indian politicians of imparting too frequent references to the Almighty.⁽³⁸⁾ Nehru was secular in his approach to politics and believed that religion should not be allowed to dominate politics.

According to Nehru, secularism did not mean that religion was discouraged; rather, it meant "a state where freedom of religion and conscience, including freedom for those who have no religion. It meant free-play for all religions, subject only to their not interfering with each other."⁽³⁹⁾ Nehru categorically reiterated that "we have opposed communalism and continue to be stoutly opposed to it. It is infact a negation of nationalism and of the nationalist state."⁽⁴⁰⁾ He believed that nationalism must be secular in general, especially for a country

like India, where persons of different religions live together. The might be termed as a liberal theory of secularism.

To Nehru, that state would be regarded ^{as} secular, "which honours all faiths equally and gives them equal opportunities, that as a state, does not allow itself to be attached to one faith or religion, which then becomes the state religion" (41). He further held that secularism was a modern concept and was appropriate for being accepted as the principle of Indian nationalism. In his words : 'in any country like India, with many faiths and religions no nationalism can be built up except on the basis of secularity.' (42). Secularism stood to be very important for India.

Socio-economic Interpretation of Secularism:

As a matter of fact, freedom had the ultimate value and place in the socio-economic thought of Nehru. He fought for socio-economic freedom of the country and in doing so, reiterated communalism as an economic problem, and partly as a middle class problem. To him, communalism was a giant with feet of clay and it was amyth far from reality and it could not endure. As such, he did not prefer the religious and spiritual overtones of freedom movement, though Indian politics of the period, was a strange mixture of religion and politics. Nehru's nationalism was composite and it embraced all inhabitants of the land. Religious fundamentalism and obscurantism were foreign to his nature and had no place in his thinking.

Throughout the freedom movement, Nehru opposed communalism and regarded it as a negation of nationalism. He wanted everyone to have the right of religion, but not interference with other religions. In his maiden Presidential address, at Lahore in 1929, Nehru stressed three problems: the minorities, princely (43) States, and the peasants and workers. The problem of communalism which consistently dogged Indian nationalism, found in Nehru a liberal base. He was all for right to religion and cultural rights. Having assured the protection of religion and culture, he equally believed that the problem had economic dimension. In his words communalism, "had nothing to do with person's religion. (44) He also blamed other Congress leaders who continued to think in the narrow framework of religion.

However, the ground reality was different. Indian freedom movement always faced Hindu - Muslim antagonism as the most recurrent theme and Nehru was in the thick of the freedom movement Nehru explained, this was the creation of the British policy. The 20th century freedom movement marked a separatist trend among the Muslims. The irresistible seduction of separatist (45) politics claimed the allegiance of these diehard politicians. They were confined to traditionalism, obscurantism and fundamentalism. But, even in this context, Nehru was modern and scientific in his ideological stand on communal problems. To some extent, he was far ahead of his contemporaries. However, the antagonism between the two communities, engaged Nehru's attention. He did not like to be guided by the religious or spiritual overtones of

freedom movement. To him, communal leaders emerged only to obstruct the political advance of freedom movement." (46)

Nehru's analysis revealed that the communal leaders represented a small upper class reactionary group, and these people exploited and took advantage of the religious passions of the masses for their own ends. To him, these communal groups represented a common camp against radical tendencies as they helped and cooperated with each other in the Assembly and elsewhere in helping the British Government to pass the reactionary measures. This analysis is quite outstanding and is valid even in the present context.

Historical Background of Nehru's Secularism:

Nehru believed that since the distant past, India had been living in harmony with each other. Buddha taught this lesson. Gandhi laid stress on it, i.e., communal-goodwill and harmony. It is our legacy, reiterated Nehru.

According to Nehru, India had a long history of religious tolerance. But as a matter of fact, these "narrow religious nationalism which is a relic of the past ages are no longer relevant to-day." (47) He further held, ultimately, nationalism would pave the way for internationalism and for that we needed secularism. Thus secularism was the base of nationalism which would lead us to internationalism without which it could not

be up-to-date and upto the mark. In his words, "without the basis of true nationalism, internationalism may be vague and amorphous without any real meaning".⁽⁴⁸⁾ He wanted Indian nationalism to be secular so that India might fit in a secular world. Thus Nehru's concept of secularism was bracketed with nationalism and internationalism.

According to Nehru, the emergence of new Muslim bourgeoisie on the scene brought their attraction and involvement towards the nationalist movement because they began to feel dissatisfied with the existing system. So Nehru held, the Muslims were not historically or ideologically ready then for the bourgeois nationalist movement as they had developed no bourgeoisie as the Hindus had done.⁽⁴⁹⁾ However, the First World War hastened the process and a new set of Muslim leaders also emerged on the national scene. It was here that Gandhi started the Khilafat movement which the Muslims joined.

With the emergence of Hindu and Muslim Bourgeoisie, their participation culminated in the national movement. But with the emergence of communal organisations such as/^{the}"Hindu Mahasabha" and/^{the}"Muslim League" with communal and backward elements began the nefarious game. Though it was a slow process, it was a continuous one. Nehru criticised, denounced and condemned communal activities of Hindu Mahasabha and wrote some articles on it and held that most of their demands had no relation whatsoever to the masses.

Nehru visited the Banaras Hindu University and castigated the Hindu audience there for the reactionary overtones of Hindu communalism. He wrote a series of articles and emphasised that the communalism was allied to vested interests. He also suggested the idea of formation of a Constituent Assembly to iron out the communal differences. He devoted his time to educate the masses about the danger of communalism through his "Speeches and writings".⁽⁵⁰⁾ While analysing the impact of communal award, he blamed even some Congressmen viz., Madan Mohan Malaviya and M.S. Aney for supporting the award and was deeply angered at them.

When the Government of India Act, 1935 was implemented in 1937, one unfortunate result led to internal conflicts on the communal front. After the installation of the provincial government, no Muslim League member, was included in the U.P. Government, because the League was defeated in the election. But, "the policy was a grave tactical blunders because it aggravated a sense of grievance, frustration and isolation among the Muslims leaders and masses."⁽⁵¹⁾ In the succeeding months, an acrimonious correspondence surfaced between Nehru and Jinnah which only widened the breach.

In 1945, the British Labour Party assumed office in England and election to the Central and Provincial legislature was announced for the winter in India. The Congress joined the election with a catch-all programme, similar to its manifesto of

1937, while the Muslim League stressed the issue of Hindu domination and the demand of a separate Muslim homeland i.e. Pakistan. The Muslim League, by this time, won thirty seats in the Central Assembly, and 427 of the 482 Muslim seats in the Provincial Legislatures. The Congress formed ministries in 8 of the 11 provinces while the League formed ministries in Bengal and Sind and the Unionists with Congress support in Punjab. Then came the cabinet mission but it also failed to achieve anything concrete. One month after the election, the Viceroy, invited Nehru to form an interim government in 1946. But all these widened the rift between the Congress and the League which led to Muslim League's call for "Direct Action", setting in motion the disastrous civil war, resulting in the "great Calcutta killing". Nothing comparable to Calcutta killing had occurred in the annals of British rule. In October 1946, the scene shifted to the Noakhali district of East Bengal, where the Muslims went on the rampage, killing, looting and converting Hindus by force and destroying all Hindus' temples. Nehru, declared, "we shall resist against Pakistan's demand" but Nehru was stunned by the turn of events.

To Nehru, the idea of "Muslim nation" within a nation was vague, indeterminate, and a mystifying nuisance. In his words, "politically the idea is absurd, economically it is fantastic and as such it is hardly worth considering. (52) To talk of a Muslim nation meant that the nation depended only on the bond of religion which, in turn, would signify that no nation should be

allowed to grow and the modern civilisation should be discarded and "we should go back to the medieval ways and even if many people believed in it, it would still vanish at the touch of reality." (53) To Nehru, even the day of national culture was rapidly passing and the world was becoming a single cultural unit. He was conscious of the fact that there existed differences between the Hindu and Muslim traditions. However, no one could ignore the modern scientific and industrial outlook. In his words "the real struggle to-day in India is not between Hindu culture and Muslim culture but between these two and the conquering scientific culture of/modern civilisation". (54)

Analysing the basic ingredients of Muslim - culture, Nehru could finally spell out that they were the common heritage of India. The two languages, Persian and Arabic, which influenced Muslim thought in India formed a common and precious heritage for all of us in India. The Muslim peasantry and the industrial workers could hardly be distinguished in terms of their fate under the communal rule. His love of the past did not allow him to bear the burden of the past. Nehru pointed out, "it is not beautiful that these people clutch at, but something i.e. seldom worthwhile and is often harmful." (55) The bond of common suffering, being faced by both/Hindu and/Muslim working class, prompted Nehru to discard irrelevant communal forces out of the area of national freedom movement. That is why, he appeared time and again out of the clutches of separatism. This was

the political philosophy of secularism which Nehru believed and practised throughout his life. However, there was a tide in favour of partition of the nation and Nehru was found at a fix.

Partition:

The struggle for power intensified with the arrival of Mountbatten, in March 1947, whose most striking feature was the rapidity with which he arrived at decisions. It became obvious, soon that United India could not be imposed without a major civil war. The riots supported this contention. Brecher held, "Nehru seemed resigned to the necessity of partition very early." (56) He added, Nehru's mood combined sadness, resignation, reflection and almost detachment. Nehru said it is with no joy in my heart that I commend these proposals, though I have doubted in my mind that this is the right course." (57)

According to Brecher, Nehru spoke about partition on June 6, 1956, "I think now, looking back, that partition could have been avoided if the British Government's policy had been different about a year or eighteen months earlier." (58) So far as the ideal of secularism was concerned, it continued, even after the partition, but the nation was divided which put a blur to his leadership and commitment to the ideology.

Nehru's concept of secularism was never 'an end' by itself but was rather a 'pragmatic solution' to the problems of religious pluralism. His concept of secularism was quite

different from being practised in Soviet Russia, where the state was promoting non-religious feeling or that of Turkey. On the other hand, Indian Secular State is nearer to the American pattern. In the words of Balsubramanium, "Nehru's concept of Secular State, besides its non-denominational character, is positive, active and geared to extricate the society from the traditional nets of religion and to promote political economic and social progress."⁽⁵⁹⁾ His views were, quite unaffected by religious or reactionary ethics, mysticism, fairly common in India.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Nehru was a whole-hearted believer of scientific, rational and human outlook and for that 'he bitterly scorned bigotry of all varieties and was himself absolutely free from Communalism, provincialism, Casteism, prejudices and things of that sort'.⁽⁶¹⁾

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.

C. Socialism:

Like any creative leader, Nehru had a multi-dimensional personality and this multi-dimensionality was reflected in his writings and speeches on various respects --both national and international. Perhaps his most ^{enduring} contribution in the domain of political thought was socialism. Nehru advocated reconstruction of Indian society on socialist lines. In the historical perspective, his inclination towards socialism might be traced to his connections with the Fabians - a small body of intellectuals namely, George Bernard Shaw, Beatrice and Sidney Webb. These intellectuals - the brilliant minds of the time, shared common desire for social reform in England.

Back home, Nehru was drawn towards freedom struggle and also developed contact with Gandhi. He undertook intensive and extensive tour of rural areas and could get the true picture of the peasantry - naked, starving, crushed and utterly miserable. Poverty and misery everywhere, under the colonial rule in India, created in him a strong urge to work in socialist direction. (62) He found in socialism the panacea to India's problems of poverty, exploitation and oppression. Now onward, he started speaking on 'political freedom' as well as on 'social freedom'. Thus nationalism and socialism were the intellectual driving forces of Nehru's life work. (63)

On the world scene, two rival economic and politi-

cal systems faced each other in the 30s --- the imperialist and the fascist on the one side, and the socialist and the nationalist on the other. He made a frontal attack on fascism and imperialism and advocated that India was to side with the progressive forces of the world. Nehru was convinced that the only key to the solution of the world's problems as well as India's problems lay only in socialism. He held that "I worked for it even more because for one it is the inevitable step to social and economic change".⁽⁶⁴⁾ Thus Marxist presumption made a deep impression on Nehru's political approach.

He spoke in terms of social, political and economic equality. It was under the presidentship of Subhas Bose, that the National Planning Committee was set up with Nehru as its Chairman. The philosophy behind its setting up was that if Indians opposed imperialism they would have to simultaneously oppose capitalism and accept socialism. Nehru believed that if socialism was to be built up, it would have to grow out of Indian conditions and for that he held, 'we want experts in the job who study and prepare detailed plans'.⁽⁶⁵⁾ Nehru had in mind the New Economic Policy of Lenin, and the initiatives taken by Stalin in this regard. Nehru believed that 'it is very difficult, and indeed impossible to separate politics and economics of one nation from those of others'.⁽⁶⁶⁾ Nehru explained how backward Russia have become far ahead of India. He always displayed a socialist framework of mind in tackling

important problems of India of tomorrow. So Narendra Deva mentioned, 'Nehru believes that economic freedom is not possible without planning. (67) Nehru's visit to Europe in 1926 gave a definite shape to his socialistic thinking. He also visited Soviet Russia in 1927, and was highly impressed by the economic development of the country. In his own words, "Russia apart, the theory and philosophy of Marxism lightened up many dark corner of my mind. History came to have a new meaning for me. The Marxist interpretation threw a flood of light on it and it became an unfolding drama with some order and purpose, however, unconscious behind it". (68) He was influenced by the socialist world-view.

To Nehru, socialism was the philosophy of life, which meant revolutionary changes in political and social structure, the ending of vested interest in land and industry, the abolition of private property, change in interests, habits and desires. Thus, to Nehru, Socialism was more than an economic doctrine, a vital creed which he held with all his head and heart. So, Nehru wanted to bring a new civilisation radically different from the present capitalist order. In Indian context, as early as 1920, the U.P. Congress, under his presidentship, resolved to "make a revolutionary change in the present social and economic structure of the society and to remove the gross inequalities." (69) He developed a conviction that the British imperialism thrived on India due to the collaboration of Indian

industrialists and Zamindars. So, he pressed for a change in the existing set-up. Due to his socialist vision the ideological orientation of the nationalist movement underwent a significant change. His ideas inspired the poor, oppressed, neglected millions of India to aspire for a life of dignity. Further, it imposed upon the Congress the added responsibility of bringing a social transformation along with political liberation. In 1928, Subhas Bose, Srinivas Iyenger and Nehru organised 'Independence for India League', within the Congress for the reconstruction of the society on the basis of social and political unity.

Nehru's socialism reflected anti-feudal and anti-capitalist stand with the participation of the working class. He took a prominent interest in the trade Union movement and was elected president of the All India Trade Union Congress in 1929. In between 1929 and 1936, he was a strong socialist, and wanted the Congress must hold the balance favourably between the capital and the labour and the zamindar and the tenants. In 1933, under the title "Whither India", -- he explained and justified socialism, both on national and international levels. As president of the Lahore Congress, Nehru declared that "I must frankly confess that I am a socialist" (70) and his speech contained support to the working class. At the Karachi Congress, the same continued, where he reiterated that everywhere, he spoke on political independence and social freedom, and made the former a step towards the attainment of the latter. He wanted to spread the ideology

of socialism specially among the Congress workers and intelligentsia. Moraes has pointed out that Nehru was particularly interested in the resolutions on Fundamental Rights, in order to broaden the objectives of the Congress, from the attainment of political freedom to the consideration of economic and social plans and policies. (71)

The Congress Socialist Party was formed under the leadership of Narendra Deva, Achyut Patwardhan, Jay Prakash Narayan, Minu Masani and others. They invited Nehru to lead the said organisation. Nehru refused although, 'he fully endorsed the goal of socialism, and, he had no faith in factionalism and sectarianism'. (72) Though Nehru was the Congress President, the old guards, controlling the Congress organisation, had submitted their resignations protesting against Nehru's socialism. The crisis was resolved by Gandhi and all concerned withdrew their resignations. All these followed owing to the fact that Nehru cultivated a better understanding with Gandhi and 'Gandhi knew that Nehru was the one persons who could bridge the growing gap between socialism and Gandhism'. (73)

After this episode, in 1937, Nehru set the tone for the ensuing election campaign with a 'left of centre manifesto', emphasizing the substantial agrarian reforms. To Nehru, 'goes the most of credit for the Congress stress on land reforms. And it was he who carried so affectively

to the Indian countryside.' (74) The controversy connected with the second presidency of Subhas Bose, in 1939, led to a split in the Congress, and the left wing was considerably weakened. Ideologically, Nehru also climbed down. He was now convinced that Gandhi began to accept others' points of view and he was now more attracted to Gandhi's moral approach to politics.

During and after the Second World War, his ideas on socialism underwent a major change. Nehru mentioned that 'In spite of this general progress and development, the Soviet Union passed through severe internal crisis during the period' (75). In the 'Discovery of India', he mentioned that nationalism appeared in such a way as it fit in with new environment and aid to the strength of people but that was against the spirit of internationalism. He noted that 'the many changes in Soviet Policy, which could be understood in relation to Russia, became totally incomprehensible as policies favoured by the communist parties elsewhere' (76). He also criticised the role of the communist party of India when it did not join 'Quit India Movement'. In his words, 'It has cut itself off from the springs of national sentiment and speaks in a language which finds no echo in the hearts of people' (77).

In 1938, Nehru confirmed his acceptance of technique of non-violence, successfully practised by Gandhi for the last twenty years. In his words, 'I have been and am a con-

vinced socialist and believe in democracy and have at the same time accepted whole heartedly peaceful technique of non-violent action which Gandhi has practised so successfully during the past twenty years. (78) Nehru's thinking on socialism evolved and crystallised into a pattern in the course of his interaction with liberal nationalists, Gandhi and Gandhites, Hindu and Muslim revivalists and finally the Indian socialists, the concern for the masses, and, moral and ethical approach to life. Thus, Nehru's socialism 'was the point of synthesising of various trends of thought at the level of the ideal. In its synthetic quaoity lay its main appeal'. (79) However, Nehru is criticised on the ground that 'Nehru's loyalty to Gandhi was more pronounced than his commitment to socialism'. (80)

But the fact remains that Nehru grew with the ideology of anti-imperialist, pro-communist, and pro-soviet nationalism on the world scene. In the national context his socialism signified anti-feudal, and anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist stand with the participation of the working class. His activities brought about a radicalisation of political thought in India. Later on, many factors, forces and events such as weakening of the left wing due to internal conflict, influence of Gandhi, co-operation of the 'right wing' of the Congress with him, convinced Nehru that the nationalist movement could be strengthened only through active co-operation of people from all walk of life and that the question of social

change could be solved later on.

Like Sidney Webb, and Ebenstein, Bernstein, appeared as a believer of the gradualist approach to socialism and argued that steps like the overnight destruction of the property would be harmful. All these considerations, reflected in Nehru a Marxist in thought wedded to democratic practices. In India, the socialist theory gave a certain social content and a sharper edge to Indian nationalism. It is here that Nehru played the pioneering role in the spread of socialism. Nehru proved that the British dominion required to be fought not only on nationalist grounds but also on social and political grounds and he provided the ideology of socialism and enthused the youth, the working class and the intelligentsia in this regard. But ultimately when India gained independence the influence of Marx, Fabians and Gandhi were reflected in his economic programme, which turned to be a queer mixture of liberalism and socialism and was later on named 'democratic socialism'.

Brief Assessment of Nehru's Socialist Ideas.

Nehru's socialism could not satisfy the diehard socialists and the communists in India. Dange spoke of Nehru's socialism as a 'plunge in dark'. M. N. Roy conceived his socialism as 'purely emotional longing for a vaguely conceived new world in the context of the disintegrating bourgeois

(81)
culture'. The fact remained that he never created any socialist group or joined the Congress socialist group within the Congress. When Subhas Bose was expelled from the Congress, Bose started the Forward Bloc, a socialist organisation. Nehru and Bose had been together for a long period, and both of them had always fought jointly for socialism and complete independence within the Congress opposing Gandhi. But this time, Nehru remained loyal to Gandhi. However, Narendra Deva has estimated Nehru's commitment to socialism, that, "without giving his adherence to any socialist group, he easily became the spearhead of broad revolutionary and socialist forces in the country." (82)
Gopal has pointed out that "Nehru was the best shield of the Congress against the left wing groups". (83)

Nehru's thinking in this respect, represented three important trends of western thought - humanism, utopian socialism and Marxism. The fundamental concern of Nehru lay in his sensitivity to the poverty of the Indian masses, their psychology of servitude and dependence, feudalism, traditionalism and superstition. Nehru saw in socialism a major weapon that could possibly remove these impediments to progress and he, therefore, 'laid emphasis on the socialist pattern from the very beginning of his political career, in his long association with the struggle for Indian independence". (84)

Temperamentally, Nehru did not subscribe to

any ideology for long and modified his own ideas according to the new experiences gained. He was not particularly wedded to any 'ism' and the world events made him sober and cautious. He believed in democracy and disliked totalitarianism. He was in a quest for an equation between liberty and planned economic order. Acharya Narendra Deva has nicely evaluated Nehru's ideas on socialism that Jawaharlal did not belong to any orthodox school of socialism. "But if I were asked to sum up his social philosophy is a neat phrase. I would say that it is 'democratic socialism'". (85) Deva further held that Nehru's activities were guided by the ideals of democracy and the betterment of the masses. Nehru himself explained that 'I have mentioned the two ways that have moved me. These are nationalism as political freedom as represented by the Congress and social freedom as represented by socialism'. (86) It was this ideology which distinguished him from both the Gandhites and the socialists. His wish to bring socialist millenium by democratic means and method' (87) dominated his political thinking - a dominant quest for a search of one suitable ideology for India.

II

Nehru's Ideas on Internationalism.

Introduction:

Nehru emerged as an outstanding leader, a spokesman of the idea of 'national liberation' and 'social progress', which ultimately became the driving force of the people of Asia and Africa both during and after the liberation movement of India. Nehru consistently maintained an international outlook. Even his nationalism remained an inalienable part of the larger humanity that transcends beyond national boundaries.

Nehru's ideology of internationalism is as powerful as his views on nationalism. Gandhi rightly mentioned (88) that 'his nationalism is equal to his internationalism'. Nehru was more interested in synthesising his ideas on internationalism. He emphasised that we have now to lay greater stress on the synthetic aspect and make the whole world our field of study. (89) He believed that this synthesis was necessary both for the individual and for the nation if they were to grow out of the narrow grooves of thought and action.

Nehru's deep and broadbased knowledge of history and philosophy helped him to encompass many world problems. He was conscious of the advance of science and technology which made the whole world one single family. Nehru was convinced that the

existed between the people of the East and the West was due to lack of industrial growth. So, according to Nehru, 'real difference was in the medievalism of the East and the industrial mechanical progress of the West.'⁽⁹²⁾ The world became too small for the high ambitions of these European powers. Narrow spirit of nationalism was whipped up in every western country to mislead the masses in order to hate their neighbours and they (masses) were kept ready for war. Europe became an armed camp, and there was a fierce competition in industry and trade, and armaments. Nehru held that 'a blind nationalism thus began to dominate Europe'.⁽⁹³⁾ Nehru asserted that owing to scientific and technological advancement, the countries came closer, but the whole structure of society under the new industrial capitalism was such that it bred friction between nation and nation, class and class, and man and man. He made appeals for nationalism and scientism. Once he held, 'politics led me to economics and this led me to science and to the scientific approach'.⁽⁹⁴⁾

A. Democracy and Socialism as basis of Nehru's Internationalism:

His ideology of internationalism was guided by the ideals of democracy and socialism. He was highly influenced by the ideas of the French Revolution because it challenged many old and orthodox notions of religion and society by way of advancing new theories. Such political thinking was confined to France at that time. Religion seemed to give permanent and even a honoured place to liberty. "The very ideas of liberty and equality were opposed to the authoritarian outlook of the

church and society.' (95) It is in this perspective that Nehru advocated secularism both for Indian nationalism and internationalism. However, the ruling class in England became more conservative and reactionary. In Europe, "the French Revolution was the parent of the democratic idea that spread throughout the first half of the 19th century." (96) He added that the early democrats naturally looked to the idea of nationalism. Their demand for freedom of thought and speech could hardly be reconciled with the dogmatic religion and theology. The advent of the modern-state, and the modern-nation, led to democratization and secularisation of politics and nationalism found in democracy a good ally which was explained by Nehru. Nehru identified democracy with nationalism. He traced from the French Revolution the dimensions of 'democracy' and 'nationalism' and applied these to the Indian context. Thus, it was the world outlook which provoked him to move in the direction of framing ideology for India. He also mentioned that Indian nationalists still referred to the French Revolution and the Rights of Man. but, 'not appreciating that much has happened since then.' (97)

It was again his world outlook which helped him to understand that democracy joined hands with science to weaken the hold of theological dogma. The old religious foundations in Europe were being weakened by science and the democratic idea. In this connection, he referred to Auguste Comte (1798-1857), who believed that the old theology and dogmatic religion were out of

date. He proposed a religion of humanity and called it 'positivism' which was to be based on love, order and progress. Nehru referred to J. S. Mill (1806 - 1873) who was also influenced by Comte's teaching. Nehru held that Mill was a strong advocate of liberty. Thus Nehru's concept of secularism as well as of democracy was derived from the eminent thinkers of the 19th century.

As the 19th century progressed further, other movements and ideas developed, such as, the working class movement and socialism. In the first half of the 19th century, democracy and nationalism came closer wherever people were fighting for freedom. Mazzini of Italy produced a kind of democratic patriotism which influenced even the Indian nationalists. Though democracy largely influenced the intellectuals, yet, the 'common people' suffered by the growth of industrialism. Industrial working class was growing and the poor workers were dying from slow starvation and overwork. It was Robert Owen, who first used the word 'socialism' somewhere about 1830. The capitalism marched ahead and so some radicals with advance views came on the scene. The British industry dominated the world and wealth poured in "both from profits of industry and the exploitation of India and other dependancies".

(98)

Nehru referred to Karl Marx and Engels for the publication of the 'Communist Manifesto' wherein the unity of the working class was envisaged. He further analysed that 'new

clear and cogently argued socialism of Marx was therefore called scientific socialism' ⁽⁹⁹⁾ as opposed to the vague utopian or idealistic socialism which had so far prevailed. Nehru mentioned different types of socialism and criticised the social democrats. Nehru now believed in the Marxist approach. He praised Lenin for the reason that he lived upto Marxism but never considered it as a dogma. Nehru considered socialism as better than traditional liberal democracy. His preference for socialism was the logical outcome of the world outlook based on the idea of exploitation under imperialism. Nehru visited Soviet Russia in 1927 and till the last, he retained a soft corner for Russia. Soviet Russia attracted him in many ways, not only as the first socialist country of the world, but further, because Soviet Russia was a backward country under the Czar but improved under socialism. So he thought India under socialism would prosper by following the Russian path. To Nehru, Soviet Russia stood as a powerful and "the only effective barrier in Europe and Asia to fascism and the anti-democratic forces." ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Nehru compared the social democrats of Europe with the communists and found them below the mark. He emphasised that Soviet Russia consistently followed a peace policy in international affairs. Nehru, even after Independence, maintained a cordial relationship with Soviet Russia due to the fact that Soviet Russia was of some positive help to the oppressed nations of the world in their fight against imperialism. Initially, Nehru was highly influenced by democracy but later on detected that liberal democracy alone would not do.

So he wanted to add socialism with democracy, which he did. Again, the influence of Gandhi led him to believe in the purity of means and think more in moral terms. All these had an impact on him in framing his views on internationalism.

B. India and the world:

The Indian National Congress in the 1920s began to take some interest in foreign affairs. As early as 1920, the resolution on foreign policy was passed by the Congress. Herein the desire to cooperate with other nations, and especially to develop friendly relations with neighbouring countries of Asia, was emphasised. Nehru mentioned that in 1927, twelve years before the start of the Second World War, the Congress first declared its policy with regard to international relation, and, 'It was he who made Congress feel to think Indian struggle of freedom as actually a part of aglobal struggle.' (101) Right from the start, he insisted that the Indians could put mass aspiration, idealism and morality in the background and, as Lincoln, reiterated that the world could not live half-free and half-slave. He wanted that the Congress should play an important role in the global affairs.

As the nationalist movement gathered strength and confidence, the people began to think in terms of a free India. The very bigness and potential, strength and resources of

were the country ~~was~~ also taken into account to shape future relationship with other nations. It was also taken into consideration that India could not be a mere hanger-on of any country or group nations. It was also thought that Indian independence would make a vital differences to Asia and the world. This demanded wider sphere of international cooperation. According to Nehru, "we thought of close relations with our neighbours, countries in the East and the West, with China, Afghanistan, Iran and the Soviet Union. Even with distant America we wanted closer relation, for we could learn much from the United States as also from the Soviet Union." (102) The pattern of this relationship revealed that India had exhausted the capacity of learning anything more from England, owing to rapid discrimination and treatment of Indians in some of the British dominion viz., South Africa, East Africa and Kenya. Nehru further interpreted that the independence of India was not in terms of isolation but in terms of world cooperation. In this regard, ^{that} he believed/British Commonwealth did not fit in. However, wrote Nehru, "we made it repeatedly clear, therefore, that we were perfectly agreeable to limit that independence, in common with other nations, within some international framework". (103) This exhibited Nehru's intense internationalism in which nations would cooperate with one another because the old type of nationalism was doomed and, instead, a new era of world co-operation was to emerge.

The dominant Indian ideology was nationalism,

but Nehru's thought went far beyond nationalism. His attempt to link nationalism with internationalism was his major contribution. Brecher rightly held that "the Indian National Congress served as a model for the intelligentsia of South-East Asia (104) and to some extent to the Middle East. To the thinking Indians, world affairs those days were not of much concern. However, with Nehru, they were burning issues which touched him personally and profoundly. Nehru, in his books and articles and essays, consistently maintained an international outlook and proved himself, not an Indian or Asiatic, but a citizen of the world. (105) So Brecher is right when he mentioned that Nehru is for many a symbol of Asia's awakening'. (106) His (107) 'nationalism is an inalienable aspect of basic national rights'.

Analysing the character of Indian nationalism, Nehru pointed out that "no other nationalist movement of a subject country came anywhere near this, and the general tendency in such other country was to keep clear of international commitment". (108) Nehru mentioned/there were some persons who objected to Nehru's anxiety for Republican Spain and China, Abyssinia and Czechoslovakia, his utterness against nations like Italy, Germany, Japan because England was their enemy. In their view, every enemy of British should be treated/as a friend and idealism had no place in politics. He diluted his nationalism with internationalism and thought that national interests could be prudently, conceived only in the

international context.

His visit to Europe in 1926 - 27, particularly, his participation in the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities and the League against Imperialism, along with his short visit to Russia, left an abiding imprint on his view. From now on, he clearly held that Indian national movement was a part of the Global anti-imperial movement. He further believed that Indian national movement should maintain close link with national when he found that the appeal of the international proletariat in Soviet Russia had surprisingly changed. Nehru mentioned that without giving up in any way its essential social and economic structure, it had become more nationalist minded and the appeal of the fatherland was now much greater than the appeal of the international proletariat. Nehru mentioned that they revived national history and heroes of the Soviet people and this going back to national tradition was more marked in the ranks of labour proletarian elements. However, he held that "it would be wrong to imagine that this nationalist outburst of Russia is just reversion to old style nationalism. It is certainly not that." (109)

Nehru cherished the tremendous experiences of the Bolshevik Revolution, the social structure and mental adjustment of Soviet people on which depended Soviet nationalism. Nehru was equally aware of the fact that the United States of America astonished the world by her stupendous production

and organising capacity. He mentioned that the world situation seemed to be drifting where England and France would form one side and Russia, and some eastern countries the other and held that In this setting Indian opinion inevitably sided with Soviet Russia and the eastern nations. In his words : "this did not mean any widespread approval of communism though a growing number were attracted to socialist thought." (110) The account placed above clearly showed how balanced view Nehru had towards the Soviet Union.

Nehru's world view influenced his political activities as well. He tried to approach them scientifically. The influence of scientific socialism on Nehru's views as well as influence of both Indian and other European views led him to adopt a rationalist and a scientific approach. (111) Ulyanovisky held that nobody had ever succeeded in producing a synthesis of ideology. Nehru's ideal was the unity of thought and action. He interpreted world culture critically. His European examples always promoted him to compare India with other countries. Writing about India, he pointed out, it was in his blood and there was much in her (India) that instinctively thrilled him. And yet he approached her almost as an alien critic, full of dislike for the present as well as for many of the relics of the past that he saw. His approach to Indian independence movement also emerged out of the world context. The

world outlook helped him to rid himself of bias, lopsidedness, and, idealisation and developed in him the pragmatist' approach.

In order to maintain a close link with other important nations of the world and to raise the level of nationalism, Nehru tried to involve the Indian National Congress in formulating a clear-cut world outlook. Thus Nehru wanted the Indian National Congress to play an international role and to improve relations with neighbouring countries so that the national movement of India could take wider shape. He also tried to involve those Indians who were settled outside, to the cause of national liberation. To Nehru, considerations of some of the principles, in the broader aspect, was always important.

C. Nehru's Account of Asia:

Capitalism spread all over the world leading to imperialism and colonisation of Afro-Asian countries. Nehru mentioned thus, "Europe sat on the giant Asia"⁽¹¹²⁾. As imperialism became more and more aggressive, nationalism grew in the East to counter it and to fight it. All over Asia, national movements took shape and ultimately challenged the colonial rule. This resulted into more and more aggressive response from the colonial power when they tried to crush nationalism of the East. Nehru clearly explained that the resistance against foreign rule also increased with the increase of the oppression and suppression of the rights of the colonised people. The first stage of Asian nationalism was led by the feudal lords followed by a new brand of nationalism tinged with

a religious outlook. This religious nationalism also failed, paving the way for the advent of the western type of nationalism. The earlier resistance failed because they could not compete with the science and technology of the west, which had made imperialist's army more powerful. Thus medievalism of the East could not combat the aggressiveness of the industrialised West. However, liberation movement against imperialism, covered the whole of Asia.

Nehru visited so many Asian countries and tried to keep contact with them because the problem was of equal concern to the vast Asian humanity. He also pointed out that this wider interest in international affairs also helped to raise our national struggle to a higher level and to lessen narrowness. Thus, to Nehru, to have friendly relations with Asian countries always proved to be useful because they could collectively react to their cause. Talking about the second world war, Nehru observed that hundreds of millions of Asians wanted to know whether did it help towards their liberation, peaceful life, bring equality and equal opportunity to nations as well as groups, an early liquidation of poverty and illiteracy. Reacting to the urgency of the above mentioned demands Nehru held even in this context they welcome all attempts at the world cooperation and the establishment of an international order'.⁽¹¹³⁾ His writings and speeches contained liberation of Afro-Asian countries from the colonial rules, and their better living conditions.

Discussing the world problems, Nehru pointed out

that throughout the world, behind the political and economic conflicts, there was a spiritual crisis, questioning old values and beliefs in a search for a way out. In India, as well as in other Asian countries, the old culture offered no solution to the modern problems. "Capitalist West lost its glamour, and new civilization in the Soviet countries attracted Indians, in spite of some dark patches, and offer prospect for world peace and prosperity, of ending the misery and the exploitation of millions" (114). Nehru, therefore, advocated close relationship with the socialist world both for India and other Afro-Asian countries. He believed that nationalism would fall of its purpose unless it is rooted through internationalism.

His attempts to achieve unity of purpose, culminated in the 'Asian Relation Conference' in 1947, in Delhi. He addressed the meeting as the meeting of old friends on equal basis in common tasks and endeavour! He mentioned colonialisaton of Asian countries by the imperialists and found that this led to disruption of the age old cordial relationship that existed between and among the nations of Asia and hoped this conference would succeed and the "walls that surrounded us fall down and we look at one another again and meet as old friends long posted." (115)

Nehru firmly believed that Asia would necessarily play a vital role and will have their own policies in the world affairs. According to Nehru, "in this 'Atomic Age' Asia will have to function effectively in the maintenance of peace. Indeed,

there can be no peace unless Asia plays her part". (116) This could be possible for the fact that the Asian countries were becoming free and hoped they would look to their political and economic freedom in terms of 'common men' of their land. Nehru proposed that Asian countries should work in a non-aligned way and support the U.N.O. He held that some kind of world federation seemed to be essential. When Nehru called the Asian Relations conference in March - April, 1947, this looked to some like anti-Europeanism, but was nothing much more than anti-European colonialism". (117) In January, 1949 he called the second, as a move against Dutch for Indonesian liberation. Thus Nehru made a big mark, for in Nehru's generation, the world was growing together, for good or evil, into a unity and 'Nehru was pioneer in taking nothing less than the world itself as the field for his public activity.' (118)

Thus, Nehru's achievement in the field of international affairs was massive. He forced the pace of liberation of Asia and Africa and insulated the new nations, from cold war alliance and devisions. (119)

D. Nehru's Ideas on War and Peace:

Recognised and respected as one of the top ranking statesmen of the world during his time for his enlightened nationalism, his boldness in accepting socialism and his earnestness for the entire world, Nehru took considerable inter-

est in world affairs. It was he who prevailed upon the Indian National Congress leaders to see the question of India's independence in the perspective of international issue. On his initiative and interest, the Indian National Congress started discussion on various international problems before India was independent. It is here that Nehru's attention was drawn to the problems of world's peace.

He fully understood the implication of the changes taking place in the world and the way it was moving ahead. He could foresee the dawn of independence of nations in the context of scientific and technological revolution. It was in this perspective that he felt the coming age would bring the nations of the world closer and make peace indivisible. While addressing Madras Congress, as early as 1927, Nehru emphasised, the need of peace. The problem of peace was important, "because any war now a days is an international disaster. It must result in terrible slaughter and destruction". (120) He further held, all countries and nations were linking together and could not be spared "even if a war is fought outside the frontier of India, that it would leave India untouched". (121) To him, the question of war and peace was directly related to the Indian war of independence. Because it might delay or make difficult for India to achieve freedom. He further emphasised that the war did not relate only to nations but also to the individuals. Thus, his philosophy of world peace depended on pragmatic analysis of the danger of war

and the indivisibility of peace. It further related to the cause of independence of so many countries living under the colonial rule. Nehru held, it was important for all and more for India. In his words : "no man or woman can ignore it, least of all an Indian (122) who desires to achieve freedom for his country". Though the war started twelve years later, Nehru could foresee just then that its preparation was going on everywhere. Nehru explained that Europe was in the grip of fear and out of fear came hatred and out of that came violence and barbarism. Every country of Europe hated every other country. Europe became an armed camp where every country was bearing the other. The Europe, between the two world wars, turned to be the centre of rivalries of the modern world. He mentioned that wars took place in Africa, in Europe, and in the far East of Asia. He mentioned Italy's attack over Abyssinia, Japan's attack over Manchuria. Hitler, in January 1935, occupied the Saar basin and decreed conscription. The year 1936 witnessed another step in the fascist attempt to dominate Spain. Europe was humbled by Nazi triumph in Austria. But Hitler's attack on Czechoslovakia brought the world closer to the Second World War, Nehru held that he intensely disliked fascism.

Nehru thought that Europe was perhaps a greater powered magazine than was in 1914. He recorded, the Balkans, Poland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania and Russia, everywhere there was preparation of War and changes of war. He referred to

the failure of various disarmament conferences at Geneva, largely because, Britain could not agree. The above view was made by Nehru as early as 1927. In 1940 he held, disarmament finally depended on the far reaching changes in the political and economic structure of the world. He also mentioned that actual disarmament should be preceded by moral disarmament.

Nehru always laid emphasis on freedom, equality and justice as principles governing the inter-state relations. The conflictory character of international society should be replaced by cooperational one. Nehru was highly disturbed when Albania was captured. He wrote in the 'National Herald' on 19th April 1939, apprehending Second World War, "who dare says that the thin thread that holds back these forces will not snap and unleash destruction and doom on hapless mankind? Peace, so-called peace, holds to-day; what of tomorrow or the day after? (123) Within months the second World War started. He held, "it was in 1914 and after, and millions believed in vein, that the war was to end war and to establish peace and freedom on this unhappy planet of ours". (124) He described in the National Herald, dated 17th July 1940, "that the map of Europe has changed utterly and many nations have ceased to be, Poland went, Denmark and Norway succumbed, Holland collapsed, Belgium surrendered, France failed suddenly and completely. All these went into the German orbit. Addressing a conference in Paris, as Congress

representative, on July 23rd & 24th 1938, when towns were bombed openly, Nehru held, 'we have associated ourselves with this work of peace most willingly because of the vital importance and (125) urgency of the problem'. He further emphasised that Indian traditions always demanded that peace be the objective of the country and the Congress likewise, have come forward with the attempt for peace. He further held that the imperial idea of fascism or imperialism was responsible for the war and without getting rid of these evils no peace could be established. He generalised that 'there is no peace for a subject country at any (126) time, for peace only comes with freedom'.

According to Nehru, 'freedom was indivisible' like peace and war and so long there was continuation of colonial rule there could be no freedom. In his words, 'if the aggression of today has to be checked the aggressors of yesterday have also to be called to account (127) because that sought to cover up the past evil. He was optimist and even when India was not independent he declared, 'but whether we live or die' the cause of peace and freedom will remain, for that is greater than us - it is the cause of humanity, itself'. If peace perishes, all perish, so 'what-ever fate may befall us to that cause let us pledge ourselves.' (128)

Justifying India's stand against nazism and fascism on the ground that they practised racialism and it was also propagated that 'nationalism in essence was racialism'. Nehru

explained the same spirit of nationalism was not applicable to India because it didn't believe either in superiority of one race over the other or the hostility with other races. Indian nationalism was anti-racialism and as such, was different from fascism. War resistance policy against fascism was adopted 'because of our love of freedom and democracy and our insistence on Indian independence' mentioned Nehru. (129) Nehru suggested not to forget recent history. It is not Hitler or Mussolini who created the present crisis, and added how British government, supported by France, led to this. The credit goes to Nehru that he could justifiably take the right stand.

Nehru also pointed out that every thing was not the same with all nationalists in India. Because some of their 'governmentarians' or pro-establishment people first supported Hitler and Mussolini and later on changed to support fight for democracy. In his analysis, he wondered what could have been if events had taken a different theme. In his words : 'there was a time not so long ago, when they praised Hitler and Mussolini, and held them as models and when they cursed the Soviet Union with bell, book and candle. Not so now for the weather has changed.' (130)

Nehru was anti-fascist from the core of his heart and he refused to meet Mussolini in the early days of March 1936 even after having a pressing invitation. Two years later, before the Munich pact, he was invited to visit Germany, on behalf of the German government, and again he declined with

thanks. But he went to Spain, Czechoslovakia and other countries of Europe. Nehru did not meet Mussolini 'when many of British statesmen spoke tenderly and admiringly of Duce those days. He (131) equally condemned Japanese aggression on China. Thus it can be safely put forward that Nehru was anti-fascist throughout the war and sided with so-called democracy only for the fact that they were the best in the worst scenario of the world politics. His admiration for democracy of the smaller countries who were badly allowed to be defeated, remained uppermost. Further, he took the cause of liberation of Afro-Asian countries and recorded that the Baltic countries and Bessarabia were more or less absorbed by the Soviet Russia. Nehru thought that a fundamental political and economic change would come out of this war since it was sad to see a great people so blind to everything except the narrow interests of a class, and risking everything but not taking the step which would put them right with the world and with the great historic process that were marching on the giant strides, but England was yet to learn the lesson. Nehru condemned Chamberlain who did not bother to pay any respect to high principles of freedom, democracy, human rights, justice and international morality and law rather, surrendered to barbarity of the way of the sword, conducting co-ercion to minorities in Germany, the high priest of nazism. So Nehru concluded, 'It is evident that Mr. Chamberlain's outlook allowing for his English environment, was not different from Hitler's'. (132)

He believed that complete disarmament of all national states should be aimed at as an urgent necessity. The question could only be considered on world basis when peace was re-established. Complete disarmament, to Nehru, meant the ending of war but that could be possible permanently if causes for war were removed. So he recommended the end of the suppression of one nation by another, of large masses of people by privileged groups, all the uneven distribution of the world's resources, all inequalities between nations and nations, groups and groups as haves and have-nots; between nations as well as between groups or classes and also the religious or the racial discrimination. In his words: "the question of complete disarmament thus becomes tied up with fundamental political and economic changes in the world. It could not be tackled, much less solved, by itself." (133)

These are his socialistic overtones based on humanism. The philosophy of internationalism of Nehru was also influenced by Gandhi when he recommended that even before the achievement of social, political and economic equality both in national and international society the priority should be given to and be preceded by moral disarmament. In the view of Nehru, "as a result of the present war the revulsion of war is likely to be tremendous". (134) In the same note, Nehru mentioned that "the question of disarmament is full of difficulty and we come back to the prior necessity of removing the causes of war".

When the United States of America bombed Japan,

Nehru reacted in these words : "my mind became more and more occupied with the latest advance of our civilisation and numerous pictures of what might happen came before me". (135) To Nehru, "it was a reminder of the Stark reality behind all the tops of the foreign ministers and the UNO. It was the dark shadow of approaching World War III. (136) In the later years, Nehru always thought for world peace and cooperation and believed in peaceful co-existence and brought up the concept of Panchasheel (Five principles) which dominated his world view. He favoured nuclear -- test ban, addressing United Nation General Assembly, New York, on 3rd October 1960, he remembered that in the faithful summer of 1938, he was a visitor at a meeting of the League of Nation at Geneva. At that time, Hitler was advancing holding out threats of war but "the League of Nations appeared to be unconcerned and discussed all manner of subjects, except the most vital subject of the day." A year later the war descended upon the world. After many years of carnage, that war ended, and a new age - the atomic age, was ushered in by the terrible experiences of Hiroshima and Nagasaki". Nehru did not like League's ^{role} inactive role in stopping aggression and establishment of peace and also the Mandatory provisions under the League and favoured its replacement.

E. United Nations organisation:

United Nations organisation arrived with a

note of high idealism inscribed in the noble wordings on the Charter. United Nation has been made structurally better than the League, but there are permanent members of the security Council with a provisions of unanimity among the great powers. "All these was not very logical" (137) mentioned Nehru. Referring to the preamble to the Constitution of UNESCO he stated, "it is stated that war begins in the minds of man" (138) and believed it, essentially true, and ultimately necessary. Further, apart from the moral imperatives of peace, every practical consideration should be made in order to achieve disarmament where the prohibition of the manufacture, storage, and use of weapons of mass destruction should be taken up.

Nehru always favoured that the United Nations Organisation should play its role because the world will not profit, "if it conquers the material ills and then commits suicide because it has not controlled its own minds." (139)

Nehru came both as a politician and an intellectual, whom, the times which were out of joints to draw into politics. He surveyed the world as a humanist and an architect of tommorrow, revindicated the glory of India and also lifted India into a world perspective. His major writings 'deal with Congress politics and India in foreign affairs, denoting his abiding faith in internationalism. He held, 'I came back full of the tragedy of Spain which was being strangled not so much by enemies, but by those who called themselves, the friends of

democracy'. He mentioned Czechoslovakia where another betrayal unrolled itself. All these led him to hold that 'the past policy of the British Government as well as recent developments demonstrated abundantly that this government does not stand for freedom or democracy and may at any time betray these ideals'. (140) He explained that both Spain and Czechoslovakia had stood for democracy but they were surrendered so 'India can't associate herself with such a government or be asked to give her resources' when bigger things were afoot and it was time that India also thought in terms of them. This is genuine internationalism when Indians were passing through some of the bitterest days in her history, even then Nehru tried to analyse those Indian problems in the context of the world.

REFERENCES:

1. Nehru, J. L., An Autobiography, (Allied, Bombay : 1962), p. 364.
2. Ibid., p. 427.
3. Nehru, J.L., Glimpses of World History, (Lindsay, London : 1940), p. 708.
4. Ibid., p. 620.
5. Autobiography., opocit., p. 437.
6. Nehru, J. L., The Discovery of India, (Oxford, New Delhi : 1985), p. 73.

7. Ibid., p. 36.
8. Nehru, J.L., Speeches, (Publication, Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Delhi : 1958 - 68), Vol. 5., pp. 541, 537.
9. Autobiography ., op.cit., p. 365.
10. Ibid., pp. 529-30.
11. Nehru, J. L., Selected Works : (ed.), by S. Gopal, (Orient Longman, New Delhi : 1972-80), Vol. 3, p. 371.
12. Ibid., p. 139.
13. Discovery, op.cit., p. 501.
14. Nehru, J.L., An Anthology, (Oxford University Press, Oxford : 1983), Convocation address at the Viswa - Bharati University, Santiniketan, 23rd December, 1945, pp. 632 - 33.
15. Glimpses, op.cit., p. 405.
16. Ibid., p. 427.
17. Martyshin, O., Jawaharlal Nehru and His Political Views, (Progress, Moscow : 1989), p. 79.
18. Speeches, op.cit., Vol.3, p. 60.
19. Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 349.
20. Nehru, J.L., A Bunch of Old Letters, Asia, Bombay : 1958), p. 142.
21. Discovery, op.cit., p. 20.
22. Ibid., p. 326.
23. Ibid., p. 330.
24. Ibid., p. 480.

25. Ibid., p. 482.
26. Ibid., p. 495.
27. Anthology, op.cit., p. 11.
28. 11th January, 1928.
29. 24 April, 1928, Sabarmati.
30. Indian Quarterly Register, Vol. 2, 1928, pp. 19-48.
31. Patil V.T., Nehru and the freedom movement, (Sterling, New Delhi : 1977), p. 89.
32. Glimpses, op.cit., p. 625.
33. Moraes, F., Jawaharlal Nehru : A Biography, (Asia, Bombay : 1956), p. 479.
34. Glimpses....., op.cit., p. 622.
35. Ibid., p. 424.
36. Brecher, M., Nehru : A Political Biography, (Oxford University Press, London : 1959), p. 28.
37. Moraes, F., op.cit., p. 26.
38. Ibid., p. 213.
39. Anthology, op.cit., p. 327.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid., p. 330.
42. Ibid.
43. Brecher, M., op.cit., p. 68.
44. Discovery....., op.cit., pp. 380-94.
45. Patil, V.T., op.cit., p. 182.
46. Anthology, op.cit., p. 138.

47. Ibid., p.330.
48. Ibid., 331.
49. Autobiography, op.cit., p. 462.
50. Moraes, op.cit., p. 223.
51. Ibid., p. 268.
52. Autobiography, op.cit., p. 469.
53. Ibid., p. 460.
55. Ibid., p. 471.
56. Brecher, op.cit., p. 133.
57. Johnson, Compbell., A Mission with Mountbatten, (British Edn), p. 107.
58. Brecher, op.cit., p. 144.
59. Balasubramaniam, M., Nehru : A Study of Secularism, (Uppal, Delhi : 1980), p. 85.
60. Ulyanovosky, R., National Liberation, (Progress, Moscow : 1978), p. 241.
61. Kaviraj, Narahari, Gandhi Nehru Through Marxist Eyes, (Manisha, Calcutta; 1988), p. 55.
62. Das, M. N., The Political philosophy of Jawaharlal Nehru, (George Allen and Unwin, London : 1961), pp. 156-57.
63. Tyson Geoffrey, Nehru The Years of Power, (Pall Mall, Delhi : 1966), p. 19.
64. Nehru, J. L., India and the World : essays, (George Allen and Unwin, London : 1936), pp. 82-83.

65. Autobiography, op.cit., p. 589.
66. Glimpsés, op.cit., p. 843.
67. Deva, Acharya Narendra, Jawaharlal the Socialist, Nehru Your Neighbour, op.cit., p. 35.
68. Autobiography, op.cit., p. 362.
69. Nehru, J. L., Recent Essays and Writings, (Kitabistan, Allahabad : 1937), p. 33.
70. Norman, Dorothy, (ed), Profiles of Nehru : America remembers a world leader, (Indian Book Co., Delhi 1966), p. 205.
71. Moraes, F., op.cit., p. 185.
72. Selected, Vol 11, pp. 495-96.
73. Brecher, op.cit., p. 88.
74. Ibid., p. 94.
75. Glimpsés, op.cit., p. 965.
76. Discovery....., op.cit., p. 516.
77. Ibid., 517.
78. Nehru, J.L., Independence and Social Revolution, (Vikas, New Delhi : 1984), p. 215.
79. Nagla, B. K., 'Nehru and Socialism in India', (Maharshi Dayananda University), Research Journal, 2nd Oct., 1989, Vol. 4, p. III
80. Ganguly, B. N., Nehru and Socialism, The Economic Weekly, Vol. XVI, July, 1984, p. 215.

81. Roy, M. N., Jawaharlal Nehru, An Enigma or a Tragedy, in A.B. Shah, (Ed.) 'Jawaharlal Nehru critical Tribute, (Manaktalas, Bombay: 1965), pp. 33-41.
82. Deva, A. N., op.cit., p. 27.
83. Gopal, S., Jawaharlal Nehru : A Biography, Vol. 1, (Oxford, London : 1975), p. 137.
84. Ganguly, B. N., Nehru....., op.cit., p. 1215.
85. Deva, A. N., op.cit., p. 35.
86. Selected....., op.cit., Vol.III, pp. 60-61.
87. Moraes, op.cit., p. 217.
88. Gandhi, M. K., Nehru Your Neighbour, op.cit., p. IX.
89. Discovery....., op.cit., p. 519.
90. Glimpses....., op.cit., p. 766.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid., p. 401.
93. Ibid., p. 400.
94. Selected , op.cit., p.110.
95. Glimpses....., p. 528.
96. Ibid., pp. 529-30.
97. Ibid.
98. Ibid., p. 535.
99. Ibid., p. 539.
100. Ibid., p.965.
101. Range, Willard, Jawaharlal Nehru's World View, (University of Georgia Press, Athens : 1961), p. 68.

102. Discovery....., op.cit., p. 421.
103. Ibid., p. 421.
104. Brecher, op.cit., p. 226.
105. Dustoor, P.E., Nehru Your Neighbour, op.cit., p. 77.
106. Brecher, op.cit., p. 229.
107. Chakraborty, Amiya, 'Nehru a modern Leader', Nehru Your Neighbour, op.cit., p. 79.
108. Discovery....., op.cit., p. 421.
109. Ibid., pp. 515-16.
110. Ibid., p. 417.
111. Ulyanovsky, R., op.cit., pp. 234-41.
112. Anthology, op.cit., p. 399.
113. Discovery....., op.cit., pp. 546-47.
114. Ibid., p. 345.
115. Ibid., p. 361.
116. Ibid., p. 362.
117. Ibid., p. 364.
118. Mukherjee, Hiren, The Gentle Colossus : A Study of Jawaharlal Nehru, (Manisha, Calcutta : 1964), p. 10.
119. Karanjia, R. K., The Philosophy of Mr. Nehru, (George Allen and Unwin, London: 1966), p. 14.
120. Anthology, op.cit., p. 383.
121. Ibid.
122. Ibid.
123. Ibid., p. 385.

124. Ibid., p. 386.
125. Nehru, J. L., The Unity of India, (John De Co., New York: 1948), p. 278.
126. Ibid., p. 279.
127. Ibid.
128. Ibid., p. 283.
129. Ibid., p. 164.
130. Discovery....., op.cit., p. 19
131. Ibid., pp. 18-19.
132. Unity....., pp. 291-92.
133. Anthology, op.cit., p. 388.
134. Ibid.
135. Ibid., p. 391.
136. Ibid., p. 395.
137. Ibid., p. 432.
138. Ibid., p. 433.
139. Ibid.
140. Ibid.