CHAPTER-I

PROFILE OF JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

J. Nehru, was one of the greatest captains of freedom struggle, a man who was next only to Gandhi in his contribution to the shaping of the struggle. He gave it a rational and modern basis, a secular and socio-economic bias, and a truly international outlook. For seventeen years, he had been India’s Prime Minister, and whatever the controversies over certain policies, it cannot be denied that he laid the foundations of our democracy, our secularism and socialism.

Nehru was well-known throughout the world and, in his own country, his was a household name taken with love and gratitude by the millions. Today, his countrymen enshrine his memory in their hearts, remember him with a sense of loss, yet he was not fully understood by most people. Like that of a sparkling diamond, each facet of his personality shone with a light of different hue. J. Nehru possessed the elegance and majesty of a rainbow in the sky. He was the combination of the writer and politician; the scientific and the mystic; the idealist and the realist; the individualist and the champion of liberty.

Nehru dominated the Indian political scene for about half a century. His personality had a glamour, a charm which at times
kept even his opponents spell-bound. Together with Gandhi and others he fought and struggled hard for the freedom of India. He spent the best period of his youth in imprisonment. His life was dedicated and devoted to the cause of his country.

After independence, he remained the Prime Minister of India for seventeen years. During this period, he raised India to an important position among nations of the world, where its voice was listened to with attention and respect. It was his sincere work for peaceful co-existence and faith in democratic socialism which made him popular with democratic nations as well as the communist states.

POLITICAL THOUGHTS OF JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU (1989-1964) was born in a prosperous Kashmiri Brahmin family of Allahabad. 'Prosperity' in the family was so pronounced that Jawaharlal in his later life admitted it, "I am a typical bourgeois, brought up in bourgeois surroundings with all the early prejudices that this training has given me. Communists have called me a petty bourgeois with perfect justification."¹ The mother was an orthodox Brahmin lady and indulged "in various ceremonies and pujas from time to time."

The influence of the mother was, very scanty on the development of Jawaharlal's thought and personality. Jawaharlal was the prisoner of his father, Motilal Nehru, and the father was fond of 'Western values, western civilisation and everything that was westernized.' Every attempt was made to provide Jawaharlal a western atmosphere and a western way of life. At an early age of fifteen he was sent to England. Even before that, his father engaged British tutors for his private education. His resident tutor, Ferdinand T. Brooks developed in him a taste for reading, initiated him into the mysteries of science and led him to the membership of the Theosophical Society.

In England, Jawaharlal spent seven valuable years. Both at Harrow and Cambridge, he was a mediocre student. He was both shy and unenterprising. There was nothing exceptional about his life in England. The total impact of his stay in England was that he emerged out of it 'with a certain mental make-up and certain habits of mind' which were thoroughly western and in which he lost his 'Indianhood.' It was because of this loss that he described his thoughts and approach to life 'more akin to what is called Western than Eastern.' He entered India as a foreigner, alien in thought, values, and way of life.

In the year 1912, he returned to India to start his legal career. He came in contact with Indian Nationalist Movement and
thought. In 1916 he met Gandhiji. This was also the time when he was reading books on utopian and humanitarian type of socialism. The turning-point in the career was the Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy (1919). That really constitutes a land-mark in the development of his thought and personality. Then came his visit to the villages and his discovery of the peasant in 1920. "But somehow I had not fully realised what they were and what they meant to India. Like most of us I took them for granted. This realisation came to me during these Partapgarh visits and ever since then my mental picture of India always contains this naked, hungry mass. Perhaps there was some kind of electricity in the air, perhaps I was in a receptive frame of mind and the pictures I saw and the impressions I gathered were indelibly impressed on my mind."

The year Nineteen-Hundred-and-Twenty-One and the Non-cooperation Movement brought Gandhi and Nehru close to each other. "We felt that we knew him quite well enough to realize that he was a great and unique man and a glorious leader, and having put our faith, in him, we gave him an almost blank cheque, for the time being at least". However, what drew Nehru to Gandhi was not his thought but the non-cooperation movement which "offered me what I wanted -- the goal of national freedom and

(as I thought) the ending of the exploitation of the underdog, and the means which satisfied my moral sense and gave me a sense of personal freedom". Nehru was conscious from the very beginning of his differences with Gandhi and he had realized that these were fundamental differences. Thus he wrote, "Gandhiji, indeed, was continually laying stress on the religious and spiritual side of the movement... the whole movement was strongly influenced by this and took on a revivalist character so far as the masses were concerned... I used to be troubled sometimes at the growth of this religious element in our politics, both on the Hindu and the Muslim side... Their history and sociology and economics appeared to me all wrong, and the religious twist that was given to everything prevented all clear thinking. Even some of Gandhiji's phrases sometimes jarred upon me - thus his frequent reference to Rama Raj as golden age which was to return."  

However, Nehru admired and accepted the moral and ethical side of the Gandhian movement.

Nehru accepted non-violence not because he believed in it but because this indicated the emphasis on the purity of means. Thus he wrote that, "A worthy end should have worthy means leading up to it". That seemed not only a good ethical doctrine

but sound, practical politics, for the means that are not good often defeat the end in view and raise new problems and difficulties." 4

The differences between Gandhi and Nehru grew more and more with the passage of time. The closer they came, they drew more apart ideologically. Each one of them entertained the hope of bringing the other to his own point of view. Ultimately, they agreed only to disagree.

The withdrawal of the Civil Disobedience Movement on a very trivial affair was a rude shock to Nehru. He could not restrain himself and said, "But even if it was a serious matter, was a national movement involving scores of thousands directly and millions indirectly to be thrown out of gear because an individual had erred. This seemed to me a monstrous proposition and an immoral one...". What was most uncongenial and reactionary for Nehru was what Gandhi had written in Hind Swaraj in 1909. Hind Swaraj was a severe condemnation of the western civilization which was a seven days' wonder. The alternative posed was complete Anarchy which was a return to the pre-civilisation times of ancient India.

Nehru was very pungent in his criticism of Hind Swaraj and he wrote, "All this seems to me utterly wrong and harmful doctrine and impossible of achievement. Behind it lies Gandhiji's love and praise of poverty and suffering and the ascetic life. For him progress and civilization consist not in multiplication of wants of higher standard of living, "but in the deliberate and voluntary restriction of wants, which promotes real happiness and contentment and increases the capacity for service". He pointed out, "Gandhiji is always thinking in terms of personal salvation and of sin while most of us have society's welfare uppermost in our minds... He is not out to change society or the social structure, he devotes himself to the eradication of sin from individuals".

Nehru summed up their differences in a chapter on 'Paradoxes' in his Autobiography. The substance of these differences is that Gandhiji wanted to improve the individual internally, morally and spiritually and thereby to change the external environment, Nehru sought to improve the external environment to enable the individual to improve himself.

1: "Gandhi's activities might lead one to think that he wanted to go back to the narrowest autarchy, not only a self-sufficient nation, but almost a self-sufficient village." He was, on the other hand, led to the
'establishment of socialist order, first within national boundaries and eventually in the world as a whole, with a controlled production and distribution of wealth for the public good.'

2. "The Khadi Movement, hand-spinning and hand weaving which is Gandhi's special favourite is an intensification of individualism in production, and is thus a throw-back to the pre-industrial age."

3. "Gandhiji fathered a policy on the Congress in regard to states, the "policy of non-interference in the internal administration of states". This was according to Nehru, unjust to the people residing in the Indian States.

4. Gandhiji suggested the noble principle of Trusteeship for the Zamindars, princes and the propertied class. To Nehru, Zamindari was a semi-feudal system "out of date" and a great hindrance to production and general progress.

Gandhiji admitted in a letter to Nehru that the differences between them were vast and radical. He wanted Nehru to adopt his independent views yet he hoped that Nehru would, after he has gone, speak his language. That did not come true.

Gandhi made a few attempts to patch up their differences and also made some concessions. Thus he wrote to Nehru, "I am also in wholehearted agreement with you when you say that without a material revision of the vested interests, the condition of the masses can never be improved... the princes will have to part with much of their power and become popular representatives. I do not have the slightest difficulty in agreeing with you that in these days of rapid intercommunication and growing consciousness of the Oneness of all mankind, we must recognize that our nationalism must not be inconsistent with progressive internationalism... we should range ourselves with the progressive forces of the world." After these concessions, Gandhi concluded that there are 'temperamental differences between us'. It is true that in this letter Gandhi made far-reaching concessions to the viewpoint of Nehru yet the differences between the two were too basic. The differences between the thought of Gandhi and Nehru cannot be dismissed as merely temperamental. Their differences were fundamental.

A visit to Europe in March, 1926 constitutes another landmark in the development of the thought and personality of Nehru. This visit enabled him to study the world-situation and

he weighed the problems of his country in the light of the world-perspective. His nationalism was not any longer confined to his land of birth. He sincerely urged that the forces of nationalism in India must ally themselves with the progressive forces in the world.

A visit to Soviet Russia in 1927, confirmed him in his views on Communism. It also strengthened his socialistic ideas. From humanitarian to scientific Socialism - this was a decisive and a fundamental change.

To a great extent, the visit to Soviet Russia was a principal cause of this change but it was also a synthesis of his scientific outlook—for which he was indebted to Cambridge, with what he had seen in Soviet Russia. He returned with a wider outlook and "Nationalism by itself seemed to me definitely a narrow and insufficient creed. Political freedom, independence, were no doubt essential, but they were steps only in the right direction; without social freedom and a socialistic structure of society and the state, neither the country nor the individual could develop much." However, the admiration for communism was not the only cause of his fascination for Soviet Russia; His goodwill for Soviet Russia was the indication of a principal pillar in the construction of an Independent Foreign Policy for India.
His impressions of Soviet Russia and his views on Communism crystallized and were put in the form of a book written in Jail during October, 1930 to August, 1933, The Glimpses of World History.

On release from the jail he wrote, 'Whither India'. The attempt was to provide a theoretical orientation to the Indian nationalist leadership and movement. The fundamental belief was that "Right action cannot come out of nothing; it must be preceded by thought. Thought which is not meant to lead to action has been called an abortion; action which is not based on thought is chaos and confusion. It is worth while therefore... to forget for the moment the immediate problem before us... and go back a little to basic facts and principles".

Independence for India in 1947 was an opportunity for Nehru to put his political ideas into effective political practice. Thought which does not lead to action is, for Nehru, abortion.

A pioneer Indian Socialist, Acharya Narendradeo, tells us, "Marxism had given him (Jawaharlal Nehru) a scientific method of studying concrete problems. The application of such method enables one to make a penetrating analysis of men and events because one sees them not in isolation but in their relation to
the social milieu from which they have issued." Nehru also stated that Marx possessed an extraordinary degree of insight into social phenomenon and "this insight was apparently due to the scientific method he adopted. This method applied to past history as well as to current events, helps us in understanding them far more than any other method of approach, and it is because of this that the most revealing and keen analysis of the changes that are taking place in the world today come from Marxist writers." It was again because of the scientific method that "the theory and philosophy of Marxism lightened up many a 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."  

Nehru believed that there was nothing dogmatic about Marxism. Thus "the whole value of Marxism seems to me to lie in its absence of dogmatism, in its stress on a certain outlook and mode of approach, and in its attitude to action". He also quoted Lenin to favour his point of view. "To attempt to answer 'yes' or 'no' to the question of the definite means of struggle,

without examining in detail the concrete situation of a given moment at a given phase of its development, means to depart altogether from the Marxist ground." And again he said "nothing is final, we must always learn from circumstances."

With the passage of time he discovered certain substantial differences between his and the communist thought. He had been particularly critical of the Indian Communists and that was not for merely political reasons. Their ideological differences can be summed up in the following manner:

1. The modern communist leaders, particularly the Chinese variety, treat the writings of Marx and Lenin as revealed scriptures and in their attitudes they are orthodox and dogmatist. Nehru believed that Marx had become out-dated and could be accepted only with revision.

2. Nehru disliked the excess use of violence. However, he accepted "compulsion will often be necessary in addition to conversion, and the best we can do is to 'limit this compulsion and use it in such a manner that its evil is lessened'. Moreover, persuasive methods must precede compulsive ones.

3. Nehru accepted the theory of class-conflict but he did not want to increase or sharpen this conflict. He did not
want to deal ruthlessly with the haves'. He did not want to abridge or destroy political and civil liberties of the entire community or a section of it. He did not accede to dictatorship under any pretext.

4. He believed that Marxist theories would need modifications in their application to India. Local circumstances demand local variations and they should be permissible. He was a staunch opponent of the Indian Communists because they did not think for themselves but ran after the Soviet or the Chinese models."

In a letter to his daughter, Indira, Nehru explained in 1933 his socialism by saying "Socialism, I have told you, is of many kinds. There is general agreement however, that it aims at the 'control by the state' of the means of production; that is land and mines and factories and the like, and the means of distribution, like railways, etc. and also banks and similar institutions. The idea is that individual should not be allowed to exploit any of these methods or institutions, or the labour of others, to their own personal advantage."³⁰

---

A writer on the political thought of Nehru has pointed out the differences in his views on Socialism in the years around 1935 and 1955. The views held in 1955 have been distinguished from those held in 1935 and the former are considered a development in Nehru's Socialist Thought. In 1935 "Nehru was quite sure that the world was faced with a clear-cut choice between Socialism and Capitalism. Nehru tended to see economic and social problems in a black-white perspective, and the black, represented by Capitalism. 'Imperialism was almost totally unrelated to the white -Socialism nationalism... In 1955, Nehru rejected the idea that the question could be framed in terms of a simple choice between two rival economic systems... Any method which 'delivers the goods' could be used, and 'that method need not necessarily be an extreme method belonging to either of these rival ideologies' but could be something in between."¹¹ This argument is reinforced by two more points. Thus Nehru believed in class-antagonism in 1935 but gave up this idea in 1955 and secondly his Socialism in 1955 was converted into a democratic Socialism. It is indeed true that Nehru's socialism was not a static concept. It was ever-changing. It was ever-evolving. It was pragmatic and not dogmatic. It was conditioned by circumstances. Thus Nehru himself admitted, "I look upon it

¹¹ Smith, D.E. Nehru and Democracy, pp.104-5.
(Socialism) as a growing, dynamic conception, as something which is not rigid, as something which must fit in with the changing conditions of human life and activity in every country." Circumstances since 1935 had changed considerably. In 1935 Nehru was in the role of a political agitator but in 1955 and later he was in the very responsible role of the prime ministership of India. That was bound to affect his language.

Nehru was unhappy about the coming up of two political parties based on religion namely the Muslim League for the Muslims and the Hindu Mahasabha for the Hindus. According to Nehru this communalism enabled to gain favour from the ruling power with regard to jobs or seats in legislatures or some such matter. The communalist never thought about the freedom of the country but in terms of the continuation of foreign domination. Nehru warned that mixing of religion into politics might weaken the nation, and he asked the people to consider whether they wanted "to make of India, one country, one nation, or 10, 20 or 25 nations" Nehru was an ardent believer in secularism as is evident from the Karachi resolution of the Congress (1931) which was drafted primarily by him. The resolution read "State shall

observe neutrality in regard to all religions." The spirit of this resolution was embodied in 1950 in the preamble to our constitution.

As President of the Congress he was instrumental for organizing the massive campaigns that led to the Congress victories in a majority of the provinces when elections were held under the Govt. of India Act, 1935. In 1937, he toured the country, covering 45,000 miles, for election propaganda. In 1938 his mother died and in the same year he visited Spain during the Spanish Civil War. He was elected as first President of the All India States People's Conference in 1939.

In individual Satyagraha movement was launched in 1940, Nehru was again jailed. He was released with other leaders in 1941 when Japanese air force attacked Pearl Harbour. He took part in the Cripps negotiations in 1942 but shortly afterwards became involved in the Quit India movement, was arrested and imprisoned at Ahmednagar fort along with the other leaders. It was here that he wrote his "Discovery of India."

Immediately after his release from the prison in June 1945, Mr. Nehru took part in the Simla Conference convened by the Viceroy, Lord Wavell, during his prolonged negotiations aimed at resolving the differences between the congress and the
Muslim League. Meanwhile the British Labour Government had come to power and sent out a Cabinet Mission which drew up a plan for an interim Indian Govt. to be followed by a constituent assembly. This plan was eventually accepted by the Congress and the Muslim League.

In August, 1946, Mr. Nehru was asked by Lord Wavell to form an Interim Govt., and took office in the following month as Vice-President of the Execution Council, with the portfolios of foreign affairs and commonwealth relations. The Muslim League joined the interim cabinet in November 1946 but held aloof from the constituent assembly. The Congress then demanded that the Viceroy should dismiss the Muslims from interim Govt. and in an effort to break this new deadlock, Lord Wavell flew to London with Mr. Nehru and Mr. Jinnah.

In 1947 Mr. Nehru persuaded the constituent assembly to adopt his resolution for a "Sovereign independent republic" for India and in the following months Mr. Attlee announced the British Government's intention of transferring power to Indian hands. Lord Mountbatten succeeded Lord Wavell as Viceroy in March, 1947. He concluded that only partition could remove the potential chaos into which India seemed in danger of lapsing. Nehru reluctantly agreed that partition was unavoidable and urged Congress to accept the British plan of June 3, 1947. India
was divided into two dimensions of Hindustan and Pakistan. At midnight of August 15, 1947, Mr. Nehru became Prime Minister of the dominion. He was at that time just three months short of 58. He remained head of the Govt. for 17 years.

Mr. Nehru underwent many shocks. The first blow was the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi on January 30, 1948. Mr. Nehru said, "A great disaster, is a symbol to us to remember all the big things of life and forget the small things." Although the light has gone, the light shall continue to guide us, he declared.

India became free but at what price? Millions of Hindus had to flee from Pakistan to India, while millions of Muslims left India for Pakistan. It was followed by a communal massacre in which half a million people died. It was no easy task to restore order, alleviate the suffering and resettle the homeless multitudes. Thanks to the Leadership of Nehru who had courage, determination and humanity and who rose to the occasion and India began to consolidate its freedom with speed and strength.

Nehru believed in parliamentary democracy. India became a sovereign democratic republic when the constitution was adopted on January 26, 1950. But to him "democracy was not only a form of Govt., it was a way of life, a way of solving problems
by argument, discussion and persuasion."

Nehru wanted C. Rajagopalachari to be the president of India in 1950, but eventually he agreed to Rajendra Prasad. He did not like Rajendra Prasad’s visit to Kutch in connection with the re-construction of the Somnath temple. Nehru was also against Rajendra Prasad’s views on the Hindu Code Bill, and co-operative farming. Nehru had differences with Sardar Patel also. But love for the country acted as the cementing force and the two continued to work together till Patel’s death in 1950. After Patel’s death in 1950 Nehru controlled the Govt. with much authority.

Though after the Chinese aggression Nehru’s popularity had declined but he still retained his supremacy over Congress affairs. In August 1963 the Kamraj plan was formulated.

During Nehru’s Prime Ministership the world was divided into two blocs. Nehru propounded a policy of peace and non-alignment. As a newly liberated country India needed time and peace for rapid development. The policy of peace was in tune with her traditions and Gandhi’s teachings. And as India had no expansionist aim for non-alignment was a natural policy for her. Nehru, along with President Tito of Yugoslavia and President Nasser of Egypt, made non-alignment a world movement.
In 1954, Nehru enunciated the doctrine of Punchsheel. It comprised five principles, namely mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and peaceful co-existence in uniting the states which had no clear idea about united states, but that if these countries knew each other better than they would realize that the other country has something worthwhile. He therefore advised greater intercourse between nations and their leaders and he initiated the experiment of having personal contacts between world leaders.

Nehru could not suspect that China had military designs against India. Nehru told the Lok Sabha, "It is quite absurd to talk of China invading India." He felt that India was secured because of the fortunate location of the Himalayan mountain ranges. Moreover, he thought that communist China was too much involved in her domestic problems to harbour aggressive designs against India, when Chou-en-Lai, the Chinese Prime Minister, visited India he was greeted with slogans of "Hindi-Chini Bhai-Bhai" and there was no discussion on the boundary problem at all. Similarly there was no mention of boundary dispute in the Sino-Indian agreement on Tibet of April, 1954.
Nehru was shocked and bewildered when Chinese attacked India in 1962. Indian army suffered reverses at the hands of the Chinese. This weakened Nehru’s position toward his prestige. His foreign policy came in for criticism.

Nehru was a man of scientific temper. He wanted his countrymen to participate fully in the march of science. Science, he stressed again and again was necessary for rapid industrialization of the country. He encouraged Bhabha, Bhatnagar, and other scientists to set up a huge network of scientific institutes. He also patronised atomic and space research.

India's first five-year-plan (1951-56) was moderate compared to subsequent plans. In it first priority was given to agriculture. Only 13 percent of the expenditure was allocated for industrial development. In the second plan industry was given first place so that India could attain economic self-reliance and development along modern lines.

In 1955, Nehru had persuaded the Avadi Congress to accept the socialistic pattern of society as its goal. Is socialistic pattern different from socialism? To this Nehru replied in April 1956 “Some people seem to make fine distinctions among socialistic pattern, socialist pattern and socialism. They are
all exactly the same thing without the slightest difference.

Nehru believed in mixed economy. In 1952 Planning Commission stated. "In a planned economy the distinction between the public and the private sector is one of the emphases. The two sectors are and must function as parts of a single organism." But Nehru said that it was obvious that an undeveloped country like India could not progress except by enlarging the public sector and except by controlling the private sector at important points." Nehru did not speak of the wholesale expropriation of private property or of the immediate socialization of the means of production. He wanted to follow the middle path in 1958 he said that he did not want state socialism of that extreme kind in which the state was all powerful and governed practically all activities.

Nehru's love for children has become proverbial. It was at his express desire that his birthday is celebrated as Children's Day all over the India. Once he remarked, "I may not have time for adults but I always have enough for children."

Nehru loved not only human beings but birds and beasts, mountains and rivers. He praised the Ganga in his will, "She has been a symbol of India's age-long culture and civilisation, ever changing, ever flowing, and yet ever the same Ganga. She reminds
me of the snow-covered peaks and the deep valleys of the Himalayan, which I have loved so much and of rich and vast plains below, where my life and work have been cast."

Mountains were a source of peace for him. In his own words, "slowly a measure of peace returned to me as I gazed at those white mountains calm and inscrutable and untouched by human folly." Even when he could not see a mountain during his imprisonment in Dehradun jail, he felt it with a secret intimacy. "I found great comfort in its proximity."

Nehru not only read books but also wrote with great intensity. The most important of his books are the 'Autobiography', 'The Discovery of India and Glimpses of World History.'

Nehru did not like the idea of joining any bloc and Nehru said at press conference in New York on October 4, 1960, "Some people use the word 'neutral' in regard to India's policy. I do not like that word at all having myself been in the past, perhaps even now to some extent, not exactly a negative individual but a positive individual working for negative causes, working with all the vigour and strength that I could command for those causes and having if I may say so with all respect, a certain contempt for a neutral person who has no views at all. One or two of the
books I have written brings this out. All my outlook on life is a positive one, not a negative one, not a complacent one. Therefore, I do not think that the word 'neutral' suits me at all. That positive aspect of life is derived from the conditioning I have had in my life. These factors are many, but the principal factor is the Indian National Movement with Gandhi as its leader.

At the inaugural address to the Indian Council for Cultural Relations on April 9, 1950, Nehru posed the question what is culture and answered it thus:-

Every country and every individual seems to have its peculiar culture. When there is talk about cultural relations - although it is very good in theory - what actually happens is that those peculiar ideas come into conflict and instead of leading to friendship they lead to more estrangement - It is basic question - What is Culture? and I am certainly not competent to give you a definition of it because I have not found one.

"One can see each nation and each separate civilization developing its own culture that had its roots in generations of hundreds and thousands of years ago. One sees these nations being intimately moulded by the impulse that initially starts a
civilization going on its long path. That conception is affected by other conceptions and one sees action and interaction between them in the world which is absolutely pristine, pure and unaffected by any other culture. It simply cannot be just as nobody can say that belongs one hundred percent to a particular racial type, because in the course of hundreds and thousands of years unmistakable changes and mixtures have occurred.

He had a keen sense of duty and believed in the dignity of labour. It was common to see him helping in spreading a carpet or arranging chairs for some function. He worked very hard and his last words, "I have disposed of all my files" sums up his sense of duty. The essential dynamism of his personality he found expressed in the following lines from Robert Frost:

The woods are lovely dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep.

After spending a couple of days' rest at Dehradun he came to Delhi on 26th of May and on May 27, 1964 he left for his heavenly abode, peacefully at 2 P.M.

In the seventeen years of his undisputed leadership in independent India Nehru sought to build a nation not only in terms of political institutions, but also in terms of mental
emancipation and economic and social progress. With the sole exception of Gandhi, Nehru was the only leader when independence came who had thought out and worked out for himself a definite political, and social philosophy for national development.

"In an almost literal sense he ran India with its 45,000,000 people single-handed," writes John Gunther, U.S.A. Ambassador. "Thing that his country might have been like a man who had not believed fervently in democracy had been at the helm during those intensely critical years."

Nehru touches the social life of the people in many way. Thus the Hindu Code Bill, which has given rise to so much argument, became a symbol of this conflict between progress and reaction in the social domain. I do not refer to any particular clause of that bill, which might or might not be changed, but rather to the spirit underlying that bill. This was a spirit of liberation and of freeing our people and more especially our women folk, from outworn customs and shackles that bound them.

As a President of Allahabad Youth League, Nehru addressed its members to shed old social and religious customs that polluted our society for centuries. I am asked by people outside what the Allahabad Youth League stands for and especially whether it has anything to do with communalism or communism or terrorism.
The questions are curious and I personally doubt if they are seriously meant. If the questioner had troubled to read the rules and objects of the league he would have got some idea of what they stood for. He would find that the league was deadly opposed to communalism. As for communism, our rules and objects say nothing about it. It is open to communists and non-communists, socialists, individualists and any other 'ists'. We welcome all who feel that they could work for our country, and want to help in strengthening it. The main principle of the League is freedom from dogma."13

Nehru recognized both before and after independence that India was not yet a structured-nation but a nation-in-the-making. But he also recognized diversity of the Indian people and that India was a land of many languages, religions and cultures.

The national struggle against foreign colonial rule had broken down many of the inner divisions, united the Indian people in struggle and promoted the process of the nation-in-the making,"14

13. The Hindu, 12 August 1929, J. Nehru was elected President and R.N. Mukherji, Secretary.
The diversity of India did not disturb Nehru. He rather welcomed it, and the effort to impose a single culture repelled him. For example, he wrote in early 1951, we have always to remember that India is country with a variety of culture, habits, customs and ways of living- It is very necessary. I think for all of us to remember that this wonderful country of ours has infinite variety and there is absolutely no reason why we should try to regiment it after a single pattern. Indeed that is ultimately impossible, because climate and geography, as well as long cultural traditions, come in the way." At the same time, the hope as well as the answer were there."15 But India is far greater, far richer and more varied than any part of it. We have to develop an outlook which embraces all this variety and considers it our very own."16

One specific expression of this strategy of unity in diversity was his policy towards the tribal people. For example towards the nagas while firmly opposing the demand for independence of naga areas and refusing to tolerate any recourse to violence, he was willing to grant the nagas much greater autonomy than enjoyed by other states in the Indian union. In particular, he fully favoured the naga's right to maintain their

15. Ibid. vol. II. p.352.
16. Ibid. p.598.
autonomy in cultural and other matters, even while they were to be encouraged to integrate with the rest of the country "in mind and spirit."

But Nehru made a big advance in the understanding of colonialism and internationalism by linking colonialism and imperialism to world capitalism. India's problem, he asserted at Lucknow in 1936, was "but a part of the world problem of capitalist imperialism. This understanding was symbolically articulated when he wrote in 1937, "the frontiers of our struggle lie not only in our own country but in Spain and China also." 17

After independence this intense internationalism was to find expression in India's foreign policy of giving all our support to the forces of peace and the struggles against colonialism. Nehru's foreign policy was a many-splendoured phenomenon. He used foreign policy as an instrument to develop and safeguard India's national interests and to develop the self-reliance self-confidence and pride of the Indian people. The policy of non-alignment was formulated in order to assert India's will for national independence and to strengthen its independence. As Nehru put it in 1949 to the constituent

17. Ibid. vol. 9, p. 235.
assembly, "what does independence consist of? It consists fundamentally and basically of foreign relations. That is the test of independence; all else is local autonomy." 

The India-China war was a "body blow" to India's foreign policy. Yet despite large-scale right-wing clamour, Nehru reaffirmed the basic principles of India's foreign policy, specially the policy of non-alignment, and refused to enter military alliance or other pacts with the big powers, especially the United States. As Nehru told R.K. Karanjia in 1963. "We have not abandoned non-alignment. This stand of ours is not so much a postulate of our foreign policy as the projection of our sovereignty, independence, and peaceful values to our international relations." 

Before 1947 Nehru saw the close resemblance between the post 1937 Muslim League and fascism both in terms of methods, techniques of hatred and violence, organization and style of leadership and in terms of language and ideology. After 1947, he began to apply this understanding to Hindu and Sikh Communalism, especially to the RSS. For example, on 7 Dec. 1947, he wrote, we

have a great deal of evidence to show that the RSS is an organization which is in the nature of a private army and which is definitely proceeding on the strictest Nazi lines, even following the technique of organization.\(^\text{20}\) "If allowed free play" he wrote in 1951, "Communalism, "would break up India"\(^\text{21}\) and the major evil today, the most dangerous for development today.

Nehru did not devote much time and effort to social reform in the narrower sense of the term. But after 1947, he regularly emphasized the necessity of bringing about changes in the social sphere along with economic and political changes. One of his greatest achievement as a prime minister was the passage of the Hindu Code Bill introducing monogamy and the right of divorce to women on an equal basis with men, and giving women the equal right of inheritance. Another of his achievements was the care with which he promoted Education among girls and public employment of middle class women.

Nehru's commitment to socialism continued after independence. He kept up the campaign for the spread of the socialist ideas and set up the aim of fundamental transformation.

---

\(^{20}\) LCM, Vol.1, p.33.  
\(^{21}\) Ibid, p.508. .

of Indian society in a socialist direction. He defined Indian politics in terms of social change in 1955, at Avadi, the Congress, under his leadership, adopted the goal of the establishment of a "socialistic pattern of society" the goal was redefined as socialism at Nagpur in 1959 and was even more rigorously asserted at Bhubaneshwar in 1964. Throughout from 1947 to 1964, Nehru shifted leftwards ideologically.