CHAPTER IV

POLITICS

4.1.0 Gandhi is often spoken in terms of 'a conflict between a politician and a saint', meaning his desire to follow moral principles in public affairs. He combines religion and politics and it is in this context that Gandhi’s works become important. He changes the very nature of politics by spiritualizing it. As a secularist, Nehru can be spoken of in terms of 'a conflict between a philosopher and a politician'. He is firm in his efforts to keep politics apart from religion and adhered to this principle to the end of his days. Whereas Gandhi and Nehru are inside the politics, Chaudhuri is outside of it. He criticizes politics and believes that the political power and religious power are almost identical. While the political leaders try to control the private life and property of people, the religious leaders exercise their power over the mind of whole populace. Both are hypocrites and Chaudhuri is therefore justified in condemning them outright. It becomes very clear that Gandhi spiritualizes Indian politics, whereas Nehru declutches it from religion and Chaudhuri simply ridicules it.
4.1.1 Gandhi formulates new political concepts like Ahimsa as a potential weapon in the non-violent struggle. He successfully blends politics and ethics and thus becomes a 'politician-saint'.

4.1.1.1 Gandhi spiritualizes politics just as Gopala Krishna Gokhale did in his own time. Gandhi's principles of truth and non-violence become the basis of social order and the instruments of socio-political dynamics and he stands for the substitution of power politics by the politics of goodness, which is based on his famous doctrine of the integrity and symmetry of ends and means.

4.1.1.2 Gandhi not only fights his political battles with new tools, but comes out with new political concepts. In the words of Buddhadev Battacharya:

Gandhi contributed much to political theory by the synthetic or syncretic character of his thought, his ethical idealism in the domain of politics, introduction of non-violence as an instrument of revolution of inter-state and intra-state conflicts (Bhattacharya 1985: 10).

But his special contribution is that he made the concept of Ahimsa meaningful in the socio-political spheres by moulding
tools of non-violent action to use as a positive force in the search for ultimate truth. He says, "My life is dedicated to the service of India through the religion of non-violence which I believe to be the root of Hinduism" (CWIV: 88).

4.1.1.3 Gandhi is an ethical absolutist and he refuses to make any compromise with what he regards as essential and fundamental principles. The principle of the sacrosanct character of human conscience and its incorporation in the structure of society and politics necessarily implies the purification of means and ends. In the Gandhian way, there is a happy blending of politics and ethics, the immediate with the ultimate.

4.1.2 Nehru opposes the Gandhian way of mixing up religion with politics. However he realises later the truth behind this principle and his speeches seem to echo the words of his master.

4.1.2.1 Nehru does not share Gandhi's profound religiosity. He feels irritated by the use of religion in politics and thinks it may have a baneful effect on the latter. He once told Gandhi "Bapu, the difference between you and me is this. You believe in gradualism; I stand for
revolution" (CW III: 84). "My dear young man", Gandhi replied, "I have made revolutions while others have only shouted revolutions. When your lungs are exhausted and you really are serious about it, you will come to me and I shall then show you how a revolution is made". (CW III: 84).

4.1.2.2 Even though there are fundamental differences between Gandhi and Nehru, the latter appreciates the methods of non-violence advocated by the former in the Indian political field. When Nehru became the Prime Minister, the ideas of liberalism and social reformism, synthesized with Gandhism, began to dominate. This brings to mind the words of Gandhi who said that after his (Gandhi's) death, Nehru would speak his (Gandhi's) language.

4.1.3 Chaudhuri is not a politician like Gandhi or Nehru. To his iconoclastic eyes the religious heads and the political leaders are one and the same because, "both the classes acquired power in the same manner", (Hinduism: 304). Mostly he tries to extol the British and denounce the Indian politicians. However, much of his criticism is palatable because it is true.

4.2.0 Gandhi tends to combine politics with religion. To him a truly religious man must also be a true politician
and a true politician must also be a true religious man. Nehru is strongly opposed to the use of religion in politics and he tries his level best to keep politics apart from religion. The iconoclastic Chaudhuri questions the Gandhian doctrine of non-violence as he believes that religion should not be mixed up with politics.

4.2.1.0 The predecessors and successors of Gandhi have a great difficulty in understanding him because they are at a loss to understand how religion can be suffused up with politics. Similarly his method of using 'fasts' as a tool for political action is also criticized. Little do they know that Gandhi uses the word 'politics' as the 'art of transforming social relations in terms of justice'.

4.2.1.1 Soon after meeting Gandhi, Lord Reading writes: "Mr. Gandhi's religious and moral views are, I believe admirable and indeed are on a remarkably high altitude, but I must confess that I find it difficult to understand his practice of them in politics" (cited in Nanda 1979: 6). Not only Reading, but some of Gandhi's own colleagues and followers argue that he is ever ready to merge religion with politics. Much of the confusion arises from the fact that Gandhi's concept of religion has nothing to do with the common religion. His religion is simply an ethical
framework for the conduct of daily life. Therefore he considers politics as a part of life. He says:

Politics are a part of our being, we ought to understand our national institutions, and we ought to understand our national growth and all those things. We may do it from our infancy. So, in our Ashram, every child is taught to understand the political institutions of our country, and to know how the country is vibrating with new emotions, with new aspirations, with a new life (CW XIII: 234-5).

4.2.1.2 Those who charge Gandhi for importing religion into politics point out to his fasts as an example of this observation. They question the ethics of fasting as a political tactic. C.F. Andrews the christian missionary, who was a friend of both Gandhi and Tagore, once wrote to Gandhi from England:

I hardly think you realize how very strong here is the mortal repulsion against fasting unto death. I confess as a christian I should do it, and it is only with the greatest difficulty that I find myself able to justify it under any circumstances.  
(Cited in Ganguli 1973: 12).
Even though fasting has a place in the religious life of the Hindus for centuries, Gandhi uses it as a tool for political action. He describes fasting as the "most potent of the weapons" (CW XII: 132) in his armoury of Satyagraha. Satyagraha is the science and art of overcoming evil with good. It is absolutely a non-violent weapon, which shook the foundation of the mightiest British Empire and liberated India. Satyagraha combines 'Satya' and 'Ahimsa' and thus, its notary has infinite spiritual power. It has been successfully used in the political sphere. Gandhi says Satyagraha in the essence is nothing but the introduction of truth and gentleness in the political life (CW XII: 132). The aim of Satyagraha movement is not to capture power but to control and guide power effectively without capturing the machinery of government.

4.2.1.3 Gandhi always argues that true religion and true politics have both to concern themselves primarily with human life and action and both must have a common basis in a common morality determined by a common set of values. He says:

I could not be leading a religious life unless I identified myself with the whole of mankind and that I could not do unless I took part in
politics. The whole game of man's activities today constitutes an indivisible whole.

(CW IV: 90).

Gandhi's conception of politics is as unorthodox as his conception of religion. He uses the word 'politics' not in the usual sense of the art of capturing, holding, and managing governmental power, but it means the art of transforming social relations in terms of justice. The national freedom struggle under his leadership is viewed by him as a moral attempt on the part of himself and the Indian people to transform the unjust relationship between the Indian and the British people into a just one, through non-violence.

4.2.1.4 Religion is the recognition of justice and action aimed at the establishment of relative justice in human society. Politics is the art of transforming social relations in terms of relative justice in each particular case. Therefore Gandhi takes a religious-cum-moral approach to politics. According to him "politics without principles is a sin" (CW V: 112). There is no distinct department called 'political'. It is only a phase and aspect of life.

4.2.2.0 Nehru differs with Gandhi on the latter's religious and sentimental approach to any political issue.
He cannot understand what religion has to do with politics. He believes that Gandhi gives every political issue a 'religious twist' which prevents clarity of thought and action. He also believes that in a national movement of vast dimension, precise definitions of priorities and objectives are the essential conditions for its success. The religious element confuses the issues and undermines the priorities and progress of the national movement.

4.2.2.1 Nehru is dead against the use of religion in modern political field. He says: "there is too much of what is called religion in our life and politics" (SW III: 1-2). He is constantly at war with the evil and he is unbending in his efforts to keep politics apart from religion and adheres to this principle to the end of his days. Nehru knows the influence of ethics on politics. However, the search for a scientific, rationalistic determination of political principles holds a much prominent place in his life. All his life, Nehru lives in the world of ideas and serves human ideals, and all his life he is torn by contradictions between ideals and reality, which he thinks is inevitable for a person trying to be both thinker and politician. "Therefore, Nehru's objection was relevant and based on a clear understanding of the interaction of socio-political forces" (Patil 1987: 214).
4.2.2.2 Religion, according to Nehru, equals blind belief, reaction, dogma, bigotry, superstition, the exploitation of the masses and the preservation of vested interests. But, at the same time, he is careful not to deny that religion satisfies some immensely felt inner needs of man. From a historical perspective Nehru readily admits that religion has produced some of the noblest types of man. But he is equally aware that this self-same religion has also produced cruel and bigotted tyrants. Nehru is dissatisfied with the influence that religion exercises on spiritual life:

Religion as practised either deals with matter rather unrelated to our normal lives and thus adopts an ivory tower attitude or is allied to certain usages which do not fit in with the present age (Nehru 1992: 1-2).

He also clearly states that "religion may be all right when applied to ethics and morals, but if it enters the political sphere it has a minus effect on morals" (Nehru 1992: 242).

4.2.3.0 There are several contradictions among the Hindus who do not practice of what they preach. The Indian political scene is no exception to this. To Chaudhuri, Indians are, by nature, choleric in temperament. No wonder
then their political history is made up of blood-stained pages. Therefore, he questions how the non-violent methods advocated by Gandhi in politics, can work out effectively in India. According to him, non-violence is a total failure. To Indians lack of self-confidence makes them run after black magic and spells. Even some of the well-known figures in politics are also lured by this. Therefore, it is clear that Chaudhuri is strongly opposed to the use of religion in politics.

4.2.3.1 In every field of Hindu culture and at every stage of Hindu behaviour, contradictions loom large in number. For every value that the Hindu teaches, there is a counter value that he practises. Chaudhuri says:

It is on account of the presence of such opposites that I have taken the Roman god Janus as the symbol of the Hindu character. But it does not present only two faces. It has a whole series of them, going in pairs. For this reason the Hindu personality might be called not even Janus Quadrifrons, but Janus Multifrons (CC: 106).

These contradictions are clearly visible in the political scene of India. Though the Indian political leaders preach
non-violence and try to mingle religion with politics, the
Indian political history is of a revolutionary nature.
Chaudhuri proceeds to give a history of Hindu militarism to
demolish the myth of the Hindu love of non-violence. The
current belief that the Hindus are a peace-loving and non-
violent people is a fallacy. He says "In reality, however,
a few human communities have been more warlike and fond of
blood-shed" (CC: 107).

4.2.3.2 Chaudhuri criticizes the Gandhian doctrine of non-
violece. According to him, non-violence is a total failure
in India. He says:

Between the unnecessary proclamation of non-
violece in the third century BC and its
reassertion, largely futile, in the twentieth
century by Mahatma Gandhi, there is not one word
of non-violence in the theory and practice of
statecraft by the Hindus (CC: 108).

The Hindus practice self-mortification because they crave
for power. He states clearly that it is not out of any moral
discipline, they indulge in self-mortification but "he
(Hindu) did not understand and practice mortification of the
flesh as a means of power, especially supernatural power,
with which he could set at nought not only the processes of nature but even the will of the gods" (CC: 216-217).

He continues further:

The Hindus have always worshipped power for power's sake, and, there is nothing they yearn for more than the removal of external checks on their desires and aspirations (CC: 217).

4.2.3.3 Chaudhuri believes even the educated Indians have lost their self-confidence whenever they are in trouble. In spite of their philosophical pre-occupation, they are imbued with the spirit of animism, homeopathic magic and spells. This continual evocation of the occult has not left even the well-known figures in politics. He says:

The occult is thrown at the head of every kind of ill man is subject to as a secular being, and therefore even the 'secularists' who are now running the government of the country see nothing incongruous in their perpetual falling back on the occult, including yoga to maintain physical efficiency (CC: 219).
Chaudhuri digs at Nehru who claims to be a rationalist, yet indulges in the practice of yoga. If the belief in the supernatural is mixed with politics, the entire faith in rational measures is lost. Chaudhuri firmly believes "there are few men in India today, out after money or office, who do not try to coerce the gods or spirits" (CC: 219).

4.3.0 Gandhi advocates the philosophy of 'Ram Rajya' for an ideal Indian administration. Though Nehru differs from Gandhi, he attaches much importance to Gram Panchayats and local self-administration. Whereas Chaudhuri merely wants the Indian politicians to ape the manners of their British counterparts.

4.3.1.0 Gandhi realises the importance of Ram Rajya - which contains all the noble principles of Gandhism. The local governing bodies will take care of the villages and the theory of trusteeship, according to him, will solve all the economic problems of the nation.

4.3.1.1 Gandhi believes that the Indian political system should be based on the philosophy of Ramrajya. He attempts the synthesis of the ideas of Vedanta, Buddhism, Jainism, Christianity and the teachings of prophets like Tulsidas, Tolstoy, Thoreau and national leaders of the Indian
Renaissance movement. The philosophy of Ramrajya takes up the Gandhian synthesis and tries to work out the implications of their ideas at more critical and analytical levels. The concept of sovereignty and its location in a state are peculiar in Gandhian thought. Gandhism is mainly a synthesis of moral institutions and experiences, the sarvodaya philosophy tries to build a synthesis of the theoretical abstractions and political and economic generalization.

4.3.1.2 Gandhi wants the subordinations of political and social consideration to moral consideration. This law of moral causation which is universal is worked with a will. Man and his environment in this life and the future will be changed so as to secure 'Ramrajya' - the highest ideal for all Gandhi's living philosophy of non-violence. Ramrajya, based on truth, love, justice, and equality is perhaps the greatest human attempt made in recent times to advance the kingdom of Heaven on this finite earth. Abid Husain is of the view that "His Ramrajya is a perfect anarchy, a stateless society which is governed by no other law except the moral law implicit in human nature by no other force except the force of love" (Cited in Bhagwan 1983: 126).

4.3.1.3 In fact Gandhi is of the view that 7,00,000 villages in India would be organised according to the will
of its citizens, all of them voting. Thus there would be 7,00,000 votes and not 400 million. Each village will have one vote. The villagers would elect the district administrators. The district administrators would elect provincial administrators, who in their turn would elect a president - the national Chief Executive. Power would thus be diffused.

4.3.1.4 Gandhi has immense faith in the goodness of human beings, irrespective of their religion, community or social status. It is this faith that makes him advocate the theory of trusteeship. Political commentators have criticised Gandhi for advocating the theory of trusteeship on the ground that it has hindered the forces of revolutionary change in the economic sphere. But Gandhi believes in divinity of man. Hence it is difficult to distinguish between man and man. He, therefore says:

Everything belonged to God and was got from God. Therefore it was for his people as a whole, not for a particular individual. When an individual had more than his proportionate portion, he became a trustee of that portion of God's people.

(CW IV: 81)
Hence he emphasises a theory of thorough equality and believes in equal distribution of wealth. The rich does not require all their wealth for the satisfaction of their personal needs. In the words of Majumdar:

... the supreme achievement of Mahatma Gandhi in the field of political thought has been the substitution of the ideal of the legal state by that of the moral state. He has placed before the world the idea of replacing force and violence by the technique of persuasion through truth and non-violence. (Majumdar 1980: 130)

4.3.2.0 While Gandhi lays stress on Ramrajya, Nehru gives much importance to Gram Panchayats. He knows fully well that the principle of Sarvodaya cannot be fully implemented in India yet he tries to modify it a little to suit the multitude. However, he is strongly opposed to the theory of trusteeship, which can produce disastrous effect on the Indian political scene.

4.3.2.1 Like Gandhi's, Nehru's vision of India is also opposed to the concepts of coercion and centralisation. It is to be democratic and federal in nature. He provides in the constitution maximum rights to the federating units,
consistent with the integrity and unity of the country. Further, importance to the Gram Panchayats reveals Nehru's keenness to effect decentralisation in the country. In the words of Hussain,

If he could work out to its logical conclusion, his idea of a political organisation under which each village will have a single vote as a corporate body and will enjoy full local autonomy, Panchayat Raj will become an actual reality and we will be able to say that Nehru's liberal state is the one envisaged by Gandhiji which governs the least (Cited in Hussain 1984: 264).

4.3.2.2 Nehru would have been the last person to profess that he is following Gandhi's blueprint for an independent India during his years in power. Even if it has been possible to recognize such a blueprint, it cannot have been adapted to the mechanism of the modern state. Sarvodaya, unlike socialism, cannot be legislated into existence. In fairness of Nehru, it must be acknowledged, however, that he applies Gandhi's ideas as far as he could to the needs of a modern India. But, as Chalapathi Rau points out: "... something of Gandhism was knocked out, everything could not be absorbed. But nobody absorbed so much of Gandhi as Nehru
did or incorporated so much of him in the inexorable working of state-hood" (Rau 1967: 102).

4.3.2.3 Nehru characterises the theory of trusteeship as 'barren', for it means that the power for good or evil remains with the self-appointed trustee and he may exercise it as he wills. Therefore, the real trusteeship is of the nation and not of an individual or a group. Nehru cannot understand how such a theory can work out in Indian politics. The leading economists and political scientists do not approve the theory of trusteeship. Patil observes, "obviously the theory was either too old or too new. It was old, because it was tried and given up long ago as impractical. It was new in the sense that it could suit, if one believed in moral evolution, a morally superior human race to come." (Patil 1987: 228)

4.3.3.0 Unlike Gandhi and Nehru, Chaudhuri is not happy with the Indian political system. He is not impressed by Gandhi or Nehru. He severely criticizes Nehru for favouring Upper Middle class Hindus. He takes him to task for not following the English language, which has shaped him to a great extent.

4.3.3.1 Chaudhuri is dissatisfied with the Indian political system. In India ministership is often claimed on
the basis of caste or communalism. He says:

In India, the insistence on the right is so great that a Chief Minister has to create ad-hoc vacancies to satisfy it. In England, this cannot be done, and therefore ability even now has some place in Parliament (PE: 190).

In India, shooting and bursting tear gas bombs in the streets are regular routine during the election time. This often happens because, unlike English people, the Indians are too much involved in politics. The factional rivalries make election campaign a nightmare.

4.3.3.2 Chaudhuri hates both Gandhi and Nehru as politicians. When he saw Gandhi for the first time, he (Gandhi) was passing in a car along the road in front of his house. Eventhough the prayer meetings of the Mahatma took place on the very roof of the house, where he was working, he did not bother to attend them. He saw Nehru for the first time only in 1931. He narrates his meeting with Nehru as follows:

I was taken to him by a friend who was known to him and I summoned courage to appear personally
before him only on the strength of the reputation I had then made by publishing some articles on military subjects and the self-confidence, I had acquired thereby. But though urged by my friend to keep up acquaintance, I dropped it so completely that Pandit Nehru did not even recognize me when, six years later, he saw me at the house of Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose, and I too did not thrust myself on him, although I would easily find an excuse, inasmuch as the Congress had in the meanwhile published an essay by me on the Indianization of the army. (CC: 265)

4.3.3.3 Chaudhuri is a bitter critic of Gandhi and Gandhism. He is not less harsh in his portrayal of Nehru. He is frank and bold enough to say that a person who is responsible for the dominance of the anglicized Middle Class Hindus is none other than Nehru himself. He says: "Nehru would not only cease to be vocal if he could not express himself in English, but would not be Nehru without that language." (CC: 357) He is angry at Nehru for not defending the English language against the fanaticism of the Hindu bigots and nationalists eventhough he knows that the Hindu moral courage and cultural personality depends on English.
4.3.3.4 While discussing the plight of the Muslims who are remaining in India, Chaudhuri remarks that even though some of the Muslims occupy very high offices in the Government, their position is not secure. This generous treatment may be due to the politically-inclined personality of Nehru. He says:

He (Nehru) is by social and cultural affiliations more a Muslim than a Hindu, so far as he is anything Indian at all. His family belonged to the circle of Islamized Hindus (CC: 300).

He further says:

Nehru has no understanding of Hinduism and not even any liking for it. He is usually repelled by anything pronounced by Hindu. This purely personal fact has certainly contributed to the position of the Muslims in India (CC: 300).

Chaudhuri calls Nehru the leader of the Anglicized upper middle class Hindus. He accuses him for sheltering them. He says ". . . so long as he (Nehru) lives and maintains the nexus, the Anglicized Hindu order will also remain in the saddle. But as soon as he goes it will quite naturally be overthrown (CC: 354).
4.3.3.5 According to Chaudhuri, Gandhi and Nehru have failed to shape the destiny of India. He also feels that the Indians have rejected their ideas. Their own countrymen do not listen to them and they too have realised that towards the end of their lives. He says,

In recent years even the funerals of great national leaders like Mahatma Gandhi or Nehru have had the character of *tamasha* for those who lined the streets. In old time all such *tamashas* were part and parcel of religious life, and the idea of purely secular amusement was not present in the Hindu mind.

(Hinduism: 298)

Yet, one cannot help feeling that Chaudhuri's bitterness about the two great leaders is mainly due to some personal grievances. Dilip Chitre rightly says,

It appears that an acute sense of insecurity in his own society, a craving for status and acceptance, and a desire to identify himself with the ruling elite, culturally and emotionally, have all been decisive factors in Mr. Chaudhuri's formulation of his views.

(Chitre 1969: 41)
4.4.0 Gandhi strives hard to free India and yet maintains a bond of friendship with the British. Though he is dead against the British rule, he never hates Britishers. Nehru is a valiant adversary of the British rule but he does not deny the fact that the Britishers rescued India from chaos and anarchy. Whereas, Chaudhuri is an anti-Indian and he blindly accepts the British rule, with a slavish spirit.

4.4.1.0 Gandhi emerges at a very critical situation when hatred against the British rule is mounting, despite much criticism from his own colleagues. He does not like to accept them even if they change their ways and become gentle. However, he has no enmity towards them and even treats them as his brethren. He is sure to win over them since he believes in truth and non-violence.

4.4.1.1 Gandhi in his book, *Hind Swaraj* raises the question why he wants to drive away the English and gives a clear answer as follows:

... because India has become impoverished by this government. They take away our money from year to year. The most important posts are reserved for themselves. We are kept in a state
of slavery. They behave insolently towards us and disregard our feelings.

( HS: 29)

He does not agree that the British imparted a sense of unity to us. He says "We were one nation before they came to India. One thought inspired us. Our mode of life was the same. It was because we were one nation that they were able to establish one kingdom" (HS: 60). What the British did was actually sowing the sure seeds of division. He belittles their greatness by saying, "The English have not taken India, we have given it to them. They are not in India because of their strength, but because we keep them (HS: 38).

4.4.1.2 To infuse a new life into the heart-broken Indians, who have been carried down by the terror of the British, Gandhi has to use strong words that give the impression of him being a rabid nationalist. He uses the adjective 'satanic' for the British Government and starts a programme of burning foreign clothes. He does not like to accept them even if they desire to change their ways. He says, "When a tiger changes his nature, Englishmen will change theirs. This is not possible, and to believe it to be possible is contrary to human experience" (HS: 29).
4.4.1.3 However, as a spiritualist, he has no hatred towards the Britishers, though he stands against their rule for a well-organised state, usurpation should be an impossibility and it is unnecessary to resort to force for dispossessing an usurper. He says: "I have no enmity towards the English, but I do towards their civilization" (HS: 104). He wants India to be free not because he wants her to isolate herself from others and live for herself alone, or to dominate and exploit other countries, but in order that she may be able to co-operate with and serve the world better. He says, "If any Englishman dedicated his life to security the freedom of India, resisting tyranny and serving the land, I should welcome that Englishman as an Indian" (HS: 68). From a spiritualist point of view, the British people or Government are not Gandhi's enemy. He finds dignity in everybody and he is sure to win over the opponent, since he relies on truth and the existence of spiritual power.

4.4.1.4 Gandhi launches the Satyagraha movement as a non-violent weapon to overcome evil with good. In a reply to poet Tagore's criticism that the non-cooperation movement is creating a spirit of narrow intolerance and chauvinism, Gandhi writes:

Our non-cooperation is neither with the English nor with the west. Our non-cooperation is with
the system the English have established, with the material civilization and its attendant and the exploitation of the weak. Our non-cooperation is a refusal to cooperate with the English administrators on their own terms. Our non-cooperation is a retirement within ourselves.

(CW XXI: 291)

4.4.2.0 Nehru is one of the worst sufferers at the hands of the British rulers. Though, he is a strong adversary of British rule in India, he pays the devil his due. It is true that the British paved way to western science and technology. In the same way, he agrees that they are responsible for bringing orderliness in India after many centuries of violence and disorder. However, he admits that India remained a helpless slave state under the British rule.

4.4.2.1 Nehru has the ability to take objective view of British imperialism in India. He agrees that the British opened the windows to western science and technology, but they did not give complete support to industrialism. On the other hand, they discouraged Indian industrialists and the Railways came not as a means of encouragement to industries but as a necessity to exploit Indian natural resources.
4.4.2.2 He also admits that it would be absurd to cast the blame for all India's life on the British. But it is certain that the record of the British rule in India has not been so golden and glamorous as the British rulers claimed. He sums up the so-called glorious rule of British:

Looking back over this period, it almost seems that the British succeeded in dominating India by a succession of fortuitous circumstances and lucky flukes. With remarkably little effort, considering the glittering prize, they won a great empire and enormous wealth, which helped to make them the leading power in the world.

(DI: 276)

4.4.3.0 Chaudhuri is an anti-Indian who calls England "the country which was the home and shelter of my body and spirit" (PE: 35). His anglicism is predominant in whatever he writes about India. In his blind infatuation for English, he makes malicious, sometimes irrational and uncalled for, comparisons between the English and the Indians, which irritates any honest critic.

4.4.3.1 The image in which Chaudhuri, would have his countrymen to remake themselves is undoubtedly the British
one. Chaudhuri proudly displays his loyalty to British by publishing a series of articles in the *Illustrated Weekly of India* entitled "Why I hate Indians". Everything western fascinates him and his book *A Passage to England* is a testament of Chaudhuri's anglomania. He presents the contrast between England and India and shows his preference to England and wilfully denigrates India. He writes:

> What my senses were dealing with and striving hard to grasp was the reality I would call Timeless England, which I was seeing for the first time, and which I was inevitably led to set against the Timeless India in which I had been steeped all my life.

*(PE: 3)*

There is a fundamental difference between the permanent face of England and 'the permanent face of India'. He says, "Time has made the face of my country stark, chastened, and sad; and it remains so in spite of the lipstick that is being put on it by the hand of the spiritual half castes. The face of England remains smiling" *(PE: 7)*.

4.4.3.2 Satish Kumar points out, "In contrasting India and England, Chaudhuri shows his partiality to England. He is unfair to India, the country of his birth. He
unhesitatingly passes biased comments on India, which demigrate her hoary past" (Kumar 1989: 30). In *The Intellectual in India* he confesses that an emotional relationship has existed between him and England since his childhood" (II: 77). It will be no exaggeration to call him a "British Indian" or "Brown Sahib". As Chaudhuri sees his homeland through western eyes, there is a resultant strange ambivalence in his attitude to the land of his birth.

4.4.3.3 Chaudhuri is deeply impressed by the British political system. The proceedings of the House of Commons impresses him very much. Even the hot debates in the House are carried out in a very decent manner. The individuals in the House perform formal constitutional roles. The formal duty of an MP is to keep the conventions and appearances of parliamentary government going. But, as it happens, his real duty in British parliament is to save the party. He votes for it and make speeches to convince the people that the rule of the party is also the rule of reason and justice. Eventhough Chaudhuri is not prepared to hail the British parliamentary system to the skies, he says that it is far better than India.

4.4.3.4 What inspires him more in the British politics is that the English politicians have no zest in politics. They
do not get excited over politics. Even the election campaign is a tame affair. A certain degree of efficiency and ability are required for an MP to become a Minister. Ministership is not allotted on the basis of caste, community or religion.

4.5.0 Gandhi wants India to become an ideal democratic nation. He considers a democracy based on the principles of non-violence, an ideal one. He believes in a stateless democracy, where the power is decentralised. Nehru's definition of democracy is not confined to mere provision of a few political institutions. It means establishing a dynamic society, extending full opportunities to the individual for his development. Whereas, Chaudhuri seems to advise the Indian politicians to follow the footprints of their British counterparts.

4.5.1.0 Gandhi believes if the national life becomes perfect, there is no need for any governing body. Everyone will be, his or her own ruler. He longs for a stateless society, which is based on non-violence. He is fully aware of the evils of the party system. Therefore, he advocates Sarvodaya, which rejects the party system and centralization of political power. Gandhi hopes that in a non-violent democratic state of his dreams, the citizens will be honest, fearless and disciplined.
4.5.1.1 Gandhi's idea of a non-violent democracy is a "federation of decentralised, self-sufficient, self-administered, independent and co-operative village republics" (CW III: 216). Where there is a non-violent democracy, there is no need of a state. Gandhi holds the view that political power means the capacity to regulate the nation through its representatives, so that it becomes self-regulated. There is, then, a state of enlightened anarchy. For such a state, everyone is his or her own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state, therefore, there is no political power, because there is no state.

4.5.1.2 The spiritualistic Gandhi pleads for a stateless society. But he knows the limitations in realizing such an ideal. Therefore he says "the ideal is never fully realised in life" (CWIV: 122). Gandhi's anarchy is not the one that leads to disorder but that which relates to a condition of statelessness as a result of the stateless society of our enlightened harmony that dispenses with the necessity of a state to enforce behaviour patterns.

4.5.1.3 Gandhi discerns the evil of party system in the working of parliamentary democracy. The very essence of democracy is corroded and corrupted by the party system.
Party interests are taken care of at the cost of the people's cause. The representatives, instead of representing the wishes of the voters, represent the interests of their parties. In spite of the institutions of popular elections, it does not really result in state policy being guided by public opinion. Vinoba is right when he calls it "demonocracy" (cited in Kriplani 1982: 37).

4.5.1.4 Centralization as a system is inconsistent with the non-violent structure of society. It cannot be sustained and defended without an adequate force. Gandhi looks upon 'centralization' with the greatest fear as it results in the concentration of power in a few hands and consequent likelihood of its misuse. Above all, he fears that centralization would curb the individual's initiative and individuality, which lies at the root of all progress. The nearest approach to his ideal of decentralized society, Gandhi finds in the autonomous village communities of India. The Panchayat Raj is in accord with the ancient traditions of India.

4.5.1.5 Gandhi foresees a decentralized Indian polity where power would be transformed into a legitimate government. Decentralization of power means for Gandhi greater freedom for the people. The problem of democracy is
how to secure an expression of the will of the ordinary man. The elections under formal democracies are clearly incapable of a climate where the ordinary man can feel that he has something to contribute to public affairs. Decentralization of power (economic and political) seems to Gandhi to be the antidote to the alienation. Decentralization is necessary for the effective participation of the people in matters concerning themselves. Gandhi reminds us that the essence of democracy lies in non-violence.

4.5.1.6 Gandhi is convinced that mere institutional structures will not suffice for the concrete realization of rights and hence he postulates the ideal of Ramrajya which means the kingdom of love, justice and righteousness. This amounts to the synthesis of the Augustinian concept of Dei Cinitata Rei with the democratic ideal of sovereignty of the people. Like the pluralists and anarchists of the West, Gandhi believes in the "Sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority" (CW III: 34). It is the stress on the cultivation of real Jansakti - the power and strength of the people, which is the most significant contribution of Gandhi to the political thought.

4.5.1.7 J.P. Kripalani observes that Gandhi does not work out the details of his conception of a democratic government
for independent India. "The present constitution of India", he says, "does not embody his ideas. It is based on a strong centre, monopolising most of the sources of power and finance, leaving the local units weak and resourceless" (Kripalani 1982: 364). It is true that Gandhi does not give any positive indication of the kind of political system he visualized for India. However, he makes it amply clear that Swaraj or self-rule should be for the millions.

4.5.1.8 Gandhi is categorical about the importance of the fundamental rights of citizens and of an independent judiciary and a free press. He is always a staunch believer in the purification of human motivation. To him, it is not enough if one has perfect control over one's will, he should be given enough freedom to express his will. Therefore, he considers "healthy, well informed and balanced" criticism to be the "ozone of public life" (CW III: 78). When the Government of India imposed restrictions on the rights of free speech and free association, towards the end of 1921, Gandhi reacted vehemently and called for action in defence of rights:

We must first make good the rights of free speech and free association before we can make any further progress towards the goal (swaraj). The
Government would kill us if they could by a flank attack. To accept defeat in the matter of free speech and free association is to court disaster. (CW III: 88)

Similarly when certain restrictions are imposed upon a Gujarati newspaper by the Government, Gandhi called upon the journalists to stand up for their rights.

4.5.2.0 Nehru does not advocate a new concept of democracy. His democratic thought comprises of amalgam of ideas of Locke, Rousseau, Mon Lesquie, Bentham, J.S. Mill and Karl Marx. His deep seated humanism, fervent individualism and intense faith in the people develop in him a great contempt for authoritarianism, and subsequently drives him closer to democracy. He denounces fascism and communism as totalitarian concepts. If fascism is a crude brutal effort to perpetuate capitalism, communism is a rude attempt to crush the free spirit of men.

4.5.2.1 Devotion to democracy is one of Nehru's political principles and the building of a democratic system is one of his principal objectives. He says,

*We believe in democracy. Speaking for myself, I believe in it, first of all, because I think it is*
the right means to achieve ends and because it is a peaceful method. Secondly, because it removes the pressures which other forms of government may impose on the individual (SW III: 139).

Nehru points out that democracy in its present shape and form "is a relatively new concept", while "the old type of democracy was a limited one in many ways" (SW II: 348-49). To him, parliamentary democracy is a product of the past 150-200 years, but even in this period it has never been the same, and it took a long struggle for democracy not to be the property of certain classes alone. He thinks that his task is to resolve the current problems on the basis of democracy. He observes:

Having approved of parliamentary democracy as the right approach, we have to see how to temper it and how to fit it in, so that it can answer the major questions of the age (SW II: 212).

4.5.2.2 Democracy has not resolved the main problems of capitalist society. There is still a conflict between the principles of democracy and capitalism. In his opinion, this led to the collapse or a decline of democracy and of parliaments after the First World War. He insists that
democracy should not be mixed up with capitalism simply because it has emerged in a number of capitalist countries, that democracy should not be thought of as an essential part of capitalism, and that socialism in itself does not inevitably mean authoritarianism. (Martyshin 1984: 278)

4.5.2.3 Nehru rejects the idea put forward by the right-wing quarters in India that socialism threatens democracy. What he actually wants to do is to turn democracy into an instrument for building a socialist society. He helps to build up a genuinely popular base of democracy with the help of the system of village panchayats in order to teach the peasants how to gradually purge local governing bodies of the bureaucratic elements coming from the city. In the words of Ashoka Mehta: "His faith in fellowmen made him a confirmed democrat. He never hesitated to endow the people with wider powers and responsibilities because he never doubted their ability to use them wisely" (Mehta 1952: 67).

4.5.2.4 What is more important about his democratic system is its secular, non-religious character. He does not reduce democracy to a political structure. To him democracy is not only a form of government and a legislative, but also a combination of certain moral values that are reflected in the thoughts and behaviour of individuals and social groups.
That is why one of the indispensable conditions for genuine democracy, in Nehru's view, is public education and political consciousness of ordinary citizens. He says, "we can hardly have a political democracy without mass education". (SW IV: 126)

4.5.2.5 Nehru attaches great importance to the freedom of the press, regarding it as a manifestation of greater tolerance of thought and its expression. Such tolerance is also a part of democratic set-up, with responsibility being its prerequisite. Freedom without responsibility will amount to laxity. He says, "strictly from the practical point of view, the more you to try to suppress an opinion, the better it survives the suppression" (SW IV: 212). And again he says:

By imposing restrictions you do not change anything; you merely suppress the public manifestation of certain things, thereby causing the idea and thought underlying them to spread further. Therefore, I would rather have a completely free press with all the dangers involved in the wrong use of that freedom than a suppressed or regulated press (SW IV: 126).
Nehru's serious concern is how to achieve the genuine freedom of the press. The press freedom can coexist with certain restrictions of a purely political and moral character. Martyshin observes:

As for political restrictions, Nehru spoke in 1951 in favour of their wider application compared with the original text of the constitution. On Nehru's insistence, the Indian Parliament adopted an amendment to the constitution banning publication in the Indian press of materials encroaching on friendly relations and inciting to commission of crimes. (Martyshin 1984: 293).

4.5.2.6 However, Nehru's ideas about the freedom of the press are sometimes contradicting. He is convinced that the Government must take action "to prevent something from spreading which it and society consider evil" (SW IV: 65-66). He himself censured some of the newspapers and magazines that are given to cheap sensation, vulgarity, obscenity and lies as they "poison the minds of the younger generation, degrading their mental integrity and moral standards." (SW IV: 124) The only reason for administrative intervention, in Nehru's views is an obvious social menace presented by the cheap press to pollute the mind of millions.
4.5.3.0 Chaudhuri turns his back upon Indian democracy. To him, the Indian politician should try to imitate the British politicians, who are both seasoned politicians and cultured personalities. England is the typical example of a 'welfare state'. He says the English political life is marked by - dualism, conservatism and radicalism.

4.5.3.1 Chaudhuri is very much impressed by the modesty of the British politicians. He describes Sir Winston Churchill as a model parliamentarian. Watching him in the House of Commons, Chaudhuri feels:

He had no broading prophetic air, no eagle glances, no rebukes for anybody. He appeared like a school boy in a class of school boys, not like a teacher among school children, as our new statesmen in India always try to look. (PE: 188)

He is equally impressed by the debates carried out in the House with the utmost gentleness. It seems to him like the burning of crackers by two friends.

It seemed that after establishing a constitutional monarchy the English people had taken another great step in the evolution of their political
institutions by bringing into existence a purely constitutional form of parliamentary government, in which the House of Commons also reigned but did not govern. (PE: 189).

4.5.3.2 In England, the election campaign is carried out in a very humble manner. The English people can never imagine hearing the sound of rifle fire or bursting of tear gas bombs in the streets or see buses and trains set on fire. The reasons are obvious:

If the English people are no longer able to get excited over politics, it is because they have solved all their political problems or got rid of them, and so there is nothing left for them to do. . . . They have also eliminated all competition for political power by distributing it among all, and making it diffuse to the point of ineffectiveness (PE:193-94).

4.5.3.3 England is a typical welfare state. Chaudhuri is convinced that it has done, and is doing, everything for the well-being of the general mass of the English people. It is indeed a pleasant surprise to Chaudhuri to find that 'welfare state' is a reality in England. He makes it clear
that welfare state means two things: first, a government which is trying to promote the welfare of the people and making contributions to it, and secondly, a general state of welfare of the people, which may or may not be due to the government and its agencies. He assumes that he sees both kinds of welfare in England.

4.5.3.4 Politically the Englishmen seem to live in the present life only and have very little thought of the future. Chaudhuri, who repeatedly asks the question about the national destiny of England, at last, gets an answer from a British lady, who explains the loss of the English political ambition as follows:

You see, Mr. Chaudhuri, we have had very bad times and we have come through, though we hardly know how to. We have also recovered more rapidly than we could have believed to be possible. I think that is why we are enjoying the present for a little while. I am sure we are not really thoughtless about the future (PE: 234).

4.5.3.5 The English political life is marked by dualism. According to Chaudhuri, this duel aspect of English political character is represented by John Bull who like
Janus, always had two faces, the conservative and the radical" (PE: 137). Although conservatism and radicalism are antithetical to each other, they are professed together by the Englishman and add irony to his character. This quality is found out not merely in political leaders, but in the working class also. It is expressed not only in public international life but in private local life also. That is why Chaudhuri is compelled to say that John Bull is "Made in England". The Englishman cannot overcome this dualism and cannot be a typical Englishman without it.

4.6.0 Gandhi, Nehru and Chaudhuri are attracted towards Marxism in their own way. Marx and Gandhi differ most fundamentally in the role they assign to violence in their respective ideologies, but it is a fact that their views on violence are not as divergent as is generally believed. Gandhi makes it clear that he prefers violence to cowardice. Nehru is considerably influenced by Marxian ideology in early days. However, he is allergic to violent methods advocated by Marxists for the achievement of ends. Whereas Chaudhuri seems to favour Marxism to relieve the misery and remove the suffering of the masses.

4.6.1.0 Gandhi, the apostle of non-violence, suggests that violence is preferable to cowardice. On the other hand,
Marx seems likely to respond to Gandhi's policy of non-violence as a powerful political force. Both Gandhi and Marx are passionate lovers of truth. They also believe in and understand the powers of awakened masses. Both of them distrust the capitalist system. Thus they are not so far apart as is commonly assumed.

4.6.1.1 Gandhi and Marx are customarily portrayed as polar opposites. Gandhi is the apostle of peace and non-violence. Marx is the archpriest of violence and insurrection. The one is a near saint, whose deeply religious life is a constant seeking after God and the other, a sinister atheist raging against religion as the opium of the masses. Comparing the ideologies of Gandhi and Marx, Vinoba Bhave, the eminent disciple of Gandhi, says "The fact of the matter is that these two ideologies are irreconcilable and the differences between are fundamental" (Vinoba Bhave 1947: 53) K.R.V. Rao the well-known Indian economist delivers the following verdict:

Gandhi's socialism cannot be treated as a first or even a second cousin of Marxian socialism. It is, in spite of superficial similarities in some of the end-products envisaged in both, quite clearly and categorically an alternative to Marx and
Lenin, Stalin and Mao. And it is this alternative that now needs consideration at the hands of the world which is seeking a new but enduring social order, that will be based on justice, equality and freedom (Rao 1974: 34).

4.6.1.2 Despite the wide currency of these view and the authoritative support given to them by scholars, it is basically false. Obviously they are differences between them and even a cursory acquaintance with their lives establishes that. But what is remarkable is that these two great men are strikingly similar in a number of fundamental respects. And these happen to be precisely in those areas where they are popularly considered different. The established view considers these two men as differing most fundamentally in the role they assign to violence in their respective ideologies. But it is not so.

4.6.1.3 It is true that Gandhi abhores violence and strongly advocates non-violence as a method of fighting against all kinds of suppression, social evils and injustices. But Gandhi's advocacy of non-violence is not unconditional. He makes it clear that he prefers violence to cowardice. To his supporters in the freedom struggle, he gives a short mantra, 'Do or Die'. He firmly declares: "We
shall free India; or die in the attempt" (CW II: 417). He also states, "I do believe that where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence" (CW III: 312). When his eldest son asked him what he should have done, had he been present, when Gandhi was almost fatally assaulted in 1908, Gandhi replied that that it was his duty to defend him even by using violence. (CW IV: 112).

4.6.1.4 Gandhi concedes the need for the amount of violence demanded by the occasion. He says: "I don't say eschew violence in your dealing with robbers or thieves or with other nations that may invade India" (CW: IV 216). Once when Gandhi was discussing with Louis Fischer, the American journalist, radical land reforms needed in rural India, he spoke of 'seizing the land' as the next step. When Fischer asked in surprise if this would be with violence, Gandhi replied "... there may be 15 days of chaos, but I think we would soon bring that under control" (CW IV: 55).

4.6.1.5 Marx, on the other hand, is not such a ruthless advocate of violence as is often claimed. He realises that in the existing social order there is a great deal of violence — the violence practised by the ruling classes and their henchman against the poor and the downtrodden.
Historically, Marx recognizes, "force as the mid-wife of every old society pregnant with new one" (Martyshin 1989: 278). But if legal and constitutional measures can bring about the social change needed to end exploitation and injustice, Marx would have been the first person to advise it against the use of force. Anyone familiar with Marx's life and personality would have to concede that had Marx been alive at the time of India's independence struggle, he would have been tremendously interested in Gandhi's social use of non-violence as a powerful political force (Charise 1982: 478-487).

4.6.1.6 Gandhi uses the word 'God' to stand for 'truth', his position is not far removed from that of Marx, because Marx too is a passionate believer in truth. William Liebknecht records Marx's devotion to truth in a moving passage:

A man of such thorough truthfulness as Marx, who knew no other cult but that of truth, who swept aside in a moment, a proposition painfully arrived at and therefore dear to him, as soon as he was convinced of the incorrectness necessarily showed himself in his works as he was in reality. Incapable of hypocrisy, dissimulation or, pretence
he was always himself, in his writings as in his life ... no man could be more truthful than Marx who was truthfulness incarnate (Liebknecht 1972: 72-78).

Both Marx and Gandhi have no use for theory unrelated to practice. They both are interested in theory only if the theory serves a practical purpose. They believe in and understand the power of awakened masses in the society. Gandhi is able to accomplish his great task of leading the people of India to freedom from foreign rule because he understands the masses and is extremely adroit in organizing them and rising their enthusiasm and energy for the tasks of national liberation. The staying power of democracy in India 44 years after independence is no doubt due to the politicisation of the masses by Gandhi during the struggle of independence. J.P. Kripalani observes:

Before Gandhiji drew up this constitution (democratic constitution), the Congress was not a mass organisation but a forum for the educated. He, like Marx, talked of the withering away of the state. But as a practical politician he could not envisage a time when the state would disappear. He held that this would be possible only when most
people were "a law unto themselves", so that they automatically did the right thing.

(Kripalani 1982: 41)

4.6.1.7 Both Marx and Gandhi distrust the capitalist system. Marx believes in the socialist society and advocates a forceful dethronement of capitalism. Gandhi too desires socialism and is opposed to private property but hopes that the rich can be persuaded to voluntarily place their wealth at the disposal of society. Thus Gandhi and Marx are not so far apart as is commonly believed.

4.6.2.0 Nehru is much influenced by Marx in his early days. But he does not like the violent methods advocated by Marxists and the Gandhian theory of means and ends has a profound influence on his mind. He is totally convinced of the futurity of violence. However, it will be no exaggeration to say that up to the late thirties, Nehru remains a Marxian socialist though he is not a communist in the sense other communists in the country are.

4.6.2.1 Nehru draws abundantly upon Marxism and Leninism for his critique of the basic promises of classical liberalism. He draws especially upon Marx's conceptions of historical materialism and class struggle and on Lenin's
conception of imperialism, to reveal the inner contradictions of liberal thought and the capitalist structure of western society. He says: "A study of Marx and Lenin produced a powerful effect on my mind and helped me to see history and current affairs in a new light" (DI: 29). B. Pradhan contends that Nehru succeeds in reconciling Marxist and Gandhian philosophies, and thereby frees Gandhism from obscurantism and brings Marxism up to date (Pradhan 1974: 127). It should be admitted however that Nehru has not created any such methods. He thinks that it is quite possible to deal with one phenomenon from the Gandhian angle, and with another phenomenon from Marxist angle, and with still another one from the angle of liberalism or social-reformation.

4.6.2.2 Nehru is not a Marxist scholar as he himself has admitted. He says:

Much in the Marxist philosophical outlook I could accept without difficulty. Its monism and non-duality of mind and matter, the dynamics of matter and the dialectic of continuous change by evolution as well as leap, through action and interaction, cause and effect, thesis and antithesis and synthesis. It did not satisfy me
completely, nor did it answer all the questions in my mind, and, almost unawares, a vague idealist approach would creep into my mind, something rather akin to the vedanta approach (DI: 29).

From the point of Marxism, Nehru is able to look beyond nineteenth-century liberalism in general and capitalism in particular. He sees very clearly the futality of repeating the course of western history in the Third World. He emphasizes the need for a new ideological basis for the changing societies in Asia. He interprets the emergence of Soviet civilization as a clear break from nineteenth-century liberalism, and as part of the search for a new type of social order based on economic and social justice.

4.6.2.3 At the same time, Nehru cannot identify himself with the violence, civil war and severe restrictions on liberty which become associated with the Stalinist alternative to western liberalism. He says,

Often I disliked or did not understand some development there and it seemed to me to be too closely concerned with opportunism of the moment or the power politics of the day. (DI: 29).
He does not consider Marxism as panacea for all the ills of the world. Though Marx can be credited with extraordinary insight into social phenomenon, yet according to Nehru, he is not immune from wrong statements. He considers it injustice to Marx to apply his theories without keeping in view the facts and conditions of a particular time and place. Despite his strong leaning to Marx, he is not prepared to be branded as a communist. In fact, Nehru is, "a Marxist theorist wedded to democratic practices" (Bhagwan 1983: 258).

4.6.2.4 When Nehru writes his historical works, he is greatly influenced by scientific methodology which has put him close to Marxist concepts. He says that Marx "reviewed the world's history scientifically, and showed in what direction it was developing and how this process could be hurried up" (GWH: 406).

4.6.2.5 Nehru assimilates the principle ideas of Marxism about the class character of the state and law. In all his assessments of states, past and present, he is guided by the conception of a "ruling class" as "the group or class which controls the state power" (SW: 156). He supports Marx and Engels in their slogan of "liberty, equality and fraternity" and agrees with them that "it meant little to the people,
and merely had a pious covering to the bourgeois state" (GWH: 538).

4.6.2.6 Nehru, who is a secularist, is of the opinion that Marxism contains some criticism and references to the so-called religious aspects of communism and to "the old religious bigots" (SW III: 23). Nehru is not an anti-communist. He is critical of religious fanaticism and blames it not only on communism, but also anti-communism, which, in his opinion, sees things only in terms of black and white and ignores anything in between.

4.6.3.0 Chaudhuri is very much convinced that the Hindus are as fanatical as the Marxists. They have a strong passion for militarism and the Hindus are not peace-loving people as they are generally believed to be. Therefore, Chaudhuri seems to suggest Marxian remedies for all the social evils. He is a 'British Indian'. The splendour of the image of England has caused him, it seems, to test the functionary reality of his own society by the most uncompromising standards. Therefore, he craves for a social change even if the methods employed for it are as aggressive as the violent methods advocated by Marx.

4.6.3.1 Chaudhuri gives a short history of the Hindu militarism in his most controversial book The Continent of
Circe to demolish the myth of the Hindu love of nonviolence. He says, "the living Hindu belongs to his own world, which is not less bizarre than the Freudian, nor is it less dogmatic and fanatical than the Marxist" (CC: 92). There is a co-existence of militarism and pacifism in the Hindu character.

4.6.3.2 As Chaudhuri believes that the Hindus possess the Marxian temperament, he suggests Marxian remedies for them. Therefore, he, like Marx, is angry at the dominant minority ruling the majority. Though their number is small, - almost negligible in relation to the rest of the population, "there is contesting the fact that they are the dominant minority. They are in the front rank in every field of human activity, political, economic, cultural, so far as anything can be called activity in present-day India" (CC: 338).

4.6.3.3 As a revolutionary, Marx made no effort to change the basic moral or political values. He wanted his revolutionary aims to be achieved through conventional means, the means which have been used through the ages to bring about changes. These have been used in the past both for aggrandisement and for resisting tyranny, injustice, and for achieving freedom. They are those of chicanery, deceit, fraud, hate, violence and war. Chaudhuri is angry at
everything 'Indian'. The bureaucratic government and the centralisation of all the political administration provokes him to a great extent. The bureaucratic set up of India, of which Delhi is the seat, is represented by the clerical job for which every educated Indian, generally hankers. But an honest clerk cannot thrive in the Indian administration because "they are about five stages of supervision by highly paid superiors" who will act "in the interest of the politicians" (TLNTL: 26). Like Marx, Chaudhuri is also a humanitarian who will be angry and bitter with the people only when the latter fail to practise their high ideals. The bitterness and anger are the obverse side of Chaudhuri's love and concern for his countrymen.

4.7.0 It is only after the emergence of Gandhi in Indian politics, one can say that women of India, started throwing their shackles more boldly and vigorously than before. He makes them jump into the political arena through which they get the courage and will power to march progressively towards their emancipation. Nehru too has done much for the elevation of women and some of the women in Nehru's family become the frontline fighters of the freedom movement. Whereas Chaudhuri feels that the emergence of working women in India itself is a great threat to the happiness in the family, not to speak of women who like to take part in politics.
4.7.1.0 Thanks to Gandhi, women, participate in non-violent struggle of independence. They brave the storm of lathi blows, swords and guns with a patriotic zeal. Sometimes even very risky tasks are assigned to them because Gandhi has such a deep faith in them. Many organisations and movements are started with women leaders like Mrs. Besant and Dr. Muthulakshmi Reddy. It is Gandhi who has infused the spirit of nationalism into women.

4.7.1.1 The spiritualist Gandhi holds the view that "the salvation of India depended upon the sacrifice and enlightenment of her women" (CW V: 207). Indian women cast off their purdhas and march shoulder to shoulder with men in the non-violent struggle of independence. They are originally called 'Abalas' and Gandhi makes them 'Sabalas'. Gandhi is not only convinced that women's participation is desirable but they should take the lead in the Satyagraha movement in India. He proudly says:

I would love to find that my future army contained a vast preponderance of women over men. If the fight come, I should then face it with greater confidence than if men predominate, I would dread the latter's violence. Women would be my guarantee against such an outbreak. (CW III: 147)
4.7.1.2 Gandhi does not see his advocacy of women's participation in non-violent resistance campaign as contradictory to his basic concept of women as nurturer and caretaker of the home. On the contrary, the participation of women in Satyagraha is seen as an extension of their special mission as the care-taker of humanity. He insists that the difference between the sexes does not signify that women are lacking; on the contrary women have special talents related to their role as nurturers of unique value of humanity.

4.7.1.3 Women, sometimes are called upon by Gandhi to undertake the difficult task of picketing foreign cloth and liquor shops, "a task carried through with such conspicuous devotion to peaceful methods that in some places both the police and congress called upon women to maintain order at times of dangerous rioting" (Malley 1941: 476). The spirit of patriotism they showed during the periods of national strife was admirable. Women flocked to the organisation and threw themselves whole-heartedly into its work. As an English observer says:

There was a breath-taking abruptness about the entry of Indian women into political life. One moment they were not there, the next they had
sprung, like Athene from head of Zeus fully armed into the forefront of the scene (Cumming 1931: 67).

4.7.1.4 Thanks to Gandhi, numerous women leaders participate in the activities of the Congress and accept responsible offices. Mrs. Besant was elected President of the Congress in 1917. She was the first woman to be given this honour. In 1930, Dr. Muthulakshmi Reddy was nominated to the Madras Legislative Council and she was the first woman in India who had this privilege. Thus, Gandhi infused the spirit of nationalism into women which has moulded them to take their rightful place with men and they in turn fall perfectly in line with the discipline of the non-violent and non-resistant political struggle and pave way indirectly to what is later known as the Feminist Movement.

4.7.2.0 Nehru is also a champion of women's cause and he feels happy and proud when women participate in the Civil Disobedience Movement, notably his mother, sisters and his wife, Kamala. When he became the Prime Minister of India, he entrusted very prestigious posts to women for the first time in Indian history.

4.7.2.1 Nehru has done much for the elevation of women in domestic and public life. A secularist in religion and a
passionate lover of humanity, Nehru exposes the woman's cause. He, as if by magic, has brought women to the public life in India. Many women have to revolt against their families, parents and husbands to participate in this revolt against British rule. Nehru's sisters are sentenced to many years of imprisonment. They exchange cheerful and optimistic letters even in prison. When Nehru hears that Krishna Nehru, his sister, is losing weight in prison, he writes to her in a humorous manner:

... but Betty has no business to lose weight. What is the good of going to jail if one does not improve in health and weight! Prison is the best of universities if only one knows how to take its courses. (SW IV: 176)

In the same way Nehru is happy beyond measure that his wife Kamala has played an active role in the freedom movement. During the struggle for independence it is she who gives him strength and enables him to "to recharge the exhausted battery of my mind and body" (DI: 41).

4.7.2.2 Nehru becomes highly sentimental whenever he talks about women volunteers who take part in the Civil
Disobedience Movement of 1930. He says:

Women had always been there of course, but there was an avalanche of them, which took not only the British Government but their men folk by surprise. Here were the women of upper, middle classes, leading sheltered lives in their homes; peasant women, poor women, pouring out in their tens of thousands in defiance of Government orders and police lathi. It was not only the display of courage and daring, but what was more surprising was the organisational powers they showed. (D9: 345)

When Nehru is in jail, he learns that his mother has been injured in a lathi charge while heading a procession along the streets of Allahabad. Writing to him about it, his mother put it quite simply: "... I was beaten by sticks - I am proud of it, I take it to be an honour. (Cited in Bond 1976: 75).

4.7.2.3 When Nehru becomes the Prime Minister of India, all services in the political field, including the Foreign Service, are thrown open to women. They are soon occupying positions of authority in schools and colleges, newspapers,
advertising agencies, legislative assemblies and municipal corporations, and in both government offices and private firms.

4.7.3.0 If Chaudhuri is prejudiced against even the working women in India, it is needless to mention his antipathy for the women who are politically inclined. Modern girls are attracted for jobs because it gives them economic independence. But at the same time, it also makes them arrogant and insensitive to all those who depend upon their earning. Sometimes married working women in India dominate their husbands who have virtually lost control over them.

4.7.3.1 According to Chaudhuri, the emergence of the working women is disastrous to the happiness of family life. He clearly states:

I regard the emergence of the working woman, unmarried as well as married, as the greatest threat to the family in every country and society, and as even a greater threat in India and Indian society. (TLNTL: 133).

To him a fruitful family is one which fosters a satisfactory home life that guarantees pleasant and loving relations
among the members, and contributes to the development and permanence of culture in a particular society.

4.7.3.2 Indian women are rather forced to work to earn their livelihood and sometimes their salary helps to save amount until it grows big enough to be an attractive dowry for the highly stationed grooms. Another reason for the girls' attraction for jobs is the economic independence which they enjoy and the consequent love and obligation of the members of her family who depend upon her earning. Chaudhuri says: "In a living society even the relatives of a girl do not feel embarrassed to be under financial obligation to her lover". (TLNTL: 150) The married women are more independent and arrogant than the jobless housewives. Chaudhuri shows how it is a Western imitation:

... the Indian phenomenon is really derivative. Its practical emergence is due substantially to the impact of Western influences, and its apologies is wholly imported. To cut the matter short, as in political ideas, economic organisation, literature and art, or fashion, here too we are faced with a case of imitation, the working woman being only the economic counterpart of the woman in jeans (TLNTL: 146).
Again the kinds of jobs preferred by the modern women are only desk jobs and not the heavy ones like agricultural or industrial ones. This may be one of the reasons why Chaudhuri is against the working women in India.

4.8.0 Deeply religious, Gandhi cannot think of dividing India. He stands for unity and universal brotherhood. Therefore, he does not root out partition but he is unable to prevent it either. As a secularist, Nehru tries his best to normalise relation between Hindus and Muslims, but he, too, has no option but to split India between the Hindu and Muslim communities. Chaudhuri sympathises with Muslims and seems to support the partition. To him, the Muslims are always in danger of being dominated by the Hindu majority, who are prejudiced against them.

4.8.1.0 Though Gandhi spends his time working for the peaceful co-operation between the Hindus and Muslim communities, he is rather forced to succumb to the 'two-nation theory', propounded by Jinnah, the leader of the Moslem League. Gandhi is shocked and reluctantly agrees to partition. Critics point out that Gandhi is not to be blamed for it.

4.8.1.1 After the failure of the Cripps Mission, the Moslem League demands a separate Moslem state, Pakistan,
claiming that as the Moslems are in a minority, they would be oppressed by the Hindu majority in a free India. Jinnah argues that the differences between Hindus and Muslims are not only confined to religion, but cover the whole range of their social, cultural and economic life. He asserts that India is not one nation, that the Muslims of India constitute a separate nation, and are therefore entitled to a separate homeland of their own where they can work out their destiny.

4.8.1.2 Gandhi's first reaction to the two-nation theory and the demand for Pakistan is one of bewilderment, almost of incredulity. As a spiritualist, he always look through the problems in terms of religion. To divide India is to demolish the centuries of work done by Hindus and Muslims. Gandhi's spiritually-inclined soul rebels against the idea that Hinduism and Islam represent antagonistic cultures and doctrines, and that 80 million Muslims have really nothing in common with their Hindu neighbours. He writes in Harijan:

I know no non-violent method of compelling the obedience of eight crores of Muslims to the will of the rest of India, however, powerful a majority the rest may represent. The Muslims must have the
same right of self-determination that the rest of India has. We are at present a joint-family. Any member may claim a division. (CW IV: 432)

4.8.1.3 H.M. Seervai accuses Gandhi of having introduced religion into politics and thus paved way for partition. Rajmohan Gandhi argues:

Gandhi did not bring religion into politics. What he brought was an unusual hold over the masses. That this hold was greatly aided by the religious or spiritual element in his personality is a truth very different from the charge levelled.

(Rajmohan Gandhi 1989: 5)

Even about the Partition of Bengal, Gandhi says:

At the time of Partition, the people of Bengal reasoned with Lord Curzon, but in the pride of power he disregarded all their prayers. He took it for granted that Indians could only prattle, that they could never take any effective steps. He uses insulting language, and in the teeth of all opposition partitioned Bengal. That day may be considered to be the day of the partition of the British Empire. (HS: 25).
Therefore, it is incorrect to say Gandhi is the cause of partition. The only thing is that he is not able to remove it. Rajmohan Gandhi points out: "Neither can the British, for all their sins, be blamed for the Muslim fear or the Hindu treatment, but they too were unable to provide a cure" (Rajmohan Gandhi 1989: 5).

4.8.2.0 Nehru is equally pained by the partition and its aftermath. He is often accused by the critics for having accepted the partition. It should be remembered that Nehru's sole aim at that time is to win the independence of the country. Therefore, he considers no sacrifice too great in accomplishing the task. As he is left with no option, he agrees to divide the country.

4.8.2.1 When Nehru becomes the Prime Minister of India, he has to deal with a multitude of problems that have accumulated over the one and a half centuries of British rule. All these problems have been compounded by the country's partition and its catastrophic consequences. Nehru says:

At the moment of independence, India is partitioned, a living thing is cut into two, with tremendous loss of blood and loss of all manner of things. Everything is cut up, our army, our
postal services, telegraph services, telephone services, irrigation services, all governmental machinery is suddenly cut in two. Now we have a refugee problem of vast dimensions, six million peoples of all classes to be looked after. (SW IV: 369)

4.8.2.2 Many critics point out that Nehru should have hold fast to the non-acceptance of Pakistan and that his relenting only aggravated the split between the Hindu and Muslim communities. The unimaginable massacres and the blood-bath which accompany partition prove this fact. But Nehru cannot be blamed for the situation. He has been working under tension and if independence can be acquired only through partition, he desires it more than no independence at all. Moreover as Martyshin observes:

In his struggle against communal violence and riots, Nehru did not succumb to the sentiment of the mob or that of some of his colleagues in the government who demanded revenge and massacre of the Muslims (Martyshin 1984: 47).

Nehru never consciously belittles the minority Muslims who remain in our country. He tries to concede that their demands and establish amicable relations with them but his
attempts have obviously failed for angry communalistic elements which are still rampant in our society.

4.8.3.0 In the early years of independence, the British favoured Muslims as they were not totally involved in the struggle of independence. Chaudhuri justifies their stand for claiming partition by pointing out that there is no sense of security for them after the Britishers leave India. Though he sympathizes with Pakistan, he warns that Pakistan is a military danger to India. But at the same time, he agrees that if the Muslims choose to remain in India, they would have suffered greatly due to the ruthless behaviour of the Hindus who are the dominating majority in India.

4.8.3.1 According to Chaudhuri, the Muslims are much hampered by the British during the nationalist movement as the former unambiguously detached themselves from the struggle conducted by the Indian National Congress. They refuse to join with the Hindu because they fear they would be submerged with the Hindu mass and lose their Islamic personality. Chaudhuri traces the attitude of the British towards the Hindu-Muslim relationship, comparing them as "two wives of a king."

Many of our folk-tales of whom were based on the theme of two wives of a king, one of whom was good
and neglected and the other wicked and favoured. Our parents and elders used to call the Muslims the favourite wife (CC: 286).

4.8.3.2 The Hindu-Muslim riots begin as the Muslims think they would be saved only as long as the British remain in India. "In simple words, the Muslims of India discovered that by regarding themselves as a non-territorial nation they were now to be without any country for themselves" (CC: 291). Therefore, they hit on the idea of partition. Though at first, the idea is considered as 'ridiculous', the unnatural partition of India becomes a fact. Chaudhuri sums up the reason behind the partition in the following words:

This was made possible by a combination of three factors - Hindu stupidity in the first instance and Hindu cowardice afterwards, British opportunitism, and Muslim fanaticism. (CC: 292).

Chaudhuri sympathizes with "this small and brave country" - (Pakistan) (CC: 292). The implacable hostility of India towards Pakistan is illustrated with the assumptions and unfounded Truths:

India held the pistol at the head of Pakistan, until in 1954, the American alliance delivered the
country from that nightmare. Though it is very
difficult to have reliable information on such
matters, I think I am right in saying that at
least twice, if not three times, between 1947 and
1954, India intended to invade Pakistan and was
deterred only by American and British
remonstrances (CC: 293).

4.8.3.3 However, Chaudhuri foresees that American aid to
Pakistan is a military danger to India. He published two
articles in 1954, one in The Statesman and the other in The
Times. In the first, he argues that the very purpose for
which American aid extends would be destroyed if Pakistan
attacks India with the arms supplied by the United States.
To him, the United States is trying to create a military
strength in Pakistan as a challenge to USSR. In the second
article, he attributes the danger of India "at the alliance
between the United States and Pakistan to the check given by
it to India's policy of keeping the latter country weak and
isolated" (CC: 294). When the article is brought to the
attention of Nehru by an American journalist, Chaudhuri says,
"the result was described to me in vivid American diction,
and I would only disclose that the man got what he deserved
for his indiscretion" (CC: 284).
4.8.3.4 The Muslims who choose to remain in India after the partition are in a worse plight because the Hindu attitude towards the Muslims of India has been, throughout, rather paradoxical. Though the Hindus allow the Muslims to carry on their work peacefully, there is no social intercourse between the members of the two communities. Chaudhuri goes even to the extent to say:

If I were a Muslim I should certainly not have cared to live in India, just as, being a Hindu, I feel I should never have been at home in Pakistan, though I was born and brought up in what is now eastern Pakistan. (CC: 298)

4.9.0 "Are we rivals?" Gandhi wrote in the Harijan of 25 July 1936, and continued "I cannot think of myself as a rival to Jawaharlal Nehru or him to me. Or, if we are rivals, in making love to each other in the pursuit of the common goal" (CW IV: 113). Gandhi and Nehru are divided not only by twenty years of age but by deep intellectual and temperamental differences. The political equation between Gandhi and Nehru is not static, but whatever be their political differences, it is important to remember that "Gandhi's link with Nehru transcends the political nexus" (Nanda 1979: 25). Comparing them Nanda writes:
Despite differences of thought, temperament and style, Gandhi and Nehru stood together for more than a quarter of a century. It was one of the longest, most intriguing and fruitful partnership in the history of nationalism. (Nanda 1979: 1)

whereas, Chaudhuri is highly prejudiced against the Indian politics and is not satisfied with either Gandhi or Nehru as leaders. His bitter criticism of the Indian Politics emanate from his inveterate anglicism and cynicism. However, his wide scholarship, penetrating observation, and consummate mastery over language make his comments an imperishable work.