CHAPTER VIII
AN ESTIMATE OF NEHRU'S ROLE IN
THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT
This study is an endeavour to present the crucial role of Nehru in the national movement and his approach to the political and socio-economic issues that faced the nation during an eventful period. Nehru's role in India's national movement — apart from Gandhi's contribution — was unique and multi-dimensional. He was at the centre of a climatic period in the first fifty years of the twentieth century in India. In the thick and turmoil of every important issue Nehru's was the moving spirit in deciding the great problems of the day. The Nehru era in Indian politics symbolised an age of patriotic urges and aspirations. It involved a complete dedication and faith in the inexorable destiny of the ancient land of India, hallowed by the memory of Buddha and his like. In this chapter an attempt will be made to estimate Nehru's role in the national movement.

Ever since the promulgation of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, negotiations were held between the British government and the Indian political leaders with a view to evolve constitutional arrangements whereby the Indians would get increasing participation in politics and administration. The British policy was one of gradual devolution of power to the Indians. But
the series of major developments leading finally to a transfer of power in 1947, clearly indicated the fact that Indian nationalists were restless and antagonistic to the 'gradualist approach' of the British. The period (1919-1947) was easily the last phase of the British rule and the most glorious chapter in the freedom struggle of India. A number of colourful and forceful personalities like the liberal and moderate Phirozshah Mehta, the sedate and gracious Gopal Krishna Gokhale, the turbulent and fiery Tilak, the deeply religious and non-violent Mahatma Gandhi, the volcanic Subhas Chandra Bose were among the many who gave a definite turn at some stage or the other to Indian politics. It was also during this period that the charismatic Nehru emerged on the Indian political scene.

He entered politics not for personal advancement or to gratify his careerist ambitions, but with the lofty purpose of emancipating his fellow countrymen from the shackles of bondage and servitude. He entered the fray and made it the mission of his life. He regarded the woes of his people as his personal humiliation and he set about the task with earnestness and dedication. His crucial role in the struggle for freedom had a
philosophical justification in the inherent right of his people for justice, equality, fraternity and fair-play.

Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the most important personalities of the twentieth century. This age has been known for many significant changes that have taken place, and Nehru in a large measure symbolised some of these major forces of change. When Jawaharlal was young the third world had not awakened from deep slumber. History was still the privilege of the West. The rest of the world lay in deliberate darkness. His education in the West may be interpreted, in a sense, as a desire to conform with the prevailing norms of the day. Though young, his letters of that period personify his immense interest and faith in the future of India and Asia. His sensitivity, his interest in science and technology and his keen appreciation of international affairs were characteristic features of this period.

He was shy, at times, diffident about public speaking and there was not much to distinguish him from the ordinary run of men. Gradually, with the evolution of his personality, he developed an engaging concern for the lot of the poor and the oppressed in India and
other parts of the world. His intellectual horizon broadened and he began to spread his compass far and wide. He developed into a universal being with an international outlook on the problems of the day. He championed the cause of the underdog and realised that the lot of the colonised countries could only be improved after the colonial power had withdrawn from the scene. He set about to channelise the nationalist aspirations of the people by developing in the people a sense of international community of interests. These were some of the guiding principles which inspired him and gave vitality to Nehru's activities in the years of India's struggle for independence from British rule. He proved to be an intense nationalist and his love of the country and people was rarely surpassed by anybody else's.

Nehru was not an ideological doctrinaire, though he was firmly committed to socialism within a democratic framework. By no means was he a Marxist. He drew as much from the East as from the West. The philosophies of the past and the present influenced him greatly. He came under the spell of the Soviet experiment when he visited the Soviet Union in 1927. He was a socialist, but his socialism was flavoured with humanism, as he had abhorrence of any regimentation. Nehru had the
greatest antipathy to the ruthlessness and violence associated with Marxist revolutions, for a strong current of humanity motivated his thought and action. He was a democrat to the core and was eager to harmonize his faith in civil liberty with the need to alleviate economic and social ills. There was this constant struggle within himself and with the outside world and his efforts to adjust to such apparent contradictions make a study of his life and work highly significant.

Champion of Human Dignity:

Nehru was not an Indian product in the intellectual sense during the early years of his life. Motilal wanted his son to get the best opportunity for development and therefore young Nehru was tutored by European governesses and European tutors. After his exclusive European training in India as a boy, Nehru was sent to England for his education at one of the best public schools, followed by study at Cambridge and the Inner Temple. Jawaharlal did not have traditional Indian education. He was not brought up on the Vedas or the Ramayana and the Mahabharata. But Nehru in
later life became very much an Indian, more than most others. His Indianness stemmed basically from his love of humanity. He regarded human beings as endowed with dignity and self-respect and he condemned any violation of man's dignity and rights. Indian tradition, has in practice given too much importance to the hierarchical order of human beings, though in theory the Upanishads said that all human beings, and even inanimate things had a divine soul in them. The hierarchical position of the individuals depended upon the caste in which they were born. Some of the lower castes were condemned to do lowly duties like that of sweeping or scavenging. Such people could never hope to rise in society and had few chances of building up a sense of self-respect. The theory of Karma and Dharma were successful in keeping the people to the position in which they were born. Nehru's feeling for the self-respect and dignity of man was an essential and integral part of his personality.

He did not like servility and dependence of his fellow countrymen. He believed that human beings had to be self-reliant, facing boldly the challenges in whatever form they came, rather than passive acceptance or conformity
out of fear or weakness of one type or another. Nehru had great compassion for those who suffered violation of their self-respect and dignity, not out of voluntary acceptance but because of their social status or economic position or religious tyranny or the intolerable burden of feudal traditions or age old superstitions. The passive acceptance of this wretched condition by the people led to further perpetuation of discrimination and loss of dignity and self-respect. He saw that even the best of Indians had to bow before the Englishman and face discrimination and differentiation.

Nehru's first contact with the rural masses was through the kisan movement in U.P. Born and bred in luxury, Nehru had no knowledge of their plight and his initial experience of sharing their joys and sorrows and their food opened a new way of life. He found among them innate dignity that could not be suppressed by oppression and discrimination and an enthusiastic response to affection that touched Nehru's heart to its inner-most being. The people in return reposed immense faith and love in him and this could be traced to his Indianness. He became Indian, not so much through training but through his contact with the Indian masses, to whose
wretched condition he reacted with anger and compassion.

The influence of the Gandhian tradition on his life was great and this stimulated him to purposeful action. Nehru found in Gandhi not only a man of action, but as one who practised with passion what he preached with conviction. Nehru saw in Gandhi an Indian who firmly believed in human dignity and who stood up and fought courageously in its defence. Gandhi had demonstrated a striking power of rousing the masses from their long life of submission and subservience. Nehru, with Gandhi, set about the task of harnessing and releasing this submerged energy of the Indian masses. He wanted the Indian to hold his head high in the presence of the Englishman, the untouchable to be treated on equal terms with the caste Hindu, the agricultural labourer not to bend his knees in the presence of the landlord, and the servant to stand erect in the presence of his employer. Nehru, through such constructive ideas and activities, found release for his passionate regard for human dignity and welfare.

Long years in jail were spent by Nehru in meticulous reading and writing. His writings are candid
and thought-provoking. They are marked by a consistency of thought, a sense of historical perspective, an awareness of social reality and a style both powerful and graceful. He reached his highest achievement in his *Autobiography*. It was a remarkable book which told the story of his life and struggle over a period of years. It was also a definitive story of India's nationalist struggle for freedom and as a reflection of the hopes and aspirations of the Indian people, it was unequalled. As a sympathetic study of the nature and character of the men who then shaped and moulded India's destiny, it revealed great insight. A feeling for the pathos and drama of life was matched by a profound insight into the motives and machinations of men. Nehru's autobiography brought out his qualities such as wholesomeness, truthfulness, detachment, fairplay, loyalty, resilience and total dedication to the cause of national freedom. The poignant and heroic story of his life was fused with the story of the nation and its valiant struggle for freedom and liberty. As a nationalist leader, he recognised that his country could not remain aloof from world affairs, nor could world events be without their influence on the nationalist struggle in India. He tried to put the freedom struggle on an
international plane by commanding an international audience. He was the spokesman of the downtrodden masses, of thinking men and women around the globe and his constituency definitely extended far beyond India. In the *Discovery of India* the pageant of the past was painted in bold touches on a broad canvas. Nehru emerged as a perceptive analyst of the trends of Indian history. It was truly a synthesis of the personal with the universal. He tried to discover India but in the process discovered himself.

Nehru's sense of pride and his faith in the dignity of human existence made him rebel against ideas and institutions that tended to degrade and dehumanise man. He felt that such social institutions and ideas must undergo change for it did not bring any credit to the dignity of man to submit to such wrongs. This explained the zeal with which Nehru threw himself into the freedom struggle and the passion with which he fought the forces of ignorance and inertia, communal and caste rigidities, which tended to diminish man by discrimination between one individual as against another. It was in this tradition that Nehru became a champion of the colonial peoples of the world.
Nehru believed that man was his own master and was capable of conquering the forces of nature and mould them to his needs. The culture and traditions of the land attracted him, though he was not religious in the formal sense. His intense dislike for religious fetishes, practices, dogmas and superstitions was understandable as these made man a prisoner and a slave, weakening his will. Man through ceaseless efforts could master and shape his own destiny. He did not approve of a large number of socio-religious practices and institutions and other narrow social groups which to him were hindrances in the fight against colonial rule.

From the depth of his knowledge of Eastern and Western philosophy, Nehru spoke for India, Asia and a new world order. While India was a colony he could speak but could not act as British imperialism strangulated his thought, imprisoned him often and opposed him always. The roots of Nehru's immense role in the freedom movement were to be traced to the grim soil of India's persistent reality. Nehru was appalled by the poverty of India, which, to him, was inconsistent with self-respect and the dignity of man. He wanted to change the social system which tolerated such universal poverty. Along with Gandhi, Nehru dedicated himself to the stupendous task
of the removal of poverty and to create a just society based on egalitarian norms. The wide disparity in wealth and income created a number of socio-economic problems and the removal of this glaring inequality required urgent and serious attention. This was Nehru's basic motivation for his total involvement in the struggle for independence. His mind was made up in the thirties, that the panacea for India's poverty lay in rapid and widespread industrialization based on modern science and technology and since industrialization had to subserve a social purpose, it had to be carried out within the framework of a socialist philosophy. His passion for socialism originated in his desire to wipe out poverty so as to make the socio-economic system subserve the needs of man in an equitable way. Socialism meant to him a society which was just and respected human dignity and self-respect.

Nehru by his personal example set high standards of morality and inspired confidence in the people by his secular and balanced views on the problems of the day. He was English by his training and education, Muslim by culture and Hindu by an accident of birth. Born and bred in such a composite environment his views on the
Nehru believed that the real problem was not communalism but economic issues. Economic problems cut across religious and communal considerations. He thus saw communalism in a proper perspective and did not attach much importance to it. Indeed it was a giant with feet of clay. According to Nehru, a religious approach to politics was harmful. He was against organised religion as it became a vested interest, acting as a reactionary force opposing change and progress. Religion was dogmatic in character and it was 'asocial', in the sense that the religious man paid no head to the sufferings of his fellowmen.

Nehru's lasting contribution through his role in the national movement was the creation of a common Indian patriotism out of the sectional interests as represented by the diversity of race, language, caste and creed. Nehru recognised the reality of a diverse people, professing different faiths and religions like Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, and others. To keep such a country united, it was an essential precondition that no single religion would dominate others. Nehru's secularism did not mean a denial of
religion, but an assertion of equal respect for all
religions and full freedom for the pursuit of ritual
practices as ordained by different religions. He regarded
religion as a personal and private affair, while
politics was a matter for the community. Nehru's
secularism involved a total divorce of religion from
the State. He regarded secularism as the bedrock of
Indian nationhood. He stressed the maintenance of communal
harmony and tolerance and respect for all religions. By
cultivating a rational and scientific attitude, he laid
the foundations of a secular policy, something he strove
to strengthen and consolidate all his life. Nehru
played a major role in building a strengthened, secularized,
modernized, and united democratic movement which acted
as a strong force to counter the canker of communalism
as well as an effective instrument against British rule.

Introduction of Planning:

Nehru's ideas on planning were formulated long
before he got the power and authority to introduce them
in an independent India. His greatest contribution to
economic strategy was in committing the nation to a policy
of planned economic development. He came to this
conclusion in his thinking because of the realisation
that social and economic consolidation had to go hand in hand with political freedom. Political freedom without social and economic freedom would be meaningless.

Thus, at Nehru's prodding the Congress passed a resolution in 1929 which emphasised the necessity for a revolutionary change in the social and economic structure to remove the glaring inequalities of income and wealth. The worldwide depression of the thirties made regulation and control of the economic system in the interest of general welfare a fundamental principle of public policy in many countries. Roosevelt's New Deal and his talk of 'weeding out the over-privileged and effectively lifting up the under-privileged' impressed Nehru and struck a chord in his heart. Pressures were building up in favour of socialism. The Karachi Congress resolution of 1931 on Fundamental Rights inter alia affirmed that the 'state shall own or control key industries and services, mineral resources, railways, waterways, shipping and other means of transport.' Nehru was convinced from the very beginning that the problem of Indian poverty could not be solved except by a massive increase in production and this could be possible only through the application of science to industry and through large scale industrialization.
The National Planning Committee was set up in 1938 with Nehru as the Chairman. Nehru took his work as Chairman seriously and prepared the blueprint for the future which would mirror the hopes and aspirations of a backward enslaved country. He gave priority to large scale industries in planning, but balanced his thesis by incorporating a scheme for cottage and village industries for the promotion of employment. Effective co-ordination was possible only through planning by the State. Nehru's concept of planning was an integrated approach to all-round development. Through planning Nehru hoped to spread industrialization and to develop a self-generating economy. The most important goal was removal of mass poverty. Mere increase in national income or per capita income was not enough, it was more important to ensure a standard of living which provided the amenities of food, shelter and clothing for his people. For effecting this objective, Nehru sought to ensure full employment. Nehru described his participation in the National Planning Committee with enthusiasm: "As we proceeded with this work it grew and grew till it embraced almost every phase of national activity. We appointed 29 sub-committees for various groups of sub-committees — agricultural, industrial, social, economic, financial —
and tried to co-ordinate their activities so as to produce a scheme of planned economy for India. For me this has been fascinating work and I have learnt much from it. It is clear that any scheme that we may produce can be given effect to in a free India. It is also clear that any effective planning must involve a socialisation of the economic structure.\(^1\) He made the people and the Congress plan-conscious. Through planning he sought to give an economic content to freedom. To Nehru political freedom without economic and social freedom was a mere shadow without substance. Nehru had found his moorings. He clearly saw what had to be done in a free India. The doctrine of socialism now ceased to be a subject of barren ideological polemics or a mere bone of academic contention.

The Socialist Ideal:

Nehru's long period of confinement provided him with the time and opportunity to read extensively in Marxist literature. The Communist Manifesto and Das Capital appealed to him with their scientific attitude

---

to history, coupled with the attempt to interpret logically the development of human society. The revolutionary doctrine of Marx had a tinge of the romantic and Nehru was very much impressed by the theory of socialism. Nehru first read Marx in the thirties against the background of the world economic depression and in that context many of Marx's ideas seemed cogent and persuasive. To Nehru, Marxism "is a way of interpreting history and politics and economics and human life and human desires. It is a theory as well as a call to action. It is a philosophy which has something to say about most of the activities of man's life. It is an attempt at reducing human history, past, present and future, to a rigid logical system with something of the instability of fate or kismet about it ... Marx surveyed past history as a socialist and drew certain conclusions from it. He saw from the earliest days man struggling for a living, it was a struggle against nature as well as against brother-man."  

Nehru, without doubt, drew inspiration from the Marxian doctrine, but he adopted it to his own way

of thinking. He was trying to prove that a social, political and economic revolution, built on the utilitarian philosophy of the greatest good of the greatest number, was equally possible without violence or class conflict. He visualised a socialist millennium by democratic means and methods. It was his cherished goal to bring together Marxism and democracy by evolving a synthesis, and called it democratic socialism. The most pervasive quality in Nehru's speculations on socio-economic issues was his sincere attempt to synthesise the egalitarian goals of socialism with his concern for freedom which was implicit in the philosophy of liberalism.

Nehru was a convinced socialist but he was not a communist. His speeches and writings provide incontrovertible evidence on this point. In 1923 he held that "Bolshevism and Fascism are the waves of the West today ... They are really alike and represent different phases of insensate violence and intolerance. The choice for us is between Lenin and Mussolini on the one side, and Gandhi on the other." This initial hostility gave place later

to prolonged flirtation with communism. But even at the height of his attraction for communism, he had serious doubts about some of its methods. He was impressed by the rapid advance made by the Soviet Union but was repelled by the mass violence. The scientific element in the Marxian interpretation lighted many a dark corner of his mind but he was firmly opposed to its dogma. Communist theory appealed to him but its practice distressed him. He wrote in 1938 that he was "a socialist in the sense that I believe in socialist theory and method of approach. I am not a communist because I resist the communist tendency to treat Communism as holy doctrine, and I do not like being told what to think and what to do ... I feel also that there is too much violence associated with the communist method and this produces untoward results as in Russia in recent years. The ends cannot be separated from the means."  

Nehru's radicalism was not merely a collection of fine sounding words and irrelevant phrases nor was his leaning towards socialism largely theoretical that led to

4. A Note by Nehru recorded at Khali in 1938, Nehru Papers, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi.
needless complications without any appreciable advantage to the poor. Nehru reasoned that the only alternative was some form of socialism which involved the state ownership of the means of production and distribution. He stressed the fact that India could not escape this choice if a better order of society based on non-exploitation of man by man was the goal. Nehru was not merely interested in a political movement with a political objective leading to freedom, but he was primarily interested in economic freedom which was to precede political independence. Freedom was essential for the individual to attain his best. But freedom without economic security had little meaning. Liberty was incomplete without equality, social as well as economic. To him, freedom meant the ending of the exploitation of the masses. He was for basic social changes that would result in a social reconstruction based on the elimination of the profit motive.

Nehru always emphasised the removal of grinding poverty of the masses, disguised and regular unemployment of the peasants, workers and the middle class and the progressive deterioration in the condition and status of all classes of people except the few handful who were
privileged and who served British imperial interests. His thinking was dominated by a consideration for economic and social issues. He believed that the poverty, degradation and misery of the people were due not only to exploitation by an alien power, but also to the economic structure of the society which the alien authority supported to the utmost, since such action helped the process of continual exploitation. Nehru was pragmatic and not dogmatic about his socialism. In his scheme there was room for individual freedom and possession of private property on a restricted scale. For him there was no inherent contradiction between socialism and individualism. He never felt it necessary to ignore or sacrifice the individual for the sake of the community. His ideal was a society where the good of each would contribute to the good of all. Nehru wrote in 1934, "whether I function inside or outside the legislature I function as a revolutionary, meaning thereby a person working for fundamental and revolutionary changes, political and social, for I am convinced that no other changes can bring peace or satisfaction to India and the world." 

The fundamental basis of Nehru's socialism lay in his sensitivity to the poverty of the Indian masses, their psychology of servitude and dependence, feudalism, traditionalism and superstition and his firm conviction that none of these ills could be eradicated except through reconstruction of Indian society on socialist basis. He saw in socialism a major weapon that could possibly remove these impediments to progress and he therefore laid emphasis on the socialist pattern from the very beginning of his political career and his long association with the struggle for Indian independence. 6 Rural economy and the peasantry were the base on which Nehru and other great leaders of the Congress operated successfully within the limits of the prevailing objective situation. Any attempt to castigate them from the standpoint of orthodox Marxism would only amount to a fruitless exercise in polemics. It was quite evident that this strand of thought could be traced back to Nehru's deep concern for the rural masses and their problems in the nineteen twenties. 7

Nehru's economic philosophy was a typical Indian amalgam of Marx, Fabian and Gandhi. It was neither orthodox nor Marxist but it had in it an admixture of Gandhian liberal values. He was greatly influenced by Gandhi and his faith in non-violence became very strong after the experience and shock of the violence that attended partition. His socialism had to look to non-violent methods for its implementation. Nehru was anxious to conceive the socialist goal in tune with Indian values and attitudes deeply rooted in the tradition of the country. His socialism was based on his social ideal of human relations dependent upon individual dignity, on his concept of social justice that required equality of opportunities for all individuals, removal of inequalities of income and wealth and prevention of the concentration of economic power.

Nehru's bias towards socialism was unacceptable to a number of influential Congressmen. The consternation among right-wing Congressmen culminated among other things in a competition to identify socialism with things less radical and controversial. But frequently in the thirties Nehru was undeterred by such criticism and opposition and he forged ahead with his ideals. He believed that
the very purpose of his joining the national movement, with its attendant suffering and sacrifice would be defeated if he did not strive wholeheartedly for the economic enfranchisement of the poor and the dispossessed. The other leaders were no obscurantists, but Nehru felt that they lacked his passion and evangelical zeal for the achievement of a new social order based on equality.

Nehru's significant role in the national movement was his formulation of an economic ideology that gave substance to the struggle. A movement can succeed only when it has a strong economic ideology which can attract the support and loyalty of the masses. Nehru had a vision of a reascent Indian society after the attainment of independence, a land in which ills of immemorial poverty, hunger and disease would be eradicated in the shortest possible time. In this vision, Nehru was alone among the Congress leaders. His specific role was to impart a socio-economic content into the meaning of *swaraj*, to give the movement for freedom a materialist and socialist orientation. Time and again in the course of the national movement, Nehru argued that political freedom was the immediate goal, but it was only a prelude to social and economic freedom of the people. In
preparation for such a goal he recognised the need for a radical programme even during the political struggle. In his presidential addresses to the Congress in 1929, 1936, 1937 and 1946, and his voluminous writings and countless speeches throughout the country, this theme was taken up with earnestness and dedication. Despite strong opposition from the conservative elements in the party, he succeeded in getting party approval for the Karachi Resolution on Fundamental Rights in 1931. This was indeed the initial step towards the ultimate goal of a socialistic pattern of society. His predilection for economic and social reform also found a cogent expression in the Congress election manifestos of 1936 and 1946 which were drafted by Nehru and contained the core of his socio-economic ideology. However, such ideas could not be put into practice until independence. Nor were Congress provincial ministries in the late thirties able to initiate large-scale socio-economic reforms, hampered as they were by many constitutional handicaps. But Nehru had planted the seed of socialism, which was to bear fruit only after freedom. Nehru's role in this respect could be considered as a pioneering effort which, because of his weight and influence, had special significance for the Congress party and the people.
Nehru certainly produced and activated a certain psychology in the Indian people and in doing so transformed the mental and social climate of the country. By his fervour Nehru laid the foundations of socialism, concretised its substance in a meaningful way and outlined its future path with clarity and sharpness.

**Internationalism:**

Perhaps Nehru's distinctive role was to prevent the national movement from becoming narrow in its scope and coverage. The national movement could not have succeeded by remaining in splendid isolation, by cutting itself away from the moving currents of world politics. In a world that was highly interdependent where barriers of every type between countries had broken down, national isolation was neither desirable nor possible. Had the movement become egocentric the world aspect of freedom would have been neglected with many undesirable consequences. None of Nehru's colleagues in the Congress showed any talent for such a task, not even Gandhi or Subhas Bose. Gandhi and others were intensely preoccupied with the Indian situation and they did not attach importance to the march of events abroad — until the war in Europe forcefully brought to their attention the happenings on
the world scene and their implications for the struggle in India. Nehru considered every major event in terms of its impact on the national movement. Nehru's nationalism was based on a broad internationalism. His nationalism was equal to his internationalism. He wrote: "my very nationalism is based on an internationalism, and I am very conscious of the fact that the modern world and the swift methods of transport, is based on internationalism. No country or people can isolate themselves from the rest of the world, and if they attempt it, they do so at their peril and the attempt is bound to fail in the end. I do not believe in a narrow autarchy. But the internationalism that I look forward to is not one of common subjection, imposed from above, but a union and a cooperation of free nations for the common good. It is this kind of world order that will bring peace and progress to mankind ... But I want them to develop at the same time the international habit of mind and to develop contacts with other countries and peoples."  

Nehru believed that mere patriotism was not enough; a more enduring ideal like internationalism which was higher,

wider and nobler would embrace entire humanity.
Patriotism for one's country was good; but if it was
carried beyond a reasonable limit it was fraught with
grave dangers, for a people who exhibited narrowness
in thought and action could never achieve greatness
in the real sense of the term. Nehru, therefore,
condemned this unhealthy trend towards isolation and
obscurantism. He had developed love for liberty, not
only for his own people but for all peoples of the world.
He expressed sympathy and support for all liberation
movements in Africa, Asia and South America. He believed
in the freedom of all without distinction of class, creed
or country. To him freedom was indivisible, and the
world could not continue long, part free and part slave.
Above all he was a citizen of the world. His vision of
the future embraced the whole of humanity. According to
Nehru, the future of mankind depended upon man's capacity
to develop his perspective from that of regionalism and
nationalism into a sense of universal responsibility.

Jawaharlal Nehru developed an international
outlook even while he was a student in England. His
education in England during the formative years of his
life left a deep mark on his sensitive mind, trained
as he was on all that was unique and best in English thought and way of life as well as European culture and civilization. Nehru hailed the Russian Revolution as the triumph of the forces of progress and freedom against age-old oppression and autocracy. He described the Russian Revolution as "a tremendous event, unique in world history." During his short visit to the Soviet Union in 1927 Nehru discovered that the study of the conditions of life in that great laboratory of human experiments quite interesting, where autocracy had played havoc for centuries with human individuality and destroyed the soul of man. Nehru drew a number of conclusions from his visit, which in due course were to have an abiding impact on the national struggle in India.

The Conference of Anti-Imperialist Congress of Oppressed Nationalities marked Nehru's baptism in international politics. The imperative necessity for concerted action among oppressed nations inter se against imperialism in their fight for freedom was the dominant theme of Brussels Congress. The conference forcefully

brought the realisation to Nehru that oppression was not only confined to India but that there were other peoples who suffered from such a handicap, even though some of them had independent governments of their own. But the exploitation in the case of colonial peoples was worse. His intense anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism found a focus not merely in a free society but also in racial equality and a socialist order. The Brussels Conference and his visit to the Soviet Union were enduring in their effect on Nehru and they laid the foundations of his subsequent role as an internationalist.

Since 1927 Nehru has put the problems connected with India's freedom in a world perspective. None else, including Gandhi, the anarchists and other patriotic Indians who fought for India's independence in other ways, really conceived of India's freedom from a world perspective. Nehru with remarkable persistence stressed that the freedom from British rule in India was an integral part of the freedom of the world, that Indian colonialism was part of the wider colonialism that was rampant in the world and that the problem of racial discrimination and economic exploitation were but closely interlinked.
with the world-wide phenomenon of racial and other
discriminations. So from the beginning Nehru's
internationalism and socialism were completely mingled
with each other. He was an internationalist as well as
a socialist. There could be no sharp distinction between
the two roles, because both were based on the same
conviction of freedom for the masses in India as well as
the world.

Nehru was alone in drawing attention of the
Indian people to the Spanish Civil War and the fascist
role of Franco. His anti-fascist rhetoric, his strong
condemnation of reactionary and anti-people forces, his
fervent plea for countering feudal and capitalist forces,
his passionate attachment to other freedom movements
and ultimately his relentless campaign seeped into the
minds of the Indian people and widened their horizons.
Anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism, anti-racism and
the genuine concern for the well-being of the masses of
the world — all these formed an important part of the
history of Congress resolutions from 1927 to 1945. All
these resolutions were in a large measure the handiwork
of Nehru and were moved by him in open sessions. He
single-handedly fashioned a Congress 'foreign policy'
through his resolutions and speeches on foreign affairs in the Indian National Congress, either in the A.I.C.C. or in the plenary sessions. Nehru cast himself into the role of a world statesman and a world citizen even before he got the opportunity to carry out his ideas. Gandhi paid tribute to this contribution of Nehru in these simple words: "Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is Indian to the core but, he being also an internationalist, has made us accustomed to looking at everything in the international light, instead of the parochial." 10

To Nehru, more than to any other single individual, the Congress owed its international orientation in the pre-independence period. During the freedom struggle, if Gandhi made India aware of itself, Nehru made India aware of others. Even more important than this was Nehru's role in making the world conscious of India and its struggle for independence. Gandhi had started the struggle for freedom in the early twenties, but it was Nehru who had become a sort of a roving ambassador for India, countering the calculated British propaganda against Indian aspirations and creating sympathy for the

Indian people in Europe and America. His autobiography written with a rare depth of feeling, eloquently expressed the vibrant voice of Indian nationalism and Nehru became a living symbol of a people in revolt. Written in a graceful style, it captivated the reader by the sincerity and courage of the author's convictions. It created a deeper understanding of the national struggle among the intelligentsia in the United States, who in the forties sought to influence the British leaders in favour of a quick transfer of power. And in England it generated a sympathetic response from the enlightened public, who began to doubt the morality and necessity of continued British rule in India. His visits to the continent and through his contacts with leading public figures he could explain to them the basic issues involved in the national struggle in India. In this way also Nehru mobilised public opinion in other countries for the success and strength of the national movement. C.F. Andrews referred to Nehru's monumental role in this regard in a letter written to him in 1935: "You are the only one outstanding person who seems instinctively to know what the West can understand and follow easily. Bapu's Gandhi's writings had to be condensed and explained over and over again, and it
was only ... a genius of the first order such as Romain Rolland who could make him really intelligible."\textsuperscript{11}

Nehru's yet another major role in the national movement was to enlist the support and participation of the younger generation and the Westernised intelligentsia in the cause of the struggle. To these sections of the Indian population Nehru symbolised their hopes and aspirations which found articulate expression in his autobiography and in his numerous public speeches. Nehru was endowed with a modern, scientific and rational mind and could speak and write in an idiom which struck a deep chord in the hearts of the young and the intelligentsia. His plea for rationalism and scientism was more than a mere application of science. He insisted that "the scientific approach accepted as a way of life, as a process of thinking regarding problems, as a method of acting and associating with one's fellowmen. He wants a civilization composed of men who are adventurous and critical in their thinking, who refuse to accept things without testing and trial, who are willing to change their previous conclusions in the face of new

\textsuperscript{11.} Nehru-Andrews Correspondence, Nehru Papers, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi.
evidence, who are engaged in an everlasting search for new knowledge." Nehru's robust optimism, his faith in the destiny of the nation and his role as one who interpreted Gandhian ideals in a language which the young and the educated could understand, created the necessary atmosphere for the enlightened segment of the population to support fully the national movement.

In performing this important role, Nehru made a tangible contribution to the Congress organisation. In the thirties the lure of communism for the youth was great as it appeared to offer a satisfying alternative to the problems of mass poverty, inequality and discrimination arising out of a highly stratified social system. Nehru through his pledge of radical socio-economic reforms which included the devesting of vested interests like the landlords and zamindars appealed to the urban classes and the rural masses as well. He was instrumental in weakening the communist movement and

attracting the radical elements in the society for
the benefit of Indian nationalism.

Nehru provided a link between the Congress
and the All-India States Peoples Conference (A.I.S.P.C.
for short) whose main purpose was to champion the cause
of the people in the princely States. He was not
responsible for the establishment of the All-India
States Peoples Conference; yet he strove hard to
strengthen the bonds between the two organisations.
On the one hand, the Princes vied with one another not
only in affirming their loyalty to the British throne
but also in unreservedly placing the resources of their
States at the disposal of their overlords for suppressing
the aspirations of the people. On the other hand, most
of the rulers of these States turned out to be monsters
of injustice, iniquity, oppression and gross misgovernment.
The A.I.S.P.C. which championed the cause of the State's
people commanded neither the prestige nor the driving
force of the Congress. Nehru realised that the fight
against the British had to be as broad-based as possible
and any policy to secure justice merely for the people
of British India to the exclusion of the people of the
princely States would have meant a betrayal of the very
ideals of the national movement. Time and again Nehru stressed the idea that he was not prepared to secure freedom for British India by sacrificing the interests of the people of the princely States. Quite often he faced strong opposition from Gandhi and the Right Wing in the Congress, who gave priority to the nationalist struggle in British India. Gandhi held the view that the Congress should offer only moral support to the efforts of the A.I.S.P.C. He did not think much of rousing the masses in the princely States against the injustice perpetrated by the Raj. But to Nehru's credit it must be said that he sought to develop and integrate the movements in both areas. He urged active political support and guidance by the Congress to the nationalist aspirations of the A.I.S.P.C.

Nehru was alone among the leading political leaders who conceived of complete independence as early as 1928 at the Calcutta Congress. Through his untiring efforts he made the Congress adopt the goal of complete independence at the Lahore Congress over which he presided with distinction. And throughout the thirties and forties he resisted all efforts to tone down the nationalist demand by the less progressive groups in the organisation.
He was not against adjustments and was even prepared for tactical concessions and retreat, if it helped the final goal of complete freedom from British rule.

Nehru's role in strengthening the Congress organisation has been generally underestimated in the face of the organisational genius of Sardar Patel. But without any hesitation it can be asserted that the infrastructure of the party organisation was built by Nehru during his long tenure as General Secretary in the 1920's. The Congress was converted into a mass organisation with its branches spread over every nook and corner of India. In later years Nehru gave up this part of Congress politics, not because he lacked the abilities to fashion an organisation, but because his mind instinctively rebelled against machine politics. From 1929 onwards, when at the Lahore session of the Congress Nehru came into his own, he was with Gandhi, the party's main spokesman to the Indian masses. The provincial elections of 1937 and 1946 brought into bold relief Nehru's capacity to galvanise the masses for the Congress programme by becoming its prize vote-getter. He was also closely involved in the formulation of the Congress policies and programmes and, along with Gandhi, acted as the principal
draftsman of the resolutions and manifestos, and after 1940 Nehru performed this important function alone.
The Mahatma no doubt was the dominant influence on policies, but Nehru's frequent dialogues influenced the former considerably, which, in large measure, ultimately shaped the programmes of the Congress. Nehru articulated these policy decisions into stirring calls for effective action.

Nehru's role as a moderating influence on the warring factions in the Congress was of no mean order. Frequently he stressed the need for party discipline and unity to put up a solid front against British imperialism. His efforts to bring about an understanding between the pro-changers and the no-changers in the 1920's and his later mediating role at the 'Tripuri Crisis' of the 1930's were clear indications of his preference for discipline and unity in the party. In these endeavours Nehru exhibited a clear grasp of the intricacies of factional politics, though temperamentally he was averse to such ugly manifestations. In these conflicts Nehru took a typical middle-of-the-road approach with a view to harmonize the conflicting interests of the divergent groups.
Another contribution of Nehru to the national movement was the influence he exercised on the common man by his remarkable political, moral and personal integrity. His honesty and dedication to India's cause, the purity of his public life and freedom from the taints of corruption served as inspiring examples for others to emulate and to draw strength to persevere in the struggle for independence. The tremendous personal sacrifices in terms of giving up a life of comfort and luxury for frequent imprisonments created in the mass mind a halo around Nehru's personality. To the Indian mind renunciation and sacrifices were part of the ancient traditions and anyone practising these values was looked upon with awe and reverence. Like all national movements, the Indian national movement was the product of a conglomeration of diverse forces with different motives and impulses. Nehru by the stamp of his magnetic personality shone as a beacon light for others to derive confidence in the goals of national liberation and salvation.

The Nehru-Gandhi dialogue was an unique phenomenon of the national movement. Two dynamic personalities arguing from different standpoints though commonly united
in the goal of national freedom, served as a great educational experience for the people. The frank and public debates between Gandhi and Nehru over the strategy and tactics of the national movement to a considerable extent generated keen participation and involvement in the affairs of the nation by the people. Frequently Nehru and Gandhi differed on such issues as the role of religion in politics, the efficacy of industrialization vis-a-vis small scale cottage and village industries and the relevance of the doctrine of non-violence as a state policy. Gandhi's thinking was deeply anchored to the past and in many ways his was an archaic conception of the ideal future. Nehru's was a modern mind and his vision was international in its ramifications and social in its dimensions.

The Conditions for the Success of the Movement:

Nehru gave a social and economic philosophy to the national movement, thereby providing it substance and intrinsic strength. A movement lacking such specific ideology would certainly degenerate into meaningless anarchy. It was to Nehru's credit that he strove hard to build up a second rung of leadership and to create a broad-based movement for national independence. Party
cadres at all levels were assiduously built up to form the core of a disciplined band of workers. Nehru also provided dynamic leadership by his foresight and clarity of the ultimate goal of complete independence.

The creation of mass consciousness was one of the essential conditions for the success of the movement and Nehru through his writings, utterances and frequent visits to the countryside awakened the masses from immemorial apathy and ignorance. Some contend that the mass movement was the product of evolution. It was a natural growth, determined by historical forces which were beyond the ken of human planning. This argument put forth the view that history was made and nations were shaped by socio-economic and political currents which drove them inexorably into predestined channels. Even outstanding leaders were supposed to be tossed about in the currents and unable to alter the scheme of things. On the other hand, it could be argued that the Indian national movement was the result of conscious, deliberate and organised efforts of dedicated men who possessed qualities of leadership. There was no doubt that Nehru by his leadership succeeded in creating mass consciousness resulting in the mobilization of public
opinion against British authority. In terms of consciousness, there was an organised mass movement by traders, workers, and intelligentsia in the urban areas and the masses in the rural areas through the instrumentality of the Congress. Nehru's role in putting up a national coalition of forces was of immense significance.

The element of time and high motivation were also important factors in the success of the movement. Nehru seized the objective conditions in the society to fashion a mass movement. The temper of the time and the mood of the masses were conducive for mass action against British rule and Nehru utilised the opportunity with the greatest skill and effect. Nehru knew that the element of time was crucial in the success of the national movement and it was not surprising that he differed with senior leaders like Gandhi on the suspension of Civil Disobedience in 1920-21 and in the early thirties and over the launching of the Quit India Movement in 1942. Had Nehru's views prevailed with the Congress organisation on these issues the entire course of modern Indian history might have been different.
Within India Nehru provided a link between the rural masses and the classes in urban areas. Historically there was a wide gap between these two groups and it was Nehru who pooled their resources and energies in a joint united front against alien rule. Nehru made the people in the urban areas conscious of the plight of the poor people in the villages. He redefined the goal of the national movement in terms of the uplift of the masses in the rural areas. At the same time Nehru also harnessed the strength of the labour movement for the national struggle. As President of the All India Trade Union Congress he brought the working class into the fold of the national movement. But for Nehru's efforts labour movement in the urban areas would have inclined towards the extreme left, leading to fruitless violence and terrorism. The success of Nehru's endeavours was evident from the keen participation of the workers in the non-cooperation movements and the Quit India Movement of 1942.

Another of Nehru's great contributions to the national struggle was his attitude to the gospel of non-violence. To him non-violence was not a creed and a way of life as it was with Gandhi. It was only a
policy of national action and could not be treated as a religion or incontrovertible creed. But though Nehru did not believe in it as a creed, he saw the force of its gospel and accepted it in all sincerity during the years of the national struggle. Without Nehru the people would have accepted and followed the advice of the Mahatma on non-violence. However, Nehru provided reinsurance of their loyalty to the doctrine of non-violence. The youth and other radical elements who had come under the influence of international communism would not probably have hesitated to use violent methods to overthrow British rule. Nehru had captivated the mind of the youth and the radicals and through his influence brought them round to the method of non-violent non-cooperation in the fight against colonial rule.

Nehru during the entire course of the national movement struck a harmonious balance between high emotionalism and cool-headed intellectualism. In a period of history characterised by momentous events, individuals become surcharged with emotion. Reason and logic are the decisive criteria for judging issues in normal conditions but these values are likely to be sacrificed at the alter of irrationality under abnormal
circumstances. Gandhi's preoccupation with the 'inner voice' and 'divine guidance' for devising the strategy and tactics of the national movement placed a premium on emotionalism, with its appeal to the heart more than to the head. Nehru's unique role was his emphasis on the need for judging events purely from the standpoint of cool-headed realism and pragmatism. His approach was an effective antidote and a countervailing force to the Mahatma's instinctive and impulsive approach to problems on a number of occasions. Nehru's rational and highly organised mind judged every event in terms of its future consequences. He took a long-range view and assessed the present in terms of future possibilities. Nehru had no objections to a leader acting on 'instinct' in a moment of crisis, but he realised that the leader should have a clear and rational grasp of the situation, as he was expected to give adequate reasons for his political decisions, especially when he wanted others to follow him.

Nehru's Charismatic Role:

At this stage it would be appropriate to explain the implications of charisma and then to assess Nehru's leadership in the national movement in terms of this concept. The concept of charisma was first propounded
by Max Weber, (1864-1920) a German sociologist. In his The Sociology of Religion, he traced the origin of the word 'charisma' to early Christianity where it signified 'gifts of grace.' This term has been frequently used in connection with Weber's discussion of power or authority. He was concerned with the problem of legitimacy in leadership pattern.

Weber distinguished three types of leadership — traditional, legal-rational and charismatic. The first derived its legitimacy from tradition. In this type leadership was based upon established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions, as in hereditary monarchy. The second type derived its authority from the legal order and formal institutions. It was rational because legal-rational authority was both objective and impersonal. Weber linked up legal-rational authority with the growth of bureaucracy. The third category was of a distinct type. Charismatic leadership depended upon certain specific qualities in an individual's personality by which he cast his spell on his followers. Weber defined charisma as a certain quality of an individual personality by which he was set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman and
exceptional powers. Exceptional powers. Charisma of a leader originated from a divine source or rested upon extraordinary heroism, supernatural powers or exemplary character. Obviously, ordinary human beings could not be endowed with such exemplary powers.

In Weber's conception, traditional authority and the legal-rational authority were considered to be stable not susceptible to constant change and flux, but charismatic leadership by its very nature was highly unstable and ephemeral. Charismatic leadership derived its source to emergent situations or to crisis periods in the history of societies. The mass of the people came under the influence of an individual believing that he possessed certain divine powers by which he would pull the people out of distress and anarchy. The charismatic leader built his powerful authority upon mass psychology. He might appeal to the religious beliefs of his followers and sway the public in such a way that he possessed a psychic hold over his followers.

He derived his powers from himself or independently of others and therefore he had the tendency to minimise the role of authority, legally and rationally constituted. By whipping up mass frenzy the leader would persuade his followers to turn away from established rules. The charismatic leader became a law unto himself as there was a retreat from external authority. Dominating others through his person, he very often revolutionised the established order. He was never a reactionary or a conservative, but he was a revolutionary and a prophet who cast away the past and called for a new dispensation.

Weber's typology of authority has been criticised from several angles. It must be conceded that Weber brought out an important aspect of power in analysing the nature of legitimacy. However, the issue of legitimacy and the basis of allegiance are much more complex than were made out by Weber. It has been argued that there was no sanctity of only three types of authority. The possibility of more types of authority was there, and many shades in-between the types conceived by Weber can be visualised. Weber exaggerated the psychological aspect of rule. He over-simplified the whole process and therefore could not provide an adequate explanation...
of the complex phenomenon of leadership.

According to Reinhard Bendix the difficulties in the use of this term arose not only from indiscriminate labelling, but also from the conflicting theories of societies. In this context, the discussion by Edward Shils on charisma threw light on this interesting subject. Shils saw charismatic element in all societies, in underdeveloped as well as developed societies. In formulating his theory Shils took into account Weber's distinction between disruptive or innovative effects of charisma and the continuous and the routine character of tradition or the legal order. Shils held the view that men in all societies were faced with exigencies of life that demanded fundamental and comprehensive solutions. Charisma attached to those individuals or institutions which satisfied this urgent need or promised to do so.

On the other hand, it can be argued that


charisma in the proper sense of the term, was likely to be a reality in those areas of the world in which popular belief in supernatural or extraordinary powers was still universal, as in many parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the context of the conditions in Indian society it had particular relevance. Indian society was tradition-bound, and in traditional societies the hold of religion was of crucial significance. Customs and traditions have an equally dominant position in the lives of these people. Old values and ideals, customs, mores and superstitions have a decisive influence. The society was in a transitional stage. The ancient way of life was gradually changing, so as to be in tune with modernity and all that it implied. But traditional social institutions were resistant to change, and change being the condition of a society invariably caused disequilibrium in the system. This being the nature of society in an underdeveloped country like India the relevance of charisma is obvious.

Tilak and Gandhi both appealed to Hindu tradition. They used the values and ideals of Hindu tradition and made them an intrinsic part of the national movement. These symbols and images associated
with Hindu traditionalism were brought by them into politics. As a contrast, Nehru's appeal was not to Hindu tradition. His appeal was rational and scientific as far as politics was concerned. In the course of the national movement he created the conditions of a mental revolution, which could form the basis for the ultimate transformation of the society. As an example of 'pure' charisma, Nehru's leadership may not fit in with the Weberian typology. But there was no doubt that abundant traces of charisma characterised his leadership in the national struggle. He combined a sense of dedication to the cause of the nation, mingled with an ardent desire to uplift the mass of humanity living in abject poverty. His concern for the peasantry was the result of first-hand observation during the course of his frequent visits to the countryside. He identified himself with the innumerable problems of the masses and through such a process developed a mystic communion with them. The masses in turn came under Nehru's hypnotic influence and adored him with religious veneration. Even the intellectuals were overwhelmed by his charismatic personality. He often spoke to them with rare passion. His speeches were not flashy; his delivery was halting and slow. But the diction and the fibre of his voice
were so alluring that people felt inspired while listening to him. His energy was tremendous and his remarkable mental alertness was matched by a driving force.

The sacrifices made by Nehru and the renunciation of a life of ease and comfort were associated with a virtuous quality in the religious mind of the Indian people. He had suffered the ardours of prison life so that India could be free. To most people he was Gandhi's heir, and given the charismatic and sanitly person of Gandhi, the people were bound to respect his wishes. Nehru was a Brahmin and a Pandit, a learned man and people believed that he was holy in his heart. Above all, in a unique way he represented the hopes and aspirations of the Indian nationalist movement. For the people, Nehru personified the great changes he visualised for India. He linked the past with the present and provided a meaningful bridge between the rural and urban masses. The masses always invigorated him and he found sustenance for his titanic energy from them. The secret of Nehru's appeal to the masses and their love for him was their realisation that he was one of them who shared their joys and sufferings and that
he was their comrade and champion in their struggle for freedom and a better and brighter life. As a man Nehru was marked by extraordinary charm and a great capacity to elicit love from all with whom he came into contact. Few men in politics had ever been so beloved as Jawaharlal Nehru. He was the darling of the Indian people. The love of the Indian people for him was unique and a rare phenomenon. As a charismatic leader Nehru could command the unconditional allegiance of his followers. Hero worship was woven into the very texture and tapestry of Indian life.

In the freedom struggle Nehru combined two extraordinary roles in himself. As a charismatic leader he was an iconoclast and a sculptor. He was an iconoclast because he was opposed to the existing establishment, namely British authority. Most of his revolutionary activities were aimed at removing British rule and authority from India. He was a sculptor in the sense that he wished to rebuild and regenerate the society according to his own conception. In fact, every charismatic leader was animated with an enduring belief that he was endowed with the extraordinary quality to fulfil the divinely ordained duty which Max Weber
labelled as the 'call.' Once Nehru's immediate goal of national freedom was reached, his charisma got routinised, as it was transformed into national leadership or traditional leadership. But, however, charisma being an individual quality with Nehru, it persisted as long as he lived.

Conclusion:

What was Nehru's philosophy of life? The basic fact was that he did not possess a systematic Weltanschauung as he was not a philosopher who would build a logical and rational system of thought. Pragmatism was the hallmark of his thought and actions. He did not cling to ideas dogmatically but viewed their relevance in the context of the social setting. He was flexible on tactics, but rigid and firm on goals. The central core of his thinking was based on his implicit faith in western liberalism which frequently expressed itself in his devotion to the ideals of democracy and individual freedom. Socialism was deeply rooted in his thinking, which provided the basis for his ideas on planning and the emphasis on social and economic equality. It was a revolutionary creed with him and he talked, argued and wrote incessantly of its power. He was a
man of passion and compassion. Intense nationalism was another passion with him and the evidence was overwhelming in terms of his role in the national movement.

Nehru was a highly complex individual. He was divided within himself yet he maintained a sense of poise and balance. It was because of this quality that it becomes difficult to analyse and probe into the complexity of his motivations in any particular policy or action. Consequently, there may be some facets of his personality which remain unexplained. He was elegant, handsome and well-dressed. Good breeding was always part of his make up. His intellectual endowment was excellent, for his knowledge was encyclopaedic, encompassing different branches of learning. His range of interests extended over science, literature and history. For sustained capacity for physical work, and his power to convey in the written word, he was surpassed by few people. His command of the English language was felicitous and exceptional.

Nehru was not a mere political agitator and a schizophrenic who shuttled between his predilection for
democracy and socialism. It was true that on occasions he compromised on important issues in the interests of national unity and with a view to carry with him the vast millions of his countrymen. This led some critics to castigate Nehru for his indecisiveness. Far from it, Nehru's mind was made up on most issues and problems of the day and he tenaciously propagated them to the Indian people. It was also true that he depended upon older and dynamic personalities like Gandhi and Motilal. As has been pointed out elsewhere, the close relationship between Gandhi and Nehru enabled them to work as a team in the fight for freedom. Nehru influenced Gandhi and through him the Congress and the national movement.

Nehru had the temper of a scientist and the mind of an artist. He strove to convert India from a medieval to a modern progressive society and to persuade a tradition bound people to take to technology. He shook the Indian society out of its apathy. He fought a valiant and ceaseless battle against outworn ideas, social inertia and cultural stagnation. He strove steadfastly for the cultivation of the scientific outlook and temper, and the promotion of science and reason in the service of an ampler life. During the
freedom struggle he wrote and preached the Indians to think about their future in rational and scientific terms and not in the traditional. He taught that man was the instrument of his own destiny and not a toy in the hands of fate. His was a many-splendoured life, lived graciously. Nehru's was a many-sided role of a revolutionary and a builder, a nationalist and an internationalist, a democrat and a socialist.

Nehru was a bundle of contradictions in himself, a personality which combined in itself conflicting and divergent forces. Throughout his life he was a fighter, and he never seemed to come to terms with the world as he knew it, for the world was different from how he wished it to be. The 'Chanakya' article (The Modern Review, 1938) revealed a fine sensitive mind inspired by a deep concern for human values and at the same time conscious of its own limitations and inner contradictions. The pull and push of these contradictory forces was evident in his writings and actions. He had immense faith in the destiny of the nation but under pressure of circumstances he expressed doubts; he was a personification of fierce determination and iron will, but yet he gave the impression of indecisiveness when
faced with a difficult choice; he was steadfast on points of principle, but life taught him to make compromises when the occasion arose; his humanism was part of his genuine concern for the downtrodden masses of humanity, but yet he was proud; he was introspective but freely self-revealing; he was lonely yet sociable; he was a democrat to the core of his being and yet an individualist par excellence; he was a man of ceaseless action and energy but contemplative all the same. He was an Indian who became a Westerner, a high-brow aristocrat who became a socialist, an individualist who became a great mass leader.

Nehru was an ardent fighter for freedom and democracy, a historian with an unusual blend of the ancient and the modern, a philosopher anchored to deep loyalties and faiths, a literary figure who wrote with grace and charm, a social architect who worked for a new social order based on equality, and an internationalist who developed a community of interests with other people of the world.

Jawaharlal Nehru's life work was an epic of a man who developed an integrated personality and who
personified all that was noble in his time. His was a story of a well-cultivated man with generous instincts who proved to be a spokesman of nations under colonial and imperial domination. Nehru led the Indian people and truly reflected their will, their passion and their determination to secure freedom. He was the foremost champion of democracy and an unbending opponent of authoritarian imperialism.

The history of India during the first half of the twentieth century was deeply intertwined with the life and activity of Nehru. As a freedom-fighter he was in the vanguard of the struggle. He courted imprisonment many times and spent crucial years of his life in British-Indian jails. From the moment he joined the national movement, he acted as the draftsman of the resolutions passed by the Indian National Congress and its All-India Committee and the Working Committee, as also the most important statements of his policy. This very clearly brought out the immense role he played in shaping the policies of the Congress. In the process, he built an imperishable movement and his name will long figure as one of the foremost fighters for human freedom. Nehru will be remembered and his memory cherished.
for his attainments, for the deep current of humanity in his make up, which made him greater than his deeds and truer than his surroundings. He was in that great galaxy of individuals like Gautama Buddha, Gandhi and others who shaped the destiny of the country. The role of such a man as Nehru in the national movement will never be forgotten as it has become part of the heritage of modern India.