Evaluating any aspect of Nehru's ideas is a daunting task. This is especially so when it is on a controversial topic like secularism. Nehru himself was an enigmatic personality embodying in himself past traditions, present compulsions and future aspirations of the people and the country. His writings reflect the inevitable contradictions of irreconcilable values. Perhaps his scientific temper prompted him to maintain a distance from religions. But his need as a leader of masses, both during freedom struggle and subsequently during democratic elections, brought him closer to religions of different denominations. Perhaps he could not resist the temptation to use religions for political purposes. But he cannot be characterised as non-secular because he maintained equal distance or equal closeness with all religions. It could be that he was trying to explore a new definition of secularism. In this chapter we would attempt to evaluate Nehru's idea of secularism.

Nehru's letters to contemporary leaders and his daughter are quite significant. His four major works The Glimpses of World History, An Autobiography. Discovery of India and Unity of India, present before us the different facets of his secularism. According to Professor C.D.Narasimhaiah: "His Autobiography gives the most moving, can did account of the sorrows, sufferings and heartaches of the most sensitive of our
public men. He explodes and legend concerning himself with admirable candour and analyses, the motive springs of his actions with that rate intellectual integrity which belongs to the truly great".  

Glimpses of world History, outlines three aspects of Nehru's ambivalent personality which depicts him as a historian, writer of great potential and vitality, and a revolutionary fighting vigorously for his nation's freedom. A part of the last letter reads:

"Our age is different one: it is an age of disillusion, of doubt and uncertainty and questioning...sometimes the injustice, the unhandiness, the brutality of the world oppress us and darken our minds, and we see no way out...And yet if we take such a dismal view we have not learnt aright the lesson of life or of history".  

His observations are translation of experiences and their realization into thought. He quotes at the beginning of *Discovery of India*: "When to the sessions of sweet silent thought I summon up remembrance of things past...."  

It was an interpretation of India's past. Narasimhaiah gives an excellent description in the following manner: "He relies on the imagination to work the miracle and imagination seldom lets him down. But he does not beat his wings in the
void; he takes care to see what he says is grounded in fact. He turns to poetry, fiction, painting, tombs, monuments, inscriptions, travel books, learned treatises and contemporary records in order to reconstruct the past. His material is not always second or third-hand as some specialists seem to think, for he goes to primary sources quite often.4

In Unity of India he attempts to highlight the cause of Indian freedom. He tries to lift his motherland into a world perspective and tries "to redeem the sordid present from shame and betrayal".5

A major part of this collection of essays deals with Congress politics and India in foreign affairs, including the period and problems of British imperialism in India. Krishna Menon who edited the Unity of India said: "....his treatment of the problems has given us much that is history, expressed with directness and simplicity, yet with great foresight and imagination".6

A bunch of old letters found in Selected works of Jawaharlal Nehru, I Series and II Series are letters written to Nehru and some written by him. The letters are purely political and some are his philosophical speculation and personal musings interwoven with the urge for social and economic action. These letters contain an epitome of Indian history of the last forty years or more. Some people do misjudge Nehru and describe him as
a man of moods and impulses. These letters reveal that behind and underneath all these outbursts of momentary feelings there was in him a deep and unchanging purpose which had swayed his thought and action since the beginning of his political life. These letters help in explaining that over more than forty years he seemed to yield to stronger personalities and it often seemed that in the end it was his way of thinking and his philosophy of life that prevailed.

Statesmanship has to be essentially pragmatic, intent on attaining practical ends through available means. Nehru achieved great distinction in numerous ways. In the freedom struggle he was a leader next in importance to Mahatma Gandhi. He spent long years in jail during which he wrote his Autobiography, Glimpses of world History and The Discovery of India, which have become world famous and been translated into many Indian and foreign languages. He travelled throughout India and several times addressed mass meetings. His association is with agrarian revolt in Uttar Pradesh, trade union and youth movements. He was a successful chairman of the Allahabad Municipality. Before and after, he become the Prime Minister of India, he was interested in the freedom movements of Asian and African countries.

His ideals were basically human, rational and worldly and he hardly attached any importance to spiritual values. He was impatient and irritataingly contemptuous of religious taboos.
communalism, caste, capitalism and landlordism yet he regained
the goodwill of even those whom he condemned. His passion for
politics seems noteworthy. He was secular to the core of his
heart and mind being aware of the susceptibilities and
sensitivities of others and did not intent hurting them.

Nehru was one who understood the character and content
of the Indian National Movement in a better perspective. From
the beginning he considered the movement as not only political
but also a socio-economic question of the whole society. His
addition of socio-economic content to the concept of 'Swaraj'
provoked many individuals and groups, in the Congress, to
criticise him. Nehru's determination to play a more decisive
role in the freedom movement, had a profound impact on Indian
political thinking.

Nehru was conscious that Indian nationalism, although
based on universal principles of 'pacifism, liberalism and
rationalism', had its own limitations. For example it was based
on non-violence, but lacked certain vital elements. He demanded
the introduction of a secular, rational and scientific,
international outlook as the essential ingredients of Indian
nationalism. He himself was a vocal critic of a religious,
metaphysical and revivalist outlook which was harmful to the
society. He was determined to rule throughout the country which
involved manipulations and a need of a strong central government
which can undermine the positions of opposition parties Nehru was
the leader of the opposition, because he was berating the subordinate leaders for not implementing congress policies effectively. 

Nehru formulated a clear ideology, i.e. commitment to secularism through state-directed planning. Under his Prime Ministership, Nehru explained his concept of secular state to Pradesh congress committees that the secular state must be thought of as a social ideal, the realization of which depends on far more than constitutional provisions. He played the role of the first Prime Minister of independent India for nearly 17 years. People admired him, although criticised, he did not mind during his life time, he wanted criticism to be fair, relevant and expressed with a historical sense and in dignified language.

Nehru's critics have been both foreign and Indian. His foreign critics are few. Michael Brecher has been fair, friendly, and sympathetic. Foreign critics range from the urbane and cynical waiter Crocker, a former Australian High Commissioner, to the polite and ironical British newspaperman Neville Maxwell. Most of the Indian critics were opposed to him in public life. Important among them are C. Rajagopalachari. Acharya Kripalani, Jayaprakash Narayan, M.N.Roy, Dr.Rammanohar Lohia, Morarji Desai, Charan Singh, D.P.Mishara, Sampumanand, Dr.Khare, and Sardar Patel. Nehru's views on secularism has been both appreciated and criticised. These evaluation are shaped and coloured by the critics perception of Nehru's role as the
country's leader and statesman and by his association with other important personalities like Gandhi or Azad.

Keeping in view the Indian conditions, Jawaharlal Nehru has given a novel version of secularism. The Italian philosopher Niccolo Machiavelli for the first time suggested a separation of religion and politics. Secularism became a western concept in order to subjugate religion and escalate politics. The Western perspective on secularism confines to this life only. It lays emphasis on moral and utilitarian principles severed from God. On the other hand Indian views on secularism lays emphasis on mixture of religion and politics or spiritualisation of Politics, since Indian people are extremely religious. Secularism being based on reason lasts as long as scientific temper exists amongst the people.

According to Alija Ali Izetbegovic there is pure reason and practical reason. Usually thought denies God, to whom man and life conform, not only on this earth but also on the next. Because there is a belief among the religious world that only those enter Paradise whom God will irrespective of their good deeds. This explains the difference between the belief of the scientist and science as a method or sum of results what a scientist thinks and believes is not science. Science is only a part of his complete impression of the world, a part that is a result of the critical, comparing, and classifying function of reason. Reason rejects supernatural explanation and retains that
which is based on the chain of natural causes and consequences
and which if possible, can be proved by experiment and
observation. Science is confined to nature and everything else
slips which are the natural limitations of science. Usually
science stops at these limitations but a scientist being a
man, goes on, since every man is an artist to a certain extent.
The difference between scientific research and the use of its
results is that the former understands the world while the latter
conquers it. Hence the scientist does not look at science with
the same eyes as other people. In general, public view science
as a sum of the results of quantitative and mechanical kind. For
the scientist as a doer, it is a search, an experience, an
effort, a desire a sacrifice in a word, life. For him science
is, moreover, the joy of learning, a sublime feeling of the
highest ethical value. In this joy, the scientist surpasses
himself and becomes a thinker, a philosopher, an artist.

Thus the difference arises spontaneously between what
the scientist discovers for himself and what he discovers for the
rest of the world. When science detaches from the scientist and
his life, it "cools" and becomes a sum of knowledge and results
it becomes indifferent and, in its final result, an irreligious
function.

May be not with the scientist but certainly with the
public, through its innate rejection of metaphysics and its
inevitable silence on "ultimate "questions", science contributes
to the formation of atheistic opinions. This contributes to the universal dualism of man's world.\textsuperscript{11}

Nehru firmly believed in 'cultural amalgamation. He himself was an outstanding and shining product of this synthesis. He was steeped in catholic, liberal, tolerant, and cosmopolitan humanism which was characteristic of his family tradition. Being a Brahmin by birth, he did not believe in the caste system, and never observed taboos about eating or drinking with the people of other faiths, or the so-called lower castes. He played in the lap of a Muslim, Minshi-Mubarak Ali, and participated in the Muslim festivals. In his house all festivals of India such as Holi, Diwali, Id and Christmas were celebrated. His elegant dress - the churidars, the achkan and the Gandhi cap symbolised the cultural amalgamation and sartorial synthesis which both Hindus and Muslims wore traditionally.

To him 'unity-in-diversity' was the most outstanding characteristic of Indian historical tradition of tolerance and assimilation. He neither appreciated the Hindu revivalists (who wanted "Hindi-Hindu-Hindustan") nor Muslim chauvinists (who wanted Pakistan). Linguistically he spoke Urdu which was the language his father used and could also speak, read and write Hindi which was the language his mother used. He respected fourteen national languages and also the literature of the four South Indian States.
His heart was open to people of all lands. His friends included people of all religions, agnostics, atheists and of 'no religion. The doors of his mind were open to any one. He was a revolutionary of the spirit, an intellectual, a statesman, a man of vision, a man of action and perfect symbol of an integrated Indian.\(^\text{12}\)

Seven years after he had become Prime Minister he wrote: "I have received so much love and affection from the Indian people that nothing I can do can repay even a small fraction of it; and indeed, there can be no repayment of so precious thing as affection. Many have been admired, some have been revered; but the affection of all classes of the Indian people has come to me in such abundant measure that I have been overwhelmed by it".\(^\text{13}\) He wrote these words when he was at the height of his power, fame and popularity. People of India gave him their affection, their admiration, their loyalty in an abundant measure.

It is sometimes said that "what Nehru thinks today, the country thinks tomorrow", and his response to the complex environment is a cliche of Indian thought. He provided a secular constitution within a humanist culture. Of course he betrayed the expectations of a small minority during his last 10 years as Prime Minister. He was a politician struggling for power through an ideology or a scale of values remaining loyal to his faith even when he comes to control the entire apparatus of political.
social, intellectual and cultural initiative within the community. The tragedy of the liberal mind is that it must create heroes first and be betrayed by them afterwards. Politics for him was a form of self-consciousness, the attempt of every individual to discover for themselves new dimensions and possibilities contributing their share to the creative activity of a whole culture.

Rather than becoming a prisoner, he would prefer breaking an organisation. He lived in a state of perpetual tension - a state adored by the liberal intellectual and the despair was an implication of the 'pale cast of thought'. His nerves and temper were rooted in the violent protest against the oppressive, the irrational, the inefficient, the gross, the vulgar and the humanly degrading in a stagnant society throwing corrupt individuals and institutions. His intension was to lift individuals from peevishness and anger, rather than descending to the level of common man. Instead of enlightening a nation rather than administering a country the Prime Minister had swallowed the thinker. He lost the feel of the dreams and the frustrations of the common people. He was hardly in touch with statistics, files, figures and protocol. There is no doubt that he was a military thinker, creative writer, philosopher, educationist, economist, parliamentarian, politician, historian, but the spirit within him languished and died. As a Prime Minister, he was a more brilliant tactician who knew how to exploit the myths and the illusions of his countrymen: he could create new myths to
replace the patched up decrepit fabric of hopes and fears which carried him to power. Certain myths of Jawaharlal are a part of the fraud called politics. The age of Nehru forgot the problem of integrity in politics, into an organic progressive and socialist society. He was concerned with a revolution in the hearts of men which compels them to attain a novel kind of adjustment within themselves as well as with their environment. Nehru's task was to give this impulse a concrete institutional and intellectual shape, and his basic failure is a fact, because he failed to rise up to this great challenge Nehru has taught us the important lesson of life:

"Every age does not get the saviour it deserves, and in politics we must look only for politicians, not for myths and destinies, humanists and prophets, martyrs and culture-heroes, because politics ultimately means betrayal (even if it is Lenin, Stalin, or Mao) and a politician can only administer, he cannot create. He is not the architect but the scavenger of history".14

In this multi-religious world, tolerance of all religions is inevitable. Nehru acknowledges that the progressive path is only that of Buddha and Gandhi. Being shrewd, he is sure that science seems to be in favour of affluents.

In order to bind the people of various civilizations, religion is based on moral and ethical principle. Machiavellian and Kautilya suggested any means to be adopted by the
state in order to attain a good end. But Nehru, unlike them seems to be a follower of Gandhi, i.e. good means to attain good end. Slight deviation from this path leads to corruption. He is aware of the good and bad aspects which religion nurtures. Religion being engrossed in the invisible world leads to fancies. Imagination, no doubt to some extent moulds individuals life. He found Buddhist monasteries peaceful due to his personal psychological experience. It appears from his religious ideas chat his faith seems to be resting on two religions namely Buddhism and Hinduism. It would be absurd to call Nehru an atheist.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's death on 26 May, 1964 made India lose a nationalist leader, heir of Mahatma Gandhi, one of the architects of independent India and its first Prime Minister. Crowds gathered the man who lectured them, sometimes even bullied them, and had received from people reverence and affection. Flowers were spread over the bier. Sanskrit mantras were chanted by a group of Hindu priests, and the banal English words of Abide with tie, were sung by a number of Christians, the reason being that it had been one of Gandhi's favourite hymns. The procession moved in the great ceremonial way to the cremation ground. When the body was placed on the pyre, the Hindu priests began the magical rites for the dead, holy water from the river Ganges was sprinkled, and some eminent leaders placed pieces of sandal wood on the pyre. The Indian flag being replaced with white scarf and flower petals. His grandson, Sanjay Gandhi, lit the pyre and the
body of Jawaharlal Nehru, socialist, agnostic, prophet of Indian secularism, went up in flames like that of a Hindu king. To many it appeared a display of bizarre incongruities. Nehru's will, which was written ten years before his death was that no religious ceremonies should be associated with his funeral. Muslims willingly took part in a Hindu ceremonial represented not only the special place they occupied in Nehru's political life, but also his antecedents, were strongly influenced by the Muslim rulers of India - the Mughals. The priests collected the ashes from the cremation ground, put into copper urns, sprinkled with water from the Ganges, and taken to Nehru's house. Thousands of people paid them homage when they were placed in the garden and later on taken to his birth place at Allahabad where the river Ganges joins the Jamuna at a spot particularly sacred to Hindus. In his will, Nehru had asked that some of his ashes be thrown into the Ganges which had been read over the radio by his sister. He disclaimed any religious implication. For him, he said, the Ganges was "a symbol of India's age-long culture and civilization, ever changing, ever flowing, and yet even the same. She reminds me of the snow covered peaks and deep valleys of the Himalayas which I have loved so much and of the vast plains below where my life and work have been". Regarding the remainder of the ashed should, he wrote,"be carried up into the air in an aeroplane and scattered from that height over the fields. Where the peasants of India toil, so that they might mingle with the dust and soil of India and become an indistinguishable part of India".16
The crowds lined the tracks when the ashes were brought by train from Delhi to Allahabad. Along with Nehru's there was an urn containing those of his wife, Kamala, which Nehru had kept in his room for the twenty eight years since her death and the urns were placed under a tree where Nehru had spent his childhood. There were flowers and adoration. Soldiers and priests took them to the bank at the sacred spot and ferried out to the confluence of the rivers where they were scattered. A helicopter showered flower-petals mantras chanted, guns boomed out, buglers blew the Last Post, a military band played Abide with Me, all its members being Hindus.

Nehru's funeral proceedings angered many Indians for its superficial absurdity. The weakness of his family in abiding to it all was excused on the grounds of thier grief. The secular intelligentsia opined the flouting of Nehru's own desires as a cynical attempt by the Government to milk emotional feelings they could from the death of Nehru whose place in the hearts of the Hindu masses owed much to traditional values. To foreigners, who had seen in Nehru a leader free from what they believed to be essential bigotry and superstition of Hindu beliefs, a modern man in their western sense who were firm for these opinions. Although being born a Hindu, his whole education was western in form and content. He escaped from Hindu society and religion inorder to become a western style liberal democrat, forward-looking, criticizing the weight of Indian tradition since he attempted to take his country into the twentieth century with
a jet speed rather than with a bullock-cart speed.

Nehru's will, was a decade old with its repeated disclaimers of any religious feeling. Since he had emerged from the Hindu world, there had been change in his attitude towards the Hindu world especially in the last few years of his life. In the governing circles Hindu occultism had had its devotees ever after independence. Advisers to ministers, officials and politicians were astrologers who made a comfortable living. Nehru had mostly ignored the soothsayers entering his palace, yet the occult had penetrated the palace, which was almost Byzantine in character, in the last months after his stroke in January 1964.

Regarding the ceremonies some people complained that they were hardly in the traditional form. The scattering of Nehru's ashes from the air should never have been allowed to happen. The presence of orthodox - and orthodoxy is in some unexpected places in India.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, the Berlin-educated socialist leader, a spokesman and a virulent political enemy of the late Prime Minister said in a public meeting: "whatever Mr. Nehru might have written in his will, whatever he might have said about his attitude towards religion, the fact remains that Mr. Nehru was born a Hindu, he had his (sacred) thread ceremony performed in the Hindu ways, he lived a Hindu, died a Hindu, and was cremated
according to Hindu rites. All his ashes should have been immersed".¹⁹

The responses were significant events in the complex plot of Nehru's life which gives an understanding of India for whose freedom he fought and visited jail and for whose destinies he presided as a Prime Minister for seventeen years after India gained independence from British rule to his death.

Nehru seemed to be over concerned for the minorities especially due to historical circumstances. The personality cult projected Nehru as the political successor of Gandhi, the sole leader of the country and the only protector of the religious minorities. He was rigidly against the separate electorates and strongly in favour of constitutional privileges to minorities so that they felt at home in India. Although he attempted to build up nexus between Hindus and Muslims he himself admitted a failure in solving the communal problem which was based on suspicion and fear. He entrusted the majority to adopt a good attitude towards the minorities because he perceived that majority communalism was much more dangerous than minority communalism. It appears that Nehru was slightly partial towards the minorities in certain aspects.
"Among the disruptive tendencies are some which come under the name communalism - politics under some religious garb, one religious group being incited to hate another religious group....Then there is casteism, perhaps the most insidious and dangerous of all in our country". On this theme Nehru harped all through his political life. He moved closer to religion during the years in which he had sought to identify himself more and more with India. Nehru's hatred of religious-communalism had kept him from formal faith but could not prevent him from creating a personal syncretism which satisfied both his desire for traditional roots in Hinduism and socialism. He had found intellectual rationalization in Vivekananda's Brahminical ideal of selfless service. He had talked often in private conversations about Hindu ideals and ideas from the late 1950s, though his uncompromising dislike of formal religious expression concealed his growing religiosity.

Nehru said, "So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to lose every election in India but to give no quarter to communalism or casteism", which was not true. Time and again he made compromises in the matter of elections. Nehru talked of the Congress leading the country to the goal of castelessness. In the selection of candidates, Nehru often blamed the Muslim League, the Akali Dal, the Hindu Mahasabha as communal parties. Yet Congress was no different, it was arousing the caste-community based-passions - because behind it was present the power of Government patronage.
In a bye-election which were held in summer 1948 in the Ayodhya - Fyzabad constituency of the U.P. legislature, the efficacy of religion as an electoral instrument had been proved. Narendra Deva, capable, reliable and sincere person of the socialist party was one of the candidates. On the other hand congress selected a Sadhu from Deoria district as its candidate which was criticised by M.N. Roy, in his Radical Humanist in the following manner: "A majority of the voters of the constituency live in the twin cities of Ayodhya and Fyzabad, the birthplace of Shri Ramachandra and a famous place of pilgrimage. Their mentality is religious in the orthodox sense.... A religiously minded electorate was asked to choose between a man of the masses and a man of God. They could make no mistake. Insidious propaganda particularly pictorial made it doubly sure.... Towards the end of the campaign, the walls of the city were plastered with huge posters depicting the Congress candidate coming to holy Ayodhya and being reverentially welcomed by Hanuman. Another poster depicted him as sitting beside Shri Rama himself. Naturally, the Congress candidate recommended by the highest conceivable authority won". Nehru who had always kept track of the developments in Uttar Pradesh knew how his party's candidate had won. This experience shows how a secular Nehru could shape things when religion was exploited in elections.

Another blatant instance of religion influencing politics with Nehru's knowledge if not approval was towards the end of his life in the bye-election in the Amroha constituency of
parliament. The independent candidate, J.B. Kripalani gained the support of the combined opposition parties. Noting that Muslims formed 37 percent of the voters, the Congress party put up Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim against Kripalani. In order to carry out the propaganda the Congress organisation brought in Muslim divines from Deoband and Ajmer to incite the religious sentiments of the Muslim voters which turned the campaign into a holy crusade. Similar communal appeals were supported by Kripalani's supporters. The Congress candidate received heavy polls from the Muslim community; the Congress registered an increase of 22 percent over the vote it had polled in the 1962 election; this time all the additional votes for the congress came from the towns in which Muslims were in a majority.

Nehru who swore by secularism selected Muslim candidates for constituencies where Muslims formed the majority electorate. Inspite of a long record of service in the rural areas in 1952 a Hindu Congressman was rejected in favour of a former Muslim League legislator for the Beldanga constituency in West Bengal which had a sizable Muslim electorate. Muslim majority constituencies were assigned to important Muslim congressmen by Nehru. Azad was moved from not so safe Burdwan constituency in West Bengal to safe Rampur constituency in Uttar Pradesh in 1952 and to a much more safer Gurgaon constituency in Punjab in 1957. Thus principle was transformed to prudence because Azad a man of great standing in the congress party, twice its president; and changing his constituency for reasons of
religion was a condemnation of the party's own declared secular ideas. Zakir Hussain criticized these changes. In Nehru's insistence, again, in 1962 the Muslim majority constituency of Basirhat in West Bengal was given to Humayun Kabir: The sequel to this arrangement was interesting. Previously in the Parliament the constituency was represented by a non-Muslim communist member; but when Congress deliberately chose a Muslim candidate, so did the communists.

The Congress all over the country appealed to religious groups, basing its appeal not on the party's social, economic or political programmes but on Nehru's image as the protector of the Minorites, asserting that to safeguard their identity they should vote for Nehru's Congress. In 1957 the Bishop of Kottayam, just before the general elections, appealed to the Christians of Kerala to vote for the Congress. Nehru remained silent, in 1962, when his friend Syed Mahmud called upon the Muslim community throughout the country to vote for Congress candidates. This made a prominent journal write, "To ask any community to vote for this or that political party is quite plain communalism of the kind that has done cruel damage to the country in the past and is hampering national integration today. In fairness to Dr. Mahmud it should be said that he has done what his party has been doing ever since independence. In the first two elections the congress openly claimed that the interests of the Muslims would be safe only in its hands; implicit in the claim was the allegation that the Muslims in this country would have a hard time of it if any other party gained power".24
Nehru's party not only urged the Muslims to vote only for the Congress, in Kerala where the party was weak but also entered into alliance with the Muslim League to capture Muslim votes, promising it a seat in the Cabinet. The countrymen were amazed with Nehru's justification - that the Kerala Muslim League was different from the All India Muslim League. After elections the Kerala Muslim League had lost this virtue, because Nehru suddenly realised that a coalition with a communal party would irreparably damage his secularism. Nehru did not give to the League the promised seat, instead offered it the speaker's office.25 Fighting against communalism Mahatma Gandhi gave his life; his political heir (Nehru) without any hesitation compromised with it for purely political gains. In state politics Nehru did not bother as long as the legislature showed a Congress majority. He was bothered by the party's factions in States like Rajasthan, Bihar, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh etc. and was obliged to intervene in order to preserve the Congress party in the state. Nehru's government received money or 'purses' presented to him, externally shown as coming from rich men who were interested in getting themselves elected though they were corrupt. When one of his old colleagues, Mohan Lal Saxena, pointed out about the corruption, Nehru conceded, "I know the Congress has many bogus members" but promptly came the justification: "other political organisations appear to be much worse in this respect. My knowledge of other countries also has shown me how political organisations deteriorate in this
respect", and he asserted that "the election purse has been collected through the sale of one rupee and five rupee tickets....it does not come from a few rich men... I see no reason why I should not accept such a purse". Nehru decided to milk the best cows in the country the industrialist and due to majority support amended the Companies Act, which meant permission for industrialists to make open donations to 'political parties' primarily the party in power, which every industrialist knew would be returned to power at the next one, two or three elections.

Nehru looked at religion as a rationalist. He knew that the overwhelming majority of his people were religious minded and to them religion was not only an integral part of their lives but very often life itself. Even though he was prepared to respect religion, he hated its rituals. His support of the Hindu Reform Bill shows how religion had degraded the human spirit of numerous people either to a lower status or hardly given them any status. He served his country and his people with all the physical and mental qualities he possessed and like Tagore he believed that service was worship. Although being aware of the slowness of the parliamentary procedure he respected democratic system. As humanist he respected the rule of law which is the base of civilized society, guaranteeing sense of security and pride which results from equality before the law and the law is equally applicable irrespective of the highest or the lowest.
As a nationalist, he saw India sharing a common heritage and tradition, which clearly explains his concern for the minorities. Even after partition he made their rightful place in the country and provided them with freedom to practice what might be an anathema to the majority. Critics point out that he was taking the minorities along with the majority on the path of social reform and of national integration into the national fold pursuing a policy of laissez-faire as far as the minorities were concerned. Everafter Nehru will remain not only as a great Prime Minister, but as a great fighter of freedom and human dignity.28

He was not only the leader of the nation but also of the masses. He was not only a national statesman as well as a citizen of the world—a universal man. In his opinion no conflict should exist between good of one nation and that of the whole world, since both are one and identical. Throughout his life he worked and was guided by this faith. He was not bound by regional, language or religion bias. He mingled with people to whatever part of the world he went feeling the exhilaration of fraternity. He felt enraptured talking and looking at people, in the language of the upanishads, the people were his God.29

A very significant development in modern history is the emergence of India in the mid-twentieth century as a secular state borrowing Fundamental Rights from U.S.A. Directive
principles of State Policy from Ireland, Fundamental Duties from Russia and Parliamentary form of Government from mother of Parliament i.e. Great Britain. His leadership was recognized by eminent observers of the political scene in the world. Chester Bowles writes of Nehru: "one of his greatest achievements is the creation of a secular state in which the 45 million Muslims who chose not to go to Pakistan may live peacefully and worship as they please". 

As any other man he was a product of his generation who rebelled against the imperialist tyranny, steeped in the culture of the East and West. He was angry against injustice which made him become an idol of Indian parliament. To the questions put forth before him, he answered gracefully, effectively, passionately and fearlessly, without concealing any information. It is said that listening to him was an education by itself.

Although, the word secular is not enshrined in the constitution, Nehru emphasised on secularisation because it is permeated with secular spirit. Some of the articles ensure that religion is a private affair of an individual and state remains indifferent in religious matters. Other than Jawaharlal Nehru, members of the Constituent Assembly and other leaders of the Congress like Patel and Tandon and non-Congressmen like Ambedkar, Gopalaswami Ayyangar, Alladi Krishnaswami Aiyyar and H.C. Mukherji contributed in devising the constitution.
He emphasised on the importance and need for a secular state: "We have said repeatedly that we will not tolerate any communalism in this country and that we are building a free, secular state where every citizen has equal liberty and equal opportunity".\textsuperscript{32} He asserted three years later, "The whole purpose of the constitution, as proclaimed in the Directive Principles, is to move towards what I may call a casteless and classless society. It may not have been said precisely in that way; but that is, I take it, its purpose, and anything that perpetuates the present social and economic inequalities is bad".\textsuperscript{33} A year before he died, "India has always been noted for religious tolerance and so it was quite natural for us, when we became independent, to decide to be what is called a secular state".\textsuperscript{34} Although he was in favour of a secular state he made certain grave lapses.

While amending the constitution in order to give special privileges to important communities which could not be brought into the category of 'Scheduled Castes', Nehru conceded that it was "wrong to dub or brand a whole class as backward. If communities as such are 'brought' into the picture, it does go against certain explicit or implicit provisions of the constitution".\textsuperscript{35} He agreed for special privileges to socially and educationally backward rather than 'economically' backward. He did not accept the suggestion that the special provisions be restricted to a certain period, because the communities would create a permanent vested interest. He exempted 'socially and
educationally' advanced castes like Brahmins from special provisions although they were economically backward. The amendment resulted in wedges between various castes. Nehru would address numerous crowds in the following manner: "I lay stress everywhere on the unity of India and on our need to fight communalism and casteism".  

Nehru decided to alter the personal law of the Hindus to be in conformity with modern thought and attitudes. He was deliberately indifferent to Muslims and Christians. He was hardly willing to explore a common civil code for all communities. Sponsoring the Hindu code Bills, he declared: "The Bill which has given rise to so much argument became a symbol of the conflicts between progress and reaction in the social domain...The spirit of the bill...was a spirit of liberation and of freeing our people, more especially our women-flok from the outworn customs and shackles which have bound them." Nehru confined towards Hindu women because they had no divorce rights which women of other communities claimed. President Bourgiba of Tunisia, President Ayub Khan of Pakistan made certain changes in the Muslim personal law in their countries, but Nehru had conceded the claim of the ulemas that the Indian Parliament has no right to legislate on the civil law of the Muslims of this country. Religious sanction and religious basis for the civil law of Indian Muslims was invoked by the Ulemas who deliberately ignored that "the Mohammedan law as practised in India is the shariat as modified by the principles of English law and equity."
in the varying social and cultural conditions of India; and during the centuries it has tended to become a discrete system, somewhat at variance with its original sources. It is a system of law in its nature civil, and, therefore, capable of being amended by a human agency, Parliament of India". Critics point out that Nehru had viewed it from political expediency of collecting votes from Muslim citizens. "We have passed one or two laws recently and we are considering one...in regard to Hindu marriage and divorce...These are personal ingrained in custom, habit and religion...Now we do not dare to touch the Muslims because they are a minority and we do not want the Hindu majority to do it. These are personal laws and so will remain for the Muslims until they want to change them...We do not wish to create the impression that we are forcing any particular thing in regard to Muslims personal laws".

Under Nehru's instigation certain unfortunate conventions could have been discouraged and the healthy ones started, when the country became independent. Ministers in their official capacity, in official cars and accompanied by personal staff attended religious functions. In the tradition of genuine secularism a firm directive could have been issued against this practice. Hardly any convention was passed against the mass media which was under the control of the Government of India, such as All India Radio to clear of denominational prayers. Although he was aware Nehru hardly restricted the radio network
which began its daily programme with Hindu devotional songs and prayers.

Certain suggestions of Nehru did not help the process of secularisation of the country. He went to extremes in his desire to prove his secularism. In one instance, he wrote to K.C. Neogy, Minister for Refugee Rehabilitation, suggesting that Muslim officers should deal with Muslim refugees. Genuinely secular, Neogy consulted Patel who said that this would lead to further demands that Sikh officers should deal with Sikh refugees and Hindu officers with Hindu refugees. One more grotesque faltering of Nehru's secularism occurred during the negotiations leading to Nehru-Liaquat Pact. A demand was made by Liaquat Ali Khan that reservations should be provided for Indian Muslims in various public services and in representative bodies in states as well as at the centre in proportion to their population. It is said that due to Gadgil's opposition the cabinet did not approve this arrangement which resulted in the partition of the country.

Nehru's desire was to assure Indian Muslims that they live as equal citizens with other religious communities, but his electoral pact with the Muslim League in Kerala was a misdirection, which was a complete departure from his declared devotion to secularism, which strengthened communalism in Kerala, Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh.
Nehru was aware of the serious drawbacks of our electoral system. During his first election campaign: "In a country like ours with such large numbers, direct election...is a complicated problem and the candidate may never come into touch with the electorate; and the whole thing becomes distant". In a UNESCO symposium he told that "the voter reacts to sound and din, he reacts to repetition and he produces either a dictator or a dumb politician who is insensible. Such a politician who stands gets elected in the end, because the others have collapsed because of the din". He has given a two-fold solution to this problem: one is to educate the voter and the second is to make "the election direct at the base and indirect from there onwards". In case a candidate lost the confidence he could be recalled which would involve the voter directly in the governance of the country. His suggestion was appeal to caste and religion would have diminished by allotting half the seats by direct elections and half by electing party lists. Persons who could be asset to Parliament could be elected without having to fight an election. Money would have been a less important factor in the composition of Parliament.

CONCLUSION

Nehru's writings depict his eminence in literary activities. His statesmanship won him worldwide fame. Due to his rational outlook he became a renowned politician. As a Prime Minister his leadership was outstanding. Even critics acknowledge him as a secular Leader especially when one views his
attitude towards minorities. As every rose has a thorn attached to it, so did Nehru's secular ideas which had its own strength and weaknesses.

Secularism in the west is complete separation of religion and politics. But in India where religion has its predominant influence on the minds of the people, we find spiritualisation of secularism. As an intellectual, Nehru kept in view this paradigm of secularism and worked for the inculcation of scientific temper among the religious minded people. In general people had their own whims and fancies whereas science confines itself on facts.

The grandeur of Indian home is explained as a Hindu kitchen, Muslim dishes and English table. This sort of multi-dimensional cultural effect was observed in Nehru family. His liberal education made him emerge as a rational person. He adopted Islamic style of dressing. Being a Brahmin and a Buddhist he favoured non-violence which immediately brings to our mind that he was a man of peace. As a nationalist, rationalist and the first Prime Minister of India he played a significant role in India.

Critics point out that as a nationalist he was a secularist, in the beginning stage as a Prime Minister he stuck to his secular principles but later on when his government was encouraging astrology, his secular ideas got merged with religion especially when we observe his desires after his death.
He advocated tolerance of religions because as the world is not based on one common religion so is India. Nehru was aware of this fact and not surprisingly in his funeral people belonging to various nationalities and people of different religions made their presence. Some foreigners criticized his cremation ceremony because it was totally based on Hindu customs and traditions.

Nehru was successful in providing similar rights to the minorities as those of the majorities. Critics point out his partial attitude towards the minorities because he provided them certain special privileges so that they do not feel alienated. In order to win the favour of the majority he made provisions for reservation of certain backward people. All these things rather than erasing differences, further nurtured communalism.

Nehru said that since time immemorial Indian state has been protecting the people of different lands and religions. Nehru was a universal man and he was successful in adopting the best political ideals from the developed countries of the world. A stigma was attached to his name because although he worked for the cultural synthesis which was present to some extent; national integration and unity of India, critics point out that he promoted casteism and could not prevent communalism. His compromises with communal parties deteriorated his secularism.
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