Gandhi and Nehru contributed to the nation-building process in India by endowing the independence struggle not only with a developmental consciousness, but also with a developmental perspective. This perspective was a combination of the in-depth analysis of the economic problem on the one hand and of resolutions for an operational strategy on the other. In this chapter an effort is made to reconstruct the brief outline of the developmental perspective, which would be the guiding principle in the post-independent India as presented by both Gandhi and Nehru and to show the ways in which the perspective of economic development is different in the Gandhian vision as compared to the Nehruvian vision.
Gandhi’s approach to economic development is an integral part of his whole philosophy of life. One may discern certain basic points in that approach. First, Gandhi has always propagated primacy of man in production, distribution and exchange. Consequently to him, machinery for man and not man for machinery would be the cardinal principle in guiding large scale industrial production. He explicitly expressed, “I do visualise electricity, ship-building, iron works, machine-making and the like existing side by side with village handicraft. But the order of dependence will be reversed. Hitherto the industrialization has been so planned as to destroy villages and village crafts. In future it will subserve the villages and their crafts”.

Secondly, since Gandhi believed that “Centralization as a system is inconsistent with a non-violent structure of society”, Gandhi maintained decentralization of production should be a basic tenet of the economy. He wrote, “The end to be sought is human happiness combined with full mental and moral growth. I use the adjective moral as synonymous with spiritual. This end can be achieved under decentralization.” Elsewhere he wrote, “Independence must begin at the bottom. Thus every village will be a republic or Panchayat having full powers. It follows, therefore, that every village has to be self-sustained and capable of managing its affairs even to the extent of defending itself against the whole world. It will be trained and prepared to perish in the attempt to defend itself against any onslaught from without. Thus, ultimately, it is the individual who is the unit. This does not exclude dependence on and willing help from neighbours. It will be free and voluntary play of mutual forces. Such a society is necessarily
highly cultured in which every man and woman knows what he or she wants and, what is more, knows that no one should want anything that others cannot have with equal labour."4

In his eagerness to achieve the goal of decentralization, Gandhi dreamt of an ideal of "an oceanic circle" of self-sufficient villages. Hence he wrote, "In this structure composed of innumerable villages, there will be everwidening, never ascending circles. Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one composed of individuals never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral units."5

Thirdly, Gandhi believed that right means can only help arriving at right goal. Hence, Gandhi's economic ideas are not separate from his ethical views. In Gandhi's own words, "I must confess that I do not draw a sharp or any distinction between economics and ethics. Economics that hurt the moral well-being of an individual or a nation are immoral and therefore sinful."6

In his article, Nirmal Kumar Bose viewed that "Gandhi held very clearly that those who subscribed to the idea of an exploitation free economic order should begin with a reordering of their own lives. Just as new institutions had to be built up, so any institution which came in the way of the practice of the New Life should also be resisted by means of non-violent non-co-operation."7 Consequently to Gandhi, the core of development should come from the individual, who would try to change the wrong socio-economic practices and institutions through the means of
non-violent co-operation and should do away with division between the mental labour and the labour in the society. It is because of their attachment to the violent means that Gandhi detested the communist paths. Gandhi observed, “My opposition to the socialists and others consists in attacking violence as a means of effecting any lasting reform.”

Elsewhere he wrote, “I cannot accept benevolent or any other dictatorship. Neither will the rich vanish nor will the poor be protected. Some rich men will certainly be killed out and some poor men will be spoonfed. As a class, the rich will remain and the poor also in spite of dictatorship labelled benevolent. The real remedy lies in non-violent democracy, otherwise spelt true education of all. The rich should be taught the doctrine of stewardship and the poor that of self-help.”

Fourthly, Gandhi believed that “The State represents violence in a concentrated and organized form. The individual has a soul, but as the state is a soulless machine, it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes very existence.” Consequently Gandhi was of opinion that “If the State suppressed capitalism by violence, it will be caught in the coils of violence itself and fail to develop non-violence at any time.” Hence to do away with the private possession Gandhi relied on “trusteeship” in accordance with which he wanted the zamindars and the privileged classes “to outgrow their greed and sense of possession, and to come down in spite of their wealth to the level of those who earn their bread by labour.” Thus Gandhi was concerned in reforming capital and labour, so that the antagonistic class divisions in the society would end and be replaced by a commonwealth of harmony.
Since whole of Gandhi's developmental perspective is based on the idea of trusteeship, it is appropriate here to elucidate Gandhi's trusteeship formula.

1. Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capitalist order of society into an egalitarian one. It gives no quarter to capitalism, but gives the present owning class a chance of reforming itself. It is based on the faith that human nature is never beyond redemption.

2. It does not recognize any right of private ownership of property except inasmuch as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare.

3. It does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth.

4. Thus under State regulated trusteeship, an individual will not be free to hold or use his wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interest of society.

5. Just as it is proposed to fix a decent minimum living wage, even so a limit should be fixed for the maximum income that would be allowed to any person in society. The difference between such minimum and maximum incomes should be reasonable and equitable and variable from time to time so much so that the tendency would be towards obliteration of the difference.

6. Under Gandhian economic order the character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed."
From the basic points of Gandhian approach to economy it is clear that Gandhi did not believe in the autonomy of economic laws. The alternative as suggested by Gandhi to industrialism and his message of the spinning wheel—in a word his advocacy of a village economy for the making of a new India was consistent with his unified outlook, where ethics was interchangeable with economics.

In the chapter devoted to machinery in *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi alludes to Ramesh Chandra Dutt’s *Economic History of India* with emotion. It was revealed to him by the study of that book that the mill industry of manchester ruined the village economy of India based on handicrafts, and impoverished its people. Consequently, by equating machinery with modern civilization he viewed that modern civilization was bad not because it was modern but because it was responsible for the impoverishment and degradation of human being. His examination of its influence upon Indian life led him to conclude that it was an evil.

In *Young India* Gandhi wrote, "'Are you against all machinery?' My answer is emphatically, 'No'. But, I refuse to be dazzled by the seeming triumph of machinery. I am uncompromising against all destructive machinery. But simple tools and instruments and such machinery as saves individual labour and lightens the burden of the million cottages, I should welcome."

He also wrote: “What I object to, is the craze for machinery, not machinery as such. The craze is for what they call labour-saving machinery. Men go on 'saving labour', till thousands are without work and thrown on open streets to die of starvation. I want to save time and labour, not for a fraction of mankind, but for all; I want the concentration of wealth, not in
the hands of a few, but in the hands of all. Today machinery merely helps a few to ride on the backs of millions."\textsuperscript{15}

He also wrote: "I am personally opposed to great trusts and concentration of industries by means of elaborate machinery."\textsuperscript{16}

Thus, we see Gandhi was more against the industrial system, which gives birth to the concentration of wealth, power and money in a few hands rather than machinery. From the point of view of a realistic economy Gandhi rightly visualised the need for a labour based economy rather than a capital based one in India. Basing on the European examples, the believers in western model argue that there cannot be any escape from industrialization as a general model of development. But showing the differences in conditions of the West and India, Gandhi refuted that argument.

As he wrote: "Why must India become industrialised in the Western sense? The Western civilization is urban. Small countries like England or Italy may afford to urbanize their systems. A big country like America with a very sparse population, perhaps, cannot do otherwise. But one would think that a big country, with a teeming population, with an ancient rural tradition which has hitherto answered its purpose, need not, must not copy the Western model. What is good for one nation situated in one condition is not necessarily good enough for another, differently situated. One man's food is another man's poison. Physical geography of a country has a predominant share in determining its culture. A fur coat may be a necessity for the dweller in the Polar regions, it will smother those living in the Equatorial regions."\textsuperscript{16}
Through his *Constructive Programme*, which Gandhi viewed "may otherwise and more fittingly be called construction of Poorna Swaraj or complete Independence by truthful and non-violent means"; Gandhi wanted "to build up nation from the very bottom upward." In that programme Gandhi emphasised upon "Khadi" and "Other Village industries". There it is observed that to Gandhi, Khadi "means a wholesale swadeshi mentality, a determination to find all the necessaries of life in India and that too through the labour and intellect of the villagers." Gandhi also viewed, "Moreover Khadi mentality means decentralization of the production and distribution of the necessaries of life. Therefore, the formula so far evolved is, every village to produce all its necessaries and a certain percentage in addition for the requirements of the cities." Thus, Gandhi through the small communities of producers wants to bring in the economic and social democracy and the decentralized initiative. Decentralized agro-industrial economy, for him, necessarily involves end of exploitation, reduction of acquisitiveness in economic life to the minimum and making well-being of the community.

The perspective of this economy is distilled from the self-contained and self-sufficient Indian village community of the ancient past and then projected into future with no time bound for its realization. In the process Gandhi endows the perspective with a highly moral content. Economic agents in this society are not maximising satisfaction in isolation from one another by seeking the largest number of goods. Instead each one has realised and incorporated in his conduct that "happiness was largely a mental condition." The distribution rule of such a society is from each according to his bread labour to each according to his primary needs and the rule is not enforced but observed by every one as a Kantian self-imperative of duty.
Regarding the realisation of his ideal Gandhi, wrote, "The ideal will cease to be one if it becomes possible to realise it. The pleasure lies in making the effort not in its fulfilment."22 Asked how can the Indians get back to ideal condition of things, Gandhi replied, "Not easily. It is an express moving at a terrific speed that we are in. We can’t all of a sudden jump out of it. We can’t go back to the ideal state all at a jump. We can look forward to reaching it some day."23 Thus Gandhi had no illusions about the realization of his ideal system, since he was neither in favour of forceful implementation of his ideas nor of an idea of class war. He wrote, "The idea of class war does not appeal to me. In India a class war is not only not inevitable, but it is avoidable if we have understood the message of non-violence."24 He emphasized on three principles to realize his ideal. First, India should be steered along the path of non-material development basing upon truth, non-violence, equality and limitation of wants. Secondly, India needs to build up a decentralized economic order. Thirdly, it must be ensured that each one does bodily labour to earn his living, all other pursuits of the individual—intellectual, aesthetic, scientific, religious etc. being voluntary and non-pecuniary in nature.

The proposals Gandhi made for translating his social idealism into reality constitute an excellent response to the challenges of colonial modernity. Three features distinguish the modern situation. Firstly, it thrives over the technological situation and a rapid growth of scientific knowledge both of which are used to produce more number and kinds of goods. Secondly, it increases the consumerist culture among the men on the basis of their affordability. This directly goes against the idea of the minimization of wants. Thirdly, modern society is developing in a direction of growth in the number of intellectual, technological, scientific and artistic disciplines. These disciplines require for their existence and growth, a "global" as
opposed to "rural" setting. Gandhi believed modernity with all these three features is bound to create impoverishment and sufferings for the people living in India. To what extent his alternative path of development could at all be realized in practical world may be a different question. Nonetheless, it is certain that Gandhi opened up an alternative discourse of development as opposed to the colonial discourse of development.

II

To Nehru, "Long subjection of a people and the denial of freedom bring many evils, and the greatest of these lies in the spiritual sphere—demoralization and sapping of the spirit of the people. It is hard to measure this though it may be obvious. It is easier to trace and measure the economic decay of a nation, and as we look back on British economic policy in India, it seems that the present poverty of the Indian people is the ineluctable consequence of it." India, during the British rule "becomes for the first time a political and economic appendage" of Britain. Until the advent of the British, according to Nehru, the village community in India was the basis of her economy. Those self-sufficient village communities had their village industries to supply the needs of the people. Nehru wrote, "The world market that the new capitalism was building up would have, in any event, affected India's economic system. The self-sufficient village community, with its traditional division of labour, could not have continued in its old form. But the change that took place was not a normal development and it disintegrated the whole economic and structural basis of Indian society."
A system which had social sanctions and controls behind it and was a part of people's cultural heritage was suddenly and forcibly changed and another system, administered from outside the group, was imposed. India did not come into a world market but became a colonial and agricultural appendage of the British structure.  

Thus, as Nehru understands, the village industries were destroyed, the balance between industry and agriculture was upset, and the traditional division of labour broke down. In early days of European contact with India, European merchants carried Indian manufactured goods and textiles etc. to European markets where there was a great demand for them. But the developments in industrial techniques in England led to the emergence of an industrial capitalist class who in their turn demanded a change in commercial policy. In course of time Indian goods were excluded from Britain by legislation, whereas the Indian market was rapidly opened to British manufacturers. By various other methods such as internal duties, which prevented the flow of Indian goods within India, the decay of village industries was gradually brought about.

The sufferings of the Indians due to this decay was unparalleled in history. Nehru quoted from the report of Lord Bentinck in 1834 that "the misery hardly finds a parallel in the history of commerce. The bones of cotton weavers are bleaching the plains of India." The dispossessed industrial population in villages fell upon land, which had no capacity to absorb them profitably. The introduction of landlordism by the British on the other hand changed the whole conception of the ownership of the land. The village community which controlled the land lost that privilege. Instead land became the private property of the landlord. In Nehru's words, "The introduction of this type of property in land was not only a great economic
change, but it went deeper and struck at the whole Indian conception of a co-operative group social structure. A new class, the owners of land appeared; a class created by, and therefore to a large identified with, the British Government.”

Nehru's understanding of this decay of Indian economy reflects a socialist consciousness. As early as in 1928 Nehru propagated that “Even from a narrow point of view it is now recognized that no effective pressure can be brought to bear on the British Government without mass support; but there is fear of the masses and little is done. Mass support cannot come from vague ideals of swaraj. It is essential that we must clearly lay down an economic programme for the masses with socialism as its ideal. We must cultivate a revolutionary outlook. Everything that goes towards creating a revolutionary atmosphere helps; everything that lessens it, hinders. I use the word 'revolutionary' without any necessary connection with violence. Indeed violence may be the very reverse of revolution. Acts of terrorism often have a counter-revolutionary effect and are injurious to the national cause.” So it is clear that for the eradication of the evils in Indian economy, Nehru wanted a mass movement with definite economic programme that would uphold socialist ideal and at the same time wanted to ensure that this movement should create a revolutionary atmosphere without any necessary connection with violence.

Orest Martyshin has shown that there were two old lines of thought in the pre-Marxian socialist thought. One came from Plato, who regarded common ownership as a prerequisite for an ideal organisation and for the comprehensive development of man. The comprehensive development of man was viewed outside any connection with the position of the oppressed and moreover with the continued exploitation of them. As Martyshin views,
here socialism was synonymous with the triumph of science and progress and was viewed in an abstract way away from the social problems of the epoch. The other line of thought came from Thomas More. Thomas More's line of thought was distinguished for its sensitive response to any social injustice and interpreted socialism not only as a rational organisation of society, but also as a method of abolishing social exploitation and inequality. This socialism was the product of the needs of the working people, of the oppressed classes.

Martyshin views that Marxism has given these two strands of socialism a scientific characterisation. "In modern conditions we speak of a class and non-class approach to socialism. In the first case socialism is treated as the ideology of the working class and all working people. The other kind of socialism is a mere symbol of abstract all-human progress. ... All his life Nehru was divided between these two trends, which took precedence over each other at different times."  

One conclusion emphatically, though implicitly, emerged from this analysis. The middle class, which had been the harbinger and leader of modernity in India, had to adjust its political thinking as also its strategy and tactics of anti-imperialist struggle since it understood that it alone could not achieve national freedom and that mere sympathy of the masses was not enough. The masses were the most consistent fighters against the foreign rule and their active participation in the national struggle was essential. To this end, a new philosophy of nationalism with an urge 'for economic betterment, to throw off the burdens that crushed the masses and to end the exploitation of the Indian people' was urgently needed. This was supplied by Nehru. The major premise of Nehru and of the middle class nationalists was to remain intact. In the event of a bout with foreign rule, the technique
and leadership of Gandhi was to be retained. Gandhi upheld a technique that was in harmony with the intellectual background and social prejudices of the middle class. What then was required, was the adoption of a new strategy and new tactics while preparing for the final encounter. The new strategy was to include socio-economic freedom in the programme of the Congress. The new tactics demanded organization of the masses by agitating for their day-to-day problems and by educating them politically.

But it was a difficult task. The National Congress possessed a bourgeois outlook, though representing revolutionary force in the cause of nationalism. Nehru hoped to drive the Congress to a more radical ideology in facing social and economic issues. In December, 1929, in the Lahore Session of the Indian National Congress, he announced, "I must frankly confess that I am a socialist and a republican and am no believer in kings and princes, or in the order which produces the modern kings of industry, who have greater power over lives and fortunes of men than even the kings of old, and whose methods are as predatory as those of the old feudal aristocracy."^32

To go on line with this idea was difficult due to two main reasons. First is that many congressmen were upset with Nehru's socialist propaganda. The obvious consequence was that the congress came forward to pay only lip service to socialism, and, in so doing changed its entire meaning. Secondly, Gandhi's concept of ethical spiritual socialism clashed with Nehru's idea of practical scientific socialism. Gandhi always considered himself 'a true servant of the peasants and of the workers' and believed that 'even a king can be a socialist by becoming a servant of the people'.

Nehru directly contradicted Gandhian ideas regarding the large scale industries. "It is not large-scale industry that brings any injustice and violence
but the misuse of large-scale industry by private capitalists and financiers. It is true that the big machine multiplies the power of man exceedingly both for construction and destruction, both for good or for ill. It is possible, I think, to eliminate the evil use and the violence of the big structure of capitalism. It is essentially private ownership and the acquisitive form of society that encourage a competitive violence. Under a socialist society this evil should go, at the same time leaving us the good which the big machine has brought."³³ In the same letter he wrote, "I am personally a believer in the development of large-scale industries."³⁴ and also that "I can see cottage industries will be essential for India in addition to large scale industries, which should be encouraged in every way. The problem, therefore, becomes one of co-ordination between the two. It is a question of planning by the state. It cannot be successfully tackled under the present anarchic capitalist system satisfactorily."³⁵

Thus we see Nehru was clear in 1939 that planning will be an effective instrument in socialist construction. But how the state power at all can be motivated towards removing the anarchy of the capitalist system in a peaceful manner has not been explicitly discussed uptill forties. In a message to the international edition of *The Textile Journal* on 4 October, 1940 Nehru wrote, "Our immediate problem is to attack the appalling poverty and unemployment of India and to raise the standards of our people. That means vastly greater production which must be allied to juster and more equitable distribution, so that the increased wealth may spread out among the people. That means a rapid growth of industry, scientific agriculture and the social services, all co-ordinated together, under more or less state control, and directed towards the betterment of the people as a whole. The resources of India are vast and if wisely used should yeild rich results in the near future".
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Although the Marxian diagnosis of the ills of modern society made a deep impression on Nehru's socialistic ideas, unlike Marx he believed in the adjustment between the social problems and production relations. In his *An Autobiography* Nehru wrote, "As between fascism and communism my sympathies are entirely with communism. As these pages will show, I am very far from being a communist. My roots are still perhaps partly in the nineteenth century and I have been too much influenced by the humanist liberal tradition to get out of it completely. This bourgeois background follows me about and is naturally a source of irritation to many communists. I dislike dogmatism, and the treatment of Karl Marx's writings or any other books as revealed scripture which cannot be challenged, and the regimentation and heresy hunts which seem to be a feature of modern communism." In the *Discovery of India* he wrote, "Marx's general analysis of social development seems to have been remarkably correct, and yet many developments took place later which did not fit in with his outlook for the immediate future. Lenin successfully adapted the Marxian thesis to some of these subsequent developments, and again since then further remarkable changes have taken place - the rise of fascism and nazism and all that lay behind them. The very rapid growth of technology and the practical application of vast developments in scientific knowledge are now changing the world picture with an amazing rapidity, leading to new problems."

In fact Nehru realised that if democracy did not function on the political plane properly, then there was no way to bring about radical social change except by some kind of pressure. Then what would be the future? What should be the method and technique? In the mid-thirties Nehru tried to evade the question of how to effect the change - by compulsion or conversion, violence or non-violence? But gradually it became almost
imperative to find out the means. Gandhian means were not acceptable. Nehru could not accept Gandhian view that better relations between landlords and tenants could be brought about by a change of hearts on both sides. On the other hand, although Nehru understood the core of the class conflict, he believed that certain doctrines of Marx, by the Marxian interpretation itself cannot belong to eternity and require profound changes. Many a socialist might agree that since inequality is the root cause of poverty, removal of the former would bring about socialism. Nehru wants to fight inequality so far as it breeds poverty, but his greater emphasis is on the latter.

At the same time Nehru detested violence. As he put it in 1958. "Thus, violence cannot possibly lead today to a solution of any major problem because violence has become much too terrible and destructive. ... The basic thing, I believe is that wrong means will not lead to right results and that is no longer merely an ethical doctrine but a practical proposition." Thus, Nehru's firm belief in socialism on the one hand and his commitment to the peaceful democratic means on the other hand, have led him to rely exclusively on the role of state in bringing about the social justice to all people in India particularly in the post-independent phase. He wrote in the Discovery of India, "If we adhered to the democratic state structure and encouraged co-operative enterprises many of the dangers of regimentation and concentration of power might be avoided." At the same time Nehru was firmly convinced of the necessity of industrialization in India both through small and heavy industries as one of the objectives of socialism. He wrote, "I am all for tractors and big machinery and I am convinced that the rapid industrialization of India is essential to relieve the pressure on land, to combat poverty and raise standards of living for defence and a variety of other purposes. But I am equally convinced that the most careful
planning and adjustment are necessary if we are to reap the full benefit of industrialization and avoid many of its dangers. This planning is necessary today in all countries of arrested growth, like China and India which have strong traditions of their own. ° Thus, Nehru was convinced in the final phase of his life that a democratic state with an essential mechanism of planning could combat poverty and raise the standards of the lives of the common people in India.

III

In his article 'Beyond Liberal Democracy: Thinking with Mahatma Gandhi', Thomas Pantham showed that Gandhi's main target of attack is amoral, coercive state, and not any particular class. He views that Gandhi did recognize the reality of class conflicts between capital and labour, and between landlords and landless labourers. Despite Gandhi not only opposed class war approach to social transformation but also regarded the domination by any particular class to be a lesser evil than the violence and oppression of the state. "He believed, in other words, that human liberation from 'the evils of capital' is hampered by the fact that the class conflicts of the capitalist imperialist system have become enmeshed with and transformed by a basic conflict between the individual and the state, which he said, 'represents violence in a concentrated and organized form'. ° Pantham has identified this as the 'post-liberal' or 'post-capitalist' thrust of Gandhi's theory of democracy. However, this thrust can be viewed in a separate framework of an alternative discourse to liberalism.
At the centre of Gandhian thought there is the relation between the individual and society or to use more contemporary terms, the relation between 'action' and 'structure'. All the liberal theorists are constrained by the apparent opposition between perspectives which emphasize structure and perspectives which emphasize action. Gandhi attempted to think through the ways in which actions and structure are interwoven in the ongoing activity of social life. For Gandhi states in general can be defined in accordance with violence and hence for him the fundamental transition is from the state to a stateless society. Gandhi believed that the said transition should not be based upon the class relations and it should stem from certain particular institutional set up like 'Trusteeship' with the objectives of promoting non-violence and removing the hiatus between the rich and the poor.

The ethical basis of this institutional set up has got no relation with the liberal rationale and should not be seen as a consequential, direct as well as indirect development of liberal rationale so as to be identified as 'post-liberal' ideas. Referring to the 'Utopian' socialists like Robert Owen, Saint Simon and Fourier, Prof. Hiren Mukherjee wrote that “Social transformation by moral persuasion which changes the hardest of hearts and by making sure of individual self-reformation guarantees the quality of the transformation, is thus not an exclusively Gandhian contribution to social thought.” Nevertheless, Gandhi's ideas on trusteeship, his emphasis on development and self-reliance through decentralized cottage industries, his emphasis on non-violent ethical means – all of these reflect faith in substantive rationality as against the western formal universal rationality.

In the pursuit of his 'vague-socialist ideal' Nehru had to face the problem of providing social justice without sacrificing individual freedom. For that
purpose Nehru chose the method of persuasion or peaceful democratic means as against the methods of destruction and extermination. In a speech at the AICC session, Indore on 4 January 1957, Nehru told, “Democracy is not merely a question of elections. The questions before us is how to combine democracy with socialism through peaceful and legitimate methods.”

Thus in building up the economic basis of the Indian nation Gandhi and Nehru had the ideological differences. But this ideological diversity between them was tolerated and encouraged by each one of them so that the other may pursue the line of action that he felt convinced about it. Nehru, for all practical purposes, accepted the command of Gandhi as he epitomised the needs and aspirations of the masses. But that does not obliterate the diversity in their discourses.
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