In one of his celebrated articles, Ashis Nandy wrote, "A stress on culture is a repudiation of the post-renaissance European faith that only that dissent is true which is rational, sane, scientific, adult and expert - according to Europe's concepts of rationality, sanity, science, adulthood and expertise." He also wrote there that "Viewed thus, the links between culture, critical consciousness and social change in India became, not a unique experience, but a general response of societies which have been the victims of history and are now trying to rediscover their own visions of a desirable society, less burdened by post-enlightenment hope of 'one world' and by the post-colonial idea of cultural relativism." Nandy's observation shows a clear and conscious recognition of the socio-historical or social-psychological
problems associated with the ideas regarding the future 'progress' of colonial and post-colonial societies in the context of the rise of modern science and rationality in Western Europe, and its intellectual flowering in the eighteenth century enlightenment.

The unfolding of the enlightenment was a series of occurrences like the commercial and industrial revolutions, the growth of representative institutions, the egalitarian ideology, the socialist state and the modern urban culture. Colonialism and the "white man's burden" were themselves integral to this process of modernisation. Modernisation set a series of prerequisites before the colonial societies for being developed and modern nations. The role of politics and leadership lay essentially in admitting these basic transformations in the socio-economic context, receiving their differentiated stimuli and responding to them with a succession of actions and thinking. Divergent responses made by Gandhi and Nehru to the challenges of the industrial society and the Western civilisation should be analysed in this perspective.

As far as the social and cultural planes are concerned, Gandhi's Hind Swaraj should be treated as an attack on the Western civilization. Gandhi viewed. "Civilization is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty. Performance of duty and observance of morality are convertible terms. To observe morality is to attain mastery over our minds and our passions. So doing we know ourselves." Basing on this definition,
Gandhi observed, "The tendency of the Indian Civilisation is to elevate the moral being, that of the Western civilization is to propagate immorality. The latter is Godless, the former is based on a belief in God."  

By 'The tendency of Indian civilization' Gandhi implied the traditions of Indian civilization. Traditions consist of the values and norms of a group that make the cultural configuration of a particular society at a definite period of time. Delving deep into the Gandhian ideas one can observe that the basic values upon which Gandhi put his thrust are truth, non-violence and self-suffering. In fact, for Gandhi truth is the end and non-violence is the means. Gandhi wrote that “the world rests on the bedrock of satya or truth. Asatya meaning untruth, also means non-existent, and satya or truth means ‘that which is’. If untruth does not so much as exist, its victory is out of the question. And truth being ‘that which is’ can never be destroyed."

For Gandhi, politics divorced from religion, has absolutely no meaning. He wrote that “For me, politics bereft of religion are absolute dirt, ever to be shunned. Politics concerns nations and that which concerns the welfare of nations must be one of the concerns of a man who is religiously inclined, in other words, a seeker of God and Truth. For me God and Truth are convertible terms, and if any one told me that God was a God of untruth or a God of torture, I would decline to worship Him. Therefore, in politics also we have to establish the Kingdom of Heaven.”

It has already been observed in Chapter-2 that through out his views on religion Gandhi was more concerned with religious values than with religious beliefs, with the universal moral principles those he believed to be common to all religions, rather than the formal allegiance to received dogmas that becomes a barrier to religious experience. In accordance with this total
spiritual commitment Gandhi rejected the modern dichotomy between religion and politics and blurred the distinction between public and private. secular and sacred by upholding Satyagraha as the right path for achieving his political ideal - 'Rama Rajya'. Thus, his goal of truth, whether in politics or elsewhere, his upholding of non-violence and self-suffering as the right means and his strict adherence to Satyagraha as the sole technique for resolving conflicts - all point to the fact that Gandhi's ideas are deeply rooted in Indian tradition.

In 1927 Gandhi wrote that "My resistance to Western civilization is really a resistance to its indiscriminate and thoughtless imitation based on the assumption that Asiatics are fit only to copy everything that comes from the West." Gandhi identified certain features of this civilization. First, "Its true test lies in the fact that people living in it make bodily welfare the object of life." In comparison to the Western civilization, Gandhi believes that "Our ancestors, therefore set a limit to our indulgences. They saw happiness was largely a mental condition. A man is not necessarily happy because he is rich or unhappy because he is poor. ... They saw that our real happiness and health consisted in a proper use of our hands and feet. They further reasoned that large cities were a snare and a useless encumbrance and that people would not be happy in them, that there would be gangs of thieves and robbers, prostitution and vice flourishing in them and that poor men would be robbed by rich men. They saw that kings and their swords were inferior to the sword of ethics, and they, therefore, held the sovereigns of the earth to be inferior to the Rishis and Fakirs. A nation with a constitution like this is fitter to teach others than to learn from others."

Secondly, "That civilization must lead to the multiplication of wants is as certain as that two and two make four." Consequently Western
civilization reflects the "mad desire to destroy distance and time, to increase animal appetites and go to the ends of the earth in search of their satisfaction."\textsuperscript{11} Since Gandhi made a firm faith in 'Wantlessness', as a desired human virtue, he believed, "Civilization, in the real sense of the term, consist not in the multiplication, but in the deliberate and voluntary reduction of wants."\textsuperscript{12}

Thirdly, modern civilization is devoid of morality and as such devoid of religion. In his \textit{Satyagraha in South Africa}, Gandhi has explicitly observed how 'civilization' (meaning thereby Western civilization) was putting its immoral imprint over the life style of the blacks in South Africa. He wrote, "Civilization is gradually making headway among the Negroes. Pious missionaries deliver to them the message of Christ as they have understood it, open schools for them, and teach them how to read and write. But many who, being illiterate and therefore strangers to civilization, were so far free from many vices, have now become corrupt."\textsuperscript{13}

Thus to Gandhi Western civilization is a 'disease,'\textsuperscript{14} the sole objective of which is to promote bodily happiness. Gandhi believed that in an acquisitive materialistic civilization all political institutions would become merely instruments for the pursuit of power and devoid of thinking what is right and what is wrong. He termed the Parliament of England as "a sterile woman and prostitute."\textsuperscript{15} He wrote, "That Parliament has not yet, of its own accord, done a single good thing. Hence I have compared it to a sterile woman. The natural condition of that Parliament is such that, without outside pressure, it can do nothing. It is like a prostitute because it is under the control of ministers who change from time to time."\textsuperscript{16}
Gandhi wrote to Maganlal Gandhi on April 2, 1910. "It is very difficult to get rid of our fondness for Parliament. It was no doubt barbarous when people tore off the skin, burned persons alive and cut off their ears or nose; but the tyranny of Parliament is much greater than that of Chengiz Khan, Tamerlane and others. ... Modern tyranny is a trap of temptation and therefore does greater mischief. One can withstand the atrocities committed by one individual as such; but it is difficult to cope with the tyranny perpetrated upon a people in the name of people. ... The common man in India at last believes that the Parliament is a hoax." 17

This should not be taken so as to interpret that Gandhi was anti-democratic. He wrote that "There is no human institution but has its dangers. The greater the institution the greater the chances of abuse. Democracy is a great institution and therefore it is liable to be greatly abused. The remedy, therefore is not avoidance of democracy but reduction of possibility of abuse to minimum." 18

Gandhi believed in the Swaraj of the masses. He wrote that "The democracy or the Swaraj of the masses can never come through untruthful and violent means, for the simple reason that the natural corollary to their use would be to remove all opposition through the suppression or extermination of the antagonists. That does make for individual freedom. Individual freedom can have the fullest play only under a regime of unadulterated Ahimsa." 19

Clarifying his notion of democracy, Gandhi wrote, "My notion of democracy is that under it the weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest. That can never happen except through non-violence. No country in the world today shows any but patronizing regard for the weak.
... Western democracy, as it functions today is diluted Nazism or Fascism. At best it is merely a cloak to hide the Nazi and the Fascist tendencies of imperialism. ... India is trying to evolve true democracy, i.e. without violence. Our weapons are those of Satyagraha expressed through Charkha, the village industries, removal of untouchability, communal harmony, prohibition, and non-violent organization of labour as in Ahmedabad. These mean mass effort and mass education. We have big agencies for conducting these activities. They are purely voluntary, and their only sanction is service of the lowliest."

To achieve this true democracy Gandhi emphasised on decentralization. A few days before his death Gandhi wrote that “True democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at the centre. It has to be worked from below by the people of every village.”

Gandhi wanted to evolve a political system suited to the genius of the Indian people. He told Fisher: “I do not think that a free India will function like the other countries of the world. We have our own forms to contribute.” And that form was village Swaraj or Panchayati Raj, which would uphold decentralised democracy from below. However, this concept of decentralised democracy will be discussed later on.

Gandhi thus identified Indian civilization along with its institutions as essentially plural, moral and non-dogmatic. Bhikhu Parekh observed that “Unlike his predecessors, Gandhi insisted that the colonial encounter was not between Indian and European but ancient and modern civilisations. This apparently trivial reformulation gave him advantages denied to them. While their formulation was territorial and neatly divided the world into the East and West or Asian and European, Gandhi’s was temporal and allowed
him to affirm the unity of mankind even within a colonial context." In joining the issue along with Bhikhu Parekh one may observe that the distinction between the Indian civilisation and Western civilisation as made by Gandhi is based on the traditional conception of spirituality which "postulated an irreconcilable conflict between spirit and body." 

Gandhi did not subscribe to the idea of original sin. On the contrary, he believed that man was 'essentially' good, for every human being had a spark of the divine in him and no one was beyond redemption even though the struggle for self-realization was bound to be long and arduous. He, therefore, discussed individual freedom in the context of a predominantly non-violent social order, which could guarantee this self-realization process. Since Western civilisation is oriented towards the achievement of materialistic bodily comforts, all its political institutions as Gandhi views, are bound to be aggrandizing.

But through his personal example of self-discipline and self-development, embodying in his self the predispositions and cultural configurations of India's traditions, Gandhi successfully carried out the thrust of modernity into the otherwise dull and stagnant society. Parekh observed that Gandhi "rejected the science-tradition dichotomy and insisted that all traditions, especially the Indian, were based on science. There was no other way to arrive at valid knowledge than the method of 'rigorous research', 'experience' and experiment and that is what both science and tradition did." 

Gandhi entitled his autobiography as My Experiments with Truth. The idea of experimentation was in itself modern. All through his life Gandhi experimented with himself. He experimented with food, apparel, medicine,
personal hygiene, social customs, language, public sanitation, not to mention his married life. At the same time the symbols he popularised, the technique he adopted, contained rich elements of past tradition. Thus, traditional in his exterior, Gandhi breathed modernity in every sphere of his thought. He reinforced national identity, achieved a rare degree of political penetration among the vast masses of India and brought forth an unusual degree of popular participation. All this was richly indicative of a discourse of modernity although unlike that which has been established in Western civilization.

II

In *The Discovery of India* Nehru wrote about Gandhi, “It is true, I think, that there is a fundamental difference between his outlook on life generally and what might be called the modern outlook.” Nehru believed, “Usually religion becomes a social quest for God or the Absolute, and the religious man is concerned far more with his own salvation than with the good of society. The mystic tries to rid himself of self, and in the process usually becomes obsessed with it. Moral standards have no relation to social needs, but are based on a highly metaphysical doctrine of sin. And organised religion invariably becomes a vested interest and thus inevitably a reactionary force opposing change and progress.” Nehru viewed, “It (religion) seems to me to be the enemy of clear thought, for it is based not only on the acceptance without demur of certain fixed and alterable theories and dogmas, but also on sentiment and emotion and passion.”

In harsher language Nehru attacked a religio-spiritual view of ‘outward’ development and progress. “There can be no doubt that this inner
development powerfully influences the outer environment. But it equally is obvious that the outer environment powerfully influences the inner development. Both act and interact on each other. It is a common place that in the modern industrial West outward development has far outstripped the inner, but it does not follow, as many people in the East appear to imagine, that because we are industrially backward and our external development has been slow, therefore our inner evolution has been greater. That is one of the delusions with which we try to comfort ourselves and try to overcome our feeling of inferiority.”

In his letter to Gandhi dated 11.1.28, Nehru wrote, "You misjudge greatly, I think, the civilization of the West and attach too great an importance to its many failings. You have stated somewhere that India has nothing to learn from the West and she has reached a pinnacle of wisdom in the past. I entirely disagree with this viewpoint and I neither think that the so-called Ram Rajya was very good in the past, nor do I want it back. I think that Western or rather industrial civilization is bound to conquer India, may be with many changes and adaptations, but nonetheless in the main based on industrialism.”

From the above passages it should not be taken for granted that Nehru wanted to imitate all the principles of Western civilization blindly. Although he welcomed whole-heartedly industrial civilization for the transformation of traditional India in an industrial society, he refused to accept the savage penal code and brutal behaviour of the English. In The Discovery of India Nehru distinguished between “The England of Shakespeare and Milton, of noble speech and writing and brave deed, of political revolution and the struggle for freedom, of science and technical progress, or the England of the savage penal code and brutal behaviour of entrenched feudalism and
He further wrote there that "The two Englands live side by side, influencing each other, and cannot be separated; nor could one of them come to India forgetting completely the other. Yet in every major action one plays the leading role, dominating the other, and it was inevitable that the wrong England should play that role in India and should come in contact with and encourage the wrong India in the process."32

Thus in identifying the 'wrong England' he was very specific. His attack against the brutality of England as expressed through her 'savage penal code' reflected his broad humanist approach whereas his aversion towards entrenched feudalism and reaction revealed his acceptance of the phases of historical development of human society as having a definite mission of human progress. He wrote that "The impact of Western culture on India was the impact of dynamic society, of a 'modern' consciousness, on a static society wedded to medieval habits of thought which, however sophisticated and advanced in its own way could not progress because of its inherent limitations. And yet, curiously enough the agents of this historic process were not only wholly unconscious of their mission in India but, as a class, actually represented no such process. They encouraged and consolidated the position of the socially reactionary groups in India, and opposed all those who worked for political and social change."33

Nehru, then believed that although the colonial rulers should have been the harbingers of 'modern' consciousness on a static society wedded to 'medieval habits of thought', in practice they were not only not interested in modernizing Indian society, but also stunted the growth of such consciousness and obstructed the process of social and political change in India in collusion with the feudal reactionary forces. In his attempt to discover India, Nehru admired, and felt proud of its classical past, but was
deeply ashamed of its medieval past. He was also pained by the reality of the colonial rule. As he viewed the social structures of the Indian traditional society were established on certain rigid ideology and unchanging general framework. "The group idea as represented by more or less autonomous castes, the joint family and the communal self-governing life of the village were the main pillars of this system, ..."34 Nehru believed that Indian civilization based upon this traditional social system had lost its dynamism, and become "static, self-absorbed and inclined to narcissism."35

Nehru observed that "The very thing India lacked, the modern West possessed and possessed to excess. It had the dynamic outlook."36 Hence he opined that "India, as well as China, must learn from the West, for the modern West has much to teach, and the spirit of the age is represented by the West."37

But this learning process and the process of continuous adaptation which made India survive as a highly evolved nation was arrested by the British power. In such a society, Nehru observed, "The normal power-relationship of society could not adjust themselves and find an equilibrium, as all power was concentrated in the alien authority, which based itself on force and encouraged groups and classes which had ceased to have any real significance. ... And so India was cluttered up with these emblems of the past and the real changes that were taking place were hidden behind an artificial facade. No true social balances or power-relationships within society could develop or become evident, and unreal problems assumed an undue importance."38

Epistemologically Nehru was certain to rely on the reason and scientific method of observation. He viewed that "There is no visible limit to the
advance of science, if it is given the chance to advance.\textsuperscript{39} Although he realized certain limitations of reason and scientific method, he was in favour of holding on to them with all his strength "for without that firm basis and background we can have no grip on any kind of truth or reality."\textsuperscript{40}

Regarding the ultimate object of knowledge, Nehru believed that human beings can achieve only a partial, value-laden truth. He viewed that the "infinite, eternal and unchanging truth cannot be apprehended in its fullness by the finite mind of man which can only grasp, at most, some small aspect of it limited by time and space, and by the state of development of that mind and the prevailing ideology of that period."\textsuperscript{41} Hence "It is better to understand a part of truth and apply it to our lives, than to understand nothing at all and flounder helplessly in a vain attempt to pierce the mystery of existence."\textsuperscript{42}

This rational approach to the past was revealed through Nehru's efforts in establishing nationalism on the basis of a flexible and adaptable culture. As early as in 1928 he wrote that "The culture of a people must have its roots in the national genius. It must smell of the soil and draw its inspiration from its past history. But it cannot live for ever on the earnings of its forefathers or on an old bank account to which nothing is added. It must be a live and growing thing responsive to new conditions and flexible enough to adapt itself to them. In India the moment we tried to make our culture rigid in order to protect it from foreign incursions, we stopped its natural growth, and slow paralysis crept in and brought it near to death."\textsuperscript{43} To Nehru, the lessons of the past and history are of paramount importance in the development of Indian nation. In a subcontinent like India disruptive tendencies were quite revealing. Communalism, provincialism or 'stateism' as it was called, and casteism—all these factors, Nehru believed, had played
vital role in making India divided and sub-divided thereby making her increasingly weak. Since communalism and casteism had their roots in religion in a very narrow sense, Nehru wanted that "India must therefore lessen her religiosity and turn to science. She must get rid of the exclusiveness in thought and social habit which has become life a prison to her, stunting her spirit and preventing growth".44

In accordance with the spirit of rationality of the West, Nehru viewed that "The spirit of the age is in favour of equality, though practice denies it almost everywhere."45 He wrote that "In India, at any rate, we must aim at equality. That does not and cannot mean that everybody is physically or intellectually or spiritually equal or can be made so. But it does mean equal opportunities for all and no political, economic, or social barrier in the way of any individual or group."46

This basic faith in the equality of men, led Nehru to lay faith in the democratic system of government. But he was a practical democrat with faith in the democratic apparatus as necessary for the management of the state. Nehru observed that "Gandhiji's conception of democracy was a metaphysical one."47 This had hardly anything to do with numbers or majorities or representation in the ordinary sense. Gandhi hoped for the evolution of a true science of democracy, since he rejected outrightly the Western democracy. Gandhi wrote that "True democracy is not inconsistent with a few persons representing the spirit, the hope and the aspirations of those whom they claim to represent."48 Besides as Nehru viewed Gandhi was opposed to "the modern idea of a party which is built up to seize the state power in order to refashion the political and economic structure according to certain preconceived notions."49 To Nehru such Gandhian doctrines appeared highly problematical. Gandhi's theory that a few persons
could represent the spirit, the hope and the aspirations of the people, made Nehru wonder if it was not similar to the authoritarian conception of democracy, where a few "will claim to represent the real needs and desires of the masses, even though the latter may themselves be unaware of them. The mass will become a metaphysical conception with them, and it is this that they claim to represent."\(^{50}\)

Nehru's basic democratic ideals consist of political liberty, equality and progress. These ideals are in no way new, but Nehru pleads for their unrestricted growth. He wanted to have, what he termed, 'the fullest democracy' with universal suffrage, to be followed by education and a good standard of living. Nehru advocated the existence of various parties as an essential element of democracy. He said that "It is good to have various parties because when there are different approaches to a problem, more light is thrown upon it. I do not believe in all people being regimented to think in one way. I want free flow and free exchange of thought and out of that we sometimes find a bit of truth."\(^{51}\)

With all these Nehru wanted to establish Western model of parliamentary democracy. To him parliamentary democracy demanded many virtues; it demanded ability, devotion to work, co-operation, self-discipline and restraint. There were not many countries in the world where it functioned successfully. But he believed that it is only the spirit of democracy in the people which could make it function. Consequently he laid great faith on parliamentary institution. Nehru believed that the democracy of the political process can be considered a fact if it is "ultimately controlled by public discussion and by Parliament elected on the basis of universal adult franchise, and not by the secret purposes of a privileged minority."\(^{52}\)
Thus we see that Nehru imbibed certain basic and essential elements of Western culture and thereby showed a positive response towards Western civilization although he viewed that these elements were not being practised in British India. Nehru himself wrote that “Culture and civilization are difficult to define, and I shall not try to define them. But among the many things that culture includes are certainly restraint over oneself and consideration for others. If a person has not got this self-restraint and has no consideration for others, one can certainly say that he is uncultured.”

This attitude towards democracy reflects tolerance, which laid the foundations of vital legal political institutions, gave federalism a good start and involved opposition parties in the conduct of public affairs. In effect this tolerance is based on rationality rather than on the irrational constraints of tradition. That way Nehru’s humanist, ‘rational’ ideas reflected the post-enlightenment western modernity establishing a liberating break from the traditions.

III

In his famous essay ‘Whither India?’ Nehru wrote that “Our politics must either be of magic or science. ... Personally, I have no faith in or use for ways of magic and religion and I can only consider the question on scientific grounds.” In his approach, as he claimed, there was no room for ‘vague idealistic or religious processes which confuse and befog the mind.’ Gandhi, on the other hand, derived certain conclusions from his basic assumptions - metaphysical and ethical. Gandhi elaborated his concepts of society and politics from a normative or evaluational stand point. It has already been observed that for Gandhi there was no line of demarcation between religion, ethics and politics.
It is questionable whether in fact there was a renaissance in India in the nineteenth century. The idea that the basic identity of Indian society was upheld by the religious community was fostered during the nineteenth century. By such acceptance Indian society moved a long distance away from the presupposition of a renaissance in the Western/Europocentric sense. Romila Thapar, in one of her articles, wrote that "The nineteenth century Indian 'renaissance' broadly accepted the European Orientalists' view of the early Indian past which was derived largely from brahmanical textual sources and which conceded the correctness of the colonial comprehension of our past. Even nationalist historians made little attempt to change the basic paradigm put forward by European Orientalist scholarship, a paradigm conditioned certainly by paucity of evidence but equally by European intellectual preconceptions within a colonial framework. A radical change in the understanding of our past, demands not only the questioning of these preconceptions and this framework but also the need to consider the perspectives of Indian sources other than only the brahmanical. This process will also enable us to place the totality of sources in a more realistic historical context."55

Gandhi differed from this basic paradigm fundamentally. In the 'Introduction' of his Colonialism, Tradition and Reform, Bhikhu Parekh showed that "Gandhi saw no hostility or contradiction between reason and tradition. Reason was not a transcendental or natural faculty, but a socially acquired capacity presupposing and constantly shaped and nurtured by tradition. Tradition was not a mechanical accumulation of precedents but a product of countless conscious and semi-conscious experiments by rational men over several generations. Reason thus lay at the heart of tradition, fully manifest in its abiding values and organising principles and not entirely absent even in its bizzare practices. ... The reformer's task was both to
elucidate the *historical rationale* of unacceptable practices and to expose their *irrationality*. He required both sympathetic understanding and critical spirit, both patience and indignation. This was how Gandhi went about reforming Hindu ways of thought and life.\(^\text{56}\)

The critical dialogue with the Hindu tradition within a colonial context was required by Gandhi to refuse the justification of colonial rule on the basis of white man’s burden establishing thereby the supremacy of the Western civilization. “He had to protect the Hindu tradition from the distortions of the colonial rule and uphold its authority. At the same time he was acutely aware, that it has accumulated a lot of dead weight and that the uncritical and ‘mindless’ traditionalism of the orthodox was both unwise and impractical.”\(^\text{57}\) Parekh has shown that in doing this Gandhi relied on *Yugadharma* which ingnored *Shastras* (Brahmanical scriptures) and basically relied on the “elusive concepts of *sadhanadharma* or *manavadharma* as he suggestively preferred to call it, *sanatanadharma* and the socially and politically oriented concept of *loksangraha*.\(^\text{58}\)

On the background of this understanding, Gandhian response to the Western civilisation and culture should be understood. Gandhi had certain universal criteria of truth viz. non-violence, self-suffering and non-possession which were fundamental in at least two senses. In the first place, they specify the ultimate constraints to which all thoughts are subjected. Thus all societies, with languages expressing beliefs, must apply them in general, since it could be argued that they represented basic adaptive mechanisms for any human society. They are fundamental also in a second sense. That is, where there are second order native beliefs about what counts as ‘true’ or ‘valid’, which are at odds with basic criteria, those beliefs can only be rendered fully intelligible as operating against the
background of such criteria. Thus Gandhi's resistance to what is seen as 'western science' or called as 'western rationality' endows the historical interpretation of his political thinking with socio-cultural significance.

Nehru also, in *The Discovery of India* placed the process of nation-building in the larger context of the Indian heritage. Nation-building in India was facilitated by a common land and a common culture. The sense of unity and integrity was an emotional reality rooted in history even more than in geography. Nehru understood that beneath the shared intellectual life of the educated lay a common popular culture of tradition, myth and legend, which made the unbroken continuity of Indian culture from the days of the Indus valley civilization possible. Despite changing conditions and contexts, this continuity was ensured by the capacity to blend the old and the new.

At the same time, Nehru believed that since the spirit of the age is represented through science, technology and rationality, Indian civilisation should be flexible enough to adapt those elements. In political arena the spirit of the age was represented through individual liberty and parliamentary democracy. Consequently Nehru accepted the model of Western democracy and wanted it to be the most dynamic of the arts of government.

In his *The Discovery of India* Nehru wrote that "It is the scientific approach, the adventurous and yet critical temper of science, the search for truth and new knowledge, the refusal to accept anything without testing and trial, the capacity to change previous conclusions in the face of new evidence, the reliance on observed fact and not on pre-conceived theory, the hard discipline of the mind all this is necessary, not merely for the application of science but for life itself and the solution of its many problems."59
Whole of this approach reflects the discourse of colonial modernity which set the frame for the Nehruvian ideas to flourish. Thus, in respect of their responses to the Western civilisation and culture, divergences between Gandhi and Nehru were prominent. But, while Nehru represented the discourses of colonial modernity, Gandhi wanted to develop an alternative discourse to that of colonial modernity.
Notes and references


2. Ibid., p. 238.


4. Ibid., p. 38.


7. Gandhi, M.K., 08.8. 27, Young India.


9. Ibid., p. 37.


15. Ibid., p. 16.

16. Ibid., p. 66.


18. Gandhi, M.K., 7.5.31., *Harijan*.


20. Gandhi, M.K., 18.5.40., *Harijan*.


24. Ibid., p. 73.

25. Ibid., p. 85.


29. Ibid., p. 378.


32. Ibid., p. 288.

33. Ibid., p. 291.

34. Ibid., p. 506.

35. Ibid., p. 506.
36. Ibid., p. 506.
37. Ibid., p. 507.
38. Ibid., p. 507.
39. Ibid., p. 512.
40. Ibid., p. 512.
41. Ibid., p. 510.
42. Ibid., p. 512.
45. Ibid., p. 521.
46. Ibid., p. 521.
49. Ibid., p. 252.
50. Ibid., p. 253.

51. *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches*: Vol. 3: March 1953- August 1957, 1958, New Delhi, Publications Division, Govt. of India, p. 36.

52. Ibid., p. 405.


57. Ibid., p. 32.
