India's nation-building represents a more complex political history than needs to be analysed here. An important focus from the perspective of this study is the early manifestation of a recurring tension in the Indian political thought between an ideological orientation favouring some type of society-centric harmonious living and a stability oriented etatisme, between a discourse of decentralised autonomous small group grass roots social life and a discourse of state-planned centralised nation-building. The difference between these two discourses revolved round the central concept of power. Consequently the structure and the modalities of power became the nodal points in moulding the ideas of Gandhi and Nehru.
Power reveals itself essentially at three levels of social life. It may be seen at the level of the social arrangements, which lead to the establishment of structures of domination. Power may also be seen at the level of social relations, which are ultimately supported by such structures. Besides power may also be seen in the ability to influence the symbols and meanings by which people experience their lives. Both Gandhi and Nehru looked at nation-building with the conceptualisation of power from all these three dimensions. This chapter attempts to identify and analyse Gandhian and Nehruvian ideas of power in all these three dimensions.

I

The concept of power occupies the most crucial position in Gandhian thought and non-violence is the central issue in that concept. As far as the social relations are concerned Gandhi believed in the non-violent way of life. Gandhi viewed that “Violence does not mean emancipation from fear, but discovering the means of combating the cause of fear. Non-violence on the other hand, has no cause for fear. The votary of non-violence has to cultivate the capacity for sacrifice of the highest type in order to be free from fear. Violence is needed for the protection of things external, non-violence is needed for the protection of the Atma, for the protection of one’s honour.”

Gandhi considers non-violence as truth, both as means and an end, a moral force par excellence. Gandhi believed that anything gained by violence could be protected by violence alone. Hence if a community wanted to protect its possessions by means of non-violence, it had to qualify itself by
getting rid of all that had been acquired by means of violence, i.e. the "ill-gotten gains" as Gandhi described it. Since capitalism, as Gandhi believed, consisted of this category of "ill-gotten gains", he upheld that a nation or a community which had capitalist possessions would have to divest itself voluntarily of such gains.

In fact Gandhi conceived and practised *satyagraha* for his relentless pursuit of truth through love and non-violence. Being confronted with any evil or injustice a *satyagrahi* would resort to non-violent resistance and self-suffering without the slightest ill-will towards the evil-doer. Gandhi wrote that "In the application of *Satyagraha*, I discovered in the earliest stages that pursuit of truth did not admit of violence being inflicted on one's opponent but that he must be weaned from error by patience and sympathy. For, what appears to be truth to the one may appear to be error to another. And patience means self-suffering. So the doctrine came to mean vindication of truth, not by infliction of suffering on the opponent, but on one's self."

To Gandhi, "Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is also the last article of my creed." In *Harijan* Gandhi wrote regarding the essence of non-violence:

"(1) Non-Violence is the law of the human race and is infinitely greater than and superior to brute force.

(2) In the last resort it does not avail to those who do not possess a living faith in the God of Love."
(3) Non-violence affords the fullest protection to one's self-respect and sense of honour, but not always to possession of land or movable property, though its habitual practice does prove a better bulwark than the possession of armed men to defend them. Non-violence in the very nature of things is of no assistance in the defence of ill-gotten gains and immoral acts.

(4) Individuals and nations who would practise non-violence must be prepared to sacrifice (nations to the last man) their all except honour. It is therefore inconsistent with the possession of other people's countries, i.e. modern imperialism which is frankly based on force for its defence.

(5) Non-violence is a power which can be wielded equally by all—children, young men and women or grown up people, provided they have a living faith in the God of Love and have therefore equal love for all mankind. When non-violence is accepted as the law of life it must pervade the whole being and not be applied to isolated acts.

(6) It is a profound error to suppose that whilst the law is good enough for individuals it is not for masses of mankind.

From the above discussion it is clear that Gandhi had a separate discourse on power. He was a believer of the power of "soul force" and not of "brute force". Gandhi believed that it was not possible for "brute force" to be so organised as to ensure that those who seek for it for its own sake or from selfish motives nevertheless use it, to a considerable extent, for the public good. To him, "Ahimsa does not simply mean non-killing. Himsa means causing pain to or killing any life out of anger, or from a selfish
purpose, or with the intention of injuring it. Refraining from so doing is *Ahimsa*."⁵

To Gandhi, violence includes not only physical coercion but also economic and social coercion. Socialism is usually taken to mean a form of society and government under which the state assumes ever-increasing functions regulating the life of the individual in different fields of activity. But Gandhi professed socialism in different sense. He stated, “Possession implies provision for the future. A seeker after Truth, a follower of the law of love cannot hold anything against tomorrow. God never stores for the morrow. He never creates more than what is strictly needed for the moment. If, therefore, we repose faith in this providence, we should rest assured that he will give us everyday our daily bread, meaning everything that we require. ... The rich have a superfluous store of things which they do not need and which are, therefore, neglected and wasted; while millions are starved to death for want of sustenance. If each retained possession only of what he needed, no one would be in want and all would live in contentment.”⁶

Thus Gandhi was never in favour of state coercion in redistributing the wealth of the society. He relied on the individual in dispossessing his superfluous wealth. The method of such dispossession, as professed by Gandhi, was trusteeship. Since power of physical coercion belongs to the state, Gandhi was ever-suspicious about the role of modern state. As Gandhi viewed, “I look upon an increase in the power of the State with the greatest fear, because, although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality which lies at the root of all progress.”
"The state represents violence in a concentrated and organized form. The individual has a soul, but as the State is soulless machine, it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence.

"It is my firm conviction 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.

"What I would personally prefer, would be, not a centralization of power in the hands of the State but an extension of the sense of trusteeship; as in my opinion, the violence of private ownership is less injurious than the violence of the state. However, if it is unavoidable, I would support a minimum of state ownership.

"What I disapprove of is an organization based on force which a state is. Voluntary organization there must be."7

This attitude to the state stands counterposed to the Hegelian metaphysical theory which endeavours to exhibit the state as the embodiment of greatness and glory and an expression of spirit or the absolute. Gandhi always favoured decentralised social arrangements so that a centralised structure of power does not arise and also emphasised on the voluntary social relations. He believed that "A votary of Ahimsa cannot subscribe to the utilitarian formula (of the greatest good of the greatest number). He will strive for the greatest good of all and die in the attempt to realize the idea."8 And this approach led Gandhi to dream of "Sarvodaya i.e. true democracy realized."9
Gandhi wrote, "To me political power is not an end but one of the means of enabling people to better their condition in every department of life. Political power means capacity to regulate national life through national representatives. If national life becomes so perfect as to become self-regulated, no representation becomes necessary. There is then a state of enlightened anarchy. In such a state everyone is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state, therefore, there is no political power because there is no state. But the ideal is never fully realized in life. Hence the classical statement of Thoreau that that government is best which governs the least."10

From the above excerpt it becomes evident that Gandhi had an ultimate political ideal of a decentralised, non-violent, state-less society. But since that ideal was rather unrealizable in reality, Gandhi believed in a predominantly non-violent society. He wrote that "A government cannot succeed in becoming entirely non-violent, because it represents all the people. I do not today conceive of such a golden age. But I do believe in the possibility of a predominantly non-violent society. And I am working for it."11

Gandhi's desire for such a political ideal has led a number of commentators to suggest that the core of his political thought is philosophical anarchism, which may be discussed later on. Gandhi believed that "Centralization cannot be sustained and defended without adequate force."12 He wrote in Harijan on 18.1.42 that "Centralization as a system is inconsistent with a non-violent structure of society". Hence he dreamt of a Rama Rajya, the ideal society. In Harijan he wrote:
"Q. What is Rama-Rajya?

"A. It can be religiously translated as Kingdom of God on Earth; politically translated it is perfect democracy in which inequalities based on possession and non-possession, colour, race or creed or sex vanish. In it, land and state belong to the people, justice is prompt, perfect and cheap and, therefore, there is freedom of worship, speech and the press – all this because of the reign of the self-imposed law of moral restraint.

"Such a state must be based on Truth and Non-violence, and must consist of prosperous, happy and self-contained villages and village communities. It is a dream that may never be realized. I find happiness in living in that dreamland, ever trying to realize it in the quickest way."

Thus Gandhi believed in the process of Sarvodaya, a term coined by him meaning the ‘generation of power’ from below. Such ‘generation of power’ is a process to change the distribution of social power in favour of the underprivileged both in the arena of interpersonal relations and in societal institutions. It is essentially an emancipatory concept. The idea of power from within defines the centrality of ‘generation of power’. Gandhi held that the rural masses of India were the actual power holders and thereby, he broke the conventional pyramidal idea of political power.

For such generation of power Gandhi, in his Constructive Programme, wanted to create new symbols and meanings. Dalton writes, "Gandhi had correctly defined the value of Swaraj as necessary for Sarvodaya. Swaraj meant ‘ruling your own self’ which implies ‘not to allow any outside power in the world to exercise control over oneself’ and ‘not to exercise power over any other. These two things together make Swaraj – no submission
and no exploitation.' ""14 To him "the constructive programme is the truthful and non-violent way of winning Purna Swaraj. Its wholesale fulfilment is complete independence."15 As K.G. Mushruwala pointed out in Harijan, "On the moral plane, Khadi is particularly the emblem of a peaceful and non-violent order. It is suggestive of industriousness, bread, labour, non-exploitation and self-expression."16 As far as the concept of Purna Swaraj is concerned, Gandhi wanted to make it egalitarian, secular and firmly grounded on truth and non-violence. He wrote, "Purna, complete, because it is as much for the prince as for the peasant, as much for the rich landowner as for the landless tiller of the soil, as much for the Hindus as for the Musalmans, as much for Parsis and Christians as for the Jains, Jews and Sikhs, irrespective of any distinction of caste or creed or status in life.

"The very connotation of the word and the means of its attainment to which we are pledged – truth and non-violence – precludes all possibility of that Swaraj being more for someone than for the other, being partial to some or prejudicial to others."17

Thus, for Gandhi Swaraj meant more than mere political independence. To him Swaraj revealed India's spiritual liberation through a fundamental change in each individual's moral perception. A simple, non-violent, and self-reliant life style along with the "acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when it is abused" was highlighted by Gandhi through his concept of Swaraj. Gandhi believed that "We can realize truth and non-violence only in the simplicity of village life and this simplicity can best be found in the Charkha and all that Charkha connotes."18 Hence, he highly emphasized upon his ideal of village Swaraj.
So, it is evident Gandhian ideas hammered on a new conceptual and symbolic network which could influence the life-style of the people of the Indian society and thereby could initiate the foundation of non-violent structure of the society.

Ideology is sustained by a theory or theories of society having a deep-rooted empirical bias. Gandhi’s core of society is morality. Gandhian ideals in epistemological phrase consisted of the ultimate volumes of truth, God and non-violence. Consequently Gandhian ideas challenged the very notion of power that had acquired importance and autonomous character in the modern world and manifested a new concept of power through ideas of a non-violent self-reliant decentralized village Swaraj.

II

Nehru wrote, “Gandhiji’s conception of democracy is definitely a metaphysical one. It has nothing to do with numbers or majority or representation in the ordinary sense. It is based on service and sacrifice, and it uses moral pressure.”19 In his An Autobiography Nehru cited Gandhi to show how Gandhian views on democracy is different from the ideas of Western.

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. I hold that democracy cannot be evolved by forcible methods. The spirit of democracy cannot be imposed from without; it has to come from within.”20
Commenting on this view of Gandhi, Nehru wrote, “This is certainly not Western democracy, as he himself says; but, curiously enough, there is some similarity to the communist conception of democracy, for that, too, has a metaphysical touch. A few communists 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 this they claim to represent. The similarity, however, is slight and does not take us far; the differences in outlook and approach are far greater, notably in regard to methods and force.”

Throughout his life Nehru could never accept this metaphysical concept of democracy. He rejected the theory of trusteeship. Nehru wrote, “The new theory of trusteeship, which some advocate, is equally barren. For trusteeship means that the power for good or evil remains with the self-appointed trustee, and he may exercise it as he will. The sole trusteeship that can be fair is the trusteeship of the nation and not of one individual or a group; many Englishmen honestly consider themselves the trustees for India, and yet to what a condition have they reduced our country!” So, it is clear that Nehru at his heart did not believe voluntary dispossession of wealth by few richmen of the society for the redistribution of their wealth in accordance with the needs of other individuals. Consequently, he recognised the inevitability of state power for securing redistributive justice in the society.

In his famous letter dated 11 January, 1928 to Gandhi, Nehru wrote, “You have criticized strongly the many obvious defects of industrialism and hardly paid any attention to its merits. Everybody knows these defects and all the Utopias and social theories are meant to remove them. It is the opinion of most thinkers in the West that these defects are not due to
industrialism as such, but to the capitalist system, which is based on exploitation of others. I believe you have stated that in your opinion there is no necessary conflict between capital and labour. I think that under the capitalist system this conflict is unavoidable.”

From this it is evident that not only Nehru had no faith in the metaphysical concept of democracy but also he was convinced about the irreconcilable conflict between capital and labour in the capitalist system. During his Europe travel in 1926-1927 Nehru came closer to Marxist viewpoints. Nehru’s biographer Sarvepalli Gopal has shown that by this time Nehru accepted the broad essentials of Marxism. About this phase in Nehru’s life S.Gopal wrote that “He had come round to the Marxist viewpoint in its broad essentials. He agreed that imperialism and capitalism went hand in hand and neither would disappear until both were put down. As against this the forces opposing imperialism and capitalism should be co-ordinated so as to strengthen each other. In colonial countries, nationalism automatically and rightly took precedence over all other ideologies, but such nationalism should have a broad basis, derive its strength from the masses and work specially for them.”

From Gopal’s writing it is clear that during his Marxist phase Nehru had faith in three specific points. First that Nehru believed in force as the only means to destroy the imperialism and capitalism. Secondly, in the colonial countries he recognised the need to find a suitable combination of the class ideology and national objectives of the liberation movement. Thirdly, in the backdrop of India’s socio-economic conditions he considered it unreal to wage a struggle for both independence and socialism at the same time and believed that nationalism should have a precedence over all other ideologies.
Glimpses of World History was written during this phase, although it was published in 1934-35. Nehru here devoted much time to make his daughter understand the simple laws of Marxist socialism as applied in Russia and the emergence of the U.S.S.R., amidst difficulties as a planned, exploitation-free country. Those chapters show the bias Nehru had towards the application of Marxism in Russia and as such the Russian experiences. This becomes evident with Nehru’s justification of the dictatorship in Soviet Russia. He wrote, “In practice the communist party controls the Soviets and the ruling clique of communists control the party. And the dictatorship is as strict, so far as censorship and freedom of thought or action are concerned, as any other. But as it is based on the good will of the workers it must carry the workers with it. And, finally, there is no exploitation of the workers or any other class for the benefit of another. There is no exploiting class left. If there is any exploitation, it is done by the state for the benefit of all. Russia it is worth remembering, as it never had the democratic form of government. It jumped in 1917 from autocracy to communism.”

Despite these impressions and so many more, which have been expressed in Glimpses of World History, in An Autobiography or in The Discovery of India, which reveal a lasting impression of Marxism and the experiences in the Soviet Union upon Nehru’s thought and vocabulary, Nehru did not become a revolutionary communist. Michael Edwardes in his book Nehru: A Political Biography wrote, “Nehru’s Marxism was never much more than a sentiment. It gave a sense of universality to the ideas he had absorbed from Vivekananda whose message influenced him more than that of Marx. It was not just Vivekananda’s vision of Indian unity but of his ideal of self-less service as a means of redeeming the poverty-stricken Indian masses that had fascinated Nehru. Under the influence of Gandhi he had discovered the terrible world of the peasant and because of it he now rejected
the Marxist thesis that revolution lay with the urban proletariat. This enabled him to accept the fact that the Indian National Congress was financed by indigenous capitalists because his radical activities were directed not against industrial capitalism but against landlords."

Nehru's understanding of the irreconcilability of class conflict gradually evaporated making place for the ideas of active intervention by the central state power in different spheres of the life of society. In the post-independence period Nehru's views changed sharply to accommodate the correlation between reform and revolution so that it can be fully applied to the future of the state apparatus. His principles of the state apparatus did not include its class character. Consequently in a vague manner he deemed it necessary to bring the state apparatus closer to the people. Hiren Mukherjee wrote, "Towards the close of 1954 a resolution in Parliament propounded the goal of socialism, and since then, between the sessions of the congress at Avadi (1955) and Bhubaneshwar (1964), and in numberless public statements socialism was endlessly talked about. But as an acute observer noted, 'the frequency with which the ideal has been reiterated is matched only by the variety of meanings assigned to it or, more revealingly, by the meaning sought to be withheld from it.'"

Thus, after independence, Nehru's views on socialism radically changed and Nehru became professedly a democratic socialist relying on state for not only an equitable distribution of wealth but also in creating further national wealth out of the resources available to Indian society. In 1957 he told that "The whole of the capitalist structure is based on some kind of an acquisitive society. It may be that, to some extent, the tendency to acquisitiveness is inherent in us. A socialist society must try to get rid of this tendency to acquisitiveness and replace it by co-operation. ... We must
realize that the process of bringing socialism to India, especially in the way we are doing it, that is, the democratic way will inevitably take time.

"We have definitely accepted the democratic process. Why have we accepted it? Well, for a variety of reasons. Because we think that in the final analysis it promotes the growth of human beings and of society; because, as we have said in our constitution, we attach great value to individual freedom; because we want the creative and the adventurous spirit of man to grow. The question before us is how to combine democracy with socialism, through peaceful and legitimate methods."\(^{28}\)

To Nehru, most important of these "peaceful and legitimate methods" was planning, since planning was "essentially a preparatory venture for greater and more rapid progress in future."\(^{29}\) Thus, the state was viewed by Nehru as having an important role in the context of the requirement of production and distribution.

From the above discussion it is clear that Nehru believed in the role of centralised state for the economic development of the nation. As means for such development he was essentially in favour of non-violence in the post-independence period. He wrote that "Thus a violence can not possibly lead today to a solution of any major problem because violence has become much too terrible and destructive. The moral approach to the question has now been powerfully reinforced by the practical aspect."\(^{30}\) It is indicative that Nehru did not put the question of the class essence of the independent Indian state in his socialist agenda. At the same time his indirect references to it reveal that he was in favour of accepting the national state in India as an embodiment of the solidarity and co-operation of the principal classes in Indian society. He also accepted bureaucracy both in theory and practice
as an instrument in expanding the functions of the state, its growing intervention in the economic and social spheres. Planning underlay the activities of the state in both economic and social spheres. Sudipta Kaviraj, in one of his articles wrote:

“But precisely because of his relative isolation within his own party, Nehru undertook another initiative which has seemed over the long run to overshadow other parts of his institutional strategy.

“Nehru began to create a base, an alternative apparatus in the bureaucracy. Planning on a large scale from 1956 onwards, made for a great expansion of an economic bureaucracy inside government. As the rhetoric of social justice and redistribution increased, this bureaucracy expanded rapidly.”

This makes it clear that through ‘the rhetoric of social justice and redistribution’ Nehru wanted to create a Western legal rational institutional network which would shape the post-independence Indian state into a centralised structure of power.

As far as the social relations are concerned, Nehru wanted to break the numerous irrational divisions that existed in the then India. Despite showing good points inherent in the caste system, Nehru wrote in his *The Discovery of India*, “In the context of society to-day, the caste system and much that goes with it are wholly incompatible, reactionary, restrictive and barriers to progress. There can be no equality in status and opportunity within its framework, nor can there be political democracy and much less economic democracy. Between these two conceptions conflict is inherent and only one of them can survive.”
In the same book he wrote, “Caste, which was necessary and desirable in its early forms, and meant to develop individuality and freedom, had become a monstrous degradation, the opposite of what it was meant to be, and had crushed the masses.” Nehru, believed that as a nation India got its growth arrested basically due to its lack of having a dynamic outlook about its social organization like caste. He wrote, “Caste survived because it continued to represent the general power-relationships of society, and class privileges were maintained, not only because of the prevailing ideology, but also because they were supported by vigour, intelligence, and ability, as well as a capacity for self-sacrifice.” “In later years the dynamic aspect began to fade away and in the name of eternal principles the social structure was made rigid and unchanging. It was, as a matter of fact not wholly rigid and it did change gradually and continuously. But the ideology behind it and the general framework, continued unchanged.” Nehru observed that “the touch-me-notism of the upper caste” and the increasing rigidity of the caste structure as such, became associated with religion and made India into “a state of 'mumified' and 'crystalized' civilization.”

As a believer in liberty and rationality - two basic traits of the Western modernity - Nehru wanted to establish power-relationships in the society on a rational basis, since that could alone provide legitimacy to a modern state structure. For the development of a rational social outlook, Nehru advocated secularism strongly. In a circular to Pradesh Congress Committees on 5th August, 1954 Nehru wrote:

“We call our state a secular one. The word secular perhaps is not a very happy one. And yet, for want of a better, we have used it. What exactly does it mean? It does not obviously mean a state where religion as such is discouraged. It means freedom of religion and conscience, including
freedom for those who may have no religion. It means free play for all religions, subject only to their not interfering with each other or with the basic conceptions of our state. It means that the minority communities, from the religious point of view, should accept this position. It means, even more, that the majority community, from this point of view, should fully realize it. For, by virtue of numbers as well as in other ways, it is the dominant community and it is its responsibility not to use its position in any way which might prejudice our secular ideal.

"The word secular, however, conveys something much more to me, although that might not be its dictionary meaning. It conveys the idea of social and political equality. Thus, a caste-ridden society is not properly secular. I have no desire to interfere with any person's belief, but when those beliefs become petrified in caste divisions, undoubtedly they affect the social structure of the state. They prevent us from realizing the idea of equality which we claim to place before ourselves. They interfere in political matters, just as communalism interferes."38

The above excerpts show the concern of Nehru in homogenising the deeply stratified Indian society so that the state power can be mobilized through modernist discourse. Kaviraj has commented in the mentioned article that "in classical European bourgeois revolutions, capitalism first emerged in initiatives and in institutions within civil society, and the state was later used as an instrument to correct its spontaneous production of inequality. In India there was no developed civil society and many of capitalism's classical initiatives within civil society were undertaken by the state."39 Consequently it becomes evident that mobilisation of the state power through a 'rational' discourse was Nehru's primary concern.
Practical considerations of the historical juncture of Indian independence at the stroke of midnight hour put their impact on Nehru's mind to consolidate his ideas on the structure and modalities of power concentrating on the activities of the state. Just after independence, the new state was immediately overwhelmed, especially in North India, with large scale communal violence. Nehru's political biographer Michael Edwardes wrote, "Nehru was particularly shocked at the bloodshed in Delhi. It was a denial of maturity and seemed to confirm the forebodings of those like Winston Churchill who had maintained until the last that Indians were not ready for freedom. But the greatest shock was to his belief that communal passions would disappear at partition because their purpose - the creation of Pakistan - had been achieved. It had been a sad misreading of mass psychology and of the evidence of five months of communal violence in the Punjab." Besides, the assassination of Gandhi, 15 month war over Kashmir with Pakistan, rising fears of political turmoil, the problem of food deficit due to the food surplus areas going to Pakistan, the problems relating to the accession of the princely states, the heavy influx of refugees – all these at the dawn of independence were to have a significant impact on Nehru in countenancing uncontrollable change and conflict in the context of a state with few resources.

To conclude, Nehru's ideas on power reflect an etatisme, established on the firm grounds of western democracy with an objective of establishing socialism. As an ardent believer of democracy he believed in peaceful method of legal discourse; but believed in violence if it was necessary for a right cause. In the *Discovery of India* Nehru wrote, "The emphasis of non-violence, here and elsewhere, is interesting, for no obvious contradiction appears to be noticed between this and fighting for a righteous cause. The whole epic *Mahabharata* centres round a great war. Evidently the conception
of *ahimsa*, non-violence, had a great deal to do with the motive, the absence of the violent mental approach, self-discipline and control of anger and hatred, rather than the physical abstention from violent action, when this became necessary and inevitable.”

III

Analysing from a class perspective Atul Kohli—in his *The State and Poverty in India* wrote about "State Consolidation: The Nehru years" that "India emerged from colonial rule under the auspices of the Indian National Congress. As the INC transformed itself from an anti-colonial movement to a ruling party, some of its acquired characteristics became more pronounced. Most significant of these was the tendency of the Congress leadership to work through rather than against powerful social interests. In spite of vocal commitments to create 'socialism', therefore, the Nehru years resulted primarily in the consolidation of newly won state power and in the initiation of industrialization by public support of the private sector. The lower classes did not gain much from this pattern of political intervention. The nationalist leadership, industrial and commercial classes, and the professional and bureaucratic groups were, however, all able to enhance their political and economic interests.

"This specific pattern of state intervention resulted from the needs of a nationalist - reformist leadership to preserve political power while presiding over a state increasingly captured by the socially powerful."
Nehru kept repeating the rhetoric of "socialism" and "fundamental change" throughout his years in power but did little. Consequently instead of reducing inequalities, state intervention intensified capitalism and tended to concentrate opportunities and resources in centres of political power. As Bhikhu Parkeh has observed, "Under Nehru's top-downwards model of development, the state also became increasingly isolated from society. It was seen as the sole agent of change and the only source of initiative, energy and new ideas. By contrast, society was considered passive, degenerate, a dark region inhabited by wild passions, blind faith, and 'obscurantist' and 'reactionary' ideas. Since Nehru had ignored the Congress and demoted the cabinet, the bureaucracy took over the mantle of the state and saw itself as the sole guardian of the collective interests."

Thus, the Nehruvian practices in reality revealed an excessive emphasis upon state as an agent of nation-building. It may be argued that since the legal-rational discourse of colonial modernity was yet to percolate in the then civil society, Nehru had no other alternative than to rely on bureaucracy and the state structure, which led to the setting up of the political institutions in accordance with the paradigms of Western modernity relatively peacefully. Indian model of democratic nation-building put a lot of faith in these representative institutions. Besides, a regime of rule-governed administration introduced the notion of legality, although the rules were accommodated to political expediency.

But all these ideas and their implementations were polar apart from Gandhian vision. Centralization versus decentralization, bureaucratic versus voluntaristic ethos, growth versus employment, internationalism versus grass roots, state versus a stateless society — are the basic parameters, within which Gandhian and Nehruvian discourses on structure and modalities of
power are set. Taken together, Gandhian ideas of a decentralised, state-less society based upon voluntary ethos having a capacity for full employment, focus upon some sort of anarchist ideas. Gandhi himself also on the occasion of the opening of Benaras Hindu University in 1916 called himself "an anarchist, but of another type." For Gandhi, it may be presumed, anarchism was not negative in the sense of unruliness, but in the positive sense of being unruled because rule is unnecessary for the preservation of order. This ultimate ideal being unrealizable, Gandhi opted for a predominantly non-violent social order.

Through these ideas Gandhi set up a new discourse as opposed to the discourse of colonial modernity, establishing it on a set of basic principles such as truth, love and ahimsa. The implication of the doctrine of non-violence is the moral dictum that the end does not justify the means, which is not compatible with 'power-politics' of western societies. In fact Gandhi’s occasional reference to "enlightened anarchy" as his political ideal led the commentators like Dr. Dhawan to describe him as a 'philosophical anarchist'. To quote Dr. Dhawan, "To Gandhiji the end is 'the greatest good of all'. He is a philosophical anarchist because he believes that this end can be realized only in the classless stateless democracy of autonomous village communities based on non-violence instead of coercion, on service instead of exploitation, on renunciation instead of acquisitiveness and on the largest measure of local and individual instead of centralization."

In fact, Gandhi’s ideas reveal a resistance to the increasing salience of a new mechanism of power in the modern western society. In his discourse Gandhi focussed on an alternative path to attain truth different from the 'rational', 'scientific' discourse of the West. In his 'Lecture-I' on 'The Juridical Apparatus' Foucault said, "When I see you straining to establish
the scientificity of Marxism I do not really think that you are demonstrating once and for all that Marxism has a rational structure and that therefore its propositions are the outcome of verifiable procedures; for me you are doing something altogether different, you are investing Marxist discourses and those who uphold them with the effects of a power which the West since medieval times has attributed to science and has reserved for those engaged in scientific discourse."46 In his 'Lecture - 2' Foucault says, "My problem is rather this: what rules of right are implemented by the relations of power in the production of discourses of truth? Or alternatively, what type of power is susceptible of producing discourses of truth that in a society such as ours are endowed with such potent effects? What I mean is this in a society such as ours, but basically in any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated or implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse."47

Obviously, the object for Foucault in his genealogical research on the juridical apparatus is to emancipate 'historical knowledges' from the subjection of the hierarchical order of power associated with science, to render them capability of opposition and of struggle against the coercion of a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse. Being concerned with the 'how of power', he related the mechanisms of power to two points of reference: "On the one hand, to the rules of right that provide a formal delimitation of power; On the other to the effects of truth that this power produces and transmits, and which in their turn reproduce this power. Hence we have a triangle: power, right, truth."48

For the present purpose, one may observe, in the light of Foucauldian
analyses, that Gandhi wanted to establish that colonial power is based on colonial wisdom which was a unitary formal and scientific discourse and that to uproot the colonial power one would have to fight also against colonial wisdom. It might be a large claim to call Gandhi an "anarchist" since even in his thought he could not get rid of the idea of having a post-independent Indian state, however decentralised it would be. What Gandhi provides is not merely a novel and ingenious theory of power, but a profound critique of the western project of modernity by sundering the positive link between modern forms of knowledge (like knowledge of medical science as he viewed in *Hind Swaraj*) and human liberation, through persuasive portrayal of the former as carriers of disciplinary power leading to an immoral subjection. He wrote, "We may pretend to be civilized, call religious prohibitions as superstition and want only to indulge in what we like. The fact remains that the doctors induce us to indulge, and the result is that we have become deprived of self-control and have become effeminate. In these circumstances, we are unfit to serve the country. To study European medicine is to deepen our slavery." Similarly regarding the English education he wrote, "To give millions a knowledge of English is to enslave them. The foundation that Macaulay laid of education has enslaved us. I do not suggest that he had any such intention, but that has been the result."

In fact Gandhi's conceptualisation of power had a practical political intent. The possibilities and modalities of resistance and emancipation in a disciplinary society are of crucial importance to it and hence he focussed upon a separate discourse of "truth" based on non-violence and self-suffering. In this negative view of enlightenment heritage, the effects of the centralising powers linked to an organised scientific discourse within a society are resisted with the methods of *Satyagraha*. He wrote, "We should abandon the pretension of learning many sciences. Religious, that is ethical, education
will occupy the first place”\textsuperscript{52}. Thus Gandhi relates the path of emancipation with liberating the potency of forms of knowledge and reveals that knowledge is always enmeshed in relations of power while the exercise of power cannot be separated from the formation and deployment of knowledges.

Nehru, on the other hand, believed that colonial power and colonial wisdom were mutually exclusive and antithetical. Nehru echoes the ideas of nineteenth century modernity mixing up Marx and J.S. Mill. In his scheme of things, colonial wisdom should be appropriated as a combative device against colonial power. In accordance with this line of thought Nehru viewed state as an \textit{impersonal apparatus} of public power. With this assumption as the basis, Nehru finds it easy to assume that the modern state has become a socially functioning organism. As he viewed, “So the State becomes more and more of a \textit{socially functioning organism} - for the good of society or the individual, as you like. And the more it becomes that, the more benefits it confers on the individual, the more, in a sense the individual has obligations to that State. So the two things, the rights and obligations, march together. If the State and individual are properly integrated and organized there is no conflict. Otherwise, if one side goes ahead of the other there is a lack of balance”.\textsuperscript{53}

In explaining his concept of the “socially functioning organism”, Nehru goes on to advocate that the State, apart from protecting the individual from foreign enemies or internal disorders, has the duty to undertake to provide him with opportunities of progress, of education, health, sanitation – generally everything that would give him the opportunities of fitting himself for such work as he is capable of. These welfare activities of the state lay the foundation of centralized authority in the modern state. The difficulty which Nehru confronts is: all centralization is a slight encroachment on the
freedom of the individual. He wants to preserve freedom of the individual, but at the same time understands the impossibility of escaping centralization in modern society. How to balance the two is the real problem for Nehru while developing his concepts regarding the structure and modalities of power in post-independent India.
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