CHAPTER – II
POLITICAL IDEOLOGY OF PANDIT NEHRU

INTRODUCTION:

Jawaharlal Nehru’s intervention in the political thought and practice of our times has been interpreted differently by the liberal rationalists and the Marxist subalternists. According to the former, Nehru’s political ideology is neither original nor autonomous as it is wholly derived from the political thought of European post-Enlightenment rationalism and industrial modernity. The Marxist subalternists deny or de-emphasize the progressive character of Nehru’s political ideology on the ground that it is simply a child or stepchild of marriage of Reason and Capital – on the ground, in other words, that it is not an ideology of “the violent struggle between classes” for the establishment of socialism.

Against these interpretations, I shall try to show firstly that though derived largely from the political thought of European post-Enlightenment modernity, Nehru’s political ideology is an ‘odd mixture’ of liberalism, Marxism and Gandhism which has a radical transformative thrust against Western modernity. Nehru, in other words, as I shall try to show, regarded India’s modernizing nationalism as inextricably linked with the radical transformation of Western modernity. He perceived the need for a fusion of horizons between the scientific spirit of post-enlightenment modernity and “the deeper lessons of life, which have observed the minds of thinkers in all ages and in all countries.”

Secondly, I shall suggest that the implication of the “relative autonomy” of the Nehruvian state from the imperialist reason of capital is not given adequate appreciation by his Marxist-subalternist critics. According to
the liberal-rationalists/structural-functionalists, Nehru was simply a "modernizing elite", acting under the universal imperative of post-Enlightenment modernity, the justificatory ideology of which he simply borrowed from the modern Western tradition of political thought. The Nehruvian 'model' of nationalism and industrial modernity, in other words, are said to be cast in the Enlightenment's theory of progress, which was based on the eighteenth century West-European ideas' about man, society and the good or happy life. The philosophers of the Enlightenment, we are reminded, inaugurated modernity and set global, universal standards of progress for the whole of humanity by emancipating the individual and his reason from faith, custom and authority. They thereby paved the way for man's scientific knowledge of, and technical mastery over, physical nature and social life. The resultant industrial civilization was a universalizing civilization, respecting no territorial barriers.

Nehru, like other "modernizing elites" of the Third World, we are told, did not have to do any original political-ideological thinking; it had already been done for them by the philosophers of the European Enlightenment! The modernizing role of the former was simply to grasp and bring about the sociological or functional conditions of Western-type industrial modernity in their own societies, in other words; they were simply required to act under the universal imperative of modernization or Westernization! Given the compelling world-wide sweep of Western industrial modernity, the political-philosophical competences or persuasions of Nehru or any other Third World nationalist leader are said to be of no consequence.

Adopting this liberal-optimist interpretative position, Ernest Geilner writes: It is not so much that the prophets of nationalism were not anywhere nears the First Division, when it came to. The business of thinking... It is rather
that these thinkers did not really make such difference. If one of them had fallen, others would have stepped into his place... The quality of nationalist thought would hardly have been affected much by such substitutions. Their precise doctrines are hardly worth analysing\(^5\).

**Nehru's political ideology**

According to this view, Nehru's contribution pertains to the "political sociology" or "political science" of modernization or development, and not to the intellectual activity of political thinking or political ideologising. We are told that whatever their rhetoric, the so-called philosopher kings of the Third World "all act as westerners"! All! The only innovativeness that the liberal-rationalists see in Nehru and the other nationalist leaders of the Third World is that they reversed the imperialist or colonial Orientalism of the European or Occidental Powers; while the colonizing Orient list political ideology regarded the Oriental as a passive object to be civilized by the active, Occidental subject, Nehru and the other Third World nationalists are said to have merely reversed that Orientalism by asserting and acting out the subjectivity of the Oriental.

The epistemological and philosophical categories of this newly proclaimed subjectivity of the Third World countries, we are told, are all borrowed from modern Western political philosophy. Hence according to the liberal-rationalists, while Nehru's 'role' as a modernizing or Westernizing elite may be a fit subject of study by the students of the political sociology or of the functionalist theory of political development, his political ideology is said to be wholly lacking in originality or creativity and therefore not worth even a mention in the study of political thought.
In this and the next sections, I shall attempt a review of aspects of Nehru's political thinking with a view to highlighting its essential tension between derivative-nationalist modernization and a complex of pre-modern / post-modern ideas, Nehru saw important socio-historical differences between n India and the modern West. He admired the scientific, technological and industrial advances of the latter and bemoaned their absence in the former. Lacking the scientific, technological and industrial advances of post-Enlightenment modernity, the Indian people, he felt, have remained poor; backward and subjugated. Unlike the colonialist Orientalists, Nehru does not attribute the poverty, backwardness and subjugation of the Indian people to their human nature; he attributes them rather to the rigid and progress-inhibiting social structures that have either evolved historically from within India or have been imposed from outside. It is important to stress Nehru's rejection of the imperialist-Orientalist thesis of essential differences in human nature between India and the West; the differences for him are socio-historical, and not ontological or natural.

According to him, both the Oriental and Occidental people share a common humanity and they can and must widen their horizons by learning from each others' socio-historical experiences. It is only from this perspective, he believes, that we earn overcome racialism, cultural arrogance and structural oppression. Rejecting the thesis of "essential difference between the East and West," Nehru writes: I do not understand the use of the words Orient and Occident, except in the sense that Europe and America are highly industrialized and Asia is backward in this respect. This industrialization is something new in the world's history... There is no organic connection between Hellenic civilization and modern European and American civilisation.
Ridiculing the Orientalist thesis that the backwardness and poverty of the Indian people are a consequence of their essential or ontological other-worldliness, Nehru writes: India, it is said, is religious, philosophical, speculative, metaphysical, unconcerned with this world, and lost in dreams of the beyond and the hereafter. So we are told, and perhaps those who tell us so would like India to remain plunged in thought and entangled in speculation, so that they might possess this world and the fullness thereof, unhindered by these thinkers, and take their joy of it. Nehru believed that the European Enlightenment and industrial modernity was a progressive step not only for Europe but for the entire world. For him, in other words, post-Enlightenment modernity represents "the spirit of the age" for the whole of humanity, and India, he says, is under the imperative of modernization: The modern mind, that is to say the better type of the modern mind, is practical and pragmatic, ethical, and social, altruistic and humanitarian. It is governed by a practical idealism for social betterment. The ideals which move it represent the spirit of the age, the Zeitgeist, the Yugadharma. It has discarded to a large extent the philosophical approach of the ancients, their search for ultimate reality, as well as the devotionalism and mysticism of the medieval period. Humanity is its god and social service its religion. We have therefore to function in line with the highest ideals of the age we live in... Those ideals may be classed under two heads: humanism and the scientific spirit.

The Indian people's participating in, and benefiting from, "the spirit of the age", Nehru felt, were blocked, or prevented not by their human nature, but by both the rigid, indigenous sociopolitical structure and the engulfing structure of Western imperialism. While a certain conjuncture of historical forces led to the Enlightenment and modernity of western Europe, a different historical conjuncture, says Nehru, brought about in India a "slow and
creeping" "inner weakness... which affects not Billy her political status but her creative activities".

In his Discovery of India, after noting "the growing rigidity and exclusiveness of the Indian social structure as represented chiefly by the caste system", he goes on to point out: Life became all cut up into set frames where each man's job was fixed and permanent and he had little concern with others. Thus particular types of activity became hereditary, and there was a tendency to avoid new types of work and activity and to confine oneself to the old groove, to restrict initiative and the spirit of innovation... So long as that structure afforded avenues for growth and expansion, it was progressive; when it reached the limits of expansion open to it, it became stationary, unprogressive, and later, inevitably regressive. Because of this there was decline all along the line-intellectual, philosophical, political, in technique and methods of warfare, in knowledge of and contacts with the outside world, in shrinking economy, and there was a growth of local sentiments and feudal and small-group feeling at the expense of the larger conceptions of India as a whole.

These progress-inhibiting rigidities and exclusivists of Indian social structure, Nehru finds, are supported and reinforced by the engulfing structure of colonial rule, which is based on force and which, besides blocking growth and industrialization, is supporting the "groups and classes which had ceased to have any real significance." Ending colonial, rule therefore becomes an absolute precondition for the modernization of the Indian society. In his historic presidential address to the 1936 Lucknow session of the Indian National Congress, he said: "I work for Indian independence because the nationalist in me cannot tolerate alien domination; work for it even more because for me it is the inevitable step to social and economic change."
Since the opposition to India's political independence comes both from the indigenous reactionary groups and classes and from the foreign capitalist-imperialist classes, Indian national movement for Nehru becomes a revolutionary movement directed as much against reactionary traditionalism as against the decaying structures of Western post-Enlightenment capitalist-industrial modernity. He could sincerely claim: "I wanted India's freedom for India's sake of course; but I also wanted it for England's sake"\textsuperscript{12}. Thus, modernizing nationalism and critical modernity become the two sides of the Nehruvian political ideology; according to him, India cannot modernize without at the same time bringing about a socialist turn of Western capitalist-imperialist modernity: In December 1936, in his presidential address to the Congress session at Faizpur, Nehru stated: During the past eight months I have wandered a great deal in this vast land of ours and I have seen again the throbbing agony of India's masses, the call of their eyes for relief from the terrible burdens they carry. That is our problem; all others are secondary and merely lead up to it. To solve that problem we shall have to end the imperialistic control and exploitation of India. But what is this imperialism of today? It is not merely the physical possession of one country by another; its roots lie deeper. Modern imperialism is an outgrowth of capitalism and cannot be separated from it\textsuperscript{13}.

If is because of this that we cannot understand our problem without understanding the implications of imperialism and socialism. The disease is deep-seated and requires a radical and revolutionary remedy and that remedy is the socialist structure of society. Eight months earlier, addressing the Lucknow session of the Congress, Nehru welcomed the emergence of a fusion of horizons between decolonization and socialism in the West: Capitalism, in its difficulties, took to Fascism with all its brutal suppression of what Western
civilization had apparently stood for; it became, even in some of its homeland, what its imperialist counterpart had long been in the subject colonial countries.

Fascism and imperialism thus stood out as the two faces of the now decaying capitalism, and though they varied in different countries according to national characteristics and economic and political conditions, they represented the same forces of reaction and supported each other, and at the same time came into conflict with each other, for such conflict was inherent in their very nature. Socialism in the West and the rising nationalism of the Eastern and other dependent countries opposed this combination of Fascism and Imperialism. Nationalism in the East, it must be remembered, was essentially different from the new and terribly narrow nationalism of Fascist countries; the former was the historical, urge to freedom, the latter the last refuge of re-action. Nehru owed his world-historical-structural perspective on India's revolutionary nationalism to Marxism-Leninism, which also made him realize the inevitability of socialism. On his return from Europe in 1927 after visiting the Soviet Union and attending the Brussels Congress of Opposed Nationalities, he wrote. My outlook was wider, and nationalism by itself seemed to me definitely a narrow and insufficient creed. Political freedom, independence, were no, doubt essential, but they were steps only in the right direction; without social freedom and a socialistic structure of society and the State, neither the country nor the individual could develop much.

Later, in prison, he wrote in his Autobiography: Russia apart, the theory and philosophy of Marxism lightened up many a dark corner of my mind. History came to have a new meaning for me. The Marxist interpretation threw a flood of light on it, and it became an unfolding drama with some order and purpose, however unconscious, behind it. The great world crisis and slump seemed to justify the Marxist analysis. While other systems and theories were
groping about in the dark, Marxism alone explained it more or less satisfactorily and offered real solution. As this conviction grew upon me, I was filled with a new excitement and my depression at the non-success of civil disobedience grew much less. Was not the world marching rapidly towards the! Desired consummation? Our national struggle became a stage in the longer journey... Time was in our favour.\textsuperscript{16}

Observing that the Maturing contradictions of the capitalist-imperialist system were being masked in the metropolis by the drained wealth and resources from the colonies, he wrote in his Glimpses of World History. But much of this wealth and the raising of the standard of living were at the expense of exploited people in Asia, Africa, and other non-industrialized areas. This exploitation and flow of wealth hid for a while the contradictions of the capitalist system. Even so, the difference between the rich and the poor grew; the distance became greater\textsuperscript{17}. The twin objectives of India's revolutionary nationalism, according to Nehru, were (i), to extend the bright side of European post-Enlightenment modernity, and (ii) to cause a revolutionary-socialist ending of its dark-side, namely the imperialist and fascist side. Of these twin goals, Nehru assigned strategic priority to the second one because the colonialist state, as the chief instrument of the "decaying stage" of world capitalist system, was preventing the spread of post-Enlightenment progress to the colonized peoples. A politically independent national state, Nehru believed, can reform and modernize the Indian society in a socialist direction. "I do not think it very difficult", he wrote in his Autobiography; to convert the masses to social reform if the State takes the matter in hand.

But alien rulers are always suspecting, and they cannot go far in the process of conversion. If the alien element was removed and economic changes were given precedence, an energetic administration could easily introduce far-
reaching social reforms. Nehru's revolutionary nationalism thus called for mobilizing the Indian people for emulating and furthering the bright side of Western post-Enlightenment modernity by opposing and destroying its dark side. Such a discriminating attitude to modernization might have been alright for the intellectual classes, but not for the poor and ignorant masses of India, who at any rate, had to be mobilized against the colonialist state. Any attempt to mobilize them against the "wrong England" by telling them of the values and potential socialist virtues of the "right England" would have been an unrealistic approach.

In this moment of intellectual dilemma, Nehru found a temporary, strategic solution in Gandhiji's mobilization of the peasantry against the colonialist state. Even though he did not appreciate or agree with Gandhiji's non-discriminating, outright condemnation of Western modernity or his non-socialist attitude or his individual-based rather than structural approach to social change, Nehru accepted Gandhiji's supreme leadership of the national movement against the chief impediment to the modernization of the Indian society. Because of Gandhiji's leadership, the Congress, Nehru realized, was able to produce "a wonderful awakening of the masses and in spite of its vague bourgeois ideology it had served a revolutionary purpose. The socialist component of his own project of revolutionary nationalism, Nehru reasoned, had to await the formation of the Politically Independent national state. He assured himself with the resolve that after Independence his modernity and socialism, and not Gandhiji's 'fads', were to be pursued. In this autobiography, Nehru wrote: He was a very difficult person to understand; sometimes his language was almost incomprehensible to an average modern.

But we felt that we knew him well enough to realize he was a great and unique man and a glorious leader, and having put our faith in him we gave an
almost blank cheque, for the time being at least. Often we discussed his fads and peculiarities among ourselves and said, half-humorously, that when Swaraj came these fads must not be encouraged. Nehru also entertained the belief that in the actual course of the political mobilization of the masses, Gandhiji would himself move a step or two toward or in favor of modernization and socialism. 'Gandhiji', Nehru wrote: Was a unique personality, and it was impossible to judge him by the usual standards, or even to apply the ordinary canons of logic to him.

But because he was a revolutionary at bottom and was pledged to political independence for India, he was bound to play an uncompromising role till that independence was achieved. And in this very process he would... himself advance step by step toward the social goal. I cannot pursue here the question of whether or not in the course of the freedom struggle Gandhiji did in fact move toward an appreciation of the Nehruvian 'model'. It is however pertinent to note that both Gandhiji and Nehru regarded; "parliamentary Swaraj" to be of crucial importance to the realization of their fuller model of swaraj. Responding to some criticisms rose against Hind Swaraj, Gandhiji said in 1920; I do not ask India to follow today the methods prescribed in my booklet. If they could do that, they would have swaraj not in a year but in a day. What I am doing today is that I am giving the country a pardonable programme for the attainment of parliamentary Swaraj. In the case of Nehru, it can be asserted that he not only appropriated the masses mobilised by Gandhiji but also came- to imbibe aspects of Gandhiji's social and political philosophy, especially the principles of non-violence, the purity of means, the 'divinity' of all life and the necessity to integrate politics and science with dharma. In 1939, Nehru stated: I have been and am a convinced socialist and a believer in democracy and have at the same time accepted wholeheartedly the
peaceful technique of non-violent action which Gandhiji has practised so successfully during the past twenty years\textsuperscript{24}.

Similarly, in his Discovery of India, he affirmed: "I have been attracted by Gandhiji's stress on right means and think one of his greatest contributions to our public life has been 'this emphasis'\textsuperscript{25}. As I indicated earlier, Nehru rejected the Orientalist or colonialist thesis of essential or ontological differences in human nature between India and the West. He however did not Jail to recognize that in their different socio-historical experiences, India and the modern West have come to stress or emphasise different values and norms. Nehru's critique, as an Indian, of Western modernity and his critique, as a Westernised/modernised bi-cultural person, of Indian tradition made him aware of some of the strengths and weaknesses of both the 'systems'. Instead of either Orientalising or Occidentalising the other, be maintained that both the Orient and the Occident must learn from each other. In his Discovery of India, which he wrote after he came under Gandhiji's influences, he wrote: '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. But the West is also obviously in need of learning, and its advances in technology will bring it little comfort if it does not learn some of the deeper lessons of life, which have absorbed the minds of thinkers in all ages and in all countries\textsuperscript{26}. Again: Science has dominated the Western world and everyone there pays tribute to it, and yet the West is still far from having developed the real temper of science. It has still to bring the spirit and the flesh into creative harmony... the essential basis of Indian thought for ages past, though not its later manifestations, fits in with the scientific temper and approach, as well as with internationalism.

It is based on a fearless search for truth, on the solidarity of man, even on the divinity of everything living, and on the free and cooperative
development of the individual and the species, ever to greater freedom and higher stages of human growth.\(^{27}\) Emphatically rejecting the idea of "each person thinking his country as a chosen country of God," he maintained that India's "national genius" and the scientific spirit of the modern age should not be approached as though they were opposed to each other. We have to function, he writes, "in line with the highest ideals of the age we live in, though we may add to them or seek to mould them in accordance with our national genius. Those ideals may be classed under two heads: humanism and the scientific spirit.\(^{28}\)

In the pre-Gandhian phase of his political thought, Nehru had dismissed metaphysics, mysticism and 'religiosity' as the concerns of the anti-scientific traditionalist. Under Gandhiji's impact, Nehru came to appreciate the interrelationship between physics and metaphysics, and politics and 'spirituality'. In 1958, enunciating his "Basic Approach", Nehru stated: The law of life should not be competition or acquisitiveness but cooperation, the good of each contributing to the good of all. In such a society the emphasis will be on duties, not on rights; the rights will follow the performance of the duties. We have to give a new direction to education and evolve a new type of humanity. This argument led to the old Vedantic conception that everything, whether sentient or insentient, finds a place in the organic whole; that everything has a spark of what might be called the divine impulse or the basic energy or life force which pervades the universe.

This leads to metaphysical regions which tend to take us away from the problems of life which face us; I suppose that any line of thought, sufficiently pursued, leads us in some measure to metaphysics. Even science today is almost on the verge of all manner of imponderables.
I do not propose to discuss these metaphysical aspects, but this very argument indicates how the mind searches for something basic underlying the physical world. If we really believed in this all-pervading concept of the principles of life, it might help us to get rid of some of our narrowness of race, caste or class and make us more tolerant and understanding in our approaches to life's problems. From the foregoing interpretative reconstruction of Nehru's political thinking, it is clear that his "odd mixture" of liberalism, Marxism and Gandhism was an innovative ideology of essential tension between modernising nationalism and pre-modern/post-modern ideas. He admitted his inability to theoretically resolve all the tensions among these ideological currents of his thought.

But he did not remain an inactive prisoner, of that theoretical tension. An independent, democratic-socialist and secular state, he believed, constituted a practical moment of commonality to the emancipatory-progressive goals of all those ideologies. To historically or contextually conceive such a practical, emancipatory progressive ideological commonality and to put it into practice was Nehru's distinctive contribution to the political thought and practice of our times. This was indeed a 'gradual' approach, but it had the merit of being able to reach a large number of people towards the long-term goal of democratic socialism. Underlining this aspect of Nehru's political ideology, S. Gopal writes: It was most an intellectual framework of logical consistency but a sense of what he regarded as essential values which held together all these elements in Nehru's mental make-up. It made him a Marxist who rejected regimentation, a socialist who was wholly committed to civil liberties, a radical who accepted non-violence, an international statesman with a total involvement in India and, above all, a leader who believed in carrying his people with him even if it slowed down the pace of progress.
A defence of his slow practical-idealist approach to social transformation was provided by Nehru in 1936, when Krishna Menon complained about his "hob-nobbing with ministerialism". "Try to imagine", Nehru wrote to Menon: What the human material is in India. How they think, how they act, what moves them, what does not affect them. It is easy enough to take up a theoretically correct attitude, which has little effect on anybody. We have to do something much more important and difficult and that is to move large numbers of people, to make them act. In which ideological direction then was Nehru attempting to "move large numbers of people"? Was it, as his Marxist sub-alternist critics say, simply towards an etatisme that remains wedded to capitalism?

These critics say that Nehru simply crowned the passive, capitalist revolution of India with a sovereign national state, which he legitimized "by a specifically nationalist marriage between the ideas of progress and social justice". This is the view of Partha Chatterjee, who, in his path-breaking study of Indian nationalist thought, maintains that Nehru's political ideology is that of "the final, fully mature stage" of the "passive revolution" of capital in colonial/post-colonial India. Following Gramsci's ideas, Partha points out that the Indian bourgeoisie, blocked by imperialism and the colonial state, was unable to carry out any full-scale (bourgeois) revolution against the old, pre-capitalist dominant classes. Thus, failing to establish hegemony over the "civil society", it tried to bring about a passive revolution by spearheading an all-class nationalist struggle against the colonial state so that a politically independent national state can be set up and used for establishing capitalism as the dominant mode of production. In this "passive revolution", the bourgeoisie make a political appropriation of the masses or the peasantry, and bring about "a 'molecular 'transformation' of the old dominant classes into 'partners in anew
historical bloc"\textsuperscript{33}. What is particularly noteworthy, according to Partha, is that the political independence that is thus brought about "does not attempt to breakup or transform in any radical way the institutional structures of ‘rational’ authority set up in the period of colonial rule, whether in the domain of administration and law or in the realm of economic institutions or in the structure of education, scientific research and cultural organisation"\textsuperscript{34}.

Those "institutional structures of 'rational' authority", we are reminded, are -subservient to capitalist-imperialism. Gandhiji, according to Partha, was the supreme leader of the penultimate phase or "moment of manoeuvre" of India's passive capitalist revolution in the sense that he "succeeded in opening up the historical possibility by which the largest popular element of the nation—the peasantry—could be appropriated within the evolving forms of the new Indian state"\textsuperscript{35}. In other words, Gandhiji is said to have made the peasantry "willing participants in a struggle wholly conceived and directed by others", namely, the bourgeoisie. To Nehru, according to Partha, the Indian passive revolution of capital owes its "moment of arrival" or "the final, fully mature" phase, he appropriated the Gandhian political legacy of the partially mobilized peasantry and crowned it with a sovereign national state, assigning to it a "central, autonomous and directing role in the further development of capitalism", which he legitimized by a specifically nationalist marriage between the ideas of progress and social justice"\textsuperscript{36}. Partha sums up the Nehruji, statist phase of the Indian passive revolution of capital, in the following manner: It is now a discourse of order, of the rational organization of power. Here the discourse is not only conducted in a single, consistent, unambiguous voice, it also succeeds in ' a glossing over all earlier contradictions, divergences and difference and incorporating within the body of a unified discourse every aspect and stage in the history of its formation. This
ideological unity of nationalist thought it seeks to actualize in the unified life of the state. Nationalist discourse at its moment of arrival is passive revolution uttering its own life-history. Partha goes on to argue that after Independence Nehru abandoned socialism and that instead of pursuing equality "by means of politics, through the violent struggle between classes", he left it to the rational, realistic management of the government by the technicians of power.

Since the Age of Enlightenment, there has been, he notes, an historical partnership between the universal march of Reason and the Universalist urge of capital. Anti-imperialist nationalism, of which the paradigmatic case is the Indian one, did, according to Partha, administer "a check on a specific political form of metropolitan capitalist dominance" and gave a "death-below... to such blatantly ethnic slogans as the civilising mission of the West, the white man's burden, etc." Nationalist thought, according to him, has lacked the ideological means to make such a challenge. In an insightful attempt to uncover the "apparent paradoxes" of Jawaharlal Nehru, Sudipta Kaviraj gives him credit for his innovativeness in setting up a politically independent bourgeois state and pursuing a relatively independent path of reformist-welfarist capitalist development. Nehru however, according to Kaviraj, restorted to an 'irresponsible' technique of legitimation, namely "a manipulation of the evident appeal of the socialist idea in a poor and illiterate country". Nehru's 'socialism', Kaviraj notes, brought him political success in the electoral arena but historical failure against such impersonal or "structural problems" of capitalism as poverty, inequality, exploitation, etc. 'Nehru', writes Kaviraj,
"was a political success and at the same time a historical failure"\textsuperscript{43}. This conclusion seems to me to be too sweeping and not quite in keeping with the theory of the "relative autonomy" of the political. If (as Kaviraj rightly maintains) the political is relatively autonomous from the economic and if Nehru is credited with political success then that success must be seen as altering the economic in some significant way.

Nehru's political success, in other words, cannot be said to be without any historical consequence. The Nehruvian ideology of anti-imperialist democratic socialism has indeed served as "a guarantee against the selling out of national economic and political interests by small elite groups or authoritarian regimes"\textsuperscript{44}. It has in fact given the Indian state "greater political and economic bargaining power" vis-a-vis the advanced nations and the international financial agencies. It has also led to a considerable sharing-of the fruits of economic growth with the disadvantaged sections of the Indian society\textsuperscript{45}.

Partha and Kaviraj are indeed right in pointing out that the Nehruvian state and ideology have not transcended capitalist-technological nationality or that they have not established socialism. Nehru himself admitted it\textsuperscript{46}. I would however urge an appreciation of the implications of the greater relative autonomy which the Nehruvian state has from the imperialist reason of capital than the other form of the capitalist state which was not only a clear alternative historical possibility in Nehru's time but also actively campaigned for. As both Partha and Kaviraj admit, the independent, national, non-aligned, democratic state, in setting up which Gandhi and Nehru played a world-historic role, braving strong opposition from within and outside the country, has a greater relative autonomy from imperialist capital than would have been the case if a non-democratic, 'non-socialistic', aligned, satellite-type or neo-colonial state
had been set up. In bringing about that "greater relative autonomy" or in other words, the 'decolonisation' or dissociation of the identity of the reason of the states system from the imperialist-global reason of capital, the Nehruvian 'mixture' of liberalism, Marxism and Gandhism did play a historic role. This ideological 'mixture' was correctly seen by Nehru to be constituting a necessary, though far from sufficient, condition for the politics of transition to a post-capitalist or 'socialistic' social order.

He as well as Gandhiji correctly perceived that the minimal requirement for the politics of exit or transition from the capitalist-imperialist system of states was the setting up of independent, non-aligned, democratic nation-states that were to constitute the counter-hegemonic points against that system. In the post-World War II context of emerging bipolar super-powerism that was beginning to engulf the whole world, Nehru's overarching concern was to create and nurture the independent, non-aligned democratic national state, and to use it both as a counter-hegemonic political space against the alignment systems of the super-powers and as an instrument for bringing about social and economic change at both national and transnational levels.

Even though Nehru did not pursue socialism "through the violent struggle between classes", the non-aligned, democratic-socialist state which he strove to institutionalize does constitute a crucial step in a larger political movement of exit or transition from the two interrelated versions of imperialism which the two super-powers have been trying to impose on the rest of the world since the end of World War II. That political movement, I would say, is not devoid of post-capitalist potentialities; the Gandhiji-Nehru complementarity in 'modern' Indian political thought sought to legitimise, a "third way" of constituting the reason of the state from out of the life concerns of the people. "This' is not to claim that the Nehruvian state.' and ideology.
constitute, in any unambiguous or. Non-paradoxical sense, a political step towards post-capitalism or post-modernity. Is not the post-modern state or ideology necessarily paradoxical or in essence a tension between capitalistic and post-capitalistic logics? Such an ambiguity or tension is indeed a characteristic not only of Nehru's "mixed economy" and non-alignment but also of his commitment to science and technology.

While he was deeply committed to the rationality of science and technology did not put absolute, faith in it; he was not a fanatic of progress. He rejected the doctrine of the amoral or non-political sovereignty of science and technology. His commitment to science and technology, in other words, was not at the expense of his commitment to democratic politics or spiritual values. In his 1959 Azad Memorial Lecture, after expressing his confidence' that India would advance in science and technology, he went on to say: What I am concerned with is not merely our material, progress, but the quality and depth of our people.. Power is necessary, but wisdom is essential.

It is only power with... wisdom that is good. Can we combine the progress of science and technology with this progress of the mind and spirit also? In one of his very last writings, he emphasized that while we: must use the; advances*in-science and technology for increasing? Production, "we must not forget that the essential objective to be aimed at is the quality of the individual and the concept of dharma underlying it."
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