In the history of modern Indian thought Jawaharlal Nehru’s name figures prominent. After Gandhi, he was the only leader who could influence Indian masses through his ideas and charming personality.

It is difficult to delineate the multidimensional personality of Nehru and to assess his contribution to Indian political economy. He has been acknowledged as an outstanding statesman, an able administrator, a messiah for the marginalized, a distinguished man of letters and a visionary, all combined in one. Besides, his rare personality is an embodiment of diverse qualities; a great scholar, a writer of repute, a true democrat and a great humanist who has a few parallels.

Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the giants of modern India, who left a lasting impact on the socio-economic and political forces of the day. He was a charismatic leader and a revolutionary who strove to provide root and branch solution to the social, economic, and political problems of contemporary India. The core of his political thought was based on his firm adherence to democracy, individual freedom, and socialism. Intense
nationalism was part of his mental make-up which was abundantly evident in the course of the Indian national movement. Yet he was an internationalist par excellence. In him the two major streams of nationalism and internationalism harmoniously blended with each other.

Chakravarthy Rajagopalachari’s statement about Nehru is worth mentioning in this context. He says, “Nehru is eleven years younger than me, eleven times more important for the Nation and eleven hundred times more beloved of the nation.” Former President of India S. Radhakrishnan described him as “incomparably the greatest figure after Gandhi in our history.”

As a student in England Nehru was influenced by the ideas of George Bernard Shaw, Bertrand Russell and Keynes. His experiences in England moulded him into a patriot. He said then, “I was a patriot and wanted India to become free.”

After his return from England in 1912, he came under the influence of Gandhian philosophy and left his legal practice to join the national
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movement during 1919-1920. In the years to follow, he has influenced the social, political, and economic thinking of the country before and after independence so much that the story of modern Indian thought cannot be considered complete without referring to his philosophy.

When he in jail between 1922-23 he developed interest on social and economic problems. Then in 1926-27 he visited Russia and other European countries. He was deeply influenced by rational attitude combined with Marxism, the western humanism and liberalism of these countries. As president of All India Congress Conference at Lahore he declared his faith in socialism. He said:

"India achieved great success in the construction of a stable society. But she lagged behind on an important matter. No solution could be found of the problem of disparity. India deliberately ignored the problem as a result of which millions of people led a miserable life. They have no chance of progress." 

Nehru expressed the similar views in his *Autobiography*:

"Our ultimate goal can be nothing but establishment of a classless society in which all people get economic justice with equal opportunities. Such an organized and planned society will ensure cultural and economic development of mankind. In such a society there will be encouragement for cooperation, selfless service,
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love, sympathy and good work. In the obstacle in the way of achieving this goal will have to be removed by peaceful methods or force.\textsuperscript{5}

Nehru propagated a political philosophy for the construction of Indian society based on equality, social justice, and security. Nehru tried to evolve a social philosophy. In order to achieve the goal of classless society he emphasized the need of total transformation of social life through democratic methods. He was of the opinion that the process of rich becoming richer and poor becoming poorer has to be stopped by planned method so that the poor can rise above their condition whenever opportunity arises.

Nehru was greatly impressed by the efforts of the Soviet Union to bring about total change in the social life by planned methods after the revolution. Even then he could not accept the practical form of communism as it involved violence in its implementation. Moreover, it is deprived of human experience of values and ideals. Classless society is a noble ideal but violent methods cannot be supported for its realization. Nehru considered violence as wholly unscientific, irrational, and uncivilized methodology. He said:

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid.
"Socialism ultimately is not only a way of life but also a scientific point of view about social economic problems. If we implement socialism in a backward and undeveloped country it will not eliminate backwardness altogether. In fact we will be left with only a poor and backward society."  

He believed that it is only by planned methods that the nation can be slowly and gradually taken towards socialism.

Nehru, with full faith in principles of socialism, stressed the need of social and economic changes for evolving a socialistic society. In the third decade of this century he said, "I have gradually accepted the point of view of scientific socialism and now I can claim myself as a socialist in the real sense of the term."  

In his message on the occasion of All India Socialist Conference, 1936, he said, "Political freedom is implied in socialism because without it there cannot be social and economic freedom."  

After 1934 he continuously talked of socialism as the only remedy of poverty, unemployment and other social problems. On May 19, 1936, Nehru said at Bombay,
"We have to construct a new social system in which all are assured of equal opportunities for development, in which there will be no exploitation, in which there will not only be political democracy but also economic democracy in the form of economic equality."\(^9\)

For nearly seventeen years after independence Nehru remained solely responsible for determining social, political, and economic policies of the country. During this period he always talked about the scientific socialism as a philosophy of life. He laid special emphasis on four important conditions for solving the India’s problems through socialism, raising of the standard of life of general masses, providing them better means of life, providing them opportunities for physical, cultural, and spiritual development, and ending of economic disparity gradually by non-violent means.

Socialism and secularism are two inseparable concepts. In democratic socialism there is no place for religious politics. Whatever Nehru did in favour of developing secular thinking in the country that is his most significant contribution to the modern Indian thought. Inheriting progressive ideas from his father, Pt. Nehru, was of the view that India should solve her
political problems within the framework of federal structure consisting of multi-religious multi-lingual and multi-cast societies.

He had no attraction for religion and during the freedom movement he always denounced communalism. In 1932, when Gandhi started his fast on the issue of separate electorate Nehru was greatly annoyed. Humanity was his temple and service of the general masses was his religion.

Evolution of secular tradition in this country is Nehru’s greatest contribution. When India got freedom there were five crores of Muslims with majority population of Hindus. For the development of an ideal democratic state religion was an important factor. There was a serious problem of organizing the nation with her different religions, languages, and cultures. For solving this problem Nehru gave practical shape to the secular policy of the Congress. He was in favour of developing modern scientific culture with industrial civilization of our time. He asked people to behave with each other as human beings and not as Hindus, Muslims, or as people of any other caste or creed.

After independence it was necessity to develop friendship with all countries of the world. This was the only way of growing strong and powerful. Nehru also felt that India must play an important role in
international politics through her efforts for establishing peace and harmony among various nations. This thinking led him to develop the policy of non-alignment. He thought that, with her policy of non-alignment, India would be able to influence the big powers of the world and consequently help in decreasing the possibilities of another world war.

Many other nations of Asia and Africa along with India became free from foreign domination. These countries due to their limited resources could easily turn towards the communist or the American Bloc for the political and economic security. But there was danger to their independent existence in such a state of independence. In order to stop this process and in order to strengthen the freedom of Asian and African countries, Nehru entered into negotiation with these countries and formed a powerful group of non-aligned countries on the basis of Panchsheel or five principles of co-existence. Through the policy of non-alignment, Nehru helped the newly independent countries to follow a new path. On September 18, 1956, Nehru said in America:

"We think that by mutual exchange of views and trade together with mutual relations with all countries of the world can learn something and develop faith in each other, for this reason we are trying to have friendship with all nations of the world in spite of differences in our policies and structures. We think that in this
way we will not only serve our country but help in contributing to peace and cooperation in the world.”¹⁰

Nehru was a great nationalist; but he was against the tendency of isolation. Peaceful co-existence for him was the practical form of non-alignment. He was of the view that millions of people living in non-aligned countries would work as a great moral force in holding the big powers from entering into conflict. He considered Panchsheel as the only guarantee for the future of mankind. His policies were criticized in some quarters after the Chinese aggression in 1962. But firm in his conviction Nehru said, “If China breaks the Panchsheel it is bad to her only. It is only the way of international behaviour. It was right, it is right, and it shall continue to be right in the future also.”¹¹

Among the builders of modern India Nehru occupies a unique place both as a thinker and practical guide. He not only helped the country in breaking her chains of slavery but also actively contributed in giving a new direction for leading a life of freedom, peace, and dignity. He set in motion the process of planned development with the ultimate goal of complete social and economic transformation of society. He played many sided role of

10. Ibid. p.222.
11. Ibid.
a revolutionary and a builder, a nationalist and an internationalist, a
democrat and a socialist. Nibedita Dash opines, “Nehru brought to India the
Renaissance of Italy, the Reformation of Germany, the Revolution of France
and the Democracy of Britain.”

Political integration of India after independence was a gigantic task in
view of nearly six hundred small and big princely states, a number of
languages, cultures and interests. Nehru was the only leader who could feel
the pulse of the country and understand the problems before her. It was his
real greatness that all the states were integrated into the union of India
without any trouble, without any violence. In this task he has the able
support from Sardar Patel. Not only this he laid the firm foundation of the
largest democracy in the world and created democratic consciousness in the
masses. The great political maturity which India, with her over sixty per cent
illiterate masses, has exhibited over the past sixty years is only due to the
democratic consciousness.

Jawaharlal Nehru has created urge in the masses for a better life,
raised their hopes and expectations, charted a course for them and set before
them a goal and a vision. Considering India’s size and its strategic situation,
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this galvanizing of the Indian masses will long be a live force affecting and influencing the course of human history. He set in motion forces for long term social, economic, and political changes. The crusade against communalism, casteism has an obvious purpose. He was spearheading the struggle for national liberation with a vision of a new Indian society. As a philosopher, guide, and the very spirit of India's revolution, the legacy of Nehru is the democratic tradition he has left. In spite of his socialist convictions and revolutionary mould, Nehru attached great importance to the individual.

Nehru in his long public life as a freedom fighter and a revolutionary, as a thinker and a political activist, formulated new concepts based on his understanding of the forces and factors operative in the Indian national movement. To Nehru the national movement at the conceptional level is made up of the activities and their effects by a determined group of people in order to achieve certain specific objectives or ideas.

One ideology of the national movement, Nehru, wanted the country to accept the goal of socialism for independent India. In his numerous writings and speeches, Nehru declared himself to be a socialist. At the Lahore
Session of the Congress [December 1929] in his presidential address, Nehru said:

"I must frankly confess that I am a socialist and a republican...........we must realize that the philosophy of socialism has permeated the entire structure of society the world over, and almost the only points in dispute are the pace and the methods of advance to its full realization. India will have to go that way too, if she seeks, to end her poverty and inequality, though she may evolve her own methods and may adapt the ideal to the genius of her race."\(^1\)

Nehru was the focus of socialist ideas in India between 1920 to 1947, and the youth of the country looked toward him for inspiration and guidance. Nehru occupied a pivotal position in this era.

Before discussing Nehru’s role in building socialist movement in the country, it is worthwhile to quote the factors which influenced the socio-political factors in India. First of all, the Russian Revolution had far reaching influence and repercussions on India. The Indian intelligentsia were attracted towards events in Russia; and read the Russian literature with keen interest. The official Report on Indian constitutional Reform [1918] said: “The
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Revolution in Russia and its beginning was regarded in India as a triumph over despotism. It has given an impetus to Indian political aspirations.\textsuperscript{14}

Working class movement and the activities of the Trade Union activities are other factors which had their impact on Nehru. He was influenced by the ideologies of Communism though not totally. Nehru's attitude towards communism could be put thus:

"While he did not accept all the fundamentals of Marxism, he did believe that were class antagonisms and exploitation of the workers and peasants by the property owners in a capitalist society. He also accepted that social organization on socialist principles was better than the exploitative capitalist social order. His assessment of Marx was: "Marx may be wrong in some of his statements ........But he seems to me to have possessed quite an extraordinary degree of insight into social phenomenon, and this insight was apparently due to the scientific method he adopted."\textsuperscript{15}

Nehru was influenced by Marx's scientific method, and later came to admire the Russian system of economic planning. At an intellectual level, both Marx and Russian experiment impressed Nehru. In a letter to his daughter Nehru wrote:

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p.100.
"The second wonder that the Soviet performed was to transform great parts of this area out of all recognition by prodigious schemes of planning. There is no instance in recorded history of such rapid advance of a people. The most notable advances have been in education and in industry. By vast First Year Plan the industrialization of Russia has been pushed on at a feverish pace and enormous factories have been set up." 16

Nehru has been inspired by the Marxist approach to the cosmos and history. In his Autobiography he confesses that the communist philosophy of life gave him comfort and hope. It attempted to explain the past and offered hope to future. The scientific anti-theological, anti-superstitious orientation of the Marxist philosophy of history appealed to him. But he never became a thoroughly convinced Marxist. Instead he advocated the concept of socialism for India’s progress. Under his leadership the Indian National Congress accepted the ideal of a socialistic pattern of society at the Avadi Session in January, 1955.

Nehru believes in ethical socialism. He has regarded socialism also as a philosophy of life and not merely as a formula for economic reconstruction. His attachment to socialism was not of the vague humanitarian type but meant socialism in an ‘economic’ sense. He would
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not subscribe to the thesis that socialism is wholly equivalent to accentuation of production through electrification and nationalization of industries. He would give a place to the rural industries and Khadi in his scheme of economic reconstruction. He said in his Lucknow Congress presidential speech:

"I believe in the rapid industrialization of the country and only thus I think will the standards of the people rise substantially and poverty be combated. Yet I have cooperated wholeheartedly in the past with the Khadi programme and I hope to do so in the future because, I believe that Khadi and village industries have a definite place in our present economy."\(^{17}\)

As chairman of the National Planning Committee set up by the Indian National Congress in 1938 when Subhas Chandra Bose was the Congress President, Nehru made it clear that planning included not only big industries but also the encouragement to cottage industries. As a result, the National Planning Committee stressed the importance of cottage industries for consumer goods and employment.
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Nehru accepts that socialism can be realized immediately. He believes in the accentuation of production by harnessing the resources of science and technology. He is deeply attached to the concept of planning as a technique of advancement of productivity. Nehru believes in nationalization but he emphasizes increase of productive resources and at least approximately full employment. He insists on the State setting up new industries. Nehru subscribes to the ideas of welfare state accepted by Pigou and the exponents of British Labour Party ideology. He talked about ‘progressive socialism’ and stressed the necessity of agrarian reconstruction in India. Under his guidance the Indian Congress Party had accepted the ideals of a socialistic pattern of society and cooperative farming.

Nehru was committed to the theory and practice of mixed economy. This was accepted by the two five year plans. He believed in nationalization of some industries as well as in the setting up by the State of new industries. He would simultaneously provide an important place to the private sector.

Nehru was keenly conscious of India’s grave economic problems—unemployment, under-employment, rampant poverty, food shortage, high prices, etc. For eradicating these maladies he accepted and tried to
implement the concepts of planned economics. He had placed socialism as a concrete social economic objective before the Congress and the country.

Nehru believed in the creative possibilities of human nature. Like Turgot Conforce and Lenin, he had faith in progress. He accepted the concept of scientific humanism. His humanism stems from his sensitive and deep reactions to pain and misery. In the early twenties his wanderings amongst the kisans of Uttar Pradesh revealed to him the rural world of abject misery, despair, and frustration. Through all his struggles and personal worries Nehru retained his love for man and his noble hope in the creative destiny of man's endeavours. He pleads for dynamic activity for building a new India with its foundations upon scientific outlook and rationalist methodology but in place of the prevalent naturalistic world-view of science, Nehru pleads for a restoration of human values and dignity.

Nehru had love for liberty, not merely for his people but for all people of the world. He therefore expressed sympathy and support for all liberation movements in Africa, Asia, and South America. He believed in the freedom of all without distinction of class, creed or country. He pointed out in his *Autobiography*, "as peace was said to be indivisible in the present day world,
so also freedom was indivisible and the World could not continue long, part free and part unfree.”

Above all, Nehru was a citizen of the world. His vision of the future embraced the whole humanity. His concern was humanity as a whole. He became in the words of Kingsley Marin, “A symbol to the entire World, a symbol of the World we look for, we hope for, which is yet to come.”

Often Nehruvian ideology is confused with Gandhian ideology. Nehru looks like a Gandhian. He is a Gandhian with a difference. This difference from Gandhian ideology creates Nehruvian ideology. Nehru is inspired by two ideologies—1. Socialism 2. Gandhianism. He is a critical admirer of Gandhianism and at the same time socialism. Nehruvian ideology is a combination of the Gandhianism and socialism. The dichotomy in his ideology emerges out of this spiritualization of socialism is his ideology. His ideology is shaped out of the compromise and conflict with Gandhian and socialist ideologies. For example, in The Sword and Sickle, Lala Singh is a critical admirer of Gandhi and socialist ideology. In Bhabani Bhattacharya’s Shadow from the Ladakh, Satyajit is presented as an admirer of Gandhian ideology whereas Bhashkar is portrayed as a believer in Nehru’s idea of
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progress. Even in *Untouchable* and *Coolie*, Nehru is presented as the critical admirer of both.

There are quite a few novels written in Indian English which portray Nehru’s ideals. But for interpretation and assessment of Nehruvian ideology in this thesis, Bhabani Bhattacharya’s *Shadow from the Ladakh*, Khushwant Singh’s *Train to Pakistan* and Shashi Tharoor’s *The Great Indian Novel* are chosen.

**SHADOW FROM LADAKH:** Casting a Long Shadow on Nehru

Bhabani Bhattacharya’s novel, *Shadow from the Ladakh* (1966) presents the Nehruvian ideology of progress and industrialization. Though the novel has already been discussed in Chapter Three for the minor treatment of Gandhian ideology, it is taken up once again for the detailed analysis of Nehruvian ideology in this chapter. The novel won the Sahitya Akademi Award of 1968, and the citation speaks of Bhattacharya as

"a writer of considerable sensitivity and charm...[who] has depicted a cross-section of contemporary India during a period of transition and rapid
development, and ahs reflected the intricate pattern of present day life with a remarkable understanding and clarity.”

The Nehruvian ideology is represented by Bhashkar Roy, the forward-looking Chief Engineer in a steel plant. Bhashkar Roy is an American trained fellow, and his outlook is highly westernized like Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru who feels India’s future lies in industrialization. He and his steel town are the shadows of Nehru and his dream edifices of industry and progress of the country.

It has been suggested that the title of the novel is based on the popular proverb “on coming events cast their shadows before.” Set against the background of the Chinese invasion of 1962, the novel presents the confrontation between Gandhism and industrialism. The theme registers the conflict of ideologies-Nehruvian with Gandhian.

Bhattacharya is a novelist strongly influenced by the ideas of Nehru. He is a novelist of ideas. His novels present a true picture of India and its teeming millions. It is evident that in *Shadow from Ladakh*, Bhattacharya is
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aiming at a vision of social regeneration in India by synthesizing Gandhism and Nehruism. Lila Ray’s observation about Bhattacharya is apt to quote here. She says,

“As we read his writing, we hear the dialogue between man and his situation, between man and man, and between man and the ideas he lives by.”

In Shadow from Ladakh, Bhashkar Roy, a true Nehruvian, stands for three notions: steel standing for machines of mass production, steel representing the weapons for the country’s defence and not to take vice as sin by avoiding all inhibitions. To him, steel is the shaper of India’s future. His steel temper is softened by his love for Sumita. The menace of China makes him vehement in his argument for industrialization. He believes that only force can face the aggression.

Bhashkar is the exponent of the theory of industrialization that should change the course of life and outlook and make life fuller and happier. He rebels against marriages in Indian society in which girls have to give themselves body and soul to the unknown men and live with them. He favours the kind of love marriages of the machine age.

The Chinese invasion of 1962 forms the setting of the novel in which the presentation of the contrast between Gandhism and Nehruism is vitiated by the importation of conventionalities. In fact, the Chinese invasion which provides the setting to the novel is largely believed to be Nehru’s failure of handling the situation. Bireswar met Suruchi, wife of Satyajit, who returned from Moscow after attending the Peace Congress. His unhappiness over Nehru’s dealing of the situation is being narrated to her in the following passage of the novel.

“Nehru has known for years what’s been happening in Aksai-Chin. But he’s been steadfast in his belief that everything will be settled in a friendly way. He kept this problem a close secret for years lest anger grow in India and chances of understanding be swept away.”

The title of the novel itself sets the pace of the writing, and the military situation casts its shadow almost everywhere. K.R. Srinivasa Iyengar opines,

“Words and snatches from Nehru’s speeches – recapitulations of recent Indian history – help to evoke the appropriate historical background; the main characters

in the novel tend to merge with the figures of history; and types, symbols, myths
and individuals mingle and fuse to throw us off our guard."  

If the whole action of the novel is something of a shadow play cast by
the Chinese peril, many of the characters are shadows too—shadows chasing
shadows. Satyajit is Gandhi’s shadow, and Bhashkar, the Chief Engineer of
Steel town, is almost a Nehruvian symbol or shadow. Satyajit’s Gandhigram
is distantly patterned after Gandhiji’s Sevagram, and Bhashkar’s Steeltown
could likewise be one of the dream-edifices of Nehru’s imagination. Nehru’s
idea of economic progress is being narrated in the words of Bhashkar Roy:

"Steel means economic progress. Machine tools, tractors, big industrial plants,
locomotives. Steel to fight poverty and hunger. But steel has gained a second
meaning. It stands for our country’s freedom. That is an inescapable fact, not to
be changed by wishful thinking. Development plus defense—a compulsion of our
current history." (P-27)

Bhattacharya is a novelist strongly influenced by Nehru’s ideals of
progressive thinking. Many of Nehru’s thoughts about the progress of the
country are well expressed in the novel. His novel, Shadow from Ladakh
provides an insight into the contrasting contemporary life of India
symbolized by Satyajit who regards Indian village life as the ideal life and
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by the westernized American trained Bhashkar, the forward-looking Chief Engineer in a steel plant, who feels India’s future lies in industrialization. It ends on a weak note of coexistence of these two ideologies. Bhashkar wants to dispossess Gandhigram, because it is a hindrance to India’s industrialization. His design for the progress of India and remedy for the unemployment are well expressed in these words:

“There lay the Steeltown- ten thousand orbs of light on the streets made various geometrical designs. Two miles away, the blaze of an open-hearth furnace gave the air a flame wash. Two hundred tons of steel ingots in each round of smelting: the means of life for two hundred newborn babies. The babies would not eat steel. But steel was the spine of the economy. Steel was food and clothing and dwelling. Steel was culture and art and ritual. And steel was soon to be the honour of the people, the shield of their freedom.” (P-35)

Nehru as a statesman had master plans for abolishing the poverty and the country’s progress. This has been enumerated in the words of Bhashkar who narrates his proposed plan to Sumita about how to utilize the recourses of the country for overall progress:

“With industrial progress we’ll attain higher standards within a short span of time. We have big resources in men, materials. What we need is application, energy. We’ve been sitting tight over the ages. Let’s start moving along. Let’s mobilize
It is evident that Bhattacharya is aiming at a vision of social regeneration in India by synthesizing Gandhism and Nehruism. A full analysis of the novel will show a synthesis of the spinning wheel and the spindle. Another synthesis is of Gandhiji’s asceticism and Tagore’s aestheticism. The question whether there is possibility for co-existence between Steel town’s furnaces and Gandhigram’s spinning wheels—produces another question whether there is a possibility of peaceful co-existence between Mao’s armour plaited expansionist absolutist China and Nehru’s democratic socialist federal republic.

The novel is an attempt to find out the meeting point of the Gandhian social ethics and the tremendous forces of science and technology. Bhattacharya made the Gandhian principle of “simple living and high thinking” a mode of life, an ideal to live by. The novel deals with the conflict of values and ultimate triumph of the Gandhian principle. Two ways of life, industrial and rural, are brought in contrast with each other. The narrative appears favouring Satyajit who is a miniature Gandhi. However, he is equally aware of the need of India’s industrialization in view of the
growing population as well as the external threat. The ambivalence is placed in this context. The conflict of ideologies is symbolized by the clash between Gandhigram and Steeltown. Taking extreme positions, Bhaskar and Satyajit lead two opposing ways of life never to be harmonized. But Sumita, moulded in Satyajit’s image and planning to marry Bhaskar, will be metaphysically speaking the meeting point of the two opposing ways.

Imbibing the Gandhian spirit, India begins treading on the path of progress, but a testing time comes with the Chinese aggression. Indian Government’s one point programme is to meet strength with strength but Satyajit is against this point. The idyllic life of Gandhigram is disturbed and Gandhian economics is threatened by the newly created noise of industrialization especially when Steeltown with its heavy machines and blast furnaces springs up in the vicinity of Gandhigram. With the Shadow from Ladakh hovering over the whole country, steel comes to acquire a greater significance. It stands as the symbol of India’s freedom since it is the core of all armament. The American trained young Chief Engineer Bhashkar Roy is the moving force behind Steeltown. He represents a three dimensional opposition to Satyajit and Satyajitism. His American education makes him believe in steel standing for mass production to cope with the
growing population of India, providing a shield to protect the infant democracy against all enemies.

Bhashkar wants to expand his Steeltown factory which will result in annexing Gandhigram. Devoting to his work he spares no pains in laboring to speed up the production to make four hundred million lives a little more livable. Thus, the two completely dedicated men, Satyajit and Bhashkar, are brought to polar opposition. The board of Directors of the Unit of Lohapur Steel Company finally approves of his scheme of expansion. Even Nehru’s Government gives his permission for this expansion. This Chinese invasion justifies Bhashkar’s standpoint and gives added urgency in executing his plan.

Bhashkar knows that Satyajit is the real obstacle to his plan for he is a man with a soul force ready to bring any political or legal pressure. On the other hand, Satyajit is rocked by two burning problems- the peril of the country from China’s attack and the peril of Gandhigram being swallowed up by Steeltown.

Of the two burning problems- China’s attack on India being the national cause, gets priority with Satyajit and he puts forward a proposal to the Government for a Peace Mission to Ladakh. But the government rejects
his proposal. At last the proposal is accepted with a slight modification. But the Chinese order ceasefire and withdraw their forces unilaterally. Thus, ends the nation's problem for the time being but leaves the conflict in the nation's policy unresolved.

Satyajit returns to Gandhigram and he is ready to resist the Steeltown's expansion by undertaking a fast unto death. He announces it in the language that Gandhi used on the occasion of one of his crucial fasts in the past. Bhashkar is intelligent enough to understand the value of non-violence and he keeps reverence for Satyajit. He has ordered the construction of Meadow House and has set up a club there, half a way between Steeltown and Gandhigram to win Gandhigram over to his side by encouraging the free mixing of the sexes of both the places in the club. He witnesses his first success when Jhanak, a girl of Gandhigram, revolts against its philosophy of anti-life. Then many of the people of Gandhigram, including Sumita, begin to take interest in the activities of the Meadow House. There is no longer an impenetrable barrier between the two worlds.

When Sumita learns Bhashkar's designs against Gandhigram, she goes to Delhi to support her father there. Her company with Nandini, the niece of Bireswar and her visits to historical monuments of Delhi, its
restaurants and clubs, make her see life in its full splendour and heightened awareness of her womanhood. After her return to Gandhigram she has been attracted to the westernized culture of Steeltown and to Bhashkar, the living symbol of this culture.

Bhashkar's falling in love with Sumita brings a synthesis or compromise between the two different ideologies. Bhashkar's attitude to Satyajit and his ideal undergoes a change. He ultimately decides not to annex Gandhigram in the way he proposed. Bhashkar himself leads a procession of workmen from Steeltown to Gandhigram to announce the victory of Satyajit. Thus the crisis of the novel is resolved. Satyajit gains Gandhigram at the cost of Sumita who is at last free from the curse of anti-life and asceticism. A lady, historically, is a myth of compromise.

Thus, the two ideologies are brought together to co-exist and Bhashkar's marriage to Sumita is the marriage of Steeltown with Gandhigram. While Bhashkar has changed his ideal and attitude to the village, Satyajit also has changed a lot. Then comes the end of the issue which is described in the words of G. P. Sarma: "A happy combination of Gandhi, Nehru and Tagore together."

Bhattacharya is concerned with the future of India, her social, religious, economic and political regeneration. So the story shows that in the contemporary context, neither Gandhian nor Nehruism can alone be the national ideal; only a harmonious combination of the two would be an answer to the problems facing the nation today.

Shadow from Ladakh reflects his affirmative vision of life. The need for the synthesis of modern industrialization with small-scale rural industry, asceticism and non-violence, is hinted at in this novel through the synthesis of ideologies of Gandhigram and Steeltown, and through the love affair of Bhashkar and Sumita. Thus all the frustrations and conflicts are calmed down to bring a new hopeful life.

The author emphasizes his point of argument that life is to be accepted in its totality. The novel concludes with Sumita's freedom from her father's strict asceticism and enjoying her life's true fulfillment. Thus, Bhattacharya's faith in the affirmative aspect of life is reflected in this entire novel. M.K. Naik opines, "the projection of a contrast between two conflicting political ideologies is an obvious strategy for a political novel."

To sum up, it can be said that *Shadow from Ladakh* presents the Nehruvian ideology in contrast with the Gandhian ideology. Though the novel tries to give a justice to Nehru’s progressive thinking through industrialization of the country but towards the end of the novel it surrenders to Gandhian ideology. The novel depicts Nehru’s attention towards the social realities of the post-Independence India- the need for overlooking caste-system for the betterment of the society and the population explosion which is becoming a problem to the national life of India. Bhashkar is portrayed to be afraid of this horrible problem of the birth of a child at every five seconds in India. The idea of feeding, rearing, clothing, educating, giving cultural welfare, giving employment and giving their due shares of human existence of these babies harasses Bhashkar.

**TRAIN TO PAKISTAN: A Shadow on Nehru’s Personality**

Khushwant Singh’s major novel, *Train to Pakistan* (1956) is one the finest realistic novels of post- Second World War. The novel critically assesses Nehru’s personality and his policies. It seems to say that the tragedy of partition is largely Nehru’s making. The blood-curdling account of the bestial cruelties let loose by the partition is conveyed through the recollections of the incidents by the Deputy Commissioner, Hukum Chand.
The author relates these incidents with stark realism and sardonic jibe at Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru:

"What do the Gandhi-caps, in Delhi know about the Punjab? What is happening on the other side in Pakistan does not matter to them. They have not lost their homes and belongings; they haven't had their mothers, wives, sisters and daughters raped and murdered in the streets."  

Train to Pakistan originally published as Mano Majra, is one of the best realistic novels of Indo-English fiction. It is a masterpiece containing well-built structure, on absorbing narrative sequences, in artistically planned plot and imaginatively alive characters. The novel presents lively picture of ghastly and inhuman incidents arising out of communal feeling fuelled by the partition of India and sordid communal politics. It also contains in its backdrop an absorbing love-story of Jugga and Nooran, who loved each other passionately despite belonging to two different religions and existing dark clouds of suspicion, fear and hatred between Sikhs and Muslims.

The story of the novel is set in a small village, Mano Majra, of Punjab province. The scene and sequences of the novel is laid down in the period of India's partition of India in 1947. Nearly ten million people - Hindus from

Pakistan and Muslims from India – are in struggle to find their new native
place amidst large scale scenes communal violence and bloodshed. Even in
such a difficult situation, the tiny hamlet of Mano Majra seems to be free
from communal frenzy and fratricidal strife. Muslims and Sikhs lived in
Mano Majra for centuries and they were always friendly and full of
fraternity.

Malli, a dacoit with his gang, entered into the village and demanded
the treasury of Ram Lal. Ram Lal, a money lender, was murdered as he had
refused to part with his treasury. The dacoits, leaving the village after
committing the crime, dropped a few bangles in the house of Juggat Singh,
popularly known as Jugga, a jail bird serving several sentences for many
charges, was not to leave home after sunset but the dating call of his beloved
Nooran, a weavers daughter, compelled him to go out of village forgetting
restricting rules.

Jugga and Nooran came back to village and found the village badly
perturbed due to dacoit and murder of Ram Lal. In the meantime, Hukum
Chand, the District Commissioner, staying in the officer’s rest house is seen
engaged in a sensual and sexual affair with a teen-aged prostitute, Haseena.
Hokum Chand hears the loud voice of gun shots, and shouting sounds of Mano Majrans. He leaves the girl and goes to enquire all about it.

The police, next day arrived at Mano Majra to make an enquiry into the dacoity and murder of Ram Lal. On the same day a Western educated young man, Iqbal Singh, arrived in the village by the train. Iqbal was taken into custody by police on suspicion and faces a typical interrogation. The magistrate, Hukum Chand, camping in the village also came to know about arrest of Iqbal. He recommends "third degree" treatment for Iqbal on hearing that Iqbal is not ready to reveal his identity. Both Iqbal and Jugga are held by police on the charge of murdering Ram Lal. Police tortured them inhumanely to extort a confession from them.

The acts of omission and commission, and fair and foul way of performing duties of Bureaucracy are major guiding forces in Train to Pakistan. The abuse of official power by police, the deprivation of human rights and the use of inhuman "third degree" treatment have been presented in the novel. Khushwant Singh throws light on the manner and culture of Punjabi rural people, who welcome whole-heartedly even to an unknown guest and serve them fresh milk. He shows that the urban people do not like
milk. The villagers express their regret in serving adequate hospitality to Iqbal when he arrives at Mano Majra.

The difference of behaviour and treatment given to Iqbal and Juggat Singh sufficiently indicates the class division in Indian society, divided between the rich and the poor, the educated and the illiterate; the Westernized and the rural people, and the urban dwellers and the rural dwellers. The police sub-inspector's inhuman treatment to Jugga and Iqbal substantiates the age-old mentality and their attitudes towards violation of human rights. Social stratification is a crude reality of Indian society and the concept of a classless society is merely a nebulous ideal.

"Kaliyug", a Sanskrit word "Kali-yug" which means a Yug (age of the Goddess Kali) symbolizes the suppression of human values by the forces of destruction and negation. It reflects the abnormal social situation of Mano Majra suffering from disorder, division and destruction where the "trains became less punctual that ever" and the alarm clock is "set for wrong hour". The news of Jugga's involvements in Ram Lal's murder has come up as great shock and surprise to Meet Singh. Meet Singh was not surprised on the fact that Juggat Singh has committed a murder and dacoity. He is amazed at the fact that he has committed sin of doing such crime in his own village.
The arrival of “ghostly” train is followed by the secret and strange activities of the police and Sikh soldiers. The villagers are much anxious and eager over the arrival of the strange train. But soon everyone came to know about the horrible truth and reality of massacring the Hindus and Sikhs, when “red tongues of flames leaped into the black sky”, causing painful destruction of large number of dead bodies.

Mano Majra is although a small rural world but represents and sketches wide socio-political situation of 1947. The moving symbol of “Kaliyug” creates a conflict and division in Mano Majra, where Sikhs and Muslims lived together happily and friendly for generations. The small world of Mano Majra has been invaded by the larger world of India-Pakistan division. The symbol of communal division is represented by the arrival of train bringing large numbers of dead bodies in the village. The machine has become the symbol of dehumanization of human beings. The human beings become demons and cut the throats of their fellowmen and the swollen river carried the corpses.

The quality of realism in Train to Pakistan deserves acclaim for highlighting the real incidents through the real people. The accurate presentation of incidents and characters exhibits Khushwant Singh’s genuine
faith in the humanistic ideals. The devotion of Jugga laying down his life for the woman he loves, is almost devotion of his own. It is really the Khushwant’s own deep and ethical moral values that govern his portrayal of the real and the actual.

The character, Hukum Chand, the Magistrate and Deputy Commissioner who seems to typify Nehruvian personality. Hukum Chand is past his middle age. He has climbed the ladders of the administrative machinery of the government as he knows how to ‘please’ his bosses.

"Hukum Chand shaved and bathed with great care. After bathing he rubbed skin-lotion on his face and arms and dusted himself with perfumed talcum powder. He dabbled his fingers with eau de cologne. Brilliantine made his hair smooth and soggy and showed the white at the roots of it."(P-25)

Hukum Chand symbolizes the inability of the Indian government to handle a crisis of this magnitude. He is brilliant, shrewd and cunning with a lot of manipulative capacity. There are frustrations for him everywhere, at home and in his job at front. He has to make a living with a wife whom he does not love and a work which is too demanding, without adequate means to handle the situation. He knows very well that he is just being tossed around by the situation, with less than adequate men and materials at his
disposal to handle the situation. The ‘government’ does not even have adequate supplies of kerosene or other wood to burn the corpses coming from Pakistan. Hukum Chand keeps ruminating at times in the novel:

“He is great man, this Mr. Nehru of yours. I do think he is the greatest man in the world today. And how handsome! Wasn’t that a wonderful thing to say? ‘Long ago we made a tryst with destiny and now the time comes when we shall redeem our pledge, not wholly or in full measure but very substantially.’ ‘Yes, Mr. Prime Minister, you made tryst.” (P-176)

All this has made him an extremely frustrated officer, knowing full well the incongruities of the situation, a weak and inadequately prepared government on the one hand and the madness that had enveloped the situation. As Ron Shephards rightly observes, “Hukum Chand is a king without kingdom as the Hindu-Muslim conflict obliterates the last remnants of law and order.”27

Not that Hukum Chand is incompetent and incapable as an administrator, but the situation is too overwhelming. The basic fairness and impartiality of Hukum Chand in the situation cannot be questioned. He has an acute sense of the practical reality.

It is obvious that the pressures of the situation have converted him into a treacherous character like the night on which they burnt thousands of dead bodies; he cannot sleep without drowning himself in whisky and women. Not that he is corrupt, but he has to keep dismissing his conscience in pegs of whisky which he can do quite easily. He has learnt to live that way, very much habituated.

Hukum Chand has the shades of a Nehruvian personality with his burning desire to do well, and also in his awareness that nothing much can be done, due to the forces of the situation. Hukum Chand, in spite of that, is brilliant. He knows whom to arrest and release and on what excuse. He also knows full well the relevance of characters like Jugga, the Badmash No-10 and Iqbal. His release of Juggat Singh and Iqbal, when he knows that all other options are closed to save the train to Pakistan is indeed a brilliant manoeuvre. He is a character who is in the full grasp of the political situation and also knows that it is beyond him. He holds the key to the events in the novel.

*Train to Pakistan* presents a moving tragic tale of partition period of Indian history during Nehru's regime. In its background there is the greatest
human catastrophe of the partition- India and Pakistan and the inhuman events that followed. As K.R.Srinivasa Iyengar says,

"The 'leaders' had sowed the wind of communal suspicion, and Partition was the result; like a whirlwind, the mad act of Partition was uprooting masses of humanity, managing them, and throwing them across the border in heap after heap."\(^{28}\)

Here the sign post has been pointed at Nehru for the partition of the country into India and Pakistan.

The Commissioner, Hukum Chand, in the novel is undoubtedly presented in the image of Nehru. Hukum Chand, the Commissioner is intelligent and has bona fide intensions. He wants to do good things. But he is overwhelmed by a circumstance of partition. He is completely out done by the evil forces of partition. Like Nehru, the Prime Minister who was overwhelmed by the circumstances and was not able to deliver results in spite of his good intensions, Hukum Chand becomes only a play thing in the hands of the circumstance. The novel is a critical portrait of Hukum Chand and hence, symbolically the novel is a critical appraisal of Nehruvian politics. The presentation of the strokes of the Nehruvian personality in

Hukum Chand is unmistakable. The novelist is often suspected to have a broad Nehruvian dimension to the character portrayal of Hukum Chand through the presentation of Hukum Chand’s fondness for women. For Hukum Chand can’t sleep without a woman in his arms. Probably, one can say that Train to Pakistan is a highly unfair representation of the Nehruvian ideology. The political details are obviously missing. The novel seems to understand Nehru and assess his personality from one dimensional point of view.

Train to Pakistan has a nice combination of tragedy and comedy. It contains a grim story of individuals and communities influenced greatly by the holocaust of the partition of India. It presents the heart rendering scenes of violence in riots of partition, resulting a thousand of charged corpses sizzling and smoking. Dr. M.K. Naik says:

"Khushwant Singh’s A Train to Pakistan is a copy-book example. The story here would fit any popular film. Juggat Singh saves the train which carries his Muslim beloved Nooran and other Muslim refugees across the border to Pakistan, but loses his life in the process. Packed with incidents of rape and murder, loot and arson, spying and accident, this is a tale told by an accomplished story-teller, but signifying nothing more than gaudy melodrama."\(^{29}\)

Thus, the novel, *Train to Pakistan* presents a critical assessment of the Nehruvian personality, politics and ideology. However, the ideology of Nehru is not given a full-scale treatment here. The details are sketchy. The positive side of the Nehruvian personality is conspicuous by its absence. But what is outstanding in the novel is a symbolic presentation of Nehruvian personality.

**THE GREAT INDIAN NOVEL: A Novel of Remaking India**

Shashi Tharoor’s *The Great Indian Novel* (1989) is another novel, chosen for the study of Nehruvian ideology. The novel assesses Nehru’s personality rather ironically. It reverses the traditional direction of cultural colonization, rewriting history through both Indian and British intertexts.

The novel uses the rough outline of *The Mahabharata* to present a parable of the politics of Indian independence and post-independence until immediately after the lift of the Emergency. This involves Tharoor in a bit of rewriting of history, and he constantly adopts a sceptical stance towards the simplicity of nationalist and socialist discourses of nationhood that prevailed in those decades.

The political history of modern India, as Tharoor’s novel demonstrates, resembles closely the events and the characters of the great
Indian epic, the *Mahabharata* (literally ‘Great India’). It is a biting commentary on the political history of modern India. History is blind like Dhritarastra (Nehru) and therefore it repeats its mistakes. In fact, Nehru was responsible in organizing the Congress (Kaurava) Party into a powerful one at all levels. The narrator of the novel describes Nehru (the Modern Dhritarastra) rather in ludicrous manner:

"Dhritarashtra’s disappointment with fatherhood and the failing health of his grim wife drove him wholeheartedly into politics. Here he surprised everyone with his flair for the task. He had the blind man’s gift of seeing the world not as it was, but as he wanted it to be. Even better, he was able to convince everyone around him that his vision was superior to theirs. In short while he was, despite his handicap, a leading light of the Kaurava Party, drafting its press releases and official communications to the government, formulating its positions on foreign affairs, and establishing himself as the party’s most articulate and attractive spokesman on just about anything on which Cantabrigian Fabianism had given him an opinion.”

The *Great Indian Novel* is the well known Hastinapur family of the *Mahabharata*, every prominent member of which is allegorized to present some important political leader. For instance, in the figure of Bhishma as

Gangaji, Gandhiji is recreated. Dhritaharastra, the blind heir to the Hastnapura throne represents Nehru, while Priya Duryodhani, his daughter stands for Indira Gandhi. The historical events covered are almost the same as those in the precursor.

The history of modern India that Tharoor re-tells in this novel covers a time-span that approximately begins with the emergence of Mahatma Gandhi (Gangaji) on the Indian political scenario during the British Raj and comes to an end with the fall of the Janata government and re-election of Indira Gandhi (Priya Duryodhani) in 1980. A passing reference to Indira Gandhi’s assassination towards the end of the novel makes the end-limit of the time-span covered to be 1984. Almost all the important personages and episodes from India’s pre-Independence and post-Independence era of the period covered in the novel are included in the narrative.

The book is dictated by the cantankerous old politician, Ved Vyas, to Ganapathi, the scribe. It narrates the story of the fight for independence of Hastinapur, led by the saintly and shrewd Mahaguru Gangaji (Mahatma Gandhi), his famous Mango March (Salt March) and “the birth of Indian democracy as the result of the passionate coupling of a blind Nationalist (Jawaharlal Nehru) and a British Vicereine (Lady Mountbatten).” Other
crucial characters are Kama (Md. Ali Jinnah), the Muslim leader who calls for and achieves the partition of the country, and Pandu the Pale (Subhash Chandra Bose), who seeks Japanese support to liberate India. This phase of intricate family politics leads on to the post-independence fight for position between the Pandavas and Duryodhani (Indira Gandhi), the only 'Kaurava' who makes it into *The Great Indian Novel* from the pages of *The Mahabharata* where Duryodhan had 99 brothers. To quote Shashi Tharoor's words:

"The Great Indian Novel is an attempt to retell the political history of 20th century India through a fictional recasting of events, episodes and characters from the Mahabharata. ...... its title is not a reflection of my estimate of its contents, but a reference to this source of inspiration (for "Mahabharata", after all, can be read to mean "Great India")." 31

Though the novel depicts a partial presentation of Nehru's personality, it is assessed here for the study of his ideology. Nehru's *Discovery of India* and *An Autobiography*, and Gandhi's autobiography, *My Experiments with Truth* serve as source material for Tharoor. His idea of the stature and significance of the father of the nation has been obviously influenced by Nehru's views. The Nehru's portrait, sketched in the novel, is not at all a

---

flattering one and, ironically enough, the basic idea is derived from blind Dhritarastra.

The novel is full of puns about Nehru’s personality, many of them very funny, some merely clever. Here is a passage about the education of Dhritarastra in England:

“... as a child he found education in India a harrowing experience, which was, no doubt, why he was in due course sent to Eton. The British public school system fitted the young man to a T (the finest Darjeeling, which he obtained every month from Fortnum and Mason...).” (P-41)

Nehru studied at Harrow and Trinity College, Cambridge.

Though many political personalities of modern India figure in this novel, only Nehru is chosen for the critical assessment of his personality and his ideals. Nehru’s ideals like equality, social justice, plans for the progress of the country, etc. represented by the major character, Dhritarastra, draws a critical reference.

Nehru’s (Dhitarashtra’s) multi-dimensional personality is being portrayed by the narrator in the following manner:
“Dhritarastra, for one, as you already know, Ganapathi, had acquired in England traces of the right accent along with streaks of the wrong ideas. He had returned fired with Fabianism, which taught that equality and justice were everybody’s right, and which (with typical imprecision) omitted to exclude the heathen from the definition of ‘everybody’.” (Pp.110-111)

Nehru’s propagation for the self-government run by the Indians for the welfare of Indians is presented in the novel.

“...so that Dhritarastra found himself drawing the corollary that the Indian government could only fulfill its duty if it were a government of India run by the Indians for the welfare of Indians... It was a doctrine persuasively and passionately argued by the unseeing visionary.”(P-111)

The partition of the country which is largely believed to be Nehru’s making is also portrayed in the novel. It is believed that the partition of India paid a high price for Dhritarashtra’s idealism.

“To this day it(partition) is scarred by tank-tracks, amputated by cease fire lines, exploited by rhetoricians and fanatics on both sides of the frontier who prostitute its name for their own meretricious purposes.” (P-260)

Nehru’s socialistic ideals are also enumerated in the novel.

“...these are the sorts of things that I have spoken and written about all my life, the kinds of things that the Kaurava movement was, as far as I am concerned, all
about. You know my views- we were (he and J.P.) Socialists in London together."(P-270)

Nehru advocated for the industrialization for progress of the country. He considered that industries are the modern temples of India. This concept also finds a space in the novel.

"Dhritarastra hopes that our people will abandon their old temples, their real temples, to pray at the altar of his new machinery... this government has got to be pressed into implementing the land reforms the Kaurava Party has promised since before Independence."(P-275)

Nehru’s concept of the nationalism and the non-aligned movement for a peaceful co-existence with the neighbouring countries are presented in the novel in an ironic manner.

"Both- Dhritarastra for idealistic reasons, Kanika for ideological ones- believed in the non-alignment they preached, but neither could control the conviction or even the conduct of those who were to implement their policies."(P-295)

Tharoor, a man of many cultures and brought up and educated abroad, has had obviously highly cerebral western education that seems to have desensitized him to the human-cultural matrices of India. His sensibilities are in sharp contrast with those of Raja Rao, who in spite of living abroad has been deeply nourished in the Indian ethos.
Thus, *The Great Indian Novel* presents the Nehruvian ideology in an ironic manner. Here blind Dhritaharastra is visualized as a power-hungry Jawaharlal Lal Nehru. The novel is a comic retelling of the *Mahabharata* story, into which the author cleverly interweaves the fate and fortunes of the players of the never-ending comic drama of modern Indian politics. His witticisms of language and caricature of characters are fitted into the ready-made structure of an epic poem. Nehru’s concern for his daughter’s future and the actions taken during his regime as the Prime Minister are depicted effectively by the novelist.

These novels, as discussed, treat Nehruvian ideology from varieties of angles. At the outset, these novels portray Nehru’s ideals like liberty, equality, fraternity, social justice, his five principles (*Panchasheela*), nationalism, humanism and his idea of progress. Broadly, these novels seem to be a critique of the Nehruvian ideology and seem to think that post-independent Indian political trauma is largely due to Nehru. If Bhabani Bhattacharya’s *Shadow from the Ladakh* portrays Nehru’s progressive thinking, Khushwant Singh’s *Train to Pakistan* and Shashi Tharoor’s *The Great Indian Novel* depict Nehru’s failure of handling the post-Independence
situation in India. Also, curiously enough the novels do not seem to undertake an extensive probing of the Nehruvian ideology.

It is interesting to note that compared to Gandhi, the representation of Nehruvian ideology draws a considerable weakened attention. No novel in Indian English Literature is exclusively built on Nehruvian personality in spite of his grace, charm, erudition and mass appeal. Unlike Gandhi, the personality of Nehru seems to draw very little attention. This is because the Indian English novelist does not seem to be able to differentiate Nehruvian politics and ideology from that of Gandhian politics and ideology. They seem to mistake Nehru for Gandhi.

Another interesting aspect of the presentation of the Nehruvian ideology is that the Indian novelist seems to see Nehru only in negatives. Nehru seems to draw flak for the weaknesses in the political system. Sometimes, he seems to be blamed unnecessarily and unjustly as in The Great Indian Novel and Train to Pakistan. It is interesting to see Nehru being blamed for the overwhelming weaknesses of an age. Gandhi gets adulation at least in a few of the Indian English novels. Gandhi is iconised. But in most of the Indian English novels, Nehru is unjustly demonized. This is a curious aspect in the presentation of the Nehruvian ideology.