

## Moderate Ideology and politics

### Mains Features: -

1. Moderate leaders were enthused by dazzling ideological achievements of western constitutional government, liberalism and representative institutions.
2. Moderates were swayed by the British liberalism and were persuaded to believe that in the long run the crown would fulfill its providential mission.
3. The leaders like Surendra Nath Banerjee underlined the importance of the loyalty of the British rule in protecting India's future.
4. They were simply opposed to the unBritish rule in India. In other words, they took Anglo-Indian bureaucracy largely accountable for mis-governance in India, otherwise, they were having highly praise for the British rule. Moderates believed that continuation of the British rule Sine-qua-non of India's progress as a civilized nation.
5. Moderates like Naoroji and Gokhale preferred to give larger political role to the Congress but they tried to avoid the friction with the ruler.
6. They did not believe in the power of the masses rather treated themselves as the natural leaders of masses.
7. Moderate leaders like Dadabhai Naoroji, R.C. Dutt and Ranade presented a systematic criticism of colonial economy through propounding the theory of Drain of wealth.
8. Even moderate politics had two major achievements- (a) There is no denying the fact that moderate leaders never launched any mass movement in India but by providing ideological critique of the British rule questioned the hegemony of the British rule in India (b) The moderate's constitutional method prepared the way for future revolution of India.

## Extremist Ideology

### Common Features: -

1. Unlike moderate leaders, they were having larger appreciation for Indian past and culture.
2. They were convinced about the fact that from the view point of cultural heritage and religion, India was far ahead of west.
3. While rejecting the moderate method as the method of political mendicancy, the extremists gave emphasis over the method of passive resistance that consisted of Swadeshi, boycott, National Education and Swarajya.
4. While the moderates drew upon the British variety of liberalism, the extremists were inspired by the writing of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee and the teaching of Vivekananda.

The poem "Bande Mataram" in Anandamath clearly set the tone of the Extremist philosophy in which the notion of 'Mother' seemed to be prominent. Mother representing simultaneously the divine motherland and the mother-goddess, Durga, conveyed both patriotic and religious devotion. This was an articulation that generated mass emotional appeal which the Moderate form of constitutional agitation failed to arouse.

### **Bal Gangadhar Tilak**

Bal Gangadhar Tilak, rooted in Maharashtra, was perhaps the most articulate militant leader of this phase of freedom struggle. In 1893, he transformed the traditional religious Ganapati festival into a campaign for nationalist ideas through patriotic songs and speeches. Similarly, in 1896, he introduced the Shivaji festival to inspire the youth by drawing upon the patriotism of Shivaji in opposition to the Moghul ruler, Aurangzeb. He rose to prominence by organising a successful campaign for boycott of foreign clothes in Maharashtra in 1896 in protest against the imposition of taxes on cotton. His involvement in the no-tax campaign in areas, adversely affected by the 1896-7 famine in Maharashtra, had clearly articulated his mission of expanding the Congress base by incorporating the peasants, a constituency that was simply beyond the Moderates purview.

Two important features in Tilak's political philosophy separated him from the Moderate thinkers. First, unlike the Moderates who argued for gradual introduction of democratic institutions in India, Tilak insisted on immediate swaraj or self rule. His concept of swaraj was not complete independence but a government constituted by the Indians themselves that 'rules according to the wishes of the people or their representatives. The second dimension relates to the notion of the revolt by the subject people or the right of the people to resist an authority that loses legitimacy.

Tilak was a nationalist par excellence. In view of his uncritical acceptance of Vedanta philosophy and orthodox Hindu rituals and practices, Tilak was accused of being sectarian in multi-religious India. That he upheld the most reactionary form of Hindu orthodoxy was evident in his opposition to the 1890 Age of Consent Bill that sought to raise the age of consummation of marriage of girls from ten to twelve years. Similarly, his involvement in the Cow Protection Society alienated the Muslims to a large extent from the Extremist campaign. Furthermore, the organisation of national festivals in honour of Shivaji, the Hindu hero of the Marathas and also redefining of an essentially Hindu religious festival - the Ganapati *utsav* - in nationalist terms, set the ideological tenor of Tilak's political philosophy where Muslims seemed to be peripheral if not entirely bypassed.

### **Sri Aurobindo Ghosh**

In the beginning of the 20th century, nationalism became more aggressive and anti-colonial. Sri Aurobindo Ghosh was instrumental in giving radical content to nationalism in India. Sri Aurobindo was a prominent figure in the renaissance of Hinduism and he wanted to complete the task left incomplete by Swami Vivekananda and Bankim Chandra Chatterjee.

Aurobindo was a harsh critic of the British rule in India. He did not agree with the opinion of the moderates that it was a divine dispensation. He said that it was a curse for the majority of the Indian people because the foreign rule in India sapped moral and mental energies of the Indian people. The British rule ruined the economy of India and did not allow the latter to develop as an independent nation. The British claim of a good government was false and a good and efficient government was no substitute for self-government and freedom. It was the contention of Aurobindo that the spirit of India could be freed only by securing complete independence of the country.

He wrote a series of articles in the 'Indu-Prakash' of Pune under the title 'New Lamps for Old' and severely criticised the politics of petitions and prayers of the moderate leaders. Aurobindo said that Swaraj, Swadeshi, national education and boycott were four methods of the new party. For him, 'Swaraj' meant complete independence because he argued that a political agitation was not launched to secure a few seats in bureaucracy and in assembly but to secure right of self-government to the people. Swadeshi meant using the products that were manufactured in our country only and national education stood for imparting education to Indians that suited to their temperament, needs and culture. Boycott meant not using the products manufactured in England. All these four methods were necessary to train the people in national spirit and to be architects of liberty.

Sri Aurobindo Ghosh was considered as a prophet of the Indian nationalism. Along with Bankim chandra, Tilak and Dayanand, he developed the theory of nationalism in India. Sri Aurobindo's theory of nationalism was based on Vedanta philosophy which saw unity and oneness in man and God. There was an essential unity in India despite the existence of the outward differences because the spirit of unity and oneness pervaded it.

According to Sri Aurobindo, for a subject country, the attainment of political independence was its highest goal. But there were different means to attain that goal. In India, for Indian patriots, three alternative means were available to win Swaraj and they were, the method of prayers and petitions, the method of armed revolt and the method of self-development and passive resistance.

In the Indian context, Sri Aurobindo pointed out that the adoption of method of prayers and petitions was out of question because its futility was proved. Again, in the Indian context, the method of armed revolt or resistance was not possible or desirable. Hence, Indians had no alternative but to take recourse to self-development which was expressed in the methods of Swadeshi and boycott.

### **Ideas of Ravindra Nath Tagore**

The process of the assimilation of western and oriental ideas which had started under Rajaram Mohan Roy, progressed further under Ravindra Nath Tagore. Ravindra Nath Tagore tried to discover an alternative modernity through assimilating some progressive elements of Indian culture and western culture both.

Ravindra Nath Tagore defined individual freedom in spiritual context. He believed that individual freedom would enable a person to manifest universal soul. Tagore gave more importance to social freedom in place of political one. It is on this basis that he rejected Gandhian movements as well. According to him, the movements like Non-cooperation and Civil Disobedience were parochial in their approach as they were thought in context of political freedom but not in context of social freedom.

Most importantly, Tagore rejected the concept of nationalism as he took the nation as commercial and political enterprise which can't give ultimate satisfaction to its citizen. Instead, he promoted the concept of liberation of all (Sarvajana muktivada) which was deeply linked to the concept of internationalism. In some of his important compositions, like Gitanjali, the concept of liberation of all has been reflected.

Apart from that, Tagore was having deep praise for modernization and industrialization which originated in western world. But he was saddened at the fact that even after the contact with the British, India could not progress on the front of modernization and industrialization. It is on that basis he criticized even the policy of boycott by Gandhi. The policy of boycott would discourage industrialization in India. Therefore, it would just like retracing back to medieval age.

Likewise, Gandhian programme of spinning wheel or *Charkha* did not impress him. It would, he believed, not bring the solution as it was not improve the economic condition of the common people rather the condition of the common people can be improved through community farming. It would help in bringing more and more barren land under cultivation. Therefore, it would ameliorate the economic condition of peasants.

Due to their rare dedication to Indian culture and strong commitment to internationalism he is characterized as cultural ambassador of India.

### **Hindu Nationalism**

The ideology of 'Hindutva' was essentially the ideology of Hindu nationalism. The first prominent exponent of Hindu nationalist ideology was Mr. V. D. Savarkar. He wrote a book called 'Hindutva' in 1924 to explain the basic principles of Hindu nationalism. In 1925, the R.S.S. or the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh was formed to protect the Hindus from the Muslim aggression'. The basic difference between Hinduism and Hindutva is that Hinduism stands for Hindu religion, but Hindutva is a political ideology that wants to establish Hindu nation in India.

The main emphasis of Hindutwa supporters was on following factors -

Firstly, in the past, the Hindus suffered many a defeat and lost their independence to the foreign invaders because of lack of unity. Secondly, the Hindus had been losing their numbers due to the aggressive proselitisation by the Christian missionaries and the Muslims. Thirdly, there was a need to protect the political interests of Hindus because the British government was hostile to them.



In India, we could see the emergence of two traditions of Hindutva, the first tradition was led by V. D. Savarkar and the second tradition was led by M. S. Golwalkar. Though both the traditions professed their allegiance to the ideology of Hindutva, their emphasis and methods differed.

### **Political Career of V. D. Savarkar**

V. D. Savarkar (1883-1966) was a charismatic leader, who played a significant role in the freedom struggle of India. For his revolutionary activities he was sent to Andamans in 1911 and was brought back to India in 1922. Subsequently, he was kept confined to Ratnagiri town from 1923-1937. In the first phase of his life, he was influenced by the philosophy of the Italian nationalist Joseph Mazzini and supported the concept of the composite Indian nationalism, which was not different from the nationalism of Aurobindo and Tilak. During this period, religion played an important role in his concept of nationalism, but it did not exclude any religious community from it. But in the second phase of his career after 1922-23, Savarkar became the supporter of Hindu nationalism. After his release from the confinement in 1937, he joined the Hindu Mahasabha and became its President from 1938 to 1945.

In the process of developing his concept of Hindu nationalism, he rejected some of the arguments of territorial nationalism. He held that the existence of a mere territory did not make nation but nation was made by the people who constituted themselves as a political community, bound together by cultural affinities and traditions.

Savarkar was a supporter of cultural nationalism. He was of the opinion that identity formation was the essence of nationalism. India had received such identity from the Hindu religion.

Savarkar argued that it was cultural, racial and religious unity that counted more in the formation of the nation.

For Savarkar, Hindus as a community, formed nation. Hence, he laid stress on the principle of exclusion. He excluded Muslims and Christians from the Indian nation because they did not consider India as a holy land because their sacred religious places were situated outside India.

What were the rights and positions of minorities in such a Hindu nation? Savarkar held that nation was a cultural category but state was a political category. All Hindus were the members of the nation. Non-Hindus might not become members of the nation but they were members of the Indian state.

Savarkar was the first Indian thinker who declared that Hindus formed separate nation in, India. He stood for a strong Hindu nation which would withstand and survive ferocious life struggle among the nations.

## The Growth of Hindutva and the RSS

The second school of Hindutva or Hindu nationalism was expounded by the leaders of the RSS. The RSS was established by Dr. Hedgewar in 1925 to protect the interests of the Hindus. Dr. Hedgewar was a follower of Lokmanya Tilak and in his young days, he had contacts with some armed revolutionaries of Calcutta. In 1920-21, Dr. Hedgewar took part in the non-cooperation movement. After the suspension of the movement, the relations between the Hindus and the Muslims got deteriorated. Hedgewar thought that due to the disorganised nature of Hindu society, the Hindus were suffering losses in the communal riots. Hence, he decided to establish a strong organisation of the Hindus to protect their interests.

In 1925, he established the RSS. It was a cultural organisation in the sense that it did not directly participate in politics. Dr. Hedgewar set three objectives before the RSS and they were as follows:

Firstly, Mobilisation of the Hindus to protect their interests and to bring about unity and coherence in all their activities.

Secondly, Opposition to British militant and communal Muslim politics and the Congress which had been following the policy of appeasement of Muslims.

Thirdly, Increasing the influence of the RSS in all walks of life by patiently undertaking organizational work and by inculcating the spirit of patriotism. According to Dr. Hedgewar, the basic purpose of the RSS was not to capture political power but to increase the influence of Hindus in the public life of the country.

During Dr. Hedgewar's time, the R.S.S. became popular among the white collar middle classes. It did not take part in the civil disobedience movement of 1930 and did not directly get involved in the political activities of the Hindu Mahasabha. In 1940, Dr. Hedgewar nominated a young university Professor Mr. Madhav Golwalkar as the chief of the R.S.S. The RSS did not join the tumultuous Quit India Movement of 1942. Golwalkar continued to occupy the position of the chief of the RSS upto 1973.

The Hindu nationalism of M. S. Golwalkar was different from that of V. D. Savarkar in the sense that Golwalkar's theory of nationalism was based on Indian spiritualism. Savarkar was a modernist and he did not oppose westernization. But Golwalkar was a supporter of Hindu culture and opposed the Western way of life.

M. S. Golwalkar was a supporter of the cultural nationalism and he defined his nationalism in the light of cultural traditions of the Hindus. He rejected the concept of territorial nationalism.

Golwalkar was of the opinion If we accepted the principle of territorial nationalism, then the country would get converted into 'Dharmashala'. Anybody could become a member of one nation. But this theory of nationalism was wrong because a nation was normally formed of the people who had developed common cultural affinities and who considered India as their motherland.

Golwalkar was of the opinion that the non-Hindu minorities could also become a part of the Indian nation, if they abandoned their separatist tendencies and accepted all the traditions as their own. He held that these communities should Indianise themselves by accepting and imbibing its cultural and historical traditions.

### Muslim Thought

It is important to note that the evolution of the Muslim political thought was a complex phenomenon involving historical context of the Muslims' social, cultural and political life and interactive process with the colonial rule which had been established in India particularly in the aftermath of the Revolt of 1857. After 1857, certain issues pertaining to the future of India came to the fore.

1. Backwardness of Muslims
2. The question of accommodation of various social groups including Muslims in the existing and future power structures became an important issue which was widely debated among all groups in nineteenth century as well as the first half of the twentieth century. All these issues emerged over the years with varying responses

It is important to recognize that the response of the Muslims to all these issues was not uniform but varied since the Muslims did not constitute a monolithic community. Even Muslims were divided on lines of language, region and class as any other religious community. When a community is vertically as well as horizontally divided, the response to any issue would most certainly be as divided. It is due to the fact that the views of Muslim leaders on different issues were not identical.

### Sir Syed Ahmad Khan

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan emerged on the Indian scene as one of the great reformers, educationist and modernizer within the Muslim community. Sir Syed was, convinced that in order to stem the declining fortunes of the Muslims, it was important that they took to modern education as it was introduced by the British. With this purpose in mind, he founded the Scientific Society in 1863 at Ghazipur, in Uttar Pradesh. During 1869-70, he travelled to England and was able to observe the British educational institutions and was impressed by them. This was the larger objective in mind with which he founded Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental (MAO) College in 1875. It was proposed that here, while modern education would be imparted to the Muslims, they would also have some training in the preservation of their cultural heritage. He also wanted the Indian Muslims to bring about reforms in their society with the help of a magazine called *Tahzib-ul Akhlaq*. For all his efforts to reconcile the Muslims with the British, modern education and his advocacy for fresh interpretation of the *Quran* and keeping the door of the MAO College open to all, he was fiercely attacked by the conservative Muslims.

Sir Syed was also a champion of the Hindu-Muslim unity. He had once described the Hindus and Muslims as two beautiful eyes of a beautiful bride. He wrote two essays in

Tahzib-ul-Akhlaq, one in 1888 and another 1898 exhorting Muslims to give up killing of cows since this would bring about a good neighbourly relations between the Hindus and the Muslims.

But later he got associated exclusively with sectional interest. He seemed to suggest distinct political options for the Muslims and did not wish them ever to come closer to the Congress. This sudden development on the language and script question led him to argue that, "Now I am convinced that these two nations will not work unitedly in any cause. At present there is no hostility between them. But, on account of the so called educated people it will increase a hundred fold in the future."

In the political realm too, Sir Syed did not have any conception of bringing religious communities together for certain political action. This was the driving force which made him argue that the Indian National Congress was not in the best interest of the community of Muslims. He thought the Congress was likely to take a confrontationist stance in due course of time, which would be injurious to the interest of the Muslims. Sir Syed was also opposed to the principle of election even for the local boards and district boards. He suffered from a strange fear that, in the event of elections, various religious communities would vote for leaders of the respective communities which would result in the political marginalization of the Muslims. Instead he favoured the principle of nomination, which would ensure certain representation of Muslims too.

### **Mohammad Iqbal**

Mohammad Iqbal is commonly referred to as Allama Iqbal for the reason that he was considered as one of the important intellectuals among the Muslims in the first half of the twentieth century. Even though he is widely known for his Urdu and Persian poetry, he was a practitioner of the politics as well.

Before Mohammad Iqbal had visited Europe he was given to espouse a rather strong sense of patriotism. For instance his famous song '*Sare Jahan se Achchha Hindustan Hamara*' was the ultimate tribute to the motherland. The period he was in Europe was truly an age of aggressive nationalism. Nations were attempting to run down each other. Such observations of Iqbal led him to believe that nationalism was too narrow an ideology to make ideal of human and territorial groups.

Muhammad Iqbal has one of his steps firmly entrenched into poetry but he had his another step set in politics as well. It is rightly said that hardly had any poet shaped up the future of a community so strongly as did Muhammad Iqbal. But on the issue of either Indian nationalism or Muslim Nationalism he was not consistent in his view.

Firstly, he emerged to be a staunch nationalist when he composed the patriotic song '*Sare Jahan se Achchha*' but once he made a trip to Europe during early twentieth century he turned to be repulsive to nationalism after observing aggressive nature of European nationalism. After returning from Europe he joined the Punjab branch of the Muslim League and later he was elected to the legislative assembly as well. Then he started



to talk about the sectarian interest of the Muslims in India. He started to talk about Islamic nationalism. But even his concept of Islamic nationalism remained to be inconsistent. Earlier he declared that Muslim Nationalism can be formed on the basis of Islam but he also made this point clear that on this basis Muslims could create a universal brotherhood. Islamic nation would be abstract in nature and needed not any territorial support. But it was same Iqbal, who while presiding over Allahabad session in 1930, propounded the idea of a united Muslim state in north-west which became the pre-cursor of future Pakistan.

In fact, earlier than Muhammad Iqbal no Muslim leader had given any such hint towards a separate identity of Muslims and their consolidation in a particular geographical region. Earlier, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan had made him limited only to promotion of education among Muslims and worked for their development through promoting pro-Raj policy. This Iqbal became an unconscious catalyst behind a political movement of the Muslim League under Jinnah for a separate homeland. It was in this context that Iqbal being a poet and literary man shaped up the political future of a community in India.

### **Muhammad Ali Jinnah**

Jinnah travelled a very distant political carrier in India and in the long run he came to earn the epithet (Qayad-e-Azam) for Pakistani. Jinnah's carrier was under several twists and turns. He started as a staunch nationalist of India but ended as an enemy to national unity.

By profession he was a lawyer. He joined Indian National Congress in 1906 and worked as an assistant to Dada Bhai Naroji in Calcutta session so that he might successfully perform his duty as the president of the session. He was elected to a seat of the national assembly in Bombay. While being a member of the Congress he joined the Muslim League as well in 1913 but initially he was much clear in his stand that his association with the league should not have undermined his commitment to nationalist programme under the Congress.

Later in 1916, in association with Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Moti Lal Nehru, he played such a vital role in Lucknow Congress that he earned the sobriquet 'An Ambassador to Hindu Muslim Unity' from Dr. Sarojani Naidu.

Then question arises what did appear to be turning point in his carrier that made him depart from the nationalist path? One such episode was created by Non-Cooperation movement on Khilaphat issue. Jinnah was not in a mood to support this issue, so in 1920 he resigned from the Congress never to return here again. Although on surface level it appears that he was opposed to some specific political issues that's why he preferred to resign from the Congress but when we observe minutely we came to realize that Jinnah was well versed in constitutional politics as he had been trained earlier under Gopal Krishna Gokhale but with advent of Gandhi there started an era of mass politics which did not fit in to Jinnah's creed of politics. It was a major reason behind resignation of Jinnah from the Congress.

Thus started Jinnah's carrier as a leader of the Muslim League. But initially he remained dormant as the leader of the Muslim League possibly due to the fact that he did not feel comfortable with the communal politics initially. That's why, the Muslim League

under Jinnah faction joined the Congress in Simon Commission boycott movement. But Jinnah felt a strong sense of alienation at the time of Nehru Report (1928). He was ready to accept the proposal of joint electorate but in return he placed certain demands before Indian National Congress but INC under counter pressure of the Hindu Mahasabha remained indecisive on this issue and the matter could not be resolved even in All Party Meeting at Calcutta. So, Jinnah parted its way with the Congress. Initially, he moved to London and remained there up to 1934. It was at the suggestion of Liaquat Ali Khan that he returned to India in 1934.

A strong sense of alienation he felt, at the second time, at the elections of 1937. His brand of moderate communal politics could not work and in these elections the League shown a very poor performance. Furthermore, numerical superiority of the Hindus terrified him when the Congress refused to form a coalition government at United Province and Bombay. It made Jinnah turn to hardcore communal politics. It was on 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 1940 that the League accepted the proposal of separate state at Lahore Session. Then Jinnah moved to crystallize its objective of Pakistan and since then he never looked back again.

The Second World War provided him a very good opportunity to do bargaining with the British government. The British government virtually surrendered before the communal demand of the Muslim League. Then Linlithgo Proposal (1941), Cripps Mission (1942), Wavell Plan (1945), all tried to appease the League and Jinnah. In this way Jinnah's tactical moves as well as favorable circumstances helped him in realizing his goal of Pakistan.

### **The contribution of Subhas in National Movement**

1. He organized the youth force and in association with Nehru he established an organization 'Independence for India League'. Then he worked with Nehru for popularizing the objective of Swarajya.
2. He worked for the promotion of socialist ideas and he presided over Haripura Congress (1938) that is known for formation of Yojana Committee.
3. He emerged to be a political heavy weight within the Congress and was able to defeat Gandhi's chosen candidate, Pattabhi Sitaramaiyya, in elections held at the time of Tripuri Congress (1939).
4. Through formation of INA and giving an example of his sacrifice at the altar of the nation he encouraged nationalist consciousness among the people.
5. Through formation of INA he caused severe damage to the British Empire in that the main pillar of the British Empire of India, army, was severely infected with the ideas of nationalism. Furthermore, the issues of the trial of INA veterans created nationalist backlash all over India.

### **The difference in the approach of Gandhi and Subhas towards freedom**

1. For Subhas freedom meant political freedom and to certain extent economic freedom as well but for Gandhi the first meaning of freedom was moral freedom then political freedom.
2. Subhas was adamant to ensure freedom of India as quickly as possible. He was not ready to wait longer for the freedom but Gandhi had to follow a gradual process for attaining freedom. It was only after being completely disenchanted with the British gesture that in 1942 he gave his famous slogan 'Do or Die'.
3. Gandhi believed in the dictum - the means justifies the end. That's why for him Satyagrah and non-violence were the effective method for attaining freedom but Subhas believed in the principle - end justifies the means, so he was ready for taking any course of action for ensuring the objective of freedom.
4. Gandhi prefers to ensure the freedom of India through the national endeavor of India but Subhas was ready even for taking support from the foreign power in order to attain the goal of Indian freedom.

But in spite of the differences in opinion, both were having deep respect for each other. Subhas called Gandhi as 'The father of the Nation' while Gandhi preferred to characterize him as 'patriot'.

### **The features of Nehruvian socialism**

1. Socialism is exclusively known for its excessive emphasis over economic redistribution but Nehru presented an alternative vision on this score. He gave the emphasis over the production and distribution both. Distribution, he believed, can't be sustained without production. Therefore, distribution would adversely be affected. If there is no production what are we supposed to distribute - poverty and hunger? There is no socialism of poverty.
2. Nehruvian socialism emerged as a result of interaction between Marxism and Gandhism. Very like Karl Marx, Nehru believed in the method of class conflict but unlike Marx he abhorred the method of violence and blood revolution, rather he was inclined to attain his objective through the democratic method or parliamentary politics.
3. Normally, economic equality and individual freedom both were declared to be incompatible with each other. On the one hand, western liberal democracies declared individual freedom as the hallmark of democracy, on the other hand, socialist economic planners were so much enthusiastic for carrying the objective of economic equality further that they were ready to attain it at all cost including individual freedom.

Nehru strove a compromise between the two extremes. He was ready to delay the process, if needed, of economic reforms but not ready to crush individual freedom.

It was due to the features mentioned above, Nehru's socialism is supposed to have reflected a third path while discarding Marxian and Utopian socialism.

Sometime Nehru appeared to be ideologically much closer to Subhas than to Gandhi. Nehru and Subhas both almost belonged to the same age group (Subhas was junior to Nehru by 8 years). Both were having too many similarities. Both set their foot in national politics in 1920s. Both were youth icons. Both the leaders together formed an organization, 'Independence for India League' and they worked together for popularizing the objective of complete freedom. They combined together and promoted socialist programme under Indian National Congress. It was under their influence that Congress adopted socialist programme in Lucknow session, Faizpur session, Haripura session etc.

But both preferred to sail in different boats during latter phase of their carrier. It was due to following regions: -

- i. Nehru was a dedicated democrat. He prioritized individual freedom. He was not ready to make compromise on individual freedom for achieving socialist objective. On the other hand, for Subhas, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his rule was a template. It is under a party dictatorship, he believed, socialist transformation was possible.
- ii. Even on the front of foreign policy measures, Nehru was guided by socialistic ideas and he was completely opposed to fascism. On the other hand, Subhas prioritized national liberation so much so that he was ready to make compromise with any ideological creed including fascism.

#### **Socialistic ideas of Nehru and Subhas**

1. Nehru believed in the theory of dialecticism and class struggle propounded by Karl Marx but simultaneously his brand of socialism reflected the imprint of Gandhism as well. Even socialism of Subhas imbibed the impact of dialectical materialism and the theory of class struggle.
2. Nehru's ideology widely reflected European brand of socialism and communism. On the other hand, on socialism of Subhas along with the impact of European communism even the influence of indigenous elements i.e. Vedas, Puranas, Buddhist and Jaina ideology, the ideas of Swami Vivekananda etc is visible.
3. Nehru was much given to western concept of individual freedom. That's why he always tried to find out a third path while making blend of two diametrically opposed ideologies i.e. western liberalism and Russian socialism.
4. Lastly, Nehru's loyalty to Gandhi weakened his resolve to work with Subhas.

But on the other hand, Subhash at least during the early phase of socialist transformation was not ready to move through democratic institutions. As he believed, just after independence and till the transitional phase of socialist transformation is completed a government with all dictatorial power, very like the government of Mustafa Kemal Pasha in Turkey, should have ruled in India. But he was opposed to perpetuation of such rule. This system, he believed, should have existed only during the phase of transition once this phase is over democratic institutions had to be restored.

Apart from that, Subhash gave emphasis over the specific type of socialism i.e. Municipal Socialism. In other words, he chose to give Municipal Corporation a major role in



providing essential service to the people. It was in this way that socialist transformation had to be carried on.

It is said that the ideas of Subhas reflected the blend of socialism and fascism both. Whereas, his commitment to class struggle and the objective of economic redistribution brought him very near to socialism. Likewise, his inclination towards an autocratic government during at least the phase of transition made his ideology come near to fascism. That's why Subhash preferred to characterize this blend as 'Samyavada' but not 'communism'.

But when we observe minutely we find that in actual sense ideology of Subhas was devoid of fascism. We can prove it on the basis of following arguments. Firstly, he accepted a government with dictatorial power simply for a phase of transition. Secondly, unlike fascism his nationalism did not give support to imperialism.

### **Did Nehru speak Gandhi's language?**

In course of national movement in India, Nehru always remained to be very near to Gandhi and he treated him as his political guide. In return, Gandhi always treated him as his political protégé. Both were deeply attached to each other but hardly do we find an example where two close associates had such a large ideological difference as we find in case of Gandhi and Nehru.

#### **Points of difference: -**

1. On Gandhian outlook there was deeper impact of religion and spiritualism. On the other hand, Nehru was guided basically by secular ideas based on basic human values.
2. Gandhi was having strong faith in traditional values of Indian society but Nehru's personality was influenced deeply by western culture.
3. The political philosophy of Gandhi was inspired by anarchism therefore for him the state was an unnecessary evil. He did not take state machinery relevant for the development of society. Instead he gave a larger role to village Panchayat in administration. But Nehru was having unflinching faith in organized state system and he treated the state machinery as a major instrument for change.
4. Whereas Gandhi advocated for the development of small scale and cottage industries, Nehru took fast industrialization as panacea for all economic ills.
5. Gandhi developed the method of non-violence and Satyagrah and favored the concept of class collaboration in place of class conflict. On the other hand, even Nehru advocated for peaceful transition based on democratic politics but unlike Gandhi he did not accept the principle of class-collaboration rather he took the recourse of class conflict in order to carry socio-economic changes.

But the view mentioned above does not mean that both the great personalities in modern India remained uninfluenced from each other. It was due to Nehru's impact even Gandhi fell under the influence of socialism. On the other side, it was possibly due to

Gandhian impact even Nehru was ready to adopt *Panchayati Raj System*, the development of small scale industries, cottage industries etc.

### **Sardar Patel**

Sardar Patel formed a trio as the path-makers of future India along with Gandhi and Nehru. Gandhi successfully presented an alternative method as a struggle for the freedom of India and Nehru emerged to be the architect of modern India while it was Patel who gave bricks and mortar to India on which the pillar of modern India could have been erected. So, he was a unifier par excellence.

His great contributions to Indian nation can be ascertained during the freedom movement and after Indian freedom both. Even after being a successful barrister, he discarded his legal practice after being influenced by Gandhian non-violent struggle and enthusiastically participated in the peasant movement of Kheda in 1918. After that he worked tirelessly within Indian National Congress and remained to be a towering figure in all Gandhian movements from Non-cooperation Movement to Quit India Movement. In 1928, he successfully led a peasant movement at Bardoli in Gujarat and earned a sobriquet, Sardar from women of Bardoli.

He was a man of conviction. Once he was convinced about certain idea or measure he was ready to stick to it. He never wavered in his loyalty to Gandhi and confidence in Gandhian method. That's why, after withdrawal of non-cooperation internal squabbles or fissures appeared within the Congress but Patel firmly stood against splinter faction, Swarajists. Likewise, earlier to him, the idea of seeing India divided was unacceptable. However once it dawned upon him that partition was going to be a reality, he came around and decided to use his influence to see that the Congress accepted it. He did not like the nation to break out in a civil war.

### **Patel's Role in Post-Independence Era:**

It is after independence that he emerged to be a great unifier. His outstanding contribution was visible in the integration of 562 princely states with Indian Union. It is an achievement which is unparalleled in history. What the British pro-consuls failed to achieve after two centuries of ceaseless efforts, Sardar Patel accomplished them through his persuasive appeal. During his visit to India in 1956, Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev, felt so overwhelmed by Patel's achievement that as to observe: you Indians are amazing people. How on earth did you manage to liquidate the princely rule without liquidating the princes.

For this achievement he is generally compared with Otto Von Bismarch, the German Chancellor of 19<sup>th</sup> century but president, Zakir Hussain considered Patel 'even greater than Bismarch because he has unified the country within a short time without much noise and trumpeting.

His role as a great unifier was not limited to the promotion of geographical integration alone but also as an administrative unifier. He was opposed to the colonial government but not to their efficient administrative machinery, civil services, the steel frame of India. He was convinced about the fact that earlier it had worked behind the

success of the colonial government for more than one and half century. Therefore, with changed objective and functioning, it could work behind nation building as well. As civil servants were having the treasure of knowledge and vast experience about India so they could better serve their country. To meet boldly the new challenge, Patel ordered the immediate replacement of the ICS with a new Indian Administrative Service and Indian Police with the Indian Police Service. Furthermore, in order to win their confidence for the new republic, he provided to bureaucrats some constitutional safeguards on the basis of Article 311 and Article 314 of Indian constitution.

In this way Sardar Patel was a great humanist, dedicated nationalist, a sensitive politician and a bold statesman combined into one.



## Multiple Choice Questions

**The objective of these multiple choice questions is not to test your knowledge rather to provide you the informations which are associated with current issues.**

1. The people who gathered at Jallian Wala Bagh were protesting against the arrest of which leaders?
  - (a) Sardar Bhagat Singh and Sukhdev
  - (b) Dr. Saifuddin Kichlu and Ajit Singh
  - (c) Dr. Saifuddin Kichlu and Dr. Satyapal
  - (d) Swarna Singh and Ajit Singh

**Ans: (c)**

2. What is correct about the reaction against Jallian Wala Bagh massacre?
  1. Gandhi returned his title of Kaisar-i-Hind.
  2. Ravindra Nath Tagore returned his title of Knighthood.
  3. Jawaharlal Nehru returned his felicitation at Oxford.
  - (a) 1 Only
  - (b) 1, 2
  - (c) 1, 2, 3
  - (d) 1, 3

**Ans: (b)**

3. Which one newspaper gave the first hand information about Jallian Wala Bagh massacre and for that he had to face the government wrath?
  - (a) Bombay Chronicle
  - (b) Hindu Patriot
  - (c) Amrit Bazar Patrika
  - (d) Som Prakash

**Ans: (a)**

4. What is correct about Hindu-Muslim riots at Noakhali-

1. It was a tragic event which had occurred just one year earlier than independence.
  2. Here occurred the incidence of forcible conversion along with massacre.
  3. In order to put a check over riots and massacre, Gandhi visited Noakhali and there he observed the fast.
  4. As a result of the riots and bloodshed there was stressed migration of some people to other regions.
- (a) 1, 2
  - (b) 1, 3
  - (c) 1, 2, 3
  - (d) 1, 2, 3, 4

**Ans: (d)**

5. What is correct about Quit India movement?
  1. Gandhi led this movement and never withdrew it formally.
  2. Some sporadic incidence of violence was visible in this movement.
  3. Underground activities among the youth leaders and the formation of a parallel government became a common feature.
  - (a) 1, 2
  - (b) 1 only
  - (c) 1, 3
  - (d) 1, 2, 3

**Ans: (d)**

6. Which of the incidents mentioned below was *not* associated with Civil Disobedience Movement?
  - (a) No Chaunkidari movement in Bihar.
  - (b) Police violence against volunteers at Dharsana.



- (c) The capture of Chittgong armory by Suryasen and his associates.  
 (d) The formation of a Parallel government at Balia.

**Ans: (d)**

7. When did Gandhi completely change his dress?  
 (a) Just after returning from South Africa (1915).  
 (b) At the time of Dandi March (1930).  
 (c) When he visited the region Madurai (Chennai) in 1921.  
 (d) At the time of Rowlett Satyagrah Movement.

**Ans: (c)**

8. What is incorrect about Belgaon Session of the Congress-  
 (a) It was presided over by Gandhi.  
 (b) It was held in 1924.  
 (c) Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Patel and Dr. Sarojani Naidu participated in this conference.  
 (d) Belgaon is situated in Andhra Pradesh.

**Ans: (d)**

9. Gandhi gave an emphasis over which method/methods for the upliftment of village economy-  
 1. Spinning  
 2. Cooperativism  
 3. Swadeshi  
 4. Complete rejection of machines  
 (a) 1, 2  
 (b) 1, 2, 3  
 (c) 1, 3  
 (d) 1, 2, 3, 4

**Ans: (b)**

10. Gandhi gave emphasis over which method/methods for the promotion of peasants?

1. Animal husbandry along with agriculture.
2. Carbonic agriculture
3. Promotion of animals of indigenous breed
4. To provide proper training

- (a) 1, 2  
 (b) 1, 2, 3  
 (c) 1, 3  
 (d) 1, 2, 3, 4

**Ans: (d)**

11. In course of his tour of South Africa he was thrown out from the train at which station?

- (a) Pittsburg
- (b) Pieter Maritzburg
- (c) Pretoria
- (d) Cape town

**Ans: (b)**

12. Put following proposals in chronological order in ascending manner-

1. Linlithgo proposal
  2. Cripps Mission
  3. Chakravarti Rajagopalachari formula
  4. Liaqat-Desai Formula
- (a) 1, 2, 3, 4  
 (b) 2, 1, 3, 4  
 (c) 1, 2, 4, 3  
 (d) 2, 1, 4, 3

**Ans: (a)**

\*\*\*\*\*