

# CHAPTER FIRST

NEHRU AND SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA.



CHAPTER - INEHRU AND SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA

During India's freedom struggle a serious debate was going on in the country about the goal and purpose of freedom and on what should be the social and economic content of political independence. In this debate two important leaders of the movement Gandhi and Nehru, found themselves poles apart and made serious attempts to sell their respective ideas to the nation. The effort of these two leaders to provide an ideological content to the national freedom in the form of competitive alternatives, and the resultant clashes and conflicts in which many other important personalities were also involved showed the desire of the Indian elite to define the picture of future India when they would be called upon to ' build ' after the British had left. One ideologue of the national movement to Nehru, wanted the country to accept the goal of socialism for free India. In his numerous writings and speeches, Nehru declared himself to be a socialist at the Lahore session of the Congress ( December 1929 ) in this presidential address, Nehru said, :

" I must frankly confess that I am socialist and republican, we must realise 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." <sup>1</sup>

He restated his position in whither India.

India's immediate goal can, therefore, only be considered in terms of the ending of the exploitation of her people. Politically, it must mean independence and the severance of the British connection, which means imperialist domination; economically and socially it must mean the ending of all special class privileges and vested interests. The whole world is struggling to this end; India can do no less, and in this way the Indian struggle for freedom lines up with the world struggle. <sup>2</sup>

If socialism was so important to Nehru what did he do in making the national movement accept it? Did he succeed in his efforts? Further, what was his attitude towards other organized socialist parties in India in the pre-independence period viz., the communist party of India and the Congress socialist party? A question may be raised here; why this attempt to interpret the events of such stormy period of India's history i.e.

1920 to 1947 with reference to the role and contribution of one individual, i.e. Nehru ? The answer is ; Nehru was the focus of socialist ideas in India in this period, and the youth of the country looked towards him for inspiration and guidance. Moreover, from the thirties, Indian National Movement worked under a ' Coalitional leadership ' of Gandhi and Nehru. Nehru occupied a pivotal position in this era. Hence/<sup>it</sup>is worthwhile to keep him in the centre and interpret the event of this period and evaluate his response to the resurgence in India. Nehru had his own approach to the problems of Indian society. Today the importance and the role played by the Five Year Plans cannot be underestimated. But Nehru had to face a great deal of problems to introduce planning in India. In this context it is worth while to reproduce a part of the speech which he had delivered at the 60th session of the Indian National Congress at Avadi January 22nd, 1955.

We talk about planning. As you all know planning is essential, and without it there would be unarchy in our economic development. About five years ago, planning was not acceptable to many people in high places but today it has come to be recognized as essential even by the man in the street. Our First Five Year Plan is now about three years old, and we are now thinking about our second five year plan. A phrase in this resolution says

that the second five year plan must keep the national aims of a welfare state and a socialistic economy before it. These can only be achieved by a considerable increase in national income, and our economic policy must therefore, aim at plenty and equitable distribution. The Second Five Year Plan must keep these objectives in view and should be based on the physical needs of the people. These are really the important and governing words of the resolution and ought to be the controlling factors in drawing up the Second Five Year Plan. Before going on to other aspects of the question may I say that a welfare state and socialistic pattern of economy are not synonymous expressions? It is true that a socialistic economy must provide for a welfare state but it does not necessarily follow that a welfare state must also be based on a socialistic pattern of society. Therefore the two although they overlap, are yet somewhat different, and we say that we want both. We cannot have a welfare state in India with all the socialism or even communism in the world unless our national income goes up greatly socialism or communism might help you to divide your existing wealth, if you like, but in India, there is no existing wealth for you to divide; there is only poverty to divide. It is not a question of distributing the wealth of the few rich men here and there. That is not going to make any

difference in our national income, we might adopt that course for the psychological good that might come out of it. But from the practical point of view, there is not much to divide in India because we are a poor country. We must produce wealth, and then divide it equitably. How can we have welfare state without wealth? Wealth need not mean gold and silver but wealth in goods and services. Our economic policy must therefore aim at plenty. Until very recently economic policies have often been based on scarcity. But the economics of scarcity has no meaning in the world of today.

Now I come to this governing clause which I just referred to, with regard to the second five year plan namely that the second five year plan should be based on the physical needs of the people. You will remember that yesterday the president also emphasized the necessity for basing planning on the people's physical needs. Our first five year plan was based on the data and the material we had at our disposal as well as on things that were actually being done at the time. Take these big river valley schemes. All these things were being done at the time and we had no choice but to continue them. We had to accept what had been done, of course we added one or two new schemes and rearranged the priorities. That is to say, our plan was largely based on the finances available and consisted in taking up those schemes which were most useful. But it was limited planning not

planning in the real sense of the word. The conception of planning today is not to think of the money we have and then to divide it up in the various schemes but to measure the physical needs, that is to say, how much of food the people want, how much of clothes they want how much of housing they want how much of education they want how much of health services they want, how much of work and employment a much more complicated process than merely drawing up some schemes and fixing a system of priorities.

They want, and so on we calculate all these and then decide what every one in India should have of these things. Once we do that we can set about increasing production and fulfilling these needs. It is not a simple matter because in calculating the need of the people, we have to calculate on the basis not only of an increasing population but of increasing needs. I shall give you an instance. Let us take sugar. Our people now consume much more sugar than they used to with the result that our calculations about sugar production went wrong. Now, why do they eat more sugar? Evidently because they are better off. If a man getting a hundred rupees finds his income increased to a hundred and fifty, he will eat more sugar, but more cloth and so on. Therefore, in making calculations, we have to keep in mind that the extra money that goes in to circulation because of the higher salaries and wages, affects consumption. So we find out what in five year's time will

be the needs of our people inducing even items needed by our defence services. Then we decide how to produce those things in India. In order to meet a particular variety of needs we have now to put up a factory which will produce the goods that the additional money that you have put in is not locked up for long. Therefore in planning we have to balance heavy industry.

#### SOCIO - POLITICAL SITUATION :

Before discussing Nehru's role in building socialist movement in the country, it is worthwhile to refer to the socio-political situation prevailing in the country at the time of world war, I. This was a period of great ferment for India. On the international scene the first socialist revolution of the world, the Russian Revolution had far reaching influence and repercussion. India could not remain aloof of or immune to the ~~terrors~~ terrors created by the October revolution of 1917. The Indian intelligentsia was attracted towards events in Russia, and in spite of the policy of British government, a great deal of smuggled literature from Soviet Russia flowed into this country which was read with keen interest<sup>3</sup>. Even the official report on Indian Constitutional Reform (1918) had to admit the great impact that the October revolution was having on India's political atmosphere. It said The Revolution in Russia and its beginning was regarded in India as a triumph over despotism. It has given an impetus to Indian political aspirations.<sup>4</sup>

Within the country also, the national movement was becoming more active and aggressive. The policy of ' mendicancy ' of appeals prayers and petitions had been rejected, and the father of Indian unrest; Bal Gangadhar Tilak, had created a new atmosphere in the country. The result was that the loyalists became non-cooperetors, and national movement under Gandhian leadership became a mass movement for the struggle against imperialism. Writing about this new phase, R. Palme Dutt states.

Working class movement, peasant's no tax comaign of Bardoli in 1922, organization of Trade Union and strikes and the Kanpur conspiracy Trial of 1924 were all the symbols of a new wind of radicalison that was blowing in India. During the period of the First World War (1914-18), industrial development took place at a rapid rate in the country. It's result was growth in the activities of the Indian capitalists, and political consciousness in the Indian working class. This fact ( New role of the Indian working class ) is described in the report of the whitely commission as follow :

Prior to the winter of 1918-19 a strike was a rare occurrence in Indian industry. The end of the war saw an immediate change. There were some importance strikes in the cold weather of 1918-19 ; they were more numerous in the following winter and in the winter of 1920-21, industrial strikes becafe

almost general in organized industry. The main cause was the realization of the potentialities of the strike in the existing situation and this was assisted by the emergence of the trade union organizers, by the scarcity of labour arising from the expansion of industry and aggravated by the great epidemics of influenza.

The first attempt to form a trade union organization was made by B. P. Wadia who formed the Madras Labour Union among the textile workers of the mills of Collai, Madras on April 21, 1918. Its main demands were (a) Mid-day recess of 40 minutes (b) Wage increase by 25 percent (c) better treatment to workers by European officers, and (d) Payment of Wage on the 1st of the month. In a short time trade unions were formed in important industrial centres of Bombay, Ahmedabad, Calcutta and Kanpur.

The most important activity in Trade Union field was the formation of the All India Trade Union Congress in 1920, as a result of the efforts of N. M. Joshi, Lala Lajpat Rai and Joseph Baptista. Its first session, under the presidency of Lala Lajpat Rai was held in Bombay in October 1920, about 60 unions were affiliated to the central body, and about 62 expressed their intention of supporting it. Thus in 20's temper of the people was undergoing radical change, and the socialist ideas were catching the imagination of the sensitive people in India. S.A. Dange started an English weekly called 'The Socialist' in Bombay 1923.

NEHRU AND INDIAN COMMUNISTS :

Peasant unrest and trade union activities of this period had their impact on the working of the national Congress, and also found concrete expression in the establishment of the first organized socialist party of India i.e. the communist party. For evaluating the role of Nehru in building socialist movement in India, it is essential to know his relationship and attitude towards the Indian communists. In 1920, some Indians had left on hijrat,<sup>7</sup> and at Tashkent at the end of 1920, they set up the emigre communist party of India. Attempts to organize communist party in India in 1921 met with great repression by the British. The peshawar conspiracy case (1922-23) the Kanpur Bolshevik or (communist) conspiracy case (1924) and later the Meerut communist conspiracy case (1929) were attempts by the British government to suppress the communist movement in India. The communist party of India (emigre) was affiliated to the communist international in the first half of 1921. The communist party of India was established in the country formally on September 1st 1924. After the famous conspiracy cases, the British finally declared the party illegal and banned it in 1934. Besides their active work in the Trade Union Movement, the communists were fighting for India's freedom in co-operation with the left-wing of the Congress. The tactics and role of the CPI underwent many changes in the pre-independence period. Its programme of action, its attitude towards

the Congress and its leaders, and the directives given by the communist international created situations owing to which the CPI could not run smoothly with the mainstream of the national movement. It occupied a predominant position in the Trade Union Movement, but on the political front its successes were limited. India had a few industrial towns and the influence of the communist party was confined to the towns only.

Nehru's attitude towards communism could be put thus; while he did not accept all the fundamentals of Marxism he did believe that there 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 have possessed quite an extra ordinary degree of insight into social phenomenon and this insight was apparently due to the scientific method he adopted.<sup>8</sup>

Nehru was influenced by Marx's scientific method, and later on 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 :

The Second wonder that the Soviet performed was to transform great parts of this area but 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 advance have been in education and in industry. By Vast Five Year Plan the industrialization of Russia has been pushed on at a feverish pace and enormous factories have been set up.<sup>9</sup>

Nehru with all his admiration for Soviet Planning did not accept the communist way for his country. The reasons were his background personality make-up, impact of Gandhian philosophy of means and his abhorrence to violence. Nehru was essentially a democrat and a liberal.

He observed :

My roots are still, perhaps partly in the nineteenth century, and I have been too much influenced by the humanist liberal tradition to get out of it completely. This bourgeois background follows me about,<sup>10</sup> in a letter to Subhas Chandra Bose, he writes about himself in these words. :

I suppose I am temperamentally and by training an individualist and intellectually a socialist, I hope that socialism does not kill or suppress individuality, indeed I am attracted to it because it will release innumerable individuals from economic and cultural bondage.

Thus the background of Nehru, the impact of British education and his personality make-up precluded him from joining hands with the Indian communist. Further, he abhorred the methods of the communists, when he attended the Brussels Congress of oppressed Nationalities, held early in February 1927, and subsequent meeting of the league, he came into direct contact with the communists who were strong in the Congress, the impact of this experience on Nehru was of a 'mixed character'. About this experience he writes :

So, I turned inevitably with good will towards communism, for whatever its faults it was at least not hypocritical and not imperialistic. These attracted me, as also the tremendous changes taking place in Russia. But communist often irritated me by their dictatorial ways, their aggressive and rather vulgar methods, their habit of denouncing everybody who did not agree with them.<sup>12</sup>

Another explanation for Nehru's not joining communists may be his own social background. He wrote about his politics and himself thus.

My politics had been those of my class the bourgeoisie indeed all vocal politics then and to a great extent even now were those of the middle classes.<sup>13</sup>

About himself he confessed :

I am a typical bourgeois, bourgeois surroundings with all the early prejudices that training has given me.<sup>14</sup>

The rough and tumble of communist politics did not suit the temperament of Nehru. He was particularly bitter with the Indian communists because of the Congress and Gandhi commenting on the Indian communists he writes :

One of the reasons for the weakness in numbers as well as influence of the communists in India is that, instead of spreading a scientific knowledge of communism and trying to convert people's mind's to it they have largely concentrated on abuse of others. This has reacted on them and done them great injury.<sup>15</sup> He criticised the Indian communist for the lack of scientific approach on their part and for taking refuge behind ' Slogans ' instead of ideas of politics. Moreover, the infant communist movement was numerically not every strong while on the other hand Congress had a very broad mass base. Thus, the objective situation was that it was the communists who needed moral support of the Congress or some place within that party and not vice-versa. Because the communist movement was confined to some industrial areas, they did not attract much attention of the Congress leadership. It was not without reason that the communists were always keen to have collaboration

with the leftists in the Congress party. As movements, the Congress and communists were of "unequal standing". This also determined the attitude of the Congress leadership in general and Nehru in particular towards the Indian communists. Comparing the two movements, he observed.

Communists in India have associated with the industrial worker of the big town. They have little knowledge of, or contact with the rural areas. The industrial workers important as they are, and likely to be more so in the future, must take second place before the peasants, for the problem of to day in India is the problem of the peasantry. Congress workers on the other hand, have spread all over these rural areas and in the ordinary course the Congress must develop into a vast peasant organisation.<sup>16</sup>

Nehru differed not only with the methods and approach of the communists, he also criticised them for not having adapted the communist ideology to the peculiar Indian conditions on this Nehru was, however, sore with all India socialists, whether communists or members of the Congress socialist party. Nehru believed that the himself was making an attempt to adapt this western concept of socialism to the Indian context. Nehru's mind was working in becoming a theoretician of something like

Indian socialism ; He admonished the Indian communists for their blindly following the western concepts and literature and said; I do believe that the philosophy of communism helps us to understand and analyse existing conditions in any country, and further ideicates the road to future progress. But it is doing violence and injustice to that philosophy to apply it blind fold and without due regard to facts and conditions.<sup>17</sup>

Thus Nehru and the communist party of India were following two party of India were following two separate paths although deriving inspiration from the same source - Marxism. Their attitudes were also different. The communists were critical in fact surrendered to it in practic it was alleged that he had not developed an alternative ideology. This view was expressed by B.T. Randndive when he said that Nehru's conflicts with old leaders were " episodic " in their character, transitory in there effect.<sup>18</sup>

To sum up the relationship between the communist and Nehru was based on the basic differeanced, the reconciliation of which was difficult the result was that they did not agree even on a minimum common programme of action. Nehru in this context had basically a different approach; which he termed as mixed economy. Nehru expressed his ideas in this context in very clear terms in the constituent Assembly on April 7th 1948 .

I have myself been concerned with the theoretical aspects of planning for a considerable time. I realize that there is a great deal of difference between its theory and practice ; as in almost everything in life, the theory is full of poetry as, if I may say so, was the speech of my honourable colleague the mover of the resolution. When we come down to applying that poetry all kinds of difficulties crop up. Normally there would be those difficulties but situated as we are today in India, after all that has happened in the course of the last seven or eight months. One has to be very careful of the steps one takes so as not to injure the existing structure too much. There has been destruction and injury enough, and certainly I confess to this House that I am not brave and gallant enough to go about destroying any more. I think there is room still in India for the destruction of many things they will not doubt have to be removed; nevertheless, it is matter of approach. Are we going to adopt the course of having a clean state or sweeping away everything so that we may have the pleasure of writing a new without anything else being written on that state ? That seems to be an easy way of doing things though perhaps there never has been a clean slate even when people imagined that there was going to be a clean slate.

I will not say that one should never try to start with a clean state. But one has to think of a country and its condition

at the time and see which is the preferable course, involving less danger. It seems to me that in the state of affairs in the world and in India today any attempt to start with what of all that we have, would certainly not bring progress nearer but might delay it tremendously. Far from bringing economic progress it might us go far back politically that the economic aspects itself might be lost sight of we cannot separate these two things. We have gone through big political upheavals and catuclysons, and if in our attempt to get something that we like and to go forward a step in one direction we lose a few steps in another, then on balance we have lost not gained. There fore, the alternative to having a clean state is to try to rub out here and there in order to corite on it again, gradually to replace the writing on the whole state not too gradually. I hope yet not with a great measure of destruction and strean parhaps I have been affected by recent events but more and more I have felt that it is wrong to destory something that is productive or capable of doing good. It takes a long time to baild and it does not take very long to destroy, so that if this house and this country think that we should go ahead in a much more constructive spirit than in a destructive spirit, then that approach has necessarily to be different. What your ideals may be is another matter but even in the realization of those ideals, do you think that the easiest way of approach will be a dean sweep

and then starting a new, or to replace as rapidly as possible and as fast as you can, with your available resource and material, the existing structure with a new one ? I have no doubt that we have to change the existing structure and as rapidly as possible.

NEHRU AND SOCIALISTS :

Besides the communists, another group of socialists emerged within the Congress known as the Congress socialist party. It aimed at spreading socialist ideology in the country and to give socialist content to the objectives of the Congress. Immediate impetus for its birth came from the sense of despondency generated by the vacuum created by the decline of the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1932.

The official historian of the Congress writes the apparent failure of the movement ( Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930-32) of non-violence leading to an accentuation of that attitude of arrogance and despotism in the rulers which for a while lay dormant gave an added impetus to the wavering beliefs of the young who were still on the border line. It was a cry of socialism all round amongst the youth of the country. Student's

Federation and Youth Leagues became the order of the day. A regular party was carved out long called the Congress Socialist Party and began to function as an organized group within the Congress. There gradually rose a party called the communist party which soon overwhelmed the former. The C.S.P. and C.P. became familiar terms. The C.S.P. soon lost wind and by 1940 almost disappeared leaving the field to the C.P. whose activities became marked during the second great war, and by the beginning of 1941. Government declared that they had detained as detneus 600 persons; a good number of whom were university students.<sup>19</sup>

In ( Nasik Jail ( 1932-33 ) the convicts of the civil disobedience movement like Jaya Prakash Narain; Achut Patwardhan, Asoka Mehta, Yusuf Meharally, N.G. Gore, S.M. Joshi and others discussed the problems of Indian society and projected the idea of creating a national Congress Socialist Party. " On May 17th 1934, the First All India Conference of socialists was held in Patna under the Chairmanship of Acharya Narendra Dev. Another conference was held on October 21st & 22nd 1934 at Ready Money Terrace in Bombay and the Congress socialist party ( C S P ) was formally established with the following declared objective.

The complete independ of India is our goal and by complete independence we mean, India's liberation from British imperialims and establishment of a socialist society.<sup>20</sup>

The blueprint of the economic reconstruction adopted at the conference advocated as follows :

All power to the toiling masses economic planning, nationalization of key industries, governer's control over foreign trade, abolition of feudalism and landlordism without compensation, redistribution of land and co-operative and collective farming.

These Congress Socialists were opposed to the willingness of the Congress to participate in legislative activities in pre-independence period, and wanted the Congress to pursue a more revolutionary socialist policy in the economic field. Marxian influence was write large on an important section of the C S P. At the second conference of the CSP, held at Meertut on January 20th, 1936 a statement was issued by the party declaring that.

Marxism alone can guide the anti-imperialist forces to their ultimate destiny party members must therefore, fully understand the technique of revolution, the thory and practice of class-struggle, the nature of the state and the processes leading to the socialist society.<sup>21</sup>

The C S P leadership also admired the achievements of Soviet Russia and its party conference held at Lahore in 1938 haild that country as " the only great power struggling for freedom and world peace." Not only this the CSP believed in close collaboration with the communist party, and motivated by

a genuine desire for " left consolidation " its annual conference held at Lahore in 1938, set its seal of approval on Unity with the communists. This collaboration was short lived and the parting of the ways.

From the very beginning the Right-wing leadership of the Congress was hostile to the programme and policies of the CSP.<sup>22</sup> The Congress working committee, which met at Bombay on June 17th, 1934, administered a rebuke to the leadership of the CSP and passed a resolution asserting that there was no threat to property interests from the Congress. The resolution read.

While the working committee welcomes the formation of groups representing different schools of thought, it is necessary in view of loose talk about confiscation of private property and the necessity of class war, to remind congress men that the Karachi resolution neither contemplates confiscation nor advocates class war. The working committee is further of opinion that confiscation and class war are contrary to the Congress creed of non-violence.

Nehru did not join the CSP because he did not want to associate himself with any function in the Congress. He wanted to play the role of a national leader in the national movement.

He felt that any association with one group might rob him of this role. He was also not satisfied with the way of the CSP functioned. As he said, :

The Congress socialist group immediately came into conflict with the right group, but in such a way that it antagonised the large middle group and did not succeed as it might have done in coming this large anti-imperialist group with it.<sup>23</sup>

Nehru was of the view that the socialists and also the communists had failed to adopt and adjust socialism to Indian conditions. In his message to socialists on ( December 20th, 1939 ) he emphasized this point. He wrote, :

Comrade Masani, has asked me for a message to your conference. I send my greetings gladly and I hope that your deliberation will result in good to the great cause we have at heart. That cause today is best served by building up a powerful anti-imperialist front in the country. It is obvious that the National Congress is the only organization which can function as such a joint front.

As you know I am vastly interested in the socialist approach to all questions. It is right that we should understand the theory underlying this approach. This helps to clarify our

minds and give purpose to our activities. But two aspects of this question fill my own mind, one is how to apply this approach to Indian conditions, and the other is how to speak of socialism in the languages of India. I think it is often forgotten that if we are to be understood, we must speak the language of the country. I am not merely referring to the various languages of India. I am referring much more to the language which grows from a complex of associations of past history and culture and present environment, so long as we do not speak in some language which has that Indian mentality for background, we lose a great measure of our effectiveness. Merely to use words and phrases, which may have meaning for us but which are not current coin among the masses of India, is often wasted effort. It is this problem of the approach to socialism that occupies my mind how to interpret it in terms of India, hearts of the people, with its hope giving and inspiring message. That is a question which I should like a socialist to consider well.<sup>24</sup>

Nehru's attitude towards the CSP has been criticised by the Congress socialist. It is alleged that Nehru wanted to take full advantage of this group because they were ideologically nearer - in his confrontation spread the message of socialism in India ? Though he was vaguely attracted to the Fabians and Socialistic ideas during his college days in England, his

political consciousness was really stirred when he came into close contact with agrarian problems of the United provinces in India in 1920-21. " In 1920 I was totally ignorant " he says of labour conditions in factories or fields, and my political outlook was entirely bourgeois.<sup>25</sup> This confrontation with downtrodden and his visit to Soviet Russia in 1927 convinced him of the merits of socialist philosophy and he undertook the task of converting congressmen to socialism.

He says :

The burden of my speeches was always much the same. Even where I spoke on political independence and social freedom and made the former a step towards the attainment of the latter. I wanted to spread the ideology of socialism especially among Congress workers and the intelligentsia, for those people who were the back bone of the national movement, though largely in terms of the narrowest nationalism.<sup>26</sup>

Was the Congress converted to the goal of socialism ? What was the class character of the Congress movement ? who were the people in control of the Congress ? Writing about the character of the Congress, Nehru wrote :

The Indian National Movement is obviously not a labour or proletarian movement . It is a bourgeois movement as its very

name implies and its objective so far has been not a change of the social order, but political independence.<sup>27</sup>

Nehru again wrote that the Congress as it was constituted could not become an instrument for agrarian reform. In 1930 " there was an ideal opportunity for a no-tax campaign, as a part of the general Civil Disobedience Movement, but " if the tenants stopped paying their rent the landlord suffered immediately. The Congress as a whole was a purely nationalist body and included many middling zimindars and a few of the with the Right-wing leadership in the Congress, but he would not join the party formally. Nehru had set himself the task of spreading socialist ideology in the Congress and the country. This was precisely the task of the CSP.<sup>28</sup> In t spite of this identity of objective the two could not combine their efforts. This is how Nehru tried to develop his own leadership, political ideas, taking into consideration the typical problems of Indian society. This does not mean that he was not influenced by Gandhian ideas. Besides he talked of the need of 'language' the language of the people, to turn them socialistic. He was against the use of jargous in political preaching. Nehru thus represented the masses, and he was not hesitant in criticising the congress movement where ever and when ever essential. His was the task of nation builder, as a leader of India.

: NOTES & REFERENCES :

- 1) Presidential Address to the National Congress, Lahore, December 1929. Jawaharlal Nehru, India's Freedom, Unwin Books, London, 1962, p. 14.
- 2) Ibid., p. 32.
- 3) Writing about the Principles of National self-determination propounded by the Soviet leaders, K.M. Pannikar remarks, This was indeed an explosive statement and all the nations of Asia, struggling for freedom, heard it with a new hope, Asia and Western Dominance, p. 250.
- 4) Quoted in Zafar Imam, " The effects of the Russian Revolution on India 1917-1919" in S.N. Mukharjee (Ed.) The movement for National Freedom in India, (St. Anthong's papers No. 18. South Asian Series, Oxford, 1966) p. 75.
- 5) R. Palme Dutt, India Today and Tomorrow, People's Publishing House, Delhi.
- 6) Quoted by Joan Beauchamp, British Imperialism in India (1935) p. 135.
- 7) 'Hijrat' means leaving one's country in order to avoid continuous repression. The propogandists of Hijrat asserted that British tyranny could no longer be tolerated and there was no other way than that of leaving the country. Refer to Muzabbar Ahmad. The communist party of India and its formation Abroad ( National Books, Agency, Culcatta, 1962) p. 13.

- 8) Jawaharlal Nehru, An Autobiography, Allied Publisher, Bombay, 1962, p. 591.
- 9) Jawaharlal Nehru, Glimpses of World History, Lindsay Drummond, London 1949, p. 586.
- 10) Autobiography, p. 591.
- 11) Jawaharlal Nehru, A Bunch of Old letters, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1960, p. 363.
- 12) Autobiography , p. 163.
- 13) Ibid., p. 48.
- 14) Ibid., p. 529.
- 15) Ibid., p. 366.
- 16) Ibid., p. 368.
- 17) Ibid., p. 407.
- 18) B.T. Ranadive, " Crisis in National Leadership, " Congress ~~Socialist~~ Socialist, 25th April, 1936.
- 19) Pattabhi Sitaramayya, The History of the Indian National Congress, Vol. II, (1935-47) Padam Publications Bombay 1947, p. 7. Also refer to M.R. Dandavate: (Evolution of Socialist Policies and perspectives 1934-64, Loka Mitra Publication, Bombay, 1964.
- 20) Cf. Acharya Narendra Dev, " Socialism and the National Revolution, " in Yusuf Meharally (Ed.) Socialism and the National Revolution, Padma Publications, Bombay, 1949; and "aya Prakash Narain;" Towards struggle " in Ibid.

- 21) P.S.Lakhappal, History of the Congress Socialist Party  
P. 144.
- 22) As Sampurnanand Cone of the founders of the (SP) writes  
" This hostility was marked from the very beginning. The  
old leaders considered the party a challenge to their  
authority and did everything in their power to submit  
and reduce ti to importance, Memories and Reflections,  
Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961, p. 76.
- 23) Doro Norman, Nehru The First Sixty Years, Asia Publishing  
House, Bombay, 1965, Vol. I, pp. 575-76.
- 24) Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Op., Cit., p. 15.
- 25) Ibid., p. 49.
- 26) Ibid., P. 182.
- 27) Ibid., p. 362.
- 28) C.F. Narendra Dev's Presidential Address to the first  
session of the All India Socialist Congress : " Our  
endeavour is to influence the nationalist Movement. The  
Congress today may accept socialist programm only in a  
mutilated form but the whole drive of the nation will be  
in that direction, because the responsibility for carrying  
on the struggle for national independence is more and  
more developing upon the masses, Address to Patna Conference  
p. 8. Also see Socialism and National Revolution, p. 83.

.....

